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Abstract
Critical pedagogy (CP) is implemented in ELT programs aiming to empower both teachers and learners to unmask underlying cultural values and ideologies of educational setting and society, and subsequently to make them agents of transformation in their society. However, despite the increase in the number of publications in the field of critical L2 pedagogy, remarkably little has been done on materials development in CP. Considering materials as the core resources in language-learning programs (Richards, 2010), the present paper attempted to offer a model for ELT materials development based on the major tenets of critical pedagogy. The principles of the model were organized according to the main factors involved in materials development, i.e. program, teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical factors. This model is sensitive to the particularities of the local context and to the learner’s problems and concerns. It offers ways to help the learners to improve their second language skills while developing a sense of critical consciousness of issues of social structures in the world around them. It could be helpful for local materials writers and language teachers in developing and critically evaluating ELT materials. Subsequently, the model might contribute to students to be more critical consumers of information.
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1. Introduction
Why have there always been a dichotomy of oppressors and oppressed in the society? What is the concrete reality of it? Where has it rooted in? How to move beyond it? What about liberation, is it a gift or a self-achievement? Critical pedagogy concerns such issues and turns the lens on such social realities. Looking at education as a political enterprise, critical pedagogy aims to raise learner’s critical consciousness to be aware of their sociopolitical surroundings and to fight against the status quo, with the intent of transformation both in the classroom and in the larger society (Norton & Toohey, 2004). Although critical pedagogy has been developed primarily in the 1970s with the work of Freire, the most renowned critical pedagogue, it entered in the second language (L2) arena from the late 1980s when L2 teaching was surrounded by the pragmatic attitude and communicative approaches (Canagarajah, 2005).

In an English language teaching (ELT), critical pedagogy does not respect the cultural/political neutrality of English. CP argues that it is inevitable to disregard the issues of power and social inequities that are masked by English language teaching (Sadeghi, 2009). As many scholars put a critical lens toward such issues, many studies have been done both theoretically and practically (though little done in the latter) to shed lights on this way. The studies are established in different facets of critical EFL/ESL such as “seeking critical classroom practices”, “educating teachers for change”, “seeking critical research practices”, critical assessment, challenging learners’ identities, “creating and adapting materials for critical pedagogies”, etc (Norton & Toohey, 2004). This last point could be quite essential especially for inexperienced teachers. In this regard, Crookes (2009) asserts that critical L2 pedagogy could be improved practically if more diverse sample materials which operationalize theories of language in critical L2 pedagogy classrooms were in access.
While materials are usually considered as the core resources in language-learning programs (Richards, 2010), remarkably little has been done on materials development in critical pedagogy and the whole area is almost under-developed. With the absence of a comprehensive framework to develop materials on critical pedagogy, this study intended to provide a materials-design framework where the main pedagogic principles of critical pedagogy are included and applied. This model sought to design a teaching materials model with the purpose of leading educational situations to flourish students to be agents of the transformation in the society. With this purpose in mind, this study tried to answer the following questions:

(1). What principles of materials development could be derived from the philosophies of critical pedagogy?

(2). How may these principles be used to end up with a model to write, adapt or evaluate ELT materials?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Critical Pedagogy: Definition, History and Key Concepts

Critical pedagogy talks about the purpose and the process of education. Education in the critical sense lights up the connection among knowledge, authority and power (Giroux, 1994; cited in Steven, 2002). Critical pedagogy particularly emerged in the 1960s and 1970s when doubts began on the societal power system prolonged within education (Baladi, 2007), though the term itself does not come into use until about two decades ago in 1983, by Henry Giroux in his effective book *theory and resistance in education*, published in 1983 (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003).

Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, the pioneering figure of the movement, initially talked about the issues of power and social injustice in the literacy programs and put forward critical pedagogy as an approach to face up with these issues (Baladi, 2007). This critical standpoint toward pedagogy keeps on chronologically by works of Apple (1982), McLaren (1989), Shor (1992), Giroux (1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, and 1997), Kincheloe (1993, 2005) and many others (cited in Baladi, 2007). With the influence of theories such as postmodernism, feminist, anti racist, postcolonialism and queer, critical pedagogy expands its dominance from social class to include categories such as race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, and age (Steven, 2002).

Freire (1970), in his most celebrated book *pedagogy of the oppressed*, argues against banking model of education in favor of a liberatory, dialogic and problem posing education. He objects the traditional frame of education, i.e. banking model, in which students are considered as “empty vessels to be filled” by the teacher (p. 79). The practice of the banking model leads to the domination and oppression. As a remedy, Freire (1970) proposes problem posing education which takes place through dialogue in which teachers and students become critical co-learners and all teach and all learn (Sadeghi, 2009). In problem-posing education the teacher challenges the learners’ existential situation by asking “simple but stimulating and probing questions” concerning the problems of learners’ lives (Crawford, 1978, p. 96).

Problem posing education looks at the problematic situation as a holistic system in interaction with other systems than as a distinct situation with merely its own parts. In this education, learners explore contradictions in the perceived problem and try to uncover the hidden issues to solve it. However, “this resolution is not a final solution” since the process of knowing is on-going; ongoing in the sense that “each knowing creates a new situation requiring new perception and new praxis” (Crawford, 1978, p. 97). Praxis conveys the cycle of reflection and action. It is a continuous process of critical reflection “that requires an individual or group to plan an action based on their understanding of a situation and then reflect on that action to change their understanding. They then plan and act again, but reflect again and change their understanding … [to improve] their plans, and make their actions more effective“. (Degener, 2001, p. 60)

Learning situations employing problem posing education support stimulating questions or, borrowing Crawford’s (1978) terms, *thought-provoking questions*. Such questions derive from generative themes. The first stage of a critical literacy work is the identification of such generative themes by analyzing the realities of learners’ life. They are generative in the sense of corresponding to the people’s concerns and ideas (Roberts, 2000) and consequently they can invoke considerable discussion. The themes are used within codification, decodification and recodification stages (Crawford, 1978). Codification is a representation of generative themes related to the learner’s life situations in the audio and/or visual forms, e.g. a photograph, sketch, film, a drawing, etc (Heaney, 1995). Decodification is an exploration and interpretation of learners’ ideas about traditional, cultural and/or political aspects of themes to see the interaction of a phenomenon with other phenomena (Crawford, 1978); in other words, decodification is an analysis of the day-to-day experiences to unmask the previously unperceived realities (Heaney, 1995). Then, in recodification level, learners expand their perceptions of the phenomena to examine the former perception and to recodify the themes more critically.
One of the distinctive features of critical pedagogy is dialogue. In the dialogical context, individuals in the classroom are considered as the members of one community in a way that all teach and all learn. In this manner, a mutual acceptance and trust between learners and the teacher would be created (Heaney, 1995). This approach of critical pedagogy is in contrast with the anti-dialogical method which holds a “hierarchical classroom structure of teacher over students” (Crawford, 1978, p. 91).

Taking an overall look at a critical curriculum, Freire and Macedo (1987) maintain that an educational program should be much more than learning how to read. In this fashion, a critical curriculum prepares learners to “read the world” while “read the word”. By “reading the world” they mean helping learners be aware of the differences between the world of nature and the world of culture while the former is made by natural forces and cannot go under change by individuals and the latter is made by humans and can go under change (Sticht, 2006).

2.2 Critical Pedagogy in ELT Program

While teaching colonial language to students is always considered as a debatable activity laden with political issues, L2 education mainly took up an innocent position toward their work (Canagarajah, 2005). For a long time, ELT has been regarded as “clean and safe exports” with few ethical issues just as a means for communication (Baladi, 2007). Canagarajah (2005) argues that the root of such attitudes could be found in: the structuralistic perspective on language (count proficiency as systematic utilization of abstract value-neutral grammar), behaviorist orientation in learning (consider exposure to linguistic stimuli as a facilitator for learning) and the positivistic tradition to language acquisition (believe in the similarity condition of a closed observation of learning in laboratory and the learning experiences in real-life situations). However, critical advocates argue that such apolitical principles are certainly stimulated by sociopolitical issues (Canagarajah, 2005).

Canagarajah's (2005) perspective is similar to Pillipson (1988, 1992; cited in Baladi, 2007) who was one of the pioneers in paying attention to the ethical problems of ELT and scrutinized the language policies imported to the third world countries from colonial times. Canagarajah (2005) asserts that after “the decolonization and around the Cold war” (p. 931), ELT shifted to an important activity and English was remarked as a more effectual channel of hegemony. In line with them, Pennycook (1990) also considers the governing linguistic principles as a mask to hide the controversial materials and ideological goals of ELT classrooms.

Trying to define critical pedagogy in ELT, Canagarajah (2005) lends critical pedagogy to a practice-oriented stance where critical pedagogy “is not a set of ideas, but a way of doing learning and teaching. It is a practice motivated by a distinct attitude toward classrooms and society” (P. 932). Critical students and teachers are planned to bring their actual life experiences and needs to the classroom to demystify power implications in pedagogical activity and struggle to alter the means and ends of learning in order to form more ethical, educational, and social environment. In this vein, Akbari (2008) contends that “the discourse of CP is the discourse of liberation and hope” (p. 277). Critical pedagogues in second language teaching are interested to explore the ways that social relationship and issues of power are settled in language (Norton & Toohey, 2004). Norton and Toohey (2004) add that from this stand point, language is not just as a means for communication rather it is “a practice that constructs, and is constructed by the ways language learners understand themselves, their social surroundings, their histories, and their possibilities for the future” (P.1).

2.3 The Trouble with ELT Materials

With the spread of criticisms on English language teaching, materials as the heart of educational setting also have gone under critical appraisal. Many applied linguists question the content of mainstream materials in ELT world. Brown (1990) argues that “best sellers are increasingly marketed to westernized young adult” (p. 13). Rinvolucri (1999) has also been bitterly opposed to the content of EFL course books where the EFL world stays away from the dark side of the life with no mention of death, poverty or war. He pronounces that EFLese course materials are just as the soft, fudgy, sub journalistic and women’s magaziney world.

Suffered from poor EFLese materials, critical pedagogy discards the use of commercially produced textbooks and instructional materials. Crawford (1978) affirms that such materials detach the learner from responsibility and opportunity to be creative and active in the language process. Crookes (2009) suggested that the practicality of critical L2 pedagogy would be improved by more accessibility and variety of “fully worked out sample materials” (p. 9). Such materials could help teachers to familiarize with the theories of language play out in critical L2 pedagogy classrooms. Beside sample materials, a framework in which the main principles essential to be considered in designing and evaluating materials could be helpful for teachers and local materials writers. In the sense that there is less research on materials development in critical pedagogy, as Crookes (2009) also believes in, this study tried to present a model for designing materials in accordance with the philosophies of critical pedagogy.
3. Method

As the purpose of this study was to extract the implications of the philosophies of critical pedagogy for the design of ELT materials, it was first required to have a general understanding of critical pedagogy. The study tried to do this by reviewing the history and philosophy of critical pedagogy in the previous section. In addition, it was also needed to have a clear definition of ‘materials’ and the major factors involved in designing ELT materials. For a definition of materials, this study adopted Tomlinson’s (1998) comprehensive definition in which material refers to anything-visual/audio aids, computer software, books, dictionaries, etc. - utilized by teachers or students as the learning facilitator.

To employ major factors for materials design, this study made use of Richards’ (2001) proposal. He specifies five factors based on which in each situation questions specific to that situation required to be constructed. These factors embrace (p. 259):

1. Program factors: questions relating to concerns of the program
2. Teacher factor: questions relating to teacher concerns
3. Learner factor: questions relating to learner concerns
4. Content factor: questions relating to the content and organization of the material in the book
5. Pedagogical factor: questions relating to principles underlying the materials and the pedagogical design of the materials, including choice of activities and exercise types.

The researchers adapt and supplement Richards’ (2001) model by dividing each factor into sub-groups, like the following:

1. Program factors
   a. purpose: relating to the ultimate goal of the program
   b. objectives: relating to the actual outcomes of the program

2. Content factors
   a. content definition: relating to the definition of the themes used in materials
   b. content source: relating to the source of content selection
   c. content arrangement: relating to the sequence of the content

3. Pedagogical factors
   a. the process of education: relating to the method of knowing and education in the materials
   b. the stance of source culture: relating to the position of local cultures in ELT materials

4. Teacher factors
   a. teacher role: relating to the role that a material adopts for the teacher
   b. expectations of teacher: relating to the expectations which are assumed teacher brings to the classroom in using the materials

5. Learner factors
   a. learner role: relating to the role that a material adopts for the learner
   b. expectations of learner: relating to the expectations which are assumed learner brings to the classroom in using the materials

4. Results and Discussion

This section attempts to answer the questions of the study by offering some principles and providing their implications. The principles presented here are organized according to the five main factors and their sub-groups discussed in the previous section. Each principle is followed by a supporting discussion. Then, implications and comments related to these principles are given.

4.1 Program Factors

4.1.1 Purpose

**Principle 1:** ELT materials should develop learners’ communicative abilities while applying these abilities to raise learners’ critical consciousness of the world around them and the ability to act on it.
Discussion: Most of ELT materials are a compilation of information and activities with the purpose of improving English communicative abilities regardless of the social issues. Such materials have been designed for traditional banking education. For critical pedagogy, on the contrary, to be truly effective in an English language program, materials should simultaneously develop learners’ language skills and their awareness of the social structures. In other words, in a critical L2 pedagogy, materials pursue a “joint goal” (Crookes & Lehner, 1998, p. 320) and the general aim of language practices is “to help students to read with and also to read against … critical literacy is not just about interrogating texts; it is also about ‘real world realities’ and the role of language, power and representation in injustice” (Edelsky & Johnson, 2004; quoted in Reagan, 2006, p. 4). Thus, the major mission of ELT materials should be to contribute students read their world while read their word.

Implications and comments: With this purpose in mind, language is considered as a communicative tool like what we have seen in communicative approaches, but unlike them instructional materials in critical L2 pedagogy do not support practices that indicate a superficial understanding of the discussed topics but rather they involve learners to go beyond the superficial to a more complex understanding of the realities. Such materials develop activities which incorporate language skills while involving students in contextualized activities to “examine language, language use, and language attitudes … more critically” (Reagan & Osborn, 2002, p. 73). Thus, within ELT materials, language can become a means to explore the sociopolitical issues and cultural values conveyed in language. The learners’ mastery in language skills could be regarded as a means to explore critically and transform their position in their own society and in the target language society (Degener, 2001).

4.1.2 Objectives

Principle 2: If the materials have a joint goal, then ELT materials for critical pedagogy are expected to have two major outcomes: social development and language skill development on the part of the learner.

Discussion: Critical second/foreign language pedagogy as an interdisciplinary education (Reagan & Osborn, 2002) has two primary objectives that should be manifested in ELT materials. As mentioned earlier, it was expected in critical pedagogy that learners experience a sense of empowerment through engaging in the emancipatory praxis, i.e. the cycle of reflection and action. In this regard, the ultimate outcome is that learners discover new ways of challenging the status quo and engaging in transformative actions in order to eliminate inequalities (i.e. social development) while they improve their mastery of the target language (i.e. language skill development). This joint outcome is reflected in the title of Freire and Macedo’s (1987) book Literacy: Reading the Word and the World as they believe that an educational program should be much more than learning how to read. A critical curriculum prepares learners to “read the world” while “read the word”. In the same vein, ELT materials should be developed in a way that can help learners to go beyond understanding the written words to come to an understanding of the realities of the world and take action to change the world. Language skills and information provided by the materials thereby are subject to creative action (Crawford, 1978). Consequently, learning language skills are valid not by themselves but in relation to transformative action.

Implications and comments: Commercially ELT materials usually have a set of prespecified objectives and outcomes settled down prior to the actual occurrence of the learning situations. Due to a critical pedagogy framework, however, such clear and precise outcomes are not identified. Nothing more than the ultimate holistic outcome, i.e. taking social action, can be predetermined. Along these lines, Crawford (1978) argues that in Freirean pedagogy, learners specify the form and content of their creative action by identifying their own needs for skills and information. What the materials need to do, then, is to provide lots of generative themes, or in Crawford’s (1978) words, action-invoking themes from the learners’ lives as the starting point for learning. And, they leave the control for the outcomes to the learners. ELT material designers can develop a number of activities to let students achieve effective outcomes. The activities should lead students and teachers to participate in a dialogical process while they are practicing different language skills and identifying the linguistic content. Students and teachers can explore cultural values, traditions, and beliefs both in the first language and target language and investigate the similarities and differences between two cultures, reflect on both language cultures and their interrelationship, and act toward transforming structural inequities. In this stage, Crawford (1978) delicately uses the term “reviewable conclusion” to call attention to the fact that the conclusion drawn by the learners is not final. “As a form of perception, conclusions themselves become subject to perception” (p. 140). This term conveys the cyclic manner of praxis.

4.2 Content Factors

4.2.1 Content definition

Principle 3: The topics and themes included in ELT materials should be generative to invoke considerable discussion and analysis.
Discussion: The grassroots of the critical ELT programs are generative themes. Such themes derived from learners’ existential situations would be used in the process of praxis to be the object of reflection (Crawford, 1978). The themes are used within the codification, decodification and recodification stages discussed before. Overall, the generative themes suggested by the students define the organization of the content of the ELT materials. Such themes could revolve around topics of the L1 culture, target language culture or the relationship between the two, e.g. the role of the minority in the society, male/female roles, predominance of some social classes, or the position of English in non-English language societies and vice versa, namely the position of non-English languages in English language countries. Furthermore, some of the themes can be extended to question other generative themes. For instance, study of the implications of the internationalization of English may lead to the problems around the economic power in the world. Then, the teacher can turn the suggested topics into English, identify the vocabulary and structures which the students require to learn and provide resources for language learning. Crawford (1978) points out that the linguistic content may also generate some cultural points to be negotiated by the students to explore the differences between first and target language structures of social events such as greeting, insults, requests, authority relationship, etc. and to examine their underlying values.

4.2.2 Content source

**Principle 4**: Source of the themes of the materials should be derived from the learners’ life situations, needs and interests.

Discussion: Based on the CP philosophies, individuals and their life experiences should be the starting point for education. Freire (1970) guarantees motivation by tying the content of the materials to the learners’ existential situations. “He molds the subject matter to the students rather than the students to the subject matter” (Crawford, 1978, p. 85). The ultimate goal is transformative action for creating better conditions. It is essential that students have a true understanding of their lives and the spread of English as a global language and act on the perceived inequalities. This understanding could be developed by addressing learners’ realities in ELT contexts.

It is essential to note that the term ‘interest’ has a different sense in critical pedagogy than it has in the common materials-designing process. In the latter, ‘interest’ signifies the current learner’s concerns; whereas, in the former, interests may initially not attract students’ attention. The criterion for the selection of themes in critical pedagogy is not actually the current interests of the learners but the problematic reality in the learners’ lives (Crawford, 1978). The students may even not perceive the problem but once, through dialogue, they comprehend the themes as problems, their interests would be stimulated (Crawford, 1978).

4.2.3 Content arrangement

**Principle 5**: ELT materials should take into account the intellectual advances of the learners in arranging the content.

Discussion: Intellectuality is a major factor in how to perceive the world and act on it. Social- intellectual advances help students to become more confident readers of the world surrounded them. ELT materials can increase learners intellectuality as the content sequence move “from lesser to greater complexity, from the more familiar to the less familiar, and from the concrete to the more abstract” (Roberts, 2000, p. 80).

Implications and comments: There is no predetermined syllabus in critical language pedagogy since every context and reality differs. While arguing that neither the thematic nor the subject matter content can be specified in advance, Crawford (1978) believes that the major subject matter concentration, however, can be defined. For instance, Freire (1970) defined curriculum area, i.e. reading, in his critical literacy work with Latin Americans though he designated the content of the materials through people’s life themes. Or taking another example, Sadeghi (2009), in her study, concentrated on analyzing the traditions, customs, and beliefs in her ELT classroom whereas the discussed topics came from the participants.

The overall form of materials -designing process commonly is that first the selected content would be defined, analyzed, and divided into learning units and then the materials would be written for teaching the corresponding units. In this fashion, Crawford (1978) explains how the organization of materials based on the learners’ lives is a reversal of the traditional educational practice. She argues that traditionally, if a problem of learner motivation arises in the learning situation, attempts to eliminate this problem address the second step of the materials-designing process, i.e. preparing more interesting materials by adding more attention-getting visuals. Conversely, in critical pedagogy, the attempts would turn on the first step, i.e. content definition. A noteworthy characteristic of such materials is that they are linked to the realities. Therefore they have an integral relationship to learning and, as a result, they can guarantee more sustainable motivation.
4.3 Pedagogical Factors

4.3.1 The process of education

Principle 6: The way of teaching is via engaging students in the cycle of reflection and action by embracing dialogical problem posing practices.

Discussion: The human vocation in relation to critical pedagogy is fulfilled perfectly by taking action to change the world for improvement of life conditions. To accomplish this vocation, Crawford (1978) maintains that people should treat themselves as reflective humans. Therefore, the mission of education is to help people fulfill their human vocation by involving in the cycle of reflection and action, i.e. praxis. This involvement requires students to participate in dialogical problem posing practices. In the process of problem posing practice, the learners first make decision on the content of discussion, i.e. generative theme. Then, they try to relate the issue or problem to their own lives, that is, personalization of the problem. Afterward, the teacher poses a number of questions aiming to critically challenge students and leads them toward a discussion on the socioeconomic, political and/or cultural reasons of the problem, namely, decodification.

Crawford (1978) argues that the traditional classroom discussions are antidialogical, in the sense that they are discussions of an idea which is predefined. Such a predefined idea may or may not correspond to the learners’ experiences and perceptions, “but it is what they are suppose to believe” (p. 92). On the other hand, the discussion that occurs in critical language classroom is “discussion for creation” not “discussion of an idea” (p. 92). In such a discussion, students combine their experiences to define the topic for themselves and verbalize what they think about.

4.3.2 The stance of source culture

Principle 7: ELT materials base their content on source culture.

Discussion: With the spread of English around the world, there is no longer the need for students to assimilate into Anglo-American culture. Bringing source culture, i.e. learners’ own culture, into materials content is valuable since focusing on local cultures contributes to learners to reflect on the positive and negative features of their own culture and consequently explore ways to make changes in the society if change is required (Akbari, 2008). In addition, considering learners’ culture as the starting point, in Akbari’s (2008) view, has an added value of empowering learners by making them “critically aware and respectful of their own culture and prevent[ing] the development of a sense of inferiority which might result from a total reliance on the target language culture where only the praiseworthy features of the culture are presented” (p. 279).

Implications and comments: In line with what was discussed related to this factor, in what follows a brief example will be offered in which a tentative sequence of the process of education in ELT materials is presented. It is supposed that this example takes place in an Iranian ELT classroom. The theme of the study is ‘trivialization of minorities and villagers in Iranian films’ (principle 7). This example aims to make students aware of the ideologies hidden in the films. In such films, the higher prestige characters e.g. chairmen, generally have a standard-Farsi accent while the lower prestige ones e.g. servants, have a villager accent or the accent of a minority group, for example Turkish.

The selected theme is a generative theme since it could invoke considerable discussion once the students perceive it as a problem (principle 3). For the codification stage, different sections of one or two films can be selected. Then, in the decodification stage, teachers ask questions directing attention to the relevant issue, i.e. posing problem (principle 6). Consequently, learners try to describe the situation in response to questions and add their own information, experiences and questions while the teacher could assist learners in developing their English language competence. When the learners perceive the problem, they can take action against the problematic situation so they involve in the process of praxis (principle 6). They can, for example, write a letter or send a mail to someone who is in charge, or they can prepare a text based on their perception and publish it in a magazine or a local newspaper. It should be noted that all of these communications take place in a dialogical form (principle 6) while students improve their listening, speaking and writing skills (principle 1 & 2).

A word of caution should be in order here. Involvement in such dialogical discussions usually requires students to be proficient enough in the second language. But critical pedagogy allows lower proficient students to use L1 logically. Akbari (2008) asserts that “the judicious use of the students’ L1” (p. 280) can be seen as a springboard for transformation in the society. But it is expected that students make greater use of the L2 as their proficiency increases.
4.4 Teacher Factors

4.4.1 Teacher role

**Principle 8:** ELT materials should take into account the teacher’s role as a co-learner and coordinator.

**Discussion:** Traditionally, in banking education, we discussed that the foreign/second language teacher’s role has been viewed as an authoritative expert who delivers information to the learners. In CP framework, on the other hand, the class works as a learning community (Crookes & Lehner, 1998) and the teacher should be considered as a member of the community who would also engage in the praxis. Therefore, teachers and students would together negotiate their ideas, perceptions and experiences. The teacher participates “as a learner among learners” (Crawford, 1978, p. 104). The teacher, in ELT materials, also would be seen as a problem poser, asking questions that can stimulate students reflect more on the aspects of their lives which may seem unchangeable (Degener, 2001).

**Implications and comments:** ELT materials should not be in a way that fosters the traditional role of the teacher to stand, lecture, distribute knowledge and control the situation. Alternatively, the materials should create an environment in which all teach and all learn. This means that, each community member can be “simultaneously both teacher and learner” (Crawford, 1978, p. 105). Nevertheless, the teachers’ linguistic knowledge should not be disregarded. The point is that their knowledge and skills, though “is not distributed, but contributed to and assessed by the study group” (Crawford, 1978, p. 107).

4.4.2 Expectations of teacher

**Principle 9:** In ELT materials, it is expected that teachers would not only bring to the class their language knowledge, but also their awareness of the implications of the internationalization of English.

**Discussion:** Teachers as transformative intellectuals are expected to be aware of the socioeconomic and political issues engaged in teaching English. Pennycook (1995) asserts that the English teacher must be sensitive to “the implications of the spread of English for the reproduction and production of global inequalities as well as be a political agent engaged in a project of critical pedagogy that helps the student to articulate in English countercodes to the dominant discourse of the West” (quoted in Cox & Assis-Peterson, 1999, p. 439). It means that teachers are responsible to use a critical lens in ELT programs (Fredricks, 2007). Such a lens could help learners to develop their own critical language awareness and sensitivity to the ideological aspects of language and language use.

**Implications and comments:** To achieve effective outcomes, besides having useful critical materials, it is required that the English teacher be knowledgeable about the social structures and specifically about the English as an international language and their advantages and disadvantages.

4.5 Learner Factors

4.5.1 Learner role

**Principle 10:** ELT materials should take into account the learner’s role as a decision-maker and subject of the act.

**Discussion:** ELT materials should refuse the passivity role of the learners in which they are passive recipients of teacher’s knowledge to memorize and master. The materials designer ought to trust the ability of learners to drive the learning process, to define the materials content and to take action on realities, i.e. “learners must act but not be acted on” (Crawford, 1978, p. 108).

4.5.2 Expectations of learner

**Principle 11:** In terms of evaluative activities, it was expected that students develop their critical consciousness in line with their language mastery.

**Discussion:** An ongoing evaluation of students is a crucial part of a critical language program (Freire, 1998; cited in Degener, 2001). Evaluative activities, however, should concern on the growth, maturity and empowerment of the learners. In this fashion, “evaluation becomes an authentic expression of each student’s unique understanding and application of learning” (Kincheloe, Slattery & Steinberg, 2000; quoted in Reagan & Osborn, 2002, p. 71). Taking an example, an evaluative activity could be a picture or a text conveying an unperceived problem in the sense that people commonly perceive it as a social norm but not as a problem. The activity then could ask students to utter their perceptions of the picture or text.

ELT materials, nevertheless, can provide some activities to evaluate linguistic competence. Crawford (1978) takes into account two positive aspects of such activities. First, these activities can demonstrate to the learners “the extent and quality of their cognitive growth and increasing ability to use language … in the second language” (p. 160). Besides, they can determine the credibility of the critical language pedagogy. ELT materials should also move...
beyond giving usual homework assignment in favor of assigning some task for students to collect, select, prepare or produce topics and learning sources (Crawford, 1978).

Implications and comments: With the change of learner’s role in critical ELT materials from a passive receptacle to a creative agent, the expectations placed on the learner also should change. The learner is no longer the consumer of information to memorize and repeat it back to the teacher. Alternatively, in critical materials, the student utilizes the language knowledge and skill in addressing the object of the study (Crawford, 1978). Furthermore, due to the decision-making role of the learners, they have rights to decide on the topics, themes and linguistic content of the study. As a result, they actively participate in cultural codification and decodification processes.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study tried to develop an ELT-materials-development model which is in consistent with the major tenets of critical language pedagogy. Consequently, this study has driven eleven principles which are sensitive to the learners’ reality lives. In this model, it has tried to increase learners’ critical awareness and encourage them to take action against the inequalities of the world around them.

One of the criticisms often directed against critical pedagogy is that it is more as a critical educational theory than as a critical pedagogy (Gore, 1993; cited in Keesling-Style, 2003). This means that critical pedagogy is more on the level of theory and lacks applicability and eventually fails in practice (Baladi, 2007). The same criticism might be directed toward the ELT materials model developed in this study. Such claim, however, could be excused. The reason is that every situation and reality differs and as a result “one cannot give the ‘ten’ steps for a critical pedagogy” (Kanpol, 1998, 3) while the starting point of CP is such situations and realities. Conversely, critical pedagogy struggles against any “formulaic enterprise” in which a set of prescribed, neatly organized steps has been given for all different arenas. So, it can be concluded that a noteworthy characteristic of this proposed model is that it is dynamics of how critical pedagogy materials can be designed and developed. This model could be used as a guide for teachers and local materials writers to point them the right direction; but, it is the immediate needs of the students that specify the actual topics, content, and the organization of the materials.

The globalization of English, as was mentioned earlier, makes it essential to bring about the tenets of critical pedagogy in the ELT programs and materials. However, the curricular mandates are not always in line with the ends of social justice. In such cases, Reagan and Osborn (2002) propose teachers make use of curricular nullification as “an effective pedagogical strategy for instructional planning” (p. 87) to challenge such curriculums. Curricular nullification – or teaching as a subversive activity – acknowledges the fact that teachers can conduct classes based on their own believes, regardless of the curricular guidelines. In other words “they can support or subvert any part of the curriculum once they shut the door to their classroom” (Graney, 2003, p. 1).

As a last remark, it is worth mentioning that even when all the curriculum, materials, and teachers are in line with critical pedagogy, it is wrong to expect students to move into their new role described by critical pedagogy all at once. It is a transition that requires time and practice. In a related vein, Crawford (1978) suggests that the teacher can facilitate such transition and “adjustment from a passive role to this active one by allowing sufficient time for the transition to take place, by refusing to make decisions which belong to the students, and by accepting the results of the students’ actions as valuable.” (p. 157)
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