

INDONESIAN EFL PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' CRITICAL THINKING PRACTICE IN ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

¹Saadatul Fitriani, ²Noni Agustina

¹Universitas Esa Unggul, Indonesia

²Universitas Esa Unggul, Indonesia

Email: saadatulfitriani26@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the application of critical thinking conducted by Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers in English instruction. This study focused on four pre-service teacher participants and used a qualitative approach, narrative research design with observation and interviews as data collection instruments. This study addresses to Bloom's Taxonomy critical thinking framework. The result the application of critical thinking applied by pre-service teachers is at a low to moderate level.

Keywords: Critical thinking, pre-service teachers, Bloom's Taxonomy

1. Introduction

Critical thinking is an essential skill that the students and teachers must be possessed in the 21th century. It means that teacher should possess not only pedagogical skill but also critical thinking skill (Petek & Bedir, 2018 cited in Ma & Luo (2020). The critical thinking skill will support students' ability in looking inside a new problem and how to solve it and decide what they believe and do (Smogorzewska, 2014).

A person's method of making rational judgements or judgments about something is known as critical thinking (Chikiwa & Schäfer, 2018). Someone who can think critically will constantly evaluate his thinking to ensure that he doesn't come to the wrong conclusion or solution. Critical thinking is the process by which a person makes decisions

about the complicated issues that he or she is confronted with (Husna, 2020).

Critical thinking skill in English language class has become the importance and inevitable skill since it promotes the development of students' creativity in English class (DfE, 2013 cited in Ma & Luo, 2020) which it consists of ability of using language for speaking and language productivity (Smogorzewska, 2014). The integration of critical thinking can help students and teachers to internalize English language acquisition (Liang & Fung, 2021). One aspect of English acquisitions is reading skill requiring critical thinking skill to be integrated in the text that the students read (Heidari, 2020). Heidari (2020) reveals that the internalizing process requires critical thinking to bridge the students to the

background information from a text or passage and to help them to understand the real meaning of the passage. Moreover, Afshar & Rahimi (2014) explicate that critical thinking has a main role to develop speaking ability by giving the students a challenging task in conveying meaning so students will have more opportunity to speak confidently.

Teachers have important role to develop students' critical thinking. They become a facilitator in integrating strategies to implement the critical thinking activity such as problem solving activity and undertake the group task (Fung, To, & Leung, 2016). Umar & Rathakrishnan (2012) also emphasizes the role of teachers in developing students' critical thinking skill as the pedagogical facilitator for students and as a moderator who creates the good social environment in the classroom.

The previous studies discussed the practise of professional teachers in developing their critical thinking conducted by Sheybani & Miri (2019). However, Liang & Fung (2021) explain that a scanty study investigates the application of critical thinking instruction in English class conducted by pre-service teachers. According to Kusaeri & Aditomo (2019) findings, pre-service teachers instructors should pay greater attention to the relevance of critical thinking and the function of constructivism learning in building critical thinking abilities. Meanwhile, Zetriuslita, Ariawan, & Nufus (2016) published a study on students' critical

thinking skills depending on their ability levels, which showed how students at each high, medium, and low ability level were able to answer the questions and how many indications were successfully answered. 21st-century learning necessitates that pupils have 4C skills, prospective instructors must be able to think critically (Husna, 2020). According to Susanti & Arista (2019) research on the degree of teacher knowledge of skills 4C, 19 percent had high abilities, 51 percent had moderate abilities, and 30 percent had low abilities. Therefore, this research is important to be undertaken to fill the gap and extend the existing literature. This study aims to investigate the application of critical thinking learning in English classrooms at junior high school level. Research question of this study is "To what extent Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers apply critical thinking in English instruction?"

2. Method

This research uses qualitative method because the purpose of qualitative methods is to explore something more deeply. According to Creswell (2018) qualitative research is ideally suited to addressing a research issue where the variables are unknown and need to be explored. This study uses a narrative research design because the researcher wants to explain and retell the experience of the participants. Data collection in this study uses video observation and online interview. Creswell (2018) argued that the method of collecting open-ended, firsthand

knowledge by observing people and locations at a study site is known as observation, during a qualitative interview, researchers ask one or more participants general, open-ended questions and record their responses.

The participants of this study consist of four pre-service teachers of a private university in West Jakarta, Indonesia. The four participants are eight semester students.

3. Finding

After conducting research on the Four Pre-service Teachers' and collecting data from the participants using video observations and online interviews.

Table 3. Teacher Identity

No	Pre-Service Teachers' Name	Class
1	Nur (T1)	9 Grade
2	Zahra (T2)	7 Grade
3	Suci (T3)	8 Grade
4	Dilla (T4)	8 Grade

To find out the extent to which pre-service teachers apply critical thinking skills in EFL, and how they apply it in the classroom, the following data are presented from the participants:

a. Remembering

All participants apply the level of remembering in their class, the following data can be presented:

1) T1

In conducting observation, the researchers found that the first participant Ms. Nur (T1) applies two indicators in the remembering level, namely recognition and recall of fact. T1

asks and asks students to remember information and facts from events that students have passed. From the beginning, T1 learning has stimulated students to remember facts and information. T1 asks students "*What is pronunciation in Bahasa?*" "*What is vowel?*" and ask students to remember a thing "*Remember what are the example of long vowel sound?*" In the interview T1 also said that he once asked students what activities were tiring for them "*Meminta siswa untuk mengingat mengenai aktivitas-aktivitas apa yang melelahkan*"

2) T2

T2 also applies the two indicators contained in remembering. In the observation video T2 asks students to remember a fact. At the beginning of the lesson she asked the students about what material they learned last week "*Wednesday what you learn?*" These questions are asked to train students' memory and know a fact, examples of other questions are "*kemaren UTS Bahasa Inggris nya susah atau gampang?*" "*Nurse apa tadi panca. What is nurse in Indonesia? Tadi dikasih tau tu sama Eva*". In addition, participants also asked students for information in the form of "*Jawabannya apa if I ask you how are you*". T2 displays a picture in PPT, then she asks the students "*What picture is that pekerjaan apa, number one pekerjaan apakah ini? menulis di papan tulis itu pekerjaannya apa?*".

3) T3

The third participant applies both indicators in remembering. At the beginning of the lesson, she

immediately asked the students in the form of *"Oke are you remember our lesson last week"*. T2 asks students to recall *"Do you still remember about our vocabulary last week?"* *"What the meaning about the declining invitation tadi apa artinya"*. Then T2 also asked students to provide an information *"So what is obligation"*.

4) T4

The fourth participant applies remembering to the recall indicator. Can be proven by findings in observation. At the beginning of learning T4 directly ask questions to students *"I want to ask you kemarin kita belajar apa?"* Even in interviews he said, he once asked students to recall what she had explained *"misalnya ketika saya sehabis menjelaskan materi saya akan bertanya kepada siswa "apa contoh kalimat invitation?"*.

b. Understanding

In the level of understanding only three participants who apply in learning.

1) T1

Understanding which is applied by T2 is asking students to re-explain the material that has been delivered. She also confirmed this in the interview that she asked students to explain again in order to find out whether the student understood and could conclude the main points or important points. *"meminta siswa untuk menjelaskan kembali materi yang telah saya sampaikan"*.

2) T2

The second participant in the study displays a picture in the PPT. Then T2 asked the students to look at the picture carefully. Then from the picture she

asked the students *"who is this in family members?"* *"and this one olahraga apa ini?"*. *"Kita hari ini akan belajar tentang job or occupation, itu artinya apa ya dalam Bahasa Indonesia ya. Itu bisa di liat ya dibagian 2a A sampai H, itu nama-nama apa ya kira-kira"*,

3) T4

During the interview T4 explained that she once asked students to conclude something. *"Meminta siswa untuk menyimpulkan sesuatu dari sebuah teks yang saya berikan"*.

c. Applying

At the level of applying only two participants apply in learning, which are as follows:

1) T1

At the time of the interview T4 stated that she once asked students to analyze the use of modals. The aim is to find out if the student understands the material and can he apply it *"Saya meminta siswa untuk membuat kalimat berisi pertanyaan untuk teman-temannya."*

2) T4

In the observation video, the researcher found that T4 applied level applying. When participant learning explains the use of modals. Participants asked one of the students to make use of modals should and shouldn't in a sentence *"Disini ada dua contoh penggunaan should and shouldn't. nayla bisa tolong sebutkan penggunaannya dalam kalimat"*.

d. Analyzing

Based on the results of observations and interviews, only two participants applied the analyzing level in learning.

1) T1

At the time of the interview T1 stated that she had asked students to analyze something. *"saya meminta siswa untuk menganalisa alasan mengapa mereka tidak bisa tidur ketika malam hari"*.

2) T2

In my observation, I found that the participants applied the use of analyzing in the classroom. T4 displays a lot of pictures and she asks the students what the picture is. *"Nomor satu kira-kira gambar apa ya. Profesi apa. Pekerjaan apa itu"* From these questions the teacher implicitly asks students to analyze what the picture is.

e. Creating

Based on the results of observations and interviews that the author got, there were three participants who applied the creating level in the classroom during learning.

1) T1

T1 applies the level of creating, namely by asking students to form a sentence from several random words. *"saya pernah meminta mereka menggabungkan kata-kata yang masih acak menjadi kalimat yang sempurna"*.

2) T3

In the observation video I found that the participants applied the creating level to the students. T3 asks students to make their own sentences according to the material they have learned. *"Make a your own about positive sentence"*

3) T4

In the observation video writer found that the participants applied the creating level to the students. T4 asks students to make examples using their own words. *"Oke now, create your own*

examples." and at the time of the interview, the writer asked whether the participants applied the creating level during the lesson. Participants answered yes ever by asking students to form new things. *"saya pernah meminta siswa menggabungkan elemen untuk membentuk hal baru seperti membuat contoh kalimat invitation selain yang saya berikan sebagai contoh"*.

f. Evaluating

Based on the results of observations and interviews, none of the participants applied that level.

4. Discussion

From the findings obtained in the study that it can be said that the results of the application of critical thinking applied by pre-service teachers are at a low to moderate level.

Iranian researchers found that in all grades lower-order cognitive skills were more prevalent than higher-order ones. The study was conducted by Riazi (2014) using Bloom's Taxonomy of learning objectives. It also found that the pre-university textbook used some degrees of high-order learning objective.

Sidek (2010) looked at how the Malaysian EFL secondary curriculum mirrored different approaches to second language reading instruction. The Malaysian EFL secondary curriculum as well as the EFL secondary textbook were examined, with a particular focus on the reading questions. The findings of the study, reading questions and tasks are largely meant to create high cognitive demands on students, but there appears to be a strong emphasis on reading

questions and tasks that require students to analyze text content. Other high-level cognitive reading questions and exercises were included in the curriculum, although only in modest amounts.

5. Conclusion

It can be concluded that, the first participant (T1) applied the levels of remembering, understanding, applying,

and analyzing. The second participant (T2) applied the levels of remembering, understanding, and analyzing. The third participant (T3) only applies remembering and analyzing. While the last participant (T4) only did not apply the level of evaluating. So the pre-service teachers' have applied critical thinking skills at the low to moderate stage.

6. Acknowledgement

All thanks to Allah SWT who has given the opportunity for researchers to complete this article. This is the result of hard efforts, support, and suggestions from many parties, and the researcher would like to express special appreciation to Noni Agustina, M.Pd. as my supervisor, lecturer, and academic advisor, my parents, and all parties involved in this research.

7. References

- Afshar, H. S., & Rahimi, M. (2014). The Relationship Among Critical Thinking, Emotional Intelligence, and Speaking Abilities of Iranian EFL Learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 75-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.291>
- Amstrong, P. (1956). *Bloom ' s Taxonomy Bloom ' s Taxonomy understand*.
- Arthur, L., & Costa, A. L. (1985). *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*, Alexandria: ASCD.
- Cheong. (2010). *Educating pre - service teachers for a sustainable environment*. (January 2014), 37-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866052000341151>
- Chikiwa, C., & Schäfer, M. (2018). *Promoting Critical Thinking in Multilingual Mathematics Classes through Questioning*. 14(8).
- Creswell W John. (2016). *Research Design*.
- Creswell W John. (2018). *Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*.
- Defianty, M., & Wilson, K. (2019). Fostering critical thinking through questioning in EFL. In L. Li (Ed.), *Thinking skills and creativity in second language acquisition* (pp. 1-230). London: Routledge.
- Doran, P. (2020). *Contributory factors to the evolution of the concept and practice of informed consent in clinical research: A narrative review*. 19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conctc.2020.100634>
- Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2018). *Informed Consent in Social Sciences Research : Ethical Challenges*. 6(5), 13-23. <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i5.3106>

- Forehand, M. (2011). *BloomsTaxonomy*.
- Fung, D. C., To, H., & Leung, K. (2016). *The influence of collaborative group work on students ' development of critical thinking : the teacher ' s role in facilitating group discussions*. 4818(May). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2016.1159965>
- Heidari, K. (2020). Critical thinking and EFL learners' performance on textually-explicit, textually-implicit, and script-based reading items. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 37(August), 100703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100703>
- Husna, M. &. (2020). *Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Matematis Berdasarkan Disposisi Matematis*. 9(2), 269-278.
- Kavenuke, P. S., Mjege, K., & Joel, J. K. (2020). ur na l P. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 100677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100677>
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2017). *A Revision of Bloom ' s Taxonomy : 5841*(November). <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104>
- Kusaeri, & Aditomo, A. (2019). *Pedagogical Beliefs about Critical Thinking among Indonesian Mathematics Pre-Service Teachers*. 12(1).
- Liang, W., & Fung, D. (2021). Fostering critical thinking in English-as-a-second-language classrooms: Challenges and opportunities. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39, 100769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100769>
- Luxton-reilly, A., Jackova, J., Johnson, C., Kay, J., Thompson, E., Grove, H., ... Robbins, P. (2008). *Bloom ' s taxonomy for CS assessment Related papers Bloom ' s Taxonomy for CS Assessment*.
- Ma, L., & Luo, H. (2020). Chinese pre-service teachers ' cognitions about cultivating critical thinking in teaching English as a foreign language. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 00(00), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1793733>
- Peter, A., & Facione, N. C. (2013). *Critical Thinking for Life : Valuing , Measuring , and Training Critical Thinking in All Its Forms*. (January), 4-25. <https://doi.org/10.5840/inquiryct20132812>
- Riazi, M. (2014). *Evaluation of learning objectives in Iranian high-school and pre-university English textbooks using Bloom ' s Taxonomy*. (May).
- Shin, H., Park, C. G., & Kim, H. (2015). Validation of Yoon ' s Critical Thinking Disposition Instrument. *Asian Nursing Research*, (October), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2015.10.004>
- Sidek, H. M. (2010). *An Analysis of the EFL Secondary Reading Curriculum in Malaysia: Approaches to Reading and Preparation For Higher Education*.
- Smith, E. B., Gellatly, M., Schwartz, C. J., & Jordan, S. (2020). *Training Radiology Residents, Bloom Style*. 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2020.08.013>
- Smogorzewska, J. (2014). Developing children ' s language creativity through telling stories - An experimental study. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 13, 20-31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2014.02.005>
- Soodmand, H., & Rahimi, M. (2014). The Relationship among Critical Thinking , Emotional Intelligence , and Speaking Abilities of Iranian EFL Learners. *Procedia*

- *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 75–79.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.291>
- Sudargo, F., & S, S. A. (2010). *Kemampuan Pedagogik Calon Guru Dalam Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Dan Keterampilan Proses Siswa Melalui Pembelajaran Berbasis Praktikum*. 4–12.
- Sulaiman, M., & Bani, H. (2014). *An Analysis of the Tenth Grade English Language Textbooks Questions in Jordan Based on the Revised Edition of Bloom ' s Taxonomy*. 5(18), 139–152.
- Susanti, E., & Arista, A. (2019). *Analisa Tingkat Pengetahuan Guru terhadap Kompetensi 4C*. (September), 73–78.
- Tican, C., & Taspinar, M. (2017). *The Effects of Reflective Thinking-based Teaching Activities on Pre-service Teachers ' Reflective Thinking Skills , Critical Thinking Skills , Democratic Attitudes , and Academic Achievement The Effects of Reflective Thinking-based Teaching Activities on Pre-service Teachers ' Reflective Thinking Skills , Critical*. 0073. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2015.11891730>
- Tuma, F., & Nassar, A. K. (2021). *Applying Bloom ' s taxonomy in clinical surgery : Practical examples*. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, 69(May), 102656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2021.102656>
- Turner, P., & Turner, S. (1970). *Triangulation In Practice 2 . Triangulation in Presence Research*. 1–13.
- Umar, I. N., & Rathakrishnan, M. (2012). *The Effects of Online Teachers' Social Role and Learning Style on Students' Essay Writing Performance and Critical Thinking in a Wiki Environment*. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5730–5735. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.506>
- Zetriuslita, Ariawan, R., & Nufus, H. (2016). *Analisis kemampuan berpikir kritis matematis mahasiswa dalam menyelesaikan soal uraian kalkulus integral berdasarkan level kemampuan mahasiswa*. 5(1), 56–65.