

# The Examination of Instructors' Views on the Principles of Critical Pedagogy

Gulenaz Selcuk and Cigdem Hursen  
*Ataturk Education Faculty, Near East University*

## **Abstract**

*The aim of this study was to examine instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy by some variables. The sample included 66 instructors who worked at the Faculty of Education, Celal Bayar University, in 2013/2014 academic year. The research was based on a descriptive survey model. The Critical Pedagogy Principles Scale, developed by Yilmaz (2009), was used as a data collection tool and SPSS 17.00 programme was used for data analysis. The instructors' views on critical pedagogy were examined by department, seniority, administrative duty (or none), title, and age. Their views on critical pedagogy did not differ by gender and department, but difference was established by title, seniority and age. Accordingly, research assistants, instructors with 1 to 5 years of seniority and instructors in the 21 - 27 age group achieved the highest score. There was also a statistically significant relationship between the instructors' age and views on critical pedagogy; however, this relationship was negative. That is, the older the instructors are, the lower their critical pedagogy scores are.*

**Key words:** *critical pedagogy; instructors; principles of critical pedagogy.*

## **Introduction**

Education is a process starting from the very beginning of an individual's birth (Hursen & Birinci, 2013). Today, critical pedagogy is one of the most significant alternative approaches to discuss the problems of education systematically. Although education is expected to be acquired within the family, school and environment, it is necessary to inquire how and why education is acquired (Yildirim, 2010). In this sense, critical pedagogy is a theory which discusses the relationships and problems of education with social institutions from philosophical, sociological, political and

ideological perspectives (Glenn, 2002; McLaren, 1998). Most of the influential claims of critical pedagogy have been revealed by critical educationalists Freire, Bowles, Gintis, Apple, McLaren, Giroux on the one side and Marxism and the Frankfurt School on the other side.

Critical educationalists have explained that education is not only a limited teaching activity that takes place within education institutions (Inal, 2010). The basic principle of critical pedagogy is knowledge and power being accepted as discussable, accountable and reproachable phenomena (Giroux, 2007). Giroux stated that the primary function of critical pedagogy was liberalisation, while the main purpose of critical pedagogy was to create skills for students to investigate the role of society in constructing itself critically and to create the conditions to teach knowledge and research types (Inal, 2009). At this point, critical pedagogy enables teachers and students to consider education as a political, social and cultural initiative (Giroux, 2009).

Critical pedagogy bears some basic characteristics, first of which is the fact that it is based on an idea of educational and social justice and equality. It deals not only with schooling, curriculum and education policy but also with social justice and the capacity of human. Secondly, critical pedagogy focuses on the belief that education has been established deeply in the field of politics. Thirdly, critical pedagogy emphasizes solving the problems of human beings, which is considered to be the ethical side of creating a real democratic society. The defenders of critical pedagogy are concerned with groups and individuals whose lives have been influenced by discrimination and poverty because critical pedagogy emphasizes the need to prevent poor children from being harmed by unequal education practices in schools. Naturally, critical educationalists do not blame students for their failure (Inal, 2009). Critical pedagogy means more than merely sharing teaching roles with students by reading texts, creating some radical classroom practices and encouraging media literacy.

Freire (2009, p. 171) emphasized the role of teachers by stating, "Being able to take risks in many fields of life apart from school is a good thing. You cannot take any risks without dominating your fear. When you don't take risks, it is not possible to create anything". According to Apple (2009, p. 46), "Today a citizen is not only a simple consumer in the whole country. The whole world is seen as a huge supermarket. In today's USA everything is made as buyable and sellable and similarly schools and even students are seen as customers to buy everything and schools are sold to bosses who try to sell their products and are turned into commodities."

Education institutions have gradually come to resemble companies and students are considered to be "active consumers" and "passive (and responsible) learners" (Ball, 2007, p. 189). Changing the conditions in which education institutions are reconstructed as running operations is only possible through critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is used in several fields; some of them are **teacher education** (Keesing-Styles, 2003; Leistyna, Lavandez, & Nelson, 2004), **foreign language teaching** (Fredricks, 2007), **learning-teaching** (Glisczinski, 2007; Kanpol, 1998) and **management** (Dehler, Welsh, & Lewis, 2001). Besides these there are also theoretical studies (Apple, 2009;

Freire, 2009; Illich, 2010; McLaren, 2007; Sagioglu, 2008; Yildirim, 2010) in the field of critical pedagogy in the literature.

According to Swazey et al. (1993), the behaviours and attitudes of teachers have significant effects on students and other values and standards of the field. Teachers and students should interact continuously during the learning-teaching process (Efilti & Coklar, 2013) since, with the arrival of the digital era, there have been radical changes in the functional descriptions of work, skill and discipline (Jaros, 2014). In this sense, critical pedagogy is closely related to transforming students' conditions and developing their critical capacities to criticise and act. Thus, critical pedagogy approves of and supports liberating efforts of both students and teachers (Darder, 1991).

According to Freire (2009), an educationist who believes in critical pedagogy is a liberating educationist. Learning opportunities, which are rather important in the education process, come true via lifelong learning (Ozcan & Uzunboylu, 2012). In a school focusing on lifelong learning, students are put into centre and taught via self-directed lifelong learning by taking their needs into consideration (Demirel, 2009). This situation enables a learning desire and wish to continue a lifetime education (Ozcan, 2011). Therefore, it is significant to determine teachers' views on critical pedagogy and their knowledge of the current education system to raise liberatory teachers. Giroux (2009, p. 36) stated, "at least higher education should not be contented with acquiring students a general education but at the same time should acquire them the habit of critical thinking and a passion of social responsibility".

It is of great significance for teachers at every level of education, especially instructors working in higher education institutions, to teach by creating a democratic classroom environment and, thus, encouraging students to develop democratic attitudes and behaviours in terms of the future of democracy and the development of the society (Yagci, 1998). In this context, the general aim of this study was to identify instructors' views on critical pedagogy. In line with this aim, the following questions were considered:

1. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by their gender?
2. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by the department where they work?
3. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by their title?
4. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by their administrative duties?
5. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by their seniority?
6. Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by their age?
7. Is there a significant relationship between instructors' age and their views on critical pedagogy?

## **Method**

In this section, information about the research model, participants, data collection tools and data analysis will be presented.

## **Research Model**

In this research, the screening model was used because the attitudes, behaviours, values, habits and opinions of people are determined with the help of the screening model (Mcmillan & Schumacher, 2001). The study tended to describe how the views of instructors on critical pedagogy differed by some variables.

## **Participants**

The participants included 66 instructors who worked at the Faculty of Education, Celal Bayar University, in 2013/2014 academic year. The convenience sampling method was used in selecting the participants. This method refers to selecting participants from easily accessible and applicable units because of some limitations in terms of time, money, and workforce (Buyukozturk, Kilic, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2011).

## **Data Collection Tool**

The data was collected by using the Principles of Critical Pedagogy Scale, developed by Yilmaz (2009); the owner's approval was obtained. The scale was composed of 3 sub-dimensions: the Education System, the Functions of School and the Liberating School. The first sub-dimension consisted of 15 items, such as "Power relations in the society affect education", "School reproduces poverty (social position)". The second sub-dimension had 11 items, e.g. "Teacher and knowledge should be at the centre of school", "The main purpose of school is to transfer knowledge". The third sub-dimension included 5 items, such as "People should make a great effort to have a good position in the society", "School should be a liberating area for students". The Principles of Critical Pedagogy Scale covered 31 items in total.

The 5-point Likert type scale had positive and negative statements (1= I strongly disagree, 5= I strongly agree). Positive statements in the scale were scored as 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, while negative statements were scored as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The recoding was applied to some of the items in the scale. The participants' answers can be evaluated on the basis of sub-dimensions and a total score from the scale can be obtained. The high scores of the participants showed the higher levels of agreement with the scale principles. Since the factor analysis of the scale was done beforehand, only the reliability coefficient was determined in our study and, accordingly, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the whole scale was .70. The reliability coefficient of the Education System sub-dimension was .73; the reliability coefficient of the Functions of School sub-dimension was .60, and the reliability coefficient of the Liberating School sub-dimension was .64. The Alpha coefficient in our study ranged from  $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$ , hence it may be concluded that the scale was reliable (Balci, 2011).

## **Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistical methods and SPSS-17 statistical package were used to analyse the obtained data. Since non-normally distributed quantitative data would be used

in order to determine whether the instructors' views on critical pedagogy differed by department, age, seniority, administrative duty, and title, the Kruskal-Wallis test, a non-parametric statistical method was used; and Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine whether the instructors' views on critical pedagogy differed by gender. Also, the Pearson Moments Correlation Analysis was used to see whether there was a significant relationship between the instructors' age and their views on critical pedagogy.

## Results

### *Results Regarding the First Sub-Problem*

The first sub-problem of the research was related to the question "Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by gender?", and the results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

*The U test results of instructors' views on critical pedagogy by gender*

Gender	N	Mean Rank	Total of Rank	U	P
Female	24	38.54	925.00	383.00	0.11
Male	42	30.62	1286.00		

When Mann-Whitney U Test results regarding the comparison of the instructors' views on critical pedagogy by gender were examined, it was seen that their views did not differ by gender ( $p > .05$ ). In other words, it is possible to say that there was no significant difference between the female and male instructors and their views on critical pedagogy.

### *Results Regarding the Second Sub-Problem*

The second sub-problem of the research referred to the question "Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by department?", and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

*Kruskal-Wallis test results of instructors' views on critical pedagogy by department*

Department	N	Mean Rank	SD	$X^2$	P
Department of Primary Education	38	32.33			
Turkish Education	13	32.85			
Education Sciences	12	38.29			
Computer Education and Instructional Technologies (CEIT)	3	32.00	3	.92	.82

When Kruskal Wallis Test results regarding the comparison of the instructors' views on critical pedagogy by department were examined, it was obvious that their views did not differ by department ( $p > .05$ ). In other words, it can be said that there was no significant difference between the instructors in Primary Education, Turkish Education, Education Sciences and Computer Education and Instructional Technologies (CEIT) departments in terms of their views on critical pedagogy.

### **Results Regarding the Third Sub-Problem**

The third sub-problem of the research covered the question “Do instructors’ views on critical pedagogy differ by title?”, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3  
*Kruskal-Wallis test results of instructors’ views on critical pedagogy by title*

Title	N	Mean Rank	SD	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Research Assistant	14	51.61			
Lecturer	30	27.28			
Assist. Prof	13	32.62			
Assoc. Prof	4	30.50			
Professor	2	33.25	5	17.43	.00
Other	3	19.17			

When Kruskal-Wallis test results regarding the comparison of the instructors’ views on critical pedagogy by title were examined, it became clear that their views differed by title ( $p < .05$ ). That is, it can be said that there was a significant difference between the views of research assistants, lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors and other instructors on critical pedagogy. The mean ranks showed that the research assistants scored the highest, whereas other instructors scored the lowest.

### **Results Regarding the Fourth Sub-Problem**

The fourth sub-problem of the research was related to the question “Do instructors’ views on critical pedagogy differ by administrative duty?”, and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4  
*Kruskal-Wallis test results of instructors’ views on critical pedagogy by administrative duty*

Administrative Duty	N	Mean Rank	SD	X <sup>2</sup>	P
None	53	34.05			
Vice Dean	2	32.50			
Head of the Department	5	39.90			
Co-head of Department	6	23.67	3	2.18	.53

When Kruskal-Wallis test results regarding the comparison of the instructors’ views on critical pedagogy by administrative duty were examined, they pointed out that their views did not differ by administrative duty ( $p > .05$ ). In other words, it is possible to say that there was no significant difference between the views of vice dean, heads of department, co-heads of department and instructors and the views of those who did not have any administrative duty.

### **Results Regarding the Fifth Sub-Problem**

The fifth sub-problem of the research was expressed with the question “Do instructors’ views on critical pedagogy differ by seniority?”, and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.  
Kruskal-Wallis test results of instructors' views on critical pedagogy by seniority

Seniority	N	Mean Rank	SD	X <sup>2</sup>	P
1-5 years	18	45.75			
6-10 years	6	30.92			
11-15 years	25	29.48	3	10.30	.02
16 years and above	17	27.35			

When Kruskal-Wallis test results regarding the comparison of the instructors' views on critical pedagogy by seniority were examined, they revealed that their views differed by seniority ( $p < .05$ ). That is, it can be said that there was a significant difference between the views of the instructors with 1 to 5 years of seniority, 6 to 10 years of seniority, 11 to 15 years of seniority, and 16 and above years of seniority. The mean ranks showed that the instructors with 1 to 5 years of seniority scored the highest, whereas the instructors with 16 and more years of seniority scored the lowest.

### **Results Regarding the Sixth Sub-Problem**

The sixth sub-problem of the research referred to the question "Do instructors' views on critical pedagogy differ by age?", and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6  
Kruskal-Wallis test results of instructors' views on critical pedagogy by age

Age	N	Mean Rank	SD	X <sup>2</sup>	P
21 to 27	6	44.08			
28 to 34	10	42.20			
35 to 41	18	41.33	4	14.11	.00
42 to 48	20	24.18			
49 and above	12	24.75			

When Kruskal-Wallis test results regarding the comparison of the instructors' views on critical pedagogy by age were examined, it could be noticed that their views differed by age ( $p < .05$ ), which means that there was a significant difference between the views of the instructors in the age ranges of 21 to 27, 28 to 34, 35 to 41, 42 to 48 and 49 and above. The mean ranks showed that the instructors in the age range of 21 to 27 scored the highest, while the instructors in the age range of 49 and above scored the lowest.

### **Results Regarding the Seventh Sub-Problem**

The seventh sub-problem of the research included the question "Is there a meaningful relationship between instructors' age and their views on critical pedagogy?", and the results are presented in Table 7.

When the results in the Table 7 were examined, it was obvious that there was a significant, negative and medium-level relationship between the instructors' views on critical pedagogy and their age ( $p < .05$ ). In general, the correlation coefficient 1.00

Table 7  
*Pearson correlation analysis of instructors' age and their views on critical pedagogy*

	Age	
Critical Pedagogy	Pearson Correlation	-.34
	Sig.	.01
	N	66

shows a positive relationship, -1.00 shows a negative relationship and 0.00 shows no relationship. Although there are no precise ranges for interpreting the correlation coefficient, Buyukozturk (2011) stated the following ranges to be used frequently: if the correlation coefficient is between 0.70 and 1.00, as an absolute value, the relationship can be defined as high-level, whereas the coefficient between 0.70 and 0.30 can be defined as a medium-level relationship. Also, the coefficient 0.30 and 0.00 shows a low-level relationship (Buyukozturk, 2011). Thus, based on the current findings, it can be said that the instructors' scores of views on critical pedagogy decreased as their age increased.

## Discussion and Conclusions

In this research, the instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy according to some variables were investigated and an attempt was made to reveal the critical pedagogy point of view at the Faculty of Education.

When the results were examined, it was found that the instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy by gender did not differ. In a study conducted by Yilmaz (2009) on primary education schools, there was no difference between teachers' views by gender, which is consistent with our findings. On the other hand, in their study "Prospective teachers' views on critical pedagogy", Yilmaz and Altinkurt (2011) found a significant difference in terms of gender, which does not overlap with our findings.

When the findings of the instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy and the departments where they worked were examined, it was seen that their views on critical pedagogy did not show any difference. In the population, it was found that there was no difference between the views of instructors working in the departments of primary education, Turkish education, and computer education and instructional technologies (CEIT). In the study "Prospective teachers' views on critical pedagogy" by Yilmaz and Altinkurt (2011), a significant difference regarding departments was not found, which supports our findings.

It was also seen that the instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy differed by their titles; that is, it may be said that there was a significant difference between the critical pedagogy-related views of research assistants, lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, professors, and other instructors. The highest scores belonged to research assistants, whereas the lowest scores belonged to other instructors. The reasons, such as research assistants being younger and dealing with



scientific studies more than the other instructors might have resulted in their scores being higher. At this point, critical pedagogy understanding, which defines education as a process that enables an individual to realize herself/himself and encourages the development of a critical point of view to change the society towards democratization, comes as an alternative education model (Sagiroglu, 2008).

It is necessary at every level of education, especially for the instructors in higher education institutions, who will raise future teachers to teach by creating a democratic classroom environment and to use standards in evaluation systematically (Usmani & Khatoon, 2013). Trying to develop democratic attitudes and behaviours in students in this way is of great importance for the development of societies (Yagci, 1998). It was found that the instructors' views on the principles of critical pedagogy did not differ by their administrative duties, which means that there was no significant difference between the views of vice deans, heads of department, co-heads of departments and instructors and the views of those who did not have any administrative duty. The data showed that the educator being an administrator or not did not affect her/his critical pedagogy views.

On the other hand, the instructors' views on critical pedagogy differed by seniority. That is, it can be said that there was a significant difference between the views of the instructors with 1 to 5 years of seniority, 6 to 10 years of seniority, 11 to 15 years of seniority, and 16 and above years of seniority. The mean ranks also showed that the instructors with 1 to 5 years of seniority scored the highest, whereas the instructors with 16 and more years of seniority scored the lowest. The education received by the newly appointed instructors is more up-to-date compared to senior instructors; therefore, it can be said that they adopt critical thinking skills to a larger extent.

It was seen that the instructors' views on critical pedagogy differed by age. In other words, it is possible to say that there was a significant difference between the views of the instructors in the age ranges of 21 to 27, 28 to 34, 35 to 41, 42 to 48 and 49 and above. When the mean ranks were examined, it was also found that the instructors in the age group of 21 to 27 scored the highest, whereas the instructors in the age range of 49 and above scored the lowest. In the study by Yilmaz and Altinkurt (2011) carried out with prospective teachers and in the study by Yilmaz (2009b) carried out with young teachers, they stated that young teachers' adoption of critical pedagogy was not sufficient, but was positive and promising. This result supports the findings of our study. It can be said that there are many reasons why the newly appointed instructors adopt the principles of critical pedagogy more than the experienced instructors, and this can be explained with "critical thinking" courses and attempts to acquire students' "critical point of view in education".

Additionally, we saw a statistically significant relationship between the instructors' ages and their views on critical pedagogy; this relationship was medium-level and negative. It can be said that as instructors' ages increase, their scores of views on critical pedagogy decrease. At this point, the ways of accessing information and methods of

using information differed by time because the education of young instructors was based on the investigation of teaching strategies, whereas senior instructors acquired more traditional methods and presentation strategies.

On the other hand, in the current situation in which citizenship has been prone to become marketable and youngsters have turned into consuming agents rather than inquiring agents (Giroux, 2009), the purpose of critical pedagogy is to help students become critical citizens who have the ability and desire to ask questions about the relationships in the society. For this reason, it is necessary for instructors to agree with these principles at a higher rate (Yilmaz & Altinkurt, 2011).

This study tried to reveal the views of the instructors on critical pedagogy at the Faculty of Education. However, due to certain limitations of this research, extending the sample and including other faculties in the research might reveal different findings.

## References

- Apple, M. (2009). *Conversations on critical pedagogics*. İstanbul, Turkey: E.Ç. Babaoğlu. Kalkedon Publications.
- Balcı, A. (2011). *Investigation method, techniques and principles in social sciences*. Ankara: Pegem Academy Publications.
- Ball, S. J. (2007). *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Buyukozturk, S. (2011). *Data Analysis for Social Science*. Ankara: Pegem Academic Press.
- Buyukozturk, S., Kılıç, E., Akgun, O., Karadeniz, S., & Demirel, F. (2011). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Pegem Academic Press.
- Dader, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Dehler, G. E., Welsh, M. A., & Lewis, M. W. (2001). Critical pedagogy in the new paradigm. *Management Learning*, 32(4), 493–511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507601324005>
- Demirel, M. (2009). Implications of Lifelong Learning on Educational Institutions. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3), 199–211.
- Efiltili, E., & Coklar, A. N. (2013). The study of the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and TPACK education competencies. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 5(3), 348–357.
- Fredricks, L. (2007). A rationale for critical pedagogy in EFL: The case of Tajikistan. *The Reading Matrix*, 7(2), 22–28.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Risks of transformation and fears caused by it: Conversations on critical pedagogics*. İstanbul, Turkey: E.Ç. Babaoğlu. Kalkedon Publications.

- Glisczinski, D. J. (2007). Transformative higher education: A meaningful degree of understanding. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 5(4), 317–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344607312838>
- Giroux, H. A. (2007). *Critical pedagogics and neoliberalism*. İstanbul, Turkey: B. Aysal. Kalkedon Publications.
- Giroux, H. A. (2008). *Promise of critical pedagogics*. İstanbul, Turkey: U.D. Tuna. Kalkedon Publications.
- Giroux, H. A. (2009). *Is there a role of critical pedagogics in the subject of language/cultural studies: Conversations on critical pedagogics*. İstanbul, Turkey: E.Ç. Babaoğlu. Kalkedon Publications.
- Glenn, C. B. (2002). Critical rhetoric and pedagogy: Reconsidering student-centered dialogue. *Radical pedagogy*.
- Hursen, C., & Birinci, C. M. (2013). Art Teacher's Educational Needs Under Five Dimensions during Teaching Process. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 8(2), 179-191.
- Illich, I. (2010). *Public without school*. (Translation M. Ozay). İstanbul: Sule Publications.
- Inal, K. (2009). Critical Pedagogics: Education for oppressed ones. *Journal of Critical Pedagogics*, 1, 2-10.
- Inal, K. (2010). Critical pedagogics: a modern liberating approach in education. *E-journal of Alternative Education*, 1, 14-23.
- Kanpol, B. (1998). Critical pedagogy for beginning teachers: The movement from despair to hope. *Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.wmc.edu/pub/jcp/jcp.html>.
- Keesing-Styles, L. (2003). The relationship between critical pedagogy and assessment in teacher education. *Radical Pedagogy*, 5(1). Retrieved from [http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue5\\_1/03\\_keesing-styles.html](http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue5_1/03_keesing-styles.html).
- Jaros, M. (2014). Leadership and methodology challenges in higher education: Integrating personal development, skills and competences in the space of digital systems. *Global Journal of Information Technology*, 4(1), 1-6.
- Leistyna, P., Lavandez, M., & Nelson, T. (2004). Critical pedagogy: Revitalizing and democratizing teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 3–15.
- McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Ozcan, D. (2011). Evaluation of 4th and 5th Classes Teachers' Competence Perceptions towards Lifelong Learning. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 3(1), 1-9.
- Ozcan, D., & Uzunboylu, H. (2012). Perceptions of principals towards lifelong learning. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(3), 148-157.
- Retrieved from [http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue4\\_1/02\\_Glenn.html](http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue4_1/02_Glenn.html)
- Sagiroglu, N. A. (2008). Seeking for liberating education: Critical pedagogics. *Journal of Education, Science, Public*, 6(24), 50-61.
- Swazey, J. M., Anderson, M. S., & Louis, K. S. (1993). Ethical problems in academic research. *American Scientist*, 81, 542-553.

- Usmani, M., A., W., & Khatoon, S. (2013). Educational evaluation in Pakistani higher education context. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*, 3(1), 12-20.
- Yagci, E. (1998). Democracy and education. *Journal of Education and Science*, 22(107), 15-22.
- Yildirim, A. (2010). *Critical pedagogy*. Ankara: Anı Press.
- Yilmaz, K. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views about the critical pedagogy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(1), 139-149. <https://doi.org/10.3860/taper.v18i1.1042>
- Yilmaz, K., & Altinkurt, Y. (2011). Views of preservice teachers about the problems of Turkish education system. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 8(1), 941-973.

---

**Gulenaz Selcuk**

Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Ataturk Education Faculty  
Near East University, Near East Boulevard, ZIP: 99138,  
Nicosia, Cyprus  
gselcuk@hotmail.com

**Cigdem Hursen**

Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Ataturk Education Faculty  
Near East University, Near East Boulevard, ZIP: 99138,  
Nicosia, Cyprus  
cigdemhursen@gmail.com

# Istraživanje o stavovima nastavnika s obzirom na načela kritičke pedagogije

## Sažetak

*Cilj istraživanja bio je utvrditi kako nastavnici Fakulteta za odgoj i obrazovanje promatraju načela kritičke psihologije s obzirom na određene varijable. Istraživačka skupina obuhvaćala je 66 nastavnika koji su bili zaposleni na spomenutom fakultetu Sveučilišta Celal Bayar akademske godine 2013./2014. U istraživanju je primijenjen deskriptivni anketni model. Ljestvica koja je sadržavala načela kritičke pedagogije, čiji je autor Yilmaz (2009), koristila se za prikupljanje podataka, a za njihovu se analizu koristio SPSS 17.00 program. Stavovi nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji istraženi su s obzirom na odsjek, godine staža, (ne)obnašanje funkcije, zvanje i dob. Njihovi se stavovi nisu razlikovali prema spolu ni matičnom odsjeku, ali jesu prema zvanju, godinama staža i dobi. Tako su najviši rezultat postigli asistenti, nastavnici od 1 do 5 godina radnog staža i nastavnici koji su pripadali dobnoj skupini od 21 do 27 godine. Pronađena je statistički značajna razlika između dobi nastavnika i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji, a bila je negativna. To znači da nastavnici postižu slabiji rezultat što su stariji.*

**Ključne riječi:** kritička pedagogija; načela kritičke pedagogije; nastavnici.

## Uvod

Obrazovanje je proces koji traje od samog rođenja (Hursen i Birinci, 2013). Danas je kritička pedagogija jedan od najvažnijih alternativnih pristupa sustavnoj raspravi o problemima obrazovanja. Premda se obrazovanje očekivano stječe u obitelji, školi i okolini, potrebno je istražiti kako i zašto se stječe (Yildirim, 2010). U tom smislu kritička pedagogija predstavlja teoriju koja se bavi obrazovnim problemima i odnosima između obrazovanja i društvenih institucija s filozofskog, sociološkog, političkog i ideološkog stajališta (Glenn, 2002; McLaren, 1998). Utjecajne tvrdnje u području kritičke pedagogije najvećim djelom potječu od autora kao što su Freire, Bowles, Gintis, Apple, McLaren i Giroux, iz marksizma i Frankfurtske škole.

Stručnjaci koji djeluju u sklopu kritičke pedagogije objašnjavaju da obrazovanje ne podrazumijeva samo nastavu čija je realizacija ograničena na obrazovne institucije (Inal, 2010). Temeljno načelo kritičke pedagogije jest u znanju i moći koji se

prihvaćaju kao pojave o kojima se raspravlja, koje su razjašnjava i na koje je moguć prigovor (Giroux, 2007). Giroux je tvrdio da je primarna funkcija kritičke pedagogije oslobođenje, a da je njezin glavni cilj dovesti učenike do vještina s pomoću kojih će istraživati ulogu društva u njezinoj kritičkoj konstrukciji te stvoriti uvjete za poučavanje raznih vrsta znanja i istraživanja (Inal, 2009). U tom smislu kritička pedagogija omogućuje nastavnicima i učenicima da razmatraju obrazovanje kao političku, društvenu i kulturološku inicijativu (Giroux, 2009).

Kritička pedagogija ima neka temeljna obilježja, među kojima prednjači činjenica da se temelji na ideji o obrazovnoj i društvenoj pravdi i jednakosti. Ne zanimaju je samo školovanje, kurikulum i obrazovna politika već također društvena pravda i ljudska sposobnost. Zatim, kritička se pedagogija fokusira na uvjerenje o dubokoj ukorijenjenosti obrazovanja u sferu politike. Nadalje, kritička pedagogija naglašava rješavanje ljudskih problema, što se smatra etičkom stranom izgradnje pravog demokratskog društva. Zagovornici kritičke pedagogije pokazuju zanimanje za skupine i pojedince na čiji život utječu diskriminacija i siromaštvo jer kritička pedagogija poglavito počiva na tome da se onemogućene nedostaci siromašne djece, koji su izazvani nejednakim obrazovnim praksama u školi. Sasvim prirodno, ti pedagozi ne okrivljuju učenike za njihov neuspjeh (Inal, 2009). Kritička pedagogija znači mnogo više od stvaranja autoritativnog stajališta s pomoću čitanja tekstova, provedbe nekih radikalnih praksi u učionici i poticanja medijske pismenosti.

Freire (2009, str. 171) ističe ulogu nastavnika sljedećim riječima: „Znati izložiti se riziku u mnogim životnim područjima, ne samo u školi, dobra je stvar. Ne možete riskirati a da ne svladate strah. Ako ne riskirate, ne možete ništa stvoriti.” (Freire, 2009). Apple (2009, str. 46) smatra kako „danas građanin nije samo posvuda prisutni potrošač. Na čitav svijet se gleda kao na jedan golemi supermarket. U današnjim Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama sve nastaje kao nešto što se može kupiti i prodati, a slično se gleda na škole, čak i na učenike, kao na potrošače koji kupuju baš sve, dok se škole prodaju šefovima koji nastoje prodavati svoje proizvode pa se tako škole pretvaraju u robu široke potrošnje.”

Obrazovne institucije postupno nalikuju kompanijama, a učenici se smatraju „aktivnim potrošačima“ i „pasivnim (i odgovornim) učenicima“ (Ball, 2007, str. 189). Promjena uvjeta pod kojima će se obrazovne institucije rekonstruirati kao aktivni pogoni jedino je moguća s pomoću kritičke pedagogije. Kritička se pedagogija primjenjuje u nekoliko područja, kojima pripadaju **obrazovanje nastavnika** (Keesing-Styles, 2003; Leistyna, Lavandez, i Nelson, 2004), **poučavanje stranog jezika** (Fredricks, 2007), **nastava** (Glisczinski, 2007; Kanpol, 1998) i **menadžment** (Dehler, Welsh, i Lewis, 2001). U literaturi se također spominju teorijske studije (Apple, 2009; Freire, 2009; Illich, 2010; McLaren, 2007; Sagiroglu, 2008; Yildirim, 2010) iz kritičke pedagogije.

Prema Swazey i sur. (1993), ponašanja i stavovi nastavnika značajno utječu na učenike te na ostale vrijednosti i standarde unutar spomenutog područja. Nastavnici i učenici trebaju biti u stalnoj interakciji tijekom nastavnog procesa (Efilti i Coklar,

2013) jer su dolaskom digitalnog doba nastale radikalne promjene kada je riječ o funkcionalnim opisima rada, vještine i discipline (Jaros, 2014). U tom je smislu kritička pedagogija tijesno povezana s promjenom učeničkih uvjeta i razvijanjem njihovih kritičkih sposobnosti radi izricanja kritičkih stavova i aktivnog djelovanja. Kritička pedagogija na taj način odobrava i potiče oslobođenje učenika kao i nastavnika (Darder, 1991).

Freire (2009) tvrdi da je nastavnik koji vjeruje u kritičku pedagogiju onaj koji oslobađa. Mogućnosti za učenje, koje su vrlo važne u nastavi, ostvaruju se s pomoću cjeloživotnog učenja (Ozcan i Uzunboylu, 2012). U školi usredotočenoj na cjeloživotno učenje učenici su u središtu zanimanja i poučava ih se s pomoću neovisnog cjeloživotnog učenja tako što se u obzir uzimaju njihove potrebe (Demirel, 2009). Takva situacija omogućuje da želja za učenjem traje cijeli život (Ozcan, 2011). Stoga je važno odrediti stavove nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji i njihovo znanje o aktualnom obrazovnom sustavu da bi se odgojili nastavnici koji rasterećuju učenike. Giroux (2009, str. 36) smatra kako se „barem visoko obrazovanje ne bi trebalo zadovoljiti time da studentima pruža opće znanje, već bi ih istodobno trebalo osposobiti za kritičko mišljenje i strastveni osjećaj društvene odgovornosti”.

Na svakoj razini obrazovanja važno je da nastavnici, osobito oni u sustavu visokog obrazovanja, poučavaju tako da stvaraju demokratsko ozračje u učionici i pritom motiviraju učenike/studente na razvijanje demokratskih stavova i ponašanja za buduću demokraciju i društveni razvoj (Yagci, 1998). U tom je kontekstu opći cilj istraživanja utvrditi stavove nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji. Stoga se nastojalo odgovoriti na sljedeća pitanja:

1. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema spolu?
2. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema odsjeku gdje su zaposleni?
3. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema zvanju?
4. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema funkciji?
5. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema godinama staža?
6. Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema dobi?
7. Postoji li značajan odnos između dobi nastavnika i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji?

## Metoda

U ovom su dijelu predstavljeni podaci o istraživačkom modelu, skupini sudionika u istraživanju, alatima za prikupljanje podataka i njihovoj analizi.

### *Istraživački model*

U ovom se istraživanju koristio *screening* model jer se s pomoću njega određuju stavovi, ponašanja, vrijednosti, navike i mišljenja ljudi (McMillan i Schumacher, 2001).

U istraživanju se nastojalo objasniti kako se stavovi nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji razlikuju prema određenim varijablama.

### ***Istraživačka skupina***

Istraživačka skupina obučavala je 66 nastavnika koji su predavali na Fakultetu za odgoj i obrazovanje Sveučilišta Celal Bayar 2013./2014. akademske godine. Pri definiranju uzorka korištena je uobičajena metoda pomoću koje se vrši odabir populacije koja je lako dostupna i korisna s obzirom na određena vremenska, novčana i radna ograničenja (Buyukozturk, Kilic, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz, i Demirel, 2011).

### ***Alat za prikupljanje podataka***

Podaci su prikupljeni s pomoću Ljestvice s načelima kritičke pedagogije, koju je izradio Yilmaz (2009), a za njezino je korištenje dobiveno autorovo dopuštenje. Ljestvica se sastoji od sljedeće 3 poddimenzije: Obrazovni sustav, Funkcije škole i Škola koja daje slobodu. Prva se poddimenzija (Obrazovni sustav) sastojala od 15 čestica i tvrdnji, kao što su Odnosi moći u društvu utječu na obrazovanje i Škola proizvodi siromaštvo (društvena pozicija). Druga poddimenzija (Funkcije škole) imala ih je 11, npr. Nastavnik i znanje trebaju imati središnju ulogu u školi i Glavna zadaća škole je prenijeti znanje. Treća poddimenzija (Škola koja daje slobodu) obučavala ih je 5, npr. Potrebno se mnogo truditi da bi imao dobru poziciju u društvu i Škola bi trebala biti područje gdje će se učenik osloboditi. Ljestvica s načelima kritičke pedagogije imala je ukupno 32 čestice.

Peterostupanjnska Likertova ljestvica sadržavala je pozitivne i negativne tvrdnje (1=Uopće se ne slažem, 5=Potpuno se slažem). Pozitivne su tvrdnje bodovane kao 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, a negativne kao 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Na neke čestice primijenjeno je obrnuto kodiranje. Odgovori sudionika mogu se vrednovati na temelju poddimenzija, a moguće je također dobiti rezultat za ljestvicu u cjelini. Visok rezultat sudionika pokazatelj je višeg stupnja slaganja s navedenim načelima. S obzirom na to da je unaprijed provedena faktorska analiza, u našem je istraživanju određen samo koeficijent pouzdanosti, dok je Cronbachov alpha koeficijent za cijelu ljestvicu iznosio ,70. Koeficijent pouzdanosti za poddimenziju Obrazovni sustav bio je ,73; koeficijent pouzdanosti za poddimenziju Funkcije škole bio je ,60, dok je koeficijent pouzdanosti za poddimenzije Škola koja daje slobodu bio ,64. Cronbachov alpha koeficijent u našem istraživanju imao je raspon od  $0,60 \leq \alpha < 0,80$ , stoga je ljestvica pouzdana (Balci, 2011).

### ***Analiza podataka***

Pri analizi podataka koristile su se metode deskriptivne statistike i statistički paket SPSS-17. Zbog korištenja nenormalno distribuiranih kvantitativnih podataka za određivanje mogućih razlika u stavovima nastavnika prema odsjeku, dobi, godinama staža, funkciji i zvanju, primijenjena je neparametarska statistička metoda Kruskal Wallis; koristio se još Mann Whitney U test da bi se utvrdilo razlikuju li se nastavnici



u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji s obzirom na spol. Osim toga, primijenjena je Pearsonova korelacijska analiza da bi se utvrdilo postoji li značajan odnos između dobi nastavnika i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji.

## **Rezultati**

### ***Rezultati s obzirom na prvi problem***

Prvi istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema spolu? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 1.

#### Tablica 1

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Mann Whitney U testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema spolu nastavnika vidi se da takva razlika ne postoji ( $p > ,05$ ). Drugim riječima, može se reći da ne postoji značajna razlika između nastavnica i nastavnika i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji.

### ***Rezultati s obzirom na drugi problem***

Drugi istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema odsjeku na kojem predaju? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 2.

#### Tablica 2

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Kruskal Wallis testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema odsjeku, vidi se da takva razlika ne postoji ( $p > ,05$ ). Drugim riječima, može se reći da ne postoji značajna razlika između nastavnika koji predaju na odsjecima Primarno obrazovanje, Obrazovanje u Turskoj, Odgojno-obrazovne znanosti te Informatičko obrazovanje i nastavne tehnologije i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji.

### ***Rezultati s obzirom na treći problem***

Treći istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema zvanju? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 3.

#### Tablica 3

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Kruskal Wallis testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema zvanju, vidi se da takva razlika postoji ( $p < ,05$ ), što znači da se može reći kako postoji značajna razlika u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji između asistenata, predavača, docenata, izvanrednih profesora, redovitih profesora i ostalih. Srednje vrijednosti pokazuju najviši rezultat među asistentima, a ostali su imali najniži rezultat.

### ***Rezultati s obzirom na četvrti problem***

Četvrti istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema funkciji? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 4.

#### Tablica 4

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Kruskal Wallis testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema funkciji, vidi se da takva razlika ne postoji ( $p > .05$ ), odnosno može se reći kako ne postoji značajna razlika između stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji prodekana, predstojnika odsjeka, njegova zamjenika i nastavnika i stavova onih koji nemaju takve dužnosti.

#### **Rezultati s obzirom na peti problem**

Peti istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema radnom stažu? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 5.

#### Tablica 5

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Kruskal Wallis testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema radnom stažu, vidi se da takva razlika postoji ( $p < .05$ ), to jest može se reći kako postoji značajna razlika između stavova nastavnika koji imaju do pet godina, od 6 do 10 godina, od 11 do 15 godina, te 16 i više godina radnog staža. Srednje vrijednosti pokazuju najviši rezultat među nastavnicima koji imaju od jedne do pet godina staža, a da su nastavnici koji imaju staž od 16 i više godina imali najniži rezultat.

#### **Rezultati s obzirom na šesti problem**

Šesti istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Razlikuju li se nastavnici u stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema dobi? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 6.

#### Tablica 6

Kada se analiziraju rezultati Kruskal Wallis testa s obzirom na usporedbu stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema dobi nastavnika, vidi se da takva razlika postoji ( $p < .05$ ), što znači kako postoji značajna razlika između stavova nastavnika u dobi od 21 do 27, 28 do 34, 35 do 41, 42 do 48, 49 i više godina. Srednje vrijednosti pokazuju najviši rezultat među nastavnicima u dobi od 21 do 27 godina, a nastavnici u dobi od 49 i više godina imali su najniži rezultat.

#### **Rezultati s obzirom na sedmi problem**

Sedmi istraživački problem definiran je u formi pitanja – Postoji li značajan odnos između dobi nastavnika i njihovih stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji? Rezultati su prikazani u Tablici 7.

#### Tablica 7

Kada se pogledaju rezultati u Tablici 7, može se vidjeti kako postoji značajan, negativan i odnos srednje razine između stavova nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji i njihove dobi ( $p < .05$ ). Korelacijski koeficijent 1,00 pokazuje pozitivan odnos, onaj -1,00

negativan odnos, a koeficijent 0,00 pokazuje da takav odnos ne postoji. Premda ne postoji precizan raspon za tumačenje korelacijskog koeficijenta, Buyukozturk (2011) tvrdi da se sljedeći rasponi često koriste: ako je raspon korelacijskog koeficijenta između 0,70 i 1,00 kao apsolutna vrijednost, odnos se može definirati kao onaj na visokoj razini, a da je u slučaju raspona od 0,70 do 0,30 riječ o odnosu srednje razine. Osim toga, odnos čiji je koeficijent od 0,30 do 0,00 pokazuje nisku razinu odnosa (Buyukozturk, 2011). Polazeći od rezultata istraživanja, može se pritom reći da se stavovi o kritičkoj pedagogiji smanjuju s porastom dobi nastavnika.

## **Zaključak i rasprava**

U ovom istraživanju analizirani su stavovi koje nastavnici imaju o načelima kritičke pedagogije prema određenim varijablama te se nastojalo otkriti kakav stav o tome imaju nastavnici Fakulteta za odgoj i obrazovanje.

Nakon uvida u dobivene rezultate utvrđeno je da se stavovi o kritičkoj pedagogiji ne razlikuju prema spolu nastavnika. U istraživanju što ga je proveo Yilmaz u osnovnim školama nije postojala razlika u odnosu na spol, što odgovara našem nalazu. No, u istraživanju pod nazivom Stavovi budućih nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji Yilmaz i Altinkurt (2011) utvrdili su postojanje značajne razlike u odnosu na spol, što se ne podudara s našim nalazom.

Nakon uvida u dobivene rezultate utvrđeno je da se stavovi o kritičkoj pedagogiji ne razlikuju prema odsjeku na kojemu nastavnik predaje. U ovoj je populaciji utvrđeno da ne postoji razlika u stavovima nastavnika koji predaju na odsjecima Primarno obrazovanje, Obrazovanje u Turskoj i Informatičko obrazovanje i nastavne tehnologije. U svom istraživanju pod nazivom Stavovi budućih nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji Yilmaz i Altinkurt (2011) nisu utvrdili postojanje značajne razlike u odnosu na odsjek, što ide u prilog našem nalazu.

Utvrđeno je također da se nastavnici razlikuju u svojim stavovima o kritičkoj pedagogiji prema zvanju; to jest u tom smislu postoji razlika između asistenata, predavača, docenata, izvanrednih i redovitih profesora, kao i ostalih nastavnika. Najbolji rezultat postigli su asistenti, a najlošiji ostali. To se može pripisati mladosti asistenata i tome što se više bave znanstvenim istraživanjima od predavača. Ovdje se shvaćanje kritičke pedagogije, prema kojem se obrazovanje definira kao proces koji omogućuje pojedincu samoostvarenje i potiče razvijanje kritičkog stajališta o promjeni društva u pravcu demokratizacije, pojavljuje kao alternativni obrazovni model (Sagiroglu, 2008).

Potrebno je na svakoj razini obrazovanja, osobito kada su u pitanju visokoškolski nastavnici, koji će osposobljavati buduće nastavnike da poučavaju u demokratskom ozračju i da se sustavno koriste standardima vrednovanja (Usmani i Khatoun, 2013). Nastojati razviti demokratske stavove i ponašanja kod učenika na taj je način važno za društveni razvoj (Yagci, 1998). Pokazalo se kako razlike u načelima kritičke pedagogije ne ovise o funkciji nastavnika, a to znači da nije pronađena značajna

razlika u stavovima prodekana, predstojnika odsjeka, njihovih zamjenika i nastavnika te onih koji takve funkcije ne obnašaju. Podaci pokazuju da obnašanje ili neobnašanje neke funkcije ne utječe na stavove nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji.

Međutim, stavovi nastavnika o kritičkoj pedagogiji razlikuju se prema godinama staža. Može se reći da postoji značajna razlika u stavovima nastavnika u kategorijama od 1 do 5, 6 do 10, 11 do 15, te 16 i više godina staža. Srednje vrijednosti ukazuju na to da nastavnici u kategoriji od 1 do 5 godina staža imaju najviši rezultat, a najniži oni koji imaju 16 i više godina staža. Novozaposleni nastavnici obrazovani su prema suvremenim načelima u odnosu na starije kolegice i kolege. Dakle, može se reći da su više usvojili vještine kritičkog mišljenja.

Zapaženo je da nastavnici različite dobi imaju različite stavove o kritičkoj pedagogiji. Drugim riječima, značajno se razlikuju stavovi nastavnika koji se nalaze u kategorijama od 21 do 27, 28 do 34, 35 do 41, 42 do 48, te 49 i više godina. Analiza srednjih vrijednosti također je pokazala da nastavnici u kategoriji od 21 do 27 godina imaju najviši rezultat, a da nastavnici u kategoriji 49 i više godina imaju najniži rezultat. U istraživanju Yilmaz i Altinkurt (2011), provedenom na uzorku budućih nastavnika, te u istraživanju Yilmaz (2009b) na uzorku nastavnika mlađe životne dobi pokazalo se da mlađi nastavnici nisu dovoljno prilagođeni kritičkoj pedagogiji, ali ipak je ta prilagodba pozitivna i obećavajuća. Spomenuti rezultat ide u prilog našem nalazu. Može se reći kako postoji mnogo razloga zbog kojih novozaposleni nastavnici više usvajaju načela kritičke pedagogije od iskusnijih nastavnika, što je objašnjivo postojanjem kolegija „kritičkog mišljenja” i nastojanjem studenata da usvoje „kritički pristup obrazovanju”.

Osim toga, otkrili smo statistički značajan odnos između dobi nastavnika i stavova o kritičkoj pedagogiji, a taj je odnos srednje razine i negativan. Može se reći da su rezultati nastavnika o stavovima slabiji što su nastavnici starije životne dobi. U tom se smislu načini pristupa informacijama i metodama njihova korištenja razlikuju prema vremenu studija zato što se obrazovanje mlađih nastavnika zasniva na poučavanju istraživačkih strategija, a stariji su nastavnici usvojili tradicionalniju metodu i prezentacijske strategije.

No, u sadašnjoj situaciji u kojoj su građani izloženi tome da postanu traženi na tržištu, a mlađe osobe sudjeluju prije u potrošnji nego u istraživanju (Giroux, 2009), cilj je kritičke pedagogije pomoći studentima da postanu kritički osviješteni građani koji su sposobni i voljni preispitivati odnose u društvu. Stoga je nužno da nastavnici uvelike prihvate ta načela (Yilmaz i Altinkurt, 2011).

U ovom istraživanju nastojalo se utvrditi koji su stavovi nastavnika Fakulteta za odgoj i obrazovanje o kritičkoj pedagogiji. Smatra se da bi se proširenjem uzorka i uključivanjem ostalih fakulteta u istraživanje mogli dobiti drugačiji rezultati.