

CRITICAL THINKING IMPLEMENTATION ON EFL STUDENTS' RHETORICAL SUMMARY IN READING FOR RESEARCH COURSE

Ilham Devara Hendar Putra

Universitas Negeri Surabaya

ilham.17020084032@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Dewasa ini, aliansi keilmuan abad ke-21 telah menetapkan kemampuan berpikir kritis sebagai wujud kesuksesan siswa dalam belajar. Untuk mencapai tujuan ini, *rhetorical summary* disajikan untuk mengintegrasikan pemikiran kritis siswa dengan membuat ringkasan yang sangat terorganisir. Maka dari itu, penelitian ini dilakukan untuk menyajikan bagaimana kemampuan mahasiswa bahasa Inggris untuk berpikir kritis diterapkan dalam penulisan *rhetorical summary* mereka dan menyelidiki bagaimana mereka menggunakan pemikiran kritis mereka dalam menyusun penulisan *rhetorical summary*. Hasil penulisan *rhetorical summary* mahasiswa jurusan bahasa Inggris menjadi objek penelitian ini dan subjeknya adalah 24 mahasiswa di salah satu mata kuliah *Reading for Research* Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Selanjutnya, tiga instrumen digunakan dalam penelitian ini — dua wajib dan satu pelengkap. Instrumen wajib pertama adalah rubrik *rhetorical summary* dan berpikir kritis, sedangkan instrumen wajib kedua adalah kuesioner. Selain itu, instrumen pelengkap berupa wawancara juga digunakan. Perlu dicatat bahwa data akan dianalisis secara kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kemampuan berpikir kritis siswa telah diimplementasikan dalam setiap struktur dalam ringkasan dengan mengikuti kriteria berpikir kritis. Disamping itu, hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa siswa menggunakan kemampuan berpikir kritis tidak hanya dalam menyusun *rhetorical summary* mereka, namun juga dalam menentukan solusi terbaik mereka terhadap berbagai tantangan yang mereka hadapi saat sedang perjalanan menyusun *rhetorical summary*.

Kata Kunci: berpikir kritis, *rhetorical summary*, kelas *Reading for Research*.

Abstract

In recent decades, the 21st-century skills alliance has established critical thinking skills to achieve students' success. The Rhetorical Summary was presented to incorporate the students' critical thinking by constructing a highly organised summary to achieve this goal. Therefore, this study is conducted to present how EFL students' critical thinking is implemented in their rhetorical summary writing and investigate how they use their critical thinking in composing their rhetorical summary writing. English department students' rhetorical summary writing results would be the objects of this study. The subjects were 24 students in one of the Reading for Research Courses of State University of Surabaya. Next, three instruments were utilised in this study—two compulsory and one complementary. The first compulsory instrument is the rhetorical summary and critical thinking rubric, while the second one is the questionnaire. Additionally, the complementary instrument is an unstructured format interview. It should be noted that the data would be analysed qualitatively. The results revealed that the students' critical thinking had been implemented in each structure within the summary by following the critical thinking criteria. Furthermore, it was discovered that the students used critical thinking to compose their rhetorical summary and determine their best solutions towards the challenges they encountered while writing is on the move.

Keywords: critical thinking, rhetorical summary, Reading for Research Course.

INTRODUCTION

On December 3rd, 2018, PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) released an alarming fact that Indonesian students' reading rank had dropped to 72nd out of 77 countries (Tehusijarana, 2019). Since taking part in PISA in 2000, Indonesia has had an exhilarating evolution in the educational system to establish good

wealthiness and gradual outgrowth. A gradual decreasing number of students' reading performance reveals that this skill has become a crucial part of being raised to accomplish both students' learning and educational development. The main philosophy behind choosing to concentrate on the comprehension of students' academic skills is social constructivism—a learning theory grounded on Vygotsky's thoughts (1978). He claims that human

improvement is culturally determined, and information is built through the interpersonal communication (McKinley, 2015). Therefore, critical reading must be incorporated in students' learning since it is believed as an act of verbal reasoning towards particular material by integrating rules, thoughts, and the reader's principles (Suarcaya & Prasasti, 2017).

As an outcome of student success, educators have long been alerted of the value of critical thinking skills. This skill includes analysing principles and evidence from an analytical position and then challenging this data in the context of our own beliefs, perceptions, and personal ideology (Judge, Jones, & McCreery, 2009). Furthermore, the current advanced Common Core State Principles embody critical thinking as a concept of multi-capability sufficient for the institution and future employment (Lai, 2011). Henceforth, critical thinking requires more than one way of looking at a problem—all the positive and negative things towards a particular issue (Babaci-Wilhite, 2020).

According to Paul & Elder (2020), critical thinking is an act of interpreting and investigating thought patterns. These actions encourage one's good communication and problem-solving skills by explicitly cultivating intellectual values. Therefore, considerate critical thinking guidance is as follows: summarising topic or argument, considering previous assumptions, communicating a point of view, providing evidence of research, and drawing implications. As well as the criteria above, the researcher will also utilise a critical thinking rubric in appendices.

As claimed by Woodworth (2009), a rhetorical summary is a perfectly organised paragraph that consists of four sentences that document a written discourse unit's core components. Relevant information is needed for any one of the four sentences. A rhetorical summary distinguishes from a summary by becoming a rather unbiased, extra critical rearrangement of either the substance or process of the original text. In that situation, students' rhetorical summary could be thought of as a succinct depiction of how a particular text both states and implies.

The following is the example of a Rhetorical Summary:

Iftanti, E. (2015). What Makes EFL Students Establish Good Reading Habits in English. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(5), 365–374. <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2015/May-2015/31.pdf>
Erna Iftanti, in her research "What Makes EFL Students Establish Good Reading Habits in English" (2015), justifies that reaching a good reading skill does not only use its function as a source of

information but also use it as an instrument to encourage one's language component to expand. Iftanti supports her justification by collecting in-depth interview towards five selected students of the English Department and categorised as a multi-case study because the subjects already have good reading habits in English. This research aims to examine EFL students' reading habit foundation to widen interest in conducting literacy research in Indonesia. The author writes her article in a formal tone for English teachers, parents, and librarians.

As previously proposed by Woodworth (2009), here is the explanation of how a rhetorical summary works: the very first sentence contains the name of the author, category, the subject of the research, the year in parentheses; the rhetorically active verb; as well as 'THAT' section comprising the main claim in the text. The second sentence provides a description, generally in chronological order, of how the author constructs and support the assertion. The third sentence gives the details of the explicable objective of the author, preceded by the phrase 'to'. The fourth sentence generates a specification of the targeted readers, and the interrelation of the author acknowledges the audience.

On that account, the Reading for Research Course is conducted to assist students in demonstrating how critical reading and critical writing work integratedly into the research process. The core subjects in this course will be reflected on the emerging EFL problems nowadays. Throughout the course, students are engaged in numerous exercises intended to individually create a rhetorical summary based on their preferred topic. In addition, this subject also seeks to construct the students' habits of reading for their educational journey by discovering, evaluating, and synthesising information needed in scientific articles from international journals all over the world according to their concern, including their critical and extensive reading skills (*Basic Course Outline: Reading for Research*, 2021).

Considering several shreds of evidence proving the Indonesian EFL students' lack of interest in reading and since there was a few study in implementing students' critical thinking in writing a rhetorical summary which will lead them to poor critical thinking skills, the researcher focused on describing the Indonesian EFL students' critical thinking skills implementation through rhetorical summary writing. As a result, the followings are formulated research objectives:

1. To present how EFL students' critical thinking is implemented in their rhetorical summary writing.

2. To investigate how EFL students use their critical thinking in composing their rhetorical summary writing.

METHOD

This study is conducted by using a descriptive qualitative research design. The researcher chose this research design because it is used to discover more about the students' performance, new ideas, or recognising complicated issues. Thus, this research design is very suitable if it is conducted in the university setting by taking a look at in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information which produced the results in the form of descriptions (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano, & Morales, 2007; Yin, 2003). The English department students' rhetorical summary writing results was the object of this study, particularly in one of the Reading for Research courses in Unesa. Subsequently, this research carried out 24 fifth-semester English department students. The researcher decided on the subjects because they must write a Rhetorical Summary for this compulsory course. In connection with this study, the researcher selected three instruments: two compulsory instruments—rhetorical summary results with critical thinking rubric and questionnaire—and one complementary instrument—interview. To discuss the first research objective, the researcher utilised rhetorical summary results with a critical thinking rubric. Meanwhile, the questionnaire and interview were utilised by the researcher to discuss the second research objective. In analysing the obtained data, the process may seem overwhelming yet manageable when broken down into three key stages as proposed by Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker (2014), which are familiarising-organising, coding-reducing, and lastly, interpreting-representing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Critical Thinking Implementation in the EFL Students' Rhetorical Summary Writing

Having relevant for the first research objective, the researcher analysed the students' rhetorical summary writing by utilising a rubric entitled "Analysing the Students' Critical Thinking in Rhetorical Summary Rubric" adapted from Ball State University and the State University of Surabaya. As previously declared, this rubric was chosen by considering the critical thinking guiding criteria proposed by Paul & Elder (2020) combined with the elements of rhetorical summary introduced by Woodworth (2009) to unveil a succinct depiction of how EFL students' critical thinking was implemented within their rhetorical summary. As soon as the analysis had been conducted through the rubric, it was discovered that the results of students' writing were the highly organised

rhetorical summary. Therefore, the total element in the rubric and the number of sentences, in summary, were equal. It is important to note that, in this research, the researcher analysed all of the 24 participants then chose two representatives for each category: expert, developing, and novice.

Student 1

Nazlınur Göktürk, in his article "Examining The Effectiveness of Digital Video Recordings on Oral Performance of EFL Learners" (2016), claims that speaking skills and students' self-confidence can increase in using digital video recordings. However, the aspects of students' oral fluency did not significantly increase. Nazlınur supports his idea by providing a preliminary examination and final examination modified from IELTS as placement tests and video recording assignments that students had to collect weekly to measure their fluency. The results of their scores will be analysed using an analytic scale as quantitative analysis. He also uses qualitative analysis of interviews with the Facebook group to know students' perceptions regarding digital video recorded in oral class. Participants who participate in this study are 10 EFL students from the Oral Communication course at Hacettepe University. The students are from intermediate proficiency grade in using English. The author proposes to test the productiveness of digital video recorded on EFL students' verbal actions to know whether it can increase students' fluency. He writes in a formal tone for teachers and students to apply digital video recordings to EFL students' oral performances.

First of all, the rhetorical summary from Student 1 was analysed by the researcher. Based on the results from Student 1, it can be inferred that the first criterion which is summarizing the topic or argument located on the first sentence. Summarizing relies upon the investigation of each section, innovative blending thoughts, also critical thinking (Shokrpour, Sadeghi, & Seddigh, 2013). The results showed that Student 1 consistently demonstrated the ability to organize information, leading to adequate understanding and correctly identified and included all of the following: author's name, title punctuated correctly, and genre. The second criterion still located on the first sentence which is considering the previous assumption showed that assumptions are defined and linked to topic ideas; Student 1 can elaborate on assumptions and discuss implications. This part has a strong claim that showed insight and understanding of the author's position and also included a rhetorically accurate verb. The third criterion located on the third sentence which is communicating a

point of view showed that Student 1 identified her position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources and also the purpose tightly connected to the claim. The fourth criterion located on the second sentence which is providing evidence of the research showed that information is gathered from appropriate and credible sources to support the argument and also specifically addressed primary evidence in the text using accurate language. The fifth criterion located on the fourth sentence which is drawing implications showed that Student 1 explained or testified to the impact of new information and accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience is, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Student 5

Laura Dörrenbächer and Franziska Perels (2016), in the article, "More? Evaluation of interventions to encourage self-directed learning in tertiary institutions " expresses that assessing various intercessions can urge students to portray the impacts of direct preparing in the SRL methodology, boost self-monitoring and SRL through learning journals, and join two strategies. They support their claim by conducting a quasi-experimental 2x2x2 factorial control team design regarding the impact of content-independent SRL preparation, learning diaries, and their mixtures. The best thought, using pre-post measures and SRL measurements and scientific interchangeability of measures, used to evaluate the impact of the intervention on 173 students. The authors aim to suggest that using a combination of SRL courses and diaries for the effect of a single intervention is to clarify the effectiveness of both methods. The author writes in a formal tone for university students, teachers, policymakers and other researchers. This article published in Elsevier International Journal of Educational Research (Q1) provides exciting ideas related to self-regulation learning in college. The author uses formal language and easy to understand.

Based on the results from Student 5 above, it was shown that the first criterion which is located on the first sentence, Student 5 consistently demonstrated the ability to organize information, leading to adequate understanding and correctly identified and included all of the following: author's name, title punctuated correctly, and genre. The second criterion still located on the first sentence which is considering the previous assumption. According to Oldham (2021), only a complete, declarative sentence may be used to express an assumption. The

results showed that assumptions are defined and linked to topic ideas; Student 5 can elaborate on assumptions and discuss implications. This part has a strong claim that showed insight and understanding of the author's position and also included a rhetorically accurate verb. The third criterion located on the third sentence which is communicating a point of view showed that Student 5 identified her position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources and also the purpose tightly connected to the claim. The fourth criterion located on the second sentence which is providing evidence of the research showed that information is gathered from appropriate and credible sources to support the argument and also specifically addressed primary evidence in the text using accurate language. The fifth criterion located on the fourth sentence which is drawing implications showed that Student 5 explained or testified to the impact of new information and accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience is, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Student 8

Siti Nurhasanah, in the article "The Use of Community Language Learning Method to Increase the Students' Participation in Classroom Conversation", claims that Community Language Learning Method can improve students engagement to speak in conversation and stimulate the willingness to learn. Hasanah supports her statement by conducting observation, giving pretest and post-test for International Class 2013 students at IAIN Salatiga. Her purpose is to investigate CLL effectiveness to boost students engagement in class. She writes in a formal tone for teachers and researchers focuses on Community Language Learning Method implementation.

The results of Student 8's rhetorical summary showed that summarizing the topic is located on the first sentence, she inconsistently demonstrated the ability to organize information, leading to inadequate understanding and included almost all of the important details of the author's, genre, and title punctuated correctly. The second criterion still located on the first sentence which is considering the previous assumption showed that assumptions are defined and linked to topic ideas; Student 8 can elaborate on assumptions and discuss implications. This part has a strong claim that showed insight and understanding of the author's position and also included a rhetorically accurate verb. The third criterion is located in the third sentence which is communicating a point of view. In line with this, communicating a point of view from

believable, relevant, and consistent must be associated with the author's principles (The Communications Network, 2021). The results showed that Student 8 identified her position on the issue, drawing support from experience and purpose that was generic or mimics the claim. The fourth criterion located on the second sentence which is providing evidence of the research showed that information is gathered from appropriate and credible sources to support the argument and also specifically addressed primary evidence in the text using accurate language. The fifth criterion located on the fourth sentence which is drawing implications showed that Student 8 explained or testified to the impact of new information and accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience is, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Student 11

Nicola Galloway and Heath Rose, in the article, *Incorporating Global Englishes into the ELT Classroom*, argue that poster presentation can help students to be more aware of global issue happen related to English as Second Language. Galloway and Rose support their argument by using Global English Language Teaching or GELT as the core ideology in their research. The authors' purpose is to investigate whether poster presentation can raise students awareness to educate them that English in the world has many varieties and can choose what they want to speak in the teaching-learning process. The authors write in a formal tone for research interested in the development of the 21st-century era, the teacher who wants to develop students awareness in the modern era.

In the rhetorical summary writing above, it was shown that the first criterion that is summarizing the topic or argument was located in the first sentence of the paragraph. Student 11 inconsistently demonstrated the ability to organize information, leading to inadequate understanding and included almost all of the important details of the author's, genre and title punctuated correctly. The second criterion still located on the first sentence which is considering the previous assumption showed that assumptions were defined and linked to topic ideas, but not clearly explained or elaborated upon and also the rhetorically accurate verb may be somewhat generic, and the author's claim was accurate. The third criterion located on the third sentence which is communicating a point of view showed that Student 11 identified her position on the issue, drew support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources and also purpose tightly connected to the claim. The fourth criterion located on the

second sentence which is providing evidence of the research such as data, facts, quotes, claims, statistics, analysis, and hypotheses must be utilised to represent rhetorical summary writing (University of Leeds, 2021). The result showed that Student 11 accepted evidence at face value, even if it is incorrect, inadequate, or misinterpreted to support the argument. She addressed relevant evidence in the text and used correct language but may overlook a primary piece of evidence. The fifth criteria located on the fourth sentence which is drawing implications showed that Student 11 explained or testified to the impact of new information and accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience is, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Student 17

Fulan Liu and Paul Stapleton, in the article, *Connecting writing assessment with critical thinking: An exploratory study of alternative rhetorical functions and objects of inquiry in writing prompts*. They claim that giving a prompt of problem-solving in writing skills can enhance students' writing performance and thinking processes. They support their claim by comparing two groups of Chinese undergraduates made up of a comparison group and an experimental group. The authors' purpose is to find the relationship between a prompt on writing affect writing performance and the level of thinking, so it gives an alternative way to teach a higher level of thinking through writing courses for university students. The authors write in a formal tone for EFL instructors, undergraduate lecturers, and researchers interested in academic writing and language acquisition.

Based on the results from Student 17 above, it was shown that the first criterion which is summarizing the topic or argument, located on the first sentence. She did not organize information, leading to inadequate understanding and misses most or all of the author's name, genre, and title. The second criteria still located on the first sentence which is considering previous assumptions showed that assumptions were defined and linked to topic ideas, but not clearly explained or elaborated upon. The rhetorically accurate verb may be somewhat generic, and the author's claim is accurate. The third criterion located on the third sentence which is communicating a point of view showed that Student 17 identified her position on the issue, drawing support from experience, and information not available from assigned sources and also the purpose tightly connected to the claim. The fourth criterion located on the second sentence which is providing evidence of the

research showed that information is gathered from appropriate and credible sources to support the argument and also specifically addressed primary evidence in the text using accurate language. The fifth criteria located in the fourth sentence which is drawing implications since interpreting your conclusions in the context of rhetorical summary aids readers in comprehending the significance of your research—how it contributes to and broadens knowledge (Australian National University, 2021). The results showed that Student 17 explained or testified to the impact of new information. Moreover, she accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience is, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Student 25

In this article, Saeidi et al. assert that the most effective vocabulary instructions among focus on form (dictogloss task), focus on meaning (FoM), and Focus on word list is focus on form (dictogloss task). According to Saeidi et al., focus on form is considered a good teaching strategy because it is student-centred that improves their lexical acquisition by responding to the assumed problem spontaneously. This study aims to examine the efficiency of three kinds of vocabulary instruction that have been mentioned above. The authors write in a formal tone for second language teachers to teach L2 vocabulary.

The results of Student 25's rhetorical summary showed that summarizing topic is located on the first sentence. Summarizing relies upon the investigation of each section, innovative blending thoughts, also critical thinking (Shokrpour et al., 2013). The results showed that Student 25 did not organize information, leading to inadequate understanding and misses most or all of the author's name genre, and title. The second criterion still located on the first sentence which is considering previous assumptions showed that assumptions were defined, but not explained as having significance to the position and misread or misstated the author's claim and also inaccurate or weak verb was used. The third criteria located on the third sentence which is communicating a point of view showed that Student 25 identified her position on the issue, drew support from experience and purpose was generic or mimic the claim. The fourth criteria located on the second sentence which is providing evidence of the research showed that Student 25 accepted evidence at face value, even if it is incorrect, inadequate, or misinterpreted to support the argument and addressed relevant evidence in the text and used correct language but may overlook a primary piece of evidence. The fifth criteria located on the

fourth sentence which is drawing implications which showed that Student 25 explained or testified to the impact of new information and accurately identified the tone, clearly explained who the target audience was, but may overlook why this audience would be receptive to the message.

Last but not least, to make sure that the students' works were authentic, the researcher used *Turnitin* as a tool for checking the level of plagiarism. It has been proven that 7 of the nine students' *Turnitin* results were below 20%. Most of the students were using their diction in composing their rhetorical summary writing.

The EFL Students' Use of Critical Thinking in Composing Rhetorical Summary Writing

By the purpose to collect the data in discussing the second research objective, the researcher proposed to utilise two instruments; questionnaire as compulsory and interview as complementary. The total number of the questions in the questionnaire was more or less 13 questions. Moreover, these questions were adapted from Ball State University by incorporating the critical thinking prominent criteria presented by Paul & Elder (2020) integrated with the components of rhetorical summary organised by Woodworth (2009) to investigate several tangible proofs on how EFL students use their critical thinking in composing their rhetorical summary writing.

First and foremost, it is the question about EFL students' general understanding of rhetorical summary; "What do you know about the rhetorical summary? Are there any significant differences between the regular summary?" the researcher concluded that 5 out of 6 EFL students can elaborate the true meaning of Rhetorical Summary and also differentiate between the regular one as stated by Student 1, e.g., "*Rhetorical summary is the way, to sum up, our understanding of how the text works rhetorically while regular summary is a general representation of what a text says*" and Student 8, e.g. "*Rhetorical summary is more likely purposed to summarise an article as our references later. The structure is also organised, such as the author, what the author purposes, etc. But the regular summary is free*". Although Student 11 said that she just defined the meaning of rhetorical summary, the overall responses show the best understanding of this topic, e.g., "Yes, because there are steps that *we should follow in writing rhetorical summary*".

Next, moving on to the second question about EFL students' considerable preparations in a way to make rhetorical summary; "Before constructing your rhetorical summary, what are the steps do you usually take into considerations?" the researcher drew the inference that 5

out of 6 EFL students had their steps to consider such as checking the content quality, reading the text repeatedly, highlighting specific information, outlining the ideas, and many more as stated by Student 8, e.g., *"Looking for credible sources, note the author, read the abstract, and write the rhetorical summary"* and Student 1, e.g., *"Read the text more than once and highlight the important points"*. Nevertheless, one ambiguous questionnaire response still existed from Student 11, e.g., *"The title, the author, the journal rank"*. However, it has been clarified clearly through an interview by the researcher, e.g., *"Determine the title and author, read the abstract, highlight point which will be written in rhetorical summary"*. Overall, the students have their guiding principle and know what to do before composing the rhetorical summary.

Then, in answering the third question about EFL students' ability to identify which scientific works suits their topic the most; *"In writing rhetorical summary, various scientific works need to be selected and in-line with your topic. Please identify each of them according to your preferred topic."* The researcher implied that all EFL students have identified and selected the scientific works they are going to use in summary. The best response from Student 5 showed that she truly identified the works by matching the various topic similarities within her work, e.g., *"I chose the topic Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) in writing for higher education students. Here are some of the article titles that I use: Evaluation of Interventions to Encourage Self-Regulated Learning in Tertiary Institutions, The Use of Self-Regulation Strategies by Foreign Language Learners and Their Role in Language Attainment, etc."*. On top of that, the 5 out of 6 responses also have their scheme to identify the scientific works as stated by Student 1, e.g., *"Find the source of articles that relate with our topic, find the source of articles that have a good accreditation, find the source of articles that you understand so well"* and Student 25, e.g., *"Use the keywords, find on trustable sources and authors, and get a recommendation from lecturer"*.

As well as that, to answer the fourth question about EFL students' strategy to classify the quality of numerous scientific works and choose them as one of their summary references; *"There are so many reputable sources of scientific works at international journals around the world. How do you classify and select them into your rhetorical summary?"* then the results showed that all the EFL students used the *Scimago Journal Rank* (International rank Q1-Q4) and *Sinta* (Indonesian rank S1-S4) website to discover and classify particular journal's reputation as stated by Student 11, e.g., *"I will classify and select it based on journal rank in Scimago or Sinta and select them based on my topic"*. Moreover, they checked into the

article's year of publication at least five years back and seven years back for the book as stated by Student 5, e.g., *"Choosing a journal whose publication year is not too old, at least five years back"*. The chosen references will not be outdated and more selective in selecting the articles since the selected ones must be in line with the writer's preferred topic. As per usual, one ambiguous response from Student 1, e.g., *"When looking for a journal, you don't always have to use a journal that has the same topic that you want to summarise"*, had been strengthened through the answer of the interview by the researcher, e.g., *"Check again with Scimago/Sinta, Q1 to Q3, and S1"*.

Furthermore, for answering the fifth question about EFL students' aptitude in making the correlation among the selected works and considering the values for their preferred topic, *"How do you define the relationships and their values between your preferred topic with the selected scientific works?"* The researcher found that all EFL students were mainly capable of understanding the relationship and the value of the selected scientific works in their preferred topic. For example, some responses stated that the title, topic, keywords, research gap, and thesis statement are frequently part of the scientific works to seek the correlation within the summary topic. For example, Student 17 *"By looking at the keywords of the article. I will select it if it has a similar scope with my topic"* and Student 5, e.g., *"Looking at the main thesis and determining the important points"*. Indeed, two ambiguous responses from Student 1, e.g., *"This makes it very easy to find the information we want to summarise"* and Student 11, e.g., *"It helps me to support my arguments in explaining my topic"*, had been clarified with the interview result by the researcher, e.g., *"I just highlight the important points that I want to put within"* and *"I read the abstract over and over again to understand the important meaning"*.

Moreover, to answer the sixth question about EFL students' strategies in composing their rhetorical summary—adopted or adapted composition; *"How do you compose your rhetorical summary? Do you adopt or adapt the experts' ideas?"* here the researcher drew the inference that 5 out of 6 EFL students were adapting the experts' ideas through paraphrasing. Then, several students chose to adopt the experts' ideas but also through paraphrasing as stated by Student 1, e.g., *"Adopt more sentences from the researchers, but we must paraphrase and include citation too"*. Moreover, Student 5 decided to adapt and adopt the experts' ideas to avoid plagiarism issues, e.g., *"I adopted according to the example, but for the contents of the summary I adapted with my sentences"*. Still, the researcher received one ambiguous response from Student 17, e.g., *"I try to arrange the rhetorical summary by my*

understanding using the certain form", but the overall data can be understood as expected.

Equally important, moving on to the seventh question about EFL students' elaboration of their writing stages, "Please elaborate your writing stages in brief." the results demonstrated that every EFL students have various stages of writing. The main differences can only be seen in the way they elaborate their stages, which were elaborated by Student 5, e.g., *"Read the text several times, determine the main topic and the important information, write a summary in your own words, include the source of text, name of the author, date of publication, and match the summary you created with the original for viewing accuracy."* or less elaborated by Student 17 *"Having a plan, composing a draft, editing draft, evaluating"*. In general, the response includes deciding the topic, finding suitable references, reading the works repeatedly, outlining the ideas, and starting writing. The response implies that they must run through stages in writing a certain summary and cannot be done instantly.

On top of that, for answering the eighth question about EFL students' techniques in arranging the rhetorical summary structures coherently; "How do you manage the structures of rhetorical summary to arrange the first until the fourth sentence? Elaborate your answer." The responses showed that 4 out of 6 EFL students had managed their structures of a proper rhetorical summary structure—author names, title, claims, supports, purposes, and tones suggested by the teachers or lecturers as stated by Student 5, e.g., *"I manage the structure of the summary of the first to fourth sentences according to the sample templates"*. Even though Student 1 showed her less-managed structure of rhetorical summary, which made the writing process becomes difficult, e.g., *"I never do it coherently"*, she had clarified her answer through interview results, e.g., *"Previously, it was highlighted, when it was possible, then it was entered into each structure summary with paraphrasing"*. Next, the researcher had interviewed one ambiguous response from Student 25, e.g., *"Start from general information to specific information"* to make it clear, e.g., *"The first stage is reading, then keywords, paraphrase, outline, then combining these ideas into paragraphs to compose our views on how these authors write about this"*.

In-line manner, to answer the ninth question about EFL students' critical thinking skill for seeking the ideas of each summary structures; "How do you critically discover the essence of each structure of the rhetorical summary inside the scientific works?" The results of this question revealed that all of the EFL students had discovered the important ideas critically by reading the content intensively, highlighting specific information, analysing the results of

the study, and discussing with peers as stated by Student 25, e.g., *"Read abstract, read the first sentence of each paragraph, underline important information, read the conclusion, and discuss with friends"*. Moreover, the best response from Student 5 claimed that finding the keyword is the essential way in searching the significant information, e.g., *"Understand the rhetorical structure first and then the content. After that, I read scientific papers by finding what important points I should look for under the rhetorical structure"*.

In answering the tenth question about EFL students' ability to develop their critical thinking skills into their rhetorical summary; "How do you develop your critical thinking rhetorically within your summary?" the results of the responses showed that all of the EFL students have their implemented critical thinking skills in this situation. However, there are two categories of the responses coined by the researcher—critical thinking developed from Student 11, e.g., *"Read the whole article first, highlight the finding which still can be used in my writing, paraphrase the sentence in the article and find my arguments which the article can support"* or yet to develop from Student 1, e.g., *"Try to use their language that is easy to understand but still related with the author's content, so there is no need to repeat reading the entire text again"*. The first category is when the students mainly read the text repeatedly to find the significant ideas. The second category is when the students are using their paraphrasing skills right after discovering the specific information they needed. Based on the interview results, the researcher found that paraphrasing skill was the core element in developing one's critical thinking skills.

Moving to the eleventh question about EFL students' willingness to preserve the uniqueness of their rhetorical summary writing, "Lastly, to be successful, maintaining uniqueness of your work is one of the challenges while you are developing this rhetorical summary. How do you manage this situation in your writing?" The researcher concluded that 5 out of 6 EFL students have their unique efforts in maintaining their masterpieces as stated by Student 8, e.g., *"Write the sentences differently, use rare vocab, and reconstruct my mind mapping"*. However, Student 1 was still being ambiguous, e.g., *"Perhaps the answer is almost the same as the previous question"*. As a result, these proofs imply that the willingness to preserve the uniqueness of the summary is quite high.

Above all, for answering the twelfth question about EFL students' difficulties in writing the rhetorical summary; "Are there any problems you have encountered? Please explain." The results portrayed that every EFL students possessed difficulties in writing the summary. The major difficulties suffered by the students were searching the reputable sources, understanding the

unfamiliar terms. Lastly, paraphrasing the ideas, as stated by Student 17, e.g., *"Sometimes, it is quite hard to understand several articles which uploaded in international journal because of many unfamiliar words or academic words"* and Student 1, e.g., *"Paraphrasing is difficult"*.

Lastly, moving on to the thirteenth question about EFL students' way to overcome their problems in composing the rhetorical summary; "Do you have any solutions related to the problems? Please explain in brief.". The result showed that most of the EFL students surprisingly were able to overcome their difficulties in writing. Generally, their resolutions are as follows: keep practising reading, writing down the important ideas, learning how to paraphrase, discussing with friends and lecturers, and also managing positive spiritual vibes within themselves as stated by Student 5, e.g., *"Read the text over and over again until I understand well the content and get the important point from the text"* and Student 25, e.g., *"I have to against my problems by finding some information on google, and for my mental, I have to think positively"*.

The Interview on the EFL Students' Use of Critical Thinking in Composing Rhetorical Summary Writing

As the researcher previously stated, the interview played its role as a complementary instrument in this section—to earn a more in-depth exploration of the EFL students' responses in the previous instrument. Henceforth, the set of questions employed within the questionnaire and the interview were identical. Following the interview, the researcher investigated if the students' interview responses were consistent with their questionnaire responses or the other way around. Without a doubt, the study's findings indicated that the student's responses to the interview questions had matched the questionnaire results and presented broader explanations.

Considering the results of the interview, it can be inferred that the data collected by the researcher has been complete and compelling enough for addressing the answer to the second research objective, which is "to investigate how EFL students use their critical thinking in composing their rhetorical summary writing.". Following explanations for this statement was that, first and foremost, the researcher had already collected the data utilising two compulsory and complementary instruments: a questionnaire and an interview. The second point was that the questionnaire and interview results were by now synchronous.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the rubric analysis towards students' rhetorical summary writing directed for discussing the first research objective, it may conclude that their critical

thinking is implemented in their rhetorical summary, which is arranged from the first sentence until the fourth sentence towards the scientific work. It has been discussed earlier that the act of summarising and paraphrasing was a single unity during the practice and perceived as a member of the tangible proofs of critical thinking. Apart from this, the result of similarity report through *Turnitin* is also portrayed as the example of one's competence in mastering paraphrasing skill.

Henceforth, based on the results of the questionnaire and interview, it should be noted that the students were implementing critical thinking in composing their rhetorical summary ever since they determined their topic, searched the reputable references, and developed the significant information from the sources by following the rhetorical summary structures. To be sure that the selected scientific works were sufficient and appropriate, most of them had certain considerations and went through autonomous principles. Besides, the students have also utilised their implemented critical thinking skills while composing their rhetorical summary and exploring all of the ideas. Throughout the journey of composing their rhetorical summary, the students demonstrated some of the characteristics of critical thinkers. These characteristics had a proclivity to read the articles from numerous sources a couple of times. Being prudent towards significant information beyond the meaning to gain holistic comprehension may bring a better learning outcome in summarising aptitude. As a result, when developing their rhetorical summary writing, the students could perform a critical way of thinking in identifying and determining the most suitable solutions to the challenges they had encountered. Furthermore, the students' questionnaire and interview responses revealed that almost all of them had already identified their challenges and clearly understood what they needed to do to solve them.

Suggestions

Since this study has presented impressive results to achieve both the teaching-learning process and the country's educational development, the researcher recommends a few suggestions for future scholars, EFL lecturers, teachers, and students. First, future researchers must undertake extensive research on this topic, as there are currently only a few related studies. This research may serve as a foundation for them to conduct a similar study. Second, EFL lecturers and teachers are encouraged to broaden their expertise in this field of rhetorical summary and implement it to their students, reflecting its pivotal role in developing critical thinking. Last of all, EFL students must begin searching for details on rhetorical summary writing because most students in Indonesia seem

to be unaware of what a rhetorical summary is or how important it is to their critical thinking advancement.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. K., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to Research in Education* (Ninth Edit; L. Ganster, Ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Babaci-Wilhite, Z. (2020). Learning Critical Thinking Skills Beyond 21st Century for Multidisciplinary Courses. *Journal of Visual Languages & Computing*, Vol. 1, p. 277. Retrieved from https://www.m-culture.go.th/mculture_th/download/king9/Glossary_about_HM_King_Bhumibol_Adulyadej's_Funeral.pdf
- Basic Course Outline: Reading for Research* (p. 3). (2021).
- Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and Implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006287390>
- Drawing Out Implications. (2021). Retrieved April 28, 2021, from Australian National University website: <https://www.anu.edu.au/students/academic-skills/research-writing/conclusions/drawing-out-implications>
- How to Incorporate Evidence. (2021). Retrieved April 28, 2021, from University of Leeds website: https://library.leeds.ac.uk/info/14011/writing/106/academic_writing/4
- How to Write a Rhetorical Summary*. (2012). Retrieved from <https://www.nms.org>
- Judge, B., Jones, P., & McCreery, E. (2009). Study Skills in Education: Critical Thinking Skills for Education Students. *Learning Matters Ltd*. Cornwall: Learning Matters.
- Lai, E. R. (2011). Critical Thinking: A Literature Review. *Pearson*, 35(3), 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1537-2995.1995.35395184278.x>
- McKinley, J. (2015). Critical Argument and Writer Identity: Social Constructivism as a Theoretical Framework for EFL Academic Writing. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 12(3), 184–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2015.1060558>
- Oldham, D. (2021). Assumptions. Retrieved April 28, 2021, from Shoreline Community College website: <https://app.shoreline.edu/doldham/101/HTML/Assumptions.htm>
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2020). *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools 8th Edition-The Foundation for Critical Thinking*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Point of View. (2021). Retrieved April 28, 2021, from The Communications Network website: <https://commatters.org/attribute/point-of-view/>
- Shokrpour, N., Sadeghi, A., & Seddigh, F. (2013). The Effect of Summary Writing as a Critical Reading Strategy on Reading Comprehension of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v3i2.2644>
- Suarcaya, P., & Prasasti, W. D. (2017). Investigating students' critical reading: Critical literacy in EFL setting. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 14(2), 220–232.
- Tehusjarana, K. M. (2019). Not even mediocre? Indonesian students score low in math, reading, science: PISA report. *TheJakartaPost*, p. 1. Retrieved from <https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2019/12/04/not-even-mediocre-indonesian-students-score-low-in-math-reading-science-pisa-report.html>
- Woodworth, M. K. (2009). The Rhetorical Précis. *Rhetoric Review*, 7(1), 156–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198809388846>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Retrieved from <https://doc1.bibliothek.li/acc/flmf044149.pdf>