Applied Research on English Language

V. 8 N. 1 2019
pp: 79-114
http://uijs.ui.ac.ir/are
DOI: 10.22108/are.2018.112452.1341

English Teachers' Perception of Critical Pedagogy: Any Discrepancy between Perception and Actual Classroom Implementation?

Hassan Soodmand Afshar [1*], Shadi Donyaie [2]

[1] *Associate Professor Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran*
[2] *PhD candidate Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran*

Received: 2018/08/09 **Accepted: 2018/11/03**

Abstract: The study investigated the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of critical pedagogy (CP) and reflective teaching (RT), the possible effect of gender, academic degree, and teaching experience on teachers' perceptions of CP, the possible differences among the three groups of teachers of universities, public schools and private language institutes regarding their perception of CP and also the possible difference between the reported CP perception of teachers and their actual classroom implementation. The instruments adopted for data collection purposes included the CP Questionnaire developed by Pishvaei and Kasaian (2013) and the RT Inventory developed by Akbari, Behzadpour and Dadvand (2010) which were validated through pilot-testing and factor analysis. Then, the CP Classroom Observation Checklist, was developed by the researchers and was viewed by an expert. The results of one-way ANOVA showed that there were significant differences among the three groups of university, school, and language institute EFL teachers regarding CP perception. Also, the results of Pearson correlation showed a significant relationship between participants' perception of CP and RT. Moreover, the results of Factorial ANOVA indicated that gender and teaching experience did not significantly differentiate the participants concerning CP perception; however, academic degree did so. Furthermore, the results of Independent Samples t-test revealed significant differences between the participants' reported perception of CP and their actual classroom implementation of it. The findings of the study might imply that English teachers should be equipped with the knowledge of how to put CP into practice in actual classroom settings in addition to the propositional knowledge of the concept.

Keywords: Critical Pedagogy, Reflective Teaching, EFL Teachers, Perception, Classroom Implementation.

[*] **Corresponding Author.**

Authors' Email Address: [1] H. Soodmand Afshar **(soodmand@basu.ac.ir),** [2] S. Donyaie **(shadidonyaie@yahoo.com)**
ISSN (Online): 2322-5343, **ISSN (Print):** 2252-0198 **© 2018 University of Isfahan. All rights reserved**

Introduction

Overview

Critical Pedagogy, which dates back to Frankfurt School and began its life by Paulo Freire (1921-1997), is chiefly concerned with developing critical and creative skills wherein students are expected to become agents of change (Abednia, 2009a). As Mayo (2003) maintains, the main responsibility of education, including language teaching is to transform society. Considering teachers as transformative agents, we can thus assume that one of the most necessary qualities of a critical teacher is critical reflection plus creative action (Abednia, 2009b).

The rise of RT in English Language Teaching (ELT), which dates back to Dewey (1933), can be regarded as one of the consequences of the post-method era debate. Language teachers are encouraged to engage in reflective practices through the use of journals, diaries, and discussion of their daily classroom achievement and failure. Those who support such an approach hold that RT makes teachers question traditional practices and clichés (Akbari, 2007) and pushes students to think critically.

Education is a systemic comprehensive view consisting of every aspect of personal, social, and ethical life, rather than a mere teaching skill (Sacadura, 2014). This suggests that classroom practices be related to the broader context of society (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) to incorporate changes in the society, the origin of which is thought to be the educational contexts, which are thought to be societies in miniature. This makes the conduction of studies on CP and RT and the factors playing role in the equation inevitable.

Theoretical Framework of the Study and Previous Research Findings

Critical Pedagogy

Critical education is an emergent approach seeking to connect the local conditions of language to such factors and concepts such as race, ethnicity, culture, identity, politics, ideology or discourse (Pennycook, 1990). In this approach, instructors and learners should get involved in the class activities as much as possible (Ellsworth, 1989) in a dialogic manner, as CP is a dialogic process in which social justice and other critical sociopolitical issues are supported by developing alternative ideas (Sharma & Phyak, 2017). Students' lives and experiences are focused during this dialogical engagement resulting in their viewing each other as sources of knowledge (Auerbach, 1995 as cited in Shin & Crookes, 2009). Moreover, in such an educational system, macro contexts including social and political

contexts should be included in the educational program (Shin & Crookes, 2009) through which students learn new ways to communicate and understand the world (Wink, 1999) and gain their own points of view (Sadeghi, 2008). Considering learning as political, historical, and situational in a negotiated syllabus between teachers and students, CP tries to analyze the existing conditions critically and transform the presiding ideologies and conditions (Atai & Moradi, 2016).

Throughout history, different scholars (e.g., Freire, 1970; Abednia, 2009a) have made remarkable comments on CP, its principles and its implementation. Larson (2014), for instance, defines CP as a learner-centered approach to education which concentrates on problem posing wherein the students get involved in critical dialogue. This approach has the aim of improving social justice with an emphasis on action. CP is thus a method of thinking about, negotiating and establishing a link between teaching in the classroom, and the social relationships existing in the wider context of society (McLaren, 2003). Moreover, CP expresses doubt about the authority relationship among teachers, students, institutions, and their society. It elucidates the impact of power, politics, history, and culture on educational system (Kuang, 2007).

Numerous studies have been conducted on CP in Iranian and non-Iranian contexts. For one, Atai and Moradi (2016) investigated Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of CP. The data were gathered through in-depth interviews and questionnaires developed by the researchers. Twenty-one (8 female and 13 male) Iranian EFL teachers participated in the interview and the questionnaire was administered to 127 (51 female and 76 male) teachers. The results of both quantitative and qualitative data analyses showed that Iranian EFL teachers were supportive of the basic principles of CP.

Additionally, Perveen (2015) carried out a study in order to implement CP in a Pakistani literature classroom through grounded theory. The study lasted two years and the participants ranged from 25 to 40 years of age. The results showed that the participants understood the power relations of Pakistan and the superiority of some people over others; they understood themselves and finally they developed a more tolerant attitude towards others. The findings of the study also implied that the contextualization of CP was of great importance in order to achieve the aim of CP principles.

Similarly, Sahragard, Razmjoo, and Baharloo (2014) investigated, in a mixed-method study, Iranian EFL teachers' awareness of CP and their viewpoints about the practicality of implementing it in the classroom. In fact, they explored whether students would experience a

change in their definition of social justice after participating in a one-semester course in which they were familiarized with issues of social justice. In addition, the study made attempts to seek the barriers that hindered the application of CP in Iranian teaching contexts. The results indicated that the majority of Iranian EFL instructors were aware of the principles of CP and supported the helpfulness of such pedagogy and its premises although they rarely applied it in their teaching.

Moreover, Milner (2003) discusses different factors in association with CP, an important one of which is RT that shows both concepts seem to have the same root. Milner adds that teachers who use CP principles in their classes, tie their classes to the real world resulting in an inherent liberation. However, Milner levels a criticism at CP which seems to be in conflict with RT which includes “the lack of authentic, structured, dimensions that guide its origins” (p. 200). He mentions some strategies such as reflecting on the existing power structures and reflective journal writing to address the problem at hand. Reflective journal writing provides students with open dialogic interaction which can eventually help them transform the existing situation to have a better and just system. In spite of the above-mentioned conflict between RT and CP, the issue of transformation is a strong link which connects the two concepts together firmly.

Reflective Teaching

Reflective teaching can mainly be traced back to the works of Dewey (1933-1993) and Schon (1983, 1987, 1991, as cited in Akbari, 2007). Wade and Yarbrough (1996, p.64) argue that "the root of the word reflection comes from the Latin 'reflectere' which means to bend back". Hall et al. (2003) maintain that RT is pondering upon the previous actions, looking under the surface of teaching, and making an intended effort to see one's teaching. It is also a tool as to look at the larger context that affects our teaching issues of social justice, of school system, and of authority. Wellington (1991, p. 4) defines RT as “a cycle of thought and action based on professional experience”. Moreover, as Soodmand Afshar and Farahani (2015) maintain, RT is a necessary characteristic of efficient teachers, and an important factor which has a considerable influence on teaching practice.

In English as a Second Language (ESL)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, these discussions are helpful in understanding what is going on in the classroom. They are equally useful in altering different aspects of teaching and learning. That is, language teachers cannot consider themselves as passive practitioners; rather, they should get involved

in the process of thinking and reflection. The only way to do so is taking time to think and reflect on one's practices and actions as a teacher in the classroom (Pacheco, 2005). As Rodriguez-Valls, (2014) holds, "a reflective teacher must argue before she/he teaches" and that "a reflective teacher is a scholar before she/he faces the teaching world" (p. 300).

It is worthwhile pointing out here that in the literature of the field on the topic, reflection is categorized into three types including reflection-*in*-action which is on-line reflection on the on-line problems during a lesson session (Messmann & Mulder, 2015) involving teachers in making continuous decisions during their teaching (Murphy, 2014). In reflection-*in*-action, teachers' previous forms of knowledge are important. Therefore, experienced teachers are more successful than their novice counterparts as the latter have not yet constructed rich schemata of their teaching (Farrell, 2007 as cited in Murphy, 2014). Reflection-*on*-action is "retrospective" (Murphy, 2014, p. 616) which engages teachers after the lesson session (Mulder, 2015). In other words, teachers think back on the lessons which have been taught and reconsider all actions and responses of all those present in the class (Murphy, 2014). Reflection-*for*-action, on the other hand, tries to predict problems before conducting the lesson session (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). The purpose of reflection-*for*-action is "proactive and future-oriented" (Murphy, 2014 p. 616).That is, teachers plan actions for future in a thinking-ahead process.

Various studies have also been conducted on RT in Iranian and non-Iranian contexts. For one, Hayden and Ming Chiu (2013) explored the development of elementary pre-service teachers' reflective practices. Written reflections (N=175) were collected during an eight-week period from 23 novice female teachers and were analyzed to survey the relationships among problem exploration, teaching adaptations, and problem resolution. The results of the study showed the effectiveness of the use of written reflections with responsive feedback in developing pre-service teachers' agency for problem solving.

In another study, Jadidi and Keshavarz (2013) explored the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' reflection and strategy-based instruction. Two Likert-scale questionnaires were administered to a group of 50 EFL teachers. The participants were both males and females with five to eight years of teaching experience. The results of Pearson Product Moment correlation revealed a high, positive correlation between teachers' reflection and their views regarding the incorporation of language learning instruction.

More recently, Soodmand Afshar and Farahani (2018) investigated Iranian EFL teachers' perception of RT, of inhibitors to their RT, of inhibitors to their students' reflective

thinking, and the impact of teaching experience and academic degree on their perception of RT. Three hundred and four EFL teachers participated in the study. The instruments adopted included Teaching Reflection Inventory developed by Akbari, Behzadpoor, and Dadvand, Inhibitors to EFL Teachers' Reflective Teaching Questionnaire and Inhibitors to EFL Learners' Reflective Thinking Questionnaire, both developed and validated by the researchers. The findings showed that Iranian EFL teachers perceived their reflective teaching to lie at a medium level. The findings also revealed that three types of inhibitors to EFL teachers' RT included 'lack of knowledge', 'affective emotional' and 'teaching situation' inhibitors. Moreover, the results indicated that three types of inhibitors to EFL learners' reflective thinking comprised 'affective emotional', 'cognitive' and 'learning situation' inhibitors. Furthermore, the findings indicated that both academic degree and teaching experience significantly affected Iranian EFL teachers' RT perception.

Another attempt was made by Moradkhani and Shirazizadeh (2017) to examine the effect of contextual differences on the degree of EFL teachers' involvement in reflection and to explore context-related factors that may help/hinder the reflection process. Eighty-five Iranian EFL teachers participated in the study completing English-language teaching reflection inventory developed by Akbari, Behzadpour, and Dadvand (2010). Ten of the participants sat a follow-up interview too. The results showed more active involvement of the participants in lower levels of reflection. Moreover, no difference was found between the two groups of public- and private-sector teachers in terms of higher levels of reflection (i.e. metacognitive and critical reflection). Furthermore, five main factors including institutional demands, teachers' attitude toward teaching, knowledge of reflection, collegial support and availability of resources were found to be effective in teachers' involvement in reflection.

Moreover, applying reflective teaching in classroom settings has received increasing attention in recent years. As an example, Alsina et al. (2017) tried to develop and apply a new instrument for the evaluation and improvement of the reflective narratives called Rubric for Narrative Reflection Assessment of students. The new instrument was designed to examine various aspects including "focus of reflection, the initial belief system, inquiry about focus of reflection (through questions and hypotheses), and rebuilding the belief system to empower new goals and new actions in order to transform prior knowledge" (p. 156). Alsina et al. conclude that the processes of applying and using this instrument provide the academics in the field with a common language. Also, their results showed that the first application of the instrument in their study proved to be encouraging.

Significance of the Study and Research Questions

CP draws upon constructivist approaches to education suggesting that learners understand the world in personal and social ways (Abednia, 2009a). RT, on the other hand, promotes teaching in a critical way, by paying critical attention to the practical values and theories which inform every day actions by examining practice reflectively and reflexively (Bolton, 2010). An immediate consequence of RT will be teachers' becoming better prepared to teach creatively and to contribute to such challenging tasks as preparing materials instead of merely teaching what they are dictated in the same way as they were taught (Abednia, Hovassapian, Teimournezhad & Ghanbari, 2013).

Therefore, CP and RT could appeal to the educational systems by looking for the transformation of society through identifying trouble spots in education (Akbari, 2008). Consequently, familiarizing EFL/ESL teachers with RT and CP could help them change the status quo of traditional teaching systems, achieve awareness of CP and RT, and practically implement them in the classroom. In other words, teachers who implement CP in their classroom teaching and reflect upon their teaching activities can better organize their students' processes of learning.

Thus, it becomes evident from what was stated above that CP and RT could play a crucial role in (language) education. Moreover, little research has been conducted in the EFL context of Iran concerning the relationship between CP and RT especially regarding the possible discrepancy between EFL teachers' perception of CP and their actual classroom implementation of it. Secondly, Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP has been little investigated in terms of their teaching experience, academic degree and gender. Thirdly, since context has been found to affect teachers' perception of CP, there appears to be a pressing need to investigate Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP in the three different EFL contexts of university, public schools and private language institutes. The study, thus, set out to fill the research gaps felt. To this end, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Is there any significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers of universities, schools and language institutes in terms of their perception of CP?
2. Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT overall?
3. Do years of teaching experience, gender, and academic degree have any significant impact on Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP?

4. Overall, is there any significant difference between the reported CP perception of Iranian EFL teachers and their actual classroom implementation of it as observed by the researchers?

Method

Participants

A total of 181 EFL teachers from both language institutes (n=64), and various universities (n=66) as well as several high schools throughout the country (n=51), who were selected randomly, participated in the study. All participants were assured about their anonymity as it was mentioned in the questionnaires. Thirty EFL teachers (10 from each group) were also selected randomly in order to be observed. Moreover, the informed consent of the participants of the study including that of the participants observed was obtained. Ninety-one of the participants were male and the rest (N=90) were female. Fifty-one of the participants had one to five, 67 had six to ten, and 63 had 11 or more years of teaching experience. In addition, 55 of the participants held BA degree or below, 104 held MA and 22 were PhD-holders in English Language.

EFL Education in Iran

Before embarking on the discussion about the instruments adopted in the study, a brief introduction of EFL teaching in Iran is deemed necessary. EFL teaching in the macro-context of Iran is restricted to three micro-contexts of public junior and senior secondary schools, private sector foreign language teaching institutes, and universities. However, differences exist among these three micro-contexts with regard to English language teaching/ learning. English is taught as an independent subject matter for only two hours a week by mainly BA or MA holding graduates of English language who have graduated directly from Teacher Training Universities formerly affiliated with the Ministry of Education and presently affiliated with the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology under the title of Farhangian University (i.e. University for Teachers). Foreign language institutes are basically run by the private sector wherein the medium of instruction is almost always English. The teachers in these institutes are usually young graduates of English language whose freedom of action in teaching is comparatively more than their counterparts in public sector schools mentioned above who have to teach the locally-produced books compiled by the Ministry of Education. The textbooks taught in language institutes, however, are selected from among the

internationally famous English language education series such as Interchange series, Four Corners (both produced by Cambridge University Press), Headway (produced by Oxford University Press), etc. Finally, English at university level in Iran is taught either as a subject matter in the form of three-credit general English courses or as a two-credit English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course or as an independent field of study with the students intending to major in either Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), English Translation or English Literature.

Instruments

Critical Pedagogy Questionnaire (CPQ)

The Critical Pedagogy Perception Questionnaire developed and validated for the context of Iran by Pishvaei and Kassaian (2013), consisting of 24 Likert-scale items, acted as the basis of CPQ. The researchers of the present study added 10 more questions adapted from Freire (1970) in order to suit the purposes of the study and to construct a more complete framework of CP perception (see Appendix 1). The respondents answered the questions by indicating the extent of their agreement or disagreement with the items of the questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (=1) to strongly agree (=5).

The CPQ was then piloted with 70 subjects similar to those of the present study and a factor analysis was run to ensure its validity. The KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy for CPQ was estimated to be 0.76 which is considered acceptable and shows enough items are predicted by each factor. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity for CPQ was also estimated to be .000 which is significant meaning that the variables correlated highly enough to provide a reasonable basis for factor analysis.

The CPQ was then subjected to a principal component factor analysis, the results of which can be found in Appendix 2. The analyses yielded six factors explaining, 42.35, 6.36, 5.39, 4.83, 4.06, and 3.94 percent of total variance, respectively. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha consistency was run to calculate the internal consistency of the CPQ, the results of which indicated the questionnaire was reliable enough (α= .84).

The Reflective Teaching Inventory (RTI)

The RTI developed by Akbari, Behzadpour and Dadvand (2010) was used to assess the participants' RT (see Appendix 3). The RTI consists of 29 Likert-scale items ranging from never (=1) to always (=5).

This instrument was also piloted by the researchers of the present study with 70 subjects similar to those of the study and a factor analysis was run to ensure the validity of the questionnaire. The KMO Measure of sampling adequacy for RTI was found to be 0.80 which is high enough and indicates sufficient items for each factor. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity for this questionnaire was found to be .000 which is significant showing the fact that the variables correlated highly enough to provide a reasonable basis for factor analysis.

The RTI was also subjected to a principal component factor analysis, the results of which can be found in Appendix 4. The analyses yielded four factors explaining, 13.35, 10.78, 8.57, and 6.99 percent of total variance respectively. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha consistency was run, the results of which indicated the RTI enjoyed high reliability index (α= .89).

Critical Pedagogy Classroom Observation Checklist (CPCOC)

An observation checklist (see Appendix 5) was developed by the researchers, which consists of 34 Likert-scale items that matched those of CPQ. The checklist item ranged from not observed (=1) to always observed (=5). The instrument was expert viewed to ensure its validity. Moreover, each teacher was observed two times and the checklist was completed.

Procedures

Because universities, schools, and private institutes are three different micro-contexts in the macro-context of Iran for teaching EFL, the present study was conducted at different language institutes, schools, and universities throughout the country selected randomly. First, the CPQ and RTI developed as mentioned earlier were administered to the participants of the study. The administration and completion of the two instruments took approximately 40 minutes.

Next, thirty EFL teachers (10 from each group), who were selected randomly, were observed two times by the researchers using CPCOC as mentioned earlier to see to what extent they implemented CP principles in their classes. The researchers were present in the classes observed during the whole class session checking the teacher's actual classroom behavior regarding CP against the CPCOC to the extent the CP principles were observable in practice. The informed consent of the participants was also obtained before the study began.

Data Analysis

To answer the first research question of the study, a one-way ANOVA was run. The second question was answered through running Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Also, the third question was addressed through running a Factorial ANOVA. Finally, the fourth research question was tackled through an Independent Samples *t*-test.

Results

First, in order to check the normal distribution of the data, one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were run, the results of which indicated the data were distributed normally (Z = 1.01, *p*.> 0.05). Furthermore, Leven's tests of homogeneity of variances were run, the results of which showed that the three groups of EFL teachers of language institutes, schools, and universities were homogenous.

The first research question set out to investigate whether there was any significant difference among the three groups of EFL teachers of schools, universities and language institutes in terms of their perception of CP. After making sure that the assumptions were met, a one-way ANOVA was run in order to answer this question. However, first, the results of the descriptive statistics for the three groups, namely language institute, school and university EFL teachers are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics of language institute, school, and university EFL teachers in terms of their CP perception*

	Critical P							
	N	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error**	**95% Confidence Interval for Mean**		**Minimum**	**Maximum**
					Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**		
Institute	64	110.88	9.66	1.20	108.46	113.29	81	128
School	51	110.78	7.63	1.06	108.64	112.93	90	125
University	66	105.59	8.88	1.09	103.41	107.78	87	131
Total	181	108.92	9.15	.68	107.58	110.27	81	131

As shown in Table 1, the means of language institute, school, and university EFL teachers were, 110.88, 110.78, and 105.59 respectively, while their standard deviations were 9.66, 7.63, and 8.88, respectively.

Table 2 displays the results of one-way ANOVA for the possible differences among the three groups of EFL teachers in their perception of CP.

Table 2. *The results of one-way ANOVA for the differences among the three groups in their CP perception*

CP					
	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	1153.33	2	576.66	7.36	.001
Within Groups	13935.58	178	78.29		
Total	15088.91	180			

As indicated in Table 2, there was a significant difference among the three groups of language institute, school and university EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP, $F (2, 178) = 7.36$, $p < 0.05$. However, to find out where the difference lay, a Tukey post-hoc comparison was run, the results of which are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *The results of Tukey post-hoc analysis for the three groups' differences in their CP perception*

Dependent Variable: Critical P Tukey HSD						
(I) Teacher Type	**(J) Teacher Type**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**	**95% Confidence Interval**	
					Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**
Institute	School	.09	1.66	.998	-3.83	4.02
	University	5.28*	1.55	.002	1.62	8.95
School	Institute	-.09	1.66	.998	-4.02	3.83
	University	5.19*	1.65	.005	1.29	9.09
University	Institute	-5.28*	1.55	.002	-8.95	-1.62
	School	-5.19*	1.65	.005	-9.09	-1.29

* *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

As is evident in Table 3, there was a statistically significant difference between language institute and university EFL teachers on the one hand and between school teachers and university EFL teachers on the other with regard to their perception of CP. However, the results indicated no significant difference between school and language institute EFL teachers in this respect.

The second research question explored if there was any significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT. To answer this question, a Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was run. First, Table 4 displays the results of the descriptive statistics for Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT.

Table 4. *Descriptive statistics of Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT*

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
CP	108.92	9.15	181
RT	100.77	15.68	181

As indicated in Table 4, the mean and standard deviation of Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP were 108.92 and 9.15, respectively. Also, the mean and standard deviation of their RT were 100.77 and 15.68, respectively.

Table 5 shows the results of Pearson correlation between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT.

Table 5. *The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT*

		RT
CP	Pearson Correlation	.35**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	181

As is evident from Table 5, there was a significant positive relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and RT.

The third research question investigated whether the years of teaching experience, gender, and academic degree had any significant impact on Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP**.** In order to address this research question, a Factorial ANOVA was run. However, first, the descriptive statistics of the responses of the participants in terms of gender, teaching experience and academic degree are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. *Descriptive statistics of the participants' responses in terms of teaching experience, gender, and academic degree*

Dependent Variable: CP					
Gender	**Teaching Experience**	**Academic Degree**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
Male (N=91)	1-5 N=51	BA and below	109.71	9.17	7
		MA	115.00	7.28	11
		PhD	101.00	.	1
		Total	112.32	8.46	19
	6-10 N=67	BA and below	112.00	15.52	3
		MA	112.08	8.37	25
		PhD	101.50	7.59	4
		Total	110.75	9.38	32
	11 and above N=63	BA and below	109.31	7.60	13
		MA	105.58	9.91	19
		PhD	105.38	11.86	8
		Total	106.75	9.57	40

Dependent Variable: CP					
Gender	**Teaching Experience**	**Academic Degree**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
Female (N=90)	Total N=181	BA and below	109.78	8.79	23
		MA	110.42	9.35	55
		PhD	103.85	10.03	13
		Total	109.32	9.48	91
	1-5	BA and below	106.20	9.49	15
		MA	108.00	8.77	16
		PhD	102.00	.	1
		Total	106.97	8.92	32
	6-10	BA and below	112.78	8.02	9
		MA	109.35	9.17	20
		PhD	102.67	7.33	6
		Total	109.09	9.00	35
	11 and above	BA and below	116.00	5.75	8
		MA	106.15	8.56	13
		PhD	109.00	4.24	2
		Total	109.83	8.55	23
	Total	BA and below	110.50	9.11	32
		MA	108.06	8.79	49
		PhD	104.00	6.63	9
		Total	108.52	8.84	90
	1-5 Total	BA and below	107.32	9.32	22
		MA	110.85	8.78	27
		PhD	101.50	.70	2
		Total	108.96	9.05	51
	6-10	BA and below	112.58	9.52	12
		MA	110.87	8.74	45
		PhD	102.20	7.03	10
		Total	109.88	9.15	67
	11 and above	BA and below	111.86	7.57	21
		MA	105.81	9.25	32
		PhD	106.10	10.67	10
		Total	107.87	9.26	63
	Total	BA and below	110.20	8.90	55
		MA	109.31	9.13	104
		PhD	103.91	8.61	22
		Total	108.92	9.15	181

Next, the results of between-subjects effects for the impact of years of teaching experience, gender, and academic degree on teachers' perception of CP are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *The Results of Between-Subjects Effects for the Impact of Years of Teaching Experience, Gender, and Academic Degree on Teachers' Perception of CP*

Dependent Variable: CP					
Source	**Type III Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Corrected Model	2331.84[a]	17	137.16	1.75	.038
Intercept	884666.16	1	884666.16	11303.57	.000
Gender	.08	1	.08	.001	.974
Exp.	28.95	2	14.48	.18	.831
Degree	507.12	2	253.56	3.24	.042
gender * exp.	146.04	2	73.02	.93	.395
gender * degree	176.31	2	88.15	1.12	.327
Exp. * degree	837.10	4	209.27	2.67	.034
gender * exp. * degree	25.51	4	6.38	.08	.988
Error	12757.07	163	78.26		
Total	2162499.00	181			
Corrected Total	15088.91	180			

a. R Square = .155 (Adjusted R Square = .066)

As shown in Table 7, neither gender nor teaching experience significantly differentiated Iranian EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP, F (1,163) = 0.001, p = 0.97 > 0.05 and F (2, 163) = 0.18, p = 0.83> 0.05 respectively. However, as the results show, academic degree significantly differentiated Iranian EFL teachers with regard to their perception of CP, F (2,163) = 3.24, p = 0.04 < 0.05. Finally, it was shown that the interaction of teaching experience and academic degree had significant impact on Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP, F (4, 163) = 2.67, p = 0.03 < 0.05.

To locate the exact place of the difference in the case of academic degree, a Tukey post-hoc analysis was run, the results of which are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. *The results of Tukey post-hoc analysis for the impact of academic degree on Iranian EFL teachers' CP perception*

Dependent Variable: CP Tukey HSD						
(I) Academic Degree	**(J) Academic Degree**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**	**95% Confidence Interval**	
					Lower Bound	**Upper Bound**
BA	MA	.89	1.47	.81	-2.60	4.38
	PhD	6.29*	2.23	.01	1.01	11.57
MA	BA and below	-.89	1.47	.81	-4.38	2.60
	PhD	5.40*	2.07	.02	.49	10.31
PhD	BA and below	-6.29*	2.23	.01	-11.57	-1.01
	MA	-5.40*	2.07	.02	-10.31	-.49

As indicated in Table 8, there was a statistically significant difference between the teachers who held BA and those who held PhD on the one hand and the teachers who held MA and those who held PhD on the other with regard to the impact of academic degree on their perception of CP. However, no significant differences were found between teachers who held BA and those who held MA in this respect.

The fourth research question of the study explored, overall, if there was any significant difference between the reported CP perception of Iranian EFL teachers and their actual classroom implementation of it as observed by the researchers. In order to answer this question, an Independent Samples *t*-test was run.

First, Table 9 displays the results of the descriptive statistics for the difference between EFL teachers' reported perception of CP and their actual classroom practices.

Table 9. *Descriptive Statistics for the Difference between EFL Teachers' Reported Perception of CP and their Actual Classroom Practices*

	Observation Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CP	questionnaire	181	108.92	9.15	.68
	observation	30	91.43	11.31	2.06

As displayed in Table 9, the means for the questionnaire and observation were 108.9 and 91.4 respectively. Table 10 shows the results of Independent Samples *t*-test for teachers' reported perception of CP and their actual classroom implementation of it.

Table 10. *The Results of Independent Samples t-test for Teachers' Reported Perception of CP and their Actual Classroom Practices*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
CP	Equal variances assumed	4.37	.03	**9.35**	209	**.00**	17.48	1.87	13.80	21.17
	Equal variances not assumed			8.04	35.57	.00	17.48	2.17	13.07	21.90

As indicated in Table 10, there was a significant difference between Iranian EFL teachers' reported perception of CP and their actual classroom practices as observed by the researchers (t (209) = 9.35, p = .00).

Discussion

The first research question investigated if there was any significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers of language institutes, schools, and university professors in terms of their perceptions of CP. The results indicated that there was a significant difference among the three groups of EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP. Moreover, the results indicated that there were significant differences between language institute EFL teachers and university EFL teachers on the one hand and school EFL teachers and university EFL teachers on the other with regard to their perception of CP. However, there was no significant difference between public school EFL teachers and private language institute EFL teachers in this respect. In other words, all the three groups of teachers in the study supported the principles of CP although to different extents.

The results of the study by Sahragard et al. (2014) corroborate the findings of the first research question of the study in particular respects. The findings of their study also indicated that the majority of Iranian private institute EFL teachers, school English teachers, and university professors were aware of the principles of CP and supported the helpfulness of such pedagogy. Furthermore, the findings of the first research question are consistent with those of Atai and Moradi (2016) who also found that Iranian EFL teachers were aware and supportive of the basic principles of CP. Therefore, it might be argued that since knowledge is socially constructed, education can also play an important role in societal issues, and can thus facilitate social change which is thought to be at the crux of CP.

The significant difference among the three groups of the study might thus be rooted in their insights towards the application of negotiated syllabus. In other words, teachers might have different points of view towards the syllabi which are developed interactively in a dialogic manner (between teachers and students and students themselves). A possible justification for our findings in this regard might lie in the fact that CP is likely to be affected by the way the teachers have been treated during their school time (Sahragard et al., 2014). That is, as the findings showed university EFL teachers in the present study were found to be the least aware of CP although they might have been expected to be more interested in CP principles. A plausible reason for this might be that university professors in the study might have thought that incorporating the tenets of CP in their teaching and engaging students in such topics would threaten their authority and power. That is, they might have been aware of CP principles, but might gave tried to avoid adopting them since they considered CP principles as threats to their own authority, and a source of challenge for them in their

classes, a line of reasoning supported by Brown (2000), who maintains CP and urges that learners be free to think and behave intellectually without coercion from the authorities and develop real life out of their classrooms which might potentially challenge traditionally-minded teachers' authority.

University EFL teachers' lower perception of CP might also be related to the age of their students who are, naturally, all adults that might resist transformation and change which are at the crux of CP. On the other hand, most of the language institute and school learners are mainly ambitious young learners who tend to make a change in their society. They might thus be more willing to accept CP tenets and avoid principles of traditional educational systems; however, university students are more consistent in their beliefs than teenagers of language institutes and schools, a plausible argumentation which seems to be the reason why public school teachers and private language institute teachers in the study tended to be more flexible regarding transformative principles of CP. Supporting this, Hall (1981) maintains that the consequences of the traditional classroom activities are that after university students have spent sixteen or more years in the educational system, they become so brainwashed that it is unlikely to simply observe and report back what they heard, what they felt, or what went before their eyes. Most of them are defenseless when they encounter real life since that is the way they have been taught during their education and it is somehow difficult to change what they have been accustomed to for 16 years or so. However, this reasoning stands in contrast with the stance of Freire (1970) who expresses greater possibility for CP to be applied in adult education.

The findings of the second question of the study indicated that there was a significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and that of RT. As Rodríguez (2008) argues, a revealing factor of improving teaching is being a reflective instructor of one's own teaching. Reflection, like CP, stands in contrast with the acceptance and practice of conventional beliefs which seems to be the common denominator firmly linking the two concepts together. The significant relationship between CP and RT perception could thus be attributed to Dewey's (1933) argument holding that when teachers reflect with an open mind resulting in the creation of an interest in considering all sides of an issue, and act with foresight and planning thus ignoring traditional mindsets and authoritative actions (i.e. teach reflectively), they are more likely to lead to transformation and change in their teaching (i.e. incorporate and implement the principles of CP).

The significant relationship between CP and RT might also rest in the aim of teaching which is to change the world. It is believed that applying CP principles would help the learners act towards each other, and to the world around them (Brookfield, 1995). CP and RT have both the same aim in common. They both tend to teach to change the world in particular aspects. As Brookfield (1995) states, a critically reflective teacher provides a model of skepticism in his/her classroom. Similarly, CP has the same view towards the world and does not accept anything without contemplation and reflection. Moreover, the significant relationship between the two constructs could be rooted in Pacheco's (2005) reasoning that reflective practice requires a commitment towards change similar to what CP is based on, i.e. change and transformation to which Mayo (2003) also refers. It is worth mentioning here that reflection is not an end per se, but a means for transforming raw experience into a theory which addresses the higher purpose of the change of the individual (i.e. change at classroom level) and the change of the society (i.e. change at the broader social level) (Rodgers, 2002).

Furthermore, when EFL instructors reflect on their own classrooms and on different aspects of teaching, they gain insights to accept, and apply societal subjects to the class. They accept less defensively the voice of the students from multivariate real life aspects since they reflect about all things that are useful for students' future and consider educational setting as a small part of their larger society beyond the institute, school or university walls. That is why RT and CP have become inextricably intertwined, an argument also supported by the results of the present study.

The findings of the third research question of the study showed, neither gender nor teaching experience differentiated Iranian EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP; however, academic degree did significantly so. Moreover, it was shown that the interaction of gender, teaching experience and academic degree had no significant effect on Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP. Finally, MA and BA EFL teachers were found to have the highest perception of CP. The results of this part of the current study stand in contrast to those of Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) who found that the teachers' teaching experience had a significant relationship with their awareness of CP with more experienced teachers being more aware of CP. This calls for the conduct of more studies on the topic to resolve the contradictions observed.

Another explanation for the result of the third research question might be related to the nature of some courses taught at university. These courses and their contents seem to make the students aware of and familiar with the principles of CP. That is perhaps why that

academic degree was found to have differentiated Iranian EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP in the present study.

The results of the last research question of the study showed that, overall, there were significant differences between the reported CP perception of Iranian EFL teachers and their actual classroom implementation of it as observed by the researchers. That is, as the results indicated, all the three groups of Iranian EFL teachers supported the principles of CP; however, they did not apply those principles in the actual context of their classrooms.

The results of the current study in this respect are corroborated by the findings of Fox (1994, as cited in Andrade, 2007) who argue that in many Asian societies, the students are not expected to challenge their teachers, but merely think over something that exists. However, in Western societies, students are commonly expected to argue and challenge rather than accept whatever is dictated to them by teachers, and textbooks. They are expected to arrive at something new and pose new questions (Fox, 1994, as cited in Andrade, 2007).

Another reason for this might be rooted in the insufficient training of EFL teachers to use and implement CP. The study teachers' way of planning the lessons observed and their inadvertent advocacy of CP might corroborate the fact that they did not understand how to implement CP principles (Ahlquist, 1990). Moreover, as CP investigates teachers, students, citizens and others' roles more deeply, and is multifaceted in nature, it is difficult to give a simple instruction on how to implement CP (Guilherme, 2002) which might naturally make its implementation difficult.

The results of the study in this respect might also be supported by Beyer's (1984) argument that the inconsistency between theory and practice happens because there is a tendency among educators to accept and take the existing classroom situations as granted, essentially unchangeable, and beyond criticism. He believes that once this occurs, critical thinking is considered as useless. Therefore, many close-minded educators do not tend to change their conventional principles in practice even if they might be highly aware of them.

The existence of a significant discrepancy between EFL teachers' perception of CP and their actual classroom implementation as found in the present study might also be rooted in the educational system and those who make educational policies. That is, as Edmondson and D'Urso (2014) point out, those who make educational policies are almost never involved in classroom activities. In other words, the policy makers ignore teachers' concerns in practice which seems to apply to Iranian educational system. CP has emerged as a new issue in the Iranian context with which the teachers might be conceptually familiar, but they do not

seemingly know how to implement CP principles in practice. The educational system in Iran still enjoys an authoritative system which is controlled by those other than the teachers themselves. In other words, Iranian teachers are not involved in decision-making activities on classroom practices. Consequently, our educational system might not necessarily lead to self-development, critical thought and reflection, and social progress, an argument supported by the results of Sahragard et al. (2014) in the context of Iran who found that almost all of the participants in their study complained about the top-down managerial system of education in the country. This might result in a situation in which the teachers either do not know how to put the theoretical underpinnings of CP into practice because they have simply not been trained by policy makers and managers how to do so or they are not allowed by the policy makers and managers to do so because they are afflicted with managerialism (i.e. the inflexible dogmatic, top-to-down control of the managers over teachers).

Conclusion and Implications of the Study

As the findings of the study indicated, significant differences were found among the three groups of private language institute, public school, and university EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP. A significant relationship was also found between Iranian EFL teachers' perception of CP and that of RT. Neither gender nor teaching experience differentiated Iranian EFL teachers in terms of their perception of CP; however, academic degree did significantly so. Significant differences were also found between Iranian EFL teachers' reported perception of CP and their actual classroom practices as observed by the researchers. The findings of the study thus show that teachers in different contexts might have different views towards their authority in the classroom which might lead to different considerations in the implementation of CP.

The findings of the current study suggest that the foreign language education policy makers provide language institute teachers, school teachers, and university teachers of EFL with both CP and RT briefing and training courses as they seem to be inextricably intertwined as shown by the findings of the present study. That is, on the one hand, RT could act as a catalyst to CP (Pacheco, 2005). On the other hand, RT is an iterative process (Rodgers, 2002) which iterates between theory and practice. Therefore, the findings of the study might imply that RT is a prerequisite for CP and that the application of RT could lead to the practicality of CP.

As the results showed, significant differences were also found between the EFL teachers' perception of CP and their actual classroom practices of it. This might show lack of practical principles of CP or lack of ability and/or skill on the part of policy makers, curriculum and material developers, syllabus designers, teacher educators and/or teachers themselves in the EFL contexts including the foreign language education context of Iran in practically implementing CP principles in the classroom environment. Therefore, the findings of the study could imply that foreign language education policymakers and curriculum developers in general and EFL teachers in particular be trained in how to implement the tenets of CP in the actual classroom environment and to become acquainted with incorporating different aspects of the outside society in the classroom, curricula and the course books as second language education requires us to understand our educational practice in the broader social, cultural and political terms (Pennycook, 1990). EFL teachers also need to be trained on how to put the tenets and principles of CP into practice in actual classroom settings through informed goal-directed pre-service and/or in-service teacher training courses.

Finally, the Critical Pedagogy Questionnaire (CPQ), the cornerstone of which was mainly built upon the inventory developed by Pishavai and Kasaian (2013), was further expanded and revalidated in the present study through the pains-taking processes of expert judgment, pilot study and factor analysis which can be safely adopted by other researchers in the field for conducting similar studies on CP and RT in other EFL contexts.

References

Abednia, A. (2009a). Critical pedagogy: historical development, philosophical principles, and pitfalls. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, *5*(1), 33-54.

Abednia, A. (2009b*).* Transformative L2 teacher development (TLTD): A tentative pro*posal. In P. Wachob (Ed.), Power in the EFL classroom: Critical pedagogy in the Middle East*, (pp. 263–282).

Abednia, A., Hovassapian, A., Teimournezhad, S., & Ghanbari, N. (2013). Reflective journal writing: Exploring in-service EFL teachers' perceptions. *System*, *41*(3), 503-514.

Ahlquist, R. (1990). Critical Pedagogy for Social Studies Teachers. *Social Studies Review*, *29*(3), 53-57.

Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, *35*(2), 192-207.

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT journal*, *62*(3), 276-283.

Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System, 38(2),* 211-227.

Alsina, Á., Ayllón, S., Colomer, J., Fernández-Peña, R., Fullana, J., Pallisera, M., ... & Serra, L. (2017). Improving and evaluating reflective narratives: A rubric for higher education students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 63*, 148-158.

Andrade, S. (2007). *Tensions and possibilities in applying Freirean critical pedagogy towards fostering critical literacy in India's education system* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://qspace.library.queensu.ca/handle/1974/945.

Atai, M. R., & Moradi, H. (2016). Critical Pedagogy in the Context of Iran: Exploring English Teachers' Perceptions. *Applied Research on English Language, 5(2),* 121-144.

Beyer, L. (1984*).* Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. *Journal of Teaching for Education, 35(3),* 36–41.

Bolton, G. (2010). *Reflective practice, writing and professional development.* California: Sage Publication.

Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of language learning and teaching. London.

Brookfield, S. (1995). *The getting of wisdom: What critically reflective teaching is and why it is important. In becoming a critically reflective teacher.* Michigan: Wiley.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Edmondson, J., & D'Urso, A. (2014). The importance of being critical: Opening possibilities and hope in education policy study. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 5*(1).

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard educational review, 59*(3), 297-325.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: The continuum international publishing group.

Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics.* Great Britain: Cromwell press.

Hall, E. (1981). *Beyond culture.* New York: Bantam Doubleday.

Hall, G., Appleby, J., Dowde, J., Grant, J., Hole, S., Peggy, S., & Check, J. (2003). *At the heart of teaching: A guide to reflective practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hayden, E., & Ming Chiu, M. (2013). Reflective teaching via a problem exploration–teaching adaptations– resolution cycle: A mixed methods study of preservice teachers' reflective notes. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 20(10),* 1–21.

Jadidi, E., & Keshavarz, Z. (2013). The impact of Iranian EFL teachers' reflection on their incorporation of strategy-based instruction. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 4(3),* 140-148.

Kuang, J. (2007). Developing students' cultural awareness through foreign language teaching. *Sino US English Teaching, 4 (12),* 74-81.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Larson, K. (2014). Critical pedagogy(ies) for ELT in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal, 25(1),* 122–138.

Mahmoodarabi, M., & Khodabakhsh, M. R. (2015). Critical Pedagogy: EFL Teachers' Views, Experience and Academic Degrees. *English Language Teaching, 8*(6), 100.

Mayo, P. (2003). A rationale for a transformative approach to education. *Journal of Trans formative Education, 1*(1), 38-57.

McLaren, P. (2003). Critical pedogogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & D. A. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69–103). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Messmann, G., & Mulder, R. H. (2015). Reflection as a facilitator of teachers' innovative behavior. *International Journal of Training and Development, 19,* 125–137.

Milner, H. R. (2003). Reflection, racial competence, and critical pedagogy: How do we

Prepare pre-service teachers to pose tough questions? *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 6*(2), 193-208.

Moradkhani, S., & Shirazizadeh, M. (2017). Context-based variations in EFL teachers' reflection: the case of public schools versus private institutes in Iran. *Reflective Practice, 18*(2), 206-218.

Murphy, J. M. (2014). Reflective teaching: Principles and practices (pp. 613-629). In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (4th edition).* Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage.

Pacheco, A. (2005). Reflective teaching and its impact on foreign language teaching. *Revista Electrónica" Actualidades Investigativas en Educación", 5*.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *System, 18(3),* 303–314.

Perveen, A. (2015). Critical pedagogy in a Pakisatani literature classroom. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 6(2),* 95–114.

Pishvaei, V., & Kasaian, S. A. (2013). Design, construction, and validation of a critical pedagogy attitude questionnaire in Iran. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 2(2),* 59–74.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and Reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104(4),* 842–866.

Rodríguez, S. J. (2008). Teachers' attitudes towards reflective teaching: Evidences in a professional development program (PDP). *Universidad Nacional de Colombia, 10(1),* 91–111.

Rodriguez-Valls, F. (2014). Reflective teaching: theory within classroom practices. *Teaching Education, 25(3),* 294–308.

Sacadura, C. B. (2014*).* Philosophy of education, values and utopia in the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire. *European Scientific Journal, 10(10),* 498-505.

Sadeghi, S. (2008). Critical pedagogy in an EFL teaching context: An ignis fatuus or an alternative approach. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *6*(1), 277-295.

Sahragard, R., Razmjoo, A., & Baharloo, A. (2014*).* The practicality of critical pedagogy from Iranian EFL instructors' viewpoints: A cross sectional study. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 5(2),* 178-193.

Sharma, B. K., & Phyak, P. (2017). Criticality as Ideological Becoming: Developing English Teachers for Critical Pedagogy in Nepal. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1-29.

Shin, H. & Crookes, G. (2009). Exploring the Possibilities for EFL Critical Pedagogy in Korea: A Two-Part Case Study. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2(*2), 113–136. Soodmand Afshar, H., & Farahani, M. (2015). Reflective thinking and reflective teaching among Iranian EFL teachers: Do gender and teaching experience make a difference? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 615-620.

Soodmand Afshar, H., & Farahani, M. (2018). Inhibitors to EFL teachers' reflective teaching and EFL learners' reflective thinking and the role of teaching experience and academic degree in reflection perception. *Reflective Practice, 19*(1), 46-67.

Wade, R., & Yarbrough, D. (1996). Portfolios: A tool for reflective thinking in teacher education*? Teaching & Teacher Education, 12(1),* 63–79.

Wellington, B. (1991*).* The Promise of Reflective Practice. *Educational Leadership, 48(6*), 4-5.

Wink, J. (1999). *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Critical Pedagogy Questionnaire (CPQ)

Dear colleagues: This questionnaire intends to investigate your perception towards critical pedagogy. Please choose the best option that shows your degree of agreement. Your personal information will be kept confidential.

Background questions

Last name:

Gender: Male Female

Years of teaching experience: 1-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 more than 20

Age: 20-30 31-40 41-50 51 and above

Last academic degree: BA MA PhD

Are you an institute teacher, school teacher or university professor?

School teacher Institute teacher

SA: strongly agree A: agree N: Neutral D: Disagree SD: strongly disagree

	SA	A	N	SD	D
1. In today's world learning English is necessary for everybody.					
2. International ELT books reinforce particular worldviews.					
3. An English teacher should be able to speak like a native speaker.					
4. ELT books tend to show that Western culture is more appreciable.					
5. English should only be taught through English.					
6. ELT industry has traces of promoting Western culture.					
7. To learn authentic English, one should trust ELT materials designed by native speakers.					
8. ELT books should not be considered as ideological.					
9. Non-native English teachers can be perfect teachers.					
10. ELT materials can be used as tools to promote Western ideologies.					
11. For political and ideological reasons, Third-World countries should design their own ELT materials.					
12. It seems strange that some English teachers mistrust internationally Marked ELT books.					
13. Students should be expected to pronounce English words like a native speaker.					
14. ELT industry seems to be pursuing hidden goals.					
15. If non-native speakers design their own ELT materials, they will lose authenticity.					
16. English teachers should look critically at ELT industry.					
17. Non-native speakers can communicate internationally with no need to speak like native-speakers.					
18. ELT books designed by Third-World countries will fail to teach good English.					

19. English-speaking countries try to promote Western culture through their ELT books.
20. ELT materials designed by native speakers are more dependable than the ones designed by non-native speakers.
21. ELT books shouldn't be mistaken for Western policies.
22. Designing local ELT materials is a waste of time.
23. Due to our cultural differences with the West, we should design our own ELT books.
24. Instead of accusing ELT books, English teachers should focus on language teaching.
25. ELT materials should contain taboo subjects.
26. Students' idea should be accepted in the classroom.
27. Students are free to voice their idea about society in the classroom.
28. EFL/ESL teachers should not only dependent on the material framework.
29. Students can be feminist, anti-racist, anti-poverty activist in the classroom.
30. EFL/ESL teachers should resist against raised questions of students.
31. The EFL/ESL teachers know everything and the students know nothing.
32. The EFL/ESL teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply.
33. The EFL/ESL teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it.
34. EFL/ESL teachers are subject of learning process and the students are just objects.

Appendix 2: Factor loadings for the Rotated Factors of the CPQ

Factor loadings for the rotated factors of the Critical Pedagogy Questionnaire

Item	Factor Loading						Communality
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Item 1	.56	.38	.50	.14	.10	-.11	.76
Item 2	.61	.38	.55	.15	.00	.04	.85
Item 3	.59	.36	.43	.28	.15	.00	.77
Item 4	.45	.24	.28	.51	.10	.09	.63
Item 5	.12	.54	.31	.48	.04	.14	.65
Item 6	.51	.21	.42	.54	.07	.05	.79
Item 7	.24	.67	.30	.09	.03	.09	.62
Item 8	.43	-.00	.18	.66	.10	-.10	.69
Item 9	.32	.41	.35	.47	.00	.19	.66
Item 10	.35	.35	.38	.51	.11	-.08	.68
Item 11	.15	.01	-.14	.39	.53	.13	.50
Item 12	.43	.55	.05	.29	.16	.29	.69
Item 13	.44	.56	.13	.24	.11	.27	.68
Item 14	.65	.37	.26	.33	.06	.12	.76
Item 15	.60	.51	.03	.15	.09	.16	.69
Item 16	.38	.09	.26	.18	.01	.72	.78
Item 17	-.15	.50	.31	.27	.25	.15	.53
Item 18	.06	.14	-.01	-.02	.16	.62	.43
Item 19	.18	.07	.05	.12	.81	.19	.75
Item 20	.51	.53	.10	.06	.04	-.03	.56
Item 21	.38	.03	.01	.19	.46	.34	.52
Item 22	.71	.11	.08	.17	.35	.03	.69
Item 23	.52	.55	.03	.17	.19	.38	.79
Item 24	.64	.45	.11	.12	-.01	.10	.65
Item 25	.17	.44	.60	.23	.19	.04	.68
Item 26	.33	.27	.69	-.00	-.12	.27	.75
Item 27	.24	.21	.54	.12	.19	-.12	.47
Item 28	-.00	.16	.27	-.22	.80	-.10	.80
Item 29	-.04	.03	.68	-.05	.01	.52	.74
Item 30	.62	.22	.38	.22	.09	.15	.67
Item 31	.65	-.14	.15	.10	.03	.35	.61
Item 32	.75	.13	.08	.10	.10	.11	.63
Item 33	.04	.10	-.08	.70	.01	.06	.52
Item 34	.10	.75	.20	-.01	.02	-.04	.62
Eigenvalues	14.40	2.16	1.83	1.64	1.38	1.34	
% of variance	42.35	6.36	5.39	4.83	4.06	3.94	

Appendix 3: RTI

Dear colleagues: This questionnaire intends to look into reflectivity of your teaching. Please check the part that shows your actual teaching. Your personal information will be kept confidential**.**

Background questions

Name: …….. Gender: …….. Academic degree: …….

1: never 2: rarely 3: sometimes 4: often 5: always

	1	2	3	4	5
1. I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purpose.					
2. I talk about my classroom experience with my colleagues and seek their advice and feedback.					
3. After each session, I write about my accomplishment/ failure of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.					
4. I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues.					
5. I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.					
6. I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance.					
7. I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.					
8. I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues.					
9. I think of writing articles based on my classroom experience.					
10. I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.					
11. I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.					
12. I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.					
13. I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.					
14. I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.					
15. I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.					
16. I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.					
17. I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.					
18. I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.					
19. I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.					
20. I think of positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice.					
21. I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.					
22. I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my class.					
23. I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting					

poverty, discrimination, and gender bias. 24. In my teaching I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty. 25. I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political view. 26. I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general. 27. I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students achievements. 28. I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class. 29. I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class.	

Appendix 4: Factor Loadings for the Rotated Factors of RTI

Factor loadings for the rotated factors of the Reflective Teaching Instrument

Item	Factor Loading				Communality
	1	2	3	4	
Item 1	.41	.30	.12	.34	.50
Item 2	.34	.25	.28	.22	.57
Item 3	.20	.01	-.11	.72	.70
Item 4	.32	.40	.21	.11	.73
Item 5	.01	.28	.21	.58	.56
Item 6	-.07	.12	.08	.79	.72
Item 7	.22	.75	-.03	.18	.75
Item 8	-.04	.73	.13	-.00	.71
Item 9	-.06	.71	.17	.04	.67
Item 10	.12	.68	.07	.09	.68
Item 11	.11	.62	.22	.12	.61
Item 12	.29	.69	.04	.03	.74
Item 13	.51	.10	.15	.22	.57
Item 14	.29	-.02	.32	.46	.77
Item 15	.41	.10	.34	.22	.69
Item 16	.47	.54	.01	.05	.63
Item 17	.54	.14	.26	.24	.68
Item 18	.70	.16	.28	.11	.71
Item 19	.74	.14	-.04	.11	.78
Item 20	.76	.19	-.01	-.03	.75
Item 21	.77	.01	-.03	.07	.68
Item 22	.61	.10	.30	-.13	.68
Item 23	.08	.36	.69	-.08	.70
Item 24	.07	.25	.65	.19	.60
Item 25	.11	.07	.69	.10	.64
Item 26	.15	.05	.74	.16	.68
Item 27	.50	.01	.50	-.15	.62
Item 28	.51	.06	.42	.16	.72
Item 29	.52	.02	.44	-.13	.60
Eigenvalues	3.87	3.12	2.48	2.02	
% of variance	13.35	10.78	8.57	6.99	

Appendix 5: CPCOC

Class observed: …… **Date: ……**

Observer: ……. **Department: ……..**

1. The teacher thought that world learning English is necessary for everybody.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

2. The teacher believed that international ELT books reinforced particular worldview.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

3. The teacher was able to speak like a native speaker.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

4. The teacher believed that ELT industry tries to show that Western culture is more appreciable.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

5. The teacher believed that ELT industry had traces of promoting Western culture.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

6. English was only taught through English.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

7. The teacher trusted ELT materials designed by native speakers.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

8. The teacher didn't consider ELT books as ideological.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

9. The teacher, as non-native English teacher, was perfect.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

10. The teacher believed that ELT materials could be used as tools to promote Western ideologies.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

11. The teacher believed that for political and ideological reasons, Third-World countries should design their own ELT materials.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observe

12. The teacher believed that it seems strange that some English teachers mistrust internationally Marked ELT books

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

13. The teacher expected the students to pronounce English like a native speaker.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

14. The teacher believed that ELT industry seemed to be pursuing hidden goals.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

15. The teacher believed that if non-native speakers design their own ELT materials, they would lose authenticity.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

16. The teacher looked critically at ELT industry.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

17. The teacher believed that non-native speakers can communicate internationally with no need to speak like native-speakers.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

18. The teachers believed that ELT books designed by Third-world countries will fail to teach good English.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

19. The teacher believed that English-speaking countries tried to promote Western culture through their ELT books.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

20. The teacher believed that ELT materials designed by native speakers are more dependable than the ones designed by non-native speakers.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

21. The teacher believed that ELT books shouldn't be mistaken for Western policies.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

22. The teacher believed that Designing local ELT materials was a waste of time.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

23. The teacher believed that due to our cultural differences with the West, teachers should design our own ELT books.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

24. The teacher believed that Instead of accusing ELT books, English teachers should focus on language teaching.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

25. The teacher believed that ELT materials should contain taboo subjects.

Students' ideas are accepted in the classroom.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

26. Students' ideas were accepted in the classroom.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

27. Students were free to voice their idea about society in the classroom.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

28. Teacher was not only dependent on the material framework.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

29. Students were feminist, anti-racist, anti-poverty activist in the classroom.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

30. The teacher resisted against raised questions of students.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

31. Teacher tended to show he/she knew everything and the students knew nothing.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

32. The teacher chose and enforced his choice, and the students complied.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

33. The teacher chose the program content, and the student adapted to it.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed

34. Teachers were subject of learning process and the students were just objects.

Not observed (at all) rarely observed sometimes observed frequently observed always observed