

## Utilizing Local Environmental Issues in Developing Critical Thinking Among High School Students

Lea Cabauatan-Garcia

*Case studies of six second year public high school students were conducted to determine the significant improvement in the students' thinking skills after analysis and discussion of local environmental issues, describe the thinking processes that the students employed before and after class discussion on the topics, and identify the teaching strategies most useful in analyzing environmental issues. A pretest-posttest instrument with three to four open-ended questions on four local environmental issues was administered to the students, with interviews to verify their analysis. Intervention strategies used in class discussions were issue analysis, lecture discussion, small group discussion, concept mapping, film showing, role playing, and a combination of film showing and small group discussion. Results reveal that critical thinking abilities indeed improved when the students analyzed local environmental issues. They used different critical thinking skills, along Freedman's model of critical thinking strategies. Improvement was noted in the posttest as more concepts, ideas and reasons were observed in the students' analysis. The most useful teaching strategies was role playing. This was followed by a combination of film showing and small group discussion.*

The objectives of Environmental Education are set towards acquiring knowledge, attitudes, skills and values about, and for, the environment (Asian Development Bank 1999; Braus 1995). The Department of Education (DepEd, then Department of Education, Culture and Sports or DECS) and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources—Environment Management Bureau (DENR-EMB) have identified specific values and skills concerning the environment that should be developed among Filipino learners in the secondary level. These include logical comprehension, emotional attachment, responsibility, moral reasoning and various thinking skills such as intuitive thinking, analytical thinking, hypothesis testing, problem solving, and critical thinking. In other words, recent trends in science education focus on higher order thinking skills.

But even before the release of the Environmental Education Guide prepared by DENR-EMB and DECS in 1999, learners were already being taught the skills of observing, describing, distinguishing, classifying, inferring, explaining, analyzing, deducting, designing, and assessing. However, no studies have been made on how these thinking skills are developed, demonstrated and observed in an Environmental Science class, although studies have been recorded for other subject areas. Hence, the researcher aimed to find out if critical thinking skills can indeed be developed among high school students using local environmental issues.

### Critical Thinking

Presseisen (1987) identifies the higher order thinking skills as problem

solving, decision making, and critical and creative thinking. She reports that students use problem solving to resolve a known difficulty by gathering and putting together facts about the difficulty, decision-making in choosing the best response given several options, and critical thinking in analyzing arguments and generating insights into particular meanings and interpretation resulting in logical reasoning patterns.

A number of authors believe that critical thinking has something to do with reasoning. For one, Siegel (in Hernandez 1991) says that a critical thinker is one who is appropriately moved by reasons. He has a propensity or disposition to believe and act in accordance with reason and has the ability to assess the force of reason. Schrag (in Hernandez 1991) believes that most creative intellectual work occurs in logic which is almost synonymous with critical thinking. Norris, et al. (1989) further say that critical thinking is reasonable thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe in and what to do.

Lauren Resnick (in Hernandez 1991) describes critical thinking as non-algorithmic and complex since it involves nuance judgment, application of multiple criteria, and uncertainty. It also requires self-regulation of the thinking process and imposing meaning (finding structure in apparent disorder). Edward de Bono (in Hernandez 1991) distinguishes between vertical and lateral thinking, adding that lateral thinking has many attributes which are associated with critical thinking.

Moore (1992) suggests that an Environmental Science class should teach students to synthesize information and think critically. This involves

not merely imparting a set of "facts"; students must be encouraged to ask and answer questions such as "Why do I believe this?" and "What is the evidence for this?" Likewise, they must be encouraged to make corrections by answering "How does this relate to other facts and principles?" Critical thinking should be stressed not only inside the classroom but also outside of it because lack of critical thinking has important consequences that extend far beyond the classroom. Moore warns that unless teachers show the students that critical thinking is valuable outside the science classroom, a large part of the population will continue to confuse science and pseudo-science. Norris (1989) fully agrees with Moore and emphasizes the importance of critical thinking in success and survival: "There is no basis for assuming that critical thinking instruction in school subjects will automatically transfer to everyday life, so critical thinking must sometimes be evaluated in everyday-life contexts."

#### *Strategies to Develop Critical Thinking*

A variety of strategies can be utilized to develop and improve critical thinking skills in students. One common strategy is issue analysis. An environmental issue can be analyzed and investigated by selecting the issue, clarifying the nature of the issue, researching and analyzing the various viewpoints, evaluating alternative viewpoints and their implications, and investigating possible solutions to the problem (Asian Development Bank 1999). Allen (1987) assigned the students to read six or seven short science news articles, contemplate on one or two hypothetical claims posed by the instructor,

and a week later, take a short quiz made up of questions selected from the list. His study revealed that science news articles helped and improved the students' ability to compose a concise, logically persuasive line of reasoning on why a claim should be either conditionally accepted or not accepted.

Another strategy is the use of small group discussions which Allen also tried in Physics. His study showed that small discussion classes facilitate a detailed verbalization of the thought process during problem solving with special attention to pursuing the consequences of incorrect theories and models. Another study in Biology (Allen 1987) showed that class/lecture discussion is effective in analyzing specific problems because Biology focuses on basic concepts and processes of scientific investigation. Allen concluded that student activities such as writing, critiquing and revising arguments and using many reasoning patterns encourage students to think critically. Frequent feedback from teachers allow students to quickly recognize and correct their mistakes.

Concept mapping has also been considered as a widely used and acknowledged teaching method in Biology, Geomorphology, Chemistry, and Physics and research and development (Hoz 1997; Primo 1996; Domin 1996). This teaching technique has been found useful in revealing cognitive structure, displaying the complexity of relationship, organizing knowledge, enhancing both instruction and learning, providing an amusement instrument for student's misconception, and serving diagnostic purposes. Concept maps of different students may vary, but they all serve to express the students' creative and critical thinking.



Another effective technique is role playing which Cherif (1995) describes as one that provides an opportunity for "acting out" conflicts, collecting information about social issues, learning to take on the roles of others, and improving students' social skills. Asian Development Bank (1997) defines role playing as on-the-spot "acting out" of a situation, problem or incident which is used to focus a group discussion around some concrete experiences. Joyce and Weil (in Cherif 1995) emphasize that role playing plays an indispensable part in human development and offers a unique opportunity for resolving interpersonal and social dilemmas.

Ornstein (1990) believes that film is the most influential and seductive educational medium for transmitting ideas and persuading an audience to a point of view. Because of the vivid, often larger-than-life images it presents, the motion picture has a dramatic impact on its audience.

Studies also show that the types of examination or test greatly influence the higher order thinking skills of students (Allen 1987; Crow 1989a; Moore 1992; Gigliotti 1994). Crow (1989) opines that testing and teaching should go hand in hand and that if a student is given tests for only recall of content, all the teaching of critical thinking is wasted. Thus, to enhance the critical thinking abilities of students, open-ended questioning about an issue should be asked during a test. Some of the skills that are associated with open-ended questions are analysis, comparison, description, evaluation, fiction writing, and problem solving. The three critical thinking skills involved in issue analysis may be developed by certain types of writing (Freedman 1994): (1) analysis (commentaries, book reviews,

sequences of events, data analyses, and explanations of how something works); (2) evaluation (what ifs, taking a stand, and making decisions on an issue) and (3) problem solving (cause and effect analyses, hypotheses, letters on local issues, editorials, and speeches, proposals and interpretation of data.

#### *A Model in Analyzing Students' Use of Critical Thinking*

Environmental issue analysis is effective in developing critical thinking because students are encouraged to accept or reject statements based on evidence on matters about the environment. But a problem may exist on how to analyze responses to open-ended questions. Freedman suggests a model based on 15 critical thinking processes that are associated with understanding issues from analysis, evaluation, and problem solving.

Analysis entails perceiving several points of view, weighing evidence, making logical conclusions, identifying relationships and patterns, identifying main ideas, and identifying errors or detecting mistakes in logic.

Evaluation starts with making value judgments based on facts and figures, not only on opinions and conjectures. It also involves organizing information by comparing, classifying, ordering, representing related facts to be taken as a unified whole, and making a decision or stand on an issue. Issues and/or technical terms are clarified through further explanation, elaboration and examples. Criteria are set for judging the value or logic of ideas. Then the truth of the idea is formally confirmed or verified from the results of the

experiment or casually checked when something does not make sense.

Problem solving calls for recognition of a problem from a variety of sources, synthesizing information, clarifying issues and terms, and making generalizations or deriving general principles.

### Objectives and Method

This study undertook case studies of six second year students in a public national high school in Laguna Province that offers the subject Ecology to two second year pilot sections following the EMB-DECS Environmental Science curriculum. The study specifically sought to find out the significant improvement in the students' thinking skills after analysis and discussion of local environmental issues, describe the thinking processes that the students employed before and after class discussion on the topics, and identify the teaching strategies most useful in analyzing environmental issues.

#### *Initial Data Gathering*

Initial data gathering consisted of identification of four local environmental issues, securing permission from the school, coordinating with the subject teacher and case students, and conducting classroom observations.

Four local environmental issues were identified based on personal interviews with key officials from DENR-CENRO (Community Environmental and Natural Resources Officer) and the municipal office of the town: (1) burning as a means of solid waste

disposal, (2) illegal occupancy in the Mt. Makiling Forest Reserve (MFR), (3) Laguna de Bay pollution by livestock production, and (4) effects of the Makiling-Banahaw (Mak-ban) Geothermal Plant/Philippine Geothermal Plant (PGI). The issues jibed with the current lesson of the class to which the six case students belonged. The topic was "Intervention in the Environment" and was taught based on the teacher's outline of Ecology (Environmental Science).

The six case students were selected from among the 54-member class in the first section (A-1) by stratified random sampling to get two students each from the high, middle and low average groups.

The pretest-posttest questionnaire was prepared by the researcher and content-validated by environment experts. It consisted of reading paragraphs about local environmental issues and answering in writing one question for each issue in either English or Filipino. Parallel questions in Filipino were prepared for those who needed further elaboration. The students' verbatim responses were recorded and analyzed.

Gathering of information and probing through face-to-face encounter with the case students was a flexible exploratory tool. To test the validity of the students' responses to the open-ended questions, one-on-one interviews or verbal answering of questions were conducted after the pretest and posttest on each local issue.

#### *Main Phase of the Study*

The main phase of the study involved the administration of the following: pretest and interview for

the six case students, intervention/class discussion for the whole class where the six case students belonged, and posttest for the case students only. More information were gathered from the journals of the researcher and the case students.

After the pretest and one-on-one interview, the researcher conducted intervention for a month with the whole class. The local environmental issues (LEIs) were analyzed in class discussions using seven teaching strategies.

The researcher discussed each of the four LEIs by employing two of the seven teaching strategies per session. These strategies were selected based on the list of teaching/learning strategies adapted from the

Environmental Education Guide (Asian Development Bank, 1999). The use of two strategies per session was suggested by the experts to inject variety in the classroom and to keep the students from boredom.

The issue on burning was discussed in the context of global warming through group concept mapping and issue analysis. The discussion used newspaper clippings about global warming and the students were asked to answer the guide questions. After the group presentation, the researcher discussed important points about global warming using a guide on issue analysis from Ramsey, et al. (1989) based on the following seven components:

PROBLEM:	A condition in which the status of someone or something is at risk
ISSUE:	A problem or its solution about which differing beliefs and values exist
PLAYERS:	The individuals or organizations with roles on the issue
POSITIONS:	The positions of the players concerning the issue
BELIEFS:	Those ideas concerning the issue, whether true or false held by The players
VALUES:	Those guides that tend to reflect the relative importance of beliefs in a given situation
SOLUTIONS:	The various strategies available to resolve the issue

The context of watershed management was considered in the discussion of the issue on illegal occupancy in MFR. Newspaper clippings about Mt. Makiling were given to each of the groups into which the 54-student class was divided. The group discussions started after the students answered the general guide questions and the researcher's lecture discussion. A film showing, "Saving Pasig River" (courtesy of DENR-EMB), was followed by small group discussions.

The issue on Laguna de Bay pollution from livestock production was discussed through film showing and small group discussion. Guide questions on the relation of Pasig River to Laguna de Bay were given to each group for discussion.

The effects of a geothermal plant were discussed through role playing. Questions about a geothermal plant were given as an assignment, after which a role was assigned to each student for presentation at the next meeting. A short lecture discussion



followed in which the researcher analyzed the issue. Although the intervention was intended for the whole class, only the six case students were asked to take the pretest. After the intervention, the same set of questions was administered to these students during their free time.

At the end of each class or day, the researcher made entries in a journal which reported and reflected on information relevant to the evaluation of case students' critical thinking. This journal also documented the researcher's own thoughts and the suggestions made to the students during interviews. Any response of the students that seemed unusual, incorrect or significant was noted and checked against other remarks or observations. Each case student was provided a journal to likewise record his/her reflections, feelings, reactions and ideas on what transpired during the interview, class discussion and/or during the course of the study.

#### *Analysis of Student Responses*

The data from the pretest-posttest, interview schedule, and the researcher's and students' journals

were analyzed and interpreted. The students' responses to the open-ended questions before and after the intervention were compared to find out the effectiveness of the intervention as well as to determine the students' critical thinking skills. A student's response in the posttest is considered "with improvement" if the score increased, indicating an increase in number or depth of concepts, ideas and reasons. Meanwhile, a student's response is deemed "no improvement" or shows regression in the posttest if the score decreased, indicating a decrease in the number or depth of concepts, ideas and reasons. To evaluate the pretest and posttest, a modified version of Freedman's Rubric Model was used to rate the answers to open-ended questions.

The rubric model assesses two important components of the students' knowledge, namely, the content knowledge/knowledge of the issue and the critical thinking processes which the student used in expressing one's stand on the issue. To grade content on a five-point scale, the researcher developed her own rubric model (Table 1). The model includes the criteria to be

**Table 1. Sample Rubric Model for Evaluation of Content and Critical Thinking**

Level of performance	Criteria
5 points	Enumerates 3 bad effects of burning; explains correctly the reasons why burning should not be practiced (based on the 3 bad effects)
4 points	Enumerates 2 bad effects of burning; explains correctly the reasons why burning should not be practiced (based on the 2 bad effects)
3 points	Enumerates 1 bad effect of burning; explains correctly the reason why burning should not be practiced (based on the one bad effect)
2 points	Enumerates 1 bad effect of burning; partially explains the reason why burning should not be practiced (based on the one bad effect)
1 point	Enumerates 1 bad effect of burning; NO explanation of the reason why burning should not be practiced

considered, the description of answers (based on the table of assumed answers prepared by the researcher), and the corresponding points given to each type of answer. Content was analyzed based on the facts, concepts, illustrations, examples, reasons and evidences presented by the student. Only content was graded; no point was given to critical thinking processes because only the number of identified thinking processes employed by the students was recorded. Based on Freedman's model, critical thinking processes identified were tallied for each student.

Table 2 shows a sample model of analyzing student responses to identify the critical thinking processes employed before and after the intervention.

**Table 2. Sample Model for Identifying the Critical Thinking Processes**

Sample Question	Pretest Thinking Strategies	Basis (as observed in the student's responses)	Posttest Thinking Strategies	Basis (as observed in the student's responses)
Do you practice burning at home as one way of disposing your garbage? Why or why NOT? State your reasons.	Perceiving several points of view	Giving different opinions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Making value judgments</li> <li>2. Organizing information</li> <li>3. Clarifying issues</li> <li>4. Setting standards</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Valuing bad effects of burning</li> <li>2. Based on information given shifts from burning to non-burning</li> <li>3. Giving examples</li> <li>4. Making principles based on discussion</li> </ol>

For reliability, the evaluation of three environmental educators were considered. The scores they gave were taken to obtain the average score of each student per question about each local environmental issue.

The researcher made in-depth analyses of student responses before and after the intervention in order to identify the critical thinking processes used by the students. All questions on each LEI were first classified into analysis, evaluation and problem solving. The specific critical thinking processes involved in the reason given by the students were then identified. The overall weighted averages of each student in the pretest and posttest were also considered. To determine any improvement in critical thinking skills, the number of critical thinking processes employed by the students before and after the intervention was compared.

The students were asked to rank the seven teaching strategies used in class. They were likewise asked to suggest other LEIs which should be included in the Environmental Science curriculum aside from those discussed in the study.

## Discussion of Results

### *Students' Knowledge of LEIs*

Table 3 shows that the posttest scores are generally higher than the pretest scores. Of the 72 score analyses of 12 questions on four local environmental issues, 61 responses showed improvement. Eleven items showed no improvement (I): eight items indicated no improvement at all since the scores were the same in the pretest and posttest (NI-S), and the other three showed no improvement because the scores showed a regression to a lower score (NI-R).



Table 3. Evaluation of Students' Written Analysis based on Knowledge of the Issue

LEI		Student No.	AVERAGE		GAIN	LEI		Student No.	AVERAGE		GAIN
			PRETEST	POST TEST					PRETEST	POST TEST	
1	Q1	1	1.25	3.75	1	3	Q1	1	2.25	3.25	1
		2	2.50	3.75	1			2	2.25	3.50	1
		3	2.75	4.00	1			3	2.75	3.00	1
		4	2.00	4.50	1			4	2.25	3.00	1
		5	3.00	4.25	1			5	3.00	4.25	1
		6	1.75	4.25	1			6	2.00	3.75	1
	Q2	1	2.25	3.50	1		Q2	1	2.00	3.75	1
		2	2.50	2.50	NR-S			2	1.75	3.50	1
		3	2.75	2.75	1			3	3.00	2.75	NR-R
		4	3.00	3.75	1			4	2.75	3.50	1
		5	2.50	3.00	1			5	2.75	2.75	NR-S
		6	3.25	3.75	1			6	4.50	4.75	1
	Q3	1	2.25	3.00	1		Q3	1	2.75	3.75	1
		2	2.00	2.00	NR-S			2	2.00	3.25	1
		3	2.75	3.25	1			3	3.00	3.25	1
		4	2.75	4.25	1			4	3.00	3.50	1
		5	2.50	3.00	1			5	3.00	4.25	1
		6	3.50	4.75	1			6	3.75	5.00	1
	Q4	1	3.50	4.50	1						
		2	3.00	3.00	NR-S						
		3	2.75	3.25	1						
		4	4.25	4.25	NR-S						
		5	2.75	3.50	1						
		6	3.00	3.50	1						
2	Q1	1	2.00	3.50	1	4	Q1	1	3.50	4.00	1
		2	1.75	3.25	1			2	2.75	2.75	NR-S
		3	1.75	2.75	1			3	3.00	3.25	1
		4	3.00	4.00	1			4	3.00	3.00	NR-S
		5	2.50	3.25	1			5	2.25	2.50	1
		6	3.00	4.25	1			6	4.50	5.00	1
	Q2	1	3.75	3.50	NR-R		Q2	1	3.75	3.75	NR-S
		2	2.00	2.75	1			2	2.25	3.00	1
		3	2.25	4.00	1			3	3.25	4.00	1
		4	3.50	4.25	1			4	3.00	3.50	1
		5	1.50	2.75	1			5	2.75	3.50	1
		6	2.75	3.50	1			6	4.50	5.00	1
	Q3	1	2.25	3.25	1						
		2	2.00	3.25	1						
		3	2.50	2.25	NR-R						
		4	2.50	3.75	1						
		5	2.50	3.50	1						
		6	2.50	4.25	1						

\*LEI - LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE \*\*I - WITH IMPROVEMENT NR-R - NO IMPROVEMENT W/ REGRESSED SCORE; NR-S - SAME PRE- & POST- SCORE TOTAL: 1 (With Improvement) — 51  
 NR-R (No Improvement due to regression from higher to lower score) — 3  
 NR-S (No Improvement, same pre- & post- test scores) — 8

The items that indicate improvement in content reflect the usefulness of the intervention. While it is true that students may have shown previous knowledge of the issue in the pretest, such knowledge increased as students gained more content-related concepts and reasons from the discussion. This is supported by Norris (1989) who said that the student's discussion of issues "is always based on their content knowledge or knowledge of the issue." Peck, as cited by Duncan (1984), also emphasized that critical thinking is "the appropriate use of reflective skepticism linked with specific areas of expertise and knowledge." Moreover, Freedman (1994) believed that responses to open-ended questions, which develop critical thinking, can be best evaluated based on content knowledge/knowledge of the issue and critical thinking processes. For instance, while analyzing the four questions about LEI 1, low scores were given to the responses. Most of the answers lacked content and were simple assumptions. However, analysis after the posttest showed improvement because most of their answers dealt with the concept being discussed. The evaluator found the answers to the posttest clearer than the answers in the pretest.

In all the questions on local environmental issues, no student got zero since no answer was considered wrong. This observation finds support in Ornstein (1990) who claims that correct answers are less important in open-ended questions than knowing how students express themselves on a particular issue.

Table 4 presents the most relevant observations on the case subjects after the intervention.

**Table 4: Observations on the Case Students after Intervention**

Local Environmental Issue (LEI)	Observations
LEI 1: Burning as a means of solid waste disposal	<p>All case students showed improvement in the posttest. Before the intervention, they had many reasons for practicing burning except for one student who did not really practice it. However, after the intervention, five students changed their view on the issue because of the knowledge they gained from the discussion. From practicing burning before, they decided not to do it anymore because they realized that burning releases too much carbon dioxide that affects the earth's atmospheric temperature and lead to global warming. They also enumerated the harmful effects of global warming.</p> <p>During the interview prior to the intervention, many students' misconceptions were noted on why people in the provinces practice burning. According to Student Nos. 1 and 4, "burning can kill mosquitoes" since they heard this from their elders. Student No. 2 claimed that elders from Bicol told her that "burning prevents misfortunes (<i>malas</i>)." Student No. 3 reported that according to her grandmother, "the smoke coming from burning causes soil fertility and flowering of fruit-bearing trees" but he also said he was not very much convinced because of lack of evidence and he believed that this happens only as a coincidence. This was</p>

Local Environmental Issue (LEI)	Observations
	<p>refuted by Student No. 6 who observed that burning could cause trees to bear fruits. The intervention was deemed important because knowledge was gained as the misconceptions were changed to correct conceptions. The students learned about the alternatives to burning like composting and the 3R's (reduce, reuse, recycle). They also realized that burning has only bad effects, and never has good effects. However, the belief of Student No. 6 remained that burning has something to do with "driving away pests and allowing trees to bear fruits."</p> <p>On the effects of burning, only Student No. 2 showed no improvement in the posttest answers. The improved answers consisted of the students' enumeration of the bad effects of burning. Student No. 2's answer had the same scores in the pretest and posttest (NI-S), which meant very low score at 2.00 points, indicating lack of content. Moreover, she maintained "that burning has good effects" and "is an effective way of disposing garbage". The interview with her also revealed the same misconception.</p> <p>On the query about burning as a means of waste disposal, Student Nos. 2 and 4 had the same pretest and posttest scores (NI-S) while the other four students showed answers with improvement since they pointed out many alternatives to burning such as composting, recycling, reuse and land filling. Student No. 2's answer indicated no elaboration or further explanation on "planting more trees" although 3.00 points was considered a good score since she mentioned two alternatives. Although the answer of Student No. 4 at 4.25 points showed no improvement, it was good enough with the additional reason that burning is "not the solution to the problem of waste disposal as this results in global warming".</p>
LEI 2: Illegal occupancy in the Mt. Makiling Reserve (MFR)	<p>All six students showed improved answers in the posttest. From just one to two effects, they enumerated three to five bad effects of illegal occupancy in MFR. This was the effect of the intervention since more concepts were formed after the discussion.</p> <p>On whether MFR should be legalized, only Student No. 1 showed no improvement in the posttest (NI-R) at 3.75 points. In the pretest, she thought of many reasons why MFR should not be legalized. The reasons included destruction, pollution, overpopulation, and overuse of resources resulting in lessening of benefits derived from MFR. She added that if "the problem is unemployment, other alternative solutions are possible." In the posttest, only one reason was given, "lessening of resources due to the many occupants who depend on MFR". For this reason, the score decreased a little to 3.50 points.</p> <p>Asked about how a student can help solve the problem on illegal occupancy of MFR, five students showed improvement in the posttest; only Student No. 3 showed no improvement (NI-R). As affected by the intervention, three to five suggestions were given by the students on how to solve the problem, such as relocation, a seminar about MFR for proper orientation before the relocation, housing programs, livelihood projects, jobs, a campaign for the conservation of Mt. Makiling, hiring a forest ranger, a signature campaign, and writing to government officials about the problem. From simple suggestions given in the pretest, more realistic suggestions were given in the posttest indicating good content. At 2.50 points in the pretest, only one alternative was suggested by Student No. 3 and this was the "creation of a brigade by the government to watch the occupants". The same suggestion was given in the posttest but her thoughts were not so organized such that her score went a little lower at 2.25 points.</p>



Local Environmental Issue (LEI)	Observations
LEI 3: Laguna Bay Pollution by livestock production	<p>On the question about decreasing livestock production as a significant source of pollution, four students were not in favor while two students were in favor in the pretest. In the posttest, Student No. 1 mentioned the consequences of not favoring livestock production such as no sustenance of the people's needs and loss of job, while Student No. 6 mentioned the other effects like problem on product cost and unavailability of chicken and pork. Student No. 2 suggested that the livestock wastes polluting Laguna de Bay could be converted to fertilizer. Student No. 3 believed that it should be "a two-way relationship" which is "increasing livestock production without polluting Laguna de Bay" with additional alternatives such as converting the chicken wastes to organic fertilizer, and pig wastes to bio-gas. A change in view was observed in Student No. 5. As influenced by the discussion, she emphasized the importance of employment by raising chicken and pigs. Instead of decreasing livestock production to protect Laguna de Bay, she suggested other ways to save it. However, Student No. 4 did not change her view. She emphasized that livestock production should be decreased since its wastes pollute Laguna de Bay. Moreover, she stressed that polluting Laguna de Bay by livestock wastes will lessen the benefits people get from it. This indicates that Student No. 4 was not influenced by the discussion though evidences were already shown.</p> <p>Asked about the suggestions a student can give to solve the problem on Laguna Bay pollution, four students showed improvement in the posttest. Compared with the pretest where only one or two suggestions were given, more alternatives were suggested during the posttest, as influenced by the intervention. The suggestions included burying the wastes and drying them to make fertilizer, converting the wastes to bio-gas, diversion of the flow of the livestock wastes, cooperating with the organization responsible for Laguna de Bay protection, a campaign calling for discipline among people not to dump garbage in Laguna de Bay, informing/writing to the government officials, other people and students about the problem, a visit to the place to initiate clean-up projects, information campaign about Laguna de Bay in the form of leaflets, and relocation. The response of Student No. 3 did not improve (NI-R) in the posttest. Among his suggestions was "only chicken manure can be converted into fertilizer while pig manure can be converted to a natural gas to be used as fuel". This reasoning was based on a previous knowledge in Science I. His answer decreased to 2.75 points since his thoughts were not so organized. Student No. 5 also had the same suggestion as Student No. 3 but no improvement was observed in the posttest (NI-S) because the idea was the same in the pretest at 2.75 points.</p> <p>On Q3, all the six students showed improvement in the posttest as an effect of the intervention. Although their letters, calling the attention of UPLB authorities about livestock production, were very simple in the pretest, more organized letters containing important information were observed in the posttest. The letter of Student No. 1 was not only informing the UPLB Chancellor about the problem but also giving specific solutions like burying the wastes and converting the wastes to fertilizer. Student No. 2 gave her view on the consequences of increasing or decreasing livestock production. Student No. 3 urged the authorities to immediately check on this problem as he was affected by the film the class watched. Student No. 4 focused on informing the UPLB authorities about the problem and, at the same time, asking for possible solutions/actions to the problem. Student No. 5 also asked the authorities to inform the two agencies about the effects of polluting Laguna de Bay by livestock wastes. She believed that closing it is not the solution but rather, the two institutes should be aware of the consequences of livestock wastes pollution. Likewise, Student No. 6 did not favor closing it and reiterated that action should be done immediately.</p>

Local Environmental Issue (LEI)	Observations
LEI 4: Effects of the Makiling-Banahaw (Mak-ban) Geothermal Plant/Philippine Geothermal Plant (PGI)	<p>On the question as to which is "more liable – the PGI or the government for the adverse effects of the geothermal plant," Student Nos. 2 and 4 showed no improvement (NI-S) since their responses in the pretest and posttest were the same. The other four students showed improvement. Only Student No. 2 was quite confused with her choice since at first, she blamed the local government but later shifted to PGI. She did not elaborate about her choice either. The same answer was observed in the posttest at 2.75 points. Likewise, at 3.00 points, student No. 4 believed that PGI is more liable because it is directly involved in the operation. She also mentioned the idea of the advantages/ consequences and disadvantages of the geothermal plant once it starts its operation. The improved answers were observed in Student Nos. 1 and 6 who both believed that both PGI and the local government are liable for the adverse effects caused by the geothermal power plant. As influenced by the intervention, they mentioned important reasons. In the pretest, Student No. 5 believed that PGI is more liable but, in the posttest, she changed it to the local government with better reasons. Likewise, Student No. 3 still believed that PGI is more liable.</p> <p>On Q2, Student No. 1 was in favor of the continuous operation of the plant with remedial measures such as "communicating with the local officials about the problem" so that proper action can be done. She also emphasized that "closing the power plant is not the solution". Although this was also her answer in the posttest with no additional suggestions indicating no improvement (NI-S), her score at 3.75 points was not bad at all. Likewise, Student Nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6 are in favor of the continuous operation of the plant. Though the effects were identified as power shortage since many residents depended on this for electricity and health problems, they also made a variety of suggestions such as limiting hydrogen sulfide emission, partial dependence on the plant since there are other sources of renewable materials such as charcoal, relocation of the nearby residents, proper legal action against PGI due to its harmful effects, survey on the residents' view about the plant, writing a letter to the local government expressing residents' complaint, use of generator, reinjection, and filtration. Only Student No. 4 was not in favor, but there was improvement in terms of the various advantages that can be obtained from the geothermal plant as she learned in the discussion.</p>

#### *Critical Thinking Processes Employed*

The results of the study show that the case students employed many critical thinking processes which vary from one student to another both in the pretest and posttest. The use of many thinking processes can be attributed to the open-ended questioning used in the test. As Crow (1989) pointed out, appropriate tests like open-ended queries can contribute to the development of critical thinking skills of students. Ornstein (1990) added that good open-ended questioning can arouse the student's curiosity, stimulate their

imagination and motivate them to search out new knowledge. It can challenge the students, make them think, and help clarify concepts and problems related to the lesson.

As a whole, the results indicate that all six students showed improvement in their critical thinking processes in the posttest. For instance, in the pretest, Student No. 1 was found "perceiving several points of view" in Q1 of LEI 1. This thinking skill is similar to decision making and allows one to choose the best response from many alternatives. In the posttest, an improvement was

observed in Student No. 1 since he could further "make value judgments based on facts, organize information and make firm judgments and set standards for judging the value or logic of ideas". This good number of critical thinking processes indicates that the thinking ability of Student No. 1 has become a complex activity which, according to Crow (1989), uses analysis, interpretation, logical argument action, organization, reflection, synthesis, decision making and cognitive reasoning. Thus, the posttest result indicates that Student No. 1 did not stop "perceiving points of view" but underwent a complex activity of problem solving and analysis which is attributed to the intervention made.

A very significant finding is that some students already employed some basic thinking processes like qualification and classification even in the pretest, and these processes were enriched after the intervention. According to Presseisen (1987), qualification is "finding unique characteristics by defining facts, while classification is determining common qualities, grouping and sorting, and comparing similarities and differences." For example, Student No. 2 just "qualified" in answering some questions in the pretest, but this basic thinking process changed to "making logical conclusions and making value judgments based on facts" in the posttest. This is also true to Student No. 3 who, from "qualifying" in the pretest, further thought critically by "making logical conclusions" in the posttest, and Student No. 4 who changed from "qualifying" in the pretest to "making value judgments based on facts, organizing information and making firm judgments, and setting standards for judging the value or logic of ideas" in the post-

test. The other basic thinking process - "classifying" - was employed by Student No. 5 in the pretest, but this improved in the posttest to "making value judgments based on facts, organizing information and making firm judgments, and setting standards for judging the value or logic of ideas." As comparison is made, thinking becomes higher order so that, as Ennis (1985) affirms, the meaning of a statement is grasped and value judgments are made. It is believed that both basic thinking processes were enriched by higher-order thinking processes as more knowledge in terms of concepts, ideas and reasons were learned through the intervention. Although qualification and classification are just of the basic thinking processes, this does not mean that they are of a lower order or that they are used only by young children. According to Hernandez (1991), they are used in critical thinking and other higher order thinking processes. She adds that each of these processes utilizes the essential or basic skills which include qualifying and classifying.

Among the six case students, only Student No. 6 used a variety of higher order thinking processes in the pretest and posttest, which means that all of the student's answers contained "good content." According to Norris (1989), correct concepts must be formed first so that students can effectively answer open-ended type of questions. He adds that critical thinking should be evaluated in terms of the subject matter's content because thinking critically in a subject is an essential part of mastering it. Freedman (1994) follows this up by saying that students will be able to answer open-ended questions critically depending on their knowledge of content; hence, the good number of



critical thinking processes in the pretest and posttest of Student No. 6.

The specific critical thinking processes employed by the students in the pretest and posttest are shown in Table 5. The table shows that Student No. 1 employed 10 critical thinking processes both in the pretest and posttest. Student No. 2 employed only four critical thinking processes in the pretest; this improved to 10 in the posttest. Student No. 3 used eight critical thinking processes in the pretest and nine in the posttest. In the pretest, Student No. 4 used eight thinking processes while in the posttest, she used 11. Meanwhile, Student No. 5 employed seven critical thinking processes in the pretest and 10 in the posttest. Student No. 6 employed 12 critical thinking processes both in the pretest and posttest.

It can be noted that Student Nos. 1 and 6 used the most number of critical thinking processes both in the pretest and posttest; they only lacked a few critical thinking processes in the posttest. Out of Freedman's 15 critical thinking processes, only five were not used by Student No. 1: "weighing evidence, identifying relationships and

patterns, identifying main ideas, identifying errors, verifying means confirming or proving the truth of an idea." Three critical thinking processes were not used by Student No. 6: "weighing evidence, clarifying issues and terms, and verifying means confirming or proving the truth of an idea." The non-use of the thinking processes has something to do with a little lack of content. This indicates that there is a direct relationship between knowledge of the issue/content knowledge and critical thinking. All the six case students did not employ many critical thinking processes before the intervention because of their limited knowledge of environmental issues; they used more critical thinking processes after the intervention because of more knowledge gained from the discussion.

As stated earlier, the open-ended questioning about the LEIs stimulated the students to think critically, and this thinking is dependent on content knowledge. It follows that with less knowledge of the issue before the intervention, fewer critical thinking processes were observed; as knowledge increased with the intervention, more and more critical thinking processes were observed.

**Table 5. Critical Thinking Processes of the Six Cases**

THINKING PROCESS	CASE 1		CASE 2		CASE 3		CASE 4		CASE 5		CASE 6	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
1. Perceiving several points of view	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Weighing evidence	✓			✓				✓				✓
3. Making logical conclusions	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
4. Identifying relationships & patterns				✓				✓			✓	✓

THINKING PROCESS	CASE 1		CASE 2		CASE 3		CASE 4		CASE 5		CASE 6	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
5. Identifying main ideas						✓			✓	✓		✓
6. ID errors/ detecting mistakes in logic	✓						✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
7. Making value judgments based on facts and figures, not on opinions and conjectures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Organizing information and making firm judgments	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
9. Clarifying issues and terms	✓	✓			✓							
10. Setting standards for judging the value or logic of ideas		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓		✓
11. Verifying means confirming or proving the truth of an idea			✓								✓	
12. Recognizing a problem using a variety of sources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
13. Synthesizing information	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
14. Clarifying Issues & Terms		✓		✓				✓		✓	✓	✓
15. Making generalizations	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>

*Teaching Strategies*

Table 6 shows the case students' ranking of the seven teaching strategies employed by the researcher in the intervention. By averaging, the top three strategies for analyzing LEIs are role playing, combination of film showing and small group discussion, and film showing.

**Table 6. Students' Ranking of the Seven Teaching Strategies Employed in the Study**

TEACHING STRATEGY	CASE						AVE	RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Role Playing	5	3	1	1	1	1	2.0	1
Combination of Film Showing & Small Group Discussion	3	2	2	4	3	2	2.7	2
Film Showing	4	1	3	5	4	4	3.5	3
Lecture Discussion	1	6	7	3	2	7	4.3	4
Concept Mapping	6	5	6	2	6	3	4.7	5
Issue Analysis	2	4	5	7	7	5	5.0	6
Small Group Discussion	7	7	4	6	5	6	5.8	7

Role playing is mostly preferred by the students. Student Nos. 3 and 4 say that "role playing gives students a chance to express their own ideas and thoughts." For Student No. 5, role playing provides a face-to-face discussion of real issues. Similarly, Student No. 6 believes that role playing shows "the reality with feelings" by relating to real life situations. These reasons are supported by Cheriff (1995) who states that role playing provides "an engaging opportunity to discuss conflicting views on scientific issues and also demonstrates how social, political and economic issues change the direction and nature of science while exploring the moral, ethical and social dimensions of our society."

On the other hand, the teaching strategy that appears least preferred by the students varies from one student to another. For example, Student Nos. 2 and 3 find small group discussion the least useful in analyz-

ing local environmental issues because it is "leader-centered"; that is, since the leader of the group facilitates the discussion, there is a tendency for him to dominate it. Lecture discussion seems to be the last according to Student Nos. 3 and 1 who claim that this strategy is "teacher-centered" since it is the teacher who does the talking. Lastly, Student Nos. 4 and 5 rank issue analysis the last because "it is similar to small group discussion" where the discussion is dominated by the leader.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

Although the study involved a small sample size, the findings clearly show that students do employ critical thinking processes when they analyze issues. It is hoped that the results of this study can provide a database upon which future studies on the development of critical thinking in an



Environmental Science class can be conducted. Likewise, the study's documentation of a pattern of critical thinking skills of students may help teachers, curriculum planners and school administrators in revising and innovating the Environmental Education curriculum.

This study is an example of how to assess the extent to which students think and feel critically about the environment. Educators have to be aware of the cognitive and affective capabilities of students so that a good Environmental Science curriculum can be developed and implemented. Science teachers must develop a curriculum on environment that will challenge the young people's higher order thinking skills and their desire to care for the environment.

Teachers themselves must be creative in exposing the students to more open-ended questioning during classroom discussions. This is important to develop to evaluate the student's thinking skills.

Another challenge is the use of role playing in classroom discussions which this study found to be a very effective strategy in analyzing environmental issues. Teachers must find means to include this strategy in many of their lesson plans, or perhaps as a culminating activity for each quarter.

Environmental science teachers should address the correction of misconceptions on LEIs.

School administrators should initiate a program to train teachers on how to teach and use the inquiry approach in teaching to facilitate the development of critical thinking in their students.

Similar studies should be conducted involving a larger and a more representative group of students to attain generalizability of findings. If dealing with a larger population, the instrument can be modified to a multiple choice type of test with high level questions. The effects on the student's analysis of LEIs of factors like adult verbal instruction, mediated instruction, socioeconomic status, societal influences, type of community, type of school, general ability, gender, and parents' occupation can also be considered as intervening variables for future studies.

## References

- Asian Development Bank. 1997. *Environmental Education Guide Draft*. Pasig City: DECS-EMB.
- Asian Development Bank. 1999. *Environmental Education Guide*. Pasig City: DECS-EMB.
- Allen, Robert. 1987. "Critical Thinking and Science Teaching". *Journal of College Science Teaching*. 17 (2), 139.
- Beyer, B.K. 1987. *Practical Strategies for the Teaching of Thinking*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Braus, Judy. 1995, October. "Environmental Education". *Bioscience Supplement*, S-45.
- Cherif, Abour H. & C.H. Somervill. 1995. "Maximizing Learning: Using Role Playing in the Classroom." *The American Biology Teacher*, 57 (1), 28-30.
- Chiras, D.D. 1992. "Teaching Critical Thinking Skills in the Biology and

- Environmental Science Classrooms." *The American Biology Teacher*, 54 (8), 464 - 468.
- Crow, Linda W. 1989. "The Nature of Critical Thinking." *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 19 (2), 114 - 116.
- Crow, Linda W. 1989a. "The Why, What, When and Who of Critical Thinking and Other Higher Order Thinking Skills." *Enhancing Critical Thinking in the Sciences*. Society for College Science Teachers.
- Domin, Daniel S. 1996. "Comment: Concept Mapping and Representational Systems." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33 (8), 935-936.
- Duncan, Barry & N. Walker. 1984. *The Critical Concept: Strategies for Critical And Creative Thinking*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.
- Freedman, R. L.H. 1994. *Open-ended Questioning*. City, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Giglioti, Larry M. 1994. "Environmental Issues: Cornell Students Willingness to Take Action 1990". *Journal of Environmental Education*. 26 (1), 34-42.
- Hernandez, Dolores F. 1991, December. "Developing and Assessing Higher Order Thinking Skills." Monograph No.46. Diliman, Quezon City: UP-ISMED.
- Hoz, Ron, et al. 1997. "Psychometric and Edumetric Validity of Dimensions of Geomorphological Knowledge Which Are Tapped by Concept Mapping." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 34(9), 925.
- Lawson, Anton E. 1988. "The Acquisition of Biological Knowledge During Childhood: Cognitive Conflict or Tabula Rasa?" *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 25(3), 185-199.
- Moore, Randy ABT. 1992, January. "Debunking the Paranormal: We Should Teach Critical Thinking as a Necessity for Living, Not Just as a Tool for Science." *The American Biology Teacher*, 54 (1).
- Napa, Zenaida S. 1988. *The Effect of LOGO Programming on Problem-Solving and Critical Thinking*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Norris, Stephen P. & R. H. Ennis. 1989. *Evaluating Critical Thinking*. City, CA: Critical Thinking Press.
- Ornstein, Allan C. 1990. *Strategies for Effective Teaching*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Presseisen, Barbara Z. 1987. *Thinking Skill: Throughout the Curriculum*. Bloomington, IN: Pi Lambda Theta, Inc.
- Primo, Ma. Araceli R. & R.J. Shavelson. 1996. "Problems and Issues in the Use of Concept Maps in Science Assessment." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33 (6), 569-600.
- Ramsey, John M. et al. 1989. "A Technique for Analyzing Environmental Issues." *Journal of Environmental Education*, 21 (2), 26-30.