Assimilating Critical Discourse Analysis and Debating Technique to Familiarize Students with the Use of HOTS in the Classroom

Istiqlaliah Nurul Hidayati[a]*, Abdul Rosyid[a], Entis Sutisna[a]
[a] Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Pakuan, Bogor, Indonesia
istiqlaliah@unpak.ac.id*; abdulrosyid@unpak.ac.id; tisna69@unpak.ac.id
*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) are not only criteria of making test items for students, they also have to be implemented in daily basis especially in the teaching and learning process. Students can use the skills when they are familiar with them. In order to make the students familiar with the use of HOTS in the classroom, the researcher assimilates critical discourse analysis (CDA) and debating technique to foster the students' ability in using their HOT skills. The use of the skills is seen from the activities of analyzing, evaluating, and creating that are done through the implementation of CDA and debate technique. Technology is also used here since the students have to enrich their knowledge on the motion debated by searching some relevant issues online. The sample of the research is 32 students of the fourth semester who are studying speaking skill in the English Education Study Program of Pakuan University. The research shows that the assimilation of CDA and debate technique can make the students familiar with the use of higher order thinking skills which are analyzing, evaluating, and creating. This paper suggests that teachers should use the assimilation to foster students' use of HOTS.
.

Introduction

As Crawford (2005) cited in Tabackovaa (2015) said that in the classroom, there are two kinds of questions and objectives that the teacher can use and practice. They are low and high levels. Low level questions and objectives concern only on memorizing and remembering facts, while the high-level ones support evaluating information and creating new ideas. This leveling is in accordance with Anderson's taxonomy which was previously known as Bloom Taxonomy. This kind of leveling is now used as the reference in many countries including in Indonesia.

In Indonesia, the citizens are obliged to take 12 years of education. From one school level to another, the students will have to take a national examination. This examination was previously very urgent since the students were said 'not graduated' when the score of their

national examination did not reach the passing grade. However, the policy had been evaluated since there were many protests coming from the parents and some institutions. The policy seemed to be ignoring the effort that the students had made during the learning years. Today, the national examination still exists but the role is not as crucial as it was before. It acts now as a report of the students' achievement at school. Not only does national examination policy change, the test item characteristics also change. In the past, mostly the items tested students' knowledge on particular subject. Thus, the students had to prepare themselves by memorizing and remembering the theory they had been taught or that were contained in the books but today, memorizing and remembering are not enough. The students are required to do more thinking process.

This additional thinking process is called as higher order thinking skills or HOTS. At the beginning of its implementation, many parents and even teachers were frustrated because the test items seemed to be very hard for the students to answer. When in the past the students could pass the examination by memorizing formulas or theory, now those are not enough. Many students got bad scores on their national examination. Because of that, now schools and some courses offer the students to master test items using HOTS. However, the question is: Is it fair to require students to use HOTS or to answer test items in national examination using HOTS while it is not done in daily teaching learning process? (Madhuri, 2012).

HOTS have to be coached. They need to be familiarized. Students have to encounter HOTS items or do activities employing their HOTS in their daily basis. It is not fair to require them to be able to answer question employing their higher-level thinking skills without exercising or practicing in a regular basis.

Based on revised Bloom Taxonomy written by Anderson, higher order thinking skills cover analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Analyzing means examining methodically and in detail the constitution or structure of (something especially information), typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation. This activity can only be done by reading or watching something. Without being given anything to read or to watch, students cannot do the activity of analyzing. Besides that, when the students do not read much, they will find difficulty analyzing something. It means that when the students are required to analyze something or have to be able to analyze something, they have to be used to read more or to watch more so that they have the 'weapon' to analyze the information given.

The next activity covered by higher order thinking skills is evaluating. Evaluating means forming an idea of the amount, number, or value of something. It can also mean assessing or examining something critically. By seeing at the meaning, to be able to evaluate something, students have to know what the idea is about. They also need to compare one idea with another. They might have to read more than one sources to finally be able to assess something. Without practicing, students are unlikely to master this ability.

The last one is creating. Creating means causing something to come into being, as something unique that would not naturally evolve or that is not made by ordinary process. It can also mean to evolve from one's own thought or imagination, as a work of art or an invention. This is the highest level. Students who can create something must read many sources to support their inventions. When someone never reads or listens to information and suddenly tells the public that he or she invents something, there is a big chance that the invention has actually been found by other people. To create something new, one needs to refer to many sources. This activity also needs to be coached.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Fairlough (1995) states that critical discourse analysis is The kind of discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (pp 132-3).

Text, interaction, and social context are three dimensions that can be called as the framework for analyzing discourse (Fairlough, 1995). He also emphasizes that text cannot be analyzed without the context. Discourse as a text is the first dimension that discusses the language being used in the text (vocabulary and grammar) and organization of discourse (cohesion and text structure). The second dimension which is text as interaction discusses the rules, norms, and mental models of socially accepted behavior which can be seen from the text production and interpretation. The third dimension which is discourse as social context refers to wider social context including the concept of ideology (Ghanizadeh, 2012).

Thus, it can be inferred that critical discourse analysis attempts to integrate the text (micro level) and social context (macro level) through discursive practices (meso level) (Thompson, 2002 cited in Ghanizadeh, 2012). Bloome and Talwalkar (1997) state that the major goal of critical discourse analysis in the study of language is to communicate how language and power are related or more precisely to observe "connection between language use and unequal relations of power".

The trend in the study of language has been variously called critical language study, critical language awareness, critical linguistics, and critical discourse analysis (Bloome and Talkawar (1997)). Critical discourse analyses focus on ways to approach language (or more widely discourse) that investigate relations of power and how they are established.

The aims of critical discourse analysis, according to Van Dijk (1988) in Hidayati (2009) is to describe, translate, analyze and criticize social lives reflected in the text. In this context, CDA relates to the study and analysis of written texts and utterances to achieve the source of discursive power, inequality, bias, and how those sources are proposed, maintained reproduced, and transformed in specific historical, political, economic, and social contexts.

Hidayati (2009) states that the important characteristics of text for being analyzed are as follows: a) a discourse is understood as an act which has an aim and is controlled; b) discourse is related to text and context at the same time; c) discourse is in a particular historical context, thus in doing the analysis, the analyst needs to know the reasons behind the language use; d) discourse considers power element in the analysis; e) discourse is a form of ideology or a reflection of a particular ideology.

The Application of Critical Discourse Analysis in the Classroom

In Indonesia, nowadays, the ministry of education and culture emphasizes the implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). The skills can be exercised in the classroom activities through various teaching methods and media. One of the media for training the students' HOTS is by using texts. The texts are used as stimulant to make the students think critically. The text used in this activity is an authentic text to make the students more motivated (Huang, 2008). This way of analyzing text is called as Critical Discourse Analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis can be used in teaching learning process. The following is an example of the use of critical discourse analysis in the classroom. This example is adapted from Subagyo (2010): In pragmatics, the word 'us' is an inclusive form

or a combination of the first persons (I) and the second (you). However, the explanation is not enough when two articles with the same topics published on the same day used different number of the word. Subagyo (2009) in Subagyo (2010) analyzed different meaning of the word 'kita' [us] in an article from two different newspaper: Republika and Suara Pembaruan, the edition of November 2008 about the death penalty of actors of Bali Bombing on October 12th 2002 (Amrozi, Mukhlas, and Imam Samudra) in Nusakambangan, November 9th 2008.

From those articles, it was found that Suara Pembaruan used the word 'kita' [us] for 4 times while Republika used it for 19 times. By the use of critical discourse analysis approach, the number of the word use can be explained as follows: first, it is used more by Republika since the newspaper would like to build 'our perspective' to the readers so that they could have sympathy toward Amrozi and his friends. By so doing, it is hoped that the readers would think that Amrozi and his friends were not terrorists. They were blamed by a particular group of people. They were also victims of the bombing. They were part of us. Second, the segments of the readers are different. People have already known that 'us' in Republika means Muslims and 'us' in Suara Pembaruan means Christians.

Based on the above problem identification, the research questions are: first, "How is the use of Critical Discourse Analysis and Debate Technique able to Familiarize Students with the Use of Higher Order Thinking Skills?" and "Do the students become familiar with the use of higher order thinking skills in the classroom after the implementation of critical discourse analysis and debate technique?"

By using critical discourse analysis, it was expected that the students would read more (Bloome and Talwalkar, 1997). To be critical, they had to compare the information they got from one text to another. It means that they cannot read only one text but at least two. After reading several texts and discussed them with their groups, they had to list the reason of why they agreed or disagreed with particular information. The result of the group discussion was then brought to the classroom. In the classroom, they could not freely express their opinion. They had to follow the rule of debate.

To conduct the debate, the lecturer divided the class into several groups. Each group contained of three members. Thus, there were ten groups. In each meeting, there were two groups performed as debaters. One group became the affirmative group and the other one became the opposite. The lecturer would toss a coin to decide which group became the affirmative group and which one was the opposite. The debaters had to be ready whether they would be the affirmative or the opposite group. The preparation for the debate was done previously in the session of critical discourse analysis. Therefore, the topics of the discourse and the motions for the debate session were the same. For example, when the topic was death penalty, a week before the debate session, the lecturer announced to the students that they had to discuss about death penalty with their group. They had to read from both sides (pro and contra). Thus, they would be ready for the debate session.

In the debate session, the debaters had their own role. The first speaker of each group had to define the motion, stated their parameter and their team split. The second speaker had to rebut the statement of the previous person, and the third speaker also did the same thing as the second person and stated more data and examples to strengthen their argument. Since each of the roles was not easy, they had to be well prepared. It means that they had to do the CDA process before they entered the classroom (the debate session). It is impossible to conduct the debate with empty headed condition.

Method

This research employed qualitative approach and descriptive method. To collect the data, the researcher used three kinds of instruments. They were observation, questionnaire and a focused group discussion. The observation was done during the teaching learning process, both in the first and the second cycles. The sample of the research is 32 students of the fourth semester who are studying speaking skill in the English Education Study Program of Pakuan University. The researcher was helped by three observers. The three observers used an observational checklist focusing on the higher order thinking skills which are: analyzing, evaluating, and creating. These three indicators were used to see the process of CDA and also the debate sessions. Besides being observed, the students were also asked to fill out questionnaires with two indicators containing five questions in each indicators. Finally, the lecturer, the observers and the students were gathered to conduct the focused group discussion.

Results and Discussion

The research was conducted from February 12th until April 19th 2019. There were nine meetings. The following is the result of observation, questionnaire, and focused group discussion which are the instruments of the research. From the data gained, the research questions could be answered.

The Implementation of Critical Discourse Analysis and Debate Technique to Familiarize Students to Use HOTS

From the two cycles of the research, it was found that the lecturer did implement Critical Discourse Analysis. The procedure could be seen from the data gathered by using observation as follows: In each meeting, the lecturer did the following steps: first she brought two texts containing the same topic but different perspectives. The students got the texts and critical discourse analysis happened there. The steps of critical discourse analysis were reading the text, listening to some related sources (videos or recordings), and discussing (Setyarini, 2018). After discussing the material, the lecturer grouped the students according to the grouping that had been made previously (1 group consisted of 6 people, 3 people belonged to affirmative group and another 3 belonged to opposition). Each group would do debate session. The motion of the debate was in accordance with the topic of the text that they have searched before. The students were given time to do 'case-building' and after that, they did the debate. The following is the list of topics of the texts and the debate motions:

Table 1 Text Topics and Debate Motions

Text Topics	Debate Motions
New York Abortion Law: Why are so many people talking about it?	Birth abortion should be illegal
Death Penalty for Corruptors	The Death Penalty Should Be Abolished
Does After School Work Affect School Performance?	Every Student Should Have an After-School Job
Should Homework Be Banned to Improve Students' Life and Health?	Homework Should Be Banned
School Uniform and Appearance Policy	School Uniforms Should Be Banned
The World's Highest-Paid Entertainers 2019	Celebrities Earn Too Much Money
E-Cigarettes: How They Work, benefits, and Risks	Cigarette Factories Should be Closed
How Social Media is Reshaping Today's Education System	Teachers Should Not Be Allowed to Contact Students through Social Media

Why Choose a Single Sex School	Single Sex Schools are Better for Students

The debate motions were selected from the motions usually used in National University Debate Competition held by the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs. Since the research was aimed at making students familiar with the use of higher order thinking skills, the indicators used in this research are: the activities of analyzing, evaluating, and creating (revised Bloom Taxonomy).

The activities of analyzing could be seen in each of the meeting. When the students were given the topics, the lecturers also gave them time to find articles on the same topic. The students were also asked to read them. After that, the lecturers gave them a piece of paper containing an article on the topic. Then the lecturer and the students analyzed the content of the text. The analysis was started from the language use. The understanding is called as analytical since the truth value does not need to be directly related to the reality (Setyarini, 2018). This activity of analyzing always happened in the classroom.

The next activity of higher order thinking skill is evaluating. Evaluating here can mean judging. After reading the text given by the lecturer and reading some other articles that they found themselves, the students had to finally decide their own opinion about the case. The students could express what they thought about the topic based on what they had read Chang (2011). Discussion occurred here (Setyarini, 2018). In the discussion, only few students still gave neutral opinion. Mostly the students had decided whether they would agree or not. This decision of being pro or cons was the result of their evaluation toward the case.

Creating is the last activity of higher order thinking skills. In this step, the students had to create a list of reasons of being pro and cons. The lecturer called the debate group (two groups consisted of six people) and she tossed a coin to finally determine the pro group and the cons one. Finally, the debate session was started. In the debate sessions, each of the students has his or her own role such as the first person of affirmative group. The person has to define the key words of the motion, mention the parameter, and the team split. Here, he or she has to create statements to argue and to defend his or her arguments.

Based on the explanation above, it can be inferred that in the classroom, in each meeting, the activities using higher order thinking skills had happened. Not only that, using language that contains beneficial material also occurred. It means that the students learn language by using it. (Huang, 2012). Analyzing was reflected in analyzing the texts given. Evaluating occurred in deciding whether to agree or not to the texts given. Finally creating happened when the students had to create their own statements about the matter.

The Students Became Familiar with the Use of Higher Order Thinking Skills after being Taught Using Classroom Discourse Analysis and Debate Technique

That CDA and Debate Technique can make students familiar with the use of higher order thinking skills is proven by the data gathered by questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to all of the students. There were 15 questions under three indicators. The indicators are analyzing, evaluating, and creating which belong to higher order thinking skills.

From the questionnaire distributed, it is clear that before the treatment, there were only 20% of the students knew what analyzing was. Only 21% knew how to analyze something. Those who used to analyze something before doing any reaction were only 26%. However, after the treatment, the percentage increased. 73% of the students knew what analyzing meant. 66% knew how to analyze and 61% tried to analyze something first before doing any reaction. It can be inferred that the students eventually knew what analyzing was and got

used to analyzing any information they got before doing any reaction. This is similar to the result of study conducted by Sahputra (2021).

Before the treatment, 77% of the students decided to agree or not only by reading or listening to one source. 81% did not have any idea whether to believe or not in an article they read. 73% of them did not crosscheck anything they read or listened with any other source. After the treatment only 18% of the students decided to agree or not only by reading or listening to one source. 5% did not have any idea whether to believe or not in an article they read. Finally, 22% crosschecked anything they read or listened to some other sources. From the result of the questionnaire, after the treatment, the students had already had the skill to evaluate the information they got before finally agreeing or not agreeing to a particular piece of information.

76% of the students did not have any self-confidence to create their own statements to convey what they believed. 82% did not create their statements with strong arguments. However, after the treatment, 68% of the students had self-confidence to create their own statements to convey what they believed. 85% of the students created their statements with strong arguments. From the result, we can conclude that the students had created their own strong arguments. This is in accordance with the finding of Hashemi and Ghanizadeh (2002) and Afri et al (2021).

To strengthen the finding, a Focused Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted on Thursday, April 25th 2019. 30 students, 1 lecturer, 2 researcher assistants and 2 researchers attended the discussion, one of the researchers acted as the moderator. The indicators of the questions were still the three activities represented the use of higher order thinking skills.

The students confessed that before the treatment, they did not analyze the text they read even, only a few of them knew what analyzing was. The following is what they said:

Excerpt 1

> *"Now I know what and how analyzing is. Before joining the class, I was not sure what it was and how to do it."*

Excerpt 2

> *"When I got a text, I read it and I rarely analyzed it but after joining the class I know that I was supposed to analyze first the information I got"*

The above excerpts clearly stated that eventually they knew and practiced analyzing and it is likely that they bring the habit to their daily life. When talking about evaluating, the students said that they used to agree or disagree to something based on what they believed without crosschecking the information to other sources. However, after the treatment, the students always tried to look for other piece of information to finally decide whether to agree or not. The following is one of the opinions:

Excerpt 3

> *"For me now, it is very important to find other sources to support the information I got. If I don't find any information supporting the information I encounter, I will not believe in that or at least I will not spread the information to anyone else.*

It is clear from the statement that the students evaluated the information they got before they decided whether to agree or disagree to the information. After the students found supports or articles which were relevant with the information they got, they had self-confidence to create their own statement. The following is the excerpt:

Excerpt 4

> *"In the past I was not able to state my opinion on something because I know that my opinion is not supported by adequate sources but now I can create statements containing what I believe because previously I have found other information to support my statements.*

Data gained from the three instruments i.e classroom observation, questionnaire, and focused group discussion, it can be said that the use of critical discourse analysis and debate technique can make students familiar with analyzing, evaluating, and creating. These three activities are the indicators of the use of higher order thinking skills. It is in line with the research conducted by Alsowat (2016).

Conclusion

From the research result, it can be inferred that assimilating critical discourse analysis and debate technique is able to make students familiar with the use of higher order thinking skills in the classroom. This combination of SDA and debate technique has never been done before and it is worth trying to enhance students' ability to think critically, which is one of the skills that has to be mastered in the 21st century.

References

Afri, E., Marpaung, E. E., & Maulina, I. (2021). Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills through Debate Techniques. International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics (IJEAL), 1(2), 141-146.

Alsowat, Hamad (2016) "An EFL Flipped Classroom Teaching Model: Effects on English Language Higher-order Thinking Skills, Student Engagement and Satisfaction." Journal of Education and Practice Vol.7, No.9, 2016: 108 -121.

Bloome, D. and S. Talwalkar (1997). "Critical discourse analysis and the study of reading and writing." Reading research quarterly 32(1): 104.

Chang, S.-J. (2011). "An Action Research Study on Teaching Oral English Argumentation to High School EFL Learners in Taiwan " Taiwan Journal of TESOL: 1 - 34.

Fairclough, N. (1995). "Critical discourse analysis; the critical study of languaje." Essex: Longman.

Hashemi, M. R. and A. Ghanizadeh (2012). "Critical discourse analysis and critical thinking: An experimental study in an EFL context." System 40(1): 37-47.

Hidayati, R. P. P. (2009). "Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis Esai Melalui Model Analisis Wacana Berorientasi Peta Berpikir Kritis Pada Mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia & Daerah FKIP UNPAS Bandung." EDUCATIONIST III: 110 - 129.

Huang, W.-J. (2008). "The Learning of Multicultural/Global Themes through Authentic Materials in EFL Classrooms " Taiwan Journal of TESOL: 95 - 118

Huang, Y.-P. (2012). "Design and Implementation of English-Medium Courses in Higher Education in Taiwan: A Qualitative Case Study." English Teaching & Learning.

Madhuri, G., et al. (2012). "Promoting higher order thinking skills using inquiry-based learning." European Journal of Engineering Education 37(2): 117-123.

Minakova, Ludmila Yu (2014). Critical Thinking Development in Foreign Language Teaching for Non-language-majoring Students. THE XXV ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC CONFERENCE, LANGUAGE AND CULTURE, 20-22 October 2014. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 154 (2014) 324 – 328

Sahputra, D. (2021). Cabinet Reshuffle News for 2020 in Van Leeweun's Critical Discourse Analysis. Polit Journal: Scientific Journal of Politics, 1(1), 11-18.

Setyarini, S., Muslim, A. B., Rukmini, D., Yuliasri, I., & Mujianto, Y. (2018). Thinking critically while storytelling: Improving children's HOTS and English oral competence. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8(1), 189-197.

Subagyo, P. A. (2010). "Pragmatik Kritis: Paduan Pragmatik dengan Analisis Wacana Kritis." Linguistik Indonesia 2: 177-187.

Tabačkováa, Z. (2015). "Outside the Classroom Thinking Inside the Classroom Walls: Enhancing Students` Critical Thinking Through Reading Literary Texts." Procedia: 726 – 731.

Zare, P and Othman, M (2013). Classroom Debate as a Systematic Teaching/Learning Approach. World Applied Sciences Journal 28 (11): 1506-1513.