The Effect of the Critical Literacy Approach on Pre-service Language Teachers’ Critical Reading Skills

SULTAN1 Ahmad ROFIUDDIN2 NURHADI3 Endah Tri PRIYATNI4

ARTICLE INFO

Purpose: This study aimed to measure the effect of the critical literacy approach on pre-service language teachers’ critical reading skills. The critical reading skills measured consisted of six levels: interpretation, analysis, inference, evaluation, explanation, and self-regulation.

Research Methods: This study was designed as a quasi-experiment which involved 56 pre-service teachers studying at the Indonesian Language Teaching Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia. Research data was collected using a critical reading test. Prior to the study, a package of instructional materials was developed for the experimental group. Data was analyzed with descriptive statistics and ANCOVA test with pretest scores as the covariate. Significance level was determined at $\alpha = .05$.

Findings: The results of the study indicated that the critical literacy approach had a significant effect on the pre-service language teachers’ critical reading skills. The experimental group achieved better at critical reading skills and reached higher post-test scores on average. It indicated that the critical literacy approach had a significant effect on critical reading skills, which include interpretation, analysis, making an inference, evaluation, explanation, and self-regulation.

Implications for Research and Practice: Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that the critical literacy approach was effective in improving the students’ critical reading skills. These findings suggest that the process of reading a text critically from the domination perspective can develop students’ critical thinking. Future research could possibly discuss the results of a test conducted to investigate the effectiveness of the critical literacy approach based on gender variables, cognitive ability levels, and reading habit.
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Introduction

Critical reading as a manifestation of critical thinking has become influential in living a more competitive life. Critical thinking, which applies higher order thinking skills and more complex cognitive processes, belongs to one of the skills needed in the 21st century to achieve success either at work or school (Greiff, Niepel, & Wustenberg, 2015). In an academic context, Bharuthram (2012) and Wilson (2016) state that many university students are not yet competent to read critically. In fact, critical reading skills may affect the students’ overall academic achievement.

Previous research findings have suggested that critical reading skills are difficult to master. Puteh, Zin, and Ismail (2016) discovered that students’ ability to reflect and evaluate a text was lower than their ability to access, retrieve, interpret, and integrate. This shortfall in skills indicates that the students struggled to understand texts at a higher level. Findings by Karadag (2014) also indicate that pre-service elementary school teachers believed that they were not critical readers and had no confidence to claim that they could perform critical reading skills. These findings have become a foundation of why research on university students’ critical reading skills needs abundant attention.

Critical reading involves readers’ active engagement to think deeply by applying various skills. The critical reading activity is done to reveal the main ideas of a text, draw a conclusion from it and connect the information, predict its purpose, analyze the arguments, find different points of view, and evaluate ideas (Flemming, 2012). A critical reader has the ability to (1) accurately summarize arguments from the text, (2) identify claims, (3) discover stated or implied assumptions, (4) analyze and evaluate the preciseness of the reasoning that supports a certain thesis statement, and (5) analyze, evaluate, and explain the purpose or consequence of the use of particular facts or sources of information (Barnet & Bedau, 2011).

Critical reading as an actualization of a critical thinking process constitutes a mental process that is directed to solve problems, make a decision, persuade, analyze, and evaluate ideas systematically (Johnson, 2007, p. 183). It is realized through a careful evaluation and decision made to identify the truth, errors, weaknesses, or strengths of a text. Critical readers collect evidence and use it to challenge mistaken assumptions and evaluate them based on criteria set to assess the quality of the value of a reading text.

Critical reading trains critical thinking skills. Critical reading makes readers more active in understanding the meaning that lies behind the text through evaluating objectives, perspectives, and assumptions of the writer (Huijie, 2010, p. 53). Finally, critical readers can make a judgment whether to believe, follow, trust, or reject the view or ideas conveyed by the author.

Critical reading skills developed in this research are adapted from the critical thinking taxonomy suggested by Facione (2013, p. 5-7; 2015, p. 5-8). These critical reading skills consist of six levels: (1) interpretation skill, (2) analysis skill, (3)
inference skill, (4) evaluation skill, (5) explanation skill, and (6) self-regulation skill. These comprehensive skills are able to promote students’ competences in understanding, evaluating, and providing responses to problems critically. As these skills develop, students are also encouraged to think analytically and reflectively, especially in dealing with various pieces of information obtained from the texts.

Critical attitude toward a text is needed to assess the meaning that lies behind the text. Critical reading skills, therefore, help readers to understand the writer’s purpose and make them active receivers (McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004a, p. 7). By reading critically, readers are not merely passively accepting the information contained in the text. Instead, they can develop their critical attitude by actively examining the writer’s background and making use of different perspectives in understanding the information provided by the text (McLaughlin and DeVoogd, 2004b, p. 53).

The importance of critical reading skills is based on two major factors, (1) reading texts and (2) readers. In this era where information and communication technology has developed rapidly, the number of available reading texts is also increasing. It is easy to receive information, whether it is from printed or electronic media such as newspapers, magazines, television, or social media. However, the information is not always accurate and cannot always be trusted. Besides, the available reading materials do not always consistently fit in with the readers’ need. Some of them are intentionally written for certain people’s interest, intended to influence public perception, gather sympathy, or implant an ideology. According to Fairclough (1989), every text is built on a particular point of view and produced for a certain purpose. Therefore, readers need to assess and select the information before accepting or utilizing it.

A study conducted by Zin, Eng, and Rafik-Galea (2014) concluded that a fundamental issue of developing critical reading skills is that readers have no ability to identify the writer’s purpose. In fact, this ability is crucial in reading critically. Critical reading requires readers’ awareness of the purpose for writing a text. This is to make them realize that there is a meaning that lies behind the text. In this context, critical reading activities should emphasize how readers can discover propositional and ideological messages delivered through the text (Wallace, 1992).

The significance of reading critically is based on Morgan’s view (1997, p. 39-44), which suggests that (1) each text is written to represent certain ideas, (2) each text does not contain a single meaning, (3) each text has its own version/emphasis which is different one from another, and (4) each text provides a way for the readers to accept it as the truth. To understand every meaning that lies behind a text, readers have to be able to read the text critically and reflectively and then draw a conclusion and make a decision about the text’s messages. Readers need to be convinced and able to utilize the information contained in the text, or on the other hand, reject it.

To every reader, critical reading skills are essential. Wallace (1992) points out three problems in reading a text: (1) readers’ tendency to obey and trust the information obtained from the text, (2) readers’ tendency to be susceptible to the text,
and (3) readers’ tendency to try to understand the propositional messages of the text and overlook the ideological messages. However, every text has been written according to a particular agenda, purpose, and point of view. Low critical thinking skills will allow readers to be easily deceived by a text.

The descriptions above demonstrate the significance of critical reading skills, especially for pre-service language teachers. The ability to read critically will support their intellectual development, learning skills, and professional competence. Teachers are the key to reinforcement of students’ critical reading skills. Therefore, the teachers first need to possess the skills. The teachers need to have an ability to plan the lesson, such as selecting appropriate reading materials and conduct learning, such as implementing relevant methods (Maltepe, 2016). To make them able to fulfill the needs, pre-service language teachers need to be competent in reading critically.

To improve the pre-service language teachers’ competence in reading critically, the learning process is designed using a critical literacy approach. This approach is sourced from critical language awareness which aims to help readers reflect on power and domination issues found in a text (Hood, 1998). The critical literacy approach is oriented to develop reading ability at the level of critical understanding. This approach encourages students to think and evaluate reading texts and guides them to find the meaning hidden behind the texts. This approach has an emphasis on messages and views brought by a text from the power-related perspective (Roberge, 2013, p. 1). The critical literacy approach is effective in teaching students how to analyze social issues and the relationship between unequal powers found in a text (Roberge, 2013, p. 1).

A study conducted by Wallace (2010) indicates that the critical literacy approach can develop students’ critical awareness of domination practice. The critical literacy approach guides readers to question information, perspective assumptions, and the purpose of the writer. Reading activity is conducted by identifying, analyzing, and reflecting on the practice of domination, discrimination, and injustice found in texts (Priyatni, 2010). The critical literacy approach develops reading ability actively and reflectively. This approach helps university students to make a link between textual and social aspects by asking analytic questions (Lesley, 2001, p. 184).

This study aimed to measure the effect of the critical literacy approach on pre-service language teachers’ critical reading skills. To be more specific, the following research questions were asked about the critical literacy approach:

1. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ interpretation skill?
2. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ analysis skill?
3. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ inference skill?
4. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ evaluation skill?
5. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ explanation skill?
6. Does it have an effect on the pre-service language teachers’ self-regulation skill?

Method

Research Design

This research project employed the quasi-experimental with nonequivalent control group design. The experiment was conducted to investigate the effect of a learning approach toward students’ critical reading ability. Dependent variables of this study were the critical reading skills of pre-service teachers. These skills are divided into six levels: interpretation skill, analysis skill, making an inference skill, evaluation skill, explanation skill, and self-regulation skill. Meanwhile, the independent variable of this study was a learning approach. The pretest conducted to represent initial knowledge of the subjects was used as the covariate (Dimitrov and Rumrill Jr., 2003).

This research was carried out by following five steps: (1) selecting the control group and the experimental group, (2) conducting a pretest, (3) performing learning in classes for both the control group and the experimental group, (4) conducting a posttest, and (5) analyzing the test. The pretest was organized in both classes in the beginning of the effectiveness test. After conducting the pretest, learning occurred in both classes. The experiment class was taught critical reading using the critical learning tools developed earlier based on the critical literacy approach. The control group undertook conventional learning using a task-based approach. The research was carried out for eight meetings. After learning was completed, all students took the posttest.

Research Sample

The 56 students participating in this study came from two classes of the Indonesian Language Teaching Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia. One class (28 students) was treated as the experimental group and the other played the role of the control group (28 students). The groups were assigned randomly since they were considered to have the same characteristics. The sample groups were all pre-service language teachers enrolled in semester three of an undergraduate program. Seventy percent of the sample was female.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Prior to conducting an effectiveness test aimed to measure the effect of the critical literacy approach on the students’ critical reading skills, a set of instructional materials were developed through several activities: (1) developing competences, sub-competences, and indicators, (2) selecting texts, (3) testing the texts’ readability and attractiveness, and (4) promoting reading activities. The competences and sub-competences of critical reading skills were adapted from Facione’s critical thinking skills taxonomy (1990, 2013, 2015) and consisted of six levels: (1) interpretation skill, (2) analysis skill, (3) inference skill, (4) evaluation skill, (5) explanation skill, and (6) self-regulation skill. The six levels of skills were then elaborated into 16 sub skills. Each of the sub-skills was divided into some indicators of competence containing the
attitude to be measured from the students to show their achievement in critical reading.

Texts used in the classroom were selected based on these criteria: authenticity, usefulness, attractiveness, appropriateness, and fairness (Nuttal, 2005). The criteria are explained in Table 1.

**Table 1**
Criteria of Selecting the Texts

| Criteria       | Description                                                                 |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Authenticity   | The texts are authentic; they have been published in the mass media.         |
| Usefulness     | The texts are chosen because they provide information for the students, which is in accordance with the society’s norms and ethics. |
| Attractiveness | The texts are chosen for their appeal and for corresponding to the students’ interests. |
| Appropriateness| The texts can be used to improve the students’ critical reading skills through the critical literacy approach. These texts contain the elements of domination that can increase students’ critical awareness. |
| Fairness       | The texts can be exploited within the six levels of critical reading skills. The length of the texts enables the students to perform the indicators of critical reading competence. |

The readability was tested by asking the students to do a cloze test. The difficulty level was categorized as medium (Gillet & Temple, 1994). The students had to complete a questionnaire to examine the attractiveness of the texts. They were asked to read each text in its entirety and respond to some yes/no questions.

The reading activities implemented in this research included four kinds of texts: (1) news items, (2) editorial, (3) advertorial, and (4) opinion. The reading process covered pre-reading, while reading, and post reading. Reading comprehension questions were carefully constructed to test students’ ability to criticize the texts from the perspective of power relations.

The critical reading test was developed based on Facione’s (1990, 2013, 2015) critical reading skills. The test consisted of 40 items: 23 items of multiple choice and 17 essay questions. Of the 40 items, eight items tested the interpretation skill, nine items tested the analysis skill, six items tested the making an inference skill, five items tested the evaluation skill, seven items tested the explanation skill, and five items tested the self-regulation skill. A literature review was conducted before developing the blueprint of the test. All the test items referred to indicators sourced from the blueprint.
Test validity was measured using content validity by expert judgment. A test that had been developed was examined by three reading experts. The experts were asked to correct every test item and evaluate the critical reading aspects of the test. The test was then tried out to test its reliability. The Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients were .645 for interpretation skill, .896 for analysis skill, .632 for inference skill, .712 for evaluation skill, .751 for explanation skill, and .725 for self-regulation skill. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for all critical reading skills was .882.

Data Analysis

Three steps of data analysis were conducted: (1) data management, (2) statistical analysis, and (3) interpretation of the results. Data management contained activities of grouping, coding, scoring, and labeling answer sheets. To maintain the objectivity of the results, the test was examined by two scorers. The data was statistically analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistic 23. The results of the normality test, which was analyzed with One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, showed a significance value of .712 for the experimental group and of .999 for the control group. This finding suggested that the distribution of the data among the experimental group and the control group was normal. The test of homogeneity of variance showed a significance value of .597, which indicated that the data had the same (homogeneous) variance. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to compare the average score of pretest and posttest achieved by the experimental and the control group of students. The ANCOVA test was conducted to reveal the effect of the critical literacy approach on improving pre-service teachers’ critical reading skills. The significance level determined was $\alpha = .05$. The interpretation of the results was based on the theories and findings of the related previous research. The researchers’ points of view were also included.

Results

This section will cover the explanation of the research findings. It attempts to investigate the effect of the critical literacy approach on students’ critical reading skills.

The Average Score of Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental and the Control Group

The average pretest and posttest scores of the experimental and control groups on every level of skill are presented in Table 2. The table also shows the percentage of the improved pretest and posttest average scores of each group.
Table 2
The Average Score of Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental and the Control Group

| Skills      | Groups  | Pre-test | Post-test | Improvement Scores | %    |
|-------------|---------|----------|-----------|--------------------|------|
| Interpretation | Experimental | 3.46     | 6.39      | 2.93               | 84.68|
|             | Control  | 3.68     | 5.29      | 1.61               | 43.75|
| Analysis    | Experimental | 2.96     | 6.96      | 4.00               | 135.14|
|             | Control  | 3.25     | 3.64      | 0.39               | 12.00|
| Inference   | Experimental | 3.86     | 5.18      | 1.32               | 34.20|
|             | Control  | 3.32     | 3.93      | 0.61               | 18.37|
| Evaluation  | Experimental | 6.91     | 14.43     | 7.52               | 108.83|
|             | Control  | 7.11     | 9.75      | 2.64               | 37.13|
| Explanation | Experimental | 10.61    | 22.93     | 12.32              | 116.12|
|             | Control  | 10.25    | 15.38     | 5.13               | 50.05|
| Self-regulation | Experimental | 7.18     | 14.96     | 7.78               | 108.36|
|             | Control  | 7.25     | 10.04     | 2.79               | 38.48|

Based on Table 2, it can be concluded that the average posttest scores of the experimental and the control group are higher than the average pretest scores on the six aspects of critical reading skills. The scores of the experimental group, however, improved more than those of the control group.

The Effect of the Critical Literacy Approach on the Pre-service Language Teachers’ Critical Reading Skills

The results of the ANCOVA test to show the effect of the critical literacy approach on the pre-service language teachers’ critical reading skills are presented below.

Table 3
The Results of the ANCOVA Test on Interpretation Skill

| Source          | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|-----------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Corrected Model | 19.846                  | 2  | 9.923       | 5.171| .009 |
| Intercept       | 169.134                 | 1  | 169.134     | 88.135| .000 |
| Pretest         | 2.685                   | 1  | 2.685       | 1.399| .242 |
| Learning Approach | 18.202               | 1  | 18.202      | 9.485| .003 |
| Error           | 101.708                 | 53 | 1.919       |      |      |
| Total           | 2031.000                | 56 |             |      |      |
| Corrected Total | 121.554                 | 55 |             |      |      |

a. R Squared = .163 (Adjusted R Squared = .132)
According to the covariate value presented in Table 3, it is seen that F=1.399 with a level of significance of .242 (p > .05). This indicates that there was no significant effect found on the improvement of the pre-service language teachers’ interpretation skill. Based on the effect of the learning approach, it was found that F=9.485 with a level of significance of .003. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on the pre-service language teachers’ interpretation skill.

Table 4
The Results of the ANCOVA Test on Analysis Skill

| Source                  | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Corrected Model         | 156.577                 | 2  | 78.288      | 32.604 | .000 |
| Intercept               | 202.172                 | 1  | 202.172     | 84.197 | .000 |
| Pretest                 | 2.130                   | 1  | 2.130       | .887  | .351 |
| Learning Approach       | 156.563                 | 1  | 156.563     | 65.202 | .000 |
| Error                   | 127.263                 | 53 | 2.401       |       |      |
| Total                   | 1859.000                | 56 |             |       |      |
| Corrected Total         | 283.839                 | 55 |             |       |      |

a. R Squared = .552 (Adjusted R Squared = .535)

According to the covariate value presented in Table 4, it is seen that F=.887 with a level of significance of .351 (p > .05). This indicates that there was no significant effect found on the improvement of the pre-service language teachers’ analysis skill. Based on the effect of the learning approach, it was found that F=65.201 with a level of significance of .000. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on analysis skill.

Table 5
The Results of the ANCOVA Test on Inference Skill

| Source                  | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig. |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|------|------|
| Corrected Model         | 25.514                  | 2  | 12.757      | 12.922 | .000 |
| Intercept               | 166.351                 | 1  | 166.351     | 168.496 | .000 |
| Pretest                 | 3.639                   | 1  | 3.639       | 3.686  | .060 |
| Learning Approach       | 24.751                  | 1  | 24.751      | 25.070  | .000 |
| Error                   | 52.325                  | 53 | .987        |       |      |
| Total                   | 1239.000                | 56 |             |       |      |
| Corrected Total         | 77.839                  | 55 |             |       |      |

a. R Squared = .328 (Adjusted R Squared = .302)
According to the covariate value presented in Table 5, it is seen that \(F=3.686\) with a level of significance of .060 (\(p > .05\)). This indicates that there was no significant effect found on the pre-service language teachers’ skill in making an inference. Based on the effect of the learning approach, it was found that \(F=25.070\) with a level of significance of .000. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on making an inference skill.

Table 6
The Results of the ANCOVA Test on Evaluation Skill

| Source              | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Corrected Model     | 321.302                 | 2  | 160.651     | 21.010| .000 |
| Intercept           | 432.074                 | 1  | 432.074     | 56.508| .000 |
| Pretest             | 14.856                  | 1  | 14.856      | 1.943 | .169 |
| Learning Approach   | 295.060                 | 1  | 295.060     | 38.589| .000 |
| Error               | 405.252                 | 53 | 7.646       |       |      |
| Total               | 8911.000                | 56 |             |       |      |
| Corrected Total     | 726.554                 | 55 |             |       |      |

a. \(R^2 = .442\) (Adjusted \(R^2 = .421\))

According to the covariate value presented in Table 6, it is seen that \(F=1.943\) with a level of significance of .169 (\(p > .05\)). This indicates that there was no significant effect found on the pre-service language teachers’ evaluation skill. Based on the learning approach, it was found that \(F=38.589\) with a level of significance of .000. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on evaluation skill.

Table 7
The Results of the ANCOVA Test on Explanation Skill

| Source              | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Corrected Model     | 799.699                 | 2  | 399.849     | 49.311| .000 |
| Intercept           | 549.279                 | 1  | 549.279     | 67.740| .000 |
| Pretest             | 909                     | 1  | .909        | .112  | .739 |
| Learning Approach   | 785.720                 | 1  | 785.720     | 96.898| .000 |
| Error               | 429.761                 | 53 | 8.109       |       |      |
| Total               | 21769.750               | 56 |             |       |      |
| Corrected Total     | 1229.460                | 55 |             |       |      |

a. \(R^2 = .650\) (Adjusted \(R^2 = .637\))

According to the covariate value presented in Table 7, it is seen that \(F=.112\) with a level of significance of .739 (\(p > .05\)). This indicates that there was no significant effect
Found on the pre-service language teachers’ explanation skill. Based on the learning approach, it was found that \( F=96.898 \) with a level of significance of .000. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on explanation skill.

Table 8
The Results of ANCOVA Test on Self-Regulation Skill

| Source                | Type III Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Corrected Model       | 340.412a                | 2   | 170.206     | 40.895 | .000 |
| Intercept             | 192.767                 | 1   | 192.767     | 46.316 | .000 |
| Pretest               | .340                    | 1   | .340        | .082   | .776 |
| Learning Approach     | 340.412                 | 1   | 340.412     | 81.790 | .000 |
| Error                 | 220.588                 | 53  | 4.162       |        |      |
| Total                 | 9311.000                | 56  |             |        |      |
| Corrected Total       | 561.000                 | 55  |             |        |      |

a. \( R \) Squared = .607 (Adjusted \( R \) Squared = .592)

According to the covariate value presented in Table 8, it is seen that \( F=.082 \) with a level of significance of .776 (\( p >.05 \)). This indicates that there was no significant effect found on the pre-service language teachers’ self-regulation skill. Based on the learning approach, it was found that \( F=81.790 \) with a level of significance of .000. These results suggest that the learning approach had a significant effect on self-regulation skill.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the study presented in Table 2 show that there was an improvement of students’ achievement in critical reading skills in both classes. However, the students in the experimental group achieved better compared to the control group. This indicates that the learning process that occurred in the experimental group was more effective than the learning process that occurred in the control group. Based on the ANCOVA test, it was found that the learning approach had a significant effect on interpretation skill, analysis skill, inference skill, evaluation skill, explanation skill, and self-regulation skill of the pre-service language teachers. The results of the analysis indicated that the critical literacy approach had a more significant effect on reading skills compared to the task-based approach. It can be concluded that the difference has resulted from different treatments implemented in each classroom.

The results of this research showing that the critical literacy approach had a significant effect on the pre-service teachers’ critical reading skills can be explained as follows. The critical literacy approach was comprehensive in developing the university students’ competence in understanding problems, evaluating, and producing critical responses. The learning activities trained them in the process of
constructing the competences by directing the students to be able to investigate meanings and messages behind language choices, information, and arguments found in texts. The critical literacy approach empowered students by assigning a role to constructing meanings and having a resistant attitude (Locke & Cleary, 2011). These characteristics encouraged the students to develop their critical reading competency.

The significant effect of the critical literacy approach on the students’ critical reading skills indicates the benefit of implementing this approach. Using this approach involved the students in learning by analyzing and evaluating from many perspectives. The students were actively engaged in discussing problems of a text within its context, connecting them with their background knowledge and experience, asking questions from different perspectives, and connecting the relevance of the text to its context in real life. Kuo (2014) revealed that the critical literacy approach could improve students’ critical attitude toward a text and their ability to investigate a problem from many perspectives. Research findings that showed the effectiveness of the approach in improving students’ critical reading skills are in line with the results of the research conducted by Yang (2011), which proved that this approach could improve the critical English reading-writing skills of Korean university students.

The critical literacy approach is a learning method that helps students to think deeply to reveal hidden domination practice (Roberge, 2013). This approach emphasizes developing higher order thinking skills. Therefore, this characteristic plays an important role in the critical reading activity. According to Soares and Wood (2010), the critical literacy approach can be used to improve the critical thinking capacity through responding to texts. The results of the effectiveness test have confirmed it.

The critical literacy approach applied in learning could encourage university students to structure their thinking process. Critical reading activities executed in the classroom provided an opportunity for the students to expand their thinking process. It resulted from the ability of the students to criticize elements found in texts and connect them with wider contexts. The students’ learning achievement, which significantly improved, indicates a similarity to findings suggested by Izadinia and Abednia (2010) who point out that the critical literacy approach to reading can improve students’ critical thinking ability, confidence, and self-awareness.

The results of this study are in line with the results of the study conducted by Ali (2011). He proved that the development of critical awareness through an explicit learning method can improve students’ critical thinking skills and motivation. Through the critical literacy approach, students have an opportunity to train their reading skills to a higher level. They can criticize texts from many aspects, such as information, data, facts, and arguments with the sense of domination. Huang (2011) states that the critical literacy approach can be used to develop students’ language skills with positive results. In reading, the critical literacy approach can improve readers’ ability to comprehend a text because it helps reveal hidden messages and perspectives.

The results of this research also show that criticizing text from the domination perspective can improve readers’ critical thinking skills. This is in accordance with
the findings of research conducted by Norris, Lucas, and Prudhoe (2012) and Gustine (2014) who found that the critical literacy approach can improve students' critical thinking skills by engaging them in various activities to analyze, respond, inquire about a text and also connect the text with its social context.

Critical reading learning developed on a critical literacy approach promotes students' competence in reading behind the lines. Reading activity covers finding arguments which represent the practice of power and domination, making an inference from a text, evaluating the text, responding to it, linking the text with the context and reflecting on the problems found in the text. Such a learning process can improve students' analytic and reflecting skills which can result in improving their critical thinking competency. Similarly, Kalantzis and Cope (2012) assert that the critical literacy approach which brings authentic texts into the classroom can help students think more critically.

Critical reading skills as a part of critical thinking skills are important elements in determining every individual’s success in this century (Morocco, Aguilar, Bershad, Kotula, & Hindin, 2008; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). The development of the pre-service teachers’ critical thinking skills can contribute to their career development as teachers. As teachers, they will have to facilitate students to think critically. Therefore, they need to master critical thinking skills and later teach their students how to develop theirs. One of the ways of doing this is through critical reading activities.

Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that the critical literacy approach is effective in improving pre-service teachers’ critical reading skills. This approach develops the students’ critical attitude by actively engaging them into a process of thinking, analyzing a problem, and providing responses from many perspectives. These findings can give an alternative to the development of critical reading skills by giving students guidance in a text investigation, which will reveal domination and power acts in texts.

Recommendations

The results of this research have proven that the critical literacy approach had a significant effect on pre-service language teachers’ critical reading skills. It implies that this approach can be an alternative to apply in universities. The implementation of this approach can improve the quality of students’ learning processes and achievements. Lecturers are expected to be able to develop students’ ability in analyzing and criticizing domination practice in a text since many texts published recently are likely to contain domination elements, such as propaganda, discrimination, persuasion, or marginalization.

Future research could possibly discuss the results of a test conducted to investigate the effectiveness of the critical literacy approach based on gender variables, cognitive ability levels, reading habits, and various kinds of reading texts. Their findings hopefully can contribute to practical use of learning materials and broaden the theoretical perspective of reading. Future research is expected to be conducted at the elementary and secondary levels of education since the students
need to improve their critical reading skills to improve their critical thinking skills in evaluating domination acts in texts and textual hegemony.
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