

## A Critical Evaluation of ESL Learners in Iran Context

Pourhassan Moghaddam M.<sup>1</sup>, Lotfi Ahmad R.<sup>2</sup>

TESOL, Islamic Azad University, Khorasgan Branch, Esfahan,  
IRAN.

<sup>1</sup> [poorhasanmoghaddam@gmail.com](mailto:poorhasanmoghaddam@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*the present research, using a researcher-made questionnaire which was validated in a pilot study, was first to evaluate second language learners' critical thinking disposition who are learning English at different levels In Iran's private English institutes (elementary, intermediate and advanced levels) and their teachers' critical thinking disposition towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism and second to see if the participants' critical thinking disposition was negatively or positively oriented. Findings of the study in case of research question one shows that only regarding religious and ethnic minorities based on the Chi-Square .020 which was less than the critical value .05, there are significant differences among the four groups' critical thinking disposition, while there have been no significant differences among the four groups regarding other variables. Regarding the second question of the study which asked if the participants' critical thinking disposition was negatively or positively oriented based on the binomial test result for all variables which was .000 less than the critical value .05, it was shown that second language learners and their teachers were significantly and positively critical thinkers towards social problems mentioned in the first question. This study can improve ESL scholars' conception of an ESL/EFL learner and further promote ideas in regard to material development in ESL/EFL context.*

**Keywords:** ESL/EFL learners, critical thinking disposition, social problems, Irans' private language schools

### INTRODUCTION

The realm of second language pedagogy is involved with a population whose characteristics can be of huge importance to the decision makers in the field. Therefore; the present research attempts to uncover second language learners' critical thinking dispositions regarding social problems, namely religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism.

"It comes in two forms. If thinking is disciplined to serve the interest of a particular individual or group, to the exclusion of other relevant persons and groups, . . . it is sophistic or weak-sense critical thinking. If the thinking is disciplined to take into account the interests of diverse persons or groups, it is fair-minded or strong-sense critical thinking." (Richard W. Paul, 1988.) Critical thinking is a process that begins with an argument and progresses toward evaluation. The process is activated by three interrelated activities:

- a. Asking key questions designed to identify and assess what is being said,
- b. Answering those questions by focusing on their impact on stated inferences, and
- c. Displaying the desire to deploy critical questions. (Browne and Keeley, 2000).

There comes critical pedagogy, which seeks to create racial, ethnic, gender, class, cultural and linguistic equality in our society based on morality and ethics (Kubota, 1998). Kubota

holds that we should develop communicative skills in English and to appropriate English for expressing cultural identity and advocating global cultural/linguistic equality. That is, we should raise our students' critical awareness about the power of English and at the same time we should develop our students' communicative skill in such a way that they can use English to express their own linguistic and cultural identity.

Facione (1990) argues that most researchers also agree that in addition to skills or abilities, critical thinking also involves dispositions. As early as 1985, researchers working in the area of critical thinking recognized that the ability to think critically is distinct from the disposition to do so (Ennis, 1985). Empirical evidence appears to confirm the notion that critical thinking abilities and dispositions are, in fact, separate entities (Facione, 2000). These dispositions have differently been named as attitudes or habits of mind.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

Critical thinking has been viewed based on two primary academic disciplines: philosophy and psychology (Lewis & Smith, 1993). Sternberg (1986) has also recognized a third critical thinking strand within the field of education. These academic strands have developed different approaches to defining critical thinking that expresses their respective concerns. Each of these approaches is explored more fully below.

### **The Philosophical Approach**

This approach focuses on the hypothetical critical thinker, enumerating the qualities and characteristics of this person rather than the behaviors or actions the critical thinker can perform (Lewis & Smith, 1993; Thayer-Bacon, 2000). It is reflected in the writings of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and more recently, Matthew Lipman and Richard Paul. Sternberg (1986) says that this school of thought approaches the critical thinker as an ideal type, focusing on what people are capable of doing under the best of circumstances. On the basis of philosophical approach, Richard Paul (1992) discusses critical thinking in the context of "perfections of thought" (p. 9).

### **The Cognitive Psychological Approach**

The cognitive psychological approach shows two differences in contrast to the philosophical perspective. First, cognitive psychologists, particularly those involved in the behaviorist tradition and the experimental research paradigm, focus on how people actually think versus how they could or should think under ideal conditions (Sternberg, 1986). Second, those working in cognitive psychology tend to define critical thinking by the types of actions or behaviors critical thinkers can do, rather than defining critical thinking by pointing to characteristics of the ideal critical thinker or enumerating criteria or standards of "good" thought. Accordingly, this approach to defining critical thinking includes a list of skills or procedures performed by critical thinkers (Lewis & Smith, 1993).

### **The Educational Approach**

Scholars such as Benjamin Bloom and his associates are included in this category. Their taxonomy for information processing skills (1956) is one of the most widely cited sources for educational practitioners when it comes to teaching and assessing higher-order thinking skills. Bloom's taxonomy is hierarchical, with "comprehension" at the bottom and "evaluation" at the top. The three highest levels (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) are frequently said to represent critical thinking (Kennedy et al., 1991).

The advantage of the educational approach is that it is based on years of classroom experience and observations of student learning, unlike both the philosophical and the psychological traditions (Sternberg, 1986). Based on the above-mentioned approaches to critical thinking, we can have different definitions for this mental disposition. Facione (2000) provides a definition for critical thinking disposition as “consistent internal motivations to act toward or respond to persons, events, or circumstances in habitual, yet potentially malleable ways” (p. 64). Accordingly, the most commonly cited critical thinking dispositions include; open-mindedness (Bailin et al., 1999; Ennis, 1985; Facione 1990, 2000; Halpern, 1998); fair-mindedness (Bailin et al., 1999; Facione, 1990); the propensity to seek reason (Bailin et al., 1999; Ennis, 1985; Paul, 1992); inquisitiveness (Bailin et al., 1999; Facione, 1990, 2000); the desire to be well-informed (Ennis, 1985; Facione, 1990); and flexibility (Facione, 1990; Halpern, 1998).

Clearly the researcher in this study follows the educational approach to defining critical thinking disposition.

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. Are there any differences among second language learners' critical thinking disposition who are learning English at different levels and their teachers' critical thinking disposition towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism in the society?
2. Is second language learners' and their teachers' critical thinking disposition positively or negatively oriented towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism in the society?

## **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

The following null hypotheses are suggested based on the above research questions:

H<sub>0</sub>1: There are no differences among English language learners critical thinking disposition who are learning English at different levels and their teachers' critical thinking disposition towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism in the society.

H<sub>0</sub>2: English language learners' and their teachers' critical thinking disposition is not positively or negatively oriented towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism in the society.

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

As promoting learners' critical thinking is the ultimate goal of any educational endeavor, the current study is to analyze language learners' critical thinking disposition at different levels of learning English and their teachers' towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation, colonialism.

The researcher has not found any studies in Iran concerning second language learners' and teachers' critical thinking disposition regarding social problems in the process of learning English. Therefore, the researcher attempts to see whether learners' attitudes may change as they are in the process of improving their English. And if second language learners' and teachers' critical thinking disposition regarding social problems is negatively or positively oriented. Such a study can promote the professional critical thinking of authorities in the realm of TEFL and ultimately of the language learners'.

### **Participants**

The study used a cluster sampling method for gathering data. It was conducted in more than ten cities around the country from Mazandaran province to Khuzestan province. Three hundred and eighty nine Iranian adolescent or adult English language learners of different grades and their teachers took part in the survey. The study consisted of 51 elementary, 223 intermediate and 96 advanced language learners, and 19 teachers. English language learners were all non-native speakers of English who were learning English all over the country at elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels. Even though age and gender were not considered as variables in this study, they are given here to have a more tangible picture of the sample studied (see tables 1 to 3).

**Table 1. Number of participants based on their language learning levels**

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Elementary	51	13.1	13.1	13.1
Intermediate	223	57.3	57.3	70.4
Valid Advanced	96	24.7	24.7	95.1
Teachers	19	4.9	4.9	100.0
Total	389	100.0	100.0	

Participants ranged from 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, to 40-50 years old. There were 111 between 10-20, 220 between 20-30, 36 between 30-40, and 2 participants between 40-50. In other words, 30.1, 59.6, 9.8, and .5, of the participants were 10-20, 20-30, 30-40, and 40-50 years old respectively.

**Table 2. Distribution of participants by age range**

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
10-20	111	28.5	30.1	30.1
20-30	220	56.6	59.6	89.7
Valid 30-40	36	9.3	9.8	99.5
40-50	2	.5	.5	100.0
Total	369	94.9	100.0	
Missing System	20	5.1		

Total 389 100.0

As it is seen in table 3.3., there were 211 female and 156 males and 3 unknown figures. In other words, 54.2 of the language learners were females and 40.1 were males, while .8 of them did not recognize their gender position.

**Table 3. Distribution of participants by gender**

		<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Valid Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
	Female	211	54.2	57.0	57.0
	Male	156	40.1	42.2	99.2
Valid	3.00	3	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	370	95.1	100.0	
Missing	System	19	4.9		
	Total	389	100.0		

### Instruments

In the second phase of the study, it was decided to examine whether there is a difference among the four groups; elementary, intermediate and advanced English Language learners' and their English teachers' critical thinking disposition towards social problems. For this purpose, 389 participants from four corners of the country participated in the study. The participants filled in a researcher-made questionnaire which was first analyzed whose validity was assured through experts' checking its face and content validity. Using factor analysis method and piloting of the questionnaire which led to a revised researcher-made questionnaire it was devised to evaluate participants' critical thinking disposition towards social problems. 80 students participated in the pilot study and the reliability was calculated via Cronbach's alpha which proved to be 0.76.

**Table 4. Reliability Statistics**

<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
.765	24

The questionnaire which is given in the appendix was devised in Farsi (Learners' mother tongue) not English because of misunderstandings which may happen and due to the fact that some of the learners were true beginners and they may not at all understand the material in English. It asked respondents to indicate their critical thinking disposition towards social problems by rating them on a five-point Likert scale from strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5. Questionnaires are to elicit the information directly from the respondents and are more reliable than indirect projective ones such as asking participants to draw some pictures. According to Best and Kahn (2006) "A questionnaire is used when factual information is desired. When opinions rather than facts are desired, an opinionnaire or attitude scale is used. Of course these two purposes can be combined into one form that is usually referred to as a questionnaire."

The data collection instrument consisted of two parts. The first part was designed to elicit some demographic information from the learners and their level of Learning English which was to be left empty by Learners and to be filled in later by their teachers to make sure of the level of English they were studying at the time of filling in the questionnaire. Questions in the first part asked their level of English, age, gender, Languages they know, the name of the textbook through which they were learning English, their mother tongue, whether they are university students or not, if they are university students what are their fields of study, and if they are employed or not. There were two questions in the questionnaire asking their names and their institutes' names which were recommended to leave empty because of washing away the learners' desirability inclination and their supervisors' sensitivity.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 12 questions drawn out of 30 items while conducting factor analysis which had been selected to evaluate one distinctive construct; learners' and teachers' critical thinking disposition towards social problems. The twelve questions of part two of the questionnaire which was divided into six categories based on the research questions consisted of items which were to measure respondents' critical thinking towards social problems such as religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism.

## **RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE**

The present study is an ex post facto design in case of the questionnaire used the study. Best and Kahn (2006) assert that descriptive studies include ex post facto or explanatory observational studies. Descriptive research methods are non-experimental because they deal with the relationships among non-manipulated variables. Because the events or conditions have already occurred, the researcher nearly selects the relevant variables for an analysis of the relationships. Ex post facto and causal-comparative research is widely and appropriately used, particularly in the behavioral sciences. In education, because it is impossible to manipulate such variables as aptitude, intelligence, personality traits, cultural deprivation, teacher competence, and some variables that might present an unacceptable threat to human beings, this method will continue to be used. According to Hatch and Farhady (1981):

Ex post facto designs are often used when the researcher does not have control over the selection and manipulation of the independent variable. This is why researchers look at the type and/or degree of relationship between the two variables rather than at a cause-and-effect relationship. In this kind of design the researcher has no control over what has already happened to the students.

The data collection procedure lasted from January to May 2013. The researcher-made questionnaire was devised into two parts 1- to collect demographic information from participants and 2- to elicit respondents' answer on a five-point Likert scale about their critical thinking disposition towards social problems. It was administered during Language learners' regular class sessions. The questionnaire was given in Persian and was to be completed anonymously to wash away Language learners' desirability inclination. Instruction as how to complete the questionnaire was given in Persian and they were reminded that research results will have no negative effect on their final exams, so that they can freely and with no anxiety answer the questions.

Statistic package for the social sciences (SPSS) software for windows version 19.0, Chi-square and K-independent sample or Kruskal-wallis test at .05 level of significance were used to answer research questions. Kolmogrov-Smirnov test (K-S test) via SPSS software was used to investigate the normality of the distribution and it was made clear that the data were

not normally distributed; therefore, non-parametric statistics was used to analyze variables' mean ranks and a binomial test to evaluate test results. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, mean, and standard deviations) were conducted to have a general picture of research population.

## METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data generation method in this research was a researcher-made questionnaire which was validated by asking experts' opinion on its face and content validity and piloting the questionnaire. Chi-square was used to find out its reliability and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to find out whether data were normally distributed or not. While Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed that the data were not normally distributed, K-independent sample which is a non-parametric counterpart of one-way ANOVA was used to compare the ranks of four independent groups.

According to Mackey and Gass (2005) "A Kruskal-wallis test is employed when a researcher wants to compare three or more independent groups. In other words, a between-groups comparison is being made." Non-parametric tests require that the variances be equal across groups or across the data set.

## FINDINGS AND HYPOTHESES ANALYSES

### Research Question

the researcher wanted to find whether the participants had some degree of critical thinking disposition towards social problems (religious and ethnic minorities, social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism ) in the society or not. In order to answer this question, First, a one-sample kolmogorov-smirnov test was conducted to see if the data was normally distributed or not. The results of K-S independent test is presented in table 5.

**Table 5. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of critical thinking variables**

		<i>Minorities   Social Inequality   Power Dominance  </i>		
N		389	389	389
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	7.5758	6.7481	5.9846
	Std. Deviation	3.30456	1.93537	1.70952
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.226	.107	.175
	Positive	.226	.104	.137
	Negative	-.165	-.107	-.175
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		4.467	2.111	3.443
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000

**Table 5. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of critical thinking variables**

		<i>Culture Diversity 1</i>	<i>Gender Differentiation 1</i>	<i>Colonialism 1</i>
	N	389	389	389
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	7.5219	6.9332	7.4499
	Std. Deviation	1.63331	1.60561	1.57810
	Absolute	.142	.172	.133
Most Extreme Differences	Positive	.141	.172	.124
	Negative	-.142	-.147	-.133
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		2.803	3.399	2.616
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000

As it can be seen in the above table the mean of variables; minorities, social inequalities', power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism is 7.5758, 6.7481, 5.9846, 7.5219, 6.9332 and 7.4499 respectively.

In the above table, standard deviations of all variables are being identified. The minorities variable SD shows the most dispersion from the mean (3.3045) in comparison to other variables.

Based on the significance level of all critical thinking variables which are less than the critical value 0.05, the normality of data for all variables is rejected. Therefore the researcher has used a nonparametric approach in analyzing research questions. Kruskal-Wallis test which is a non-parametric test is known as a non-parametric variance analysis method has been used to compare the mean ranks of all critical thinking variables in the four groups (elementary, intermediate, and advanced learners, and teachers). Of 389 participants who took part in filling in the questionnaire, 13.1% elementary, 57.3% intermediate, and 24.7% advanced English language learners and 4.9% were teachers. In table 6 the results of Kruskal-Wallis test followed by its Chi-square results.

Based on the Kruskal-Wallis test results in table 6 below, there was a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking disposition towards *minorities'* variable ( $\chi^2=9.873, p=.020$ ) with a mean rank of 199.90 for elementary, 194.92 for intermediate, 207.30 for advanced learners, and 120.63 for teachers. The difference can be traced between teachers and other groups based on their mean ranks.

There was not a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking towards *social inequality* variable ( $\chi^2=5.756, p=.124$ ) with a mean rank of 173.511 for elementary, 194.34 for intermediate, 213.45 for advanced learners, and 167.16 for teachers. Therefore, all groups seem to have given equal responses to *social inequality* variable questions.

There was not a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking towards power dominance variable ( $\chi^2=4.829, p=.185$ ) with a mean rank of 166.79 for elementary, 202.47 for intermediate, 195.98 for advanced learners, and 178.11 for

teachers. Therefore, all groups seem to have given equal responses to power dominance variable questions.

**Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis test to compare mean Ranks of all groups**

	<i>Term</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>
Minorities 1	Elementary	51	199.90
	Intermediate	223	194.92
	Advanced	96	207.30
	Teachers	19	120.63
	Total	389	
Social Inequality 1	Elementary	51	173.51
	Intermediate	223	194.34
	Advanced	96	213.45
	Teachers	19	167.16
	Total	389	
Power Dominance 1	Elementary	51	166.79
	Intermediate	223	202.47
	Advanced	96	195.98
	Teachers	19	178.11
	Total	389	
Culture Diversity 1	Elementary	51	203.91
	Intermediate	223	195.72
	Advanced	96	186.19
	Teachers	19	207.21
	Total	389	
Gender Differentiation 1	Elementary	51	177.89
	Intermediate	223	194.66
	Advanced	96	211.71
	Teachers	19	160.42
	Total	389	
Colonialism 1	Elementary	51	223.56
	Intermediate	223	187.39
	Advanced	96	190.03
	Teachers	19	232.82
	Total	389	

Table 7. Chi-square results of critical thinking variables

	<i>Minorities 1</i>	<i>Social Inequality 1</i>	<i>Power Dominance 1</i>	<i>Culture Diversity 1</i>	<i>Gender Differentiation 1</i>	<i>Colonialism 1</i>
Chi-Square	9.873	5.756	4.829	1.194	5.360	6.897
df	3	3	3	3	3	3
Asymp. Sig.	.020	.124	.185	.754	.147	.075

There was not a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking towards *culture diversity* variable ( $\chi^2=1.194, p=.754$ ) with a mean rank of 203.91 for elementary, 195.72 for intermediate, 186.19 for advanced learners, and 207.21 for teachers. Therefore, all groups seem to have given equal responses to *culture diversity* variable questions.

There was not a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking towards *gender differentiation* variable ( $\chi^2=5.360, p=.147$ ) with a mean rank of 177.89 for elementary, 194.66 for intermediate, 211.71 for advanced learners, and 160.42 for teachers. Therefore, all groups seem to have given equal responses to *gender differentiation* variable questions.

There was not a statistically significant difference among all groups in case of their critical thinking towards *colonialism* variable ( $\chi^2=6.897, p=.075$ ) with a mean rank of 223.56 for elementary, 187.39 for intermediate, 190.03 for advanced learners, and 232.82 for teachers. Therefore, all groups seem to have given equal responses to colonialism variable questions. However, because the significance level obtained is close to the critical value 0.05 we can trace some significant difference to some degree, as the mean ranks of elementary learners and teachers (223.56, 232.82) seem to be apparently higher than the intermediate and advanced learners' mean ranks (187.39, 190.03).

Because the normality of data distribution was rejected by using a K-S test and acceptance of a non-parametric method, a binomial test has been used to analyze and measure critical thinking variables based on five-point Likert scale. Table 8 shows the results of a binomial test for critical thinking variables.

As shown in the table 8, respondents' responses for each variable have been divided into two groups. Group one are those responses whose averages have been less than the mean (i.e. 5) (average of two 5+5 answers based on Likert scale), and group two are those responses whose averages have been more than the mean (i.e. 5).

In case of minorities variable we have 59 responses in group 1 and 330 responses in group 2. The observed proportion for group 1 is .15 and .85 for group 2. The exact significance level obtained in the second table for minorities' variable is .000 which is less than the critical value .05 in the above table which shows a significant difference. The same exact significant levels are observed for all critical thinking variables, while all G1 observed proportions are less than all G2 observed proportions (e.g. in the colonialism variable we have .8 for G1 and .92 for G2). Therefore, the responses regarding critical thinking variables are highly positively evaluated meaning that the respondents have not only a highly sensitive critical thinking disposition towards social problems, but they also have an immediate critical thinking disposition.

**Table 8. Binomial Test results of critical thinking variables**

		<i>Category</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Observed Prop.</i>	<i>Test Prop.</i>	<i>Exact Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
Minorities 1	Group 1	<= 5	59	.15	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	330	.85		
	Total		389	1.00		
Social Inequality 1	Group 1	<= 5	105	.27	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	284	.73		
	Total		389	1.00		
Power Dominance 1	Group 1	<= 5	128	.33	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	261	.67		
	Total		389	1.00		
Culture Diversity 1	Group 1	<= 5	31	.08	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	358	.92		
	Total		389	1.00		
Gender Differentiation 1	Group 1	<= 5	52	.13	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	337	.87		
	Total		389	1.00		
Colonialism 1	Group 1	<= 5	33	.08	.50	.000
	Group 2	> 5	356	.92		
	Total		389	1.00		

According to Farahmandpur and McLaren, Preparing students for critical citizenship through critical literacy deepens the roots of democracy by encouraging students to actively participate in public discourses and debates over social economic and political issues that affect everyday life in their own and neighboring communities. In this way, students can acquire the civic courage and moral responsibility to participate in democratic life as critical social agents, becoming authors of their own history rather than being written off by history (2001:3).

CDA studies want the readers to be alert of cultural tendencies, historical setting and political aspect of text production. These points are the basic elements of self-actualization and critical thinking which is the last output of all enterprises in education (Reichenbach, 2001). The first question sought the answer to whether English language learners and their teachers critically thought of the social problems mentioned above or not. Using Kruskal-wallis test, it was made clear that only in case of the first dependent variable (religious and ethnic minorities)

the Chi-square statistical significance level obtained was .020 which was smaller than .05; thus only in case of the first variable, the four groups are thinking critically differently, But in case of other dependent variables (i.e. social inequality, power dominance, culture diversity, gender differentiation and colonialism) they were not thinking critically differently. Using a binominal test to measure the four groups' performance on the variables mentioned above which was based on five-point Likert scale, it was shown that the statistical significance level was .000 less than the critical value .05 for all variables which meant that all groups had a significant critical thinking disposition towards social problems and were eager to find a solution for them.

Ndura, E. (2004) suggests five strategies for dealing with stereotypes and other cultural biases in ESL textbooks and other instructional materials.

Strategy 1: Become aware

Strategy 2: Critically examine instructional materials

Strategy 3: Prepare supplementary teaching materials

Strategy 4: Avoid the avoidance game

Strategy 5: Listen to the students

Based on the findings of the second phase of the study, ESL learners are highly critical thinkers in case of social problems involved in the textbooks, therefore those social issues could be used to teach language mechanism in a new style which will make language learning more interesting to them. Teachers need to know in which areas their students are interested in order to help them develop their linguistic abilities and critical awareness. Flowerdew (2013) in his book "discourse in English language Education" richly demonstrates how discourse studies can inform the teaching of English and other languages, both as a foreign language and in the mother tongue. In the same vein Pennycook (1994) argues that teachers who teach English must:

1. Doubt and be critical of the idea that the internationalization of English is good and can lead people to a better world.
2. Think about the relation their work has with the spread of English and critically evaluate how their practice can produce social inequality.
3. Question whether they are helping to spread the domination of English.

Finally, the gigantic industry of ELT requires as many research studies as possible in order to enlighten the way for the production of more culturally inclusive ELT textbooks and for the growing body of English language learners wishing to think more critically.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bailin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. (1999). Conceptualizing critical thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(3), 285–302.
- [2] Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in Education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- [3] Browne, M. N., & Keeley, S. M. (2000). *Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [4] Ennis, R. H. (1985). A logical basis for measuring critical thinking skills. *Educational Leadership*, 43(2), 44–48.
- [5] Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction*. Millbrae, CA: The California Academic Press.
- [6] Facione, P. A. (2000). The disposition toward critical thinking: Its character, measurement, and relation to critical thinking skill. *Informal Logic*, 20(1), 61–84.
- [7] Farahmandpur, R., & McLaren, P. (2001). The Globalization of Capitalism and the New Imperialism: Notes towards a Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, Cultural Studies*, 23(3), 271–315.
- [8] Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English language Education*. New York: Routledge.
- [9] Halpern, D. F. (1998). Teaching critical thinking for transfer across domains: Dispositions, skills, structure training, and metacognitive monitoring. *American Psychologist*, 53(4), 449–455.
- [10] Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1981). *Research design and statistics: For applied linguistics*. Tehran: SAMT.
- [11] Kubota, R. (1998a). An investigation of Japanese and English L1 essay organization: Differences and similarities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 475–507.
- [12] Kubota, R. (1998b). An investigation of L1–L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 69–100.
- [13] Lewis, A., & Smith, D. (1993). Defining higher order thinking. *Theory into Practice*, 32(3), 131–137.
- [14] Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research methodology and design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- [15] Ndura, E. (2004). ESL and cultural bias: An analysis of elementary through high school textbooks in the Western United States of America. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(2), 143–153.
- [16] Paul, R. W. (1992). Critical thinking: What, why, and how? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1992(77), 3–24.
- [17] Pennycook, A. (1994). *English as an International Language*. London: Longman.
- [18] Reichenbach L. (2001). Priority setting in international health: Beyond DALYs and cost-effectiveness analysis. *Cambridge, MA: Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies Working Paper Series*, 11(9), 2001.

- [19] Sternberg, R. J. (1986). Critical thinking: Its nature, measurement, and improvement. *National Institute of Education*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED272882.pdf>
- [20] Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (2000). *Transforming critical thinking: Thinking constructively*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.