

Design, Construction, and Validation of a Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire in Iran

Vahideh Pishvaei

MA in TEFL, Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran Science and Research Branch, Iran
vahide.pishvaei@gmail.com

and

Seyed Ahmad Kasaian

PhD in Applied Linguistics, Islamic Azad University, Mazandaran Science and Research Branch, Iran
ahmadkasaian@gmail.com

Abstract

The application of the principles of critical pedagogy to the field of ELT in the last few decades has contributed to the emergence of critical perspectives toward ELT industry and the role of English in the world. These views known as the critical standpoint acknowledges the existence of non-neutral hidden aspects in ELT and regards English as a tool to promote selected ideologies and to pursue hidden goals. Despite the rapid spread of English in Iran and the relevance of the issues addressed by the critical standpoint in ELT to this specific context, few studies have been conducted to survey Iranian EFL teachers' critical attitude towards ELT industry and the lack of an instrument to measure their critical attitude was highly remarkable. The present study, therefore, aimed at developing a Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire that could be used to evaluate Iranian ELT community's critical attitude towards ELT industry. The newly developed questionnaire was validated by administering it among 100 English professors and institute teachers in 21 cities of Iran. This study investigated the internal consistency and the construct validity of the newly-developed instrument which both indicated acceptable results.

1. Introduction

Critical Pedagogy, with roots in the works of Paulo Freire (1970), the Brazilian educator, has influenced the area of education in general, and Applied Linguistics in particular. In the light of Critical Pedagogy (CP), education, including English Language Teaching (ELT), takes on a new dimension, which is the sociopolitical aspect. It holds that education is not neutral, and it both influences and is influenced by the social and political relations in society. Critical pedagogy attempts to transform students from being mere objects of education to autonomous subjects of their own learning. Students are expected to have voice and take part actively and critically in their education. Therewith, they are empowered to critique inequalities and start seeking justice in the confines of their classroom –what they will need to do in the larger society in the future.

In recent years, scholars in the field of ELT have begun to adopt and adapt the ideas of critical pedagogy to their own field. They are in a way acknowledging the non-neutrality of language teaching as a branch of education, and are beginning to recognize the sociopolitical aspects of it. (Cox and Assis-Peterson, 1999) With the emergence of this critical standpoint many scholars in this field consider ELT industry as pursuing the hidden goal of disseminating Western thoughts and ideologies (Kasaian and Subbakrishna, 2011). These hidden aspects and layers which are part of any course, including ELT, constitute what has been called the hidden curriculum. (Cuningsworth,

1995) From the perspective of critical pedagogy, teachers bear the responsibility of questioning the hidden curriculum as well as helping their students develop such a perspective. (Canagarajah, 1999) Hence, English teachers should have a critical eye toward their discipline in order to acknowledge and discern the non-educational aspects of ELT and its consequences.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

In recent decades there has been a growing tendency among Iranian people to learn English. In the meantime, with the development of critical pedagogy and hidden curriculum theories, and their application to the field of English teaching, critical perspectives towards ELT industry and the role of English in the world are immersing worldwide. These views, as mentioned above, lay the great responsibility of identifying and dealing with the non-educational and hidden aspects of ELT materials on English teachers. Now Given the crucial role of English teachers, the rapid spread of English in Iran, and the Islamic national law and the anti-imperialistic policies of this country, the need was felt for a reliable and valid instrument to evaluate Iranian ELT community's critical attitude. The researchers, therefore, decided to develop a Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire that can be used in future studies. This study, also investigated the internal consistency and the construct validity of the newly-developed instrument. This questionnaire can help determine the extent to which teachers and professors of English in an Islamic and anti-imperialistic country have the expected critical attitude towards ELT industry which will, in turn, help educators and policy makers make appropriate decisions about the measures that need to be taken in this regard.

1.2. Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: The Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire will not show good internal consistency.

H₀₂: The Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire will not show good indices of construct validity as measured by Principal Component Analysis.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Critical Pedagogy and Hidden Curriculum

Giving a clear-cut definition for critical pedagogy seems difficult, for by their very nature, critical approaches tend to stay away from prescription. (Hall, 2000) What is agreed upon is that critical pedagogy is neither "a set of ideas" (Giroux, 1995, p. 29; Canagarajah, 2005, p. 932), nor "a theory" (Akbari, 2008, p. 276). It is, according to Canagarajah (2005, p. 932), "a way of 'doing' learning and teaching" or to use Pennycook's terms (1999), teaching with an attitude.

Critical pedagogy can be best described as an egalitarian approach to teaching, learning, and knowing, which contextualizes socially and politically, pedagogical practices and institutions and views education as a venue for the preparation of individuals for social transformation toward justice. There are a number of concepts and principles in critical pedagogy such as problem-posing education, dialogism, praxis, critical consciousness, humanization, and authentic curricula (Aliakbari & Faraji, 2011), but their explanation goes beyond the scope of this research.

Pertinent to the ideas developed by critical pedagogy was the concept of hidden curriculum, which consists of hidden cultural and social values inherent in all course books. (Cunningsworth, 1995) The responsibility of recognizing and addressing hidden curriculum is on educators. (Dickerson, 2007; Kasaian, 2011) From the perspective of critical pedagogy, teachers should not only challenge the hidden values and assumptions, but also help their students develop a critical perspective. (Canagarajah, 1999) In order for this to happen, teachers should be equipped with a critical tool that enables them to identify and expose the unstated values, beliefs, and ideologies inherent in curricula. "This is where critical pedagogy derives its legitimacy: to expose the contradictions in mainstream discourses and to offer counter-hegemonic discourses in the pursuit of

a more equitable and just literacy system.” (Chege, 2009, p. 233) Therefore, a significant mission of critical pedagogy is to reveal and unravel the hidden curriculum by providing students and teachers with a critical perspective.

2.2. The Critical Shift: Critical Pedagogy and Hidden Curriculum in ELT

In 1990s English language teaching discipline decided to turn critical. (Kumaravadivelu, 2006b) Davari (2011) attributes the emergence of this critical standpoint in ELT to Phillipson’s ‘Linguistic Imperialism’(1992). Ghaffar Samar and Davari (2011) go further to name the critical trend as linguistic imperialism theory. According to Aghagolzadeh and Davari (2012), “the appearance of a critical intellectual shift in applied linguistics has not only significantly challenged the mainstream ELT, but also has mostly introduced critical pedagogy (CP) as an alternative approach to the mainstream ELT especially in the Periphery.” (p. 973) Critical pedagogy in ELT especially suits countries that are different from or in contrast with Inner Circle countries in terms of cultural, political, social, and ideological orientations. (Aghagolzadeh&Davari, 2012) Taking into account these probable incompatibilities between the learner’s culture and the target culture, which is often the case with learners from Outer and Expanding Circle countries, helps make more sense of a hidden curriculum in foreign language learning and teaching and English teachers’ role in identifying them.

2.3. Critical Issues in ELT

The critical trend in ELT has evoked critical discussions over different aspects of this discipline. The most crucial issue has been to critically re-examine the role of English in the world and the nature of ELT industry. A critical scrutiny of ELT curricula and practices also reveals certain widely-held taken-for-granted assumptions which, given the new critical perspective, should be re-analyzed. These assumptions include monolingualism(Kumaravadivelu, 2003b; Phillipson, 1992, p.185), monoculturalism (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b), and native-speakerism(Phillipson, 1992; Rajagopalan, 1999).

2.3.1. The Role of English and the Nature of ELT Industry

For long the teaching of English was considered as a neutral, if not beneficial practice, and English language itself was seen as a useful instrument. Baladi (2007) points out that “the teaching of English and the English language itself have, for a long time, been seen as clean and safe exports, as a practical means of communication carrying few ethical implications.” (p. 21) But the critical shift in 1990s introduced the spread of English and the mainstream ELT “as inherently problematic phenomena” (Ghaffar Samar & Davari, 2011, p. 63). Denying the neutrality of English and its tool-like image, Phillipson (1992) explains that English has been successfully ‘propelled’ and ‘promoted’ by economic, political, intellectual, and social forces. (p.6) According to Pennycook (1994), ELT practices support “the vested interests of Western nations” (p 179).

2.3.2. ELT Materials

As with the role of English and its spread in the world, it was previously assumed that the internationally-marketed ELT materials were not only neutral but purely beneficial knowledge packages that served the interests of English learners throughout the world. But the rise of critical issues in ELT led some scholars in the field to question the legitimacy of these widely trusted ELT goods and services. (Littlejohn, 1992; Hurst, 2008; Akbari, 2008; Banegas, 2010) Offering a critical analysis of ELT textbooks, Littlejohn (1992) believes that they “constitute part of a struggle for hegemony in which (ruling class) ideologies are represented as ‘natural’ and ‘commonsensical’.” (p. 256) Moreover, following critical pedagogy, ELT curricula should address learners’ needs, which necessitates the localization of these curricula and materials. (Canagarajah, 1999; Akbari, 2008) The prevalent commercially produced English coursebooks, however, do not take into account learners’

real lives (Akbari, 2008). English course books are also criticized for avoiding controversial topics and presenting a favorable portrait of Inner-Circle countries. (Hurst, 2008; Banegas, 2010) Even if such topics as poverty or discrimination are discussed, they are contextualized exclusively in Africa or the Muslim world. (Banegas, 2010) Consequently, ELT course books become an ideal representation of a utopian culture, which is said to be the target culture. Furthermore, relying totally on the target culture, with only its favorable features might result in a sense of inferiority on the part of learners (Akbari, 2008). It is the duty of English teachers and teacher educators “to deconstruct the ready-made packets of principles, methods, techniques, and materials in ELT that are imposed by the center and passively consumed by the periphery” (Cox and Assis-Peterson, 1999, p. 449).

2.3.3. Use of L1 in ELT

One of the most prevalent assumptions in second language learning and teaching is that learners should not be permitted to use their L1 while in an L2 class. Following the critical turn in ELT, however, some scholars have begun to question the legitimacy of this widely enacted assumption. (Phillipson, 1992; Akbari, 2008) Phillipson (1992) refers to this trend in ELT as the “monolingual fallacy” which holds that “English is best taught monolingually” (p.185). Akbari (2008) points out the lack of evidence to confirm the total exclusion of L1 from L2 classroom, as well as probable cases in support of L1 use. While acknowledging the significance of the focus on, exposure to, and practice of L2, Akbari (2008) maintains that a “judicious” (p. 280) and “more liberal” (p. 279) use of L1 can facilitate L2 learning. Since L1 is part of learner’s communicative experience, and also their identity, its significance cannot and should not be ignored. Instead, if following the tenets of critical pedagogy, learners are to be given voice and power, their values and experiences should be appreciated, which also include their L1. (Akbari, 2008)

2.3.4. Culture in ELT

Another area of concern in ELT which needs a reconsideration in the light of critical pedagogy is the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of culture inclusion in ELT materials. The teaching of culture as an inseparable part of second/foreign language learning and teaching is mostly limited to the norms and values of the target culture. (Kramsch, 1993; Akbari, 2008) The justification has been that language learners want to communicate with speakers of that language, however, this assumption does not apply to all learners (Akbari, 2008). McKay (2003) distinguishes between English learners who live in English-speaking countries and those who do not, in terms of pragmatic needs. This new perspective to the inclusion of target culture in L2 classroom has roots in the spread of English as an International Language (EIL). (Momenian & Shirazizadeh, 2009) Given this international status of English, most communications in English occur between non-native speakers (Rajagopalan, 2004) who don’t need the Anglo-American culture to talk about or identify with. (Akbari, 2008) On the other hand, reliance on the learners’ own culture as a source enables them to reflect critically on their culture and identify its strengths and weaknesses. This indeed conforms to the social transformation function of critical pedagogy and its emphasis on learner needs. (Akbari, 2008)

2.3.5. Native Speaker in ELT

Relying on the above discussions, the current trend in mainstream ELT is the inclusion of, and emphasis on the target language and culture, and the exclusion of learner’s mother tongue and home culture. According to Kumaravadivelu (2003b), both these trends, that is, monolingualism, or the exclusion of L1 in the class and monoculturalism or the mere focus on the target culture purposefully benefit the native speaker of English. Previously native speaker was set as a goal for language learners (Richards, 2003), which resulted in ‘mythologizing’ of this notion in ELT (Mahboob, 2005, p. 82). Furthermore, as Rajagopalan (2004) points out, “it was the figure of the native speaker that invariably served as the yardstick with which to measure the adequacy of policy

decisions, the efficacy of methods and authenticity of materials, the learner's proficiency, and so on" (p. 114). Cox and Assis-Peterson (1999) complained that "we spend most of our classroom time trying to make students repeat another's words fluently, trying to erase the traces of their identities shown in their accents" (p. 449). But in 1990s, the critical standpoint in ELT, "questioned these assumptions and unpacked the various factors that are glossed over and merged into the term 'native speaker'" (Mahboob, 2005, p. 87). Apart from the fact that the native model is an unachievable goal for non-native speakers (Mahboob, 2005) the pragmatic needs of non-native speakers who don't live in the target community are also different. (McKay, 2003) According to Kasaian and Subbakrishna (2011), "there is a growing tendency in many parts of the world to dissociate the ELT profession from the native speakers' norms of linguistic accuracy and social appropriateness" (p. 230). Another controversial result of such an emphasis on the notion of native speaker was the devaluation of non-native teachers. Phillipson (1992) refers to this ELT tenet as the "native speaker fallacy" which holds that "the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker" (p. 193). According to Mahboob (2005), however, following the critical trend in ELT being native is not any more regarded as an ideal quality for a successful English teacher, and hence the 'demythologizing' of the native speaker (p. 78) and the 'reevaluation' of non-native teachers. (p. 62) Rajagopalan (2004) argues that today with all the communications taking place between non-native speakers, it is the inability to get along with non-native English accents that makes one "communicatively deficient", and not the using of non-neutral varieties of English. (Rajagopalan, 2004, p. 114) So the Standard and American English are no longer the primary concern for teachers and learners. In fact the focus of attention is moving away from the native speaker to the learner. Hall (2000) talks about the "local ownership of English" which according to him "is founded upon the conception that English no longer 'belongs' to only native-speakers" (p. 6). Phillipson (1992), therefore, argues against one English language and for 'several Englishes' as a possible key to the decentralization of ELT. (p. 197) Hence, English is not only a world language but a 'worldly language' (Pennycook, 1994, p. 295).

2.4. English Teachers' Role

Bearing in mind the vital role critical pedagogy envisages for teachers, Pennycook (1999) asserts that English teachers should bear even more responsibilities due to the global status of English. According to Gee (1994) "English teachers stand at the very heart of the most crucial educational, cultural, and political issues of our time" (p. 190). In fact, being "aware of the interlinked facets of English and its underlying ideologies in ELT, English teachers need to approach ELT with more critical minds" (Byean, 2011, p. 5). According to Canagarajah (1999), they should critically question the hidden curricula of their courses and also help their students develop a critical point of view toward hidden aspects of curricula.

2.5. Works Done

Although critical pedagogy has received scholarly attention in the recent few decades, few attempts have been made to design reliable, valid and comprehensive instruments to study where critical pedagogy stands in ELT.

Azimi (2008) developed and validated a critical pedagogy questionnaire for Iranian English teachers, with a focus on the application of critical pedagogy to the classroom.

Yilmaz (2009) developed a 'Principles of Critical Pedagogy Scale' in Turkey to study school teachers' agreement with the principles of critical pedagogy.

Davari and Ghaffar Samar (2011) developed a questionnaire to study Iranian ELT professionals' and university teachers' attitudes on mainstream and critical ELT. This instrument is a 10-item questionnaire which hasn't been factor-analyzed.

Davari, Iranmehr, and Erfani (2012) developed a questionnaire to study Iranian ELT community's attitudes to some practical implications of critical pedagogy in ELT. This instrument, too, is a 10-item questionnaire which hasn't been factor-analyzed.

In the light of the existing body of literature and the lack of a reliable and valid critical pedagogy questionnaire in the context of Iran, this study is an attempt to develop and validate a questionnaire to gauge ELT community's attitude towards the critical standpoint in ELT as opposed to the mainstream ELT.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

This study, given its procedure for data collection and the nature of data collected falls into the category of quantitative research and follows the survey design.

3.2. Sampling

The type of sampling adopted for this research was stratified random sampling. The population was categorized according to level of education, type of institution, and gender. Major also emerged as an a posteriori variable. Then from each category an adequate number of participants were selected randomly.

3.3. Participants

Since internationally-marketed ELT materials are allowed to be used only in private English institutes in Iran, and not in the Iranian public schools, the participants of the present study were English institute teachers. This study also addressed English university professors in that they serve as teacher educators who train and guide prospective English teachers for the private institutes. The respondents were 100 English professors and teachers holding BA, MA, or PhD degrees in different English majors, i.e. Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), English Literature, Translation, and General Linguistics. Their characteristics are provided below in Table 1.

Table 1. Participants' Characteristics.

Level of Education			Type of Institution		Gender		Major	
BA	MA	PhD	University	Institute	Male	Female	TEFL	Other
44	39	17	26	74	52	48	66	34
100			100		100		100	

3.4. Procedure

3.4.1. Data Collection

The researcher distributed the questionnaire in 21 cities of Iran including both major and small cities. In terms of the province, the participants were from Tehran, Alborz, Qom, Azarbayejan-e-Sharghi, Semnan, Mazandaran, Zanzan, Khorasan-e-Razavi, Khorasan-e-Shomali, Golestan, and Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad.

3.4.2. Data Analysis

The collected data were fed into SPSS 19.0.0 and the questionnaire was investigated in terms of internal consistency and construct validity. The statistical measures used were Cronbach's Alpha and Principal Component Analysis, respectively.

3.5. Instrumentation

In this study a Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire was developed through a step-wise process, the details of which are explained below.

3.5.1. Reviewing the Literature

The relevant literature for the content of this questionnaire consisted of critical pedagogy works in ELT. The most productive and well-known resource in this regard was 'Linguistic Imperialism' written by Robert Phillipson. (1992) Other ELT experts who are cited the most after Phillipson in this issue, are A. Suresh Canagarajah (1999, 2005), Alastair Pennycook (1989, 1994, 1999, 2001, 2006), Kumaravadivelu (2003a, 2003b, 2006a, 2006b), and KanvillilRajagopalan (1999, 2004). The common theme in the writings of these authors was the critical standpoint in ELT as opposed to the mainstream ELT, focusing on the role of English in the world and the nature of ELT industry. This constituted the underlying theme of the questionnaire. The sub-themes of the questionnaire were the tenets of the critical standpoint, namely, monolingualism (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b; Phillipson, 1992), monoculturalism (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b), and native-speakerism. (Phillipson, 1992; Rajagopalan, 1999) The issue of the native speaker was seen to be discussed in different respects, that is, native teacher (Phillipson, 1992), native-like pronunciation (Rajagopalan, 2004), and authenticity (Rajagopalan, 1999) of native-designed materials. Therefore, the literature was extracted so as to encompass all these aspects.

3.5.2. Narrowing Down the Literature and Developing Questionnaire Items

Reviewing the literature, around 300 lines were extracted as the raw material which were narrowed down and converted into items. An item pool was drawn up based on the elicited themes, with a 5-point Likert Scale as the questionnaire format. In so doing, the first draft of the questionnaire with 35 items was prepared.

3.5.3. Preliminary Validation, Finalizing Item Wording and the Questionnaire Format

After the researchers confirmed the face validity of the questionnaire, a number of colleagues, including two BA students of English Literature, as well as four instructors (two MA and two PhD holders in TEFL), were asked to read the questionnaire statements and comment on their appropriateness, wording, and relevance. The received comments from the reviewers were applied as long as the main theme behind each item remained intact. In order to ensure an acceptable level of content validity, six university professors, four PhD-holders and two MA-holders in TEFL were asked to provide feedback on different aspects of its content, namely, comprehensiveness, clarity, specificity, fairness, and pertinence. The most notable change was to remove four items which reduced the number of items to 31.

3.5.4. Final Validation

In this stage, the questionnaire was administered to more than 100 professors of English and institute English teachers in 21 cities of Iran. Out of the returned questionnaires, 100 were qualified for use. Following Dornyei (2007) the typed-in data was scanned for cases who had clearly misunderstood the questionnaire or had left many items blank, and also the range of elicited responses by each item was checked by SPSS so as to exclude items that are approved by almost everyone or by almost no one. As for the internal consistency, Cronbach's Alpha indicated a reliability of 0.93 (See Table 2 below) which is acceptable and strong in educational research. (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991)

Table 2. Reliability Coefficient.

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.932	31

Thus the first null hypothesis was *rejected*, that is the Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire showed good internal consistency.

A further step was needed to fully validate the instrument, which was to confirm its construct validity. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was picked and run in SPSS.

The minimal number of participants to do factor analysis is 100. (Hatcher, 1994; Dornyei, 2010) As for factorability of the data, two measures were used, namely, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy, in which the former should be significant ($p < .05$) and the latter should reach a minimal value of .6. (Pallant, 2005, p. 174) Having run PCA, the p value for Bartlett's Test was measured to be .000, which indicated significance. KMO index also enjoyed a value of .863 which was higher than .6. Table 3 below reports the results of these two tests.

Table 3. KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.863
	Approx. Chi-Square	1643.133
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	465
	Sig.	.000

Moreover, the correlations in the correlation matrix should exceed .3. This condition was also met, and thus, the appropriateness of doing PCA was confirmed. (See Table 6) In order to determine the number of meaningful components to retain, scree test was considered but since there was no 'obvious breaks' in the scree plot, as Hatcher (1994, p. 25) explains, Kaiser's criterion or the eigenvalue rule had to be adopted. As a result, 5 components were extracted. The resulting solution was rotated to make the interpretation easier. Since the components were supposed to be uncorrelated, orthogonal rotation was used, not to mention its ease of interpretation, description, and report. (Pallant, 2005) 'Varimax' was chosen out of orthogonal rotations which is the most commonly used. (Hatcher, 1994, p. 28) Table 4 and 5 below show the components and the variance they accounted for before and after rotation, but they include only 7 components out of 31, because components 8 to 31 had eigenvalues smaller than one, and therefore, did not meet Kaiser's criterion.

The decision to be made at this stage was to decide as to how large a factor loading should be in order to determine the remaining items under each component. Hatcher (1994) contends that loadings with absolute values greater than .4 are considered 'meaningful'. (p.29) On the other hand, as he points out, it "is highly desirable to have at least three (and preferably more) variables loading on each retained component when the principal component analysis is complete." (Hatcher, 1994, p.12) Setting the cut-off point at .5 for factor loading, three to seven items are remained under components up to component 5. Table 6 below illustrates the number of remaining items with a high enough loading factor in the rotated component matrix.

Cummulatively, factors should explain at least 50% of the total variance. As can be seen in Table 4, these 5 components accounted for 58% of the total variance. After rotation, this value decreased to 55% which still met the criterion. (See Table 5). Hence, all the statistical requirements for doing an eligible factor analysis were met. At this stage the researchers had to name the remaining meaningful components. The items under the five resulting components perfectly matched in terms of meaning and the components were named accordingly. (See Table 7 below).

Table 4. Total Variance Explained.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.995	35.466	35.466	10.995	35.466	35.466
2	2.304	7.432	42.899	2.304	7.432	42.899
3	1.851	5.971	48.870	1.851	5.971	48.870
4	1.493	4.816	53.686	1.493	4.816	53.686
5	1.360	4.387	58.074	1.360	4.387	58.074
6	1.161	3.744	61.818	1.161	3.744	61.818
7	1.034	3.337	65.154	1.034	3.337	65.154

Table 5. Total Variance Explained After Rotation.

Component	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.902	15.814	15.814
2	4.202	13.554	29.368
3	2.926	9.440	38.808
4	2.923	9.429	48.237
5	2.320	7.483	55.720
6	1.541	4.971	60.691
7	1.384	4.463	65.154

Table 6. Rotated Component Matrix.

Items	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1				.661			
2	.710						
3				.611			
4	.755						
5							

6	.725
7	.815
8	.570
9	.590
10	.554
11	.504
12	.734
13	.522
14	.782
15	.522
16	
17	
18	.732
19	.659
20	
21	.603
22	.580
23	.783
24	.573
25	.749
26	.543
27	.635
28	.658
29	.813
30	.769
31	.518

Table 7. Components and their Corresponding Items.

Components	Items
1. Disbelieving the neutrality of the native-speaker-run ELT	2, 4, 6, 10, 14, 16, 19
2. Countering ELT hidden agendas by favoring Local materials	11, 15, 18, 22, 23
3. Legitimizing sensitivity to the ideology of ELT materials	8, 12, 21, 24
4. Countering Pre-EIL Misconceptions	1, 3, 5, 7, 20
5. Prioritizing EIL principles	9, 13, 17

It should be noted here that since items with loading factors below .5 were ignored, the number of items in the questionnaire was reduced to 24. Therefore the questionnaire with 24 items was confirmed in terms of construct validity as well. In so doing, the second null hypothesis was

rejected, that is, the Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire showed good indices of construct validity as measured by Principal Component Analysis.

This final validated version is provided in Appendix A.

4. Recommendations for Further Research

Critical pedagogy has been explored in Iran for less than a decade and therefore is quite an untouched field of inquiry in this context. In order to investigate the status quo of critical pedagogy among Iranian ELT community, it is worthwhile to develop a knowledge test of critical pedagogy. It also seems helpful to develop similar instruments for English learners as well as ELT policy makers in Iran. Moreover, if the critical standpoint in ELT is going to find a place in Iranian context, instruments can be designed to address relevant concepts such as linguistic imperialism, English as an International Language (EIL), English as a Lingua franca (ELF), and World English(s) (WE).

5. Final remarks

As far as language teaching and learning is concerned, we live in the post-method era with its innovative guidelines. Critical pedagogy is one of those approaches with an egalitarian view towards education and society. The field of ELT has been particularly influenced by the power structures in the world. On the one hand, English, despite its international status, and English language teaching are controlled exclusively by an industry governed by Inner-Circle countries. On the other, the products of ELT industry, while skillfully ignoring the implications of what has come to be known as world Englishes and EIL, are depicting a safe and promising portrait of the Western culture and offering it as an indispensable part of English language learning. What aggravate the situation are the prevalent educational misconceptions held by many ELT experts and professionals around the world who contribute to their own 'self marginalization'. (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a) As Kumaravadivelu (2006a, p. 22) points out, "by their uncritical acceptance of the native speaker dominance, non-native professionals legitimize their own marginalization." It takes a critical pedagogy to relinquish this standpoint and join the critical. What makes the above mentioned critical attitude more important in the country in which the present research has been done is that it has always had strong anti-imperialistic policies and is fully conscious of and highly concerned about the adverse influences of the dissemination of Western ideologies through whatever cultural or non-cultural means. The implication of such a critical attitude is that approaches adopted for the teaching of foreign languages in a country like Iran must be equally critical. Having said this, the researchers would like to suggest that a critical standpoint in ELT with roots in critical pedagogy is what suits the Iranian context in the sense that it has the potentials to counter the much-despised linguistic and cultural imperialism. Furthermore, critical pedagogy, due to its ethical nature, and anti-imperialistic and justice-seeking claims, conforms to the humane and religious values held by people in Iran. In view of the appropriateness and essentiality of applying the principles of critical pedagogy to ELT in the context of anti-imperialistic Iran, one does not need to justify the importance of the role EFL teachers in general and English institute teachers who teach the internationally-marketed ELT products in Iran, in particular, should play in this regard. University professors of English have even a heavier responsibility in that they are not only teachers but also teacher educators. The first step to reach for a critical ELT can be the investigation of the status of the critical standpoint among Iranian ELT community. Therefore, the present study was conducted as a preliminary step for Iranian English teachers to join the critical, that is, paving the way to identify the extent to which Iranian private institute English teachers and Iranian university professors of English are critical of the

hidden and null curricula of internationally marketed ELT materials. In so doing, a Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire was developed and validated in the context of Iran.

References

- Aghagolzadeh, F., & Davari, H. (2012). The Rationale for Applying Critical Pedagogy in Expanding Circle Countries: The Case of Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 823-828.
- Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276-283.
- Aliakbari, M., & Faraji, E. (2011). Basic Principles of Critical Pedagogy. In *2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences IPEDR* (Vol. 17, pp. 78-85).
- Azimi, H. (2008). *On the Attitude of English Teachers and University Students in The Implementation of Critical Pedagogy*. Unpublished master's thesis, TarbiatModares University, Tehran, Iran.
- Baladi, N. (2007). *Critical Pedagogy in the ELT Industry: Can a Socially Responsible Curriculum Find its Place in a Corporate Culture?* Unpublished master's Thesis, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Banegas, D. L. (2010). Teaching more than English in secondary education. *ELT Journal*, 65(1), 80-82.
- Byean, H. (2011). *An Exploration for Glocalizing Critical Pedagogy in the Korean Middle School Context: Toward Critical Co-teaching Praxis between Local and Native-English-Speaking Teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-River Falls—River Falls.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). Critical pedagogy in L2 Learning and Teaching. In E. Hinkel (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. (pp. 931-949). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chege, M. (2009). Literacy and hegemony: Critical pedagogy vis-à-vis contending paradigms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 21(2), 228-238.
- Cox, M. I. P., & Assis-Peterson, A. A. (1999). Critical pedagogy in ELT: Images of Brazilian teachers of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 433-484.
- Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing Your Coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Davari, H. (2011). *Linguistic Imperialism or Global Understanding: ELT in Globalization from an Iranian Perspective*. Unpublished master's thesis, TarbiatModares University, Tehran, Iran.
- Davari, H., Iranmehr, A., & Erfani, S. M. (2012). A Survey on the Iranian ELT Community's Attitudes to Critical Pedagogy. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 101-111.
- Dickerson, L. (2007). *A Postmodern View of the Hidden Curriculum*. Unpublished doctoral Thesis. Georgia Southern University—Statesboro.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. Bergman Ramos, Trans.). NY: Continuum.
- Gee, J. P. (1994). Orality and literacy: From the savage mind to ways with words. In J. Maybin (Ed.), *Language and literacy in social practice* (pp. 168-192). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ghaffar Samar, R., & Davari, H. (2011). Liberalist or Alarmist: Iranian ELT Community's Attitude to Mainstream ELT vs. Critical ELT. *TESOL Journal*, 63 (5), 63-91.

Giroux, H. (1995). Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-Utopianism. In Peter McLaren (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era* (pp. 29-57). London: Routledge.

Hall, G. (2000). *Local approaches to Critical Pedagogy: An Investigation into the Dilemmas Raised by Critical Approaches to ELT* (CRILE Working Paper No. 48). Lancaster, Lancashire, England: Lancaster University. Linguistics Department. Retrieved January 15, 2012, from <http://www.ling.lancs.uk/groups/crile/workingpapers.htm>

Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hatcher, L. (1994). *A Step-By-Step Approach to Using the SAS® System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Hurst, N. R. (2008). The Hidden Curriculum: issues and angst about cultural content in ELT materials. In L. Perez Ruiz, I. Pizarro Sanchez, and E. Gonzalez Cascos, (Eds.), *Estudios de Metodología de la Lengua Inglesa (IV)*, Universidad de Valladolid Publicacions, Centro Buendía, Valladolid, España.

Kasaian, S. A. (2011). *Cultural Resistance and EFL Curriculum Development: An Investigation of the Possible Effects of Resistance to Western Cultural Values on EFL Curriculum Development*. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, University of Mysore, Manasagangothri, Mysore, India.

Kasaian, S. A., & Subbakrishna, R. (2011). Iranian Parents' Resistance to Incompatible Aspects of Western Culture: Implications for ELT Material Development. *CCSE English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 230-239. Retrieved February 7, 2012, from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/9792>

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003a). *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003b). Critical Language Pedagogy: A Postmethod Perspective on English Language Teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539-50.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006a). Dangerous Liaison: Globalization, Empire and TESOL. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re)Locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 1-26). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006b). TESOL Methods, Changing Tracks, Challenging Trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 59-81.

Littlejohn, A. (1992). *Why Are English Language Teaching Materials The Way They Are?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University—Lancaster.

Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the Native Speaker in TESOL. In Z. Syed (Ed.), *Culture, Context, and Communication in English Language Teaching* (pp. 60 – 93). Abu Dhabi: Military Language Institute.

McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an Appropriate EIL Pedagogy: Re-examining Common ELT Assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.

Momenian, M., & Shirazizadeh, M. (2009). Putting Things Right: State-of-the-art on Critical Pedagogy and Writing. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(4), 223-243.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Version 12)*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

- Pennycook, A. (1989). The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-618.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329-348.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). Critical applied linguistics. In *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 283-290). Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier Science.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rajagopalan, K. (1999). Of EFL teachers, conscience, and cowardice. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 200-206.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The Concept of 'World English' and Its Implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 111-117.
- Richards, J.C. (2003). *Current Trends in Teaching Listening and Speaking*. Transcript of JALT National Conference, Shizuoka, November 22-24, 2003. Tokyo: OUP.
- Yilmaz, K. (2009). Elementary School Teachers' Views about the Critical Pedagogy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(1), 139-149.

Appendix A**A Critical Pedagogy Attitude Questionnaire**

Instructions: Read each item and show your level of agreement with it by choosing one of the five choices given.

SA: Strongly Agree A: Agree N: Neutral D: Disagree SD: Strongly Disagree

No.	Statement	S	A	N	D	S	D		
		A				D	D		
	City:	Gender:		Major:		Degree:		Type of Institution:	
		Male	Female	Teaching	Translation	BA	MA	PhD	University
				Linguistics	Literature				Institute
1	In today's world learning English is necessary for every body.								
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-marketed 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.					

Thank you very much