

Effects of Critical Pedagogy on Iranian Upper-intermediate EFL Learners' Writing Quantity and Quality

Zhila Zabihi, Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

zhili.zabihi@gmail.com

Ahmad Ameri-Golestan*, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Majlesi Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

a.ameri@iaumajlesi.ac.ir

Abstract

Critical pedagogy is regarded as an exhaustive system of learning through which learners' critical consciousness, self-regulation and autonomy, individuality, and learning achievements are promoted. Therefore, 60 Iranian upper- intermediate EFL learners (both male and female) from among 75 students based on their OPT test scores were selected. These participants were divided into a control group (N = 30) and an experimental group (N = 30). In order to ascertain that the students in the two groups were homogeneous in terms of writing quantity, the writing pretest was administered. The control group (CG) received the traditional writing instructions, whereas the experimental group (EG), who was taught writing instructions as guideline, received critical pedagogy. After the treatment, the writing posttest was also constructed. The scores of the students on the placement test, writing pretest, and posttest of the two groups were analyzed using SPSS 20. In addition, an independent-sample *t*- test and a one-way ANCOVA were used to compare the CG and EG learners' writing quantity and quality on the posttest scores. The data obtained from the study indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group counterparts. Implications for EFL teachers include drawing the attention to the importance and usefulness of critical pedagogy in L2 teaching classes.

Keywords: Critical pedagogy, Writing quantity, Quality, EFL learners

Introduction

Writing is an important productive skill that can be used in learning other receptive and productive skills (Zhu, 2004). Writing encourages thinking and learning, motivates communication, and makes thought available for reflection (Mekheimer, 2005). It is through writing that ideas are evaluated, given a second thought, and reshaped. Olshtain (2001) pointed out that "...the skill of writing enjoys special status—it is via writing that a person can communicate a variety of messages to close or distant known or unknown readers". In fact, writing is one of the commonest means to communicate with a wider range of audience than other productive skill. Writing in English as a second or foreign language (EFL/ESL) creates challenging situations for learners because it is an overwhelmingly complex process. This process involves generation ideas, shaping them in the form of organized structures, such as paragraph and essays while taking into account issues concerning proper rhetorical patterns and the audience (Dujcik, 2008). In addition, another challenge for EFL writers is dealing with micro-level skills (e.g, punctuation, spelling, grapheme and orthographic patterns, particular meaning and acceptable grammatical systems) as well as macro-level skills (e.g, planning, organization, generalization, and creating links and connections between events and ideas). This perspective makes EFL/ESL writing a real challenge for learners to foster and for teachers to instruct. New ELT perspectives remind the significance of contextualizing English learning and considering

cultural and social contexts in which the foreign language is taught. In other words, to come up with effective foreign language outcomes, individual's life experiences and their social beings should be integrated to educational practices. In addition, Educational approaches ask ELT educators to act as a mentor and help learners to promote critical language awareness.

Educators have well recognized that the ability to write well at schools or universities is very important means of instruction. Harris (1993), maintained that EFL writing teachers are required to work hard so that we can provide the best instructional techniques to help language learners to be professional EFL writers. To achieve this goal critical pedagogy (CP) seems to be very practical and promising. CP is a new approach to language teaching and learning. It can raise the students' consciousness and motivates them to engage in a larger struggle in classroom setting. Originally, "CP is a way of thinking about, negotiating, and transforming the relationship among classroom teaching, the production of knowledge, the institutional structure of the school, and the social and material relations of the wider community, society, and nation state (McLaren, 1998). Learners are provided with a learning process in which teacher and students negotiate whole of the class procedures, material, and grading process (Moreno-Lopez, 2005). Therefore, attempts have been made to implement critical approaches into education and educational pedagogy. Furthermore, critical approaches to education have gained interest of other domains, such a second/foreign language learning and teaching. Unlike traditional methods, critical pedagogy views learners as active participants in their own learners-initiated dialogues (Mohamed & Malik 2014).

Although the new language teaching approaches emphasize on the development of more critical approaches for improving language learning, there have been little changes in educational systems, and schools usually perpetuate traditional approaches in language classroom settings. The educational systems determine particular dispositions in students and teachers so that they are expected to behave in their predetermined roles of the teacher as the knowledge broker and the student as the receiver of knowledge. Also, in recent years, some researchers such as Mohebi, Beykmohammadi, and Farsani (2011); Alsamadani (2010); Cuenca-Sanchez (2008); Majid (2007); Graham (2006); Ruan (2005) have emphasized on the significant role of critical pedagogy in promoting language learning achievements. In the language classroom settings, the instructors should raise students' motivation to regulate their own learning. In addition, the language teachers must activate both their own self-regulatory processes and strategies and those of the students'. Facing the problems mentioned above, the researchers try to investigate to what extent applying critical pedagogy promotes students' writing ability.

In critical pedagogy approach, the teachers regarded as problem posers. Dewey (1963) believed that learners take an active role in determining their experiences through practical application and problem solving. Kincheloe and McLaren (1994) stated that it is the duty of a teacher to empower his or her learners by enhancing their awareness. Furthermore, Giroux (1997) stated that teachers, by creating ideal conditions, enable learners to become cultural producers who can renew their perceptions and experiences. Moreover, Paulo Freire (1998) stated that teachers should turn classrooms into a place where learners take responsibility for their own education and raise a consciousness that helps them to properly assess the validity and authority of their living and educational situations. Kessing-Styles (2003) believed that both teacher and learner must engage in questioning knowledge, but it is the duty of the teacher to guide learners to move forward in their critical practice.

Review of the Literature

Writing Quantity and Quality

According Pennington (2003), writing quantity refers to the writing for extended periods of time, producing long texts with much content and many revisions, and writing quality relates to a high standard and well format of writing in terms of topic development, formal characteristics, and writing goals.

Writing is not a naturally acquired skill; it usually requires explicit instruction and learning. Writing skills must be practiced through experience and a set of practices. Moreover, writing can take the form of composing, which is the ability to communicate pieces of information in the form of description or narratives, or to transform information into new texts, as in argumentative or expository writing (Myles, 2002). To date, a grate number of studies applied by specialists in order to explore ways of improving writing. In this regard, the focus of many studies has been on finding ways of improving quality of writing. Rahimi and Noroozisiyam (2013) attempted to explore the effects of strategy-based instruction on the improvement of EFL learners' writing quality. For this aim, they randomly assigned learners of two EFL writing classes to two groups of experimental and control. Participants in both groups performed their tasks in group activities. However, only participants in the experimental group received mediation. The results of the study revealed that the writing performance of the participants who had used sociocultural strategies during their writing practices was vastly better than the performance of the participants who had not received mediate.

In recent years, critical pedagogy (CP) seems to be a new way to improve writing ability. Mohamed and Malik (2014) defined critical pedagogy as “an approach to teaching and curriculum development that aims to be more reflective of immediate relevance by framing learning in a locally-situated context with a view to raising consciousness of the learners for the ultimate purpose of social transformation”. Akbari (2008) stated that critical pedagogy deals with questions of social justice and social change through education. Mohammadi, Motallebzadeh, and Ashraf (2014), investigated the effects of critical pedagogy on writing performance and self-regulation of Iranian EFL learners. To this end, they had 60 female students participate in a free paragraph writing course base on their scores on a writing placement test and a self-regulatory questionnaire. Participants were equally divided into two groups (experimental and control). In the experimental group, learners received paragraph writing instructions via critical pedagogy. In the control group, however, learners received paragraph writing instruction via traditional methodology. In order to assess performance, learners received a writing placement test and a self-regulation questionnaire before and after the treatment. After a 5-month course, the results showed that critical pedagogy could significantly improve the writing skills of Iranian EFL learners.

The studies examining the effect of critical pedagogy in teaching and learning English as foreign language are inconclusive. This study seeks to find out two research questions- whether critical pedagogy has any significant effects on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' writing quantity and whether critical pedagogy has any significant effects on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' writing quality.

Method

Design of the study

This study was a quantitative research with a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design. This design does not have randomly assigned groups. The independent variable was critical pedagogy and dependent variable was the changes on writing quantity and quality of the Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners

Participants

The participants of this study were 60 male and female upper-intermediate English students, ranged from 16-25. They were already enrolled in upper-intermediate level or B2 in an English institute. They could write and understand most texts, including a simple essay or composition. They were selected from among 75 students in an English language institute according to their performance on the Oxford Quick Placement Test. Then they divided into two groups of 30 participants each (experimental and control). This research study was administered in 10 sessions.

Instruments

In order to conduct the experiment and collect the required data the following types of materials were employed.

The Quick Oxford Placement Test (QOPT)

- The participants' proficiency level were assessed by the OPT test, contains 60 standardized multiple-choice items, in cloze test format to examine the participants' general knowledge (grammar and vocabulary).
- They choose the correct choices in 35 minutes. Then the scores were calculated and their mean scores compared through the independent-sample *t* test.

The Writing Pretest

- The writing pretest was used to make certain the students in the two groups were homogenous.
- The writing task in the pretest for control and experimental groups had an argumentative prompt. The participants in both groups were asked to write an open-ended question and complete the writing task within 45 minutes, (e.g, Can the Internet be bad for you? Discuss your answers and provide reasons.)

Operationalizing the Writing Quantity

The writing pretest was applied first in the matter of writing quantity for the control and the experimental groups. According to the first research question, the researcher made attempt to find out whether the critical pedagogy had any effective role to motivate the learners to write more and in large extent. The quantity of the writing pretest was operationalized through the micro-skills at the sentence level. A debatable issue among L2 or foreign language composition researchers concerns the role that micro and macro skills play in becoming effective writers. The focus was on the students' ability to produce long texts with much content.

Table 1. *Features of micro-level skills, Brown (2007)*

Produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English, or spelling	Use the correct forms of words (this might mean using forms that express the correct vocabulary)
Produce appropriate word order patterns, sentences, generating paragraphs and using grammatical systems	Such as quantifiers, tenses, agreements, pluralization, patterns, and rules

Produce mechanical accuracy or punctuations marks	Such as commas, colons, semicolons, periods
Produce writing at an effective rate of speed to suit the purpose	Appropriate speed in writing to achieve goal
Produce the style appropriate to the gender and special audience	Recognize the status of the gender and audience
Make the main sentence constituents	Such as verbs and objects, clear to the reader
Express a particular meaning	In different grammatical forms

According to micro-level skills the participants' writing quantity were assessed and via scoring scale, the papers were scored. Then the mean score were compared through a one-way ANCOVA test.

Operationalizing the Writing Quality

The writing pretest was conducted second, in the matter of writing quality for the control and the experimental groups. According to the second research question, the researcher tried to investigate whether the critical pedagogy had any successful role to persuade the students to write well in general excellent of standard or level. The quality of writing pretest was operationalized through macro-level skills at the paragraph level.

Table 2. *Features of macro-level skills, Brown (2007)*

Use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written Discourse	Such as narration, description, expository, or Argumentation
Apply the appropriate the communicative functions of written texts	According to form, purpose, and audience
Convey links and connections between events and communications	Such relation as main idea, supporting idea, give new information, generalization, and exemplification
Distinguish between literal and implied meaning when writing	Correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text

The participants' writing quality were assessed through the macro-skills and via Weir's scoring scale the papers were scored, then based on one-way ANCOVA test, the mean scores were compared.

The Weir's Scoring Scale

Weir's believed that evaluating essays in EFL/ESL program has been conducted mainly for diagnostic, developmental, or promotional purposes. The writing quantity and quality of the pretest and the posttest of this study were rated based on Weir's (1990), scoring scale.

Table 3. Operationalizing writing quantity and quality via Weir's scoring scale

Relevance and adequacy of content	for instance, the exemplification must be relevant to the main idea
Compositional organization (chronological order; time, importance)	order of time such as first, second and next order of importance (ascending or descending)
Cohesion, supported coherence devices	such as "in order to", or "in addition"
Coherence, supported main idea and meaning	such as literal and implied meaning
Adequacy of vocabulary for purpose	for example, using collocations or vocabularies that support purpose
Grammar accuracy	for instance, tense, agreement, pluralization, rules, and patterns
Mechanical accuracy (punctuation) and spelling	right and left margins, needed capital letter, comma, and dictation

These are seven equally weighed criteria of scoring (0-28). Based on this scale, the learners' scores ranged between 7 and 28.

Instructional Materials

The Textbook: Paragraph Development

The participants were given a textbook- *Paragraph Development* "A guide for students of English" by Martin L. Arnaudet & Mary Ellen Barret (1990), which was taught during the sessions for both control and experimental groups. The control group was taught via traditional approaches through this book and the materials followed the book chapters; however, for the experimental group, the researcher used the book as guideline.

The Text book: Steps to Understanding

The book *Steps to understanding* by Hill (1980), is a series of four sets of short stories appropriate for students from introductory to advanced levels. The stories provide training in listening and reading comprehension. This book was used in two sessions, in order to prepare the students' discussion and write more about the events. Then they could recall more vocabularies and sentences in their mind for writing.

The researcher also provided a standardized movie and made the students to watch it without any previous explanation. The participants viewed 'Stand and Deliver' movie in one session. The film was a story of triumph in the face of adversity.

Task: Paragraph Writing

Writing as a comprehensibility language is a very different task and it is demonstrated as a complex activity, thus the teachers need to strive continually to find the best ways to help the learners write adequately. In this regard, the teacher provided an opportunity in which the students talked about their problems related to the society in order to find solutions and shared their experiences to write paragraphs in the rest two sessions. In these sessions the focus was on the enhancing the learners' motivation and complete willingness towards writing.

Procedure and Data Collection

First, the students took a placement test on general English proficiency. All 75 students were asked to conduct an Quick Oxford Placement Test (QOPT), which assessed their general knowledge on vocabulary and grammar. Based on their performance, 60 students who scored 40-47 were chosen as the participants of this study. Then, the participants were assigned to two groups of 30 participants each (control vs. experimental) to receive different types of treatment. In order to make certain that the participants in the two groups were homogeneous in the matter of writing quantity and quality, the writing pretest was administered. The writing task in the pretest had an argumentative prompt. The learners were asked to complete the writing task within 45 minutes.

Treatments for the Control and Experimental groups

Table 4. *Treatments for the control and experimental groups*

Instructional Materials	Treatments for control group via traditional approach	Treatments for experimental group via critical pedagogy
The text book: Paragraph Development	The instructional materials followed the order of book chapters.	The learners applied the book as a guide line and did not follow the content step by step.
	The teacher taught the predetermined materials.	The students and the teacher discussed together and decided what to be taught first, second, and so on.
	The teacher taught a brief description of paragraph and student read some examples and wrote at home as an assignment.	The learners provided some short n selections of texts from newspapers, magazines, English literature(drama, novel, short stories) and practiced them through the guidelines, then they re-wrote with their own words.
The textbook: Steps to	The learners listen, read, and	The learners listen, read,

Understanding	practice the exercises which the teacher had chosen.	discussed, and re-wrote the stories that they had chosen.
Task: The short movie or film	The teacher used a summary of standardized film, showed in the class and ask some questions.	The teacher provided a summary of standardized film, showed in the class the students negotiated and wrote about e the movie
Task: Paragraph writing	The teacher selected tow optional titles, the learners wrote about one of them as assignment.	In order to increase the learners' motivation to write well, they negotiated about real-life problems, their experiences, their solutions, then they started writing.

The nature of critical pedagogy is focusing on the learners' real-life problems and by diagnosing those problems and connecting them to broader context such as society, will enable learners to develop their thoughts, ideas and beliefs to write critically about issues of their interest in order to find solutions and have better conditions in educational system and society. The learners always wrote about what they were interested in not what had been determined by the book. Every decision in the class was made according to the opinions of the majority of the class participants including the teacher and the students. In class activities, the learners could display creative and critical thoughts through the learning language. They could be inventive in their ideas' production and critically supported them with logical explanation, details and examples. They were be able to determine whether accept or reject the other opinions in the classroom. They could also identify and cite reasonable reasons for their opinions and answers.

The writing Posttest

After operationalizing the writing quantity via micro-skills and rating through the Weir's scoring scale, and also functioning the writing quality according to macro-skills and assessing based on Weir's scoring scale for the pretest, the learners in the control and experimental groups were received treatment. After the treatment, the students in both groups took the writing posttest two weeks later the tenth training session was completed. The writing posttest were administered as the same as writing pretest. The mean scores were analyzed and then compare through a one-way ANCOVA test.

Data Analysis

The scores of the students on the placement test, pretest, and posttest were calculated. The data were analyzed using the SPSS 20, used for statistical analysis. The Independent-samples *t*-test was used to ascertain the homogeneity of the EG and CG in terms of their language proficiency. In addition, a one-way ANCOVA, was once conducted to compare the experimental and the control group learners' writing quantity post-test scores, and once again to compare their

writing quality post-test scores. Results of the Independent-sample t test showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in the OPT scores for EG ($M = 44.16$, $SD = 3.57$) and CG ($M = 43.12$, $SD = 3.49$), $t = -.72$, $p = .49$. This was so because the p value was larger than the significance level ($p > .05$). Thus, the learners in the two groups were at same level of proficiency.

Results

The computing of the pretest and posttest scores of writing quantity and quality of the learners in the two groups enabled the researcher, through conducting t test and a one-way ANCOVA in SPSS 20, to answer the research questions of the study. Results of the analyses are presented in the following:

Results for the Effects of Critical Pedagogy on Writing Quantity

This way the researcher could control for any possible differences between the two groups on the pretest and then compare their post-test score. The results of the ANCOVA test are presented below:

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Writing Quantity Post-test Scores of EG and CG

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
EG	18.26	1.50	30
CG	17.43	1.56	30
Total	17.85	1.58	60

Such descriptive statistics as mean and standard deviation are shown for both EG and CG learners in Table 3. The writing quantity post-test mean score of the CG ($M = 17.43$) was less than the writing quantity post-test mean score of the EG ($M = 18.26$). To determine whether this difference was a statistically significant one or not, one needed to look down the Sig (2-tailed) column in the ANCOVA table below:

Table 2. Results of One-Way ANCOVA for Writing Quantity Post-test Scores of EG and CG

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	126.46	2	63.23	170.08	.000	.85
Intercept	.74	1	.74	2.01	.162	.03
Pretest	116.04	1	116.04	312.15	.000	.84
Groups	10.41	1	10.41	28.02	.000	.33
Error	21.19	57	.37			
Total	19265.00	60				
Corrected Total	147.65	59				

In table 2, the p value was smaller than the specified level of significance ($.000 < .05$). This means that the treatment (i.e. critical pedagogy) significantly and positively affected the writing quantity of the upper-intermediate EFL learners in the EG.

Under Partial Eta Squared, the relevant value was .33, which shows that being in different groups (EG vs. CG) accounted for 33% of the variance in the writing quantity post- test scores of the learners. Another noteworthy piece of information in Table 4 concerns the influence of the covariate or pretest, (the results of the writing quantity pretest scores are shown in one-way ANCOVA table). In fact, it explained 84% of the variance in the writing quantity post-test scores of the participants.

Results for the Effects of Critical Pedagogy on Writing Quality

The second research question of the study was- intended to examine whether critical pedagogy has any significant effects on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' writing quality. Like what was done for the preceding research question, one-way ANCOVA was conducted to capture the possible differences between the writing quality post-test scores of the learners in the EG and CG.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics for Writing Quality Post-test Scores of EG and CG*

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
EG	17.80	1.49	30
CG	15.90	1.66	30
Total	16.85	1.83	60

Table 3 shows that the writing quality mean score of the CG ($M = 15.90$) was less than that of the EG ($M = 17.80$). To find out whether this difference in the writing quality post-test scores of the EG and CG learners was a significant one or not, one had to look down the *Sig* (2-tailed) column in front of Groups in Table 4 below:

Table 4. *Results of One-Way ANCOVA for Writing Quality Post-test Scores of EG and CG*

Source	Type Sum Squares	III Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	179.22	2	89.61	250.05	.000	.89
Intercept	10.21	1	10.21	28.49	.000	.33
Pretest	125.07	1	125.07	349.00	.000	.86
Groups	65.19	1	65.19	181.91	.000	.76
Error	20.42	57	.35			
Total	17235.00	60				
Corrected Total	199.65	59				

In Table 4, in front of Groups, under the *Sig.* column, the p value was smaller than the specified level of significance ($.000 < .05$), indicating that the treatment (critical pedagogy) was effective in improving the EG learners' writing quality. Under Partial Eta Squared, the corresponding value was .76, which shows that the treatment accounted for 76% of the variance in the writing quality post-test scores of the EG and CG learners. In addition, the *Sig.* value in front of the covariate or pretest, (the results of the writing quality pretest are shown in the one-

way ANCOVA table) was .000, which was lower than the significance level, indicating that the covariate was significant. In fact, it explained 86% of the variance in the writing quality post-test scores of the learners. All in all, it could thus be concluded that implementing critical pedagogy had a significant impact on the writing quality of the upper-intermediate Iranian EFL learners.

Discussion

The objectives of the current study, was to explore the effects of critical pedagogy on Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners' writing quantity and quality. Data collected via pretest and posttest scores of writing quantity and writing quality of the 60 learners from institute, were analyzed by conducting a *t-test* and one-way ANCOVA. The results for the first research question, displayed that, there was a statistically significant difference between EG and CG learners' writing quantity post-test mean score (CG, M= 17.43, EG, M= 18.26, and $p = .000 < .05$), that it explained 84% of the variance. As well as second research question, writing quality post-test mean score (CG, M= 15.90, EG, M= 17.80, and $p = .000 < .05$), that it showed 86% of the variance. According to the results, the *p* value in writing quantity and quality post-test mean scores were smaller than the specified level of significance, indicating that the critical pedagogy significantly and positively affected the writing quantity and quality of the upper-intermediate EFL learners in the EG. The outcome of the current study lend support to the findings of the study conducted Barjesteh, Nasroulahi and Esmaili (2014), who aimed to explore how critical literacy approach in an EFL writing classroom may improve Iranian EFL learners' writing performance and their attitude towards critical writing. To this end, forty university students attend a writing course. The participants were required to write an essay on an IELTS based topic. Through the training course participants were encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning to reflect what they were writing. The participants actively participated in the course through negotiated syllabus. The results demonstrated that critical pedagogy principles positively influenced the participants' performance. The results of this study also corroborate those of Siha (2014), who examined university students in a 15-week writing course. This study used critical pedagogy as its theoretical framework and attempted to foster writing competency and critical consciousness. Through, the use of writing assignments, reading and in-class journaling, group discussion and projects, and critical incident questionnaires (CIQs), this study raised a critical consciousness in participants while increasing writing competency.

Conclusion

Highly profitable instructional strategies could always be a pattern to follow for the teachers and the learners. Many teachers investigated the ways to simplify the lessons they were going to teach to increase the students' motivation and willingness to learn. Burbules and Berk (1999) believed that critical pedagogy is "an effort to work within educational instructions and other media to raise questions about inequalities of power. Also, about the false myths of opportunity and merit for many students, and about the way belief systems become internalized to the point where individuals and groups abandon the very aspiration to question or change their lot in life". Taking the crucial role of the critical pedagogy (CP), in second or foreign language education into account, the present research uncovered that the CP significantly and positively affected the writing quantity and quality of the upper-intermediate EFL learners in experimental group.

This study focused on the practical applications such as tasks, activities, and practices of critical pedagogy approaches to the writing classroom with the goal of improving writing competency. The learners in both groups (control and experimental) received the same materials-

Paragraph Development, Steps to Understanding books, Short movie or film, and Writing paragraph, whereas in the critical pedagogy (CP) classroom the students via CP approach were interested in to improve their writing. They talked, listened, read, learnt and re-wrote more. Critical pedagogy lesson plans were based on authentic materials and creative tasks in which they could be applied in negotiations or discussion before writing. These materials increase the learners motivation to write well and help students link their knowledge to existing problem in society.

Implications of the Study

The study in hand bears a number of implications for educationalists, policy makers and teacher trainers. First, those in charge of EFL teacher education are recommended to draw the attention of the importance and usefulness of critical pedagogy. In addition, curriculum designers are advised to dedicate a sufficient part of the curriculum to the teaching of critical consciousness based on the established principles and components of critical pedagogy. Likewise, materials developers can enrich the SL/FL education through including in their instructional materials whatever lessons and hints that help boost the critical pedagogy of the teachers and the learners as well. Eventually, it is hope that the findings of this study will help learners to utilize critical pedagogy to improve their performance in writing. It will be a good idea for teachers to pay more attention to critical pedagogy to follow better techniques of teaching and to modify their assessment based on them. In addition, it will help curriculum developers and syllabus designers through which they will be able to curriculum developers plan critical pedagogy to facilitate foreign language testing.

A great many number of studies in the future can deal with different aspects of this topic. Very simply, a replication study could investigate the EFL students' writing quality and quantity in different educational contexts (high school, universities, intensive language teaching programs) using different data elicitation tools.

References

- Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276-283
- Alsamadani, H. A. (2010). The relationship between Saudi EFL students' writing competence, L1 writing proficiency, and self-regulation. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 53-63.
- Arnaudet, M. L. & Barret, M. E. (1990). *Paragraph Development: A Guide for students of English* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barjesteh, H., Nasroulahi, A., & Esmaili, M. R. (2014). Reformulating short stories through the lens of critical pedagogy: A critical literacy practice in essay-writing classrooms. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(3), 531-542.
- Burbules, N.C. & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. In Popkewitz, T.S & Lynn, F. (Eds.), *Critical Theories in Education* (pp.45-66). New York: Routledge.
- Cuenca-Sanchez, Y. (2008). *Self-regulated strategy development through a critical literacy approach: Teaching students with disabilities to write persuasively by understanding the word and the world*. Retrieved April 3, 2016, from: <http://mason.gmu.edu/~ycuencas/documents/Literacy%20course%20EDRD%20830/Final%20Paper%20Literacy%2005.12.08%20a.pdf>
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier Books.

Dujcik, D. (2008). *The Effects of Pre-writing Strategy Training Guided by Computer-based Procedural Facilitation on ESL Students' Strategy Use, Writing Quantity, and Writing Quality*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. College of Education, University of South Florida, Florida, United States.

Freire, P. (1988). The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom and education and Conscientization. In E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Perspectives In literacy* (pp. 398–409). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Giroux, H. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(2), 285-321.

Graham, S. (2006). Strategy instruction and the teaching of writing: A meta-analysis. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.). *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 187-207). New York: Guilford.

Harris, J. (1993). *Introducing Writing*. (pp.16-63). London: Penguin

Hill, L. A. (1980). *Step to Understanding* (pp.176-236). Oxford University Press. English language teaching.

Kessing-Styles, L. (2003). The relationship between critical pedagogy and assessment in teacher education. *Radical Pedagogy*, 5(1), 1-21.

Majid, F. A. (2007). Self-regulated learning: Effective practices in ESL writing classes. *Journal of Language Studies*, 3, 115-120.

McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture, Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era* (p.2). London: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (1998). Che: The pedagogy of Che Guevara: Critical pedagogy and globalization thirty years after Che. *Cultural Circles*, 3, 29-103.

Mekheimer, M. (2005). Effects of Internet-based instruction, using website and email on developing essay writing skills. Unpublished PhD Cairo University, Egypt.

Mohamed, A. A., & Malik, A. (2014). ELT teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy: A Cross Culture Study. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL)*, 2(3), 13-27.

Mohammadi, N., Motallebzadeh, K., & Ashraf, H. (2014). Critical Pedagogy: A key factor for improvement of Iranian EFL learners' self-regulation and writing ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(4), 46-54.

Mohebi, A., Beykmohammadi, M., & Farsani, M. A. (2011). On the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' goal oriented and self-regulated learning and their writing performance. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 26, 192-196.

Moreno-Lopez, I. (2005). Sharing power with students: The critical language classroom. *Radical Pedagogy*, 7(2), 1-25.

Mozaheb, M. A., Seifoori, Z., & Biglar Beigi, A. (2012). A Technology-based Framework: Effective Iranian EFL Writing Teachers, vol.70, pp.18-27.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ*, 6(2), 1-20.

Olshtain, E. (2001). Functional tasks for mastering the mechanics of writing and going just beyond. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 3, 207-232.

Pennington, M. C. (2003). The impact of the computer in second language writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp.287-310). Cambridge England and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rahimi, M., & Norooziasiam, E. (2013). The effect of strategies-based instruction on the improvement of EFL learners' writing quality. *SAGE Open*, 3(2), 2158244013494222.

Ruan, Z. (2005). A metacognitive perspective on the growth of self-regulated EFL student writers. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8, 175-202.

Siha, A. A. (2014). *Critical Pedagogy, Discourse Tensions, and the Basic Writing Classroom: A Critical Action Research Study* (pp.485-490). Paper presented at Adult Education Research Conference. Harrisburg, PA.

Weir, C. (1990). *Communicative Language Testing*. Prentice-Hall, London. Retrieved from System 29 (2001), 371-383.

Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of second language Writing*, 13(1), 29-48.

