

# **Characteristics of facilitated critical thinking when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia**

**Ricky Fernandes,**

School of Education, The University of Adelaide

**John Willison**

School of Education, The University of Adelaide

**Christopher Boyle**

School of Education, The University of Adelaide

## **Abstract**

This article presents a qualitative case study of a teacher facilitating Critical Thinking (CT) through listening and speaking in an English as an Additional Language (EAL) Year 10 Indonesian high school class. Such CT facilitation and development are required not only by the Indonesian government's EAL policies, but also in other countries with developing economies. CT is thought to promote language acquisition as well as being developed through language learning, if well-facilitated. This paper presents a case study of a teacher and her class based on triangulated data comprising pre- and post-interviews with the teacher, student classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. The findings revealed evidence for rich CT when analysed through the analytical framework of Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS). However, factors were identified as obstacles for CT development, including first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. These barriers to effective facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking form the basis for further investigation of the areas of CT in EAL listening and speaking pedagogy and assessment. Moreover, the CTELS shows promise to illuminate CT as evidenced by students and has the potential to guide teacher facilitation of CT.

**Keywords:** *Critical Thinking (CT), English as an Additional Language (EAL), Case Study, Teacher Practice, Listening and Speaking*

## 1. Introduction

Critical Thinking (CT) has become an educational objective to enhance both student performance and national global competitive ability in numerous nations with developing economies (Tan, 2017). This is partly because CT plays a central role in developing new knowledge through problem-solving, sophisticated thinking and decision-making (Cottrell, 2017; Kelley, 2014). CT is also associated with student learning improvement, not only in academic contexts but also equipping them to be flexible, adaptive and resilient (Gambrill, 2019) in natural settings. Moreover, CT is essential for students to make better decisions, be less susceptible to cognitive biases and fallacies and use evaluative thinking (Davies & Barnett, 2015) to develop a comprehensive understanding.

While there is a debate about how CT could be effectively developed, in terms of '*generic skills*' (Kelley, 2014) vs '*content-specific*' (Ellerton, 2022), these orientations to CT development are viewed in this article as complementary enablers of student CT development (Wale & Bishaw, 2020). Nevertheless, the focus of this research is context-sensitive CT development, a focus necessary to add to the field understandings that are fit-for-purpose (Ghanizadeh et al., 2020). Context-sensitive development impacts on the facilitation of generic CT and how effectively CT is developed by students (Starichkova et al., 2022; Thomson & Yedidi, 2020).

Somewhat controversially, some languages are thought to be associated with cultural norms for more transmissive modes of teaching (Wang & Wu, 2023), and therefore limit the potential development for CT in EAL. This is a crude distinction, as high school instruction in English has long been associated with transmission teaching, and to a substantial extent, still is (Ilyas, 2017). Nevertheless, this study was conducted in the context of EAL, because English has a supposed tradition of enlightenment thinking that may challenge norms and promote CT (Starichkova et al., 2022).

Research on the development of CT in EAL learning contexts, set in non-English speaking countries, is required to determine whether EAL may indeed contribute to student CT development (Liang & Fung, 2021), specifically listening and speaking skills. This is partly because there is some evidence that students who struggle with literacy in reading and writing may benefit from a listening and speaking orientation to CT (Akatsuka, 2019; Erkek & Batur, 2020). In China, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at providing a communicative context for students to listen to each other, make comments on their peers' opinions and question (Yu et al., 2021), while in Turkey, the facilitation of CT

in EAL listening and speaking is to develop student active communication through reasoning (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In this sense, CT in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at transferring information and expressing opinions in an additional language, providing opportunities for students to practise the target language in authentic activities (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In both the Chinese and Turkish contexts, the learning experiences of CT in EAL listening and speaking simultaneously enhance student communicative competence by understanding and evaluating different types of information (Ferrari-Bridgers et al., 2015; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014) through analytical thinking, collaborative capacity and new expertise development (Hegazy et al., 2021). In the long run, CT in EAL listening and speaking could potentially provide opportunities for students to understand multiple sources of information, listen to different perspectives and communicate their understanding orally (Schieble et al., 2021). Therefore, CT in EAL listening and speaking can be defined as an active and persistent process that requires a commitment to conceptualise different knowledge and beliefs by communicating key ideas followed by reasoning with evidence, solving problems and formulating solutions.

One specific context that is suitable for CT in EAL research is Indonesian high school setting. CT is typically regarded as one of the most pivotal attributes in education in Indonesia, and English is perceived to be an instruction medium that may better promote CT (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). The Indonesian Ministry of Education is committed to developing CT through pedagogical practices in EAL courses, especially for high school students. EAL for Indonesian high school students is a compulsory subject, and the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires them to develop CT skills through asking, reasoning, discussing, presenting and other forms of active oral communication (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). CT in EAL learning is aimed at student engagement with global concerns, Industrial Revolution 4.0 and the related Education 4.0 (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Consequently, teachers are expected to prepare their students to be increasingly self-directed when learning English.

However, CT facilitation in Indonesia remains elusive and requires further investigation, possibly in part because of the diverse definitions and procedures stated in the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum (Ilyas, 2017). Another factor may be inconsistency between the definitions and procedures and existing cultural norms, language barrier and epistemological beliefs (Wang & Wu, 2023). Culturally, many Indonesian teachers struggle to shift from monological thinking to independent thinking (Ilyas, 2017) and rely heavily on standardised tests. This is similar to the context of Hong Kong where the

entrenched examination-orientation hinders students' ample opportunities to practise CT in EAL, and thus little progress has been made in integrating CT into language teaching there (Liang & Fung, 2021). This may be contrasted with Singapore, where CT has been valued and cultivated in their education system for all teaching subjects, emphasising teacher improvement of students' consciousness and mindfulness in their pedagogical practices through reasoning (Low et al., 2017). The purpose is to enhance a habit of mind to think critically, ensuring effective teaching and learning processes (Low et al., 2017; Tan, 2017).

Although the importance of CT in EAL has become prevalent in Indonesia, relatively few studies on CT are set in Indonesia (Anggraeny & Khongput, 2022; Purnamaningwulan, 2022), even though this nation has committed to CT development in EAL. The majority of studies that have been conducted on Indonesian CT tend to highlight the focus on reading and writing for tertiary levels (Aunurrahman et al., 2017; Muthmainnah, 2019). However, pedagogies around listening and speaking to develop CT tend to be under-theorised and under-researched (Havwini, 2019) and few studies explore CT in listening and speaking (Purnamaningwulan, 2022) in the high school contexts.

In order to address these gaps in research on CT in the context of listening and speaking in EAL, a case study was conducted in an Indonesian Year 10 classroom where pedagogies for listening and speaking were evident. By observing the teacher's practice around facilitating listening and speaking, and the student engagement in these tasks, evidence of CT was determined, in order to provide a rich understanding of pedagogy and student CT outcomes. Therefore, this article aims to add to the understanding of teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking and its outcomes in the Indonesian high school classroom.

To address the aim above, two questions guided the present inquiry:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?

Data were collected of the teacher's perceptions and practices, student listening and speaking in their classroom and of curriculum and planning documents.

Lamb et al. (2017) reported that three main ways of assessing students' CT were student self-rating, direct assessment using tests and teacher judgments and reporting. The

limitations of these CT assessments are substantial as they provided narrow student data (Lamb et al., 2017), whereas student classroom observations of CT are both rarer and provide a valuable perspective. To gain this perspective, this article presents the investigation of CT in EAL listening and speaking through a rich extended observation of an Indonesian Year 10 class. The research explored the nature and possible developments of CT during the teaching and learning processes (Boryczko, 2020; Starichkova et al., 2022) conducted by the Year 10 class teacher. The article thus aims to provide a close investigation of how CT in EAL listening and speaking is realised in a local Indonesian high school context.

Specific to this aim, sustained longitudinal observations of the teacher's practice and student engagement in learning were conducted in the classroom in weekly visits across two school terms, from January to May 2023. These observations were triangulated with the teacher's perceptions and knowledge of CT in advance of the observations, and the teacher's perceptions and challenges of facilitating CT in the lessons observed after observations were finished, as well as the curriculum and teaching documents.

The analysis of this rich and complex data required a pertinent analytical framework. Two frameworks that individually addressed a salient dimension of CT in EAL listening and speaking were combined: The Models of Engaged Learning and Teaching (MELT) (Willison, 2020) and the Dimensions of CT in English Listening and Speaking (DCTELS) (*see Appendix A*). The MELT provide insight into the multifaceted nature of sophisticated learning, including student engagement in CT (Willison, 2020). The DCTELS dimensions were adopted from the framework of critical thinking and collaborative inquiry (Ellerton, 2017) to illuminate CT in EAL listening and speaking. The resulting conceptual framework, Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) (*see Appendix A*) placed five MELT facets on the vertical axis of a matrix and the four DCTELS dimensions on its horizontal axis. The resulting twenty cells comprehensively capture the intricacies of CT in a classroom with rich evidence of listening and speaking in EAL. For instance, the integration between the facets of *evaluate & determine (discerning)* from "MELT" and *clarity* from "DCTELS" provides description of processes when students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/sources. In order to address the study's aim with reference to the CTELS framework, the article's research questions, methods, findings, discussion and conclusion follow.

## 2. Methods

This study employed a qualitative case study conducted to determine the nature of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in a local Indonesian high school in a naturalistic setting. A case study is a qualitative approach that explores a contemporary bounded system and/or phenomena through in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (i.e., teacher pre- and post-interviews, classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices) (*See Appendices B, C and D*) (Creswell, 2013; Rashid et al., 2019). As the present study addresses an in-service teacher's personal perceptions and practices of CT in EAL listening and speaking, the epistemological view is through the subjective orientation provided by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). This is because the authors had to interpret the reality subjectively, with the teacher creating an evolving knowledge base and understanding during the investigation (Rashid et al., 2019). The process of investigation was refined through interactions between the first author and the teacher (Rashid et al., 2019).

Prior to the commencement of data collection, ethical approval from the first author's university was obtained. The first author contacted the target high school in Indonesia and went on site to discuss the research with the principal. EAL at the school is a compulsory subject, providing a potentially good site to investigate facilitated CT in EAL. After obtaining the agreement and permission from the principal, three EAL teachers volunteered to participate, and each signed a consent form. This paper focuses on the case of one Teacher and her Year 10 EAL class.

In a case study, the purpose of selecting the school, teacher and class is not to determine statistical inferences for a population (Creswell, 2013) but rather useful information in the form of context-sensitive and rich descriptions (Campbell et al., 2020) within the school. Teacher interviews, classroom observations and curriculum documents were collected to provide a triangulation of data. The aim of employing triangulated data is to use different sources of evidence that may support as well as challenge the perspectives of each and so provide an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the phenomena under study (Yin, 2018).

The teacher in this case study was assigned a pseudonym, Elisa, and the study focus was her Year 10 EAL class. Elisa was recruited to be involved in the study in large part because she was willing to be observed over an extended time period in order to investigate her facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. Elisa's understanding and conceptualisation of CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed the authors to explore her

perceptions and practices. Elisa was an EAL teacher at the target high school for seven years, holding a bachelor's degree in English teacher training education from a local university in Indonesia. As a case study, there are limitations of this research situated in a target single institution with one in-service teacher, and the outcomes are specific to the context and different from those in other contexts (Trowler, 2012). In the research project, a total of nineteen students, out of a class of twenty-seven students, participated after returning the consent forms signed by themselves and their parents.

In EAL subject, students needed to learn four different language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Although the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires students to use CT in active oral communication through asking, reasoning, discussing and presenting, according to Elisa, there were still very limited numbers of students who could communicate fully in English, especially in listening and speaking. This is partly because students needed to pass standardised tests (Ilyas, 2017), in which the forms of the tests only consisted of grammar, reading and writing. Subsequently, they commonly spoke Indonesian when communicating with their peers during oral group discussions in EAL classes, as it was easy for them to communicate their key ideas directly using their first language (Wang & Wu, 2023). Lastly, some students wrote scripts in English first before they attempted to express their opinions and key ideas during the teaching and learning processes.

As Elisa's spoken English was proficient, the pre- and post-interviews were collected in English to provide detailed and reflective accounts of her perceptions and experiences (Smith et al., 2009). A dialogical method was employed to explore the interpretation of committing to both thematic analysis and presentation of the emic perspective in a novel manner (Agarwal, 2021).

Classroom observations were made from 17 January 2023 to 19 May 2023, with a total of twelve lessons observed. Classes ran for eighty minutes and occurred immediately after the school's lunch break. There were two lessons each week, but the teacher allowed the first author to attend one lesson each week. However, during mid-term exams and any other school events, the classroom observations were postponed. The teacher thus informed the first author to observe subsequent lessons twice in a week. For the classroom observations, field notes were taken with particular attention paid to dialogues between Elisa and her students, dialogue between students in the whole-class setting, the physical environment of the classroom and learning activities (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Yin, 2018). The dialogues between Elisa and her students were fully in English and recorded



using audio-recordings. However, during peer small group discussions, students spoke in Indonesian, and so this data was not captured. Meanwhile, documents such as teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices were deemed by Elisa to be the evidence of her epistemological CT facilitation.

Smith et al.'s (2009) IPA was used to analyse and process the pre-and post-observation interviews. IPA is underpinned by *phenomenology* (a philosophical approach to the study of experience), *hermeneutics* (theory of interpretation) and *ideography* (depth of analysis) (Smith et al., 2009). The limitations of IPA evident in critiques (Manen, 2017; Stolz, 2022) were accounted for, and its strengths to explore the teacher's cognitive, affective and natural responses to make sense of the experiences (Smith, 2011; Zahavi, 2020) were highlighted. The first step was reading the original interview transcripts and listening back to the audio recordings to ensure that the teacher became the main analysis. The second step focused on investigating the semantic content and language uses to familiarise with the transcripts, identify what the teacher said, understand the experiences and develop a specific phenomenological focus that was close to the teacher's words by exploring descriptive, linguistic and conceptual comments. The comments were not intended to be prescriptive, but were presented as the analytic tools to comment similarities and differences in what the teacher said (Smith et al., 2009). For example, when analysing the transcripts, the first author could ask questions of what the words, phrases and sentences were meant to the teacher. For descriptive comments, the focus highlighted the objects which structured the teacher's thoughts and experiences, while linguistic comments focused on the language uses such as repetitions, tones and degrees of fluency (Smith et al., 2009). Meanwhile, conceptual comments were more interpretative towards the teacher's overarching understanding of the matters that were discussed (Smith et al., 2009). The third step involved turning the notes into themes that remained close to the teacher's words by shifting from the initial notes. The fourth step was to emerge the process of abstraction to identify patterns between emergent themes, develop a sense of 'superordinate' themes and map how themes fit together. The fifth step focused on seeking the patterns and developing a main table of themes to reflect the teacher's words comprehensively.

Field notes, which were transcribed from classroom observations, were verified by skimming, reading and interpreting (Yin, 2018). Out of twelve lessons observed, one lesson exemplified the active process of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking when students watched a video and discussed its content collaboratively. This lesson was



selected for detailed analysis in order to clearly articulate the rich and multi-faceted nature of CT facilitated. The recorded accounts did not contain any subjective or personal opinions from the authors (Yin, 2011), but were an attempt to re-create the conversation based on the recording, transcription and observations. An excerpt of the classroom observations was chosen from the exemplifying lesson, located in the results section below, and was analysed with reference to the CTELS. Analysis of the conversation excerpt used pattern-matching (Yin, 2018) with the cell descriptions of the CTELS framework. Curriculum and classroom documents were selected based on the relevance to the research questions (Bowen, 2009; Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2018) and analysed to look for congruence with other data and discomforting evidence.

### **3. Results and Analysis**

The centrepiece of the data is the classroom observation accounts of the teacher's practice and the student responses to this practice. These observation data are compared and contrasted with the statements made by the teacher during the pre- and post-interviews and documents on teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. Three key findings emerged from the data analysis: teacher conceptualisation of CT; CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students; and challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking.

#### *3.1 Teacher conceptualisation of CT*

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The section below discusses data gathered through pre-observation interview to obtain Elisa's general conceptualisation of CT. The term was familiar to her because it has generally been issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Education as one of the national objectives to develop human resources (Ilyas, 2017; The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Elisa stated that the key characteristics of CT were analysing different points of view from the perspective of evidence as well as identifying problems and their solutions:

*I find problems and offer solutions. I also analyse different points of view based on the data.*

Although the target high school implemented Curriculum 2013 that highlighted CT facilitation, Elisa claimed that the outcomes were not as expected. This is partly because many students still required intensive effort to stimulate their sophisticated thinking in EAL (Liang & Fung, 2021):

*Curriculum 2013, which includes critical thinking, doesn't work well. I'm trying to implement critical thinking although the result is not as I expect.*

Content materials designed by the government did not enable Elisa's teaching of CT that facilitated student learning. Elisa claimed that receiving updated teaching resources for embedded CT was vital for her pedagogical practices and development:

*I don't think that the teaching materials designed by the government made my students think critically. I need valid sources to teach critical thinking.*

Despite the insufficiency of CT materials, Elisa remained committed to facilitating CT by providing cases and asking her students to respond. This was aimed at improving students' sophisticated thinking by conveying their key ideas based on evidence:

*I ask questions to brainstorm and analyse the cases. Students should then share the results of what have been discussed based on the facts.*

However, Elisa perceived that some students tended to be passive because they were afraid of making mistakes in English and peer-judgments. Elisa believed that the limited vocabularies of students in English and first language interference hindered the facilitation of CT in EAL teaching and learning processes. In this sense, Elisa valued practical and authentic activities to model CT facilitation: *"I give my students cases which are related to their contexts"* and *"they should share the results based on facts"*. Elisa's pedagogical practice for CT facilitation was primarily the design of instructional activities based on pertinent and stimulating content materials (Esmaeilzad et al., 2022).

### *3.2 CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students*

*RQ2: What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?*

The following section discusses data gathered through classroom observations. In none of the 12 lessons did the teacher explicitly mention to students that CT was being taught, and so the development of CT was left implicit to students. Only those lessons that involved watching videos and discussing the contents evidenced CT facilitated through

listening and speaking tasks. The excerpt below was chosen to epitomise the CT demonstrated across the 12 lessons, because there is a multi-pronged approach in it to facilitating CT through listening and speaking. It is not typical or representative of any other lessons, but rather exemplifies CT evidenced in the Year 10 EAL class. The excerpt therefore sheds light on the nature of CT that may be facilitated, with reference to the CTELS framework.

In the excerpt below, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking was focused on engagement with a video about moving the capital city of Indonesia, Jakarta, to Borneo Island, answering questions, discussing and offering solutions. Seven of the nineteen students who gave permission to be involved in the research were involved in English discussion after watching this video. However, all the other twelve students were involved in speaking in English in other transcripts. The transcript in this article may provide evidence of CT skewed towards high achieving students, those who had confidence to speak to the whole class in English.

The classroom was hot and humid. There were two ceiling fans and no air conditioners. This condition made Elisa, students and first author perspire during the teaching and learning processes. Elisa used the teaching media to facilitate CT in EAL listening and speaking called '*nearpod.com*' (Kusmaryani et al., 2019) with a PC connected to a projector and speakers. Elisa's desk was front and centre of the classroom, and student desks all faced towards the front.

### *3.2.1 Teacher facilitating and students listening and speaking*

The facilitation of CT in listening and speaking was initiated when Elisa played a video narrated in English. Students viewed and listened to the video once and then Elisa asked a question in English about the video. Elisa encouraged her students to share their responses orally while their peers listened, resulting in a conversation-like exchange, as follows:

*Elisa (Teacher): "Now, let's discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved. Hansen, please share your thoughts."*

*Hansen (Student 1): "Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean."*

*Felicia (Student 2): "What if there is no rain in dry season?" (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Hansen (Student 1): “We can store the rainwater in a storage place to keep the water in dry season. As a preventive act, if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter.”*

*Vincent (Student 3): “I don’t think rainwater is good enough to be consumed because of the industrialisation and acid rain.” (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): “Well, when you consider storing the water, think about mosquito larvae that can infect the water.”*

*Hansen (Student 1): “Yes, that’s right, Ms. So, we need to use filter to make the rainwater clean.” (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): “Yes, that might work. Noreen, please share your ideas to your friends.”*

*Noreen (Student 4): “I believe that one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality. As the president said that it shows how much the stable capital city is needed to have equal economy.”*

*Elisa (Teacher): “Do you guys agree with Noreen? How can this be called economic equality?”*

*Victoria (Student 5): “I think new capital city will offer jobs for the locals.” (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Jorgen (Student 6): “Yes. And if we move the capital city sooner, the problem of sinking in Jakarta can also be avoided.” (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Nixsen (Student 7): “Objection, but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo.” (Shouted spontaneously)*

### *3.2.2 CTELS analysis of the conversation*

The whole excerpt above comprises students and teacher listening and speaking in an EAL context. The teacher initiated student active listening and speaking by targeting one student to answer her question about the video “*Hansen, please share your thoughts.*”. In this context, Elisa strategically ‘withdrew’ from the conversation only speaking occasionally in the transcript as she otherwise allowed students to respond to other students. This practice was prevalent in Elisa’s other lessons. Of the twelve lessons, eleven lessons showed this teacher withdrawal from the classroom conversation. This specific teaching characteristic of Elisa engaged a substantial proportion of students to converse in English during the whole-of-class teaching and learning processes. In the above transcript, seven students engaged in on-topic conversation that was more spontaneous than

orchestrated by Elisa. As a component of this strategy, Elisa allowed her students to use their mobiles to translate words into English or Indonesian. This enabled students to participate actively during discussions by voicing their key ideas in English (Starichkova et al., 2022). The evidence for student listening was strong in the authentic conversation-like interactions. Student listening was evidenced by appropriate responses to other student statements, to teacher questions and by their verbal recounts and re-interpretations of statements made by the video's narrator. There were visual and text components in the video for students to understand the content, however audio information from the video became the main guidance in the conversation. Using the CT through EAL listening and speaking, conceptual framework (*see Appendix A*) analysis was conducted cell by cell.

#### *a. Evaluate & Determine (Discerning)*

Each of the four dimensions of *evaluate and determine* is epitomised in the transcript. 'Clarity' was evident when Hansen emphatically stated, "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems...*". Here, Hansen showed an awareness of the teacher's purpose to have all students evaluate deeply the consequences of moving Jakarta's location and clearly asserted that Jakarta's water problem would be solved by moving the capital city. 'Relevance' was evident in Felicia's immediate, pertinent and evaluative challenge to Hansen "*What if there is no rain in dry season?*". 'Depth' was epitomised by Hansen's detailed explanation based on audio evidence in the video that he saw as convincing: "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean.*". This elaboration drew on multiple evidence from the video to make his case for solving Jakarta's problems. 'Coherence' is demonstrated by Vincent's evaluative challenge which listened to and followed on carefully from Hansen's claims: "*I don't think rainwater is good enough to be consumed...*". *Evaluate and reflect* are the heart of CT, because without such challenges, the listening and speaking may promote group-think, but challenges drive students to deeper levels of understanding.

#### *b. Find & Generate (Determined)*

Students may *find* information audibly when watching the documentary or *generate* new ideas based on the information. 'Clarity' was epitomised when Hansen found one

solution that had been specified in the video “... *if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter.*”. However, Hansen seemed to use that concept as an overarching solution, almost a repeated refrain, not realising that the use of a filter did not necessarily deal with Vincent’s concern about *acid rain* (the acid in which cannot be filtered out). At this point in the interaction, where Vincent challenged Hansen’s found solution of the filter, the teacher may have prioritised confidence to listen and speak over accuracy, as she interrupted the flow of the conversation with her interjection about *larvae* that a filter can deal with. At first, it seemed like Elisa, as teacher, was blocking the flow of a multi-student, rich and on-task conversation. However, it may be that either she made a pedagogical choice to value contributions that were on-topic even if not accurate, in order to boost confidence, or was herself unaware that acid could not be filtered out by standard filters, when she declared “*Yes, that might work...*”. ‘*Relevance*’ was evident when Victoria addressed Elisa’s question “...*How can this be called economic equality?*” by explicitly linking the evidence of beneficial impact in moving the capital city with the audio information from the video that the “...*new capital city will offer jobs for the locals.*”. ‘*Depth*’ was showed in Nixsen’s claim: “...*it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo.*”. Nixsen’s concern, from the audio information, was that there might be a specific drawback to Borneo’s ecosystem when moving the capital city. Moreover, he recalled audio information that there would be a time lag due to the development of the area that may make the project unfeasible. ‘*Coherence*’ of information found was evident in Noreen’s claim: “...*one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality...*”. Noreen attributed the source of her found information ‘*as the president said*’.

### c. *Embark & Clarify (Curious)*

Elisa launched the purpose of the conversation with her prompt “*let’s discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved.*”. The students needed to both process the documentary that had just been watched and relate this to Elisa’s intentionally general prompt, which needed student clarification of purpose. Elisa made the pedagogical decision to choose Hansen to determine that purpose, and out of all possible components in the video, he chose water supply. This was the direction of half of the transcript, and the direction only changed from Hansen’s clarification when Elisa steered it towards Noreen, who then specified the different theme of ‘*economic equality*’. In the case of both themes,



'relevance' was shown by student comments and questions closely adhering to the theme at hand, showing students followed both Hansen then Noreen's clarification of purpose. 'Coherence' was epitomised in Victoria's main point "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals." as she responded to Noreen's economic idea equity. Evidence for 'depth' was evident in Nixsen's response to Noreen's, when he challenged equity with the complexities of what will happen economically when the capital city is moved.

#### *d. Organise & Manage (Harmonising)*

Taken as a whole, the transcript above is fundamentally evidence of listening and speaking. One person was speaking at a time, and given the responses, there were at least seven others in the classroom were listening. No hands were raised, but rather students were self-managing their speaking in a conversation-like manner with no interruption of the speaker. Because, as noted, Elisa's teaching structure was familiar to the students, this is evidence of student 'clarity' about how to organise and manage conversations in EAL that are far more than superficial recounts or agreements. There are strategies by students to manage a 'depth' of conversation, exemplified by the three student challenges to other student statements: "What if there is no rain in dry season?", "I don't think rainwater is good enough" and "Objection". In the Indonesian classroom context, challenging others tends to be seen as inappropriate or rude (Ilyas, 2017), and so the classroom culture provides evidence of a harmonious approach to conversation management. 'Relevance' is evident in the on-topic nature of responses, whether on Hansen's topic of water or Noreen's topic of economy. The evidence for the conversation's managed 'coherence' was evident in the appropriate responses to the shift to the economic topic by Victoria and Nixsen: "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals" and "...it takes a lot of years to move the capital city".

#### *e. Analyse & Synthesise (Creative)*

'Clarity' was evident in Hansen's response, as he *analysed* and *synthesised* the aim of moving the capital city of Indonesia by communicating his own example "...Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water...". This is a synthesis of an idea that is not exactly correct, because irrigation is used to move water, not process it. This is one reason why 'evaluate and reflect' are pivotal to CT. Moreover, CT is multi-faceted, not conducted

linearly, facet by facet, but rather each facet is mutually interdependent. During the initial theme of water, the conversation centred around Hansen's synthesis of, understanding of, and defence of, the use of filters, even when this was applied wrongly to acid rain. The conversation risked becoming more a defence of filters than a promotion of CT and this may be another reason why Elisa suddenly redirected the conversation to Noreen. That pedagogical redirection fundamentally changes the type of conversation, from a person-centred defence to a conversation probing the '*depth*' of synthesised ideas across five people, listening, analysing and '*coherently*' synthesising ideas that flowed from one to the next. This starts with Noreen's economic equality theme, then Elisa's prompt to see if others agreed with this. Victoria and Jorgen respectively amplified with the idea of "*jobs for the locals*" and Jorgen's "*move the capital city sooner*". Jorgen's analysis that speed would overcome some problems is challenged by Nixsen's analysis, who saw obstacles to speedy development: "*...but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city*".

Based on Elisa's facilitation involving both promoting and withdrawing, the CT evident in her EAL students' listening and speaking was rich and this exemplifying, five-minute excerpt provided evidence for all 20 cells of the CTELS framework. Students listened to their peers' main points and questions and responded with detailed explanations or challenging questions orally (Liang & Fung, 2021; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Moreover, the facilitation showed that students were able to justify their views and take turns to express opinions. Students were willing and able to express views that differed from others and even challenged one another's key ideas. Students' engagement with one another's key ideas enabled them to elaborate their main points, think critically and initiated a dialogic space to contribute in the discussion (Ellerton, 2017; Willison, 2020). Elisa's awareness towards the dispositions needed for listening and speaking in English was perhaps as vital as the more cognitive facets and dimensions. Elisa's occasional interventions seem to be particularly salient, to prevent students getting 'stuck' on one solution, so they may think more broadly and critically. Her interventions were, however, done in a very sensitive manner that did not undermine student confidence to speak out, nurturing student determination to participate in the conversation. When Elisa shifted the conversation away from Hansen, however, there is evidence that she took this risk to his confidence to promote students being *discerning*, rather than stick to one solution (filters). Based on the string of student-student conversation, the students provide evidence that they had, or were developing, the disposition of *harmonising*, and the respectful

conversation-like nature of the discourse is a particularly striking feature of this classroom. Such harmony was not agreement, and in fact there was evident a comfort for students to disagree, often using *creative* challenges that were a complex synthesis of information from the video, listening to other students and imagined possibilities. All of these dispositions emerged from a lesson, in which Elisa chose a pertinent stimulus to entice student *curiosity*. The content was important to Elisa, for she disregarded government-provided content and took the time to find a resource she believed the students would engage with. The level of engagement in this excerpt shows students conversing in English as their additional tongue and doing so in a *constructive* open-hearted fashion that leads to deeper understanding of the topic and use of, and probably deeper development of, CT. There is a complex interplay between different dispositional facets that is, perhaps, impossible to pre-programme, but requires teacher agility and their own teacherly CT. However, when the EAL classroom enables students to be increasingly discerning, determined, curious, creative, harmonising and constructive through stimulated conversation, there may be a virtuous circle of CT development and associated dispositions.

### 3.3 Challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The following section discusses the data gathered through post-observation interview and documents that included lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment tasks. After the final classroom observation, Elisa was interviewed to analyse her underlying ideas about the facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. There were significant constraints that hindered the teaching and learning processes, when Elisa facilitated CT practices in EAL listening and speaking. Despite Elisa's attempts to encourage her students to share ideas, discussions in student small groups tended to be in their first language, Indonesian. Elisa described challenges when she facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking as *first language interference*, *insufficient authentic content materials* and *constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*.

### 3.3.1 First language interference

Elisa stated that the relationship between CT and EAL listening and speaking was dynamic, however, the students' limited English vocabulary was a primary factor in their use of Indonesian in their small group discussions:

*Some students had a limited vocabulary. When discussing with their peers, they tended to mix up with Indonesian.*

While the first language interfered with the teaching and learning processes, a lack of self-confidence in actively participating also prevailed in the classroom. Elisa thus instructed her students to write down the scripts before speaking and read during the speaking:

*Passive students were instructed to make scripts for speaking. By scripting, they learned how to analyse the topics being discussed, even though it wasn't spontaneously speaking.*

The comments above indicated that Elisa encouraged her students to be prepared to speak in English by scripting. This is partly because Elisa tried to encourage all her students to be able to present as well as share their ideas orally. Elisa also believed that scripting before speaking was an initial step for her students to analyse the given topics before discussions and improve their engagement:

*Although my students were scripting before speaking, they were analysing the given topic critically. I could say that my students tried to engage with my teaching in the class.*

As shown in this quote, while engaging all students to be active and spontaneous speakers in English remained a challenge for Elisa, scripting before speaking provides evidence for her to show her students' independent thinking and critical evaluation of the given issues (Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). In Elisa's case, her CT engagement in the teaching practice shows that she realised the importance of understanding her students' learning conditions. She further observed that her students were struggling with English vocabulary and designed teaching materials to embed active participation discussing the given topic. Elisa perceived that such a contextual support could improve her students' learning engagement and reduce their anxieties while speaking in English and internalising CT (Yuan et al., 2022). Therefore, Elisa's quotes seem to suggest an active learning process for her students to communicate their key ideas in purposeful CT development.

### 3.3.2 *Insufficient authentic content materials*

Elisa claimed that the provision of updated and authentic content materials was lacking. Elisa believed that intensive knowledge to design suitable learning topics would enhance her students' interests and sophisticated thinking. However, Elisa added that the Indonesian EAL syllabus primarily focused on grammar, reading and writing and minimised listening and speaking:

*The syllabus focuses on grammar and reading. It's hard for me to carry out the listening and speaking.*

The syllabus that Elisa was required to adopt trivialised listening and speaking, rather requiring students to listen to short pre-recorded dialogue and then precisely imitate the intonations of the recording, as well as identify some grammatical features. Although the syllabus also required students to reflect on what is learned, there are no clear indicators in the documents about how reflection should be conducted. Elisa thus expected updated content materials and syllabus that facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking, knowing:

*If I keep using the sources from the government, those materials won't help my students think critically.*

Representing Elisa's notion, Hegazy et al. (2021) suggested that issues around curriculum development, the role of content materials, school cultures and institutional frameworks to create thinking classrooms should be addressed to solve these challenges. Therefore, looking into the future, Elisa's quotes represented the need for continuous supports to enhance her own competence and knowledge to teach CT, especially in EAL listening and speaking.

### 3.3.3 *Constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*

The primary guidance for Elisa's assessment design was the textbook. However, she found that:

*The assessments from textbook don't cover the assessments that I need.*

Elisa used scales from zero to five to systematically assess students' speaking performances, in which five was the highest and zero was the lowest:

*For speaking, I assess the grammar accuracy, pronunciation, fluency and details.*

Her assessment approach to encourage CT in EAL listening and speaking was emphasised in discussions that were integrated with active listening (Yu et al., 2021). Despite her

attempt to design assessment practices for CT in EAL speaking, Elisa was required to follow the standardised test in the form of a written assessment regulated by her high school. Because of this requirement and the classroom time that it took for each student to individually answer questions orally, the listening assessment was neglected. Elisa's epistemological conceptions of assessing CT in EAL speaking were depicted by the importance of details on her students' speaking accuracies, while the standardised goal from the target high school was to enable students to master the language skills through the focus on grammar structures, reading and writing. While Elisa's lesson, as epitomised by the data above, demonstrably facilitates some students' CT in EAL listening and speaking, the constraints of the curriculum and assessment minimise these efforts and possibly minimise the CT that students ultimately develop.

#### **4. Discussion**

Classroom observations in this study provided evidence of Elisa's facilitation of student CT in listening and speaking activities (Starichkova et al., 2022). Elisa's perceptions derived from interviews and documents also shed light on what was occurring during facilitation, sometimes corresponding to, and at other times contradicting, the events in the classroom. The findings show a teacher prompting student CT and withdrawing, only to re-appear at key moments in a very simple conversation structure, in which students asserted, challenged, asked and answered other students, allowing those that participated to delve deeply into problems collaboratively (Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). These results do not show the classroom culture needed to engender student-to-student and student-to-teacher trust in order to allow such a conversation to flow in English. They also do not show the careful planning of the teacher in finding and selecting appropriate stimuli, despite any pressures, including reduced time for preparation, to use government-supplied resources. Therefore, the findings show authentic use and development of CT in EAL listening and speaking, a process involving an evolving conversation between teacher and students (Liang & Fung, 2021).

The data selected exemplified CT developed at a high level with relation to the CTELS, but did not epitomise the standard teaching and learning of CT in Elisa's classroom. Nevertheless, implications can be drawn from Elisa's dispositional and epistemological practices. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in the results focused on watching a video to discuss its contents and solve problems (Rahmawati & Ashadi, 2018). While



the data were created and gathered through interviews, classroom observations and documents, the analysis revealed that the process of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed Elisa to focus on the development of students' cognitive and affective skills, particularly in terms of collaborating and listening to their friends' ideas, while emphasising the development of reasoning and justification (Kelley, 2014). This epistemological shift from teacher didactics is appropriate to increase student engagement (Abrami et al., 2008) during the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, the enhancement of students being critical while listening and speaking was reported in Elisa's CT facilitation to form student simultaneous engagement and pedagogical reflection (Chen & Hwang, 2019; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Significantly, the analysis of the data with the CTELS showed just how rich, multi-faceted and dynamic the student listening and speaking was in the classroom.

Despite the potential for developing student CT, there are numerous shortfalls evident from the data. Some students did not fully participate either being reluctant to speak to the class in English, or not able to engage in such a CT-rich conversation. Moreover, evidence of student CT while listening and speaking was relatively rare during Elisa's teaching. This is partly because Elisa struggled to overcome curriculum and assessment constraints to ensure student achievement of listening and speaking as well as CT learning objectives (Ellerton, 2017). While Elisa argued that some students tended to be disengaged due to the lack of English proficiency, it may be that emphasising dispositions associated with argumentation, reasoning and questioning could promote the development of CT in EAL listening and speaking (Afshar & Movassagh, 2014). For instance, Elisa endorsed Hansen's increasingly tenuous defence of the use of filters, possibly in part to support and value his contributions in English. An integrated and systematic understanding of CT in EAL listening and speaking, including student dispositions, could therefore enhance CT development (Ellerton, 2017). For example, the CTELS may provide teachers and researchers a systematic understanding of the nature of CT in listening and speaking in English.

Another essential finding of this study relates to the lack of provision of authentic and updated content materials. As reported in the result, teacher-selected materials from the internet became the main source of CT in EAL listening and speaking. However, the question that remains is whether the target high school gave permission to Elisa to utilise the video that she played for her students. Elisa did not articulate the criteria for choosing content materials from the third-party sources, but only that the syllabus and textbook from

the government did not entirely cover assessments based on her students' learning needs. Moreover, Elisa tended to distrust the content materials designed by the government. It is uncertain whether the target high school provided professional training for Elisa to address this distrust and improve her epistemological practices in engaging language teaching and sophisticated thinking. The lack of school support and learning opportunities for Elisa also played a minimised role in her professional learning and subsequent epistemological practice improvement. Such a finding attests to the potential to embed CT with in-service teacher education programmes in parallel with EAL teaching and learning procedures and students' needs. Therefore, CT-oriented pedagogical practices to navigate contextual challenges and promote the integration with EAL listening and speaking remain pivotal for Elisa to expand her professional competence.

Elisa's summative assessment of listening and speaking focused on fluency, pronunciation, detail and grammar accuracy in keeping with the government materials and school's policies. However, Elisa knew that the summative assessment regime did not correspond with her rich facilitation and formative assessment of listening and speaking tasks and she was unsure whether the assessment tasks and criteria were suitable for assessing her students' CT in EAL. Schieble et al. (2021) argued that the alternative to measure CT when speaking is for students to write all the information into a journal. However, the data and analysis in this current study suggest that assessing CT in EAL listening and speaking should be conducted through corresponding listening and speaking tasks. The lack of congruence between teaching and learning of listening and speaking in EAL and its summative assessment needs further investigation. Arguably, student capacity to develop CT and to use the English language after studying it is reduced by pressures towards assessing listening and speaking through writing. The richness of student CT when speaking spontaneously in this study show the potential, and the practice gap, for development of both CT and English language in the classroom.

The short sequence of data demonstrated that the complexity and richness of genuine CT when learning to listen and speak to EAL are attainable, if not common or easy. Further case studies are needed both as exemplars of CT facilitation and learning outcomes, but also to probe the efficacy of the CTELS. If the model proves to yield deep insights into CT in EAL teaching and learning, then subsequent research may adopt other strategies informed by the CTELS, including quantitative studies.

## 5. Implications and Conclusion

The present study constitutes the case of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking by investigating the teacher's perceptions and epistemological practices through interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents. The data exemplifies student CT evidence from student voices during the teaching and learning processes and implicates overt and active listening by students. The study contributes to the existing knowledge about CT progression, which not only entails student cognitive engagement but also connects with the teacher's practices that seem to priorities student confidence over factual correctness. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in this study involved viewing a teacher-selected, student-pertinent video, questioning, logical reasoning and discussing. The teaching and learning processes were aimed at encouraging students to learn how to understand problems and offer solutions.

However, there were four major obstacles to Elisa's facilitation of CT. First, there was a lack of authentic content materials for engaging students' CT. The teacher remained committed to providing cases that students perceived to be relevant, to elicit not only evidence but also their opinions to prompt engaged and affective responses. Secondly, Indonesian language interference remained a hindrance when students discussed with their peers in small groups. This was because of the limited vocabulary in English that some students had during the teaching and learning processes. Third, classroom conversations were prevalent in teaching, learning and formative assessment of listening and speaking, yet were neglected in summative assessment. This neglect was not of Elisa's choosing but rather a function of curriculum time and government and school assessment requirements in which writing is a de facto proxy for speaking when students listen to pre-determined, pre-scripted English audio. The fourth obstacle to Elisa's CT facilitation is the inadequacy of CT in EAL theories to stimulate teaching and learning processes. This was reflected on Elisa's epistemological belief and practice that providing her students with only familiar cases to convey their opinions along with the evidence would develop CT. Additionally, engaging all students to participate actively, Elisa solely instructed them to script before speaking. It is therefore important to consider how to improve the facilitation of CT in EAL with the types of constraints this might arise. Ultimately, the CTELS framework may be used to promote teacher professional training to overcome the constraints on facilitating CT during EAL teaching and learning processes.

This qualitative case study is non-generalisable and designed to yield rich insights yet has numerous limitations. The study collected data comprising teacher interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents, and the triangulated data not only showed congruence but also discrepancies, such as first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. The interpretation of these discrepancies is debateable, and assertions made by the authors are open to be challenged. The use of IPA for teacher interviews and the conceptual framework for analysing student CT in EAL listening and speaking, while based on two published frameworks, skews the interpretation of data. Moreover, the study only sought teacher interview data and did not capture student interviews, where students could provide insights into their thought processes in class. In addition, perceptions from other EAL teachers from the target high school were not sought yet could have added valuable insights to the case study, for example by comparing and contrasting stated practices for facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking. Future studies should thus widen the samples, conduct further classroom observations to investigate students' perceptions as a minimum. A specific focus of future research should be on summative assessment practices that are congruent with well-facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking.

To conclude, the study revealed that the teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking at a target Indonesian high school evidenced sophisticated, multi-faceted CT outcomes for students. The findings suggest that further improvements of facilitating CT in EAL are needed, reflecting the challenges at the emotional, interpersonal and organisational levels in Indonesian contexts. The findings may serve as a case used in professional training for EAL teachers to develop their pedagogical knowledge and competence in facilitating CT, negotiating intensive practices to solve the constraints. Considering the findings of this study, future research should continue to investigate CT issues from wider perspectives (e.g., school principals, additional teachers, teacher educators, parents and students), and specifically include examining students' perspectives on classroom observation. Investigation is also required on summative assessment that is congruent with student learning and in-service teacher development of their CT pedagogical practices. As a starting point, through its use of the CTELS framework, this case study demonstrates characteristics of facilitated CT when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia.

## References

- Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Surkes, M. A., Tamim, R., & Zhang, D. (2008). Instructional interventions affecting critical thinking skills and dispositions: A stage 1 meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 1102-1134. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326084>
- Afshar, H. S., & Movassagh, H. (2014). On the relationship among critical thinking, language learning strategy use and university achievement of Iranian English as a foreign language majors. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 382-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.914238>
- Agarwal, A. (2021). *Understanding the value of an MBA by exploring the perspective MBA students and graduates have of their MBA: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis* [Dissertation, The University of Adelaide].
- Akatsuka, Y. (2019). Awareness of critical thinking attitudes and English language skills: The effects of questions involving higher-order thinking. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 59-84. <https://doi.org/10.25256/paal.23.2.4>
- Anggraeny, E., & Khongput, S. (2022). Teachers' perceptions and practices of critical thinking instruction in Indonesian senior high schools: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 33(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/1-26>
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, F. A., & Emilia, E. (2017). A joint construction practice in academic writing course in Indonesian university context. *Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching and Literature*, 17(1), 20.
- Boryczko, M. (2020). Critical thinking in social work education: A case study of knowledge practices in students' reflective writings using semantic gravity profiling. *Social Work Education*, 41(3), 317-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1836143>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qj0902027>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *J Res Nurs*, 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Chen, M. R. A., & Hwang, G. J. (2019). Effects of a concept mapping- based flipped learning approach on EFL students' English speaking performance, critical thinking awareness and speaking anxiety. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(3), 817-834. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12887>
- Cottrell, S. (2017). *Critical thinking skills: Effective analysis, argument and reflection*. Palgrave Macmillan Education.
- Creswell, J. D. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Davies, W. M., & Barnett, R. (2015). *The palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ellerton, P. (2017). *On critical thinking and collaborative inquiry*. E. F. Frontiers.
- Ellerton, P. (2022). On critical thinking and content knowledge: A critique of the assumptions of cognitive load theory. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100975>
- Erkek, G., & Batur, Z. (2020). A comparative study on critical thinking in education: From critical reading attainments to critical listening attainments. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.1p.142>
- Esmailzad, S., Gavvani, V. Z., Zarei, A., & Familrouhany, S. A. A. (2022). Effect of evidence-based information management and practice training on librarians' critical thinking: A randomized educational trial. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/09610006221114648>



- Ferrari-Bridgers, F., Vogel, R., & Lynch, B. (2015). Fostering and assessing critical listening skills in the speech course. *International Journal of Listening*, 31(1), 19-32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1020231>
- Gambrill, E. (2019). *Critical thinking and the process of evidence-based practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Ghanizadeh, A., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2020). *Higher order thinking skills in the language classroom: A concise guide* Springer.
- Havwini, T. (2019). Indonesian EFL students' willingness to communicate in the 2013 curriculum implementation: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal - A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i1/105-120>
- Hegazy, H., Ellerton, P., Campos-Remon, H., Zaphir, L., Mazzola, C., & Brown, D. (2021). Working from theory: Developing the bases of teachers' critical thinking pedagogies through action research. *Educational Action Research*, 31(1), 78-93.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.1877757>
- Ilyas, H. P. (2017). Historical perspective: The development of critical thinking in Indonesian ELT. *Journal of ELT Research*, 2(2), 89-102. [https://doi.org/10.22236/JER\\_Vol2Issue2](https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vol2Issue2)
- Kelley, D. (2014). *The art of reasoning: An introduction to logic and critical thinking*. Norton & Company.
- Kusmaryani, W., Musthafa, B., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). The influence of mobile applications on students' speaking skill and critical thinking in English language learning. *International Conference of Computer and Informatics Engineering (IC2IE)*, 1-6.
- Lamb, S., Maire, Q., & Doecke, E. (2017). *Key skills for the 21st century: An evidence-based review* [Analytical Report].
- Liang, W., & Fung, D. (2021). Fostering critical thinking in English-as-a-second-language classrooms: Challenges and opportunities. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100769>
- Low, E. L., Hui, C., & Cai, L. (2017). Developing student teachers' critical thinking and professional values: A case study of a teacher educator in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(4), 535-551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2017.1386093>
- Manen, M. V. (2017). But is it phenomenology? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775-779.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570>
- Muthmainnah, N. (2019). Optimising critical thinking through peer editing technique in teaching writing. *ELTIN Journal*, 7(1), 1-7.
- Purnamaningwulan, R. A. (2022). Listening journals to promote students' critical thinking skills in an integrated listening-speaking course. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(2), 744-760. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.23387>
- Rahmawati, N., & Ashadi. (2018). Problem-based English speaking material to enhance students' critical thinking skills. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 2(2), 285-301.
- Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- Sanavi, R. V., & Tarighat, S. (2014). Critical thinking and speaking proficiency: A mixed-method study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpis.4.1.79-87>
- Schieble, M., Vetter, A., & Martin, K. M. (2021). Critical listening for critical conversations. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 111(2), 71-77.
- Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2010.510659>
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. SAGE.
- Starichkova, V., Moskovskaya, N., & Kalinovskaya, E. (2022). *Development of students' critical thinking skills via teaching English VII* International Forum on Teacher Education,
- Stolz, S. A. (2022). The practice of phenomenology in educational research. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(7), 822-834. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2022.2138745>
- Tan, C. (2017). The enactment of the policy initiative for critical thinking in Singapore schools. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(5), 588-603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1305452>




- The Indonesian Education Ministry, N. (2022). *Improving the quality of education in Indonesia that is equitable with the independent curriculum*. Retrieved 20 May 2022 from <https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Thomson, V., & Yedidi, M. R. (2020). A practical approach to critical thinking among EFL learners. *Int. J. Technology Transfer and Commercialisation*, 17(1), 43-55.
- Trowler, P. (2012). Disciplines and interdisciplinary: Conceptual groundwork. In *Tribes and territories in the 21st century* (pp. 5-29). Routledge.
- Wale, B. D., & Bishaw, K. S. (2020). Effects of using inquiry-based learning on EFL students' critical thinking skills. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00090-2>
- Wang, Y., & Wu, Z. (2023). Adapting or adopting? Critical thinking education in the East Asian cultural sphere: A systematic integrative review. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101330>
- Willison, J. (2020). *The models of engaged learning and teaching: Connecting sophisticated thinking from early childhood to PhD*. Springer.
- Yaparak, Z., & Kaya, F. (2020). Improving EFL learners' oral production through reasoning-gap tasks enhanced with critical thinking standards: Developing and implementing a critical TBLT model, pre-task plan, and speaking rubric. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.11n.1p.40>
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. The Guildford Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. SAGE.
- Yu, M. H., Reynolds, B. L., & Ding, C. (2021). Listening and speaking for real-world communication: What teachers do and what students learn from classroom assessments. *SAGE Open*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009163>
- Yuan, R., Liao, W., Wang, Z., Kong, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). How do English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers perceive and engage with critical thinking: A systematic review from 2010 to 2020. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101002>
- Zahavi, D. (2020). The practice of phenomenology: The case of Max van Manen. *Nurs Philos*, 21(2), e12276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12276>

# Appendix A. Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students-English as an Additional Language

## Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students – English as an Additional Language

### Dimensions of CTELS

		Clarity	Relevance	Depth	Coherence
		<i>Students communicate key ideas in a precise manner</i>	<i>Students communicate key ideas that are related to the given information/topics</i>	<i>Students communicate detailed explanations of key ideas to develop thorough arguments</i>	<i>Students communicate arguments of key ideas in a logical sense to build the overall intended meaning</i>
 <b>F</b> <b>a</b> <b>c</b> <b>e</b> <b>t</b> <b>s</b>  <b>o</b> <b>f</b>  <b>M</b> <b>E</b> <b>L</b> <b>T</b>	<b>a. Evaluate &amp; Determine</b> <i>What will we trust?</i>  <i>Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas.</i>	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Evidence is presented in the context, and direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas that are closely aligned with the most important information and support the topics.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating detailed explanations to develop their key ideas.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas with logical and coherent structures. Logical and causal relationships are identified.
	<b>b. Find &amp; Generate</b> <i>What will we use?</i>  <i>Students find and generate their key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies.</i>	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Points at issues are clearly defined and stated.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students orally discuss their key ideas that are related to the given topics. Direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students also consider alternative perspectives in relation to the given information/topics by communicating with breadth to ensure that they do not ignore any important components.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their most important key ideas related to the significance of given information/sources. Claims for logical coherence are examined through evidence and methodology.
	<b>c. Embark &amp; Clarify</b> <i>What is our purpose?</i>  <i>Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and clarify their key ideas while considering ethical, cultural, social and team (ESCT) issues.</i>	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the most important information related to the given topics. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues. Given information that is significant and relevant is highlighted.	Students orally respond their key ideas to given questions/tasks and discuss the complexities of the given information/sources. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the premises of given information/sources that support conclusions. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.
	<b>d. Organise &amp; Manage</b> <i>How do we arrange?</i>  <i>Students organise given information/sources. to reveal their key ideas while managing the processes through spoken conventions.</i>	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the given information/source. Students clearly assert the main purpose of the given information/source by communicating their key ideas.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the topics by communicating the causal relationships.	Students organise and manage their key ideas that by communicating detailed and thorough explanations and/or arguments.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments, intended to build the logical sense of meaning.
	<b>e. Analyse &amp; Synthesise</b> <i>What does it mean?</i>  <i>Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce their key ideas and coherent understandings.</i>	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students communicate their own examples, and the structures are clear, unambiguous and easy to understand.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources by communicating their key ideas and coherent understandings that are aligned with the given information/topics.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments. Students communicate their key ideas by considering alternative perspectives and justifying arguments.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating the arguments intended to build the logical sense of meaning. Students communicate by developing key ideas and using transition phrases to identify logical and coherent progression.

## Appendix B. Interview protocol

### A. Pre-interview

1. Have you ever heard the term "critical thinking"? (*If the answer is "YES", then go to the additional questions. If the answer is "NO", go to question 2).*

*Additional questions:*

- a. Is critical thinking useful to you and your students?
  - b. Why is it important for you and your students?
  - c. Do you think you, as a teacher, are a critical thinker?  
If yes, please explain.  
If no, please explain.
2. What does critical thinking mean to you?
  3. What characteristics should a critical thinker have?
  4. Do you facilitate critical thinking in your classes? If so, please explain.

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you define that critical thinking is facilitated in your classes?
  - b. What experiences do you provide to achieve the goal?
  - c. How do you assess the goal?
5. Do you think there is a relationship between critical thinking and English language teaching?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you think you are able to integrate critical thinking into your teaching?
  - b. How do you think critical thinking can be used in your language teaching?
6. Do your students actively participate in speaking and listening activities in your classes?

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you encourage your students' active participations and involvement in speaking and listening activities?
  - b. How do you facilitate speaking and listening skills in your classroom?
  - c. How do you improve your students' speaking and listening skills?
7. Have you ever facilitated the teaching of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  8. How do you facilitate the critical thinking teaching that focuses on speaking and listening skills?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you find any difficulties or problems in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - b. What are the possible challenges of integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - c. What do you do to overcome those challenges or problems?
  - d. What are the factors that would enable you to integrate critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
9. How do you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  10. In your opinion, what are the things you have not achieved in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?

11. What specific supports do you need H?-<2[<J U9.improve your skills on the integration of critical thinking in speaking and listening activities?
12. Would you like to participate in classroom observations on critical thinking and its integration into speaking and listening skills? *(If the answer is "YES", then go to question 13 and 14. If the answer is "NO", the interview ends).*
13. What would you like to expect throughout the classroom observations specifically?
14. Are you willing to share and copy your syllabus, lesson plans, teaching materials and students' works that show the integration of critical thinking into speaking and listening skills throughout the classroom observations?

## **B. Post-interview**

1. Do you think you were able to successfully facilitate critical thinking when speaking and listening skills were practised in your classrooms? If yes/no, please explain.
2. Do you think that your students actively participated during the teaching and learning process? If yes/no, please explain.
3. Do you think your teaching activities improved your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills and engaged their active participations?

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What were the most engaging activities you conducted in your classrooms?
- b. Did your students find it difficult to follow the activities?
- c. How did you manage to differentiate your students' critical thinking skills when speaking and listening were facilitated?
4. What do you think were the challenges you faced during the teaching and learning process?
5. Do you think that your assessments were effective to obtain your learning objectives? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. Were your students able to follow the assessment?
- b. What assessment forms did you design to obtain your learning objectives?
- c. How did you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
6. Are you thinking of continuing to develop the facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classes? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What is your perception on the future facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classrooms?
- b. How will you develop your teaching and learning strategies to construct your students' critical thinking skills and active participations?




## Appendix C. Classroom observation (Field Note Form)

Classroom Observation (Field Note Form)	
An investigation of facilitating critical thinking in an English language class when listening and speaking are practised in an Indonesian high school	
<u>School</u>	
<u>Participant</u>	
<u>Age range</u>	
<u>Qualification</u>	
<u>Years of teaching experience</u>	
<u>Years at the school</u>	
<u>Date and Time</u>	
<u>Classroom Observation</u>	
<i>Portraits of Participants (The characteristics of individuals, including their dresses, gestures and non-verbal behaviour)</i>	
<i>Reconstructions of Dialogue (The interactions between or among people)</i>	
<i>Descriptions of Physical Setting (The “actions” taking place)</i>	
<i>Classroom Activities (The physical surroundings)</i>	
<u>Researcher's Personal Note (Ideas, Impressions, Problems, Feelings and Speculation)</u>	

## Appendix D. Documents

### 1. The sample of lesson plan

<b>Grade</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Tuesday, 14 February 2023</b>	
<b>Time</b>	<b>13.40-15.00</b>	
<b>Duration</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Teaching Aids</b>
<b>15 mins</b>	<p><b>Orientation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher will open the class and welcome the students.</li> <li>2. Teacher is checking the students' attendance.</li> <li>3. Teacher is organizing the class and getting all the students ready for the lesson.</li> </ol> <p><b>Aperception</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher motivate the students before the lesson's started  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg</a></li> <li>2. Teacher brainstorms the students with a picture about creative thinking and looking up the updated information about moving Indonesia capital.  <b>(Nearpod link :</b>  <a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>  <b>)</b></li> </ol>  <p>Teacher is asking the students some questions, such as: Look at the map, what can you see on the map given?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Students answer the question with their own idea.</li> <li>4. Teacher explains the students what was really happening based on the picture.</li> <li>5. Teacher devides students into some groups.</li> <li>6. Teacher asks the students to work within their group to answer the questions that the teacher gives.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Laptop, Loud Speaker, Projector, projector screen</b></p> <p><b>Nearpod.com</b></p>



55 mins	<b>Main Activity (The lesson about Moving Indonesia Capital to Nusantara)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Teacher shows the questions that the students need to discuss. These questions will stimulate the student to think critically. The questions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the video you have seen, explore the solution you could probably suggest to the capital problem instead of moving the capital?</li> <li>If the government still move the Indonesia capital what they need to prepare to restore the habitat of endangered animal?</li> <li>The biggest problem that makes Jakarta's sinking is 60% population rely on ground water wells. Pumping too much ground water cause the condition. Explain your best solution to prevent Jakarta from sinking!</li> <li>Comparing to the sinking Jakarta, can you explain what's in common between Jakarta and Pekanbaru nowadays?</li> <li>As mentioned in the video, it is said that traffic causes \$5 billion dollar a year in Economic losses. Based on your point of view, why this thing is happening and what's the best solution you can find for solving this problem?</li> <li>"Professor of Urban Design" from Monash University said that Indonesia canal built in colonial era doesn't really work in Indonesia. Why is that so? Explain your reason!</li> <li>As Mr Jokowi said, one of the reasons to move Indonesia capital is Economic equality. Based on your point of view, why the president expected this?</li> <li>In the end, what will be happening to Indonesia Economic if building a new capital costs billion dollars?</li> <li>From your point of view, What's the biggest risk of moving new capital to Nusantara? Explain!</li> </ul> </li> <li>The teacher plays the video 2 times about Why Indonesia Capital is moving? (<a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>), the video is taken from the youtube and the teacher attaches the video into Nearpod platform.</li> <li>The teachers ask the students to share their thoughts about the question given.</li> <li>The students take turn in sharing their ideas by giving feedback to each group points (students' ideas could be difference based on their understanding/ critical thinking.)</li> <li>The teacher gives feedback to the students' answer.</li> <li>The students also give feedback to their friend's answer.</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

10 mins	<b>Closing</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher asks the students to sum up the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher wraps up all of the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher motivates the students regarding to the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher mentions the students the upcoming lesson.</li> <li>The class is ended by praying together</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

## 2. The sample of the syllabus only available in Indonesian version

### SILABUS PEMBELAJARAN

NAMA SEKOLAH : SMAS DHARMA LOKA  
 MATA PELAJARAN : Bahasa Inggris  
 KELAS / SEMESTER : X / 1  
 TAHUN PELAJARAN : 2022/2023

#### Kompetensi Inti

KI 1 Menghargai dan menghayati dan mengamalkan ajaran agama yang dianutnya

KI 2 Menunjukkan perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (gotong royong, kerjasama, toleran, damai), santun, responsif dan pro-aktif dan menunjukkan sikap sebagai bagian dari solusi atas berbagai permasalahan berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam serta dalam menempatkan diri sebagai cerminan bangsa dalam pergaulan dunia.

KI 3 Memahami, menerapkan, dan menganalisis pengetahuan faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural berdasarkan rasa ingintahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya, dan humaniora dengan wawasan kemanusiaan, kebangsaan, kenegaraan, dan peradaban terkait penyebab fenomena dan kejadian, serta menerapkan pengetahuan prosedural pada bidang kajian yang spesifik sesuai dengan bakat dan minatnya untuk memecahkan masalah.

KI 4 Mengolah, menalar, dan menyaji, dalam ranah konkret dan ranah abstrak terkait dengan pengembangan dari yang dipelajarinya di sekolah secara mandiri dan mampu menggunakan metoda sesuai kaidah keilmuan.

Kompetensi Dasar	Materi Pembelajaran	Kegiatan Pembelajaran	Alokasi Waktu	Sumber belajar
<p>3.1 Menerapkan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya. (Perhatikan unsur kebahasaan <i>pronoun: subjective, objective, possessive</i>)</p> <p>4.1 Menyusun teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis pendek dan sederhana yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri, dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan yang benar dan sesuai konteks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fungsi Sosial Mengenalkan, menjalin hubungan interpersonal dengan teman dan guru</li> <li>• Struktur Teks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Memulai</li> <li>- Menanggapi (diharapkan/di luar dugaan)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Unsur Kebahasaan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sebutan anggota keluarga inti dan yang lebih luas dan orang-orang dekat lainnya; hobi, kebiasaan</li> <li>- Verba: <i>be, have, go, work, live</i> (dalam <i>simple present tense</i>)</li> <li>- Subjek Pronoun: <i>I, You, We, They, He, She, It</i></li> <li>- Kata ganti possessive <i>my, your, his, dsb.</i></li> <li>- Kata tanya <i>Who? Which? How? Dst.</i></li> <li>- Nomina singular dan plural dengan atau tanpa <i>a, the, this, those, my, their, dsb.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Menyimak dan menirukan beberapa contoh interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, dengan ucapan dan tekanan kata yang benar</li> <li>- Mengidentifikasi ungkapan-ungkapan penting dan perbedaan antara beberapa cara yang ada</li> <li>- Menanyakan hal-hal yang tidak diketahui atau yang berbeda.</li> <li>- Mempelajari contoh teks interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarganya yang dipaparkan figur-figur terkenal.</li> <li>- Saling menyimak dan bertanya jawab tentang jati diri masing-masing dengan teman-temannya</li> <li>- Melakukan refleksi tentang proses dan hasil belajarnya</li> </ul>	18 JP	Gold Experience -Pierson

### 3. The sample of content material

- 1st team : Living as a teen in Asian community.
- 2nd team : Dealing with insecurities.
- 3rd team : Living without gadgets.
- 4th team : Sleepy teen: a worldwide pandemic.
- 5th team : Teen Stress
- 6th team : How the media affects the youth.
- 7th team : Top tips to boost the confidence for teens.
- 8th team : What makes you special?
- 9th team : The perks of being introvert

Our Discussion Topic



#### 4. The samples of assessment practices for students

29. According to the picture, what is the best advice the coach could give to her athlete?



- A. You could train yourself more so you'll be the next winner in the upcoming session.  
 B. You should stop practicing in the field.  
 C. How about going to Coffee shop to get Vanila Late?  
 D. Why don't we go and forgetthat we ever exist?  
 E. Shall I give you a back pain after this training?
30. What is the best offer they could give?



#### B. Answer the question below correctly!

1. Sometimes people tend to have a lot of things in his mind.



Let me know how you could make them better with your suggestion, offer, and your advice.

2. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences!
- A. You and me is a married couple now. Why don't ..... go to Maldives for our honeymoon?  
 B. It's raining now. How about ..... a ramen soup? (Make)  
 C. It's too dark here. You ..... Turn on the light.
3. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences Use Future tense.
- A. In my mind, she ..... her donut later. (eat)

## SPEAKING ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Subject : English  
 Class /Semester : 10 Science 3/ II  
 Topic : The Biggest Landfil of Earth  
 Date : Friday, 19 May 2023

Name	Fluency	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Details	Score
<u>Cindy ong</u>	4	3.5	4	4	4	97.5
Cynthia Tan	3.5	4	4	4	4	97.5
<u>Daniel wang</u>	3	3	3	3	2	70
<u>Dorelia juliestya</u>	3.5	3.5	3.7	4	4	93.5
Felicia C	3	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	90.5
Freddie Justin	3	3.5	3.5	3.8	3	84
Hansen Lim	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8	89.5
<u>Jason A Kardono</u>	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	90.5
Jocelyne A F	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	90
Jonathan	3.5	3.8	3.8	4	4	95.5
Jorgen W Chang	4	4	4	4	3.5	97.5
<u>Marihito N M</u>	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	4	93.5
<u>Nixsen O</u>	3	4	3	4	3	85
Noreen Tamarin	4	3.65	4	4	4	98.25
<u>Sannie</u>	3.2	3	3.6	3.6	3.6	85
Valentina Sun	3.3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	84
<u>Victoria Cantika</u>	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	92.5
<u>Vikenzo Carlos</u>	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	90
Vincent V	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5	90.5



**Speaking Assessment Rubric**

	<b>Fluency</b>	<b>Pronunciation and accent</b>	<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>Grammar</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>4</b>	Smooth and fluid speech; few to no hesitations; no attempts to search for words; volume is excellent.	Pronunciation is excellent; good effort at accent	Excellent control of language features; a wide range of well-chosen vocabulary	Accuracy & variety of grammatical structures	Excellent level of description; additional details beyond the required
<b>3</b>	Smooth and fluid speech; few hesitations; a slight search for words; inaudible word or two.	Pronunciation is good; good effort at accent	Good language control; good <b>range</b> of relatively well-chosen vocabulary	Some <b>errors</b> in grammatical structures possibly caused by attempt to include a <b>variety</b> .	Good level of description; all required information included
<b>2</b>	Speech is relatively smooth; some hesitation and unevenness caused by rephrasing and searching for words; volume <b>wavers</b> .	Pronunciation is good; Some effort at accent, but is <u>definitely non-</u>	Adequate language <u>control</u> ; vocabulary range is lacking	Frequent grammatical errors <b>that</b> do not obscure meaning; little variety in structures	Adequate description; some additional details should be provided
<b>1</b>	Speech is frequently hesitant with some sentences left uncompleted; volume very soft.	Pronunciation is okay; No effort towards a native accent	Weak language <u>control</u> ; basic vocabulary choice with some words clearly lacking	Frequent grammatical errors even in simple structures that at times obscure meaning.	Description lacks some critical details that make it difficult for the listener to understand

# **Characteristics of facilitated critical thinking when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia**

**Author Name (Author 1 - Corresponding Author):** Ricky Fernandes

**Position:** Doctoral Student

**Department:** School of Education, The University of Adelaide, Australia

**Email:** ricky.fernandes@adelaide.edu.au

**ORCID ID:** 0000-0002-8260-3539

**Author Name (Author 2):** John Willison

**Position:** Senior Lecturer

**Department:** School of Education, The University of Adelaide, Australia

**Email:** john.willison@adelaide.edu.au

**ORCID ID:** 0000-0003-1892-1089

**Author Name (Author 3):** Chris Boyle

**Position:** Professor

**Department:** School of Education, The University of Adelaide, Australia

**Email:** chris.boyle@adelaide.edu.au

**ORCID ID:** 0000-0001-6196-7619



**Credit authorship contribution statement:**

**Ricky Fernandes:** Conceptualising, collecting data, analysing and writing.

**John Willison:** Reviewing, analysing and revising/editing.

**Chris Boyle:** Reviewing.

**Acknowledgment:**

Special gratitude is expressed for the target high school in Indonesia, the teacher and all students in Year 10 EAL class for having provided the access of high levels of collaboration to successfully support the research. This research is a part of doctoral degree programme supported by the University of Adelaide, Australia.

**Disclosure Statement:**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. The research was conducted after the research ethics approval was issued by the University of Adelaide (H-2021-007). The interviews, classroom observations and documents were collected after the teacher and students provided their consent forms. The data that support the findings are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable request.

# Characteristics of facilitated critical thinking when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia

## Abstract

This article presents a qualitative case study of a teacher facilitating Critical Thinking (CT) through listening and speaking in an English as an Additional Language (EAL) Year 10 Indonesian high school class. Such CT facilitation and development are required not only by the Indonesian government's EAL policies, but also in other countries with developing economies. CT is thought to promote language acquisition as well as being developed through language learning, if well-facilitated. This paper presents a case study of a teacher and her class based on triangulated data comprising pre- and post-interviews with the teacher, student classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. The findings revealed evidence for rich CT when analysed through the analytical framework of Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS). However, factors were identified as obstacles for CT development, including first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. These barriers to effective facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking form the basis for further investigation of the areas of CT in EAL listening and speaking pedagogy and assessment. Moreover, the CTELS shows promise to illuminate CT as evidenced by students and has the potential to guide teacher facilitation of CT.

**Keywords:** *Critical Thinking (CT), English as an Additional Language (EAL), Case Study, Teacher Practice, Listening and Speaking*

## 1. Introduction

Critical Thinking (CT) has become an educational objective to enhance both student performance and national global competitive ability in numerous nations with developing economies (Tan, 2017). This is partly because CT plays a central role in developing new knowledge through problem-solving, sophisticated thinking and decision-making (Cottrell, 2017; Kelley, 2014). CT is also associated with student learning improvement, not only in academic contexts but also equipping them to be flexible, adaptive and resilient (Gambrill, 2019) in natural settings. Moreover, CT is essential for students to make better decisions, be less susceptible to cognitive biases and fallacies and use evaluative thinking (Davies & Barnett, 2015) to develop a comprehensive understanding.

While there is a debate about how CT could be effectively developed, in terms of '*generic skills*' (Kelley, 2014) vs '*content-specific*' (Ellerton, 2022), these orientations to CT development are viewed in this article as complementary enablers of student CT development (Wale & Bishaw, 2020). Nevertheless, the focus of this research is context-sensitive CT development, a focus necessary to add to the field understandings that are fit-for-purpose (Ghanizadeh et al., 2020). Context-sensitive development impacts on the facilitation of generic CT and how effectively CT is developed by students (Starichkova et al., 2022; Thomson & Yedidi, 2020).

Somewhat controversially, some languages are thought to be associated with cultural norms for more transmissive modes of teaching (Wang & Wu, 2023), and therefore limit the potential development for CT in EAL. This is a crude distinction, as high school instruction in English has long been associated with transmission teaching, and to a substantial extent, still is (Ilyas, 2017). Nevertheless, this study was conducted in the context of EAL, because English has a supposed tradition of enlightenment thinking that may challenge norms and promote CT (Starichkova et al., 2022).

Research on the development of CT in EAL learning contexts, set in non-English speaking countries, is required to determine whether EAL may indeed contribute to student CT development (Liang & Fung, 2021), specifically listening and speaking skills. This is partly because there is some evidence that students who struggle with literacy in reading and writing may benefit from a listening and speaking orientation to CT (Akatsuka, 2019; Erkek & Batur, 2020). In China, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at providing a communicative context for students to listen to each other, make comments on their peers' opinions and question (Yu et al., 2021), while in Turkey, the facilitation of CT

in EAL listening and speaking is to develop student active communication through reasoning (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In this sense, CT in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at transferring information and expressing opinions in an additional language, providing opportunities for students to practise the target language in authentic activities (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In both the Chinese and Turkish contexts, the learning experiences of CT in EAL listening and speaking simultaneously enhance student communicative competence by understanding and evaluating different types of information (Ferrari-Bridgers et al., 2015; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014) through analytical thinking, collaborative capacity and new expertise development (Hegazy et al., 2021). In the long run, CT in EAL listening and speaking could potentially provide opportunities for students to understand multiple sources of information, listen to different perspectives and communicate their understanding orally (Schieble et al., 2021). Therefore, CT in EAL listening and speaking can be defined as an active and persistent process that requires a commitment to conceptualise different knowledge and beliefs by communicating key ideas followed by reasoning with evidence, solving problems and formulating solutions.

One specific context that is suitable for CT in EAL research is Indonesian high school setting. CT is typically regarded as one of the most pivotal attributes in education in Indonesia, and English is perceived to be an instruction medium that may better promote CT (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). The Indonesian Ministry of Education is committed to developing CT through pedagogical practices in EAL courses, especially for high school students. EAL for Indonesian high school students is a compulsory subject, and the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires them to develop CT skills through asking, reasoning, discussing, presenting and other forms of active oral communication (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). CT in EAL learning is aimed at student engagement with global concerns, Industrial Revolution 4.0 and the related Education 4.0 (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Consequently, teachers are expected to prepare their students to be increasingly self-directed when learning English.

However, CT facilitation in Indonesia remains elusive and requires further investigation, possibly in part because of the diverse definitions and procedures stated in the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum (Ilyas, 2017). Another factor may be inconsistency between the definitions and procedures and existing cultural norms, language barrier and epistemological beliefs (Wang & Wu, 2023). Culturally, many Indonesian teachers struggle to shift from monological thinking to independent thinking (Ilyas, 2017) and rely heavily on standardised tests. This is similar to the context of Hong Kong where the

entrenched examination-orientation hinders students' ample opportunities to practise CT in EAL, and thus little progress has been made in integrating CT into language teaching there (Liang & Fung, 2021). This may be contrasted with Singapore, where CT has been valued and cultivated in their education system for all teaching subjects, emphasising teacher improvement of students' consciousness and mindfulness in their pedagogical practices through reasoning (Low et al., 2017). The purpose is to enhance a habit of mind to think critically, ensuring effective teaching and learning processes (Low et al., 2017; Tan, 2017).

Although the importance of CT in EAL has become prevalent in Indonesia, relatively few studies on CT are set in Indonesia (Anggraeny & Khongput, 2022; Purnamaningwulan, 2022), even though this nation has committed to CT development in EAL. The majority of studies that have been conducted on Indonesian CT tend to highlight the focus on reading and writing for tertiary levels (Aunurrahman et al., 2017; Muthmainnah, 2019). However, pedagogies around listening and speaking to develop CT tend to be under-theorised and under-researched (Havwini, 2019) and few studies explore CT in listening and speaking (Purnamaningwulan, 2022) in the high school contexts.

In order to address these gaps in research on CT in the context of listening and speaking in EAL, a case study was conducted in an Indonesian Year 10 classroom where pedagogies for listening and speaking were evident. By observing the teacher's practice around facilitating listening and speaking, and the student engagement in these tasks, evidence of CT was determined, in order to provide a rich understanding of pedagogy and student CT outcomes. Therefore, this article aims to add to the understanding of teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking and its outcomes in the Indonesian high school classroom.

To address the aim above, two questions guided the present inquiry:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?

Data were collected of the teacher's perceptions and practices, student listening and speaking in their classroom and of curriculum and planning documents.

Lamb et al. (2017) reported that three main ways of assessing students' CT were student self-rating, direct assessment using tests and teacher judgments and reporting. The

limitations of these CT assessments are substantial as they provided narrow student data (Lamb et al., 2017), whereas student classroom observations of CT are both rarer and provide a valuable perspective. To gain this perspective, this article presents the investigation of CT in EAL listening and speaking through a rich extended observation of an Indonesian Year 10 class. The research explored the nature and possible developments of CT during the teaching and learning processes (Boryczko, 2020; Starichkova et al., 2022) conducted by the Year 10 class teacher. The article thus aims to provide a close investigation of how CT in EAL listening and speaking is realised in a local Indonesian high school context.

Specific to this aim, sustained longitudinal observations of the teacher's practice and student engagement in learning were conducted in the classroom in weekly visits across two school terms, from January to May 2023. These observations were triangulated with the teacher's perceptions and knowledge of CT in advance of the observations, and the teacher's perceptions and challenges of facilitating CT in the lessons observed after observations were finished, as well as the curriculum and teaching documents.

The analysis of this rich and complex data required a pertinent analytical framework. Two frameworks that individually addressed a salient dimension of CT in EAL listening and speaking were combined: The Models of Engaged Learning and Teaching (MELT) (Willison, 2020) and the Dimensions of CT in English Listening and Speaking (DCTELS) (*see Appendix A*). The MELT provide insight into the multifaceted nature of sophisticated learning, including student engagement in CT (Willison, 2020). The DCTELS dimensions were adopted from the framework of critical thinking and collaborative inquiry (Ellerton, 2017) to illuminate CT in EAL listening and speaking. The resulting conceptual framework, Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) (*see Appendix A*) placed five MELT facets on the vertical axis of a matrix and the four DCTELS dimensions on its horizontal axis. The resulting twenty cells comprehensively capture the intricacies of CT in a classroom with rich evidence of listening and speaking in EAL. For instance, the integration between the facets of *evaluate & determine (discerning)* from "MELT" and *clarity* from "DCTELS" provides description of processes when students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/sources. In order to address the study's aim with reference to the CTELS framework, the article's research questions, methods, findings, discussion and conclusion follow.



## 2. Methods

This study employed a qualitative case study conducted to determine the nature of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in a local Indonesian high school in a naturalistic setting. A case study is a qualitative approach that explores a contemporary bounded system and/or phenomena through in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (i.e., teacher pre- and post-interviews, classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices) (*See Appendices B, C and D*) (Creswell, 2013; Rashid et al., 2019). As the present study addresses an in-service teacher's personal perceptions and practices of CT in EAL listening and speaking, the epistemological view is through the subjective orientation provided by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). This is because the authors had to interpret the reality subjectively, with the teacher creating an evolving knowledge base and understanding during the investigation (Rashid et al., 2019). The process of investigation was refined through interactions between the first author and the teacher (Rashid et al., 2019).

Prior to the commencement of data collection, ethical approval from the first author's university was obtained. The first author contacted the target high school in Indonesia and went on site to discuss the research with the principal. EAL at the school is a compulsory subject, providing a potentially good site to investigate facilitated CT in EAL. After obtaining the agreement and permission from the principal, three EAL teachers volunteered to participate, and each signed a consent form. This paper focuses on the case of one Teacher and her Year 10 EAL class.

In a case study, the purpose of selecting the school, teacher and class is not to determine statistical inferences for a population (Creswell, 2013) but rather useful information in the form of context-sensitive and rich descriptions (Campbell et al., 2020) within the school. Teacher interviews, classroom observations and curriculum documents were collected to provide a triangulation of data. The aim of employing triangulated data is to use different sources of evidence that may support as well as challenge the perspectives of each and so provide an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the phenomena under study (Yin, 2018).

The teacher in this case study was assigned a pseudonym, Elisa, and the study focus was her Year 10 EAL class. Elisa was recruited to be involved in the study in large part because she was willing to be observed over an extended time period in order to investigate her facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. Elisa's understanding and conceptualisation of CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed the authors to explore her

perceptions and practices. Elisa was an EAL teacher at the target high school for seven years, holding a bachelor's degree in English teacher training education from a local university in Indonesia. As a case study, there are limitations of this research situated in a target single institution with one in-service teacher, and the outcomes are specific to the context and different from those in other contexts (Trowler, 2012). In the research project, a total of nineteen students, out of a class of twenty-seven students, participated after returning the consent forms signed by themselves and their parents.

In EAL subject, students needed to learn four different language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Although the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires students to use CT in active oral communication through asking, reasoning, discussing and presenting, according to Elisa, there were still very limited numbers of students who could communicate fully in English, especially in listening and speaking. This is partly because students needed to pass standardised tests (Ilyas, 2017), in which the forms of the tests only consisted of grammar, reading and writing. Subsequently, they commonly spoke Indonesian when communicating with their peers during oral group discussions in EAL classes, as it was easy for them to communicate their key ideas directly using their first language (Wang & Wu, 2023). Lastly, some students wrote scripts in English first before they attempted to express their opinions and key ideas during the teaching and learning processes.

As Elisa's spoken English was proficient, the pre- and post-interviews were collected in English to provide detailed and reflective accounts of her perceptions and experiences (Smith et al., 2009). A dialogical method was employed to explore the interpretation of committing to both thematic analysis and presentation of the emic perspective in a novel manner (Agarwal, 2021).

Classroom observations were made from 17 January 2023 to 19 May 2023, with a total of twelve lessons observed. Classes ran for eighty minutes and occurred immediately after the school's lunch break. There were two lessons each week, but the teacher allowed the first author to attend one lesson each week. However, during mid-term exams and any other school events, the classroom observations were postponed. The teacher thus informed the first author to observe subsequent lessons twice in a week. For the classroom observations, field notes were taken with particular attention paid to dialogues between Elisa and her students, dialogue between students in the whole-class setting, the physical environment of the classroom and learning activities (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Yin, 2018). The dialogues between Elisa and her students were fully in English and recorded

using audio-recordings. However, during peer small group discussions, students spoke in Indonesian, and so this data was not captured. Meanwhile, documents such as teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices were deemed by Elisa to be the evidence of her epistemological CT facilitation.

Smith et al.'s (2009) IPA was used to analyse and process the pre-and post-observation interviews. IPA is underpinned by *phenomenology* (a philosophical approach to the study of experience), *hermeneutics* (theory of interpretation) and *ideography* (depth of analysis) (Smith et al., 2009). The limitations of IPA evident in critiques (Manen, 2017; Stolz, 2022) were accounted for, and its strengths to explore the teacher's cognitive, affective and natural responses to make sense of the experiences (Smith, 2011; Zahavi, 2020) were highlighted. The first step was reading the original interview transcripts and listening back to the audio recordings to ensure that the teacher became the main analysis. The second step focused on investigating the semantic content and language uses to familiarise with the transcripts, identify what the teacher said, understand the experiences and develop a specific phenomenological focus that was close to the teacher's words by exploring descriptive, linguistic and conceptual comments. The comments were not intended to be prescriptive, but were presented as the analytic tools to comment similarities and differences in what the teacher said (Smith et al., 2009). For example, when analysing the transcripts, the first author could ask questions of what the words, phrases and sentences were meant to the teacher. For descriptive comments, the focus highlighted the objects which structured the teacher's thoughts and experiences, while linguistic comments focused on the language uses such as repetitions, tones and degrees of fluency (Smith et al., 2009). Meanwhile, conceptual comments were more interpretative towards the teacher's overarching understanding of the matters that were discussed (Smith et al., 2009). The third step involved turning the notes into themes that remained close to the teacher's words by shifting from the initial notes. The fourth step was to emerge the process of abstraction to identify patterns between emergent themes, develop a sense of 'superordinate' themes and map how themes fit together. The fifth step focused on seeking the patterns and developing a main table of themes to reflect the teacher's words comprehensively.

Field notes, which were transcribed from classroom observations, were verified by skimming, reading and interpreting (Yin, 2018). Out of twelve lessons observed, one lesson exemplified the active process of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking when students watched a video and discussed its content collaboratively. This lesson was

selected for detailed analysis in order to clearly articulate the rich and multi-faceted nature of CT facilitated. The recorded accounts did not contain any subjective or personal opinions from the authors (Yin, 2011), but were an attempt to re-create the conversation based on the recording, transcription and observations. An excerpt of the classroom observations was chosen from the exemplifying lesson, located in the results section below, and was analysed with reference to the CTELS. Analysis of the conversation excerpt used pattern-matching (Yin, 2018) with the cell descriptions of the CTELS framework. Curriculum and classroom documents were selected based on the relevance to the research questions (Bowen, 2009; Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2018) and analysed to look for congruence with other data and discomfoting evidence.

### **3. Results and Analysis**

The centrepiece of the data is the classroom observation accounts of the teacher's practice and the student responses to this practice. These observation data are compared and contrasted with the statements made by the teacher during the pre- and post-interviews and documents on teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. Three key findings emerged from the data analysis: teacher conceptualisation of CT; CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students; and challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking.

#### *3.1 Teacher conceptualisation of CT*

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The section below discusses data gathered through pre-observation interview to obtain Elisa's general conceptualisation of CT. The term was familiar to her because it has generally been issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Education as one of the national objectives to develop human resources (Ilyas, 2017; The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Elisa stated that the key characteristics of CT were analysing different points of view from the perspective of evidence as well as identifying problems and their solutions:

*I find problems and offer solutions. I also analyse different points of view based on the data.*

Although the target high school implemented Curriculum 2013 that highlighted CT facilitation, Elisa claimed that the outcomes were not as expected. This is partly because many students still required intensive effort to stimulate their sophisticated thinking in EAL (Liang & Fung, 2021):

*Curriculum 2013, which includes critical thinking, doesn't work well. I'm trying to implement critical thinking although the result is not as I expect.*

Content materials designed by the government did not enable Elisa's teaching of CT that facilitated student learning. Elisa claimed that receiving updated teaching resources for embedded CT was vital for her pedagogical practices and development:

*I don't think that the teaching materials designed by the government made my students think critically. I need valid sources to teach critical thinking.*

Despite the insufficiency of CT materials, Elisa remained committed to facilitating CT by providing cases and asking her students to respond. This was aimed at improving students' sophisticated thinking by conveying their key ideas based on evidence:

*I ask questions to brainstorm and analyse the cases. Students should then share the results of what have been discussed based on the facts.*

However, Elisa perceived that some students tended to be passive because they were afraid of making mistakes in English and peer-judgments. Elisa believed that the limited vocabularies of students in English and first language interference hindered the facilitation of CT in EAL teaching and learning processes. In this sense, Elisa valued practical and authentic activities to model CT facilitation: *"I give my students cases which are related to their contexts"* and *"they should share the results based on facts"*. Elisa's pedagogical practice for CT facilitation was primarily the design of instructional activities based on pertinent and stimulating content materials (Esmaeilzad et al., 2022).

### *3.2 CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students*

*RQ2: What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?*

The following section discusses data gathered through classroom observations. In none of the 12 lessons did the teacher explicitly mention to students that CT was being taught, and so the development of CT was left implicit to students. Only those lessons that involved watching videos and discussing the contents evidenced CT facilitated through

listening and speaking tasks. The excerpt below was chosen to epitomise the CT demonstrated across the 12 lessons, because there is a multi-pronged approach in it to facilitating CT through listening and speaking. It is not typical or representative of any other lessons, but rather exemplifies CT evidenced in the Year 10 EAL class. The excerpt therefore sheds light on the nature of CT that may be facilitated, with reference to the CTELS framework.

In the excerpt below, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking was focused on engagement with a video about moving the capital city of Indonesia, Jakarta, to Borneo Island, answering questions, discussing and offering solutions. Seven of the nineteen students who gave permission to be involved in the research were involved in English discussion after watching this video. However, all the other twelve students were involved in speaking in English in other transcripts. The transcript in this article may provide evidence of CT skewed towards high achieving students, those who had confidence to speak to the whole class in English.

The classroom was hot and humid. There were two ceiling fans and no air conditioners. This condition made Elisa, students and first author perspire during the teaching and learning processes. Elisa used the teaching media to facilitate CT in EAL listening and speaking called '*nearpod.com*' (Kusmaryani et al., 2019) with a PC connected to a projector and speakers. Elisa's desk was front and centre of the classroom, and student desks all faced towards the front.

### *3.2.1 Teacher facilitating and students listening and speaking*

The facilitation of CT in listening and speaking was initiated when Elisa played a video narrated in English. Students viewed and listened to the video once and then Elisa asked a question in English about the video. Elisa encouraged her students to share their responses orally while their peers listened, resulting in a conversation-like exchange, as follows:

*Elisa (Teacher): "Now, let's discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved. Hansen, please share your thoughts."*

*Hansen (Student 1): "Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean."*

*Felicia (Student 2): "What if there is no rain in dry season?" (Shouted spontaneously)*



*Hansen (Student 1): "We can store the rainwater in a storage place to keep the water in dry season. As a preventive act, if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter."*

*Vincent (Student 3): "I don't think rainwater is good enough to be consumed because of the industrialisation and acid rain." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Well, when you consider storing the water, think about mosquito larvae that can infect the water."*

*Hansen (Student 1): "Yes, that's right, Ms. So, we need to use filter to make the rainwater clean." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Yes, that might work. Noreen, please share your ideas to your friends."*

*Noreen (Student 4): "I believe that one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality. As the president said that it shows how much the stable capital city is needed to have equal economy."*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Do you guys agree with Noreen? How can this be called economic equality?"*

*Victoria (Student 5): "I think new capital city will offer jobs for the locals." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Jorgen (Student 6): "Yes. And if we move the capital city sooner, the problem of sinking in Jakarta can also be avoided." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Nixsen (Student 7): "Objection, but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo." (Shouted spontaneously)*

### *3.2.2 CTELS analysis of the conversation*

The whole excerpt above comprises students and teacher listening and speaking in an EAL context. The teacher initiated student active listening and speaking by targeting one student to answer her question about the video "*Hansen, please share your thoughts.*". In this context, Elisa strategically 'withdrew' from the conversation only speaking occasionally in the transcript as she otherwise allowed students to respond to other students. This practice was prevalent in Elisa's other lessons. Of the twelve lessons, eleven lessons showed this teacher withdrawal from the classroom conversation. This specific teaching characteristic of Elisa engaged a substantial proportion of students to converse in English during the whole-of-class teaching and learning processes. In the above transcript, seven students engaged in on-topic conversation that was more spontaneous than

orchestrated by Elisa. As a component of this strategy, Elisa allowed her students to use their mobiles to translate words into English or Indonesian. This enabled students to participate actively during discussions by voicing their key ideas in English (Starichkova et al., 2022). The evidence for student listening was strong in the authentic conversation-like interactions. Student listening was evidenced by appropriate responses to other student statements, to teacher questions and by their verbal recounts and re-interpretations of statements made by the video's narrator. There were visual and text components in the video for students to understand the content, however audio information from the video became the main guidance in the conversation. Using the CT through EAL listening and speaking, conceptual framework (*see Appendix A*) analysis was conducted cell by cell.

*a. Evaluate & Determine (Discerning)*

Each of the four dimensions of *evaluate and determine* is epitomised in the transcript. 'Clarity' was evident when Hansen emphatically stated, "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems...*". Here, Hansen showed an awareness of the teacher's purpose to have all students evaluate deeply the consequences of moving Jakarta's location and clearly asserted that Jakarta's water problem would be solved by moving the capital city. 'Relevance' was evident in Felicia's immediate, pertinent and evaluative challenge to Hansen "*What if there is no rain in dry season?*". 'Depth' was epitomised by Hansen's detailed explanation based on audio evidence in the video that he saw as convincing: "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean.*". This elaboration drew on multiple evidence from the video to make his case for solving Jakarta's problems. 'Coherence' is demonstrated by Vincent's evaluative challenge which listened to and followed on carefully from Hansen's claims: "*I don't think rainwater is good enough to be consumed...*". *Evaluate and reflect* are the heart of CT, because without such challenges, the listening and speaking may promote group-think, but challenges drive students to deeper levels of understanding.

*b. Find & Generate (Determined)*

Students may *find* information audibly when watching the documentary or *generate* new ideas based on the information. 'Clarity' was epitomised when Hansen found one

solution that had been specified in the video “... *if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter.*”. However, Hansen seemed to use that concept as an overarching solution, almost a repeated refrain, not realising that the use of a filter did not necessarily deal with Vincent’s concern about *acid rain* (the acid in which cannot be filtered out). At this point in the interaction, where Vincent challenged Hansen’s found solution of the filter, the teacher may have prioritised confidence to listen and speak over accuracy, as she interrupted the flow of the conversation with her interjection about *larvae* that a filter can deal with. At first, it seemed like Elisa, as teacher, was blocking the flow of a multi-student, rich and on-task conversation. However, it may be that either she made a pedagogical choice to value contributions that were on-topic even if not accurate, in order to boost confidence, or was herself unaware that acid could not be filtered out by standard filters, when she declared “*Yes, that might work...*”. ‘*Relevance*’ was evident when Victoria addressed Elisa’s question “...*How can this be called economic equality?*” by explicitly linking the evidence of beneficial impact in moving the capital city with the audio information from the video that the “...*new capital city will offer jobs for the locals.*”. ‘*Depth*’ was showed in Nixsen’s claim: “...*it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo.*”. Nixsen’s concern, from the audio information, was that there might be a specific drawback to Borneo’s ecosystem when moving the capital city. Moreover, he recalled audio information that there would be a time lag due to the development of the area that may make the project unfeasible. ‘*Coherence*’ of information found was evident in Noreen’s claim: “...*one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality...*”. Noreen attributed the source of her found information ‘*as the president said*’.

### c. *Embark & Clarify (Curious)*

Elisa launched the purpose of the conversation with her prompt “*let’s discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved.*”. The students needed to both process the documentary that had just been watched and relate this to Elisa’s intentionally general prompt, which needed student clarification of purpose. Elisa made the pedagogical decision to choose Hansen to determine that purpose, and out of all possible components in the video, he chose water supply. This was the direction of half of the transcript, and the direction only changed from Hansen’s clarification when Elisa steered it towards Noreen, who then specified the different theme of ‘*economic equality*’. In the case of both themes,

'relevance' was shown by student comments and questions closely adhering to the theme at hand, showing students followed both Hansen then Noreen's clarification of purpose. 'Coherence' was epitomised in Victoria's main point "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals." as she responded to Noreen's economic idea equity. Evidence for 'depth' was evident in Nixsen's response to Noreen's, when he challenged equity with the complexities of what will happen economically when the capital city is moved.

#### *d. Organise & Manage (Harmonising)*

Taken as a whole, the transcript above is fundamentally evidence of listening and speaking. One person was speaking at a time, and given the responses, there were at least seven others in the classroom were listening. No hands were raised, but rather students were self-managing their speaking in a conversation-like manner with no interruption of the speaker. Because, as noted, Elisa's teaching structure was familiar to the students, this is evidence of student 'clarity' about how to organise and manage conversations in EAL that are far more than superficial recounts or agreements. There are strategies by students to manage a 'depth' of conversation, exemplified by the three student challenges to other student statements: "What if there is no rain in dry season?", "I don't think rainwater is good enough" and "Objection". In the Indonesian classroom context, challenging others tends to be seen as inappropriate or rude (Ilyas, 2017), and so the classroom culture provides evidence of a harmonious approach to conversation management. 'Relevance' is evident in the on-topic nature of responses, whether on Hansen's topic of water or Noreen's topic of economy. The evidence for the conversation's managed 'coherence' was evident in the appropriate responses to the shift to the economic topic by Victoria and Nixsen: "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals" and "...it takes a lot of years to move the capital city".

#### *e. Analyse & Synthesise (Creative)*

'Clarity' was evident in Hansen's response, as he *analysed* and *synthesised* the aim of moving the capital city of Indonesia by communicating his own example "...Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water...". This is a synthesis of an idea that is not exactly correct, because irrigation is used to move water, not process it. This is one reason why 'evaluate and reflect' are pivotal to CT. Moreover, CT is multi-faceted, not conducted

linearly, facet by facet, but rather each facet is mutually interdependent. During the initial theme of water, the conversation centred around Hansen's synthesis of, understanding of, and defence of, the use of filters, even when this was applied wrongly to acid rain. The conversation risked becoming more a defence of filters than a promotion of CT and this may be another reason why Elisa suddenly redirected the conversation to Noreen. That pedagogical redirection fundamentally changes the type of conversation, from a person-centred defence to a conversation probing the '*depth*' of synthesised ideas across five people, listening, analysing and '*coherently*' synthesising ideas that flowed from one to the next. This starts with Noreen's economic equality theme, then Elisa's prompt to see if others agreed with this. Victoria and Jorgen respectively amplified with the idea of "*jobs for the locals*" and Jorgen's "*move the capital city sooner*". Jorgen's analysis that speed would overcome some problems is challenged by Nixsen's analysis, who saw obstacles to speedy development: "*...but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city*".

Based on Elisa's facilitation involving both promoting and withdrawing, the CT evident in her EAL students' listening and speaking was rich and this exemplifying, five-minute excerpt provided evidence for all 20 cells of the CTELS framework. Students listened to their peers' main points and questions and responded with detailed explanations or challenging questions orally (Liang & Fung, 2021; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Moreover, the facilitation showed that students were able to justify their views and take turns to express opinions. Students were willing and able to express views that differed from others and even challenged one another's key ideas. Students' engagement with one another's key ideas enabled them to elaborate their main points, think critically and initiated a dialogic space to contribute in the discussion (Ellerton, 2017; Willison, 2020). Elisa's awareness towards the dispositions needed for listening and speaking in English was perhaps as vital as the more cognitive facets and dimensions. Elisa's occasional interventions seem to be particularly salient, to prevent students getting 'stuck' on one solution, so they may think more broadly and critically. Her interventions were, however, done in a very sensitive manner that did not undermine student confidence to speak out, nurturing student determination to participate in the conversation. When Elisa shifted the conversation away from Hansen, however, there is evidence that she took this risk to his confidence to promote students being *discerning*, rather than stick to one solution (filters). Based on the string of student-student conversation, the students provide evidence that they had, or were developing, the disposition of *harmonising*, and the respectful

conversation-like nature of the discourse is a particularly striking feature of this classroom. Such harmony was not agreement, and in fact there was evident a comfort for students to disagree, often using *creative* challenges that were a complex synthesis of information from the video, listening to other students and imagined possibilities. All of these dispositions emerged from a lesson, in which Elisa chose a pertinent stimulus to entice student *curiosity*. The content was important to Elisa, for she disregarded government-provided content and took the time to find a resource she believed the students would engage with. The level of engagement in this excerpt shows students conversing in English as their additional tongue and doing so in a *constructive* open-hearted fashion that leads to deeper understanding of the topic and use of, and probably deeper development of, CT. There is a complex interplay between different dispositional facets that is, perhaps, impossible to pre-programme, but requires teacher agility and their own teacherly CT. However, when the EAL classroom enables students to be increasingly discerning, determined, curious, creative, harmonising and constructive through stimulated conversation, there may be a virtuous circle of CT development and associated dispositions.

### *3.3 Challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking*

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The following section discusses the data gathered through post-observation interview and documents that included lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment tasks. After the final classroom observation, Elisa was interviewed to analyse her underlying ideas about the facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. There were significant constraints that hindered the teaching and learning processes, when Elisa facilitated CT practices in EAL listening and speaking. Despite Elisa's attempts to encourage her students to share ideas, discussions in student small groups tended to be in their first language, Indonesian. Elisa described challenges when she facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking as *first language interference*, *insufficient authentic content materials* and *constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*.



### 3.3.1 First language interference

Elisa stated that the relationship between CT and EAL listening and speaking was dynamic, however, the students' limited English vocabulary was a primary factor in their use of Indonesian in their small group discussions:

*Some students had a limited vocabulary. When discussing with their peers, they tended to mix up with Indonesian.*

While the first language interfered with the teaching and learning processes, a lack of self-confidence in actively participating also prevailed in the classroom. Elisa thus instructed her students to write down the scripts before speaking and read during the speaking:

*Passive students were instructed to make scripts for speaking. By scripting, they learned how to analyse the topics being discussed, even though it wasn't spontaneously speaking.*

The comments above indicated that Elisa encouraged her students to be prepared to speak in English by scripting. This is partly because Elisa tried to encourage all her students to be able to present as well as share their ideas orally. Elisa also believed that scripting before speaking was an initial step for her students to analyse the given topics before discussions and improve their engagement:

*Although my students were scripting before speaking, they were analysing the given topic critically. I could say that my students tried to engage with my teaching in the class.*

As shown in this quote, while engaging all students to be active and spontaneous speakers in English remained a challenge for Elisa, scripting before speaking provides evidence for her to show her students' independent thinking and critical evaluation of the given issues (Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). In Elisa's case, her CT engagement in the teaching practice shows that she realised the importance of understanding her students' learning conditions. She further observed that her students were struggling with English vocabulary and designed teaching materials to embed active participation discussing the given topic. Elisa perceived that such a contextual support could improve her students' learning engagement and reduce their anxieties while speaking in English and internalising CT (Yuan et al., 2022). Therefore, Elisa's quotes seem to suggest an active learning process for her students to communicate their key ideas in purposeful CT development.

### 3.3.2 *Insufficient authentic content materials*

Elisa claimed that the provision of updated and authentic content materials was lacking. Elisa believed that intensive knowledge to design suitable learning topics would enhance her students' interests and sophisticated thinking. However, Elisa added that the Indonesian EAL syllabus primarily focused on grammar, reading and writing and minimised listening and speaking:

*The syllabus focuses on grammar and reading. It's hard for me to carry out the listening and speaking.*

The syllabus that Elisa was required to adopt trivialised listening and speaking, rather requiring students to listen to short pre-recorded dialogue and then precisely imitate the intonations of the recording, as well as identify some grammatical features. Although the syllabus also required students to reflect on what is learned, there are no clear indicators in the documents about how reflection should be conducted. Elisa thus expected updated content materials and syllabus that facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking, knowing:

*If I keep using the sources from the government, those materials won't help my students think critically.*

Representing Elisa's notion, Hegazy et al. (2021) suggested that issues around curriculum development, the role of content materials, school cultures and institutional frameworks to create thinking classrooms should be addressed to solve these challenges. Therefore, looking into the future, Elisa's quotes represented the need for continuous supports to enhance her own competence and knowledge to teach CT, especially in EAL listening and speaking.

### 3.3.3 *Constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*

The primary guidance for Elisa's assessment design was the textbook. However, she found that:

*The assessments from textbook don't cover the assessments that I need.*

Elisa used scales from zero to five to systematically assess students' speaking performances, in which five was the highest and zero was the lowest:

*For speaking, I assess the grammar accuracy, pronunciation, fluency and details.*

Her assessment approach to encourage CT in EAL listening and speaking was emphasised in discussions that were integrated with active listening (Yu et al., 2021). Despite her

attempt to design assessment practices for CT in EAL speaking, Elisa was required to follow the standardised test in the form of a written assessment regulated by her high school. Because of this requirement and the classroom time that it took for each student to individually answer questions orally, the listening assessment was neglected. Elisa's epistemological conceptions of assessing CT in EAL speaking were depicted by the importance of details on her students' speaking accuracies, while the standardised goal from the target high school was to enable students to master the language skills through the focus on grammar structures, reading and writing. While Elisa's lesson, as epitomised by the data above, demonstrably facilitates some students' CT in EAL listening and speaking, the constraints of the curriculum and assessment minimise these efforts and possibly minimise the CT that students ultimately develop.

#### **4. Discussion**

Classroom observations in this study provided evidence of Elisa's facilitation of student CT in listening and speaking activities (Starichkova et al., 2022). Elisa's perceptions derived from interviews and documents also shed light on what was occurring during facilitation, sometimes corresponding to, and at other times contradicting, the events in the classroom. The findings show a teacher prompting student CT and withdrawing, only to re-appear at key moments in a very simple conversation structure, in which students asserted, challenged, asked and answered other students, allowing those that participated to delve deeply into problems collaboratively (Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). These results do not show the classroom culture needed to engender student-to-student and student-to-teacher trust in order to allow such a conversation to flow in English. They also do not show the careful planning of the teacher in finding and selecting appropriate stimuli, despite any pressures, including reduced time for preparation, to use government-supplied resources. Therefore, the findings show authentic use and development of CT in EAL listening and speaking, a process involving an evolving conversation between teacher and students (Liang & Fung, 2021).

The data selected exemplified CT developed at a high level with relation to the CTELS, but did not epitomise the standard teaching and learning of CT in Elisa's classroom. Nevertheless, implications can be drawn from Elisa's dispositional and epistemological practices. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in the results focused on watching a video to discuss its contents and solve problems (Rahmawati & Ashadi, 2018). While

the data were created and gathered through interviews, classroom observations and documents, the analysis revealed that the process of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed Elisa to focus on the development of students' cognitive and affective skills, particularly in terms of collaborating and listening to their friends' ideas, while emphasising the development of reasoning and justification (Kelley, 2014). This epistemological shift from teacher didactics is appropriate to increase student engagement (Abrami et al., 2008) during the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, the enhancement of students being critical while listening and speaking was reported in Elisa's CT facilitation to form student simultaneous engagement and pedagogical reflection (Chen & Hwang, 2019; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Significantly, the analysis of the data with the CTELS showed just how rich, multi-faceted and dynamic the student listening and speaking was in the classroom.

Despite the potential for developing student CT, there are numerous shortfalls evident from the data. Some students did not fully participate either being reluctant to speak to the class in English, or not able to engage in such a CT-rich conversation. Moreover, evidence of student CT while listening and speaking was relatively rare during Elisa's teaching. This is partly because Elisa struggled to overcome curriculum and assessment constraints to ensure student achievement of listening and speaking as well as CT learning objectives (Ellerton, 2017). While Elisa argued that some students tended to be disengaged due to the lack of English proficiency, it may be that emphasising dispositions associated with argumentation, reasoning and questioning could promote the development of CT in EAL listening and speaking (Afshar & Movassagh, 2014). For instance, Elisa endorsed Hansen's increasingly tenuous defence of the use of filters, possibly in part to support and value his contributions in English. An integrated and systematic understanding of CT in EAL listening and speaking, including student dispositions, could therefore enhance CT development (Ellerton, 2017). For example, the CTELS may provide teachers and researchers a systematic understanding of the nature of CT in listening and speaking in English.

Another essential finding of this study relates to the lack of provision of authentic and updated content materials. As reported in the result, teacher-selected materials from the internet became the main source of CT in EAL listening and speaking. However, the question that remains is whether the target high school gave permission to Elisa to utilise the video that she played for her students. Elisa did not articulate the criteria for choosing content materials from the third-party sources, but only that the syllabus and textbook from

the government did not entirely cover assessments based on her students' learning needs. Moreover, Elisa tended to distrust the content materials designed by the government. It is uncertain whether the target high school provided professional training for Elisa to address this distrust and improve her epistemological practices in engaging language teaching and sophisticated thinking. The lack of school support and learning opportunities for Elisa also played a minimised role in her professional learning and subsequent epistemological practice improvement. Such a finding attests to the potential to embed CT with in-service teacher education programmes in parallel with EAL teaching and learning procedures and students' needs. Therefore, CT-oriented pedagogical practices to navigate contextual challenges and promote the integration with EAL listening and speaking remain pivotal for Elisa to expand her professional competence.

Elisa's summative assessment of listening and speaking focused on fluency, pronunciation, detail and grammar accuracy in keeping with the government materials and school's policies. However, Elisa knew that the summative assessment regime did not correspond with her rich facilitation and formative assessment of listening and speaking tasks and she was unsure whether the assessment tasks and criteria were suitable for assessing her students' CT in EAL. Schieble et al. (2021) argued that the alternative to measure CT when speaking is for students to write all the information into a journal. However, the data and analysis in this current study suggest that assessing CT in EAL listening and speaking should be conducted through corresponding listening and speaking tasks. The lack of congruence between teaching and learning of listening and speaking in EAL and its summative assessment needs further investigation. Arguably, student capacity to develop CT and to use the English language after studying it is reduced by pressures towards assessing listening and speaking through writing. The richness of student CT when speaking spontaneously in this study show the potential, and the practice gap, for development of both CT and English language in the classroom.

The short sequence of data demonstrated that the complexity and richness of genuine CT when learning to listen and speak to EAL are attainable, if not common or easy. Further case studies are needed both as exemplars of CT facilitation and learning outcomes, but also to probe the efficacy of the CTELS. If the model proves to yield deep insights into CT in EAL teaching and learning, then subsequent research may adopt other strategies informed by the CTELS, including quantitative studies.

## 5. Implications and Conclusion

The present study constitutes the case of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking by investigating the teacher's perceptions and epistemological practices through interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents. The data exemplifies student CT evidence from student voices during the teaching and learning processes and implicates overt and active listening by students. The study contributes to the existing knowledge about CT progression, which not only entails student cognitive engagement but also connects with the teacher's practices that seem to priorities student confidence over factual correctness. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in this study involved viewing a teacher-selected, student-pertinent video, questioning, logical reasoning and discussing. The teaching and learning processes were aimed at encouraging students to learn how to understand problems and offer solutions.

However, there were four major obstacles to Elisa's facilitation of CT. First, there was a lack of authentic content materials for engaging students' CT. The teacher remained committed to providing cases that students perceived to be relevant, to elicit not only evidence but also their opinions to prompt engaged and affective responses. Secondly, Indonesian language interference remained a hindrance when students discussed with their peers in small groups. This was because of the limited vocabulary in English that some students had during the teaching and learning processes. Third, classroom conversations were prevalent in teaching, learning and formative assessment of listening and speaking, yet were neglected in summative assessment. This neglect was not of Elisa's choosing but rather a function of curriculum time and government and school assessment requirements in which writing is a de facto proxy for speaking when students listen to pre-determined, pre-scripted English audio. The fourth obstacle to Elisa's CT facilitation is the inadequacy of CT in EAL theories to stimulate teaching and learning processes. This was reflected on Elisa's epistemological belief and practice that providing her students with only familiar cases to convey their opinions along with the evidence would develop CT. Additionally, engaging all students to participate actively, Elisa solely instructed them to script before speaking. It is therefore important to consider how to improve the facilitation of CT in EAL with the types of constraints this might arise. Ultimately, the CTELS framework may be used to promote teacher professional training to overcome the constraints on facilitating CT during EAL teaching and learning processes.

This qualitative case study is non-generalisable and designed to yield rich insights yet has numerous limitations. The study collected data comprising teacher interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents, and the triangulated data not only showed congruence but also discrepancies, such as first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. The interpretation of these discrepancies is debateable, and assertions made by the authors are open to be challenged. The use of IPA for teacher interviews and the conceptual framework for analysing student CT in EAL listening and speaking, while based on two published frameworks, skews the interpretation of data. Moreover, the study only sought teacher interview data and did not capture student interviews, where students could provide insights into their thought processes in class. In addition, perceptions from other EAL teachers from the target high school were not sought yet could have added valuable insights to the case study, for example by comparing and contrasting stated practices for facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking. Future studies should thus widen the samples, conduct further classroom observations to investigate students' perceptions as a minimum. A specific focus of future research should be on summative assessment practices that are congruent with well-facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking.

To conclude, the study revealed that the teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking at a target Indonesian high school evidenced sophisticated, multi-faceted CT outcomes for students. The findings suggest that further improvements of facilitating CT in EAL are needed, reflecting the challenges at the emotional, interpersonal and organisational levels in Indonesian contexts. The findings may serve as a case used in professional training for EAL teachers to develop their pedagogical knowledge and competence in facilitating CT, negotiating intensive practices to solve the constraints. Considering the findings of this study, future research should continue to investigate CT issues from wider perspectives (e.g., school principals, additional teachers, teacher educators, parents and students), and specifically include examining students' perspectives on classroom observation. Investigation is also required on summative assessment that is congruent with student learning and in-service teacher development of their CT pedagogical practices. As a starting point, through its use of the CTELS framework, this case study demonstrates characteristics of facilitated CT when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia.



## References

- Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Surkes, M. A., Tamim, R., & Zhang, D. (2008). Instructional interventions affecting critical thinking skills and dispositions: A stage 1 meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 1102-1134. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326084>
- Afshar, H. S., & Movassagh, H. (2014). On the relationship among critical thinking, language learning strategy use and university achievement of Iranian English as a foreign language majors. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 382-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.914238>
- Agarwal, A. (2021). *Understanding the value of an MBA by exploring the perspective MBA students and graduates have of their MBA: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis* [Dissertation, The University of Adelaide].
- Akatsuka, Y. (2019). Awareness of critical thinking attitudes and English language skills: The effects of questions involving higher-order thinking. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 59-84. <https://doi.org/10.25256/paal.23.2.4>
- Anggraeny, E., & Khongput, S. (2022). Teachers' perceptions and practices of critical thinking instruction in Indonesian senior high schools: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 33(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/1-26>
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, F. A., & Emilia, E. (2017). A joint construction practice in academic writing course in Indonesian university context. *Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching and Literature*, 17(1), 20.
- Boryczko, M. (2020). Critical thinking in social work education: A case study of knowledge practices in students' reflective writings using semantic gravity profiling. *Social Work Education*, 41(3), 317-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1836143>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qj0902027>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *J Res Nurs*, 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Chen, M. R. A., & Hwang, G. J. (2019). Effects of a concept mapping- based flipped learning approach on EFL students' English speaking performance, critical thinking awareness and speaking anxiety. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(3), 817-834. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12887>
- Cottrell, S. (2017). *Critical thinking skills: Effective analysis, argument and reflection*. Palgrave Macmillan Education.
- Creswell, J. D. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Davies, W. M., & Barnett, R. (2015). *The palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ellerton, P. (2017). *On critical thinking and collaborative inquiry*. E. F. Frontiers.
- Ellerton, P. (2022). On critical thinking and content knowledge: A critique of the assumptions of cognitive load theory. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100975>
- Erkek, G., & Batur, Z. (2020). A comparative study on critical thinking in education: From critical reading attainments to critical listening attainments. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.1p.142>
- Esmailzad, S., Gavvani, V. Z., Zarei, A., & Familrouhany, S. A. A. (2022). Effect of evidence-based information management and practice training on librarians' critical thinking: A randomized educational trial. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/09610006221114648>

- Ferrari-Bridgers, F., Vogel, R., & Lynch, B. (2015). Fostering and assessing critical listening skills in the speech course. *International Journal of Listening*, 31(1), 19-32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1020231>
- Gambrill, E. (2019). *Critical thinking and the process of evidence-based practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Ghanizadeh, A., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2020). *Higher order thinking skills in the language classroom: A concise guide* Springer.
- Havwini, T. (2019). Indonesian EFL students' willingness to communicate in the 2013 curriculum implementation: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal - A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i1/105-120>
- Hegazy, H., Ellerton, P., Campos-Remon, H., Zaphir, L., Mazzola, C., & Brown, D. (2021). Working from theory: Developing the bases of teachers' critical thinking pedagogies through action research. *Educational Action Research*, 31(1), 78-93.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.1877757>
- Ilyas, H. P. (2017). Historical perspective: The development of critical thinking in Indonesian ELT. *Journal of ELT Research*, 2(2), 89-102. [https://doi.org/10.22236/JER\\_Vol2Issue2](https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vol2Issue2)
- Kelley, D. (2014). *The art of reasoning: An introduction to logic and critical thinking*. Norton & Company.
- Kusmaryani, W., Musthafa, B., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). The influence of mobile applications on students' speaking skill and critical thinking in English language learning. *International Conference of Computer and Informatics Engineering (IC2IE)*, 1-6.
- Lamb, S., Maire, Q., & Doecke, E. (2017). *Key skills for the 21st century: An evidence-based review* [Analytical Report].
- Liang, W., & Fung, D. (2021). Fostering critical thinking in English-as-a-second-language classrooms: Challenges and opportunities. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100769>
- Low, E. L., Hui, C., & Cai, L. (2017). Developing student teachers' critical thinking and professional values: A case study of a teacher educator in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(4), 535-551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2017.1386093>
- Manen, M. V. (2017). But is it phenomenology? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775-779.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570>
- Muthmainnah, N. (2019). Optimising critical thinking through peer editing technique in teaching writing. *ELTIN Journal*, 7(1), 1-7.
- Purnamaningwulan, R. A. (2022). Listening journals to promote students' critical thinking skills in an integrated listening-speaking course. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(2), 744-760. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.23387>
- Rahmawati, N., & Ashadi. (2018). Problem-based English speaking material to enhance students' critical thinking skills. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 2(2), 285-301.
- Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- Sanavi, R. V., & Tarighat, S. (2014). Critical thinking and speaking proficiency: A mixed-method study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpis.4.1.79-87>
- Schieble, M., Vetter, A., & Martin, K. M. (2021). Critical listening for critical conversations. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 111(2), 71-77.
- Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2010.510659>
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. SAGE.
- Starichkova, V., Moskovskaya, N., & Kalinovskaya, E. (2022). *Development of students' critical thinking skills via teaching English VII International Forum on Teacher Education*.
- Stolz, S. A. (2022). The practice of phenomenology in educational research. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(7), 822-834. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2022.2138745>
- Tan, C. (2017). The enactment of the policy initiative for critical thinking in Singapore schools. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(5), 588-603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1305452>

- The Indonesian Education Ministry, N. (2022). *Improving the quality of education in Indonesia that is equitable with the independent curriculum*. Retrieved 20 May 2022 from <https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Thomson, V., & Yedidi, M. R. (2020). A practical approach to critical thinking among EFL learners. *Int. J. Technology Transfer and Commercialisation*, 17(1), 43-55.
- Trowler, P. (2012). Disciplines and interdisciplinary: Conceptual groundwork. In *Tribes and territories in the 21st century* (pp. 5-29). Routledge.
- Wale, B. D., & Bishaw, K. S. (2020). Effects of using inquiry-based learning on EFL students' critical thinking skills. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00090-2>
- Wang, Y., & Wu, Z. (2023). Adapting or adopting? Critical thinking education in the East Asian cultural sphere: A systematic integrative review. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101330>
- Willison, J. (2020). *The models of engaged learning and teaching: Connecting sophisticated thinking from early childhood to PhD*. Springer.
- Yaparak, Z., & Kaya, F. (2020). Improving EFL learners' oral production through reasoning-gap tasks enhanced with critical thinking standards: Developing and implementing a critical TBLT model, pre-task plan, and speaking rubric. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.11n.1p.40>
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. The Guildford Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. SAGE.
- Yu, M. H., Reynolds, B. L., & Ding, C. (2021). Listening and speaking for real-world communication: What teachers do and what students learn from classroom assessments. *SAGE Open*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009163>
- Yuan, R., Liao, W., Wang, Z., Kong, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). How do English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers perceive and engage with critical thinking: A systematic review from 2010 to 2020. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101002>
- Zahavi, D. (2020). The practice of phenomenology: The case of Max van Manen. *Nurs Philos*, 21(2), e12276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12276>



# Appendix A. Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students-English as an Additional Language

## Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students – English as an Additional Language

### Dimensions of CTELS

		Clarity	Relevance	Depth	Coherence
		<i>Students communicate key ideas in a precise manner</i>	<i>Students communicate key ideas that are related to the given information/topics</i>	<i>Students communicate detailed explanations of key ideas to develop thorough arguments</i>	<i>Students communicate arguments of key ideas in a logical sense to build the overall intended meaning</i>
<b>F</b> <b>a</b> <b>c</b> <b>e</b> <b>t</b> <b>s</b>  <b>o</b>  <b>f</b>  <b>M</b> <b>E</b> <b>L</b> <b>T</b>	<b>a. Evaluate &amp; Determine</b> <i>What will we trust?</i>  <i>Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas.</i>	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Evidence is presented in the context, and direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas that are closely aligned with the most important information and support the topics.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating detailed explanations to develop their key ideas.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas with logical and coherent structures. Logical and causal relationships are identified.
	<b>b. Find &amp; Generate</b> <i>What will we use?</i>  <i>Students find and generate their key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies.</i>	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Points at issues are clearly defined and stated.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students orally discuss their key ideas that are related to the given topics. Direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students also consider alternative perspectives in relation to the given information/topics by communicating with breadth to ensure that they do not ignore any important components.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their most important key ideas related to the significance of given information/sources. Claims for logical coherence are examined through evidence and methodology.
	<b>c. Embark &amp; Clarify</b> <i>What is our purpose?</i>  <i>Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and clarify their key ideas while considering ethical, cultural, social and team (ESCT) issues.</i>	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the most important information related to the given topics. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues. Given information that is significant and relevant is highlighted.	Students orally respond their key ideas to given questions/tasks and discuss the complexities of the given information/sources. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the premises of given information/sources that support conclusions. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.
	<b>d. Organise &amp; Manage</b> <i>How do we arrange?</i>  <i>Students organise given information/sources. to reveal their key ideas while managing the processes through spoken conventions.</i>	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the given information/source. Students clearly assert the main purpose of the given information/source by communicating their key ideas.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the topics by communicating the causal relationships.	Students organise and manage their key ideas that by communicating detailed and thorough explanations and/or arguments.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments, intended to build the logical sense of meaning.
	<b>e. Analyse &amp; Synthesise</b> <i>What does it mean?</i>  <i>Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce their key ideas and coherent understandings.</i>	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students communicate their own examples, and the structures are clear, unambiguous and easy to understand.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources by communicating their key ideas and coherent understandings that are aligned with the given information/topics.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments. Students communicate their key ideas by considering alternative perspectives and justifying arguments.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating the arguments intended to build the logical sense of meaning. Students communicate by developing key ideas and using transition phrases to identify logical and coherent progression.

## Appendix B. Interview protocol

### A. Pre-interview

1. Have you ever heard the term "critical thinking"? (*If the answer is "YES", then go to the additional questions. If the answer is "NO", go to question 2).*

*Additional questions:*

- a. Is critical thinking useful to you and your students?
  - b. Why is it important for you and your students?
  - c. Do you think you, as a teacher, are a critical thinker?  
If yes, please explain.  
If no, please explain.
2. What does critical thinking mean to you?
  3. What characteristics should a critical thinker have?
  4. Do you facilitate critical thinking in your classes? If so, please explain.

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you define that critical thinking is facilitated in your classes?
  - b. What experiences do you provide to achieve the goal?
  - c. How do you assess the goal?
5. Do you think there is a relationship between critical thinking and English language teaching?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you think you are able to integrate critical thinking into your teaching?
  - b. How do you think critical thinking can be used in your language teaching?
6. Do your students actively participate in speaking and listening activities in your classes?

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you encourage your students' active participations and involvement in speaking and listening activities?
  - b. How do you facilitate speaking and listening skills in your classroom?
  - c. How do you improve your students' speaking and listening skills?
7. Have you ever facilitated the teaching of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  8. How do you facilitate the critical thinking teaching that focuses on speaking and listening skills?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you find any difficulties or problems in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - b. What are the possible challenges of integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - c. What do you do to overcome those challenges or problems?
  - d. What are the factors that would enable you to integrate critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
9. How do you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  10. In your opinion, what are the things you have not achieved in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?

11. What specific supports do you need to improve your skills on the integration of critical thinking in speaking and listening activities?
12. Would you like to participate in classroom observations on critical thinking and its integration into speaking and listening skills? *(If the answer is "YES", then go to question 13 and 14. If the answer is "NO", the interview ends).*
13. What would you like to expect throughout the classroom observations specifically?
14. Are you willing to share and copy your syllabus, lesson plans, teaching materials and students' works that show the integration of critical thinking into speaking and listening skills throughout the classroom observations?

## **B. Post-interview**

1. Do you think you were able to successfully facilitate critical thinking when speaking and listening skills were practised in your classrooms? If yes/no, please explain.
2. Do you think that your students actively participated during the teaching and learning process? If yes/no, please explain.
3. Do you think your teaching activities improved your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills and engaged their active participations?

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What were the most engaging activities you conducted in your classrooms?
- b. Did your students find it difficult to follow the activities?
- c. How did you manage to differentiate your students' critical thinking skills when speaking and listening were facilitated?
4. What do you think were the challenges you faced during the teaching and learning process?
5. Do you think that your assessments were effective to obtain your learning objectives? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. Were your students able to follow the assessment?
- b. What assessment forms did you design to obtain your learning objectives?
- c. How did you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
6. Are you thinking of continuing to develop the facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classes? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What is your perception on the future facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classrooms?
- b. How will you develop your teaching and learning strategies to construct your students' critical thinking skills and active participations?


## Appendix C. Classroom observation (Field Note Form)

Classroom Observation (Field Note Form)	
An investigation of facilitating critical thinking in an English language class when listening and speaking are practised in an Indonesian high school	
<u>School</u>	
<u>Participant</u>	
<u>Age range</u>	
<u>Qualification</u>	
<u>Years of teaching experience</u>	
<u>Years at the school</u>	
<u>Date and Time</u>	
<u>Classroom Observation</u>	
<i>Portraits of Participants (The characteristics of individuals, including their dresses, gestures and non-verbal behaviour)</i>	
<i>Reconstructions of Dialogue (The interactions between or among people)</i>	
<i>Descriptions of Physical Setting (The “actions” taking place)</i>	
<i>Classroom Activities (The physical surroundings)</i>	
<u>Researcher's Personal Note (Ideas, Impressions, Problems, Feelings and Speculation)</u>	



## Appendix D. Documents

### 1. The sample of lesson plan

Grade	10	
Date	Tuesday, 14 February 2023	
Time	13.40-15.00	
Duration	Activities	Teaching Aids
15 mins	<p><b>Orientation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher will open the class and welcome the students.</li> <li>2. Teacher is checking the students' attendance.</li> <li>3. Teacher is organizing the class and getting all the students ready for the lesson.</li> </ol> <p><b>Aperception</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher motivate the students before the lesson's started  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg</a></li> <li>2. Teacher brainstorms the students with a picture about creative thinking and looking up the updated information about moving Indonesia capital.  <b>(Nearpod link :</b>  <a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>  <b>)</b></li> </ol>  <p>Teacher is asking the students some questions, such as: Look at the map, what can you see on the map given?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Students answer the question with their own idea.</li> <li>4. Teacher explains the students what was really happening based on the picture.</li> <li>5. Teacher devides students into some groups.</li> <li>6. Teacher asks the students to work within their group to answer the questions that the teacher gives.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Laptop, Loud Speaker, Projector, projector screen</b></p> <p><b>Nearpod.com</b></p>

55 mins	<b>Main Activity (The lesson about Moving Indonesia Capital to Nusantara)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Teacher shows the questions that the students need to discuss. These questions will stimulate the student to think critically. The questions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the video you have seen, explore the solution you could probably suggest to the capital problem instead of moving the capital?</li> <li>If the government still move the Indonesia capital what they need to prepare to restore the habitat of endangered animal?</li> <li>The biggest problem that makes Jakarta's sinking is 60% population rely on ground water wells. Pumping too much ground water cause the condition. Explain your best solution to prevent Jakarta from sinking!</li> <li>Comparing to the sinking Jakarta, can you explain what's in common between Jakarta and Pekanbaru nowadays?</li> <li>As mentioned in the video, it is said that traffic causes \$5 billion dollar a year in Economic losses. Based on your point of view, why this thing is happening and what's the best solution you can find for solving this problem?</li> <li>"Professor of Urban Design" from Monash University said that Indonesia canal built in colonial era doesn't really work in Indonesia. Why is that so? Explain your reason!</li> <li>As Mr Jokowi said, one of the reasons to move Indonesia capital is Economic equality. Based on your point of view, why the president expected this?</li> <li>In the end, what will be happening to Indonesia Economic if building a new capital costs billion dollars?</li> <li>From your point of view, What's the biggest risk of moving new capital to Nusantara? Explain!</li> </ul> </li> <li>The teacher plays the video 2 times about Why Indonesia Capital is moving? (<a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>), the video is taken from the youtube and the teacher attaches the video into Nearpod platform.</li> <li>The teachers ask the students to share their thoughts about the question given.</li> <li>The students take turn in sharing their ideas by giving feedback to each group points (students' ideas could be difference based on their understanding/ critical thinking.)</li> <li>The teacher gives feedback to the students' answer.</li> <li>The students also give feedback to their friend's answer.</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

10 mins	<b>Closing</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher asks the students to sum up the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher wraps up all of the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher motivates the students regarding to the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher mentions the students the upcoming lesson.</li> <li>The class is ended by praying together</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

## 2. The sample of the syllabus only available in Indonesian version

### SILABUS PEMBELAJARAN

NAMA SEKOLAH : SMAS DHARMA LOKA  
 MATA PELAJARAN : Bahasa Inggris  
 KELAS / SEMESTER : X / 1  
 TAHUN PELAJARAN : 2022/2023

#### Kompetensi Inti

KI 1 Menghargai dan menghayati dan mengamalkan ajaran agama yang dianutnya

KI 2 Menunjukkan perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (gotong royong, kerjasama, toleran, damai), santun, responsif dan pro-aktif dan menunjukkan sikap sebagai bagian dari solusi atas berbagai permasalahan berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam serta dalam menempatkan diri sebagai cerminan bangsa dalam pergaulan dunia.

KI 3 Memahami, menerapkan, dan menganalisis pengetahuan faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural berdasarkan rasa ingintahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya, dan humaniora dengan wawasan kemanusiaan, kebangsaan, kenegaraan, dan peradaban terkait penyebab fenomena dan kejadian, serta menerapkan pengetahuan prosedural pada bidang kajian yang spesifik sesuai dengan bakat dan minatnya untuk memecahkan masalah.

KI 4 Mengolah, menalar, dan menyaji, dalam ranah konkret dan ranah abstrak terkait dengan pengembangan dari yang dipelajarinya di sekolah secara mandiri dan mampu menggunakan metoda sesuai kaidah keilmuan.

Kompetensi Dasar	Materi Pembelajaran	Kegiatan Pembelajaran	Alokasi Waktu	Sumber belajar
<p>3.1 Menerapkan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya. (Perhatikan unsur kebahasaan <i>pronoun: subjective, objective, possessive</i>)</p> <p>4.1 Menyusun teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis pendek dan sederhana yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri, dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan yang benar dan sesuai konteks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fungsi Sosial Mengenalkan, menjalin hubungan interpersonal dengan teman dan guru</li> <li>• Struktur Teks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Memulai</li> <li>- Menanggapi (diharapkan/di luar dugaan)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Unsur Kebahasaan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sebutan anggota keluarga inti dan yang lebih luas dan orang-orang dekat lainnya; hobi, kebiasaan</li> <li>- Verba: <i>be, have, go, work, live</i> (dalam <i>simple present tense</i>)</li> <li>- Subjek Pronoun: <i>I, You, We, They, He, She, It</i></li> <li>- Kata ganti possessive <i>my, your, his, dsb.</i></li> <li>- Kata tanya <i>Who? Which? How? Dst.</i></li> <li>- Nomina singular dan plural dengan atau tanpa <i>a, the, this, those, my, their, dsb.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Menyimak dan menirukan beberapa contoh interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, dengan ucapan dan tekanan kata yang benar</li> <li>- Mengidentifikasi ungkapan-ungkapan penting dan perbedaan antara beberapa cara yang ada</li> <li>- Menanyakan hal-hal yang tidak diketahui atau yang berbeda.</li> <li>- Mempelajari contoh teks interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarganya yang dipaparkan figur-figur terkenal.</li> <li>- Saling menyimak dan bertanya jawab tentang jati diri masing-masing dengan teman-temannya</li> <li>- Melakukan refleksi tentang proses dan hasil belajarnya</li> </ul>	18 JP	Gold Experience -Pierson

### 3. The sample of content material

- 1st team : Living as a teen in Asian community.
- 2nd team : Dealing with insecurities.
- 3rd team : Living without gadgets.
- 4th team : Sleepy teen: a worldwide pandemic.
- 5th team : Teen Stress
- 6th team : How the media affects the youth.
- 7th team : Top tips to boost the confidence for teens.
- 8th team : What makes you special?
- 9th team : The perks of being introvert

Our Discussion Topic



#### 4. The samples of assessment practices for students

29. According to the picture, what is the best advice the coach could give to her athlete?



- A. You could train yourself more so you'll be the next winner in the upcoming session.
- B. You should stop practicing in the field.
- C. How about going to Coffee shop to get Vanila Late?
- D. Why don't we go and forgetthat we ever exist?
- E. Shall I give you a back pain after this training?
30. What is the best offer they could give?



#### B. Answer the question below correctly!

1. Sometimes people tend to have a lot of things in his mind.



Let me know how you could make them better with your suggestion, offer, and your advice.

2. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences!
- A. You and me is a married couple now. Why don't ..... go to Maldives for our honeymoon?
- B. It's raining now. How about ..... a ramen soup? (Make)
- C. It's too dark here. You ..... Turn on the light.
3. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences Use Future tense.
- A. In my mind, she ..... her donut later. (eat)



## SPEAKING ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Subject : English  
 Class /Semester : 10 Science 3/ II  
 Topic : The Biggest Landfil of Earth  
 Date : Friday, 19 May 2023

Name	Fluency	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Details	Score
<u>Cindy ong</u>	4	3.5	4	4	4	97.5
Cynthia Tan	3.5	4	4	4	4	97.5
<u>Daniel wang</u>	3	3	3	3	2	70
<u>Dorelia juliestya</u>	3.5	3.5	3.7	4	4	93.5
Felicia C	3	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	90.5
Freddie Justin	3	3.5	3.5	3.8	3	84
Hansen Lim	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8	89.5
<u>Jason A Kardono</u>	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	90.5
Jocelyne A F	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	90
Jonathan	3.5	3.8	3.8	4	4	95.5
Jorgen W Chang	4	4	4	4	3.5	97.5
<u>Marihito N M</u>	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	4	93.5
<u>Nixsen O</u>	3	4	3	4	3	85
Noreen Tamarin	4	3.65	4	4	4	98.25
<u>Sannie</u>	3.2	3	3.6	3.6	3.6	85
Valentina Sun	3.3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	84
<u>Victoria Cantika</u>	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	92.5
<u>Vikenzo Carlos</u>	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	90
Vincent V	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5	90.5

**Speaking Assessment Rubric**

	<b>Fluency</b>	<b>Pronunciation and accent</b>	<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>Grammar</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>4</b>	Smooth and fluid speech; few to no hesitations; no attempts to search for words; volume is excellent.	Pronunciation is excellent; good effort at accent	Excellent control of language features; a wide range of well-chosen vocabulary	Accuracy & variety of grammatical structures	Excellent level of description; additional details beyond the required
<b>3</b>	Smooth and fluid speech; few hesitations; a slight search for words; inaudible word or two.	Pronunciation is good; good effort at accent	Good language control; good <b>range</b> of relatively well-chosen vocabulary	Some <b>errors</b> in grammatical structures possibly caused by attempt to include a <b>variety</b> .	Good level of description; all required information included
<b>2</b>	Speech is relatively smooth; some hesitation and unevenness caused by rephrasing and searching for words; volume <b>wavers</b> .	Pronunciation is good; Some effort at accent, but is <u>definitely non-</u>	Adequate language <u>control</u> ; vocabulary range is lacking	Frequent grammatical errors <b>that</b> do not obscure meaning; little variety in structures	Adequate description • some additional details should be provided
<b>1</b>	Speech is frequently hesitant with some sentences left uncompleted; volume very soft.	Pronunciation is okay; No effort towards a native accent	Weak language <u>control</u> ; basic vocabulary choice with some words clearly lacking	Frequent grammatical errors even in simple structures that at times obscure meaning.	Description lacks some critical details that make it difficult for the listener to understand

## **Characteristics of facilitated critical thinking when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia**

### **Abstract**

This article presents a qualitative case study of a teacher facilitating Critical Thinking (CT) through listening and speaking in an English as an Additional Language (EAL) Year 10 Indonesian high school class. Such CT facilitation and development are required not only by the Indonesian government's EAL policies, but also in other countries with developing economies. CT is thought to promote language acquisition as well as being developed through language learning, if well-facilitated. This paper presents a case study of a teacher and her class based on triangulated data comprising pre- and post-interviews with the teacher, student classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. The findings revealed evidence for rich CT when analysed through the analytical framework of Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS). However, factors were identified as obstacles for CT development, including first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. These barriers to effective facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking form the basis for further investigation of the areas of CT in EAL listening and speaking pedagogy and assessment. Moreover, the CTELS shows promise to illuminate CT as evidenced by students and has the potential to guide teacher facilitation of CT.

**Keywords:** *Critical Thinking (CT), English as an Additional Language (EAL), Case Study, Teacher Practice, Listening and Speaking*



## 1. Introduction

Critical Thinking (CT) has become an educational objective to enhance both student performance and national global competitive ability in numerous nations with developing economies (Tan, 2017). This is partly because CT plays a central role in developing new knowledge through problem-solving, sophisticated thinking and decision-making (Cottrell, 2017; Kelley, 2014). CT is also associated with student learning improvement, not only in academic contexts but also equipping them to be flexible, adaptive and resilient (Gambrill, 2019) in natural settings. Moreover, CT is essential for students to make better decisions, be less susceptible to cognitive biases and fallacies and use evaluative thinking (Davies & Barnett, 2015) to develop a comprehensive understanding.

While there is a debate about how CT could be effectively developed, in terms of '*generic skills*' (Kelley, 2014) vs '*content-specific*' (Ellerton, 2022), these orientations to CT development are viewed in this article as complementary enablers of student CT development (Wale & Bishaw, 2020). Nevertheless, the focus of this research is context-sensitive CT development, a focus necessary to add to the field understandings that are fit-for-purpose (Ghanizadeh et al., 2020). Context-sensitive development impacts on the facilitation of generic CT and how effectively CT is developed by students (Starichkova et al., 2022; Thomson & Yedidi, 2020).

Somewhat controversially, some languages are thought to be associated with cultural norms for more transmissive modes of teaching (Wang & Wu, 2023), and therefore limit the potential development for CT in EAL. This is a crude distinction, as high school instruction in English has long been associated with transmission teaching, and to a substantial extent, still is (Ilyas, 2017). Nevertheless, this study was conducted in the context of EAL, because English has a supposed tradition of enlightenment thinking that may challenge norms and promote CT (Starichkova et al., 2022).

Research on the development of CT in EAL learning contexts, set in non-English speaking countries, is required to determine whether EAL may indeed contribute to student CT development (Liang & Fung, 2021), specifically listening and speaking skills. This is partly because there is some evidence that students who struggle with literacy in reading and writing may benefit from a listening and speaking orientation to CT (Akatsuka, 2019; Erkek & Batur, 2020). In China, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at providing a communicative context for students to listen to each other, make comments on their peers' opinions and question (Yu et al., 2021), while in Turkey, the facilitation of CT

in EAL listening and speaking is to develop student active communication through reasoning (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In this sense, CT in EAL listening and speaking is aimed at transferring information and expressing opinions in an additional language, providing opportunities for students to practise the target language in authentic activities (Yaprak & Kaya, 2020). In both the Chinese and Turkish contexts, the learning experiences of CT in EAL listening and speaking simultaneously enhance student communicative competence by understanding and evaluating different types of information (Ferrari-Bridgers et al., 2015; Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014) through analytical thinking, collaborative capacity and new expertise development (Hegazy et al., 2021). In the long run, CT in EAL listening and speaking could potentially provide opportunities for students to understand multiple sources of information, listen to different perspectives and communicate their understanding orally (Schieble et al., 2021). Therefore, CT in EAL listening and speaking can be defined as an active and persistent process that requires a commitment to conceptualise different knowledge and beliefs by communicating key ideas followed by reasoning with evidence, solving problems and formulating solutions.

One specific context that is suitable for CT in EAL research is Indonesian high school setting. CT is typically regarded as one of the most pivotal attributes in education in Indonesia, and English is perceived to be an instruction medium that may better promote CT (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). The Indonesian Ministry of Education is committed to developing CT through pedagogical practices in EAL courses, especially for high school students. EAL for Indonesian high school students is a compulsory subject, and the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires them to develop CT skills through asking, reasoning, discussing, presenting and other forms of active oral communication (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). CT in EAL learning is aimed at student engagement with global concerns, Industrial Revolution 4.0 and the related Education 4.0 (The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Consequently, teachers are expected to prepare their students to be increasingly self-directed when learning English.

However, CT facilitation in Indonesia remains elusive and requires further investigation, possibly in part because of the diverse definitions and procedures stated in the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum (Ilyas, 2017). Another factor may be inconsistency between the definitions and procedures and existing cultural norms, language barrier and epistemological beliefs (Wang & Wu, 2023). Culturally, many Indonesian teachers struggle to shift from monological thinking to independent thinking (Ilyas, 2017) and rely heavily on standardised tests. This is similar to the context of Hong Kong where the

entrenched examination-orientation hinders students' ample opportunities to practise CT in EAL, and thus little progress has been made in integrating CT into language teaching there (Liang & Fung, 2021). This may be contrasted with Singapore, where CT has been valued and cultivated in their education system for all teaching subjects, emphasising teacher improvement of students' consciousness and mindfulness in their pedagogical practices through reasoning (Low et al., 2017). The purpose is to enhance a habit of mind to think critically, ensuring effective teaching and learning processes (Low et al., 2017; Tan, 2017).

Although the importance of CT in EAL has become prevalent in Indonesia, relatively few studies on CT are set in Indonesia (Anggraeny & Khongput, 2022; Purnamaningwulan, 2022), even though this nation has committed to CT development in EAL. The majority of studies that have been conducted on Indonesian CT tend to highlight the focus on reading and writing for tertiary levels (Aunurrahman et al., 2017; Muthmainnah, 2019). However, pedagogies around listening and speaking to develop CT tend to be under-theorised and under-researched (Havwini, 2019) and few studies explore CT in listening and speaking (Purnamaningwulan, 2022) in the high school contexts.

In order to address these gaps in research on CT in the context of listening and speaking in EAL, a case study was conducted in an Indonesian Year 10 classroom where pedagogies for listening and speaking were evident. By observing the teacher's practice around facilitating listening and speaking, and the student engagement in these tasks, evidence of CT was determined, in order to provide a rich understanding of pedagogy and student CT outcomes. Therefore, this article aims to add to the understanding of teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking and its outcomes in the Indonesian high school classroom.

To address the aim above, two questions guided the present inquiry:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?

Data were collected of the teacher's perceptions and practices, student listening and speaking in their classroom and of curriculum and planning documents.

Lamb et al. (2017) reported that three main ways of assessing students' CT were student self-rating, direct assessment using tests and teacher judgments and reporting. The

limitations of these CT assessments are substantial as they provided narrow student data (Lamb et al., 2017), whereas student classroom observations of CT are both rarer and provide a valuable perspective. To gain this perspective, this article presents the investigation of CT in EAL listening and speaking through a rich extended observation of an Indonesian Year 10 class. The research explored the nature and possible developments of CT during the teaching and learning processes (Boryczko, 2020; Starichkova et al., 2022) conducted by the Year 10 class teacher. The article thus aims to provide a close investigation of how CT in EAL listening and speaking is realised in a local Indonesian high school context.

Specific to this aim, sustained longitudinal observations of the teacher's practice and student engagement in learning were conducted in the classroom in weekly visits across two school terms, from January to May 2023. These observations were triangulated with the teacher's perceptions and knowledge of CT in advance of the observations, and the teacher's perceptions and challenges of facilitating CT in the lessons observed after observations were finished, as well as the curriculum and teaching documents.

The analysis of this rich and complex data required a pertinent analytical framework. Two frameworks that individually addressed a salient dimension of CT in EAL listening and speaking were combined: The Models of Engaged Learning and Teaching (MELT) (Willison, 2020) and the Dimensions of CT in English Listening and Speaking (DCTELS) (*see Appendix A*). The MELT provide insight into the multifaceted nature of sophisticated learning, including student engagement in CT (Willison, 2020). The DCTELS dimensions were adopted from the framework of critical thinking and collaborative inquiry (Ellerton, 2017) to illuminate CT in EAL listening and speaking. The resulting conceptual framework, Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) (*see Appendix A*) placed five MELT facets on the vertical axis of a matrix and the four DCTELS dimensions on its horizontal axis. The resulting twenty cells comprehensively capture the intricacies of CT in a classroom with rich evidence of listening and speaking in EAL. For instance, the integration between the facets of *evaluate & determine (discerning)* from "MELT" and *clarity* from "DCTELS" provides description of processes when students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/sources. In order to address the study's aim with reference to the CTELS framework, the article's research questions, methods, findings, discussion and conclusion follow.

## 2. Methods

This study employed a qualitative case study conducted to determine the nature of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in a local Indonesian high school in a naturalistic setting. A case study is a qualitative approach that explores a contemporary bounded system and/or phenomena through in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (i.e., teacher pre- and post-interviews, classroom observations and documents on lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices) (*See Appendices B, C and D*) (Creswell, 2013; Rashid et al., 2019). As the present study addresses an in-service teacher's personal perceptions and practices of CT in EAL listening and speaking, the epistemological view is through the subjective orientation provided by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). This is because the authors had to interpret the reality subjectively, with the teacher creating an evolving knowledge base and understanding during the investigation (Rashid et al., 2019). The process of investigation was refined through interactions between the first author and the teacher (Rashid et al., 2019).

Prior to the commencement of data collection, ethical approval from the first author's university was obtained. The first author contacted the target high school in Indonesia and went on site to discuss the research with the principal. EAL at the school is a compulsory subject, providing a potentially good site to investigate facilitated CT in EAL. After obtaining the agreement and permission from the principal, three EAL teachers volunteered to participate, and each signed a consent form. This paper focuses on the case of one Teacher and her Year 10 EAL class.

In a case study, the purpose of selecting the school, teacher and class is not to determine statistical inferences for a population (Creswell, 2013) but rather useful information in the form of context-sensitive and rich descriptions (Campbell et al., 2020) within the school. Teacher interviews, classroom observations and curriculum documents were collected to provide a triangulation of data. The aim of employing triangulated data is to use different sources of evidence that may support as well as challenge the perspectives of each and so provide an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the phenomena under study (Yin, 2018).

The teacher in this case study was assigned a pseudonym, Elisa, and the study focus was her Year 10 EAL class. Elisa was recruited to be involved in the study in large part because she was willing to be observed over an extended time period in order to investigate her facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. Elisa's understanding and conceptualisation of CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed the authors to explore her

perceptions and practices. Elisa was an EAL teacher at the target high school for seven years, holding a bachelor's degree in English teacher training education from a local university in Indonesia. As a case study, there are limitations of this research situated in a target single institution with one in-service teacher, and the outcomes are specific to the context and different from those in other contexts (Trowler, 2012). In the research project, a total of nineteen students, out of a class of twenty-seven students, participated after returning the consent forms signed by themselves and their parents.

In EAL subject, students needed to learn four different language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Although the Indonesian 2013 Curriculum requires students to use CT in active oral communication through asking, reasoning, discussing and presenting, according to Elisa, there were still very limited numbers of students who could communicate fully in English, especially in listening and speaking. This is partly because students needed to pass standardised tests (Ilyas, 2017), in which the forms of the tests only consisted of grammar, reading and writing. Subsequently, they commonly spoke Indonesian when communicating with their peers during oral group discussions in EAL classes, as it was easy for them to communicate their key ideas directly using their first language (Wang & Wu, 2023). Lastly, some students wrote scripts in English first before they attempted to express their opinions and key ideas during the teaching and learning processes.

As Elisa's spoken English was proficient, the pre- and post-interviews were collected in English to provide detailed and reflective accounts of her perceptions and experiences (Smith et al., 2009). A dialogical method was employed to explore the interpretation of committing to both thematic analysis and presentation of the emic perspective in a novel manner (Agarwal, 2021).

Classroom observations were made from 17 January 2023 to 19 May 2023, with a total of twelve lessons observed. Classes ran for eighty minutes and occurred immediately after the school's lunch break. There were two lessons each week, but the teacher allowed the first author to attend one lesson each week. However, during mid-term exams and any other school events, the classroom observations were postponed. The teacher thus informed the first author to observe subsequent lessons twice in a week. For the classroom observations, field notes were taken with particular attention paid to dialogues between Elisa and her students, dialogue between students in the whole-class setting, the physical environment of the classroom and learning activities (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Yin, 2018). The dialogues between Elisa and her students were fully in English and recorded

using audio-recordings. However, during peer small group discussions, students spoke in Indonesian, and so this data was not captured. Meanwhile, documents such as teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices were deemed by Elisa to be the evidence of her epistemological CT facilitation.

Smith et al.'s (2009) IPA was used to analyse and process the pre-and post-observation interviews. IPA is underpinned by *phenomenology* (a philosophical approach to the study of experience), *hermeneutics* (theory of interpretation) and *ideography* (depth of analysis) (Smith et al., 2009). The limitations of IPA evident in critiques (Manen, 2017; Stolz, 2022) were accounted for, and its strengths to explore the teacher's cognitive, affective and natural responses to make sense of the experiences (Smith, 2011; Zahavi, 2020) were highlighted. The first step was reading the original interview transcripts and listening back to the audio recordings to ensure that the teacher became the main analysis. The second step focused on investigating the semantic content and language uses to familiarise with the transcripts, identify what the teacher said, understand the experiences and develop a specific phenomenological focus that was close to the teacher's words by exploring descriptive, linguistic and conceptual comments. The comments were not intended to be prescriptive, but were presented as the analytic tools to comment similarities and differences in what the teacher said (Smith et al., 2009). For example, when analysing the transcripts, the first author could ask questions of what the words, phrases and sentences were meant to the teacher. For descriptive comments, the focus highlighted the objects which structured the teacher's thoughts and experiences, while linguistic comments focused on the language uses such as repetitions, tones and degrees of fluency (Smith et al., 2009). Meanwhile, conceptual comments were more interpretative towards the teacher's overarching understanding of the matters that were discussed (Smith et al., 2009). The third step involved turning the notes into themes that remained close to the teacher's words by shifting from the initial notes. The fourth step was to emerge the process of abstraction to identify patterns between emergent themes, develop a sense of 'superordinate' themes and map how themes fit together. The fifth step focused on seeking the patterns and developing a main table of themes to reflect the teacher's words comprehensively.

Field notes, which were transcribed from classroom observations, were verified by skimming, reading and interpreting (Yin, 2018). Out of twelve lessons observed, one lesson exemplified the active process of CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking when students watched a video and discussed its content collaboratively. This lesson was



selected for detailed analysis in order to clearly articulate the rich and multi-faceted nature of CT facilitated. The recorded accounts did not contain any subjective or personal opinions from the authors (Yin, 2011), but were an attempt to re-create the conversation based on the recording, transcription and observations. An excerpt of the classroom observations was chosen from the exemplifying lesson, located in the results section below, and was analysed with reference to the CTELS. Analysis of the conversation excerpt used pattern-matching (Yin, 2018) with the cell descriptions of the CTELS framework. Curriculum and classroom documents were selected based on the relevance to the research questions (Bowen, 2009; Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2018) and analysed to look for congruence with other data and discomfoting evidence.

### **3. Results and Analysis**

The centrepiece of the data is the classroom observation accounts of the teacher's practice and the student responses to this practice. These observation data are compared and contrasted with the statements made by the teacher during the pre- and post-interviews and documents on teacher lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment practices. Three key findings emerged from the data analysis: teacher conceptualisation of CT; CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students; and challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking.

#### *3.1 Teacher conceptualisation of CT*

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The section below discusses data gathered through pre-observation interview to obtain Elisa's general conceptualisation of CT. The term was familiar to her because it has generally been issued by the Indonesian Ministry of Education as one of the national objectives to develop human resources (Ilyas, 2017; The Indonesian Education Ministry, 2022). Elisa stated that the key characteristics of CT were analysing different points of view from the perspective of evidence as well as identifying problems and their solutions:

*I find problems and offer solutions. I also analyse different points of view based on the data.*

Although the target high school implemented Curriculum 2013 that highlighted CT facilitation, Elisa claimed that the outcomes were not as expected. This is partly because many students still required intensive effort to stimulate their sophisticated thinking in EAL (Liang & Fung, 2021):

*Curriculum 2013, which includes critical thinking, doesn't work well. I'm trying to implement critical thinking although the result is not as I expect.*

Content materials designed by the government did not enable Elisa's teaching of CT that facilitated student learning. Elisa claimed that receiving updated teaching resources for embedded CT was vital for her pedagogical practices and development:

*I don't think that the teaching materials designed by the government made my students think critically. I need valid sources to teach critical thinking.*

Despite the insufficiency of CT materials, Elisa remained committed to facilitating CT by providing cases and asking her students to respond. This was aimed at improving students' sophisticated thinking by conveying their key ideas based on evidence:

*I ask questions to brainstorm and analyse the cases. Students should then share the results of what have been discussed based on the facts.*

However, Elisa perceived that some students tended to be passive because they were afraid of making mistakes in English and peer-judgments. Elisa believed that the limited vocabularies of students in English and first language interference hindered the facilitation of CT in EAL teaching and learning processes. In this sense, Elisa valued practical and authentic activities to model CT facilitation: *"I give my students cases which are related to their contexts"* and *"they should share the results based on facts"*. Elisa's pedagogical practice for CT facilitation was primarily the design of instructional activities based on pertinent and stimulating content materials (Esmaeilzad et al., 2022).

### *3.2 CT facilitated by the teacher and evidenced by students*

*RQ2: What are the characteristics of student CT evident in the classroom when students listen to and speak in English as an additional language?*

The following section discusses data gathered through classroom observations. In none of the 12 lessons did the teacher explicitly mention to students that CT was being taught, and so the development of CT was left implicit to students. Only those lessons that involved watching videos and discussing the contents evidenced CT facilitated through

listening and speaking tasks. The excerpt below was chosen to epitomise the CT demonstrated across the 12 lessons, because there is a multi-pronged approach in it to facilitating CT through listening and speaking. It is not typical or representative of any other lessons, but rather exemplifies CT evidenced in the Year 10 EAL class. The excerpt therefore sheds light on the nature of CT that may be facilitated, with reference to the CTELS framework.

In the excerpt below, CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking was focused on engagement with a video about moving the capital city of Indonesia, Jakarta, to Borneo Island, answering questions, discussing and offering solutions. Seven of the nineteen students who gave permission to be involved in the research were involved in English discussion after watching this video. However, all the other twelve students were involved in speaking in English in other transcripts. The transcript in this article may provide evidence of CT skewed towards high achieving students, those who had confidence to speak to the whole class in English.

The classroom was hot and humid. There were two ceiling fans and no air conditioners. This condition made Elisa, students and first author perspire during the teaching and learning processes. Elisa used the teaching media to facilitate CT in EAL listening and speaking called '*nearpod.com*' (Kusmaryani et al., 2019) with a PC connected to a projector and speakers. Elisa's desk was front and centre of the classroom, and student desks all faced towards the front.

### *3.2.1 Teacher facilitating and students listening and speaking*

The facilitation of CT in listening and speaking was initiated when Elisa played a video narrated in English. Students viewed and listened to the video once and then Elisa asked a question in English about the video. Elisa encouraged her students to share their responses orally while their peers listened, resulting in a conversation-like exchange, as follows:

*Elisa (Teacher): "Now, let's discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved. Hansen, please share your thoughts."*

*Hansen (Student 1): "Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean."*

*Felicia (Student 2): "What if there is no rain in dry season?" (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Hansen (Student 1): "We can store the rainwater in a storage place to keep the water in dry season. As a preventive act, if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter."*

*Vincent (Student 3): "I don't think rainwater is good enough to be consumed because of the industrialisation and acid rain." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Well, when you consider storing the water, think about mosquito larvae that can infect the water."*

*Hansen (Student 1): "Yes, that's right, Ms. So, we need to use filter to make the rainwater clean." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Yes, that might work. Noreen, please share your ideas to your friends."*

*Noreen (Student 4): "I believe that one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality. As the president said that it shows how much the stable capital city is needed to have equal economy."*

*Elisa (Teacher): "Do you guys agree with Noreen? How can this be called economic equality?"*

*Victoria (Student 5): "I think new capital city will offer jobs for the locals." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Jorgen (Student 6): "Yes. And if we move the capital city sooner, the problem of sinking in Jakarta can also be avoided." (Shouted spontaneously)*

*Nixsen (Student 7): "Objection, but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo." (Shouted spontaneously)*

### *3.2.2 CTELS analysis of the conversation*

The whole excerpt above comprises students and teacher listening and speaking in an EAL context. The teacher initiated student active listening and speaking by targeting one student to answer her question about the video "*Hansen, please share your thoughts.*". In this context, Elisa strategically 'withdrew' from the conversation only speaking occasionally in the transcript as she otherwise allowed students to respond to other students. This practice was prevalent in Elisa's other lessons. Of the twelve lessons, eleven lessons showed this teacher withdrawal from the classroom conversation. This specific teaching characteristic of Elisa engaged a substantial proportion of students to converse in English during the whole-of-class teaching and learning processes. In the above transcript, seven students engaged in on-topic conversation that was more spontaneous than

orchestrated by Elisa. As a component of this strategy, Elisa allowed her students to use their mobiles to translate words into English or Indonesian. This enabled students to participate actively during discussions by voicing their key ideas in English (Starichkova et al., 2022). The evidence for student listening was strong in the authentic conversation-like interactions. Student listening was evidenced by appropriate responses to other student statements, to teacher questions and by their verbal recounts and re-interpretations of statements made by the video's narrator. There were visual and text components in the video for students to understand the content, however audio information from the video became the main guidance in the conversation. Using the CT through EAL listening and speaking, conceptual framework (*see Appendix A*) analysis was conducted cell by cell.

*a. Evaluate & Determine (Discerning)*

Each of the four dimensions of *evaluate and determine* is epitomised in the transcript. 'Clarity' was evident when Hansen emphatically stated, "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems...*". Here, Hansen showed an awareness of the teacher's purpose to have all students evaluate deeply the consequences of moving Jakarta's location and clearly asserted that Jakarta's water problem would be solved by moving the capital city. 'Relevance' was evident in Felicia's immediate, pertinent and evaluative challenge to Hansen "*What if there is no rain in dry season?*". 'Depth' was epitomised by Hansen's detailed explanation based on audio evidence in the video that he saw as convincing: "*Moving the capital city will solve Jakarta's problems because Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water. Jakarta also needs to store rainwater. People can use filter to make the rainwater clean.*". This elaboration drew on multiple evidence from the video to make his case for solving Jakarta's problems. 'Coherence' is demonstrated by Vincent's evaluative challenge which listened to and followed on carefully from Hansen's claims: "*I don't think rainwater is good enough to be consumed...*". *Evaluate and reflect* are the heart of CT, because without such challenges, the listening and speaking may promote group-think, but challenges drive students to deeper levels of understanding.

*b. Find & Generate (Determined)*

Students may *find* information audibly when watching the documentary or *generate* new ideas based on the information. 'Clarity' was epitomised when Hansen found one

solution that had been specified in the video “... *if we want to use rainwater, we need to use filter.*”. However, Hansen seemed to use that concept as an overarching solution, almost a repeated refrain, not realising that the use of a filter did not necessarily deal with Vincent’s concern about *acid rain* (the acid in which cannot be filtered out). At this point in the interaction, where Vincent challenged Hansen’s found solution of the filter, the teacher may have prioritised confidence to listen and speak over accuracy, as she interrupted the flow of the conversation with her interjection about *larvae* that a filter can deal with. At first, it seemed like Elisa, as teacher, was blocking the flow of a multi-student, rich and on-task conversation. However, it may be that either she made a pedagogical choice to value contributions that were on-topic even if not accurate, in order to boost confidence, or was herself unaware that acid could not be filtered out by standard filters, when she declared “*Yes, that might work...*”. ‘*Relevance*’ was evident when Victoria addressed Elisa’s question “...*How can this be called economic equality?*” by explicitly linking the evidence of beneficial impact in moving the capital city with the audio information from the video that the “...*new capital city will offer jobs for the locals.*”. ‘*Depth*’ was showed in Nixsen’s claim: “...*it takes a lot of years to move the capital city. Think about the forests in Borneo.*”. Nixsen’s concern, from the audio information, was that there might be a specific drawback to Borneo’s ecosystem when moving the capital city. Moreover, he recalled audio information that there would be a time lag due to the development of the area that may make the project unfeasible. ‘*Coherence*’ of information found was evident in Noreen’s claim: “...*one of the reasons to move the capital city of Indonesia is economic equality...*”. Noreen attributed the source of her found information ‘*as the president said*’.

### c. *Embark & Clarify (Curious)*

Elisa launched the purpose of the conversation with her prompt “*let’s discuss what happens when the capital city of Indonesia is moved.*”. The students needed to both process the documentary that had just been watched and relate this to Elisa’s intentionally general prompt, which needed student clarification of purpose. Elisa made the pedagogical decision to choose Hansen to determine that purpose, and out of all possible components in the video, he chose water supply. This was the direction of half of the transcript, and the direction only changed from Hansen’s clarification when Elisa steered it towards Noreen, who then specified the different theme of ‘*economic equality*’. In the case of both themes,

'relevance' was shown by student comments and questions closely adhering to the theme at hand, showing students followed both Hansen then Noreen's clarification of purpose. 'Coherence' was epitomised in Victoria's main point "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals." as she responded to Noreen's economic idea equity. Evidence for 'depth' was evident in Nixsen's response to Noreen's, when he challenged equity with the complexities of what will happen economically when the capital city is moved.

#### *d. Organise & Manage (Harmonising)*

Taken as a whole, the transcript above is fundamentally evidence of listening and speaking. One person was speaking at a time, and given the responses, there were at least seven others in the classroom were listening. No hands were raised, but rather students were self-managing their speaking in a conversation-like manner with no interruption of the speaker. Because, as noted, Elisa's teaching structure was familiar to the students, this is evidence of student 'clarity' about how to organise and manage conversations in EAL that are far more than superficial recounts or agreements. There are strategies by students to manage a 'depth' of conversation, exemplified by the three student challenges to other student statements: "What if there is no rain in dry season?", "I don't think rainwater is good enough" and "Objection". In the Indonesian classroom context, challenging others tends to be seen as inappropriate or rude (Ilyas, 2017), and so the classroom culture provides evidence of a harmonious approach to conversation management. 'Relevance' is evident in the on-topic nature of responses, whether on Hansen's topic of water or Noreen's topic of economy. The evidence for the conversation's managed 'coherence' was evident in the appropriate responses to the shift to the economic topic by Victoria and Nixsen: "...new capital city will offer jobs for the locals" and "...it takes a lot of years to move the capital city".

#### *e. Analyse & Synthesise (Creative)*

'Clarity' was evident in Hansen's response, as he *analysed* and *synthesised* the aim of moving the capital city of Indonesia by communicating his own example "...Jakarta needs better irrigation system to process clean water...". This is a synthesis of an idea that is not exactly correct, because irrigation is used to move water, not process it. This is one reason why 'evaluate and reflect' are pivotal to CT. Moreover, CT is multi-faceted, not conducted

linearly, facet by facet, but rather each facet is mutually interdependent. During the initial theme of water, the conversation centred around Hansen's synthesis of, understanding of, and defence of, the use of filters, even when this was applied wrongly to acid rain. The conversation risked becoming more a defence of filters than a promotion of CT and this may be another reason why Elisa suddenly redirected the conversation to Noreen. That pedagogical redirection fundamentally changes the type of conversation, from a person-centred defence to a conversation probing the '*depth*' of synthesised ideas across five people, listening, analysing and '*coherently*' synthesising ideas that flowed from one to the next. This starts with Noreen's economic equality theme, then Elisa's prompt to see if others agreed with this. Victoria and Jorgen respectively amplified with the idea of "*jobs for the locals*" and Jorgen's "*move the capital city sooner*". Jorgen's analysis that speed would overcome some problems is challenged by Nixsen's analysis, who saw obstacles to speedy development: "*...but it takes a lot of years to move the capital city*".

Based on Elisa's facilitation involving both promoting and withdrawing, the CT evident in her EAL students' listening and speaking was rich and this exemplifying, five-minute excerpt provided evidence for all 20 cells of the CTELS framework. Students listened to their peers' main points and questions and responded with detailed explanations or challenging questions orally (Liang & Fung, 2021; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Moreover, the facilitation showed that students were able to justify their views and take turns to express opinions. Students were willing and able to express views that differed from others and even challenged one another's key ideas. Students' engagement with one another's key ideas enabled them to elaborate their main points, think critically and initiated a dialogic space to contribute in the discussion (Ellerton, 2017; Willison, 2020). Elisa's awareness towards the dispositions needed for listening and speaking in English was perhaps as vital as the more cognitive facets and dimensions. Elisa's occasional interventions seem to be particularly salient, to prevent students getting 'stuck' on one solution, so they may think more broadly and critically. Her interventions were, however, done in a very sensitive manner that did not undermine student confidence to speak out, nurturing student determination to participate in the conversation. When Elisa shifted the conversation away from Hansen, however, there is evidence that she took this risk to his confidence to promote students being *discerning*, rather than stick to one solution (filters). Based on the string of student-student conversation, the students provide evidence that they had, or were developing, the disposition of *harmonising*, and the respectful



conversation-like nature of the discourse is a particularly striking feature of this classroom. Such harmony was not agreement, and in fact there was evident a comfort for students to disagree, often using *creative* challenges that were a complex synthesis of information from the video, listening to other students and imagined possibilities. All of these dispositions emerged from a lesson, in which Elisa chose a pertinent stimulus to entice student *curiosity*. The content was important to Elisa, for she disregarded government-provided content and took the time to find a resource she believed the students would engage with. The level of engagement in this excerpt shows students conversing in English as their additional tongue and doing so in a *constructive* open-hearted fashion that leads to deeper understanding of the topic and use of, and probably deeper development of, CT. There is a complex interplay between different dispositional facets that is, perhaps, impossible to pre-programme, but requires teacher agility and their own teacherly CT. However, when the EAL classroom enables students to be increasingly discerning, determined, curious, creative, harmonising and constructive through stimulated conversation, there may be a virtuous circle of CT development and associated dispositions.

### *3.3 Challenges of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking*

*RQ1: What are the perceptions and practices of Indonesian EAL high school in-service teacher regarding CT facilitation with a focus on listening and speaking?*

The following section discusses the data gathered through post-observation interview and documents that included lesson plans, content materials, syllabus and assessment tasks. After the final classroom observation, Elisa was interviewed to analyse her underlying ideas about the facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking. There were significant constraints that hindered the teaching and learning processes, when Elisa facilitated CT practices in EAL listening and speaking. Despite Elisa's attempts to encourage her students to share ideas, discussions in student small groups tended to be in their first language, Indonesian. Elisa described challenges when she facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking as *first language interference*, *insufficient authentic content materials* and *constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*.

### 3.3.1 First language interference

Elisa stated that the relationship between CT and EAL listening and speaking was dynamic, however, the students' limited English vocabulary was a primary factor in their use of Indonesian in their small group discussions:

*Some students had a limited vocabulary. When discussing with their peers, they tended to mix up with Indonesian.*

While the first language interfered with the teaching and learning processes, a lack of self-confidence in actively participating also prevailed in the classroom. Elisa thus instructed her students to write down the scripts before speaking and read during the speaking:

*Passive students were instructed to make scripts for speaking. By scripting, they learned how to analyse the topics being discussed, even though it wasn't spontaneously speaking.*

The comments above indicated that Elisa encouraged her students to be prepared to speak in English by scripting. This is partly because Elisa tried to encourage all her students to be able to present as well as share their ideas orally. Elisa also believed that scripting before speaking was an initial step for her students to analyse the given topics before discussions and improve their engagement:

*Although my students were scripting before speaking, they were analysing the given topic critically. I could say that my students tried to engage with my teaching in the class.*

As shown in this quote, while engaging all students to be active and spontaneous speakers in English remained a challenge for Elisa, scripting before speaking provides evidence for her to show her students' independent thinking and critical evaluation of the given issues (Sanavi & Tarighat, 2014; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). In Elisa's case, her CT engagement in the teaching practice shows that she realised the importance of understanding her students' learning conditions. She further observed that her students were struggling with English vocabulary and designed teaching materials to embed active participation discussing the given topic. Elisa perceived that such a contextual support could improve her students' learning engagement and reduce their anxieties while speaking in English and internalising CT (Yuan et al., 2022). Therefore, Elisa's quotes seem to suggest an active learning process for her students to communicate their key ideas in purposeful CT development.

### 3.3.2 *Insufficient authentic content materials*

Elisa claimed that the provision of updated and authentic content materials was lacking. Elisa believed that intensive knowledge to design suitable learning topics would enhance her students' interests and sophisticated thinking. However, Elisa added that the Indonesian EAL syllabus primarily focused on grammar, reading and writing and minimised listening and speaking:

*The syllabus focuses on grammar and reading. It's hard for me to carry out the listening and speaking.*

The syllabus that Elisa was required to adopt trivialised listening and speaking, rather requiring students to listen to short pre-recorded dialogue and then precisely imitate the intonations of the recording, as well as identify some grammatical features. Although the syllabus also required students to reflect on what is learned, there are no clear indicators in the documents about how reflection should be conducted. Elisa thus expected updated content materials and syllabus that facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking, knowing:

*If I keep using the sources from the government, those materials won't help my students think critically.*

Representing Elisa's notion, Hegazy et al. (2021) suggested that issues around curriculum development, the role of content materials, school cultures and institutional frameworks to create thinking classrooms should be addressed to solve these challenges. Therefore, looking into the future, Elisa's quotes represented the need for continuous supports to enhance her own competence and knowledge to teach CT, especially in EAL listening and speaking.

### 3.3.3 *Constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks*

The primary guidance for Elisa's assessment design was the textbook. However, she found that:

*The assessments from textbook don't cover the assessments that I need.*

Elisa used scales from zero to five to systematically assess students' speaking performances, in which five was the highest and zero was the lowest:

*For speaking, I assess the grammar accuracy, pronunciation, fluency and details.*

Her assessment approach to encourage CT in EAL listening and speaking was emphasised in discussions that were integrated with active listening (Yu et al., 2021). Despite her

attempt to design assessment practices for CT in EAL speaking, Elisa was required to follow the standardised test in the form of a written assessment regulated by her high school. Because of this requirement and the classroom time that it took for each student to individually answer questions orally, the listening assessment was neglected. Elisa's epistemological conceptions of assessing CT in EAL speaking were depicted by the importance of details on her students' speaking accuracies, while the standardised goal from the target high school was to enable students to master the language skills through the focus on grammar structures, reading and writing. While Elisa's lesson, as epitomised by the data above, demonstrably facilitates some students' CT in EAL listening and speaking, the constraints of the curriculum and assessment minimise these efforts and possibly minimise the CT that students ultimately develop.

#### **4. Discussion**

Classroom observations in this study provided evidence of Elisa's facilitation of student CT in listening and speaking activities (Starichkova et al., 2022). Elisa's perceptions derived from interviews and documents also shed light on what was occurring during facilitation, sometimes corresponding to, and at other times contradicting, the events in the classroom. The findings show a teacher prompting student CT and withdrawing, only to re-appear at key moments in a very simple conversation structure, in which students asserted, challenged, asked and answered other students, allowing those that participated to delve deeply into problems collaboratively (Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). These results do not show the classroom culture needed to engender student-to-student and student-to-teacher trust in order to allow such a conversation to flow in English. They also do not show the careful planning of the teacher in finding and selecting appropriate stimuli, despite any pressures, including reduced time for preparation, to use government-supplied resources. Therefore, the findings show authentic use and development of CT in EAL listening and speaking, a process involving an evolving conversation between teacher and students (Liang & Fung, 2021).

The data selected exemplified CT developed at a high level with relation to the CTELS, but did not epitomise the standard teaching and learning of CT in Elisa's classroom. Nevertheless, implications can be drawn from Elisa's dispositional and epistemological practices. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in the results focused on watching a video to discuss its contents and solve problems (Rahmawati & Ashadi, 2018). While

the data were created and gathered through interviews, classroom observations and documents, the analysis revealed that the process of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking allowed Elisa to focus on the development of students' cognitive and affective skills, particularly in terms of collaborating and listening to their friends' ideas, while emphasising the development of reasoning and justification (Kelley, 2014). This epistemological shift from teacher didactics is appropriate to increase student engagement (Abrami et al., 2008) during the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, the enhancement of students being critical while listening and speaking was reported in Elisa's CT facilitation to form student simultaneous engagement and pedagogical reflection (Chen & Hwang, 2019; Schieble et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Significantly, the analysis of the data with the CTELS showed just how rich, multi-faceted and dynamic the student listening and speaking was in the classroom.

Despite the potential for developing student CT, there are numerous shortfalls evident from the data. Some students did not fully participate either being reluctant to speak to the class in English, or not able to engage in such a CT-rich conversation. Moreover, evidence of student CT while listening and speaking was relatively rare during Elisa's teaching. This is partly because Elisa struggled to overcome curriculum and assessment constraints to ensure student achievement of listening and speaking as well as CT learning objectives (Ellerton, 2017). While Elisa argued that some students tended to be disengaged due to the lack of English proficiency, it may be that emphasising dispositions associated with argumentation, reasoning and questioning could promote the development of CT in EAL listening and speaking (Afshar & Movassagh, 2014). For instance, Elisa endorsed Hansen's increasingly tenuous defence of the use of filters, possibly in part to support and value his contributions in English. An integrated and systematic understanding of CT in EAL listening and speaking, including student dispositions, could therefore enhance CT development (Ellerton, 2017). For example, the CTELS may provide teachers and researchers a systematic understanding of the nature of CT in listening and speaking in English.

Another essential finding of this study relates to the lack of provision of authentic and updated content materials. As reported in the result, teacher-selected materials from the internet became the main source of CT in EAL listening and speaking. However, the question that remains is whether the target high school gave permission to Elisa to utilise the video that she played for her students. Elisa did not articulate the criteria for choosing content materials from the third-party sources, but only that the syllabus and textbook from

the government did not entirely cover assessments based on her students' learning needs. Moreover, Elisa tended to distrust the content materials designed by the government. It is uncertain whether the target high school provided professional training for Elisa to address this distrust and improve her epistemological practices in engaging language teaching and sophisticated thinking. The lack of school support and learning opportunities for Elisa also played a minimised role in her professional learning and subsequent epistemological practice improvement. Such a finding attests to the potential to embed CT with in-service teacher education programmes in parallel with EAL teaching and learning procedures and students' needs. Therefore, CT-oriented pedagogical practices to navigate contextual challenges and promote the integration with EAL listening and speaking remain pivotal for Elisa to expand her professional competence.

Elisa's summative assessment of listening and speaking focused on fluency, pronunciation, detail and grammar accuracy in keeping with the government materials and school's policies. However, Elisa knew that the summative assessment regime did not correspond with her rich facilitation and formative assessment of listening and speaking tasks and she was unsure whether the assessment tasks and criteria were suitable for assessing her students' CT in EAL. Schieble et al. (2021) argued that the alternative to measure CT when speaking is for students to write all the information into a journal. However, the data and analysis in this current study suggest that assessing CT in EAL listening and speaking should be conducted through corresponding listening and speaking tasks. The lack of congruence between teaching and learning of listening and speaking in EAL and its summative assessment needs further investigation. Arguably, student capacity to develop CT and to use the English language after studying it is reduced by pressures towards assessing listening and speaking through writing. The richness of student CT when speaking spontaneously in this study show the potential, and the practice gap, for development of both CT and English language in the classroom.

The short sequence of data demonstrated that the complexity and richness of genuine CT when learning to listen and speak to EAL are attainable, if not common or easy. Further case studies are needed both as exemplars of CT facilitation and learning outcomes, but also to probe the efficacy of the CTELS. If the model proves to yield deep insights into CT in EAL teaching and learning, then subsequent research may adopt other strategies informed by the CTELS, including quantitative studies.

## 5. Implications and Conclusion

The present study constitutes the case of facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking by investigating the teacher's perceptions and epistemological practices through interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents. The data exemplifies student CT evidence from student voices during the teaching and learning processes and implicates overt and active listening by students. The study contributes to the existing knowledge about CT progression, which not only entails student cognitive engagement but also connects with the teacher's practices that seem to priorities student confidence over factual correctness. CT facilitation in EAL listening and speaking in this study involved viewing a teacher-selected, student-pertinent video, questioning, logical reasoning and discussing. The teaching and learning processes were aimed at encouraging students to learn how to understand problems and offer solutions.

However, there were four major obstacles to Elisa's facilitation of CT. First, there was a lack of authentic content materials for engaging students' CT. The teacher remained committed to providing cases that students perceived to be relevant, to elicit not only evidence but also their opinions to prompt engaged and affective responses. Secondly, Indonesian language interference remained a hindrance when students discussed with their peers in small groups. This was because of the limited vocabulary in English that some students had during the teaching and learning processes. Third, classroom conversations were prevalent in teaching, learning and formative assessment of listening and speaking, yet were neglected in summative assessment. This neglect was not of Elisa's choosing but rather a function of curriculum time and government and school assessment requirements in which writing is a de facto proxy for speaking when students listen to pre-determined, pre-scripted English audio. The fourth obstacle to Elisa's CT facilitation is the inadequacy of CT in EAL theories to stimulate teaching and learning processes. This was reflected on Elisa's epistemological belief and practice that providing her students with only familiar cases to convey their opinions along with the evidence would develop CT. Additionally, engaging all students to participate actively, Elisa solely instructed them to script before speaking. It is therefore important to consider how to improve the facilitation of CT in EAL with the types of constraints this might arise. Ultimately, the CTELS framework may be used to promote teacher professional training to overcome the constraints on facilitating CT during EAL teaching and learning processes.

This qualitative case study is non-generalisable and designed to yield rich insights yet has numerous limitations. The study collected data comprising teacher interviews, classroom observations and relevant documents, and the triangulated data not only showed congruence but also discrepancies, such as first language interference, insufficient authentic content materials and constraints on the design of appropriate assessment tasks. The interpretation of these discrepancies is debateable, and assertions made by the authors are open to be challenged. The use of IPA for teacher interviews and the conceptual framework for analysing student CT in EAL listening and speaking, while based on two published frameworks, skews the interpretation of data. Moreover, the study only sought teacher interview data and did not capture student interviews, where students could provide insights into their thought processes in class. In addition, perceptions from other EAL teachers from the target high school were not sought yet could have added valuable insights to the case study, for example by comparing and contrasting stated practices for facilitating CT in EAL listening and speaking. Future studies should thus widen the samples, conduct further classroom observations to investigate students' perceptions as a minimum. A specific focus of future research should be on summative assessment practices that are congruent with well-facilitated CT in EAL listening and speaking.

To conclude, the study revealed that the teacher's facilitation of CT in EAL listening and speaking at a target Indonesian high school evidenced sophisticated, multi-faceted CT outcomes for students. The findings suggest that further improvements of facilitating CT in EAL are needed, reflecting the challenges at the emotional, interpersonal and organisational levels in Indonesian contexts. The findings may serve as a case used in professional training for EAL teachers to develop their pedagogical knowledge and competence in facilitating CT, negotiating intensive practices to solve the constraints. Considering the findings of this study, future research should continue to investigate CT issues from wider perspectives (e.g., school principals, additional teachers, teacher educators, parents and students), and specifically include examining students' perspectives on classroom observation. Investigation is also required on summative assessment that is congruent with student learning and in-service teacher development of their CT pedagogical practices. As a starting point, through its use of the CTELS framework, this case study demonstrates characteristics of facilitated CT when students listen to and speak English as an additional language in Indonesia.



## References

- Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Surkes, M. A., Tamim, R., & Zhang, D. (2008). Instructional interventions affecting critical thinking skills and dispositions: A stage 1 meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 1102-1134. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326084>
- Afshar, H. S., & Movassagh, H. (2014). On the relationship among critical thinking, language learning strategy use and university achievement of Iranian English as a foreign language majors. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 382-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.914238>
- Agarwal, A. (2021). *Understanding the value of an MBA by exploring the perspective MBA students and graduates have of their MBA: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis* [Dissertation, The University of Adelaide].
- Akatsuka, Y. (2019). Awareness of critical thinking attitudes and English language skills: The effects of questions involving higher-order thinking. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 59-84. <https://doi.org/10.25256/paal.23.2.4>
- Anggraeny, E., & Khongput, S. (2022). Teachers' perceptions and practices of critical thinking instruction in Indonesian senior high schools: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal: A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 33(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/1-26>
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, F. A., & Emilia, E. (2017). A joint construction practice in academic writing course in Indonesian university context. *Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching and Literature*, 17(1), 20.
- Boryczko, M. (2020). Critical thinking in social work education: A case study of knowledge practices in students' reflective writings using semantic gravity profiling. *Social Work Education*, 41(3), 317-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1836143>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/qj0902027>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *J Res Nurs*, 25(8), 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Chen, M. R. A., & Hwang, G. J. (2019). Effects of a concept mapping- based flipped learning approach on EFL students' English speaking performance, critical thinking awareness and speaking anxiety. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(3), 817-834. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12887>
- Cottrell, S. (2017). *Critical thinking skills: Effective analysis, argument and reflection*. Palgrave Macmillan Education.
- Creswell, J. D. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Davies, W. M., & Barnett, R. (2015). *The palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ellerton, P. (2017). *On critical thinking and collaborative inquiry*. E. F. Frontiers.
- Ellerton, P. (2022). On critical thinking and content knowledge: A critique of the assumptions of cognitive load theory. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100975>
- Erkek, G., & Batur, Z. (2020). A comparative study on critical thinking in education: From critical reading attainments to critical listening attainments. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.8n.1p.142>
- Esmailzad, S., Gavvani, V. Z., Zarei, A., & Familrouhany, S. A. A. (2022). Effect of evidence-based information management and practice training on librarians' critical thinking: A randomized educational trial. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/09610006221114648>

- Ferrari-Bridgers, F., Vogel, R., & Lynch, B. (2015). Fostering and assessing critical listening skills in the speech course. *International Journal of Listening*, 31(1), 19-32.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1020231>
- Gambrill, E. (2019). *Critical thinking and the process of evidence-based practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Ghanizadeh, A., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2020). *Higher order thinking skills in the language classroom: A concise guide* Springer.
- Havwini, T. (2019). Indonesian EFL students' willingness to communicate in the 2013 curriculum implementation: A case study. *TEFLIN Journal - A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i1/105-120>
- Hegazy, H., Ellerton, P., Campos-Remon, H., Zaphir, L., Mazzola, C., & Brown, D. (2021). Working from theory: Developing the bases of teachers' critical thinking pedagogies through action research. *Educational Action Research*, 31(1), 78-93.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.1877757>
- Ilyas, H. P. (2017). Historical perspective: The development of critical thinking in Indonesian ELT. *Journal of ELT Research*, 2(2), 89-102. [https://doi.org/10.22236/JER\\_Vol2Issue2](https://doi.org/10.22236/JER_Vol2Issue2)
- Kelley, D. (2014). *The art of reasoning: An introduction to logic and critical thinking*. Norton & Company.
- Kusmaryani, W., Musthafa, B., & Purnawarman, P. (2019). The influence of mobile applications on students' speaking skill and critical thinking in English language learning. *International Conference of Computer and Informatics Engineering (IC2IE)*, 1-6.
- Lamb, S., Maire, Q., & Doecke, E. (2017). *Key skills for the 21st century: An evidence-based review* [Analytical Report].
- Liang, W., & Fung, D. (2021). Fostering critical thinking in English-as-a-second-language classrooms: Challenges and opportunities. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100769>
- Low, E. L., Hui, C., & Cai, L. (2017). Developing student teachers' critical thinking and professional values: A case study of a teacher educator in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(4), 535-551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2017.1386093>
- Manen, M. V. (2017). But is it phenomenology? *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775-779.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570>
- Muthmainnah, N. (2019). Optimising critical thinking through peer editing technique in teaching writing. *ELTIN Journal*, 7(1), 1-7.
- Purnamaningwulan, R. A. (2022). Listening journals to promote students' critical thinking skills in an integrated listening-speaking course. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(2), 744-760. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i2.23387>
- Rahmawati, N., & Ashadi. (2018). Problem-based English speaking material to enhance students' critical thinking skills. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 2(2), 285-301.
- Rashid, Y., Rashid, A., Warraich, M. A., Sabir, S. S., & Waseem, A. (2019). Case study method: A step-by-step guide for business researchers. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919862424>
- Sanavi, R. V., & Tarighat, S. (2014). Critical thinking and speaking proficiency: A mixed-method study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpis.4.1.79-87>
- Schieble, M., Vetter, A., & Martin, K. M. (2021). Critical listening for critical conversations. *National Council of Teachers of English*, 111(2), 71-77.
- Smith, J. A. (2011). Evaluating the contribution of interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Health Psychology Review*, 5(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2010.510659>
- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. SAGE.
- Starichkova, V., Moskovskaya, N., & Kalinovskaya, E. (2022). *Development of students' critical thinking skills via teaching English VII International Forum on Teacher Education*.
- Stolz, S. A. (2022). The practice of phenomenology in educational research. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(7), 822-834. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2022.2138745>
- Tan, C. (2017). The enactment of the policy initiative for critical thinking in Singapore schools. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(5), 588-603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1305452>


- The Indonesian Education Ministry, N. (2022). *Improving the quality of education in Indonesia that is equitable with the independent curriculum*. Retrieved 20 May 2022 from <https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Thomson, V., & Yedidi, M. R. (2020). A practical approach to critical thinking among EFL learners. *Int. J. Technology Transfer and Commercialisation*, 17(1), 43-55.
- Trowler, P. (2012). Disciplines and interdisciplinary: Conceptual groundwork. In *Tribes and territories in the 21st century* (pp. 5-29). Routledge.
- Wale, B. D., & Bishaw, K. S. (2020). Effects of using inquiry-based learning on EFL students' critical thinking skills. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00090-2>
- Wang, Y., & Wu, Z. (2023). Adapting or adopting? Critical thinking education in the East Asian cultural sphere: A systematic integrative review. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2023.101330>
- Willison, J. (2020). *The models of engaged learning and teaching: Connecting sophisticated thinking from early childhood to PhD*. Springer.
- Yaprak, Z., & Kaya, F. (2020). Improving EFL learners' oral production through reasoning-gap tasks enhanced with critical thinking standards: Developing and implementing a critical TBLT model, pre-task plan, and speaking rubric. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.11n.1p.40>
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. The Guildford Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. SAGE.
- Yu, M. H., Reynolds, B. L., & Ding, C. (2021). Listening and speaking for real-world communication: What teachers do and what students learn from classroom assessments. *SAGE Open*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009163>
- Yuan, R., Liao, W., Wang, Z., Kong, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). How do English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) teachers perceive and engage with critical thinking: A systematic review from 2010 to 2020. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101002>
- Zahavi, D. (2020). The practice of phenomenology: The case of Max van Manen. *Nurs Philos*, 21(2), e12276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12276>



# Appendix A. Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students-English as an Additional Language

## Framework for facilitating Critical Thinking in English Listening and Speaking (CTELS) for high school students – English as an Additional Language

### Dimensions of CTELS

		Clarity	Relevance	Depth	Coherence
		<i>Students communicate key ideas in a precise manner</i>	<i>Students communicate key ideas that are related to the given information/topics</i>	<i>Students communicate detailed explanations of key ideas to develop thorough arguments</i>	<i>Students communicate arguments of key ideas in a logical sense to build the overall intended meaning</i>
 Facets of MELT	<b>a. Evaluate &amp; Determine</b> <i>What will we trust?</i>  <i>Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas.</i>	Discerning  Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas precisely, clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Evidence is presented in the context, and direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas that are closely aligned with the most important information and support the topics.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating detailed explanations to develop their key ideas.	Students evaluate and determine the credibility of given information/sources by communicating their key ideas with logical and coherent structures. Logical and causal relationships are identified.
	<b>b. Find &amp; Generate</b> <i>What will we use?</i>  <i>Students find and generate their key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies.</i>	Determined  Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Points at issues are clearly defined and stated.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students orally discuss their key ideas that are related to the given topics. Direct links between evidence and claims are made explicit.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students also consider alternative perspectives in relation to the given information/topics by communicating with breadth to ensure that they do not ignore any important components.	Students find and generate key ideas from given information/sources by using given methodologies. Students communicate their most important key ideas related to the significance of given information/sources. Claims for logical coherence are examined through evidence and methodology.
	<b>c. Embark &amp; Clarify</b> <i>What is our purpose?</i>  <i>Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and clarify their key ideas while considering ethical, cultural, social and team (ESCT) issues.</i>	Curious  Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss key ideas by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the most important information related to the given topics. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues. Given information that is significant and relevant is highlighted.	Students orally respond their key ideas to given questions/tasks and discuss the complexities of the given information/sources. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.	Students orally respond to given questions/tasks and discuss the premises of given information/sources that support conclusions. Students orally clarify questions, terms, requirements, expectations and ethical, cultural, social and team issues.
	<b>d. Organise &amp; Manage</b> <i>How do we arrange?</i>  <i>Students organise given information/sources. to reveal their key ideas while managing the processes through spoken conventions.</i>	Harmonising  Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the given information/source. Students clearly assert the main purpose of the given information/source by communicating their key ideas.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas that are aligned with the topics by communicating the causal relationships.	Students organise and manage their key ideas that by communicating detailed and thorough explanations and/or arguments.	Students organise and manage given information/sources to reveal their key ideas by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments, intended to build the logical sense of meaning.
	<b>e. Analyse &amp; Synthesise</b> <i>What does it mean?</i>  <i>Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce their key ideas and coherent understandings.</i>	Creative  Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by clearly asserting the main purpose of the given information/source. Students communicate their own examples, and the structures are clear, unambiguous and easy to understand.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources by communicating their key ideas and coherent understandings that are aligned with the given information/topics.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating detailed explanations and/or arguments. Students communicate their key ideas by considering alternative perspectives and justifying arguments.	Students analyse and synthesise given information/sources to produce key ideas and coherent understandings by communicating the arguments intended to build the logical sense of meaning. Students communicate by developing key ideas and using transition phrases to identify logical and coherent progression.

## Appendix B. Interview protocol

### A. Pre-interview

1. Have you ever heard the term "critical thinking"? (*If the answer is "YES", then go to the additional questions. If the answer is "NO", go to question 2).*

*Additional questions:*

- a. Is critical thinking useful to you and your students?
  - b. Why is it important for you and your students?
  - c. Do you think you, as a teacher, are a critical thinker?  
If yes, please explain.  
If no, please explain.
2. What does critical thinking mean to you?
  3. What characteristics should a critical thinker have?
  4. Do you facilitate critical thinking in your classes? If so, please explain.

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you define that critical thinking is facilitated in your classes?
  - b. What experiences do you provide to achieve the goal?
  - c. How do you assess the goal?
5. Do you think there is a relationship between critical thinking and English language teaching?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you think you are able to integrate critical thinking into your teaching?
  - b. How do you think critical thinking can be used in your language teaching?
6. Do your students actively participate in speaking and listening activities in your classes?

*Additional questions:*

- a. How do you encourage your students' active participations and involvement in speaking and listening activities?
  - b. How do you facilitate speaking and listening skills in your classroom?
  - c. How do you improve your students' speaking and listening skills?
7. Have you ever facilitated the teaching of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  8. How do you facilitate the critical thinking teaching that focuses on speaking and listening skills?

*Additional questions:*

- a. Do you find any difficulties or problems in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - b. What are the possible challenges of integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
  - c. What do you do to overcome those challenges or problems?
  - d. What are the factors that would enable you to integrate critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?
9. How do you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
  10. In your opinion, what are the things you have not achieved in integrating critical thinking into speaking and listening skills?

11. What specific supports do you need H?-<2[<J U9.improve your skills on the integration of critical thinking in speaking and listening activities?
12. Would you like to participate in classroom observations on critical thinking and its integration into speaking and listening skills? *(If the answer is "YES", then go to question 13 and 14. If the answer is "NO", the interview ends).*
13. What would you like to expect throughout the classroom observations specifically?
14. Are you willing to share and copy your syllabus, lesson plans, teaching materials and students' works that show the integration of critical thinking into speaking and listening skills throughout the classroom observations?

## **B. Post-interview**

1. Do you think you were able to successfully facilitate critical thinking when speaking and listening skills were practised in your classrooms? If yes/no, please explain.
2. Do you think that your students actively participated during the teaching and learning process? If yes/no, please explain.
3. Do you think your teaching activities improved your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills and engaged their active participations?

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What were the most engaging activities you conducted in your classrooms?
- b. Did your students find it difficult to follow the activities?
- c. How did you manage to differentiate your students' critical thinking skills when speaking and listening were facilitated?
4. What do you think were the challenges you faced during the teaching and learning process?
5. Do you think that your assessments were effective to obtain your learning objectives? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. Were your students able to follow the assessment?
- b. What assessment forms did you design to obtain your learning objectives?
- c. How did you assess your students' critical thinking in speaking and listening skills?
6. Are you thinking of continuing to develop the facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classes? If yes/no, please explain.

### *Additional questions:*

- a. What is your perception on the future facilitation of critical thinking in speaking and listening skills in your classrooms?
- b. How will you develop your teaching and learning strategies to construct your students' critical thinking skills and active participations?


## Appendix C. Classroom observation (Field Note Form)

Classroom Observation (Field Note Form)	
An investigation of facilitating critical thinking in an English language class when listening and speaking are practised in an Indonesian high school	
<u>School</u>	
<u>Participant</u>	
<u>Age range</u>	
<u>Qualification</u>	
<u>Years of teaching experience</u>	
<u>Years at the school</u>	
<u>Date and Time</u>	
<u>Classroom Observation</u>	
<i>Portraits of Participants (The characteristics of individuals, including their dresses, gestures and non-verbal behaviour)</i>	
<i>Reconstructions of Dialogue (The interactions between or among people)</i>	
<i>Descriptions of Physical Setting (The “actions” taking place)</i>	
<i>Classroom Activities (The physical surroundings)</i>	
<u>Researcher's Personal Note (Ideas, Impressions, Problems, Feelings and Speculation)</u>	



## Appendix D. Documents

### 1. The sample of lesson plan

Grade	10	
Date	Tuesday, 14 February 2023	
Time	13.40-15.00	
Duration	Activities	Teaching Aids
15 mins	<p><b>Orientation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher will open the class and welcome the students.</li> <li>2. Teacher is checking the students' attendance.</li> <li>3. Teacher is organizing the class and getting all the students ready for the lesson.</li> </ol> <p><b>Aperception</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher motivate the students before the lesson's started  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WJKVGtkLljg</a></li> <li>2. Teacher brainstorms the students with a picture about creative thinking and looking up the updated information about moving Indonesia capital.  <b>(Nearpod link :</b>  <a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>  <b>)</b></li> </ol>  <p>Teacher is asking the students some questions, such as: Look at the map, what can you see on the map given?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Students answer the question with their own idea.</li> <li>4. Teacher explains the students what was really happening based on the picture.</li> <li>5. Teacher devides students into some groups.</li> <li>6. Teacher asks the students to work within their group to answer the questions that the teacher gives.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Laptop, Loud Speaker, Projector, projector screen</b></p> <p><b>Nearpod.com</b></p>



55 mins	<b>Main Activity (The lesson about Moving Indonesia Capital to Nusantara)</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Teacher shows the questions that the students need to discuss. These questions will stimulate the student to think critically. The questions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the video you have seen, explore the solution you could probably suggest to the capital problem instead of moving the capital?</li> <li>If the government still move the Indonesia capital what they need to prepare to restore the habitat of endangered animal?</li> <li>The biggest problem that makes Jakarta's sinking is 60% population rely on ground water wells. Pumping too much ground water cause the condition. Explain your best solution to prevent Jakarta from sinking!</li> <li>Comparing to the sinking Jakarta, can you explain what's in common between Jakarta and Pekanbaru nowadays?</li> <li>As mentioned in the video, it is said that traffic causes \$5 billion dollar a year in Economic losses. Based on your point of view, why this thing is happening and what's the best solution you can find for solving this problem?</li> <li>"Professor of Urban Design" from Monash University said that Indonesia canal built in colonial era doesn't really work in Indonesia. Why is that so? Explain your reason!</li> <li>As Mr Jokowi said, one of the reasons to move Indonesia capital is Economic equality. Based on your point of view, why the president expected this?</li> <li>In the end, what will be happening to Indonesia Economic if building a new capital costs billion dollars?</li> <li>From your point of view, What's the biggest risk of moving new capital to Nusantara? Explain!</li> </ul> </li> <li>The teacher plays the video 2 times about Why Indonesia Capital is moving? (<a href="https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link">https://app.nearpod.com/?pin=A97D441D5A369E762EA63D5130A0A5E4-1&amp;oc=user-created&amp;utm_source=link</a>), the video is taken from the youtube and the teacher attaches the video into Nearpod platform.</li> <li>The teachers ask the students to share their thoughts about the question given.</li> <li>The students take turn in sharing their ideas by giving feedback to each group points (students' ideas could be difference based on their understanding/ critical thinking.)</li> <li>The teacher gives feedback to the students' answer.</li> <li>The students also give feedback to their friend's answer.</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

10 mins	<b>Closing</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher asks the students to sum up the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher wraps up all of the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher motivates the students regarding to the lesson.</li> <li>The teacher mentions the students the upcoming lesson.</li> <li>The class is ended by praying together</li> </ol>	
---------	--	--

## 2. The sample of the syllabus only available in Indonesian version

### SILABUS PEMBELAJARAN

NAMA SEKOLAH : SMAS DHARMA LOKA  
 MATA PELAJARAN : Bahasa Inggris  
 KELAS / SEMESTER : X / 1  
 TAHUN PELAJARAN : 2022/2023

#### Kompetensi Inti

KI 1 Menghargai dan menghayati dan mengamalkan ajaran agama yang dianutnya

KI 2 Menunjukkan perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (gotong royong, kerjasama, toleran, damai), santun, responsif dan pro-aktif dan menunjukkan sikap sebagai bagian dari solusi atas berbagai permasalahan berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam serta dalam menempatkan diri sebagai cerminan bangsa dalam pergaulan dunia.

KI 3 Memahami, menerapkan, dan menganalisis pengetahuan faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural berdasarkan rasa ingintahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya, dan humaniora dengan wawasan kemanusiaan, kebangsaan, kenegaraan, dan peradaban terkait penyebab fenomena dan kejadian, serta menerapkan pengetahuan prosedural pada bidang kajian yang spesifik sesuai dengan bakat dan minatnya untuk memecahkan masalah.

KI 4 Mengolah, menalar, dan menyaji, dalam ranah konkret dan ranah abstrak terkait dengan pengembangan dari yang dipelajarinya di sekolah secara mandiri dan mampu menggunakan metoda sesuai kaidah keilmuan.

Kompetensi Dasar	Materi Pembelajaran	Kegiatan Pembelajaran	Alokasi Waktu	Sumber belajar
<p>3.1 Menerapkan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya. (Perhatikan unsur kebahasaan <i>pronoun: subjective, objective, possessive</i>)</p> <p>4.1 Menyusun teks interaksi transaksional lisan dan tulis pendek dan sederhana yang melibatkan tindakan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait jati diri, dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan yang benar dan sesuai konteks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fungsi Sosial Mengenalkan, menjalin hubungan interpersonal dengan teman dan guru</li> <li>• Struktur Teks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Memulai</li> <li>- Menanggapi (diharapkan/di luar dugaan)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Unsur Kebahasaan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sebutan anggota keluarga inti dan yang lebih luas dan orang-orang dekat lainnya; hobi, kebiasaan</li> <li>- Verba: <i>be, have, go, work, live</i> (dalam <i>simple present tense</i>)</li> <li>- Subjek Pronoun: <i>I, You, We, They, He, She, It</i></li> <li>- Kata ganti possessive <i>my, your, his, dsb.</i></li> <li>- Kata tanya <i>Who? Which? How? Dst.</i></li> <li>- Nomina singular dan plural dengan atau tanpa <i>a, the, this, those, my, their, dsb.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Menyimak dan menirukan beberapa contoh interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarga, dengan ucapan dan tekanan kata yang benar</li> <li>- Mengidentifikasi ungkapan-ungkapan penting dan perbedaan antara beberapa cara yang ada</li> <li>- Menanyakan hal-hal yang tidak diketahui atau yang berbeda.</li> <li>- Mempelajari contoh teks interaksi terkait jati diri dan hubungan keluarganya yang dipaparkan figur-figur terkenal.</li> <li>- Saling menyimak dan bertanya jawab tentang jati diri masing-masing dengan teman-temannya</li> <li>- Melakukan refleksi tentang proses dan hasil belajarnya</li> </ul>	18 JP	Gold Experience -Pierson

### 3. The sample of content material

- 1st team : Living as a teen in Asian community.
- 2nd team : Dealing with insecurities.
- 3rd team : Living without gadgets.
- 4th team : Sleepy teen: a worldwide pandemic.
- 5th team : Teen Stress
- 6th team : How the media affects the youth.
- 7th team : Top tips to boost the confidence for teens.
- 8th team : What makes you special?
- 9th team : The perks of being introvert

Our Discussion Topic



#### 4. The samples of assessment practices for students

29. According to the picture, what is the best advice the coach could give to her athlete?



- A. You could train yourself more so you'll be the next winner in the upcoming session.  
 B. You should stop practicing in the field.  
 C. How about going to Coffee shop to get Vanila Late?  
 D. Why don't we go and forgetthat we ever exist?  
 E. Shall I give you a back pain after this training?
30. What is the best offer they could give?



#### B. Answer the question below correctly!

1. Sometimes people tend to have a lot of things in his mind.



Let me know how you could make them better with your suggestion, offer, and your advice.

2. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences!
- A. You and me is a married couple now. Why don't ..... go to Maldives for our honeymoon?  
 B. It's raining now. How about ..... a ramen soup? (Make)  
 C. It's too dark here. You ..... Turn on the light.
3. Use the words in brackets to complete these sentences Use Future tense.
- A. In my mind, she ..... her donut later. (eat)

## SPEAKING ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Subject : English  
 Class /Semester : 10 Science 3/ II  
 Topic : The Biggest Landfil of Earth  
 Date : Friday, 19 May 2023

Name	Fluency	Pronunciation	Vocabulary	Grammar	Details	Score
<u>Cindy ong</u>	4	3.5	4	4	4	97.5
Cynthia Tan	3.5	4	4	4	4	97.5
<u>Daniel wang</u>	3	3	3	3	2	70
<u>Dorelia juliestya</u>	3.5	3.5	3.7	4	4	93.5
Felicia C	3	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	90.5
Freddie Justin	3	3.5	3.5	3.8	3	84
Hansen Lim	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8	89.5
<u>Jason A Kardono</u>	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	90.5
Jocelyne A F	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	90
Jonathan	3.5	3.8	3.8	4	4	95.5
Jorgen W Chang	4	4	4	4	3.5	97.5
<u>Marihito N M</u>	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	4	93.5
<u>Nixsen O</u>	3	4	3	4	3	85
Noreen Tamarin	4	3.65	4	4	4	98.25
<u>Sannie</u>	3.2	3	3.6	3.6	3.6	85
Valentina Sun	3.3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	84
<u>Victoria Cantika</u>	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	92.5
<u>Vikenzo Carlos</u>	3	4	3.5	3.5	4	90
Vincent V	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5	90.5



Speaking Assessment Rubric

	Fluency	Pronunciation and accent	Vocabulary	Grammar	Details
4	Smooth and fluid speech; few to no hesitations; no attempts to search for words; volume is excellent.	Pronunciation is excellent; good effort at accent	Excellent control of language features; a wide range of well-chosen vocabulary	Accuracy & variety of grammatical structures	Excellent level of description; additional details beyond the required
3	Smooth and fluid speech; few hesitations; a slight search for words; inaudible word or two.	Pronunciation is good; good effort at accent	Good language control; good range of relatively well-chosen vocabulary	Some errors in grammatical structures possibly caused by attempt to include a variety.	Good level of description; all required information included
2	Speech is relatively smooth; some hesitation and unevenness caused by rephrasing and searching for words; volume wavers.	Pronunciation is good; Some effort at accent, but is <u>definitely non-native</u> .	Adequate language control; <u>coherent</u> vocabulary range is lacking	Frequent grammatical errors that do not obscure meaning; little variety in structures	Adequate description; some additional details should be provided
1	Speech is frequently hesitant with some sentences left uncompleted; volume very soft.	Pronunciation is okay; No effort towards a native accent	Weak language control; <u>coherent</u> basic vocabulary choice with some words clearly lacking	Frequent grammatical errors even in simple structures that at times obscure meaning.	Description lacks some critical details that make it difficult for the listener to understand