



Critical Thinking in the Teaching of EFL Academic Writing

Fahmy Imaniar¹, Raga Driyan Pratama², Lies Amin Lestari³, Ahmad Munir⁴

fahmy.imaniar@uinsa.ac.id¹
raga_driyan@poltekbangsby.ac.id²
lieslestari@unesa.ac.id³
ahmadmunir@unesa.ac.id⁴

¹UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

²Politeknik Penerbangan Surabaya

^{3,4}Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Received: 2024-07-10 Accepted: 2024-08-01

DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v12i2.5165

Abstract

This study aims at describing critical thinking subskills taught by Indonesian EFL teachers in academic writing and explaining how they taught the subskills. This qualitative study used two Indonesian EFL teachers who taught academic writing at one of state universities in Surabaya. Data were collected using observation checklist and field note. The obtained data were analyzed using interactive model analysis. Results showed that there were three out of forty critical thinking subskills that were not taught by the teachers namely providing and selecting the best examples, using credible sources, and maintaining the consistency of tenses choice. Another finding showed that there were seven ways of teaching critical thinking subskills namely individual consultation and feedback, class explanation, peer-feedback, groupwork of ideas construction and discussion, general class feedback, analysis task, and work review and discussion. This study suggests that EFL teachers can use the forty critical thinking subskills in teaching writing through one of the seven ways of teaching found.

Keywords: *critical thinking, Indonesian EFL context, teaching academic writing, subskills.*

Introduction

In university context, students are expected to be able to report research academically. The report can be in the form of essays, papers, or theses. Through that way, students are expected not only to conduct valuable research in academic way, but also to jot it down into a systematic writing product to contribute to academic literature. Therefore, the approach of learning in the university level starts to move on analytical approach which requires capability of critically questioning, thinking, and presenting certain ideas (Ballard and Clanchy, 1984).

The academic report is generally presented in the form of thesis which also becomes one requirement for them to graduate (Saville-Troike, 2012) and, furthermore, it will be examined before it is published. Yet, in order to pass the examination, moreover, a thesis needs to successfully present an idea which is logically accepted, well-structured, and strongly reasoned that can give genuine contribution to the related field of knowledge (Evans et al., 2014; Pratama, 2015).

In addition, writing thesis prevails among all college students from any majors, including undergraduate English department students learning English as a foreign language. In order to accomplish the project, they need a special writing skill which can help them to write their thesis such as academic writing. All academic writing is basically orientated on answering a question, solving a problem, or even resolving an issue (Vallis, 2010) so that it surely will assist them in writing their theses.

In order to achieve good academic writing, critical thinking is needed along with its relevance to the current 21st century. Such thinking skill is crucial as it is included in "Framework for 21st Century Learning" that a lot of educators and educational institutes in the global context has constructed and applied (P21 Partnership for 21st Century Learning, 2009, cited in Al Zahrani & Elyas, 2017).

In other words, Al Zahrani and Elyas state that critical thinking is the core skill to achieve (2017). In line with it, the world, moreover, sees critical thinking today as a highly necessary life skill (Mimbs, 2005) as well as necessary educational aim (Indah, 2017). In writing class, in the context of teaching and learning writing, critical thinking is considered as an aspect which cannot be separated from the writer (Indah, 2017).

Therefore, through academic writing, one will be able to evaluate the writer's critical thinking. Aunurrahman, Hamied, and Emilia (2016) point out that a good academic writing class needs to target on academic writing aspects which involve critical thinking and characters which are good so that they can help the students to write academically.

In university level especially, among other types of academic writing taught in EFL area, argumentative writing is deemed to be the best writing path to reflect university students' critical thinking (Coffin & Donohue, 2012; Indah, 2017). Hence, academic writing is important to reflect one's critical thinking and, at the same time good academic writing requires critical thinking along with its aspects.

Critical thinking encompasses some subskills as designed by Finken and Ennis (1993) and the indicators of the subskills are made into detailed by Cottrell (2005). The subskills focus, supporting reasons, reasoning, organization, convention, and integration. Those subskills were indicated by identifying other people's positions, arguments, and conclusions.

Then, it is continued by evaluating the evidence for alternative points of view and weighing up opposing arguments and evidence fairly. Not only those attitudes, critical thinking also requires capability to read between the lines, see behind surfaces, and identify assumptions which are considered unfair. In addition, recognizing techniques employed is another indicator to consider in order to construct certain positions which are more interesting than others. The last one is drawing conclusions based on reasonable evidence and assumptions, and also presenting a point of view in a structured, clear, well-reasoned way that can convinces others. Those subskill indicators are essential in order to employ critical thinking apart from the issue whether critical thinking can be taught or not.

Although some argue that critical thinking cannot be taught and improved, some others believe that critical thinking believe it can. It is because critical thinking is a part of thinking skills and, furthermore, thinking skills can be taught (Ilyas, 2016). In other words, it is regarded as teachable skill (Paul & Elders, 2002). When it goes to EFL context, moreover, academic writing alters to be a suitable context in which training in writing involving the developing of critical thinking (Mehta & Al-Mahrrouqi, 2014). Therefore, there are a great possible chance for critical thinking to be taught and improved.

Consequently, teachers need to be able to engage the students with critical thinking skills as well as teach them how to think critically (Mimbs, 2005). In other words, such condition requires teachers' capability to teach critical thinking for writing in the correct way. Actually, several ways of teaching critical thinking have been proposed as attempts to find the effective ones. They are Cavdar and Doe (2012) who suggest staged writing assignment with postscript as a strategy to improve critical thinking, Emilia (2005) proposes critical genre-based approach as a way to teach academic writing in tertiary level context in Indonesia, and

Rokhaniyah (2016) who raises collaborative learning as an alternative way to do so.

In this case, the importance of teaching should not only focus on the way of the teaching or what strategies used, but also to the teachers as the one who teach the students and put all the things into practice in the classroom. Therefore, the role of the teacher is crucial in the teaching of critical thinking, especially in EFL academic writing.

Unfortunately, not only teachers but also universal Indonesian writers, as part of Asian, are close with the tendency of having circular thinking as categorized by Kaplan (1996). One essential factor is their cultural background as stated by Ha (2011) that writing across cultures has a great tendency to be possessed by the writer's culture. Trying to distinguish the difference between Asian and Australian way of teaching and learning, Ha (2011) inferred that teaching and learning in Asia limitedly focuses on bringing "simple (unreconstructed) transfer of knowledge and skills" into practice.

They are disposed to adjourn the development of critical thinking. In addition, some other dispositions of Asian academic writing were found by Kaplan (1966) stating that Asian thought likes to adopt indirect approach to present a certain point and Burns (1991) asserting that Asian tend to have wholistic view, circular structure of argument, and gap between the points constructed and the main problem raised. Straightforwardly, Atkinson (1997) claims and concludes that critical thinking can only be applied in Western context.

His argument, then, is argued by Stapleton (2001) who affirms that it does not truly mean that Asian writing does not display critical thinking, but the notion of critical thinking between Asian and Western is different which leads to different thinking abilities, different approaches, and different point of views. Despite of those debates, a crucial point slightly ignored is that if the teachers stay as what Ha (2011), Kaplan (1966), and Burns (1991) asserted, the students are likely to learn, adopt, and employ the same way of thinking.

Therefore, it is actually essential to see what subskills of critical thinking that Asian teachers teach and how they teach critical thinking in academic writing, other than only seeing the writing product.

Beneath it all, there have been several studies that have been carried out dealing with the teaching of critical thinking for EFL writing (Vyncke, 2012; Areni & Syafri, 2015; Emilia, 2005; Rahmawati, 2015). However, none of those studies have attempted to get to know what critical thinking subskills taught so and how, actually in the field, the teacher teaches it. Vyncke (2012) focus on the investigation

of students' perceptions and their experiences dealing with critical thinking in academic writing, while Areni and Syafri (2015) did action research proposing strategy that can foster students' critical thinking in writing book report and review as part of academic writing.

Unlike Vyncke (2012) and Areni and Syafri (2015), Emilia (2010) and Rahmawati (2015) analyzed the academic writing product particularly on discussion text. The difference is that Emilia (2010) included data presentation section in her analysis and use transitivity system to do the analysis. Meanwhile, Rahmawati (2015) spotlighted the critical thinking subskills in her analysis which were performed differently by students with different level of proficiency.

Regarding to the previous explanation, most studies attending to critical thinking in EFL academic writing that have administered, concern on the display. They mostly deal with analysis of the students' writing and the ways that teachers can carry out in order to teach critical thinking to their students.

Additionally, the debate involving Asian academic writing has not ended yet, but it is important to find out what critical thinking subskills taught by the teachers in EFL academic writing and to see how, actually, the teachers teach critical thinking for EFL academic writing. However, former researchers rarely conducted any study concerning with particular scope of critical thinking.

Accordingly, this present study is going to reveal the critical thinking subskills taught by teachers in EFL academic writing as well as ascertaining and portraying on how, in reality, Indonesian teachers, as part of Asian community, teach critical thinking in their teaching of EFL academic writing. Therefore, this study involves university teachers and the students they teach as the participants. The teachers are those who teach academic writing at university. Meanwhile, the students taken as the participants are those who are taught by the subject teachers. In other words, both participants are in the same umbrella.

The focal point of this research deals with two aspects involving critical thinking and EFL writing. However, the core action of teaching become the main concern as it is the umbrella of both aspects. The researcher needs some questions to determine the path of the study as well as its execution. Therefore, in order to achieve the aim of this research in portraying the teaching of critical thinking in EFL Writing, three research questions are formulated as follows.

1. What critical thinking subskills are taught by the teachers in EFL academic writing?
2. How do they teach those critical thinking subskills in EFL academic writing?

Method

This study used a qualitative research approach to portray the phenomena dealing with the teaching of critical thinking conducted by Indonesian EFL teachers in academic writing class. Two Indonesian EFL teachers were purposively chosen as the research subjects who taught academic writing in tertiary education level (coded as T1 and T2). This study was undertaken at Department of English Education at one of state universities in Surabaya.

The rationale of determining the setting was based on the visibility of undertaking the present study. Data were collected using observation checklist and field note. Observation checklist consisted of several subskills of critical thinking conveyed in the teaching activities while field note accommodated the whole portrayal of the teaching process undertaken.

The obtained data were then analyzed using interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) that covered data reduction, data display, and verification or drawing conclusion. To answer the first research question, the data obtained from the observation checklist was used while the data obtained from the field note was employed to address the second research question.

Discussion

This study found that more than 90% of the critical thinking subskills from the aspects of focus, reasoning, organization, and convention were taught by the teachers. Such finding indicates a tendency that the teachers are aware of the teaching of critical thinking subskills in EFL academic writing. While Rachmawati's (2015) finding discovered that the students in tertiary level are aware of critical thinking skill to be engaged in their writing, this study discovered that the teachers in tertiary level are actually aware too.

Despite the difference of participants, Rachmawati's (2015) finding and this current study's finding derive the same upshot that the teachers are possibly conversant of the teaching of critical thinking in EFL academic writing. Such similar finding may due to the context of EFL academic writing, as the course, which provided an area for the teachers' action of teaching critical thinking subskills. Academic writing tends to serve as a suitable context in which there is training in

writing that involves the development of critical thinking.

This gives students opportunity to not only get acquaintance with the critical thinking subskills but also understand and apply them in the process of their writing development. The process includes pre-writing, drafting, revising or editing, and publishing (Harmer, 2012; D'Aoust, 1992; Kirsznner & Mandell, 2005). Yet, the context is not the only possible factor to explain the awareness of teaching most of the critical thinking subskills.

The quality of the teachers is also a possible element that stimulates their awareness towards the teaching of the critical thinking subskills in their teaching of academic writing. This basically supports Widodo (2008) who states that teachers have task to promote a learning atmosphere which is supportive and be able to provide students opportunity to reveal and express their voices – an important part dealing with critical thinking. Therefore, the quality of the teacher gives impacts towards the students' critical thinking since the outcome is based on what the teacher taught in the classroom. Not only proving that the teachers are aware of teaching the critical thinking subskills, the finding of this study mentioned earlier also signifies the existence of critical thinking.

The result found in this study also exemplifies that critical thinking exists in Asian context. It is so since the critical thinking subskills designed from Finken and Ennis (1993) and Cottrell (2005) were taught in their teaching and learning process of academic writing. The obvious existence leads to the rejection of the statement of Atkinson (1997) that critical thinking can only be implemented in Western context. He seems too early to conclude it.

Whereas, the critical thinking existed in different contexts out of Western, Indonesia for example, as revealed by through this study. The similar findings are also found in the former researches (Indah & Kusuma, 2016; Emilia, 2010; Rohayati, 2017; Rachmawati, 2015) which shows that critical thinking was applied by Indonesian university students. Hence, the finding of this study strengthens the phenomena found in those former researches.

It is necessary to realize that in academic writing, critical thinking is a compulsory skill that needs to be achieved as stated by Al Zahrani and Elyas (2017). Hence, it may lead to the critical thinking's obvious existence in the process of teaching and learning. Therefore, it is true that critical thinking is an element that cannot be separated from a writer (Indah, 2017).

In addition, good academic writing class needs to involve critical thinking which can help the students to write academically (Aunurrahman, Hamied, & Emilia; 2016). Without critical thinking, it is impossible to have good academic writing. Hence, this means that academic writing requires critical thinking, the relation of which in this context – academic writing, tends to be indisputable. Notwithstanding, it is important to notice that from the total 40 critical thinking subskills, there were three subskills untaught by one of the teachers, either T1 or T2. This should be given attention beyond the dominant critical thinking subskills taught by the teachers.

Such imperfection implies that the teaching of the critical thinking subskills is not either fully complete nor spotless. This is allied to Mehta's (2015) study which shows that the educators have general distress towards the classes in which some of the students are difficult to develop critical thinking through their teaching. Basically, there are two possible factors derived from this spotted weakness of this study's finding.

In the teaching process, the critical thinking subskills were integrated into the strategies of teaching academic writing that opens possibility for the teachers to leave some of them out. The 40 items of the critical thinking designed by Finken and Ennis (1993) and Cottrell (2005) were not taught in isolated way or one by one with clear separation. Basically, the teachers teach academic writing including all the patterns in it. In the process of the teaching, they teach critical thinking since academic writing and critical thinking cannot be separated (Indah, 2017).

Therefore, they taught the all the elements of academic writing but it is possible for them to leave some of the critical thinking subskills. Additionally, the teachers consciously or subconsciously have their priority related to the critical thinking subskills they taught to the students. In other words, the critical thinking subskills in certain aspect that the teachers think are necessary to emphasize compared to the others make it possible for them to leave them – the ones they think less necessary, out. This factor inherently attends to the study of Vyncke (2012) dealing with teacher's perception. The study shows that the teachers still have problems related to the personal voice which give accounts to what they teach in their classroom.

The second finding of this study that the teachers taught the critical thinking subskills through seven ways including (1) individual consultation and feedback, (2) class explanation, (3) peer-feedback, (4) groupwork of ideas construction and discussion, (5) general class feedback, (6) analysis task, and (7) work review and discussion. These ways evidently prove that critical thinking can be taught as

suggested by Paul and Elders (2002). It is not something that exclusively owned by individuals or a group of people.

Critical thinking is a skill and the skill can be developed seen from the development of the sub parts it has. This finding declines McPeck's (2016) view showing no sense to teach critical thinking as it is an abstract area cannot be taught. This finding hardly denies that critical thinking difficult to teach as isolated parts of a course, especially writing, since it is not easy to foster due to the necessity of integration (Wang and Zheng, 2016). However, the subskills are more operational so that the teaching of the whole skill can be seen from this finding which strongly put an essential confirmation upon the aforementioned discussion.

Viewing from another side, the whole finding attending to the teachers' ways of teaching critical thinking subskills in academic writing signifies that the ways with individual approach is the most-used one implemented by the teachers to teach most of the critical thinking subskills. This is why the individual consultation and feedback becomes the most favorite way for teachers to teach most subskills. It supports Donnelly and Fitzmaurice's (2011) statement in their study, that pedagogic intervention improves the confidence towards the skills of the participants. Therefore, it suggested the teachers to help their own students in the academic writing process. Furthermore, Widodo (2008) also explains that, in academic writing, teacher needs to focus not only on the writing products but also on the writing process involving teacher-student interaction.

One possible factor why the aforementioned finding could occur is because the English skill taught is writing in which every writer has their thinking ideas and rhetoric. The ideas between one student to another student are different while the different ideas are hardly put into one single composition. Therefore, individual interaction between the students and the teachers are viewed as the best way to help them develop their academic writing as well as their critical thinking.

As found in some meetings, the students could get the error parts of their draft when they are having consultation since their writing ideas and rhetoric are different one another. Likely, they will not have such chance if the teachers did it non-individually. The teachers' feedback given may only prevail for some students, but not all of them. Therefore, individual consultation and feedback becomes the best way to accommodate such need. Such factor basically supports Hyland's (2009) statement that writing is focal to one's personal experience as well as social identities. Therefore, it can be seen that all the main drafts of academic writing were done individually.

Another possible reason why individual approach is favorite to be used is because of the setting teaching context. Teaching university students is different from teaching high school students. University students' purpose is different from high school in which it is more individual. They seem well-prepared for having their turn which shows their level as university student that are more independent and responsible for their own task.

This strengthens Hu (2017) and Yanning (2017) statement that teaching university students is more individual. The students follow and did the whole process of writing by themselves although teacher's intervention need to exist in order to help them develop their critical thinking as well as their writing. Almost all the projects are individuals since they have different thinking and also flow of writing as well as the rhetorical performance. Such factor shows a tendency that the higher the education, the more personal the teachers' ways to teach writing.

Even though most ways used are student-centered, teachers play a big role that sometimes they became the center as they teach some of the subskills. The existence of class explanation and other teacher-centered elements might be seen as conventional ways of teaching especially writing. However, without them the students will find it hard to understand what they are going to write. With teacher-centered elements, the students are able to get to know the pattern of the academic writing, the rules as well as the critical thinking subskills they need to employ – although they are not stated in literal way.

This finding seconds Hu (2017) who mentions that teachers' suitable intervention in different stages of teaching writing lead the imposition for the students to think critically and, for university students English writing, it simultaneously improves their writing skill as well as their critical thinking skill. Such way is important but it should not be dominant over the student-centered ways. Hence it does not mean that student-centered ways are less important since student-centered strategies and activities necessarily promote critical thinking in which they lead students to develop their writing and critical thinking (Duron, Limbach, & Waugh, 2006; Sayre, 2013). Therefore, the mixing of them, with certain portions, is the most possible way for teaching critical thinking in writing context.

Basically, the mixing of student-centered and teacher-centered ways or strategies cannot be separated from their role as EFL teachers. They performed a way such as class explanation in order that the students understand first before they are able to apply the critical thinking subskills in their writing. Often times, they used both languages when they were teaching, L1 and L2. Such way used to help the students comprehend the elements of academic writing. Teacher's ways of

facilitating and guiding the students throughout the process of writing are substantial since they are the ones understand the students' problems in writing as well as in developing their critical thinking skill.

It strengthens the newest conclusion about this stated by Yanning (2017) about explicit instruction that the critical thinking instruction need to encompass an extended introduction or a certain aspect of critical thinking in order the students develop their comprehension towards critical thinking They understand the context and how to deal with it. Therefore, their role as the center is possibly dominant. Yet, if the teachers were not EFL teachers, they might not use teacher-centered way as much as the EFL teachers.

Among those ways of teaching critical thinking subskills, feedback and discussions are two important elements that are frequently involved in the ways of teaching critical thinking subskills. It augments Wang and Sheepo (2017), Dong (2015), and Mehta's (2015) idea that feedback and discussion is an effective way to teach critical thinking. Through the feedback and discussion, the critical thinking subskills in some of the aspects were implicitly taught. Feedback and discussion give opportunities for the students to think critically in which, doing so towards the issue being raised became an influential way for the students' process of writing development (Zechminster & Johnson, 1992). Therefore, those two elements are frequently used in the process of teaching critical thinking subskills in the process of teaching academic writing.

Looking beyond the frequent usage of feedback and discussion, the type of the students is the main possible reason why it occurs. University students have better competence of thinking and writing. During the consultation, the students understood what the teachers told and suggest them in relation to their draft. It seems that there is no problem in understanding the teachers' feedback or even explanation. Teaching them is different from teaching high school students. In teaching writing for high school students, the students work more in pair or group although the dominant activities are still teacher-centered (Sayre, 2013). Meanwhile, in teaching students in university level, teachers need to have effective intervention while letting the students individually do the continuous writing process (Hu, 2017). Accordingly, through feedback and discussion, the teachers are able to help the students based on their level of thinking and writing development.

The finding of the revealed ways used by the teachers implies that technology contributes to the process of teaching the critical thinking subskills in the teaching of academic writing. They use electronic mails for getting the students' written composition as well as giving them written feedback. Furthermore, they also used Power Point Presentation (PPT) for class explanation as well as work review and discussion. Smartphone with internet connection was also used for the students to explore a topic as well as the evidence, facts, and reference they needed for their construction of ideas. Moreover, the composition that the students carried out is in the form of Microsoft word which means that they typed them using computer or laptop. All of them signifies that such revelation is in line with the finding of Peretz' (2005) study which exemplifies that some ICT attributes were integrated into academic writing course.

The integration of ICT might be the result of the limitation of the time teachers had to run the whole academic writing course. It is not easy to teach all the patterns in academic writing in which the students need to write several drafts. The students and the teachers only met once a week with around 2 hours of time allotment. Therefore, ICT attributes, such as electronic mails, are needed for the students to hand their works or their written composition to the teachers. If the writing process was done in the classroom, it is likely impossible to have the whole course finished in one semester. Such phenomenon concludes that ICT possibly enables features that can improve the students' development of writing as well as their critical thinking skill (Peretz, 2005; Godat, 2012).

The critical thinking subskills were taught implicitly in integrated way which means that it was not easy to observe during the teaching process. Actually, the ways discovered in this study are the ways to teach academic writing but critical thinking subskills are implicitly taught there. Such thing occurs because thinking and writing tend to go together simultaneously. While teaching the patterns of academic writing with all the ways they implemented, the teachers also taught the critical thinking subskills. For example, in teaching how to construct thesis statement, as a part of academic writing, the teachers simultaneously teach some of the subskills in focus aspect. This explanation is supported by Wang and Zheng (2016) who states that the critical thinking is not taught in discrete or isolated way that it must be integrated into the language skill such as writing. This is why none of the teachers in this study stated that they are teaching critical thinking subskills, but they are teaching writing, academic writing more exactly.

Therefore, it is possible for them to leave out the subskills which are left-integrated into the teaching of the language skill. Among all the similar ways that the teachers used in teaching the critical thinking subskills, there is difference that should be given attention. Although both teachers are similar as they used peer-feedback, but the procedure is different between the one used by T1 and T2 that has been explained in chapter 4 in which the peer-feedback for T1's class was done outside the classroom and the peer-feedback for T2's class was done outside the classroom. The difference emphasizes that peer-feedback, as one of the ways the teachers used to teach critical thinking subskills, can be done inside or outside the classroom.

The difference is possibly caused by the teachers' preference tendency in which T1 preferred to have them being continuous action. She even determined the partner for peer-feedback in the earlier meetings. Her instruction of doing the peer-feedback using track changes feature in Microsoft word before they submitted the composition to the teachers indicates her expectation that such ways can improve the students' critical thinking and their academic writing. On the other hand, there is a tendency that T2 prefers conventional way of peer-feedback which was done in the classroom with the printed version of their written composition. He suggested them to apply peer-feedback for the next drafts of the rest academic writing patterns but he did not really make it compulsory to do. This shows that he puts more preference to teacher's feedback rather than peer-feedback. The action he did reveals his view that teacher feedback is more significant than peer-feedback. Despite the different feedback used, both teachers' actions prove that feedback is an important part of teaching critical thinking in writing (Duron, Limbach, & Waugh, 2006; Mehta, 2015; Yanning, 2017).

Conclusion

This study shows that almost all of the critical thinking subskills from the aspects of focus, reasoning, organization, and convention; were taught by the teachers. Such finding indicates that the teachers are aware of teaching the critical thinking subskills in their teaching of EFL academic writing. It shows that the teachers are aware of teaching the critical thinking subskills in their teaching of EFL academic writing and proves that they are competent in terms of teaching the students critical thinking.

The context of academic writing as well as the quality of the teachers are possible elements that possessed it. It is also important to underline that this study proves that critical thinking exists in Asian context meaning that it cannot only be applied in Western context. Nevertheless, there are few subskills that are left out by the teachers due to the non-discrete teaching and the teachers' priority.

In addition, there are seven ways of teaching critical thinking subskills in academic writing exhibited through this study including (1) individual consultation and feedback, (2) class explanation, (3) peer-feedback, (4) groupwork of ideas construction and discussion, (5) general class feedback, (6) analysis task, and (7) work review and discussion. Even though most ways used are student-centered, teachers play a big role that sometimes they became the center as they teach some of the subskills. Their role as the center is possibly dominant, but if teachers were not EFL teachers, they might not use teacher-centered way as much as the EFL teachers.

Further exploration on the frequency of each critical thinking subskills is expected to be carried out in order to see whether such thing give effects towards the teacher's preferences of teaching those subskills as well as the students' performances. Moreover, further research is also expected to explore further the effectiveness of each way in order to find the ideal procedure on how to teach critical thinking in EFL academic writing. The carry-out of those suggestions are expected to give greater contribution towards not only the knowledge of the practical application of critical thinking in writing but also the improvement of EFL students as the time goes by and the world requires more critical thinking skills for every aspect of life, including the educational context of English language teaching.

References

- Al Zahrani, B. & Elyas, T. (2017). The Implementation of Critical Thinking in Saudi EFL Context: Challenges and Opportunities. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 133-141.
- Areni, G. K. D. & Syafri, P. (2015). Critical Thinking in Teaching Writing Book Review. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 9(2), 141-150.
- Atkinson, D. (1997). A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 71-94.
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, F.A., & Emilia, E. (2016). Exploring an Academic Writing Class in an Indonesian University Context. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 11(1), 1-12.
- Ballard, B. & Clanchy, J. (1984). *Study Abroad: A Manual for Asian Students*. Selangor: Longman.
- Burns, R. B. (1991). Study and Stress among First Year Overseas Students in an Australian university. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 10, 61-77.
- Cavdar, G, Doe, S. (2012) Learning through writing: teaching critical thinking skills in writing assignments. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(2), 298-306.
- Coffin, C. & Donohue, J. (2012). Academic Literacies and Systemic Functional Linguistics: How do they relate? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(1), 66-75.
- Cottrell, S. (2005). *Critical Thinking Skills*. Palgrave Macmillan
- D'Aoust, C. (1992). Writing as a Process. In Carol Booth Olson, *Thinking Writing: Fostering Critical Thinking through Writing*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Dong, Y. (2015). *Critical Thinking in Second Language Writing: Concept, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Published Doctoral Dissertation. Vancouver: The University of British Columbia.
- Duron, R., Limbach, B., Waugh, W. (2006). Critical Thinking Framework for Any Discipline. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 17(2), 160-166.
- Emilia, E. (2005). *A Critical Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Academic Writing in A Tertiary EFL Context in Indonesia*. Published Doctoral Thesis. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne.
- Emilia, E. (2010). Analysing Students' Critical thinking in Writing a Thesis Using the Transitivity System. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 17(2), 101-111.
- Evans, D., Gruba, P., Zobel, J. (2014). *How to Write a Better Thesis (3rd Edition)*.

Melbourne: Springer.

- Finken, M. & Ennis, R. H. (1993). Illinois Critical Thinking Test. Illinois Critical Thinking Project. Department of Educational Policy Studies University of Illinois. (Online), (www.critical-thinking.net/IllCTEssayTestFinkenEnnis12-1993LoowR.pdf)
- Godat, M. (2012). *Collaborative Learning and Critical Thinking in Technology-enhanced Environments: An Instructional Design Framework*. Published Doctoral Dissertation. Queensland: Queensland University.
- Ha, P.L. (2011). The Writing Culture Nexus: Writers' Comparisons of Vietnamese and English Academic Writing. *Voices, Identities, Negotiations, and Conflicts: Writing Academic English Across Cultures Studies in Writing*, 22, 23-40
- Ilyas, H. P. (2016). Infusing Critical Thinking into English Coursebooks. *Journal of ELT Research*, 1(1), 113-134.
- Harmer, J. (2012). *Essential: Teacher Knowledge*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hu, M. (2017). Teachers' Intervention in Developing English Majors' Critical Thinking When Teaching Writing in Chinese Universities. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(12), 1290-1294.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. London: Longman.
- Indah, R. N. (2017). Critical Thinking, Writing Performance and Topic Familiarity of Indonesian EFL Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 229-236.
- Ismayanti, D., Said, Y. R., Usman, N., & Nur, M. I. (2024). The Students Ability in Translating Newspaper Headlines into English A Case Study. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(1), 108-131.
- Indah, R. N., & Kusuma, A. W. (2016). Factors Affecting The Development of Critical Thinking of Indonesian Learners of English Language. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 21(6), 86-94. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2106088694>
- Kaplan, R.B. (1996). Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education. *Language Teaching*, 16, 1-2.
- Kirszner, L.G., and Mandell, S.R. (2015). *Patterns for College Writing: A Rhetorical Reader and Guide*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- McPeck, J.E. (2016). *Critical Thinking and Education*. London: Routledge.
- Mehta, S.R. & Al-Mahrouqi, R.I. (2014). Can Critical Thinking be Taught? Linking Critical Thinking and Writing in an EFL Context. *RELC Journal*, 1-14.

- Mehta, B. (2015). *The Teaching of Critical Thinking: Reviewing the Perceptions of Educators in Tertiary Institutions in New Zealand*. Published Master Thesis. Auckland: Unitec Institute of Technology.
- Masruddin, M., & Nasriandi, N. (2022). Lexical and Syntactical Errors Performed by Junior High School Student in Writing Descriptive Text. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 1094-1100.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd Edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Mimbs, C.A. (2005). Teaching from the Critical Thinking, Problem-based Curricular Approach: Strategies, Challenges, and Recommendations. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 23(2), 7-18.
- Pratama, R.D. (2015). *Analysis of Argument and Argumentation made by S1 Students of English Department*. Unpublished Thesis. Surabaya: State University of Surabaya.
- Paul, R, Elder, L. (2002). *Critical Thinking: Tools for Taking Charge of your Professional and Personal Life*. NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Peretz, A. (2005). Teaching Scientific/Academic Writing in the Digital Age. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 3(1), 43-54.
- Rachmawati, Y. (2015). *An Analysis of Critical Thinking Aspects in Students' Discussion Texts*. Published Master Thesis. Bandung: Indonesia University of Education.
- Rohayati, D. (2017). Students' Critical Thinking in Writing an English Exposition Text, *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 82, Atlantis Press.
- Rokhaniyah, H. (2016). The Implementation of Collaborative Learning to Enhance the Students' Critical Thinking in Writing. *Jurnal At-Ta'dib*, 11(1), 73-87.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition (2nd Edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayre, E. (2013). *Integrating Student-Centered Learning to Promote Critical Thinking in High School Social Studies Classrooms*. Published Master Thesis. Florida: University of Central Florida.
- Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing Critical Thinking in the Writing of Japanese University Students: Insights about Assumptions and Content Familiarity. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 506-49.
- Vallis, G. L. (2010). *Reason to Write: Applying Critical Thinking to Academic Writing*.

Charlotte: Kona Publishing.

- Vyncke, M. (2012). *The Concept and Practice of Critical Thinking in Academic Writing: An Investigation of International Students' Perceptions and Writing Experiences*. Kings College of London: Postgraduate Thesis.
- Wang, X., Zheng, H. (2016). Reasoning Critical Thinking: Is It Born or Made? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(6), 1323-1331.
- Wang, S., Seepho, S. (2017). Facilitating Chinese EFL Learners' Critical Thinking Skills: The Contributions of Teaching Strategies. *SAGE Publication Open Journal*, 1-9. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017734024>.
- Widodo, H.P. (2008). Process-Based Academic Writing Instruction in an EFL Context. *Bahasa dan Seni*, 26(1), 101-111.
- Yanning, D. (2017). Teaching and Assessing Critical Thinking in Second Language Writing: An Infusion Approach. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 40(4), 431-451.