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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study is to discover the levels of thinking of the twelfth graders of SMA Negeri 1 Malang by analyzing their self-generated questions in the English Final Project in terms of (1) forms of questions, (2) types of question, (3) levels of thinking, and (4) knowledge dimensions. The research design is descriptive qualitative. The sample was ninety students’ self-generated questions collected based on cluster stratified random sampling method, and analyzed by utilizing checklist as the main instrument. The findings show that: (1) most of the students’ self-generated questions are in the form of WH-Questions; (2) most of the questions are questions requiring literal comprehension, questions involving reorganization and reinterpretation, and questions of inference; (3) students’ levels of thinking are mostly found at remembering and understanding levels; (4) most of the questions require factual and conceptual knowledge.
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Teaching and assessment are simply inseparable. Assessment is needed to picture the learning, achievements, motivation, and attitudes of students based on multiple forms (O’Malley and Pierce, 1996). It is done by collecting and combining students’ tasks in order to make judgment based on certain criterion (Athanasou and Lamprianou, 2002, cited in Sulistyo, 2007). Related to that, SMA 1 Malang assigns the XII graders in all majors to work on an English final paper. It mainly focuses on Reading and Writing skills, yet, later, it is also used as the material of speaking examination. Here, teachers play their role as facilitators and supervisors. The students are required to individually pick a novel or an English article from printed media. Then, they have to retype the articles, find the meaning of difficult words and create sentences based on it, choose ten complex sentences and analyze them syntactically, analyze the main paragraph and main idea, generate explicit and implicit questions, and choose ten sentences to translate. The interesting part is the Text Discussion consisting of students’ self-generated questions.

The section implements a post-reading technique known as Student Quiz. Students’ self-generated questions are considered as a technique which helps students in reading comprehension and critical reading. Chin (2002) states that self-generated question is a psychological tool which helps students scaffolding ideas. Remembering facts and information stated in a text intrigues students’ capability in generating a mental picture. Furthermore, in generating questions, students activate their background
knowledge—schemas—to obtain more detailed picture of information. Mostow and Chen (2011), who conducted a research on children ability in understanding narrative texts, argue that self-questioning activates reader’s background knowledge, and it can help students to self-monitor their reading comprehension. Moreover, self-generated questions indeed help students to make sense of the text (Nutall, 1982). Once students question what makes something works, they will try to analyze, evaluate, and finally create new knowledge based on the existing knowledge. In short, students will be able to develop their critical thinking skills which are needed for real life.

Moreover, through analyzing students’ self-generated questions, the students’ levels of thinking can be elicited. Teachers can use students’ question-posing to evaluate the higher-order thinking of the students (Chin, 2002). Self-questioning invokes higher-order comprehension process, for students have to make inference from the text before answering questions. In addition, Hernawati (2011) states that the ideas of stating different kind of questions can lead students to different goals representing thinking levels. To sum up, self-generated questions can be used as a tool in eliciting students’ ability in reading, and their thinking levels. Students’ ability in answering comprehension questions of a text correctly indicates an achievement, that is students’ ability to process information at a particular point of the targeted level through the questions. Related to this study, then, students’ self-generated questions actually represent their levels of thinking, because students can only create a question based on information if they have already understood it.

The background above drives the researcher to discover the students’ levels of thinking represented in the self-generated questions. To obtain clear picture, then, it is necessary to figure out what form of questions the questions are in, what type of question the questions belong to, what levels of thinking most of the questions are at, and in what knowledge dimensions most of the questions belong to. In this study, there are four theories adopted to analyze the questions. The first two theories consist of Nuttall’s (1982) idea in defining questions from its form and type. The second two theories consist of Krathwohl’s (2001) conceptualization about the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy, including levels of thinking and knowledge dimensions. Bloom’s Taxonomy has been implemented to develop critical thinking skills for students (King, 2004) for better logic and reasoning.

According to Nuttall (1982), there are four forms of questions. The first is the Yes/No Question. This form of question has the shortest answer, unless the teacher asks for explanation. The second form is the Alternative Question. It is similar to the Yes/No Question, but it offers alternatives that students have to compare before answering. The next
one is the WH-Question, which starts with *who, what, which, when, and where*. It requires factual details. The last form of question is the How/Why Question. This question probably has the longest answer because students give reasons to support their answers.

Moreover, Nuttall also conceptualized five types of questions. These types of questions are used as the recommended standard in Students Quiz the post-reading tactic. The first is (1) the Question of Literal Comprehension, which is also known as the Literal Question. The answer is clearly written in the text. The second one is (2) the Question Involving Reorganization or Reinterpretation, which requires students to put various information of the text together in order to obtain literal information. Then, there is (3) the Question of Inference in which students have to arrange pieces of information to come to an inference as the answer. There is also (4) the Question of Evaluation in which students make judgment about the text and learn to judge whether or not the writer is biased, argue about their judgment, and appreciate it. This type of questions is considered as questions for advanced students. The last one is (5) the Question of Personal Response which depends a lot on the reader. It is mostly invoked in creative writing for it needs explanation about why students feel the way they feel.

Another conceptualization of questions is based on Bloom’s Taxonomy. In 2001, Anderson and Krathwohl published their work which is popular as the Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy. The theory propose not only the concept of division of the cognitive domain or the levels of thinking into two (lower and higher-order thinking), but also the concept of knowledge dimensions, which are overlapping.

Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) classify the six levels of thinking from the lowest one to the highest into two levels: lower and higher-order thinking. The first three levels (remembering, understanding, and applying) are considered to be of the same level or as the lower-order thinking. The second upper levels (analyzing, evaluating, and creating) are categorized into higher-order thinking, which are also necessary for critical thinking and problem solving, and also useful to be used after learning activities. Moreover, each level of thinking has action words to represent the cognitive process. Several keywords for Remembering level are *define, describe, list, memories, write, select and outline* (Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, 2012). Several keywords for the Understanding level are *comprehend, convert, defend, explain, identify, discuss, give examples of, paraphrase, describe, report, interpret, give main idea, and define*. The Applying level is represented by such words as *translate, illustrate, calculate, interpret, practice, apply, operate, change, sequence, demonstrate, adapt, and draw*. At the Analyzing
level, the action words are distinguish, experiment, inspect, examine, arrange, criticize, compare, debate, analyse, relate, and categorise. Then, at the Evaluating level, the cognitive process is presented by words: judge, validate, predict, assess, score, revise, infer, determine, tell why, evaluate, defend, justify, appraise, value, argue, and criticize. The highest level, Creating, is indicated by the words compose, assemble, compile, propose, construct, plan, prepare, develop, imagine, generate, act, produce, and compile. Krathwohl (2001) also mentions another dimension termed the Knowledge Dimension which characterizes the information processed namely factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive knowledge. Factual knowledge consists of knowledge on terminology and specific details and elements. Conceptual knowledge covers classification and categorization, principle and generalization, and theories. Procedural knowledge covers the ability to do something, methods of inquiry, and criteria for using skill, algorithm, techniques, and methods. Meanwhile, meta-cognitive knowledge covers the awareness of one’s cognition, including strategic knowledge and self-knowledge. The overlapping dimensions create Taxonomy Table that one can utilize to construct ideal question related to the thinking level and knowledge gained.

METHOD

The design of this study is descriptive qualitative. The objective of the study is to elicit students’ level of thinking reflected in the self-generated questions constructed by the twelfth graders of SMA 1 Malang. The school is located at Jalan Tugu Utara No. 1 Malang, East Java. It is a favorite senior high school, and has been one of the RSBI schools in Malang since 2008. As a prospective international school, the school adopts the Cambridge Curriculum and harmonizes it with school-based curriculum in its international standard class (Maulidyah, 2010). The subjects of the study are the twelfth graders of 2011/2012. The researcher, with the help of the teachers implemented judgmental sampling in collecting the data. The main data of this study are the students’ self-generated questions which are included in the chapter of Text Discussion. Nine papers were chosen as the samples to get ninety explicit and implicit questions to analyze.

There are only two instruments utilized in this study. The first instrument is the researcher herself. The second instrument is the checklist. This checklist is used to classify and analyze the data. It is constructed based on several criteria derived from the theories of forms of questions, types of questions, levels of thinking, and knowledge dimensions. The checklist is constructed by the researcher herself, consists of the columns for forms of questions, types of questions, levels of thinking, and knowledge dimensions.
In the data collection, the researcher implemented cluster stratified random sampling. The samples were taken based on judgment sampling in which teacher’s opinion is taken into consideration in picking the sample. Based on the daily performance, the teacher picked several papers from each major, and categorized them into high, average, and low classes. After that, the researcher randomly picked one paper to represent each classification from each major. They are three papers from each major as the sample of high class, the average class, and the low class. Of three hundred papers, nine were selected. After that, the researcher took the Text Discussions and eliminated the other chapters of the English final project and collected ninety questions from the nine papers.

Furthermore, the researcher analyzed the data step by step. The first step was categorizing. The data were categorized into three classes; high, average, and low. After that, the students’ self-generated questions were categorized based on the major; Natural Science, Social Science, and Language Science. Lastly, they were categorized based on the original assignment of the teacher into two types of questions: explicit and implicit questions. Moreover, each question was coded. Each code consists of three characters. The first character refers the checklist code from the highest class to the lowers class (A, B, C, D, E, and F). The second character refers to the students’ major. There are A, S, and B to represent Natural Science class, Social Science class, and Language Science class. The third character refers to the question numbering. Then, the questions were tabulated into the checklist provided. Then, the data were analyzed. The researcher determined the questions’ forms and types. After that, the researcher categorized the level of thinking and the knowledge dimension based on the action verb used in the questions. In addition, the researcher also noted down the additional information, such as grammatical error in the Note column. Then, the sum of each category was counted. The results were presented in the forms of number and percentage. The last step of data analysis was drawing conclusion. The results of the study were interpreted in order to find the answer of research problems; the forms of questions that most frequently occurred, the types of questions, students’ levels of thinking, and the knowledge dimensions.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The findings show the results of analyzing students’ self-generated questions. They are mostly pictured in numbers. From ninety questions, as many 77.8% or 70 questions are WH-Questions. This is significantly higher than the other three forms of questions. However, more heterogeneous results are found in the types of questions. Question Type 1 or the
Question of Literal Comprehension scores 33.4% or more than one-third of the total number of questions. After that, around 50% or as many as thirty-nine questions constructed by students require the Level of Remembering. However, most questions are also categorized in Conceptual Knowledge, pictured by forty-eight questions or as many as 53.3%.

**Forms of Questions as Reflected in Students’ Self-Generated Questions**

The results of analyzing students’ self-generated questions based on the form shows relatively homogeneous data. Among the ninety self-generated questions analyzed, only one question (1.1%) is Yes/No Question. The only question is *When Dan asked Vanessa to transfer to the poetry or film class, did Vanessa actually agree?* The second form, Alternative Answer, also has similar results. Only two questions (2.2%) are alternative questions. These questions are *Do you think the writer agree or disagree with Confucianism return in China?* and *Do you think Grace is already enter the haunted house or still in the entrance of the house?* However, the number increases drastically when it comes to the form of WH-Question. Seventy questions (77.8%) use what, where, when, who, and even how many to ask for specific information, for example, *What was John Muir doing when he spotted three polar bears off Point Barrows?* *Where did Grace Abbott and her family move?* *When do the Eurozone have the worse credit rating than Pakistan?* *Who is Blair?* and *How many polar bears are living in the world today?* Lastly, seventeen questions, or 18.9%, are Why/How Questions. Several examples of the questions are *Why did Scholar Kang Xiaoguang think that Confucian is important for Chinese society?* *How does the result of an experiment that take double face photograph? Why?* and *Why the astronomers cant observe Eta Carinae star without modern instrument?*

The results show the students’ familiarity to WH questions, which is proven by seventy questions (77.8%) that are in the form of WH Questions. It indicates several matters, including the fact that students are more accustomed to scrutinizing details of particular information. This has correlation to the standard of learning English for senior high school which expects them to be in informational level of literacy; using English to gain more knowledge. Secondly, the finding pictures that students are still in the second lowest levels of thinking; Remembering and Understanding, regarding WH Question as interrogative question whose purpose is finding specific information desired.
On the other hand, having a good ability in finding facts, or mastering literal comprehension, can actually be a great baby step to teach students to master reading comprehension (Basabara et al., 2013). Teachers need to use the information students have gotten to create them to the higher level. One of the ways that can be implemented to continuously stimulate students to think is by offering a follow-up question. By questioning the relevance of the question and the follow-up question, students learn to organize information and give meaning on the information they have obtained (The Critical Thinking Community, 2011). Thus, students develop their higher-order thinking skills including analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

Moreover, WH Questions are popularly known as questions which require long answers, and belong to open-ended questions in the presentation. Thus, creating WH Questions require students to construct answers in complete sentences which sometimes have different grammatical structure and content from the text. Students also put their ideas about suitability and appropriateness in dealing with such questions (Nutall, 1982). In short, students must be able to deal with complex grammar. The finding indicates that students are able to use grammar fairly enough. This is supported by the percentage of grammar error which is as few as 31.1%. Question What was John Muir doing when he spotted three polar bears off Point Barrows? for example, gives an excellent grammatical structure of complex sentence used in Wh-movement.

The argument is also supported by column Notes, which in this case, covers the condition of students’ self-generated questions in terms of grammar. Twenty-eight out of ninety questions are grammatically incorrect (31.1%). The most errors are found in the low class, and the least errors are spotted in the high class.

Even though twenty eight questions are proven grammatically incorrect, the messages of the grammatically incorrect questions are still understandable. Grammatical errors occur in
significant number in the students’ self-generated questions because most of the questions are in the forms of WH Questions and Why/How questions. The questions require relatively long answers and even full-structured sentences. Moreover, the questions are also presented in open-ended style. This very style frees students to use language in expressing their understanding. According to Nuttal (1982), there is possibility that students indeed understand the content of a text, but they are not able to express it in English. They often find difficulties in giving response in English. Therefore, they respond to the comprehension question by using the language which they perceive suitable and appropriate enough. This explains why there are many grammar errors occurring during the process of answering questions. Fortunately, paying attention too seriously to grammatical errors in this case is irrelevant because comprehension is the main focus of questioning (Nutall, 1982).

Moreover, the grammatical errors also indicate that students still have doubts in differentiating spoken language and written language. The question What Grace hated about New Orleans? indicates that the students who created the questions missed the grammar structure of questioning in formal way. The language is acceptable in speaking. However, written language requires more discipline especially in dealing with structure.

Types of Questions as Reflected in Student’s Self-Generated Questions

The findings on analyzing students’ self-generated text based on its types show that Questions Type 1 (Literal Comprehension) have the highest result with thirty one questions (34.4%). One of the examples is Where did the Breakers stay? Twenty six questions (28.9%) belong to Questions Type 2 (Questions Involving Reinterpretation and Reorganization). One of the examples is What does make financial system in America to be repression? In addition, inferential questions (Type 3) score 27.8% or 25 questions. Two of the examples are Why Grace and Ben broke up? and After reading this article, what can you conclude about the landscape beauty? On the other hand, questions of Evaluation type 4 score 5 or 5.6% of ninety questions. One example is question Do you think the writer agree or disagree with Confucianism return in China? Lastly, there are only as few as three Questions of Personal Response from the ninety questions or 3.3%. One of them is the question What do you think about the aesthetics of thrift in a soap bubble?
The findings show that most of the questions are categorized into questions of factual comprehension (Type 1). Thus, the questions mostly represent Literal level of reading. The data reveal that students are good in finding any information explicitly written in the text. The second type of questions, on higher level, supports the fact that working on explicit questions and locating the answers is not a problem for the students. According to Nutall (1982), types of questions represent readers’ ability in processing knowledge. The fact that the three lower types of questions score the highest numbers shows that students are actually good readers, in terms of obtaining information. Hypothetically, as long as students have a text in front of them, they will be able to answer comprehension questions. This brings good news for the students, who have to pass the National Examination and/or college enrollment, regarding reading test is mostly created based on students’ ability in comprehending materials.

On the other hand, the results also show that students are less exposed to questions of evaluation and personal response. Students do exercise for developing ability in critical reading and affective reading less than reading comprehension. Thus, it can be concluded that the students’ ability in reading critically and in appraising a text still needs to be developed, since their main focus is on understanding the content of information.

However, there is a possibility that the findings of students’ type of questions are affected by the teachers’ instruction for the assignment. Since the students were required to create explicit and implicit answers, they generated explicit and implicit only. That is the reason why the gap between Question Types 1, 2, and 3 and Question Types 4 and 5 is considerably high. While paying more attention to generating literal and inferential comprehension questions only, they take evaluative and affective reading for granted. In short, the results are not merely influenced by students’ ability in constructing questions, but also from teachers’ instruction.
Students’ Levels of Thinking as reflected in the Self-Generated Questions

The results of analyzing students’ self-generated questions to figure out their thinking levels present rather homogenous scores. The Remembering and Understanding levels get the highest percentages. The Remembering level has the highest percentage with 43.3%. One of the questions is *What does the polar bear prey on?* The Understanding level scores thirty one (34.4%). One of the questions is *Why the writer said that the warming is as if a giant hand has trained a magnifying glass over the pole?* Only one question is categorized into the Applying level, that is, *How to resist evil spirits?* In addition, twelve questions are categorized into the level of Analyzing. One of them is *Why did Chinese society disagree with Confucianism?* Then, six questions were categorized to Evaluating; *What is the correlation between warming temperature and polar bear?* Lastly, only one question was categorized into the level of Creating, which is *If the writer’s prediction about the Blue Arctic comes true, do you thinking that polar bears will be survived?*
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The data analysis shows that most of the students’ questions generated belong to the two lowest levels: Remembering and Understanding. On the contrary, Applying and Creating levels have the least number of questions. In addition, Analyzing and Evaluating levels have only a small number of questions. Generally speaking, the results show that the students have the ability in both understanding the content of a text and figuring the background why the writer writes a text. In short, the students have the ability to understand implicit and explicit information of text quite well.

First of all, the high results of Remembering and Understanding levels indicate that the students have considerably good ability in remembering and understanding information. Students are accustomed to identify, locate, and retrieve knowledge or information explicitly stated in a text. They find no serious difficulties in dealing with comprehension questions in
the post-reading activity. Moreover, by comparing the results of the Remembering and Understanding levels with those of the Analyzing and Evaluating levels, we can conclude that students have good ability in dealing with contexts. The Remembering and Understanding levels shows that students are good in dealing with the internal component or content of a text. On the other hand, the results of the Analyzing and Evaluating levels show that students can find the background information based on the context, such as the purpose of writing, the rationale of the ideas, the bias, etc. The results also picture the same thing, that students can only accept knowledge, but not use it. The number of questions in the Applying and Creating levels shows that students are not accustomed to applying the knowledge that they have obtained. There is an indication that students do not have authentic reason to read English. Their only reason is simply to take part in the reading class, and to obtain good mark to pass the course. Surprisingly, such condition often happens in English for foreign classroom (Nuttall, 1982).

More importantly, the results of the study show that the students have reached the national standard of learning English, which is informational level. In other words, students are ready for college life. In contrast to that, the results concerning the questions that require higher-order thinking show that students still need to develop their critical skills.

Another thing pictured by the results of analyzing students’ self-generated questions is the possibility that the teachers are also the reason why the students only reach those levels of thinking. That is possible since assessment does not only picture students’ competence but also teachers’ treatment towards the students’ achievement (Heaton, 1990:5). This is correlated with the teachers’ instruction in creating explicit and implicit questions. Consequently, students generated explicit and implicit questions which actually belong to Remembering and Understanding levels. However, the teachers are not to blame because they are guided by the Standards of Content which are conceptualized based on the standard of learning English for senior high students, i.e. informational level of literacy (BSNP, 2006).

Related to the issue, assigning students to generate questions may be more suitable for the future curriculum in Indonesia, which is Curriculum 2013. Those who support the curriculum agree that Curriculum 2013 is a "thinking” curriculum (Kasali, 2012), as it offers a breakthrough to students’ mastery in learning to think critically. As stated in the empirical philosophy, students’ ability in thinking critically, especially in analyzing and applying information they obtained from materials. The very purpose of the curriculum in developing students’ ability in critical skill is clearly stated in the wording used for explaining the main competence, Kompetensi Inti, or Standards of Competence in the KTSP. There are several
words such as to internalize (menghayati), to apply (menerapkan), to analyze (menganalisa), to evaluate (mengevaluasi), to create (mencipta), and many more which indicate the activity that students should undergo (Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2013). From those points, it can be concluded that the curriculum call for a massive alter from obtaining knowledge, to internalizing, applying, analyzing, evaluating the knowledge, and using it to create a invention.

**Students’ Knowledge Dimensions as reflected in the Self-Generated Questions**

The data analysis of knowledge dimensions reflected in the students’ self-generated questions shows that Factual Knowledge has 45.6% portion or forty two questions in number. One of the questions is the question *What was John Muir doing when he spotted three polar bears off Point Barrows?* Conceptual Knowledge has the biggest percentage with 53.3% or forty eight in numbers. One of the examples is *Who is Blair?* Moreover, the last two knowledge dimensions; Procedural and Meta-Cognitive, only score one and zero, which makes them having 1.1 and 0 in percent. The only question categorized into procedural knowledge is *How to resist evil spirits?*

![Figure: Students’ Knowledge Dimensions](chart.png)

The result of analyzing students’ knowledge dimensions reflected in the self-generated questions shows the similar result in which students have good ability in finding information, and the inter-relationship among them, and that they are not accustomed to applying the knowledge they have obtained.

On the other hand, empirically speaking, the fact that XII graders year 2011-2013 were able to create explicit and implicit questions and finalize the English final project show students meta-cognitive knowledge in applying knowledge in their real life. Finalizing the project indicates students awareness and their knowledge about their own cognition (especially in choosing articles and generating questions and answer), or students’ meta-
cognitive skills (including the ability to know the strategy used to finalize the project). Students were able to create explicit and implicit questions because they had the experiences in processing such material. Not only that, but the fact that students were able to finalize the English final project shows their ability in applying useful knowledge and strategies that they have obtained before. Borrowing from Cross and Paris (1988 in Lai 2011), that is a form of the ability of knowing and control one has over their own thinking and learning activities (Lai, 2011).

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussions, reflected in the self-generated questions, most of the students’ self-generated questions are in the form of WH-Questions. Moreover, based on the types, most of the questions are categorized into three; questions of literal information, questions involving reorganization and reinterpretation, and questions of inference. Then, the questions also show that students’ levels of thinking are mostly at the Remembering and Understanding levels. Several numbers of questions also show that students’ levels of thinking are at Analyzing and Evaluate. However, only a few numbers shows that students are at the levels of Applying and Creating. Lastly, the questions indicate students’ familiarity in processing factual and conceptual knowledge, but the fact that students were able to finalize the project shows students ability in meta-cognitive dimensions.

The big picture of the finding indicates that students have good ability in comprehension, especially in finding details, analyzing content, and determining the effectiveness of a text. However, the findings also show that students have not mastered critical thinking depicted by small number of questions categorized into higher-order thinking skills; analyzing, evaluating and, creating. The result is affected by the background of the English Final Project itself in which the teachers required students to construct explicit and implicit questions, as students are expected to master reading comprehension after graduating from senior high school. Consequently, students more concern to construct questions which have correlation with the content of the text. However, teachers do not deserve to blame because they merely follow the Standard of Content.

Moreover, compared to Reading Levels, students are at Comprehension Levels, which also means that students have achieved Informational Level of Literacy which is used as standard of English Language Teaching in Indonesia. That has meaning that students are able
to use English as a mean to obtain knowledge. In short, students are also ready for college life, yet need to develop their critical thinking more intensively.

**Suggestions**

There are several suggestions proposed by the researcher to the English teachers of SMA Negeri 1 Malang, the English Teachers, and future researchers. The first suggestion is addressed to the English teachers of SMA Negeri 1 Malang. The first thing that should be emphasized is to give more guidance to students to create questions. It does not matter which theory which will be applied, but to introduce the kind of questions based on the theory is necessary. Another option is giving students the examples of thinking levels questions as the guidance to generate questions. Moreover, it is also necessary to make student accustomed to answering question of personal response, and make students accustomed to question after answering questions. Lastly it is also suggested to give follow-up questions which can intrigue students to think deeper to understand clearer and longer.

The second suggestion is for other English teachers to implement Students Quiz to stimulate students to question more. Asking students to generated question does not only help students to understand material better, but also challenge students more that they will not get bored by reading section. Moreover, asking students to generated question will also help students to express themselves that they will be more confident in answering comprehension question as well. It is also suggested to the teachers of the other school to adapt the concept of English final project by regarding the students’ ability as well. In case the project is too hard for the students, then, implementing Students Quiz is more recommended. Not only that, but teachers can also change the tactic in using Students Quiz to improve students’ ability orally instead of written. Students Quiz can be applied before a discussion, as a preparation. That way, students will not only learn to think, but also grow their confidence in discussion.

Lastly, it is a call for future researchers who are interested in conducting research dealing with using Students Quiz technique and Bloom’s Taxonomy in terms of enhancing students’ reading ability. It is suggested to conduct comparative study of English class and classes of other disciplines in order to discover various findings.
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