TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEALING WITH CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN THE EFL CLASSROOM: A PILOT STUDY

Rita Divéki
Language Pedagogy PhD Programme,
Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
divekirita@gmail.com

Abstract:
The main aim of this small-scale questionnaire study involving 35 participants was to validate a research instrument which is to be used in the author's main study on Hungarian EFL teachers' attitudes towards the incorporation of controversial issues (CI) into their lessons. The other aims of the study were to reveal how often teachers teach CI, what CI they teach, what background variables influence their decisions to teach CI and what stance they take when dealing with CI in class. After an extensive review of literature on global education and teaching controversial issues, some insight is given into the validating process and some preliminary results are provided regarding the research questions. Findings suggest predominantly positive attitudes from the participants. Based on the results, it seems that teachers deal with a wide range of controversial topics quite frequently, mostly because they take their students' interest into consideration.

Keywords:
global citizenship education, controversial issues, pilot study, validation, teachers' attitudes

1 Introduction

We live in turbulent times. In the last few decades, the pace of life has accelerated dramatically, the speed of technological advancement has increased, and our world is more globalized than ever before. All these changes have serious repercussions on education, as there is a new need to educate students who will be able to meet the challenges of an ever-shifting, ever-progressing world and who will be prepared for a competitive and unpredictable job market (UNESCO, 2014). Although these changes might be regarded as progress, our world is also full of inequalities, injustice, racial and religious tensions and divisions, even in developed democracies, and it is getting more complicated than ever to interpret what is going on around us (UNESCO, 2014). Education policy-makers around the world have realised the increasing need for change and have started to adopt the Global Citizenship Education (GCE) framework (UNESCO, 2015), which was developed to help students become global citizens, who will be able to face the above-mentioned challenges.

To educate global citizens, teachers should assume different roles and reconsider what and how they teach (Cates, 2002; Bourn, 2015). Many teachers have already started to bring global topics, such as poverty, freedom, climate change, sustainability and AIDS, into their classrooms. However, most of these issues can be considered controversial and though their discussion has various benefits, many teachers are steering away from treating them in class because of their sensitive nature (Haynes, 2009; Yoshihara, 2013). Therefore, there is a gap

between what would be advisable to do for teachers in class according to the recently adopted educational frameworks and what they actually do when it comes to dealing with controversies.

Although GCE has not been implemented in Hungary yet, the National Core Curriculum already contains some elements of the global dimension (CONCORD, 2018). However, sociological research has revealed that Hungarian youngsters are uninterested in participation in public affairs and they mostly blame their school education for not providing them with enough knowledge about their rights and obligations (Gáti, 2010). Despite the relevance of GCE, there is a dearth of educational research on this area in the Hungarian context, so the present research was done to fill a part of this gap.

The aims of the present study were to inquire into Hungarian EFL teachers' attitudes towards dealing with controversial topics and to gain insight into what controversial topics they discuss and how often they include them in their lessons. Furthermore, the author wanted to understand what background variables influence teachers to incorporate controversial issues into their lessons and what stance they take when they talk about these sensitive topics with their groups. Given the pilot nature of the study, the principal aim was to validate the research instrument which is to be used in the main study. The present paper starts with a literature review on global education and the relevance of dealing with controversial topics. Then, the validation process is described in detail, and some preliminary results are provided. The paper is concluded by some implications for the main study to come.

2 Review of literature

2.1 The definition of key terms

2.1.1 Global Education, Global Citizenship Education and Global Competence

Several attempts have been made to define the global dimension of education in the last three- to four decades and although different terms have been used and its different aspects have been emphasised throughout the years, its main premise has remained the same: educating responsible citizens who will be able to contribute to the creation of a better world. When Global Education (GE) first gained momentum in the 1980s, Fisher and Hicks (1985) defined it as "education which promotes the knowledge, attitudes and skills relevant to living responsibly in a multicultural, interdependent world" (p.8). ELT professionals also realised the pedagogical potentials of bringing real world issues into their classrooms. As Cates (2004) puts it, GE "aims to enable students to effectively acquire a foreign language while empowering them with the knowledge, skills and commitment required by world citizens to solve global problems" (p.41).

The promotion of Global Education stepped into a new phase in 2012, when the UN launched its Global Education First Initiative, making the nurturing of global citizens one of its priorities (UNESCO, 2014). As a part of this new agenda, UNESCO (2014) developed a complex educational framework, called Global Citizenship Education (GCE), which "aims to empower learners to engage and assume active roles, both locally and globally, to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world" (p.15). GCE is intended to play a pivotal role in equipping learners with the competencies they need to face the challenges of life

in the 21st century. It incorporates all the theories and methodologies that were already implemented by peace education, human rights education and education for sustainable development (UNESCO, 2014). Global education has widely influenced education systems all around the world and the global component is already present in the core curricula of several countries (e.g., the UK, Australia, Colombia and the Republic of Korea) (UNESCO, 2015).

The significance of GCE is supported by the fact that from 2018 on, the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) set out to assess students' *global competence*, which is by definition

> the capacity to examine local, global and intercultural issues, to understand and appreciate the perspectives and worldviews of others, to engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures, and to act for collective well-being and sustainable development. (PISA, 2017, p.7).

A globally competent student thus has knowledge about the world and other cultures, has the skills to understand the world and take action, has the attitudes of openness and respect for people from different backgrounds and global mindedness, and values human dignity and diversity (PISA, 2017).

2.1.2 The global content and controversial issues in education

The key thematic areas proposed to be dealt with in the context of GCE include human rights issues (e.g., fundamental human rights and responsibilities, child's rights, gender equality, cultural rights, the freedom of expression), environmental issues (e.g., sustainability, impact of patterns of production and consumption, climate change, biodiversity), issues of social and economic justice (e.g., poverty, health and wellbeing, inequality, migration, discrimination) and intercultural issues (e.g., identity, cultural diversity, world heritage, peace and conflict) (Tawil, 2013).

Most of the above-mentioned topics are likely to be controversial issues (CI) as they have a "political, social and personal impact and arouse feeling and/or deal with questions of value or belief" (Oxfam, 2006, p.2). Controversial issues can be local or global, they tend to be complex and complicated, with no easy answers and people usually hold strong opinions about them (Oxfam, 2006). As some controversial topics have the potential to divide societies and cause disagreements and conflicts between people, the question arises whether they should be treated in school and in the language lesson at all.

2.2 The rationale behind teaching controversial topics in the EFL class

The very concept of dealing with controversial issues in school appears to be controversial. While taking a global perspective and discussing controversial issues in the EFL classroom has been promoted by several authors (Brown, 2009; Jacobs & Cates, 1999; Maley, 2004; Ruas, 2017; Sampedro & Hillyard, 2004) and organisations (Council of Europe, 2014; Gimenez & Sheehan, 2008; Oxfam, 2006; UNESCO, 2015), there are some dissenting voices in the profession as well (Scruton, 1985 as cited in Hicks, 2003; Perrin, 2010 as cited in Rebuck, 2012) and teachers also seem to have mixed feelings about dealing with such topics in class. While some studies report mostly positive attitudes from teachers (Evripidou & Çavuşoglu,

2014; Gürsoy & Saglam, 2011; Yakovchuk, 2004); other studies (Haynes, 2009; Macfarlane, 2015; Yoshihara, 2013) suggest that teachers have mostly negative attitudes towards dealing with controversial issues in class, which usually results in them avoiding these topics (Haynes, 2009; Yoshihara, 2013).

However, dealing with controversial issues in class has several benefits, which teachers might consider. Firstly, they are in the curriculum in many countries, as policymakers have already recognised that "knowledge and skills divorced from real world situations leave young people unprepared for the complexities of the modern world" (Oxfam, 2006, p.3). Secondly, students seem to be interested in controversial topics; most of them want to know what is happening in the world and they feel that they should learn about it in school (Oxfam, 2006; Sampedro & Hillyard, 2004). Finally, discussing controversial topics helps students develop their various skills: they can effectively work on their four basic language skills by dealing with real-life issues (Brown, 2009; Sampedro & Hillyard, 2004) and they can also develop their creative and critical thinking skills (Brown, 2009; Oxfam, 2006; Sampedro & Hillyard, 2004). The main idea behind dealing with controversial topics in the EFL class is educating citizens who can communicate effectively in English, understand, evaluate and discuss problems without losing their temper in heated moments, and therefore "[contribute] to the maintenance of a strong participatory democracy" (Noddings & Brooks, 2017, p.1).

Although the pedagogical affordances of dealing with controversy in schools have been pointed out by several authors, some others have expressed their concerns. The most common criticism is the indoctrination of students, as the discussion of such issues can provide teachers with a platform to express their own possibly biased views and even force-feed opinions to their students (Hess, 2004). Sometimes teachers might even want to present partial opinions or censor some views if they feel that they are not appropriate (Noddings & Brooks, 2017). Nevertheless, as Brown (2009) points out, discussing *hot* topics and engaging in critical pedagogy comes with some moral dilemmas: even if the teacher has good intentions and wants to act as an agent of change, "how far should [they] push their own personal beliefs and agendas in their zeal for realizing visions of a better world and for creating critically thinking future leaders among [their] students?"(p.269) Sargent (2007) also warns about the dangers of brainwashing the students, however, he claims that it is possible to teach about controversial issues in a multidimensional way, without championing one particular view. Successfully dealing with controversy in school is thus no mean feat; however, it seems that it can benefit students in many ways, which might be advisable to consider for teachers.

2.3 Teachers as agents of change and teacher stance

Although the question of whether we should include controversial issues in our lessons is controversial in itself, as it could be seen above, there are sound arguments for their incorporation (Hess, 2004). Another controversy regarding dealing with these issues in class is the role of teachers and whether it is right for them to disclose their views to the students or they should remain impartial.

According to the advocates of critical pedagogy (Freire, 2014; Giroux, 1997), education is an inherently political act and teachers are key figures in effecting change in their communities. Freire claims that education cannot be neutral as it is linked to the ideal society people want to see, and if educators want to make a difference, they cannot shelter their students from challenges.

> When we try to be neutral, we support the dominant ideology. Not being neutral, education must be either liberating or domesticating. Thus, we have to recognise ourselves as politicians. It does not mean that we have the right to impose on students our political choice … our task is not to impose our dreams on them, but to challenge them to have their own dreams, to define their choices, not just to uncritically assume them (Freire, 1985, as cited in Huber & Bitlieriüté, 2011, p.73).

Although Freire argues that teachers must have a political opinion and they should voice it in order to effect change, he asserts that educators cannot force their students to think in the same way as them. The main aim of education is not to indoctrinate or brainwash the students but to challenge them to see other points of view and to make them think critically about different ideas.

As GCE is also closely linked to the concept of education being transformative and a tool for personal and social change, it can easily be assumed that the role of the educator is, in fact, that of an agent of change (Bourn, 2015). In order to be credible in their role of promoting global citizenship, teachers have to be committed to social justice and diversity, have to be open-minded and respectful towards other cultures, have to have a large knowledge base about the world and most of all, they need to be critical. Briefly, they must become global citizens if they are to teach global citizenship effectively (Andreotti in Bourn, 2015).

The roles teachers are willing to assume are reflected in the way they approach CI in their lessons. Having analysed high school teachers' treatment of CI, Hess (2004) identified four distinct approaches. The first one is *denial,* meaning that teachers do not treat the issue as controversial, they do not take sides, they simply assert that whatever they say about the topic is the truth. Although, it certainly is a committed stance, as the teacher is promoting change, it is entirely questionable whether the students benefit from this kind of teaching at all.

The second one is *privilege,* which means that teachers acknowledge the controversial nature of the issue, but clearly teach towards one perspective, which they think is the right one, and try to influence their students to adopt the same position. One could very easily criticize this committed stance as well and it is often stigmatized as brainwashing or indoctrination. Nevertheless, its defenders argue that teaching is a political act and that "the very possibility that neutrality is a pedagogical possibility is naïve, impossible and immoral" (Hess, 2004, p. 259).

Those teachers who opt for the third stance, *avoidance,* simply do not include controversial issues in their curriculum. Their explanations can be manifold – some teachers feel uncomfortable dealing with controversies, some fear potential uproar from students, parents, and colleagues and some do not want to disclose their opinion to their students.

The fourth approach is called *balance* and it means teaching about an issue without taking sides. It can also be considered a neutral stance and it is favoured by most teachers, parents and policy-makers. From a pedagogical point of view, it is the best approach one can take as it is built on the premise of exposing the students to different perspectives and getting them to think about the issues critically so that finally they can take a position. There are problems with the balanced approach as well, as it is quite difficult for some teachers to remain neutral and there are some situations when it is not advisable at all – there are some views that

"should not be given a fair hearing" (Noddings & Brooks, 2017, p. 2), including racist or sexist comments or the endorsement of violence.

2.4 The state of GCE in Hungary and the rationale for the pilot study

In 2015, the Hungarian Government accepted the NEFE strategy (International Development Strategy), which includes their commitment to the inclusion of Global Citizenship Education on all levels of the Hungarian educational system (HAND, 2016). There seems to be "no accredited formal global educational curriculum in any level yet" (CONCORD, 2018, p.72) but it is reported that the "work is ongoing regarding the integration of GE into the national curriculum at primary and secondary level" (p.72). Nevertheless, the Hungarian National Core Curriculum (NCC) already contains some aspects of the global perspective; the key development tasks include Education for Environment Awareness and Education for Active Citizenship and Democracy, the core competences students have to acquire by the end of their studies include Social and Civic Competences and Sense of Initiative and Entrepreneurship (Government of Hungary, 2012).

Although the fact that these concepts are present in the NCC is reassuring, how they translate into practice is dubious, looking at studies on Hungarian youngsters' participation in public affairs. Several studies suggest that Hungarian students are apathetic and disillusioned with politics, which is manifested in their lack of interest and participation in public affairs (Gáti, 2010; Integrity lab, 2016; Szabó & Kern, 2011). However, other studies show that they want to make their voice heard, they want to talk about current issues, and they feel that their schools should have a role in preparing them to do so. Unfortunately, 60% of the participating students claimed that this dimension is missing from their education (Gáti, 2010). Thus, it is imperative to examine how teachers see their role in fostering the above-mentioned competences, what attitudes they have towards dealing with sensitive and controversial issues in class and what happens effectively in the classrooms.

2.5 Research questions

The following questions, which I intend to answer in this present study, arise based on the literature:
1. What is Hungarian EFL teachers' attitude towards dealing with controversial issues in class?
2. Do teachers' attitudes towards dealing with controversial issues differ according to their age and teaching experience?
3. What influences Hungarian EFL teachers' decision to incorporate controversial issues in their lessons?
4. How often do Hungarian EFL teachers incorporate controversial issues in their lessons?
5. What controversial topics do Hungarian EFL teachers deal with in class?
6. What stance do teachers take when they deal with controversial issues in class?

3 Methods

3.1 Participants

Although this was a pilot study, the aim was to involve participants from as many different teaching contexts and age groups as possible. Given that the questionnaire was distributed online, mostly among the author's EFL teacher acquaintances, the participants self-selected for the study, which resulted in an uneven distribution of teachers representing different teaching contexts. All in all, 18 secondary grammar school teachers, 4 secondary technical school teachers, 9 university teachers, 2 university and high-school teachers and 2 private teachers participated.

The 35 participants of this study were Hungarian EFL teachers (28 female, 7 male), aged between 24 and 66 ($M = 41.85$, $SD = 12.58$), with a mean of 17.2 years of teaching experience ($SD = 12.53$). In order to answer research question 2, the participating teachers were put into three age groups: group 1 ($n = 14$) comprised teachers under the age of 35, group 2 ($n = 10$) teachers between the age of 35 and 50, and group 3 ($n = 11$) teachers over the age of 50.

3.2 Instrument

3.2.1 The questionnaire

As there was no previous research with the same focus and thus no instrument already created to examine these issues, the questionnaire was developed on the basis of the issues that came up from the relevant literature and the results of the available empirical studies into dealing with different CI (Evripidou & Çavuşoglu, 2014; Gürsoy & Saglam, 2011; Haynes, 2009, Macfarlane, 2015; Yakovchuk, 2004). The first scale of the questionnaire was developed according to a different principle. In the first two questions, the teachers were asked to evaluate some topics based on how controversial they think they are and how controversial they think their students would find them. Although it is not stated in the questionnaire, the topics were selected from the Frame Curriculum, which is part of the Hungarian National Core Curriculum, based on whether they can be linked to the above-mentioned key competences and key development tasks (see in 2.4) that are part of the global dimension. The idea was to see how teachers assess the controversial nature of the broad topics that are recommended for them to teach. During the validation process, it became evident that only asking teachers to assess some broad topics would not provide the author with adequate data about how teachers perceive them. Question 3 was then created to give the opportunity to teachers to really see the controversial nature of the broad NCC topics, so every topic was broken down into four controversial statements and teachers were asked to decide to what extent they would like to bring in those statements for in-class discussion.

The final version of the questionnaire comprised seven different scales.

1.   *The controversial nature of the given topics/The inclusion of different CI* (5 questions)
Example: Are there any taboo topics, that you would not discuss with your students in an EFL class under any circumstances? (Please, list at most 3)

2.   *Frequency of the inclusion of CI* (5 questions)
Example: How often do you discuss controversial issues in class? (Please mark your answer on the following scale: 1 = never; 2 = 1x-2x a year; 3 = 1x-2x a month; 4 = once a week; 5 = more than once a week)

3.   *Teachers' preferences and the importance of teaching CI* (5 questions)
Example: How much do you like dealing with controversial issues in class if you bring the topic into class? (Please mark your answer on the scale: 1 = I don't like it at all; 2 = I don't really like it; 3 = I partly like it, partly not; 4 = I like it; 5 = I like it very much)

4.   *What influences the inclusion of CI* (2 questions)
Example: To what extent are these statements true for you? (Please mark your answer on the scale: 1 = not at all true; 2 = not really true; 3 = partly true, partly not; 4 = quite true; 5 = absolutely true)
I only discuss controversial issues in class, if the questions are in the coursebook.

5.   *Techniques teachers use to teach CI* (2 questions)
Example: To what extent do you find the following techniques effective for working with controversial issues in class? (Please mark your answer on the scale. 1 = not at all effective; 2 = not really effective; 3 = partly effective, partly not; 4 = quite effective 5 = very effective)

Small group discussion

6.   *Teacher stance when discussing CI* (3 questions)
Example: To what extent do you think the statements are true for you when it comes to dealing with controversial issues in class? (Please mark your answer on the scale:1 = not at all true; 2 = not really true; 3 = partly true, partly not; 4 = quite true; 5 = absolutely true)
I try to show my students both sides of the argument and I'm not disclosing my own opinion in the matter.

7.   *Information on the participants* (10 questions)
Example: Your age?

Data for the study were gathered using an online questionnaire powered by Google Forms. The completion of the questionnaire was anonymous and voluntary, and it took approximately 15-20 minutes to fill it in.

3.3 Data collection and analysis

Data were collected over the course of two weeks (in April 2018) with the help of an online Google questionnaire in the respondents' native language, Hungarian. The questionnaire

was shared on various online platforms, including Facebook groups for teachers (IATEFL-Hungary Community, ELTE English teachers 2012-15, Mi, angoltanárok) and mailing lists.

After data collection, data were transferred to SPSS 22 and subjected to analysis. The reliability of the instrument was tested by the calculation of the internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scales, and by running factor analysis and principal component analysis on them. Data analysis mainly included descriptive statistical tests performed on the dependent variables. In order to answer research question 2, to be able to compare the answers of the different groups of participants based on their demographic characteristics, ANOVA tests were run.

3.4 Validity and reliability check

Establishing internal validity and especially content validity was an essential step of the validation process. First, the questionnaire constructs and then the first draft of the questionnaire were given to six experts, the author's four group mates in the Language Pedagogy PhD Programme at ELTE, the teacher of the course, and the author's supervisor, to obtain expert judgement on the relevance of the items to the issue, possible wording problems and the clarity of the instructions. Some changes were implemented as a result of the content validity and face validity check; the instructions were made clearer; some questions were deleted, and some new ones were added. The second draft was then submitted to the course teacher and the author's supervisor, following which further minor changes were implemented.

The external validity of the study was ensured by the sampling procedure. Even though it was a case of convenience sampling and data were collected online, mostly among the author's teacher friends, in order to involve participants teaching in different contexts and representing a variety of age groups, the questionnaire was circulated in specialized Facebook groups and in different mailing lists. Respondent self-selection based on topic preference was levelled off by giving the questionnaire a title that did not reveal much about what the author intended to measure.

The reliability of the instrument was established by testing its internal consistency: by calculating the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients of the different scales.

Scales (number of items)	Cronbach Alpha
Teachers' perception of the controversial nature of topics (24)	0.97
Teachers' perception of whether students find the topics controversial (24)	0.95
Teachers' willingness to include controversial statements in their lessons (76)	0.96
Frequency of the inclusion of controversial issues in class (4)	0.86
Teacher attitudes - whether teachers like dealing with controversial issues and find them important (3)	0.85
What influences decisions about the inclusion of controversial issues (12)	0.46
Teacher stance when discussing controversial issues (6)	0.09

Table 1. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the scales

The first five scales were found to be reliable as their Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient reached the .7 threshold. The low scores in the last two categories indicated that there were problems with the last two scales.

To find out the underlying problems with what influences decisions about the inclusion of controversial issues scales, a factor analysis was run as an exploratory tool to identify the questions that loaded together and that constituted separate dimensions. Four dimensions were identified in this way, centred around the following themes: the coursebook, student interest, teacher preparedness, conflicts. After the negative scales were reversed, a principal component analysis was run to test whether the regrouped items measured the same dimension. Then, the internal consistency reliability coefficients of the different dimensions were recalculated, and in two cases (teacher preparedness and conflicts), they reached the .7 threshold (with .73 and .79 respectively). In the first two cases (coursebooks: .55, student interest: .53), the coefficients were still low, which can be explained by the small number of questions. Broadening the categories by adding some more questions might make the scales more reliable. What became evident after the reliability check was that the variables influencing the teachers' decisions about incorporating CI in their lessons cannot be analysed as one dimension as there are some underlying constructs.

The teacher stance scales were also subjected to factor analysis, and two main dimensions emerged. However, the main problem was that there was an item which completely dominated one of the dimensions, and there were two items which at first did not even load, as their scores were too low. By discarding half of the items, a new dimension was created, namely the disclosure of the teacher's opinion. A principal component analysis was run on it to check whether it only really measured one component; then, its internal consistency was tested, which reached the threshold with its .74 Cronbach alpha score. The given scales will have to be completely revised for the main study.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Controversial topics in the classroom

The first question inquired into to what extent teachers find the recommended topics by the NCC controversial. On the basis of their answers, the most controversial topics seem to be religions ($M = 3.74$), prejudice ($M = 3.4$) and the rich and the poor in society ($M = 3.2$). According to the participating teachers, the least controversial topics were languages ($M = 1.74$), information and communication technologies ($M = 1.83$) and employment competences ($M = 1.86$).

Topic	N = 35		Group 1 n = 14		Group 2 n = 10		Group 3 n = 11	
	M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Religions	3.74	1.26	4.71	.47	3.2	1.13	3.0	1.34
Prejudice	3.4	1.14	3.57	.94	3.6	1.26	3.0	1.26
The poor and the rich in society	3.2	1.35	3.21	1.25	3.2	1.55	3.18	1.40
Gender roles	3.14	1.42	3.57	1.5	2.9	1.29	2.82	1.40
Tolerance	3.08	1.15	3.43	1.02	2.9	.9	2.82	1.40
Global issues	3.03	1.56	3.71	1.59	2.3	1.49	2.82	1.33
Conflicts and dealing with conflicts	3.00	1.41	3.29	1.38	2.6	1.35	3.0	1.55
Social responsibility	2.74	1.34	2.93	1.21	2.8	1.39	2.46	1.44
Helping people in need	2.71	1.23	2.93	1.27	2.7	1.16	2.46	1.37
Addictions	2.69	1.39	3.21	1.53	2.3	1.42	2.36	1.02
Media awareness and literacy	2.69	1.37	3.21	1.31	2.5	1.27	2.18	1.4
Relationships	2.46	1.17	2.85	1.29	2.3	.82	2.09	1.22
Disability	2.46	1.38	3.21	1.37	2.1	1.98	1.81	1.16
Sustainability	2.37	1.26	2.86	1.46	2.1	1.97	2.0	.9
Compassion	2.26	1.32	2.64	1.39	2.0	1.05	2.0	1.41
Family life, family relations	2.2	1.11	2.36	1.33	2.2	1.0	2.0	.91
Physical and mental health	2.1	1.18	2.36	1.39	1.9	1.1	2.0	1.0
Environmental awareness	2.09	1.38	2.5	1.45	1.9	1.29	1.73	1.27
Conscious consumption	2.03	1.38	2.36	1.45	2.0	1.5	1.64	1.21
Choice of career	2.03	1.29	2.36	1.44	1.7	.83	1.91	1.45
Lifelong learning	1.91	1.36	2.21	1.47	1.7	1.34	1.73	1.27
Employment competences	1.86	1.27	1.86	1.46	1.6	.85	2.09	1.45

| **Information and communication technology** | 1.83 | 1.27 | 2.14 | 1.61 | 1.3 | .48 | 1.9 | 1.22 |
| **Languages** | 1.74 | 1.26 | 2.0 | 1.47 | 1.4 | .84 | 3.0 | 1.34 |

Table 2. The mean values of the teachers' ratings of the controversial nature of the broad NCC topics

Interestingly, it seems that younger teachers found the broader NCC topics more controversial than the other two age groups. Although group 1 gave higher scores in most of the categories than the other two groups, significant differences were found between how they perceived three topics: disability [$F(2,32) = 3.34$, $p < 0.05$]; global issues [$F(2,32) = 2.81$, $p < 0.05$] and religions [$F(2,32) = 10.96$, $p < 0.01$]. Group 1 found the topic of disability more controversial ($M = 3.21$) than group 2 ($M = 2.1$) and group 3 ($M = 1.82$); group 1 found global issues more controversial ($M = 3.71$) than group 2 ($M = 2.30$) and group 3 ($M = 2.81$) and group 1 also found religions more controversial ($M = 4.71$) than group 2 ($M = 3.20$) and group 3 ($M = 3.00$).

Among the controversial statements, the following five received the highest scores (the maximum being 6), meaning that teachers have either already included them or would like to include them in their lessons:

1. Consumerism encourages waste. ($M = 5.46$, $SD = .92$)
2. Money won't make you happy. ($M = 5.26$, $SD = 1.22$)
3. Today, it is impossible to find a great job without speaking languages. ($M = 5.11$, $SD = 1.35$)
4. Selective waste collection should be made mandatory. ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.07$)
5. Enjoying what you do is more important than how much you are paid for it. ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.16$)

The lowest scoring controversial statements (the ones teachers are less likely to bring into class) were the following:

1. Budapest Pride is just for provocation. ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.46$)
2. Depression is not an illness, it's a character flaw. ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.65$)
3. War is a necessary evil. ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 1.81$)
4. Politicians don't do anything to stop wars as wars can make them wealthier. ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.96$)
5. Religious education has no place in schools. ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.57$)

What is interesting is that although the younger generation seems to find the broad NCC topics more controversial, they also seem to be more likely and willing to bring in those issues for in-class discussions. When asked how much they would like to include the listed controversial statements in their lessons, Group 1 gave higher scores in most of the cases, but significant differences were found between the groups especially when it came to statements relating to personal relationships and social issues. The reason why younger teachers are more likely to bring in topics relating to personal relationships might be the small age difference between them and the students and the fact that they might feel more comfortable talking about these issues or they might even relate more easily to their students' issues/problems.

Controversial statement	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
If your best friend got together with your ex, it would mean the end of your friendship.	4.21	1.12	3.50	1.90	2.81	1.53	*F*(2,32) = 2.66; *p* < 0.05
Refugees are treated unfairly in European countries.	4.21	1.63	2.40	1.51	3.27	2.15	*F*(2,32) = 3.09; *p* < 0.05
One kiss doesn't count as cheating.	3.93	1.59	2.50	1.35	2.81	1.33	*F*(2,32) = 3.32; *p* < 0.05
Budapest Pride is just for provocation.	3.07	1.73	1.70	0.94	2.64	1.20	*F*(2,32) = 2.88; *p* < 0.05

Table 3. The results of the ANOVA test with significant differences between the groups.

These results are also reflected in the participating teachers' answers to the open-ended question about taboo topics in class. The first three most frequently mentioned ones can hardly come as surprise, as they belong to the so-called PARSNIP topics (politics, alcohol, religion, sex, narcotics, isms, pork), so the issues that are censored from course-books and that teachers are usually advised to avoid in school: politics (13), religion (6) and sex (5). Other answers included rape, sexual harassment, sexual identity (3), students' family problems, students' financial situation (2), "anything personal" (4), war and death. As the results suggest, not only do the teachers take the controversial nature of the topics into consideration, but they also consider their sensitive nature and whether the students would take them personally.

4.2 The frequency of the inclusion of controversial issues in class

There were no significant differences found between the age groups based on how often they deal with controversial issues in class; however, the different types of discussions proved to have different levels of frequency. When asked how frequently they discuss controversial issues in their lessons (M = 3.28, SD = .89), almost half of the respondents (48.6%) (n = 17) answered once or twice a month. The second most popular answer turned out to be once a week (28.6%) (n = 10) and the third was once or twice a year (11.4%) (n = 4). Three teachers said that they discuss CI more than once a week (8.6%) and only one teacher said that they never do so (2.7%). Interestingly, the proportions were very similar in connection with debating controversial issues in class (M = 3.03, SD = .92). More than half (52.4%) of the participating teachers (n = 18) stated that they debate CI once or twice a month. In this category, the second most popular answer was once or twice a year (22.9%) (n = 8) and the third one was once a week (14.3%) (n = 5). The number of participants choosing the two extremes remained the same as for the previous question.

Teachers were also asked how often they discuss current public issues in their lessons (*M* = 2.91, *SD* = 1.12). The most frequently chosen answer was *once a week* (34.3%) (*n* = 12), then came once a month (28.6%) and then once or twice a year (20%) (*n* = 7). It might be interesting to note that one third of the respondents claimed that they either never discuss current public issues in class (14.3%) (*n* = 5) or they do so only once or twice a year (20%) (*n* = 7). Debating current public issues seems to be an even less popular activity (*M* = 2.51, *SD* = 1.07): more than half of the participants stated that they either never have debates on these

current issues (14.3%) (*n* = 5) or only once or twice a year (42.9%) (n = 15). Quite surprisingly, two teachers (5.7%) answered that they debate current public issues more than once a week.

4.3 The importance of dealing with controversial issues in class

The results suggest that the participating teachers feel that it is important to deal with controversial issues in the language class (M = 4.14, SD = 1.06). No one said that it is not important at all to discuss hot topics, and only 4 participants (11.4%) stated that it is not important, while more than half of the participants (51.4%) (n = 18) answered that for them it is very important to discuss CI in class.

When asked to explain their answers, the teachers came up with a variety of reasons. One of the most common answers was that students are interested in these topics (7) and because of this interest, they are more engaged in discussions centred around CI. They also pointed out that it can be an important tool for learning about each other's opinions and learning to respect different points of view (5). Teachers think that through these discussions, students can learn a lot about the world and develop their own worldview (5) and thus, they are effectively prepared for real life. Some teachers highlighted that they feel that they are more than just EFL teachers and they think that by addressing these issues they educate their students (2), and they might make the world a better place. Some teachers also pointed out that discussing CI is essential for creating meaningful discussions, making the students form opinions, and making them think critically (3). Moreover, developing the students' debating skills (6) and argumentation (6) were among the most frequently mentioned benefits of dealing with CI in class. Finally, teachers mentioned that it is a great way to develop their students' vocabulary (2) and communication skills (4) as well.

A few teachers, however, expressed their concerns about dealing with CI in class: they think that the aim of bringing up CI would be agitating students and trying to influence them. One of the teachers stated that in their experience, those teachers who bring up controversial issues are usually biased, and they are not interested in balanced debates, they just want to force-feed their opinion to others. Three teachers claimed that they do not want to feel responsible for creating uncomfortable situations and generating bad feelings in their students.

4.4 Do teachers like dealing with controversial issues?

It is fair to say that the participating teachers do like dealing with controversial issues in their lessons if they initiate the discussions (M = 3.89, SD = 1.08), with the majority of the respondents (62.8%) (n = 21) answering either that they like dealing with CI (25.7%) (n = 9) or that they like dealing with CI very much (37.1%) (n = 13). Almost one third of the participants (28.6%) (n = 10), however, have mixed feelings about CI, and 3 people (8.8%) stated that they do not like discussing hot topics.

Teachers seem to be rather less eager when it comes to discussions of CI initiated by their students (M = 3.76, SD = 1.16). Although the proportions remained the same, fewer teachers answered that they like discussing CI very much (25.7%) (n = 9) or that they like

discussing CI (28.6%) (n = 10) than in the previous question. There was no significant difference found between the age groups based on their feelings about including these topics.

4.5 What influences decisions about including controversial topics

Although the scales did not prove to be reliable based on the internal consistency test, the author decided to include the answers to her inquiry into what influences teachers' decisions about incorporating CI into their lessons as it did yield some interesting results, which can be seen in the following table:

To what extent to you agree with the statement?	M	SD
12. I think that I can solve the potential conflicts that might arise when dealing with controversial issues in class.	4.09	.91
4. I only bring controversial issues into class, if I know that my students will be interested in the topic.	4.00	.94
7. I only bring controversial issues into class, if I feel prepared in the given topic.	3.88	.90
8. I bring controversial issues into class, even if I know that my students will have completely different opinions about them.	3.83	1.29
3. It is easy for me to access materials we can use when dealing with controversial issues.	3.82	1.32
6. I only bring controversial issues into class, if I am interested in the given topic.	3.77	1.03
9. When dealing with controversial issues in class, it is very important for me what the other teachers of the same class would think about it.	2.93	1.50
11. I only bring controversial issues into class, if I am almost sure that there will be no conflicts in class between the students.	2.66	1.30
2. I only discuss controversial issues in class, if I can link the issue to a topic in the coursebook.	2.60	1.03
5. I bring controversial issues into class, even if I know that some of my students will find them sensitive.	2.49	1.29
10. When dealing with controversial issues in class, I take into consideration what the students' parents would think about it.	2.49	1.36
1. I only discuss controversial issues in class, if the questions are in the coursebook.	1.91	1.09

Table 4. The mean values on what influences teachers' decisions about using controversial issues in class

Contrary to what the literature leads one to believe, the participating teachers did not attribute too much importance to the coursebook ($M = 1.91$), nor did they find it too difficult to access materials dealing with CI ($M = 3.91$). This might be due to the fact that some of the participants teach in a university context, where it is not compulsory to use coursebooks. Also, the participants only seem to be moderately concerned about their colleagues' opinion ($M = 2.93$) and the parents' opinion ($M = 2.49$) when dealing with CI.

What seems to have the most influence on them when deciding whether to incorporate CI is student interest (*M* = 4.00), their own interest (*M* = 3.77), their belief that they can cope with unexpected situations and conflicts (*M* = 4.09) and their preparedness (*M* = 3.88).

4.6 Teacher stance

Among the participating teachers, the most popular teacher stance turned out to be balance (M = 3.94, SD = 1.06), as 69.5% (n = 24) of the participants agreed that when it comes to discussing CI, they try to present both sides of the argument and they only disclose their views if the students ask them to. The results suggest that denial (M = 1.63, SD = 1.00), avoidance (M = 1.6, SD = .95) and the committed stance (M = 2.86, SD = 1.22) are no very common among the surveyed teachers.

Although it seems that teachers are not particularly keen to disclose their opinion on controversial issues (M = 3.5, SD = 1.14), teachers think their students are more likely (65.7%) (n = 23) to be aware of what views they hold on public issues than not. However, when it comes to their political opinion, teachers think that mostly their students are unaware of what kind of views they have (62.9%) (n = 22).

5 Conclusion -- limitations and implications for the main study

Despite the fact that it was a small-scale pilot study, it did yield some interesting findings which can be used to provide tentative answers to the research questions.

The answer to research question 1 (What is Hungarian EFL teachers' attitude towards dealing with controversial issues in class?) seems to be quite positive: based on how likely they are to bring in some issues (4.1), how important they think they are (4.3) and how much they like dealing with these issues in class (4.4), it is fair to say that the participating teachers have a predominantly positive attitude towards dealing with controversial issues in class. Most teachers feel that it is important to talk about their issues and their reasons mirror the literature on the topic. Regarding research question 2 (Do teachers' attitudes towards dealing with controversial issues differ according to their age and teaching experience?), we can say that they differ in the case of some topics, but there are no significant differences in most cases.

The answers to research question 3 (What influences Hungarian EFL teachers' decisions about incorporating controversial issues in their lessons?) suggest that teachers are more likely to bring CI into class if they think that their students would be interested in them, if the teachers themselves are interested in them, if they feel prepared in the topic, and if they think that they would be able to cope with potential conflicts.

The answers to items linked to research question 4 (How often do Hungarian EFL teachers incorporate controversial issues in their lessons?) indicate that the participating teachers include CI in their lessons at regular intervals, most commonly once or twice a month. Teachers tend to discuss CI more often than they have debates on them. However, it seems that

they talk about current public issues less frequently and it is even rarer to have debates on current hot topics in the EFL class.

In connection with research question 5 (What controversial topics do Hungarian EFL teachers deal with in class?) it is safe to say that they deal with a wide range of issues. The highest scoring controversial issues, the ones that teachers are likely to include, do not have a sensitive dimension, however, the ones that teachers tend to omit are those that might affect the students on a personal level. The topics that most teachers consider taboo for class discussion include politics, religion and sex.

The answers to research question 6 (What stance do teachers take when deal with controversial issues in class?) suggest that most teachers prefer a balanced stance; they favour addressing both sides of the argument and they only reveal their own opinion to their students if they are asked.

Naturally, there are some limitations to this study. Increasing the external validity is going to be an essential step in my main research. Although the questionnaire was distributed online, most of the participating teachers were from Budapest and they teach in secondary grammar schools or universities. Involving more teachers from the provinces and from different teaching contexts (i.e., secondary technical schools and vocational schools) might lead to different (and potentially less positive) results. After rethinking the questionnaire constructs, further steps will include revising the scales by deleting some items and adding others, as in two cases reliability was questionable.

Better sampling and a large-scale study might offer a better overview of Hungarian EFL teachers' attitude towards the incorporation of controversial issues into their EFL lessons. However, some qualitative investigations might add a greater depth to my inquiries, especially regarding teachers' motivations behind teaching controversial issues and their actual classroom practices.

Proofread for the use of English by: Frank Prescott and Gergely A. Dávid, Department of English Language Pedagogy, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

References

Andreotti, V. (2012). Global education, social change and teacher education: The importance of theory. In L. Jääskeläinen, T. Kaivola, E. O'Laughlin & L. Wegimont (Eds.), *Becoming a Global Citizen. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Competencies of Global Citizens*. Espoo, Finland: The Finnish National Board of Education.

Bourn, D. (2015). Teachers as agents of social change. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, *7*(3), 63-77.

Brown, H. D. (2009). Imperatives, dilemmas, and conundrums in spiritual dimensions of ELT. In M. S. Wong & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp.265-271). New York: Routledge.

Cates, K. A. (2002). Teaching for a better world: Global issues and language education. *Human Rights Education in Asian Schools*, *5*, 41-52.

CONCORD. (2018). Global citizenship education in Europe: How much do we care? Brussels: CONCORD Europe. Retrieved 11 June, 2018 from https://library.concordeurope.org/record/1917/files/DEEEP-REPORT-2018-006.pdf

Council of Europe. (2014). *Living with controversy: Teaching controversial issues through education for democratic citizenship and human rights*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Evripidou, D. & Çavuşoglu, Ç. (2014). English language teachers' attitudes towards the incorporation of gay- and lesbian related topics in the classroom: A case of Greek Cypriot EFL teachers. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *12*(1), 70-80.

Fisher, S. & Hicks, D. (1985). *World Studies 8-13: A teacher's handbook*, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (2014). *Pedagogy of commitment*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Gáti, A. (2010). *Aktív állampolgárság Magyaroroszágon nemzetközi összehasonlításban: Másodelemzés nemzetközi adatbázisok és szakirodalom alapján*. [Active Citizenship in Hungary as Compared Internationally in Databases and in the Reyearch Literature] Budapest: Tárki-tudok. Retrieved 11 June, 2018 from http://ess.tk.mta.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Gati_Annamaria_TARKI_TUDOK.pdf

Gimenez, T., & Sheehan, S. (2008). *Global citizenship in the English language classroom*. London: The British Council.

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

Government of Hungary. (2012). *National Core Curriculum*. Retrieved 11 June, 2018 from http://regi.ofi.hu/download.php?docID=5846

Gürsoy, E. & Saglam, E. T. (2011). ELT teacher trainees' attitudes towards environmental education and their tendency to use it in the language classroom. *Journal of International Education Research*, *7*(4), 47-52.

Jacobs, G.M., & Cates, K. (1999). Global education in second language learning. *KATA*, *1*(1), 44-56.

HAND. (2016). *Koncepció a globális felelősségvállalásra nevelésről a formális és nem-formális oktatásban Magyarországon*. Budapest: HAND. Retrieved 11 June, 2018 from http://hand.org.hu/media/files/1488224424.pdf

Haynes, L. (2009). Empowering or force-feeding? Raising controversial issues in a Japanese EFL classroom. *Journal of Engaged Pedagogy*, *8*(1), 14-25.

Hess, D. E. (2004). Controversies about controversial issues in democratic education. *Political Science & Politics*, *37*, 257-26.

Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: a reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review, 55*(3), 265-275.

Huber, J. & Bitlieriüté, S. (2011). Further food for pedagogical thought: Influences and inspirations. In J. Huber & P. Mompoint-Gaillard, *Teacher education for change: The theory behind the Council of Europe Pestalozzi Programme*, (pp.69-76). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Integrity Lab. (2016). Generációs helyzetkép – Fiatalok, részvétel, politika. [A Generational Overview – Youth, Participation, Politics.] Retrieved 11 June, 2018 from https://integritylab.files.wordpress.com/2016/07/generacios-helyzetkep-integrity-lab.pdf

Macfarlane, F. K. (2015). Tutors' perceptions on the pedagogical validity of teaching 'taboo' topics in the second language learning sector. *Practice and Research in Education*, 2, 8-18.

Maley, A. (2004) Foreword. In R. Sampedro & S. Hillyard, *Global issues.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noddings, N. & Brooks, L. (2017). *Teaching controversial issues: The case for critical thinking and moral commitment in the classroom*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Oxfam. (2006). *Global citizenship guides: Teaching controversial issues*. Oxford: Oxfam.

Perrin, G. (2010). EFL teachers and social change. *Modern English Teacher*, *19*(4), 43-45.

PISA. (2017). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world: The OEACD PISA global competence framework*. Paris: OECD.

Rebuck, M. (2012). The CI-slot approach to controversial issues: The students' views. *The Language Teacher*, *36*(3), 9-14.

Ruas, L. (2017). *Why global issues?* Brighton: Academic Study Kit.

Sampedro, R., & Hillyard, S. (2004). *Resource books for teachers: Global issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sargent, T. (2007). Tackling controversial issues: Balance and integrity. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT 2006 Conference Proceedings*. (pp.124-134). Tokyo: JALT.

Scruton, R. (1985). *World studies: Education or indoctrination?* London: Institute for European Defence & Strategic Studies.

Szabó, A. & Kern, T. (2011). A magyar fiatalok politikai aktivitása. [Level of Activity in Hungarian Youth.] In B. Bauer & A. Szabó (Eds.), *Arctalan (?) Nemzedék: Ifjúság 2000-2010*, (pp.37-80). [Faceless (?) Generation: Youth 2000-2010.] Budapest: Nemzeti Család és Szociálpolitikai Intézet.

Tawil, S. (2013). Education for global citizenship: A framework for discussion. *ERF Working Papers Series, 7*, 1-8.

UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO.

Yakovchuk, N. (2004). Global issues and global values in foreign language education: Selection and awareness-raising. *ELTED*, *8*, 28-47.

Yoshihara, S. (2013). Learning and teaching gender and sexuality issues in the EFL classroom: Where students and teachers stand. *The Language Teacher*, *37*(5), 8-11.

Appendix

The English version of the questionnaire

Different topics at the EFL lesson

Dear Colleague,

I'm Rita Divéki, a first-year student at the Language Pedagogy PhD Programme at ELTE. I'm doing research in the field of active (global) citizenship education in the EFL classroom. With this questionnaire, my aim is to investigate into high school and university EFL teachers' attitudes towards dealing with different topics in their lessons. The questionnaire consists of different parts and filling it in takes approx. 15-20 minutes. The mandatory questions are marked with an asterisk, they must be filled in so that you can proceed. The questionnaire is anonymous, and its completion is voluntary.

Thank you in advance!

1. Possible topics in the EFL lesson

Several topics are listed here. First, I would like to know to what extent do you find the following topics controversial and then, I am interested in what you think about your students' views on these topics.

1.1 To what extent do you find the following topics controversial?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = not at all controversial; 2 = a little bit controversial; 3 = partly controversial; 4 = quite controversial; 5 = very controversial

	1	2	3	4	5
Family life, family relations					
Social relationships					
Prejudice					
Tolerance					
Compassion					
Disability					
The rich and the poor in society					
Social responsibility					
Helping people in need					
Conflicts and dealing with conflicts					
Gender roles					
Sustainability					
Conscious consumption					
Environmental awareness					
Global issues					
Lifelong learning					
Choice of career					
Employment competences					

Physical and mental health					
Addictions (smoking, alcohol, drugs, Internet)					
Media awareness and literacy					
Languages					
Religions					
Information and communication technologies					

1.2 To what extent do you think your students would find the following topics controversial?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = not at all controversial; 2 = a little bit controversial; 3 = partly controversial; 4 = quite controversial; 5 = very controversial

	1	2	3	4	5
Family life, family relations					
Social relationships					
Prejudice					
Tolerance					
Compassion					
Disability					
The rich and the poor in society					
Social responsibility					
Helping people in need					
Conflicts and dealing with conflicts					
Gender roles					
Sustainability					
Conscious consumption					
Environmental awareness					
Global issues					
Lifelong learning					
Choice of career					
Employment competences					
Physical and mental health					
Addictions (smoking, alcohol, drugs, Internet)					
Media awareness and literacy					
Languages					
Religions					
Information and communication technologies					

1.3 In what follows, you can read some controversial statements connected to the above-mentioned topics. To what extent would you bring these topics to class?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = I wouldn't like to bring it at all; 2 = I wouldn't really like to; 3 = I would partly like to and partly not; 4 = I would like to; 5 = I would like to very much

If you have already dealt with this topic in class, please mark 6.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Marriage is outdated.						
Under no circumstances should you slap a child.						
It would be a good idea to authorize same-sex marriage in Hungary.						
Gay couples should be allowed to adopt children.						
There can be no friendship between a woman and a man.						
If your best friend got together with your ex, it would mean the end of your friendship.						
The man has to pay on the first date.						
One kiss doesn't count as cheating.						
Everyone is prejudiced.						
Budapest Pride is just for provocation.						
Refugees are treated unfairly in European countries.						
Racism is a serious issue in Hungary.						
Wheelchair users still have a difficult time getting around in the city.						
Disabled children should study at the same schools as their same age counterparts.						
Disabled people can also enjoy a full life.						
Euthanasia should be allowed for patients with terminal illness.						
A basic income guarantee should be introduced in Hungary.						
It's impossible to eradicate poverty.						
Money won't make you happy.						
The homeless have no one to blame but themselves for being on the street.						
If I see a person lying in the street, who needs help, I'll go up to them and help.						
If someone is harassed in front of me in the street, I feel that it is my duty to help.						
You shouldn't give the homeless money as they'll just spend it on alcohol.						
It is not the citizens' but the government's duty to help people in need.						
Every conflict can be resolved peacefully.						
Eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth.						
Stricter gun control is needed.						
Military service should be compulsory in Hungary again.						
Women's basic duty is raising children, while men's is making a living.						
Boys shouldn't play with Barbie dolls.						
A man can't cry.						
There are jobs that only men can do.						

Plastic bags, bottles and cutlery should be banned.						
Striving for sustainability requires too much effort from the individual and not much can be achieved by it.						
Supermarkets and restaurants should donate leftover food to people in need.						
Consumerism encourages waste.						
People who litter the streets should be fined.						
Diesel cars should be banned from cities.						
Selective waste collection should be made mandatory.						
Global warming is a myth.						
Birth control is essential in the developing world to stop overpopulation.						
Instead of leaving their country, refugees should deal with their problems at home.						
Politicians don't do anything to stop wars as wars can make them wealthy.						
War is a necessary evil.						
It's no longer important to learn handwriting; today, it's enough to be able to type.						
Learning facts, dates and data is superfluous in the Internet age.						
Education should be free at all levels in Hungary.						
In today's world, schools are no longer needed, as everything can be learnt with the help of the Internet.						
People work better if they get paid more for their work.						
Enjoying what you do is more important than how much you're paid for it.						
For the same job, everyone should be paid the same.						
Today, it is impossible to find a great job without speaking foreign languages.						
Stress can be useful sometimes.						
Homeopathy is a scam.						
Vegetarian and vegan lifestyles can be dangerous for one's health.						
Depression is not an illness, it's a character flaw.						
The age limit to consume alcohol should be raised from 18 to 21.						
Prohibition is not the best solution when it comes to addictions.						
Smoking should be permitted in all public places.						
Marijuana should be legalised in Hungary.						
Social media helps in spreading fake news.						
Manipulative advertisements should be banned.						
The censorship of social media limits our freedom of speech.						
TV channels should operate independently of political parties.						
Students should learn about all main religions in school.						
Religious education has no place in schools.						

Science and religion are compatible with each other.						
More people have been killed in the name of God than for any other reason.						
Internet shopping is not dangerous.						
Social media should only be used above the age of 16.						
It's not that difficult to distinguish between real and fake news.						
It's not enough to punish hate speech on social media by banning people from the site.						
In Hungary, BBC English should be learnt.						
In an English lesson, we should only discuss the target cultures.						
It's completely unnecessary to learn English slang.						
The English language is going to lose its prominent status in the EU because of Brexit.						

1.4   Apart from the above-mentioned topics, what other controversial issues would you bring into class? (*Please list maximum 3*)

1.5   Are there any taboo topics that you would not discuss with your students in an EFL class under any circumstances? *(Please list maximum 3)*

2.   The frequency of the inclusion of controversial topics in the EFL class

Please mark your answer on the following scale:

1 = never; 2 = 1x-2x a year; 3 = 1x-2x a month; 4 = once a week; 5 = more than once a week

2.1 How often do you discuss controversial issues in class?

1   2   3   4   5

2.2 How often do you have debates on controversial issues in class?

1   2   3   4   5

2.3 How often do you discuss current public issues in class?

1   2   3   4   5

2.4 How often do you have debates on current public issues in class?

1   2   3   4   5

2.5 Which were the public issues from the previous year that you discussed in class?

(If you didn't discuss any public issues, please leave this space empty.)

3. Teacher preferences

3.1 How much do you like dealing with controversial issues in class if you bring the topic into class?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = I don't like it at all; 2 = I don't really like it; 3 = I partly like it, partly not; 4 = I like it; 5 = I like it very much

1   2   3   4   5

3.2 Do your students bring up controversial issues in class?

Yes (Please, go to question 3.2.1)

No (Please, go to question 4.1)

3.2.1 How much do you like dealing with controversial issues in class if your students bring up the topic in class?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = I don't like it at all; 2 = I don't really like it; 3 = I partly like it, partly not; 4 = I like it; 5 = I like it very much

1   2   3   4   5

4. The importance of dealing with controversial topics

4.1 How important is it to deal with controversial topics in class?

Please mark your answer on the scale.

1 = not at all important; 2 = not really important; 3 = partly important, partly not; 4 = important; 5 = very important

1   2   3   4   5

4.2 Please explain your answer to the previous question.

5. Background variables influencing the incorporation of controversial issues

5.1. To what extent are these statements true for you?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = not at all true; 2 = not really true; 3 = partly true, partly not; 4 = quite true; 5 = absolutely true

	1	2	3	4	5
I only discuss controversial issues in class if the questions are in the coursebook.					
I only discuss controversial issues in class if I can link the issue to a topic in the coursebook.					
It's easy for me to access materials we can use when dealing with controversial issues.					
I only bring controversial issues into class if I know that my students will be interested in the topic.					

I bring controversial issues into class even if I know that some of my students will find them sensitive.					
I only bring controversial issues into class if I'm interested in the given topic.					
I only bring controversial issues into class if I feel prepared in the given topic.					
I bring controversial issues into class even if I know that my students will have completely different opinions about them.					
When dealing with controversial issues in class it's very important for me what the other teachers of the same class would think about it.					
When dealing with controversial issues in class I take into consideration what the students' parents would think about it.					
I only bring controversial issues into class if I'm almost sure that there will be no conflicts in class between the students.					
I think that I can solve the potential conflicts that might arise when dealing with controversial issues in class.					

5.2 What other factors do you take into consideration when dealing with controversial issues in class?

(If nothing more than the ones mentioned above, please leave this space empty.)

6. Techniques used for working with controversial issues

6.1 To what extent do you find the following techniques effective for working with controversial issues in class?

Please mark your answer on the scale.

1 = not at all effective; 2 = not really effective; 3 = partly effective, partly not; 4 = quite effective 5 = very effective

	1	2	3	4	5
Small group discussion					
Full class discussion					
Debates					
Discussion based on picture(s)					
Discussion based on a video					
Discussion based on a reading					
Discussion based on a listening					
Role play					
Simulation					
Project work					
Problem-solving task					
Student presentation					
Making posters					

6.2 Which of these techniques have you already used for dealing with controversial issues in class?

Please tick all that apply.

Small group discussion	
Full class discussion	
Debates	
Discussion based on picture(s)	
Discussion based on a video	
Discussion based on a reading	
Discussion based on a listening	
Role play	
Simulation	
Project work	
Problem-solving task	
Student presentation	
Making posters	

7. Teacher stance

In what follows, you can read some statements concerning teacher stances in connection with teaching controversial issues.

7.1. To what extent do you think the statements are true for you when it comes to dealing with controversial issues in class?

Please mark your answer on the scale:

1 = not at all true; 2 = not really true; 3 = partly true, partly not; 4 = quite true; 5 = absolutely true

	1	2	3	4	5
The topic is not even controversial, my point of view is the only right one and my students also have to think the same way as I do.					
Though I admit that the topic we're discussing is controversial, I clearly take one side and I'm trying to convince my students that that is the right side.					
I try to show my students both sides of the argument and I don't disclose my own opinion in the matter.					
I try to show my student both sides of the argument, and then I disclose my own opinion.					
I try to show my students both sides of the argument, and I only disclose my own opinion if my students ask me to do so.					
If possible, I try to stay away from controversial issues.					

7.2 Do you think your students are aware of what views you hold on current public issues?

Yes

No

7.3. Do you think your students are aware of what views you hold on political issues?

Yes

No

Bio

Your age?

Your gender?   Male   Female

How long have you been teaching?

In what kind of institution do you teach?

      Secondary grammar school

      Secondary vocational school

      Secondary technical school

      University

In what grades/levels do you teach?

      9th

      10th

      11th

      12th

      Language preparatory course

      BA/BSC

      MA/MSC

      OTAK

Which subjects do you teach apart from EFL?

Do you play any extra roles in your school?

Do you play any roles in public affairs?

Have you ever participated in any trainings in connection with teaching controversial issues?