Turkish EFL Teachers' Awareness of Critical Pedagogy Implementation

Melih KIRCALI

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, TURKEY
emirmelihkircali@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2833-549X

Abstract: The practice of critical pedagogy principles in EFL (English as a foreign language) classrooms in recent years has contributed a lot to the emergence of critical perspectives toward EFL instruction among the EFL teachers and this study has aimed to determine Turkish EFL teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy implementation in the classrooms in Turkey. The awareness levels of 103 teachers working in Turkey have been measured by an adapted version of "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" which was developed and validated by Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015). The researcher has translated and adapted the questionnaire into Turkish, calculated the internal reliability of it using Cronbach's alpha coefficiency, and found it as a reliable instrument (17 items; α = .91). The factor analysis of the adapted version has also been conducted and three-factor solution has been recommended for the questionnaire. The findings of the study have revealed that Turkish EFL teachers are to some extent aware of how critical pedagogy principles can be implemented in EFL classrooms in Turkey. Also, a statistically significant difference between the participants holding MA degrees and BA degrees has been found when a series of Mann-Whitney U tests have been conducted for each sub-scale. On the other hand, no significant difference has been found between the self-reported scores of males and females according to the Mann-Whitney U test results.

Keywords: EFL, critical pedagogy, awareness levels, academic degrees

Türk İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Eleştirel Pedagoji Uygulamaları Farkındalığı

Özet: Son yıllarda **e**leştirel pedagoji ilkelerinin İngilizce'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği sınıflarda uygulanması İngilizce öğretmenleri arasında İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesine karşı eleştirel perspektiflerin ortaya çıkmasına fazlasıyla katkı sunmuş olup bu çalışma İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Türkiye'deki sınıflarda eleştirel pedagoji uygulamalarına farkındalık düzeylerini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Türkiye'de çalışan 103 İngilizce öğretmeninin farkındalık düzeyleri, Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) tarafından geliştirilen ve doğrulanan "Eleştirel Dil Pedagojisi Anketi"'nin uyarlanmış versiyonu ile ölçülmüştür. Araştırmacı anketi Türkçeye tercüme etmiş ve uyarlamış, Cronbach alfa katsayısın kullanarak iç güvenilirliğini hesaplamış ve güvenilir bir ölçme aracı olduğunu saptamıştır (17 madde; α = .91). Aynı zamanda uyarlanmış versiyon üzerinde faktör analizleri uygulanmış ve ölçek için üç faktörlü bir çözümleme önerilmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin eleştirel pedagoji ilkelerinin Türkiye'deki sınıflarda nasıl uygulanabileceğinin bir dereceye kadar farkında olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Aynı zamanda, her bir alt ölçek için Mann-Whitney U testleri uygulandığında Yüksek Lisans ve Lisans derecelerine sahip olan katılımcılar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. Diğer taraftan, Mann-Whitney U test sonuçlarına göre erkekler ve kadınların öz-bildirim skorları arasında herhangi anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İngilizce öğretimi, eleştirel pedagoji, farkındalık, mezuniyet derecesi

1. Introduction

Most of the traditional approaches to education provide teachers with a set of pre-packaged strategies, techniques, tools, and materials, and expect them to claim the sole authority role in the classroom and transfer knowledge to learners (Freire, 1993; Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Therefore, learners have to follow the predetermined elements and features in the curriculum which consist of fixed schedules, methods, techniques and learning styles. Besides, textbooks serve normative statements, and functions in educational settings. Thus, learners and teachers have to follow the same pattern of practice in learning and teaching which is transferring knowledge from the source of knowledge to learners. These traditional approaches are criticized for being "banking models of education" by Freire (1993). In Freire's banking concept of education, knowledge is seen as a gift presented by those who consider themselves as an authority, and students are seen as containers for educators to deposit knowledge (Freire, 1993).

Freire proposes problem-posing concept of education as a rewarding alternative option to traditional forms of education. Problem-posing concept of education has been arranged to support critical thinking in learners. In this approach of education, the teacher and the learner get into co-operation and engage in a dialogue to jointly come up with solutions and conclusions about problems instead of merely noticing those problems. The solutions and conclusions must not be pre-decided by the teacher; rather, they should be offered during the process of a dialogue. The teacher and the learners acquire knowledge from one another and students are not considered as empty boxes. In this way, Freire elaborates a methodology to work with people in a certain society to understand the topics that can directly be linked to their lives and this methodology is called as critical pedagogy. It is considered as a postmodern approach that "applies the tenets of critical social theory to the educational arena and takes on the task of examining how schools reproduce inequality and injustice" (Beck, 2005, p. 393). According to its principles, teachers are not expected to be the only authority in the classroom, but instead they are required to be the facilitators of sharing knowledge with the students. They lead students to question and criticize ideologies and practices that are considered as being oppressive and support emancipation and individual reactions towards real oppressing conditions on their own lives. According to Riasati and Mollaei (2012), it joins criticality with the existing materials and daily teaching rather than overlooking or changing well-developed designs of teaching. It is an approach to teaching that attempts to guide students to challenge and criticize oppression, and the assumptions and applications that oppress and dominate (Riasati, & Mollaei, 2012). As a result, it is combining the theory with practice to support students for acquiring critical awareness and critical qualities.

Nowadays, the Turkish education system is going through a constant change and it is engaged in a ruthless pursuit to provide its stakeholders with a modern understanding of education and catch up with the newest approaches and considerations in the field; however, there are several studies which indicate that some of the EFL teachers and instructors are still addicted to the traditional understanding of English teaching (Kaçar & Zengin, 2013; Kırkgöz, 2007) and avoid certain topics particularly political issues (Ordem & Yükselir, 2017). Critical pedagogy has a lot to offer for the teachers and instructors as it can provide them with opportunities to recreate their own teaching and learning opportunities by equipping them with tools to re-think and re-arrange their techniques and methods in order to serve better in every unique occasion. With regard to critical pedagogy, teachers need to be aware of the principles and understanding of such a fruitful educational approach to create a better EFL classroom atmosphere where learners can take control and responsibility of their own learning. Therefore, this study was conducted to explore Turkish EFL teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy, through adapting the "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" which was developed and validated by Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) into Turkish and focusing on the relationship between teachers' gender, academic degrees and their awareness of critical pedagogy implementation in the classroom. This study can also contribute to the development of the appropriate instruments for measuring the teachers' beliefs about critical pedagogy through exploring the reliability and validation of the Turkish version of "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" in Turkish reality. Additionally, it can help to increase the limited number of studies on critical pedagogy in Turkey.

2. Literature Review

The notion of critical pedagogy has been around in the EFL field for about two decades (Canagarajah, 2005) and several researchers define its role in EFL as a crucial one because its principles can be utilized

to rearrange the classroom practices and aims of EFL in foreign language classrooms in favor of others whose languages and cultures might be oppressed due to the imperial nature of EFL (López-Gopar, 2019; Norton & Toohey, 2004). However, it may still prove to be a relatively new concept for some teachers, and utilizing its views and principles may even be resisted and rejected by some teachers and instructors in the classroom (Jeyaraj, & Harland, 2019; Ordem, & Ulum, 2019; Ordem, & Yükselir, 2017). With a qualitative study based on the answers of nine Turkish EFL instructors working at Turkish universities to an open-ended questionnaire, Ordem and Yükselir (2017) have found that the participants in their study have avoided talking about a certain list of matters in EFL classroom settings because they have called some topics risky to discuss. Yılmaz (2009) has investigated a group of Turkish elementary school teachers' views about critical pedagogy and found that the elementary school teachers follow its principles to a low degree. It has also been found that the teachers with 1 to 5-year teaching experience embrace its principles more enthusiastically than the more experienced ones. Besides, Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2011) have examined prospective teachers' views about critical pedagogy in the Faculty of Education in Dumlupınar University and their study has demonstrated that prospective teachers' acceptance of critical pedagogy principles stand on a mid-level. However, it has been found that prospective teachers' degrees of accepting its principles are higher than experienced teachers because prospective teachers have taken courses on critical thinking and neo-liberal policies have negative effects on the Turkish National Education system.

With a broader perspective and a quantitative research design to reach more participants in the Iranian context, Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) have studied Iranian EFL teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy across different educational levels. The authors have found statistically significant differences among the BA, MA, and PhD subjects' awareness of critical pedagogy. The teachers with PhD degrees have been found to possess the highest awareness of the importance of critical pedagogy in EFL. It has also been concluded that there is a significant relationship between the respondents' teaching experience and their awareness of critical pedagogy. Similarly, Aliakbari and Amoli (2014) have questioned whether Iranian English Institute instructors support its principles or not and studied the possible correlation between teachers' views on its principles and age, gender, and educational level or degree, and work experience. According to the results of their study, Iranian teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy and its principles is positive. They have also found a positive correlation between their age and the mean scores. The more the participants get old, the more their mean scores increase. Additionally, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of female and male participants. Female participants have self-reported better mean scores. Statistically significant difference has been found among the mean scores of the participants having different educational degrees. Participants with MA and PhD degrees have self-reported higher mean scores of awareness.

On the other hand, Sarvestani and Yamini (2016) have not found any difference between the experienced and inexperienced teachers' attitudes towards the principles of critical pedagogy. There is not any statistically significant difference found between the attitudes of BA and MA degree holders, either. Nevertheless, the key research finding of their study demonstrates that the Iranian EFL teachers have mostly self-reported to agree with the application of critical pedagogy in Iranian foreign language classrooms.

When the literature in the Turkish context is reviewed, a limited number of research studies conducted on the awareness of Turkish EFL teachers and instructors towards critical pedagogy implementation can be found. Besides, mostly qualitative research method has been implemented with small sample sizes. As a result, with a quantitative method, and a broader sample size, the following research questions were raised to determine and guide the scope of this study:

1- What are Turkish EFL teachers' awareness levels of critical pedagogy implementation in EFL classrooms?

2- Is there any statistically significant difference in Turkish EFL teachers' awareness levels of critical pedagogy across BA and MA educational levels?

3- Is there any statistically significant correlation between EFL teachers' gender and their awareness of critical pedagogy?

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

"The method must be appropriate to our research objective and able to elicit a form of data appropriate for testing our hypothesis or addressing our research questions" (Brewerton, & Millward, 2001, p. 68). Accordingly, the quantitative survey model was employed to collect descriptive data from a relatively larger sample group of EFL teachers on their beliefs about applying critical pedagogy principles in the classroom and elicit statistical information related to their opinions. As Fowler (2009) suggests, the model can be implemented to conduct meaningful statistical tests and obtain information on the opinions of a sample group with an intention to generalize the results to a certain population.

3.2. Participants

Participants in this study were 103 voluntary Turkish EFL teachers who work in state schools in Turkey. The number of 76 participants has BA degrees and 27 participants have MA degrees and 25 participants were male while 78 were female. Their teaching experience ranges from one year to 27 years. The convenience sampling method was used for this study as it is "affordable, easy and the subjects are readily available" (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016, p. 2). The researcher delivered the printed questionnaire forms to most of the participants of the study. Additionally, some of the participants were contacted through e-mails and WhatsApp messages to get the forms completed through Google forms.

3.3. Instrument

As an instrument "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" developed and validated by Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) was adapted into Turkish by the researcher and it was administered to collect quantitative data from 103 Turkish EFL teachers (See Appendix A). In the process of the translation, the suggestions of repeating nouns rather than utilizing pronouns, using simple sentences, and avoiding passive voice, colloquialisms, metaphor, subjunctive mood, and hypothetical expressions from Werner and Campbell (1970) were taken into consideration in order to avoid any misinterpretation and non-equivalence, and provide the researcher with an adequate translation and an appropriate questionnaire. The questionnaire was translated into Turkish by the researcher and the Turkish version was back-translated into English by two EFL teachers who were studying on their MA and Phd degrees and took courses related to critical pedagogy in order to provide the researcher with an insight into the competence of his translation. In the end, the final Turkish version was checked with the help of two Turkish Language and Literature teachers to prevent any ambiguity and incoherency in Turkish.

The internal reliability of the original questionnaire was measured as .82 using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Ghasemi and Abedini (2018) also used the "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" in their study and found the internal reliability of the questionnaire as .81. Factor analysis using Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was implemented by Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) to control the construct validity of the 30-item questionnaire. 13 items were found problematic and omitted during the analysis of different factorability solutions. The most reasonable and interpretable 17 items in the form of a 4-factor solution explaining altogether 39.802% of the total variance was conducted. The final version of the scale included 17 items that were scored on a 6-point Likert Scale, and was organized as: "strongly agree (6), agree (5), partly agree (4), slightly disagree (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1)."

3.4. Data Analysis Procedures

The researcher administered the scale in the months of November and December in 2019 and performed the data analysis by using SPSS (Version 22.0). The statistical analyses that were conducted to provide answers to the research questions can be found below under the discussion part. The descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were computed and used, and the mean, median, and standard deviation scores of all the sets of data were calculated to summarize the responses in the findings part. The reliability analysis and validation study of the Turkish questionnaire were also conducted to detect any violation.

4. TheReliability andValidation of the Adapted Instrument

The internal reliability of the current study was computed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient and found to be reliable (17 items; α = .91). According to Tavakol and Dennick (2011), a .90 or higher degree of Cronbach's alpha indicates a very high degree of reliability.

The construct validity of the Turkish version was checked through Factor Analysis by using PCA as Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) did. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy demonstrated that the relationships among variables were strong (KMO = .87) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi 2$ (136) = 1128.502, $p<0.001$); therefore, it proved to be acceptable to continue with the factor analysis. Three factors that have eigen values higher than one were extruded. Initial eigen values demonstrated that three factors are 44.241, 12.518, 8.892 respectively, and form 65.652% of the total variance. Varimax was used to conduct the rotation procedure and no violation was detected. The obtained component rotation matrix is displayed in Table 1. The factor labels proposed by Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh (2015) did not suit the extracted factors of the adapted Turkish version as they found four factors and proposed four labels in their original scale. The two factors "Incorporating dialogue and learners' real life into SLA" and "Decision making through negotiation" proposed by the authors were extracted as one component in this study. Thus, the researcher renamed this combined factor as "Facilitating dialogue and negotiation for decision making and integrating real lives with SLA". The internal reliability of each sub-scale was also measured using Cronbach's alpha and found .90 for the first sub-scale, .81 for the second one, and .83 for the third one.

Table 1.
Factor loadings based on a PCA with Varimax rotation for 17 items from the CLP Questionnaire (N = 103)

	Component		
Item	Facilitating Negotiation	Critical Approach to Content	Liberatory Autonomy
8	**.813**	.224	
3	**.791**	.183	.131
9	**.764**	.189	.152
11	**.757**	.436	
7	**.683**		.255
13	**.675**	.307	
17	**.615**	.248	.387
2	**.552**	.220	.377
6	**.546**	.176	.340
14	.370	**.783**	.181
12	.369	**.773**	.200
5	.130	**.686**	
10	.372	**.583**	.271
16	-.128	.410	**.777**
1	.487		**.765**
15	-.117	.484	**.753**
4	.475		**.692**

Only items with factor loadings of above .10 are shown.

Since the self-reported awareness levels for each factor in the current sample did not meet the parameters of normal distribution, non-parametric tests were able to be conducted as a hypothesis testing procedure with the data set for the current study. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicated that the self-reported awareness scores did not follow a normal distribution in the sub-scale 1, D (103) = 0.17, p= .000, in the sub-scale 2, D(103) = 0.13, p = .000, and in the sub-scale 3 , D(103) = 0.10, p = .02. Therefore, a series of Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the self-reported awareness levels of EFL teachers with MA degrees and EFL teachers with BA degrees for each subscale, and in the same way, a series of Mann-Whitney U tests was performed to test whether there was a significant difference between two different genders concerning their awareness levels of critical pedagogy.

5. Findings and Discussion

As the findings in Table 2 demonstrate, the participants in this study are to some extent aware of how critical pedagogy can be implemented in EFL classrooms in Turkey. However, teachers who have BA degrees possess relatively lower levels of critical pedagogy awareness than Iranian EFL teachers with BA degrees who have been reported to possess higher levels of awareness in a similar study conducted with the Farsi original version of the instrument (Mahmoodarabi & Khodabakhsh, 2015). According to a recent research study conducted qualitatively on the perceptions of 39 pre-service EFL teachers concerning the inclusion of some recent critical issues and headline news into the classrooms in Turkey; such topics are hardly discussed in the EFL department classrooms. It is also maintained that the participants do not take courses related to critical pedagogy (Ordem, & Ulum, 2019).

Table 2.
Academic degrees with sub-scale grand mean scores

Academic Degree		Facilitating Negotiation	Liberatory Autonomy	Critical Approach to Content
	M	5.10	4.23	4.32
BA	*SD*	0.77	1.0	0.89
	N	76	76	76
	M	5.50	5.11	5.10
MA	*SD*	0.35	0.60	0.72
	N	27	27	27

The results also reveal that the sub-scale "Facilitating dialogue and negotiation for decision making and integrating real lives with SLA" has been acknowledged with a relatively higher grand mean score than the other sub-scales in this study. This finding is in line with another study with a different research design in Turkish reality as it demonstrates that the participants of this study possess lower levels of awareness towards the factors tested by the other two sub-scales (Ordem, & Yükselir, 2017). In other words, the items to test "liberatory autonomy" and "critical approach to content" mainly aims to investigate teachers' stance towards liberation, inequalities, dominant social norms and beliefs in the society and educational system, and the participants in this study self-reported to possess lower levels of awareness towards the implementation of these crucial principles of critical pedagogy in the classrooms. Ordem and Yukselir (2017) have found that Turkish EFL instructors in their study appearto avoid discussing risky subjects on account of cultural, social and traditional beliefs and in their own words, "this situation probably stems from the oppression, confusion, stress, social and political concerns" (p. 287). Some of the participants in the current study may have possessed the same point of view and hesitated to favor "critical approach to content" or encourage "liberatory autonomy" in their own classrooms.

The findings of Ordem and Ulum (2019) similarly reveal that EFL teachers in Turkey tend to adhere to the national curricula and international coursebooks; therefore, they tend to avoid discussing socio-political issues in the classroom. Jeyaraj and Harland (2019) criticize a similar approach of Malaysian teachers towards debating critical issues in the classroom and suggest policymakers and authorities support the change of strict social order and understanding. Nevertheless, the authors maintain that their suggestion is difficult to be adopted because critical pedagogy is generally based on the questioning of the rulers and their positions. Likewise, in a different context where political matters is still carefully discussed Shang and Troudi (2020) argue that "there is some space for some elements of critical teacher

education, such as questioning inequity, discrimination and injustice in the educational arena, which may appeal to the government and consequently leading to pedagogical improvement" (p. 100). Whatever the circumstances are, teacher educators can at least assume the role of empowering and encouraging student teachers to discuss such issues beginning with less sensitive but more necessary ones. It can be started with challenging inequity, discrimination, and injustice as Shang and Troudi (2020) recommend.

Additionally, as a result of conducting a series of Mann-Whitney U tests for each sub-scale, it has been concluded that self-reported awareness levels of "facilitating negotiation" is greater for the teachers who have MA degrees (Mdn = 5.56) than for the teachers who have BA degrees (Mdn = 5.28), U = 673.00, p = .01, r = .07, self-reported awareness levels of "liberatory autonomy" is greater for the teachers who have MA degrees (Mdn = 5.25) than for the ones who have BA degrees (Mdn = 4.50), U = 482.00, p = .000, r = .16, and self-reported awareness levels of "critical approach to content" is greater for the teachers who have MA degrees (Mdn = 5.50) than for the teachers who have BA degrees (Mdn = 4.50), U = 504.50, p = .000, r = .15. These results confirm the similar results of some other studies (Aliakbari, & Amoli, 2014; Atai, & Moradi, 2016; Mahmoodarabi, & Khodabakhsh, 2015) and contradict the findings of Sarvestani and Yamini (2016). One of the possible reasons for this finding might be the availability of critical pedagogy content in MA courses in Turkey. Likewise, Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh, (2015) have proposed the availability of critical content to some extent in graduate programs for a similar significant difference.

Besides all these results, conducting a series of Mann-Whitney U tests for each sub-scale have also helped to determine that self-reported awareness levels of "facilitating negotiation" do not significantly differ between the males (Mdn = 5.22) and the females (Mdn = 5.44), U = 951.50, p = .46, r = .14, self-reported awareness levels of "liberatory autonomy" do not significantly differ between the males (Mdn = 4.87) and the females (Mdn = 4.50), U = 976.50, p = .58, r = .11, and self-reported awareness levels of "critical approach to content" do not significantly differ between the males (Mdn = 4.62) and the females (Mdn = 4.50), U = 1041.50, p = .95, r = .01. On the contrary to this finding, Aliakbari and Allahmoradi (2012) examined Iranian teachers' attitudes with regard to critical pedagogy at elementary, secondary, and high school levels, and found significant differences between teachers' attitudes towards its principles based on their gender. With a quantitative research design, Behrouzi (2018) has also found a significant relationship between gender and critical pedagogy awareness when he has researched language teachers and learners' beliefs about critical pedagogyconcerning their gender. Beyond the findings of this study, gender may be of paramount importance in most of cases as it is directly related to the values a specific society holds (Hofstede, 1980).

6. Conclusion and Implications

This study has been conducted to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy implementation in EFL classrooms, and the findings demonstrate that the participant teachers are to some extent aware of how critical pedagogy principles can be implemented in EFL classrooms in Turkey. Additionally, statistically significant differences have been found between the awareness levels of the participants across two different academic degrees. The study indicates that teachers who have MA degrees possess greater levels of awareness with regard to critical pedagogy implementation in EFL classrooms. Beside these findings, no statistically significant difference has been detected between the awareness levels of males and females concerning critical pedagogy implementation on the contrary to the findings of Aliakbari and Allahmoradi (2012) and Behrouzi (2018).

It can also be concluded that graduate programs of EFL departments in Turkey could be beneficial for the development of teachers' awareness about different and advantageous approaches such as critical pedagogy. However, getting enrolment in MA programs requires a great deal of effort, time, and cost for the teachers in Turkey and the heavy workload for most of them may prevent them from further training in the field. Hence, the participation in MA programs can be supported by the school managements and policymakers in Turkey if it is intended to equip teachers with a continuous process of development in the field.

When compared to the first sub-scale, the relatively lower awareness scores in the sub-scales of "liberatory autonomy" and "critical approach to content" also supports the findings of Ordem and Yükselir (2017) and Ordem and Ulum (2019) in that Turkish teachers may hesitate to adopt some critical

pedagogy principles. One of the reasons behind this may be the strict social norms and hierarchy at schools and in the society as Jeyaraj and Harland (2019) suggest.

As a limitation to this study, it is vital to express that this study is limited to Turkish EFL teachers working in state schools and restricted to the number of 103 teachers who have voluntarily participated in this study. However, the Turkish adapted version of "Critical Language Pedagogy Questionnaire" can be administered to a greater sampling size and this study can be replicated in different contexts to get a detailed analysis of teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy implementation and compare the results.

References

Aliakbari, M., & Allahmoradi, N. (2012). On Iranian school teachers' perceptions of theprinciples of critical pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4*(1),154-171.

Aliakbari, M., & Amoli, F. (2014). Teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy: A case study ofIranian EFL teachers. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 3,* 128-134.

Atai, M., & Moradi, H. (2016). Critical pedagogy in the context of Iran: Exploring Englishteachers' perceptions. *Applied Research on English Language*, *5*(2), 121-144.

Beck, A. (2005). A place for critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 48*(5), 392-400.

Behrouzi, Y. (2018). The relationship between teachers' and learners' gender and their view on principles of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Education and Practice, 9*, 64-71.

Brewerton, P., & Millward, L. (2001). *Organizational research methods*. London: SAGEpublication.

Etikan, İ., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4.

Fowler, F. J. (2009). *Survey research methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*: *Revised twentieth Anniversary Edition*. New York: Continuum.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Jeyaraj, J. J., & Harland, T., (2019). Linking critical pedagogy practice to higher education in Malaysia: insights from English language teachers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, DOI: 10.1080/02188791.2019.1572590

Kaçar, I. G., & Zengin, B. (2013). Perceptions of pre-service teachers of English towardsgrammar teaching in the Turkish context. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 8*(3), 50-80.

Kirkgoz, Y. (2007). English Language Teaching in Turkey: Policy Changes and their Implementations. *Relc Journal, 38,* 216-228.

Kumararavadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macro strategies for language teaching.*New Heaven, CT: Yale University press.

López-Gopar, M. E. (2019). Introducing international critical pedagogies in ELT. In M. E. López-Gopar (Ed.). *International perspectives on critical pedagogies in ELT* (pp. 1-15). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mahmoodarabi, M., & Khodabakhsh, M. (2015). Critical Pedagogy: EFL teachers' views, experience and academic degrees. *English Language Teaching, 8,* 100-110.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). Critical pedagogies and language learning: An introduction.In B. Norton, & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ordem, E., & Ulum, Ö. (2019). Critical pedagogy and participatory approach in Turkey: views of pre-service ELT teachers. *Journal ofTurkish Studies*, *14*, 679-693.

Ordem, E., & Yükselir, C. (2017).Views of Turkish EFL instructors on Critical pedagogy.*Journal of Turkish Studies, 12*(14), 285-294.

Riasati, M. J., & Mollaei, F. (2012). Critical pedagogy and language learning. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(21), 223-229.

Sarvestani, N., & Yamini, M. (2016). Iranian EFL Teachers' attitudes towards Critical 7 Pedagogy. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 6*(1).

Shang, R., & Troudi, S. (2020). Critical english foreign language teacher education in

China. *Journal of Advances in Education Research*, *5*(2), 92-104.

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53-55.

Werner, O., & Campbell, D.T. (1970). Translating, working through interpreters, and the problem of decentering. In: Naroll, R. and Cohen, R., (Eds*.), A Handbook of Methodin Cultural Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History*, New York, 398-420.

Yilmaz, K. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views about the critical pedagogy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 18*(1), 139-149.

Yılmaz, K., & Altınkurt, Y. (2011). Prospective teachers' views about critical pedagogy. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 12*(3), 195-213.

Appendix A.

İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Eleştirel Pedagoji Farkındalık Ölçeği (EPFÖ)						
	1- Kesinlikle katılmıyorum.	2 – Katılmıyorum.	3- Kısmen katılmıyorum.	4- Kısmen katılıyorum.	5- Katılıyorum.	6- Kesinlikle katılıyorum.
1- İngilizce öğretmenlerinin temel rollerinden bir tanesi öğrencilere daha bağımsız öğrenmenin yanında, daha bağımsız düşünmeyi ve hareket etmeyi öğretmektir.						
2- İngilizce öğretmenlerinin temel rollerinden bir diğeri öğrencilere kim olduklarının ve dünyadaki yerlerinin ne olduğuna yönelik kendi anlayışlarını geliştirmelerine yardımcı olmaktır.						
3- İngilizce öğretmenleri öğretme strateji ve tekniklerini, öğrencilerin belirli özelliklerine (yaş, cinsiyet, ihtiyaçlar ve ilgiler) göre belirlemelidir.						
4- İngilizce öğretmenleri otoritelerini ve sorumluluklarını sınıftaki öğrencilerle paylaşmalıdır.						
5- İdeal İngilizce ders kitapları, yerli olarak ve öğrencilerin gerçek hayatları göz önünde bulundurularak tasarlanmalıdırlar.						
6- İngilizce öğretmeni sınıf içi iletişime ve tartışmalara bir öğrenci gibi katılmalıdır.						
7-Öğretmenler İngilizce derslerinde tek bilgi kaynağı değildirler.						
8- İngilizce öğretmenleri, öğrencilerin kendi öğrenme fırsatlarını yaratmalarını cesaretlendirmeli ve desteklemelidir.						
9-İngilizce öğretmenleri, derslerde fikir paylaşımı için diyalog ve açık iletişim kanallarını kullanmalıdır.						
10- Türkiye'de yaygın olarak okutulan İngilizce derslerinin ve kitaplarının içeriği, öğrencilerin gerçek hayatlarından ilgi ve meselelerle çok fazla alakalı değildir.						

11- İngilizce dersi öğretiminin içeriğini, özgün ve gerçek hayatla bağdaşık iletişim stilleri oluşturmalıdır.						
12- İngilizce öğretmenleri, İngilizce ders kitaplarının içeriğindeki kültürel ve sosyopolitik bakış açılarına karşı eleştirel yaklaşıma sahip olmalıdır.						
13- İngilizce öğretmenlerinin temel rollerinden bir tanesi de öğrencilerin eleştirel düşünme becerilerini geliştirmektir.						
14- Çevresel, sosyal ve politik konular ve sorunlar İngilizce dersinde odaklanmak için uygun konulardır.						
15- İkinci dil eğitiminin temel hedeflerinden bir tanesi, toplumdaki ve eğitim sistemindeki baskın sosyal normları ve inanışları anlamaları için öğrencilere yardımcı olmaktır.						
16- İngilizce öğretmenlerinin temel rollerinden bir tanesi, öğrencilerin toplum içerisindeki eşitsizliklerin farkına varmalarını sağlamaktır.						
17- İngilizce öğretmenleri, İngilizce derslerinde, konuşma, yazma ve okuma aktiviteleri gibi çalışmalarda konuların seçilmesi sürecine öğrencileri de dahil etmelidir.						

Note on Ethical Issues

The author confirms that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country (Date of Confirmation: 05/05/2021).