Interrogating Colonial Legacy of Active Learning Strategies in English Language Education: A Postcolonial Critique

Deepak Thapa
MPhil Scholar, Kathmandu University, Nepal
Email: deepak_mpele2024@kusoed.edu.np

Abstract

Linguistic imperialism continues to persist unintentionally through pedagogical practices, even within contemporary decolonial contexts. Drawing insights from postcolonial theoretical lens, this thematic paper critically interrogates the colonial legacy embedded within Nepalese English language classrooms. I adopted Braun and Clarke's thematic literature review as a theoretical framework to identify recurring pattern and themes from the existing literature around my study area of the western dominance in the adoption of pedagogical approaches in the non-western contexts. For the study purpose, secondary sources were used to critique on the issue. Using Google database search engine as the data source, I collected only eight relevant academic papers strictly following the systematic literature review process. Furthermore, four books were purposively selected to respond to the search questions. The findings of the study revealed that teaching approaches developed in monolingual context, still dominates significantly even within the post-colonial context. This study highlights the importance of developing culturally relevant active learning teaching approaches to resist the western legacy, arguing that uncritically adopted methods in multilingual and multicultural contexts like ours, reinforces the unintentional western legacies to non-western unique educational settings. This study is significant because it serves as an instrumental tool for policy makers and academic leaders to strategically adapt the western centric teaching approaches and focus more on culturally sensitive pedagogical approaches in multilingual and multicultural classrooms within post-colonial settings.

Keywords: Linguistic imperialism, post-colonial pedagogy, language teaching, multilingual

Introduction

Almost all dominant teaching approaches, including active learning strategies are originated in western contexts. The western methods, paradoxically considered as the mainstream teaching approaches, are functioning as a soft form of pedagogical control of English language teaching (ELT) to the non-west. ELT has functioned as a linguistic imperialism - a soft power of British industry for ideological dominance and power structures (Phillipson, 2016). Through English language, the British are implicitly colonizing non-native English people for centuries, though their flags have transition to independence. Colonialism is replicated primarily through the expansion of British/American models of teaching and periphery countries are accepting and adopting the pedagogical models believing that they are universal, superior and standard for teaching a second language (Phillipson, 2016; Pennycook, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 2003). The predetermined assumption about teaching is sustained by the fact that the British-American represent mainstream theories about language teaching providing a methodological guide for 'how to teach English language' worldwide. As a result, some of the common traditional British and American modeled pedagogical methods such as Audiolingual, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Learning (TBL) and Total Physical Response (TPR), though they are mutually not inclusive, have been globally adopted, institutionalized and practised uncritically, across diverse sociolinguistic educational settings.

To further accelerate this assumption, mainstream theorists have advocated for active learning strategies as an absolute learner-centered method for the 21st century second language classrooms. Active learning strategies, though set in monolingual context, basically aim to promote learner autonomy, enhance engagement for developing language proficiency, fostering critical thinking abilities. Active learning is grounded on social constructivism, and based on the assumption that students' collaboratively can co-construct knowledge when they are actively engaged in the learning process (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding supports from the teacher or mentor maximize the students' learning and transform the learning process. Active learning strategies, from this perspective, are considered to be the transformative tools for promoting learners autonomy, enhancing engagement and developing language proficiency. Active learning strategies are meant for fostering learners' critical thinking abilities through active engagement with the teaching materials and content.

Mainstream active learning strategies are key to language success, enabling learners to actively engage in the classroom for a deeper understanding of the text through contextually meaningful activities. Active learning strategies such as discussion, project-based learning, and collaborative tasks are vital for enhancing problem-solving skills and critical thinking abilities of students in modern language

classrooms (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Johnson & Johnson, 2009). In addition, active learning strategies are the practical instrumental tools to ensure teacher agency and promote learners' autonomy in learning process. However, the uncritical transfer of colonial power and adoption of western-centric active learning strategies are posing significant threats on their efficacy of ELT in second or foreign language context (Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Pennycook, 2007). It is significant to note that mainstream active learning has become a soft engine to reproduce their colonial power.

Framed in Paulo Freire's emancipatory approach to teaching, active learning serves as an obvious transformative teaching method, which empowers learners for critical engagement in the learning process, promoting their proficiency and fostering autonomy in English language classroom (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Freire, 1970; Johnson & Johnson, 2009). Nevertheless, scholars form post-colonial critique tradition have argued that active learning strategies such as group work, role play and debates, etc. are fundamentally embedded with Eurocentric assumptions about learning and conflicting with local knowledge system, classroom practices and worldview. It is to be noted that the adoption of teaching strategies developed in monolingual context is unlikely to fit in Nepali sociolinguistic settings primarily for the two reasons. First, the uncritical adoption of unexamined teaching strategies developed in the western context may not sufficiently address the learning ability, styles and needs of learners form diverse sociolinguistic and cultural settings of Nepalese classrooms. Secondly and more importantly, such colonial teaching strategies are covertly replicating pedagogical dominance of the west, perpetuating the educational neocolonialism and epistemic injustices.

Nepal has a unique political history. Unlike other Asian countries, e.g. India, Nepal was not colonized politically. Though it was not colonized geographically, the linguistic colonization is inherently intersected through missionary, education development aid and global language policy. The covert colonial hegemony is mainly reflected through English language and language teaching, nevertheless subalterns are resisting colonial dominance critically (Canagarajah, 1999).

English language teaching is taken as the one of the most respected jobs in non-native English speaking countries including Nepal, as English language is perceived as a ladder for career advancement, elite privilege, modernization and global social mobility through the British-Indian colonial connection (Phyak, 2016). In a similar vein, Kumaravadivelu (2003) argued that the teaching approaches are evolved and developed mostly in the global west and decentralized to the global east and global south. Hence, British-American metropolis are at the center of developing ELT theories and methods. They are the producer of theories, while remotely located decentered non-nonnative countries are the consumers of theories. This prototypical division of labour is unproductive and unrealistic.

Therefore, it is important to take control in principles and practices and restore agency of peripheral community, and resist linguistic coloniality through alternative context sensitive teaching principles. Furthermore, moving forward Kumaravadivelu (2003) presented an influential alternative theoretical framework of *postmethod pedagogy* for contesting the colonial legacy of teaching approaches of 3Ps parameters: particularity, practicality, and possibility. This 3Ps theoretical framework states that teaching context and learners' cultural identities are absolutely diverse (particularity); the mere application of one particular theory in multilingual settings is unrealistic and insignificant (practicality). It is possible to resist the western dominance of western traditions in language teaching through critical pedagogy empowering classroom participants (possibility).

Similarly, Pennycook (2007) ironically stated that colonial roots of active learning are 'donor-driven-international agenda' which promotes standardized model of teaching marginalizing the local pedagogical knowledge, multilingual realities and indigenous learning culture. Furthermore, Phillpson (2016) demonstrated through his investigation of Native English Speaking Teachers' (NEST) performance in six different Asian countries that monolingual teachers were under qualified to teach in unfamiliar conditions with learners' languages, cultures and pedagogical tradition and pointed out for the need of multilingual competence to the language teachers. He further argued that deployment of NEST to Asia was the vested economic and geopolitical agenda behind English language teaching business. That is to say, hidden intentional political and economic interest was located under the canopy of ELT methods.

These intentional motives of the colonizers and theoretical underpinning entail to develop a conceptual framework to critically examine the colonial domination and think of alternatives to colonial ELT methods and resist the dominance. This situation inspires to find some alternative methodologies where classroom participants (students and teacher) construct a new theory of teaching which, in turns, supports to interrogate on the relevance of dominant mainstream teaching approaches developed in the west and circulated to the southeast and the south.

These discussions appear to support the fact that non-native English speaking countries are resisting active learning teaching strategies, which are set in the monolingual context, and exploring alternatives to teaching strategies, which can actively engage students for promoting their autonomy and critical thinking abilities. Number of post-colonial theories, teaching methods and teaching techniques have been put forward to counter monolingual ideology in language teaching and teach in multilingual and multi-cultural contexts. For instance, Cnagarajah (2011) illustrated how codemeshing and translanguaging writing strategies served as the act of linguistic resistance through analysis of his students' writing in a multilingual classroom which included: a) Reconceptualization strategies, b) Voice strategies, c) Interaction strategies and d) Textualization strategies (see Canagarajah, 2011).

These theoretical discussions provide a critical roadmap for anti-colonial learning strategies in Nepalese multilingual educational settings. While recent studies in Nepal are focused on the exploration of relative benefits, effectiveness and challenges of implementing active learning strategies in language classrooms. For instance, some studies have explored how student-centered teaching such as active learning, group work and flipped classroom model are beneficial for developing language proficiency, promoting learners' autonomy and classroom engagement in second language classrooms (Thapa, 2025; Dhami & Neupane, 2025; Maharjan, 2024). However, these studies tend to focus on the classroom procedures and pedagogical outcomes rather than the ideological underpinnings. Similarly, studies on alternative teaching principles, appropriate for multilingual and multi-cultural context have obviously been done for teaching in diverse contexts. Similarly, several fascinating studies on culturally responsive alternative strategies have been conducted being influenced by post-colonial thinkers such as Freire's school of thought, suggesting the outstanding active learning strategies to resist the colonial legacies in Nepalese second language educational landscape. Nevertheless, critique on monolingual active learning strategies from post-colonial perspective is still undocumented, interrogating how such strategies are reproducing the colonial ideologies within Nepalese English language education system. This study critically aims to address this gap with the research question: How do active learning strategies reproduce colonial legacies in Nepalese English language classrooms?

Methods and Procedures

A thematic review often integrates elements from both thematic synthesis and systematic reviews. Combining two have two different proposes. First, it generates the themes from the critiques of existing literature and secondly, to systematically select relevant literature for the review. Together these methods are often referred to as hybrid or semi-systematic or narrative review (Snyder, 2019).

Guided by this conceptual framework, I employed thematic review to generate themes for this study. A thematic review, according to Braun and Clark (2006), is in-depth synthesis of diverse sources for identifying patterns, debates and gaps across existing literature. Following this guideline, I critically synthesized on the existing literature on active learning from post-colonial perspective. Based on the readings of diverse existing literature, I derived three broad conceptual patterns from which I generated four major themes to discuss the finding and make a new interpretation.

While for collecting the existing literature for the study, I utilized systematic-literature review. A systematic literature review involves systematically collecting, evaluating and synthesizing all relevant studies on a specific topic using pre-defined

criteria (Damayanti et al., 2022). I took the help of Google Scholar online database with key words such as *active learning strategies, interrogation, postcolonial critique, colonial legacy,* and *multilingual context* to get the relevant literature for the study, strictly mentioning inclusion and exclusion criteria which allowed me to focus on my research questions. I followed the four successive steps of the Systematic Literature Review (SRL) process, which included *identification, screening, eligibility*, and *final selection* of relevant studies.

Screening Process and Eligibility Criteria

With the key words, Google Scholar retrieved n=770 results in less than 0.04 seconds in a single hit. However, nearly 700 articles were eliminated through first round of screening process due to thematic irrelevance. I set this inclusion or exclusion criteria due to the reason that I could be able to incorporate the papers which were directly connected to my research agenda, on the one hand, and on the other hand, I could systematically include the relevant research articles in an unbiased manner excluding irrelevant ones. The remaining 70 articles were screened against eligibility criteria. Out of these, only 8 articles met the eligibility criteria and included for the syntheses and remaining others 67 articles were excluded due to various reasons such as the lack of full text, being languages other than English and not being scholarly articles.

I set the following inclusion and exclusion criteria for selecting relevant articles. The inclusion criteria included: a) scholarly articles only (excluding theses and grey literature) in English language, b) active learning strategies, c) articles critiquing on post-colonial pedagogies and, d) flexible teaching approaches. On the other hand, the exclusion criteria were: a) non English articles, b) articles with unavailable full text, c) articles focusing only teaching methods, d) theses and grey literature instead of articles on active learning strategies. Of all n=8 selected articles, 2 were form western context, 6 were form South Asian and African including Nepali writers on active learning and post-colonial methodologies. Furthermore, I purposively selected 4 books on post-colonial ELT approach and methods for the review.

Results and Discussion

The critical review and analysis of existing literature on academic papers and books enabled the researcher to identify three major themes: two themes for the first research question and one theme for second research question. The themes are: *1)* Tension between Western and local approaches, 2) Colonial hegemony in current pedagogical strategies, 3) Reclaiming pedagogy through postcolonial alternatives

The following visual representation demonstrates the process of developing

four themes form the exiting literature to make new interpretation.

Themes	Literature synthesized
Tension between Western and local approaches	Pennycook (2007), Canagarajah (1999), Phyak (2016), Thapa (2025), Dhami and Neupane (2025), Maharjan (2024) Kumaravadivelu (2003)
Colonial hegemony in current pedagogical strategies	Kumaravadivelu (2003), Canagarajah (2011), Phyak (2016) Phillipson (2016)
Reclaiming pedagogy through postcolonial alternatives	Kumaravadivelu, (2006), Canagarajah (1999), Maharjan (2024)

This section presents the thematic interpretation of how western model teaching strategies are unintentionally reproducing the colonial hegemony in Nepalese English teaching context and explores the underlying philosophies and methodologies attached to them.

Tension between Western and Local ELT Approaches

The review of existing literature on postcolonial pedagogies indicated that is there is still the dominance of western centric standard teaching methods in English language education. There is decade's long ideological tension between the supremacy on two distinct ideological approaches in adopting methods in English language learning and teaching. The teaching approaches of: a) the west and b) the local pedagogical approaches.

Western pedagogical approaches were based on the assumption that teaching approaches should be inherently developed by the theories especially by the native professional theorists, and non-native language teachers faithfully apply the theories into practice through language teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). The westerners intentionally created an artificial dichotomy of theorists and practitioners and maintained a social hierarchy. The westerners made to believe non-native English teachers that they were the producers of theories and non-native English teachers were considered as the consumers and practitioners of the theories. This dichotomy is deeply institutionalized in non-native community. Through this predetermined ideological orientation, western the professional experts and intellectuals played a dominant role to govern the entire process of teaching and learning, including setting goals, devising curriculum, prescribing teaching methods, determining teacher and students roles and suggesting assessment procedures. In this educational setting, teachers are assigned as the passive technicians who pass the presequenced and predetermined content knowledge mostly originated in the west to the successive generation of students

of non-west (Kuamarvadivelu, 2003). Hence, the design of learning process in this framework is automatically top-down approach.

In addition, this ideological construct assumed that the westerns represented the authentic and original source of knowledge and it should be disseminated in the language classroom following a strict of set of methods. The most commonly used eleven western centric ELT approaches and methods in ESL/EFL context are mentioned in Larsen-Freeman (1986) and Richards and Rodgers (1986) which are alphabetically as Audiolingual Method, Communicative Methods, Community Language Learning, Direct Method, Grammar-Translation Method, Natural Approach, Oral Approach, Silent Way, Situational Language Teaching, Suggestopedia, and Total Physical Response. It is to be noted that methods, however, weren't mutually exclusive to each there. They were conceptually similar in sense that these methodologies were designed with monolingual mindset, intentionally aiming to perpetuate the colonial legacy in ELT domain.

Within western circle, John Dewey the propounder of experiential learning, however, led the progressive school of thoughts primarily in the roles of teachers in teaching. He attempted to define the reflective role of teachers for experiential learning. He severely criticized routine based-handed-down pedagogic models arguing that language experts are far removed from classroom reality, so their explicit teaching methods were unlikely to address the complex reality of the classroom. He forwarded the concept of reflective action'arguing that the teacher should look back critically and imaginatively on his/her teaching and derive explanatory principles for next teaching (Dewey, 1930 as cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Following this principles of reflective action, teacher's reflection undertakes in two ways: a) reflection-on-action (where teachers' reflection happens before or after the class), b) reflection-in-action (where teachers attempt to locate the unexpected problem on the spot) .This progressive pedagogical approach sharply challenged the conventional notion of teachers as the implementers of established theories reimagining them as reflective practitioners.

Nevertheless, the postcolonial critical thinkers and transformative intellectual denied the supremacy of western methods and knowledge system in L2 learning. They demonstrated that one-sized-fits- all cookie-cutter approach were in sufficient to address the complex socio-cultural situation of L2 learning and advocated for the construction of context sensitive local pedagogical methods. They stated that tea a teaching a language was absolutely subjective activity and it was impossible to carry the activity in an organized way. Heavily influenced by postcolonial linguistic imperialism and critical discourse analysis, critical thinkers like Robert Phillipson,1992; Panneycook, 1994a; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Holliday, 1994; Canagarajah, 2003 to name a few, explored the possible alternatives to resist the western pedagogical influence in English language teaching in nonnative context, intending to maximize the role of teachers form reflective practitioners to transformative intellectuals.

Therefore, the synthesis of the existing literature on post-colonial teaching revealed that the contribution of Kumaravadivelu and Cangarajah, who are the outstanding South Asian critical applied linguists, was paramount to resist the pedagogical dominance of the west. The study revealed that the conception of post method pedagogy in ELT domain by Kumaravdivelu laid a strong foundation to challenge the grand narratives of mainstream teaching methods with the formulation of three Ps parameters- particularity, practicality and possibility. The three Ps approach challenged the conventional understanding on teaching methods which significantly empowered the teachers in language learning process. Teachers are free to design their own methods based on their practice. In such post method teaching conditions, according to Kumaravadivelu (2003) teachers are provided full autonomy to determine not only 'what to teach' but also 'how to teach' automatically within the academic and administrative constrains imposed by the situation, curricula and textbook. Hence, teaching approaches according to this perspective is more 'learning centered' rather than 'learner-centered' and works in bottom up approach'. Similarly, Suresh Canagarajah developed the theoretical framework for teaching in multilingual contexts, outlining the strategies of codemeshing, codemixing and code switching to resist the post-positivist mainstream pedagogical approaches through critical pedagogy. It is to be noted that the teacher applies that method which arises from the commonsense and subjective understanding, own experience, through professional education and peer consultation. For this subjective understanding what Prabhu (1990) called- *principled pragmatism*.

Active Learning Replicates the Colonial Legacy

Active learning strategies such as role play, pair work, group collaborations etc. are the corner stones for empowering teachers and promoting learners' autonomy in second language classrooms. These strategies are framed as 'student centered and emancipatory teaching' models. Furthermore, active learning strategies are designed for enhancing learners' problem solving skills and critical thinking abilities (Esion & Benwell, 1991). However, the study revealed that the use of active learning strategies in second language classrooms had hidden power structures as these strategies were unintentionally replicating western colonial education system in non-native contexts, especially in marginalized communities of global south.

Essentially, active learning strategies are learners centered teaching approaches, which give the direction of 'how to teach' primarily through strategies like role play, group collaboration, think-pair and share activity etc. for promoting learning autonomy and language proficiency, nevertheless, they were equally found to be directing 'what is to be taught' overemphasizing the value of western knowledge system. The use of active learning in English language teaching has implicitly made to assume that they were the prefect methods for addressing teaching and learning problem. Furthermore,

after going through the literature, I perceived that British-modeled active learning has implicitly made to assume that it is insignificant and irrelevant, rather they were counterproductive primarily due to the monolingual nature and deadly intentional motive of suppressing peripheral communities through language teaching (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1998; Canagarajah, 1999). Moreover, the application of western centric active learning strategies in Nepalese multilingual context were almost impracticable and unrealistic (Kunaravadivelu, 2006).

Westerners considered themselves that they were the cater of education, research and held the responsibility for providing financial backing, donate textbooks, share expertise, train non –native English teachers and scholars and sometimes run ELT enterprise in the periphery (Cangarajah, 2003).

The study indicated that the entire English language education system such as English language policy, English language curriculum, teaching methods, framework for English language teacher development, language assessment, monitoring mechanism is directly or indirectly governed by the native English speaking countries' language education system. The most worrying aspect of peripheral circle is that non-native English speaking countries are uncritically adopting and accepting British-American model knowledge system and teaching methods in non-native multilingual contexts without understanding their intrinsic side effects on indigenous languages and cultures. It is important to note that the uncritical mimicry of western teaching methodologies poses a serious threat of local languages and knowledge system, particularly within the educational landscape of global South, including Nepal.

Canagarajah (2003) provided an insightful vignette on how western pedagogical models are imposed under the shadow of English language teaching and learning by providing a reference of English language class of Sri Lankan war-affected school. He artistically sketches a scene of the terrifying situation of civil war in the towns of Tamil in the early years of 21st century and presents a memory of Mrs. K's teaching English to her students. Mrs. K. as an English starts the lesson in a fearful situation of possible war out of the school compound. Initially, students are perplexed to take the class. As an obstinate teacher, Mrs. K opens the lessons reading of John's daily activity and hobbies ingoing war situation. She starts reading a piece of information to her students saying that "John is English boy, he is well organized, focused and goal oriented…" She was reading this from the newly imported book from England. She aimed to teach 'present tense' inductively. However, her students showed little interest and engagement with the English lesson. Comparatively, Mrs. K's students' realities were far beyond of John's.

I observed that the colonial legacy in Mrs. K's classroom is reflected in three significant way: a) through the use imported book form England, b) through lesson content featuring John ('John' is English name and he has positive attributes), and

c) through fearful classroom situation (as students were barricaded due to frequent explosion outside the school compound). This classroom situation clearly indicated the hegemony of English culture in non-native context. One critical point to mention here is that Mrs. K was applying western model teaching strategies without acknowledging the socio-cultural cultural realities of Srilankan Tamil students, deriving examples of John's who is culturally distant. John is often an English name. It is to be noted that Mrs. K was seen as unintentionally constituting linguistic imperialism in English language teaching and her teaching strategies were deeply rooted in British approach absolutely disconnected from the lived experiences of her students.

Reclaiming Pedagogy through Postcolonial Alternatives

The review of postcolonial literature conformed that western centric handed-down one-size-fits-all teaching approaches has severely dominated the domain of English language teaching. English culture and western values are deeply rooted in the soil of periphery countries, especially in former British colonies (Canagarajah, 2003). Western countries are intentionally reproducing implicit neocolonial linguistic imperialism as a silence poison in the name, of methodological advancement and universal knowledge system. Postcolonial critical thinkers, however, are consistently the challenging the intentional imposition of language teaching methods. Postcolonial methodologists have outlined anticolonial methods alternatives to mechanical homogenous mainstream pedagogies. They have critically defended the cognitive, cultural, linguistic and methodological superiority of one particular language and opened-up the way for subjectivity and consciousness in language teaching and learning.

The postcolonial pedagogical approaches are based on the assumption that knowledge is conditioned by the local context and it is socially constructed. Learners' emotions, imagination and intuition are considered most important in language learning process. If language learning is the case, dominant mainstream approaches are based on analysis, comprehension and interpretations. The concrete realization of empirical objective-based knowledge without cultural relevance is almost insignificant in non-native contexts.

The most effective way of reclaiming postcolonial pedagogy is through critical pedagogy. When the teachers are empowered to design their personal theories based on their experiential knowledge and encouraged to understand, interpret and test their professional theories outside expert, they will start to challenge the colonial hegemony language teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). With this argument, it could be interpreted that teachers' autonomy/agency is a powerful construct to challenge the colonial legacy.

Highlighting the importance of agency and critical roles of the teachers, Girux (1988) argues that teachers are transformative intellectual whose have dual tasks of starving for educational advancement and striving for personal transformation. As the role of educational advancement a teacher is supposed to create and implement the knowledge that are relevant to specific context, construct curricula around the needs and interest of students, while a personal transformer, a teacher is expected to educate students about the various form of injustices and inequalities.

English is obviously a vital tool of communication as it is used as lingua franca for humanity. Basic skills in English is indispensable to fully to participate in 21st century civil society. Otherwise one has to be 'marginalized and excluded' (Graddol, 2006). Due to this reason, no one can deny the importance of English language and English language teaching. However, one should equally be aware of the fact that teaching of English, following mainstream meta-method is irrelevant and unscientific as it kills the critical consciousness of teaching participants, on the one hand, and more specifically, it unintentionally reproduces the colonial legacy, on the other. Hence, context sensitive and culturally responsive pedagogies which can empower both students and teachers are effective teaching techniques in Nepalese bilingual English classrooms.

Furthermore, teaches must be encouraged for creative and critical instructional practices which promotes to use of mother tongues education because learners' L2 is detrimental to L2 learning. The strategies such as translanguaging, codemeshing, code switching promote multilingual education. The dependence on the prepackaged, ready-to-use material freely provided by the Western cultural agencies must be adapted as much as possible to minimize the influence of pedagogical imperialism. The teachers must explore the appropriate teaching method out of the various teaching methods of fit for his/ her context.

Emphasizing the value of critical ethnographic research in decolonizing the ELT, Canagarajah (1999) stated that a critical ethnographic research will enable us to discern the hidden agendas, interests, and values that shape ELT in the periphery. Besides, the activities such as small group discussions, peer reviews/interactions, collaborative writing, and paired assignments are appropriate for periphery teachers. These teaching strategies would substitute the mainstream active learning teaching strategies. Furthermore, such methods would enable students the scope for experimentation and independence, ultimately leading them for liberation. Similarly, methods such as collaborative projects, guided fieldwork, and research activities (in libraries, dormitories, or off campus) enable students to construct safe houses outside classrooms. It is equally important to teach students that any dialect has to be personally and communally appropriated to varying degrees in order to be meaningful and relevant for its users. This would lead to the pluralization of standards and democratization of

access to English. (Canagarajah, 1999, p.181). Additionally, Gilmour (2005) states that it is the responsibility of those same Western (or "Center") curricula designers to accommodate the needs of Periphery English as a Foreign Language learning communities when constructing their materials.

Hence, the ideology of teaching should be directed towards the critical thinking and reasoning, through which we can perceive the real world. The pedagogists and teachers must consider that learners' first language is not the linguistic barrier while teaching English language, rather it is a wonderful resource to learn English language in non-native English speaking countries like Nepal. At the same time, it is equally important for the donor agencies to understand and acknowledge the multilingualism, heterogeneity and diversity in de the devising methods and course material for language teaching.

Conclusion

Although the territorial colonialism has formally ended worldwide, a new form of linguistic colonialism is reflected in non-west with the hegemonic influence of dominant language teaching methodologies in post-colonial context. Dominant and mainstream pedagogical teaching methods, mostly originated in western soil are still heavily influencing ELT of peripheral context, including Nepal. For instance, there is still massive use of adiolingual and communicative language teaching methods with the aim of developing linguistic and communicative competence. These methods are based on post positivist approach and are designed with monolingual mind-set and are intentionally exported for colonizing the language teaching landscape of the 'third world'. Unfortunately, the third world and periphery countries are adopting these mainstream theories and methods uncritically, without understanding their pedagogical relevance in non-native multilingual context. As a result, British or American born mainstream theories and methods are unknowingly perpetuating western legacy in language teaching.

The beginning of 21st century marks transformative turning point for enriching second language classrooms with active learning strategies with the central promise of enhancing classroom engagement, promoting learners' autonomy, and foresting critical thinking abilities. These methods are intentionally reproducing new form of pedagogical colonialism in second language teaching spectrum. However, these dominant narratives about language teaching which views 'west is the center of educational theories' has begun to be challenged slowly by post-colonial critical pedagogists and thinkers. Due to the contributions of critical thinkers, the ideology of English teaching has begun to be seen form critical perspective. More specifically, the educational assumptions of the post method critical pedagogy has played a significant role in resting the western

hegemony and has opened up the way for new research in local, context sensitive and culturally responsive teaching approaches in ELT domain.

References

Bonwell, C.C., & Eison, J.A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). George Washington University.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2003). *Local knowledge, global claims: Teaching English in the age of globalization*. In C. Mair (Ed.), *The politics of English as a world language* (pp. 91–104). Rodopi.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417.

Damayanti, I. L., Wulan, R. T., & Hamied, F. A. (2022). Systematic literature review in education research: A step-by-step guide. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 355–365. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.43142

Dewey, J. (1930). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology*. Modern Library. (As cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2003)

Dhami, J., & Neupane, B. P. (2025). *Collaborative learning in English classrooms. Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning, 3*(2), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.54536/jtel.v3i2.5307

Gilmour, D. R. (2005). Designing EFL curriculum for the periphery: Incorporating global and local perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 601–604.

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

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. British Council.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (2009). *An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. Educational Researcher, 38*(5), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to*

postmethod. Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Maharjan, A. (2025). *English language teachers' experience of implementing flipped classroom. ELE Praxis, 2*(1), 74–88.

Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2016). Native speakers in linguistic imperialism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(5), 453–467.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phyak, P. (2016). Local-Global tension in the ideological construction of English language education policy in Nepal. In T. Tupas (Ed.), *Rethinking English language education in Asia: From critical perspectives to policy and practice* (pp. 65–78). Routledge.

Prabhu, N.S. (1990). There is no best method—Why? *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(2), 161–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586897

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature reviews as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Thapa, D. (2025). *Exploring lived experiences and perceptions of teachers on active learning strategies in second language classrooms: A phenomenological study. Nepalese Linguistics, 39*(1), 182–192. https://doi.org/10.3126/nl.v39i1.86252

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.