



ENGLISH EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH TEACHING AND RESEARCH



Analysis of Web-based College English Teaching from 2000 to 2017 in China Baohuan Zhang	1
Podcast Usage: Expanding English Learning of Undergraduate Student Imam Tyas Sansinadi, Dwi Suny Wardhany Winarko	13
The Implementation of SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visual and Intellectual) to Increase the Students' English Structure at English Education Department Samsi Rijal, Nurdiana Arifah	25
The implementation of metacognitive strategy training to enhance EFL students oral presentation skill Christina Innocenti Tumiar Panggabean, Risa Triassanti	32
Mobile-Assisted on Extensive Reading: Students' Voices Dzurriyyatun Ni'mah, Atik Umamah	41
Character Educational Value of Stephen Hawking in the Theory of Everything Movie Directed by James Marsh Tati Mardewi, Endra Wanto, FuriIndriyani	49
Using English Movie to Enhance Students's Interest in Speaking Skill at SMAN 1 Galis Pamekasan Wildona Zumam, Fujiono	62
Pragmatics in EFL Classroom: Avoiding Pragmatic Failure in Cross-Cultural Communication Nailul Author Restu Pamugkas, LutfinaTarita Wulandari	74
ENHANCING CRITICAL THINKING IN SPEAKING SKILL THROUGH SEKAWAN-P Diani Nurhajati, Dewi Kencanawati, Rika Riwayatningsih	92

ENGLISH EDUCATION | VOLUME 5 | NUMBER 1 | MAY 2020 |



Published by:

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
UNIVERSITY OF NUSANTARA PGRI KEDIRI

Jl.KH. Achmad Dahlan 76 Kediri, Indonesia, Postcode: 64119
Website: <http://english.unpkediri.ac.id/> E-mail: english@unpkediri.ac.id

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief:

Mrs. Yunik Susanti

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=EsfBByUAAAAJ>

Editors:

Mrs. Desi Tri Cahyaningati

Politeknik Perkapalan Negeri Surabaya, East Java Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=IX3CmV4AAAAJ>

Mr. Agung Guritno

Faculty of Islamic and Economic Business, IAIN Salatiga, Middle Java, Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=7G4rRbAAAAAJ>.

<https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57213521016>

Mrs. Dewi Nur Suci

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kediri

<https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=en&user=zbTkAT4AAAAJ>

Mrs. Rika Riwayatiningasih

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java, Indonesia

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=LcGXEcwAAAAJ>

Mrs. Sulistyani

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java Indonesia.

https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=N1yz_SIAAAAAJ

Mrs. Khoiriyah

English Education Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=UJHwrmeAAAAJ&hl=en>

Mrs. Dewi Kencanawati

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of

Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java, Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=rrwssUYAAAAJ>

Mr. Agung Wicaksono

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java, Indonesia.

<https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=wErKatQAAAAJ&hl=en>

Layout Editor

Suhartono, English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri East Java Indonesia.

Production Editor

Mr. Mahendra Puji AP

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri, East Java, Indonesia. <https://scholar.google.co.id/citations?hl=id&user=LOoq644AAAAJ>


Table of Content

ANALYSIS OF WEB-BASED COLLEGE ENGLISH TEACHING FROM 2000 TO 2017 IN CHINA

Baohuan Zhang

1-12

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14251>

 Abstract views: **376** ,  pdf downloads: **521**

 PDF

PODCAST USAGE: EXPANDING ENGLISH LEARNING OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT AT UNIVERSITAS AHMAD DAHLAN

Imam Tyas Sansinadi, Dwi Suny Wardhany, Winarko

13-24

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14033>

 Abstract views: **1108** ,  pdf downloads: **964**


 PDF

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SAVI (SOMATIC, AUDITORY, VISUAL AND INTELLECTUAL) TO INCREASE THE STUDENTS' ENGLISH STRUCTURE SKILL AT ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Samsi Rijal, Nurdiana Arifah

25-31

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14236>

 Abstract views: **420** ,  pdf downloads: **474**

 PDF

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF METACOGNITIVE STRATEGY TRAINING TO ENHANCE EFL STUDENTS ORAL PRESENTATION SKILL

Christina Innocenti Tumiar Panggabean, Risa Triassanti

32-40

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14324>

 Abstract views: **679** ,  pdf downloads: **590**

 PDF

MOBILE-ASSISTED ON EXTENSIVE READING: STUDENTS' VOICES

Dzurriyyatun Ni'mah, Atik Umamah

41-48

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14367>

 Abstract views: **988** ,  pdf downloads: **792**

 PDF

CHARACTER EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF STEPHEN HAWKING IN THE THEORY OF EVERYTHING MOVIE DIRECTED BY JAMES MARSH

Tati Mardewi, Furi Indriyani

49-61

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14315>

 Abstract views: **1027** ,  pdf downloads: **727**

 PDF

USING ENGLISH MOVIE TO ENHANCE STUDENTS INTEREST IN SPEAKING SKILL AT SMAN 1 GALIS PAMEKASAN

Wildona Zumam, Fujiono

62-73

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14337>

 Abstract views: **2502** ,  pdf downloads: **1662**

 PDF

PRAGMATICS IN EFL CLASSROOM: AVOIDING PRAGMATIC FAILURE IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Nailul Author Restu Pamungkas, Lutfina Tarita Wulandari

74-91

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14310>

 Abstract views: **948** ,  pdf downloads: **1141**



 PDF

ENHANCING CRITICAL THINKING IN SPEAKING SKILL THROUGH SEKAWAN-P

Diani Nurhajati, Dewi Kencanawati, Rika Riwayatningsih

92-102

 <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v5i1.14370>

 Abstract views: **489** ,  pdf downloads: **461**

 PDF

Enhancing Critical Thinking in Speaking Skill through *Sekawan-P*

Diani Nurhajati¹, Dewi Kencanawati², Rika Riwayatningsih³

Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri

dianihamzah@unpkediri.ac.id¹, dewikencanawati@unpkediri.ac.id²,

rieka@unpkediri.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

There were some problems in teaching English faced many high school teachers and students. Based on the observation in one a senior high school, it was found out some weaknesses in teaching English. Firstly, the teaching process relied on the exercises in the student book. Then, the teaching activity was more teacher-centered. Furthermore, the teacher never made development on the materials, which were more challenging. As a result, the students were not trained to have Critical Thinking. This could be seen when the teacher asked questions, they answered using short answer, without any elaboration. The process influenced the ability of their Critical Thinking. Actually, graduates of high schools should be equipped with 4C skills to face the Industrial era 4.0, namely Collaboration, Creativity, Critical Thinking, and Communication. All teachers can train those skills when they teach, including English teachers. Therefore, the objective of the research is to answer the question: "How the teaching model *Sekawan-P* can enhance the students' Critical Thinking in speaking skill?" It was a Lesson Study (LS) program between an English teacher and three lecturers. They worked together to solve the problems mentioned above using this teaching model. They revised the existing lesson plan and materials, made improvement, and revised the teaching plan. The results showed that after they applied *Sekawan-P*, the Critical Thinking of the students developed. It can be seen on how they delivered their arguments in speaking skill.

Key words: Critical Thinking, *Sekawan-P*, Teaching Model

INTRODUCTION

The world change very vast because of the industrial revolution 4.0. In this era, the use of advance information technology cannot be avoided in all aspects of human life. People cannot live without gadget. They share information and other get the information quickly from various sources, including from social media. They can access any information easily. In fact, not all the information is real and true. Many of the information are even hoax and unimportant. Therefore, they must be smart and wise to process the information.

To face the era, students in all school levels must be equipped new skills, which are ignored before by many teachers. They do not realize that the skills are really needed.

According to Zubaidah (2018), to face the Revolution Era 4.0 all the graduates must be equipped with 4C skills, namely Creativity, Collaboration, Critical Thinking, and Communication. She explains that *Creativity* is the ability to create innovation or to get new ways to solve problems. *Collaboration* means that ones are able to collaborate, adapt with the team, and share the roles to reach the goal. It means that ones can work together with others. *Critical Thinking* is about thinking skill outside the box, and it is all about how to solve problems. Finally, *Communication* is skill to express ideas, question, and solution in a good way.

Critical Thinking is one of the four C skills that students must have. It is a solving problem skill that help the students face the era. Janicek (2006) states:

“Critical Thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication as a guide to belief and action. In its exemplary form, it is based on universal intellectual values that transcend subject matter divisions: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, sound evidence, good reasons, depth, breadth, and fairness. It entails the examination of those structures or elements of thought implicit in all reasoning: purpose, problem, or question at-issue, assumptions, concepts, empirical grounding; reasoning leading to conclusions, implication and consequences, objection from alternative viewpoints, and frame of reference”.

Based on the quotation above, Critical Thinking is process and ability used to understand a concept, apply, synthesize, and evaluate information one gets or produces. Ones can filter the useful information because not all information can be accepted and used as knowledge and guidance for their life. In short, teachers should train and develop students Critical Thinking.

Another definition of Critical Thinking is proposed by Baharal (2008) in Brookhart (2010) who stated that Critical Thinking is “artful thinking”, which includes reasoning, questioning and investigating, observing and describing, comparing and connecting, finding complexity, and exploring viewpoints. It means that Critical Thinking is integrated skills before someone makes an important decision based on many considerations.

Ideally, English teachers provide a series activity so that the students have Critical Thinking. The activities here are learning activity in the classroom when they study English. Through the activities students use to identify problems: what the real problem is, why the problems happen, what the alternative solutions are, which one is the best

solution, and why it is the best solution. They may teach those abilities by applying a teaching model in which the students can practice their Critical Thinking.

Based on the previous observation done by the writers in a senior high school, there were some problems in classroom of a senior high school. First, the teaching learning in the classroom was based on teacher-centered activities in which the English teacher dominated the hours during the teaching and learning process. The teacher gave more explanation on the materials, and after she finished giving explanation, she asked the students to do the exercises in the book. As a result, some students did not pay attention to the class. Furthermore, the activity focused on written activity. The students did the exercises found in the book. The teacher gave very little feedback and never trained them to give reasons if she gave problems. They were not familiar with Critical Thinking activity during the English lesson.

Realizing the facts, the writers joined in Lesson Study (LS) program team. They tried to find the best solution in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning. They applied *Sekawan-P* to enhance the students' Critical Thinking in speaking skill. This model developed by the team involved in this research, which consists four persons. Three of them are the lecturers who teach at English Education Department, Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri. The other one is an English teacher of SMAN1 Kediri. The name comes from Javanese word *sekawan* which means four Ps. So, *Sekawan-P* is PPPP: ***Pemilihanmateri*** (selecting materials), ***Perencanaan***(planning), ***Pengembangan*** (developing), and ***Penyajian*** (presenting).

Sekawan-P is adapted from Project Based Learning. It is an instructional approach, to provide students opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills by creating challenging projects. During the process of completing the products, they engage projects set around challenges and problems they may face in real world.

The first step of *Sekawan-P* is selecting materials. It means the teacher makes adaptation on the materials. S/he select suitable product for the learning outcome formulated in the lesson plan. The next is selecting the materials. In this phase, the teacher provides topics that the students may select, or they may have their own topic. After that, the students do in groups to design a product that they are going to present later. They have to divide the roles of each individual. At the same time, they have discussion talking about how to have the best product. Finally, they have to present

their product in front of the class. They will get feedback from both the teacher and their peers.

Realizing the facts above, this research was carried out to find out the Critical Thinking of the students in speaking skill were enhanced through *Sekawan-P*. The objectives of the research are to describe and explain: 1) the application of teaching model *Sekawan-P* to enhance Critical Thinking of the students in speaking skill, and 2) the students' Critical Thinking Ability after following teaching model *Sekawan-P* through Lesson Study program.

METHOD

This research is a descriptive study that adopts the step in Lesson Study (LS). LS is more than studying instructional materials and developing useful lessons (Wang-Iverson and Yoshida, 2015). Zahroh and Wardani (2011) state the aim of LS is to improve the quality of teaching and encourage students' thinking processes, help them develop mental image for solving problems and understanding topic, and expand those skills and abilities. In other words, LS is collaborative activities among teachers or lecturers to find solution of the problem of teaching and to improve the quality of teaching.

The writers worked together with one English teacher at SMAN 1 Kediri as a team in LS program. Through this program, they collaborated to identify problems in the class, discussed the best solution, and evaluated the activity. The research was carried out in SMAN 1 Kediri. The subjects of the research were the four classes of eleventh grade students. Each class consists of 32 students. The team involved in this research were three lecturers and one teacher. One lecturer played a role as a teacher model. She was a lecturer of English Education Department of Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri. The other two lecturers and one English teacher took parts as collaborators. The steps of carrying out the research followed the ones proposed by Lewis (2002) who stated that in each cycle there are three main stages; they are **Plan**, **Do**, and **See**. The team decided to do LS in three cycles. First, they did observation in XI IPA1. They identified the problems in teaching English faced by the teacher and the students. Then, they planned to do something for the first open class. They made revisions on the lesson plan. After that the first cycle was done. At the end of the cycle they always made revision on the almost all aspects of teaching, such as developing the

materials, changing the way to manage the class, and improving the classroom interaction. The flow of the LS can be seen in Figure 1.




Figure 1. The Flow of LS

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The writers presents the results of the research, which is divided into three parts. They are the application of teaching model *Sekawan-P*, the students' Critical Thinking, discussion.

The Application of *Sekawan-P*

Before the writers explains how *Sekawan-P* was implemented in the class, it would be presented how the Lesson Study was carried out. There were three phases in one cycle of Lesson Study program, namely **Plan**, **Do**, and **See**. The first thing to do before **Plan**, the team did preliminary study. The objective was to find out the problems happened in the English class faced by the teacher and the students. After they found out the problems, they discussed to find the solution in **Plan** phase. They revised the existing Lesson Plan Made by the real teacher by developing materials, selecting interesting activities, and the way to assess the students' progress. The next activity was **Do**. The teacher model applied the results of discussion in the previous activity (**Plan**). The other two lecturers and the real teacher observed the teaching-learning process by taking notes the good and the bad things. The last activity was **See**. The team discussed the results of the teaching and tried to identify the weaknesses. They used the feedback to make the improvement for the next cycle.

Sekawan-P has two steps; they are preparation and implementation. In preparation, the teacher assisted by the collaborators formulated the teaching objective and its indicators. Then, they made a list of topics, which the students had to choose.

The topics here had connection with the material: 'Asking and Giving Opinion'. Here are the examples of the topic: a) You fall in love with someone, but s/he loves someone else, b) Online Transportation, c) Body shaming, d) Going to Padang Restaurant or Un-normal Café?". The reason why the team decided to choose those topics because they were familiar with the students. The team designed the project as the learning outcome that the students had to make with their group. The project that the students had to perform was a role-play in groups. The team prepared the expressions that the students needed when they had to perform. The last, the team prepared the scoring rubric to assess the students' performance.

The next step is implementation in the classroom. This step is divided into four phases. The first phase was selecting materials. In the first phase, the teacher introduced the objectives of the teaching and the project that they had to create and present at the end of the class. The teacher asked the students to do in groups of four students. Before the students did the assignment, the teacher gave the model of the product using video. She asked the students to observe the video to identify the aspects included in the product. After they understood what they had to do, the teacher asked them to choose one of the topics in the list. They may use their own topic as long as it was still relevant with the materials.

The second phase is planning. The teacher model informed the steps of doing the project and the time allocation. Based on the topic they chose, they started to design the project. The students discussed about the project with their friends in their groups. The project was that they had to perform role-play in front of the class.

The next, they came to the developing phase. The students collaborated with their peers in their groups to create the project. They discussed the story of the role-play, so each member of the group had different role. They involved in discussion about who asked the suggestion and who gave the suggestion. They also discussed the sentences and expressions they used. They practiced to perform the role-play. In the third phase, the teacher monitored each group to know whether they had problems or not. After she knew that most of the groups are ready to perform, she invited some groups to present the projects in front of the class. The objective was to monitor the students' progress and to know whether they had the Critical Thinking through the quality of their reasons.

The last phase was presentation. In this phase, the teacher model asked all of the groups to give presentation in turn. During the presentation, the teacher assessed the students' Critical Thinking. She also made some notes for the feedback. The students, who did not give presentation, observed and made some notes in checklist given by the teacher. At the end of the class, the teacher and the students discussed on the strengths and weaknesses on their project.

The Students' Critical Thinking

In each cycle, the model teacher and the observers assessed the Critical Thinking when the students performed speaking. They developed the scoring rubric to measure students' Critical Thinking. Students will get 4 if they are able to give opinion and provide three considerations or reasons. They will get 3 if they are able to give opinion and provide two considerations or reasons. They will get 2 if they are able to give opinion and provide one consideration or reason. They will get 1 if they are able to give opinion without consideration or reason.

At the end of every open class (Do phase) the teacher assessed the students' progress, especially their Critical Thinking. The Critical Thinking of the students improved gradually. Table 1 presents the results of the assessment.

Table 1. Results of Students' Critical Thinking in Open Class

Score	Number of student 1st OC	Number of student 2nd OC	Number of student 3rd OC
4	-	2	3
3	3	7	7
2	19	16	16
1	10	7	6
Total	32	32	32
Average Score	1,78	2,12	2.21

Table 1 above shows the results of the score in Open Class (OC). In the first open class (first cycle), the average score of the students' Critical Thinking skills was 1,78. There were 3 students who got score 3, 19 students got 2, and 10 students got 1. Based on the scoring rubric the criteria of the score was most of the students had already given opinion on the problem the discussed, but 10 students only gave no reason, 19 students gave one reason, and 3 students gave 2 reasons.

Their critical developed. It could be seen in the average scores of the 2nd and 3rd OC. The average score in the second open class was 2,12 and the average score in the third open class was 2,21. In the 2nd OC, 7 students did not gave reason, 16 students gave one reason, 7 students gave two reasons, and 2 students gave 3 reasons. In the 3rd OC, 6 students did not gave reason, 16 students gave one reason, 7 students gave two reason, and 3 students gave three reasons. From the data, it can be concluded that the Critical Thinking of the students improved after the teacher and the team developed the materials, selected the classroom activity. The teacher followed the steps in *Sekawan-P*.

Discussion

The Critical Thinking skill of the students can be observed and seen. The indicators of the skills are that they could analyze, evaluate, and create. First, students have Critical Thinking skill in speaking if they can analyze a problem given. It means that they are able to identify the problems given. In speaking skill, they can express what problems dealing the topics they choose from various points of view.

Here are some examples of the students' critical thinking.

1. One group in Class XI-IPA 3 chose the topic "You fall in love with someone, but s/he loves someone else". Student A asked to Student B that he had a problem. He fell in love with someone, but she loved someone else. He asked what he should do. Student B answered that love was beautiful, it was painful. If he loved to someone, but the girl did not give response, he could leave her. He stated two reasons. First, he was still young, so he should focus to reach his goal of life. Second, there were thousands girls waited for him. She was not the only girl. He could get more intelligent and beautiful one.
2. One group in Class XI-IPA 4 discussed about "Going to Padang Restaurant or Up-normal Café?" Student C asked to Student D and Student E: "Where should we go after this, to Padang Restaurant or Up-normal Café?" Student D answered that it was better to go Padang Restaurant, as she did not have much money and there were a lot of menus they could choose. Besides, the place was close to the school. Student E preferred to go to Up-Normal Café with some reasons. The first reason was the place was comfortable and instagramable. It was the right place for young people like them. They could take pictures and uploaded them in their

Instagram. The choice of menu was varied, although the price was more expensive.

3. One group in Class XI-IPA 5 talked about Online Transportation.

Student F asked to student G about the trend that many students preferred to use this mode transportation. Student G gave his opinion that using online transportation gave advantages disadvantages. He explained the advantages were they did not have to buy a motor cycle which meant they had to think provide money. Then, they never thought about the fuel, and they felt safe because they were spared from theft. One of the disadvantages was that he could not go anywhere, as he had to pay more. He also admitted, although he could not go hanging around with his friends, he could focus going to one place only.

From the three examples above show that the Critical Thinking of the students improves. The first example shows that the student can identify the problem. He has already analyzed and evaluated by giving two reasons for his suggestion. Example 2 shows the two students more elaborated their reasons by giving the positive and negative sides. In example 3. Student F and Student G discussed about online transportation. Student G compared the problem of using the mode transportation with personal transportation, in this case motor cycle, from economic and safety points of view. He thought about the positive things of using the mode in term of how much money he spent for this mode comparing using his own motor car. Besides, using this mode was safer.

From the example above, the students' Critical Thinking in speaking skill can be seen from their opinions. In this case, the students are able to analyze, evaluate, and make the best solution or choice. Besides, they are able to evaluate comparing the problems from various points of view. They are able to choose the right solution based on their evaluation. Finally, they can give the best suggestion. Those ideas are in line with Baharal (2008) in Brookhart (2010) who stated that Critical Thinking includes reasoning, questioning and investigating, observing and describing, comparing and connecting, finding complexity, and exploring viewpoints.

Besides, to train Critical Thinking of the students, English teachers should apply teaching strategies, including developing materials and learning activities. Developing materials, in this case, is by selecting the up-to-date topics that the students are familiar and interested in. Learning activities are activities that engage them to develop and

practice to use English for communication in context. The activities promote them actively participated, beginning from deciding topics which are suitable with their interest, planning an investigation activity, conducting an investigation to see environmental problems, presenting report, discussing the problems in the class, and providing solution to the problem. Those things will stimulate their Critical Thinking. The idea is line with Romanowski and Nasser (2012) who state that Critical Thinking is ability that students can learn. When teachers often train them, they become good critical thinkers.

As mentioned above that *Sekawan-P* is adopted from Project Based Learning. The results of the research proved that this teaching model could help the students to train their Critical Thinking. This finding supports the previous researches by Ellis (2004), Patton (2012), and Nurhajati (2016) who stated that Project Based Learning gives experience students to solve a problem by sharing and discussing with their peer. The experience is very useful for them to face the real problems happened surround them and help them to get better Critical Thinking.

CONCLUSION

All school graduates must have Critical Thinking skill. It is one of the skills needed to face the Industrial Era 4.0. Teachers can train this skill by applying a teaching model called *Sekawan-P*. This teaching model proves that it helps the English teacher do a sequence of teaching steps. The steps are selecting materials, planning, developing, and presenting. By following the steps, the teacher can make a good preparation and control the classroom activity to improve the Critical Thinking of the students. Realizing the process of the research and the findings, it is recommended for English teachers to make some innovation, including the teaching model. One of the suggested models is *Sekawan-P*.

REFERENCES

- Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How To Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills In Your Classroom*. ASCD
- Ellis, E. (2004). *What's the Big Deal with Graphic Organizers?*. (online). Available at http://www.Graphic_organizers.Org.

- Jenicek, M.(2006).*A Physician's Self-Paced Guide to Critical Thinking*. Chicago: AMA Press.
- Lewis, C. (2002). *Lesson Study: A handbook of Teacher-Led Instructional Change*. Philadelphia.PA: Research for Better School.
- Nunan. D. (2004). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Nurhajati, D. (2016). *Project-Based Learning Used to Develop Supplementary Materials for Writing Skill*. ASIA EFL Journal, Indonesian Conference Edition December 2016. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/9928/research-editions/2016/12/aej-tesol-indonesia-conference-volume-2/#squelch-taas-tab-content-0-1>
- Patton, M. (2012). *Work that matters: The teachers' Guide to Project-Based Learning*. London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Romanowski, M.H. and Nasser, R. (2012), "*How Critical Thinking is taught in Qatari independentschools' social studies classrooms: teachers' perspectives*", International Journal of Education, Vol. 4 No. 1.https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298833146_Improving_critical_thinking_skills_through_the_integration_of_problem_based_learning_and_group_investigation
- Wang-Iverson P., and Yoshida, M. (2015). *Building Our Understanding of Lesson Study*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.
- Zahroh, N. and Wardani. H.K. (2011). Using Lesson Study to Improve English language Teaching and Learning. In Cahyani, H. and Cahyono, B.Y. (Eds) *Best Practices in the Teaching of English*. (pp.457-480). Malang: State University of Malang Press.
- Zubaidah, Siti. 2018 Mengenal 4C: Learning and Innovation untukMenghadapi Era RevolusiIndustri 4.0. Article in "*2nd Science Education National Conference*".UniversitasTrunojoyo, Bangkalan, Madura. Pp. 1-18.