

Feasibility of Higher Order Thinking Skill-Based on Descriptive Text Assessment Instruments Developed on 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP Methodist Wesley Medan)

Lentare Pinta Sianturi¹, Biner Ambarita², Khairil Ansari²

¹Master Student in State University of Medan (Unimed), Medan, Indonesia

²Lecturer in State University of Medan (Unimed), Medan, Indonesia

sianturilentare@gmail.com

Abstract : *The development of a descriptive text assessment instrument must be considered in the regularity of the questions in accordance with the question grid. Based on the results of observations at Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan, the teacher gave a questionnaire only in the form of essay questions (explanations) even though, in tests or tests carried out it was actually not just essays, but multiple choices. Feasibility of Higher Order Thinking Skill-Based Descriptive Text Assessment Instruments which is Developed on 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan is eligible and suitable for use in learning. Based on material experts, evaluation experts, Indonesian language teacher assessments and student responses.*

Keyword : *assessment; nature of higher order thinking skill (HOTS); students*

I. Introduction

Based on the Trends in the International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Indonesia's ranking for 2007 was 35th in 49 countries and in 2011 was ranked 40th out of 42 countries. The low achievement of Indonesian students is caused by the large number of test material in TIMSS which are not found in the Indonesian curriculum and the questions developed by TIMSS require students to think low and high level (The Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013: 2).

2013 curriculum on dominant Indonesian subjects uses material about text. One of them is the description text in the 7th grade odd semester junior high school. Mahsun (2014: 28) explains, "Description text is text that has a social purpose to describe an object / object individually based on its physical characteristics." The description presented in this text must be the specific feature of the object described. Therefore, the text description has a thinking structure: a general description, a description of the parts. In the basic competencies of writing description text students must be able to write description text based on the structure of the content and the language characteristics of the description text. The structure of the contents of the description text consists of the title, general description, and description of the part. The characteristic of the description text language is to contain the term, containing conjunctions that indicate the existence of a stage, the sentence structure using conjunctions that show the description of an object, explaining the condition (describing an object rather than telling the past).

In accordance with the 2013 curriculum, 7th grade students of junior high school are expected to be able to achieve core competencies and basic competencies. In learning at school most students get difficulties in the text description material. Development in assessment instruments based on high-level thinking skills in descriptive text material is expected to enable students to achieve the basic competencies in learning carried out in the learning process and can measure students' abilities. The accuracy of the teacher in selecting and using

assessment instruments used in the description text material greatly influences the learning process, but in this case the teacher is still inaccurate.

The results of the analysis show that the instruments in the student book are inadequate because each task is only 5 questions. The instruments used in cognitive assessment are questions that tend to test aspects of memory, while questions that train students' high-level thinking skills are not yet available, so it is necessary to develop a high-level thinking assessment instrument. Thus, the instruments of high-level thinking that are developed will help students exercise the ability to reason, analyze and express their opinions.

The development of a descriptive text assessment instrument must be considered in the regularity of the questions in accordance with the question grid. Based on the results of observations at Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan, the teacher gave a questionnaire only in the form of essay questions (explanations) even though, in tests or tests carried out it was actually not just essays, but multiple choices. The previously created grid should be in the form of multiple choices and essays.

Based on the observations of the researchers and interviews with 2 Indonesian language teachers at Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan stated that the questions used tended to test the memory aspects that lacked training in high-level thinking skills of students or HOTS, even though some Competency Standards (SK) and Competencies Basic (KD) on Indonesian language subjects can be developed about HOTS. Of the 10 multiple choice questions the description text material studied, all fall into the category of low-level thinking, namely levels c1, c2, and c3. The problem faced by teachers was also the ability of teachers to develop HOTS assessment instruments is still lacking and the unavailability of assessment instruments specifically designed to train HOTS or high-level thinking skills of students. This is consistent with the results of Thompson's research (2008: 96) which states that the interpretation of mathematics teachers from 32 people had difficulty interpreting thinking skills in Bloom's Taxonomy and making test items for higher-order thinking. description text assessment instruments so that HOTS-based description text assessment instruments need to be developed.

The fact that happened in school based on the results of an Indonesian teacher's questionnaire at Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan proved that the teacher had not made the questions until high-level thinking, namely analyzing, judging, and creating. The questions made by the teacher still tend to be at the stage of remembering, understanding, and applying. According to the new Bloom Taxonomy version of Anderson (2010) in the cognitive domain consists of six levels, namely remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Krathwohl's revision is often used in formulating learning goals that we often know with the terms C1 to C6. Krathwohl's first three levels of Bloom's new Taxonomy, namely remembering, understanding, and applying are LOT (Lower Order Thinking), while the next three levels are analyzing (analyzing, parsing), evaluating (evaluating), and creating (creating) is HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills). So that this study will focus on the three cognitive processes contained in the revised Bloom Taxonomy. "Three cognitive processes including HOTS include analyzing, evaluating, and creating" (Churches, 2008: 4).

Based on the above problems, it is necessary to develop HOTS based assessment instruments in the form of HOTS test questions in the form of multiple choices and a description of the class VII SMP text description material. The HOTS-based assessment instrument developed aims to produce a valid and reliable instrument for measuring HOTS of students.

II. Literature Review

2.1 Definition of Assessment

Assessment cannot be separated from the quality of education because results are one indicator of the quality of education. The implementation of the assessment in learning is an activity carried out by the teacher to obtain information objectively, sustainably and comprehensively about the process and learning outcomes achieved by students, the results of which are used as a basis for determining subsequent treatment. This means that the assessment does not only reach the target for a moment or just one aspect, but is comprehensive and includes cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects.

Haris (2013: 54) suggests "Assessment is a general term that includes all methods commonly used to assess the performance of individuals or groups of students." The assessment process includes collecting evidence that shows the learning achievement of students. Assessment is an activity carried out by the teacher to obtain information in an objective, sustainable, and comprehensive manner about the process and learning outcomes achieved by students whose results are used as a basis for determining subsequent treatment. Furthermore Sunarti and Selly (2014: 7) said, "Assessment is part of learning activities carried out to determine the achievement of student competencies which include knowledge, skills, and attitudes." Related also to the opinions of Trotter and Walsh in his book entitled *Teaching and Learning* (1990: 109) said, In the continuous assessment mode, the teacher can also suffer from examiners and rapport. Failing a student can be a traumatic experience for both the axer and the student which can be interpreted as follows: in a continuous assessment, the teacher is also one of the evaluators / test takers who understands their students. Appraisal mismatches can be a measure of teacher failure for students. Furthermore, Agus (2010: 135) said, "Class assessment / assessment is a procedure used to obtain information about the achievements or performance of students whose results will be used for evaluation." Educational Assessment according to the Minister of National Education Number 20 of 2007 concerning Educational Assessment Standards is the process of gathering and processing information to determine the learning outcomes of students.

2.2 Nature of Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS)

Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) is the ability to think that is not just recall (recall), restate (restate), or refer without doing processing (recite). Thinking means finding, analyzing, creating, reflecting, and arguing. Thinking is not just knowing, remembering, and repeating. Creative problem solving includes (analyzing unfamiliar situations, evaluating problem solving strategies and creating new problem solving methods).

Thinking is a cognitive process for acquiring knowledge of Nickerson, 1985 (in Lilisari, 2000). Based on the process of thinking can be grouped in basic thinking and complex thinking. Complex thinking processes called high order thinking skill include problem solving, decision making, critical thinking and creative thinking. According to Sanjaya (2009: 12) explains that thinking ability requires the ability to remember and understand, therefore the ability to remember is the most important part in developing thinking skills. high order thinking skill includes the ability to explore a problem, question or situation, interrogate all available information about a problem to a solution or hypnotic.

High order thinking skill involves several special abilities such as analyzing and evaluating evidence, producing rational solutions, detecting errors, expressing assumptions

implicitly and understanding the implications of the argument. In the context of learning, the development of thinking skills is aimed at several things including (1) obtaining training in critical and creative thinking to make decisions and solve problems wisely, for example flexible, reflective, curious, able to take risks, not despair, able to work and others, (2) applying knowledge, experience and skills to think more practically both inside and outside of school, (3) producing creative and innovative ideas or creations, (4) overcoming rash thinking ways rush, vague and narrow, (5) improve cognitive and affective aspects, and so on the development of their intellect, and (6) be open in accepting and giving opinions, making judgments based on reason and evidence, and dare to give views and criticism.

2.3. Development of Instrument Descriptive Text Based on Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS)

The development of cognitive assessment instruments in the form of Higher Order Thinking Skills requires criteria both in terms of the form and the content of the subject matter. The technique of writing Higher Order Thinking Skill questions in the form of multiple choices or descriptions in general is the same as writing low level questions, but there are several characteristics that distinguish them.

Devi in Rochmah & Asih (2015: 29) argues that there are several ways that can be used as guidelines by writing authors to write items that require high-level thinking, namely the material to be asked is measured by behavior according to the cognitive domain Bloom revision at the analysis level (C4), evaluation (C5), and creation (C6). Each question is given a basic question (stimulus) and a question of measuring critical thinking skills. In order for the items to be able to demand high-level thinking, each item is always given a basic question (stimulus) in the form of sources or reading material such as: reading texts, paragraphs, texts, drama, fragments of novels / stories / fables, poems, cases, pictures, graphics , photos, formulas, tables, lists of words / symbols, examples, maps, and films / sound recordings.

2.4 Descriptive Text

Descriptive come from verbs to describe (English). The description text is an essay whose main ideas are conveyed by describing objects, places or events that become the topic to the reader clearly. Descriptive paragraph is a paragraph that aims to give the impression or impression to the reader of the objects, ideas, places, events, and the like that the author wants to convey. A good descriptive paragraph can make the reader as if they can see, hear, feel, or be involved in the events described by the author (Wiyanto, 2004: 64-65). The same thing was expressed by Waluyo (2014: 73) that the descriptive text is a type of text that functions to draw objects as clearly as possible so that the reader or listener seems to see the object. While Mulyadi (2013: 70) explains that the descriptive text is a text that contains an impression of what is observed obtained through the senses so that the reader as if to see and feel an object as a whole as experienced by the author.

III. Research Methods

This research method uses Research and Deveplomend (R & D) methods. Sugiono (2010: 407) says that research and development methods are research methods used to produce certain products and test the effectiveness of certain products. Furthermore Putra (2012: 67) explains that R & D is a research method that intentionally, systematically aims /

directed to find, formulate, improve, develop, produce, test the effectiveness of products, models, methods / strategies, methods of procedure that are superior, effective , efficient, productive and meaningful.

The ultimate goal of this research is to develop a product that can be used in learning. The scope is the development of HOTS-based assessment instruments in descriptive text material on 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan. Development of this assessment instrument is expected to be able to improve students' high order thinking skill in the descriptive text.

The population of research and development is teachers and students of 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan. To see the effectiveness of the product being developed, the researcher took a sample using a random sampling technique. Researchers took the subject of the study amounted to 30 students. The object of this study is the development of a text learning learning assessment instrument for 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan based on the 2013 curriculum.

IV. Discussion

The feasibility of the assessment instrument is obtained from the results of the validation and assessment provided by the material expert and evaluation expert. Through the results of these assessments, the data obtained are then analyzed to determine whether or not the appraisal instrument is in the form of assessment instrument of descriptive text based on high order thinking skill to be tested at a later stage. The process for obtaining the feasibility of the assessment instrument is divided into two, namely material feasibility and evaluation feasibility. For material feasibility, validated aspects include: 1) eligibility of content, 2) feasibility of presentation, 3) language feasibility. While for evaluation feasibility, the validated aspects include: 1) material feasibility / substance, 2) construction feasibility, 3) language feasibility. The process in determining the feasibility of the assessment instruments developed can be seen in table 1 below.

Table 1 Process of Feasibility of Assessment Instruments

Feasibility of Assessment Instruments	Validation Process
1. Feasibility of content 2. Feasibility of presentation 3. Language assessment	Validated by material experts: 1. Mara Untung Ritonga, S.S., M.Hum.,Ph.D. 2. Prof. Amrin Saragih, M. A., Ph.D.
1. Feasibility of substance material 2. Construction feasibility 3. Language worthiness	Validated by evaluation experts: 1. Prof. Dr. Paningkat Siburian, M.Pd. 2. Prof. Dr. Sumarno, M.Pd.

4.1 Validation of Material Experts

Validation of the contents of the material to the product is intended to find out the opinions of experts on the feasibility of content, the feasibility of presentation, and the feasibility of language. This validation was carried out by Mara Untung Ritonga, S.S., M. Hum., Ph.D. and Prof. Amrin Saragih, M.A., Ph.D. who is a Lecturer at Medan State University. Assessment was carried out to obtain information on the quality of assessment

instruments developed to improve the quality of learning in the Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan.

The results of the validation and assessment by the material experts in each aspect of the overall assessment are determined by the average score and the criteria respectively. The results of the study were analyzed to determine whether or not the appraisal instrument developed in the form of an instrument in the text material of high-level thinking-based descriptions to be used.

A. Feasibility of content

Feasibility of content, namely the appropriateness of substance or content of material presented or presented in the assessment instrument developed. The instrument for evaluating the description text that was developed received a good response from the material experts on the aspect of content eligibility.

Table 2. Instrument Assessment by Material Experts on Content Feasibility

Sub Component	Assessment Indicator	Validator		%	Criteria
		1	2		
A. Compatibility of Materials with KI and KD	1. Completeness of material	4	3	87.5%	Good
	2. Material depth	3	4	87.5%	Good
B. Material accuracy	3. Accuracy of concepts and definitions	4	3	87.5%	Good
	4. Accuracy of facts and data	4	3	87.5%	Good
	5. Accuracy of examples and cases	4	3	87.5%	Good
	6. Accuracy of images, diagrams and illustrations of text descriptive text	4	3	87.5%	Good
	7. Accuracy of terms	4	3	87.5%	Good
	8. Accuracy of notations, symbols and icons	3	4	8.75%	Good
	9. Accuracy of references	4	3	87.5%	Good
C. Material Update	10. Compatibility of material with the development of science	4	4	100%	Excellent
	11. Use case examples in everyday life	4	4	100%	Excellent
	12. Pictures, diagrams and illustrations in everyday life	4	3	87.5%	Good
	13. Use examples of cases found in everyday life	4	4	100%	Excellent
	14. Library update	3	4	87.5%	Good
D. Encourage curiosity	15. Encourage curiosity	4	4	100%	Excellent
	16. Creating the ability to ask	4	3	87.5%	Good
Total		61	55	116	
Validation results		90.6%		Excellent	

Based on the data presented in the table above, this is inseparable from the acquisition of scores on the loyal sub-component of content eligibility. Thus, the assessment instrument developed in the aspect of content eligibility is stated to have fulfilled the demands of learning. Components of content feasibility include: a) conformity of material with KD, b) accuracy of material, c) updating of material, d) encouraging curiosity. the average number of all aspects of content eligibility is in the criteria of "Excellent" with a total percentage of 90.6%. This percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{116}{16 \times 8} \times 100 = 90.6\%$$

B. Feasibility of presentation

Feasibility of presentation, namely in the systematics and sequence of presentation of learning material in the assessment instruments developed. In the aspect of feasibility the presentation of the assessment instruments developed also received a good response from the material experts.

Table 3 Instrument Assessment by Material Experts on Feasibility of Presentation

Sub Component	Assessment Indicator	Validator		%	Criteria
		1	2		
A. Presentation Techniques	1. Systematic consistency of presentation in learning activities	4	4	100%	Excellent
	2. Creed concept	4	3	87.5%	Good
B. Learning Presentation	3. Involvement of students	4	3	87.5%	Excellent
	4. Student-centered	4	4	100%	Excellent
	5. Stimulating students' ability to solve problems	3	4	87.5%	Good
C. Presentation Completeness	6. Item items in each learning activity	3	3	75%	Enough
	7. Answer key	4	4	100%	Excellent
	8. Preface	4	3	87.5%	Good
	1. Table of Content	4	4	100%	Excellent
	2. Glossary	4	3	87.5%	Good
	3. References	4	4	100%	Excellent
Total		42	39		81
Validation results		92.04%			Excellent

Based on the data presented in the table above, this can not be separated from the acquisition of scores in each sub-component of presentation eligibility. Thus, the assessment instrument developed in the aspect of feasibility of presentation is stated to have fulfilled the demands of learning. Components of presentation feasibility include: a) presentation techniques, b) learning presentation, c) presentation. The average number of all aspects of the feasibility of presentation are in the criteria of "Excellent" with a total percentage of 92.04%. The percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{81}{11 \times 8} \times 100 = 92.04\%$$

C. Language Richness

Language feasibility is the feasibility of using the language used to express ideas in the assessment instruments developed. In the feasibility aspect the assessment instrument language developed also received a good response from material experts. Data from the validation by material experts on the feasibility of language can be seen in table 4 below.

Table 4. Instrument Assessment by Material Experts on Language Feasibility

Sub Component	Assessment Indicator	Validator		%	Criteria
		1	2		
A. Straightforward	1. Accuracy of sentences	3	4	87.5%	Good
	2. Effectiveness of sentences	3	4	87.5%	Good
	3. Stiffness of terms	4	4	100%	Excellent
B. Communicative	4. Message readability	4	3	87.5%	Good
	5. Accuracy of language use	4	3	87.5%	Good
C. Dialogue and Interactive	6. The ability to motivate messages and information	4	3	87.5%	Good
	7. The ability to encourage critical thinking	4	4	100%	Excellent
D. Conformity with the level of development of students	8. Conformity of students' intellectual development	4	3	87.5%	Good
	9. Conformity with the level of emotional development of students.	4	3	87.5%	Good
E. Allegiance and integration of the mindset	10. Allegiance and integration between learning activities	4	3	87.5%	Good
	11. Allegiance and integration between paragraphs	4	4	100%	Excellent
F. Use of terms, symbols and icons	12. Consistency in the use of terms	4	4	100%	Excellent
	13. Consistency of using symbols and icons	4	3	87.5%	Excellent
Total		50	45	95	
Validation Results		91%		Excellent	

Based on the data presented in the table above, this is inseparable from the acquisition of scores on the faithful sub-component of language feasibility. Thus, the assessment instrument developed in the aspect of language feasibility is stated to have fulfilled the demands of learning. The average number of all aspects of language feasibility is in the criteria of "Excellent" with a total percentage of 91%. This percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{95}{13 \times 8} \times 100 = 91\%$$

Note: suggestions from the material expert validators in writing and verbally are generally listed in the following table 4.

Table 5. Suggestions from the Material Validator

No	Suggestion
1	Add text source

2	Text must be better known by students (contextual)
3	Text added with map
4	Every question about the description must have a complete answer

1) Validation of Evaluation experts

Validation of learning evaluation was carried out by Prof. Dr. Paningkat Siburian, M.Pd. and Prof. Dr. Sumarno, M.Pd. who is a Lecturer at Medan State University. Assessment was carried out to obtain information on the quality of assessment instruments developed to improve the quality of learning in the Charles Wesley Methodist Private Junior High School in the text description material.

The results of the validation and evaluation by the evaluation expert on each aspect of the overall assessment are determined by the average score and the criteria respectively. The results of the study were analyzed to determine whether or not the appraisal instrument developed in the form of an instrument in the text material of high-level thinking-based descriptions to be used. The average percentage of the results of the evaluation by expert evaluations of the assessment instruments developed, there are three aspects of assessment, namely: material / substance, construction and language feasibility.

2) Multiple choice eligibility

Sub Component	Assessment Indicator	Validator		%	Criteria
		1	2		
A. Material / substance	1. Questions according to KD	3	4	87.5%	Good
	2. Questions in accordance with indicators (demanding multiple choice written test)	4	4	100%	Excellent
	3. Questions in accordance with the preparation of the grid	4	4	100%	Excellent
	4. Choice of homogeneous and logical answers	3	4	87.5%	Good
	5. There is only one answer key	4	4	100%	Excellent
B. Construction	6. The subject matter is formulated briefly, clearly and firmly	3	4	87.5%	Good
	7. The subject matter of the question and the answer key are the only questions that are needed	4	3	87.5%	Good
	8. The subject matter does not give an answer key hint	3	4	87.5%	Good
	9. The subject matter is free and the question is double negative	3	3	75%	Enough
	10. The choice of answers is homogeneous in terms of material questions	4	3	87.5%	Good
	11. The choice of logical answers is viewed in terms of material questions	4	4	100%	Excellent
	12. The answer choice length is	3	4	87.5%	Good

	relatively the same				
	13. The choice of answer does not use the statement "all the answers above are wrong / correct"	4	4	100%	Excellent
	14. Choice of answers in alphabetical form	3	4	87.5%	Good
	15. The question item does not depend on the answer to the previous question	3	3	75.0%	Enough
C. Language	16. The question formulation is easy to understand	4	3	87.5%	Good
	17. Does not contain multiple interpretations	3	4	87.5%	Good
	18. Do not use local language	3	4	87.5%	Good
	19. Guided by PUEBI writing rules	3	4	87.5%	Good
Total		65	71	136	
Validation Results		89.4%		Good	

Based on the data presented in the table above, this can not be separated from the acquisition of scores in each sub-component of feasibility in the multiple choice assessment instrument. Thus, the assessment instrument developed in the aspect of multiple choice feasibility is stated to have fulfilled the demands of learning. The average number of all aspects of the feasibility of multiple choice instruments is in the criteria of "good" with a total percentage of 89.4%. The percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{136}{19 \times 8} \times 100 = 89.4\%$$

3) Validation of Evaluation experts

Sub Component	Assessment Indicator	Validator		%	Criteria
		1	2		
A. Material / substance	1. Questions according to KD	3	4	87.5%	Good
	2. Questions in accordance with indicators (require written test description form)	4	4	100%	Excellent
	3. Limitations of the questions and answers expected are appropriate	4	3	87.5%	Good
	4. Questions in accordance with the preparation of the grid	4	3	87.5%	Good

	5. Fill in the material in question according to the level of type of school	4	4	100%	Excellent
B. Construction	6. There are clear instructions on how to work on the problem	3	4	87.5%	Good
	7. Question formulation and clear and firm	3	3	87.5%	Good
	8. Use the question word or command that demands a description answer	3	4	87.5%	Good
	9. There are scoring guidelines	3	4	87.5%	Good
C. Language	10. The formulation of the question is easy to understand	4	3	87.5%	Good
	11. Do not use multiple interpretations	4	3	87.5%	Good
	12. Do not use local language	4	4	100%	Excellent
	13. Guided by PUEBI writing rules	4	3	87.5%	Good
Total		47	46	93	
Validation Results		89.42%		Good	

Based on the data presented in the table above, this is inseparable from the acquisition of scores in each sub-component of eligibility in the description form evaluation instrument. Thus, the assessment instrument developed on the feasibility aspect of the description form has been stated to have fulfilled the demands of learning. The average number of aspects of the feasibility of the description form instruments is in the criteria of "Good" with a total percentage of 89.42%. This percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{93}{13 \times 8} \times 100 = 89.42\%$$

Table 6. Suggestions from the Evaluation Expert Validator

No	Suggestion
1	Fix description descriptors
2	Rubrics are said to be valid if some of the score scorers are the same

4) Results of Assessment of Indonesian Teachers on assessment instruments

The Indonesian teacher's assessment of the product development assessment instrument was carried out by Lina Meriaty, M.Pd. and Eva Marpaung, M.Pd. teacher in Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan. The assessment of instruments in the form of text instruments based on high order thinking skill developed was carried out to obtain

information that will be used to improve the quality of products developed. The results of the assessment are in the form of scores on the components of learning that are in accordance with the learning that is in accordance with the learning of Indonesian language especially in the text description material.

Each assessment result will be classified with the percentage criteria table for the appearance of indicators on the assessment instruments as follows:

No	Answer	Score
A	Excellent	90% - 100%
B	Good	80% - 89%
C	Enough	60% - 79%
D	Fair	40% - 59%
E	Unsatisfied	< 40%

(Arikunto, 2013:46)

Table 7. Data on Indonesian Teachers' Response to the Assessment Instrument

No	Indicator	Respondents		%	Criteria
		1	2		
1	The overall appearance of the assessment instrument is interesting.	4	3	88%	Good
2	The language used in the assessment instrument is easy to understand.	4	4	100%	Excellent
3	The presentation of material in the assessment instrument is arranged systematically.	4	3	88%	Good
4	Text in the assessment instrument is in accordance with the learning objectives.	3	4	88%	Good
5	Use of question instructions in class assessment instruments.	4	4	100%	Excellent
6	The instrument of learning assessment stimulates high order thinking skill (HOTS).	4	4	100%	Excellent
7	The types of activities in the assessment instrument vary.	4	3	88%	Good
8	Test questions in the assessment instrument are in accordance with learning.	4	3	88%	Good
9	Use of time in accordance with existing rules.	3	3	75%	Enough
10	The assessment instrument helps students think high-level in the text description material.	4	3	88%	Good
11	Instrument valuation is different from the usual teaching material.	4	4	100%	Excellent
12	Assessment instruments can be studied independently by students.	3	4	88%	Good

13	Assessment instruments train students to enrich students' knowledge.	4	3	88%	Good
14	Assessment instruments make it easier for teachers to evaluate students	3	4	88%	Good
15	The assessment instrument makes it easier for students to express their opinions in the form of tests	3	4	88%	Good
Total		55	53	108	
Validation Results		90%		Excellent	

The results of the teacher's response to the assessment instruments instrument of high-level thinking-based descriptions developed have a total percentage of 90% with the criteria of "Excellent". Thus, the assessment instrument developed can meet the demands of learning needs that will be taught to 7th students. This percentage is obtained from the calculation:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{108}{15 \times 8} \times 100 = 90\%$$

In addition to providing value, the teacher also provides input in the form of comments and suggestions related to aspects assessed in a high order thinking skill based assessment instrument. The following are suggestions and criticisms given by the teacher.

Table 8. Teacher's Comments and Suggestions for Assessment Instruments

Suggestions and critics
1. Pay attention to the use of punctuation (dots, commas)
2. Pay attention to the use of effective sentences

Table 9. Results of Validation of Aspects of Learning Materials

No.	Aspect	Number of Assessment Scores	Percentase	Criteria
1	Content Feasibility	116	90.6%	Excellent
2	Feasibility of Presentation	81	92.04%	Excellent
3	Language Feasibility	95	91%	Excellent
Average Earnings Percentage			91.25%	Excellent

The results of the validation on the evaluation aspect are divided into two aspects of assessment, namely, validation of multiple choice assessment instruments and description validation instruments. The results of the assessment on the validation of multiple choice instruments are obtained by the criteria "good". The results of the evaluation on the description instrument validation are obtained by the criteria "Good". The total assessment results from both aspects are obtained by the criteria "Good".

The indicator for teacher assessment consists of fifteen different statements. The fifteen statements received a response that supports the development of text assessment instruments based on higher order thinking skills. The results of assessments conducted by Indonesian language teachers on assessment instruments based on Higher Order Thinking Skills were obtained in the criteria of "Excellent" with a score of 108 (90%). This means that the description text assessment instrument based on Higher Order Thinking Skills that has been

developed can meet the demands of learning needs to be taught to 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan.

Based on the results obtained from the series of stages of development of Higher Order Thinking Skills based assessment instruments declared feasible according to the results of the validation of material experts, evaluation experts, and teacher responses to the criteria of "Excellent"

V. Conclusion

Feasibility of Higher Order Thinking Skill-Based Descriptive Text Assessment Instruments which is Developed on 7th Grade Students of Junior High School (SMP) Methodist Charles Wesley Medan is eligible and suitable for use in learning. Based on material experts, evaluation experts, Indonesian language teacher assessments and student responses. The product is known to be feasible to use after using the validity analysis of the product using the Sugiyono formula, then the classification of scores in the form of percentages is interpreted with qualitative sentences. The product is said to be suitable for use when it reaches a score of $61\% \leq X < 80\%$ with the criteria of "good" and a score of $81\% \leq X < 100\%$ with the criteria "very good" with a note "without any revision". this shows:

- a. material expert validation after being combined with material experts 1 and 2 on the content feasibility assessment was in very good criteria (90.6%), the feasibility of presentation was in excellent criteria (92.04%) and the feasibility of language was in very good criteria (91%)
- b. expert evaluation validation after being combined with evaluation experts 1 and 2 on the validation assessment of multiple choice instruments is in the criteria of good (89.4%), in the validation assessment the description assessment instrument is in the good criteria (89.42%).
- c. The results of the teacher's questionnaire responses to the assessment instruments are based on Higher Order Thinking Skills according to the average teacher by 90% in the excellent category.

References

- Arikunto. 2013. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta: Jakarta
- Arifin, Zainal. 2012. *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Citapustaka Media
- Budiman, Agus & Jailani. 2014. *Pengembangan Instrumen Asesment Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) Pada Mata Pelajaran Matematika SMP Kelas VIII Semester 1*. Jurnal Riset Pendidikan Matematika, 1(2): 139-151. Diakses pada 10 Oktober 2018
- Djiwandono, Soenardi. 2011. *Tes Bahasa Pegangan bagi Pengajar Bahasa*. Jakarta Barat: Indeks
- Ennis, R.H.1985. *Goals for A Critical Thinking Curriculum*. Costa, A.L. (Ed). *Developing Minds A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, Virginia: Associationfor Supervisions and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
- Filsaime, D. 2008. *Menguak Rahasia Berpikir Kritis dan Kreatif*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka
- Krulik, S. dan Rudnick, J.A. 1999. *Innovatiev Tasks to Improve Critical and Creative Thinking Skills*. Reston: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc. 2 (1)138-145
- Krathwohl, Bloom dan Masia. 1964. *The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II*

- Krathwohl, D.R. 2002. *A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview- Theory into Practice*, College of Education, The Ohio State University Learning Domains or Bloom's Taxonomy: The Three Types of Learning, tersedia di www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.htm (24 Agustus 2018)
- Kusaeri. 2014. *Acuan dan Teknik Penilaian Proses dan Hasil Belajar dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media
- Liliasari. 2000. *Model pembelajaran untuk meningkatkan Keterampilan Berpikir Konseptual Tingkat Tinggi Calon Guru IPA*, Makalah Seminar Nasional Permasalahan dan Alternatif Pemecahan Masalah Pendidikan MIPA Malang. UNM.
- Mahsun. 2014. *Teks dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada
- Mohammed, Gulistan Saidol., et.al. 2015. *Higher Order Thinking Skill Among Secondary School Students in Science Learning. The Malasyan Online Journal of Educational Science*, Vol 3 (3): 13-20. <http://www.mojes.net/frontend/articles/pdf/v03i03/v03-i03-02.pdf>. Accessed August 1, 2018
- Narayanan, S. & Adithan, M. 2015. *Analysis of Question Papers in Engineering Course with Respect to Hots (Higher Order Thinking Skill)*. American Journal of Engineering Education (AJEE), Vol. 6. No. 1. pp:1-10
- Nufus, Hayatun dkk. 2017. *Pengembangan Instrumen Penilaian Sikap Berbasis Kurikulum 2013 pada Pelajaran Kimia SMA*. Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Indonesia. Vol 5 No 01. Diakses Januari 2018
- Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. 2010. *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. Yogyakarta: BPFY-Yogyakarta
- Nuriadin, Ishaq dan Krisna Satrio Perbowo. 2013. *Analisis Korelasi Kemampuan Berpikir Kreatif Matematik terhadap Hasil belajar Matematika Peserta Didik SMP Negeri 3 Luragung Kuningan Jawa Barat*. Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Matematika STKIP Siliwangi Bandung. 2 (10), 65-74
- Permendikbud Nomor 23 Tahun 2016. *Standar Penilaian Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Permendikbud No. 66 tahun 2013. *Standar Penilaian Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Pohl. 2000. *Learning to Think, Thinking to Learn*: tersedia di www.purdue.edu/geri
- Rochmah, Nur Laillily & Asih Widi Widiastuti. 2015. *Analisis Soal Tipe Higher Order Thinking Skill (HOTS) dalam Soal UN Kimia SMA Rayon B Tahun 2012/2013*. Kaunia. Vol 11. No 1: 27-39. Accessed on August 1, 2018.
- Rubin, Jim & Manikya Rajakaruna. 2015. *Teaching and Assessing Higher Order Thinking in the Mathematics Classroom with Clicjers*. *International Society of Educational Research*, 10 (1): 37-51. iejme.com/makale-indir/88. Accessed August 20, 2018.
- Sudijono. 2008. *Pengantar Statistik pendidikan*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sunarti dan Rahmawati, Selly. 2014. *Penilaian dalam kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Andi
- Wardany, K., Sajidan & Murni R. 2015. *Penyusunan Instrumen Tes Higher Order Thinking Skill pada Materi Ekosistem SMA Kelas X*. Seminar Nasional XII Pendidikan Biologi FKIP UNS 2015. 538-543. Accessed January 10, 2018.