

Evaluation of an English Textbook: Does ‘English in Mind’ Promote Critical Thinking Skills?

Bernard Richard Nainggolan*, Yanty Wirza

Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung

**Corresponding author. Email: bernardnainggolan@upi.edu*

ABSTRACT

Critical thinking skills have become one of the most needed skills in the 21-st century era. Therefore, teaching and learning must situate to support critical thinking skills, that is through the use of the textbook. This study aims to investigate to the manifestation of critical thinking skills in the ‘English in Mind’ textbook. The textbook evaluation was based on the qualitative design with the use of content analysis to examine whether the tasks and activities in the textbook promote students’ critical thinking skills. This textbook evaluation was based on Ilyas’s critical thinking framework. To support the context of applying critical thinking, an interview was conducted with a teacher who used the ‘English in Mind’ textbook. The questions analysed and categorized were the implicit questions. The study found that there were 102 of 168 implicit questions revealed to promote critical thinking. Concerning the critical thinking categories, critical thinking skills in the textbook were dominated by questions or tasks of clarification, viewpoints, prediction, reason and evidence, and assumptions. However, the discussions attempted to modification of less critical thinking questions to be more critical questions. The findings suggested textbook writers, teachers, and school stakeholders modify more tasks and questions that can promote students’ critical thinking skills.

Keywords: *Critical thinking skills, content analysis, Ilyas’ framework, textbook evaluation*

1. INTRODUCTION

In this 21st-century, the rapidly changing world from traditional to multidimensional has been undeniable. Facing the changes, teachers are responsible for preparing their students to be ready to face the challenges in the 21st-century challenges. One of the most needed skills needed is critical thinking skills (National Education Policy, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008; Pacific Policy Research, 2010; Scott, 2015). These skills are much needed to solve the problems that learners are going through. Therefore, teaching and learning must be situating the real problems or environment that can trigger learners to be more motivated and involved to discuss and solve problems (Bouزيد, 2016).

The changes also happen to English learning. The use of English as a ‘global language’ is thus demanded to contribute to establishing learners’ critical thinking skills (Nunan, 2013). To the changes in English learning, curriculum and English materials are expected to facilitate students to gain critical thinking skills. The English materials are closely related to availability of English textbooks which has become crucial in learning

and teaching. There are thousands of English textbooks are published every year regarded to different levels and programs. With the popularity and needs of critical thinking skills, it is considered important to use English textbooks to promote critical thinking skills.

Previous studies investigating critical thinking skills (Assaly & Igbaria, 2014; Birjandi & Alizadeh, 2012; Es-Salhi & Elfatihi, 2019; Ilyas, 2015; Margana & Widyantoro, 2017) try to examine the CTS in English textbooks in the scope of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). However, there are fewer discussions about the implementation of critical thinking skills in English textbooks in the context of English as a global language. Therefore, this study aims to investigate to what extent the globally used English textbook, English in Mind, promotes critical thinking skills.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Textbook Evaluation

Textbooks are not only representative of English language teaching (ELT) but also the advantages for both teachers and students (Sheldon, 1998). They are

psychologically important for students as their progress can be measured when using them (Haycroft, 1998). Textbooks are efficient in terms of time and money and they give room for students for adaptation and modification (O'Neil, 1982). They also help teachers in preparing the lesson (O'Neil, 1982; Sheldon, 1998). Finally, textbooks are effective for self-regulated learning (Cunningsworth, 1995). However, a textbook needs an evaluation to improve the process of learning that meets students' needs and to acquire the best materials that can help learning achieve the objective of learning (Cunningsworth, 1995; Ellis, 1997).

The availability of textbooks becomes crucial in teaching and learning as they helpful as guidance for both teachers and students regardless of curriculum and levels of education. Thus, the textbook selection is effective to achieve the learning goals and meet the learning needs. To this, there are several criteria of good English textbooks, such as accommodating learners' needs, equipping students to use language effectively, facilitating learners to the process of learning, having a clear role as learning support, having aims/layout/methodology/organization, and considering macro-language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), micro-language skills (grammar, vocabulary, etc.), and the language forms (Cunningsworth, 1995; Cunningsworth & Kussel, 1991; Harmer, 1991; Mayfield, 2001; Ur, 1996).

However, the criteria mentioned seem to ignore the issue of engaging critical thinking as one of the criteria of a good English textbook (Margana & Widyanoro, 2017). Thus, it is important to study how critical thinking elements could be implemented in English textbooks.

2.2. The importance of Critical Thinking

Critical thinking (CT) has been a very long journey of western education indicated with memorization of canonical texts in the Enlightenment era (Lawton & Gardon, 2002). However, in this modern era, some non-Western countries have concerned CT into their education system that can be seen by some research on critical thinking on education in several countries, such as in Malaysia (Salih, 2010), Morocco (Es-Salhi & Elfathi, 2019), Indonesia (Margana & Widyanoro, 2017), Israel (Assaly & Igbaria, 2014), Singapore (Tan, 2017; Matthews & Lally, 2010), Japan (Okada, 2017), Hong Kong (Fung & Liang, 2019), Taiwan (Chen, Tolmie, & Wang, 2017).

Critical thinking is defined in various ways. As a cognitive activity, it involves mental processes such as attention, categorization, selection, and judgment (Cottrell, 2005). In advanced, some scholars, Mulnix (2012), Elder and Paul (2009) referred to higher-order stages in Bloom's taxonomy when elaborating critical

thinking, however, this was rejected by Rudd (2007) as CT also includes problem-solving, creative thinking, and decision making (as cited in Tuzlukova, Busaidi, & Burns, 2017). This is also supported by Ennis (1987) that CT involves several skills such as metacognition or 'knowing about knowing', logically evaluating information sources, problem-solving, and selecting appropriate strategies or solutions (as cited in Yang & Gamble, 2013).

Over the discussions on CT, some experts also emphasize the benefits of CT. Cottrell (2011) describes that CT benefits can improve attention and observation, read more focus, identify the key points in a text, improve to respond to points of a message, get the knowledge to get the point easily, and facilitate the skills of analysis to a particular situation. Adding the benefits of CT Judge, Jones and McCreery (2009) describe that think critically, analytically, and objectively about an issue is very essential in the study. Ilyas (2016) then elaborates that critical means using cognitive, rational, and intelligence while objective means it is not influenced by personal belief or feelings to avoid personal bias.

2.3. Implementation of Critical Thinking

There are three approaches to teach critical thinking (Ennis, 1992 as cited in Norris, 1992). They are the general approach, the infusion approach, the immersion approach, and the mixed approach. The general approach is to teach CT using non-subjects. This is supported by McGregor (2007) stating that thinking is a skill, thus it can be taught and learned. Following, Solon (2001) prefers the general approach the most effective after studying three groups that experimented with three different approaches. The infusion approach is to teach CT by incorporating subjects with explicit general principles, however, the immersion approach is incorporated into subjects without making explicit general principles of CT. A study by Angeli and Valanides (2009) reveals that after testing the four groups, it is found that the most effective is in the infusion group and the immersion group. The mixed approach is the combination of the general approach with infusion and/or immersion.

Following the approaches mentioned, Yang and Gamble (2013) elaborate that CT-integrated in course activities were successfully improving reading and listening comprehension. CT was implemented by supporting learners in process of information literacy and critical reading, by providing a collaborative environment, and by exposing learners to various additional, authentic, and relevant readings and related materials. The second implementation is CT-integrated EFL instruction including activities and assignments. This can result in both higher order of thinking and

knowledge retention leading to improve academic and target language performance (Yang & Gamble, 2013).

Following the implementation of CT, Numrich's (as cited in Beaumont, 2010) states that the implementation of CT could be integrated by a sequence of tasks related to adapted English materials. The tasks concern identifying assumptions, understanding, and organizing, interpreting, inquiring further, analysing, evaluating, and making a decision. Bloom's (1956) dimensional taxonomy, the cognitive dimension, contains six ways of thinking- remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating (as cited in Beaumont, 2010). This has been largely used to be the foundation of CT implementation on activities on materials or literacy. To sum up, it is possible to incorporate CT in textbooks. The approach suggested used is the infusion as it is compatible with school subjects. Therefore, CT can be explicitly taught with the general principles of CT (Costello, 2000; Fisher, 2008; Halpem, 2014).

2.4. Critical Thinking Components on Textbooks

There are some studies to examine the infusion of CT on English textbooks. A study by Assaly and Igbaria (2014) examines the CT on an English textbook used in Israel. This study investigates the CT by analysing the listening and reading activities with the ground theory of Bloom's taxonomy that hierarchical orders are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. This study revealed findings that more activities represented by comprehension, which is a lower order of thinking skill. Similarly, a study by Es-Salhi and Elfatih (2019) that evaluated two Moroccan English textbooks found that the textbooks represented knowledge, application, and comprehension, which are identified as the lower order of thinking.

The following is a study by Birjandi and Alizadeh (2013) that investigates three English textbooks used in Iran. This applies Bloom's taxonomy added by categories of deduction, induction, building a community of thinkers, balanced-thinking, multiple perspective-taking, and creative thinking. However, this study does not elaborate on the notions and examples of elements added to Bloom's taxonomy. These findings finally revealed critical thinking aspects were found in comprehension, knowledge, application, and community thinkers. In another two studies in Indonesia, Ilyas (2015) studied nine English textbooks for the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and Solihati and Hikmat (2018) studied critical thinking in Indonesian language textbooks. Ilyas finally revealed that English textbooks contain few elements of critical thinking, that is only 15% of critical thinking questions. Similarly, Solihati and Hikmat (2018) also found that less than

17% of tasks had the potential to promote students' critical thinking skills. Both studies did not use Bloom's taxonomy, instead, they applied Ilyas' critical thinking framework. This framework is the result of synthesizing 21 critical thinking theories that are two critical thinking taxonomies (Freeman's and Bloom's), six empirical studies on critical thinking in English language teaching, nine critical thinking programs, and four critical thinking tests. The studies elaborated previously have shown that critical thinking was found in the language textbooks, therefore, it is assumed that critical thinking can be taught through literacy.

3. METHOD

This study adopted content analysis to investigate to what extent activities, tasks, and instructions in the 'English in Mind Level 3' promoted critical thinking skills. This content analysis focused more on the qualitative approach that is the data generated mostly qualitative, while the generated quantitative data was used to see the percentage of tasks promoting students' critical thinking skills (Ilyas, 2015; Krippendorff, 2004; Salihati & Hikmat, 2018). To the content analysis, it is believed to promote several advantages, such as cost-effective, transparent, flexible, and copiable (Ilyas, 2015). Then, analytic categories are needed to identify the components of critical thinking in the textbook (Krippendorff, 2004). The categories used are to distinguish between critical and noncritical tasks, activities, and instructions (Salihati & Hikmat, 2018).

The analytic categories adapted the critical thinking framework by Ilyas (2015). This framework was synthesized from 21 critical thinking theories: 2 taxonomies (Bloom's and Freeman's), 6 empirical studies on critical thinking in English Language Teaching, 9 critical thinking programs, and 4 four critical thinking tests. This framework could surpass Bloom's taxonomy because it is stronger and less criticized than Bloom's. This framework also can be adapted to other textbooks, such as sciences, social, etc. (Ilyas, 2015, 2016).

To support the data of critical thinking implementation at school, an interview was conducted with a teacher whose high school has been using English in Mind for years. The school decided to use a series of English in Mind because they provide four macro skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Furthermore, the series of textbooks provide what students need to compete globally and have the skills demanded in the 21st century. The English in Mind series are also supported by the audio, CD-ROM for students, manual book for teachers, digital book integrated with audio and video, test-maker software, and online resources.

Activities/questions/tasks that probe:

Clarification (*What does the phrase 'some days deliver happiness' mean? What do you mean by ...?*)
 Assumptions (*What are you assuming? Are you assuming that ...?*)
 Reason (*What are the reasons given by the author? Are the reasons convincing?*)
 Evidence (*Can you give evidence to support your response? What is the evidence provided by the author in the text?*)
 Implication/Consequence/Alternative (*Can you suggest a better alternative to help them? What is the consequence of not studying seriously at school?*)
 Viewpoints or Perspectives (*What do you think we should do to drug dealers? What is your view to pesticides? What is your opinion about ...?*)
 Question (*Are these questions appropriate? Is question no 5 understandable?*)
 Prediction (*What is the further effect if we have poor development of agriculture? What will happen if we keep cutting trees?*)
 Agreement/disagreement (*Do you agree with that? Why/Why not*)
 Summary (*Write the summary of this story? What can you summarize from this passage?*)
 Conclusion (*What can you conclude from the story? What is the conclusion of the text?*)

Figure 1 Ilyas' Framework of critical thinking (Solihati & Hikmat, 2018)

This study carried out several stages synthesized from Ilyas (2015) and Salihati and Hikmat (2018). First, a research question was generated. Second, analytic categories were selected, that is the Ilyas' critical thinking framework. Third, the unit analysis was decided. The unit analysis focused on the 'questions' and the 'instructions' and was taken 10 chapters out of 14 chapters of 'English in Mind Level 3'. The questions taken were the questions that potentially promoted critical thinking skills and the answers were implicitly stated in the texts. In other words, the answers went beyond the texts (Ilyas, 2005). Fourth, the questions and instructions following after texts (any genres), illustration, tables, diagrams were transcribed and coded. The coding adopted hypothesis coding (Saldana, 2013) in which the codes were developed from theory or prediction about what would be found in the data before they were collected and analysed. Fifth, potential categories were reviewed. Finally, the results were analysed.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

From the interview (figure 1) the study revealed some findings First, the teacher thinks that critical

thinking (CT) is significantly needed by the students to be literate and selective to the information.

"It (CT) is really important. CT can help my students not to believe easily on a hoax, question many things, and contribute positively to giving solutions on problems they face."

Figure 2 Interview extract 1

The CT is helpful to problem-solving, too. This is in line with the importance of CT that CT can promote problem-solving, creative thinking, and decision making (Rudd 2007 as cited in Tuzlukova et al., 2017; Ennis, 1987 as cited in Yang & Gamble, 2013).

Secondly, the teacher explained that CT can be taught through activities such as reading, speaking, writing, and listening (figure 2).

"CT can be taught through any activities from reading, speaking, listening, and writing. For example, in reading, we can ask the students to predict the content of the text from the picture or the title. Teachers can give them hots questions related to the text. In speaking, teachers can give them arguable topics to debate. In listening, ask the students to listen to an intriguing podcast dialogue, or speech and ask their responses. In writing, ask the students to write their ideas on a current issue and how they can give solutions by doing simple research."

Figure 3 Interview extract 2

This is relevant to the notion proposed by Numrich's (as cited in Beaumont, 2010) that the implementation of CT could be integrated by a sequence of tasks related to adapted English materials. In reading, students can be asked to predict the reading by cues, such as pictures, titles, etc., and to answer the higher-order thinking questions. In speaking, students can be asked to debate on arguable topics. In listening, students can be asked to listen to podcasts, speeches, and to check their responses to them. In writing, they can write their ideas on current issues and solve-problem by researching.

Third, there are some aspects to contribute to students' critical thinking skills, such as reading resources, movies, and listening programs (figure 4).

"I think, they are the reading resources, the movies they watch and listen to, even the music they listen to contribute to their CT."

Figure 4 Interview extract 3

Fourth, the book used (English in Mind) was believed to support critical thinking skills because it

provides various activities involving critical thinking (figure 5).

"... Because in EIM, many activities can increase the CT of the students..."

"I think analysis, evaluation, reasoning, predicting, assumption, perspective, agreement, clarification are covered in EIM through various activities in all skills."

Figure 5 Interview extract 4

Finally, the teacher considers questions in English in Mind are considered good enough to promote the students' critical thinking (figure 6).

"... I think all questions provided in the EIM have been adjusted to the students' cognitive level. I won't make my students get difficulties with my perception. Yes, some are less critical questions, but they are still useful to level the students' understanding of the topic discussed."

Figure 6 Interview extract 5

To the less critical questions, the teacher thinks it can be a trigger and bridge to higher or more critical thinking questions, therefore adjustment to less critical questions is not urgent. However, this is not relevant to Ilyas' that question modifications and additions to be more critical questions are suggested to promote critical thinking (Ilyas, 2015, 2016).

The following findings were taken from the content analysis. After selecting 10 of 14 chapters of the textbook, the writer listed all questions of the 10 chapters that were implicit and explicit. It was found that the 168 implicit questions were considered appropriate to be analysed potentially promoting critical thinking. However, there were 102 of 168 questions categorized to encourage critical thinking skills. Concerning the categories, critical thinking skills were dominated by questions or tasks of clarification, viewpoints, prediction, reason and evidence, and assumptions. Therefore, the study will discuss findings on clarification, viewpoint, prediction, reason, and assumptions.

Tasks/questions promoting:

- Clarification 29 (28%)
- Viewpoint or perspectives 25 (25%)
- Prediction 14 (14%)
- Reasons and evidence 12 (12%)
- Assumptions 11 (11%)
- Implication/Consequence/Alternative 5 (5%)
- Agreement/disagreement 3 (3%)
- Summary/Conclusion 3 (3%)

Figure 7 Percentage of Critical Thinking Categories in English in Mind Level 3

The first category manifested in the 'English in Mind' was clarification with the percentage at 28% of 102 questions (see figure 7). This seems to be highly promoting critical thinking. Clarification is urgently needed so that someone can express their idea either written or oral clearly (Elder & Paul, 2009; Ennis, 1996). Additionally, clarification might be the result of clear thought that can promote critical thinking. This became the most dominant category of critical thinking skills as it became the foundation of steps to the other categories of critical thinking.

Findings revealed that questions of clarification could be divided into 5 types; those were clarification of questions/sentences, clarification of examples, clarification of text structures, clarification of themes/topics of a text, and clarification of words/phrases.

Figure 7 shows five questions of clarification based on their categories. Question 1 could be considered to encourage more critical thinking if it is expanded to ask, 'why are the two tenses used?'. Question 2 was considered less critical as learners could just 'remember' the example. However, this question could be modified to be more critical by adding a question asking for perspective such as 'What do you think of the shows?'. Question 3 was considered just to locate the answer in the reading. This could be more critical if modified with a reason, such as 'Why do you think so?'. Question 4 was considered critical enough. Finally, question 5 might be considered less critical if the learners just know the meaning of the vocabulary. So, this can be modified into making the target vocabulary into their sentences.

1. *Kylie uses two tenses in her composition. Which are they? Underline them in different colours. (clarification of tenses)*
2. *What are the most popular reality TV shows in your country? What kind of things do people do on these shows? (clarification of examples)*
3. *How does she end the letter? What do you write if you know the name of the person you are writing to? (clarification of text structures)*
4. *What do you think the song is about? Use lines from the song to support your ideas. (clarification of themes/topics of a text)*
5. *Look at these sentences from the radio show in Exercise 6b. What do fantastic, huge, and awful clarification of words/phrases mean?*

Figure 8 Clarification Categories

The second category promoted in the 'English in Mind' was viewpoint or perspectives with the percentage at about 24% of 102 questions (see figure 8). Robson (2006) states the importance of promoting viewpoint to young children is that the learners can challenge other learners' perspectives starting from young (as cited in Ilyas, 2005). Additionally, there are no right or wrong answers, thus the questions are considered to build the student's confidence. These

questions might lead learners to be more independent thinkers (Solihati & Hikmat, 2018).

Findings found that questions of viewpoint or perspectives were categorized into 4 types; they were viewpoint through discussion in pairs/groups/class, viewpoint on direct questions, viewpoint on Yes/No questions, and viewpoint through ordering ideas.

1. *Why is it important for animals to be able to communicate? Discuss in small group.* (viewpoint through discussion in pairs/groups/class)
2. *Lots of people think telepathy is not possible. What's your view?* (viewpoint on direct questions)
3. *Do you think Laura was right to give the tickets and interview to Nick?* (viewpoint on Yes/No questions)
4. *What do you think of the most important thing for someone to be happy in their job?* (viewpoint through ordering ideas)

Figure 9 Viewpoint Categories

Figure 9 shows four questions of viewpoint based on their categories. Questions 1, 2, and 4 were considered critical enough. However, those questions could be much stronger by adding questions for facts or evidence from the text and/or from learners' knowledge. Thus, they could be modified by adding a question on evidence, such as 'Support your view by giving example(s)'. Question 3 was thought to be less critical since it did not ask for 'argument/reason', thus it can be developed by adding a question 'Why do you think so?'. Finally, questions on viewpoint could be suggested to ask the writer's perspective rather than the students' perspective.

The third category manifested in the textbook was a prediction, which was 14 % of 102 questions. Prediction questions will trigger learners' critical thinking by given clues or information provided by the text, as well as student's schemata. This is critical to motivate students to remain to recall their knowledge and the new information they just got. The findings showed that predictions were divided into 3 types; they were prediction on the possible themes/topics/ideas, prediction on the continuation of a text, and prediction on student's perspectives. However, no questions were asking the prediction of a writer's perspective.

1. *Before reading the text, think about two methods of communication that animals use.* (prediction on the possible themes/topics/ideas)
2. *What do you think happen next? How do you think the story ends?* (prediction on the continuation of a text)
3. *What jobs do you think will exist in fifty years that don't exist now?* (prediction on student's perspectives)

Figure 10 Prediction Categories

Figure 10 shows three questions on prediction with two categories. Question 1 is a prediction question because it was asked before reading a text. This was considered less critical as learners were not asked to give 'clarification' on the 'two methods of communication'. Thus, it could be more critical if modified by adding a clarification "Tell the two methods of communication with your partner!". Question 2 was considered critical enough. However, question 3 was thought to be less critical because it did not ask for a reason/argument. Thus, question 3 could be developed by adding an instruction 'Provide any reasons to support your prediction'.

The fourth category in this study was the reasons and evidence. Questions probe reasons can promote critical thinking if they propose evidence written on text or by learners' idea. This study identified 2 types of reasons and evidence. The first was supporting/arguing the answer that is to answer Yes/No questions embedded with Why. The second was stating the argument/reason based on the problem provided in the reading. Questions promoting reasons can promote when students are asked to present evidence, examples by their knowledge and/or with the ones presented in the reading.

1. *Think of four reasons why someone might not be happy in their job.*
2. *Would you like to be a contestant on a reality TV show? Why/Why not?*

Figure 11 Reasons and Evidence Categories

Figure 11 displays two questions on reasons. Question 1 and 2 were considered less critical as they did not ask for presenting evidence of examples. Thus, they can be improved by adding a question 'Support your reasons with evidence or examples!'

The fifth category was the assumptions. Halpern (2014) claims that an assumption is a statement that has no proof or evidence provided. Thus, it needs to be challenged. Questions on assumption will help learners rehearse to challenge the assumption by giving intellectual and rational judgments. This study found 4 types of questions on assumptions. First, it was the assumption with WH questions. Following, it was the assumption with conditional sentences. Thirdly, it was an assumption based on the given situation. Finally, it was an assumption with a class discussion.

1. *What might it be use for now, do you think? (assumption with WH questions)*
2. *If you were one of the 18 great thinkers, which problems would you discuss? (assumption with conditional sentences)*
3. *There is no proof for mobile phone theory, but what can we say for sure about bees? (assumption based on the given situation)*
4. *Work with a partner. Have you heard of cryptozoology? If so, explain what it is. If not, discuss what it might be. (assumption with a class discussion)*

Figure 12 Reasons and Evidence Categories

Figure 12 shows questions on assumptions. Question 1 was based on a WH question. This question would be more critical if it asks reasons. Thus, it can be improved by adding the question ‘Why do you think so?’. Question 2 was considered less critical as it just asked learners to choose. It will be much critical if modified with reasons and evidence by adding the question ‘support you’re your choice with reasons and evidence.’ Question 3 was an assumption based on the given situation. This question asks for basic assumption and like question 3, it needs a reason to make it more critical. Thus, the question can be modified by adding ‘Provide the reason(s) for your assumption.’ Question 4 was an assumption by discussion, and this was considered critical as it required learners to explain and discuss with their friends. However, this can be more critical if it was developed with perspective and reason question, Thus, the question can be modified such as ‘What do you think of it?’.

The following category of critical thinking was the implication/consequence/alternative. The urgency of questions promoting these skills is to guide students to be problem-solving and wisely deciding a choice (Hunter, 2009). The study found that there were 2 types of questions for implication/consequence/alternative. The types were asking WH questions and questions using conditional sentences.

1. *What can be done to help the situation?*
2. *Think of some other common animals and insects. How would the world be affected if they disappeared?*

Figure 13 Implication/Alternative/Consequence Categories

Figure 13 displays two questions on implication/alternative/consequence categories. Question 1 was a WH question. This was considered critical to find a solution after implicating the situation in the text. However, it will be more critical if extended

to reason categories. The added question to this is ‘Why will it help the situation?’. Similar to question 1, question 2 was also considered more critical if it was extended to evidence and reason categories. The extended question to question 2 is ‘Give some reasons and evidence to support your answer!’.

The seventh category was agreement/disagreement. Along with viewpoint, agreement questions are needed for dialogical thinking. Therefore, the question of agreement/disagreement should be followed by “why” to support their response. The findings showed that type of agreement was based on Yes/No questions.

1. *Do you agree that fame brings problem?*
2. *Do you agree with Mark or Grace? Why?*

Figure 14 Agreement/Disagreement Categories

Figure 14 shows agreement/disagreement categories. Question 1 and 2 were the agreement/disagreement categories. Question 2 was considered critical. However, question 1 was considered less critical and thus, it can be developed with reason categories. The added question 1 is ‘Why do you think so?’.

The eighth category was the summary/conclusion. This category was one of the least categories. It is because the questions require students to read, analyse, evaluate, and present their summary in the written form. However, this can be done orally too, such as retelling the story or text that learners have read. The study showed that there were two types of this category. They were retelling the story and comparing the information from the text.

1. *Work with a partner. Retell the first part of the story of Gelert.*
2. *Listen to a girl telling the story of Gelert. Write the five things that are different from the story you read.*

Figure 15 Summary/Conclusion Categories

Table 15 displays the summary or conclusion categories. Question 1 was by retelling the story, which is verbally or spoken. Question 2 was comparing the information, to sum up, the information from the text and from what learners listen.

5. CONCLUSION

Critical thinking skills are important for students to shape them to be more literate and solve the problem. The activities in the classroom can situate the critical thinking skills, such as reading, speaking, listening, and writing. It has been discussed above that the implementation of critical thinking through infusion approaches can be taught in the subjects, included through using textbooks. The study has tried to evaluate

the elements of critical thinking manifested in English in Mind Level 3. The number of explicit questions or instructions considered promoting critical thinking were categorized. The critical thinking elements were dominated by categories of clarification, viewpoint or perspectives, prediction, reason and evidence, and assumptions. The 102 out of 168 implicit questions were revealed to engage students' critical thinking. Therefore, English in Mind Level 3 was considered significantly promoting critical thinking skills. However, modifications to some implicit questions are suggested to make them more critical.

The findings of this study may suggest the textbook writers, teachers, and school stakeholders, to include more various critical thinking elements in the implicit questions, such as the elements of implication, consequence, alternative, agreement, disagreement, and summary or conclusion. The question modification to promote critical thinking can be also applied to explicit questions.

By the limitations of chapters analysed in this textbook evaluation this study also recommends further research of critical thinking elements on English textbooks and other textbooks.

REFERENCES

- Angeli, C., & Valanides, N. (2009). Instructional effects on critical thinking: Performance on ill-defined issues. *Learning and Instruction, 19*(4), 322–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.06.010>
- Assaly, I. & Igarria A.K. (2014). A content analysis of the reading and listening activities in the EFL textbook of master class. *Education Journal, 3*(2), 22–38. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20140302.11>
- Beaumont, J. (2010). A sequence of critical thinking tasks. *TESOL Journal, 1*(4), 427–448. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tj.2010.234763>
- Bouزيد, H. (2016). Boosting 21st century skills through Moroccan ELT textbooks. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 1*(2), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v1i2.24>
- Birjandi, P., & Alizadeh, I. (2012). Manifestation of critical thinking skills in the English textbooks employed by language institutes in Iran. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 2*(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2012.100>
- Chen, P., Tolmie, A. K., & Wang, H. (2016). Growing the critical thinking of schoolchildren in Taiwan using the analects of Confucius. *International Journal of Educational Research, 84*(2016), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.02.002>
- Costello, P. J. M. (2000). *Thinking skills and early childhood education*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Cottrell, S. (2005). *Critical thinking skills: Developing effective analysis and argument*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cottrell, S. (2011). *Critical thinking skills* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann Garinger.
- Cunningsworth, A., & Kussel, P. (1991). Evaluating teacher's guides. *ELT Journal, 45*(2), 128-139.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2009). Close reading, substantive writing and critical thinking: Foundational skills essential to the educated mind. *Gifted Education International, 25*(3), 286-295.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Ennis, R. H. (1996). Critical thinking dispositions: Their nature and assessability. *Informal Logic, 18*(2), 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v18i2.2378>
- Es-salhi, A., & Elfatih, M. (2019). Evaluating critical thinking skills in Moroccan EFL textbooks: Gateway to English 2 as a case. *Higher Education of Social Science, 17*(1), 13-22. doi:10.3968/11284
- Fisher, A. & Ennis, R. H. (1996). Critical thinking. *Argumentation 14*, 48–51 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007850227823>
- Fisher, R. (2008). *Teaching thinking: Philosophical inquiry in the classroom* (3rd ed.). London, England: Continuum.
- Fung, D. C.-L., & Liang, T. W. (2019). *Fostering critical thinking through collaborative group work*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2411-6>
- Halpern, D. F. (2014). *Thought & knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching. Longman handbooks for language teachers*. London: Longman.
- Haycroft, J. (1998). *An introduction to English Language Teaching*. England: Longman.
- Hunter, D. A. (2009). *A practical guide to critical thinking: Deciding what to do and believe*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ilyas, H. P. (2015). *Critical thinking: Its representation in Indonesian ELT textbooks and education*

- (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of York, UK.
- Ilyas, H. P. (2016). Infusing Critical Thinking into English Coursebooks. *The Academic Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 113-134.
- Judge, B., Jones, B., McCreery, E. (2009). *Critical thinking skills for education students*. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lawton, D., & Gordon, P. (2002). *A history of western educational ideas*. London: Woburn Press.
- Margana, M., & Widyantoro, A. (2017). Developing English textbooks oriented to higher order thinking skills for students of vocational high schools in Yogyakarta. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.04>
- Matthews, R., & Lally, J. (2010). *Critical thinking, thinking skills and global perspective: The thinking teacher's toolkit*. London: Continuum.
- Mayfield, M. (2001). *Thinking for Yourself: Developing Critical Thinking Skills through Reading and Writing* (5th ed.). United States: Thomas Learning.
- McGregor, D. (2007). *Developing thinking; Developing learning: A guide to thinking skills in education*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Mulnix, J. W. (2012). Thinking critically about critical thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44(5), 464-479.
- National Education Policy. (2012). *Preparing 21st Century Students for a Global Society: An educator's guide to the 4Cs*. Retrieved from <http://dl.icdst.org/pdfs/files3/0d3e72e9b873e0ef2ed780bf53a347b4.pdf>
- Norris, S. P. (1992). *The generalizability of critical thinking: Multiple perspectives on an educational ideal*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613. doi:10.2307/3588214
- O'Neill, R. (1982). Why use textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 36(2), 104-111.
- Okada, R. (2016). Conflict between critical thinking and cultural values: difficulty asking questions and expressing opinions in Japan. *Asian Education Studies*, 2(1), 91. <https://doi.org/10.20849/aes.v2i1.122>
- Pacific Policy Research Center. (2010). *21st Century Skills for Students and Teachers*. Retrieved from Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation Division: <http://dl.icdst.org/pdfs/files/d4bde6fc25aa1cf1f6d2389eec297487.pdf>
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2008). *21st century skills, education & competitiveness*. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519337.pdf>
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Salih, M. (2010). Developing thinking skills in Malaysian Science students via an analogical task. *Journal of science and mathematics education in Southeast Asia*, 33(1), 110-128.
- Scott, C. L. (2015). *The futures of learning 2: What kind of learning for the 21st century? Education research and foresight working papers*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Sheldon, L. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.
- Solihati, N., & Hikmat, A. (2018). Critical thinking tasks manifested in Indonesian language textbooks for senior secondary students. *SAGE Open*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018802164>
- Solon, T. (2001). Improving critical thinking in an introductory psychology course. *Michigan Community College Journal: Research & Practice*, 7(2), 73-80
- Tan, C. (2017). Teaching critical thinking: Cultural challenges and strategies in Singapore. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(5), 988-1002. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3295>
- Tuzlukova, V., Al-Busaidi, S., & Burns, S. L. (2017). Critical thinking in the language classroom: Teacher beliefs and methods. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 25(2), 615-633.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, Y. T. C., & Gamble, J. (2013). Effective and practical critical thinking-enhanced EFL instruction. *ELT Journal*, 67(4), 398-412. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct038>