Lectura: Jurnal Pendidikan
Volume 15, Nomor 2, Agustus 2024, Halaman 405-419
P-ISSN: 2086-4876
E-ISSN: 2549-063X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v15i2.20257
Link: https://journal.unilak.ac.id/index.php/lectura/article/view/20257

The Effectiveness of Summary Writing Strategy with Bloom Taxonomy Questions

Atika Kumala Dewi
Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: atika.kumala.2202218@students.um.ac.id

Bambang Yudi Cahyono
Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: bambang.yudi.fs@um.ac.id

Nanang Zubaidi
Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: nanang.zubaidi.fs@um.ac.id

Submitted: 19-05-2024 Accepted: 03-06-2024 Published: 10-08-2024

Abstract
English as a Foreign Language (EFL) evolves to include reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Writing is crucial in higher education for academic report preparation and final project requirements by developing a proper summary. However, there is a lack of research on enhancing summary writing skill in EFL contexts. The Bloom taxonomy model can help to develop students' cognitive analysis. Therefore, this study aims to examine the difference in summary writing skills among EFL students taught using Bloom taxonomy questions. To achieve this aim, a quasi-experimental method was employed by two groups: an experiment group and a control group. The experimental group was taught summary writing strategies using Bloom taxonomy questions, while the control group received a control group. Both groups were given a pre-test and a post-test before and after the treatment. The results showed that the pre-test scores and post-test scores were similar between the experimental and control groups. However, the paired sample t-test showed a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group, indicating a significant increase in results. The study provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of different treatment methods in improving students' summary writing skills. In conclusion, the study shows that Bloom taxonomy questions can significantly enhance students' summary writing skills, as they are more attractive, hierarchical, and cognitively domain-specific than conventional teaching methods. The experimental group achieved higher mean scores. The results suggest that EFL teachers should select appropriate source texts and future research should consider locations and subjects.

Keywords: Bloom taxonomy questions, students' writing skills, summary writing

INTRODUCTION

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) integrates reading, writing, and speaking skills. However, relying on models for writing proficiency is problematic, necessitating innovative frameworks for university students. The field of EFL has undergone development over time, emphasizing the integration of reading and writing abilities with listening and speaking proficiency (Council of Europe, 2001). Writing is becoming more common in higher education because it is used for academic report preparation and final project requirements, which necessitate the creation of a well-crafted summary (Ahn, 2022; Chuenchaichon, 2022). Nevertheless, a prevalent issue in EFL settings is the dependence on models and studies based on the learning experiences of university EFL students in order to improve writing skills (Tlonaen, 2020). The efficacy of instructing EFL models in enhancing writing proficiency was analyzed (Kim & McCarthy, 2021a; Konuk et al., 2016), specifically for university students who are acquiring EFL and need to navigate diverse language and writing conventions (Fauziah et al., 2023). This problem has necessitated the development of inventive frameworks and concepts to tackle the specific situations in which university students studying EFL participate in summary writing activities.

A significant number of students find the process of summary writing to be tedious, which ultimately results in bad grades on their examinations. Students have a unique problem when it comes to summary writing since it requires them to be able to identify the most important aspects included within each paragraph of their textbook (J. Li, 2021; M. Li et al., 2022). Students who locate the process of summary writing to be difficult or confusing can, fortunately, take use of the numerous ways and resources that are offered to them. There is also the possibility of using a tool that summarizes information for this purpose. It is possible for a student to improve their understanding and their capacity to properly synthesize the material once they have completed reading their textbooks if they set aside some time before beginning to study them.

In academic writing, summary writing is a critical skill (Nurkamto et al., 2022). In academic discussion, it is standard practice to succinctly communicate essential concepts by condensing one's argument and discoveries (Cahyono & Rahayu, 2020). A summary allows one to record their thoughts in an efficient and accurate manner, ensuring that they do not become bogged down by excessive information or overlook significant subtleties of the material they have read and understood. Furthermore, it helps students who are short on time by providing them with enough information to understand the main point. For students seeking a more exhaustive elucidation of the causes behind a particular incident or persistent circumstance, this synopsis functions as a valuable reference (Mali, 2022).

Producing summaries is an effective method for augmenting the desirability and dependability of a written product. By providing succinct and pertinent information, it relieves the reader of the strain associated with perusing extensive paragraphs. Moreover, it facilitates the writer's sustaining concentration on the topic at hand (Hadiyanto, 2019; Pan, 2015), all the while proficiently communicating the essential arguments of every paragraph in an easily comprehensible format that averts curiosity or diversion, thus guaranteeing the reader's active involvement with the written material. Summary writing is a highly effective technique for upholding a record of the credibility of the sources consulted. It allows for easy tracing and verification when questioned.

Several EFL teachers trust their students' summaries, which serve as indicators of which students conducted studies on a specific topic (Weerasekara et al., 2023; Zare et

al., 2023). The research's specific timing and goal are unknown. Students use a summary as a tool to consolidate their previously acquired knowledge, which they can then use to explore further research or initiate discussions on specific issues. Hence, it is a crucial aptitude that we employ on a daily basis while engaging with media and assimilating new information from it.

The goal of summary writing is to provide students with relevant information (OECD, 2016). Simply put, it involves expressing an idea or notion in concise terms. Summaries are advantageous for several reasons; they enhance the learning experience by emphasizing crucial information, making it more engaging and efficient. When writing a summary, a student's goal is to effectively convey the fundamental content of the provided source materials in a captivating manner (Creswell, 2012). The student does this by emphasizing and elucidating crucial concepts that are essential for comprehending the written material. A summary enables readers to grasp the essence of a document without having to read it in its entirety (Zare et al., 2023). By condensing the major points and concepts of a piece of material into a single paragraph, someone else can more effectively comprehend its content. This concise summary allows for a rapid understanding of the topic. However, it should not be excessively succinct, like the process of whittling wood by removing unneeded words.

Previous studies have consistently identified university EFL summary writing as a significant area of concern (Ahn, 2022; Choe et al., 2022; J. Li, 2021; Mallahi, 2022), particularly with regard to specific writing tasks such as summary writing, which serve as a preliminary exercise to enhance students' academic research writing skills (Benzer et al., 2016; Hood, 2008; Kim & McCarthy, 2021b; M. Li et al., 2022; McDonough et al., 2014). The objective of this study is to ascertain whether summary writing reflects a student's individualized and authentic rendition of the source text (Chuenchaichon, 2022). To fulfill these requirements, the suggested method involves cultivating students' cognitive analysis through the Bloom taxonomy model, a valuable framework for categorizing learning and understanding through summary writing. This model is a valuable tool for English teachers, especially when designing writing assignments that include rhetorical tasks in the context of writing.

As a result of their inadequate comprehension, a significant number of students struggle with summary writing their reading material, resulting in academic performance. Summary writing is an essential skill in academic writing because it enables efficient and accurate communication of important concepts (UNESCO, 2016). It aids time-constrained students by offering sufficient information to comprehend the primary objective. Summary writing is a reliable technique for maintaining sources' trustworthiness and facilitating straightforward tracking and verification in cases of doubt. Consequently, EFL teachers frequently rely on students' summaries as reliable indicators of their comprehension of particular subjects. Teachers utilize summaries to condense previously acquired knowledge, which they can then utilize to delve into additional research or initiate discussions on specific topics (Brown, 2012). The goal of summary writing is to provide students with pertinent information by highlighting essential concepts and improving the learning experience so that it is more captivating and effective.

The goal of a student is to proficiently communicate the core substance of the given source materials in an engaging way, highlighting and clarifying critical concepts necessary for understanding. A succinct summary allows readers to understand the fundamental content of a document without having to peruse it in its entirety (Cambridge

Assessment English, 2013). However, it should not be overly concise, akin to carving wood by eliminating superfluous words. Academic scholars recommend that programs for developing the Bloom taxonomy model include skills that are in line with current academic research and instructional practices (Brookhart, 2010). This includes incorporating strategies for summary writing, which assist in succinctly summary writing a wide range of information, effectively demonstrating and defending the significance of multiple sources on the same subject, and providing a structured overview of the concepts.

A framework known as Bloom taxonomy model classifies educational learning objectives into cognitive, affective, and sensory domains (Bibi et al., 2020). English skill development and improvement widely use Bloom taxonomy model to achieve their learning objectives (Butarbutar & Sauhenda, 2022; Horváthová & Naďová, 2021; Muhayimana et al., 2022). However, the study of content analysis provides limited answers, highlighting the need for active learning to understand their promotion in dynamic situations. Therefore, developing particular English skills, such as writing, should consider student cognition to instill critical thinking skills and enhance higher-order thinking for active learning and language development. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the difference in summary writing skills among EFL students taught using Bloom taxonomy questions. The study focuses on incorporating Bloom taxonomy domain levels into teaching materials to facilitate the production of more thorough English summaries.

Teaching students to write a summary is crucial for their social and academic development (Brown, 2012; Cambridge Assessment English, 2013). However, EFL students in Indonesia face challenges in distinguishing between written and spoken English, formulating outlines, identifying essential skills, and avoiding plagiarism (Bacinschii, 2018; Li, 2021; Stander, 2020). Cultural differences and limited exposure to English writing outside the classroom also contribute to these difficulties. To improve writing proficiency, it is essential to establish protocols that eliminate inaccuracies and promote proper citation and plagiarism avoidance. Additionally, increasing accessibility to writing exercises, incorporating authentic writing tasks into the academic curriculum, providing guidance on proficient writing methods, and raising awareness about citation and plagiarism avoidance are essential steps.

Questions for developing summary writing strategies based on the Bloom taxonomy model of the cognitive domain, a hierarchical classification of different levels of knowledge acquisition, focus on the cognitive domain (Bibi et al., 2020; Fuller, 1997; Muhayimana et al., 2022). To configurize Bloom taxonomy model in summary writing, protocol questions have been developed, consisting of six distinct types: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating, which are presented in Table 1. People often illustrate the model as an inverted pyramid, placing complex tasks at the top and fundamental aspects of learning at the bottom. EFL students are required to produce written work through the processes of remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating. The model categorizes cognitive skills into lower-level thinking skills (LOTS) and higher-order thinking skills (HOTS). Academic scholars suggest that Bloom taxonomy model development programs should incorporate skills that align with current research and instructional practices, including writing skills.

Table 1. Protocol Questions by Bloom Taxonomy Model

Paragraph	Organization Type by Protocol Question
1	**The writer(s) and the title** *Who is the writers?* [remembering] *What is the title?* [remembering]
2	**Thesis statement** *What is the article's thesis statement?* [understanding] **Elaboration of the thesis statement** *How do you elaborate the thesis statement and the gap of the study?* [applying]
3	**Critical personal comment.** *How do you describe the results from the thesis statement, the investigation and the main topic?* [evaluating]
4	**Conclusion** *What is your personal comment from this study?* [evaluating]

In order to write a summary that is effective, students must possess a thorough comprehension of the Bloom taxonomy guideline and adhere to appropriate protocols. An effective summary should possess clarity, brevity, and logical structure, showcasing the writer's understanding of their readership and their anticipations. Additionally, it should possess exceptional quality, showcasing the author's deep respect for language and its influential capabilities. Effective writing abides by four essential principles: catering to the intended audience, comprehending their preferences, and upholding grammatical accuracy. The summary's duration may differ depending on the complexity and length of the source material. The summary should be succinct, cohesive, and rational, with an emphasis on substance, consistency, vocabulary choice, and linguistic attributes.

By comprehending the various levels of cognitive complexity and richness described in Bloom taxonomy model of the cognitive domain, one can anticipate that understanding Bloom taxonomy questions in English summary writing will lead to suggestions for improving teaching and learning strategies for writing. This will be particularly beneficial for EFL students who need to effectively manage their academic writing tasks, including undergraduate theses, articles, and participation in national and international conferences. Therefore, Bloom taxonomy model is configurized to enhance students' cognitive abilities and improve their learning outcomes, particularly in the area of summary writing. Universities ought to employ Bloom taxonomy model as a structural model for categorizing cognitive capacities and cultivating students' proficiency in the art of summarization. This research can serve as an inquiry for English language lecturers and academic members in Indonesia to enhance the proficiency of EFL students in writing English summaries.

METHOD

To achieve the aim of this study on how Bloom taxonomy questions affected EFL students' ability to write summaries required a quasi-experimental approach in line with the protocols of Creswell (2012). This study involved 51 EFL students from the English Language Department at the Faculty of Letters, UM, who were instructed to summarize research articles. The study aimed to compare the effectiveness of Bloom taxonomy questions as an independent variable and students' summary writing as a dependent variable. The experimental group was taught five sessions of Bloom taxonomy questions, while the control group did not. Both groups took pre- and post-tests, with the post-test

scores comparing to pre-test scores. The investigation aimed to assess the effectiveness and impact of Bloom taxonomy questions on students' summary writing. This research method was used to address assessment inquiries on the effectiveness and impact of Bloom taxonomy question applications in summary writing. The formula of quasi-experimental design is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Formula of Quasi-Experimental Design

Group	Population	Quasi-experimental design		
		Pre-Test	Treatment	Post-Test
Experiment	28 student	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control	23 students	Yes	No	Yes

In order to produce a brief summary, the writers (the EFL students) must carefully consider numerous concerns. Therefore, the researchers construsted a scoring rubric, blended by the literature research sources from Brown (2012), Cambridge Assessment English (2013), OECD (2013), to be one summary writing assessment. It resulted four primary components, namely content, coherence, lexical selection, and linguistic aspects. Then, a homogeneity test was conducted on EFL students to identify a uniformly dispersed sample. The results of the summary writing exam were used to conduct the homogeneity test using the IBM SPSS 24 program. Furthermore, normality testing was used to verify if a set of data follows a normal distribution, enhancing evaluation objectivity and reducing prejudice by comparing the sample to the population. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used. Inter-rater reliability testing was used to compare pre-test values. An independent sample test was administered to determine the homogeneity of treatment groups. A homogeneity test was used with 10 students to determine the sample size. The experimental group's results were compared with the control group using an independent sample t-test. The results were analyzed using IBM SPSS 24. The EFL students were cooperative in the test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Based on the results of calculating score from both experimental and control groups above, there was a significant difference in the skill in summary writing among the EFL students who are taught based on Bloom taxonomy questions.

Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) method was used to test inter-rater reliiability. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

		95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
	Intraclass Correlation[b]	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	**0.821**[a]	0.706	0.894	10.162	50	50	0.000

Average Measures	0.902[c]	0.828	0.944	10.162	50	50	0.000

The results of inter rater reliability testing to compare the assessment between rater 1 and rater 2 of the pre-test value were seen from the ICC test results and obtained a reliability value of 0.821. This value shows a result of more than 0.600 so it can be stated that the assessments between raters are not different or the same.

The distribution of the study data was ascertained using the normality test. Results from the Shapiro-Wilk test were used to compare each group's pre- and post-test scores; these results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Group	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test Score	Experimental	0.149	28	0.116	0.940	28	0.110
	Control	0.180	23	0.052	0.925	23	0.085
Post-test Score	Experimental	0.121	28	0.200*	0.958	28	0.316
	Control	0.136	23	0.200*	0.973	23	0.759

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

A normality test was conducted on the pre-test results, yielding significant values (sig) of 0.110 and 0.085 for the experimental group and control group, respectively. These findings indicate that the significance value is more than 0.05 (sig > 0.05), suggesting that the pre-test scores follow a normal distribution. A normality test was conducted on the post-test results, yielding significant values (sig) of 0.316 and 0.759 for the experimental group and control group, respectively. These findings indicate that the significance value is more than 0.05 (sig > 0.05), suggesting that the post-test scores follow a normal distribution.

To find out whether the treatment groups are homogenous or not, statisticians use the independent samples test. The results of the administration of the Levene's samples test on both the pre-test and the post-test is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	
	F	Sig.
Pre-test Score	0.063	0.803
Post-test Score	0.014	0.906

Using a significant value (sig) of 0.803 for the pre-test and a sig of 0.906 for the post-test, we conducted a normality test. The findings demonstrate that the difference across the treatment groups in pre- and post-test scores is homogenous, since the significance value is greater than 0.05 (sig > 0.05).

A total of 51 students participated in the study, with 23 as the control group and 28 as the experimental group. The number of samples represents the proportion of the total population that participated in both the pretest and the posttest. Table 6 presents the findings from the pre-test, and Table 8 presents the results from the post-test, both after using the average value and standard deviation to describe the scores.

Table 6. Group Statistics of Pre-Test

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pre-test Score	Experimental	28	75.4241	11.36904	2.14855
	Control	23	75.4620	11.43506	2.38437

In the experimental group, the pre-test results showed a mean of 75.424 and a standard deviation of 11.369, while in the control group, the findings showed a mean of 75.462 and a standard deviation of 11,435. These findings demonstrate that there is little difference in the pre-test scores between the two groups, suggesting that their starting talents are comparable.

Table 7. Group Statistics of Post-Test

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test Score	Experimental	28	89.1295	6.84514	1.29361
	Control	23	84.4293	6.73650	1.40466

Comparing the two groups, the experimental group's post-test findings were more descriptive, with a mean of 89.129 and a standard deviation of 6.845, while the control group's results were more straightforward, with a mean of 84.429 and a standard deviation of 6,736. These findings demonstrate that there is a significant difference in the post-test scores between the two groups, suggesting that their final skills are distinct.

When comparing the outcomes of two groups—the experimental group and the control group—the independent sample t-test is the statistical test to use. Table 8 presents the results from the pre-test, and Table 9 presents the results from the post-test.

Table 8. Independent Samples Test of Pre-Test

	t-test for Equality of Means					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

						Difference	Lower	Upper
Pre-test Score	Equal variances assumed	**-0.012**	**49**	**0.991**	-0.03785	3.20774	-6.48403	6.40834
	Equal variances not assumed	-0.012	46.989	0.991	-0.03785	3.20959	-6.49476	6.41906

By comparing the experimental group's and the control group's pre-test scores using an independent sample t-test, we found a t-value of 0.012 and a sig-value of 0.991. According to these results, the significance value is more than 0.05 (sig > 0.05). This means that the experimental group and the control group did not vary significantly in their pre-test scores, suggesting that their starting talents were equal.

Table 9. Independent Samples Test of Post-Test

		t-test for Equality of Means						
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Post-test Score	Equal variances assumed	2.457	49	0.018	4.70012	1.91264	0.85653	8.54370
	Equal variances not assumed	2.461	47.375	0.018	4.70012	1.90958	0.85935	8.54089

A t-value of 2.457 and a sig-value of 0.018 were the outcomes of the independent sample t-test that compared the post-test scores of the two groups. According to the results, the significance value is less than 0.05 (sig < 0.05), meaning that the post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group are significantly different. This suggests that the two groups' final abilities are different, and that the treatment in the experimental group was successful in raising scores compared to the control group, which did not receive any treatment.

Repeated comparisons of one group's outcomes, specifically between pre- and post-test scores, are the goal of the paired sample t-test. Table 10 presents the findings from the pre-test, whereas Table 11 presents the results from the post-test.

Table 10. Paired Samples Test of Pre-Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test Score – Post-test Score	-13.70536	11.79730	2.22948	-18.27987	-9.13084	**-6.147**	27	**0.000**

A paired sample t-test comparing the experimental group's pre- and post-test scores yielded a t-value of 6.147 and a sig-value of 0.000. The results demonstrate that the sig < 0.05 significance value, indicating a significant change from the pre-test to the post-test score in the experimental group. Therefore, it can be inferred that the experimental group achieved significantly better results.

Table 11. Paired Samples Test of Post-Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test Score – Post-test Score	-8.96739	13.45976	2.80655	-14.78783	-3.14696	-3.195	22	**0.004**

A t-value of 3.195 and a sig-value of 0.004 were the findings of the paired sample t-test that compared the control group's pre- and post-test scores. This study's findings demonstrate that the sig < 0.05 significance value, indicating a notable disparity between the control groups' pre- and post-test scores, suggesting a notable improvement in their performance.

Discussion

Summary writing requires measurable learning outcomes, avoiding quantifiable verbs, matching content, coherence, word choice, and linguistics, and guiding with an educational framework, including Bloom taxonomy questions. Therefore, summary writing standards is needed to include the inclusion of learning outcomes that can be objectively measured. In line with Benzer et al. (2016) and Mauludin (2018), this research has come into the objective that summary writing questions are possible to be the standard of writing summary. Using summary question table from this research is accepatable to be considered in circumventing paragraphs that lack comprehend. This research has been

in line with the theory of Wallace et al. (2004) who stated that writing English should be comprehended by the logical aspects and hierarchical levels. For a reason, summary writing necessitates that the evaluations of the summary (regarding its content, coherence, word choices, and linguistics aspects) be in accordance with the source text (Brown, 2012). Thus, the process of creating a summary should be directed by an educational framework. This research has yielded substantial findings using an experimental approach, highlighting the necessity of utilizing Bloom taxonomy questions for the purpose of summary writing.

The results of this research has demonstrated that, by utilizing Bloom taxonomy questions, the EFL students' summary writings are significantly better if compared to those who did not experience the teaching treatment of Bloom taxonomy questions. This research in line with Li (2021) which stated that effective summary writing requires careful consideration. It signifies the writer's inclination to contemplate specific subjects as a focal point. Furthermore, a well-executed summary writing exhibits a high level of organization. It signifies the writer's proficiency in articulating their thoughts, discerning the crucial elements, and arranging them in a logical sequence. In addition, the act of summary writing information is highly efficient (Chew et al., 2020; J. Li, 2021). It demonstrates the writers' awareness of their audience and their regard for their audience's typical expectations or demands. Those all theories have been found in this research results which demonstrated that a well-written summary by comprehending Bloom taxonomy questions protocols has come to a high quality.

The well-organized and logical arrangement of summary writing exhibits traits such as being meaningful, clear, cohesive, and well-structured (Kim & McCarthy, 2021b, 2021a; Li et al., 2022). Put simply, it progresses in a logical order, being both economically and sufficiently developed while also maintaining grammatical correctness. To summarize, good writing may be characterized by its positive attributes. A well-regarded piece of writing is one that is informative and engaging, capturing the readers' attention and interest. It follows a logical and coherent structure with clear and precise expression. In addition, the duration of a summary also needs to be managed by the writer.

Based on this research, Bloom taxonomy questions can assist in directing students through the process of summary writing. In line with Bibi et al. (2020) and Muhayimana et al. (2022), the feature of this summary writing strategy is especially advantageous for enhancing cognitive processes in the task of summary writing. It may also aid in the creation of assessments by helping you align the aims of summary writing with any desired degree of expertise. The objectives of summary writing should be clearly defined during the summary writing process to ensure that both teachers and students comprehend the true aim of summary writing. Based on the results of this study, the EFL students taught using Bloom taxonomy questions are guided through a structured approach to summary writing. They are encouraged to engage with text at various cognitive levels, including analyzing, evaluating, and creating, which helps develop a deeper understanding of the material. Bloom taxonomy questions promote higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Students are challenged to think critically about the content they are summary writing, leading to more thoughtful and nuanced summaries.

According to the results of this research, by engaging with Bloom taxonomy questions, EFL students are more likely to improve their comprehension and retention of key information in their summary writing. In line with Shaarawy (2014), the process of answering questions at different cognitive levels reinforces learning and enhances

memory recall, which is beneficial for creating accurate summaries. Students taught with Bloom taxonomy questions are encouraged to organize their thoughts logically, synthesize information effectively, and present ideas coherently. Therefore, based on this research, the structured approach helps students create summaries that are clear, concise, and well-structured. Due to the analytical and evaluative nature of Bloom taxonomy questions, students taught using this method tend to produce higher quality summaries (Bibi et al., 2020; Butarbutar & Sauhenda, 2022). They are better equipped to identify main ideas, differentiate between essential and non-essential information, and articulate key points with clarity and precision. Based on the results of this study, the EFL Students who are not taught using Bloom taxonomy questions may have a limited depth of understanding of the material they are summary writing. Without engaging with higher-order thinking skills, their summaries may lack critical analysis and evaluation. Students not exposed to Bloom taxonomy questions may produce surface-level summaries that focus on basic content recall rather than deeper comprehension. This can result in summaries that lack insight, analysis, and original interpretation.

EFL students possibly have difficulty efficiently structuring their summaries if they do not have the assistance of Bloom taxonomy questions. It is possible that they may have difficulties in arranging their thoughts, linking the most important elements in a logical manner, and keeping coherence throughout their work. It is possible that EFL students who are not taught using Bloom taxonomy questions will have a learning experience that is less interesting and participatory. It might happen that the lack of organized questions may result in passive reading and a shallow engagement with the topic, which will also have an effect on their ability to write summaries. If EFL students do not have the scaffold of Bloom taxonomy questions to guide their thinking, they may be more likely to misread the substance of the assignment, misrepresent the major concepts, or leave out important material in their summaries. However, this study still has limitation in gathering the data as the researchers employed in one institution which limit the generalizability of the results. Therefore, future researchers are suggested to implement this study with larger population and different levels of EFL programs.

CONCLUSION

The study found that using Bloom taxonomy questions in summary writing can significantly improve students' writing abilities by targeting different cognitive thinking levels. This approach is particularly beneficial for senior high school students, as textbooks often include intellectual and hierarchical topics. EFL teachers should exercise caution when choosing source material for summary writing, considering study sites and subjects. Students taught using Bloom taxonomy questions demonstrated stronger summary writing skills, including critical thinking, coherent organization, clarity, and depth of analysis. The use of Bloom taxonomy questions as a complement to traditional methods can improve students' summary writing, offering a more attractive alternative to conventional education. In conclusion, implementing a summary writing strategy with Bloom taxonomy questions is effective. Therefore, this structured approach is suggested to be implemented to enhance students' writing skill to create insightful and well-crafted summaries for demonstrating a deeper understanding of the material.

REFERENCES

Ahn, S. (2022). Developing summary writing abilities of Korean EFL university students through teaching summarizing skills. *English Teaching (South Korea)*, *77*(2), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.2.202206.25

Bacinschii, S. (2018). *Summarizing as an important skill for business English students*. *2*, 28–29. www.ase.md.

Benzer, A., Sefer, A., Ören, Z., & Konuk, S. (2016). A student-focused study: Strategy of text summary writing and assessment Rubric. *Egitim ve Bilim*, *41*(186), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2016.4603

Bibi, W., Butt, M. N., & Reba, A. (2020). Relating teachers' questioning techniques with students' learning within the context of Bloom taxonomy. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, *14*(1), 111–119.

Brookhart, S. M. (2010). How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom. In *ASCD*. ASCD.

Brown, H. D. (2012). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. In *Pearson Education* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc All. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_347

Butarbutar, R., & Sauhenda, A. F. (2022). The impact of video integrated with Bloom taxonomy on the improvement of English-speaking performance. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, *7*(2), 126–134. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1649

Cahyono, B. Y., & Rahayu, T. (2020). EFL students' motivation in writing, writing proficiency, and gender. *TEFLIN Journal*, *31*(2), 162–180. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i2/162-180

Cambridge Assessment English. (2013). *Cambridge English Qualifications C1 Advanced Handbook for Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Chew, C. S., Wu, W. C. V., Idris, N., Loh, E. F., & Chua, Y. P. (2020). Enhancing summary writing of ESL learners via a theory-based online tool: System development and evaluation. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *58*(2), 398–432. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119837765

Choe, Y., Ryu, J., & Jeon, M. (2022). Effects of pre-task planning and source texts on Korean EFL college learners' summary writing. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *19*(1), 109–124. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2022.19.1.7.109

Chuenchaichon, Y. (2022). The problems of summary writing encountered by Thai EFL students: a case study of the fourth year English major students at Naresuan University. *English Language Teaching*, *15*(6), 15. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n6p15

Council of Europe. (2001). Comes: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. In *Common European Framework*. Modern Languages Division, Strasbourg, Cambridge University Press. https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational Research : Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. In *Pearson*.

Fauziah, D., Nawir, E., Susanti, S., Bueraheng, R., Ridhoni, W., & Elsara, W. (2023). Micro learning for undergraduate students' writing ability: An effect on writing English text. *Lectura : Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(2), 236–248. https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v14i2.14463

Fuller, D. (1997). Critical thinking in undergraduate athletic training education. *Journal of Athletic Training*, *32* *3*, 242–247. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/1f663de2de6ff79e9b9d27d620325a909d353db0

Hadiyanto, A. K. (2019). Students' collaborative story writing project in an extensive reading program. *TEFLIN Journal*, *30*(2), 197–211. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/197-211

Hood, S. (2008). Summary writing in academic contexts: implicating meaning in processes of change. *Linguistics and Education*, *19*(4), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2008.06.003

Horváthová, B., & Naďová, L. (2021). Developing critical thinking in reading comprehension of texts for specific purposes at all levels of Bloom taxonomy. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *9*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2101001H

Kim, M. K., & McCarthy, K. S. (2021a). Improving summary writing through formative feedback in a technology-enhanced learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *37*(3), 684–704. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12516

Kim, M. K., & McCarthy, K. S. (2021b). Using graph centrality as a global index to assess students' mental model structure development during summary writing. In *Educational Technology Research and Development* (Vol. 69, Issue 2). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09942-1

Konuk, S., Ören, Z., Benzer, A., & Sefer, A. (2016). A study on creating writing strategy and evaluation tool for book summary. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *11*(21), 2021–2033. https://doi.org/10.5897/err2016.3020

Li, J. (2021). Examining EFL learners' source text use in summary writing. *Language Teaching Research*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211055887

Li, M., Chan, J., & Kirby, J. R. (2022). The summary writing performance of bilingual learners with reading difficulties. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *73*(1), 109–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-022-00258-0

Mali, Y. C. G. (2022). The exploration of Indonesian students' attributions in EFL reading and writing classes. *Bahasa Dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Pengajarannya*, *50*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.17977/um015v50i12022p1

Mallahi, O. (2022). Investigating the strategies and problems of Iranian EFL learners while writing summaries in academic contexts. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *28*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2022.28.01

Mauludin, L. (2018). Dynamic assessment to improve students' summary writing skill in an ESP class. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *36*(4), 355–364. https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2018.1548296

McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *24*(1), 20–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.03.001

Muhayimana, T., Kwizera, L., & Nyirahabimana, M. R. (2022). Using Bloom taxonomy to evaluate the cognitive levels of primary leaving English exam questions in Rwandan schools. *Curriculum Perspectives*, *42*(1), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-021-00156-2

Nurkamto, J., Djatmika, D., & Prihandoko, L. A. (2022). Students' problems of academic writing competencies, challenges in online thesis supervision, and the solutions: Thesis supervisors' perspectives. *TEFLIN Journal*, *33*(1), 123–147. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/123-147

OECD. (2013). Assessment of higher education learning outcomes (AHELO): rationale, challenges and initial insights from the feasibility study. In K. Tremblay, D. Lalancette, & D. Roseveare (Eds.), *OECD* (Vol. 1). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-867-4

OECD. (2016). *Educational Research and Innovation: Innovating Education and Educating for Innovation*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264265097-en

Pan, Y. (2015). The effect of teacher error feedback on the accuracy of EFL student writing. *TEFLIN Journal*, *21*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i1/57-77

Shaarawy, H. (2014). The Effect of Journal Writing on Students' Cognitive Critical Thinking Skills A Quasi-Experiment Research on an EFL Undergraduate Classroom in Egypt. *The International Journal of Higher Education*, *3*, 120. https://doi.org/10.5430/IJHE.V3N4P120

Stander, M. (2020). Strategies to help university students avoid plagiarism: a focus on translation as an intervention strategy. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *44*(2), 156–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1526260

Tlonaen, Z. A. (2020). Grammatical error found in the academic essays written by students of English education. *Lectura : Jurnal Pendidikan*, *11*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.31849/lectura.v11i1.3635

UNESCO. (2016). What Makes A Good Curriculum? In *Current and Critical Issues in Curriculum and Learning* (Issue 2). http://forums.groundspeak.com/GC/index.php?showtopic=341672&st=0&p=5613282&#entry5613282

Wallace, T., Stariba, W. E., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). Teaching Speaking, Listening and Writing. *International Academy of Education*, *May*, 13.

Weerasekara, I., Hall, M., Shaw, L., & Kiegaldie, D. (2023). Instruments evaluating the quality of the clinical learning environment in nursing education: An updated systematic review. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *71*(June), 103732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2023.103732

Zare, J., Aqajani Delavar, K., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). The impact of altruism on the emotions and English summary writing skills of L2 learners: An intervention study in light of positive psychology. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231151632