



AMC Journal (Pp. 18-33)
(A Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal, Indexed in NepJOL)

Research Management Cell

Adarsha Multiple Campus, Gajuri, Dhading

DOI: : <https://doi.org/10.3126/amcj.v5i1.75959>

ISSN: 2717-4808 (Print) 2738-9987 (Online)

Critical Pedagogy in Higher Education: EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Applications

Devi Prasad Adhikari* & Dr. Gopal Prasad Pandey**

Abstract

Critical Pedagogy (CP) is a radical approach in education that transforms English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms into a discursive, interactive, and dialogic platform for raising students' voices. The practice of CP in the classroom helps teachers to patronize their students' oppressive voices. This study explored the perceptions and practices of critical pedagogy among higher-level EFL teachers. This is a qualitative study. It comprises a small sample; representing each university-level EFL teacher from different five colleges in Dhading district in Nepal. We used semi-structured interviews to collect information. The findings indicate that EFL teachers teaching at higher levels in Nepal are aware of students' voices. They are practicing CP in their classrooms although they do not sound principally knowledgeable on CP. The practices of CP have fostered classroom environments supportive of hearing students' suppressive voices. The teachers exhibited a positive stance on the importance of students' voices within the classroom, actively listening to students' interactions and encouraging their critical involvement in classroom dialogues. More broadly, classroom attentions by teachers to individual students are required to better practice CP.

Keywords: Critical pedagogy, EFL, pedagogy of oppressed, students' participation, students' voices

* Mr. Adhikari is a PhD Scholar at Graduate School of Education, Tribhuvan University. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4163-2595>. Email: deviprasad.adhikari@gmail.com

** Dr. Pandey is an Associate Professor at University Campus, Central Department of English Education, Tribhuvan University. Email: gpandeytu@gmail.com

Introduction

The origins of incorporating critical practices in education can be traced back to Freire's influential work, 'Pedagogy of the Oppressed' against the traditional banking model (Khanal, 2023; Luitel et. al., 2022). Freire's ground-breaking concepts regarding education, pedagogy, and the learning process laid the groundwork for the development and implementation of critical pedagogy (Nols et al., 2019). In the book, Freire gives insights to the teachers to be more democratic to incorporate students' voices in classrooms. Students' voices in the classroom are crucial aspects of effective teaching and learning. Teachers, who aim to create an interactive and engaging learning environment need to prioritize listening to their students. Classrooms where teachers stifle the voices of students tend to lack vibrancy. Thus, teachers are free to have a choice of pedagogy to comprehend the learners' voices.

Critical pedagogy helps to facilitate teachers in acknowledging and embracing students' voices. The main thrust of critical pedagogy is to explore oppressed voices of students. According to Freire (2010), the students labelled as the oppressed often face directives from teachers, urging them to conform to certain behavioural norms. Further, Freire (1998a) argues that critical pedagogy is a way to help people who are oppressed to gain power. He believes that this can be done by encouraging them to speak up and think critically about their situation.

Furthermore, critical pedagogy holds significant importance in fostering both interactive and critical thinking skills among students. Critical thinking involves the capacity to express opinions and perspectives. Aliakbari and Allahmoradi (2012) view that CP involves a classroom environment that is democratic, where students' viewpoints are highlighted. Similarly, CP challenges any form of domination, oppression and subordination (Aliakbari & Faraji, 2011). It helps to create closeness between teachers and students. Closer relationships increase opportunities for interactions between teachers and students.

Conversely, teachers have the freedom to select teaching pedagogies that cater to the needs of their students. By employing impactful pedagogical approaches, the expression of students' voices can be enriched. Teachers have the opportunity to opt for methodologies that encourage students to actively participate in critical discussions. Critical pedagogy, in particular, fosters an environment where students engage with content thoughtfully and interactively.

Moreover, critical pedagogy is also the “pedagogy of hope” (Freire, 1992). It provides chances to change their hope into reality. If a teacher can change the classroom,

students can change many things by themselves. Similarly, CP provides historical, cultural, political, and ethical direction for those in education who still dare to change. Such pedagogy has been the invocation of students' voices as a measurement of participation presumed that when spaces are made in schools and classrooms for students' voices to be heard, their participation would be enhanced. Thus, critical pedagogy becomes a part of the classroom to surface the voice of students. Through discussion and debate, there is a sharing of power and dialogue among students and teachers (Aliakbari & Allahmoradi, 2012). The effectiveness of pedagogy depends on the affirmative perception of teachers. Although CP provides the students with chances to present their voices (Freire, 2005), teachers in many contexts do not opt for the pedagogy. They rather knowingly and unknowingly suppress their learners' voices. Their methods of teaching hinder the learners from exploring their voices. Teachers bear the responsibility of cultivating critical thinking skills in students and ensuring that their voices are heard. Following student-centric activities, critical pedagogy guides the learners towards collaborative conversations, which help them put their voices in the right manner, right time and right places.

As a long time teaching practitioners, we observed that in the Nepalese educational setting, there is limited student-teacher interaction, leading to a deficiency in developing a habit of critiquing. Consequently, the study sought to explore the perspectives and methodologies employed by EFL teachers teaching at higher level in Nepal.

The study was carried out in the context where teachers mostly follow traditional approaches in teaching language. Traditional instructional methods are still dominant in Nepal (Kadel, 2020). Modern pedagogical practices only gradually began to emerge in Nepal's national education system plans after 1971 (Mainali, & Heck, 2015). The government's plans and policies advocate the use of recent and interactive pedagogies in classrooms, however, there is still a long way toward inclusive and high-quality education (Pangeni, 2014), and pedagogy that aims more at the comprehension of subject matter than high pass rates in examinations. Mainali and Heck (2015) claim that teachers in Nepalese government schools and colleges generally use the textbook as an ultimate means of teaching: they explain the content and try to transmit it into their students' minds by drill and practice. Students memorize matters but do not practice thinking for themselves. The teachers rarely apply the pedagogies that play an effective role in enhancing students' interactive voices in Nepalese EFL classrooms. In this context, this article has been written.

Objectives

This study aimed to investigate how higher-level teachers have implemented critical pedagogy in EFL classrooms and explore their perceptions of it. Specifically, the study comprises the following objectives:

- i. To explore teachers' perceptions of critical pedagogy and its relevance in higher education settings.
- ii. To investigate how teachers implement critical pedagogy in their classroom practices at the higher education level.

The novelty of this paper lies in recognizing the implementation of critical pedagogy within EFL classrooms. The application of the pedagogy holds significance in fostering students' ability to critically analyse, leading to enhanced self-awareness and a more meaningful life orientation for the students. Significantly, the findings of the study will empower educators to advocate pedagogical approaches based on inclusivity, critical appraisal and self-directed learning. This new paradigm of critical pedagogy can also transform language teachers into professional pedagogues.

Literature Review

Critical pedagogy is an appropriate pedagogy to hear the voices of learners. For Freire (1973), this becomes the role of a "pedagogy of oppressed." In other term, it is similar to critical pedagogy that helps the oppressed people to critically examine the nature of oppression, and act to change their conditions. Critical pedagogy emphasizes the importance of students' active participation in their learning, in contrast to the conventional "banking model" that treats students as passive recipients (Khanal, 2023). The pedagogy is necessarily dedicated to the development and evolvement of a culture of schooling that helps to empower culturally marginalized and economically deprived students. Critical pedagogy tries to transform classroom structure and practices that perpetuate an undemocratic life. Critical pedagogy is a major approach to education that seeks to transform oppressive structures in society and the classroom using democratic and activist approaches to teaching and learning (Darder et al., 2003; Freire 1973). The goal of critical pedagogy is to enhance freedom through personal and social transformation (Braa & Cellerio, 2006) and the application of critical pedagogy has the potential to affect change.

According to Smyth (2011), a critical pedagogy of schooling extends well beyond a mere 'reflective' teaching approach and traditional banking model (Luitel et al., 2022). Giroux (1983) argues that the limitation of the reflective approach lies in its severe constraints, as it is significantly restricted by what it overlooks. Being critical, or

engaging in critique, involves analysis, enquiry and critique into the transformative possibilities implicit in the social context of classrooms and schooling itself. Smyth (2011) further considers that the intent of critical pedagogy is that of ‘liberation’ in the sense that people want to go with their interests. In this regard, Wink (2005) claims that critical pedagogy gives voice to the voiceless; and gives power to the powerless. However, change is often difficult. Critical pedagogy is all about change from coercive to collaborative; from transmission to transformative; from inert to catalytic; and from passive to active. Wink further contends that engaging in critical pedagogy motivates us to become advocates and activists for the most vulnerable individuals within both classroom settings and broader society.

Moreover, critical pedagogy contributes to instigating transformation among the learners concerning transforming relations of power that are oppressive, and lead to the oppression of people (Kincheloe, 2005). Oppressed people are those who have been excluded from the social, economic, and cultural aspects and unheard in different contexts (Freire, 1998a). Critical pedagogy releases the voice of the oppressed people and makes the authorities listen. In the context of language classrooms, learners can project their voices freely to their teachers. Dharam (2007) suggests that both students and teachers should act with awareness-raising critiques having the aim of identifying positive and negative aspects of education. Thus, teachers should challenge the current structure by rejecting long-standing cultural expectations and mores of their own and the system, additionally, they must give up much of the power which is given to them through their titles (Foley, 2007). It is the power of language that enables students to enlarge their scope of understanding (Dheram, 2007). Similarly, Giroux (2018) suggests that with the help of critical, oppositional, and theoretical language, teachers can move toward a discourse by which they seek educational criticism.

In this regard, Kincheloe (2005) maintains that teachers must empower their students by raising their awareness of the reproducing process of an inequitable status quo in schooling and offer societal institutions. Teachers act as transformative agents for the students. So, teachers, in Giroux’s terms, are ‘Transformative Intellectuals’ who have the knowledge and skills to critique and transform existing inequalities in society (Sadeghi, 2008). As time practitioners of ELT, we believe that teachers can enhance students’ critiquing ability about the inequality in every aspect of society through classroom practices adopting critical pedagogy. Having long-time teaching experience, we strongly believe that language teachers have more chances to facilitate students in increasing their critiquing capacity. The teachers have the authority to let students speak about their issues. They can hear the voices of the students in classrooms whose voices have been oppressed in the society. Classrooms could be a platform to recognize and flourish the

oppressed voices of the learners. To practice it well, the teachers need to opt discourse-discourse-friendly pedagogies such as critical pedagogy.

However, as a longer period witnesses or practitioners of the language classrooms, we do not find students flourishing their critiquing capacity to its full extent. Traditional instructional methods are still dominant in Nepal. Modern pedagogical practices only gradually began to emerge in Nepal's national education system plans after 1971. Classroom experiences, with the help of the teachers, should become situations in which students are encouraged to act as active agents in their education and to develop a critical consciousness that helps them evaluate the validity, fairness, and authority within their educational and living situations (Freire, 1998b). Critical pedagogy, in this context, is a foundational method that supports students in elevating their awareness and comprehending their full potential. Similarly, Degener (2001) states that a critical educator helps students to understand the reasons behind the facts. Correspondingly, it is useful in EFL classrooms. The learners' critiquing capacity is beneficial in their social life as well. Incorporating students' voices in the classroom requires deliberate intention and commitment. While critical pedagogy has yielded favourable outcomes in education through the transition from conventional to critical pedagogy, there has been a lack of emphasis on addressing the implementation challenges and issues in Nepal (Paudel, 2020). While Kadel (2020) conducted a study focusing on secondary-level teachers, there is an absence of research investigating the perceptions and practices of university-level teachers regarding the practice of critical pedagogy in the Nepalese context. Thus, this research is an endeavour to explore how tertiary teachers perceive and practice critical pedagogy in EFL classrooms. This study mainly aimed to investigate the perception towards critical pedagogy and its practices in higher-level EFL classrooms by teachers.

Methods and Materials

This research adopted an interpretivist paradigm (IP) employing a qualitative approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015) to focus on the consciousness and essence of phenomena towards elaborative and interpretive dimensions (Finlay, 2009). In this study, we applied qualitative inquiry which allows emergent research questions, emergent modes of inquiry and emergent reporting structure (Creswell, 2012; Taylor et al., 2012) and attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions with ordinary people in the particular situation of daily lives (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). As researchers, we collected for stories of the research participants to look for ways to gain and represent experiences (Clandinin & Caine, 2013; Creswell, 2007; Lapan et al., 2012; Stephen et al., 2012). Teachers' and students' narrative reflections are valuable tools for comprehending critical pedagogy.

We selected one English teacher teaching at a bachelor's level purposively from each of five different campuses of Dhading district out of 12 community campuses. The teachers, we selected as participants have more than 10 years of experience in teaching English and each of them holds at least a master's degree in education. We assigned pseudonyms to the participants for ethical consideration (Creswell, 2012; Flick, 2012). We used pseudonyms such as Tirtha, Mohan, Tara, Manu and Vim to hide their real names.

Table 1
Demography of participants

Teacher	Qualification	Years of experience	Age	Gender
Tirtha	M. Ed., M. Phil.	21	52	Male
Mohan	M. Ed.	13	45	Male
Tara	M. Ed.	10	38	Female
Manu	M. A.	11	39	Female
Vim	M. Ed.	11	42	Male

We used semi-structured interviews as the tool for collecting information which is considered an adaptable and exploratory measure that allows the participants to potentially take the study in unforeseen directions (Gaylor & Nicol, 2016). We took consent from every teacher to interview them. We duly followed interview protocols. The approach of the interviews involves sharing the participants' stories (Suryana et al., 2021). We conducted some follow-up interviews in informal settings.

We obtained informed consent from all participants before conducting interviews in formal or informal settings to hear their stories. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and the information was then coded and categorized into five themes. Repetitions were removed from the data to ensure accuracy and prevent the fabrication, falsification, or misrepresentation of research information (Gajjar, 2013). Further, we mentioned the findings based on the recurrent patterns identified in the information. The narratives were organized and described into different themes. Similar occurrences and anecdotes from the participants were categorized under each overarching theme.

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the findings of the study based on the information gathered under research questions. The study mainly aimed to investigate how higher level teachers have practiced critical pedagogy in EFL classrooms and to explore their

perceptions on it. The analysis of findings has been presented under five different overarching themes that represent the key insights or patterns that reflect the participants' experiences or the core findings of the research.

Navigating pedagogical knowledge: Teachers' awareness and application of critical pedagogy

Regarding the question of general information about CP, three teachers responded that they knew about it. They said that they had learned a chapter about CP in their master's degree course. They believed CP was a useful pedagogy for teaching language. One of the teachers (Tirtha) did not have a fundamental idea of CP. Another teacher (Manu) knew a little bit about critical pedagogy. From all of their narrations, we discovered that they employed interactive methods in their classrooms. Each of them conveyed that the utilization of collaborative learning practices can improve students' interactive behaviours both within the classroom and in their social interactions.

Although two teachers (Manu and Tirtha) did not have theoretical knowledge regarding critical pedagogy, they were aware that interactive pedagogy enhances the critical thinking ability of the students. They both agreed that an interactive classroom is helpful for students to raise their voices. Responses of all the teachers showed that they have a better understanding of interactive pedagogy. Examples of their response include 'We're fully aware that it is needed to use critical pedagogy to raise students' voice' (Mohan and Vim), 'I know that I have to use interactive pedagogy to encourage students to speak their voice' (Tara). Based on their comprehension, it can be deduced that teachers possess varying degrees of knowledge about interactive pedagogy.

The transformative power of CP in fostering student interaction and critical thinking

In this regard, we asked them how CP was helpful in classrooms. Mohan, Vim and Tara shared that they had experiences of applying critical pedagogy in classrooms. They found it useful to enhance students' creativity and criticality. They experienced that when they used CP they found students critiquing in the issues presented by the teachers. When the teachers allowed students to talk, they liked to critically present their views. The students started to critically assess their friends' ideas and views. Tirtha also found his classroom interesting when students interact. He said, "When my students interact with me, I feel more interested to support them in learning." "When students find the interactive environment in the classroom, they like to freely express their ideas, concepts and opinions," Tirtha added.

Mohan has been teaching English at a higher level for more than ten years. He allowed students to speak in the class. He found his silent students speaking in the issues although they did not willingly take part in the beginning. He thought practicing interactions in classroom helped students forward their ideas on different issues. Mohan shared similar experiences, "I have found my students interested to interact when I allowed them to speak on issues. In the beginning, some students seemed reluctant to put their ideas but slowly they started following their friends who freely talked in the issues raised in classroom."

Although Manu is not principally aware about critical pedagogy, she practiced interactive classes. She believed that interactions and discussions in classroom between teacher and students, among students help students grow their critiquing habits. She shared that she provided ample opportunities to her students to discuss the issues. Without much interaction in classroom, it is not possible to make our students critical and creative (Manu). All of the teachers had experience that when they allowed students to speak, interact in the classrooms freely, they developed critical thinking ability.

Cultivation of interactive learning environments: Teachers' commitment to student participation

We inquired about the teachers' consciousness regarding participation of students in classroom interaction. They all claimed that they were conscious regarding their students' involvement in classroom discussions. Tara, Mohan and Tirtha claimed that they were fully conscious on the use of discussions, interactions and students' participations in the classrooms. They believed that these emphasize on student-centred activities in order to make them critical and creative. Tara not only a teacher for ten years, but also the mother of two children treated her students like her children in order to foster interactive environment in classrooms. She believed that her students who were silent and passive started taking part in discussion when she listened them individually. In large class, she practiced group discussions. She thought that when teacher became close to them, they share ideas on issues. She shared, "I often encourage passive students to avoid hesitation. I become close to them, hear them well and check their copies being close to them. I freely allow them to talk or present their voices."

Similarly, Manu has been teaching English at bachelor's level for eleven years but does not principally know about critical pedagogy. However, she is fully aware about the importance of interactions and participation of students in classroom. She mentioned that teachers who fostered interactive environment in classrooms could enhance students'

critiquing habits. She believed that teachers should inspire and motivate students to participate in classroom interactions. She pointed, "I believe that students could not develop critical thinking without participating in interactions. They have to participate in classroom. They should be critical and interactive."

The responses of the participants show that all teachers are conscious on the use of interactions and discussions in the classroom. They all agree that the interactions in classroom is necessary. Teachers have to create interactive environment in classroom to involve and make the students critically interactive.

Teachers' endeavours to hear and respond to student voices

All the teachers as participants in the interviews assured that they often paid attention to their students' voices in classroom. They enjoyed interactions in classroom. Students did not willingly talk in the beginning but they slowly engaged in interactions when teachers showed interest to listen them (Vim). All teachers claimed that they liked to listen their students in classrooms.

However, in large classrooms, teachers faced difficulty to listen student individually. Manu put, "Since I handle large classes (60-70 students), it is often more difficult to have individual interaction with each student. I try to listen them in group." Mohan had similar experiences, "I allow them to interact in three- or four-day's gap. In large class, I often try to listen individually. I divide the class into groups. I allow either a group in a day to interact". Tara also managed the large class forming small groups in order to listen students' voices.

Overall, the teachers listened students' voices in their classrooms. They had the experiences that large classrooms did not support to handle voices of students easily, individually, regularly and promptly. Although it was not easy to listen voices of students in large classes, we found that the teachers managed to listen voices from groups and peers. They also adopted time frame to listen them in the large classrooms.

Empowering student voices: Strategies and challenges in encouraging classroom participation

Regarding the issue of empowering students raising their voice in the classroom and outside, the teachers mentioned that they encouraged to raise their voices every time. They claimed that they had put considerable efforts to explore the voices of silent students and change them to be critical, creative and interactive. They said that they

largely encouraged students to put their voices in classroom using different methods and techniques. Sometimes, they also used punishment and reprimands if students ignored to take part in interactions. They also prepared guidelines for participating in classroom discussions. Tirtha put, "A student may remain silent because of his personal habit or their family or social background. I encourage them to raise up their voices. I used different methods, techniques or pedagogy to shape habit to present their voices critically." In a similar tone, Mohan viewed, "Humm... for the silent students I give easy tasks to encourage. They have to present in their group. I also motivate them to speak giving interesting topics or issues."

In this regard, a teacher had a bit different experience. Sometimes, teachers had to impose rules and put pressure to listen students' voices (Manu). Manu mentioned, "I imposed rules to students to speak in the class. I even threatened them to reduce marks in practical examinations if they did not participate in interactions".

In general, teachers exerted significant efforts to encourage their students to be actively engaged, interactive and creative. They achieved this through the implementation of rules and regulations, occasionally applying pressure to prompt students to express their opinions when deemed necessary.

Discussion

Examining the efficacy of critical pedagogy, it was observed that all five teachers held the perspective that CP proved to be highly beneficial in their classrooms. They actively incorporated its principles to uncover the voices of their students. All of them asserted their awareness of their students' engagement in day-to-day classroom discussions and interactions. The results align with Thiessen (2006), who concurred that there is a growing emphasis on actively seeking the perspectives of students in classroom practices. The teachers stated that they emphasized on activities that create the situations for students to interact critically. Nevertheless, the methods employed by the teachers to encourage their students to present their ideas critically in the classroom lacked explicit strategies. This indicates that while the teachers are implementing critical pedagogy, there is a lack of clarity in the specific strategies employed, echoing the observations made by Thiessen (2006) in his study on teachers as researchers.

Similarly, participants' stories revealed that teachers were conscious about the students' involvement in classroom activities in order to enhance their critiquing habits (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021). They believed that students could not develop critical thinking without participating in such activities. This idea integrates with the perspective

of Aliakbari and Allahmoradi (2012), who assert that critical pedagogy necessitates a classroom setting characterized by democracy. In such an environment, students' perspectives take centre stage through discussions and debates, fostering shared power and dialogue between teachers and students. Students need to involve themselves in classroom dialogues in order to develop critiquing ability.

Regarding participation of students in classroom activities, teachers agreed that academically lower ranking students tend to be less active whereas students having good ranks are often proactive. The teachers claimed that they encouraged the former category of students to put their voices freely. However, they did not find expected result as they mentioned. On contrary to this, Bista (2012) discovered that the responses of both teachers and fellow students in the classroom impacted the subsequent engagement levels of the students. Bista further mentioned that skilful teachers always gave enough time for their students to respond instead of expecting immediate responses to every query.

Moreover, in the process of fostering critical thinking among students both within and beyond the classroom, pedagogy assumes a pivotal role. How teachers employ pedagogical approaches holds a significant influence on this transformation. Similar to the view of Fabbian and Carney (2018), transformative education is the practice of freedom which fosters the development of critical thinking. Being critical, or engaging in critique, involves analysis, enquiry and critique into the transformative possibilities implicit in the social context of classrooms and schooling itself (Smyth, 2011; Kopnina, 2020). The experiences of participants showed that student-centric activities, dialogues and interactions played an important role in boosting learners' exposure to creative enquiry and creative involvement in social activities. Freire (2005) also believes that critical transitivity is characteristic of authentically democratic regimes and corresponds to the highly permeable, interrogative, restless and dialogical form of life.

Additionally, based on the findings, it was evident that teachers made efforts to boost critical interactions among their students in the classroom. Nevertheless, teachers acknowledged the challenges of fostering critical interactions, particularly in larger class settings. Teachers also accepted that they often did not give chance for all students because of time constrain. They asked the students to speak allotting a certain time twice a week. These rare chances and allotment of certain times do not suffice for raising their voices. Students who rarely talk in class view the classroom as a threatening environment and show more concern about how they are perceived by classmates and teachers (Tatum & Schwartz, 2013). The findings indicate that the controlled interactions imposed by teachers within specific time frames and intervals do not have a positive effect on silent students.

Moreover, the study found that teachers had a willingness to promote the critical ability of students. Though two of them had principally little understanding and perception of critical pedagogy, they practised it. Their practice of pedagogy has helped to increase students' participation, which is helpful to present themselves in critical discourses. In a similar vein, Giroux (2018) suggests that with the help of critical, oppositional, and theoretical language, teachers can move toward a discourse by which they seek educational criticism.

In summary, the findings suggest that English teachers at the university level possess a moderate level of understanding and knowledge about critical pedagogy. While they may not exhibit extensive familiarity with the principles of critical pedagogy, they demonstrated practical experiences in implementing this pedagogical approach in their classrooms. These experiences align with Jordan's (2012) perspective. According to him, when students do not adhere to behavioural expectations, teachers frequently resort to more authoritarian approaches such as detention, stern verbal admonishment, or other forms of coercive management. This contradicts the study's findings as well as the practical application of critical pedagogy in teaching.

Conclusions and Implications

This research delved into the practices and perspectives of critical pedagogy among EFL teachers at the tertiary level. Based on the analysis of the participants' shared experiences, it can be inferred that university EFL teachers in the Nepalese context demonstrate an awareness of critical pedagogy. While not all teachers may possess a foundational theoretical understanding of CP, they incorporate its principles into their teaching. Teachers exhibit a positive stance on the importance of students' voices within the classroom, actively listening to students' interactions and encouraging their critical involvement in classroom dialogues. They attentively observed students' interactions, fostering their active participation in classroom discussions with a critical approach. They recognized the significance of listening to students' voices as a means to improve their habits of constructive criticism. On the flip side, teachers possess a complete understanding of the importance of students' voices.

Implications apart, one must keep in mind that this study focused on a very limited area of a topic and took few teachers as a sample. The discussion shows that it is not easy to create a classroom environment for individual dialogue and interaction in large classrooms. It would be beneficial in the future if this study could be replicated and validated on a larger and more representative sample comprising students and on more

issues in CP in order to generalize the results to the Nepalese EFL classroom context. More broadly, classroom attentions by teachers to individual students are required to better practice CP in large classrooms. Along with the issue of critical pedagogy, there are still many concerns unexplored regarding use of modern pedagogy and post pedagogy in context of Nepalese EFL classrooms.

Acknowledgements

Mr. Devi Prasad Adhikari, as the principal author, would like to acknowledge the University Grants Commission Nepal for providing the PhD Fellowship and Research Support (PhD-079/80-Edu-05) to conduct this research, titled "Critical Pedagogy in Higher Education: EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Applications." I also extend my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Gopal Prasad Pandey, who co-authored this study.

References

- Aliakbari, M., & Allahmoradi N., (2012). On Iranian schoolteachers' perceptions of the principles of critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 4(1), 154-171.
- Aliakbari, M., & Faraji, E. (2011). Basic principles of critical pedagogy. In *2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences*, 17. IACSIT Press.
- Banegas, D. L., & Gerlach, D. (2021). Critical language teacher education: A duo-ethnography of teacher educators' identities and agency. *System*, 98, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102474>
- Bista, K. (2012). Silence in teaching and learning: Perspectives of Nepalese graduate students. *College Teaching*, 60 (2), 76-82.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2011). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. (5th Ed). PHI Learning.
- Braa & Cellerio (2006). Critical pedagogy and classroom praxis. *Teaching in Sociology*, 34, 357-369.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Caine, V. (2013). *Narrative inquiry*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Sage.
- Degener, S. C. (2001). Making sense of critical pedagogy in adult literacy education. *Annual Review of Adult Learning and Literacy*, 2(1), 26-62.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2003). *The critical pedagogreader*. Routledge.
- Dheram, P. (2007). Empowerment through critical pedagogy. *Academic Leadership*, 5(2), 1-7.

- Fabbian, C., & Carney, E. (2018). Critical pedagogy, social justice, and prosocial identities in the Italian classroom (Part II). *Italica*, 95(3), 417-433. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45173084>
- Finlay, L. (2009). Debating phenomenological research. *Phenomenology & Practice*, 3(1), 6-25.
- Flick, U. W. E. (2012). *An introduction to qualitative research. (4th ed.)*. Sage.
- Foley, P. (2007). A case for and of critical pedagogy: Meeting the challenge of liberatory education at Gallaudet University. *American Communication Journal*, 9(4), 1-21.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum Books.
- Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of hope*. The Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Freire, P. (1998a). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum Books.
- Freire, P. (1998b). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach the edge, critical studies in educational theory*. West View Press.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2010). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Gajjar, N. B. (2013). Ethical consideration in research. *International Journal for Research in Education* 2 (7), 8-15.
- Gaylor, L., & Nicol, J. J. (2016). Experiential high school career education, self-efficacy, and motivation. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 39 (2), 1-24.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. Praeger.
- Giroux, H. A. (2018). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling: A critical reader*. Routledge.
- Jordan, J. B. S. (2012). *Teaching past the test: A pedagogy of critical pragmatism*. University of North Texas.
- Kadel, P. B. (2020). Teachers' perceptions of critical pedagogy in English language teaching classroom. *Journal of NELTA*, 25(1-2), 179-190.
- Khanal, H. R. (2023). Freirean strategies in meaningful learning: A critical pedagogy of contextualized classroom. *Journal of Transformative Praxis*, 4(1), 42-53. <https://doi.org/10.51474/jrtp.v4i1.578>
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). *Critical pedagogy primer*. Peter Lang Publishing.
- Kopnina, H. (2020). Critical pedagogy. *Studieri Pædagogisk Filosofi*, 8(1), 43-68. <https://doi.org/10.7146/spf.v8i1.114773>
- Lapan, S. D., Quartaroli, M. T., & Riemer, F. J. (2012). *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs*. Wiley.
- Luitel, B. C., Dahal, N., & Pant, B. P. (2022). Critical pedagogy: Future and hope. *Journal of Transformative Praxis*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.51474/jrtp.v3i1.599>

- Mainali, B. R., & Heck, A. (2015). Comparison of traditional instruction on reflection and rotation in a Nepalese high school with ICT-rich, student centred, investigative approach. *International Journal of Science and Math Education 15*, 487–507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-015-9701-y>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nols, Z., Haudenhuyse, R., Spaaij, R., & Theeboom, M. (2019). Social change through an urban sport for development initiative? Investigating critical pedagogy through the voices of young people. *Sport, Education and Society*, 24(7), 727-741. doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2018.1459536
- Pangeni, K. P. (2014). Factors determining educational quality: Student mathematics achievement in Nepal. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 34, 30–41.
- Paudel, J. R. (2020). Critical pedagogy in Nepalese EFL classrooms: Perceptions, practice and problems. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 7(4), 67-78. [doi:10.333329/joell.7.4.67](https://doi.org/10.333329/joell.7.4.67)
- 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.
- Smyth, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice*. Continuum Books.
- Stephen, D., Feances, & L., Riemer, J. (2012). *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs*. Jossey-Bass.
- Suryana, I., Hidantikarnillah, V., & Murwantono, D. (2021). A narrative inquiry of language teachers' perceptions and experiences in using WhatsApp during new normal post-covid-19 era. *Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 6 (1), 55-70. [doi: 10.30659/e.6.1.55-70](https://doi.org/10.30659/e.6.1.55-70)
- Tatum, H. E., Schwartz, B. M., Schimmoeller, P. A., & Perry, N. (2013). Classroom participation and student faculty interactions: Does gender matter? *Journal of Higher Education*, 84 (6), 745-768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2013.11777309>
- Thiessen, D. (2006). Student knowledge, engagement, and voice in education reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36 (4), 345-358.
- Taylor, P. C., Taylor, E., & Luitel, B. C. (2012). Multi-paradigmatic transformative research as/for teacher education: An integral perspective. In K. G. Tobin, B. J. Fraser & C. McRobbie (Eds.). *Second International Handbook of Science Education*, 373- 387. Springer.
- Wink, J. (2005). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. Retrieved from: <http://www.joanwink.com/scheditems/CP-050911-Part1.pdf>