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Language development and thinking are closely related and the teaching of critical thinking skills should be an integral part of the language classroom. The purposes of this study were to investigate the effectiveness of using children’s literature to enhance students’ critical thinking ability of Thai EFL university students. It also examined the student's perception of critical thinking after children's literature instruction. The research design is one single group pre-test-post-test design. The participants of the study were fifty third-year EFL students majoring in English. Data were collected through the pre and post critical thinking ability test, and students' critical thinking perception questionnaire. In the experiment, the students learned to read both prose and poetry, and write in response to the questions in accordance with the reading texts selected from children's literature books. The teaching approach used in the implementation was the Inquiry-based Approach. The result revealed that overall children's literature instruction was effective in improving students' critical thinking ability. There was a significant different in the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test at the .05 level; the means of the pre-test was higher than that of the post-test. This indicated the development of critical reading and writing ability after children’s literature instruction. However, when comparing the mean scores between each part of the test, the results revealed that the mean of the prose was significantly higher than poetry. The results from the questionnaire confirmed that the students
enjoyed reading both text types. The questionnaire showed that the students increased awareness and gained more knowledge of critical thinking skills after the children's literature based instruction. They reported that they can apply critical thinking in other classes because they were taught to think systematically and critically. The study suggested that critical thinking ability could be as the important part of lifelong learning, especially at positive responses toward the children’s literature based instruction towards the class activities.
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Classification of Bloom’s Taxonomy
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Critical thinking has become a worldwide phenomenon today because of the changes in advanced societies affected by the rapid growth of information technology. Teaching critical thinking is therefore an essential goal of modern education because it equips students with the competence necessary for the changing world (Ku, 2009). Wherever one lives, one needs to be informed, selective, creative, and able to apply knowledge and information useful for one’s daily life.

The major goal of higher education in most countries is to develop critical thinking skills and critical disposition in learners in the hope that they can perform well within society, behave appropriately, and solve problems when dealing with real situations (Pither & Soden, 2000; Tung & Chang, 2009; Ku, 2009; Fahim, 2011, Shaila & Trudell, 2010). In addition, learners need to organize, plan, monitor and evaluate their learning process both in the university environment and outside the classroom. In the latter situation, they are required to think, reason, communicate and continue thinking (Gardner, 2001). Therefore, to achieve the goal of modern education, institutes of learning have to offer curricula that enable students to develop a high level of thinking skills. It is believed that students with good critical thinking ability can be better prepared to compete and exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens in a global workplace and community (Tung & Chang, 2009, p.288).
The importance of teaching critical thinking has also been mentioned in Thailand’s national educational policy. The National Education Act recommends that educators provide training in thinking processes, management, ways to face various situations and the application of knowledge for solving problems. Moreover, teachers are urged to organize activities for learners to draw from authentic experience which is drilled in practical work for complete mastery, enabling learners to think critically, acquire the habit of reading and develop a continuous thirst for knowledge (National Education Act of B.E. 2542, Chapter 4, p. 11). Therefore, the intentions of the Act are guidelines for the development of critical thinking among tertiary level Thai students. The statements aim to ensure that the learning process for students starts with curiosity, followed by planned learning activities. Through teacher-student interaction, it is also expected that students should be assisted in learning critical thinking skills, such as gathering knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation in classrooms where supportive learning environments are presented.

Research has shown there are many benefits of using literature to develop critical thinking in ESL and EFL classes. For example, Erkaya (2005) integrated short stories in the class and discovered that the students were highly motivated, had increased knowledge of literary texts, and developed higher-order thinking skills. Based on Bloom's Taxonomy and Wakefield's applied taxonomy, Ishikawa, Sasaki, and Yamamoto, (2011) developed English courses that integrated critical thinking skills in a Japanese university. One example of the course objective was to develop the synthesis level of thinking skills using poems and songs to assign students to predict or hypothesize the
author's intentions. Jarudom and Wasanasomsithi (2010) used drama and questioning techniques to promote critical thinking of Thai EFL learners. The findings of the study showed that these techniques were effective in enhancing critical thinking and the students’ critical thinking improved.

Since the 1980s, the amount of research on children's literature has grown as the literature-based instruction movement took place in the West and in many Asian countries. Teaching children's literature is claimed to be beneficial for learners as it provides sources of reading (Pearson, 1986), innovative learning tools (Vygotsky, 1978), and a means of solving through personal problems (Heppner & Krauskopf. 1987). Apart from being a source of reading, learning, and a tool for developing students' thinking skills, children's literature is also important as the conveyor of world knowledge, ideas, values, and socially accepted behavior (Puurtinen, 1998, p.2). Wu (2008), who developed strategies for teaching young adult literature, maintains that using literature in the ESL classroom can foster critical thinking by offering students multiple perspectives, particularly in books dealing with issues such as immigration, cultural differences, social upheavals, and so forth.

A number of research studies have revealed that the level of critical thinking of Thai students graduating from Thai universities is unsatisfactory. Research has been conducted to enhance critical thinking ability in Thai students from the primary level to the university level. However, Chaisuriya (2000) pointed out that it has been mostly conducted outside the field of literature at the university level, particularly with English major students. Thus, very few studies have investigated the teaching of critical thinking
through using children's literature in Thailand. The efficiency and correlations of explicating critical thinking and children's literature found in previous studies provides the background for the present research. Therefore, this study could be beneficial to both EFL teachers and students as it could shed light on the significance of encouraging critical thinking in Thailand since the ability to think, read and write critically is required for those in information-driven societies.

**Purposes of the Study**

This study attempted to

1. investigate the effects of children’s literature on students’ critical thinking abilities in reading and writing.
2. explore student’s perceptions of their critical thinking abilities.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed:

1. Do students who study children’s literature get higher scores on critical thinking ability?
2. What are students’ perceptions of their critical thinking abilities before and after using children’s literature-based and inquiry-based instruction?

**Significance of the Study**

This study intended to investigate the effectiveness of the children’s literature instruction on students’ critical thinking ability. It also examined the students’ perception of critical thinking ability after the instruction. The findings of this study might have academic benefits and provide a clear understanding for teachers of English of how to
develop Thai EFL students’ critical thinking ability, specifically their critical reading and writing performance through children’s literature instruction.

1. The findings from this study would provide both the benefits and drawbacks of using literature-based instruction for instructors who attempt to foster students’ critical thinking ability using alternative methods.

2. Thai instructors could gain insight into the implementation of literature to boost students’ critical thinking skills.

3. Therefore, the direct results of the study would provide some examples of theoretical guidelines for students to develop effective learning styles with critical thinking as the background framework in the lesson plans.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined since they were used frequently and specifically in the present study

**Children’s literature.** Children’s literature is worthy of children’s attention and should convey truth to children. Lynch-Brown and Tomlinson (2005) maintain that most children’s books are based on moral and ethical standards, covering topics of relevance and interest to children from birth to adolescence through prose and poetry, fiction and nonfiction. Moreover, the Encyclopædia Britannica defines children’s literature as the body of written works and accompanying illustrations produced in order to entertain or instruct young people (Children's literature, 2012).

In this study, the researcher selected the two genres; prose and poetry, encompassing a wide range of works, including acknowledged classics of world
literature, poetry, picture books and easy-to-read stories written exclusively for children, as well as fairy tales, lullabies, fables, folk songs, and other primarily orally transmitted material for the students.

**Critical thinking ability.** Critical thinking ability is defined according to the scholars’ viewpoints toward intellectual disposition and purposes to develop and employ that intellectual ability. Stenberg (1986, p.3) defines critical thinking as “the mental processes, strategies, and representations people use to solve problems, make decisions, and learn new concepts” For Bassham et al. (1994), critical thinking involves such abilities as identification, analysis, and evaluation of arguments. It also includes the ability to reason and justify ideas.

In this study, critical thinking ability refers to skillful decision-making, starting with a decisive and tactical thought process. Many sources characterize critical thinking as the ability to direct one's thinking. The six levels of Bloom’s taxonomy (1956), starting with the lowest level (decisive) and moving up to the highest level (tactical), include remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating.

**Inquiry-based learning.** Inquiry-based learning is an educational approach that is driven more by a learner's questions than by a teacher's lessons. It is inspired by what is sometimes called a constructivist approach to education. A constructivist approach is based on an understanding of how we all learn, with the idea that everyone must construct their own understanding within the framework of their own lives and experiences (Brew, 2003).
In this study, students worked to find an answer to a question which would involve them in asking and answering other questions along the way by reading or writing. Students then took the information they found, developed an answer to the question, and created a product to show what they had learned through discussion or presentation.

**Perception.** Perception is the way learners look at things. It can be much more than sensing; sighting, hearing, smelling, tasting, and touching. The American Heritage Dictionary (2009) defines perception also as the insight, intuition, or knowledge gained by perceiving. In addition, perception is interpreting, processing, and reacting while learners perceive information (Critical Thinking and Perception, 2005).

In this study, the perceptions of learning with critical thinking on reading and writing refer to gathering, processing, considering all possibilities, rational decision-making, learned knowledge, and exploration of information which are the ongoing processes before, during, and after learning children’s literature in class.

**Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter presented the background of the study, the context and the direction for this present study. The chapter first discussed the importance of critical thinking ability in today world. It also discussed the need of teaching critical thinking mentioned in the national educational policy in Thailand. It also reviewed some of the research that showed the benefits of using literature to develop critical thinking in the ESL and EFL contexts.
Organization of the Research

The rest of this research is organized as follows:

Chapter 2 presents the literature related to the study as the foundations of the study. It includes a description of children’s literature and the emergence of teaching children’s literature and a review of related studies on the use of children's literature to develop students’ critical thinking ability. This chapter also discusses critical thinking theory consisting of Bloom’s Taxonomy and the approaches of teaching children’s literature.

Chapter 3 presents the research design and method strategies used in the study. It also discusses the research instruments as well as the method of establishing the validity and reliability and materials employed in collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Data analysis of both quantitative data is also discussed in the last part of the chapter.

Chapter 4 first presents the results of the critical thinking pretest and posttest. It then discusses the results from the self-ratings from the perception questionnaire.

Chapter 5 presents the summary of the study and the main findings of the study. It also provides the discussions and explanations based on the main findings. In addition, the recommendations and implications for further studies are presented.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

According to the research framework, this chapter reviews theory and research related to the study. First, it provides definition of children’s literature and the emergence of teaching children’s literature. Second, critical thinking theory and process are discussed. The third section presents the perceptions on critical thinking. The final section reviews the related studies.

Children’s Literature

Definition of children’s literature.

Because the term “children’s literature” is difficult to define, some experts suggest a general meaning for it. Lonsdale and Mackintosh (1973) define literature as any story or poem that demonstrates it is meaningfully written. If the meaning is hidden, it is for a good reader to scrutinize it. Hanson (1998) recommends that an appropriate definition is: “…the material created for and widely read, viewed and heard by children, that has an imaginative element…” Hancock (2000) feels that children’s literature appeals to interests and needs, and can be fictional or factual with the motivating content to inspire children as they progress into becoming master readers. Siwasriyanon (2001) emphasizes literature that brings the reader to an understanding of art and to the relationship between the real world and imagination. The components of literature are important, for example, the content, story ideas, writing style, and even what the book cover looks like. Siwasriyanon explains that every poem and story brings meaning to the readers. Not only are the elements of literature appreciated, but also the hidden information that the author would like to convey to the readers, such as
history, political situations, people’s lives, and so forth. In addition, Chen (2012) observed, “Children’s literature is any good quality books for children from birth to adolescence, covering topics of relevance and interests to children of those ages, through prose and poetry, fiction and nonfiction (p. 3)”.

Children’s literature has also had various instructional roles. It has been used as a resource for language development (Zhang & Alex, 1995), a vehicle for comprehension assessment (Standiford, 1984), and a source of alternative texts to motivate students’ reading skills (Van Sledright & Kelly, 1998).

Elements of children’s poetry.

In order to help the students understand children’s poetry, the elements of poems were presented as a basic background in class. Lynch-Brown and Tomlinson (2005) have suggested providing background elements, such as meanings, rhythms, sound patterns, figurative language, and sense imagery before teaching traditional poems to the readers. The poetry elements were stated as follows.

Meaning.

Meaning is the idea, feeling, or mood expressed through words in the poem. There are ways for poet to communicate and express emotions and thoughts. Thus, the meaning of the poem is the expressed or implied message the poet is passing on (Hellett and Karasek, 1996).

Rhythm.

Rhythm is the beat which is the regular accent of a poem. Poetry is usually oral literature. Rhythm helps communicate the meaning of the poem. The best method of
understanding this is to read the poem aloud, and understand the stressed and unstressed syllables (Ghare, 2011). The poem’s rhythm is important as the signal to the listeners to the changing meaning in the poem.

*Sound Patterns.*

Sound patterns are made by repeated sounds and combinations of sounds in the words. Children can easily recognize sounds and enjoy repeating them. There are some patterns which are always in poems:

*Rhyme.* Rhyme occurs when the ends of words have the same sounds, for example, vat, rat, that, and flat.

*Assonance.* Assonance is another pattern poets use for effects. In this case, the same vowel sound is heard repeatedly within a line or a few lines of poetry, such as hoop, gloom, moon, moot, and boots, etc.

*Alliteration.* Alliteration is a pattern in which consonant sounds are heard frequently within a few lines of poetry.

*Onomatopoeia.* Onomatopoeia is the device in which the sound of the word imitates the real world sound, for example, *buzz* for the sound of a bee and *hiss* for the sound of a snake.

*Figurative language.*

Figurative language is used by an author to state an idea directly. The author aims to make comparisons and indirect statement to help readers see things in vivid,
imaginative ways. Sometimes an author will compare one object, idea, or feeling with another.

**Simile.** A simile is a comparison of things using the words *like, as, as if, than, such as, or resembles.*

**Metaphor.** A metaphor is a figure of speech comparing things that are basically unalike to make the reader see them as similar in some way.

**Personification.**

Personification is the technique in which an author gives human characteristics to non-human things (animals, natural forces, objects, ideas, etc.).

**Hyperbole.** Hyperbole is overstatement or a deliberate exaggeration used for an ironic or humorous effect to emphasize a point.

**Sense Imagery.** In descriptive and narrative language in poetry, a poet will play on one or more of the five senses: (a) sight may be awakened through the illustration of beauty; (b) hearing may be evoked by the sounds of a city street; (c and d) smell and taste may be recalled through the description of a fish left too long in the sun; and, finally, (e) touch can be described with words so that readers can feel the texture of things.

In sum, in order to learn and take pleasure in poetry, children need to be exposed to many poems, to hear them read well, and to be able to hear them again and again. The purpose of the poem can be defeated by attempting to analyse the structure and form other than to show whether it rhymes, what the verse pattern, a ballad, a
limerick, a lyric poem are. From the enjoyment of the poetry may come the desire of the students to create their own poems.

**Elements of children’s prose.**

In order to help the students understand children’s literature, the elements of prose were delivered to them as a basic background in class. Understanding the different parts, or elements, of a story and how they work together can help learners become more analytical about literary works. Therefore, it can improve a student’s judgment of literature. There are basically five elements that produce a story: plot, characters, setting, theme, style or tone.

**Plot.**

Plot is defined as the events that make up the story, particularly as they relate to one another in a pattern, in a sequence, or through cause and effect (Foster, 1960). Plots come in many different forms. The most usual found in children’s stories are chronological plots, which cover a particular period of time and relate the events in order within the time period (Lynch-Brown & Tomlinson, 2005, p. 21).

**Conflict.**

Conflict is the heart of any plot which creates the excitement and suspense needed to keep the reader involved. While a conflict can be very straightforward, such as good versus evil, the best conflicts force a character to choose between two basically good outcomes. Therefore, conflict can be between the protagonist and another character, the antagonist; between the protagonist and nature; or the protagonist and society. It can also be an internal or psychological conflict.
Two distinct types of chronological plots are progressive plot and episodic plot.

**Progressive plot.**

In progressive plots, the first few chapters are exposition, in which the characters, setting, and basic conflict are established. The story builds through rising action to a climax. The climax occurs, a satisfactory conclusion or denouncement is reached, and the story ends. It ties together separate short stories or episodes. These episodes are typically unified by the same cast of characters and the same setting. Because this type of plot is less complex, it tends to be easier to read and the readers may find this plot particularly appealing. Many easy-to-read books for the beginning reader are also structured in this way.

In short, plot is viewed as an important element for all readers, especially for young readers who seem to enjoy reading fast-moving and exciting stories. A well-constructed plot contributes substantially to children’s acceptance and enjoyment of stories.

**Characters.**

Characters are another enjoyment element of a story. A well-portrayed character can become a friend, a role model or a temporary parent, and can take readers through exciting events, and show how they develop in the course of the story. In studying a story character, Eagleton (1983) suggest two aspects to be considered: characterization and character development.

**Characterization.** Characterization refers to the way that an author describes a character’s physical appearance and personality. A character’s emotions, moral
features or the relationships with other characters in the story are distinctive and effective techniques for the author to exploit in a story.

*Character development.* During the events in the story, characters undergo positive or negative changes. The character will be different at the end of the story than at the beginning as a result of the events which he or she faces.

In many children’s books, there is usually one or sometimes two main characters (sometimes called protagonists) surrounded by minor characters (“Poetic Forms and Literary Terminology.”, 2000). One of the characters in the story will always present both good and bad features, which are the characteristics of real people. This kind of character is called a round character. On the other hand, minor or secondary characters always present themselves in a less complete or partial manner. Even though a minor character is considered less important than the main character, they cannot be left out.

In summary, character is one of the elements that can develop a vivid and exciting story. Furthermore, creating situations and having a well-portrayed character can enable young readers to see and understand a wider view of life. The characters can be divided into three categories: (1) round characters, (2) flat characters, and (3) foils.

*Setting.*

Setting is the place where the story takes place and also the time when the story occurs. It sometimes is sometimes set simply by using backdrop setting. For example, “Long ago in a cottage in the deep woods,...”. This kind of setting describes a place and time to convey a universal, timeless tale, one that could happen anywhere, anytime
except present or recent past. Another setting is integral setting which fully describes place and time. Integral setting is always used when the author needs essential comprehension of the story’s events.

**Theme.**

Sometimes, in order to identify the theme, readers may want to ask themselves what the author’s purpose was in writing the story, or what the author was saying in the story (Cuddon, 1991). It can be a message of morals or an aesthetic understanding, such as appreciation for nature, or societal issues.

Themes in children’s books should be worthy of children’s attention and should convey truth to children. Most children’s books are based on moral and ethical standards; examples are *Harry Potter* by J.K. Rowling, *The Chronicle of Narnia* by C.S Lewis, and *Charlotte’s Web* by E.B. White.

In the history of children’s literature, authors often have written stories not only for children’s pleasure, but also to teach moral lessons such as good versus evil. Children’s literature has also been used current authors as platform to teach about drug abuse, animal rights, and other issues of contemporary interest.

**Style.**

Style is the way in which an author tells the story and presents his or her views. It can be noticed in the words chosen to tell the story. There will be an effect from the words that an author can create for readers. The authors choose words and try to achieve the story effect. Thus, style used in the story can be divided into two main groups: a plain style which contains simple words and is easy to understand, and an
ornate style containing odd sentence structures and needing readers’ interpretation skills.

Point of view is another aspect of an author’s style. According to Gabel and Charles (1986) omniscience is a kind of narrating technique by which readers and narrators can see into the minds of all characters (p. 42). In additional cases, the narrators narrate from the perspective of only one character in the story. This is called the limited omniscient point of view.

In some cases, the story is told through the eyes and voice of the third-person narrator technique. This technique lets the readers know everything about the events of the story. Another is when authors choose to tell the story through the main character of the story and present the character in a first-person narrator technique (using I), so readers gain the sense of closeness to the main character.

The most famous technique is symbolism. This technique represents an abstract or figurative meaning in the story in addition to its literal meaning. Some symbols can be a person, an object, or a situation in which are in the universal and can be found in many literary works.

The Teaching of Children's Literature

The emergence of teaching and using children’s literature began in conjunction with the Bible. The Bible was considered the only reading material necessary for children (Clyde, 1983), and all early efforts in reading instruction were ultimately directed at achieving comprehension of this work.
In the nineteenth century, works of literary merit, although not specifically aimed at children, were made available but only to children of middle and upper classes. The twentieth and twenty-first centuries have seen the development of literature specifically for children, catering to their wants and needs. Development in this area is continuing as educational theories evolve and specific requirements of individual learners are identified.

Through the 1980s, literature was used because it is an authentic material which is enjoyable, and it can motivate the students to read. However, Hall (2005) points out that the problem of using literature in humanistic and communicative language teaching classrooms comes from a tendency to move too quickly toward content and response. This kind of teaching does not consider the language of the literary texts as discourse. It ignores literary values and linguistics features of the text; therefore, it is not effective. As a result Hall maintains, "In the dominant communicative paradigm, the teaching of literature in second-language contexts is typically not systematic, not well integrated and often peripheral" (p.58). Because of this, Hall calls for a third type of literature teaching. He suggests that literary criticism, which includes the nature of literary language, reader response theory, and communicative language teaching should be applied.

In teaching students to think critically using children’s literature, Green (1991) strongly recommends that it should involve enabling them to make meanings about the real world. Paran (2008) proposed the intersection of literature and language teaching that can clearly describe the use of children’s literature in language teaching. According to Paran (2008), there are four types of intersection of literature and
language teaching. The first type has a focus on language learning as well as literary focus. The second type focuses on language learning and a text with no concern for literary value, literary knowledge, or literary skill. The third type focuses mainly on literary values without concern for language learning; an example of this type of intersection is the use of literature in the traditional approach. The last type is extensive reading, where there is no focus on the literary qualities or language learning work; an example is the use of literature in the communicative classroom setting.

Consequently, researchers have noted that they need to continue to examine what is best for early-childhood reading instruction and fruitful for further higher education. Hiebert revisits the question of whether literature should be the sole material for reading instruction. She examines how young children best learn to analyze the written text and discovers that at the earliest stages of reading acquisition, especially when children are introduced to book reading in school rather than at home, careful attention must be paid to the texts they are using. She concludes that although authentic literature is vitally important, young children also need texts that are more systematic with skill development to learn how to read; skills must be explicitly taught. She considers several different types of texts and the tasks they pose for beginning readers, and concludes that literature is not the only source of materials for early literacy instruction (1999).

Experimental investigations in school settings have tried to identify specific elements of storybook reading that enhances literacy skills. Each of the studies has involved children in some type of active participation before, during, or after storybook reading. Qualitative studies, through observations and interviews, have documented
how children and parents interact and participate together in reading in the home environment (Teale, 1987).

Briefly, children's responses to read-aloud experiences and literature based reading to children’s literature-based instruction, both in questions and in comments, are a critical aspect of the interactive process. When questions are asked and then answered, children receive immediate feedback, which may aid their literacy development. Children benefit by having the opportunity to regulate their own learning by questioning adults in literacy situations and such comments help teachers gain insights into the way young children attempt to construct meaning and make sense of text.

**Teaching Approach for Children’s Literature**

**The Inquiry-based Approach.**

While there are a variety of approaches to teaching literature within critical thinking methods, two basic background framework approaches are discussed in this review. They is the inquiry-based approach within Bloom's Taxonomy (revised) methods suggested in Stella’s critical thinking development and assessment.

According to Cottrell (2005), the focus of the two methods is on the readers or students. That is, students are considered subjectively as playing an important role in understanding and thinking about the text. Critical thinking can be developed by the employment of both cognitive and affective domains mediated through the classroom and homework. The extent to which critical thinking can be achieved corresponds to what the readers bring to literary reading and writing— their experiences, maturity, attitudes, biases and so on.
The close relationship between literature and reality lends support to the tradition of asking from the mind of individuals. Moreover, forms of inquiry are also a mode for developing critical thinking. Applebee (1996) suggested that literature should be studied as a significant cultural discourse, which is a traditional way of knowing. This is the way of “knowledge-in-action.” It encourages students to participate in ongoing reading and writing within particular contexts.

In accordance with Applebee (1996), Green (1995) emphasizes that in teaching students how to think, teachers should select the topic or issue relevant to their presently problems to reflect the solutions; this is one of the most effective ways of learning suggested by Applebee (1996). According to Applebee, once students are motivated to act in such a way, they will acquire the content simultaneously. He emphasized that one of the most important things is questioning, a method that influences critical thinking. Therefore, different kinds of questions contribute to how texts are read in different ways. His students also shared their experience in class when they studied a poem by Robert Frost. In other words, the process of inquiry urges students to read to make their own understandings. In doing so, students are likely to foster their capacity for critical thinking.

In practice, Friedman (2008) suggests that the method of questioning of the text, especially the characters' actions, is a good approach to analysis and critique. One of the ways to practice thinking critically is to have students confront characters’ and authors' beliefs with their own. That is why Green (1995) suggests that teachers should find ways of being dialogical in relation to the texts.
In an addition, critical thinking accompanies a movement in education toward inquiry-based learning. According to Schamel and Ayres (1992), students learn best by doing. They are preparing their own questions based on their observations rather than participating in a prearranged exercise limited by preordained conclusions and the teacher’s influence. The suggestion of Ahern-Rindell (1999) that students be fully engaged in learning and cooperative group learning helps students interact with one another.

In summary, the inquiry-based approach therefore deserves recognition in any literature curriculum for several reasons. First, it is a living tradition which is based on contextualized social reality. Second, it treats knowledge as a form of action that can be obtained through class participation. Third, it encourages students to become conscious of their own reading and writing when trying to interpret learning texts. Finally, it enables students to make meaning of the world as well as to find possibilities to transform it. All of these provide a strong foundation for students to develop critical thinking.

**Related Studies in the Using of Children's Literature**

Three different types of research that support literature in the curriculum are identified. Wagner (1985) notes that students are motivated in first language acquisition, emergent literacy, and effective classroom experiences. It is self-evident that children's literature is extremely suitable for at least the first two, if not all three areas.

Current research on critical thinking and cognitive development demonstrates the link between language and thinking ability. Zhang and Alex (1995) bemoan the fact
that in teacher-centred classrooms, dominated by teacher discourse and worksheets, the development of oral language is not as progressive as that where children's literature dominates.

Supporting this view is Senechal et. al. (1996), who undertook a study of 47 first-grade children to investigate the effects of storybook exposure, and found that language skills and emergent literacy were enhanced. Similarly, Otto (1993) undertook a project designed to increase inner-city children's opportunities to interact with storybooks. She found that 75 percent of those in the study demonstrated a higher level of emergent reading at the end of the project.

The role of interactive storybook software was examined by Johnston (1997), in relation to kindergarten children; a significant increase in verbal ability was measurable after a 7-week period. Kelly (1990) examined third graders' response to children's literature that was read aloud to them, and determined that the exposure fostered comprehension, discussion, and writing skills and also promoted emotional involvement.

The recommendation of employing children's literature to promote critical thinking was made by Lehman et. al. (1990). They found that ownership of the learning produced more satisfactory results in relation to emergent literacy. Moreover, Caldwell (1991) emphasises the dynamic process of constructing meaning from text.

Children's literature can be applied as an alternative to set “textbooks.” Van Sledright & Kelly (1998) found that fifth grade students who were permitted to use alternative texts that they had selected demonstrated emerging signs of advanced thinking, in addition to the development of information quality judgment skills.
Additionally, Angeletti (1990) conducted research on teaching critical thinking strategies with the use of student-selected reading materials. It was proven that gains were made in skills areas and attitudes towards reading. The validity of the study was ensured by the use of high, average, and low ability readers in second, fourth, and fifth grades.

In terms of Schema Theory, exposure to a wide range of literature increases the learners' skills in critical thinking by providing a broad knowledge base in scenarios (Smith, 1991). Referring to the earlier research of Eckhoff (1983), Smith summarizes the results of a study of second graders who demonstrated an increase in writing ability after exposure to a range of different literary forms, when compared to a control group.

Readers draw on background experiences to compose a text, whether in concrete or abstract form. For this reason, reading offers the potential for higher level thinking (Collins, 1993). Through children's literature, students learn to read personally, actively, and deeply (Sweet, 1993). The syllabus requires students at Stage 1 to express ‘their own interpretation’ from information provided by texts (BOS, 1998, p.32).

Staniford (1984) investigated the application of children's literature and its value from a meta-cognitive perspective. In identifying common features of comprehension deficiencies, it was concluded that contributing to this deficit was the lack of appropriate schemata. This issue could be addressed by the application of children's literature when and as appropriate. Further, Douglas & Hartman (1993) argue that encouraging students to read across texts promotes deeper understanding and response.

Equity issues may be addressed through the integration of children's literature within the curriculum. D'Alessandro (1990) undertook research on the introduction of a
literature-based reading program for emotionally handicapped children, and found that not only did they learn to read more proficiently, but that there was also a measurable increase in their desire to read.

Englert et. al. (1995) explored the effect of an integrated reading or writing program that utilized children's literature for the development of literacy with mildly intellectually handicapped children, and reported positive benefits of this approach.

Although there was a severe delay in learning language, deaf children's responses to picture books were found to be similar to those of hearing children. The use of visual material in teaching deaf children language skills was examined by Williams & McLean (1997). Children experiencing learning difficulties were exposed to children's literature. In 1993, a longitudinal study of low socioeconomic status background African-American kindergarten and first-grade students was undertaken by Sulzby et. al. The research results have shown that the students responded positively to literature that was identified as being more appropriate to their personal circumstances.

In sum, children’s literature provides numerous benefits when used as learning material. The rich variety of material offered by children's literature stimulates language growth, and thus improves the learners' empowerment by increasing communication skills.

Moreover, children's literature addresses all of these issues. Research has demonstrated that the consolidation of the role of children's literature will benefit the development of language, and thus literacy. Critical thinking will be enhanced, as will the learners' engagement in their learning. In addition, children's literature enables equity and access issues to be addressed. The needs of the individual are
acknowledged; appropriate action is possible in responding to individual differences between learners.

**Critical Thinking**

In higher education, critical thinking has been identified as a necessary skill. Critical thinking is the ability to inquire, think, and make sound decisions regarding each individual’s learning skills. Alfaro-Le Fevre (2003) identifies a set of indicators of critical thinking that reflect the cognitive, affective, and knowledge behaviors of this complex construct. Many educators try continually to strive to promote the skill of inquiry in a variety of ways. A necessary component of literature education incorporates strategies to enhance learning and critical thinking in literary texts and the variety of literature themes.

Critical thinking theorists, such as Watson and Glaser (1980), McPeck (1981), Facione (1990), Boychuck (1999) and Simpson and Courtney (2002), all generally define critical thinking as including analysis, evaluation, and inference. In addition, Bitner and Tobin (1998) add interpretation, explanation, and self-regulation as central to critical thinking. Many theoretical approaches to critical thinking have been developed, but there is yet no theoretical approach which can integrate, at least to some degree, the given theoretical models, or evaluate their relevance for daily instruction.

In addition, O’ Tuel and Bullard (1993) have developed a taxonomy to describe the processes we see as important. The emphasis in this taxonomy is on processing, so verb participles have been used to describe the hierarchy. The suggested verbs range from least complex (collecting data process) to most complex (using multi-processes).
However, constructivist and information processing theories suggest that knowledge needs to be organized, that certain ways of presenting processes and information facilitate learning, that practice and feedback are necessary for processes to be learned, that a base of information is needed on which processes may be carried out, and that much of what we say about how the brain works is inferred from a variety of measures and deductions. These all have implications for instruction, particularly for instruction in higher order thinking processes. This review of theory and process addresses the considerations in selecting an instructional model and some of the better articulated approaches to using these models.

Bloom's Taxonomy.

There are many ways of organizing the field of knowledge and the processes of thinking. Although there are lists of several taxonomies, or classification systems which the reader may want to explore, the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain (Bloom et. al. 1956), also known as "Bloom's Taxonomy," is reviewed as a domain theory in this study.

Bloom's Taxonomy is used in planning instruction in mastery learning programs. Mastery learning has been combined successfully with thinking skills in Maryland and New York (Arredondo & Block, 1990).

Bloom's Taxonomy is hierarchical in that the lower levels are considered inherent in the higher levels; that is, the students can perform the activities of the levels under the one with which they are working. For example, if we ask students to apply a formula to solve a problem (application), we assume they could define the terms (information) and tell us in their own words what the solutions mean and recognize
instances where they might use them (comprehension). When the class has discussions and asks questions, six levels or groups of verb lists are given to the students. They can be the tools for asking for information. This is the first step for students to make informative and questions.

Using verbs at the various levels can assist us in preparing questions which will take students to higher levels of thinking. This is not to imply that we should avoid asking the who, when, what, how, and where questions; they are basic. The problem is that many times those questions are all we ask and all we test. Questions such as, Why do you think so? and What would happen if..., will engage students in processing the material in more meaningful ways. Some teachers post the levels and several verbs from each category in their classroom to serve as prompts when they are asking oral questions.

The six levels of Bloom's revised taxonomy (2001), starting with the lowest level and moving up, are remembering, understanding, applying, analysing, evaluating, and creating (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

**Remembering.** This category refers to what one can remember from previous learning or experience. It involves simple recall and recognition; the learner may have acquired the information by rote learning. This is the lowest level of understanding; examples are naming and defining three parts of a cell.

Verbs which describe what we ask students to do at this level include list, describe, identify, state, etc.
Understanding. This category indicates some understanding of the knowledge the learner has acquired. If one can paraphrase or translate knowledge, put it in his or her own words, he or she comprehends it. It may involve recognizing or giving examples of a category. When one translates from words to numbers, comprehension is being demonstrated. Changing a word problem in mathematics to a number sentence is one example of translation; reading a graph or chart is another.

Verbs which refer to this level include paraphrase, translate, extend, and give examples.

Applying. This is the ability to use previously learned material in new situations. The material may be facts, rules, methods, concepts, or generalizations. The person understands the material and recognizes the appropriateness of using it in a new and concrete situation. This is considered the beginning level of higher order thinking.

Verbs which indicate the activities at this level include operate, use, compute, solve, apply, etc.

Analyzing. As the name of the category implies, analysis is the process of breaking into parts, making comparisons, finding similarities and differences between parts of a whole or separate sets, and seeing organizational patterns and structures. Many of the most interesting activities in which we ask students to participate fall in this category. Even kindergartners can observe objects, events, or persons and discern differences and similarities. In fact, this ability to discriminate differences is a forerunner of being ready to read. The ability to recognize organizational patterns and break large amounts of material into smaller segments would seem a necessary precursor to being able to put elements or components together in meaningful new ways (synthesis).
Verbs which illustrate the activities at this level include differentiate, discriminate, infer, outline, compare, relate, contrast, plan, design, generate, etc.

*Evaluating.* Some educators think of evaluating as another higher level of Bloom's hierarchy. It consists of making judgments based on previous levels of learning to compare a product of some kind against a designated standard. The major difference between evaluating and creating is the necessity to have an *a priori* standard against which one makes the evaluation. Because evaluation implies valuing in the decision making, some characteristics of the affective domain may be included. Judgments based on personal likes and dislikes cannot be ruled out, as those are still standards, albeit personal ones. If justification of a decision can be explained, then evaluation is presented. This is the level where many of the "WHY" questions we ask fit. Why do you believe that? What is the reason you have for that choice? How do you know that is so?

Verbs which are used to ask for processes at this level include rate, judge, decide, defend, debate, appraise, justify, evaluate, etc.

*Creating.* The top level in terms of complexity, difficulty, and abstractness is evaluation. The processes here involve making judgments based on some type of criteria. Creating is a critical skill in academic settings and in the world beyond. It includes the ability to organize, to arrange elements in meaningful relationships, and to make inferences about those relationships. Another important activity of creating is judgment in composing. When students write compositions, regardless of the type, they are creating something new based on what they know. Constructing an organizational
pattern for a body of material or developing plans and sequences of events are other creative activities.

Verbs for this category include compose, create, organize, construct, etc.

However, there is more than one way to teach literature that promotes critical thinking in classrooms. Manlove (1989) stated that students need to pay careful attention to the texts selected in literature class in order to find evidence for literary meaning and criticism. Some poems, novels, and plays are used to engage students with the actual analyses of the texts. Moreover, Cassel and Congleton (1988) used the technique of reading-aloud, discussion, role playing, and mind mapping with the novel to motivate critical thinking in relation to the novel. Figure 1 illustrates six categories of Bloom taxonomy: the old version and new version.

![Bloom Taxonomy Old and New Version](http://www.odu.edu/educ/lbschult/blooms_taxonomy.htm)

**Figure 1.** Classification of Bloom Taxonomy: Old Version and New

*Source: [http://www.odu.edu/educ/lbschult/blooms_taxonomy.htm](http://www.odu.edu/educ/lbschult/blooms_taxonomy.htm)*
The Emergence of Teaching of Critical Thinking on Reading and Writing

At present, the Internet has become a major source of knowledge, and many young people search for information from it every day. However, information on the Internet is not always reliable, so people can be deceived, and they can receive wrong information (Chareonwongsak, 2008). As a consequence, people need to be equipped with critical thinking to be able to judge the reliability of the information (Chareonwongsak, 2008). That is why the ability to think critically is essential for people to live and work effectively (Howe & Warren, 1989). Changes in technology have made critical thinking more important than before (Halpern, 1989).

In Thai society, it is often claimed that Thai people lack critical thinking skills. While some reviews online mention this concern among foreigner teachers, Thai students’ thinking in reading and writing seems to lack the ability to give logical supporting details (Stapleton, 2002). Young Thai people also tend to lack critical thinking skills, so they are not able to judge whether they should believe the information they have received (Chareonwongsak, 2006, 2008). According to Chareonwongsak (2006), there are two main factors that discourage critical thinking among Thai people. On the one hand, in Thai culture, young people must follow what their elders say. Society expects that, in order to be decent people, they should be obedient. In the family, parents often tell their children what to do. Children who keep questioning things around are perceived as aggressive. When they enter school, they need to do as their teachers want them to do. They do not have much opportunity to think for themselves or think differently from others for fear that they might be rejected. Moreover, some Thai teachers do not want their students to make an argument, so the
students always sit quietly. Second, the educational system of Thailand focuses on rote learning. Therefore, students usually try to memorize the things they are taught. They do not have a chance to think about or ponder on that knowledge, so they do not give reasons for what they do. Furthermore, students get used to the teacher-centred approach, so they do not try to make an argument. An exam always tests for memorization, and it leaves no place for students to give reasons. A lot of students study only when they need to take an exam, and they do not truly learn for knowledge, but learn only for passing an exam. This kind of learning behaviour prevents students from being critical thinkers. Chareonwongsak (2008) explains more that the lack of argument shows the failure of Thai educational system in terms of teaching the students to be able to think critically.

Understanding about or responding to what you are reading is not just critical reading though; comprehension is the reason for and main motivator reading. The aim of reading comprehension has driven hundreds of research studies in the area that probably has gotten the least attention in the classroom in the last 30 years. Reading with critical thinking methods and learning how to use logic are probably the policies that Thai students need the most.

Delores (1978) suggested a study to demonstrate that there was little if any reading comprehension instruction happening in most classrooms and that the little that did occur was “mentioning” rather than teaching. Having children answer comprehension questions to assess their reading comprehension was the main activity most often seen. This finding surprised the reading community and probably drove much of the reading comprehension research that has occurred since. Unfortunately, more recent research (Beck, McKeown & Gromoll, 1989; Pressley & Wharton-
McDonald, 1998) indicates that reading comprehension instruction is still a rare commodity in most elementary classrooms.

One important type of reading comprehension research has focused on the characteristics of good readers. Duke and Pearson (2002) summarized what good readers do. They always: (a) are active and have clear goals in mind, (b) preview texts before reading, make predictions and read selectively to meet their goals, (c) construct, revise and question the meanings they are making as they read, (d) try to determine the meanings of unfamiliar words and concepts; (e) draw from, compare and integrate their prior knowledge with what they are reading, (f) monitor their understanding and make adjustments as needed, (g) think about the authors of the text had in mind and evaluate the text’s quality and value, and (h) read different kinds of texts differently, paying attention to characters and settings when reading narratives, constructing and revising summaries in their minds when reading expository texts.

Earlier reviews of research on teaching reading comprehension found that a number of specific lesson frames can improve reading comprehension ability (Pearson & Fielding, 1991; Tierney & Cunningham, 1984). What most of these lesson frames have in common is that they include guidance throughout and links among before, during, and after reading activities. They each teach one or more strategies that appear in one of the lists (above) with explicitness, application, or both. Comprehension strategies taught in SAIL (Pressley, Almasi, Schuder, Bergman, Hite, El-Dinary, et. al., 1994) include predicting, visualizing, questioning, clarifying, making associations between text and reader’s experience and summarizing. In SAIL (Students Achieving...
Independent Learning), students observe teacher think-alouds and then practice applying these strategies to a variety of texts.

Elley (1989) found that 7 and 8-year-old children in New Zealand learned new word meanings incidentally from being read to, and remembered those word meanings months later. He also found that below-average children learned about as many word meanings from teacher read-alouds as did above-average children.

Similarly, Stahl, Richel, and Vandevier (1991) found that sixth graders in an urban school acquired a significant number of new word meanings from being read to. Again, there was no difference between children with low versus high previous word meaning knowledge, and even those with the lowest knowledge learned word meanings when they were read a book above grade level.

However, comprehensive reading and writing programs have two reasons to include effective writing instruction as a component. First, it cannot be a comprehensive reading and writing program without adequate quantity and quality of writing instruction. Second, there is evidence that good writing instruction also teaches children how to read better.

The research on teaching writing is clear: grammar instruction does not result in students writing more correctly (Hillocks & Smith, 2003). Traditional, presentational instruction, where there are examination of written models, specific writing assignments, and teacher feedback on that writing, has only a small effect (Hillocks, 1986). Instead, natural process writing instruction is more effective, and what has been called environmental writing instruction, where students engage in various writing
activities designed to teach them to learn and apply specific writing strategies and skills is more effective still (Hillocks, 1986).

The key to teaching writing, including the conventions of writing, appears to include being consistent with a developmental sequence that recognizes the commonalties of children as they move from early emergence to sophisticated ability (Dyson & Freedman, 2003; Farnan & Dahl, 2003; Hodges, 2003). Effective writing programs will look very different, grade-by-grade, and will have expectations for children at each grade that are appropriate to their development as writers rather than to arbitrary standards based on tradition or how officials would like to test writing. The best writing instruction will teach students how to plan, compose, revise, and edit their own pieces of writing, all within the context of inquiry, self-assessment and self-regulation fostered by interaction with teachers and peers.

The Perceptions on Critical Thinking

The most common definition of perception is “the attitude or understanding based on what is observed or thought”. In the contemporary empirical research on directions and processes of intellectual development, perception is defined as "the process of using the senses to acquire information about the surrounding environment or situation" (Encarta World Encyclopedia, 2005). In other words, perception is the act of gaining information through one’s sense. Another definition according to Encarta World Encyclopedia is "the result of the process of perception". It is the information acquired by the interpretation of the senses. Robbin (2005, p.4) defines perception as “a process by which individuals, organize and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment”. Brignall (2001) considers perception as
the process to which people attach meaning to the world. Therefore, perception refers to the way people try to comprehend the world around them. Mosher (1998, p.1) proposes that perception is not only a gathering of input from the sensory system, but also the brain’s interpretation of stimuli depending on an individual’s genetics and former experience. He concludes that “perception is actually message constructed using outside input, inner neuron processes and past, relevant information stored in the brain”.

As discussed above, perception is the way that people look at things and try to understand something by organizing and interpreting their sensory impression in order to create their beliefs, opinions and views towards that particular thing.

Brignall (2001) points out the three stages of the perception process as follows:

Selection is the first stage in which we select stimuli attended through five senses: sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch.

Organization is the second stage in which we psychically organize the stimuli or information we attend to so we understand the stimuli.

Interpretation is the last stage in which we provide meaning to the stimuli. The interpretation of stimuli depends on our values, beliefs, needs, experiences, involvement, self-concept and experience.

According to Robbin (2005), there are three factors influencing perceptions: first, the perceiver referring to attitudes, motives, interests, past experiences and expectations; second, the target being perceived made up of novelty, motion, sound,
size background and proximity, and third, the context of the situation referring to time, setting and social setting.

Therefore, perception refers to people’s views, opinion, and beliefs towards things events or situations. The meanings they attach to the environment is also interpreted from their past experience, expectation interest, and attitude. Consequently, students’ experience in language learning, their expectations and interest towards the class environment and teaching methodology also affect their views, beliefs and their opinions towards learning language is class. If students have the good perceptions towards language learning, they are likely to learn English successfully. This study explores students’ perceptions towards the critical thinking ability after children’s’ literature –based instruction consisting of the study of students’ views, opinions and belief towards the critical thinking activities in the classroom.

**Related Studies**

According to the earlier research of Eckhoff (1983), Eckhoff summarizes the results of a study of second graders who demonstrated an increase in writing ability after exposure to a range of different literary forms, when compared to a control group.

Staniford (1984) investigated the application of children's literature and its value from a meta-cognitive perspective. In identifying common features of comprehension deficiencies, it was concluded that contributing to this deficit was the lack of appropriate schemata. This issue could be addressed by the application of children's literature when and as appropriate. Wagner (1985) notes that students are motivated in first language acquisition, emergent literacy, and effective classroom experiences. It is
self-evident that children's literature is extremely suitable for at least the first two, if not all three areas.

Current research on critical thinking and cognitive development demonstrates the link between language and thinking ability. Zhang and Alex (1995) bemoan the fact that in teacher-centred classrooms, dominated by teacher discourse and worksheets, the development of oral language is not as progressive as that where children's literature dominates.

In terms of Schema Theory, exposure to a wide range of literature increases the learners' skills in critical thinking by providing a broad knowledge base in scenarios (Smith, 1991). Readers draw on background experiences to compose a text, whether in concrete or abstract form. For this reason, reading offers the potential for higher level thinking (Collins, 1993). Through children's literature, students learn to read personally, actively, and deeply (Sweet, 1993). The syllabus requires students at Stage 1 to express 'their own interpretation' from information provided by texts (BOS, 1998, p.32). Further, Douglas & Hartman (1993) argue that encouraging students to read across texts promotes deeper understanding and response.

Supporting this view is Otto (1993) undertook a project designed to increase inner-city children's opportunities to interact with storybooks. She found that 75 percent of those in the study demonstrated a higher level of emergent reading at the end of the project. Similarly, Senechal et. al. (1996), who undertook a study of 47 first-grade children to investigate the effects of storybook exposure, and found that language skills and emergent literacy were enhanced.
The role of interactive storybook software was examined by Kelly (1990) examined third graders' response to children's literature that was read aloud to them, and determined that the exposure fostered comprehension, discussion, and writing skills and also promoted emotional involvement.

Additionally, Angeletti (1990) conducted research on teaching critical thinking strategies with the use of student-selected reading materials. It was proven that gains were made in skills areas and attitudes towards reading. The validity of the study was ensured by the use of high, average, and low ability readers in second, fourth, and fifth grades.

The recommendation of employing children's literature to promote critical thinking was made by Caldwell (1991) emphasises the dynamic process of constructing meaning from text. In a study of 192 teachers and their teaching practices, Lehman et. al. (1990) found that ownership of the learning produced more satisfactory results in relation to emergent literacy.

Equity issues may be addressed through the integration of children's literature within the curriculum. D'Alessandro (1990) undertook research on the introduction of a literature-based reading program for emotionally handicapped children, and found that not only did they learn to read more proficiently, but that there was also a measurable increase in their desire to read.

Children's literature can be applied as an alternative to set “textbooks”. Englert et. al. (1995) explored the effect of an integrated reading or writing program that utilized children's literature for the development of literacy with mildly intellectually handicapped children, and reported positive benefits of this approach. Johnston
(1997), in relation to kindergarten children; a significant increase in verbal ability was measurable after a 7-week period. Van Sledright & Kelly (1998) found that fifth grade students who were permitted to use alternative texts that they had selected demonstrated emerging signs of advanced thinking, in addition to the development of information quality judgment skills.

Although there was a severe delay in learning language, deaf children's responses to picture books were found to be similar to those of hearing children. The use of visual material in teaching deaf children language skills was examined by Williams & McLean (1997). Children experiencing learning difficulties were exposed to children's literature. The research results have shown that the students responded positively to literature that was identified as being more appropriate to their personal circumstances.

In sum, children’s literature provides numerous benefits when used as learning material. The rich variety of material offered by children's literature stimulates language growth, and thus improves the learners' empowerment by increasing communication skills.

Moreover, children's literature addresses all of these issues. Research has demonstrated that the consolidation of the role of children's literature will benefit the development of language, and thus literacy. Critical thinking will be enhanced, as will the learners' engagement in their learning. In addition, children's literature enables equity and access issues to be addressed. The needs of the individual are acknowledged; appropriate action is possible in responding to individual differences between learners.
In the context of English language learning and teaching in Thailand, English is considered a compulsory course for all undergraduate students since it is important and relevant to the current situation of a globalizing world. Consequently, it is the responsibility of Thai EFL instructors to help their students to become critical thinkers while learning English. This can be supported by many previous studies. First, research has shown the close relationship between language and thinking skills (Piaget, 1971; Vygotsky, 1962). It is believed that students’ ability to think about their own language process can enhance their learning (Liaw, 2007). In addition, critical thinking skills promote higher-order learning skills which in turn enable students to reach higher levels of language proficiency (Renner, 1996 as cited in Liaw, 2007, p.46).

The review has shown that various methods and techniques have been tried successfully, and there are many benefits of using literature to develop critical thinking in the ESL and EFL classes. For example, Erkaya (2005) integrated short stories in class and discovered that the students had high motivation, increased knowledge of literary texts as well as the development in higher-order thinking skills. Based on Bloom’s Taxonomy and Wakefield’s applied taxonomy, Ishikawa, Sasaki, and Yamamoto, (2006) developed the English courses that integrated critical thinking skills in a Japanese University. One example of the course objective is to develop the synthesis level of thinking skill using the poem and song to assign students to predict or hypothesize the author’s intentions. Jarudom and Wasanasomsithi (2010) used drama and questioning techniques to promote critical thinking of Thai EFL learners, the findings of the study showed that these techniques were effective for enhancement of critical thinking, and the students’ dispositions of critical thinking improved.
Tung and Chang (2007) attempted to develop critical thinking through literature reading. The study aimed to investigate the efficacy of developing critical thinking skills through activities designed using the reading comprehension pop quizzes, learning log, and group presentations, guided in-class discussion with questioning skills and individual essay-question reports. Khuankaew (2010) employed literary texts and non-literary texts as supplementary reading and writing to enhance Thai EFL university students focusing on critical writing. The development of writing and critical thinking was found in students, and students revealed the positive attitudes towards reading both literary and non-literary texts.

Another piece of research which explores the impact of children’s literature on literary development in EFL was by Lao and Krashen (2000). The experimental group in this study comprised six classes, with a total of 91 first-year students majoring in translation at a university in Hong Kong. The study was divided into three periods: two classes in the spring semester of 1996, two in the fall of 1996 and two in the fall of 1997. The comparison group of students were 39 first-year social science majors who enrolled in a traditional academic skills development course. The students in the experimental groups read six novels in one semester. Students saw corresponding films after they read a book, and they discussed what they read together. After that, they were asked to do short essays. Students in the comparison group did not read the novels; they were required to do a research project instead. A pre-test and post-test, plus a questionnaire were used as instruments. In order to measure the acquisition of vocabulary, the Accuracy Level Test (ALT) was administered, and The Rate Level Test (RLT) was used to measure the reading rate.
The results showed that students in the experimental group made significant gains in their vocabulary growth and reading rate. Eighty-eight percent of these students felt that reading literature would help them in other university courses, and eighty-seven percent were more interested in reading for pleasure. Eighty-five percent found reading for pleasure a better approach to acquire English than formal instruction. Thus, this study confirms that meaningful reading is an important source of literary development.

Research using children's literature to teaching English was conducted by Liaw (2001). This study explored Taiwanese university students' literary responses to five American short stories. The researcher aimed to explore the role of literature in a foreign language classroom focusing on reading and writing skills. The participants were 31 non-English-majoring freshmen. Various activities such as discussions and journal entries were used to allow students to develop their own views. This study examined the students’ written journal to see the effects of reading the short stories. Furthermore, interviews were conducted to gain the students' opinions on the effectiveness of using short stories. The results revealed that the students used their background knowledge, life experiences, values, and personalities in their interpretations of the stories. This showed that they became very much involved with the stories. Moreover, their English language proficiency improved. The interview results showed that the students became active in their learning and they had positive attitudes towards the use of children’s literature in learning English as a foreign language. The researcher concluded that the use of children’s literature in the EFL classroom was significantly effective.
To sum up, studies in finding ways to improve students' critical thinking skills using literature were applied to many different groups of learners. Moreover, the researcher used numerous and techniques and methods that researcher for collecting data, interpreting the data, and presenting the results. Many existing studies of improving critical thinking skills have focused on EFL students as target groups and have involved critical literacy including listening, speaking, reading and writing as techniques and methods in collecting and analyzing the data.

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter reviewed the theoretical background of children’s literature, critical thinking and approaches to teaching that develop critical thinking ability through literature, including the inquiry-based approach and the reader-response based approach. The next chapter presents the research methodology used for the study.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was an investigation of two research questions related to the effectiveness of using children’s literature to enhance students’ critical thinking ability by focusing on critical reading and writing ability. The first research question aimed to investigate whether students who study children’s literature get higher scores in critical thinking ability on reading and writing. The second explored students’ perceptions towards the use of children’s literature designed for these ends. This chapter describes the research methodology beginning with research procedures, the population and participants, research instruments, instruments construction, and data collection procedures.

Research Procedure

Research design.

This study used a quasi-experimental study with one single group pretest-posttest design. The study examined the third-year English major student’s critical thinking ability in reading and writing both before and after taking a Children’s Literature course (ENG 2302). In the study, the Pretest and Posttest Critical Reading and Writing Ability were used as the main research instrument to evaluate the participants’ critical thinking ability after children’s literature instruction. The Students’ Perception of Critical Thinking Ability Questionnaire was used as the source for obtaining the students’ perception toward critical thinking ability after the literature-based instruction.
Context of the main study.

This study is a quantitative research aimed at helping to develop the reading and writing ability of students enrolled in a children’s literature course. The course, was designed for undergraduate students majoring in English, and it included the components of raising critical thinking awareness with the use of the six domain steps of learning (Bloom’s Taxonomy revised version). The study asked whether students would be able to improve their critical reading ability through the response writing process. In this process they practiced general to specific levels of Bloom’s taxonomy questions, which are the following: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating. To help the students to think and write more effectively, the inquiry-based instruction and the six domain learning steps were employed as the dependent variable for teaching. The students, in class, were asked to write short responses from the reading activities provided by the critical thinking questions. Students could write their responses on the papers as class work and homework. The students could also freely express their own thoughts, learning experiences, personal observations, problems or difficulties they encountered and the plan to solve the stimulated problems.

Population and Participants

The population of this study was EFL third-year undergraduate students majoring in English at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Chiang Mai Rajabhat University (CMRU) who took the course ENG 2302, Children’s Literature, in the second semester of academic year 2011.
The participants were 50 third-year undergraduate students majoring in English in the second semester of academic year 2011, selected by the convenience sampling procedure.

Research Instruments

The research instruments used in collecting data were as follows:

The Pretest and Posttest on Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing.

The test was designed to be used in assessing the critical thinking ability of third-year students at Chiang Mai Rajabhat University. More specifically, the test was used for comparing the difference in critical thinking before and after the course. The test was based on the level of critical thinking domain steps and educational approach of the revised version of Bloom’s taxonomy (remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating).

The critical reading abilities assessed in the test were: a) identifying the author’s purpose and intent; b) identifying tone, attitude, and bias; c) reaching conclusions, inferences, and implications; d) recognizing relations between text parts, and e) interpretation of “vocabulary in the context of literature.”

The Pretest and Posttest Construction

The research instruments were designed as follows:

The Pretest and Posttest Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing. Two genres of children’s literature poem and prose were used for the test. Thereby, the Pretest and Posttest Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing were divided into two types: multiple-choice items and written questions, and there
were two parts of the test according to the types of literature: poem and prose. Table 1 presents the description of the Pretest and Posttest.

**Table 1**

*Types and Content of Literature and the Number of Test Items in the Pretest and Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Types of Texts</th>
<th>Number and Test items for Critical Reading</th>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>Number of Test Items for Critical Writing</th>
<th>Type of Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 1-2</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 17</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 1-2</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 16</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 3-4</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 17</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 3</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 15</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 5-6</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 17</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 4</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 15</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 7-9</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 17</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 5-6</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 15</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 10-11</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 19</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 8</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 14</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>Part 1 Poem</td>
<td>15 items Item 12-15</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 20</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 2 Prose</td>
<td>10 items Item 9-10</td>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>5 questions item 15</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the reading part of the test consisted of a total of 25 multiple-choice items aimed at assessing students’ critical reading ability in ways such
as remembering, comprehending the meaning, interpreting instructions, stating a problem in one's own words, using their concept in a new situation, and applying or testing their judgments about the value of ideas or materials with emphasis on creating a new meaning or structure. The ability to see relationships between ideas and use them as the supporting details in reading and writing is the definition of critical reading ability (Halvorson, 1992). Since these students took The Pretest and Posttest Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing before, it can be assured that this test can measure student’s critical reading ability.

In addition, the Pretest and Posttest Writing Ability consisted of 10 open-ended questions aimed at assessing students’ critical writing ability in several ways. These include a clear and confident refusal to accept the conclusions of other writers without evaluating their arguments and evidence; a balanced presentation of reasons why the conclusions of other writers may be accepted or may need to be treated with caution; a clear presentation of one’s own evidence and argument, leading to conclusion; and a recognition of the limitations in this evidence, argument, and conclusion. Wellington et al. (2005) states that to obtain the information about student’s critical writing ability, a teacher should get into the habit of writing critically by making sure that students read critically, and that they include critique in their writing (p.84). (See Appendix A for the Pretest and Posttest Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing).

**Validity of the Test.** To establish the validity of the test, the researcher asked three experts in TEFL and literature to examine the clarity of test directions, the statement and wording of test items, length and readability of the reading passages, representation of test items of the critical reading and writing skills under
consideration, and the overall suitability of the test for assessing critical reading and writing. After that the test was revised according to the comments and suggestions of these experts as well its appropriateness. Some statements and test items were deleted, modified, or added to increase clarity.

**Reliability of the Test.** Then the test was piloted with another group of English major students who were not participants of the study. The test was administered to 50 third-year EFL students; scores on answers of the odd-numbered questions were correlated to their scores on answers of the even-numbered questions. The reliability of the test calculated used the results from the pilot test. The calculated reliability coefficient made the test reliable enough at .984 to be used for the purpose of the study.

**The Student’s Perceptions of Critical Thinking Ability Questionnaire.**

The questionnaire aimed to obtain the student’s perception toward their critical thinking ability after learning through children’s literature instruction. There were 25 items of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was adapted from Cottrell (2005). The statements in the questionnaire asked about the students’ general knowledge and skills of critical thinking. First, it asked what the students perceived about the critical thinking ability, what they know or don’t know about critical thinking, whether they need to develop their critical thinking, and confidence about their critical thinking ability. The critical skills asked in the questionnaire included evaluating the strength of the evidence to support different arguments, giving reasons for arguments, constructing a line or reasoning to guide the audience through the evidence and lead them towards conclusion, selecting the examples, providing evidence to illustrate arguments, and evaluating the source of materials.
The questionnaire was examined by three experts, one native speaker of English, and two non-native speakers for the appropriateness of the language use, the objectives, the content and ambiguity and then the unclear items were revised based on the comments and feedback. Table 2 shows the categories of the students’ perception toward critical thinking ability of the questionnaire.

Table 2

*Categories of Critical Thinking Knowledge, Skills, and Perception and Number of Items Used in the Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Items in the questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Understanding of the wider context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Understanding benefits of critical thinking</td>
<td>2, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Developing underlying thinking skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Identifying the component parts of an argument for critical thinking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Distinguishing argument from disagreement, summaries and explanation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Being able to analyze the structure of an argument</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Being able to read between the lines</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Identifying false or unfair assumptions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Seeing behind the surface</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Weighing up opposing arguments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Analytical strategy for the material</td>
<td>5, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evaluating the evidence for alternative points of view</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Checking for levels of probability</td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Applying critical thinking when taking notes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Using language more effectively to structure argument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Presenting my own arguments clearly in writing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Evaluating and selective approach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Recognizing techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Reflecting on issues in a structure ways, bringing logic and persuasive</td>
<td>18, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the table, the knowledge part of the questionnaire consisted of an total of 7 self-rating items aiming at assessing students’ perceptions of critical thinking ability such as understanding the context, understanding the benefits of critical thinking, developing underlying thinking skills, identifying the component parts of an argument for critical thinking, distinguishing argument from disagreement, summaries and explanation, being able to read between the lines, identifying false or unfair assumptions, seeing behind the surface, weighing up opposing arguments, developing analytical strategies for the material, evaluating the evidence for alternative points of view, checking for levels of probability, applying critical thinking when taking notes. Therefore, the ability to see the relationships between ideas and use them as supporting details in reading and writing is the definition of critical reading (Halvorson, 1992). (See Appendix B for Student’s Perceptions of Critical Thinking Ability Questionnaire.)

**Validity of the Questionnaire.** To decide on the validity of the questionnaire, it was submitted to university EFL specialists to decide on wording, format,
directions, and the overall appropriateness of the questionnaire for assessing the reading and writing motivation of prospective EFL students. Some items were restated, deleted, or modified according to the suggestions of the specialists.

**Reliability of the Questionnaire.** The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated using the test-retest method. A preliminary form of the questionnaire was administered to the pilot sample of the study (N=50) twice a month. Students’ scores in the two administrations were calculated using Pearson’s formula for reliability coefficient. The accepted value of reliability coefficient is 0.965 which makes it reliable enough to be used in assessing the students’ perception of critical thinking ability.

**Instructional Materials.**

**Lesson Plans and Class Activities.**

The lesson plans in this course were based on the children’s literature course syllabus. The course aimed to provide a core of experiences to support development of students’ critical thinking in reading and writing.

**Descriptions of the Lesson Plans.** The lesson plans consist of 8 units, as follows:

- **Lesson plan 1:** “THE GIVING TREE” by Shel Silverstein
- **Lesson plan 2:** “JABBERWOCKY” by Lewis Carroll
- **Lesson plan 3:** "I WANDERED LONELY AS A CLOUD" by William Wordsworth
- **Lesson plan 4:** Six Nursery Rhymes, The Mother Goose collections
- **Lesson Plan 5:** African Folktale: THE MAN WHO NEVER LIED
Lesson Plan 6: Fairy tale: THE EMPEROR’S NEW CLOTHES by Hans Christian Andersen

Lesson Plan 7: Six Fables, Aesop's fables

Lesson Plan 8: Mythical story: ECHO AND NARCISSUS

(See Appendix C for the detailed class schedules and class activities.)

The lesson plans included reading and writing selections chosen individually by teachers and students. Students were asked to apply the process of Bloom’s taxonomy as their own reading and writing guideline, shown in the training procedures. As Wells (1990) indicates, children and young adults develop literacy (reading, writing, and thinking) by having real literacy experiences and getting support from more experienced individuals, who may be adults or peers. Research clearly shows that literature-based instruction helps all students become better readers, writers, and thinkers (Tunnell & Jacobs, 1989).

Scoring Criteria.

William Peirce’s critical thinking scoring rubric (2006) was used to evaluate the second section of the pretest and posttest-writing in which the students wrote in response to the questions asked in accordance with the content of the test: poem – “Love and Friendship” in part 1, and prose “The Wisdom of Solomon” in part 2. A rubric is a matrix with a concise description of expectations at different levels of accomplishment and an organized approach to evaluate the conclusion of a multi-steps exercise (Ramey, 2007). Analytic rubrics feature multiple scales that provide diagnostic information useful to both students and teachers. The rubric construction avoids inclusion of unrelated factors, such as inconsequential grammatical errors, and it ensures consistent measurement of student performance (Moskal, 2007). It is hoped
that generating data feedback will be useful for instruction and students. Critical thinking scoring rubric (Peirce, 2006) and TAKS short answer (McDonald, 2003, 2004) were used to assess students’ critical think ability in reading and writing (see Appendix D).

Inter-rater Reliability. There were three raters who rated students’ overall critical thinking ability on writing. The first rater was a university lecturer from Chiang Mai Rajabhat University, the second held a Ph.D. in English and was from Chiang Mai University, and the third was an experienced teacher of English writing from Maejo University. The raters had practiced scoring with TAKS short answer scoring criterion and critical thinking rubrics. The scores of the rating were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment correlation to ensure inter-rater reliability. The correlation between rater 1 and rater 2, rater 1 and rater 3, and rater 2 and rater 3 was at 0.965, 0.963, and 0.966 for the pretest, as well as 0.966, 0.965, and 0.963 for the posttest. This shows that the correlation between the raters was high.

Data Collection Procedures

The data were collected according to the following procedures:

1. The students enrolled in the ENG 2302 Children’s Literature course were asked to participate in the study. The researcher provided the consent forms to students, so the students participated in the study through their own willingness. The pretest was administered to students at the beginning of the experiment. The test had two parts: Part 1- poem and Part 2- prose. Then the students’ pretests were scored for analysis. The data obtained from the reading part, the reading scores, which were given 1 point for each item, and the scores used to assess students’ critical reading before the implementation. Then the scores from the writing part (responses to the
open-ended questions) had also scored by three raters, they are Thai instructors. The scores from raters were calculated for inter-rater reliability. The sums of the scores of the writing part were used to assess students’ critical writing.

2. The researcher taught the students how to use the materials constructed following the class and the teaching method used was children’s literature-based instruction. The teaching lasted 16 weeks including the pretest and posttest. (See class schedule planned in Appendix C.)

3. The post-test was administered to the students in groups at the end of the course (week 16). The scores from the reading part and the writing part were processed using the same procedures as the pretest, so that the both sets of the posttest scores were used to compare as the pretest scores to determine the changes and development in students’ critical thinking ability.

4. The Students’ Perceptions of Critical Thinking Ability Questionnaire was administered to students in the experimental group to examine their attitudes toward critical thinking including interpreting skills (knowledge), processing skills (skills) as well as reacting skills (perception reaction). The questionnaire was administered to students two days after the posttest.

Data Analysis and Statistic Used for Data Analysis

The data was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively in according to research questions as follows:

**Research Question 1.** Do students who study children’s literature get higher scores in critical thinking ability?

**Quantitative Data Analysis.** To find the answer for Research Question 1, the data were analyzed quantitatively.
1. The total mean score of pretest and posttest of students were calculated to determine the significant difference between their total mean score. The results revealed the change or growth in critical thinking in the students’ reading and writing ability learned through the use of children’s literature and the teaching approach designed based on inquiry-based and Bloom’ six domain steps approach in the course syllabus of the Department of English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Rajabhat Chiang Mai University, before and after instruction.

2. The students’ scores from the reading part of Pretest and Posttest Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing were first analyzed to determine the means and standard deviations. Then the mean pre and post test scores were compared using dependent t-test by the computer software program. The results revealed the development of students’ critical thinking, critical reading affected by learning through the inquiry-based instruction.

3. The students’ scores from the writing part of Pre and Post Critical Reading and Writing Ability Test were obtained using William Peirce’s Critical thinking scoring rubric (2006) and Ana McDonald’s TAKS short answer scoring rubric (2003-2004). Then the scores were analyzed to determine the means and standard deviations, and finally the mean scores of writing from the pre and post test in both groups were compared using dependent t-test by the computer software program.

Research Question 2. What are students’ perceptions of critical thinking ability after using children’s literature-based instruction?

Quantitative Data Analysis.

1. The scores of student’s perception of critical thinking ability were analyzed to determine the mean and standard deviations, and then the mean scores of the
questionnaire of students in the experimental group were compared using independent
$t$-test by the computer software program. The results revealed the development of
students’ critical thinking and critical reading through the use of children’s literature.

**Qualitative Data Analysis.**

1. The self-ratings from the Student’s Perceptions of Critical Thinking Ability
   Questionnaire were calculated using descriptive statistics to determine mean and
   standard deviations for the level of students’ opinions of knowledge, skills, and
   perception.

2. To triangulate quantitative data, the questionnaire data were analyzed
   qualitatively using the content analysis with reference to the six main level of learning
   of Bloom’ Taxonomy: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating
   and creating. The researcher and the raters read and reread notes and rated the themes
   relevant to critical reading and writing ability of students in each lesson plan entry
   based using the Revised Bloom’ Taxonomy. Then the emergent answers were
   identified.

3. The opinions of the Student’s Perceptions of Critical Thinking Ability
   Questionnaire were analyzed descriptively to confirm the answer from self-ratings of
   the questionnaire.

**Summary of the Chapter**

Chapter 3 first presented the research design, which is a mixed methods
design, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. The
subjects of this study were 50 third-year English majors enrolled in ENG 2302
Children’s Literature course at Chiang Mai Rajabhat University. The Pretest and
Posttest critical thinking ability on reading and writing was employed as the main research instrument for collecting data in the quantitative part of the study to examine reading and writing ability of EFL that the students perceive and possess.

In addition, this study involved qualitative data collected from students’ activities and tasks writing during learning through the children’s literature course. The activity sheet entries were used as the source of qualitative data to gain more insight into students’ critical thinking. It also sought to learn when, why and how students develop critical reading and writing and how to read and write responses to literature.

Finally, Chapter 3 discussed how the data analysis methods concerning descriptive statistics, statistical procedure; qualitative data analysis were applied to find the results for this study, the development of students’ critical thinking ability in reading and writing and their perceptions toward the teaching of children’s literature.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of learning children’s literature as a means of implementing critical thinking of the third year university students. The participants of the study were 50 third-year students majoring in English at Chiang Mai Rajabhat University. Data form this study were obtained through the pre-test and post-test critical thinking ability answered by the participants. This study also explored the students’ critical thinking perception questionnaire regarding the use of children’s literature instruction in the classroom as well as their awareness and knowledge receiving in the classroom. This chapter presents the quantitative results of the research showing the difference between students’ critical thinking before and after the experiment. In addition, the students’ perceptions of the children’s literature based instruction are also discussed.

The following section presents the findings for Research Question 1: Do students who study children’s literature get higher scores in critical thinking ability?

The Effectiveness of Using Children’s Literature Instruction in Developing Students’ Critical Thinking Ability.

The difference between the overall mean scores of pre-test and post-test.

The mean scores of the third-year English major students’ critical reading and writing on the pre-test and post-test were calculated using descriptive statistics for the mean and standard deviation. Then the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test were compared using a paired t-test in order to investigate the effectiveness of using of children’s literature to teach critical thinking.
The analysis of the paired t-test calculated on the mean scores of the pretest and posttest showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest. Table 3 illustrates the comparison between the overall means of the pretest and posttest scores of students.

Table 3

*The Comparison of the Overall Mean Scores on Pre-test and Post-test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical thinking ability score on reading and writing</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>-83.17</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level (p < .001)

Regarding Table 3, the results show a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the third year students’ critical thinking ability at the .01 level. The mean scores of post-test (\(M = 32.40, SD = 5.78\)) were higher than the mean scores of pre-test (\(M = 20.32, SD = 5.77\)).

The Improvement in Critical Thinking Ability after the Experiment.

The difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test in poem reading.

In order to study the level of improvement in critical thinking ability after the experiment, fifty students had to take both a pre-test and a post-test about the poem in 25 items on six levels of critical thinking according to Bloom’s taxonomy. The first ten items tested students’ critical reading ability and the last 15 items tested student’s critical writing ability.

The analysis of the pair t-test calculated on the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test in all critical thinking levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy showed that there was a
statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test in critical reading and writing. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate the mean scores of reading in the poetry pre-test and post-test scores of students on poetry reading and writing. Tables 6 and 7 illustrate the mean scores of reading in the prose pre-test and post-test scores of students on prose reading and writing respectively.

Table 4

The Mean Scores of Reading in the Poetry Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Poetry Reading levels</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level (p < .001)

As shown in Table 4, the mean scores of the post-test were higher than the mean scores of the pre-test in all levels of critical thinking. The highest mean score of the pre-test among the first 15 critical poetry reading items was the mean score of remembering level ($M=1.78$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.74$), followed by the mean score of understanding level ($M=1.24$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.96$). Then, the mean score of applying level ($M=1.14$) which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.66$), followed by the mean score of analyzing level ($M=1.26$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.44$). In addition, in the higher level of critical thinking ability level, the mean
score of evaluating ($M=1.98$) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=1.08$), followed by the mean score of creating ($M=1.20$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.36$). Table 5 illustrates the mean scores of writing in the poetry pre-test and post-test.

Table 5

**The Mean Scores of the Writing in the Poetry Pre-test and Post-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Poetry Writing levels</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level (p < .001)

As shown in Table 5, the mean scores of the post-test were higher than the mean scores of the pre-test in all levels of critical thinking. The highest mean score of the pre-test among the critical poetry writing items was the mean score of understanding ($M=1.12$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=1.16$), followed by the mean score of applying level ($M=1.14$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.19$). Then, the mean score of analyzing ($M=1.12$) which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.25$), followed by the mean score of evaluating ($M=1.18$), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.25$). In addition, in the higher level of critical thinking ability, the mean score of creating ($M=1.31$) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test ($M=0.37$). Table 6 illustrates the Mean Scores of Reading in the Prose Pre-test and Post-test.
Table 6

The Mean Scores of Reading in the Prose Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Prose Reading levels</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-11.80</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-11.22</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-12.46</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-5.96</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-21.00</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-46.65</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level (p < .001)

As shown in Table 6, the mean scores of the post-test were higher than the mean scores of the pre-test in all levels. The highest mean score of the pre-test among the critical prose reading items was the mean score of remembering (M = 0.10), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.00), followed by the mean score of understanding (M = 1.00), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.26). Then, the mean score of applying (M = 0.76) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.04), followed by the mean score of analyzing (M = 0.92), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.16). In addition, in the higher level of critical thinking ability, the mean score of evaluating (M = 0.48) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.060), followed by the mean score of creating (M = 1.34), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 0.44). Table 7 illustrates the mean scores of the writing in the prose pre-test and post-test.
Table 7

*The Mean Scores of the Writing in the Prose Pre-test and Post-test*

| Critical Prose Writing levels | Pre-test | | | | | | Post-test | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                              | \( n \) | \( M \) | \( SD \) | \( M \) | \( SD \) | \( t \) | \( p \)-value | \( p \)-value | **Significant at the .01 level (p < .001)** |
| Understanding                | 50       | 0.26 | 0.44 | 1.00 | 0.73 | -21.48 | 0.000** |
| Applying                     | 50       | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.76 | 0.52 | -39.12 | 0.000** |
| Analyzing                    | 50       | 0.16 | 0.37 | 0.92 | 0.63 | -20.28 | 0.000** |
| Evaluating                   | 50       | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.48 | 0.61 | -30.92 | 0.000** |
| Creating                     | 50       | 0.44 | 0.50 | 1.34 | 0.65 | -29.05 | 0.000** |
| Overall                      | 50       | 0.19 | 0.35 | 0.90 | 0.63 | -28.17 | 0.000** |

As shown in Table 7, the mean scores of the post-test were higher than the mean scores of the pre-test in all levels of critical thinking. The highest mean score of the pre-test among the critical prose writing items was the mean score of understanding (\( M = 8.18 \)), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (\( M = 0.43 \)), followed by the mean score of applying level (\( M = 8.24 \)), which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (\( M = 0.45 \)). Then, the mean score of analyzing level (\( M = 7.33 \)) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (\( M = 0.39 \)), followed by the mean score of evaluating level (\( M = 8.40 \)) which was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (\( M = 0.35 \)). In addition, in the higher level of critical thinking ability, the mean score of creating level (\( M = 8.18 \)) was higher than the mean score of the pre-test (\( M = 0.41 \)). The following section presents the finding for Research Questions 2: What are students’ perceptions of critical thinking ability after using children’s literature-based instruction?
Students’ Perceptions towards the Critical Thinking after Children’s Literature-based Instruction

To explore students’ perceptions of the use of children’s literature, students were required to answer the students’ perception questionnaire by rating each item on a five-rating scale from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. Students’ self-rating scores of the perception questionnaires were analyzed and calculated for the mean and standard deviation and interpreted into five levels from very low to very high. The result showed that students had a positive perception of critical thinking, rated at a high level ($M=3.54$).

To gain some insight into the students' attitudes were asked to answer a questionnaire at the end of the experiment with the students in the experimental group. The numerical values of one (1) for Strongly agree, two (2) for Agree, three (3) for Neutral, four (4) for Disagree, and five (5) for Strongly Disagree were assigned to these Likert-Scale items, so it was possible to calculate a numerical value for the mean, and the standard deviation that shows the variability of the mean response to each question. The sample mean and the sample standard deviation are listed for questions one through ten in the following table. The questions were abbreviated to fit the table. The following is the analysis of the results. The scale values were interpreted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Range</th>
<th>Scale Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.21-5.00</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.41-4.20</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.61-3.40</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.81-2.60</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-1.80</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows students’ perceptions of critical thinking ability.

**Table 8**

*Students’ Perceptions of the Critical Thinking after Using of Children’s Literature in the Classroom*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel comfortable pointing out potential and hidden idea in literary works.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can remain focused on the exact requirements of an activity.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know the different meanings of the word 'argument' in critical thinking.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can analyze the structure of poem and prose in literary works.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can offer criticism without feeling this makes me a bad person.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know what is meant by a line of reasoning.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am aware of how my current beliefs might prejudice fair consideration of an issue.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am patient in identifying the line of reasoning in an argument.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am good at recognizing the signals used to indicate stages in an argument.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I find it easy to separate key points from other material to apply for using.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am very patient in going over the facts in order to reach an accurate view.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am good at identifying unfair techniques used to persuade literature readers.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am good at reading between the lines.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I find it easy to evaluate the evidence to support a point of view.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. I usually pay attention to small details.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I find it easy to weigh different points of view fairly.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If I am not sure about something, I will research to find out more.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I can present my own arguments clearly.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I understand how to structure an argument for critical thinking.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I can tell descriptive writing from analytical writing.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I can spot inconsistencies in an argument easily.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is a good opportunity for me to thinking critically.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am aware of thinking while I study in other subjects.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I know why I need to learn materials evaluating.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I know that the way for practicing critical thinking is very hard but worthy.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 8, the overall mean scores of students’ perception of critical thinking ability instruction in classroom were high with the mean score at 3.54. It was found that the learners had the highest positive attitude towards awareness of thinking while they were studying another subjects. The learners had the highest positive attitude towards the application of critical thinking (Item 23 $M= 4.34$). The learners responded to the item asking that, “I am aware of thinking while I study in another subjects.” Next, the students had a high positive attitude towards critical thinking in Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 22, as presented in
Table 8. The lowest of attitude fell in Item 8: “I am patient in identifying the line of reasoning in an argument.” ($M=2.90$). In addition, the students had a medium level of critical thinking after learning through children’ literature-based instruction in Items 2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 24, and 25.

The findings demonstrated students’ positive perceptions on the critical thinking ability after children’s literature-based instruction using the inquiry-based approach and reader response approach. From the questionnaire, it was found that the high score of the student’s responses to the questions was 3.54 which indicated that most students liked the critical thinking methods in children’s literature class. Their responses to the questionnaire provided at the end of the semester also confirmed the findings. Many students thought that learning through critical thinking methods such as inquiry-based approach made the lessons more interesting and more practical. One of the students stated that, “This class is different from the other classes. It is more interesting”. Another student added, “The kind of teaching by keeping asking makes students interested in their learning, enjoyable, and relaxed”.

Furthermore, some students commented that learning by reading and writing altogether through responding to the questions in the reading text made them feel more confident to express themselves, as can be seen from one of the students’ sentiment, “This course is very beneficial because it makes us feel more confident to express ourselves both in asking questions and writing with supporting details”. In addition, a number of students stated that they thought that learning in this course helped them to improve their language and thinking ability, as they noted that “after studying this course, I think I have gained improvement in critical thinking ability on reading and writing from the children’s literature text provided”.
Moreover, most students thought that the activities in the first teaching steps helped and enhanced their understanding of the lessons, their language, and their thinking ability. Students rated in the high level of the high opinion in the item that “I can practice many skills such as asking the informative questions and thinking analytically”. They also liked the learning atmosphere which they thought the winter time was very “relaxing and enjoyable”. They also like the inquiry-based approach for the same reasons. They added that the inquiry-based teaching approach helped create their confidence to express and present themselves with well-reasoned details supporting. They responded that “I feel comfortable pointing out potential and hidden idea in the literary works”.

Although, the students like the children’s literature that it seemed to be their most favorable teaching materials, as was evident in the students’ expression of their positive feeling including “I can analyze the basic structure of the poem and prose in children’s literature” and “I understand how to structure an argument for critical thinking”. Students expressed their feelings that “I feel I can make a good questions much better than the previous times in reading poem and prose. I can see my progress in many aspects. I am proud that I can ask for more details”. For the critical thinking ability on reading, many students stated that they liked reading children’s literature because it provided them with opportunities to practice thinking, expressing, opinions and exchanging ideas. For example, they pointed out that “It is a good opportunity for me to thinking critically” and “I learnt how to evaluate materials.

Similar to the data obtained from the teacher’s dairies, most students’ dispositions to respond to the inquiry-based teaching method in positive perceptions. The teacher noted that students had active involvement in critical thinking methods
teaching and the class discussions. They also worked attentively in games and the group discussion. The teacher, for example, recorded that “The students were fun in class discussion”.

The findings from the teacher’s diaries concerning the students’ perception on the critical thinking seemed to be confirmed the students’ perceptions reflects in the questionnaires and their class discussion. However, it may notice that the students were afraid of making mistakes or the waiting time was not adequate for them to formulate their thought (Tan, 2007). It was also possible that the students had difficulty expressing their thoughts towards literature. As a result, they kept quiet. It is therefore the teacher’s responsibility to examine the cause of the silence and encourage the students to get more actively involved in the class activities.

In conclusion, students had positive attitudes towards the teaching method. Students agreed that critical thinking activities and literary texts helped them read and write better and think more critically.

**Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter presented the results of the study showing the effectiveness of using children’s literature to enhance students’ critical thinking ability in reading and writing before and after the experiment. In addition, the students’ perceptions of the critical thinking ability after using children’s literature were also presented. The next chapter summarizes the research, main results of the study with discussions and explanations. Implications of the study as well as recommendation for further studies are also presented.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The study aimed to investigate the effective learning of using children’s literature to enhance students’ critical thinking ability on reading and writing of the third year university students. In addition, the study explored students’ perceptions of critical thinking ability. This chapter presented the summary of the research, the results using children’s literature-based instruction, the extent the students improved their critical thinking ability after experiment, students’ perceptions towards critical thinking ability in relation to the use of children’s literature-based instruction and class activities. In the last section, the conclusion and discussions of significant findings of the present study, the implications and recommendation for the research are also discussed.

Summary of the Research

This research investigated whether using children’s literature to enhance student’s critical thinking ability on reading and writing. Furthermore, the purpose of the study was to investigate whether the two genres of literary texts: poem and prose could enhance overall critical thinking ability on reading and writing. The participants of this study were 50 third-year undergraduate students majoring in English in the second semester of academic year 2011, selected by convenience sampling procedure. Three students who were absent on the first day of the class were excluded from the study because they had missed the pre-test. Then, the 50 participants studied in ENG 2032 class (Children’s Literature) for 16 weeks as their regular class; they were taught to read the literary texts: poem and prose, but the experiment lasted 8 weeks, totally 24
periods excluding the time for the pretest and posttest. The teaching method for students was carried on using the lesson plans and class activities designed for motivating critical thinking based on Inquiry-based Approach and Reader-Response Approach. Students were required to read a supplementary text both poetry and prose, discuss in groups, and then write short answers for the response to the questions. The questions asked after reading the texts aimed to encourage their critical thinking and elicit their level of thoughts in accordance with Bloom’s taxonomy: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating. The students’ responses to the questions were in the form of written text. Two types of rubrics were employed to see the students’ development in critical thinking ability on reading and writing. Critical thinking scoring rubric (Peirce, 2006) and TAKS short answer (McDonald, 2003, 2004) were used to assess students’ critical thinking ability on writing. In terms of the writing ability, three inter-raters scored the written works then the scores were calculated for the average means and used to determine whether there was the improvement in their writing ability. The development of the overall reading and writing ability of the students was also assessed by comparing their pretest scores and posttest scores; there were two types of test items: multiple choice and essay test. The dependent t-test was used to test the statistical difference between the sets of scores: reading and writing of the pretest and posttest, before and after the experiment. The significance level (α) was set at the .05 level.

The analysis indicated that critical thinking ability on reading and writing of students significantly improved from the beginning to the end of the semester. The questionnaire results showed positive perception towards the critical reading ability after the use of children’s literature in class. Students liked reading the supplementary
texts, and they agreed that the activities were useful and effective to develop critical thinking ability on reading and writing. Students reported their feelings towards the group discussions in class, and they pointed out problems of using Bloom’s taxonomy approach and self-inquiry in the classroom.

**Discussion**

Discussions of the results are presented under two major topics: (1) reasons for students’ development in critical thinking ability on reading and writing and by the end of the semester, and (2) reasons why students have the high level of perception toward critical thinking ability after learning through children’s literature.

**Reasons for Students' Development in Critical Thinking Ability on Reading and Writing**

It is evident that the students developed their writing skills and critical thinking ability throughout the semester. The accounts for this development were from the information of the texts. Students have opportunities to acquire words and ideas from the text before starting writing. First, reading has a good effect on writing performance. Therefore, reading before writing is beneficial to general students. Grabe (2003) pointed out that reading and writing had a strong relationship, and reading had an impact on writing performance. As he suggested, students learned how to organize a text, and collect information while they read the texts. This finding is in agreement with Krashen (2004), who suggested that extensive reading contributes to better writing ability. The class activities results confirmed that the students were positive about the integration of reading in the writing class, and they agreed that reading either poem or prose texts had a positive effect on their writing performance. Moreover, the students have positive perception on reading and discussion. Moreover, class activities that
focus on students' response to the texts and discussion could develop students' overall critical thinking on reading and writing at a certain level. As Alverinann (1998) and Combs (1997) stated, by comparing and contrasting students' own ideas with their friends, students learned to think critically. This research was based on Bloom’s taxonomy theory in which knowledge was built through steps of learning. Students worked together in reading activities and a discussion when they learned to elaborate their ideas from their less competent peers. In class reading activities and discussion, students learned to see the similarities and differences in their ideas, and this expanded students' views towards the reading topics. Thus, they began to think more critically.

The last factor concerns writing in response to the questions. In this study, students had a chance to reflect on their own and their friends' ideas. They could use their life experiences and explore themselves while they wrote a short paragraph response. In a short writing, students did not have to think much about grammar, so they rather appreciated it. Grabe (2003) also stated that making an inquiry while reading in the combination with writing is an efficient way to improve students' writing. This finding is consistent with those of Angelo (1990) and Khoenkaew (2003), who studied the impact of journal writing. In Angeletti’s study, conducted research on teaching critical thinking strategies with the use of student selected reading materials. It was proved that gains were made in skills areas and attitudes towards reading. Similarly, Khoenkaew's study also showed that students who wrote in response to a reading text (reading logs) improved their writing ability. Cadet (2009) also suggested that incorporating journal writing with the writing class enhanced writing quality. Therefore, free-write writing with making inquiry while writing could have a great
impact to develop students' overall reading and writing ability because students learned to relate their ideas, solve problems, discover themselves, and use their imagination.

In summary, three factors influencing students' improvement in overall critical thinking ability on reading and writing were a reading-writing relation, role of the class activities, the class discussion, and role of free-write writing.

**Reasons for Students have Overall High Perception on Critical Thinking Ability towards Using Children’s Literature**

The possible explanations why students have overall high perception towards using children’s literature in terms of overall critical thinking ability on reading and writing are discussed as follows.

**Literary Texts.**

It was found out that students preferred reading prose such as legends, fables, tall tale, and folktale in the class. According to Thai literature class, most of the literature class, most of the literary texts had provided for students to study in prose. Students stated that they liked to read a descriptive story from the book, worksheet provided or from the Internet. Students suggested that the reading texts should not be limited to short stories. Moreover, one of the students said that she disliked reading poem, and she found them not practical to real life. For her, poem was just imaginative, and she preferred reading short stories or prose such as fables or tall tales. This is in line with the experiment by Erkaya (2005) integrated short stories in class and discovered that the students had high motivation, increased in the knowledge of literary texts as well as the development in higher-order thinking skills.
The readability level of the texts and the difficulty in the interpretation plausibly affected the results. Because the poem selected was difficult for the students in the pilot study, some of the poem was changed into easier ones. For example, *The Chaos* was viewed by students in the pilot study as the most complicated poem to study, so it was changed into *Country Rhymes for Children*, in which the theme of the poem was back to country and good environmental setting. When the poem which required a lot of interpretations was changed into an easier one, the students probably gained and acquired critical thinking ability. Thus, the poem used in this study yielded the significant different effect from the student’s perception of critical thinking on using children’s literature for example, tall tales, fables, and legends.

**Reading Ability.** The study in this study majored in English, and their reading ability was in a certain level to understand the basic literary texts. It can be seen from their pretest scores on reading that students had done very well. However, reading with inquiry-based approach is considered as an activity for literature subject and English students (Applebee, 1996). Friedman (2000), suggest the way to questioning of the text, especially on the part of characters' actions, is a good approach to analysis and critique. One of the ways to practice thinking critically, students is focused to confront characters and authors’ beliefs or their own. Once in Applebee's study, students are motivated to act in such a way, they will acquire the content simultaneously. He emphasized that one of the most important things is questioning which traditional method for critical thinking is. Therefore, different kinds of questions contribute to how texts are read in different ways. It could be concluded that the inquiry-based method using when reading the literary texts is probably suitable for all students who need a technique to effective reading.
**Writing Ability.** The students in this study majored in English, and their writing ability was in intermediated level. It can be seen from their pretest scores on writing; the students had low scores. However, writing in response to the literary text is often considered as an activity for language superior students as the English majored students. (Steinberg, 1993). Akyel and Yalcin (as cited in Liaw, 2001) also pointed out that only students who felt that they had a very good command of English appreciated the use of literature. Those who felt they had low language proficiency found literary works too boring, and too hard. Although Paran (2008) stated that literature could be used at any level, this study can be emphasized that it might not be suitable for less competent learners in non-English major. As previously mentioned, writing is not only about thinking, but it also about grammar and usage. This finding is consistent with Akyel and Yalcin's findings. It could be concluded that literary response is probably suitable for English majored students who already have a competent level of English.

**Motivation.**

Motivation is another factor involved. As stated, the participants were English majors. The results from the questionnaire as well as the discussion in the classroom showed that a lot of them lacked interest in English reading and writing before studying this class because it would be hard job for them to write and revise many times in their third-year studying in order to be survived. In the first week, the students were asked which English skills they were interested in the most, they answered speaking and listening. The students reported that they had rarely written anything in their daily lives except for exams. Some even stated that they thought writing skills were not important. When they responded to the questionnaire asking whether they preferred basic writing
such as simply fact report, writing for their presentation than analytical writing, the majority of the students then chose the neutral response; 46%. Not highly motivated, students did not desire to learn English writing, nor to participate in reading and discussion. Furthermore, the questionnaire results revealed that a lot of students came to class earlier and discussed the stories with their friends which provide as the homework in the previous class. One of the students stated that she loves the way to read with critical thinking and discuss with her friends. She always needs the opportunities to exchange her idea with class and in her group. This positive motivation to come to class might have resulted from the children’s literature texts as well as the inquiry-based approach.

**Thai culture.** The Thai culture of studying and learning might inhibit students' critical thinking. As Chareonwongsak (2006, 2008) pointed out, Thai students were used to teacher centered learning. Moreover, not many subjects in the university level in Thailand focus on critical thinking. This is related directly to the students' learning style. Thai students still preferred teacher-centered classroom as the spoon feed learning system (Piyanukool, 2001). Moreover, Hyland (2003) points out different cultural aspects between Western and Asian learners. He states that while Western learners are encouraged to criticize, analyze problems, and reflect on arguments, Asian learners tend to conserve the existing knowledge, and use strategies such as memorizing and imitation. This Asian culture of teaching and learning has a great impact on discussion activities. Instead of criticizing their peers' ideas, students respect their peers' comments. According to the class discussion, students preferred to discuss the question and the topic provided in the class based up on their implementation and experience with the topic. This problem on discussion was noticeable that students
sometimes seemed reluctant to share ideas during group work or class discussion in class activities. For example, one of the students said that she could not learn from her own idea because she has the direct experience on the issue and does not know how important to give or share opinions. She further stated that because of Thai learning culture from the primary school, she was not confident enough to speak. It is quite clear that some of students liked to be listeners. They liked listening to their friends' ideas, but they did not want to share their ideas. In the other hand, one of student stated that discussion with friends was somewhat fun, but he thought that the teacher should give feedback to his ideas whether they were right or wrong. It showed that this student still wanted to rely on the teacher's judgment, and he still believed that there must be a correct answer to every question. These results are consistent with those of Roxana (2003), who found that students needed an instructor's interpretations of the literature reading. Another student shared similar opinions towards discussion. She thought that her friends’ opinions were weird, and they were somehow not correct, so she did not like this activity. She said that it did not mean that only her ideas were correct, but her friends' ideas were not acceptable for her. These attitudes were similar to Kim's (2001). He stated that there were still some teachers as well as students who believed in the notion of one correct answer. These attitudes somehow inhibit the students’ ability to think critically, and it showed that the students did not have critical thinkers' characteristics; open minded, and respectful of other opinions. Therefore, it is important for the teachers to encourage their students to become critical thinkers.

**Timing.** Time is probably another learning factor to account for the students. This study began in the end of October 2011 and lasted for 16 weeks. There was a suitable weather for learning which the winter time in Chiang Mai was. The cool and
comfort weather motivated students to come to class. However, they spent time on the green lawn in front of the building, got gathering in the warm sun and made a discussion about literary texts and vocabulary before class. However, at the first week, the class met was in afternoon 15.00-17.00 on Tuesday, students did not pay full attention during the study. A lot of students wanted to finish the class as early as possible in order to go to part time job, and they were not willing to have a discussion because they wanted to leave. Students usually complained that they were hungry and tired, so they could not concentrate much. So, the researcher was suggested to move up class to the morning. It starts from 9.00-12.00 on the same day. Students were willing to come and could concentrate for the activities and lessons. With the problem of inappropriate class time, the teacher can take a role solving and changing class time.

In short, six reasons why students have overall high perception towards using children’s literature in terms of overall critical thinking ability on reading and writing include literary texts, reading ability, writing ability, motivation, Thai learning style, and time.

Implications

The findings of this study have a number of important implications for Thai EFL classroom setting. The implications of this study are described as in the following.

1. Based on the findings previously discussed, both poem and prose as the literary texts are worth applied in teaching in college reading and writing class to help improve students' critical thinking ability on reading and writing because the two reading text types yielded significant different results. In this study, reading prose literary text might be more effective than reading poem literary texts in the
development of critical thinking on reading and writing. The scores of pretest and posttest have shown that integrating inquiry-based and response of the writing in class was beneficial. Nevertheless, the texts used should have appropriate length and difficulty and they should be appropriate for the students’ language level.

2. Regarding the group discussion, as reading activities, in the implementation, the students could have the opportunities to share their ideas with their peers. The discussion encouraged them to work together, to have more confidence, and learn from each other. This allows collaborative learning. Although the students’ opinion reflected their positive opinion on self-confidence from the questionnaire result, they reported that the critical thinking method is quite hard to realize, but practical. The results also showed that students take a good chance to bring the critical thinking method to use in daily life and other classes after learning the inquiry-based approach. The self-questioning could be applied to elicit the students’ background knowledge (schema) related to the lesson learned in each class, the students can reflect on their thoughts and think more critically.

3. This study showed that Thai students still have problems with reasoning and the method of thinking although they have not studied the ways to think correctly since primary school. There should be more concern about critical thinking method and teaching steps of thinking. Zhang and Alex (1995) argue that in teacher-centred classrooms, dominated by teacher discourse and worksheets, the development of oral language is not as progressive as that where children's literature and inquiry-based approach dominate.
Recommendations

The following are some recommendations for further studies:

1. This study supported that reading prose literary texts was as effective as poem literary texts in terms of overall critical thinking ability on reading and writing. However, prose literary texts seemed to have a better role in promoting critical thinking of Thai low proficiency students than the poem literary texts. As one of the students on the class discussion, poem is too hard and boring. More studies are needed to confirm these results.

2. Since the participants in this study seemed to be confident with their English, further studies on this issue should be pursued with different groups of participants as it is claimed that literature is suitable for superior students (Steinberg, 1993). It is worth investigating whether children’s literature is the most effective for teaching students at what educational levels: primary, secondary or tertiary.

3. In this study, the students showed positive interest in class activities and the discussion. In further research, inquiry-based learning approach should be taught to the students to motivate them to discuss. Moreover, everyone in the group should have their role in solving a task. One technique used is to assign a group of students to do a group project, but when it comes to the presentation, one of the group members will be randomly selected, and the entire group will receive the same grade from the presentation. This method can encourage students to actively participate in the discussion.
4. The time for this study was inappropriate. As mentioned earlier, the class time was 15.00 - 17.00. This afternoon time had a lot of disadvantages; for example, students were too tired, hungry, and they wanted to leave as early as possible. Therefore, different class time could yield different results as the researcher had made to the participants. Literature class should be in the morning period of study.

5. Regarding to the failing critical skills, this research showed that the Bloom’s Taxonomy theory in critical thinking steps helped develop critical thinking ability. However, some of the students were still at a low level of critical thinking ability from pretest and posttest. From week one to week six student’s responses, students were not able to write with properly details supporting. It was considered short period for improving critical thinking ability. Therefore, longitudinal study might provide more solid evidence of this teaching method.

6. In this study, the teacher selected the reading texts for the students. In the further studies, the students might be given the lists of reading texts and select the texts to read according to their own interests.

7. Finally, the reading texts used in this study was the simplified and retold version. The students, however, still used a retold literary textbook in their literature class. Future research should use the reading texts as a primary source for the class so that the effect of using prose literary text and poem literary texts might be more distinct and practical for them to study the original text.
Conclusion

This chapter discussed the two major results of the study; (1) the critical thinking ability on reading and writing of the students significantly improved from the beginning to the end of the semester; (2) students have overall high perception towards the critical reading ability after using children’s literature. The results confirmed the usefulness and effectiveness of using and learning children’s literature to enhance student’s critical thinking ability on reading and writing. The two text types; prose and poem had equally good effects on the students' writing and critical thinking skills. The suggestions for further research were to use this teaching method with different groups of students, and to try to motivate students to participate in the discussions. Although the students benefited from self-inquiry reading and writing response, a variety of activities such as games, songs, charts, pictures are also needed. Their writing and critical thinking levels were significantly improved gradually. The recommendations for this study were to study further on the role of literature and inquiry-based approach on another group of participants and to use more various literary texts as a primary source. This study revealed the picture of Thai college students who were English majors and the ways to improve their critical thinking ability on reading and writing.
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APPENDIX A
The Pretest and Posttest
The Critical Thinking Ability in Children’s Literature Test

คำอธิบาย: ข้อสอบชุดนี้ต้องการวัดความรู้ความสามารถในการตีความและวิเคราะห์เหตุการณ์
องค์ประกอบ แง่คิดแฝงใน เนื้อเรื่องนักศึกษาจะต้องทำการทำข้อสอบทั้งส่วนทั้งหมด 90 นาที
และให้เขียนคำตอบไว้ในกระดาษที่จัดไว้ให้

Part 1: Emily Bronte’s Love and Friendship

Love and Friendship
by Emily Bronte

Love is like the wild rose-briar,
Friendship like the holly-tree
The holly is dark when the rose-briar blooms
But which will bloom most constantly?

The wild-rose briar is sweet in the spring,
Its summer blossoms scent the air;
Yet wait till winter comes again
And who will call the wild-briar fair?

Then scorn the silly rose-wreath now
And deck thee with the holly’s sheen,
That when December blights thy brow
He may still leave thy garland green.

Source: http://www.online-literature.com/bronte/1349/
Instruction: Mark [X] for multiple-choice questions and write your answers in the answer sheet provided.

1. What does Emily compare ‘Love’ to?
   a. The wild rose
   b. The bush of holly tree
   c. The darkness of the winter wild
   d. Her best friend

2. What is the relationship symbolic between Love and Friendship in the poem?
   a. Rose-briar : cherry tree
   b. Rose-briar : holly tree
   c. Rose-bear : cherry tree
   d. Rose-bear : holly tree

3. What happen to the holly tree when the rose is blooming?
   a. The white horse will come.
   b. All trees in the wood will turn dark.
   c. The tree leaves will fell off.
   d. The rose will be very beautiful but the holly tree will turn dark.

4. Can you tell why Emily compare rose-briar and holly tree?

5. Which is true about the statement?
   a. Rose-briar is a kind of beautiful wild rose.
   b. The holly tree is a god tree.
   c. It is very difficult to see rose-briar.
   d. The taste of rose-briar is very sweet.

6. Why Emily says ‘The wild rose briar is sweet in the spring’?
   a. It is the time to change season.
   b. The bush of holly tree will grow faster and kill wild rose at last.
   c. The darkness of the winter makes the rose grows quicker.
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d. The rose is in the highest blossoms time so it is very beautiful and smell good.

7. When is no rose in the wood?
   a. In the winter
   b. In the summer
   c. In the spring
   d. All year long

8. What is the meaning of ‘fair’ in line 8?
   a. The dark color of wild rose
   b. The pale color of wild rose
   c. The darkness of the winter wild
   d. The pale color of the holly tree

9. What could happen if there is no holly tree?
   a. The attraction of the bee and insect is very important.
   b. The darkness of the winter in the wood makes every tree die.
   c. The wild rose can’t be survived because of any light for it leaves.
   d. Her best friend doesn’t want her to plant the rose in the house.

10. What does Emily compare ‘the silly rose-wreath’ to?
    a. The human invention
    b. The deforestation
    c. The friendship which is very sensitive.
    d. Her best friend who died a year ago

11. Why does Emily use the word ‘scorn’ for the rose in today?
    a. The wild roses are extinct.
    b. She can’t smell the scent of wild rose any more.
    c. She tries to make a new scent of her perfume.
    d. Emily satires these days people who don’t care about love and friendship.

12. How people use the rose wreath?
    a. They would like to celebrate their Christmas.
    b. They use the rose wreath for someone who died.
c. They hang the rose wreath on front door to show that they miss family members.
d. They want their holly’s sheen back to home.

a. Plant the wild rose around people house
b. Remove holly tree out of your house
c. Cut off the tree which named for bad luck

13. When there is no flower on the wreath, what will happen there?

a. The wild rose will grow well.
b. The bush of holly tree will grow quickly.
c. The month of December is begun.
d. There is just the garland green without flowers.

14. What is suggested as the solution for keeping love and friendship together?

a. The world will be no wars.
b. People will leave alone with no chatting.
c. The rose and the holly tree will be blossom
d. There will be no any participation.

15. How would you feel if we have no any serious arguments?

a. The world will be no wars.
b. People will leave alone with no chatting.
c. The rose and the holly tree will be blossom
d. There will be no any participation.

16. What is the most important about your friendship?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

17. What in the world can be comparing with your love?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

18. If you want to explain someone about your friendship and love, what can be your way to present them?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
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19. In this world, if there is just friend and love, what will happen?
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
20. In your opinion, what is the most important, your lover or your friends?
Why?
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
Part 2: The Wisdom of Solomon

The Wisdom of Solomon

As the two women came to King Solomon to plead their case, one of them spoke first. “I plead with you, Sire, to hear what I have to say!”

“Speak!” said the King. “What is your problem?”

She pointed to another woman who was standing near her with a tiny baby in her arm. “Sire, this woman and I live in the same house. About two weeks ago I gave birth to a son. She helped me. She and I were the only ones there.” As the spoke, tears came to her eyes.

“Go on, my daughter,” said the King.

“Three days later, my lord, this woman also had a baby. And it, too, was a son. I helped her give birth. There were still only two of us in the house.” Tears streamed from her eyes as she continued.

“A few days later, her baby died in the night because she accidentally lay on it as she slept. And then she took my son from my bed while I was sleeping and put her dead child beside me.” She continued to weep as she spoke. “When I got up in the morning to nurse my son, I found that it was dead; but when I examined it, I discovered that it was not my child.”

“That’s not the way it was!” the other woman interrupted. “That is not the way it was at all! She’s just making up an emotional story for you, Sire, and
she has produced some tears to go with it! This is my son; the dead child is hers!"

“You’re lying!” said the other woman. “And you know it! The living son I mine and the other is hers!”

“Oh no it isn’t!” said the other woman, as she held the child close to her. “It’s the other way around! This is my son!”

And in this way they argued back and forth in front of the King. Solomon had listened and observed carefully and it seemed as though he had made up his mind. However, he asked the woman to lay the child down in front of him. He looked intently at the child and then at each of women as thought he was trying to determine by appearance whose child it was. Then, to the great came with a sword in his hands. “Divide the child in two parts!” he said coldly. “Give half to one and half to the other!”

As the guard raised the sword to obey the King, the first woman cried out, “Don’t kill the child, my lord! Please don’t do it! Let him live and give him to her.”

The other woman, however, thought Solomon’s idea was a good one. “Cut it in two!” she shouted. “Then neither one of us will have it!”

Then the King raised his hand and spoke. “Don’t kill the child! Give it to the first woman! He commanded, pointing out her. “She is the mother!”

Source: The NEW ENGLISH BIBLE, Oxford University Press

21. Why do two women come to King Solomon?
   a. They come to visit the King.
   b. They want to please the King with their cookies.
   c. They need the justice in their case.
   d. They need King to judge who should be a son’s mother.

22. What had happened with the two women?
   a. They had killed their baby.
   b. They still argued about who baked cookies.
   c. They wanted the King to judge who is the baby killer.
   d. They don’t know who the real mother of a son is.
23. When you read the story, do you believe what the first woman is saying?
   a. Yes, I do. She cries a lot.
   b. Yes, I do. She says a lot of information about her son.
   c. No, I don’t. She tries to pretend as she lost her child.
   d. No, I don’t. The story is not end yet, so I will read until the end first.

24. What is the theme of this story?
   a. Real love is just the mother’s love.
   b. Do not lie and greedy.
   c. The justice is always existed.
   d. War will always end with tears.

25. What are the differences exist between the two mothers?
   a. The first woman is very sensitive with this case.
   b. The first woman loves to tell stories, but other does not.
   c. The first woman is talkative so we know a lot about her tricks.
   d. No evidence shows that they are quite difference.

26. The end of this story was entirely……………… .
   a. unhappy
   b. foolish
   c. boring
   d. happy

27. The King was so confident while the two mothers are arguing. He had……………… .
   a. judged correctly
   b. nearly fainted
   c. felt very clam
   d. been angry

28. When the King order his guards to cut half the baby, the attitude of the second mother toward him changed from nothing to……………… .
   a. love
   b. happy
   c. understanding
   d. fear

29. Everyone understood the King that he wants to prove who the real mother with his intelligent is. The king…………………………… .
   a. discovered the real love of mother
   b. showed the lie and greedy of humanity
   c. did not understand
   d. smiled
30. If you are the second mother how would you do?
   a. I will stay calm and cry.
   b. I will ask the King not to kill my son.
   c. I will ask the first mother to take care of the son with her.
   d. I will go home and find a new husband.

31. What can be describing about the King in your words?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

32. Does the King remind you of someone you know before? Please explain.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

33. If there is NO king what do you think will happen there?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

34. What is the theme of the story?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

35. What do you learn from this story?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Good Luck
APPENDIX B
Questionnaire
Critical thinking: Knowledge, Skills and Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-evaluation</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Student code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For each of the following statements, Tick ( / ) to rate your responses as outlined below. Note that 'strongly disagree' carries no score.

5 = 'strongly agree' 4 = 'agree', 3 = 'sort of agree', 2 = 'disagree' 1 = 'strongly disagree'

5 = 'เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง' 4 = 'เห็นด้วย', 3 = 'เห็นด้วยบ้าง', 2 = 'ไม่เห็นด้วย', 1 = 'ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง'

Rating 5-1

1. I feel comfortable pointing out potential and hidden idea in literary works.

2. I can remain focused on the exact requirements of an activity.

3. I know the different meanings of the word 'argument' in critical thinking

4. I can analyse the structure of poem and prose in literary works.

5. I can offer criticism without feeling this makes me a bad person

6. I know what is meant by a line of reasoning

7. I am aware of how my current beliefs might prejudice fair consideration of an issue

8. I am patient in identifying the line of reasoning in an argument

9. I am good at recognising the signals used to indicate stages in an argument

10. I find it easy to separate key points from other material to apply for using.
๑๐. ฉันพบว่า มันง่ายมากที่จะแยกแยะ ข้อคิดต่างๆ ออกมาใช้ได้

11. I am very patient in going over the facts in order to reach an accurate view

๑๑. ฉันมีความตั้งมั่นเพื่อพิจารณาเอกสารเพื่อให้ได้ความจริงที่ถูกต้องที่สุด

12. I am good at identifying unfair techniques used to persuade literature readers

๑๒. ฉันสามารถแยกแยะ เทคนิคต่างๆที่ผู้เขียนใช้ในการจูงใจผู้อ่านในเนื้อเรื่องทางวรรณคดี

13. I am good at reading between the lines

๑๓. ฉันมีความตั้งมั่นเพื่อพิจารณาเอกสารเพื่อให้ได้ความจริงที่ถูกต้องที่สุด

14. I find it easy to evaluate the evidence to support a point of view

๑๔. ฉันพบว่า มันง่ายมากที่จะประเมินค่าเหตุผลในเนื้อเรื่องเพื่อพัฒนาความคิดของฉัน

15. I usually pay attention to small details

๑๕. ฉันยังจำเจาะจงในเนื้อความละเอียดเล็กๆ ในเนื้อเรื่อง

16. I find it easy to weigh up different points of view fairly

๑๖. ฉันเข้าใจวิธีการชั่งน้ำหนักรูปแบบ

17. If I am not sure about something, I will research to find out more

๑๗. เมื่อฉันไม่เข้าใจอะไรในเนื้อเรื่อง ฉันจะหาข้อมูลเพื่อหาคำตอบนั้นๆ

18. I can present my own arguments clearly

๑๘. ฉันสามารถพูดและบอกเหตุผลที่มีได้อย่างชัดเจน

19. I understand how to structure an argument for critical thinking

๑๙. ฉันเข้าใจโครงสร้างของการหาเหตุผลเพื่อการคิดวิเคราะห์

20. I can tell descriptive writing from analytical writing

๒๐. ฉันสามารถแยกแยะระหว่างการคิดของบุคคลได้

21. I can spot inconsistencies in an argument easily

๒๑. ฉันสามารถชี้เหตุและผลให้เห็นอย่างชัดเจนได้ เมื่อมันคาบเกี่ยวกัน

22. It is a good opportunity for me to thinking critically.

๒๒. มันเป็นโอกาสที่ดีสำหรับฉัน ที่จะฝึกการคิดวิเคราะห์อย่างมีระบบ

23. I am aware of thinking while I study in another subjects.

๒๓. ฉันเกิดความตระหนักที่จะใช้ความคิดที่มีมา ไว้ในชีวิตอื่นๆ

24. I know why I need to learning materials evaluating

๒๔. ฉันเข้าใจว่า การประเมินค่าสำคัญในสถานการณ์

25. I know that the way for practicing critical thinking is very hard but worthy.

๒๕. ฉันเข้าใจว่า การฝึกฝนการคิดวิเคราะห์นั้นยาก แต่ก็มีประโยชน์เช่นกัน

Adapted from Stella Cottrell (2005), Critical Thinking Skills, Palgrave Macmillan Ltd
APPENDIX C

Teaching Materials for Children’s Literature-based Instruction
Lesson Plan 1

Lesson topic: “The Giving Tree” by Shel Silverstein

Class: 3rd year students

Time: 90 minutes

Lesson Objectives: Students should be able to

1. Answer some questions that lead to logical and critical thinking
2. Write a response entry giving, receiving, appreciation, and love. Then discuss the point of views of main character and the massage between the lines in the poem.
3. Support reasons for supportive claim using students’ own personal experience and opinions to the poem.
4. For the writing objectives, answering with supportive claims and link paragraphs by using basic questions within Bloom’s Taxonomy.

Grammar focus: Wh-questions and Question tags

Material Needed: A poem, “The Giving Tree” by Shel Silverstein

Content

The lesson focuses on poetry elements and the theme of environmental appreciation, love, or give and take. Students needed the good reasoning that students withhold judgments until students have all the facts, collect evidence from neutral sources, and make sure that students understand all side of an issue. With exceptional training in analytical thinking, students have to overcome instincts to think simplistically and non-analytically. In this lesson, student explore some of the irrational ways in which humans think, and learn to recognize and overcome the habits of mind that can get the way of good reasoning. So, the lesson plan focuses on the love and appreciation, give and take themes in the provided poem. The lesson plan also provided how people develop our personal and need something against nature,
how people treat people whose identifies as the greedy or taker, and how this effects our perception and ability to reason and everyday life.

Synopsis

_The Giving Tree_ is a tale about a relationship between a young boy and a tree. The tree always provides the boy with what he wants: branches on which to swing, shade in which to sit and apples to eat. As the boy grows older, he requires more and more of the tree. The tree loves the boy very much and gives him anything he asks for. In an ultimate act of self-sacrifice, the tree lets the boy cut it down so the boy can build a boat in which he can sail. The boy leaves the tree, now a stump. Many years later, the boy, now an old man, returns, and the tree sadly says: "I'm sorry, boy... but I have nothing left to give you." But the boy replies: "I do not need much now, just a quiet place to sit and rest." The tree then says, "Well, an old tree stump is a good place for sitting and resting. Come, boy, sit down and rest." The boy obliges and the tree is very happy.

**Instructional activities**

The students have given the poem in class. Students are assigned to be in group of four or five students. In each group, good, average, and weak students work together to help each other complete the tasks.

**Beginning to the literary experience with inquiry–based approach**

Min

1. Take attendance. Teacher needs to evoke personal or conceptional connections of the students. During the attendance, students are to brainstorm their definition of the word “give and take” with the inquiry-based instruction.

2. Students are in groups of four and they need to construct a semantic map for the word “give and take” and asking each others idea and opinion for the word “love and appreciation”.

3. Each group briefly presents their own semantic map to their classmate.

4. Teacher briefly talks about “The Giving Tree” and ask the students if they understand the theme of the story. While teacher delivered how to make Wh-questions, students learn to make the proper questions.
5. Some comprehensive to evaluative levels of questions are also prepared and asked students. Students may ask more than these guidelines questions. Students help each other in their group to answer these questions.

1. Who was the giving tree?
2. How and where did the giving tree locate?
3. What had been told by the giving tree?
4. What did the child do to the tree when he was young?
5. Why did the tree give everything as the child want?
6. What makes the tree decide to do that?
7. What happen with the tree branch?
8. How did the tree become when the child had left?
9. How could the child need everything from the tree
10. What happened to the child when he gets older?
11. What did the child do in order to solve the problem when the tree can not give him more?
12. How was all the truth about the giving tree and a child revealed?
13. In a short summary, recount the events that lead up to the self-appreciation of the tree and love of the child.

And more questions that students may ask for more information.

6. The teacher checks the answer with the students as a whole class discussion.

7. The students are assigned to write reflection about the poem as their homework.
The Giving Tree by Shel Silverstein

Once, there was a tree;...
And she loved a little boy.
And every day the boy would come
And he would gather her leaves
And make them into crowns and play king of the forest.
He would climb up her trunk
And swing from her branches
And eat apples
And they would play hide-and-go-seek.
And when he was tired, he would sleep in her shade.
And the boy loved the tree... very much...
And the tree was happy.

But time went by.
And the boy grew older.
And the tree was often alone.
Then, one day, the boy came to the tree and the tree said:
"Come, Boy, come and climb up my trunk and swing from my branches and eat apples and play in my shade and be happy!"
"I am too big to climb and play" said the boy. "I want to buy thing and have fun. I want some money.
Can you give me some money?"
"I'm sorry", said the tree,"but I have no money. I have only leaves and apples. Take my apples, Boy, and sell them in city. Then you will have money and you'll be happy."
And so the boy climbed up the tree and gathered her apples and carried them away.
And the tree was happy...

But the boy stayed away for a long time... and the tree was sad.
And then one day the boy came back, and the tree shook with joy, and she said:
"Come, Boy come and climb up my trunk and swing from my branches and eat apples and play in my shade and be happy."
"I am too busy to climb trees," said the boy. "I want a house to keep me warm", he said. "I and want a wife and I want children, and so I need a house. Can you give me a house?"
"I have no house", said the tree. "The forest is my house", said the tree. "But you may cut off my branches and build a house. Then you will be happy".
And so the boy cut off her branches and carried them away to build his house. And the tree was happy.
But the boy stayed away for a long time…
And when he came back, the tree was so happy she could hardly speak.
—“Come, Boy” she whispered, “Come and play”.

—I am too old and sad to play”, said the boy. “I want a boat that will take me away from here. Can you give me a boat?”
—“Cut down my trunk and make a boat”, said the tree. “Then you can sail away… and be happy”.
And so the boy cut down her trunk
And made a boat and sailed away.
And the tree was happy…
But not really.

And after a long time the boy came back again.
—I am sorry, Boy”, said the tree, “but I have nothing left to give you – My apples are gone”.
—“My teeth are too weak for apples”, said the boy.
—“My branches are gone”, said the tree. “You cannot swing on them”.
—“I am too old to swing on branches”, said the boy.
—“My trunk is gone”, said the tree. “You cannot climb”.
—“I am too tired to climb”, said the boy.
—I am sorry” sighed the tree. “I wish that I could give you something… but I have nothing left. I am just an old stump. I am sorry…”
—I don’t need very much now”, said the boy. “Just a quiet place to sit and rest. I am very tired”.
—“Well”, said the tree, straightening herself up as much as she could, “well, an old stump is good for sitting and resting. Come, Boy, sit down… sit down and rest”.
And the boy did.
And the tree was happy…

The end.
APPENDIX D

TAKS Short Answer Rubric
## TAKS Short Answer Rubric (Ana McDonald, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary - A (3)</th>
<th>Sufficient - B (2)</th>
<th>Partially Sufficient - C (1)</th>
<th>Insufficient - F (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Thoughtful, Insightful Ideas (Important evidence, preferably both: A’s are by definition, rare.)</td>
<td>□ Reasonable Idea</td>
<td>□ No Idea (Evidence Without Idea)</td>
<td>□ Incorrect or Vague Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Strongly Supported by</td>
<td>□ Supported by</td>
<td>□ Reasonable Idea with</td>
<td>□ Idea NOT based on text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence</td>
<td>□ Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence</td>
<td>□ General, Incomplete, or Partially Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence</td>
<td>□ Idea NOT reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ No Inaccuracies</td>
<td>□ No Inaccuracies</td>
<td>□ OR No Evidence</td>
<td>□ Plot Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Depth of Understanding</td>
<td>□ Clear &amp; Specific</td>
<td>□ OR Evidence Weakly Connected to Idea</td>
<td>□ Incomplete, Inaccurate, or Incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Connect evidence to ideas</td>
<td>□ Undeal &amp; Vague</td>
<td>□ Evidence NOT from text</td>
<td>□ Lack Clarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1:** Literary theme, literary technique, and elements

- Thoughtful, Insightful Ideas (Important evidence, preferably both: A’s are by definition, rare.)
- Strongly Supported by
- Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence
- No Inaccuracies
- Depth of Understanding
- Connect evidence to ideas

**Objective 2:** Expository, narrative, synthetic, comparative, argumentative, and persuasive

- Thoughtful, Insightful Ideas (Important evidence, preferably both: A’s are by definition, rare.)
- Strongly Supported by
- Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence
- No Inaccuracies
- Depth of Understanding
- Connect evidence to ideas

**Objective 3:** Crossover: combining skills, strategies, and techniques to achieve a specific purpose

- Thoughtful, Insightful Ideas (Important evidence, preferably both: A’s are by definition, rare.)
- Strongly Supported by
- Accurate/Relevant Textual Evidence
- No Inaccuracies
- Depth of Understanding
- Connect evidence to ideas

*Note: The rubric includes criteria for evaluating the depth and accuracy of textual evidence, as well as the clarity and support of ideas and arguments.*
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