The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
International Journal of Pedagogics

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue12 2025
PAGE NO. 373-377
DOI 10.37547/ijp/Volume05Issue12-98

Integrating Critical And Creative Thinking In English Language Teaching Through Problem Scenarios

Mamadiyeva G.M.
Senior Lecturer, New Uzbekistan University, Doctoral student of Tashkent State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 October 2025; **Accepted:** 26 November 2025; **Published:** 30 December 2025

Abstract: Contemporary English language teaching increasingly aims to cultivate not only linguistic accuracy and fluency, but also transferable competencies such as critical and creative thinking. However, many classrooms still treat thinking skills as "add-ons" rather than embedding them in the core logic of instruction. This paper argues that carefully designed problem scenarios can serve as a robust pedagogical bridge between language development and higher order thinking. Drawing on research on problem-based learning, critical thinking instruction, creativity frameworks, and second language pedagogy, the article conceptualizes problem scenarios as ill structured, authentic, and communicatively demanding tasks that require learners to interpret information, evaluate evidence, generate alternatives, and justify decisions in English. A practical instructional cycle is proposed to integrate critical and creative thinking within a single lesson sequence: scenario activation, inquiry and evidence building, ideation and creative production, evaluation and decision making, communication and dissemination, and reflection and revision. The paper also discusses scaffolding techniques to support learners' language and cognition, and outlines assessment principles that value originality while maintaining accountability for clarity, coherence, and evidential reasoning. The article concludes that problem scenario pedagogy can make thinking visible and assessable in English classrooms, provided that teachers receive support in task design, facilitation, and formative assessment practices. [1], [3], [6], [8]

Keywords: Problem scenarios, problem-based learning, English language teaching, critical thinking, creative thinking, communicative competence, scaffolding, formative assessment, reflective practice.

Introduction: The global emphasis on twenty first century competencies has intensified expectations for English language education. Learners are increasingly expected to operate in multilingual academic and professional environments where they must analyze information, collaborate, propose solutions, and communicate persuasively. These demands position English not merely as a subject, but as a medium for reasoning and participation. Policy and research discussions therefore highlight the importance of integrating higher order thinking into everyday classroom practice, including in language education. [12] Despite this shift, many English language classrooms continue to prioritize lower level learning goals such as memorization of vocabulary, controlled grammar practice, and comprehension checks that reward recognition rather than evaluation. This is not to dismiss the importance of linguistic form, but to note that language knowledge alone does not guarantee communicative effectiveness in complex contexts. When learners face real communicative pressure, they must choose what information to trust, how to frame an argument, how to adjust tone and register, and how to respond to counterarguments. Such processes are inherently cognitive and social, and they require both critical and creative thinking.

Critical thinking is typically associated with analyzing, evaluating, and reasoning with evidence, while creative thinking is commonly associated with generating multiple possibilities and producing original yet appropriate ideas. In classroom practice, however, these are often treated as separate skills, taught in isolation or addressed sporadically. A more instructionally productive approach is to design

learning experiences that require both forms of thinking within the same communicative event. Creativity without evaluation can become unfocused novelty, while critical analysis without ideation can become narrow and risk averse. Integrating both within meaningful tasks is therefore essential for balanced intellectual engagement. [4], [6], [7] Problem scenarios offer a promising pathway for such integration. As an instructional device, a problem scenario presents learners with an authentic or realistic situation that contains uncertainty, competing constraints, and multiple possible solutions. Learners must inquire, negotiate meaning, construct arguments, and make decisions, using English as the tool for thinking and communication. This paper advances a conceptual and practical framework for integrating critical and creative thinking in English language teaching through problem scenarios. It synthesizes relevant theory and offers an instructional cycle, scaffolding strategies, and assessment considerations suited to international classroom contexts.

Conceptual foundations

Problem scenarios are closely aligned with the tradition of problem-based learning, which emphasizes learning through engagement with complex, authentic problems rather than through direct transmission of content. In problem-based learning, learners work collaboratively to define the problem, identify knowledge gaps, gather information, and propose defensible solutions. The problem is not a decorative context; it is the organizing principle that drives inquiry and communication. [2], [3] A well-designed problem scenario typically includes several defining features. First, it is ill structured, meaning that the problem cannot be solved by applying a single known procedure. Second, it involves ambiguity or incomplete information, which motivates inquiry. Third, it includes constraints, such as time, resources, or stakeholder interests, which require prioritization and trade offs. Fourth, it is communicatively consequential: learners must explain, justify, and negotiate their decisions with others. These design elements encourage learners to engage in both divergent and convergent thinking, making problem scenarios especially suitable for integrating creativity and criticality. [1], [2] Hung emphasizes that problem quality is central: if the scenario is too closed, learners simply search for the "correct" answer; if it is too vague, learners become directionless. Effective problems create productive struggle by offering sufficient structure to guide inquiry while leaving enough openness to invite multiple solutions. [1]

Critical thinking in educational practice

Critical thinking has been conceptualized in numerous ways, but educationally actionable definitions typically highlight purposeful, self-regulated judgment involving interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, and explanation. In practical classroom terms, critical thinking becomes visible when learners ask clarifying questions, distinguish claims from evidence, evaluate source credibility, identify assumptions, recognize logical relationships, and justify conclusions. [4] Meta analytic evidence suggests that critical thinking can be taught and learned when instruction is explicit, sustained, and embedded in meaningful tasks rather than treated as a generic ability. Strategies such as modeling reasoning, using questioning routines, engaging learners in argumentation, and providing feedback on thinking processes have shown positive effects across educational settings. [5]

For English language teaching, the implication is clear. If learners are expected to write persuasive essays, participate in debates, interpret media, or make decisions in professional simulations, they require language resources and cognitive routines to do so critically. The language classroom is therefore an appropriate and necessary space for teaching reasoning in tandem with linguistic expression. [4], [5] Creative thinking in education commonly involves producing ideas that are both novel and appropriate for a given purpose and context. Frameworks for creative thinking emphasize processes such as idea generation, flexibility, imaginative exploration, and elaboration, alongside evaluation and refinement. In this view, creativity is not limited to artistic talent; it is a learnable disposition and practice that can be developed through tasks, environments, and feedback. [6], [7] In language education, creativity matters because communication rarely follows scripted patterns. Learners often need to rephrase, improvise, adapt tone, and select expressions strategically. Creative thinking supports this adaptability by expanding learners' options for meaning making. Work in English language teaching also points out that

creativity can be fostered through tasks that encourage play with language, alternative perspectives, and multiple solutions, provided that classroom culture supports risk taking and experimentation. [7], [11]

Although critical and creative thinking are distinguishable, they are not opposites. In authentic problem solving, learners usually generate possibilities and then evaluate them. In other words, creative thinking broadens the solution space, while critical thinking helps select, justify, and refine a defensible course of action. Problem scenarios are well suited to this integration because they naturally invite brainstorming, hypothesis building, negotiation, and decision making, all within a communicative context where language is necessary for thinking to be externalized and shared. [1], [3], [6]

Pedagogical rationale for problem scenario integration in English language teaching

Second language pedagogy has long emphasized that language develops through meaningful use, interaction, and feedback. Task based approaches, for example, highlight that learners benefit when they are engaged in goal-oriented communication that requires them to convey meaning, negotiate misunderstandings, and adjust their output. Problem scenarios function as high value tasks because they create real reasons to speak, listen, read, and write in an integrated manner. [8], [9] From an interactional perspective, problem scenarios prompt negotiation of meaning: learners ask for clarification, confirm understanding, and reformulate ideas. Such interaction can support language development by drawing attention to gaps between intended meaning and available language resources. From an output perspective, learners are pushed to produce extended language, which can promote fluency, accuracy, and complexity as they try to express nuanced reasoning. [10]

Many international educational settings expect learners to develop academic literacy in English, including argumentation, synthesis, and evaluation. Problem scenarios can be designed to require learners to engage in reasoned argument, not simply opinion exchange. For example, learners may be asked to propose a policy, evaluate sources, or defend a recommendation to a skeptical stakeholder. These tasks make academic discourse functional rather than ceremonial. They also provide a natural context for teaching language for reasoning, such as hedging, stance markers, concession, and justification. [4], [9] Problem scenarios often enhance learner engagement because they are purposeful and socially situated. When learners perceive a task as authentic and consequential, they are more likely to invest cognitive effort and participate actively. Moreover, collaborative problem work distributes responsibility across group members, creating more opportunities for interaction and peer support. Problem based learning research emphasizes that students can develop autonomy and self-efficacy when they are positioned as decision makers rather than passive recipients of information. [2], [3] To support classroom implementation, this paper proposes a six-phase instructional cycle. The cycle is adaptable for different age groups, proficiency levels, and modalities.

Scenario activation and framing

Phase 1

In this phase, the teacher presents the scenario using a short text, infographic, email message, audio clip, or role play prompt. Learners then identify what the scenario is about and why it matters. The teacher's goal is to establish a shared understanding of the problem space and to elicit initial reactions. Pedagogically, this phase benefits from structured questioning that models critical thinking routines. Learners can be guided to articulate what is known, what is unclear, and what assumptions they are making. This early framing helps prevent superficial engagement and prepares learners for inquiry. [4]

Phase 2:

Learners identify what information they need and where they might obtain it. In a classroom setting, the teacher can provide a curated set of materials, such as short articles, policy excerpts, data tables, or stakeholder statements. Learners read and evaluate these materials, and they can also generate additional questions for further research. This phase operationalizes critical thinking as evidence based reasoning. Learners distinguish between claims and evidence, assess credibility, and synthesize key points. Because learners must report findings to group members, the phase naturally supports reading to

learn and speaking to explain. [4], [5]

Phase 3:

Learners generate as many solution options as possible, temporarily suspending judgment to encourage divergent thinking. The teacher can prompt creativity by asking learners to consider alternative perspectives, constraints, or audiences. For example, learners can be asked to produce solutions under different conditions: minimal budget, short timeline, or conflicting stakeholder preferences. In English language teaching, ideation can be paired with targeted language support, such as functional phrases for suggesting, imagining, and proposing alternatives. Creativity in this phase is not only the novelty of the solution, but also the flexibility and appropriateness of communicative design, such as selecting an effective format for the proposal. [6], [7], [11]

Phase 4:

Learners evaluate options and select a solution or a combination of solutions based on explicit criteria. Criteria may include feasibility, impact, ethical considerations, cost, sustainability, and stakeholder acceptance. Learners must articulate why their chosen solution is better than alternatives, using evidence gathered in Phase 2. This phase shifts learners from divergence to convergence, making critical thinking central again. Importantly, evaluation should be dialogic. Learners challenge each other's assumptions, request justification, and revise their proposals. Such argumentative talk supports both reasoning and language development. [4], [5]

Phase 5:

Learners communicate their final solution in an authentic genre. Possible genres include a proposal, presentation, policy brief, email to stakeholders, debate, or simulated meeting. Genre choice matters because different genres require different rhetorical and linguistic resources. For example, a policy brief requires concision and formal register, while a presentation requires audience engagement and oral clarity. From a language pedagogy perspective, this phase aligns strongly with task based principles because learners have a clear communicative goal, an audience, and a real need to organize meaning. Teachers can support this phase with genre models and rehearsal opportunities. [8], [9]

Phase 6:

Reflection consolidates both language and thinking. Learners review what they did, what evidence influenced their decision, what language resources they used successfully, and what they would change. Reflection can be individual, peer based, or whole class. Revision based on feedback turns reflection into action. This phase is critical for developing metacognition and learner autonomy. It also supports more equitable learning because students can identify personal learning needs and set goals for subsequent tasks. [2], [4]

Scaffolding strategies for integrated cognition and language

To ensure that thinking does not collapse due to limited language resources, teachers can provide targeted support. This includes functional language for inquiry, such as asking clarifying questions; for argumentation, such as giving reasons and conceding points; and for creativity, such as proposing alternatives and imagining possibilities. Such scaffolding supports communicative competence without replacing the need for authentic learner production. [9] Cognitive scaffolding can take the form of reasoning prompts, checklists for evaluating evidence, and graphic organizers for comparing solutions. Explicit criteria for evaluation help learners move beyond opinion-based decision making. Modeling how to justify claims with evidence is particularly important in multilingual classrooms where learners may have different academic discourse norms. [4], [5] Group work is central to problem scenario pedagogy, but collaboration must be structured. Role assignment, turn taking protocols, and accountability mechanisms help ensure participation. Collaboration also provides natural peer scaffolding, as learners jointly construct meaning and support each other's language use. [2], [3]

Implementation considerations and challenges

While problem scenarios are conceptually compelling, implementation requires support.

1. One challenge is teacher preparation. Facilitating inquiry, managing group dynamics, and assessing reasoning require pedagogical skills beyond traditional language teaching routines. Teachers need training in designing problem scenarios, guiding discussions through questioning, and providing

feedback on thinking as well as language. [2], [3]

2. A second challenge is time. Problem scenario cycles often require more time than textbook driven lessons. This can be addressed by using shorter "micro scenarios," recycling scenario themes across units, and integrating language targets into each phase rather than treating thinking tasks as separate activities. [8], [9]

3. A third challenge involves classroom culture. In some contexts, students may be accustomed to teacher centered instruction and may initially resist open ended tasks. Establishing norms for respectful disagreement, evidence-based argumentation, and collaborative responsibility is essential. [4]

CONCLUSION

Integrating critical and creative thinking in English language teaching is not an optional enrichment but a central requirement for learners who must operate in complex academic and professional environments. Problem scenarios offer a coherent pedagogical mechanism for such integration because they make thinking necessary, social, and communicative. By engaging learners in inquiry, ideation, evaluation, and authentic communication, problem scenarios allow English to function as both the object of learning and the tool of reasoning.

This paper proposed a six-phase instructional cycle and highlighted design, scaffolding, and assessment principles that can help teachers implement problem scenario pedagogy with rigor. The core argument is that critical and creative thinking should be cultivated together: creativity expands what is possible, and critical thinking determines what is defensible and appropriate. When aligned with task-based language pedagogy and supported by formative feedback, problem scenario instruction can foster deeper engagement, richer discourse, and more transferable communicative competence. Future research should empirically test the proposed cycle across contexts, examine how different proficiency levels mediate participation in reasoning and ideation, and explore assessment models that validly capture both linguistic and thinking outcomes without discouraging risk taking. [1], [5], [6], [8]

REFERENCES

1. Hung, W. (2016). All PBL starts here: The problem. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 10(2).
2. Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 1(1), 9–20.
3. Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? Educational Psychology Review, 16(3), 235–266.
4. Cottrell, S. (2017). Critical Thinking Skills: Developing Effective Analysis and Argument (3rd ed.). Palgrave.
5. Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Waddington, D. I., Wade, C. A., & Persson, T. (2015). Strategies for teaching students to think critically: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 85(2), 275–314.
6. OECD. (2019). PISA 2021 Creative Thinking Framework. OECD Publishing.
7. Maley, A., & Kiss, T. (2018). Creativity and English Language Teaching: From Inspiration to Implementation. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Long, M. H. (2015). Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching. Wiley Blackwell.
9. Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research. Routledge.
10. Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2015). Input, Interaction, and Output in Second Language Acquisition. Routledge.
11. Maley, A., & Peachey, N. (Eds.). (2015). Creativity in the English Language Classroom. British Council.
12. Pellegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (Eds.). (2012). Education for Life and Work: Developing Transferable Knowledge and Skills in the 21st Century. National Academies Press.