

# **ELT Teachers' Awareness of Critical Pedagogy: A Cross-Cultural Study**

Anes Abdelrahim Mohamed<sup>1</sup>, & Akhtar Malik<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Tehran

<sup>2</sup>University of Toronto

(Corresponding Author: [abdelrahim.anas{at}gmail.com](mailto:abdelrahim.anas@gmail.com))

## **ABSTRACT**

*This qualitative and cross-cultural study investigated the extent to which English teachers from five different countries (Sudan, Iran, Pakistan, India, America) are aware of critical pedagogy within English language teaching (ELT). Drawing upon the rich literature of critical pedagogy in ELT, eight ELT-related themes were developed for the purpose of measuring awareness of this approach. Of particular relevance to this study is the distinction made by Paulo Freire between banking concept of education (mainstream) and critical pedagogy. The data was collected through semi-structured interviews with 10 ELT teachers (two from each one of the five countries). The main findings reveal that there is very little awareness of critical pedagogy among ELT teachers due to institutional structure that favors mainstream pedagogy. These findings point to a dire need for exploring other venues for raising teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy.*

**Keywords:** Critical, Pedagogy, mainstream, ELT Teachers' awareness.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Critical pedagogy is 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. Though it has been gaining ground vis-à-vis mainstream approaches, awareness of critical pedagogy among teachers has not received enough attention. For this reason, this cross-cultural study was designed to look into ELT teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy.

### **Overview of critical pedagogy**

Critical pedagogy is mostly associated with the work of Paulo Freire who is deemed to be “the inaugural philosopher of critical pedagogy” (McLaren, 2000: 1). Freire is known for his critique of what he refers to as *the banking concept of education* (Freire, 1970). In this book, Freire outlines the features of this kind of education as follows:

- \*the teacher teaches and the students are taught;
- \*the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;

- \*the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;
- \*the teacher talks and the students listen-meekly;
- \*the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
- \*the teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply;
- \*the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;
- \*the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who are not consulted) adapt to it;
- \*the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his own professional authority, which he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students;
- \*the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects. ((Freire, 1970, p. 46-57)

At the core of critical pedagogy is the need to bring into focus the uneven power structure whose manifestations can be seen in every aspect of life (McLaren, 2000). This is achieved through critical re-examination of taken-for-granted assumptions about the world. This re-examination is guided by learners-initiated dialogues that prompt them to ask probing questions about their social reality. Critical pedagogy goes beyond the notion of critical thinking because Freire's praxis-critical reflection and action-sets the stage not only for engaging learning environment, but also it contributes to changing the world; hence, "reading the word and the world" as Freire (1973) famously stated.

Freire (1984) coined the term "banking concept of education" to capture the stultifying nature of the indoctrination system of education. Within such a system of education, learners have no say in what and how to learn. Rather, imparting knowledge is supposed to be the job of the teachers, but ironically the teachers don't have much of a say in what and how to teach either, as these are issues dictated by educational policies whose intent is to maintain and reproduce the dominant social order. It is in this sense that education is political despite the attempt to portray it otherwise. Freire contrasts this form of education with critical pedagogy:

Whereas banking education anesthetizes and inhibits creative power, problem-posing education involves a constant unveiling of reality. The former attempts to maintain the *submersion* of consciousness; the latter strives for the *emergence* of consciousness and *critical intervention* in reality(1984: 68).

Critical pedagogy problemtizes social realities, which are brought into focus through engaging dialogues. A space is provided for learners to express their own views on a wide range of issues immediately relevant to their lived reality. However, mainstream approaches are characterized by the passive roles assigned to learners. In this connection, Giroux (1988) states:

If students are subjected in the classroom to a language as well as a set of beliefs and values whose implicit message is that they are culturally illiterate, students will learn very little about critical thinking, and a great deal about what Freire has called 'culture of silence'. (p. 48)

As critical pedagogy seeks to realign education with its wider socioeconomic context, it aims at raising consciousness of what's possible in terms of social transformation. To that end, it creates conditions for

the empowerment of learners by tapping into their human agency. It encourages both learners and teachers to call into question the purpose of education. Of more significance is the fact that critical pedagogy rejects and refutes the mainstream facile claim that education is neutral. As Freire famously stated:

"Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world" (Freire, 1970, p.34).

This quote lays out two diametrically opposed approaches to education. The first one aims primarily at maintaining, legitimizing, and ultimately reproducing the dominant social order while the second one is geared toward challenging, contesting, and ultimately transforming the dominant social order. What's more, these two approaches entail entirely different sets of pedagogical practices and implications.

### **Critical pedagogy in ELT**

As cited above, critical pedagogy repudiates the value-laden mainstream notion that language education is apolitical. Numerous critical educators and researchers have conclusively demonstrated that as social practice, language and language education are as political as anything. (Canagarajah, 1999; Norton & Toohey, 2004; Pennycook, 2001). While mainstream pedagogy still reigns supreme, critical approaches to education have begun to constitute serious counterweight to the banking concept of education. For instance, the increasing rejection of the practice of one-size-fits-all paradigm is largely due to the inroads critical pedagogy has made into the dominant approaches to education. In turn, this has led to the advocacy of locally-situated and context dependent pedagogies. This has started to pull the rug from under the feet of mainstream hold on language teaching and learning. Likewise, the increased pace of globalization has prompted many language educators and researchers to question the validity and continuity of mainstream education practices. Kumaravadivelu, (2001) challenged the concept of method and put forth post-method as a viable alternative to what he rightly perceives as outmoded teaching methods. Within post-method, the conditions are provided for both teachers and learners to work out a context-sensitive approach that is in tune with the local lived realities of a given learning setting.

It should be noted that critical pedagogy reverses and reinvents the traditional roles of students and teachers. Within mainstream model, teachers are seen as passive transmitters of knowledge that is not even theirs while learners are seen as passive receivers of that knowledge. As a result, both teachers and learners are deskilled and disempowered. By contrast, critical pedagogy views teachers as intellectual transformative and learners as active participants in their own learners-initiated dialogues. The following diagram illustrates the difference between mainstream pedagogy and critical pedagogy within ELT context:

	<b>Mainstream pedagogy</b>	<b>Critical pedagogy</b>
<b>Teacher's roles</b>	Transmitter, Guide, Facilitator	Change agent/ Co-learner
<b>Learner's roles</b>	Passive receivers	Active participants

<b>Teacher's authority</b>	Sole power	Shared power
<b>Teaching Method</b>	Standardized method (CLT)	Dialogic & problem-posing
<b>Teaching materials</b>	Standardized Textbooks	Locally-situated
<b>Type of Dialogues</b>	Set dialogues	Learner-initiated
<b>Standard English/accent</b>	US/UK	World Englishes
<b>Nature of ELT</b>	Neutral	Value-laden

While teachers may not necessarily fit neatly into one of these two opposite ends of the pedagogical spectrum, it is a helpful way to gauge how the degree to which they are conscious of critical pedagogy, which is the main crux of the present study.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The method of this inquiry emerged out of the research problem itself. In other words, As this study is concerned with ELT teachers' perception of a number of issues related to language teaching in order to look into their awareness of critical pedagogy, qualitative research seems to lend itself better to it. While there several data collection methods in qualitative research, the most widely used is the interview (Rogers and Bouey, 1996). The present study employed semi-structured interviews as they are extensively utilized in qualitative research (Flick, 1998). One advantage of semi-structured interviews is that they are flexible enough to allow interviewers to explore complex issues or questions that do not have a finite or predetermined set of response categories.

### **Participants**

Since this was a cross-cultural study, the participants were from five countries: Sudan, Iran, Pakistan, India, and America. Altogether there were 10 participants (two from each country). The American, Indian, and Pakistani participants are currently teaching at a foundation program at a university in Oman while the Iranian and Sudanese are teaching at language institutes in Tehran and Khartoum. Their ages ranged from twenty-five to forty-three while their teaching experience ranged from one to eighteen years.

The purpose of the study was explained prior to conducting the interviews but the question of anonymity and confidentiality did not come up simply because the participants were ELT teachers and the subject matter of the interviews wasn't even remotely detrimental to their practice but nonetheless pseudonyms were used.

### **Data collection and Analysis**

The main tool for data collection consisted of semi-structured audio-recorded interviews (Appendix A) with 10 ELT teachers from five countries: Sudan, Iran, Pakistan, India, and America. The interview questions were based on eight categories that emerged from extensive reading of the literature. The way critical pedagogy perceives these categories sets it apart from mainstream pedagogy as outlined above. The recorded interviews were transcribed and analyzed for themes relevant to the study.

## **FINDINGS**

Since this study sought to investigate ELT teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy, the responses to each one of the interview questions were selected on the strength of their relevance to the research questions. However, it should be noted that all the elicited responses were trawled and collated thoroughly during the analysis phase of the study. The Findings are presented thematically based on the questions asked in the interviews.

### **1. What are your roles as a language teacher?**

The first interview question dealt with the way teachers viewed their roles. Most responses to this question fall into two categories. The first category reflects a technician strand of thought, where teachers are seen as "conduit" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:8).

For instance, Amir, a teacher with five years of teaching experience in Tehran, had the following to say about how he perceived his roles:

I think the first and the most important one is transferring knowledge. The second one is helping them (Students) doing their assignment and homework (Amir, Iran).

Laya, a teacher with three years of teaching experience, believed her main role as a teacher to be:

Authoritative if I get your point correctly. I don't approve of learner-based classes. I am the center of the class especially in elementary classes. I am a kind of counselor but a consoler who has the last word in the classroom (Laya, Sudan).

The second category regards teachers' as reflective practitioners where teachers play the role of a facilitator. Sharma and Jahan, teachers with nine years of teaching experience, stated:

The way I see it is more like a facilitator, to help them put things into context. Because language is very contextual (Sharma, India ).

Personally, I feel that a teacher is a facilitator, especially in ESL classes, I feel he has to guide the students. (Jahan, Pakistan)

Anita, a teacher with eleven years of teaching experience, voiced the same opinion:

Everything, sometimes I am transferring knowledge, sometimes I work as a facilitator, depending on different situations I play different roles (Anita, Iran).

The view that teachers' roles can vary depending on the context is shared by David who has been teaching English in the gulf for three years:

I think the role of a teacher is shaped by the needs of the students and the requirements of the institutions. So, sometimes you can't do all the roles or some of the roles you might personally like the most because you have to do what the institution requires and you have to follow their script. Ideally, I would like to be a motivator. (David, America)

David refers to the institutional constraints that make it difficult for teachers to be what they want to be. However, he made it clear that other things being equal, he would be a motivator rather than a transformative intellectual.

The perception of the participants with respect to their roles as language teachers fall within the range of mainstream pedagogy. Even those who view their role as facilitators are not essentially different from those who see their role as transmitters in that they facilitate the transfer of prepackaged curriculum developed mostly by inner circle 'experts'. It is striking to note that none of the participants came close to echoing critical pedagogy in viewing teachers' role as change agents.

## **2. What are the roles of the learners?**

As with teachers' roles, respondents tended to see learners' roles as falling into categories that correspond with their conception of teachers' roles. The first one viewed learners as passive receivers of knowledge. For instance, Anita responded by saying:

The students exactly learn and imitate the model. If the teacher had discipline in the class, most of the students would learn that discipline. This is part of teaching (Anita, Iran).

Ahmed, a teacher with two years of teaching experience, echoed a somewhat similar stand:

They are just followers. They should just provide the language the way the teacher wants and the teacher will correct them (Ahmed, Sudan).

Just like children who are looking for the best way and mother is the best model. So they just follow me as a mother (Mitchell, America)

The second category believed that learners can be active participants but with a view to just improving their languages skills:

I always expect them to be active participants, not just sitting there and being a kind of receiver for what is given to them (Subra, India).

The second category takes into account the ages and levels of the learners when it comes to their roles and this category is mostly represented by female teachers. Mitra and Beta who were quoted above in relation to their perception of teachers' roles commented that:

As learners it really depends again on their ages. Smaller children are like sponges. Whatever you teach them and whatever you say to them they absolutely take it in and they really digest the information and they really accept it. When they are adults because they have had experiences, then they try to compare it to what they have already learned. New experiences don't necessarily come to them until they have actually felt it (David, America).

It depends on the level of the students and their age. I mean sometimes they can have a receptive role and other times they can help in the learning process (Faiz, Pakistan).

It is not surprising that the views of the participants on learners' roles correspond to their views on their roles of language teachers.

### **3. How do you view the authority of the language teacher?**

Teachers' authority elicited responses which for the most part reflect a banking concept of education where the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his own professional authority, which he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students (Freire, 1970:58-59). In critical pedagogy, authority is shared among the participants including the teachers.

I do believe I am an authority in the classroom. I respect that authority and I don't let my students threaten it (Amir, Iran)

I think the teacher is the authority in terms of behavior in the classroom, but as far as linguistically, a teacher is not an authority on language (David, America)

In the classroom I don't like to have a complete 100% authority I mean not as a tyrant or a dictator which means that I also like to have a friendship next to the teaching role. I think that I like to show my authority more through praising, being happy towards their progress, not necessarily yelling at them or giving them negative feedback. Of course, with smaller children you have to be more of a tyrant (Sharma, India).

I do believe I am an authority in the classroom. I respect that authority and I don't let my students threaten it. I am quite strict about my students being absent and present. I really do what I think is right in the classroom. For instance sometimes the students say that this exercise is boring and they nag but I say no do it and they say why and sometimes I say because I know what is good for them as a teacher (Jahan, Pakistan).



I think students are like a doll. Sometimes you must be soft with them and sometimes rough. I think in some classes I am very cool and joking and sometimes I am very rough. I think the most authority is with the teacher and a teacher must supervise and control the students and we must not give any right to them to interfere to our job (Laya, Sudan).

The concept of power-sharing with a view to raising critical consciousness seems to be foreign to them. The views on authority reflect a positivistic thinking as well as a hierarchical social structure.

#### **4. What teaching method do you use?**

As far as teaching methods are concerned, the majority of respondents seem to opt for communicative language teaching methods (CLT) which is subsumed under learner-centered methods. According to (Kumarvadivelu, 2003), the main focus of language-centered methods is on linguistic forms where opportunities are created for the learners to practice preselected and presequenced linguistic structure through form-focused exercises.

I use Communicative method. Because the reason why students come to English classes is to be able to communicate in English (Anita, Iran).

CLT. The students like it more. They like to take part in the class. They like to talk (Michelle, America).

Two of the respondents used eclectic method because they believed it is more appropriate for the levels of students and for Iranian culture:

All methods together, sometimes it is communicative and sometimes it is something else. It depends on the level of the students. In general you can say it is eclectic (Subra, India).

It is eclectic somehow communicative and in fact sometimes I should use grammar-based. In fact, it is something based on experience (Ahmed, Sudan).

CLT is more popular with all the participants though a few expressed their preference for an eclectic approach. It should be noted that the participants may have their own understanding of CLT. Problem-posing approach seems to be foreign to them.

#### **5. What do you consider as appropriate teaching materials?**

Authentic teaching material as defined by Nunan (1999) is spoken or written language data that has been produced in the course of genuine communication, and not specifically written for purposes of language teaching. This definition excludes most English textbooks from the



category of authenticity. In this study most respondents used a Textbook, especially New Interchange, in their teaching. Some participants pointed out some of the disadvantages of Interchange:

The disadvantage of these books is that they are very western-oriented. Most of my students don't relate to the subjects so what I do is I usually bring a real life situation of their own experiences (Jahan, Pakistan).

I think one of the disadvantages (of New Interchange) is that it is culturally-biased. Everything is looked at from the perspective of that country and sometimes students find it difficult to grasp what that unit is talking about (Sharma, India).

Aside from teaching the prescribed textbook, most participants hold the view that learners need to be exposed to other materials.

Well media is really helpful. You have got the basic conversation book and you have got stuff like Select Reading. That is fine but you kind of have to take it to the next level like using modern media to get them to talk and interested, actually using the language in a useful context. And also certain listening materials, newsreel, movies etc... (Anita, Iran).

No pre-determined materials. I cannot say Interchange for example is a good book. I can say a teacher somehow should teach selectively (Michelle, America).

Of course I think it should be culturally-based and I think it is the most important item we should consider when choosing teaching materials (Laya, Sudan).

While it seems that there is a growing recognition of the fact that standardized textbooks like Interchange might not be entirely suitable for cultural reasons, there is very little awareness of using the lived experiences of the learners as appropriate and relevant teaching materials.

#### **6. What do you think of dialogue as a teaching technique?**

Dialogue is very pivotal to the development of critical consciousness as Freire stated in pedagogy of the oppressed:

Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. (1970:53)

In response to the interview question related to dialogue as a teaching technique, most respondents associate dialogue with the set dialogues in the textbooks. Repetition and memorization of set dialogue especially for lower levels and children are recurring themes among quite a number of the respondents.

For elementary levels I do believe that they need to repeat the dialogue in the text-book and for upper levels dialogue can be based on books or the students themselves can start it (Ahmed, Sudan).

For the lower level, first they listen and I force them to memorize in class and repeat (Amir, Iran).

It (dialogue) is really good but I don't think it is really achievable in classes where basically you are bound to a book. If you want it to be a natural learning process it should be nothing based on books. It should come up naturally (Sharma, India).

It is helpful. It is nice to get a conversation going between students, getting a dialogue and getting them to use the language as much as they can (Faiz, Pakistan).

It is a great idea but it does not work here (oman) (David, America)

None of the respondents seem to be cognizant of the purpose behind using dialogue to raise critical awareness through learners-initiated dialogues. On the other hand, the majority of respondents seem to set a great store by the use of set dialogue especially with lower levels.

#### **7. What is your idea of Standard English and Standard accent?**

The concept of Standard English has been called into question by critical pedagogues on the grounds that English now is the world lingua franca and no single country can claim its ownership. However, the myth of Standard English is maintained through misconception or through a hidden agenda. As Strevens notes:

The great majority of the world's English users, being non-native users, speak and write varieties different in detail from NS varieties. But many native speakers--perhaps the majority, even among teachers of English--overtly or unconsciously despise these varieties. [. . .] The basic reason for these native speakers' attitudes is ignorance--a total lack of awareness of the existence of flourishing, effective, functional, sometimes elegant and literary varieties of English. (1980: 37)

In this study many respondents are of the opinion that American or British is the Standard English. For instance Arezo believes that:

Standard accent is what native people speak. I mean the people who are brought up speaking English like in America or Canada or Britain (Amir, Iran).

Between British and American. At university I learnt that there are two standard accents in the world British and American but honestly I am interested in American accent (Laya, Sudan)

I think most people want to be taught the inner circle English. They don't want to be taught external varieties of it (David, America).

However, few participants demonstrate an awareness of English as the world lingua franca where the underlying assumption is that teaching or learning English shouldn't be based on what is perceived to be Standard.

I don't believe in standard accent because now English is for everyone. It isn't just for the British or for the American so everyone who could speak English in a good way that other people understand that's ok with me (Sharma).

Almost all the respondents seem to take it for granted that Standard English should be either American or British English with the exception of Sharma, Jahan, and Ahmed.

### **8. What do you think of this statement; English language teaching (ELT) is neutral and value-free?**

The last interview question tackled the issue of whether or not ELT is value-free or value-laden. In this study this question was the only one that elicited responses echoing what critical pedagogues believe, namely that ELT is highly charged with hidden agenda but once more the main difference is that almost all the respondents hold the implicit belief that teaching those hidden agendas is part and parcel of ELT whereas critical pedagogy explicitly holds that ELT doesn't necessarily have to be embedded in those hidden agendas.

I don't know about neutral. I don't think it can be neutral. You see language has a psychology and certain belief system attached to it and to teach it is to teach that belief system as well (Anita, Iran).

It should be neutral but it isn't. I have to go back to the cultural items because definitely when you are teaching an American book you are going to get that American culture in it (Jahan, Pakistan).

I guess it isn't. In fact when you teach language you must value something. I don't think it is value-free. And also if someone is learning a language, he or she is getting another culture. When you are learning about language, you are learning about another country. In Iran having a boyfriend or a girlfriend is something decried and it is against the law, it is against the religion. So when you start teaching it, you must ask about blind date, boyfriend, girlfriend, and ex-boyfriend. It is a change in culture, you are also teaching that. So definitely it isn't value-free (Ahmed, Sudan).

There is nothing value-free (David, America)

To recap the last question was the only one that elicited responses echoing what critical pedagogists believe, namely that ELT is highly charged with hidden agenda but once more the main difference is that almost all the respondents hold the implicit belief that teaching those hidden agendas is part and parcel of ELT whereas critical pedagogy explicitly holds the belief that ELT doesn't necessarily have to be embedded in those hidden agendas.

## **DISCUSSION**

The primary reason for the lack of awareness of critical pedagogy on the part of the participants is that all of them are caught up in institutionalized pedagogical practices that preclude knowledge of alternative pedagogies besides the mainstream. The second main reason for this is that banking concept of education is still the norm where both pre-service and in-service teachers find themselves being drawn into the mainstream pedagogy and consequently they tend to take it for granted. According to Bezzina (1991) teachers mostly perceive their role to be confined to curriculum implementation. Another important factor is that most teachers are being commercialized into the mainstream pedagogy simply because all language institutes around the world maintain a policy of uniformity of teaching methods with a view to securing a better profit. This condition makes for passive and deskilled language teachers who just receive their teaching instructions from the ‘experts’ and apply them to the classroom verbatim or with little modification.

It is our contention that critical pedagogy offers much more meaningful and liberating learning than mainstream pedagogy and for this reason it should be spotlighted and promoted. In order to do this teachers, who are at the forefront of furthering critical pedagogy, should be equipped with sufficient awareness and knowledge of critical pedagogy.. ELT would benefit enormously if educational institutions incorporated a course on critical pedagogy in the curriculum, it would go a long way towards raising teachers’ awareness of critical pedagogy. Noffke and Stevenson (1995) assert that student teachers need to be made aware of, and provided with opportunities to practice critical inquiry and reflection. Friere (1970) encourages participation in critical teacher study groups in order to raise critical awareness because it can “enable teachers...to become subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism....” (74). However, in the teacher study group model, knowledge is not meant to be transmitted by experts. Constructivist notions of collaborative construction, context, and conversation (Jonassen et al, 1995) are crucial components in teacher study group communication. It is believed that these measures may prove to be instrumental in raising teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy and thereby the field of ELT will be enormously enriched.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study was conducted to examine ELT teachers’ awareness of critical pedagogy. The main findings indicate the dominance of the banking concept of education. The implications of these findings are threefold; for teachers, for students, and for the profession as a whole. The implications for teachers are that the overwhelming majority of them are deprived of opportunities to broaden their teaching horizons by exploring other venues. Language teachers find themselves exposed just to what is loosely defined as communicative teaching method and they go about teaching without being given another perspective on it. Critical awareness isn’t a viable option when the market is solely dominated by mainstream pedagogy.

Likewise the implication for students is that under the current learning conditions they aren’t given any voice in what to learn and how to learn it. The prescribed textbook comes with a

teacher's manual and all that students have to do is to sit passively and wait for the teacher, who doesn't have any voice either, to fill their minds with what ELT experts dictate. Given this kind of environment, development of critical consciousness is simply out of the question.

The implications for the profession are that with mainstream pedagogy being very much in the foreground, there isn't much hope to capture the complexity of language teaching and learning in an ever changing world. As a consequence the profession lags behind. ELT profession would benefit a lot if critical pedagogy were allowed to gain a foothold.

In short, the findings of this research point to a dire need for broadening the scope of language teaching and learning. That potential can only be fully realized through conscious critical reflection (Ramanathan 2002). In so doing, the profession can measure up to its expectations at linguistics, methodological, and pastoral levels. More research into the factors affecting teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy would enable its findings to be verified and extended and thus new vistas for critical pedagogy would open up.

## REFERENCES

- Bezzina, M. (1991). "Teachers' perceptions of their participation in school-based curriculum development: A case study". *Curriculum Perspectives*, 11(2), 39-47.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford:
- D'Annunzio, A. (1991). Using bilingual tutors and non-directive approaches in ESL: A follow-up report. *Connections: A Journal of Adult Literacy* 4, 51-52.
- Flick, U. (1998). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education: The Practice of Freedom*. London: Writers and Readers
- Freire, P. (1984). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Corporation
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage* (Clarke, P., rans.). Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey, Inc.
- Hemmindinger, A. (1987). Two models for using problem-posing and cultural sharing in teaching the Hmong English as a second language and first language literacy. Unpublished master's thesis, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Canada.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). *Towards a Postmethod Pedagogy*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4), 537-560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Pergamon Press.
- Jonassen, D. H., Davidson, M., Collins, M., Campbell, J., & Haag, B. (1995). "Constructivism and computer-mediated communication in distance education". *American Journal of Distance Education*, 9(2), 7-26.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Possibility*. In S. Steiner, H. Krank, P.
- Newman, I., Ridenour, C. S., Newman, C., & DeMarco, G. M. P. (2003). A typology of research purposes and its relationship to mixed methods. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.),

*Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 167-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Noffke, S. E. & Stevenson, R. E. (1995). *Educational action research: Becoming practically critical*. New York: Teachers College Press

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2004). Mixed research. In R. B. Johnson & L. B. Christensen (Eds.), *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (2nd ed., pp. 408-431). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah.

Philipson, R. (1992) Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ramanathan, V. (2002). *The politics of TESOL education-writing, knowledge, critical pedagogy*. New York, Routledge Farmer

Rogers, G., & Bouey, E. (1996). Collecting Your Data. L. M. Tutty, M. Rothery, R. M. Grinnell, Jr. (Eds.), *Qualitative Research for Social Workers: Phases, Steps, and Tasks* (4th ed.), (pp. 50-87). Boston: Ally & Bacon

Stevens, P. (1980) *Teaching English as an international language: from practice to principle*. Oxford: Pergamon.

**Appendix (A) Interview Questions**  
**Interview questions**

Question	Theoretical base
1-What are your roles as a language teacher?	Critical pedagogy holds that developing critical consciousness in learners is central to a teacher's job and his role which is perceived as transformative.
2-what are the roles of the learners?	In critical pedagogy learners are as active participants as teachers
3-how do you view the authority of the language teacher?	Power-sharing is a key concept to capturing the question of teacher's authority in critical pedagogy, whereas in mainstream pedagogy teacher's authority is confused with professional authority.
4- What teaching method do you use?	Critical pedagogy repudiates the use of any method and maintains that the educational context and setting determine the way teachers should teach.
5- What do you think of dialogue as a teaching technique?	Critical pedagogy encourages the use of dialogue as a tool for developing critical consciousness.
6-what do you consider as appropriate teaching materials?	In contrast to mainstream pedagogy critical pedagogy believes that textbooks aren't

	suitable since they don't reflect the realities of the learners.
7-what is your idea of Standard English and Standard accent?	Critical pedagogy challenges the conventionally held belief in a Standard English and accent.
8- What do you think of this statement; English language teaching (ELT) is neutral and value-free?	Unlike mainstream pedagogy, critical pedagogy views language teaching as value-laden rather than value-free.