Teachers' Attitudes towards Critical Pedagogy and its Practice in ELT Classrooms

Jagadish Paudel

Abstract

Critical Pedagogy (CP), a mode of pedagogy, aims to empowerlearners and provide justice by offering preferential options and deconstructing authoritative and logo centric tendency in education. The current study, by using a mixed methodological design (qualitative and quantitative), illustrates a group of Nepali English language teachers' attitudes regarding CP in ELT, focusing on how they employ CP in their classrooms. For this research, a sample of 10 teachers was purposively selected from Baitadi and Dadeldhura districts. Five teachers' classes were observed. Analyzing the data collected through a survey questionnaire, it was found that all the teachers are in favour of CP in most cases in ELT. Even if all the teachers were notionally appeared in favor of practicing CP in most of the aspects that were asked to them, quite contrary to it, observation results of the teachers' classes revealed that they did not, in any real sense, embrace CP in their teaching practice. Hence, this study invoked the ELT teachers to embrace CP practically in the classrooms.

Key words:CP, teachers' attitudes, ELT, main stream pedagogy, classroom delivery

Introduction

Looking at the present inclination towards pedagogy across the globe, it is commonly found that most of the Euro-American academic institutions have employed critical pedagogy (CP) for improving quality in education in the country. The concept of CP was originally propounded by the late Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire; later it was advocated and promoted by Antonio Gramsci along with the works of key thinkers from the Frankfurt School (Noroozisiam and Soozandehfar, 2011), and has appeared in "diverse incarnations" (Mclaren, 2002, p. 83) viz. post-modern pedagogy, feminist pedagogy, radical pedagogy, pedagogy of empowerment, transformative pedagogy, pedagogy of possibility, marginalized pedagogy, learner autonomy (Sharma, 2014) and the like.

CP, which situates education in the context of social justice and students' empowerment, has made a great shift in the field of education after the introduction of the seminal book Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1972) by Friere. CP rejects the conventional tendency in ELT, for example, of valuing only American and British English, target language culture, banking model of education and instead it advocates in favor of marginalized and neglected sides in language teaching. CP is a "de-

centering" pedagogy (Daspit& Weaver, 2000). In fact, by de-centering CP strives to empower the people for social transformation. CP seeks to develop humanization in the education sector. Freire(1972) says CP is for personal liberation. For Monchinski (2008) "critical pedagogy is a form of democratic schooling" (p.203). It is an inclusive-democratic approach in the field of education. It is against the mainstream pedagogy. Giroux says critical educational theorists attempt "to empower the powerless and to transform social inequalities and injustices" (as cited in Mclaren, 2002, p.29). Mclean (2006) remarks "critical pedagogy has as its final aim changes in society in the direction of social justice. It has a respectable lineage"(p.1). Giroux says CP offers "preferential options" for the weak and marginalized students. He further states that critical theorists focus on "individualism and autonomy", the liberal democracy (as mentioned in Mclaren, 2002, p.31).

From the literature on CP, ELT practitioners can learn that change can occur, not through global top-down imposition, but from a bottom-up, localized perspective (Phyak, 2011). An approach to teaching that seeks to examine critically the conditions under which language is used and the social and cultural purposes of its use, rather than transmitting the dominant view of linguistic, cultural and other kinds of information. Both the process of teaching and learning and its study are viewed as inherently evaluative or ideological in character (Richards and Schmidt, 2010, p.146).Monchinski (2008) writes "All forms of critical pedagogy respect the context in which knowledge creation and transmission occurs. Knowledge in critical pedagogy is situated and context specific…critical pedagogy attempts to organize the program content of education with the people, not for them" (p.123). By focusing on the context and local, CP also re-introduces the pluralism and de-centralisation of ELT, avoids ELT 'bandwagons', and answers charges of reification and culturalism (Holliday, 1994).

As mentioned above, there are many assertions made by various scholars, authors on CP in ELT. Similarly, there are lots of core tenets of CP in ELT; here, it is plausible to discuss a summary of some core tenets of CP for theoretical background of the present study.

Using nativised English (Nenglish)

In different societies and localities, different forms of English language are developing, with differing lexis, grammar and pronunciation. If we talk in the context of Nepal, a variety of Nepalese English has been developing and creating its space. Rai (2006) has proposed to call Nepalese English variety as 'Nenglish'. Recently, Mid-Western University, a newly established university in Nepal has proposed a course namely 'Nepalese English and Nepalese ELT' for Master level programme (Karn, 2012). The Nenglish has been started to recognize by linguists, for instance, McArthur has mentioned Nenglish as "a sub-variety of South Asian English" (McArthur, 1998, p.97). Similarly, other varieties of English have been developing viz. Hinglish, Singlish and the like. Since native varieties are developing, now, British, American, Canadian and Australian English are no longer the primary concern for teachers and learners. It is thus important to recognise different localized native varieties of English that have been emerging around the globe. Englishes used in Malaysia, India, Hong Kong, Nepal, Japan, Pakistan and in other parts of the world are all influenced by the native language of the regions, and all are distinctive in linguistic features (Phyak, 2011). Some linguists have showed positive attitude in using

nativisedvarieties in ELT classrooms. Reiterating the importance of using nativised varieties, Holmes (2004) argues that the nativised varieties express local aspirations and identities, reflecting linguistics features including stress patterns, vocabulary, grammar usages and semantic concepts.

The use of the L1 in ELT

CP allows the judicious use of the L1 in ELT classrooms assuming that it is beneficial, and also provides justice to language learners. Favoring the use of the L1 in ELT, Deller (2003, in Harmer, 2007, p.133) states that the use of the L1 is useful for students to notice differences between their L1 and the target language, that when students use their L1 between themselves and with the teacher. It has a positive effect on group dynamics; and that it allows students to give on-going feedback about the course and their experiences of learning much more fluently than they would if they were only using English. Similarly, Akbari (2008) asserts that "the judicious use of the students' L1" (p. 280) can be seen as a springboard for transformation in the society. But it is expected that "students make greater use of the L2 as their proficiency increases" (as cited in Rashidi and Safari, 2011, p.256). Disfavoring monolingual policy in education, Phillipson (1992) says monolingualism is the rejection of students' current knowledge of other languages which cuts social reality as well as students' most intense experience in the language, and strives to impose a single lens on the world. Similarly, it is argued that ELT has suffered from a monoglossic bias due to the assumption of the western countries especially North America and the UK that English could only be taught monolingually, rejecting the students' prior knowledge of their own languages (García, 2013).

Involvement of learners in decision making

For CP to be truly effective, learners should have the ownership of lessons. All decisions concerning planning of methodology, syllabus, materials, content, teaching learning activities, project work etc. should ultimately rest with students. Furthermore, it views decision-making as an on-going process of exploration and review, negotiated by all participants within the lesson. Clearly, the key to negotiation is that all participants have an equal status. Power within the classroom can thus be re-conceptualised. We no longer have a limited force of domination; it becomes an expandable force of construction (Reynolds, 1990). The ownership of learning questions who learning is really for. Critical approaches stress that it is not only for learners, but emerges through learners. The individual expertise and experiences of learners rather than teachers are the driving force of the learning process, as participants become investigators, collaborating in search for understanding. Although lessons still focus on English and culture, it is the students' language and culture which is investigated. Teachers can thus 'extricate themselves' from charges of being 'technicians', trivialisation of content and passivating learners (Pennycook, 1990b). Mclaren (2002) writes "critical pedagogy has appeared, in its many diverse incarnations since the beginning, on a collision course with the empowerment of the student as autonomous individual" (p.83). That is to say, CP speaks in favor of learner autonomy. Autonomy is a capacity for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action. It presupposes, but also expects that the learner will develop a particular kind of psychological relation to the process and content of his learning. The capacity for autonomy will be displayed both in the way the learner learns and in the way he or she transfers what has been learned to

wider contexts (Holec, 1983; Little, 1991). Similarly, Hedge (2000) writes it is "the ability of the learner to take responsibility for his or her own learning and to plan, organize, and monitor the learning process independently of the teacher" (p.410).

Learning tools

CP regards dialogue as one of the tools in ELT. While using the dialogical tool, individuals in the classroom are considered as the members of one community in a way that all are potential to teach and learn. Similarly, a kind of mutual acceptance and trust is created between the teacher and learners (Heaney, 1995). CP is in contrast with the anti-dialogical method which holds a "hierarchical classroom structure of teacher over students" (Crawford, 1978, p. 91). It is the approach against the act of depositing knowledge instead it strives to generate knowledge through the processes of interaction, negotiation, partnership work etc. In CP, both teachers and students should play the role of managers of learning. Students hold an equal responsibility for negotiating the necessary pedagogy for their purpose. Young (2007, p. 193) writes "a person's sense of dignity and worth derives from interaction with others who care for him or her, and acknowledge him or her as contributing to their own well being"(as cited in Wise and Velayutham, 2009, p. 35). Similarly, focusing on interaction, Lusted (1986) states that knowledge is not produced with intentions of somebody's belief but it is generated in the process of interaction between the writer and the reader, and between the teacher and the learner at the time of classroom teaching. He further says that to think only teachers and academics as sources of knowledge is wrong.

Incorporation of real-life local and global concerns as teaching topic

It is commonly accepted that the real-life local events make a greater impact on teaching learning activities. Nowadays, ELT practitioners and pedagogues have started to advocate for the incorporation of real-life local events in teaching learning, assuming this leads towards success. But if we talk in the context of Nepal, we won't find the incorporation of real-life topics in all courses, for example, the compulsory English at grade 11 and 12. Phyak (2011) argues:

Through the texts like *how much Bill Gates earns (New Headway/Upper-Intermediate, 1998)* and going on holidays in London, New York, Paris and other expensive cities of the world, the global textbooks are projecting pleasure in life but they are ignoring pain of how a farmer in rural villages works hard to earn money and feed his family. Why don't we have reading texts on holidaying in Jomsom, paragliding from Sarangkot, trekking in Karnali and so on? Can't we think about including the texts related toMaruni, Kauda, Dhan-nach, Deuda, Goura, Maha-puja, and so on? Are they not useful in teaching English? Of course, they are. On one hand, such texts promote interconnectedness between society and classroom teaching/learning and on the other hand, they help to address precious linguistic and cultural diversity we have (NELTA Choutari, January 1, 2011).

Indeed, CP is the approach of appropriating discourses where students' own traditions, cultures and needs are valued. CP always focuses on appropriating, connecting and incorporating the real-life topics into the classroom. CP not only values to real-life local events but also, Lissovoy (2008), it connects students to urgent global questions and to a critical reading of power.Erfani (2012) suggests "thinking globally and acting locally" (p.2413) in the

perspective of preparing the students for a changing world.

Incorporation of learners' local cultures in ELT

For the most part, it is found that culture is an integral part of language teaching which cannot be divorced from it. Nowadays the incorporation of local culture has been vigorously discussed in academia by various scholars.Valuing local culture, Phyak (2011) argues that anything that is 'local' is generally better in terms of quality and permanence. He further draws the examples: local chicken is tasty, local fruit is hygienic, local vegetable is fresh, and local people make a big difference in your life. Nowadays, the incorporation of the learners' local cultures is the most preferred content in ELT. Hunter and Morgan (2001) say "language is not neutral or objective. It is often framed by cultural and institutional perspectives; language represents, creates, and reflects social perspectives of the world, of reality" (p.102). As we know, culture reflects the true identity of a person. In this connection, Noroozisiam and Soozandehfar (2011) say culture is the source of getting real identity of people where language is the vehicle to voice their demands.The familiarity of English culture is necessary when we learn it to communicate with the users of the target language (Aghagolzadeh and Davari, 2012). And this becomes true for the people who want to migrate to countries like the US or the UK for work or study (Akbari, 2008b). Akbari further states that due to the scope of English application both geographically and communicatively, most of the communication carried out in English is between people who are themselves so-called non-native speakers of English with a distinct cultural identity of their own. Focusing on the importance of local culture, Akbari (2008b) argues that reliance on one's own cultures enables the learners to think about the different aspects of the cultures in which they live and find ways to bring changes in society where change is needed and that also make them critically aware and respectful of their own culture (as mentioned in Davari, Iranmehrand Erfani, 2012). Lissovoy (2008) argues that "culturally relevant pedagogy emphasizes the positive content of the cultural space that difference defines, against the subordination of it by the violence of the dominant" (p.109).

The Study

The dominant approaches, methods and techniques, used in ELT classrooms in Nepal, are the Grammar Translation Method, lecturing, paraphrasing, drill, reading and repeating from the textbook, memorizing questions and answers, monolingual language instruction, single session, same materials, and same methods are the general practices in classrooms delivery (Thapaliya, 2012).If we examine primary level education to higher level education in Nepal, some of the ELT courses have incorporated CP; but it is doubted that whether those courses have beeneffectively practicing by embracing CP or not. The ground reality may be different. There may be incompatibility between teachers' attitudes and classroom delivery. Hence, we need to examine teachers' attitudes and existing practice of CP in ELT. Similarly, if we look at research studies and papers that discuss critical pedagogy in ELT in Nepal, we find very few.This study attempts to address two questions: i) What is the teachers' attitudes towards CP in ELT? If they have affirmative attitudes towards it ii) Is there congruency between their attitudes and classroom delivery? To answer these questions the researcher used a mixed methodological design: qualitative and quantitative. The required data were purposively collected by distributing questionnaires to teachers from Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts who have been teaching at the B.Ed. level.Ten-teachers were asked to

complete the likert scale questionnaire about their views on CP in ELT; and five teachers' classes were also observed to examine how they might apply CP in their classrooms.

Results

Questionnaire

Using nativised English (Nenglish)

In order to check teachers' attitudes towards nativised English, in Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts, the following two statements (no. 1 and 2) were asked:

1. Nativised English (Nenglish) can be used in ELT.

2. Only British and American English should be used in ELT.

Regarding the statement no. 1, one of the tenets of CP, findings reveal that 2 teachers agreed on this issue and 8 teachers disagreed. Concerning the statement no. 2, one of the tenets of mainstream pedagogy, findings show that 7 teachers agreed on this issue and 3 teachers disagreed. By the above findings, it can be inferred that most of the teachers are in favourof mainstream pedagogy.

The use of the L1 in ELT

In order to check teachers' attitudes towards the above issue, in Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts, the following two statements (no.3 and 4) were asked:

3. English is best taught monolingually (only through English medium).

4. L1 can,sometimes, be used to facilitate communication and comprehension in English classes.

As regards to statement no. 3, one of the features of mainstream pedagogy, findings reveal that 3 teachers agreed and 7 teachers disagreed on the issue. Likewise, as concerns to statement no. 4, one of the features of CP,

findings show that 7 teachers agreed and 3 teachers disagreed on the issue. Reviewing the results, regarding the questionnaires no. 3 and 4 issues, the majority of the teachers affirmed for intermittent use in favor of the L1 for classroom facilitation and comprehension in English classes.

Involvement of learners in decision making

In order to check teachers' attitudes towards involvement of learners in decision making, in Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts, the following statements (no.5, 6, 7 and 8) were asked.

5. Along with the other stakeholders, university authority should also involve students in choosing syllabus, methodology, content etc.

6. Students should not be involved in selecting and determining objectives, planning of methodology, content and syllabus.

7. Teachers should provide different options to their students while carrying teaching learning activities.

8. While teaching in classroom, teachers should make all the students carry outthe same activities.

Concerning the statement no.5, one of the features of CP, findings show that 7 teachers agreed and 3 teachers disagreed on the issue. Regarding the statement no. 6, one of the tenets of mainstream pedagogy, findings reveal that 6 teachers agreed and 4 disagreed on the issue. As regards to the statement no. 7, one of the features of CP, findings reveal that all the 10 teachers agreed on the issue. As concerns to the statement no. 8, one of the features of mainstream pedagogy, findings show that 7 teachers agreed and 3 teachers disagreed on the issue. Reviewing the results, teachers appeared in line with the CP regarding the issues 5 and 7 but majority of the teachers

appeared against CP regarding the statements no. 6 and 8.

Learning tools

In order to check the teachers' attitude towards the above issue, the following statements (no. 9 and 10) were asked:

9. Interaction, discussion, collaboration, sharing and generating ideas should be teaching learning tools in ELT.

10   Teachers' lecture should be teaching learning tools in ELT.

Concerning the statement no. 9, one of the tenets of CP, findings show that all the 10 teachers agreed on the issue but regarding the statement no. 10, one of the features of mainstream pedagogy, findings reveal that all the 10 teachers disagreed on the issue. From the above data, it can be implied that all the teachers are evidently in favor of CP.

Incorporation of real-life local and global concerns as teaching topic

In order to check the targeted places teachers' attitude towards the above issue, the following statements (no. 11 and 12) were proposed:

11. Local and real-life related events and experiences can be good topics in ELT as global topics.

12. Global issues and problems (environmental, social, etc. issues) can be a   suitable source of English classes.

Regarding the statement no. 11, findings show that 9 teachers agreed and 1 teacher seemed undecided. Concerning the statement no. 12, findings show that 9 teachers agreed and 1 seemed undecided. Hence, this result evidently shows that majority of the teachers are in favor of CP.

Incorporation of learners' local culture in ELT

In order to check the targeted places teachers' attitudes towards the above issue, the following statements (no. 13 and 14) were asked:

13. Students' local culture should be content of teaching.

14. The cultural content of ELT materials should be from the countries where English is spoken as a native language.

Concerning the statement no.13, one of the tenets of CP, findings show that all the 10 teachers agreed and regarding the statement no. 14, one of the tenets of mainstream pedagogy, findings reveal that 3 teachers agreed and 7 teachers disagreed on the issue. By the above result, it is implied that the majority of the teachers have affirmative attitudes towards CP.

Class Observation

From the class observation, it was found that one of the teachers (Ram- pseudonym) started class without motivating the students. He entered into classroom and wrote the title of the story "My Life in the Bush of Ghosts", and did not elicit any ideas from the students about the story. He read the story and told the meaning of words in the story in his own way, without considering students' interests and level. It was quite difficult to know whether he was teaching the story or the meanings of the words in the story. He did not give students chances to anticipate the contents of story. He was delivering a lecture, sometimes using the L1. Sometimes he asked the meaning of words to the students. His teaching focused exclusively on competent students in the classroom. Only two-three students were most often responding to the teacher's questions. Most of the time, the teacher was speaking himself. No interaction and group work were

carried out in the classroom. He did not make use of local dialects in the classroom. He taught the story line by line. He did not give students chances to put opinions. It was found that the teacher was teaching without understanding the level of students, for example, he was telling even the word meaning of 'wheel' for B.Ed. first year students. Sometimes he used the L1 to facilitate communication. From the class observation, it was found that the teacher was depositing knowledge to the students rather than generating ideas from them. The students seemed to be accustomed to be passive recipients. He did not relate the story to the students' real-life events. Moreover, from the observation what was found is that no students asked questions to the teacher, only sometimes the teacher asked questions to the students.

Similarly, from the other three teachers' (Hari, Nuri and Dari- pseudonyms) class observation, the same type of delivery was found. Among the five teachers' class observation, it was found that one of the teacher's class quite different to the four. When Dinesh (pseudonyms) entered into classroom, he greeted the students and asked some questions froma previous lesson. Then he wrote the teaching topic "Gender role". Instead of saying something on gender role and depositing knowledge to the students himself, he tried to generate some ideas from the students but the students did not respond initially. He tried to relate socially, culturally and contextually occurring events to gender role. He was teaching the topic relating to the students' daily life, family, society and classroom context (he was asking such questions – who is more responsible in your family? father or mother? What works does your father do at your home? What works does your mother do at your home? Is gender inborn or constructed? Who wears KurtaSarwal and Pant in your society? and the like). He assigned the students class work as well as gave chances to put their

opinions concerning the topic. Initially, he did not make use of the L1 in the classroom but later he did. As the other teachers, he did not manage the classroom in terms of students' ability and gender; he did not create a supportive environment where less competent students can also put their opinions on the topic being taught. Similarly, he did not assign group work. If we examine his delivery from CP perspective, in comparison to the other four teachers, it was found more satisfactory.

Discussion and implications

From this study, it was found that the majority of the teachers, in most cases, have affirmative attitudes in employing CP but there seemed a lack of compatibility between teachers' attitudes and their deeds. Theoretically, the teachers seemed in favor of CP but in practice most of the teachers were not practicing what they had agreed upon; there seemed weaknesses in classrooms practicing.Thus, it is suggested that CP should be employed in ELT classrooms practically. Canagarajah (2005) looks at CP from "a practice-oriented stance, a way of doing learning and teaching" (p.932). CP is a praxis which demands "action and reflection" on the part of teacher (Freire, 1985).

CP assumes that, along with the development of language skills, ELT should develop awareness of the social structures on the part of learners. We should have the mission of making learners "read their world while read their word" (as cited in Rashidi and Safari, 2011,p.254) . That is, social development and language skills development is sought on the part of the learners. Thus, it pursues a "joint goal" (Crookes & Lehner, 1998, p. 320). This joint goal is reflected in Literacy: Reading the Word and the World by Freire and Macedo (1987). Hence, from the above, it is implied that only teaching words meaning does not foster social development, probably not so much language skills too. Hence, ELT should

equally focus on both: social skill and language skill.

Giroux says CP offers preferential options for the weak and marginalized students. He further says that critical theorists focus on individualism and autonomy (as mentioned in Mclaren, 2002, p.31). As had seen from class observation, almost all the teachers gave attention to competent students only, not to the weak ones; accordingly, it was found that only the competent students were responding to the teachers' questions. Hence, here seemed the teachers' weakness since they did not offer preferential options and alsocreate a situation to come up with the responses to the less competent students too. Therefore, a favorable situation should be created where it would be possible to bring ideas and responses from the less competent ones too.

As a critical educator "teachers must go beyond the roles of technicians, managers or efficient clerks imposed upon them by others and be unwilling to continue to accept the way things are in schools" (Smyth, 2001, pp.23-24).Summarizing Holliday's key speech, NELTA editors in editorial review of NELTA conference proceedings (2011) states that teachers should play the role of transformative intellectual; they should create, understanding social and historical situation, such an environment where students from diverse backgrounds can get opportunities to apply their previous experience and knowledge. It is further stated that ELT teachers can contribute, as an agent of change, to promotion of democracy and critical thinking skills. Monchinski (2008) states "Critical pedagogy reaffirms the democratic faith in human beings' ability to make and remake our worlds" (pp.2-3). It is argued that teachers should not be frightened of leaving their "comfort zones" and taking risks in the classroom as well as demands commitment

to their fields, teachers who will link the subject matter both inside and outside the classroom (Monchinski, 2008). It is commonly realized that the world pedagogy has been changing from authority to democracy, therefore, it is recommended that the students should also be involved in decision making activities, for example, in the selection of methodology, syllabus, materials, designing materials, planning teaching learning activities. The teaching world has shifted from knowledge depositing to knowledge generating mode. Hence, it is suggested that teachers should teach in generating mode rather than depositing knowledge assuming they are the store house of knowledge. Friere (1997) states that the role of teachers is not to transmit knowledge, but to create possibilities for the students' own production or construction of knowledge. It is normally accepted the path of generating ideas from the students lead to the path of exploration. For this reason, it is suggested that to employ dialogue, interaction, discussion, collaboration, sharing. Dialogue increases creative power of teacher as well as students hereby reflects democratic commitment of the both (Monchinski, 2008).

The real-life topics are of importance to see how social actors experience and negotiate cultural difference in their society and how their social relations and identities are shaped and re-shaped (Wise and Velayutham, 2009). CP not only values real-life local events but also, it connects students to urgent global questions and to a critical reading of power. And so, it is suggested that to incorporate real-life concerns and global issues as teaching topic which not only bring interest in students but also make the students updated with the global trends. Akbari (2008b) maintains that reliance on one's own culture enables the learners to think about the different aspects of the culture in which they live and find ways to bring changes in society where

change is needed and that also make them critically aware and respectful of their own culture (mentioned in Davari, Iranmehr and Erfani, 2012). For this reason, it is suggested that local culture needs to be incorporated in their curriculum. As we know, the Nepalese English (Nenglish) is creating space in academic dialogue in Nepal (Karn, 2012), has been used in composing poems, stories, novels, dramas, essay. It is recommended to use the nativised English which not only makes the students learn and grasp the ideas easily but also it sends the message to the world about the Nepalese English variety-Nenglish.

Acknowledgments

About the author

Jagadish Paudel, a faculty at Dadeldhura Multiple Campus (T.U.), Dadeldhura, has done M.A. and M. Ed. in English from Tribhuvan University, Nepal. He, associated in the field of ELT for eight years, has participated and presented papers in national and international conferences. His areas of interest include critical pedagogy, learner autonomy and new trends in ELT.

References

Aghagolzadeh, F. and Davari, H. (2012). The rationale for applying critical pedagogy in expanding circle countries: The case of Iran. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 3, No. 5, pp. 973-980, doi:10.4304/jltr.3.5.973-980.

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276-283. http://dx.dor.org/10.1093/elt/ccn025.

Cannagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford: OUP.

Crawford, L. M. (1978). *Paulo Freire's philosophy: derivation of curricular principles and their application to second language curriculum design.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota. Retrieved from Pro Quest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 7911991).

Crookes, G. & Lehner, A. (1998). Aspects of process in an ESL critical pedagogy teacher education course. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 319-328.

Daspit, T. & Weaver, J.A. (2000). *Popular culture and critical pedagogy: reading, constructing, connecting.* New York: Garland Publishing, INC.

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); www.ccsenet.org/journal/.../elt/...14567

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* London, Penguin.

Freire, P. (1985).*The politics of education: culture, power and liberation,* trans. Donaldo

Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: reading the word and the world.* London: Routledge.

García, O. (2013). Translanguaging to teach English in Nepal. *NELTA Choutari, a professional blog* http://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2013/07/01/translanguaging-to-teach-english-in-nepal/.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: toward a critical pedagogy of Learning.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin Garvey.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching.* London: Longman.

Heaney, T (1995). *Issues in freirean pedagogy.* Retrieved May 30, 2010, from http://www3.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/resources/Documents/FreireIssues.cfm

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context.* Camridge: CUP.

Holmes, J. (2004). *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* London: Longman.

Hunter, J., & Morgan, B. (2001). Language and public life: Teaching multiliteracies in ESL. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 99-109). Case Studies in TESOL Practice Series. Alexandria, VA: TESOL. *Issues in Applied Linguistics.*1/1. pp 8-2.

Karn, S.K. (2012). This is how I can write: towards Nepalese English literature. *Journal of NELTA,* vol. 17.

Lissovoy, N. D. (2008). *Power, crisis, and education for liberation.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Little, D. (1991).*Learner autonomy: Definitions, issues and problems.* Dublin: Authentik.

Mclaren, P. (2002). *Oppositional politics in a postmodern era.* London: Routledge.

Mclean, M. (2006). *Pedagogy and the university: Critical theory and practice.* New York: Continuum.

Monchinski, T. (2008). *Critical pedagogy and the everyday classroom.* New York, USA: Springer.

Noroozisiam, E. & Soozandehfar, S.M.A. (2011). Teaching English through critical pedagogy: problems and attitudes. *Theory and practice in language studies, 1* (9), 1240-1244.

Paudel, J. (2014). *Critical pedagogy in ELT: A case of Dadeldhura and Baitadi districts.* An unpublished mini-research, office of the dean, faculty of education, Tribhvan University, Kathmandu.

Pennycook, A. (1990b). Towards a Critical Applied Linguistics. *Issues in Applied Linguistics,*1(1), 8-28.

Phillipson, R. (1990). *English language teaching and imperialism.* Denmark,

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phyak, P. (2011). Towards local literacy: Globalization and Nepalese ELT. *NELTA Choutari,a professional blog* http://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2011/01/01/towards-local-literacy-for-nepalese-elt/.

Rai, V.S.(2006). English, Hinglish and Nenglish. *Journal of NELTA, 11,* 24-33.

Rashidi, N. & Safari, F. (2011). A Model for EFL Materials Development within the Framework of Critical Pedagogy (CP).*English language teaching, 4*(2)

Reynolds, M. (1990). Classroom power: Some dynamics of classroom talk language and power 5. *BAAL Papers from the 22nd annual meeting.*

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Longman (Pearson Education).

Sharma, B. (2013). *The Critical in Language Education*. A guest lecture at Kathmandu University, Nepal.

Smyth, J.(2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice.* New York: Continuum.

Thapaliya, M.P. (2012). Teaching short story through critical thinking (CT) strategies. *Journal of NELTA*, *17*, 93-103.

Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday multiculturalism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix A: Questionnaire Results of the Teachersa.

a.   Using nativised English (Nenglish) in ELT

1. Nativised English (Nenglish) can be used in ELT.		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		1	1	0	8	0
	N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
	N	2		0	8	

2. Only British and American English should be used in ELT.		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		0	7	0	3	0
	N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
	N	7		0	3	

b.   The Use of L1 in ELT

3. English is best taught monolingually (only through English medium).		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
		0	3	0	7	0
	N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
	N	3		0	7	

4. L1 can be used to facilitate communication and comprehension in English classes.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	0	7	0	3	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	7		0	3	

c.   Involvement of learners in decision making

5. Along with the other stakeholders, university authority should also involve students in choosing syllabus, methodology, content etc.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	3	4	0	3	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	7		0	3	

6. Students cannot make decision in selecting and determining objectives, planning of methodology, content and syllabus.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	1	5		4	
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	6		0	4	

7. Teachers should provide different options to their students while carrying out teaching learning activities.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	3	7	0	0	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	10		0	0	

8. While teaching in classroom, teacher should make all the students carry out same activities.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	1	6	0	3	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	7		0	3	

d. Learning tools

9. Interaction, discussion, collaboration, sharing and generating ideas should be teaching learning tools in ELT.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	3	7	0	0	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	10		0	0	

10. Teachers' sermon should be teaching learning tools in ELT.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	0	0	0	10	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	0		0	10	

10. Teachers' sermon should be teaching learning tools in ELT.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	0	0	0	10	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	0		0	10	

e. Incorporation of real-life related and global concerns as teaching topic

11. Local and real-life related events and experiences can be good topics in ELT as global topics.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	2	7	1	0	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	9		1	0	

12. Global issues and p r o b l e m s (environmental, social, etc. issues) can be a suitable	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	2	7	1	0	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	9		1	0	

f.   Incorporation of learner's local culture in ELT

13. Students' local culture should be content of teaching.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	2	8	0	0	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	10		0	0	

14. The cultural content of ELT materials should be from English language.	Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	0	3	0	7	0
N	Agree		Undecided	Disagree	
N	3		0	7	

Appendix B: Classroom Observation Form

Name of the Teacher: ……………………

Name of the Campus:……………………

Observed Class:……………………...……..

1.   How was the diversity managed?

In terms of a. ability b. ethnicity c. gender

2.   What did the teacher maximize- TTT or STT?

3.   Did the teacher assign different works to different students (according to the students' level)?

4.   What roles did the teacher play in the classroom? (authoritarian, manager, sharing, informant, source of advice, caring, evaluator, creator of classroom atmosphere etc.)

5.   Which teaching strategies did the teacher follow in the classroom?

a. Lecture b. Demonstration c. Discussion d. Question answer (lesson method) e.

Simulation f. Role play g. Project work h. Personal coaching

6.   Did the teacher contextualize the teaching?

7.   Did the teacher mobilize all the students in the classroom?

8.   Were all the students active during the class?

9.   Did the teacher create opportunities to the students to put their opinions?

10. Did the teacher involve the students in critical thinking and analysis of the language item?

11. Do the students and teacher use contextual language in the ELT classroom?

12. Does the teacher provide choices or possibilities or alternatives in ELT classroom?

13. Are the learners free to think themselves, to behave intellectually without coercion from teacher?