



Developing Critical Thinking Among Inter-Level Students of Bannu Through Dialogic Pedagogy

Ihsan Ullah Khan*

Abdul Hamid Khan[†]Abdul Karim Khan[‡]

Vol. V, No. IV (Fall 2020)

Pages: 88 – 97

DOI: 10.31703/gesr.2020(V-IV).10

Abstract: *The aim of the study is to explore the role of dialogic teaching, based on Bakhtin's concept of 'Dialogism', in developing critical thinking among students of intermediate level in District Bannu. The experimental research design was used in the study. Data was collected from the pre and post-tests of an experimental study, which was carried out on the 12th grade class of a public sector college. For this purpose, a pretest-posttest control group design was selected. In this design, the control group and treatment group were administered pre and post-tests, but treatment was provided to the treatment group only. The test was designed to assess the critical thinking of the treatment group. The data from an experimental study was analyzed through paired sample t-test. The mean value of the difference between post-test and pretest of the treatment group is 7.16129, which indicates that the performance of the treatment group improved significantly, proving the positive role of dialogic teaching.*

Key Words: Critical Thinking, Dialogism, Dialogic Teaching, Experimental Study, Paired Sample T-Test

Introduction

According to [Vdovina & Gaibisso \(2013\)](#), critical thinking as a practice or concept is not new but can be traced back to antiquity. [Paul & Elder \(2009\)](#) are of the view that the practise can be traced back to Socrates and Plato. According to [Elder \(2007\)](#), critical thinking is self-disciplined and self-guided thinking that attempts to reason in a fair-minded way at the highest level of quality. [Paul \(1990\)](#) is of the view that questions drive all thinking, and it is the quality of the questions that determine the quality of thinking. In order to develop material for fostering Socratic questions and critical thinking in the classroom, he established a center for critical thinking at Sonoma State University. According to [Billing and Fitzgerald \(2002\)](#), this practice was adopted by many schools in at least ten states.

According to [Chandella \(2011\)](#), power relationship inside the classroom is challenged and questioned in critical pedagogy. In the majority of the traditional classrooms, power is tilted towards teachers, and students are marginalized. Ways and means are explored in critical pedagogy to change the status quo. According to [Pennycook \(1994\)](#) and [Giroux \(1992\)](#), the change in power relations, brought about by critical pedagogy, brings a change in the nature of schooling as well as the relationship in society. According to [Lankshear & McLaren \(1993\)](#) and [Shor \(1999\)](#), change in perspectives is possible whenever learning possesses the power of transformation. Whenever a change in perspectives takes place, individuals understand how to interact with the world. It is through dialogue that such kind of learning process is extended. According to [Lander \(2005\)](#), [Cervetti \(2004\)](#), and [Lewison, et al., \(2002\)](#), many examples of teachers practicing critical pedagogy can be found. According to [Chandella \(2011\)](#), critical

*Assistant Professor; Department of English and Applied Linguistics, University of Science and Technology Bannu, KP, Pakistan. Email: ihsanlakki@yahoo.com

[†]Head, Department of Linguistics and Literature, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

[‡]Assistant Professor; Department of English and Applied Linguistics, University of Science and Technology Bannu, KP, Pakistan.

dialogic pedagogy is useful as it gives value both to the practical and theoretical nature of pedagogy and education.

My interest derives from the conviction that critical dialogic pedagogy is valuable as it takes into account both the theoretical and practical nature of education and pedagogy. I, however, feel that these aims have not been adequately translated into valid practices.

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking, according to [Siegel \(1988\)](#), is the ability of a person to assess and evaluate a statement correctly. Such skill should not only be used by students to get good marks in the exams but also be exercised in the statements of everyday life. According to [Rfaner \(2006\)](#), as quoted in [Masduqi 2011](#), historians believe that critical thinking can be found in the teaching of Socrates some twenty-five hundred years ago. This theme was followed by Montesquieu and John Locke in their essays. [Sternberg \(1986\)](#) is of the opinion that critical thinking is the use of such activities and strategies by people which help in solving problems, learning new concepts, and making sound decisions. According to [Halpern \(2002\)](#), critical thinking is the use of cognitive skills, which enhances the possibility of attaining the desired outcome. [Bensley \(1998\)](#) contends that in critical thinking, evaluation of evidence is made and that evidence helps in arriving at a sound judgment. [Levy \(1997\)](#) is of the opinion that critical thinking is a cognitive strategy that understands and examines the event, find a solution to the problem, and, on the bases of sound evidence, makes decisions. [Diestler \(2001\)](#) also holds the same opinion that critical thinking is the making of sound decisions through evaluation and reasoning. According to [Paul \(1985\)](#), critical thinking trains in asking and answering, analyzing and evaluating a question.

According to [Chandella \(2011\)](#), the Power relationship inside the classroom is challenged and questioned in critical pedagogy. In the majority of the traditional classrooms, power is tilted towards teachers, and students are marginalized. Ways and means are explored in critical pedagogy to change the status quo. According to [Pennycook \(1994\)](#) and [Giroux \(1997\)](#), the change in power relations, brought about by critical pedagogy, brings a change in the nature of schooling as well as the relationship in society. According to [Alexander \(2008\)](#), it is wrong to consider dialogic teaching as merely the listening and speaking components of English language teaching. Dialogic teaching improves the communication skills of English language learners, but it also accomplishes many more useful jobs. According to him, through dialogic teaching, students learn to: explain, analyze, imagine, evaluate, justify, and argue. According to [Freire, P. \(2005\)](#), as quoted in [Stewart and McClure \(2013\)](#), dialogue must create space for questioning, disagreement, and critique. Nystard (1997) is of the view that dialogic instruction is mainly dependent upon what the learners bring to their own classroom. According to him, dialogic teaching enables the students to think critically rather than presenting someone else's point of view. Dialogic teaching, thus, values critical thinking.

The main objective of the study was to explore the role of dialogic teaching in fostering critical thinking among English language learners at an intermediate level. With the traditional methods of teaching, the desired results of improving learners' overall competence in English language learning could not be achieved in the local context. For this purpose, the experimental study was conducted in order to check the effect of dialogic teaching on learners' ability to learn the language and, especially, to check its effect on learners' critical thinking.

Research Question

The study aims to answer the following research question:

- How far dialogic teaching fosters critical thinking among English Language learners?

Research Problem

Effective communication in the English Language is the problem faced by the majority of the students at an intermediate level in District Bannu. Diverse reasons can be held responsible for the problem, but the most crucial among them seems to be the teaching-learning process. Traditional methods of teaching

are still in vogue in the majority of the classes, which produce no fruitful results. The traditional methods of teaching neither improve students' communication in L2 nor their critical thinking. The present study explores the role of dialogic teaching in improving students' critical thinking.

Methodology

Research Design

A true experimental design was used in the study. For this purpose, a pretest-posttest control group design was selected. In this design, the control group and treatment group are administered pre and post-tests, but treatment is provided to the treatment group only.

The main advantage of the pre-posttest research design is to assess the impact of intervention after a specific time ([Kumar, 2011](#)). After the pretest, only the treatment group is exposed to the intervention. After a specific time, when it is assumed that the intervention has made its impact, a post-test is taken. Any difference between the pre and post-tests regarding the dependent variable is attributed to the intervention. Following the procedure, the treatment group was taught through dialogic pedagogy, based on Bakhtin's concept of 'Dialogism', while the control group was taught through the traditional method. After 45 days' teaching, " observation of the two groups was made through post-tests. Their pre and post-tests were compared using paired t-test.

Research Instrument

Pre and post-tests were used for the collection of primary data required for the study. Pretest for the study was designed in the light of instructions developed by Dr Fernando Fleurquin, Director University of Michigan- Flint, and Teresa Valais in the E-Teacher scholarship program spring (2011); [Brown \(2004\)](#) and [Brown \(2001\)](#). The test was further divided into two subparts, namely: warm-up and level check.

Research Sample

Two population groups were selected from 12th-grade students of GDC No. 2, District Bannu. For this purpose, 62 students belonging to Arts and Inter-science subjects; were equally divided into two groups, 31 in each class, on the bases of their performance in the pretest. In order to ensure that both the groups consisted of students of equal ability, the pretests of control and treatment groups were compared through an independent sample t-test. [Seaberg \(1988\)](#) and [Grinnell & Williams \(1990\)](#) are of the view that 30 respondents are sufficient to carry out the basic statistical procedure. These groups were termed as the treatment group and control group, respectively. The treatment group and control groups were randomly selected. [Keppel & Wickens \(2003\)](#) are of the opinion that due to the random selection of the groups, the possibility of systematic differences among characteristics of the participants is eliminated. In many experimental studies, a researcher compares two or more than two groups ([Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991](#)).

Validity of the Research Instrument

According to [Babbie \(1989\)](#), validity means the extent to which empirical measure properly exhibits the actual meaning of the concept under consideration. In order to give an answer to the question of whether a researcher measures what s/he intends to measure, the content validity of the research instrument was found. In this regard, the pretest was discussed with a number of experts, and their valuable suggestions were accommodated in it. Dr Abdus Samad suggested clarifying the qualifications of examiners and the duration of the oral part of the examination. He further suggested to modify question No. 2 of the warm-up part from "To which area do you belong?" to "Which area do you belong to?" Similarly, he and Dr Asim Karim were not satisfied with the questions of the 'Probe' section. Initially, the questions were:

1. What is your opinion of the decision in the Panama case?
2. If you were a prime minister of the country, what would you do for the country?

According to them, the questions were non-academic. Secondly, such questions should be avoided of which students had no idea to answer. In such a case, instead of giving an answer, they would prefer

to remain silent. Dr Abdus Samad showed his satisfaction with the topic of the paragraph. Mr. Shafqat Zaidi also showed his disagreement with the questions in the 'probe' section. According to him, instead of the Panama case, something about sports or the examination system should be asked in the first question. Similarly, the second question should also be modified by asking something from the academic field. He further suggested consulting a language assessment book written by Bachman. About the scoring criteria in the oral part of the test, he suggested breaking the components into accuracy and fluency. Rao Kashif suggested making the questions politer by following a certain model. Similarly, he suggested that such questions should be selected in the 'probe' section, which is short but extracts a long explanation from students. He added that the word limit must be mentioned for paragraph writing. Dr Gulap suggested applying the six levels of Bloom's Taxonomy to the questions. He and Dr Zafar pointed out that questions must be related to the textbook of the students. Dr. Gulap further suggested clarifying the marking criteria. Dr. Ghazi also pointed out that questions must be related to the academic field. Time duration, which was initially 12-15 minutes, seemed to him short. Dr Qureshi suggested to modify the text in light of the presentation 'Communication Pre-testing, Need assessment'. Mr. Abdul Karim gave his suggestion to modify the questions in the 'probe' section. In addition, to modifying the questions in the 'probe' section, Dr. Allah Noor suggested giving a word-limit to a paragraph. Ms. Teresa Valais pointed out to give proper citation to the work cited.

In order to avoid threats to internal validity, students of the same age were selected for both groups. Similarly, both groups experienced the same external events.

Reliability of the Research Instrument

A research instrument is reliable if it is stable and consistent and gives accurate results ([Kumar, 2011](#)). [Neuman & Kreuger \(2003\)](#) suggest the conduction of a pilot study for increasing the reliability of the research instrument. For the pilot study, the ESL class of Government Post Graduate College was selected. Students' response to two questions was not satisfactory. One question was in the 'Level Check', which was about the interest/hobbies of the students. The second question was in the 'probe' section, which sought the students' opinion about the merits and demerits of modern technology. In response to these two questions, students either gave one or two words answers as they did not understand the wordings of the questions. As the questions in the interview were not clear, hence they were improved. The reliability of the research instrument is affected if slight ambiguity is there in the wordings of the questions ([Kumar 2011](#)). According to [Opie \(2004\)](#), one of the purposes of pilot testing is to remove or improve any of the questions which are ambiguous or not clear. In order to check the reliability of the research instrument, the results from field testing were drawn through SPSS 22. The Alpha value for the oral part of the test was recorded as .855, while for the written part of the test, it was .844 and .785, respectively.

Data Analysis

Developing Critical Thinking among students

According to [Rezaei & Derakhshan \(2011\)](#), the main focus of teaching critical thinking is to teach students how to develop reasoning skills and also bring awareness among them the value of critical thinking. [Elder and Paul \(2004\)](#) are of the opinion that critical thinking develops in students the art of reading a text very closely. A study conducted by [Solon \(2003\)](#) revealed that critical thinking of students is greatly enhanced when a teacher actively engages his/her students through different activities designed for improving critical thinking. Critical thinking can be made a part of a lesson designed for a class having a very large enrollment. Students in such classes show a very advanced level of reasoning skills when they are taught how to analyze and evaluate a question and discuss it in the group ([Yuretich, 2004](#)). [Elder and Paul \(2003\)](#) are of the view that a very significant part of critical thinking education is to develop among the students the habit of asking questions. According to [Smith \(1990\)](#), students learn to think critically when there are equal opportunities for all the students of listening to other classmates, engaged in critical thinking, and taking active participation in the discussion.

In order to develop critical thinking among the students, dialogic sessions, one of the basic requirements of dialoguing teaching, were carefully planned by the researcher during the experimental study. The researcher always played the role of facilitator. In every lesson of the textbook, certain questions were raised by the researcher, which were made open for dialogue. The dialogues took place in the whole class discussion and pair work. Following were the dialogic sessions. The names of the participants are pseudonyms.

Lingkuan Gorge (A Man Should Never Leave His Post)

The very first question that initiated the dialogic discussion was the title of the essay. Usman told that it reminded them of the Battle of Uhud, one of the greatest battles in the history of Islam. He added that Muhammad (SAW) urged his followers in the battle not to leave the post. They did not follow his instructions, left the post and had to face the consequences. This view was shared by some other students as well. Sabir concluded the discussion by saying: *we should not leave the post in any case*. This was a good beginning as students showed great interest in the process. It is very interesting to observe how minds change in the dialogic process. It happened in the dialogic session that followed. A child in the story was fearless when he met with a stranger. On this point, the researcher asked the students to compare their own children with the child in the story. Nasir believed that children in Europe and other western countries were very bold as compared to children in the area. Bakht Ullah contradicted his viewpoint by telling that their children were also bold, but they were not exposed by their parents to face situations like that. According to [Meiramova \(2017\)](#), one of the main advantages of developing critical thinking among the students is that students learn how to clarify and interpret the ideas. Sabir supported the stance of the elders of his area as he did not approve of mixing children with strangers. Bakht Ullah objected and told that instead of preventing children from mixing with the stranger, they should be taught as to what extent they were supposed to mix with the strangers. According to him, if they were forbidden from mixing, they would remain shy and hesitant throughout their lives. Children should be taught, instead, to what extent they should mix with strangers. Sabir supported the views of Bakht Ullah by telling that there was a huge difference between the living conditions in those countries and his own country. People in those countries were living a very peaceful life and didn't have any threats to their lives. In his case, the situation was different. In his area, there was a great threat to life because of terrorism. He concluded that how could the parents allow their children when they themselves did not trust anybody. Nasir had no choice but to agree with Sabir's point of view. According to [Bakhtin \(1986\)](#), as quoted in Chandella), the meaning is created when different voices engage in dialogue. By entering into dialogue, the change in perspective occurs. The researcher appreciated the contribution of all the participants.

IF (Poem) by Rudyard Kipling

In this poem, the poet enumerates the skills necessary for a successful life. The dialogic discussion ensued from the line:

If you can dream and not make dreams your master (Textbook P-109)

The question raised was about the role played by dreams in the lives of students. Israr commented that instead of indulgence in the practice of dreaming dreams, one should be practical. Razi Ullah also agreed with Israr and told that dreams lead one astray; instead, one should utilize time in practical enterprises. Usman believed that there was no doubt that a man should be practical, but behind every concrete shape, there existed an idea. First, there came an idea in mind, and then man strove to give practical shape to that idea. According to him, those ideas were nothing else but dreams. Israr commented that it meant students must also have dreams about their career. Razi Ullah supported Israr and told that dreams were necessary for students as well. Usman added that along with dreams, what mattered in their lives was hard work to actualize the dreams. Razi Ullah smiled and approved of Usman's remarks.

It was encouraging for the researcher to observe that students had started to open up. They argued, analyzed others' statements and reached a consensus. According to [Cottrell \(2005\)](#), teaching critical

thinking develops the abilities to respond to the appropriate points in a message and analyzing them critically among the students. [Facione \(2011\)](#) also holds the same opinion when he argues that critical thinking develops the students' power to analyze, interpret and evaluate. The response and the active participation of the students proved that the instructional strategies used were proving very helpful in developing critical thinking among the students. According to [Tsui \(1999\)](#), proper selection and use of instructional strategies can prove very helpful to implement changes. These changes will shape the curriculum in such a way that one of the universally accepted educational objectives of developing critical thinking of the students can be achieved. Davidson (1998) also supports this idea when he argues that it was up to the language teachers to include such approaches in their teaching plan, according to their teaching situations, which would improve their students' critical thinking.

The interest of the students was growing, and it was visible through their active participation. [Fisher \(2001\)](#) recorded the views of one of his students in his study. According to that student, critical thinking developed in them through certain strategies proved to be very beneficial. She was surprised why such activities were not applied when they were in school. Students were learning the art of how to form a prudent judgement after analyzing statements. [Facione \(2010\)](#) considers it to be a great achievement on the part of the learners if they could learn how to make a prudent judgement based on sound evaluation. Developing critical thinking among the students need consistency and continued practice on the part of a teacher. Critical thinking will be developed if strategies applied by a teacher are continued for a longer time. [Vdovina & Gaibisso \(2013\)](#) also hold the same opinion when they argue that critical thinking cannot be improved by applying strategies to a single lesson. According to them, it was a process, and that process should continue for a longer time.

Results

Control Group

In order to check the improvement in the critical thinking of the students, the pre-and post-tests were compared using paired t-test. From the test scores, mean, standard deviation and value of t were calculated through SPSS. The calculations are as under:

Table 1. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	posctcon	5.6452	31	2.55014	.45802
	prectcon	4.9032	31	2.59942	.46687

Table 2. Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	posctcon & prectcon	31	.819	.000

Table 3. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	posctcon prectcon	-.74194	1.54850	.27812	.17394	1.30993	2.668	30	.012

Treatment Group

In order to check the improvement in the critical thinking of the students, the pre and post-tests were compared using paired t-test. From test score, mean, standard deviation and value of t were calculated through SPSS. The calculations are as under:

Table 4. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	poscttrt	11.8710	31	3.18059	.57125
	precttrt	4.7097	31	2.61015	.46880

Table 5. Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	poscttrt & precttrt	31	.867	.000

Table 6. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	poscttrt - precttrt	7.16129	1.59367	.28623	6.57673	7.74585	25.019	30	.000

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

In the table, No 1 'N' represents the numbers of observations, i.e., the number of participants who took part in the experiment. The average score of the participants of the control group, in their pretest, was 4.9. Similarly, their average score in their post-test was 5.6. These values indicate a very minimal change in the pre and post-tests. Table No 2 shows that the value of the correlation was .819. The correlating range is 0-1. The value of correlation shows that there is a strong positive correlation between pre and post-test results of the control group. It indicates that the weaker students remained weak while the bright students remained bright. In Table No 3, the mean value of the difference between post-test and pretest is .74194. This value indicates that the performance of the students belonging to the control group in critical thinking tests remained almost the same.

In the same manner, in order to check the improvement of the students belonging to the treatment group in critical thinking, the value of 't' was calculated. The number of participants 'N' in the treatment group was 31. Table No 4 shows that the average score of the participants of the treatment group, in their pretest, was 4.7. Similarly, their average score in their post-test was recorded as 11.8. It shows that their average score was increased. The value of correlation, as shown in Table No 5, was .867. The correlating range is 0-1. The value of correlation shows that there is a strong positive correlation between pre and post-test results of the treatment group. Table No 6 indicates that the mean value of the difference between post-test and pretest is 7.16129. As the value is positive, it indicates that the performance of the students belonging to the treatment group improved a lot. The table shows that the 't' calculated result is significant. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, which stated that the pre and post-tests had the same effect. On the contrary, it proved that H_1 was accepted, which stated that pre and post-tests had a different effect. As the proficiency of the students, belonging to treatment group, in L2 writing improved; H_0 was rejected; which stated that dialogic teaching, based on Bakhtin's dialogism, did not improve English Language learners' critical thinking at Intermediate level.

$$H_0 = \mu_D = 0 \text{ OR both pre and post-tests have same effect.}$$

$$H_1 = \mu_D \neq 0 \text{ OR both pre and post-tests have different effect.}$$

In order to know the difference between the performances of control and treatment groups, their post-tests were compared using an independent sample t-test. The results indicate that a significant difference was there between the performances of the control group and the treatment group in their post-tests.

The results show that the critical thinking of the students belonging to the treatment group was greatly improved by the dialogic teaching. Critics rightly believe that dialogic teaching performs more useful tasks in addition to improving the communication skills of the students. Students' ability to

analyze, evaluate, argue, and form sound judgement is the outcome of critical thinking. It is unfortunate that no attention is given by the teachers in the district to improve their students' critical thinking. The students of the area are very talented, but they cannot compete with the students of the big cities, as they lack the ability to think and talk critically. It is the basic requirement of all the competitive examinations that the candidates must have the ability to analyze, evaluate, and exhibit sound judgement, both orally as well as in the written part of the examination. Apart from this, the people having this ability lead a more successful life. Thus, students of the area lag behind in getting lucrative positions in life because of lacking the ability, in addition to other reasons. One of the major responsibilities of the teachers was to prepare their students for practical life. Unfortunately, this factor was not given any attention by the teachers. In this context, dialogic teaching proved very fruitful.

The results of the study are also supported by [Hajhosseiny \(2012\)](#), who conducted research to identify the effect of dialogic teaching on social interaction and critical thinking. He applied two methods of dialogic teaching to two groups of undergraduate female students. He concluded that dialogic discussion in the classroom led to an increase in the critical thinking of the students. Similarly, [Lip man \(1997\)](#) is of the view that students, in the dialogic discussion, justify their viewpoint with proper reasoning and their self-confidence is improved a great deal. [Slavien \(2006\)](#) holds the opinion that by taking part in classroom dialogue, students show respect for others' views that lead to a democratic process.

Developing critical thinking among the students was not an insignificant practice. Owing to the growing importance of critical thinking, workshops, training and seminars for college teachers were arranged by the government of the province. A very interesting development occurred during the experimental study, which enforced the researcher's claim for the importance of dialogic teaching. One day, during the class, the researcher received a notification from the directorate of colleges of the province. It was notified that instead of setting short questions from the exercises, students would be required to give answers to the ideas taken from the lessons and analyze them in their annual examination. The excitement of the researcher needed no bounds as the major claim of the researcher, the application of dialogic teaching for developing critical thinking among the students, was recognized by the government. Students were very much jubilant as, in their opinion, they could attempt the question very easily. They were happy that analyzing and evaluating ideas was no more a problem for them. It also strengthened the researcher's claim that modern teaching methods, like dialogic teaching, were the need of the day.

Developing critical thinking among the students was the need of the day, especially in the context of district Bannu. Teachers in the district must exhibit responsible behavior by adopting practical ways and means for developing the critical thinking of their students. Dialogic teaching, in this context, could prove very helpful in developing students' critical thinking within a limited time.

Based on the results of the study, it is highly recommended that the traditional method of teaching the English language should be replaced by dialogic pedagogy. Developing critical thinking among the students is a new subject in the local context, which could effectively be achieved, as it is an important component of dialogic pedagogy. The research was conducted at an intermediate level in district Bannu. It would be worthwhile to try dialogic pedagogy at different levels in the district for meaningful implications. Especially, it would be interesting to check its value at primary and secondary levels, which form the base of the academic journey of students.

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards Dialogic Teaching: rethinking classroom talk* (4th edition), *Dialogos*
- Babbie, E. (1989). *Survey Research Methods* (2nd edn), Belmont, CA, *Wadsworth*.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*, (M. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press)
- Bensley, D. A. (1998). *Critical thinking in psychology: A unified skills approach*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Billings, L., & Fitzgeralds. J. (2002). Dialogic discussion and the Paideia seminar, *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 907-941.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: AW Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Principles and classroom practices*. White plains, NY: *Longman*.
- Chandella, N. (2011). *The Lighting of a Fire: The Value of Dialogic in the Teaching and Learning of Literature for EF/SL Learners at the University- level in UAE. (Dissertation)*.
- Cottrell, S. (2005). *Critical thinking skills*. London, UK: *Pallgrave MacMillan*.
- Davis, F. & Buskist, W. (Eds.). *The teaching of psychology: Essays in honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer*. Mahwah, NJ: *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*.
- Diestler, S. (2001). *Becoming a critical thinker: A user friendly manual* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Elder, L. (2007). A brief conceptualization of critical thinking. August 21, 2012 <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/410/>.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2003). Critical thinking: Teaching students how to study and learn (Part IV). *Journal of Developmental Education*, 27(1), 36-37.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2004). Critical thinking... and the art of close reading (part IV). *Journal of Developmental Education*, 28(2), 36-37.
- Facione, P. A. (2011). Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts. *Insight assessment*, 2007(1), 1-23.
- Fisher, A. (2001). *Critical thinking: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Fleurquin, F., & Valais, T. (2011). *Developing Effective Oral evaluations: EFL assessment. E-Teacher scholarship program: Survey of Best Practices in TESOL*. UMBC & University of Oregon, USA.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Giroux, H. (1992b). Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In *Cultural Studies*, Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, eds. 199-212. New York: *Routledge*.
- Grinnell, R., M., & Williams, M. (1990). *Research in social work: a primer*. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Hajhosseiny, M. (2012). The effect of dialogic teaching on students' critical thinking disposition. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 1358-1368.
- Halpern, D. F. (2002). Teaching for critical thinking: A four-part model to enhance thinking skills. In S. Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D. (2003). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: *Prentice Hall*.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd Ed) *SAGE Publications Ltd*.
- Lander, R. (2005). *Critical literacy: A view from a classroom*, *Michigan State University*.
- Lankshear, C., & McLaren, P. (1993). *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern*. Albany, NY: *State University of New York Press*.
- Levy, D. A. (1997). *Tools of critical thinking: Metathoughts for psychology*. Boston: *Allyn & Bacon*.
- Lewis, M., Flint, S. A., Sluys, V. K. (2002). Taking on critical literacy: The journey of newcomers and novices, *Language Arts*, 79, 52-62.
- Lip man, M. (1997). Philosophical discussion plans and exercises, *Critical and Creative thinking*, 5(1), pp. 1-7.
- Masduqi, H. (2011). Critical Thinking Skills and Meaning in English Language Teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, 22(2), July 2011, 185-200.

- Meiramova, S. (2017). Applications of Critical Thinking Research: Foreign Language Teaching in an Intercultural Context. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education* - Volume 7, Issue 1
- Neuman, W. L., & Kreuger, L. W. (2003). Social work research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Boston: Allyn & Bacon*.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). Opening dialogue: understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom, New York, NY: *Teachers College Press*.
- Opie, C. (2004). Doing Educational research: A guide to first time researchers. London. *SAGE publishers*.
- Paul, R. & Elder, L. (2009). The miniature guide to critical thinking, Concepts and tools. *Rowman & Littlefield Publishers*.
- Paul, R. W. (1985). Bloom's taxonomy and critical thinking intervention. *Educational Leadership*, 42(8), 36-39.
- Paul, R. W., & Binker, A. J. A. (1990). Critical thinking: What every person needs to survive in a rapidly changing world. Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA 94928.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). Critical pedagogical approaches to research, *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 690-693.
- Rezaei, S., Derakhshan, A., & Bagherkazemi, M. (2011). Critical thinking in language education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 769-777
- Rfaner, S. (2006). Enhancing thinking skills in the classroom. *Humanity & Social Sciences Journal*, 1(1), 28-36.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis. New York: *McGraw-Hill*.
- Seaberg, J. R. (1988). Utilizing sampling procedures. In Grinnell, R.M. (Ed.), *Social work research and evaluation*, 3rd ed. Itasca, IL: *Peacock*.
- Siegel, H. (1988). Educating reason: Rationality, critical thinking and education. New York: *Routledge & Metheun*.
- Slavien, R. E. (2006). Educational Psychology Theory and Practice (8th ed.). Boston: *Allyn & Bacon*.
- Smith, F. (1990). To think. New York: *Teachers College Press*.
- Solon, T. (2003). Teaching critical thinking: The more, the better! *The Community College Enterprise*, 9(2), 25-38.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). Critical thinking: Its nature, measurement, and improvement. *New Haven, CT: Yale University*.
- Stewart, T. T., & McClure, G. (2013). Freire, Bakhtin, and collaborative pedagogy: A dialogue with students and mentors. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 7(1), 91-108.
- Tsui, L. (1999). Courses and Instruction Affecting Critical Thinking. *Research in Higher Education* 40(2) 187-188.
- Vdovina, E., & Gaibisso, C. L., (2013). Developing Critical Thinking in the English Language classroom: A Lesson Plan. *English Language Teachers' Association*, 1(1), 54-67.
- Yuretich, F. R. (2004). Encouraging critical thinking: Measuring skills in large introductory science classes. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 33(3), 40-46.