CHAPTER V
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides findings and discussion of data obtained from the whole instruments utilized in this study. Those instruments of collecting data involve classroom observations, students’ reflective learning journals, students’ reading works, questionnaire, and interview. It starts with the presentation of findings to answer the two research questions pursued in this study in Section 5.2. The findings presentation is then followed with the discussion of findings that have been described previously (Section 5.3).

5.2 Findings

This section presents the findings obtained from the data taken in this study. Firstly, it portrays the findings of the first research question which investigates how the teaching program which incorporates critical literacy assists students to be critically literate (Section 5.2.1). It can be assumed as the summary of findings from various stages of teaching program activities that have been described previously in Chapter IV. Secondly, the section depicts the findings concerning benefits and challenges found during the implementation of this teaching program (Section 5.2.2).

5.2.1 The Incorporation of Critical Literacy to the Teaching Program in Assisting Students’ Critical Literacy Development

With regard to the first research question, it was found that the incorporation of critical literacy to the teaching program had assisted students in junior high school to be critically literate. This assistance of students’ critical literacy development was achieved through three ways. The ways are encouraging students to realize that no text is neutral, establishing democratic atmosphere and non-threatening environment, and positioning teacher as an essential role during the learning process. The
aforementioned ways inserted as the features of various teaching program activities will be described in the following sections.

5.2.1.1 The Encouragement of Students’ Awareness of Text as Value-Laden

In order to be critically literate, students should be firstly aware that “no text is neutral” (Wallace, 2003; Wood, et.al, 2006). Therefore, the first characteristic of this teaching program was encouraging students to be conscious that the texts they meet or create in their daily life are not neutral and as simple as they see. In this study, the teaching program was found effective in encouraging students to realize that notion. It was proven by students’ responds which indicated that the teaching program encouraged students to think and investigate further before believing the information in the texts. The encouragement was employed by having students to read the texts in active and reflective manner, so that they would be able to analyze the texts critically. In this sense, the students were stimulated by the provision of suitable contextual and controversial topic and materials, the distribution of guiding questions to analyze the texts regarding the topic discussed, and the use of various media.

a. The Provision of Suitable Contextual Topics, Authentic Materials, and Various Media

The selection of suitable topics and materials was considered significant in the teaching program which attempted to develop students’ critical literacy. With regard to the learning topics, it was suggested that the practice of critical literacy pedagogy apply the social movement topics around students’ life (Freire & Macedo, 2005) who suggested the social movement topics around students’ life in the practice of critical literacy pedagogy. In this teaching program, there were three topics that were adjusted with the syllabus of English for eighth grade students. As previously mentioned in Chapter IV, the topics were mainly about Indonesia involving My Indonesia, Social Equality of Indonesia, and Natural Disasters in Indonesia. These
topics were considered appropriate to be given for students in the first attempt of incorporation of teaching program to critical literacy. It was because the topics were near with students’ life and likely potential to promote students’ discussion.

The aforementioned description of topics selection was asserted by the data revealed from students’ interview. In this way, all interviewees stated that they preferred the topics that were relevant with their daily life. It was because the topics allowed them to increase their knowledge regarding the issues in a real life. Furthermore, it allowed them to participate actively in “finding the solutions” (Kevin). Based on the interview, it was found that one of the most favorite topics in the teaching program was about social inequality as indicated by one student “it told us about the life of people in the street and how hard their life is, the effect is I can be more tolerant and respect them” (Andy). Hence, the students’ statement showed that the topics in the teaching program enabled them to reflect their life and become more sensitive towards the social condition around their life. It is related with the theory that critical literacy should empower students to be critically conscious about the sensitive issues in the society, then to take action on it (Wood, Soares, & Watson, 2006; Dale & Margison, 2010).

In relation to the teaching materials, various authentic texts from many sources were selected. Based on the classroom observation, the authentic teaching materials were found “beneficial for exploring criticality” (Brown, 1999; Wallace, 2003; Freire, 1998 cited in Emilia, 2005) besides creating teaching learning process more contextual and promoting students’ discussion as also by Freire (1998 cited in Emilia 2005). These findings were supported by Vivi’s statement in the interview who commented that the contextual materials were more interesting than the textbook materials which provided limited visualization. She further stated that the contextual materials triggered her to understand, criticize and give opinions toward issues in daily life. The aforementioned student’s statement became an evidence that the use of authentic materials in the critical literacy pedagogy had enabled students to read “the
word and the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987) and view literacy as “a critical arena for cultural and social power” (Emilia, 2005; Mochinsky, 2008).

Additionally, the teaching program was equipped by various media in delivering the materials. In this teaching program, the students were introduced that text is not only limited to printed text. On the other hand, it also refers to various forms of language and images provided in digital, audio, visual, and audiovisual used as vehicles for people to communicate one another using codes and conventions of society (Leicester & Taylor, 2010; Coffey, 2010; Gee, 2010 in Gustine, 2013; and Metcalfe et.al, 2013). Thus, many media such as printed text, video, pictures, and power point presentation were utilized to support the effectiveness of the teaching program. Besides, literacy, which became the concern of this study, refers to “the ability to use language and images in rich and varied forms to read, write, listen, speak, view, represent, and think critically about ideas” (Expert Panel on Ontario, 2004).

Based on the interview, the use of various media in the teaching program was recognized to be different with the previous regular teaching. On this point, Sabrina said:


The difference between previous teaching learning process and this teaching program is the use of various media such as video, power point, text. Generally, we just learnt from textbook. In this teaching program, we have to analyze the texts provided in various media deeply. It encouraged us to have more vocabularies and think more critical.

From the statement above, it could be seen that the provision of various media supported students to develop their English proficiency and critical capacity. Among all media given, video was the most favorite media for students as stated by Kevin the video “made me as the visual person, easier to understand what is being discussed”.

It is similar to the theory which states that the audiovisual provided by the video can
help develop students’ comprehension of the text by integrating the function of eyes (watch), ears (listen), and brain (watch, ears and identify) (Candlin, 1981; Astarina, 2012). In addition, video provides authentic materials and cultural input (Tobing, 1993; Sherman, 2003; Hu, 2006) which makes the learning process more contextual and culture based. It is in line with the materials suggested for critical literacy which should be authentic and contextual (Freire & Macedo, 1987; Freire, 1998 cited in Emilia, 2005).

b. The Provision of Guiding Questions

In enabling students to prove that no text is neutral, the students were required to analyze the texts through some guiding questions that were given in every unit of meetings. The guiding questions set entailed two main components involving comprehension questions and critical questions. Students’ answers to the aforementioned questions were then analyzed based on critical reading rubric that was adapted from CRHS (2006) and Sandretto (2011). The detail description of those questions including the example of students’ answers unit by unit will be presented in the following sections.

- Comprehension Questions

The utilization of comprehension questions aimed to check students’ understanding concerning the texts discussed. Generally, they consisted of questions which asked students to summarize the main idea and identify the information regarding the texts as displayed in the table below.
Table 5.1
Comprehension Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does the text describe about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is Indonesia known/popular for based on that text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When did Indonesia begin to share many features with the U.S?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who are characters described in the video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Why do they sing on buses? What is their purpose based on that video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do they think education is quite important for them? Why do you say so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What does the text tell about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What were the main causes of flash flood based on the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What did the Forestry Minister Zulkifli Hasan say about the causes of flash flood in Wasior?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By giving the comprehension questions of text in every unit, the students’ development in terms of text comprehension could be analyzed. In this study, there were three students’ reading works taken as the samples to be analyzed. Those reading works were taken from various students’ levels entailing low, mid, and high achiever students, to have the teacher/researcher avoid bias research conclusion.

Based on the analysis of students’ reading works, the sample of low achiever students indicated a development of texts comprehension from reading assignment I, II, and III. In reading assignment I, the student’s comprehension was identified to be in developing level (2) or one level upper than the lowest level. It meant that student identified and summarized the main idea and answered the question with partial accuracy due to limited comprehension. In identifying main idea indicated in no 1, student answers “about country of corrupted”. It seemed less accurate because he did not mention the name of country described in the text. Furthermore, the answer was not arranged grammatically even though it could be likely understood showing about
“a corrupted country”. The similar identification was found in student’s answers to question no 2 and 3. Student’s answer of no 2 was “Indonesia popular because (it) is the third country of corrupted and Indonesia including”. Besides grammatical thing, the answer seemed to be unfinished and incomplete. Student’s answer of no 3, “when it is known for corruption, sloth, poverty, as well as discount prostitution”, was also less accurate or did not really match with the information given in the text.

On the other hand, student’s comprehension was developed to be proficient in reading assignment II and III. According the the rubric, it was because he identified and summarized the main idea or question with nearly complete accuracy due to proficient comprehension. For example, in reading assignment II when the student was asked about characters in the video, he answered “people (in) the street” without mentioning them in detail. However, the word “people” was assumed to represent the whole characters. His comprehension was supported by his answer to question no 2 regarding the purpose of singer beggars singing on the bus. He answered “looking for money and looking for justice”. It was interesting that he mentioned justice besides money in his answer. Presumably, he was able to get an implicit purpose of those beggars from the sarcasm words stated. This finding was supported by the student’s answer to question no 3 who stated that “yes (they think education is important), because for looking (for) money you have to (be) intelligent to find money”. Hence, he understood that some people described in the video realized that education is important even though he did not use the pronoun of reference appropriately.

With regard to the sample of mid achiever students’ reading comprehension, it was assessed that the student was in proficient level (3) in reading assignment I and II. It was because he was able to identify and summarize the main idea and answer the question with nearly complete accuracy due to proficient comprehension. Yet, in reading assignment III, his comprehension developed to be distinguished. His answers to the comprehension questions indicated that he was able able to fully identify and summarize the main idea and questions with complete accuracy. For example, asked about the main causes of flash flood based on the text, the student
answered accurately that it was caused by “environmental damage in upstream areas, where much of the natural forests had been changed for mining and plantation purposes”. This answer was accurately similar to the information in the text. Hence, the student was assumed able to identify the expected answer based on the given question due to his comprehensive understanding to the text.

In relation to high achiever student, it was found that there was no any significant development since this student showed distinguished comprehension or the highest level according to the rubric adapted from CCHS (2006) in all reading assignments. He constantly gave complete and accurate answers in identifying and summarizing the main idea as well as answering the questions. Based on the analysis, it revealed that besides giving accurate answers, the student was also able to arrange the sentences grammatically. Furthermore, he was even able to give hedging in his statement as indicated in his answers to comprehension questions of reading assignment I. Hence, he answered question no 2 of reading assignment I by saying that “Indonesia is known/ popular for corruption, sloth, property, as well as discount prostitution based on that text”. This answer was correct and it was a good point for him to give hedging for that sentence by saying “based on that text”. The hedging might indicate that the statement was based on data, not his opinion. His great comprehension was also shown from his long explanation to question no 3 in reading assignment II which asked whether they, the singing beggars think education is important. He answered:

Yes, but only some of them. The others don’t. Most (of) them who agree with education are having children. It’s clear they want their children (to be) better than them. Some of sing beggars who agree with education cannot write. So they want to learn how to write, so they can write their own music. The others who don’t agree think that education is not important enough. They think money is the one important to fulfill their life necessities. But some of them think that happiness is more important than money because happiness is hard to be found.

Hence, it was obvious that the student had a great comprehension due to his very complete answer. Different from two other previous students, this student identified
two groups of people who agreed and disagreed with the importance of education. He illustrated his answer by giving justification. Therefore, this student was assessed to be in distinguished or highest level of comprehension.

- **Critical Questions**

  Critical questions were meant to help students analyze the texts based on some critical literacy capacities. In this study, there were five capacities of critical literacy taught and analyzed which were in accordance with the model proposed by Lewison, et. al (2002). The capacities that were adopted from Sandretto (2011) in this present study involved: 1) linking a text and personal experience/knowledge; 2) explaining how topic/characters are represented in a text; 3) identifying included and excluded voice within a text; 4) seeing from multiple views; and 5) explaining influence of text on his/her thinking. The aforementioned capacities including the critical questions for each capacity will be discussed below.

  1. **Linking a text and personal experience/knowledge**

     In the corporation of critical literacy to teaching program in this present study, the students were disrupted to investigate “the everyday” experience from the texts that might be found around students’ life as mentioned in the first dimension of CL model proposed by Lewison, et.al (2002). It was meant to encourage students to see that any kind of texts of products or ideas around them are motivated, not neutral, and should be investigated further. Thus, the students were firstly persuaded to link the text and their personal experience/knowledge by some questions presented in the following table.

     **Table 5.2**

     **Critical Questions to Link a Text and Personal Experience/ Knowledge**

     1. Do you think that all information in this text is right?
     2. Do you think that all information in this text is relevant to the topic that you see and feel in your daily life?
3. Are you familiar with this topic? From what media did you know about this topic?
4. What similarities and differences of information do you find in this text and in what you have known?

Through the aforementioned questions that were given in all reading assignments, the students were promoted to consider critical stance (McLaughlin and Devoogd in Jeong, 2012) or using their prior knowledge to understand and relate their ideas and the ideas presented by the author of the text given. Meeting by meeting, students’ capacity in terms of this critical literacy aspect seemed to develop as shown by the following samples of low, mid, and high achiever students.

Based on the analysis, the low achiever student’s capacity in terms of linking a text and personal experience/ knowledge developed. In reading assignment I, the student’s capacity was still unacceptable (i) because he inaccurately linked a text and personal experience/ knowledge. In this sense, he gave unclear and inconsistent answers without justification. For example, when the student was asked whether all information in this text was right, he answered “yes, maybe”. It indicated that he was not really sure with the answer. Then, when he was asked whether the topic/ information was relevant to what he knew in daily life, he said “no, different”. He gave example by saying “yes” familiar with the topic from “social media like twitter”. Asked further about similarities and differences between information in the text and his daily life to support his previous answers, he answered “similarity is the natural wealth of Indonesia and differences in this text it’s clear about Indonesia”. Those answers were quite confusing and not clear, therefore his capacity was still categorized unacceptable.

Nevertheless, in reading assignment II and III, the student’s capacity seemed to develop one step higher to be developing level. This student gave more relevant and consistent answers to these kinds of questions, even though with little explanation due to his restricted vocabularies. According to the rubric, it can be concluded that his critical literacy capacity particularly this aspect was developing as
he was able to link the text and personal experience/ knowledge with insufficient evidence and explanation.

In relation to mid achiever student, it was analyzed that his critical literacy capacity in linking a text and personal experience/ knowledge in reading assignment I, II and III remained proficient. In these all assignments, he linked the texts and personal experience/ knowledge by providing with less but nearly relevant evidence and explanation. For example, in reading assignment II, particularly question no 10, 11, and 12 he wrote that the information was relevant to what he knew in daily life “because at every street there must be minimal one person/ street people”. Hence, he confirmed that the phenomenon shown in the video indeed existed in a real life. He also stated that he knew the information about this topic from news at TV and radio. Asked further about similarities and differences of the information he knew in text and his daily life, he answered with unspecific and less accurate reply. He said:

The similarities are telling about street people. The differences are there are rich people and there are poor people. I’ve known kind of street people’s job.

That answer actually was unclear and little bit irrelevant with the question. Probably, it was because of inadequate explanation and example supporting that answer. Nevertheless, his previous answer was sufficient. Based on the consideration of the whole answers to the questions of this critical literacy aspect, this student was assessed proficient.

The high achiever student was analyzed well in linking a text and personal experience/ knowledge. In all reading assignments, the student’s critical capacity had given satisfying answers which led him to have distinguished level in this capacity. It was proven by to his answers, for example in reading assignment I. To question no 10, he said that not all information in the text was right by justifying “I don’t think that Indonesians practice Jew’s activities which support bacon consumption. The religion that most people in Indonesia follow is Islam which means that most
Indonesians don’t support bacon consumption”. This point was supported by his answers to question no 11, 12, and 13. He wrote:

It is not relevant to the topic that I see and feel in my daily life. I’m only familiar with little information in this text. I knew it from television. The similarities are Indonesia is known for corruption, sloth, poverty, as well as discount prostitution. The difference is mentioned in number 10 (concerning bacon consumption).

His answers were logic and completed by justification and example. The same result was also shown in two other reading assignments. Thus, based on the rubric used, student’s critical literacy in terms of linking a text and personal experience/knowledge was classified to be distinguished.

2. Explaining how topic/characters are represented in a text

The second way of having students investigate the motives of text is by encouraging students to explain how topic/characters are represented in a text. It was triggered by providing students questions as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are statements/information in the text stated clearly? Is there any ambiguous meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think that all information in this text is right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there any difference between text 1 and 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If yes, what is the difference?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your opinion about this condition? Explain!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning those questions, the students particularly those who were taken as samples from low, mid, and high achiever students showed various answers and capacity levels, as discussed below.

In explaining how topic was represented in text, the low achiever student was analyzed to be in developing level. He was able to explain how topic was represented in the text. However he did not provide any evidence to justify his assumption. For example, in reading assignment II, the student assumed that the topic is sad. He said, “it’s sad because the government is protected while the street people are always punished”. Hence, his assumption indicated the recognition of unfairness. However, hi did not complete his assumption with further explanation and example. Thus, he was assessed to be still developing in explaining how topic is represented in a text as he was able to explain this point but he did not provide any justification.

Similar to the low achiever student, the mid achiever student was analyzed to be still in developing due to an absence of evidence and justification for his answer. For example, in reading assignment I, the student thought that the topic is represented correctly except information regarding Jew’s activities. Based on his answers, Indonesia as the topic is represented positively in text 1 and negatively in text 2. No relevant evidence as well as justification made his answers incomplete to be assumed critical. Thus, he was assessed to be in developing level in explaining how topic is represented in a text. Additionally, it was found that there was no development for this student in this capacity of critical literacy.

The high achiever student had proficient level in explaining how topic is represented in a text in reading assignment. The questions of reading assignment I attached in the table 5.3 were answered that some information in the text was stated clearly and some others were not. As a matter of fact, he related it to some vocabularies which were difficult to understand, for example marijuana. However, he could recognize how Indonesia as the topic was represented in the two texts given. He wrote:

\[\text{[student's response: TBC]}\]
The text 1 is telling about Indonesia biography such as Indonesia’s history, language, culture, population, islands, religion, the neighbor countries, etc. The text 2 is telling about Indonesia’s negative side that Indonesia is known/ popular for corruption, sloth, property, as well as discount prostitution, etc.

The student’s answers above were nearly relevant. Furthermore he provided justification and example. For that reason, according to the rubric adapted from Sandretto (2011), his capacity in explaining how topic was represented in the text was assessed to be proficient. In addition, the same level of capacity was given to this student in the next reading assignment. In explaining how topic is represented in a text, this student had not developed his capacity to distinguished level as he did not provide evidence to make his answer more accurate. In conclusion, all students’ samples did not show any improvement from one assignment to other assignment in this capacity of critical literacy.

3. Seeing something from multiple viewpoints

In order to be critically literate, the second dimension of critical literacy model by Lewison, et. al (2002) proposed the notion of interrogating multiple points of view. This dimension encouraged students to see something from different points of view (Luke & Freebody, 1997; and Harste et.al, 2000 cited in Lewison, et.al, 2002). It is essential to remind students that there is no absolute truth in this world. Therefore, the students should be trained to consider other perspective in reading any kind of texts or receiving any kind of information. In this sense, the students were stimulated by the following questions.

Table 5.4

Critical Questions to See Something from Multiple Viewpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment I, II, III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will all reader groups respond the text in the same way? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you agree with this text? What different interpretation of the text is possible?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Those questions were provided to encourage students consider multiple views in interpreting the text. However, it was found that this capacity of critical literacy was quite hard for the students as proven in the following analysis samples of students’ reading works.

In answering questions, concerning seeing something from multiple viewpoints, the student often gave confusing and irrelevant answers. In reading assignment I, it was found that he realized that all reader groups might respond to the text differently by saying “because everyone has different opinion” in number 7. However, he himself had not been able to see other possible interpretation of the text in all reading assignments. For example, in reading assignment I, he answered that the text “maybe (it) is clear, but there is a bit of an unknown word meaning”. This answer was not correlated with the question which asked whether he agreed with the text and what other possible interpretation of the text. It might because of his lack comprehension as reflected in his answer. Nevertheless, in reading assignment II and III, the student also had not been able to give expected answer regarding multiple viewpoints even though his comprehension of the texts was indicated well. Thus, due to inaccurate answer in using multiple views, the student was assessed to be unacceptable in this capacity of critical literacy. Moreover, he did not provide evidence as well as justification.

Similar result was found to mid achiever student in terms of seeing from multiple viewpoints. In reading assignment I and II, the student was analyzed unable to see other interpretation of the text. As indicated in reading assignment I, he was not able to see bias or other possible interpretation of the text since he stated that “the text stated clearly”. However, in reading assignment III, he tried to give other interpretation of the text by saying “I’m not sure but if we unite together I think it will happen soon”. That answer was indeed unclear, particularly the reference of pronounce used. Yet, it was understood that he tried to give different interpretation of text which seemed to blame certain position. Hence, he interpreted differently that if we, who referred to writer, government, activists, and society, work together, it
which referred to overcoming of flood or other natural disaster, will occur shortly. For that answer, it was assumed that student’s capacity in seeing something from multiple views increased from unacceptable to be developing as he did not provide relevant evidence and explanation.

Different from previous two students, the high achiever student seemed to decrease his capacity in responding question of seeing something from multiple viewpoints. In reading assignment I, he responded the questions by assuming that all reader groups would not respond the text in the same way “because every reader has his/her opinion, some readers may agree with the text, some may not”. He himself disagreed with this text since for him:

It could give the information in different ways. The writer shouldn’t offend Indonesia. He/she could write in different ways. People who are offended could sue the writer!

Hence, the student was identified being able to see from different point of views. Based on his ability in relating text to personal information, he did not accept the information as that way and then he assumed that the text could be written by not offending Indonesia. To this point, his critical literacy capacity in terms of multiple views was proficient because he was able to see a text from multiple views with nearly relevant evidence as well as justification. Unfortunately, in reading assignment II and III, he did not show the same capacity as he mentioned totally agree with the texts discussed. For example, in reading assignment II he answered:

I agree (with the text/video) because what the video shows is similar with my daily life. I think there’s no different interpretation of the video since the maker of the video wants to show people about real story of singing beggars.

In this case, the student justified why he agreed with the text and found no other interpretation of the text. Meanwhile, he actually revealed bias or different information in other section. Therefore, in this reading assignment his critical
capacity in seeing from multiple views was unacceptable because he was not able to see the interpretation of the text from other points of view.

4. Identifying included and excluded voice within a text

In critical literacy dimension of interrogating multiple view points, the students was also encouraged to interrogate and discover marginalized voices behind the text (Luke & Freebody, 1997; and Harste et.al, 2000 cited in Lewison, et.al, 2002). It taught them that no text is neutral since an idea of truth depends on who tells to whom. Therefore, the students were supplied by following questions to be able to identify included and excluded voice within a text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who is writing to whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the text trying to do to you? Why is the text written?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who is granted from this text?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What target market does the video want to capture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Why do you think the video is made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who may be advantaged or disadvantaged by the video?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think that the video is fair? Any position which is not described in the video?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Why is the text written?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding identifying included and excluded voice within a text, the low achiever student seemed to develop his capacity from unacceptable in reading assignment I to be developing in reading assignment II. An improvement was indicated by better answer even though it was found likely inconsistent. In reading
assignment II, he said that the target market of the video shown is “Indonesian people” and the video was created “for government”. Unfortunately, he did not explain why the video was created for the government. Hence, he mentioned that the video might disadvantage “people in the street” yet, he also stated that the video was not fair “because the government (was) not described in this video”. It was rather confusing to identify the position he took in viewing this video as he also did not provide any justification as well as example to support his statements. Therefore, he was assessed to be in developing level in terms of identifying included and excluded voice within a text. Nevertheless, in reading assignment III, his capacity decreased to be unacceptable again since he did not provide accurate and relevant answer to the given question.

The mid achiever student remained in developing level in the identification of included and excluded voice within a text. It was because according to the rubric adapted from Sandretto (2011), he identified included and excluded with some relevant evidence without justification. For example, in reading assignment II, he answered question no 5 that the target market of the video was “government and everybody”. In his opinion, the video was created “to make the government and everyone realize how important the street people are”. In this case, he did not explain further what he meant. Presumably, he wanted to convey the existence of those street people which need support from government and society. When the student was asked about who might get advantage and disadvantage from the video, it seemed that the student was incorrect to interpret this question. Therefore, the answer was irrelevant or not as expected. However, he could recognize the unheard voice by saying that the video was not fair because “there’s the position which is not described in the video, it is government”. From the exposition above, this student was likely able in identifying included and excluded voice within a text. However, he did not provide justification and example which could support his statement. Thus, he was assessed to be in developing level for this critical literacy aspect.
Satisfying result was found in high achiever student. In the first assignment, his capacity in terms of identifying included and excluded voice within a text was assessed to be proficient because he provided nearly relevant justification for his answer. In reading assignment II and III, his capacity improved to be distinguished. In reading assignment II, he asserted that the video was made for all people in Indonesia to show Indonesia’s condition, especially its social inequality. In his opinion, who might be advantaged by the video was poor people “because this video showed how hard their live”. On the other hand, people who might be disadvantaged were “the passengers who did not give money to singing beggar and the government who wanted to eliminate the poor people”. This answer indicated that the student was able to identify both excluded and included voice within a text. The statement of government who wanted to eliminate poor people was presumably triggered by the illustration of officer such as SATPOL PP who attempted to drive the poor people out. At this point, he assumed that the video was not fair by justifying that “some beggars use the money for drug, not for their life necessities of education”. Hence, he aimed to say that the video did not describe facts from different aspect. For accurate answers and relevant justification, the student’s capacity in identifying included and excluded voice within a text was analyzed to be in distinguished level as also found in reading assignment III.

5. Explaining influence of text on students’ thinking

The focus of critical literacy is promoting reflection, transformation, and action based on the analysis of power issues (Morgan, 1997; Coffey, 2010; Dale & Hyslop, 2010; Gustine, 2013; Lee, 2011; Jeong, 2012). Thus, taking action in analyzing and using language to criticize unequal and injustice in the daily life is considered to be significant in implementing critical literacy. Nevertheless, taking action is not merely becoming social activist (Lee, 2012; see also Gustine, 2013) which is risky for Indonesian junior high school. Hence, shifting attitude in way of thinking and behaving after reading and analyzing the text also can be assumed as the
form of taking action (Sandretto, 2012; Van Sluys et al., 2006 cited in Gustine, 2013). In this way, students’ taking action can be explored by providing the question below.

### Table 5.6

**Critical Questions to Explain Influence of Text on Students’ Thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment I</th>
<th>1. What lesson can you take after reading and discussing the texts?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reading Assignment II | 1. What is the effect of that video?  
2. What do you think they, government, and you should do to make Indonesia’s condition better (especially in terms of social inequality)? |
| Reading Assignment III| 1. What is the effect of that text? |

In responding the questions of influence of text, the low achiever student was assessed to be in developing level in all reading assignments. It was because his answers were not completed by evidence and justification. For example, in reading assignment II, he said that the effect of the text/video was “must be more feel share for people in street”. In this case, probably he wanted to say that he or everyone must be more tolerant to street people. He did not explain specifically and give example on what the street people, government, and he himself as the student and society should do concerning this social inequality. On the point of that, based on the rubric, he was still developing in explaining influence of text on his thinking.

Different from the low achiever student, the mid achiever student was found improved his capacity in terms of explaining influence of text on his thinking. In reading assignment I, his capacity was developing since his answer was not completed by explanation and example which reflected his thinking or action after
reading the text. On the contrary, in the next reading assignments his capacity improved to be proficient as he provided example. The process of reading this text (video) in the second unit seemed to give a good effect to this student’s thinking and action. He stated that the effect of the video was “to know about the street people, how is the feeling to live in the street, and care to street people”. It showed that the video gave an effect to be more tolerant and aware toward society, particularly poor people. In no 14, the student suggested solution to “help the street people by giving food, money, house, expansion the job vacancy, and school”. Hence, he tried to say that government and all society should help street people in some aspects, particularly economy and education. On the basis of his answers, this student was analyzed to be in proficient level in explaining influence of text on his thinking and action.

Last of all, the high achiever student gave different result from other previous students in terms of explaining influence of text on his thinking. In reading assignment I, he stated that “I learn vocabularies that I don’t know before, I learn more about Indonesia biography” and “the text 2 let us to “mirror” ourselves first about Indonesia” after reading and discussing the texts. His answers reflected that the reading and discussion of the texts influenced his enrichment of linguistic and general knowledge as well as action of being critical. He provided good answers, yet his critical capacity of this aspect was assumed to be developing because of no example/justification. His capacity then perfectly improved in the other reading assignments to be distinguished as he had explained his answer by giving relevant justification. For example, he said that the video gave an effect in making people who watched it know about Indonesia’s condition and feel pity to poor people. This answer indicated that the video influence him and probably other people becoming more tolerant to poor people. In addition, he stated further that it influence his thinking and action “to study diligently to be a critical and smart student”. He also suggested government and other people “to help the poor people, so they can have education and job”. For that good answer, his capacity in explaining influence of text was distinguished.
6. Focusing on sociopolitical issue

Besides the aforementioned points of critical literacy, the model proposed by Lewison, et.al (2002) puts emphasis on sociopolitical issue in implementing critical literacy. It is necessary since the ultimate goal of critical literacy is not only able to read the texts critically, but also able to analyze the sociopolitical injustice and inequality in order to be part of active society members (Brown, 1999; Freire, 2005; Gustine, 2013). Hence, the sociopolitical issues might be brought to the classroom by providing students texts about the aforementioned issues or inserting such sociopolitical questions about the texts as presented below.

Table 5.7

Critical Questions to Focus on Sociopolitical Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Assignment III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think that government has done his works well and equal in preventing and solving the natural disasters in all areas of our country? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question above successfully invited students to examine and talk about the sociopolitical injustice and inequality in Indonesia. It revealed the same students’ opinion with different justification as described below.

The low achiever student responded the question by simply saying “no because the government makes corruption”. Without further explanation, this student related the inequality in Indonesia with government’s corruption case. The mid achiever student also responded no to this question. He commented this issue by saying that the government still runs some activities “like expansion at the forests areas mining” which could damage the environment. On the other hand, the high achiever student seemed to provide more critical answer since he considered multiple views by using other source to justify his statement, as below.
Not in all areas, especially for Papua. I think the government has tried his best to prevent and solve the natural disasters. Even so, the government only concerns with metropolitan city. Papua, which is secluded, is underappreciated by the government. The governments have been divided into regions, but why is Papua still left behind? After reading from the internet (http://ituumuka.blogspot.com/2009/05/mengapa-papua-terus-disebut-tertinggal.html), I found something about Papua government. It says that Papua government is selfish, which means Papua doesn’t make progress in Papua. Besides, he should know about Papua’s condition, which is still left behind, and fixes it. Maybe that’s why Papua is still left behind.

Compared to other students’ answers, this student’s answer was considered better and satisfying. From his answer, it was seen that he did not totally blame the government as the previous students. Hence, he tried to see the government, as the focus, equally from two points of view, positively and negatively. Furthermore, he even initiated to search information from other sources as the data to justify his statement. To this point it can be assumed that the student had been careful and critical in criticizing something.

5.2.1.2 The Establishment of Democratic Atmosphere and Non-Threatening Environment

The second feature of this teaching program in developing students’ critical literacy is democratic atmosphere and non-threatening environment during the learning process. It is in line with the principle of democratic public sphere in education which focuses on creating classrooms as a conducive place for individual learning to live a democratic life in which freedom and social justice are allowed (Giroux, 1988). The presence of democratic atmosphere supported students to reflect together on a reality that “we know” and “we don’t know” in order to be able to act critically in transforming the reality of world (Freire & Shore, 1987). It put emphasis on an idea that all people in the classroom including teacher and students have the same right to speak out and contribute their critical insight towards the society issues.
based on their reflection on their own everyday life (Bercaw & Stooksberry, 1998; Giroux, 1997; Izadinia & Abednia, 2010).

In addition, the non-threatening environment encouraged students to see the large opportunity in sharing their ideas with no fear of being judged wrong. The students were assured to be brave and respect each other in giving and listening all ideas since there is no any wrong judgment for every idea shared. They were even encouraged to have diverse ideas or opinion (Emilia, 2005).

As a result, the classroom observation, as mentioned in Chapter IV, indicated great students’ participation in every discussion conducted. Moreover, the interview data revealed that through discussion, the students divulged that they are more confident to speak out and share their ideas about an issue because Daffa said that “we, the students were motivated by the teacher and other friends who take in turn giving opinions”. Another similar opinion was put forwarded by Vivi who drew attention to the benefits of critical literacy pedagogy in reading “the word and the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987) and viewed literacy as a critical arena for cultural and social power (Emilia, 2005; Mochinsky, 2008).

Pembelajaran dengan critical literacy membuat lebih bisa memahami karena belajarnya dari macam-macam media kaya video jadi lebih menarik juga kalo biasanya cuma dari buku yang lebih kaya pelajaran, gambrannya itu-itu aja. Enaknya kaya gini yang lebih nyambung sama kehidupan terus dikritik membuat kita juga lebih berani berpendapat dan ga takut disalahkan karena kan masing-masing punya pendapat jadi bisa liat dari berbagai sisi.

The teaching program which incorporated critical literacy encouraged us to comprehend more the text/ topic/ material since we learned from various media. It makes the teaching learning process more interesting because we used to learn from textbook which provides limited visualizations. It was enjoyable because the learning process encouraged us to criticize and give opinions about an event or issue in our daily life. We were not afraid to give opinion because everyone might have his own opinion. Consequently, we can see an event from different points of view.

The two students’ comments above asserted the research findings that this teaching program had established democratic atmosphere and non-threatening environment during the learning process. This kind of learning environment highly impacted to the promotion of students’ participation in giving their critical insight towards the issue
discussed. On the point of that, students’ critical literacy could be assisted to develop progressively.

5.2.1.3 The Positioning Teacher as an Essential Role

In this teaching program, teacher played an essential role in assisting students to be critically literate. As previously described in Chapter IV regarding teaching program, the teacher’s role was started in the teaching preparation phase in which teacher should be able to select appropriate topic, texts, and questions for stimulating students’ critical literacy. The teacher was also required to plan the teaching program well as an attempt to make the teaching learning process effective.

While entering the teaching phase, the teacher played the role to do scaffolding as recommended by Emilia (2010), Metcalfe, Todd & Toyn (2013), and Panel Ontario (2004). The incorporation of critical literacy to teaching program in this present study was new for the junior high school students. Thus, scaffolding is needed since in this way, the teacher prompts the students to builds on prior knowledge and forms new knowledge (Stuyf, 2002). This concept also has the teacher give feedback to motivate as well as minimize the level of students’ frustration (Stuyf, 2002). In this sense, the scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1962) was conducted by explaining, simplifying, and exemplifying the critical questions. They also should be adjusted with students’ linguistic capacity to make students understand the questions better. The adjustment was conducted by bridging, contextualizing, simplifying and exemplifying those questions.

Additionally, in this teaching program, the teacher played her authority and directive role as an expert who assisted and led the discussion or dialogue in the classroom as suggested by Emilia (2005). Giroux states “critical direction is necessary to help students recognize the political and moral implications of their own experiences” (1988). Hence, the teacher could be a source but she was not the only source since the students were also given large opportunity to share the information and the opinion that they had. Consequently, besides playing her role as an expert, the
teacher also had a position as a facilitator who created democratic atmosphere and non-threatening environment which made students feel relax, motivated, and confident to convey their opinion.

5.2.2 Benefits and Challenges of the Incorporation of Critical Literacy to the Teaching Program

In relation to the second research question, this present study revealed that the incorporation of critical literacy to the teaching program had given some advantages regarding students’ critical literacy and English proficiency. Nevertheless, the study also found some challenges in the implementation of this teaching program. The benefits and challenges that were found in this study will be depicted in the following sections.

5.2.2.1 Benefits of the Incorporation of Critical Literacy to the Teaching Program

This study attained three benefits from the incorporation of critical literacy to the teaching program. The benefits involved the development of students’ critical literacy capacity, the improvement of students’ English proficiency, and the promotion of more active and dynamic learning process. The aforesaid benefits are described below.

a. Students’ Developed Critical Literacy Capacity

On the basis of classroom observation, students’ reflective learning journals, students’ reading works, questionnaire, and interview, it was found that the students developed their critical literacy capacity. Students’ critical literacy capacity in this study was divided into some capacities involving relating texts with personal knowledge or experience, seeing something from multiple views, identifying included and excluded voices within the text, discussing how topic or characters are represented in the text, and discussing influence of the text. Based on the obtained
data, it was found that the development for each capacity of critical literacy was different.

In general, the difference between students’ critical literacy capacity before and after the teaching program which incorporated critical literacy could be seen from the data of self assessment questionnaire as presented in the following table.

### Table 5.8
Data of Questionnaires in Pre and Post Teaching Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Students’ Critical Literacy Capacity Aspects</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Relating texts with personal knowledge or experience</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Seeing something from multiple views</td>
<td>22.34%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>60.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Identifying included and excluded voices within the text</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Discussing how topic or characters are represented in the text</td>
<td>63.34%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Discussing influence of the text</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>93.33%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, it can be seen that there was about 53.33% development of students’ critical literacy capacity in terms of relating texts with personal knowledge or experience. Before the teaching program, it was found that many respondents (73.33% or 22 of 30 students) consider that they did not know whether they were able to relate the information that they got with their personal experience or not. In this aspect, it was only 26.67% (8 respondents) who positively
respond the statements that they were able to relate the information that they got with their personal experience.

However, after the teaching program, students’ understanding about relating texts or the information that they got with their personal experience or information was developed. Not less than 80% students were able to have the aforementioned critical literacy capacity. Their positive responds were completed with example which supported the data. One of the examples given by respondent who gave a positive respond stated:

Sayamelihatberita BBM naikdanturun, saat BBM turunberitamenyatakanbawahpedagang-pedagangsusahmenurunkanhargakanpedagangBBM sudah turun kembali.

I saw news about the fluctuating price of fuel oil. When the price of fuel oil decreased, the news stated that the traders were hard to redecrease the prices and it was true. When my aunt was shopping in the market, the price of vegetables was still expensive even though the price of fuel oil had decreased.

The above example showed that the student was able to relate the information about fuel oil that she watched and listened from the news in television with her personal information experienced by her aunt in life. It means that the student was able to relate or recheck the information with real experience data in life.

In specific, the sample analysis of students’ reading works also indicated development in this capacity of critical literacy as illustrated in Section 5. 2.1.1.2.2, Part Linking a text and personal experience/ knowledge. The low achiever student developed his capacity from unacceptable to be developing level. Meanwhile, the mid achiever student remained in proficient level and the higher achiever student was found distinguished in this capacity from the first up to the last assignment.

Regarding the second aspect, in the beginning, 76, 67% (23 respondents) consider that they did not know about seeing something from multiple views. On the
other hand, at the second distribution of questionnaires, 83, 33% or 25 of 30 students were indicated to have capacity in seeing something from many points of view. It means, students’ critical literacy capacity in this aspect was developed for about 60, 99%. This data was proven by case example they gave completing their choice. One of the examples stated:


The example is a case of TKI (Indonesian labors) who were tortured and killed in Arab. I consider it as normal. The employers might be cruel and crude, nevertheless the labors also could cause an extraordinary vexation since the employers had paid millions for the bad attitude of labors. So, it’s just normal.

From the example above, students tried to view a case of Indonesian labor embellishment or torturing in Arab from two sides. She stated, this case might because of the Arabian employers’ attitude which is crude and cruel. Meanwhile, it also might because of the Indonesian labors’ inappropriate behavior. Hence, even though it was not completed with a deep explanation, the student was able to see the case from different views.

The students’ capacity level in seeing something from multiple views was various. Yet, from the number of students who have this capacity, most of them were still in developing level and some others are in proficient level. This assumption was based on the sample analysis of students’ reading works which indicated no significant improvement. The low achiever student was analyzed still incapable to see something from different points of view. The mid achiever student remained in developing level, while the achiever student decreased his capacity from proficient to be unacceptable. Hence, it was analyzed that students’ capacity in seeing an event from multiple viewpoints depended on the issue and text discussed. The more
controversial an issue, the more capable students to view the issue from different point of views. In addition, the teacher was also required to take the critical questions given into account. It was found that the more detail questions given by the teacher, the more complete answers given by the students.

Compared with other aspects, the aspect of identifying included and excluded voice within a text was considered the most unfamiliar aspect and hard for the students. Before the teaching program, the questionnaires data indicated that 25 of 30 respondents (83, 33%) were lack of knowledge and capacity in identifying included and excluded voices within the text. After the teaching program, it was obtained that it was only 40% students who understood identifying the included and excluded voices within the text. It means, more than 50% students or 18 of 30 students were still hard to have this critical literacy capacity. Most students affirmed that unlike analyzing the unheard voice within the text, it was easier to identify voice or position which was stated clearly.

The analysis of students reading works regarding this aspect indicated an improvement at low and high achiever students. The low achiever student improved the level from unacceptable in reading assignment I to developing in reading assignment II. The improvement was also proven by the high achiever student who reached a proficient level in reading assignment I and then a distinguished level in reading assignment II. Meanwhile, it was found that the mid achiever student stayed at developing level in all reading assignments.

Concerning students’ capacity in discussing how topic or characters are represented in the text, the data indicated positive result. More than half of students’ number (63, 34%) in the classroom was signified to have the capacity of this critical literacy aspect before the teaching program. After the teaching program, the number of students who had the capacity in discussing the representation of topic or characters in the text was developed for about 36, 67%. Hence, the data showed that all students were able to have the capacity of this critical literacy aspect. On the basis of data, it can be concluded that this critical literacy aspect was considered as the
easiest of all for students. The additional information given by students implied that it was due to students’ preference in watching movies and reading story books.

The last one indicated students’ capacity in discussing the influence of the text. Contrasting to other aspects, this critical literacy aspect was considered as the second aspect that was mastered mostly by students. Before the teaching program, there were 12 out of 30 students (40%) who were able to discuss the influence of the text. After the teaching program, the number of students who have this capacity was increased up to 53, 33%. As a result, at the end of the teaching program, 93, 33% or 28 out of 30 students had a capacity of critical literacy in terms of discussing the influence of a text.

The data above was also supported by students’ reading works data. In this case, the mid achiever student improved one level higher from developing to be proficient. Meanwhile, the high achiever student developed his capacity two levels higher from developing to be distinguished level. In addition, students’ reflective journals indicated that most of students were able to convey the influence of text on students’ thinking after discussing it as mentioned clearly in Chapter IV, concerning the post-reading part of the teaching program.

More to the point, the interview data were found in line with the abovementioned data description. Based on the interview with the students, it divulged that the teaching program promoted the students to be more critically literate in life. Most students stated that the teaching program encouraged them to think and investigate further before believing the information as Sabrina stated:

The teaching program helped us to analyze information/ text deeper, more critical, and accurate. It encouraged us to see something from different points of views, so that the problem can be revealed.

The comment above was in the same vein with the theory that critical literacy benefits students individually in being more critically literate to receive such information, biased persuasion, and irrational behavior or belief (Leicester & Taylor, 2010). In this case, the students seemed to realize that “no texts are neutral “(Wallace,
2003; Wood, Soares, & Watson, 2006). They also seemed to recognize the significance of reading in active and reflective manner as indicated by looking beyond the literal messages and finding multiple meaning from multiple perspectives in the text (Morgan, 1997; Lewison, et.al, 2002; Wood, Soares, & Watson, 2006; Coffey, 2010; Dale & Hyslop, 2010; Lee, 2011). For example, Daffa said:

"Ini membuat kita selalu melihat dari berbagai sudut pandang, menghubungkan suatu kejadian dengan pengalaman kita, dampaknya kita jadi lebih bijaksana, tidak terburu-buru dalam mengambil kesimpulan, karena belum tentu yang menurut kita salah itu salah"

It encouraged us to see problem from different points of view and relate it with our experience. Consequently, we can be wiser and easily taking conclusion because what we think wrong might not be truly wrong.

The statement above showed that the teaching program encouraged as well as enabled students to think critically to find an idea or a solution towards the problem discussed based on multiple views. Other students added that the teaching program made them realize the importance of being critical in life, as can be seen below.

"It makes us know and understand more about something critically. Being critical means I can know more about the truth, it makes me not to judge something easily (Andi)"

"It means that I should be wiser and more selective, I can see an event from multiple views, it makes me not to be fooled easily (Wensan)"

From the comments above, it could be concluded that the students seemed to be mindful of the teaching program values in facilitating students to be more sensitive towards issues in society and to be more critically literate, particularly in aspects investigated in this study. It is in line with theory who states that critical literacy is highly potential to enhance students’ critical thinking and understanding of different perspectives toward the world in general and the society in particular (Morgan, 1997, p.48; Expert Panel of Ontario, 2004, p.37; Wood, et. al, 2006; Coffey, 2010; Mc, Leicester & Taylor, 2010, p.2; Lee, 2011; Jeong, 2012, p.17, and Metcalf. et.al, 2013,
This finding supported the other previous data discussed that the teaching program can assist junior high school students to be critically literate.

b. Students’ Improved English Proficiency

Besides developing students’ critical literacy, it was found that the incorporation of critical literacy to teaching program was likely able to improve students’ English proficiency. This improvement was due to some reasons. Firstly, the teaching materials were mostly provided in English. In the critical literacy concept, texts, which are the main teaching materials in this teaching program, were utilized as a medium of teaching language, vocabulary (Wallace, 1992), and also structure (Freire, 2005). Furthermore, the English teaching materials enabled students to learn Standard English which is acceptable throughout the world as mentioned by Jeong (2012).

Secondly, the provision of English teaching materials was supported with the existence of various activities and media that enabled students practice their English. Based on classroom observation, students’ reflective learning journals, students’ reading works, and interview, it was divulged that students’ English vocabularies, structure, reading, writing, and speaking gradually improved meeting by meeting. This finding was depicted in the data of students’ interview which highlighted the students’ English improvement as follow.

Pengajaran ini memacu kita untuk bisa lebih memahami teks, menambah vocabulary, presentasinya membantu kita berani bicara depan orang banyak. Kalau dulu kan belajarnya lebih ke grammar-grammar doang, kalo sekarang campur jadi memahami lebih banyak, grammarnya tuh langsung dipraktikkan saat nulis, bicara, kan langsung dibenerin kalo salah. (Audria)

This teaching program triggered us to understand the text better and enrich our vocabularies. The presentation also helped use to be confident to speak in front of many people. The previous learning used to focus on grammar (structure), but now we learn more then we know more. The grammar was directly practiced while writing and speaking, and the correction was immediately given if we did some grammatical errors. (Audria)
One of the examples of students’ remarks above indicated that the teaching program allowed students to learn English comprehensively. It was different with regular teaching learning process that used to focusing on grammar. Even though this teaching program was admitted more challenging, yet, most students commented that it was motivating to learn English more and more as they were challenged to speak out their ideas better in the discussion.

c. More Active and Dynamic Teaching Learning Process

The third benefit that was obtained through this teaching program is the existence of more active and dynamic class as previously found by Jeong (2012) in his study. Critical literacy employed philosophical belief that “students are language users, not language recipients” (Lee, 2011). Thus, in the incorporation of critical literacy to teaching program, the students were placed to be more active than the teacher who acted more as a facilitator of dialogue/discussion rather than an instructor as suggested by Coffey (2010). The students were given large opportunities to actively participate in the dynamic learning activities from various forms of texts through dialogue such as discussing pictures, videos, or other texts given.

As a consequence, the students were found motivated to speak out. Based on the classroom observation, it was found that even the passive students became more active in answering teacher’s question and sharing their opinions regarding the issues discussed. The classroom observation as well as interview data indicated that the existence of democratic atmosphere and non-threatening environment was essential in having the students feel relax and motivated to give opinions without anxiety to be judged wrong. In addition, the students were also allowed to switch English into Indonesian when they found difficulties in conveying their ideas. Nevertheless, the competitive atmosphere that had been built up because of the aforementioned environment encouraged students to improve their English more and more. Salman, Audria, and Chairunnisa said in the interview that it motivated them to speak English better when they share the ideas in the classroom discussion. Moreover, the students
were also given opportunity to do collaborative learning or working in group which enabled students to help each other in understanding the texts, exchanging information, and practicing English in a smaller circumstance. Consequently, all students including passive or low achiever students were more confident to speak out in the classroom discussion which is bigger than in the group discussion.

The dynamic learning activities such as watching videos, reading and discussing texts, doing collaborative as well as independent learning also seemed to equip various students’ characteristics in learning. Particularly, it was considered in line with primary students’ characteristics which are physically active and cannot sit to pay attention for a longer period (Expert Panel of Ontario Education, 2004, p.16; and Linse, 2005). As a result, it was revealed that all interviewees thought that the teaching program was beneficial, pleasurable, and even challenging as indicated by students below:

*Pembelajarannya seru dan menantang karena membuat kita harus ngasih pendapat dan lebih berfikir* (Chairunnisa).

The teaching program was enjoyable and challenging because it encouraged us to give opinion and think deeply (Chairunnisa).

*Seri, menambah hal-hal baru, materi-materi baru, melihat dari sudut pandang, melatih kekompakan dalam diskusi* (Daffa).

It was enjoyable, enriched new knowledge and materials, encouraged us to see from multiple views, and trained to have harmony in a discussion (Daffa).

The students’ comments above implied their appreciation of the teaching learning process which is pleasurable and generates satisfaction (Freire, 1998, p. 88-92). In addition, these comments were in line with the notion that “knowing is something demanding many things” (Freire and Shore, 1987, p. 79). It indicated the requirement
of some cognitive efforts in the teaching learning process as mentioned by Cummins (1996, p.72) that “instruction must evoke intellectual effort on the part of students, i.e. be cognitively demanding, if it is to develop academic and intellectual abilities”.

5.2.2.2 Challenges of the Incorporation of Critical Literacy to the Teaching Program

In implementing the teaching program which incorporated critical literacy, there were three main challenges that could hamper the effectiveness of the teaching program in attaining its benefits. The challenges had something to do with time of learning, students’ English proficiency, and teacher’s competence as depicted in the following sections.

a. Time of Learning

The first challenge of incorporating critical literacy to teaching program dealt with time of learning. It is previously found by Jeong (2012) who found difficulty in implementing critical literacy as it is not included into school district curricula which gives such impacts to the practical issue including time of learning. In Indonesian junior high school, the time of learning English for eighth grade students is 4 x 40 minutes in a week. As a matter of fact, this time of learning was considered less to have students master all critical literacy capacities well. Furthermore, critical literacy concept which was something new for the students was only implemented in six meetings of the teaching program due to its licensing from the school institution.

Critical literacy was largely implemented to secondary and tertiary level students who were assumed better in terms of English proficiency and order of thinking than the primary level or junior high school students. Moreover, the time of learning English in secondary and tertiary level was longer than in primary level or junior high school students. As a result, this condition became a challenge in this teaching program.
The limited time of learning also impacted to students’ language learning, particularly grammar. On the basis of classroom observation and interview, the students seemed to need more duration of explicit grammar teaching. It might because of their past habit in learning English which emphasized the teaching of word formation, spelling, and vocabulary (Alwasilah, 2001). Meanwhile, due to the limited time, this teaching program focused on optimizing students’ critical literacy capacity. By considering junior high school students’ English level, it is suggested that further study can manage better the proportion of each learning aspect to gain the more satisfied teaching program results.

Nonetheless, by looking at good findings in this present study, the incorporation of critical literacy to teaching program was assumed applicable for junior high students. Furthermore, critical literacy is actually a philosophical belief embodied in literacy education, as stated by Lee:

> Critical literacy is not a pedagogical technique to be learned but our ontological existence, i.e., part of our lives. It is something we do everyday to be informed agents in relation to others in a society where knowledge is socially constructed (Lee, 2011).

By taking that theory into account, it was suggested for the teacher to consequently and continuously incorporate critical literacy in the language teaching. Accordingly, it was expected that the students’ critical literacy could be developed optimally.

### b. Students’ English Proficiency

The second challenge mainly deal with students’ lack of English proficiency. All students admitted that the lack of language proficiency such as vocabularies, grammar, and pronunciation was their obstacle in this teaching program. This obstacle instigated students hard in understanding the texts comprehensively and in expressing their opinions, as stated by Wensan:

> The challenge is found when I tried to express my opinion because I have restricted vocabularies, grammar and pronunciation. It’s harder. Therefore, I want to learn more grammar and pronunciation in the teaching learning process.
The students’ reading works data also indicated that the students with better language proficiency were able to have higher score. It was because the students with better language proficiency could comprehend the text better and answer the questions more relevant and detail. Previous studies found that critical literacy learning would require higher linguistic process skills that ESL/ EFL students might not be equipped with (Lee, 2011; Park cited in Jeong, 2012). Thus, this challenge should be taken into account for the teacher in selecting teaching materials and designing the lesson plan that can accommodate all students’ English proficiency levels.

c. Teacher’s Competence

With regard to the lack of learning time and students’ English proficiency, teacher’s competence was considered as one of influential things which might affect the effectiveness of this teaching program in enhancing students to be critically literate. Hence, teacher’s competence was required in all stages of teaching learning process. In the preparation stage, the challenges were found in selecting appropriate teaching materials, preparing questions which can stimulate students’ critical literacy optimally, and finding appropriate assessment rubric. The appropriate teaching materials and questions for the texts were found highly influential to explore and improve students’ critical literacy capacity. Naturally, the students’ critical literacy capacity was found hard to be assessed due to the subjectivity in the assessment process. It could be denied that the result assessment might be various depending on the rubric utilized. Thus, it was suggested to find and use the most suitable and detail assessment rubric in order to have more valid result.

Additionally, the teacher’s competence in designing effective lesson plan, explaining the lesson, and managing the classroom was essential. The teacher was challenged to reach the teaching learning goals in the certain learning duration. Moreover, each class would have various students’ characteristics. Hence, the teacher should be able to manage the teaching activities which could accommodate all
students to obtain the learning objectives as effective as possible in the certain period of time.

5.3 Discussion

In accordance with the aforementioned findings, it can be concluded that it is possible to incorporate critical literacy in language education, particularly in English teaching program of junior high school. Foreign language education is believed playing a central role in every individual’s education. Hence, it is stated that language education “must become a core element in the teaching of critical perspectives for life in a democratic society” (Reagan & Osborn, 2002). In this sense, teachers are required to incorporate a critical perspective into everyday lives in order to assist students understanding the social and political issues around them (Vasquez, 2004).

In Indonesian context, the essential role of language education as embodied in the critical literacy principles is in line with the aim of Indonesian language education, which is reflected in the English 2013 Curriculum. In this context, Permendikbud No. 67 states:

…kurikulum 2013 bermaksud untuk mengembangkan potensi peserta didik menjadi kemampuan dalam berfikir reflektif bagi penyelesaian masalah sosial di masyarakat, dan untuk membangun kehidupan masyarakat demokratis yang lebih baik (2013, p.5)

The quotation above reflected the expectation of the 2013 Curriculum in developing students’ competences to think reflectively in order to be able to solve social problems in society and enhance democratic social life. On that point, it further states that some development of learners’ competencies will not only benefit them individually, but also for society and nation in general.

The expected standard of language education is also stated by Alwasilah (2014) who suggests that the language teaching should be professionally designed as a medium “to improve the teaching of other subjects, enhance students’ intellectual
ability, and shape human civilization”. Alwasilah (2014) further states that the language teaching should transform the prior language teaching which tends to emphasize the theory such as spelling and grammar rather than practice of language.

The transformation is conducted by designing the language education which is able to enhance students’ critical literacy and develop students’ social awareness (Alwasilah, 2001; Emilia, 2011). Thus, the incorporation of critical literacy to the language teaching program is considered relevant with the needs of language education in this era. The relevancy deals with the purpose of critical literacy itself in enabling students to actively participate in comprehending, analyzing, and transforming the unequal and injustice power of political, social, and cultural relationship through texts (Morgan, 1997; Wallace, 2003; Coffey, 2010; Dale & Hyslop, 2010; Lee, 2011; Luke & Dooley in Gustine, 2013).

On the other hand, even though it is possible to be implemented, the incorporation of critical literacy to the language education, particularly English teaching program, deals with some challenges. As previously mentioned, this study found some challenges related with time of learning, students’ English proficiency, and teachers’ competence.

In relation to time of learning, the incorporation of critical literacy to the English teaching program in junior high school is constrained by the limited time of learning. As it is still a novel knowledge and program for the students and probably for the teachers, the adjustment of this teaching program requires more time than the regular time given. The time of learning English for eighth grade junior high school is 4 x 40 minutes per week. As a matter of fact, this time of learning feels less to reach the goals of learning optimally. The study indicates that it is because the requirement of English proficiency in this learning process is restricted with students’ English proficiency itself.

In this teaching program, the students were required to read and analyze texts which mostly in English. Furthermore, they were required to do discussion in English, even though they were also allowed to switch or mix the language with
Indonesian. Consequently, the English proficiency became the challenge besides the requirement of higher order thinking, particularly, for the low achiever students. At junior high school where this study was conducted, the students’ English proficiency was various. This junior high school is included into the first rank of junior high schools in Bandung which is considered more excellent, particularly in terms of students’ intelligent and English proficiency. It is proven by the English high score achievement of National Examination which is almost in every year. Accordingly, the students’ English proficiency in this school might be higher than the students’ English proficiency in other cluster of schools. This condition might affect the possibility of incorporating critical literacy to the English teaching program in other schools, which have students with lower English proficiency.

Nevertheless, this challenge can be anticipated with teachers’ competencies in selecting appropriate materials, utilizing various supporting media, planning the lesson, and managing the activities. In this sense, the students’ English proficiency and thinking capacity should be taken into account by the teachers. The teacher can adjust and modify this incorporation depending on the students’ English proficiency and thinking capacity. Critical literacy is not a method of teaching, yet, it is a valuable concept that should be embodied in the teaching (Lee, 2011). In addition, it is dynamic and adapt to the contexts in which it is used (Mclaughlin and Devoogd in Jeong, 2012). Thus, by considering the significance of incorporating critical literacy to language education in this era, it is concluded that the incorporation of critical literacy to language education, particularly English is possible and good to be implemented in junior high school level with some adjustment and modification.

5.4 Concluding Remark

This chapter has presented and discussed the findings obtained from all instruments employed in this study. It has illustrated that the teaching program has developed students to be critically literate in some ways. Additionally, it depicted benefits of the critical literacy teaching program besides developing students’ critical
thinking, such as increasing students’ English proficiency, and creating more active and dynamic class. Nevertheless, the findings also indicated challenges in this teaching program that should be improved. The challenges mainly deal with time of learning, students’ English proficiency, and teacher’s competence.