

# **Uncovering Critical Language Teacher Education Presence In Iranian English Language Teacher Training Program And Its Indication In Teacher Educators**

## **Introduction:**

The ELT (English Language Teaching) practicum, for many of us involved in teacher education. The teaching practicum holds, I think, a certain equivocal: It involves lots of challenges, programs, comprehensions and attentions that make it a hard and important work. Because individual teachers in individual classrooms play an important role in providing equity of opportunity to learn and in improving problem posing education environment.

So there are increasing questions about teachers and teaching like: What is language teacher's job? Is their job to provide instruction using mainstream SLA methods proclaimed to best promote language acquisition? Is their job to provide what students expect in a language classroom in order for instructors to claim that her or his teaching is humanistic and student-centered? Is their job to empower students so that they feel encouraged to achieve their goals in and outside the classroom? Is their job to offer content-based language instruction that helps students pay attention to social issues and social inequalities? How should a teacher perceive language teaching? Although I consider it extremely important to promote effective language teaching to improve students' language proficiency, in this paper, I will focus on the educational, ethical, and sociopolitical (critical) roles of a language teacher.

Therefore teacher education programs in particular are responsible for preparing future teachers to promote meaningful, engaged learning for all students, regardless of their race, gender, ethnic heritage, or cultural background. Also there is increasing world-wide issues in teacher education programs for training competent English teachers and for more effective approaches to their preparation and professional development, that over the last 30 years or so scholars in the field of ELT has identified different key issues that are shaping the way second language teacher education is conceptualized and realized today, and respectively they are seeking to introduce innovations and social changes in teacher education practices. In recent years, scholars in the field of ELT have begun to adapt the ideas of critical pedagogy to their own field. They are in a way acknowledging the non-neutrality language teaching as a branch of education, and beginning to recognize the sociopolitical aspects of it. Today the task of successfully preparing teachers to effectively work with an ever-increasing attention to critical language teacher education. Banks (1991a) notes "An effective teacher education policy for the 21st century must include as a major focus the education of all teachers, in ways that will help them receive the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to work effectively with students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social class groups." (pp. 135-136). It means we are living in education reform period – the restructuring of education and

teacher education – within the global and national requirements and demands of Capital in the current epoch of global neoliberalism and neo-conservatism.

### **Statement of the Problem:**

As there is a growing concern about the steadily increasing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations in schools, global teaching methods makes increasingly diverse the teaching domain in a world of post method to demonstrate the need for rethinking current approaches to teacher education pedagogy and to provide guidelines for developing culturally responsive teacher education pedagogy. Because teacher education advocates counter that there are positive relationships between teacher certification status and student achievement, demonstrating that teacher education plays a role in teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Felter, 1999; Hawk, Coble, & Swanson, 1985; Laczko & Berliner, 2001).

These mentioned inter-related facts made me to pay a little more attention to my hometown English language student performances and English literacy, which was not neither satisfactory nor advanced, and teachers intention about their students, that 99% knew their students inattentive about their own learning whom are too passive and illiterate. In another word English language education in the Iran has produced limited success. Despite innovations and improvements in language education methodology and equipment all over the world, and the increasing number of Language institutes and graduated English language students, English language educators still face what must seem like an insurmountable challenge. All these findings according to what was mentioned about the positive relationship between teacher certification status and students achievement, led me to concern on Iranian English language teacher education program and compare it with global ongoing programs. Certainly there are too many differences and mismatches but I'd like to concentrate just on the item Criticality which is widely spread in TESOL (teaching English language to speaker of other language) and affected its different sub-branches. As Timothy G. Reagan and Terry A. Osborn propose adopting a critical pedagogical approach, which involves the teacher dealing not only with classroom issues but also with the different cultural and social issues that present and buttress the challenges.

Some researches in the fields of teacher education and language learning recognized that there is a mismatch between educational systems and pedagogies, and the teacher learners that they serve. In response, theories that re-conceptualize teaching and teaching environments are emerging that represent new ways of thinking about the goals of education, the roles of teachers and learners, and the processes of learning. Perhaps the most visible and widely represented paradigms that challenge traditional views of language, teaching and learning are sociocultural and critical approaches. Iran with its anti-imperialistic policies in social, political, economic, and even educational aspects of life is apparently expected to be concerned with such issues, but unfortunately the scope of research in critical pedagogy has been extremely limited and impossible. Western scholars, however, have been involved in the argument around critical pedagogy for many years. While our educational system and the policy makers let English teachers, teacher educators and teacher students take care of themselves against the cultural invasion of often incompatible ideologies conveyed through the language and the materials developed by those in power, the scholars in the center of the hegemonic power of the world, have enthusiastically been listening out for the voice of Paulo Freire, who sacrificed many things to wake up the oppressed people to the existing oppression. In order to become aware, we need an approach, through which

we can scrutinize the process of English teaching in Iran, with all its sociopolitical and critical implications, in order not to be contributing to the existing oppressive structures. The realization of this goal is not possible, but by using critical pedagogy and critical teacher education which emphasizes awareness of the power relations. It seems self-evident that students do not gain awareness, unless their teacher leads them to do so. It certainly requires an intense awareness on the part of English teachers, of the beliefs and principles of critical pedagogy. Hence, critical pedagogy needs to be known by teachers in teacher educating programs and if not, it should be introduced and applied. But the first step is to find out what our English teacher educators know of and think about critical pedagogy and its implications. So doing critical pedagogy and critical teacher education is a long-term goal, for which, assessing our English teachers' awareness of and attitudes toward the concept is a preliminary. This study, therefore, attempts to shed light on presence or absence of critical pedagogy in Iranian teacher education programs and if it is present, how these Iranian English teachers use those critical agendas in their teaching process.

### **Purpose of the Study:**

This study seeks to find and to explore the critical pedagogy and critical education presence in Iranian teacher educating programs, and to determine the way teacher educators put this post-method approach practical in their teaching classes. Given that the context of the study is a country with strong anti-imperialistic tendencies, and different kind of limitations, it is expected that teacher educators are familiar with the concept and have, for the most part, positive attitudes toward applying it to their own teaching program. This study is also supposed to recommend a course on critical pedagogy for Iranian teacher students of ELT, whether they are familiar with the concept or not. If the concept is unfamiliar to them, the necessity for such a course is proved, and if they know what critical pedagogy is, their awareness should be made explicit and also scientific, this study would like to raise the profile of critical pedagogy in our field a little higher, and provide some suggestions that it hopes would be of use to others working in this area.

### **Significance of the Study:**

After the recognition of the shift from a marginalized, centralized, transmission mode of education to an equitable, de-centralized, and transformation mode of education, critical pedagogues asked for the notion of critical language teacher education (CLTE) to pave the way for a critical appraisal of teacher education. Indeed, the notion of critical in CLTE is directly related to critical applied linguistics which relates micro-relations of applied linguistics to macro-relations of social reality. CLTE empowers teacher-learners to see the inequitable relationships of power and social reality and recognize that language is not neutral. In this domain, three critical perspectives are central including: **critical self awareness, critical self reflection, and critical pedagogical relations**. Although there are no neat boundaries between these three categorizations, but I understand them as follows:

#### **Critical Self Awareness:**

A key focus of critical teacher educators is to promote critical awareness in their teacher learners by raising consciousness about the ways in which power relations are

constructed and function in society, and the extent to which historical, social, and political practices structure educational inequity.

**Critical Self-Reflection:**

In seeking to address inequities, critical language teacher educators encourage teacher learners to critically reflect on their own identities and positioning in society. Self-reflection provides a window on the relationship between the individual and the social world, highlighting both constraints on and possibilities for social change.

**Critical Pedagogical Relations:**

If the goal of critical pedagogy is to empower learners, pedagogical relations between teacher educators and teacher learners must be structured on equitable terms.

However, this domain does not limit itself to these factors and other principles are also at play such as dialogic engagement, reflectivity, post-method conditioning and identity. With the shift from cognitive SLA perspective to sociocultural framing, discourse and identity are at the heart of language teaching and learning. As for identity, self-knowledge is the key for successful teaching. If a teacher does not know himself, he could not know his students. The task of the post-method teacher educator is to create conditions for prospective teachers to acquire necessary authority and autonomy that will enable them to reflect on and shape their own pedagogic experiences in a dialogic interaction, it means prospective teachers should not be a mere student in teacher educating classes, they should act as as a teacher who is dynamic and concerned in his/her own learning. However, CLTE suffers from proposing a one-size-fits-all framework and also within institutions of education, there are traditional power hierarchies in Iran, that are not easily disrupted. Impracticality is also another criticism leveled against CLTE which brings out difficulties for teachers to engage in critical works.

Teachers, and therefore teacher educators who ‘produce’ them, are important for Capital. As I understand them, therefore, critical approaches seek to develop an awareness of self, and to re-humanize the classroom. Classrooms are not only arenas of ‘pure pedagogy (an oxymoron within the critical perspective), but are places of committed social encounter between participants who struggle for empowerment and emancipation. The concept of Critical is especially salient for language teachers, because language, culture, and identity are integrally related, language teachers are in a key position to address educational inequality, both because of the particular learners they serve, some of whom are marginalized members of their community, and because of the subject matter they teach –language- which can itself serve to both empower and marginalize. Language teachers are often the first contacts that newcomers (here students) have in the target language community (class), and they serve as social mediators and informants in the new environment. They play a key role in the construction of the learners’ views of new language, understandings of unfamiliar belief systems, values and practices, and their negotiations of new social relationships. For those who practice in a context in which the language they teach is not the majority language, they nevertheless represent the values, beliefs and practices of the cultural groups with whom the new language is associated. Critical language teachers make transparent the complex relationships between majority and minority speakers and cultural groups, and between diverse speakers of the majority language, thus having the potential to disrupt potentially harmful and oppressive relations of power. Critical language teachers are aware of issues surrounding linguistic genocide, and work to mitigate this damage through finding educational alternatives that promote access to new languages, while maintaining and valuing heritage languages.

In a country like Iran, where strong anti-imperialistic tendencies have deep roots in the culture, and religion. Hence, the extent of teachers' familiarity and awareness will and should be of interest to English teaching policy makers, in that it sheds light on the necessity of introducing critical pedagogy to all students of ELT at universities in Iran, in the sense that teacher's beliefs and attitudes toward critical pedagogy can constitute an underlying reason for the impacts of the Western English-only policies of English teaching, currently found in Iran. Furthermore, the extent of consistency between the English teacher's attitudes and the general English teaching policies set in Iran as an anti-Imperialist country, can determine the amount of work that needs to be done on the issue.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses:**

To survey the Iranian English Language teacher educators' awareness of and concern towards critical teacher education and pedagogy in their teacher education program, two major research questions were posed and their corresponding null hypotheses and sub-hypotheses were formulated, but only the hypotheses and the two research questions are included here.

-The first null hypothesis: Iranian English teacher Educators are not concerned and are not taught the concept of critical teacher education and pedagogy in teacher training program.

-The second null hypothesis: Iranian English Language teacher educators don't indicate critical pedagogy in their own teaching practicums.

This study addresses two issues; Iranian English Language teacher educators' awareness of and indication toward the concept of critical pedagogy. The research questions, therefore, will be as follows:

1. Is the concept and implication of critical pedagogy in Iranian English Language teacher Education program?

2. Do Iranian English Language teacher educators indicate the concept of critical pedagogy in their teaching practicums?

## **Theoretical Background**

### **The Concept of Critical**

There is much debate about what is meant by a "critical approach" to education and applied linguistics. Critical theory, initially attributed to the Frankfurt school of critical theory (Habermas, 1976), challenges constructs such as naturalism, rationality, and neutrality, referencing instead the subjective, the social, and the partisan nature of reality, and the ways in which our understandings of the world are constructed by contextual factors which are ideologically informed. It enables us to see that our ideas, interactions, language use, texts, learning practices, and so forth, are not neutral and objective, but are shaped by and within social relationships that systematically advantage some people over others, thus producing and re-producing inequitable relationships of power in society.

While critical theory is predominantly abstract, critical pedagogy is directly concerned with social action and educational change. Rooted in the work of Paulo Freire, a Brazilian educator whose mission was the emancipation of peasants in colonial and

postcolonial societies, critical pedagogy seeks to empower people to challenge oppressive conditions in their lives. One central tenet in Freire's work, is praxis: the site where theory and practice come together to create action that leads to social and political change. Freire advocated for dialogue, or the importance of engaging in a dialogic process, as a means to make visible ideologies and relations of power, and the ways in which people are situated within them (Freire 1973, 1974). Critical, then, refers to a focus on how dominant ideologies in society drive the construction of understandings and meanings in ways that privilege certain groups of people, while marginalizing others.

Theorists and researchers have examined how language shapes and reproduces power relations in society. As Fairclough (1995) claims: "It is mainly in discourse that consent is achieved, ideologies are transmitted, and practices, meanings, values and identities are taught and learnt" (p.219). Fairclough advocates for critical language awareness, to recognize "...nontransparent aspects of the social functioning of language" (p. 224). Within applied linguistics, Pennycook (2001) offers the concept of critical applied linguistics, arguing for, "...the importance of relating micro relations of applied linguistics to macro relations of society."(p. 2). It is perhaps this work that best links notions of "critical" to language learning and teaching.

### **The Concept of Critical Language Teacher Education**

Teacher education (both initial teacher education and professional development courses) should enable teachers to develop knowledge and skills to critically examine the ideological nature of teaching and the nature of teachers' work, besides teachers must be aware of themselves as practitioners and as human beings if they wish to teach students in a non-threatening, anti-discriminatory way. Self-actualization should be the goal of the teacher as well as the students. Here, teachers, teacher educators and student teachers should develop an understanding of the potential role of teachers in transforming society. It remains possible for teachers to adopt the function of intellectuals and to resist becoming mere managers of day-to-day activities imposed from beyond the school, and to redefine their role within counter-hegemonic practice (Harris, 1994, p. 115).

CLTE deals with developing awareness and consciousness among teacher-students in order to enable them improve their teaching education and teaching life. According to Keesing-Styles "distinct from critical theory in that it is primarily an educational response to oppressive power relations and inequalities existing in educational institutions" (2003). Critical pedagogy in literature, has been given different titles, such as "critical work", transformative pedagogy" (Pennycook, 1999), "participatory approach" (Auerbach, 1993), "emancipatory literacy" (Wink,1997), "critical education" (Apple, 1999), "pedagogies of resistance (Aronowitz and Giroux 1985), liberatory teaching (Shor 1987), radical pedagogy (Hooks 1989), post-modern pedagogy (Giroux 1992), border pedagogy (Giroux and McLaren 1994), and pedagogies of possibility (Simon 1987)," (In Canagarajah, 1999, p. 18-9).

Giving a clear-cut definition for critical pedagogy which is the basis of CLTE seems difficult, for as Hall (2000) points out "by their very nature, critical approaches are unwilling to prescribe what 'should be done' ". It seems reasonable, however, to suggest that critical pedagogy aims at clarifying the power relations in education, and

emphasizing the non-neutral and non-educational aspects of education. The main goal of critical pedagogy is, to use Freire's terms, to transform students from being mere objects of education to autonomous subjects of their own learning. critical pedagogy, therefore, attempts to enhance people's awareness, give them courage, and lead them to improve both their education and society.

Critical pedagogy in ES/FL, then, takes as joint goals the simultaneous development of English communicative abilities together with the ability to apply them to developing a critical awareness of the world and the ability to act on it to improve matters (praxis; cf. Walsh, 1991). In general, ES/FL teachers have not been encouraged to address sociopolitical issues that educators like Freire (1970) have placed within the very heart of educational purposes. One of the earliest extensive presentations of these ideas for S/FL instruction (Crawford, 1978) provides a basis for indicating what might be expected of critical pedagogy in our area, some of which were particularly important to name here:

- a. the purpose of education should be to develop critical thinking by presenting (teacher) students' situation to them as a problem so that they can perceive, reflect and act on it.
- b. the content of curriculum should derive from the life situation of the learners as expressed in the themes of their reality.
- c. dialogue, interaction and discourse should form the content of the educational situation.
- d. the organization of curriculum should recognize the class as a social entity and resource.
- e. the learners should produce their own learning materials.
- f. the task of planning should first organize generative themes and second organize subject matter as it relates to those themes.
- g. the educator should participate as a learner or teacher students among them.
- h. the educator should contribute his/her ideas, experiences, opinions, and perceptions to the dialogical process.
- i. the educator's function should be one of posing problems.
- j. the teacher students should possess the right and power of decision making.

### **Focusing On Critical Pedagogy In Teacher Education**

Critical pedagogy is a philosophy of education described by Henry Giroux as an "educational movement, guided by passion and principle, to help students develop consciousness of freedom, recognize authoritarian tendencies, and connect knowledge to power and the ability to take constructive action. Critical pedagogy includes relationships between teaching and learning. Its proponents claim that it is a continuous process of what they call "unlearning", "learning", and "relearning", "reflection", "evaluation", and the impact that these actions have on the students, in particular students whom they believe have been historically and continue to be disenfranchised by what they call "traditional schooling".

Focusing on a critical pedagogy in teacher education is because of the goal of preparing citizens for participation in a democratic society. Though one cannot give a procedural guideline for implementing critical pedagogy into a program of teacher education, there are three tenets that are inherent in a critical pedagogy. These tenets are a culmination

of perspectives from various critical theorists including Giroux, McLaren, Delpit, Ladson-Billings, Dillard, hooks, and others. The three tenets are as follows: (a) reflection upon the individual's culture or lived experience, (b) development of voice through a critical look at one's world and society, which takes place in dialogue with others, and (c) transforming the society toward equality for all citizens through active participation in democratic imperatives.

### **The Main Tenets of Critical Language Teacher Education Practice**

According to Wink, "Transformative education aims at going beyond addressing the issues, to coming up with a plan to fight against what needs change and to actually acting upon it" (Santana-Williamson, 2000). But the need to change, necessitates a need to know, or as Pennycook has pointed out "nothing will change unless people know things need to" (Pennycook, 1999, p.336).

Critical education, as Santana-Williamson has put it, "should raise teachers' and students' awareness to the social, political, educational, or any inequalities in their life contexts, and help them realize that by knowing and questioning, they can promote change" (2000). In other words, critical pedagogy "moves us from the passivity of 'yeah-but-we-can't-do-that' to the power of 'we-gotta-do-the-best-we-can-where-we-are-with-what-we've-got'" (Wink, 1997, p.26).

Given the educational backgrounds of many S/FL teacher educators, S/FL teacher education often shows banking education characteristics. It is often at odds with the collaborative, interactive, communicative, small group task-oriented characteristics of the kind of teaching commonly thought desirable in S/FL classrooms. With this in mind, scholars wanted to do critical pedagogy in the process of the teacher education class itself. they followed, conceptually, the "double-loop" approach to SL teacher education of Woodward (1991); the term denotes the simple idea that teacher educators should use the techniques and principles they hope their student teachers will use, as also advocated early by Crawford (1978, pp. 171-2):

For those who become committed to this risky task , the simple acceptance of underlying philosophy does not guarantee the ability to act out the implications of that philosophy. Teachers teach the way they have been taught. For those who were taught by a banking method and who now find themselves committed to problem-posing, their experiential history with a banking method interferes with their ability to implement problem-posing. The most effective means of training problem-posing teachers is to teach them by a problem-posing methodology and curriculum.

### **Towards a Model Of CLTE**

Bonny Norton as a language teacher educator, propose a model of CLTE (see Appendix). It defines when student teachers enter language education programs the two central questions they ask are as follows: What do I teach? And How do I teach it? But researches suggest that teaching is not just about Content , and that teaching is not just about Methods. Teachers have to ask the question, Why do we teach what we teach? And Why do we teach the way we teach? Of central interest is who the student



teachers are? What histories they bring with them to the classroom? Which community they desire to be part of? And What learners they will have to teach?

It is clear from the researches that learners, teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators are part of wider sociocultural communities in which there is frequently unequal access to power and possibility. The challenge for those who are language teacher educator should be to understand the communities of practice in which they work and to incorporate innovative practices in their language teacher education programs.

## **Research In Critical Education**

Some forty years ago, critical pedagogy has never been restricted to a single individual, time, or place. In fact more recently, the social theorist Gramsci has mentioned explicitly, that, it is the role of an educator to identify and admit to the “existing oppressive structure” in schools (Wink, 1997).

McDonald & Zeichner (2008) discuss the current move from multicultural teacher education to social justice teacher education. They claim that multicultural teacher education focuses on “celebration of cultural diversity and the experience of the individual”, while ignoring the “institutionalized relationships among groups.” This is to say that, while multicultural teacher education does acknowledge status differences among people based on culture, ethnicity, and language, it does not take up the explicit study of the production and reproduction of power relationships in institutions (such as schools) and society. Social justice teacher education seeks to address institutionalized as well as individual power differentials, with the goal of promoting teachers’ recognition and ownership of their roles as social activists. There is a growing body of literature within the fields of TESOL, Applied Linguistics, and Second Language Acquisition that addresses critical theoretical stances around language use, language teaching, and language planning (e.g., Canagarajah, 1999; Hawkins, 2004a; Norton 2000; Pennycook 2001; Phillipson, 1992; Ricento, 2006; Tollefson, 2002). There are also accounts, although more rare, of critical language teaching practices, most often authored by the language teacher (e.g., Morgan 1998; TESOL Quarterly special issue, 1999). More difficult to find are accounts of critical language teacher education practices. Below I discuss accounts of critical practices in language teacher education, which can be categorized as promoting, respectively, critical awareness, critical self-reflection, and critical pedagogical relations. These accounts span international locales, in-service and pre-service programs, undergraduate and graduate courses, and experiences both within and outside of institutions of higher education. These accounts only address instances where English is the target language, and do not wish to imply that critical work is not being done in language teacher education in other languages; however. Although there are no neat boundaries between these three categorizations, scholars use them as heuristic tools to guide analyses of practices, and highlight, in each account, the notion of praxis as well. I do this not in an attempt to be prescriptive, but to provide models that illustrate the range of practices associated with critical language teacher education.

Some critical theorists applied ideas in critical theories to education. Scholars such as Giroux who has worked on curriculum and its contribution to power, and Cummins who focuses on the issue of power in education and in society, and claims education to be also empowering. Other names include Michael Apple, Douglas Kellner, Carlos Torres, and Kris Guitierrez. In the field of TESOL, too, critical pedagogy, has been

worked on by scholars such as Phillipson, Canagajarah, Pennycook, Liu, Auerbach, Benesch, Erlbaum; the most famous of all being Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educator, who was imprisoned and even exiled for his beliefs (2000). Critical pedagogues may be from different ethnic backgrounds, and they may be talking about different aspects of the issue, but as Santana-Williamson (2000) has pointed out “they share one common goal” and that is “to fight against imperialism and social and political injustices through education.”

### **Critical Approach In TESOL**

In recent years some scholars in the field of TESOL have attempted to apply the ideas of critical education to their own field. According to Cox and Assis-Peterson, they have tried to develop arguments around the political and sociocultural implications that pervade English language teaching (1999). “According to Pennycook (1994),” these authors write, “the spread of English is considered to be natural, neutral, and beneficial: natural because it is the inevitable result of global forces; neutral because it assumes that English has been stripped of its original cultural contexts and has been transformed into a transparent, universal medium of communication; and beneficial because it is a condition for cooperation and equality” (1999). The rather vague title for the issue was intended to address both critical ways of teaching English and critical appraisals of contexts in which English is being taught, that is to say, both accounts of teaching practice and research on teaching contexts (though another goal of this issue was to break down some of these divides, critical approaches to TESOL involve both pedagogy and research and are fundamentally political.

Freire 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” (1982, 1984).

Freire, therefore, assumes a greater responsibility for teacher educators and teachers. He claims they “need 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” (1982, 1984).

A significant problematic issue is addressed by Pennycook (1999). He criticizes the work in second language acquisition, in that it “has tended to locate the process of learning solely in the psychological domain without taking into account the social, economic, cultural, political, or physical domains in which language learning takes place ... ” (p. 331). Phillipson (1992) and Pennycook (1994), attribute the lack of a critical perspective toward the international role and teaching of English to English teachers' submission to a version of applied linguistics, which is primarily concerned with formal and methodological issues. They believe in a critical version of applied linguistics and pedagogy whereby the relationship between languages and the global power relations is recognized and acknowledged.

Pennycook also emphasizes that teachers need to be critically aware of the implications of developing English for sustaining the existing inequalities (1994). Hall (2000) illustrates the lack of this awareness in ELT practitioners and learners, by claiming that they “may believe that they are pursuing non-ideological goals, but they are in fact educating and being assimilated into hidden socio-cultural values. Thus a non-critical teaching of appropriacy inherently includes surreptitious cultural, social, political and possibly economic value-judgments. ELT becomes an ideologically-based practice.” He goes even further to claim that “ELT practitioners stand accused of complicity in

the maintenance of an unequal society, teaching for themselves and hidden power interests within society, rather than for the learners' real needs" (2000).

## **Critical Education In Iran**

Despite all the attention and effort critical education in TESOL has received during the past several years, this post-method approach has no place in Iran educational system. Apart from the fact that critical pedagogy is not used practically in language classrooms, only few research has been done to investigate the issue (Akbari, 2008; Sadeghi, 2009; Kasaian and Subbakrishna, 2011; Aliakbari and Faraji, 2011; Rashidi and Safari, 2011). It seems drastically ironic that in a country with strong anti-imperialistic tendencies and social, political, economic, and even educational policies, there is no room for an approach that fights against linguistic imperialism. It has taken some forty years for us to hear the anti-imperialistic voice of Paulo Freire, whereas for years western scholars, at the heart of imperialism, have been following his words. Given the growing tendency to learn English, among Iranian people, specifically youth who are more susceptible to the potential damages of a non-neutral multi-dimensional curriculum, the need for an in-depth analysis of English learning according to the principles of critical pedagogy becomes even more evident. This study aims at clarifying the necessity for more work on critical pedagogy in English learning domain in Iran, by assessing its presence in Language teacher education programs and its indication among Iranian English teachers.

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

The research will follow qualitative paradigm, adopting survey design for doing the research and collecting data. A checklist is used in language teacher educating classes to find out its presence or absence by the observer (researcher) and a researcher made questionnaire to assess Iranian English teacher educators' awareness, idea and indication toward critical pedagogy.

### **Instrumentation**

The instrument for the data collection of this study will be a checklist which is prepared by the observer (researcher) which will be used in teacher education classes and a questionnaire that teacher educators answers will represent their indication toward critical pedagogy in their teaching practicum.

### **Sampling**

The method of sampling in this study will be stratified random sampling, since the whole population of the research will be divided into some 'strata' from which a

proportionate size would be randomly selected. The population and therefore the participants will be stratified based on such factors as highest relevant qualification to ELT (Bachelor's, Master's, or PhD.), type of institution where they work (Public university, Azad university, etc.), and years of experience.

## **Participants**

Iranian English language teacher educators comprise the population of this study. Thus the participants who take part will be selected from different classes in some universities, so that the sample will resemble the population of all Iranian English language teacher educators. The participants will be divided according to the factors mentioned above.

## **Data Analysis**

The data will consist of two sets of data; one addressing qualitative data's and the other teacher educators awareness and promotion. They both will be analyzed through SPSS, based on which interpretations and analysis will be made.

## **Limitations and Delimitations**

The study will be based on the assumption that the sample does actually represent the population, that is, the English teacher educators participating in this study do resemble all Iranian English teacher educators. The study will not take account of participants' age and gender and thus will be equally concerned with their knowledge and opinion. However, issues such as the educational status of the participants, their years of experience, and the institution where they work, are of interest to this research. This study will scrutinize teachers' awareness of, and their attributes toward critical pedagogy, but will encompass those aspects of critical pedagogy that are relevant to the field of ELT. It will take account those aspects of critical pedagogy that are related to education in general and with ELT. Moreover, the study is aimed to examine teachers' application of this concept in their classes.

## **References**

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62 (3). doi:10.1093/elt/ccn025.

Aliakbari, M. & Faraji, E. 2009. Basic Principles of Critical Pedagogy. Paper presented in the International Conference on English Language Teaching ICELTL2009. Hotel Equatorial Melaka, Malaysia. *IPEDR*, 17 (2011) Singapore: IACSIT Press.

B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 311-326.

Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (eds). (2004) *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Essex UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Foley, J. A. (2012). *The struggle for critical teacher education: How accreditation practices privilege efficiency over criticality and compliance over negotiation*. *Critical Education*, 4(3). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/article/view/182433>

Freire, P. (1998) *Teachers as cultural workers - letters to those who dare teach* (trans. by D. Macedo, D. Koike & A. Oliveira) Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1974). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Goldstein, T. (2004) Performed ethnography for critical language teacher education. In

Hawkins, M.R. (ed.) (2004). *Language Learning and Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Approach*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hall, G. (2000). Local approaches to critical pedagogy: An investigation into the dilemmas raised by critical approaches to ELT. CRILE Publications. Linguistics Department, Lancaster University.

Hawkins, M. (2004a). Researching English language and literacy development in schools. *Educational Researcher* 33(3):14-25.

Hawkins, M.R. (2004b). Social apprenticeships through mediated learning in language teacher education. In Hawkins, M.R. (ed.) *Language Learning and Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Approach*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hawkins, M., & Norton, B. (2009). Critical language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. Richards (Eds.), *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. (pp. 30-39) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Johnston, B. (1999). Putting critical pedagogy in its place: A personal account. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 557-565.

Keesing-Styles, L. (2003). The relationship between critical pedagogy and assessment in teacher education. *Radical Pedagogy*, 5 (1). [http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue5\\_1/03\\_keesing-styles.html](http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue5_1/03_keesing-styles.html)

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Post-Method*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Lin, A. Y. M. (2004). Introducing a critical pedagogical curriculum: A feminist reflexive account. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds). *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 271-290.

Luke, A. (1997). Critical approaches to literacy. In Corson, D. (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McDonald, M.A. & Zeichner, K. (2008). Social justice and teacher education. In Ayers, W., Quinn, T. & D. Stovall (eds). *The Handbook of Social Justice in Education*.

Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Morgan, B. (1998). *The ESL Classroom: Teaching, Critical Practice, and Community Development*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

Norton, B. (2005). Towards a model of critical language teacher education. *Language Issues*, 17, 1: p. 12-17.

Pennycook, A. 2001. *Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum. In B. Norton & K.

Ricento, T. (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Sadeghi, S. (2009). Critical pedagogy in an EFL teaching context: An ignis fatuus or an alternative approach? In L.J. Zhang, R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.). *Englisches und Literatures-in-English in a Globalised World: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on English in Southeast Asia* (pp. 362-375). Singapore: National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.

Santana-Williamson, E. (2000). Critical Pedagogy in TESOL: A Review of the Literature. ED447700.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). Linguistic human rights and teachers of English. In Hall, J.K. & Eggington, W.G. (eds) *The Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching*. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.

TESOL Quarterly Special Topic Issue: Critical Approaches to TESOL. (1999). *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (3).

Tollefson, J. (ed.). (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Toohey, K. & Waterstone, B. (2004). Negotiating expertise in an action research community. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press p. 291-310.

Toohey, (Eds.) *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 327-345.

## Appendix

### CLTE(critical language teacher education)

