Pedagogy of Possibility for EFL Learners: Principles, Application, and Course Development

Leila Akbarpour
(Ph.D. candidate, Shiraz University, Iran)
Corresponding author email: akbarpour@iaushiraz.ac.ir

Rahman Sahragard
(Associate professor, Shiraz University, Iran)

Abstract
This study reports on the development of a reading comprehension course based on Critical Pedagogy principles, and the result of its application on EFL learners' reading comprehension competence, their motivation to read English materials, their democratic attitudes towards their English classrooms, and also their attitudes towards the critical course. The present study is, in fact, a step forward to scrutinize the outcomes of the beginning phases of a dissertation which was intended to develop a tentative model of Critical Pedagogy for English language teaching practice in Iran. Sixty one sophomore students (in two groups) were the participants of the present study. One group was randomly assigned to the control group (n=31) who received instruction based on the conventional method of teaching reading comprehension practiced in most reading comprehension courses in Iran, while the other one made the experimental group (n=30) who received instruction based on the Critical Pedagogy course. Results of the statistical analyses comparing the participants' performance on pre- and post-tests regarding reading comprehension, a questionnaire on motivation, and a democratic attitude questionnaire which were administered before and after the treatment, besides the qualitative data from a semi-structured interview, suggested that despite some problem issues rising while practicing the principles of Critical Pedagogy, the developed course proved to have a significant positive impact on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability, developing a positive democratic attitude towards their English classroom and also their motivation towards reading English materials. Students' attitude towards the critical reading comprehension course was also discussed in terms of four emerging themes driven out of the qualitative data analysis. The most important message, however, may be the applicability of Critical Pedagogy principles in Iran, which had been reported by some researchers as impractical.

Keywords: *Critical Pedagogy, course development, language teaching, reading comprehension, EFL, EFL learners*

Introduction

The question of the best method for language teaching had obsessed all language teaching programs before the initiation of a constructivist approach into education. Teachers, and students alike, had been required to be after, and appreciate, a set of fixed procedures in order to handle different aspects of the complicated issues of language acquisition. No one could argue for the rejection of the "right" answers which had been cultivated by the proponents of the culture of "monologue". Not only students, who were, despite their differences, taught by means of the same procedures and tested accordingly, but

teachers, who were appreciated only based on how successful they could follow what the method designers had prescribed for them in order to use for the students of diverse variables, were dissatisfied with the positivist approach to language teaching.

When the constructivist outlook entered the arena, it argued for the significance of all people's ideas, hence the consideration of students and teachers' viewpoints in all aspects of the language learning process. This was good news for the oppressed who had always been forced to accept the "right" answers provided by the privileged stakeholders. But unfortunately, the constructivist viewpoints' entrance into the language education era almost remained as an introduction in many places of the world, and in some contexts the results of their implementation never lived up to expectations (Chomsky & Robichaud, 2014). Our country, Iran, is just an example of such places, where after more than three decades since the introduction of the principles of Critical Pedagogy very little seems to have happened to the educational system regarding its advancement even towards accepting the principles of a critical education (Aliakbari & Allahmoradi, 2012), let alone their implementation. As Pishghadam and Mirzaee (2008) maintain, the educational system of Iran is still in the modern era (cited in Pishghadam & Naji Meidani, 2012, p. 466). Every year, the educational system installs strict rules regarding teaching and learning practices, and imposes a standardized curriculum to be used by all schools (Pishghadam & Naji Meidani, 2012) , regardless of their specific educational and societal contexts. Our educational system seems to have not even accepted the very idea behind the notion of Critical Pedagogy which is to respect the differences, and thus regards all types of learners, on the one hand, and all kinds of teachers, on the other, to be treated the same. This is the very basic reason for developing only a standardized curriculum for the whole country. Besides, learners are not given the right to choose the way in which they are taught and tested, as well as what they should be taught, and teachers have had little opportunity to express their viewpoints regarding how textbooks should be written to fit the specific contexts in which they teach. As Pishghadam & Naji Meidani (2012) claim, "Centralization, transmission, and behaviorism are prevalent from the primary years of education through the tertiary level, with students accustomed to didactic teaching and learning" (p. 466).

Furthermore, despite going through English language courses for 6 years, Iranian high school seniors' knowledge and use of English does not come up to expectations, and many university students seem to come up against difficulty even when passing a simple General English course. Though such problems may have diverse sources, one seems to us to be a lack of awareness of the very principles of the Critical Pedagogy on the part of the teachers (Esmaili & Barjesteh, 2013) and the learners, or to take its premises for granted in the rare cases in which these principles are known.

In order to better portrait the conditions, an investigation of the Constitution of Iran may be helpful.

Education and language teaching in the Constitution: a critical stance

When reviewing the literature on Critical Pedagogy, we got concerned with exploring the Constitution for articles regarding education in general, and language education, in particular. We noticed that the 3rd and 30th articles state that the government has the duty of directing all its resources to free education for everyone at all levels; besides, in article 104, it is declared that

In order to ensure Islamic equity and cooperation in carrying out the programs and to bring about the harmonious progress of all units of production, both industrial and agricultural, councils consisting of the representatives of the workers, peasants, other employees, and managers, will be formed in educational and administrative units, units of service industries, and other units of a like nature, similar councils will be formed, composed of representatives of the members of those units. (Constitution of Islamic Republic of Iran, Article 104)

The fact, however, is that although education is given high priority in the Constitution, there is no indication of a reference to foreign language education in the whole text, except for a reference to Arabic language teaching in the 16th article. There was no indication of an article regarding foreign language education in the ministry of education documents, either. This is also articulated by Aghagolzadeh and Davari (2014):

"Looking at the current changing situation of Iranian society reveals that the lack of any applicable and justifiable language in education policy is totally visible". (p. 405)

Although this may seem to be a lack of attention to foreign language education, it also indicates the likelihood of existing a second meaning which is the capability of the Constitution for a reform in language education, since the Constitution does not articulate any prohibition of attending to foreign language education. This is also confirmed by the Fundamental Reform Document of Education (FRDE) (2011) which is developed by the Ministry of Education, the Supreme Council of Cultural Revolution, and the Supreme Council of Education.

In FRDE, there are references to foreign language education: "provision of foreign language education within the optional (Core-elective) section of the curriculum framework by observing the principle of stabilization and enforcement of the Islamic–Iranian identity" (FRDE, chapter 7, p. 32). Moreover, though less than enough, there seems to exist traces of Critical Pedagogy principles (though not Critical Language Pedagogy) in some chapters, which indicates the possibility for the application of Critical Pedagogy principles in the educational system: "Provision and development of equal learning opportunities both for male and female students in various areas of the country that take into account their characteristics and differences" (FRDE, chapter 7, p. 36). What is of note, however, is that the FRDE does not seem to be more than a set of general guidelines whose applicability, at least regarding the language teaching issue, has not put into practice yet.

In the present piece of research, Critical Pedagogy principles (see the "method" section below) have been applied to develop an EFL reading comprehension course in order to investigate the effect of the course on learners' reading comprehension ability, their motivation to read English materials, changes (if any) in their attitudes towards how democracy is treated in their classrooms, and their attitudes towards the critical reading comprehension course. In fact, the present study is a step forward to examine the outcomes of the beginning phases of a dissertation which aimed at developing a tentative model of Critical Pedagogy for English language teaching practice in Iran. The rationale behind choosing reading comprehension was that this is the skill which is practiced in all educational contexts in Iran (i.e., schools, universities, language institutes), and is mostly favored by the ministries of Education and Sciences, Research, and Technology as the most important skill to be acquired by the students.

According to a classification of different definitions of Critical Pedagogy and the different contexts in which they can be used (Akbarpour, forthcoming) there is no room, at least for the present situation, for applying a strong version of Critical Pedagogy in our context and, thus, to confront the whole educational system; as a result, a weak version of Critical Pedagogy (Akbarpour, forthcoming) was employed in the present study. In fact, this piece of research, as Schultz, Mcsurley, and Salguero (2013) state, "offers students opportunities to engage in both democratic processes and experiential learning while also meeting benchmarks and standards" (p. 53). Thus, besides following the very basic principles of the educational policy, such as teaching reading comprehension as the most important skill in all educational contexts, the researchers have tried to provide a space for practicing Critical Pedagogy in EFL classrooms.

Literature Review

What is Critical Pedagogy?

According to Freire (1972) education is not a neutral activity but a basically political and power related one, since it either redresses the imbalances in the society or makes the biased conditions worse. This remark elucidates Critical Pedagogy, which in Conagarajah (2005)'s terms is "a way of doing learning and teaching" (Conagarajah, 2005, p. 932), and whose mission is to find the political and societal inequalities regarding education, and to initiate a change in order to help the oppressed to have a voice. By this means, learners and teachers' ideas are respected by virtue of the very fact that in Critical Theory every individual is regarded as significant in the society.

As Thomson-Bunn (2014) argues, "there is a lack of definitional precision surrounding *critical pedagogy* and its core terms". Some critiques of Critical Pedagogy believe that the reason behind its falling short of practice is in the way it is defined (see for example Durst, 2006). However, according to the literature introducing the concept of Critical Pedagogy and the different disciplines related to it, one can identify the three elements of "hegemony identification, awareness-raising, and change" inherent in the concept of

Critical Pedagogy (Akbarpour, forthcoming). Therefore, considering these three ingredients, Critical Pedagogy may be broadly defined as a framework for learning and teaching which strives to:

1. Identify the hegemony, the oppressive cultural and sociopolitical conditions in education and the related contexts, and the way the ideology behind the oppressive powers interact with the involved people's beliefs, and

2. Encourage educators, including teachers, and students to be

 A. aware of the oppressive cultural and sociopolitical conditions and the ideology behind them

 B. emancipated by means of critical awareness

 C. able to have a voice and to initiate a positive change for the better (Akbarpour, forthcoming).

Studies on Critical Pedagogy in practice

Although the concept of Critical Pedagogy has been appealing to many EFL/ESL practitioners since its introduction, only a few pieces of research have put its principles into practice in language classrooms, and many have only theoretically elaborated on its benefits regarding language learning and teaching practices. As Ross (2007) better explains, "the few authors or practitioners who offer concrete examples of critical teaching and learning practices are contrasted with the relative many who focus on theorizing a vision of society and schooling that is intended to shape the direction of a

critical pedagogy... Few, if any, critical pedagogues believe that critical teaching practices can be reduced to recipes" (p. 160). Critical pedagogues, including Henry Giroux (1997), Ken Osborne (1990), and Stephen Sweet (1998) argue that "critical theory needs to move beyond educational ideology, examining how it can be meaningfully employed in classroom practice" (cited in Breuing, 2011, p. 2). This issue is even more noticeable regarding studies concerning EFL/ESL practices.

During our literature review, there were moments of joy when we encountered a study which had traces of practicality in its title, but when we read the whole paper we did not observe but the same mentioning of theories. Of course, there were some studies introducing ways to apply the principles of CP, for instance through vignettes, but they were mostly concerning issues not related to our context in Iran, such as the hip hop culture or racism, frequently concerning African-American students (i.e. Barrett, 2013; Meacham, Anderson, & Correa, 2013;Simmons, Carpenter, Ricks, Walker, Parks, Marquin, & Davis, 2013; Williams, 2009). Besides, most studies seemed to have based their course- or practice-development on what we would like to call *their* principles of CP, for none reported to have had a thorough literature review on the history of Critical Pedagogy and its proposed principles before their practice, and to have checked the appropriateness of such principles for their context. In Iran, the situation seems to be even worse, since language education still appears to suffer from what Pennycook twenty five years ago called a "divorce from broader issues in educational theory" (Pennycook, 1990, p. 1), and thus, even

fewer pieces of research have investigated the Critical Pedagogy issue in practice, and many have confined their research to investigating Iranian teachers' attitudes towards Critical Pedagogy (i.e. Alliakbari & Allahmoradi, 2012; Davari, Iranmehr, & Erfani, 2012; Esmaili & Barjesteh, 2013; Naderi Anari & Zamanian, 2014; Pishvaei & Kasaian, 2013; Shabani & Khorsandi, 2014), or have examined Critical Pedagogy in general, and not Critical Language Pedagogy (e.g. Abdelrahim, 2007). No pieces of research, to the knowledge of the researchers, have put the principles of Critical Pedagogy into practice after investigating their appropriateness for the educational context of Iran, and none have ever made a language teaching course based on such principles. Therefore, in order to fill in the gaps in the literature, the present piece of research has aimed at answering the following questions:

What does a critical reading comprehension course look like?

Does employing Critical Pedagogy principles have any effects on reading comprehension ability of EFL learners?

Will a critical reading comprehension course make EFL learners more motivated towards learning English and reading English materials?

Will a critical reading comprehension course change learners' democratic attitudes towards their English classrooms?

What is the learners' attitude towards the critical reading comprehension course?

Method

The present study adopted a mixed-methods design including a pre-test post-test design with a control group, plus qualitative data analysis techniques, for scrutinizing the effect of the application of Critical Pedagogy principles on reading comprehension competence of EFL learners, their attitudes towards English language learning and reading English material, and their democratic attitudes towards their English classrooms. First, score distributions of 89 sophomore students majoring in English teaching and English translation on their Reading Comprehension (2) course were explored in order to choose homogeneous groups to take part in the study. Based on the results, 61 of the students (in two different classes) were recognized as appropriate to participate, and their scores were taken as their pre-test scores. One class was randomly assigned to control (n=31) and the other made the experimental group (n=30). The data for this research was collected during the first semester of the 2014-2015 academic year in the participants' Reading Comprehension (3) course.

The following four instruments were employed for fulfilling the purpose of the current study. The first one was a reading comprehension test which was developed especially for the purpose of the present research based on the materials covered during the semester, and aimed at testing different sub-skills of reading comprehension. This instrument was utilized as a posttest in order to test the control and experimental groups in terms of their reading comprehension competence.

The second instrument was a

questionnaire on the participants' attitudes and opinions regarding reading comprehension before and after the experiment. This questionnaire consisted of two questions which required the participants' to write about their attitudes towards reading comprehension. Whenever necessary, the participants were asked to explain about their answers in order for the researchers to know about the nature of their responses and what they really intended. Results generated by this instrument were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative technique (t-test) was used to explore changes (if any) in the participants' attitudes towards reading comprehension during the treatment, while the qualitative technique helped the researchers transcribe the results obtained by means of the third instrument whenever necessary.

The third instrument, whose results were transcribed and analyzed through qualitative techniques of grounded theory, was semi-structured interviews consisting of 5 open-ended items, which invited the participants to express their attitudes towards the critical reading comprehension course at the beginning, during, and after the experiment. Results of the interviews were reviewed several times to find the recurrent patterns for classifying the data and generating themes in order to answer the research questions.

Finally, the fourth instrument was a democratic attitude questionnaire whose items were taken from Ekman' study (2006) regarding school effects on democratic attitudes among school students. By democratic attitudes of the students, we mean the attitudes of the students towards how democracy is treated in their classroom. In fact, the present paper aimed at investigating whether the attitudes of the students towards how democracy is treated in their classrooms would change after the treatment or, in other words, whether the experimental group would feel a more democratic atmosphere in their classroom as a result of the treatment.

It may be worth mentioning that we just attempted at the educational aspect of democracy as introduced by Dewey (1916), to whose theory of education the idea of a democratic classroom is traced back. Dewey's (1916) theory of education explores the relationship between democracy and education, and advocates a student-centered pedagogy. The viewpoints of the proponents of democracy in education are in close agreement with those of critical pedagogues, and Dewey even considers democracy as the central aim of Critical pedagogy (Breuing, 2011); this relationship between Critical Pedagogy and democracy made the grounds on which we decided to explore the participants' democratic attitudes as one of our dependent variables. In a democratic classroom, teachers are not considered as dictators of knowledge, and thus there is shared responsibility for learning. Students enjoy freedom of speech, freedom to choose, and freedom to question the system (Waterman, 2007). "Schools are miniature societies and should focus on real-life problems students face in school or will face in the future" (Moss & Lee, 2010, p. 39). Kubow and Kinney (2000) developed eight characteristics for a democratic classroom as follows: active participation, avoidance of textbook dominated instruction, reflective

thinking, student decision-making and problem-solving choices, controversial issues, individual responsibilities, recognition of human dignity, and relevance. For the purpose of the present piece of research we made use of Ekman's (2006) democratic attitude questionnaire, which is regarding Dewey's (1916) theory of education and Kubow and Kinney's (2000) characteristics of democratic classrooms, and is in line with Critical Pedagogy principles.

A classical three-stage Delphi technique (Walker & Selfe, 1996), which makes use of three postal rounds and can be administered by email (Landeta, 2006, cited in Khatib & Fathi, 2014), was employed to examine the content validity of the questionnaire. The Delphi technique is defined as a multi-staged survey which attempts at achieving consensus on an important issue (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; McKenna, 1994). Employing the Delphi technique, we made use of the opinions of ten PhD holders in TEFL, whose experience in teaching English ranged between 8-20 years, and four of whom worked in the area of Critical Pedagogy, in order to validate the questionnaire items for the context of Iran. The result of the Delphi technique reduced the number of questionnaire items form twelve to seven. The items which were recognized as appropriate for the purpose of the present study are as follows:

1) Students are allowed to disagree with the teacher or to question what the teacher is teaching.

2) Teachers respect students' opinions and encourage them to express their opinions during class.

3) Students feel free to express opinions in class even when their opinions are different from most of the other students.

4) Students are allowed to bring up current political events for discussion in class.

5) Teachers encourage students to work cooperatively to solve problems.

6) Teachers lecture and students take notes.

7) Teachers are always right and thus students must obey them.

These items were on a likert-scale ranging from "often" to "never", which were, therefore, coded from one to four. The reliability of the new questionnaire was estimated to be 0.82 on Cronbach alpha measure. The questionnaire was administered before and after the experiment to know about whether the participants' attitudes towards how democracy is treated in their classroom will change after the critical pedagogical reading comprehension course.

Both groups received the same amount of classroom instruction (28 sessions, each lasting for 90 minutes) and were instructed by the same teacher. The course materials were also identical for both. The only difference was in the method chosen in order to teach reading comprehension to the participants. While the control group was instructed by means of the conventional method of teaching reading comprehension practiced in most reading comprehension

classes in Iran, the experimental group received instruction based on the assumptions of Critical Pedagogy. More specifically, while the classroom in the control group was a typical teacher-fronted one, the experimental group experienced a rather different approach. This approach will be explained in detail in terms of Richards' (2001) proposal regarding the following five factors based on which questions specific to any educational situation could be constructed:

(1). Program factors: questions regarding concerns of the program

(2). Teacher factors: questions regarding teacher concerns

(3). Learner factors: questions regarding learner concerns

(4). Content factors: questions regarding the content and organization of the material

(5). Pedagogical factors: questions regarding principles underlying the materials and the pedagogical design of the materials, including choice of activities and exercise types (p. 259).

We further divided the first factor into "language policy" and "curriculum development factor", and thus the resulting framework consisted of the six factors of *curriculum development, language policy, teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical concerns*. For the reasons mentioned before, the researchers had to adopt "a weak version of critical pedagogy" (Akbarpour, forthcoming) for the purpose of the present research, as a result of which the research focused only on some of the mentioned processes. In fact, areas which were influenced least by the teacher's critical stance were the language policy and the general policy

of the curriculum development, and areas mostly influenced by the teacher were regarding teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical factors.

In order to develop a framework for incorporating the critical pedagogy principles into the reading comprehension course for the experimental group, after reviewing nearly three hundred papers and book chapters regarding Critical Pedagogy, the researchers decided to make use of Crawford's (1978, pp. 73-112) twenty principles of Critical Pedagogy (cited in Abednia, 2010) which focused on different dimensions of a critical educational program. In other words, the concept of "Critical Pedagogy principles" was operationalized by means of what Crawford (1978) offered as principles of Critical Pedagogy for ELT programs. These principles were found to present a rather fuller account of the premises expressing CP as no other different principles emerged from the literature reviewed. Since these principles had originally been developed to provide a theoretical framework for ELT programs in general, they needed to be tailored to the specifics of the focus of the present piece of research. Accordingly, our framework's items were classified based on the six factors mentioned above (four of which had been taken from Richards (2001)), and thus, the order in which we classified the items were different from the one presented by Crawford (1978).

As it was stated earlier, the final draft of our framework had originally made use of the six factors of curriculum development, language policy, teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical concerns as the factors used in the

process of the first factor analysis (Akbarpour, forthcoming), and thus, the final emerging principles were the result of estimating all these six processes. However, since the present piece of research aimed at taking only the four factors of teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical concerns into account, another factor analysis was run to produce critical pedagogy principles which were especially appropriate for the present study. Therefore, the original twenty-five critical pedagogy items which had been derived from Crawford's work (1978), and had been recognized as appropriate for the context of Iran, were again put to factor analysis while the six factors had been reduced to four. As a result, the instrument was validated through confirmatory factor analysis and the number of items was reduced to twelve. These items were employed as the general principles to teach reading comprehension to the experimental group.

a. Teacher factors:

1. *The teacher participates in the process of knowing as a learner among learners, since knowing as a process of transformation is participation in the human vocation.*
2. *The teacher's function is one of posing problems, since education is for posing of problems.*

According to the first principle, there seems to be a shift of position for the critical teacher from that of "expert, trainer, or supervisor, to that of collaborator, consultant or facilitator" (Richards, 1989). The discourse of the overriding educational practices, according to critical pedagogists, follows

the "banking" model of education (Freire, 1972) which considers learners as passive recipients of pre-packaged knowledge. While the above-mentioned principles are in contradiction with the banking model, they never equalize the roles assumed for the teacher and the students. In other words, although teachers are classroom participants like their students, and they contribute their insights to the process, their authority is preserved due to their sophisticated knowledge regarding the subject matter, coupled with their teaching experiences. This is what resolves the seemingly contradiction of being a "learner among learners" and a "problem poser" at the same time, and would be an answer to those critiques who believe that Critical Pedagogy falls short of offering a sort of control over the teaching process, and results in a messy classroom condition.

Bickel (2006) exemplifies "democratizing the classroom" whereby students decide about such issues as the subject matter, the amount of reading assigned per week, the due date for assignments, and the class attendance policy. This co-ownership assumed by the students, however, as Bickel argues, gives the instructor more respect and, paradoxically, more authority among the students. As Friere (1998) suggests, "to teach is not to transfer knowledge but to create the possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge" (cited in Fobes & Caufman, 2008, p. 28).

In an introduction to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Donaldo Macedo (2000) introduces Freire's problem-posing education in the following way:

"Paulo Freire's invigorating critique of the dominant banking model of

education leads to his democratic proposals of problem-posing education where "men and women develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality but as a reality in the process of transformation." (p. 12)

Furthermore, according to Freire (2000), "Problem-posing education, responding to the essence of consciousness—*intentionality*—rejects communiques and embodies communication. It epitomizes the special characteristic of consciousness: being *conscious of*, not only as intent on objects but as turned in upon itself in a Jasperian "split"—consciousness as consciousness *of* consciousness." (P. 79)

b. Learner factors:

3. *Following a problem-posing education, the student is one who acts on objects.*
4. *The student possesses the right to and power of decision-making, since each person is to fulfill his/her human vocation, and if each person has the right to name the world.*

These two principles are quite well explained by the two quotations mentioned above regarding problem-posing education. As Friere (2000) argues, "any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects." (p. 85). The power of decision-making by the

students when collaborating the content of the course with them was evident in the joy and excitement from the part of the students, and this may explain what Jesús Gómez (Pato) called the "Pedagogy of the Shine in the Eyes" (cited in Puigvert, 2008). This was only an example of the feeling of success and satisfaction reported by both students and the teacher while experiencing a "critical" classroom.

To employ the problem-posing approach regarding learner factors more specifically, the researchers made use of the five steps mentioned by Auerbach (1992) as follows: 1. describe the content, 2. define the problem, 3. personalize the problem, 4. discuss the problem, and 5. discuss alternatives to the problem (cited in Izadinia, 2009), and also Naiditch (2009)'s guidelines regarding teaching reading for social action (p. 97).

c. Content factors:

5. *The content of curriculum derives from the life situation of the learners as expressed in the themes of their reality, the object of knowing is the person's existential situation*
6. *The learners produce their own learning materials since s/he is considered as a creative actor, and since each person has the right to name the world for her/himself.*
7. *7. The content of curriculum aims at teaching conscientization (which is the ability to acquire critical perception of the interaction of phenomena) to learners.*

8. *If an aim of conscientization is to acquire critical perception of the interaction of phenomena, then curriculum content is open to interdisciplinary treatment.*

These content-related principles are, like the other critical pedagogy principles, in line with the problem-posing education, in which the learner is the one who acts on objects, and whose final aim is learners' conscientization. In fact, all critical pedagogy principles, seem to be directly related to, and affected by, the principle of "conscientization", since, by its definition, it seems to be the final aim of critical pedagogy. Therefore, strategies suggested to apply other CP principles, including problem-posing education, are suggestions to pave the way for conscientizing learners.

Each learner brings with him/her a set of "life situations" or "views impregnated with anxieties, doubts, hopes, or hopelessness" which "imply significant themes on the basis of which the program content of education can be built" (Freire, 2000, P. 93). Freire further explains "life situations" in terms of "the reality which mediates men" and "the perception of that reality held by educators and people" and asserts that "we must go to them to find the program content of education" (Italics added) (p. 96). The eighth principle, which is the result of its preceding principle, implies using a variety of means in the curriculum content including technology, which has been reported to be useful in education (see for example, Bishop, 2010; Haugue, 2011; Hussein, 2012).

d. Pedagogical factors:

9. *The organization of curriculum recognizes the class as a social entity and resource, and thus makes use of dialog as the context of the educational situation.*
10. *Combined reflection and action (praxis) constitute the method of education, since praxis is a method of knowing.*
11. *The teacher's task is first to organize generative themes (which are derived from the learners' existential situation) as problems and second to organize subject matter as it relates to those themes.*
12. *Life situation and the learners' perceptions of it inform the organization of subject matter, i.e. skills and information acquisition, within the curriculum.*

In explaining "dialog" as the context for the educational situation, Freire (2000) argues:

"The investigation of what I have termed the people's "thematic universe"—the complex of their "generative themes"—inaugurates the dialogue of education as the practice of freedom. The methodology of that investigation must likewise be dialogical, affording the opportunity both to discover generative themes and to stimulate people's awareness in regard to these themes." (p. 96)

Guilar (2006) has introduced and elaborated on four major features for dialogic instruction which have been employed in the present experiment

when feasible. These features are: *listening and respect, direction, character building, and authority*. In an article regarding how to do praxis in writing classrooms, Rypstat (2002) lists some suggestions based on students and teachers' roles. Although these hints are suggested for writing classrooms, many of them seem to work in teaching other language skills, and thus were employed in the present research.

Results and Discussion

The first research question, i.e. *"What does a critical reading comprehension course look like?"*, was answered in the method section, using the twelve critical pedagogy principles which were validated and divided into the four factors of "teacher", "learners", "content", and "pedagogy" through a process of factor analysis. In other words, in the present study, a critical reading comprehension course was defined as one which is based on Critical Pedagogy principles in terms of teacher, learner, content, and pedagogical factors.

The second research question, i.e. *"Does employing Critical Pedagogy principles have any effects on reading comprehension ability of EFL learners?",* was answered positively using two independent-samples and one paired-samples t-test as follows (see the appendix for the tables). The first independent-samples t-test, which had been employed to explore the homogeneity of the control and experimental groups, indicated a mean difference of -.19462 between their pre-test reading comprehension (2) scores used as the pre-test, which did not prove significant at 0.05 level. The second independent-samples t-test, which had

aimed at examining any significant difference in the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups in terms of reading comprehension, showed a mean difference of 1.34409 which proved to be significant. The first paired-samples t-test which examined any significant growth in the reading comprehension scores of the experimental group from the pre- to the post-test indicated a mean difference of 1.1333 which proved significant at 0.01 level.

In order to answer the third question of the experiment, i.e. *"Will a critical reading comprehension course make EFL learners more motivated towards reading English materials?",* two independent-samples and one paired-samples t-test were employed (see the appendix for the tables). The first independent-samples t-test, examining any significant difference in the pre-test scores of the control and experimental groups in terms of their motivation in reading English materials, illustrated a mean difference of -.12796 which was not significant at 0.05 level. The second independent-samples t-test, showing a mean difference of -.56022, indicated a significant difference in the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups in terms of motivation, and finally, the paired-samples t-test, which aimed at exploring any significant growth in the scores of the experimental group from the pre- to the post-test, showed a mean difference of -.40000 which proved to be significant at 0.05 level. This was also clear from the fact that the instructor was mostly engaged with speaking to the learners of the experimental group who indicated a greater enthusiasm to speak about their problems, their likes and dislikes, and

their learning process than those in the control group, and this may be an indicative of motivation in the experimental group. Moreover, personal interviews of the instructor with the learners in both the control and the experimental groups revealed the same results. Accordingly, the third research question was answered positively.

In order to answer the fourth question of the experiment, i.e.*"Will a critical reading comprehension course change learners' democratic attitudes towards their English classrooms"*, a democratic attitude questionnaire was employed which consisted of seven items on a likert-scale ranging from "often" to "never". The following tables illustrate the control and experimental groups' responses to the questionnaire before and after the experiment.

Table1. Experimental Group's Responses to the Democratic Attitude Questionnaire before the Experiment

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Item 1	7%	20%	50%	23%
Item 2	10%	33%	43%	13%
Item 3	10%	23%	50%	17%
Item 4	3 %	10%	30%	57%
Item 5	7%	13%	27%	53%
Item 6	57%	37%	7%	0%
Item 7	47%	33%	10%	10%

Table2. Experimental Group's Responses to the Democratic Attitude Questionnaire after the Experiment

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Item 1	17%	30%	33%	20%
Item 2	53%	33%	7%	7%
Item 3	30%	30%	33%	7%
Item 4	10%	17%	30%	43%
Item 5	37%	30%	27%	7%
Item 6	27%	27%	40%	7%
Item 7	20%	30%	27%	23%

Table3. Control Group's Responses to the Democratic Attitude Questionnaire before the Experiment

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Item 1	10%	23%	48%	19%
Item 2	16%	29%	39%	16%
Item 3	6%	23%	55%	16%
Item 4	6%	10%	32%	52%
Item 5	10%	13%	26%	52%
Item 6	55%	39%	3%	3%
Item 7	55%	32%	10%	3%

Table4. Control Group's Responses to the Democratic Attitude Questionnaire after the Experiment

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Item 1	13%	23%	48%	16%
Item 2	16%	32%	35%	16%
Item 3	10%	32%	52%	13%
Item 4	3%	10%	35%	52%
Item 5	13%	13%	26%	48%
Item 6	52%	39%	6%	3%
Item 7	55%	29%	10%	6%

The control group's responses before and after the experiment, and also those of the experimental group before the experiment, indicate that they had not experienced quite democratic classes before the experiment. Although the experimental group's democratic attitudes seem to have changed towards being more positive by the end of the semester, this change does not seem to be great. This may be natural, however, since the critical reading comprehension course seems to have been the only critical course they had ever taken. The results, nevertheless, seem to be

encouraging enough for including more critical courses in the curriculum.

The main outcome of empowering students, however, is illustrated more in the "good feeling" attitude reported by the students when they experience freedom of choice, than in the data quantification and list of tables presented above. Students' attitudes towards the critical reading comprehension course will be discussed in terms of the following themes emerging from a semi-structured interview with the students in the experimental group. The themes were entitled based on Freire' (1972) principles as *"teachers as transformative intellectuals"*, *"problem-posing education"*, *"conscientization"*, and *"dialogical method"*. The following discussion, therefore, would help answer the fifth research question, i.e. *"What is the learners' attitude towards the critical reading comprehension course?",* while they would also shed light on the third and fourth questions as well.

1. Teachers as transformative intellectuals:

"Transformative intellectual" (Giroux, 1988) is a new identity assumed for critical teachers who strive to combine "reflection" and "action" in order to empower students to become thoughtful and active citizens (Giroux, 1988, cited in Izadinia, 2009). Therefore, the teacher is no longer the only source of knowledge who tries to transfer to the students what is supposed to be the right answer. The effect of having a "transformative intellectual" in our critical classroom was twofold: on the one hand, as the results of the attitude questionnaire also indicated, this kind of

teacher proved to be successful in changing the students' democratic attitudes towards being positive. On the other hand, however, some students felt uncomfortable, especially at the beginning of the semester, experiencing a new role for their teacher and also for themselves. As Fobes and Kaufman (2008) also maintain, "The main challenge we face is re-socializing students to accept" the new "learning experiences" such as "discovering and/or recovering their own voices, asking questions, and tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty" (p. 27). Of course, this problem (if it is called a problem) was observed only at the beginning sessions of the course, and students adapted to the new situation and accepted their teachers' new role quickly. As it was expected, the teacher's new role not only did not take the authority of the teacher, but created more respect for her from the part of the students.

2&3. Problem-posing education and Conscientization:

Problem-posing practices and the emerging conscientization, or the ability to acquire critical perception of the interaction of phenomena, which was mostly achieved through teaching the critical thinking strategies suggested by Loewen (1995) (cited in Romanowsky & Nasser, 2012, p.131) seemed to be appreciated by the learners in the critical classroom, as they expressed their satisfaction by statements such as "before I took this course, I didn't know how to look for the real idea behind a text", and expressions of gratitude for "being able to think in a new way" and "becoming a new person".

4. Dialogical method:

The dialogic method seemed strange to some of the students in the early days, since, as they reported later, they preferred the traditional method of being told everything, obligatory note taking, reiteration of facts, etc, than engaging in dialogues with the teacher about different aspects of teaching, because this new practice contradicted their previous classroom experiences. Some of the students later mentioned that they constantly compared their new teacher with the previous ones and concluded that "this one is less experienced". Some even reported that sometimes they couldn't bear what seemed to them "a messy classroom climate full of hesitations about everything"! Some students, however, found the new experience of getting involved in collaborating the course content with the teacher "exciting" and "bringing about a sense of difference". Of course, these comments were mostly related to the beginning of the course, and as the students got more familiar with the approach taken by the teacher and the rationale behind it, difficulties gave their place to students' satisfaction and pleasure.

What is of note, however, is that although the difficulties were mostly resolved by the end of the semester, their very existence warn us about the survival of an educational system in which students have not learnt the rules of independency and democracy. On the one hand, they are dependent on the teacher in all aspects of learning, and thus, some are never able to take responsibility for their own learning. On the other hand, they misinterpret democracy to the point that some try to take advantage of the "democratic proceedings" (Thelin, 2005). As Thelin (2005) also suggests, all these may result from the fact that students have not been exposed to critical pedagogy courses, and thus are not used to critical pedagogy principles.

Conclusion

In this paper, we attempted at developing and examining a critical language teaching course, which was based on Richards' (2001) proposal and Crawford's (1978) Critical Pedagogy principles. More specifically, we found, by means of statistical and qualitative data analyses, that despite some problem issues rising while practicing the principles of Critical Pedagogy, our critical reading comprehension course had a positive effect on EFL learners' reading comprehension ability, developing a positive democratic attitude towards their English classroom and also their motivation towards reading English materials. Students' attitude towards the critical course was also discussed in terms of the following four themes which emerged from the qualitative data analysis process: teachers as transformative intellectuals, Problem-posing education, conscientization, and dialogical method.

Besides providing responses to the five research questions stated above, the results of the present study suggested the applicability of the Critical Pedagogy principles in Iranian classrooms despite the existence of a "top-down educational management" (Aliakbari & Allahmoradi, 2012) in Iran, and what Safari and Pourhashemi (2012) describe as "fossilized unequal power relationship between teachers and students". Therefore, although a strong version of Critical Pedagogy which embraces all

aspects of the educational system may not be applicable in the present context, a "weaker version" (Akbarpour, forthcoming) with the framework proposed in this study can be put into practice, since the problem seems not to be as devastating as it appears to some researchers who have reported the impracticality of Critical Pedagogy principles in Iran. Safari and Pourhashemi (2012), for instance, claim that,

"It seems to be really unlikely that Iranian English teachers who have long been accustomed to possessing the absolute authority of traditional classes as the main source of knowledge and information can modestly quit their presumed roles at the cost of applying an anonymous innovative approach." (p. 2552)

Perhaps some of the opponents of the application of Critical Pedagogy have based their arguments not on actually examining the practicality of the principles, but rather on surveys on teachers who, as the researchers themselves argue, have not practiced critical pedagogy principles yet. According to Hall (2000), "Critical approaches are often perceived as abstract and impractical which, it is argued, causes a lack of practical focus. Therefore, they are too removed from their historical context and "fail to develop a clear articulation for the needs of their existence and goals" (Ellsworth, 1989:101). Ellsworth maintains that they are too ready to criticize, but unable to offer solutions." (pp. 11-12).

Although Iran, as Pishghadam and Mirzaee (2008) claim, "has been dominated by ideas of modernism"

rather than post-modernism, this does not mean that post-modernism is totally impractical in this context. The present piece of research was an attempt to indicate that Critical Pedagogy, as a post-modern issue, can be applied in the present educational context of Iran, since on the one hand, the outcome of the critical course indicated a positive effect on the dependent variables, and on the other hand, results of the qualitative data analysis illustrated the positive attitude of the learners towards the critical course. Accordingly, the most important theme of the present paper may be the applicability of the principles of Critical Pedagogy in the context of Iran.

A word of caution may need to be stated here: our students seem not to have learnt the rules of independency and democracy, and some misinterpret democracy to the point that they try to take advantage of the "democratic proceedings" (Thelin, 2005). As Thelin (2005) proposes, this may result from the fact that students have not been exposed to critical pedagogy courses, and thus are not used to critical pedagogy principles. Therefore, the first step in the application of Critical Pedagogy in our educational context may be to apply its weak versions (see above) to small communities such as classrooms where Critical Pedagogy principles are put into practice by the teachers, so that the students find the opportunity to get accustomed to the principles of independence. In this way, one can hope that in near future, the whole educational system can benefit from the principles of Critical Pedagogy. The first step, therefore, may concern teacher educators whose responsibility is to familiarize the teachers with the basic

principles of Critical Pedagogy and the ways for their application in teaching.

Although in the present work our proposed framework was employed in a reading comprehension course, it does not mean that it cannot be applied to other language teaching courses. This work may be worth replicating in different educational contexts, with different participants, and regarding different language skills. We seek other researchers' company in this long journey and struggle for a better educational system.

References

Abdelrahim, A. T. (2007). *The relationship between gender and experience in teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy*. (Unpublished thesis). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

Abednia, A. (2010). Investigating conflict between the critical nature of transformative language teacher development and student teachers' traditional background. *Iranian EFL Journal, 6 (2)*, 50-74.

Aghagolzadeh, F. & Davari, H. (2014). Iranian critical ELT: a belated but growing intellectual shift in Iranian ELT community. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 12(1)*, 391-410.

Akbarpour, L. (forthcoming). *Towards developing a model of critical pedagogy for English language teaching practice in the Iranian context*. Unpublished doctorial dissertation, Shiraz University.

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

Auerbach, E. (1992). *Making meaning, making change: participatory curriculum development for adult ESL literacy*. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems, Inc.

Barrett, C. (2013). (Re)Imagining TESOL through critical hip hop literacy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(3)*, 100-115.

Bickel, C. (2006). Cultivating orchids: promoting democracy in the classroom. In P. Kaufman (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom* (pp. 93-107). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Bishop, E. (2010). An ethic of engagement: qualitative learning in the 21st century. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3(2)*, 47-58.

Breuing, M. (2011). Problematizing Critical Pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3(3)*, 2-23.

Chomsky, N. & Raubichaud, A. (2014). Standardized testing as an assault on humanism and critical thinking in education. *Radical Pedagogy, 11(1)*.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research methods in education. New York: Routledge.

Conagarajah, A. S. (2005). Critical pedagogy in L2 learning and teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and research*, (pp. 931-949). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Crawford, L.M. (1978). *Paulo Freire's philosophy: derivation of curricular principles and their application to second language design*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Davari, H., Iranmehr, A. & Erfani, S.M. (2012). A survey on the Iranian ELT community's attitudes to critical pedagogy. *English Language Teaching, 5(2)*, 101-111.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. Macmillan: Harvard.

Durst, R.K. (2006). Can we be critical of critical pedagogy? *Collage Composition and Communication, 58(1)*, 110-114. Retrieved December, 15, 2014, from:
www.jstor.org

Ekman (2006). Democratic ideals and practices; Utopian dreams or what? School effects on political attitudes among upper secondary school students in Sweden.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59(3)*, 297-324.

Esmaili, M.R. & Barjesteh, H. (2013). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' awareness of critical pedagogy and their professional success. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, 3(2)*, 259-267.

Fobes & Kaufman (2008). Critical pedagogy in the sociology classroom: Challenges and Concerns. *Teaching Sociology, 36*, 26-33.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom. Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Friere, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

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

Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Guilar, J.D. (2006). Intersubjectivity and dialogic instruction. *Radical Pedagogy, 8(1)*.

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.

Haugue, C. (2011). Teaching youth media through international exchange. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3(3)*, 113-134.

Hussein, A. (2012). Freirian and Postcolonial Perspectives on e-Learning Development: A Case Study of Staff Development in an African University. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(1)*, 135-153.

Izadinia, M. (2009). Critical pedagogy: an introduction. In P. Wachob (Ed.), *Power in the EFL classroom: critical pedagogy in the Middle East* (pp. 7-16). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.

Khatib, M. & Fathi, J. (2014). The investigation of the perspectives of Iranian EFL domain experts on post-method pedagogy: a Delphi technique. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 6(3)*, 101-124.

Kubow, P.K. & Kinney, M.B. (2000). Fostering democracy in middle school classrooms: Insights from a democratic institute in Hungary. *The Social Studies, 91(6)*, 970-977.

Landeta, J. (2006). Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 73*, 467–482.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: The New Press.

Macedo, D. (2000). *An introduction to Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

McKenna, H.P. (1994) The Delphi technique: a worthwhile approach for nursing? *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 19*, 1221–1225.

Meacham, S., Anderson, M.A. & Correa, C. (2013). Coining phrases for dollars: Jay-Z, economic literacy, and the educational implications of hip-hop's entrepreneurial ethos. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(3)*, 69-82.

Moss, G. & Lee, C. (2010). A critical analysis of philosophies of education and INTASC standards in teacher preparation. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3(2)*, 36-46.

Naderi Anari & Zamanian (2014). Relationship between critical pedagogical attitudes and effectiveness among high school English teachers. *International*

Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 6(3), 429-441.

Naiditch, F. (2009). Critical pedagogy and the teaching of reading for social action. *Critical Questions in Education, 1(2)*, 94-107.

Osborne, K. (1990). Is there a democratic socialist pedagogy? In D. Henley & J. Young (Eds.), *Canadian perspectives on critical pedagogy* (pp. 43-73). Manitoba, Winnipeg: The Canadian Critical Pedagogy Network with Social Education Researchers in Canada.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *System, 18(3)*, 303-314.

Pishghadam, R. & Mirzaee, A. (2008). English language teaching in postmodern era. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature, 2(7)*, 89-109.

Pishghadam, R. & Naji Meidani, E. (2012). A critical look into critical pedagogy. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 10(2)*, 464-484.

Pishvaei, V. & Kasaian, S. A. (2013). Design, Construction, and validation of a critical pedagogy attitude questionnaire in Iran. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 2(2)*, 59-74.

Puigvert, L. (2008). Breaking the silence: the struggle against gender violence in universities.

International Journal of Critical Pedagogy,1(1), 1-6.

Romanowski, M. H. & Nasser, R. (2012). Critical thinking and Qatar's education for a new era: negotiating possibilities. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(1)*, 118-134.

Richards, J.C. (1989). Beyond training: approaches to teacher education in language teaching. A keynote address given at a workshop on Second Language Teaching Education, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, E.W. (2007). Critical Pedagogy. In S. Mathison & E. W. Ross (Eds.), *Battleground schools* (pp. 156-161). Greenwood Press: London

Rypstat, A. (2002). Ethos and social action: reasons and methods for stressing praxis in the writing classroom. *Radical Pedagogy, 2(2)*.

Safari, P. & Pourhashemi, M. (2012). Toward an empowering pedagogy: is there room for critical pedagogy in educational system of Iran? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2(12)*, 2548-2555.

Shabani, M. B. & Khorsandi, M. (2014). An investigation into the role of Iranian EFL teachers' critical pedagogical views in their

educational success. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(1)*, 144-153.

Schultz, B. D., Mcsurley, J. & Salguero, M. (2013). Teaching in the cracks: student engagement through social action curriculum projects. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(2)*, 53-68.

Simmons, R., Carpenter, R., Ricks, J., Walker, D., Parks, M. & Davis, M. (2013). African American male teachers and African American students. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 4(2)*, 69-86.

Sweet, S. (1998). Practicing radical pedagogy: Balancing ideals with institutional constraints. *Teaching Sociology, 26*, 100-111.

Thelin, W. H. (2005). Understanding problems in critical classrooms. College *Composition and Communication, 57(1)*, 114-141. Retrieved July, 1, 2014, from: www.jstor.org

Thomson-Bunn, H. (2014). Are they empowered yet? Opening up definitions of critical pedagogy. *Composition Forum, 29*.

Walker, A.M. & Selfe, J. (1996). The Delphi method: a useful tool for the allied health researcher. *British Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation , 3(12)*, 677–681.

Waterman, S. (2007). *The democratic differentiated classroom*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Williams, A. D. (2009). The critical cultural cypher: remaking Paulo Freire's cultural circles using hip hop Culture. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 2(1)*, 1-29.

Appendix

Table1. Results of t-test 1: Examining any Significant Difference in the Pre-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups in terms of Reading Comprehension

Group Statistics

Code1			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PretestReadingControlExperimental	dimension1	1.00	31	15.0887	2.81184	.50502
		2.00	30	15.2833	2.98107	.54427

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PretestReadingControlExperimental	Equal variances assumed	.357	.553	-.262	59	.794	-.19462	.74176	-1.67887	1.28963
	Equal variances not assumed			-.262	58.508	.794	-.19462	.74248	-1.68058	1.29133

Table2. Results of t-test 2: Examining any Significant Difference in the Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups in terms of Reading Comprehension

Group Statistics

Code1		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PosttestReadingControlExperimental	dimension1 1.00	31	15.0726	2.76375	.49638
	2.00	30	16.4167	2.37655	.43390

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PosttestReadingControlExperimental	Equal variances assumed	1.381	.245	-2.034	59	.046	-1.34409	.66094	-2.66662	-.02155
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.039	58.206	.046	-1.34409	.65929	-2.66370	-.02447

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	PretestReadingExperimental - PosttestReadingExperimental	-1.1333	1.47936	.27009	-1.68574	-.58093	-4.196	29	.000

Table4. Results of t-test 4: Examining any Significant Difference in the Pre-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups in terms of Motivation

Group Statistics

Code1		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PretestControlExperimentalAttitude	dimension1 1.00	31	.8387	.68784	.12354
	2.00	30	.9667	.66868	.12208

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PretestControlExperimentalAttitude	Equal variances assumed	.608	.439	-.736	59	.464	-.12796	.17377	-.47566	.21975
	Equal variances not assumed			-.737	58.998	.464	-.12796	.17368	-.47550	.21958

Table3. Results of t-test 3: Examining any Significant Growth in the Scores of the Experimental Group from the Pre- to the Post-test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PretestReadingExperimental	15.2833	30	2.98107	.54427
	PosttestReadingExperimental	16.4167	30	2.37655	.43390

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

Table5. Results of t-test 5: Examining any Significant Difference in the Post-test Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups in terms of Motivation

Group Statistics

Code1		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PosttestControlExperimentalAttitude	dimension1 1.00	31	.8065	.65418	.11749
	2.00	30	1.3667	.61495	.11227

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
PosttestControlExperimentalAttitude	Equal variances assumed	.115	.735	-3.444	59	.001	-.56022	.16268	-.88574	-.23469
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.447	58.952	.001	-.56022	.16251	-.88541	-.23502

Table6. Results of t-test 6: Examining any Significant Growth in the Scores of the Experimental Group from the Pre- to the Post-test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PretestAttitudeExperimental	.9667	30	.66868	.12208
	PosttestAttitudexperimental	1.3667	30	.61495	.11227

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	
Pair 1	PretestAttitudeExperimental - PosttestAttitudexperimental	-.40000	.93218	.17019	-.74808	-.05192	-2.350	29	.026