

Postmethod Pedagogy and Reflective Practice: Current Stance of Turkish EFL
Teachers

The Graduate School of Education
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

İpek Dağkırın

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in
The Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

June 2015

To my beloved niece, my little sunshine, Lidya...

Postmethod Pedagogy and Reflective Practice: Current Stance of Turkish EFL
Teachers

The Graduate School of Education
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

İpek Dağkırın

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

June 2015

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BILKENT UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis Title: Postmethod Pedagogy and Reflective Practice: Current Stance of
Turkish EFL Teachers

İpek Dağkiran

June 2015

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe (Supervisor)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Prof. Dr. Kimberly Trimble (Examining Committee Member)

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Doyuran (Examining Committee Member)

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

Prof. Dr. Margaret K. Sands (Director)

ABSTRACT**POSTMETHOD PEDAGOGY AND REFLECTIVE PRACTICE: CURRENT
STANCE OF TURKISH EFL TEACHERS**

İpek Dağkırın

M.A., Program of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

June, 2015

Current discussions about the methods in English language teaching show the dissatisfaction with the outcomes of the implementations of the conventional teaching methods. The postmethod pedagogy argues that traditional methods have limiting and limited effects on both language learners and teachers. In this sense, postmethod pedagogy, which highlights the importance of location specific, context-sensitive and teacher-generated educational settings, values teachers' decisions during teaching and highlights the importance of actual practices of teachers.

One of the overarching features of postmethod pedagogy is that it highly emphasizes the role of the teachers as decision-makers. Teacher reflection is seen as a major component as teachers with the help of self-observation, self-analysis and self-evaluation can shape and reshape classroom learning and teaching. This process can only occur with teachers who have a sense of plausibility, which means subjective understanding of the teaching they do". It is claimed that one of the

consequences of the postmethod era can be regarded as the rise of reflective practice in language teaching. In this sense, a reflective teacher is defined as a critical examiner of classroom practices who comes up with different ideas to enhance students' learning and be able to put these ideas into practice.

This quantitative study, with the participation of 347 Turkish EFL teachers, investigated their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and reflective practices. The data was collected in Turkey via a nation-wide online survey consisting of two separate sets of questionnaires focusing on postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice. The survey also includes a set of questions to obtain demographic data. The data gathered via this survey was also analyzed to see whether there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their reflective practices.

The results of the quantitative data revealed that Turkish EFL teachers do not have resistant attitudes towards the postmethod condition and they also seem to be open to changes with regard to altering the current methods in line with the needs of the students. Moreover, when Turkish EFL teachers' responses to the five elements of reflective practice were considered, it was seen that most of the reflective activities are sometimes engaged in. The analysis of the relationship between postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice revealed that the principles of postmethod pedagogy and elements of reflective practice interrelated with each other specifically with regards to local needs, critical reflections on teaching and socio-political issues in teaching/learning environment.

Key words: Postmethod pedagogy, methodology, reflective practice, teacher reflection, EFL teachers

ÖZET

POST METOT PEDAGOJİ VE YANSITICI UYGULAMA: İNGİLİZCE'Yİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETEN TÜRK ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN GÜNCEL BAKIŞ AÇILARI

İpek Dağkiran

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

Haziran 2015

İngilizce öğretim yöntemleriyle ilgili güncel tartışmalar, alışlagelmiş öğretim yöntemlerinin uygulamasının sonuçlarından doğan memnuniyetsizliği göstermektedir. Post metot pedagoji , geleneksel öğretim yöntemlerinin hem öğretmenler hem de öğrenciler üzerinde kısıtlayıcı ve sınırlı etkileri olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bulunduğu yere özgü, durumlara duyarlı, öğretmenlerin yarattığı eğitsel ortamların önemini vurgulayan post metot pedagoji, öğretmenlerin öğretim sırasındaki kararlarını önemseyerek, onların sınıf içi uygulamalarına dikkat çekmektedir.

Post metot pedagojinin öne çıkan en önemli özelliklerinden biri, öğretmenlerin karar merci olma görevlerinin altını çizmesidir. Yansıtıcı öğretim, önemli bir bileşen olarak görülmektedir çünkü öğretmenler kendilerini izleyerek analiz ederek ve değerlendirerek sınıf içi öğretim ve öğrenmeyi şekillendirebilirler. Bu süreç, akla yatkınlık duyusu ile gerçekleşir ki bu da öğretmelerin öğretim yöntemlerine öznel bakış açısıyla açıklanabilecek bir durumdur. Yabancı dil

öğretiminde yansıtıcı uygulamanın, post metot çağının sonuçlarından biri olarak kabul edildiği öne sürülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, yansıtıcı öğretmen sınıf içi öğretimin eleştirel incelemesini yapan, öğrencilerin öğrenme düzeylerini arttıracak farklı fikir önerileri bulup, bu fikirleri uygulamaya koyabilen kişi olarak tanımlanabilir.

İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğreten 347 Türk öğretmenin katılımıyla gerçekleşmiş olan bu nicel çalışma, post metot pedagoji algıları ve yansıtıcı öğretim uygulamalarını incelemiştir. Elde edilen veri, Türkiye'de çevrimiçi yapılan ve post metot pedagoji ve yansıtıcı uygulamaya odaklanan iki ayrı bölümden oluşan ülke genelinde bir anket vasıtasıyla toplanmıştır. Bu anket aynı zamanda demografik bilgiler hakkında sorular da içermektedir. Bu anket ile toplanan veri, öğretmenlerin post metot pedagoji algıları ve yansıtıcı uygulama arasında bir ilişki olup olmadığını görmek için kullanılmıştır.

Nicel verinin sonuçları, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğreten Türk öğretmenlerin post metot durumuna karşı dirençli bir tutumlarının olmadığını göstermektedir aynı zamanda bu öğretmenler, varolan metotların öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarına göre değiştirilmesi anlamında değişikliklere açık görülmektedir. Buna ek olarak, bu öğretmenlerin yansıtıcı uygulamanın beş bileşenine verdikleri cevaplar düşünüldüğünde, çoğu yansıtıcı uygulamanın öğretmenler tarafından bazen yapıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Yapılan analiz sonucunda, post metot ilkelerinin yansıtıcı uygulama bileşenleriyle özellikle yerel ihtiyaçlar, öğretim hakkında eleştirel yansıtıcılar ve öğretim/öğrenim ortamındaki sosyo-politik konular bağlamında birbiriyle ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Post metot pedagoji, yöntembilim, yansıtıcı uygulama, öğretmen yansıtması, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğreten öğretmenler

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should admit that writing this thesis was one of the most challenging things in my life. I take this opportunity to extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to all those who made this thesis possible.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe. Without her continuous support, invaluable feedback, friendliness and patience, it could be really difficult for me to overcome the difficulties I face throughout the year. She means more than a supervisor to me now!

Besides my advisor, I would also express my deep appreciation to Prof. Dr. Kimberly Trimble for his motivation, enthusiasm and immense knowledge he shared with us. I would also like to thank my committee member, Asst. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Doyuran who has provided me with much assistance and encouragement throughout my time as both an undergraduate and graduate student.

I am especially grateful to the director of Anadolu University, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Belgin Aydın, and the vice director of Anadolu University, Meral Melek Ünver, for giving me permission to attend MA TEFL program and for their support.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my colleagues who participated in the questionnaire and my colleagues in Anadolu University who did not leave me alone not only with their phone calls but also with their presence.

I want to express my love and gratitude to my dear “18. lojman” mates; Pınar Kocabaş, Sultan Zarif Kılıç and Zeynep Saka for making this program and year unforgettable. I would never forget all the chats and beautiful moments I shared with them.

I also owe many thanks to all my classmates in the 2014-2015 MA TEFL program for this very enjoyable and productive year. My special thanks goes to E. Evrim Önem for his warm company and true friendship. Thank you for listening, offering me advice, and supporting me through this entire process.

I would like to express my indebtedness to my beloved parents Nilgün and Fahrettin Yılmaz and to my dearest sister Petek Karaağaç. I cannot find the appropriate words that could properly describe my appreciation for their love, devotion, support and faith throughout my life. I am also grateful to my mother-in-law, Şükran Şankazan for her love and affection.

Last but not least, my utmost thanks and deepest gratitude go to my beloved husband, my other half, Deniz Dağkırın. He was ‘there’ whenever I needed him with his unflagging love, support and encouragement. I am lucky to have you, thank you for brightening my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Research Questions	7
Significance of the Study	7
Conclusion	8
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction.....	10
The Method Era.....	10
The Background of the Methods.....	11
Early Methods	11
Designer Methods	13
Communicative Approaches	14
The Eclectic Method	16

The Post Method Era.....	17
The Theoretical Dimension.....	18
The Practical Dimension.....	21
Frameworks for Postmethod Pedagogy.....	23
Reflective Teaching.....	29
The Role of the Teacher in ELT.....	29
Reflective Practice in ELT.....	31
Components of Reflection.....	32
Conclusion.....	34
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	35
Introduction.....	35
Participants of the study.....	35
Instrument.....	38
Pilot Study.....	41
Data Collection Procedures.....	42
Data Analysis.....	42
Conclusion.....	43
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	44
Introduction.....	44
Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy.....	45
Turkish EFL Teachers' Engagement in Reflective Practice.....	50

The Relationship between EFL Teachers' Reflective Practices and Their Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy	56
Conclusion	58
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Findings and Discussion	61
Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy.....	61
Turkish EFL Teachers' Engagement in Reflective Practice	66
The Relationship between Postmethod Pedagogy and Reflective Practice	70
Pedagogical Implications of the Study.....	73
Limitations of the Study.....	75
Suggestions for Further Research	76
Conclusion	77
REFERENCES.....	80
APPENDIX A	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Designer methods of the 1970s	14
2. Macrostrategies and explanations	25
3. Demographic information of the participants	37
4. Distribution of the survey items	38
5. Items' correspondence to Kumaravadivelu's (2003) three operating principles ...	40
6. Items' correspondence to the components of reflective practice	41
7. Guidelines for categorizing degree of agreement with items related to postmethod pedagogy	45
8. Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the particularity principle.	46
9. Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the practicality principle ..	47
10. Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the possibility principle..	49
11. Guidelines for categorizing frequency of engagement in items related to reflective practice	50
12. Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the practical element of reflective practice	51
13. Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the cognitive element of reflective practice	52
14. Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the learner element of reflective practice	53
15. Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the meta-cognitive element of reflective practice	54

16. Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the critical element of reflective practice	55
17. Correlation among principles of postmethod pedagogy and elements of reflective practice	56

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Even before the arrival of language teaching methods, people who had their own teaching principles shaped by their individual knowledge and experience had taught languages for various reasons in various contexts. The need for finding the best method has been considered as a fundamental step in language education since then. Prabhu (1990) states that there is no single method which is best for everyone because the term best method could change according to various teaching contexts. For some researchers, educators and also teachers the concept of method is open to debate since it has drawbacks on teaching and learning. However, there is still considerable number of people who believe that methods are essential because they offer principled theories to guide teachers in the classroom (Bell, 2007).

There have been cyclical and overlapping patterns of the conventional methods' theoretical constructions and practices. Thus, Kumaravadivelu proposing a novel notion, which is called postmethod condition, challenged the concept of method in the 1994 *TESOL Quarterly* series. According to Kumaravadivelu (2006), postmethod pedagogy recognizes teachers' prior knowledge, their way of teaching and autonomous decisions they take within the constraints they face in both their academic and administrative environments. As a result of postmethod pedagogy, teachers' knowledge, experiences and creating their own teaching theories are greatly valued and it is the teacher who comes to the center of language learning and teaching. Since postmethod pedagogy gives language teachers apparent freedom of action, reflective practice, which allows teachers to evaluate their teaching practices, can also provide language teachers with techniques and principles to become more

aware of their own feelings and actions in and outside classrooms. Thus, this study presents research that investigates the relationship between EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy.

Background of the Study

Throughout the history of language teaching, there has been a cyclical pattern of the introduction of new methodologies, with about every quarter of a century a new method emerging. A brief history of English language teaching (ELT) methods was presented in an article on postmethod thinking by Hashemi (2011). He classifies the periods of methods as the grey period, the black-and-white period and the colored period suggesting an analogy between the periods and colors. In the grey period between the 14th and the late 19th centuries, methods were mixed rather than categorical or systematic entries. Practitioners followed their intuition, common sense and experience. Hashemi (2011) states that in the pursuit of effective techniques, there appeared the black-and-white period between the late 19th and the late 20th centuries. Grammar Translation Method (GTM) seemed to vanish and the Audio Lingual Method (ALM) took center stage in the literature. Although the era was colorful in itself, language teachers' perspectives were black-and-white in terms of inventing and applying a method in practice. Also in this period, there were both language-centered methods such as ALM and Total Physical Response (TPR) and learner-centered methods such as Community Language Learning (CLL), Suggestopedia, and Silent Way which opened the doors to a new period in language learning. In this historical sketch of methodology, with the introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1970s, and succeeding approaches such as Content Based Instruction (CBI) and Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT), the field entered the colored period where learners were engaged in the functional use of language for meaningful purposes (Brown, 2007). While in the

language teaching profession, there was still a search for finding the one, ideal method that could meet the needs of successful foreign language teaching in the late 1980s, some researchers (Allwright, 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990) started criticizing and questioning the concept of method itself.

Maintaining a stance against the concept of method, Kumaravadivelu (1994) officially introduced the term *postmethod condition* that was generally based on the idea of postmodernism. Kumaravadivelu's (2006) first major criticism of the concept of method is that it has limiting and limited effects on language teachers and learners in that it seems challenging to apply the pure forms of the methods in the classroom. Since language learning and teaching needs and situations are idiosyncratic, methods fail to provide actual practitioners with situation-specific suggestions because they are artificially transplanted into the classroom and far from classroom realities. Therefore, method should not be thought of as a valuable construct so there is a need for an *alternative to method* rather than an alternative method. Secondly, Kumaravadivelu (1994) criticizes conventional methods for not being context-sensitive and giving unnecessary importance to theorizers in pedagogical decision-making process. Accordingly, he presents a set of macro-strategies that are subject to change and enable teachers to discover their own context-sensitive micro-strategies.

Along with the macro-strategic framework that is constructed in postmethod pedagogy, Kumaravadivelu (2001, 2003, 2006) conceptualizes three-dimensional operating principles namely *particularity*, *possibility* and *practicality*. *Particularity* seeks to highlight a context sensitive, location-specific nature of language teaching based on local, linguistic, social, cultural and political features. *Possibility* deals with the sociocultural realities and socio-political experiences that participants bring to the pedagogical setting. On the other hand, *practicality* spells out the relationship between theory and practice, highlighting the need for teachers to generate their own

theory of practice. The concept of *practicality* gives the opportunity for teachers to analyze and assess the situations, consider the alternatives and then, construct their own theories according to the needs appeared. This can only be possible through continuous reflection and action.

One of the overarching features of postmethod pedagogy is that it strongly emphasizes the role of the teachers as decision-makers. In that sense, teacher reflection is seen as a major component; i.e., it is believed that teachers with the help of self-observation, self-analysis and self-evaluation can shape and reshape classroom learning and teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). This process can only occur when teachers have a sense of plausibility which means “subjective understanding of the teaching they do” (Prabhu, 1990, p. 172). In this sense, Akbari (2007) claims that one of the consequences of the postmethod era can be regarded as the rise of reflective practice in language teaching.

The literature has provided different definitions of reflective practice (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Florez, 2001; Loughnan, 2002). For instance, Osterman and Kottkamp (1993) define reflective practice as “a means by which practitioners can develop a greater level of self-awareness about the nature and impact of their performance, an awareness that creates opportunities for professional growth and development” (p. 2). In addition, a reflective teacher is defined as a critical examiner of classroom practices who comes up with different ideas to enhance students’ learning and someone who can put these ideas into practice (Akbari, Behzadpoor, & Dadvand, 2010).

As Braun and Crumpler (2004) suggest, “those who do not reflect upon their practices will be likely to teach as they were taught and thus ineffective teaching strategies will be replicated” (p. 61). Therefore, reflective teaching can play a vital role in refining teachers’ theories about teaching, as they will relate what they know

and learn to their practical experiences. Killen (2007) supports the idea that if teachers do not understand the reasons behind their teaching practices, there is little chance that their teaching practices will be morally and ethically appropriate. This suggests that reflection will improve practice when teachers think purposefully to seek possible solutions encountered in the process of teaching.

The literature thus argues that teachers should have the opportunity to generate their theory of practice within a particular context and shape them according to the needs of the students. In the method era, however, teachers have had to implement what the language teaching methods dictated and there was a gap between theorizers and practitioners, which resulted in teachers having almost no critical voice (Akbari, 2007). Thus, the concept reflective practice has direct implications for postmethod pedagogy as it enables teachers to “develop more informed practice, make tacit beliefs and practical knowledge explicit leading to new ways of knowing, articulating and teaching ” (Crandall, 2000, p. 40).

Statement of the Problem

Changes in language teaching methods throughout history have resulted in discussions of the concept of method and the questioning of its nature. Yet, from the mid-1880s to the mid-1980s, there was a search for finding a single, ideal method that would aid teaching students English language in the classroom (Brown, 2000). Since the early 2000s, postmethod pedagogy proposing the death of methods and suggesting new principles has been a major focus (Akbari, 2008; Alemi & Daftarifard, 2010; Kumaravadivelu, 2001; 2003; 2006). However, although some researchers have welcomed the arrival of this state-of-the-art pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2002; Pishghadam, 2012), others have questioned the ideas of this new pedagogical philosophy (Bell, 2003; 2007, Larsen-Freeman, 2005, Masouleh, 2012).

Among some studies on postmethod thinking, Hazratzad and Gheitanchian

(2009) attempted to explore possible relationships between EFL teachers' attitudes toward postmethod pedagogy and their students' achievement. Also, Tekin (2013), in a qualitative study, investigated novice teachers' views and beliefs related to methods and postmethod discussions as well as their current teaching practices. Another study conducted in an Iranian ELT context focused on the reflection of principles-based and postmethod pedagogy in teachers' performance in the classroom. (Khanya & Darabi, 2014) In addition, Tasnimi (2014) outlined the role of teachers in the postmethod era. Because of the possible relationship between teacher beliefs and classroom practices, these studies suggest a need to investigate the actual language teaching practitioners' perceptions of postmethod.

Parallel with the global discussions on conventional methods and postmethodology, within the Turkish EFL context, there have been various studies that have examined certain aspects of teachers' attitudes towards methods and postmethod pedagogy. For example, Kırmızı (2012) reviews the literature and reports that although there have been considerable research conducted on teaching methods, only a few of them have specifically focused on postmethod pedagogy. On the other hand, Tosun's (2009) study comments on best method concern and the future of postmethod pedagogy. Arıkan (2006) discusses the relation of postmethod condition and English language teacher education practices from a critical perspective. Similarly, Can (2009) touches upon the frameworks of postmethod pedagogy and its possible outcomes on teacher growth. More recently, Tıǧlı (2014) conducted a survey on prospective EFL teachers' perspectives of methods and postmethod pedagogy.

Reflective practice has been of great importance and has received attention in teacher education (Clarke & Otaky, 2006; Griffiths, 2000; Jay & Johnson, 2002; Vieire & Marques, 2002; Gayford, 2013; Raven, 2014). Conford (2002), in the

article called “Reflective Teaching: Empirical Research Findings and Some Implications for Teacher Education” examined the results of relevant qualitative and case studies on reflective practice and found that only a small number of empirical studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of reflective practice in achieving the objectives of a specific reflective approach. However, the number of the studies conducted in Turkey with regards to reflective practice is limited. One of the prominent studies on reflective practice focused on the practices of instructors at a private university in every stage of their lessons (Tatış, 2010). Another one looked at how gaining reflective teaching skills affected English language teachers' professional development (Başaga, 2005).

Thus, when the literature is reviewed, the absence of extensive literature on both postmethod pedagogy and teacher reflection suggests a clear need to examine postmethod pedagogy among EFL teachers in Turkey and the extent which reflective practice contributes to postmethod pedagogy. In that sense, interrelating reflective practice and postmethod pedagogy framework may help to evaluate the relationship between these two important theoretical frameworks.

Research Questions

The present study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What are Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?
2. To what extent do Turkish EFL teachers engage in reflective practice?
3. What is the relationship between Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?

Significance of the Study

Delport (2010) mentions Kumaravadivelu's thoughts on the need to conduct sustained and data-oriented studies on postmethod condition. Also, since the current status of postmethod in EFL contexts is considered controversial by many

researchers as well as language teachers, there is an obvious need for more research on this issue. Therefore, this study may be significant in terms of providing valuable information about teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy. As Akbari (2008) points out, in order to be more effective, many teachers have to deal with the day-to-day necessity of meeting pacing schedule deadlines and worrying about the success of their students; however, there is a need to hear the reflections of teachers within the discussion of postmethodology.

Postmethod pedagogy proposes a closer inspection into local occurrences due to the fact that methods-based pedagogies are not sensitive to local exigencies of learning and teaching. This study may contribute to the existing literature by drawing Turkish ELT teachers' attention to the existence of local needs propounded by postmethod condition. Also, the state of current practice in language education in the EFL context seems to result in anti-method thinking after the shifts occurring in L2 teaching field. Thus, this study intends to explore whether Turkish ELT instructors are aware of the latest principles discussed within the anti-method framework and how reflective they are. With the comparison of reflective practice and postmethod pedagogy, this study may reveal the possible relationship among the frameworks constructed in postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice. As a result, the empirical findings of this study might influence language teachers, teacher educators and also future method designers in Turkey.

Conclusion

In this chapter, an overview of the literature on the historical phases of English language teaching (ELT) methodology, teaching methods, postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice in English language teaching field have been provided. Then, the statement of the problem, research questions and the significance of the study have been presented respectively. The next chapter focuses

on the relevant literature on ELT methods, postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice in ELT in more detail.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce and review the literature related to this research study examining postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice in English language teaching. This review will be in three main sections. In the first section, a general introduction to the term, method, and an outline of English language teaching methodology will be presented in detail. In the second section, a discussion of postmethod era along with its theoretical and practical dimensions will be provided. This section will continue with the literature on the three frameworks for the postmethod condition. In the last section, reflective teaching, definitions of reflective practice and the role of the teacher in ELT along with a review of components of reflective practice will be outlined.

The Method Era

In the late nineteenth century, linguists and language specialists had many attempts to improve the quality of language teaching by referring to general principles and theories (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In an attempt to define those principles, Anthony (1963) postulated three terms: approach, method and technique. According to Anthony (1963), an approach was a set of specified assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. A method was a plan for the organized presentation of language material based upon the approach and a technique was described as the activities implemented in the classroom in harmony with a method and an approach as well. Even though these definitions proposed by Anthony (1963) were explanatory in terms of distinguishing the relationship between theoretical principles and practices which stemmed from those principles, they were

not elaborate enough to define the nature of a method (Richards & Rodgers 2001). Richards and Rodgers (2001) proposed that method, as an umbrella term, is theoretically related to an approach, is organizationally formed by a design and is practically implemented in procedure. Although the terminology used in pedagogical literature seems to be in line with Anthony's (1963) definitions, Brown (2007) outlined the term method with some additions. A method, for Brown (2007), is a generalized set of classroom specifications for attaining objectives and it is more related to teacher and student roles than linguistic objectives and materials.

The Background of the Methods

Early Methods

From a historical perspective, it would not be wrong to say that the field of second or foreign language teaching has been subject to tremendous fluctuations and shifts over the years. A great number of language teaching methods and approaches have emerged one after another and the late twentieth century witnessed the rise and fall of a variety of these methods. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), although in the last 60 or so years different teaching approaches and methods have been generated, the peak of this method shift in the history of language teaching was between the 1950s and the 1980s.

Modern foreign language teaching is claimed to have started in the 17th century when learning a language was usually linked to learning Latin or Greek (Brown, 2007). After the status of Latin diminished, English as a modern language has taken a great place in most of the European countries. Beginning with the classical method namely Grammar Translation Method, most of the language teaching methods, including current communicative approaches, have emerged as a reaction to the former; however, major differences in their characteristics have not

been observed since they seemed to have covered the flaws of the previous methods (Brown, 2007).

In the Western world, the systematic study of languages started with Latin and Greek in the Middle Ages. These languages were taught for the purpose of promoting intellectuality and had a major role for higher education (Brown, 2007). The first method used for language teaching was called the Classical Method, later on becoming known as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), GTM teaches grammar deductively, promotes learners' native languages as a medium of instruction, emphasizes accuracy and pays almost no attention to speaking or listening. Although GTM is criticized for not having a theoretical basis and opposed in European countries in the mid and late nineteenth century because of several other factors, this method has until recently been very strong among other models of language teaching.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Direct Method (DM) was introduced as a reaction to GTM. Gouin (1831-1896), one of the reformers of that century, is referred to as the founder of this method (Celce-Murcia, 1991). The theory of DM is based on the naturalistic approach that holds the idea that learning a second language is similar to first language acquisition. The principles of the DM approach can be listed as teaching grammar inductively, using the target language, teaching speech and listening comprehension, and putting emphasis on correct pronunciation and grammar. Criticism of the DM for having weak theoretical foundations and being difficult to adopt, led to a shift to the Audio Lingual Method (ALM) (Brown, 2007). By the mid-1950s, ALM, also called the Army Method, had taken center stage after the U.S. entered World War II with the need of producing proficient speakers of their allies' and enemies' languages (Thanasoulas, 2002). In this method, grounded in the habit formation model of behaviorist psychology and in

a structural linguistics theory of language, the emphasis was on memorization through pattern drills and conversation practices rather than promoting communicative ability. As Brown (2007) states, this method started to lose its popularity by the end of the 1960s because of its failure to teach long-term communicative proficiency and the limitations of structural linguistics that the method is based on.

Designer Methods

The decades of the 1970s and the 1980s witnessed a significant paradigm shift in language learning and this resulted in a movement from conventional methods such as Grammar Translation Method (GTM), Direct Method (DM) and Audio-lingual Method (ALM) to more innovative methods like Total Physical Response (TPR) and Community Language Learning (Celce-Murcia, 1991). These last two were among a group often identified as the *designer* methods that were developed around particular learning and learner theories and frequently based upon one single theory.

The table below reveals an overview of the designer methods with their main characteristics:

Table 1

Designer Methods of the 1970s (Adapted from Roberts, 2012)

Teaching Method	Theory of Learning	Theory of Language	Teachers' Role
The Silent Way	Learning is facilitated if the learner discovers or problem solves. Students work co-operatively and independently from teacher.	Very structural- language is taught in 'building blocks', but syllabus is determined by what learners need to communicate.	Teacher should be as silent as possible, modeling items just once. Language is learnt inductively.
Total Physical Response	Learners will learn better if stress to produce language is reduced. Learners, like children, learn from responding to verbal stimulus.	Also structural. Mainly used "everyday conversations" are highly abstract and require advanced internalization of the target language.	Teachers' role is mainly to provide opportunities for learning. Yet, very teacher directed - even when learners interact with each other, usually the teacher directs.
Community Language Learning	Not behavioral but holistic. Teacher and learners are involved in "an interaction in which both experience a sense of their wholeness."	Language is communication. Not structural, but based on learning how to communicate what you want to say.	Learners learn through interaction with each other and the teacher. They attempt communication and the teacher helps them.
Suggestopedia	People remember best and are most influenced by material coming from an authoritative source. Anxiety should be lowered through comfortable chairs, baroque music etc.	Language is gradually acquired. No correction.	The teacher starts by introducing the grammar and lexis 'in a playful manner' while the students just relax and listen. Students then use the language in fun and/or undirected ways.

Communicative Approaches

In the 20th century, a major shift within language teaching started with the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) all the general principles of CLT are widely used around the

world today. British Linguist D. A. Wilkins (1972) proposes the basis of language teaching providing communicative syllabuses. Instead of describing the language with traditional concepts of grammar and vocabulary, he attempts to analyze communicative uses of language that a language learner needs to understand and express (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Communicative Language Teaching is usually defined as a broad approach to language teaching rather than as a teaching method with precise set of classroom practices. According to Finocchiro and Brumfit (1983), some specific characteristics of the Communicative Approach can be listed as: a) effective communication is sought, b) meaning is paramount, c) dialogues, if used, center around communicative functions and are not normally memorized, d) language learning is learning to communicate, and e) communicative competence is the desired goal. In addition to this, Nunan (1991) also offers five core characteristics that summarize the CLT approach as follows:

- an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
- the introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
- the provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on the language but also on the learning process itself.
- an enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
- an attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom. (p. 279)

After the introduction of CLT in the 1970s, Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) emerged as CLT's successors within the scope of Communicative Approaches (CA).

Content-Based Instruction is an approach offering a way of teaching language with content or information. Both CBI and TBLT make communication central and the priority given in these approaches is *using English to learn it not learning to use English* (Howatt, 1984). While CBI integrates language teaching with another subject area, TBLT aims to provide an atmosphere where learners work on a task and find opportunities for interaction. Thus, in TBLT, in order to promote learning, meaningful tasks in the form of a problem-solving negotiation are used as tools (Candlin & Murphy, 1987).

The Eclectic Method

In the late 1980s, after the emergence of a wide variety of methods, the debate over which method was the best for teaching languages started among researchers and practitioners. For some teachers, implementing just one method and following what the theorizers found as practical techniques are appropriate. On the other hand, there are some practitioners who reject the idea of limiting themselves and instead try to adapt or adopt approaches in order to construct their own repertoire of teaching practices appropriate for their context and goals of their learners. According to Prabhu (1990), because of the variations that occurred in a teaching context such as social situation, educational organization, teacher-related and learner-related factors, there was no one method that can be described as best for everyone. He continues his argument by noting that if teachers are asked the reason why there is no best method, the answer will probably be “Because it all depends” (p. 162). He further adds that if teachers choose a method and apply it mechanically with no sense of involvement, then the method itself cannot be efficiently implemented. Teachers’ subjective understanding and operating with some personal conceptualization or perception is said to be teacher’s sense of plausibility.

The term, principled eclecticism, recently used by Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Mellow (2002), can be described as a desirable, coherent, pluralistic approach to language teaching. Principled eclecticism entails using diverse language learning activities that have different characteristics in response to learner needs (Mellow, 2002). Eclecticism is said to be opposed to a) single-theory reliance or absolutism, b) relativism, and/or c) unconstrained pluralism (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). To rely on a single theory of teaching or method has been criticized since it may cause inflexible and mechanistic teaching (Gilliland, James & Bowman, 1994; Lazarus & Beutler, 1993, as cited in Mellow, 2002). Relativism based on the idea that each educational situation is unique has been criticized by the eclectic approach because relativism puts emphasis on dissimilarities, rather than similarities, across teaching contexts (Eisner, 1984; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Prabhu, 1990, as cited in Mellow, 2002). Lastly, unconstrained pluralism, which emphasizes the eclectic use of activities, is also criticized because of its unsystematic, incoherent and uncritical nature of using of activities that lacks philosophical and theoretical basis.

Prabhu (1990) nicely summarizes the importance of the role of teachers as decision makers stating that although every method has some value, teachers' subjective understanding, called their sense of plausibility, is more valuable than the haphazard use of different teaching styles, which is called eclecticism.

The Post Method Era

The search for a good method, and its practical counterpart that is called methodology, still remain as a valid quest for many teachers (Bell, 2007). Since the 1980s, communicative approaches especially Communicative Language Teaching have enjoyed their popularity. As Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out, "Mainstream language teaching on both sides of the Atlantic, however, opted for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as the recommended basis for language

teaching methodology in the 1980s and it continues to be considered the most plausible basis for language teaching today...” (p. 244). Dissatisfactions with the practice of former methods including CLT resulted in questioning the concept of method itself by some researchers (Allwright, 1991; Canagarajah, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Murphy, 2001; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990; Widdowson, 1990). In addition, there was a considerable opposition to the term eclecticism because of its unprincipled nature. These objections can be summarized in two different dimensions: theoretical and practical. The theoretical dimension focuses on the issues related to the status of English as a colonial construct and its connection to the concept of method. On the other hand, the practical dimension involves the possible shortcomings of teaching methods when implemented by actual practitioners.

The Theoretical Dimension

Apart from the general tendency to criticize the concept of method, the underlying reason for such a debate comes from the role of English as a political construct and its use as a *lingua franca* all around the world (Jenkins, 2007). The classification of English language teaching and learning in the world can be outlined by Kachru's (1992) three-dimensional model. In this model, the diffusion of English is represented in three groups. The first group, the Inner Circle, refers to countries where English is now used as the primary language such as the U.K., the U.S.A., Canada and Australia. The second group is the Outer Circle where English is not the native language, but instead serves as a *lingua franca* between ethnic and language groups. Most of the countries, including India, Nigeria, Pakistan and Bangladesh, were colonized by English-speaking countries, and English is used as a second language (ESL). Finally, the Expanding Circle encompasses countries such as China,

Russia, Japan and Turkey where English is used for international purposes and as a foreign language (EFL).

The effects of Western globalization can be observed in countries that Kachru (1992) classified as outer and expanding circle. Nevertheless, it is expectable that aforementioned boundaries are highly influenced by the linguistic imperialism and this, accordingly, seems problematic for many researchers and teachers because of the political oppression that Communicative Approaches present to the non-Inner circle countries.

According to Holliday (1994), particular methods such as CLT may address the cultural and contextual needs of the BANA (Britain, Australia, and North America) countries. However, when both Outer and Expanding Circle countries are considered in terms of application of the same methods, complications are likely to occur. Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) claim that the introduction of CLT in countries with different educational traditions from Inner Circle countries can be described as cultural imperialism. Since the practices that constitute CLT are seen as correct, the assumptions of target culture are seen in need of replacement.

In addition to the political side, many researchers have questioned and criticized the concept of method and tried to redefine or reconsider it entirely since the mid 20th century. The first researcher who attempted to challenge the concept of method was Mackey (1965) stating that the meaning of the word method is obscure and restrictive. Also, Stern (1983) suggests that although the concept of method should not be ignored completely, teachers should not follow the techniques that the methods impose, but instead question the techniques they employ in practice. Furthermore, Richards and Rodgers (2001) state that methods have a top-down and prescribed nature which give little room for teachers' own personal teaching style and their learners' needs.

Among the researchers who criticize the concept of method as being limiting, Pennycook (1989) describes the concept of method as invalid and prescriptive rather than descriptive. In his famous work, he explains the political reasons to be skeptical about methods. For him, methods are reflections of a particular view of the world and are rooted in unequal power relationships. Method favors Western approaches to learning over non-Western practices, as methods have generally originated in the U.S.A. or the U.K. and been *exported* around the world. Pennycook (1989) also outlines the former methods in the history of language teaching and adds that:

The Method construct that has been the predominant paradigm used to conceptualize teaching not only fails to account adequately for these historical conditions, but also is conceptually inconsistent, conflating categories and types at all levels and failing to demonstrate intellectual rigor. It is also highly questionable whether so-called methods ever reflected what was actually going on in classrooms. (p. 608)

Parallel with these, Allwright (1991) gives four reasons why he describes the concept of method as insignificant:

- it is built on seeing differences where similarities may be more important, since methods that are different in abstract principle seem to be far less so in classroom practice; it simplifies unhelpfully a highly complex set of issues, for example seeing similarities among learners when differences may be more important. . . ;
- it diverts energies from potentially more productive concerns, since time spent learning how to implement a particular method is time not available for such alternative activities as classroom task design;
- it breeds a brand loyalty which is unlikely to be helpful to the profession, since it fosters pointless rivalries on essentially irrelevant issues; it breeds

complacency, if, as it surely must, it conveys the impression that answers have indeed been found to all the major methodological questions in our profession;

- it offers a “cheap” externally derived sense of coherence for language teachers, which may itself inhibit the development of a personally “expensive,” but ultimately far more valuable, internally derived sense of coherence . . . (1991, pp. 7–8).

The Practical Dimension

The discussions and common attacks on the concept of method are not just related to its theoretical aspects. According to Chowdhury (2003), Western approaches such as CLT, TBLT and CBI are very popular among language teachers around the world. However, Kumaravadivelu (2006) asserts that these communicative approaches still have problems and are inadequate in addressing the contextual issues. Previous research on the efficacy of these communicative approaches (Bax, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999; Holliday, 1994; Li, 1998; Nunan, 1991; Prabhu, 1987; Widdowson, 2003) showed that the practical implementation of these methods could be problematic in terms of their adaptability and acceptability especially for countries outside the Inner circle. In addition, Küçük (2001) problematizes the authenticity of CLT in Turkey stating that:

As the learners in BANA institutions have access to English they can read authentic texts, they can take place in authentic conversations. However, the learners in Turkey always question the authenticity of the materials and activities because some of them already know that they will not have the chance to go abroad and use the language just for communication. (p. 5)

All in all, in spite of their popularity, communicative approaches are reported to be far away from local linguistic, educational, cultural, and socio-political exigencies.

All these theoretical and practical complications on conventional and more recent methods have given rise to anti method thinking beginning in the early 1980s. In light of postmodern and postcolonial ideas, Kumaravadivelu (1994) in *TESOL Quarterly* series suggested the deconstruction of the term method and coined the term *postmethod condition*. In his article renowned for identifying a major shift from methods to postmethod condition, Kumaravadivelu (1994) declares that

Having witnessed how methods go through endless cycles of life, death, and rebirth, we now seem to have reached a state of heightened awareness— an awareness that as long as we are caught up in the web of method, we will continue to get entangled in an unending search for an unavailable solution, an awareness that such a search drives us to continually recycle and repackage the same old ideas and an awareness that nothing short of breaking the cycle can salvage the situation. This awareness is fast creating what might be called a postmethod condition. (p. 28)

According to Kumaravadivelu (1994), the postmethod condition emphasizes three interrelated attributes that can be listed as a) an alternative to the concept of method, b) teacher autonomy and reflection, and, c) principled pragmatism. First of all, finding an alternative to method rather than an alternative method suggests a need to look beyond the notion of method itself. For him, postmethod pedagogy highlights the importance of constructing classroom-oriented theories of practice by empowering practitioners rather than constructing knowledge-oriented theories of practice entitled by method theorizers. Therefore, while the concept of method empowers theorizers in the pedagogic decision making process and this, in turn, makes methods artificially transplanted constructs, postmethod pedagogy enables teachers to constitute location-specific and classroom-oriented practices.

In addition to this, in practical terms, Kumaravadivelu (1994) also points out that postmethod condition signifies teacher autonomy and reflection. He supports the idea that teachers should have the freedom of action in practicing their profession by making decisions on how to teach autonomously within imposed constraints of institutions, curricula and textbooks. In terms of developing a reflective approach to teaching, postmethod condition promotes the ability of teachers to analyze and evaluate their teaching practices, to initiate change in the classroom and to observe the possible effects of these changes. Thus, empowering teachers and promoting teacher autonomy enable them to theorize from their practice and practice what they have theorized.

Finally, the third feature signified in the postmethod condition is principled pragmatism. Principled pragmatism is different from eclecticism which, as mentioned earlier, is an approach to teaching claiming to promote teachers with the opportunity to use different teaching techniques. Even though eclecticism may have good intentions, it has been criticized by Kumaravadivelu and several other researchers (Prabhu, 1990; Stern, 1992; Widdowson, 1990) for not having a systematic framework. Principled pragmatism, however, deals with the ways of shaping and managing classroom learning by informed teaching and critical appraisal. As Prabhu (1990) states, in order to follow a principled pragmatism, teachers need to operate with their subjective understanding and this, accordingly, leads to desired learning. Teachers own experience as learners and teachers and through professional education and peer feedback contribute to their subjective understanding.

Frameworks for Postmethod Pedagogy

Three main frameworks that are proposed for language teachers can be categorized under the postmethod condition as: Kumaravadivelu's (1994) Ten

Macrostrategies framework, Stern's (1992) Three Dimensional framework, and Allwright's (2000) Exploratory Practice framework.

Kumaravadivelu's (1994) ten macrostrategies framework. These ten macrostrategies proposed by Kumaravadivelu (1994) seek to provide a general mechanism for teachers to start constructing their own teaching theories. In doing so, Kumaravadivelu (1994) highlights the importance of the role of the teachers as strategic explorers and thinkers who can

- reflect on the specific needs, wants, situations, and processes of learning and teaching;
- stretch their knowledge, skill, and attitude to stay informed and involved;
- design and use appropriate microstrategies to maximize learning potential in the classroom;
- monitor and evaluate their ability to react to myriad situations in meaningful ways. (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, pp. 42-43)

He also adds “practicing and prospective teachers need a framework that can enable them to develop the knowledge, skill, attitude, and autonomy necessary to devise for themselves a systematic, coherent, and relevant personal theory of practice” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 40). Each principle within macrostrategic framework is outlined in Table 2.

Table 2

Macrostrategies and explanations

Macrostrategies	Explanation
Maximize learning opportunities	This macrostrategy envisages teaching as a process of creating and utilizing learning opportunities, a process in which teachers strike a balance between their role as managers of teaching acts and their role as mediators of learning acts.
Minimize perceptual mismatches	This macrostrategy emphasizes the recognition of potential perceptual mismatches between intentions and interpretations of the learner, the teacher, and the teacher educator.
Facilitate negotiated interaction	This macrostrategy refers to meaningful learner-learner, learner-teacher classroom interaction in which learners are entitled and encouraged to initiate topic and talk, not just react and respond.
Promote learner autonomy	This macrostrategy involves helping learners learn how to learn, equipping them with the means necessary to self-direct and self-monitor their own learning.
Foster language awareness	This macrostrategy refers to any attempt to draw learners' attention to the formal and functional properties of their L2 in order to increase the degree of explicitness required to promote L2 learning.
Activate intuitive heuristics	This macrostrategy highlights the importance of providing rich textual data so that learners can infer and internalize underlying rules governing grammatical usage and communicative use.
Contextualize linguistic input	This macrostrategy highlights how language usage and use are shaped by linguistic, extralinguistic, situational, and extrasituational contexts.
Integrate language skills	This macrostrategy refers to the need to holistically integrate language skills traditionally separated and sequenced as listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
Ensure social relevance	This macrostrategy refers to the need for teachers to be sensitive to the societal, political, economic, and educational environment in which L2 learning and teaching take place.
Raise cultural consciousness	This macrostrategy emphasizes the need to treat learners as cultural informants so that they are encouraged to engage in a process of classroom participation that puts a premium on their power/knowledge

(Kumaravadivelu, 1994, pp. 33-42)

This ten-macrostrategic framework proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2001) is shaped by a three-dimensional system that consists of three operating principles:

particularity, practicality and possibility. First of all, a methodology that is related to postmethod pedagogy should be directly linked to *particularity* because any kind of

language pedagogy must be “sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural milieu” (p. 538). The idea of pedagogic particularity can only be constructed with a holistic understanding of specific situations and improvement of those particular situations. Achieving this pedagogic process necessitates critical awareness of local exigencies, which can start with teachers observing their teaching practices, assessing their outcomes, determining problems, and finding solutions and deciding on the things that go well in the classroom. Additionally, Cook (2008) states “an understanding of the varying roles for language teaching in different societies and for different individuals is an important aid to teaching” (p. 211). That is to say, in order to have that kind of context-sensitive pedagogic knowledge, actual practitioners should be in the continual cycle of observation, reflection and action.

The other parameter, which is closely related to *particularity*, is the pedagogy of *practicality*. At its core, the pedagogy of *practicality* highlights the relationship between theory and practice. According to Kumaravadivelu (2001), there is a distinction between theories produced by theorists and theories constructed by teachers and this discrepancy has led to an emphasis on reflective teaching. It is assumed that if teachers construct their own theories around professional theories proposed by experts, the possibility of being reflective individuals decreases. In that case, teachers should be able to theorize from their practice and implement their theories that lead to teacher-generated classroom practices.

Finally, the pedagogy of *possibility* focuses on the relations of power and dominance brought by any pedagogy and thus social inequalities created by those pedagogies. It mainly empowers the participants who bring their experiences to the learning environments and these experiences are said to be shaped not only by

teaching/learning acts the participants encountered in the past but also by the social, economic and political environments which they have been raised in. An important argument put forward by Kumaravadivelu (2001) is that policy planners, curriculum designers and textbook producers cannot assume that these experiences have the potential to change classroom practices.

Stern's three-dimensional framework (1992). The three-dimensional framework proposed by Stern (1992) offers ways for language teachers not to restrict them but allow them to construct and achieve their teaching objectives.

The first principle is *the intra-lingual and cross-lingual dimension*. Since "L1-L2 connection is an indisputable fact of life" (Stern, 1992, p. 282), this strategy mainly focuses on the use of L1 and L2 in the classroom. As opposed to many conventional methods restricting the use of native language in the classroom, this principle allows teachers to decide on the degree of using L1 according to the needs and levels of the students.

The second principle is the *analytic-experiential dimension*. While analytic strategy deals with accuracy involving explicit focus on forms of language, that is grammar and vocabulary, experiential focuses on fluency referring to interaction-based communicative activities such as discussions, games and problem-solving tasks. Stern (1992) points out that without analytic strategy, experiential strategy cannot be effective as they have a mutual relationship.

The third and last principle is the *explicit-implicit dimension* that is concerned with learning a language consciously or subconsciously. On the one hand, many conventional methods dictate that languages can be learned explicitly; more innovative ones such as Communicative Approaches tend to favor implicit learning, on the other hand. Stern (1992) however, asserts some language forms should be taught explicitly, while some others are appropriate for implicit teaching.

Allwright's exploratory practice framework (2000). The other principled framework for teachers offered by Allwright (2000) emphasizes creating learning opportunities in the classroom for developing local understandings. For him, the dynamics of the classroom life is of considerable importance compared to the techniques or any kind of method employed in the classroom. In order to deepen both learners' and teachers' understandings of language learning and of life, Allwright (2000) proposes six principles and two suggestions:

Principle 1: Put "quality of life" first.

Principle 2: Work primarily to understand language classroom life.

Principle 3: Involve everybody.

Principle 4: Work to bring people together.

Principle 5: Work also for mutual development.

Principle 6: Make the work a continuous enterprise.

Suggestion 1: Minimize the extra effort of all sorts for all concerned.

Suggestion 2: Integrate the "work for understanding" into the existing working life of the classroom. (Allwright, 2000)

As it can be understood from the aforementioned frameworks, postmethod pedagogy not only challenges the traditional and conventional language teaching methods, but it also emphasizes the importance of constructing context sensitive methodologies related to the teaching and learning environment. As mentioned earlier, in aiming at location specific language teaching, postmethod pedagogy also recognizes language teachers' prior knowledge as well as their potential to make decisions within the academic obligations imposed by their work place, curricula and textbooks they use. As Wallace (1991) points out, postmethod pedagogy promotes teachers' ability to know how to evaluate and modify their teaching acts, how to bring innovation to their classroom by developing reflective approach to their own teaching.

Reflective Teaching

Reflection in teaching has been of great importance and has received noticeable attention in teacher education in recent years and is said to be a key component of teacher development (Clarke & Otaky, 2006; Griffiths, 2000; Jay & Johnson, 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Vieira & Marques, 2002). In the heyday of conventional methods, procedural or practical knowledge was considered inferior to theoretical knowledge and theoreticians were highly esteemed (Johnson, 1996). In conventional approaches, it is claimed that teachers do not find much in terms of ways to deal with their practical problems and reflective teaching has emerged as a response to the call for a substitute for the concept of method (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). From this perspective, the revolutionary debate about postmethod started large amount of changes in the practice of the EFL teacher including the concept of reflective teaching. According to Farrell (2004) with the help of reflective teaching “teachers can become more empowered decision makers, engaging in systematic reflections of their work by thinking, writing, and talking about their teaching; observing the acts of their own and others’ teaching; and by gauging the impact of their teaching on their students’ learning ” (pp. 5-6). Thus, teachers can start finding a place within their profession and decide on how to shape their practice by taking more responsibility.

The Role of the Teacher in ELT

There have been a lot of changes over the second half of 20th century more specifically from 1990 onward in second and foreign language teaching. These changes resulted in “a shift from transmission, product-oriented theories to constructivist, process-oriented theories of learning, teaching, and teacher learning” (Crandall, 2000, p. 34). This, in turn, has paved the way for more democratic approaches to teaching. As Akbari (2004) sums it up “the shift in paradigm is due to

the change of scope observed in modern language teaching literature and concern for disciplines and issues previously regarded as irrelevant by both practitioners and theoreticians” (p. 14). As discussed earlier, the top-down criticism towards methods puts forward the idea that methods are too prescriptive and teachers do not seem to have any voice in what and how to teach and the limiting effects of the methods can be observed in the roles of teachers and learners.

According to Crandall (2000), traditionally, teachers are seen as “passive recipients of transmitted knowledge rather than active participants in the construction of meaning ... which does not take into account the thinking or decision-making of teachers” (p. 34). Similarly, as Akbari (2007) puts it, in the method era, teachers were to implement what language teaching methods dictated without almost no influence on the way methods were formulated. He also adds that because of the top down nature of the relationship between theoreticians and practitioners, teachers did not have much critical voice (Akbari, 2007). However, the postmethod condition raises serious questions regarding the traditional gap between theorizers and practitioners with a view to empowering teachers whereby they can “theorize what they practice and practice what they theorize” (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 545).

In postmethod pedagogy, one of the key components is teacher empowerment and within the pedagogy of *particularity*, one of the constituents of postmethod condition, the teacher is given the responsibility for observing their own teaching acts, identifying possible problems, finding solutions to those problems and also deciding on what works and what does not. Similarly, Akbari (2004) claims:

The postmethod condition is a more democratic approach to language teaching profession since it assigns a voice to practitioners and respects the type of knowledge they possess. In addition, it is a liberatory move which

gives teachers more autonomy and confidence in the decisions they make in their classes. (p. 5)

Teachers, from this perspective, should analyze the activities and events that occur in the teaching processes and make interpretations from these experiences to enrich their knowledge. These, in turn, enable them to become more autonomous teachers with better understanding of instructional, social and institutional factors.

Reflective Practice in ELT

Historically speaking, when it comes the notion of reflection, most articles in the literature trace the origins of reflective practice to John Dewey (1933) and to Schön (1983, 1987, 1991). Reflective action, for Dewey (1933) is “the active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (Dewey, 1933, p. 9, as cited in Jay & Johnson, 2002, p. 74). Schön built on Dewey’s (1933) ideas on reflection by introducing two terms in the 1980s: *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action*. Reflection in action involves real life action that the teachers engage in as they face problems in the moment of teaching. Reflection-on-action, on the other hand, occurs after the event and involves teacher reconsideration of the action in the class. As Farrell (2004) states, “Reflection-in-action is concerned with thinking about what we are doing ... Reflection-on-action deals with thinking back on what we have done to discover how our knowing-in-action may have contributed to an unexpected action” (p. 12). In addition to Schön’s two-dimensional framework of reflection, Farrell (2004) has summarized five approaches to reflective teaching. First of all, he refers to *technical rationality*, in which reflection is defined as the effective use of *technical knowledge* and *cognitive aspects* of teaching practice by novice teachers. The second and third types, reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, were mentioned before. The fourth type of reflection he refers to is

reflection-for-action which is *proactive in nature* and through developing certain procedures “teachers can prepare for the future by using knowledge from what happened during class and what they reflected on after class” (Farrell, 2004, p. 31). Finally he refers to *action research* as an integral part of reflective teaching. It could be defined as a vehicle through which teachers become researchers of their own; they can be autonomous and have their own voice in order to reflect on the particularities of their problematic situations (Farrell, 2004). According to McMahon (2006) action research, by its nature, involves strategic action. When reflective practice can be used to detect problems, action research can find ways of providing solutions. Also, Farrell (2004) identifies seven general phases of the reflective practice in action research as:

- diagnosing the problematic situation,
- finding a plan to examine the predicament identified at first,
- talking to colleagues and reading the related literature to know what is there regarding that particular situation,
- employing different procedures such as observation and diary keeping to come up with more tangible data,
- interpreting and evaluating the obtained data,
- reframing the predicament and trying out the solutions that have been arrived at,
- keeping on the same procedure to know whether those solutions have been consequential or not. (pp. 31-32)

Components of Reflection

Although there can be found many definitions of reflective practice; Jay and Johnson (2002) propose a comprehensive definition of the term:

Reflection is a process, both individual and collaborative, involving experience and uncertainty. It is comprised of identifying questions and key elements of a matter that has emerged as significant, then taking one's thought into dialogue with oneself and with others. One evaluates insights gained from that process with reference to (1) additional perspectives, (2) one's own values, experiences, and beliefs, and (3) the larger context within which the questions are raised. Through reflection, one reaches newfound clarity, on which one bases changes in action or disposition. New questions naturally arise, and the process spirals onward. (p. 76)

According to Akbari (2007), because of the vagueness of what reflection actually entails, not much has been done in order to operationalize this construct. For the purpose of developing a model for teacher reflection, an instrument consisting of five components is proposed (Akbari et al., 2010).

1. Practical element: Practical aspects of reflection refer to different tools and procedures used and followed by the teachers. These include: journal writing, lesson reports, surveys and questionnaires, audio and video recordings, observation, action research, teaching portfolios, group discussions, analyzing critical incidents (Farrell, 2004; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Richards & Farrell, 2005).
2. Cognitive element: This component is more related to teachers' own professional development to accomplish different levels of reflection by doing small-scale classroom projects, attending the conferences or workshops and reading the literature.
3. Learner (Affective) element: This element involves teachers' reflection on their learners and deals with the ways of learners' learning, responding strategies and emotional behaviors. This tradition "emphasizes reflection about students, their

cultural and linguistic backgrounds, thinking and understandings, their interests, and their developmental readiness for particular tasks” (Zeichner & Liston, 1996, p. 57).

4. Meta-cognitive element: In order to be a reflective practitioner, teachers should focus on their own beliefs and personality and effective reflective practice can occur with reflecting on the way they define their own practice and emotional constructs.

Akbari (2007) points it out as “Teachers’ personality, and more specifically their affective make up, can influence their tendency to get involved in reflection and will affect their reaction to their own image resulting from reflection” (p. 10).

5. Critical element: According to Zeichner and Liston (1996), “instruction is embedded within institutional, cultural, and political contexts ... and these contexts both affect what we do and are affected but what we do” (p. 59). Thus, this component focuses on socio-political aspects brought by practitioners to the classroom and reflection on political significance of their practice including the introduction of topics related to race, gender and social class (Akbari et al., 2010). Teachers reflect on the moral and ethical implications and consequences of their classroom practices on students (Larrivee, 2008).

Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of English language teaching methods and then discussed the occurrence of postmethod pedagogy along with its theoretical and practical dimensions. Then, three frameworks for postmethod condition were outlined in detail. Finally, reflective teaching, the role of the teacher in English language teaching, an overview of reflective practice, and components of reflective practice were provided. The next chapter will focus on the methodology of this study, including the participants, instrument, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this descriptive study is to investigate EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and the relationship between their reflective practices and perceptions of postmethod pedagogy.

The research questions that guided the study are as follows:

1. What are Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?
2. To what extent do Turkish EFL teachers engage in reflective practice?
3. What is the relationship between Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?

The aim of this chapter is to give information about the methodology of this study. First, the participants who took part in the study will be described with their demographic information. Next, the instruments used to collect data and the procedure for data collection will be presented in detail. Finally, the data analysis procedure will be explained.

Participants of the Study

The study was conducted with 347 in-service English language teachers who are currently working at different universities in Turkey. Due to confidentiality reasons, the name of these universities and the participants will not be revealed.

The study aimed at nation-wide demographics. In accordance with this purpose, online sources and the web site of Higher Education Council in Turkey (YÖK) were used for obtaining the list of all state, private and foundation universities with preparation schools (*hazırlık*) in Turkey. Among 184 universities, the researcher made a list of all universities from each region in Turkey in order to

reveal different sociocultural features that can reflect the country's population. All the selected universities were contacted via e-mails and phone calls. Although the researcher aimed at reaching all the universities, 50 universities did not respond to the e-mails or phone calls at all. Among 134 universities, the researcher got only 10 confirmation e-mails stating that the head of departments shared the online survey with their instructors. Also, the researcher attempted to communicate with specific regions such as Mediterranean, Eastern Anatolia and South Eastern Anatolia because of the limited number of participants who completed the online survey. Since the participants were not asked to mention the universities they work for in the demographic information part, this study focused on six demographic information namely; gender, age, years of experience in teaching English, the department they graduated from, most recent degree they received related to language studies and the region their institutions are located in.

Although 390 participants from different regions involved in the study, 43 of them filled out the demographic information section of the survey and failed to complete postmethod and reflective practice questionnaires. For this reason, the responses of 347 participants were included in this study.

Seventy four participants were from Marmara region, 81 participants from the Aegean region, 59 participants from the Black Sea region, 92 participants from the Central Anatolia region, 13 participants from the Eastern Anatolia region, 17 participants from the Southeastern Anatolia region and 11 participants from the Mediterranean region. As the number of the participants from Eastern Anatolia, South Eastern Anatolia and Mediterranean regions was quite low, the 11 participants from the Mediterranean region were combined with the participants from the Aegean region. Also 13 participants from Eastern Anatolia and 17 participants from South Eastern Anatolia were combined with the participants from Central Anatolia. Finally,

four different regional distributions (Marmara, Aegean, Black Sea and Anatolia) were presented. See Table 3 for more detailed demographic information about the participants of this study.

Table 3

Demographic information of the participants

Background Information	N	%
Gender		
Female	240	69.2
Male	107	30.8
Age group		
21-25	19	5.5
26-30	111	32
31-35	97	28
36-40	54	15.6
41-45	29	8.4
46+	37	10.7
Years of experience		
1-5	77	22.2
6-10	89	25.6
11-15	65	18.7
16-20	63	18.2
21-25	36	10.4
26+	17	4.9
Major		
English Language Teaching (ELT)	181	52.2
Linguistics	36	10.4
English Language and Literature	109	31.4
Translation and Interpreting	12	3.5
Culture studies (American)	2	.6
Other (Tourism, etc.)	7	2
The latest degree received		
B.A.	159	45.8
M.A.	152	43.8
Ph.D.	36	10.4
Region		
Marmara	74	21.3
Aegean	92	26.5
Black Sea	59	17
Anatolia	122	35.2

The results indicate that most of the participants (32%) belonged to the age group of 26-30 years. The second most common age category was between 31-35 years of age (28%). In addition, the teachers who participated in this study had different educational backgrounds and years of experience. Also, most of the

teachers (52.2%) participated in this study graduated from English Language Teaching departments. The amount of teaching experience was moderately skewed towards less experienced teachers, with the two largest groups having 6 to 10 years (25.6%) and 1 to 5 years (25.6%) of experience. Moreover, the participants held degrees that ranged between B.A and Ph.D.

Instrument

In order to gather data for the purposes of this study, an online survey composed of three main sections was designed. Since the researcher aimed at reaching different regions in Turkey (Marmara, Aegean, Black Sea and Anatolia), the online survey utilized in the study served as a practical and an efficient tool for the participants to respond and share their views. Also, for the implementation process, it required little time, enabling the researcher to gather the data more quickly.

Since all the instructors were proficient in English, the survey was designed in English and it had three main sections (See Appendix A for the survey in paper format). The first section of the survey was developed by the researcher and used to collect demographic data [Demographic Information Questionnaire (DIQ)]. This questionnaire consisted of 6 drop-down items including the participants' gender, age, years of experience in teaching English, the department they graduated from, most recent graduate degree they received related to language studies and the region their institutions are located in.

The second section of the survey aimed at finding out the perceptions of in-service EFL instructors regarding postmethod pedagogy [Postmethod Questionnaire (PMQ)]. The focus of the third section; however, was to measure EFL instructors' reflective practices in English language teaching pedagogy [Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ)]. There were 23 items in the PMQ and 29 items in the RPQ.

Table 4

Distribution of the survey items

Section	I (DIQ)	II (PMQ)	III (RPQ)
	Demographic Information	Perceptions of Postmethod	Reflective Practice
Number of the Items	6	23	29

The PMQ was originally designed by Tıǧlı (2014) to identify Turkish prospective English language teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy. It consisted of 25 Likert scale items and the participants were asked to select the best response that reflect their perceptions on a scale ranging from one to six as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, and 6 = strongly agree. Even though all the items were constructed according to theoretical background that postmethod pedagogy offers, the postmethod condition was not mentioned in any of the items because the aim of this section was to evaluate the participants' perceptions of a *possible* postmethod pedagogy. The content validity of individual items is determined by expert opinion in the area of language methodology. The researcher adapted the same questionnaire by omitting two items. Minor changes in the wordings of a few items were also made for the sake of item clarity and readability as suggested by several experts who were asked to read the early drafts of the questionnaire. For instance, item number 4 in the original version, "The assumption that teachers are the consumers of knowledge produced by theorists is wrong" was readjusted as "Teachers are the consumers of knowledge produced by theorists" in order to make the item easier to understand. Item number 20 "Popular methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are not convenient for Turkish language learners" was omitted and item number 19 "Popular methods

such as Communicative Language Teaching are not applicable for Turkish learners of English” was used instead. In addition, item number 21 “I agree that the era of methods is over” was omitted because the item could have been considered as leading. Tıǧlı (2014) reports that the reliability of postmethod questionnaire was calculated and Cronbach’s alpha was found to be .88 of the pilot test.

All the items in this section of the survey were grouped under three operating principles that Kumaravadivelu (2003) proposed. The correspondence of each item in PMQ to these three operating principles can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5

<i>Items’ correspondence to Kumaravadivelu’s (2003) three operating principles</i>			
Operating Principle	Particularity	Practicality	Possibility
Frequency	7	11	5
Number	3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 19	1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 21	15, 17, 18, 22, 23

The last section of the survey aimed to investigate whether teachers engage in reflective practices or not and a questionnaire developed by Akbari et al. (2010) was used for this purpose. In the reflective practice questionnaire (RPQ), there were 29 items on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging between *never* and *always*. Akbari et al. (2010) developed all the items in this questionnaire after reviewing the relevant literature on reflective teaching and grouped these items under 5 overarching components of reflection. The components and the item numbers that are grouped accordingly are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Items correspondence to the components of reflective practice

Elements	Frequency	Number
Practical	6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Cognitive	6	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
Learner	3	13, 14, 15
Meta-cognitive	7	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
Critical	7	23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29

After receiving expert opinion in order to have clear and readable items, Akbari et al (2010) report that Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was employed using STATISTICA and for the indicators i.e. Practical, Learner, Critical, Meta-Cognitive and Cognitive, the Cronbach's alpha were calculated and it was found that they were .73, .78, .84, .82, and .83, respectively. In addition, in a five factor model, all the loadings between the indicators and latent factors and also the covariance among the factors were significant at " α " =.001 ($p \leq .001$).

Pilot Study

All the items in this survey were shown to experts at Bilkent University to assure content and face validity. After receiving necessary feedback on the items' content and face validity, the questionnaires were revised. Although the Postmethod questionnaire (Tıǧlı, 2014) and Reflective Practice questionnaire (Akbari et al., 2010) used in this study were reliable and valid data collection instruments as mentioned earlier, the researcher thought that it would be beneficial to conduct a pilot study in order to see any possible problems that the participants might face in answering the survey items. Thus, a pilot study of the survey was to be used as a tool for this study was conducted with the participation of 30 randomly selected English

language teachers in Anadolu University. After piloting, the reliability of both questionnaires was measured and Cronbach's α were found to be .86 for the PMQ and .95 for the RPQ. Also, the reliability coefficient for the questionnaires combined was .92, which indicated that the survey had quite high internal consistency. The researcher finalized the survey by making the necessary revisions to prevent the possible problems during the administration of the final survey.

Data Collection Procedures

Once the final version of the survey was developed, the survey items were grouped and transformed into an online survey. Then, the researcher sent the online link to 180 universities with preparatory schools in Turkey. School of Foreign Languages heads, deputy heads and English language instructors from these universities were contacted via e-mail and phone calls and they were requested to forward the related e-mail to the instructors working at their institutions. At the very beginning of the survey, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and indicated that all information gathered would be kept confidential.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the online survey were analyzed quantitatively via the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 21) to measure descriptive and inferential statistics.

Data for research question 1 which aimed to explore EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and for research question 2 which focused on EFL teachers' recourse of reflective practice were analyzed by descriptive statistics to calculate frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Lastly, in order to explore the relationship between EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy, correlations were carried out separately

between the three components of postmethod pedagogy and five components of reflective practice by using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology of the study including the participants, the instrument that was used in data collection, data collection procedures and data analysis were explained in detail. A total of 347 EFL teachers from different regions in Turkey participated in the study. The data obtained from the online survey were analyzed quantitatively. In the next chapter, the findings of the statistical analysis will be presented in detail.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This descriptive study aimed to explore Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and whether they engage in reflective practice or not. This study also investigated the relationship between Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices and perceptions of postmethod pedagogy. Thus, the following research questions were addressed in the study:

1. What are Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?
2. To what extent do Turkish EFL teachers engage in reflective practice?
3. What is the relationship between Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?

In order to answer these questions, the data were collected from 347 EFL teachers through an online survey that consisted of three sections. In the first section, the demographic information was collected. The purpose of the second section was to find out Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod condition. Finally, in the last section, there were 29 items related to Turkish EFL teachers' engagement in reflective practice. The data gathered from the survey were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS.

In order to analyze Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod condition, descriptive statistics were used and means and standard deviations were calculated. The same procedure was repeated to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices. Finally, to see any relationship among the scores for the three principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice (*Practical, Cognitive, Learner, Meta-cognitive and Critical*), *Pearson Product Moment correlation test* was used.

The salient findings of the data were analyzed in three sections. In the first section, Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy in respect to three principles were analyzed and in the second section, the extent they engaged in reflective practice in respect to five elements were outlined. Finally, in the last section of this chapter, the results for the relationship between EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy were calculated and analyzed.

Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy

In order to answer the first question, which explores the participants' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy, descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data gathered from the Postmethod Questionnaire (PMQ). The PMQ had 23 items that were grouped under three principles of postmethod pedagogy. The participants selected the answers on a six-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree "1" to Strongly Agree "6". The results of this section were analyzed by clustering the mean scores of each item according to the scales mentioned in the survey. In Table 7, the correspondence of each mean score is presented.

Table 7

Guidelines for categorizing degree of agreement with items related to postmethod pedagogy

Degree of Agreement	Range of the scale
Strongly Agree	5.5 to 6.00
Agree	4.5 to 5.4
Somewhat Agree	3.5 to 4.4
Somewhat Disagree	2.5 to 3.4
Disagree	1.5 to 2.4
Strongly Disagree	1.0 to 1.4

When Turkish EFL teachers' responses to the items on the PMQ were analyzed, it was found that the participants somewhat agreed with the ideas in this questionnaire (\bar{x} = 4.09, SD = .45).

In Table 8, seven questionnaire items, the means, standard deviations along with the number of participants of the responses for *particularity* principle are shown.

Table 8

Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the particularity principle

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
12. Methods may be altered to suit local needs	5.57	.74
5. Method is what emerges over time as a result of the interaction among the teacher, the students, the materials and activities in the classroom	4.86	1.02
14. Every English teacher has his/her own methodology	4.85	1.02
6. Teachers should not follow a certain method in their classes	4.17	1.43
3. Teachers are resourceful enough to produce their own teaching methods	4.01	1.20
19. Popular methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are not applicable for Turkish learners of English	2.74	1.3
10. Methods are not applicable in language classrooms	2.58	1.16

N=347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

When Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of the particularity principle were analyzed, the results indicated mixed reactions. Of all the seven items, the participants strongly agreed only with the idea that methods can be changed in accordance with the local needs of the learners and teachers ($\bar{x} = 5.57$, $SD = .74$ for item # 12). In addition, they think that when students, teachers, materials and activities interact with each other over a period of time, method emerges ($\bar{x} = 4.86$, $SD = 1.02$ for item # 5). Moreover, the participants also agreed that every English teacher has their own individual methodologies and they should not apply only one method in their teaching practices ($\bar{x} = 4.17$, $SD = 1.43$ for item # 6 and $\bar{x} = 4.85$, $SD = 1.02$ for item # 14). However, they were less sure of themselves as resourceful enough to produce their own theories ($\bar{x} = 4.01$, $SD = 1.20 =$ Somewhat Agree, for

item # 3). Also, as opposed to what postmethod pedagogy suggests, the participants somewhat disagreed that methods are not practical and that common language teaching methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are not useful for Turkish learners of English ($\bar{x} = 2.58$, $SD = 1.16$ for item # 10 and $\bar{x} = 2.74$, $SD = 1.3$ for item # 19). It can be concluded that Turkish EFL teachers have almost positive attitudes towards the *particularity* principle proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2003).

As for the *practicality* principle proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2003), eleven questionnaire items were grouped under this principle. Item # 7 and 21 were reverse coded and these items were re-coded accordingly. The responses of the participants were outlined in Table 9.

Table 9

Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the practicality principle

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
11. There is not a single, ideal method for teaching English	5.59	0.88
16. Teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes	5.54	0.69
13. Method is just a tool of instruction for language teachers which helps them deliver their lesson better	4.95	0.90
7. Students who are trained to be English teachers at universities should be instructed on methods	4.73	1.10
2. Methods can never be realized in their purest form in the classroom according to their core principles	4.02	1.28
4. Teachers are the consumers of knowledge produced by theorists	3.50	1.20
8. Methods are artificially designed constructs	3.39	1.22
21. Teachers should follow the principles and practices of the established methods	3.24	1.10

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means.

Table 9 (continued)

Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the practicality principle

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
20. Methods are not derived from classroom practice	2.89	1.27
1. Methods are not significant for teaching English	2.80	1.28
9. Methods are irrelevant to ELT classes	2.32	1.10

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

As seen in Table 9, the highest mean score among these items belong to the idea that only one ideal method does not exist for teaching English ($\bar{x} = 5.59$, SD = 0.88 for item # 11). They also have a positive stance towards the Eclectic Approach, which supports the combination of different methods in teaching ($\bar{x} = 5.54$, SD = 0.69 for item # 16). In addition, EFL teachers somewhat agreed with the statements that to actualize the methods in their purest forms is not possible and that teachers are under the influence of the knowledge produced by theorists ($\bar{x} = 4.02$, SD = 1.28 for item # 2 and $\bar{x} = 3.50$, SD = 1.20 for item # 4). In addition to these, the participants somewhat disagreed with the idea that teachers have to implement current methods. ($\bar{x} = 3.24$, SD = 1.10 for item # 21). On the other hand, they think that method is an important element for language instruction ($\bar{x} = 4.95$, SD = 0.90 for item # 13). From the educational perspective, the practitioners think that the prospective language teachers should be trained in methodology ($\bar{x} = 4.73$, SD = 1.10 for item # 7). Parallel with these, the participants also emphasized that the concept of method is still significant and necessary for ELT classes on the two items with the lowest means ($\bar{x} = 2.80$, SD = 1.28 for item # 1 and $\bar{x} = 2.32$, SD = 1.10 for item # 9). All in all, as for EFL teachers' perceptions of the practicality principle, it is obvious that they believe that methods play a role in actual classroom practices.

As far as Kumaravadivelu's (2003) *possibility* principle is concerned, Turkish EFL teachers seem to respond the items somehow favorably. Table 10 displays the surveys responses grouped under the last principle.

Table 10

Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of items related to the possibility principle

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
22. Teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic, and educational environment they are teaching	5.37	0.78
23. Teachers should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms	5.35	0.79
17. Methods should not concentrate on native speakers' values	4.12	1.46
18. Since ESL/EFL speakers outnumber those who are native speakers, EFL speakers should lead methods' design processes	3.95	1.10
15. Methods are Western concepts which ignore the local needs of language learners	3.58	1.31

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

Turkish EFL teachers agreed with the idea that teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic, and educational environment and that teachers should have an important role in raising cultural awareness in their classrooms ($\bar{x} = 5.37$, $SD = 0.78$ for item # 22 and $\bar{x} = 5.35$, $SD = 0.79$ for item # 23), ideas emphasized in postmethod pedagogy. Also, survey takers have a slightly positive stance towards the ideas that methods should not focus on just native English speakers' values ($\bar{x} = 4.12$, $SD = 1.46$ for item # 17) and that EFL speaker should have voice in method design processes ($\bar{x} = 3.95$, $SD = 1.10$ for item # 18). Moreover, teachers somewhat agreed with the idea that methods, as Westerns concepts, do ignore the local needs of language learners ($\bar{x} = 3.58$, $SD = 1.31$ for item # 15). Among the three principles of postmethod pedagogy mentioned in this study, Turkish EFL teachers have the most favorable opinion of items, which give importance to local needs of learners. From the results, it can be concluded that the

participants are aware of the fact that being sensitive to their teaching environment is also significant for ELT classes.

Turkish EFL Teachers' Engagement in Reflective Practice

In this study, the second section of the survey examined Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices. In this section, there were 29 items and participants were asked to choose the appropriate response on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'never' to 'always' for the purpose of assessing their recourse to reflective practice. The items were grouped under five core elements of reflective practice (*Practical, Cognitive, Learner, Meta-cognitive and Critical*). In order to analyze the results, descriptive statistics was utilized for the five different elements. The results of this section were analyzed by clustering the mean scores of each item according to the scale mentioned in the survey. Table 11 below shows the meaning of each score.

Table 11

Guidelines for categorizing frequency of engagement in items related to reflective practice

Frequency of Reflective Practice Engagement	Range of the scale
Always	4.5 to 5.00
Often	3.5 to 4.4
Sometimes	2.5 to 3.4
Rarely	1.5 to 2.4
Never	1.0 to 1.4

When the overall score that the participants received from the RPQ was calculated, it was found that Turkish EFL teachers 'sometimes' engage in reflective practice. ($\bar{x} = 3.46$, $SD = .55$)

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations of six items grouped under the *practical* element that focuses on teachers' sharing experiences with their colleagues and actual practices of reflection.

Table 12

Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the practical element of reflective practice

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
2. I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback	4.09	.76
4. I discuss practical/ theoretical issues with my colleagues	3.85	.85
1. I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes	3.10	1.18
5. I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices	2.47	1.05
6. I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance	2.26	1.06
3. After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/ failures of that lesson	1.82	.98

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

As shown in Table 12, the item that attained the highest mean score was “I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback” which shows that they ‘often’ share their experiences and try to learn from each other ($\bar{x} = 4.09$, SD = .76 for item # 2). The participants also often discuss both practical and theoretical issues with their colleagues ($\bar{x} = 3.85$, SD = .85 for item # 4). In addition, the survey takers sometimes keep notes on their teaching experiences ($\bar{x} = 3.10$, SD = 1.18 for item # 1). In terms of classroom observation, they are not so active and rarely ask their colleagues to observe their teaching practices ($\bar{x} = 2.47$, SD = 1.05 for item # 5 and $\bar{x} = 2.26$, SD = 1.06 for item # 6). However, teachers state that they never write about the progress they have made after each lesson ($\bar{x} = 1.82$, SD = .98 for item # 3). For the reflective practices grouped under the practical element, the participants have a tendency to inform their colleagues about their experiences and try to receive advice on their teaching practices.

As for the *cognitive* element, which is related to teachers' professional development, there were six items and according to the responses of teachers, they 'sometimes' or 'rarely' engage in reflective practices grouped under this element. In Table 13, mean scores with their standard deviations are shown.

Table 13

Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of to the cognitive element of reflective practices

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
8. I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues	3.46	.98
7. I read book/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance	3.43	.99
10. I look at journal articles or search the Internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are	3.35	1.01
12. I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them	3.20	1.17
11. I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes	2.72	1.14
9. I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences	2.46	1.31

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

As it can be seen in Table 13, in order to improve classroom teaching and learning, instructors 'sometimes' take part in workshops/ conferences and do reading related to effective teaching (\bar{x} = 3.46, SD = .98 for item # 8 and \bar{x} = 3.43, SD = .99 for item # 1). By reading journals and searching the Internet, instructors also 'sometimes' follow the recent developments in language teaching (\bar{x} = 3.35, SD = 1.01 for item # 10). Finding a method to investigate classroom events is also a practice that is 'sometimes' done by language teachers (\bar{x} = 3.20, SD = 1.17 for item # 12). Also, in order to be informed about learning and teaching processes, teachers 'sometimes' carry out small scale research activities (\bar{x} = 2.72, SD = 1.14 for item # 11). On the other hand, the lowest mean score belongs to thinking of writing

reflective articles about classroom experiences ($\bar{x} = 2.46$, $SD = 1.31$ for item # 9), which is ‘rarely’ done by EFL teachers.

The data related to the teachers’ responses to the *learner* element, which deals with teachers’ reflections on his/her students, are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Turkish EFL teachers’ responses to items of the learner element of reflective practices

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
14. I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities	3.97	.90
13. I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences	3.90	.86
15. I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not	3.86	.85

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

As for the responses to learner element, the participants reported that they ‘often’ talk to their students to learn about their personal information, and learning styles ($\bar{x} = 3.97$, $SD = .90$ for item # 14 and $\bar{x} = 3.90$, $SD = .86$ for item # 13). In addition to this, the participants ask for their students’ ideas about a teaching task ($\bar{x} = 3.86$, $SD = .85$ item # 15). Of all the three items related to language learners, it can be concluded that teachers do care about their students’ preferences and behave accordingly.

Table 15 presents the data related to the teachers’ responses to the *meta-cognitive* element, which is related to teachers’ reflections on their own personality and beliefs.

Table 15

Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the meta-cognitive element of reflective practices

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
20. I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher	4.43	.67
18. I think of the meaning or the significance of my job as a teacher	4.32	.76
19. I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction	4.20	.69
16. As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my job as a teacher	4.08	.80
21. I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice	4.05	.83
17. I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher	3.86	.89
22. I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice	3.27	.78

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

When the responses of the teachers were analyzed, it was seen that the mean scores of the items included in the meta-cognitive element were the highest in respect with the other elements of reflective practice. Although item # 22, "I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice" (\bar{x} = 3.27, SD = .78), received the lowest mean score in this element, the rest of the items were in the 'often' range. For example, item # 19 had the highest mean score and teachers stated that they 'often' question their strengths and weaknesses (\bar{x} = 4.43, SD = .67). They also 'often' think about their teaching philosophy, the meaning of their job as a teacher and how these affect their teaching careers (\bar{x} = 4.32, SD = .76 for item # 18 and \bar{x} = 4.08, SD = .80 for item # 16). Moreover, the participants 'often' think of their past experiences and the effects of them on their teaching practices (\bar{x} = 4.05, SD = .83). Their self-definition as a teacher was 'often' affected by their biography or

background (\bar{x} = 3.86, SD = .89). All in all, the participants often engage in reflective practices related to teachers' views of their profession and beliefs.

The data related to the teachers' responses to the *critical* element, which is about the socio-political elements of their teaching pedagogy, could be seen in Table 16.

Table 16

Turkish EFL teachers' responses to items of the critical element of reflective practices

Questionnaire Items*	\bar{x}	SD
27. I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general	3.81	.94
29. I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class	3.53	1.05
28. I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements	3.43	.97
24. I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias	3.35	1.03
23. I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes	3.27	.98
25. In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty	3.16	1.02
26. I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views	2.46	1.33

N= 347, *The items are listed from highest to lowest according to their means

When the responses of the teachers for the critical element were analyzed, it was seen that the teachers' reflective practices ranged from 'rarely' to 'often'. For instance, reflective practices that language teachers 'often' engage in are bringing democracy and tolerance to the classroom (\bar{x} = 3.81, SD = .94 for item # 27), and thinking of outside social occurrences that can influence their actual practices in the classroom (\bar{x} = 3.53, SD = 1.05 for item # 29). In addition, teachers 'sometimes' consider how social class, gender and ethnicity affect their students' success level

(\bar{x} = 3.43, SD = .97 for item # 28). As seen in items # 23 and 24, teachers ‘sometimes’ assist their learners to think about social injustice in their environment by discussing them in their classrooms (\bar{x} = 3.27, SD = .98 for item # 23 and \bar{x} = 3.35, SD = 1.03 for item # 24). Also, including less discussed topics in their teaching was reported to be practiced ‘sometimes’ by the teachers (\bar{x} = 3.16, SD = 1.02 for item # 25). Regarding political aspects of language teaching, the participants reported that they ‘rarely’ engage in activities that could affect their students’ political ideologies. As for the items related to the critical element, it was seen that even though they do not always reflect socio-political aspects in their teaching, yet they do not discard these aspects in their practices altogether.

The Relationship between EFL Teachers’ Reflective Practices and Their Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy

In order to see the relationship between EFL teachers’ reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was obtained. The mean scores of the *practicality*, *particularity* and *possibility* principles and also the mean scores of the *practical*, *cognitive*, *learner*, *meta-cognitive* and *critical* elements of reflective practice were compared. Table 17 displays the correlation among the principles of postmethod pedagogy and elements of reflective practice.

Table 17

Correlation among principles of postmethod pedagogy and elements of reflective practice

	Practical	Cognitive	Learner	Meta-cognitive	Critical
Particularity	.062	.022	.162**	.188**	.079
Practicality	.024	.002	.117*	.106*	.059
Possibility	.060	.055	.191**	.263**	.111*

Note * p < .05 level (2-tailed), ** p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Regarding the relationship among three principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice, *particularity* principle seems to have a significant relationship with the *learner* element ($r = .162, p < .01$) and the *meta-cognitive* element of reflective practice ($r = .188, p < .01$). However, as the correlation among the *particularity* principle, the *learner* and *meta-cognitive* element was weak, it suggests there was a mild relationship among these variables. Since *particularity* principle focuses on the local conditions of teaching and learning, the items in this principle are related to altering methods to suit particular situations in particular teaching contexts. The *learner* element of reflective practice also emphasizes changing teaching tasks and methods according to the needs of the learners. Moreover, it should be remembered that the *meta-cognitive* element of reflective practice deals with teachers' awareness of their beliefs and personality and this might result in adapting what they have already known.

As far as *practicality* principle was concerned, however the strength of them was weak, the relationship was statistically significant between the *learner* element ($r = .117, p < .05$), and the *meta-cognitive* element ($r = .263, p < .01$). For the *practicality* principle of postmethod pedagogy is related to making a distinction between professional theories and personal theories and teachers' self-monitoring of his/her effective teaching. The *learner* element focuses on learners' need and teachers alter their teaching by reflecting on their learners' progress. Thus, this relationship between the *learner* element and the *practicality* principle seems reasonable. Furthermore, in *meta-cognitive* element, it is highlighted that teachers should evaluate their strong and weak aspects of their teaching and also learn from their past experiences. Parallel with this, the *practicality* principle underlines the fact that in order to better understand what is happening in the classroom, teachers should analyze and identify alternatives by evaluating themselves critically.

Regarding the relationship between the *possibility* principle and the *learner* element, the relationship was statistically significant ($r = .191, p < .01$), as well. In addition, a positive correlation between the *possibility* principle and the *meta-cognitive* element was found ($r = .188, p < .01$). Also, there was a positive correlation between the *possibility* principle and the *critical* element ($r = .111, p < .01$). The *possibility* principle stresses the importance of the experiences brought by learners and teachers to the classroom and how these experiences have considerable effects on classroom activities and goals. It is reasonable to observe positive correlation between the *learner* element and the *possibility* principle. Also as mentioned earlier, the *meta-cognitive* element, which signifies teachers' personal backgrounds thus, to see a relationship between the *possibility* principle and the *meta-cognitive* element is presumable. Moreover, the idea that teachers should not separate the linguistic needs of learners from their social needs is an important feature of the *possibility* principle. Accordingly, when the *critical* element of reflective practice is concerned, the focus of this element is mainly on the socio-political aspects of language pedagogy and that is why positive correlation was found between these two.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings of quantitative data obtained from an online survey, which was composed of three questionnaires [Demographic Information Questionnaire (DMQ), Postmethod Questionnaire (PMQ) and Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ)]. 347 EFL teachers from different regions in Turkey participated in this study and the aims of this online survey were to find out about the participants' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their engagement in reflective practice. Also, the relationship between the principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice were analyzed. First, the data regarding Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod condition were described regarding the

three principles of postmethod pedagogy and also descriptive statistics was utilized in order to display the participants' engagement in reflective practice. Finally, correlation analysis was conducted to see the relationship between three principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice.

The descriptive data analysis results regarding postmethod pedagogy displayed that Turkish EFL teachers had somehow positive reactions towards a possible postmethod condition. The participants seemed to be sensitive to local needs of their learners. They also do not believe that teacher should follow only one method instead they should use a combination of methods. Although teachers think that methods are still significant, they believe that one ideal method does not exist for teaching English.

As for the data describing reflective practice, it was observed that the participants share their ideas with their colleagues and it is important for them to think of their learners' needs to improve learning and teaching. Also, teachers often engage in *meta-cognitive* practices such as thinking about their strengths and weaknesses and thinking of the meaning and significance of their job as teachers.

The results of the correlation analysis show that there is a statistically significant relationship between the *learner* and *meta-cognitive* element of reflective practice and the three principles of postmethod pedagogy. In addition, the *critical* element correlates only with *possibility* principle. However, the *practical* and *cognitive* elements of reflective practice do not correlate with any principle of postmethod pedagogy. The next and the last chapter of this study will discuss the findings, pedagogical implications, suggestions for further studies and limitations.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study aimed to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their recourse to reflective practice. Also, this study was designed to find out the relationship between teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and reflective practices. In this respect, the research questions addressed in this study were:

1. What are Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?
2. To what extent do Turkish EFL teachers engage in reflective practice?
3. What is the relationship between Turkish EFL teachers' reflective practices and their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy?

The data were obtained through an online survey with the participation of 347 Turkish EFL teachers working at different universities in Turkey. The study was a quantitative research and the data emerged from the survey were analyzed through SPSS version 21.

The data analysis had three main stages. In the first two stages, in order to find out Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their engagement in reflective practice, descriptive statistics were used and the means and standard deviation of each item in two sections of the survey were calculated. For the third stage of the data analysis, *Pearson Product correlation test* was run to explore the relationship among three principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice.

In the last chapter of this study, findings and discussions will be presented along with reference to the relevant literature. Then, pedagogical implications and

limitations of the study will be outlined. Finally, suggestions for further research will be discussed.

Findings and Discussion

This section elaborates on the significant findings and conclusions drawn by the data analysis process. The findings of this study will be discussed under three sub-sections referring to each research question.

Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Postmethod Pedagogy

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of this study is that Turkish EFL teachers have slightly positive attitude towards a possible postmethod pedagogy. When their responses to the items grouped under three principles of postmethod pedagogy (*Particularity*, *Practicality* and *Possibility*) were analyzed in detail, the results revealed that most of the items in each principle were somewhat agreed to by the teachers. This shows that they do not have a resistant attitude towards the postmethod condition.

The first principle, *particularity*, focuses on a pedagogy that is sensitive to the particular needs of both learners and teachers so as to pursue specific set of goals within a particular educational setting. Concerning local conditions of learning and teaching, this pedagogy rejects the idea that there should be an established method with a predetermined set of theoretical principles. In that sense, in order to construct a meaningful pedagogy, teachers should have a holistic understanding of particular situations and this pedagogy can only be improved with general improvement of these particular situations (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). When general descriptive information were analyzed in detail, it was observed that according to teachers, conventional methods may be changed in line with the local needs of a particular teaching context. For Turkish EFL teachers, as a result of the interaction among teachers, students, materials and activities in the classrooms, method emerges over

time. This could be evaluated as a positive attitude towards the *particularity* principle since in this principle the interrelation of particularities in learning environments is indicated.

As Kumaravadivelu (2003) suggests that teachers should have a room where they can conceptualize and construct their own pedagogical knowledge realizing the local condition of learning and teaching. In the present study, the teachers believe that each and every language teacher has their own methodologies and teachers should not follow just one method in language classrooms. The participating teachers in this study somewhat agree with idea that they perceive themselves as resourceful enough to construct their own teaching methods. These findings are parallel with what Kumaravadivelu (2003) proposes to achieve the *particularity* principle.

However, teachers find that both conventional and popular teaching methods are still applicable. This finding may be due to the fact that majority of the teachers participated in this study were graduates of ELT departments (See Chapter III, Table 3). Thus, the finding may differ if existing curricula of ELT departments change or the participants receive additional education on postmethod pedagogy. As for being sensitive to local divergences in learning environments, Küçük (2001) reports that

As the center countries dominate ELT sector, most of the time they undermine the characteristics of the countries where English is taught as a foreign language. It can be concluded that in terms of the methodologies in ELT, teachers should analyze their context and their learners' needs before acknowledging these methodologies as the best way to teach. (p. 7)

All in all, when Kumaravadivelu's (2003) *particularity* principle is concerned, EFL teachers agreed that methods could be adapted for the purpose of meeting the local needs of the learning environment. Furthermore, constructing their own

methodologies can be counted as a positive inclination towards the postmethod pedagogy.

The second principle proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2003) is the *practicality* principle. This principle builds a bridge between theoretical and practical aspects of teaching. Focusing on the dichotomy between the roles of theorists and teachers in education, context-sensitive pedagogy can only emerge from theorizing what the teachers practice and practicing what they theorize. To this end, when practitioners' responses to the *practicality* principle are analyzed, they seem to agree to the idea that there is no single, ideal method for teaching English which may lead them to actualize their own theory. They also perceive methods as just tools of instruction that can facilitate delivering their lesson better. Also, using a combination of different methods is another idea that was agreed to by EFL teachers, as Larsen-Freeman (2000) states, choose from methods to establish teachers' own blend and their practice is said to be eclecticism. In addition, following the practices and principles of the established methods did not resonate among the language instructors and that instead may support the idea of *principled eclecticism* which can be defined as creating their own method by blending aspects of other methods in a principled manner (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). This, as stated above, may be because of their tendency to use established methods actively in their teaching practices. Another idea that supports the link between teachers and methods is that in this present study Turkish EFL teachers believe that in ELT departments, prospective teachers should be instructed on methods. Therefore, the results also show that the teachers accept the notion that they are consumers of knowledge produced by theorists, which is consistent with the previous results suggesting the active use of methods. The teachers were opposed to the idea that methods are not important for teaching English and also they took a stand against the idea that methods are not relevant to

ELT classes. As a result, from a broader perspective, Turkish EFL teachers somehow rejected the idea that constitutes the backbone of postmethod pedagogy: methods are no longer alive (Allwright, 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990). These findings may be interpreted as although Turkish EFL teachers have still strong links to methods, believing that methods have crucial roles in language teaching, although they are also opposed to following the prescribed principles of existing methods.

The *possibility* principle, according to Kumaravadivelu (2003), suggests a pedagogical setting that is shaped by teachers' and students' learning/teaching experiences they brought to the classroom and by the social, economic and political environment they are raised in. It is also emphasized that there is a need to question the status quo that keeps both learners and students subjugated. When Turkish EFL teachers' responses were considered to understand their perceptions of the *possibility* principle, it was found that among the three principles, the *possibility* principle was the one that teachers most strongly agreed with. For instance, Turkish EFL teachers agreed that they should pay attention to the socio-political circumstances they encountered in educational settings and they are aware of their roles as cultural mediators that raise cultural awareness in language classrooms. In terms of native speakers' values, the general consensus is that, EFL/ ESL speakers should lead the process of designing the methods rather than native speakers. Similarly, the participants agreed that methods should not focus on native speaker values. So, the perceptions of the practitioners who participated in this study seem to be in line with what Cook (2008) states as "... the responsibility for international languages has passed out of the hands of the original owners ... the right to say how something should be taught is even less a right of the native speaker..." (p. 200). Additionally, Kumaravadivelu (2003) mentions the perception of the superiority of Western

methods over local practices within the scope of learning environment. Turkish EFL teachers somehow accepted that methods, in general, are the result of Western dominance and methods ignore the local needs of language learners. These findings may imply that these language teachers may consider the socio-political, economic and educational alterations in teaching contexts. With a clear understanding of these local sociocultural dynamics, it is likely that they can transform themselves into teachers who can deal with local conflicts.

The field of ELT has witnessed the rise and falls of particular methods since the 1960s. However, many researchers (Allwright, 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990) claim that the heyday of both conventional and modernist methods has come to an end since the introduction of a new, post-modernist era. Thus, it should be kept in mind that such an evolution could be witnessed in Turkish contexts, as well. As this study suggests, Turkish EFL teachers seem to have positive attitudes towards postmethod pedagogy. The results show that according to the practitioners, there is no best method for language teaching and methods can and should be altered. They also have a positive stance towards constructing their own methodologies. Apart from these, they are aware of the socio-political circumstances and the importance of local needs. However, the findings may also suggest that for Turkish EFL teachers, method is still an appropriate and viable construct. Thus, they believe that prospective language teachers should be instructed in methods. The reason for this may be due to the lack of emphasis given to postmethod pedagogy in ELT departments. As mentioned by Tıǧlı (2014), there is a need to determine whether postmethod pedagogy has received enough attention among language teachers and in Turkish curricula. Similarly, Akbari (2008) clearly states “Many members of our community have not yet heard about the postmethod and have no regard for social and critical implications of education; the urgently

needed first step, it seems, is to raise the awareness of academia” (p. 649). As mentioned above, although the link between methods and teachers exists, postmethod pedagogy may need more attention in English language field.

Turkish EFL Teachers’ Engagement in Reflective Practice

One of the aims of this current study was to find out the extent to which Turkish EFL teachers’ engage in reflective practice. In this respect, the participants were given an online survey and they selected the most appropriate items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from ‘never’ to ‘always.’¹ To this end, the second conclusion that can be drawn from the findings of this study is that in terms of reflective practices grouped under five elements (*Practical, Cognitive, Learner, Meta-cognitive* and *Critical*), the general tendency was that the participants ‘sometimes’ engage in these activities. The findings also revealed that Turkish EFL teachers did not choose either ‘always’ or ‘never’ categories in this particular survey indicating that there are no reflective practices they always or never do, hence their practices are somewhere in between.

First of all, the *practical* element refers to using and following different tools, techniques and procedures such as journal writing, classroom observation or doing action research. According to Richards and Farrell (2005), teachers should try to meet or talk to their peers in order to find out what their experiences of different reflective practices were, what they learned from such kind of activities and what recommendations they would give. When Turkish EFL teachers’ responses to the *practical* element were analyzed, they ‘often’ discuss practical or theoretical issues with their colleagues and also share their classroom experiences in order to get feedback or advice. In addition, the participants ‘sometimes’ keep their accounts of teaching for reviewing purposes. However, Turkish EFL teachers do not seem

¹ The extent to which the participants engaged in reflective practices was given in single quotation marks.

willing to be observed by other teachers and they also ‘rarely’ observe other teachers’ classrooms. This may be due to teachers’ current work conditions or time constraints. As classroom observation requires extra time and energy, it may be challenging for them to engage in peer observation. They also report that after each lesson, they ‘rarely’ write about the accomplishments and failures of that lesson. The general complaint directed at journal keeping is that it is really time consuming (Cooper & Stevens, 2006). The reason for their opposition to journal keeping might be that Turkish EFL teachers may consider journal keeping as boring and waste of time.

The *cognitive* element of reflective practice is concerned with teachers’ own efforts to fulfill the necessities of professional development. It should be kept in mind that reflective activities under this element are conducting action research, participating in conferences and/or workshops related to language learning and teaching and reading related literature (Farrell, 2004; Richards & Farrell, 2005). When the items related to the *cognitive* element were analyzed, the participants mostly reported that they ‘sometimes’ engage in such kind of activities. To be more specific, Turkish EFL teachers reported that they ‘sometimes’ participated in workshops or conferences and they also ‘sometimes’ read books or journal articles to catch up with the latest developments in language teaching field. This would suggest that the participants prefer engaging in more passive activities such as reading the related literature or searching the Internet for following the recent developments in language teaching. However, the items related to writing journals based on classroom experiences and carrying out action research had lower mean scores for these production-based activities.

The *learner* element can be defined as the emphasis given to the learners’ learning processes, linguistics or social backgrounds, their interests and abilities. The

findings related to the *learner* element showed that the participants are sensitive to their learners' family backgrounds, hobbies and interests. They 'often' talk to students to have information both about their learning styles and personal experiences. Additionally, asking their learners' preference about a teaching task is also a reflective activity they engaged in. These findings imply that in order to enhance learning and be better informed about their learners, teachers often communicate with their students and give importance to their preferences.

According to the responses of the participants, the *meta-cognitive* element, which is related to self-evaluation by reflecting on their own personality and beliefs, was the most frequently reflective practice engaged in. These activities in this element are related to thinking about their strengths and weaknesses as a teacher or evaluating their teaching philosophy. The findings reveal that teachers are reflective while engaging in *meta-cognitive* activities. The participants 'often' try to find out which aspects of their teaching provide them with a sense of satisfaction. They also reported that they 'often' think of both positive and negative role models they had when they were students. This may indicate that teachers bring their past experiences to the learning environment and they shape their teaching practices in line with the effectiveness of these experiences. Moreover, they 'often' think of the ways their background affects the way they define themselves as teachers. Surprisingly, Turkish EFL teachers 'sometimes' think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in the classroom. This may be due to their tendency to avoid such circumstances or they may try to prevent these contradictions before they occur.

Concerning the last element of reflective practice, the *critical* element, which emphasizes the interrelationship among instruction and social, institutional and political contexts, Turkish EFL teachers 'sometimes' involve themselves in *critical* reflection. Larrivee (2008) defines critically reflective teachers as individuals who

are concerned about inequity and social justice that arise in and outside the classroom. Parallel with this definition, Turkish EFL teachers ‘often’ try to find ways of promoting tolerance and democracy not only in their classes but also in the society in general. They also seem to be responsive to the social events that can have effects on their teaching practices. On the other hand, teachers ‘sometimes’ think of the issues related to gender, race and social class that may influence students’ achievements. This may result from teachers’ present teaching environment and their students’ profile. The opposite situation would be that if teachers were teaching students who were coming from totally different backgrounds, races and social classes, then the frequency of their engagement of such a critical activity would be higher. Another *critical* reflection that was ‘sometimes’ done by teachers was thinking of instances of social injustice in their own surroundings and discussing them in their classes. Akbari (2008) touches upon a controversial issue about what the majority of the teachers teach and how they teach. According to him, in order not to lose their market potential, almost all textbooks are sanitized and neutralized. Thus, most of the topics of interests for a critical pedagogy are removed and this accordingly limits what teachers choose (Akbari, 2008). The reason why teachers ‘sometimes’ include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty is a parallel issue. Since most of the topics in textbooks are related to harmless issues such as food, travel, and holidays, they seem to hardly leave room for societal and political awareness issues (Akbari, 2008). Surprisingly, teachers avoid thinking of political aspects of their teaching and how this may have effect on students’ political views. However, it is vital that teachers should be aware of the social and political roles they play and the social and political implications that inform their work (Pennycook, 1989). Therefore, from this

perspective, political concepts could be seen as involving all the inequalities related to gender, class and race differences.

When all the elements of reflective practice are considered, it can be said that Turkish EFL teachers do not seem to reject engaging in reflective practices, instead they reported that most of the reflective activities are sometimes done. As for the practical activities, they often talk about practical or theoretical issues and thus share their classroom experiences. They often think about their learners' needs, background and learning styles. Also, they often question their personality, beliefs and reflect on their teaching philosophy. While doing these, teachers are sensitive to social events, promoting democracy and tolerance in the classroom. On the other hand, Turkish EFL teachers tend to shun classroom observation. Similarly, they rarely write articles or keep files for reviewing purposes. On the political side, they almost never think about political aspects of their teaching and the ways they may affect their learners' political views. When it comes to pondering upon issues, Turkish EFL teachers seem to have active roles. However, if actual practice and taking the initiative to engage in reflective practice are considered, they seem passive.

The Relationship between Postmethod Pedagogy and Reflective Practice

This study also investigated whether there is a relationship among three principles of postmethod pedagogy (*Particularity, Practicality and Possibility*) and five elements of reflective practice (*Practical, Learner, Cognitive, Meta-cognitive, and Critical*).

To begin with, the *learner* element of reflective practice, which includes items dealing with teachers' reflecting on and being responsive to their learners' needs, background, learning styles and preferences, has a positive relationship with each and every principle of postmethod pedagogy. This may suggest that, despite the

impositions of textbooks, curricula or their institutions, teachers try to construct their own pedagogies which reflect their learners. Within the light of the three operating principles of postmethod pedagogy, they tend to be sensitive to the particular experiences that their learners bring to the classroom and reflect on their learners' progress and needs.

When teachers' responses to the *meta-cognitive* element and the principles of postmethod pedagogy were analyzed, a significant relationship was observed. From a general perspective, postmethod teachers can be defined as autonomous teachers, with teacher autonomy, constituting a fundamental part of postmethod pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). It recognizes not only teachers' prior knowledge and how to act autonomously but also promotes teachers' knowledge on developing a reflective approach (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). Teachers can develop a reflective approach by self-analysis and self-evaluation. In line with these, the *meta-cognitive* element of reflective practice emphasizes the importance of teachers' self-monitoring by reflecting on their own beliefs and personality (Akbari et al., 2010). By looking at this finding, it can be said that Turkish EFL teachers tend to question themselves by thinking of their own strengths and weaknesses, the significance of their job and personal experiences and this may result from their positive stance towards a possible postmethod condition.

When teachers' responses to the *critical* element of reflective practice were analyzed, it was observed that among three principles of postmethod pedagogy, it has a relationship only with the *possibility* principle. The underlying reason for this result is that the *critical* element focuses on the socio-political aspects of teacher reflection. It is particularly related to reflecting on social issues and local differences that the participants experience and bring to the classroom. Accordingly, these may affect teaching and learning at the same time. The *possibility* principle, which is in

harmony with *critical* reflection, stresses the need to develop theories and social practices that work with the particularities brought to the pedagogical setting (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). This may suggest that teachers who are reflecting on social occurrences may potentially have an understanding of contextual factors and try to alter their teaching accordingly.

However, when the *practical* element and the *cognitive* element of reflective practice were considered, there was not a significant relationship among the three principles of postmethod pedagogy and these two elements. First of all, teachers' actual practices such as keeping a journal, classroom observation, reflective writings and also sharing experiences are among the activities that can be counted as practical reflection. In postmethod pedagogy, there is no specific reference to these activities. According to Kumaravadivelu (2001), postmethod pedagogy can only give teachers a broad road map to empower self-development and its teachers' responsibility and decision to choose a specific road depending on their day-to-day teaching. In addition, the same results were noted when the relationship between the *cognitive* element and three principles of post method pedagogy was concerned. The *cognitive* element is composed of reflective actions that deal with what teachers do to promote their professional development such as reading books or articles or participating in conferences. From a broader perspective, postmethod pedagogy does not give recipes to the teachers for how to reflect on their teaching. Parallel with this point of view, McMahon (2006) indicates:

The critical part of reflective practice is that it requires a commitment to learning from experience and from evidence, rather than to learning certain 'recipes' for action... The analysis involves not just your own practice, but also the social, moral and political context for that practice. (p. 165)

Therefore, the reason why there is no relationship between the *practical* element and postmethod pedagogy can be explained by the opposition that postmethod pedagogy has towards dominance. Because, as mentioned earlier, teachers' prior knowledge and autonomy were generally emphasized, postmethod pedagogy expects teachers to be decision makers and to have a voice in how to act and evaluate themselves, and thus the results seem to be predictable.

Consequently, it is seen that there is a relationship between the elements of reflective practice and principles of postmethod pedagogy in varying levels, which shows that reflective practice and postmethod pedagogy are mutually inclusive especially in terms of local needs, socio-political issues and critical reflections on teaching.

Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The aims of this present study were to investigate teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their engagement in reflective practice. Also in this study, the relationship between postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice were examined. Thus, the findings retrieved from this study reveal some pedagogical implications that can inform not only pre-service teachers but also EFL teachers, curriculum designers and ELT professors in Turkey.

One of the overarching pedagogical implications that can be drawn from this study is that Turkish EFL teachers seem to be open to changes in that they are aware of the importance of the socio-political issues in teaching contexts and constructing their own context-sensitive pedagogies. Administrators can encourage their teachers to take a more active part in curriculum design process in their institutions while considering the local needs of their learning/teaching environment. As a result, there is a possibility that postmethod can get into language classes and it could be easier to see the reflections of teachers ideas on postmethod pedagogy. As Akbari (2008)

states, the realization of a postmethod pedagogy necessitates the existence of an appropriate teacher education infrastructure. That's why, in English language teaching departments, prospective teachers need to be instructed on postmethod pedagogy as well.

Another pedagogical implication that can be derived from this study is about Turkish EFL teachers' engagement in reflective practice. Based on the results, the participants reported that they 'sometimes' engage in reflective activities and practices mentioned in five different elements. While most of the *learner* and *meta-cognitive* related items were 'often' engaged in, practical reflective practices such as peer observation and keeping journals did not resonate with Turkish EFL teachers. Since the *learner* element was the most frequently engaged reflective practice, this may mean that Turkish EFL teachers plan their lessons and design their activities accordingly. For instance, at the end of the lesson, a teacher can ask his/her students whether they liked the teaching activities and this feedback can lead the teacher to consider what works or not in the learning environment. The other most frequently practiced element, *meta-cognitive*, shows that teachers spare time to think about the way they teach. For example, before their actual teaching practices, they may review the shortcomings in their teaching and try to find ways to improve them to reach a sense of satisfaction in their job.

Even if they seem to be sensitive to their students needs and critical about their own teaching philosophy, teachers may need assistance in becoming reflective practitioners. In order to enhance professional development as well as learning, teacher trainers in the institutions could provide language teachers with in-service training or educational supplies. They can be asked to observe their colleagues, make notes about the way they teach so that they can improve the overall quality of teaching and learning environment. Turkish EFL teachers prefer engaging in more

passive reflections such as thinking about their own beliefs and considering their strengths and weaknesses; however, professional development activities could trigger more initiative-taking reflective practices. Thus, teachers are more likely to be active in what they do. Other collaborative activities may include writing and sharing articles or journals based on teachers' classroom experiences. Circulating articles and journals within the institution may lead teachers to gain insights from their colleagues and revise the way they teach. Similarly, administrators could allocate time for teachers to collectively meet and discuss what they could do to improve their teaching and may give advice on planning their reflective actions for continuous development.

Limitations of the Study

This study shed light on the current stance of Turkish EFL teachers towards the postmethod condition and their reflective practices; however, there are several limitations of the present study suggesting that the findings should be interpreted with caution.

First of all, one of the most important limitations of this study is the number of the participants involved. Although the researcher tried to contact the department heads of universities with School of Foreign Languages in Turkey, most of them failed to respond to the e-mails sent by the researcher and some of them did not share the e-mail with their instructors in their institutions. The study could have reached a larger population including more universities and instructors from Turkey.

Secondly, the present study, at first, aimed at nation-wide demographics covering seven regions in Turkey; however, the participation rate of some regions particularly Mediterranean, Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia was quite low. For this reason, the researcher re-designed the scope of this study.

In addition, the data collection tool of this study was an online survey which is composed of three parts. The number of the participants that seemed to complete the survey was 390, however, 21 of the participants did not complete the second part of the survey, which aimed at finding out teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy. Also, 22 of the participants failed to complete the third part of the survey which focuses on teachers' reflective practices. Thus, the researcher had to discard 43 of the participants from the study in order to obtain more reliable results. Besides, because of the time constraints, the survey used for this study was online and open for only one month. More participants could have been included in this study, if the survey remained online through one semester.

Moreover, since the participation for this study was on volunteer basis, the teachers who participated in this study were more likely to be interested in methodology or reflective practice issues. If simple random sampling technique was utilized, the results might have been different.

Finally, in this particular survey there were only questionnaire items that the participants could select options that appeal best to their teaching philosophy and reflective practices. Qualitative data collection tools such as interviews or open-ended items were not used because of the feasibility issues including the high number of the participants.

Suggestions for Further Research

Considering the findings and limitations of this study, there may be some suggestions for further research on this topic. Firstly, the research design on this study was based on an online survey and numeric data were analyzed to draw conclusions. In further research, semi-structured and structured interviews could be included in order to reach more in-depth results on teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy. Also, case studies can be conducted using different data

collection procedures such as classroom observations so as to better determine actual reflective practices of language teachers.

In addition, the present study can be replicated in order to investigate the perceptions of professors in English language teaching departments in Turkey. The researcher aimed at exploring EFL instructors' perceptions of postmethod condition and their reflective practices; however, including ELT professors as participants could also result in significant findings. Particularly, since university professors who offer methodology courses could have more knowledge on postmethod pedagogy, their perceptions can be a focus of another research.

Since postmethod pedagogy offers location-specific teaching and learning, the scope of the study could be more local. In another classroom based study, a researcher may train the teachers both on postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice to observe the conceptualization of this context sensitive pedagogy and can listen to the participants' voice through their reflective actions.

Further research could also be conducted including the demographic variables of the participants in order to investigate whether years of experience in teaching English, departments the participants graduated from and region affect their perceptions of postmethod pedagogy or the extent to which they engage in reflective practices.

Conclusion

This current study, which was conducted with 347 Turkish EFL teachers from different regions of Turkey, investigated teachers' perceptions of postmethod pedagogy and their engagement in reflective practice. Moreover, the present study tried to shed light on the relationship between three principles of postmethod pedagogy and five elements of reflective practice. In this respect, the results showed that Turkish EFL teachers have somehow positive attitudes towards a possible

postmethod condition. Although they report that methods are significant for teaching English, they believe that there is not a best method to follow and every teacher has his/ her own methodology. They also report that methods may be altered according to the local needs and they are opposed to the Western dominance of methods.

Also, the results of this study constitute an attempt to demonstrate the extent that Turkish EFL teachers' engage in reflective practice. Sharing with colleagues is a common reflective practice among teachers. They also participate in workshops or conferences, read books related to the field. Another important point to be considered is Turkish EFL teachers do care about what their learners think and ask for their preferences. In order to be better informed about their learners, teachers also try to learn about their learners' social backgrounds and interests. In addition, they often try to promote democracy and tolerance in their classes. As for self-evaluation, they think about their strengths and weaknesses and also benefit from their past experiences. Apart from these, the participants do not choose to be observed by their colleagues and they avoid engaging in writing about their accomplishments/ failures.

As for the relationship between postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice, the findings revealed that there is a relationship between the *learner* and *meta-cognitive* elements of reflective practice and the three principles of postmethod pedagogy (*Particularity*, *Practicality* and *Possibility*). On the one hand, there is a relationship between the *critical* element and only the *possibility* principle, on the other hand for the *practical* and *cognitive* elements of reflective practice no such relationship is found among any of the principles of postmethod pedagogy.

To conclude, these findings may contribute to the literature by pointing out how Turkish EFL teachers perceive a possible postmethod condition and the extent of their reflective practice engagement. Considering these findings, administrators,

policy makers, and curriculum designers could seek ways of increasing awareness on what postmethod pedagogy possibly might bring about and what the benefits of reflective practice could be. Also, the findings will hopefully enable both practitioners and prospective teachers to reconsider their methodological preferences although the issue of actualizing postmethod pedagogy is open to debate.

REFERENCES

- Akbari, R. (2004). Recent developments in foreign language teaching. *ROSHD FLT*, 20(76), 25-32.
- Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35(1), 192-207.
- Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod discourse and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(4), 641-652.
- Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System*, 38(2), 211-227.
- Alemi, M., & Daftarifard, P. (2010). Pedagogical innovations in language teaching methodologies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(6), 765-770.
- Allwright, R. (2000). *Exploratory practice: An "appropriate methodology" for language teacher development*. Paper presented at the 8th IALS Symposium for Language Teacher Educators, Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Allwright, R., & Bailey, K. (1991). *The death of the method*. Paper presented at the plenary paper for the SGAV Conference. Ottawa: Carlton University.
- Anthony, E. M. (1963). Approach, method, and technique. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 17, 63-67.
- Arikan, A. (2006). Postmethod condition and its implications for English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Başağa, N. (2005). *A study of promoting reflective practice among English language instructors at tertiary level* (Unpublished master's thesis). Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.

- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Bell, D. M. (2003). Method and postmethod: Are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 325-336.
- Bell, D. M. (2007). Do teachers think that methods are dead? *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 135-143.
- Braun, J. A., & Crumpler, T. P. (2004). The social memoir: An analysis of developing reflective ability in a pre-service methods course. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 59-75.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Can, N. (2009, May). *Postmethod pedagogy: Teacher growth behind walls*. Paper presented at the 10th METU ELT convention, Ankara.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). Globalization, methods, and practice in periphery classrooms. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 134-150). London, UK: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Candlin, C., & Murphy, D. (1987). *Language learning tasks* (Vol. 7). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chowdhury, M. R. (2003). International TESOL training and EFL contexts: The cultural disillusionment factor. *Australian Journal of Education*, 47(3), 283-302.

- Clarke, M. & Otaky, D. (2006). Reflection 'on' and 'in' teacher education in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26(1), 111-122.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Cooper, J. E., & Stevens, D. D. (2006). Journal-keeping and academic work: four cases of higher education professionals. *Reflective Practice*, 7, 349–366.
- Cornfrod, R. I. (2002). Reflective teaching: Empirical research findings and some implications for teacher education. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 54(2), 219-236.
- Crandall, J. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 34-55.
- Delport, S. (2010). *Exploring postmethod pedagogy with Mozambican secondary school teachers*. Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process*. Boston: DC. Heath and Company
- Eisner, E. (1984). No easy answers: Joseph Schwab's contributions to curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 14(2), 201-210.
- Farrell, T. (2004). *Reflective practice in action: 80 reflection breaks for busy teachers*. California: Corwin Press.
- Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice*: ERIC.
- Florez, M. C. (2001). Reflective teaching practice in adult ESL settings. ERIC Digest. *National Center for ESL Literacy Education Washington DC*.
- Gayford, C. (2003). Participatory methods and reflective practice applied to

- research in education for sustainability. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 8(1), 129-142.
- Gilliland, B. E., James, R. K., & Bowman, J. T. (1994). Response to the Lazarus and Beutler article "On Technical Eclecticism." *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72(5), 554-555.
- Griffith, V. (2000). The reflective dimension in teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33(1), 539-555.
- Hashemi, S. M. R. (2011). (Post)-Methodism: Possibility of the impossible? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 137-145.
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 11(1), 33-49.
- Hazratzad, A., & Gheitanchian, M. (2009). *EFL teachers' attitudes towards post-method pedagogy and their students' achievement*. Paper presented at the 10th METU ELT convention, Ankara.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching* (Vol. 1, No. 4, p. 2). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 18(1), 73-85.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, K.E. (1996). The role of theory in L2 teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly* 30, 711-765.

- Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Kırmızı, O. (2012). Research trends in MA ELT programs in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 4687-4691.
- Killen, R. (2007). *Teaching strategies for outcomes-based education*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Towards a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537-560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539-550.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 59-81.
- Küçük, A. N. (2011). The application of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Turkish primary and secondary schools. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 13.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2005). A critical analysis of postmethod. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, 1(1), 21-25.
- Larrivee, B. (2008). Development of a tool to assess teachers' level of reflective practice. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 9(3), 341-360.
- Lazarus, A. A., & Beutler, L. E. (1993). On technical eclecticism. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 71(4), 381-385.

- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 33-43.
- Mackey, W. F. (1967). *Language teaching analysis*. London: Longman.
- Masouleh, S. N. (2012). From method to post method: A panacea!. *English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 65-73.
- McMahon, T. (1999). Is reflective practice synonymous with action research? *Educational Action Research*, 7(1), 163-169.
- Mellow, J. D. (2002). Towards principled eclecticism in language teaching: The two-dimensional model and the centering principle. *TESL-EJ*, 5(4), 1-18.
- Noormohammadi, S. (2014). Teacher reflection and its relation to teacher efficacy and autonomy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98(1), 1380 – 1389.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers* (Vol. 128). United Kingdom: Prentice hall.
- Osterman, K. F., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1993). *Reflective practice for educators: Improving schooling through professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-618.
- Pishghadam, R. (2012). Educational language teaching: A new movement beyond reflective/critical teaching. *Life Science Journal*, 9, 892-899.
- Prabhu, N. (1990). There is no best method—why? *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 161-176.

- Raven, N. (2014). Learning from experience: Reflective practices amongst higher education professionals. *Reflective Practice*, 15(6), 766-779.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, R. (2012). The Silent Way, Suggestopaedia, TPR and other 'designer' methods: What are they and what can we learn from them? Retrieved from <http://elt-resourceful.com/2012/09/14/the-silent-way-suggestopaedia-tpr-and-other-designer-methods-what-are-they-and-what-can-we-learn-from-them/>
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, D. A. (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching: Historical and interdisciplinary perspectives on applied linguistic research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tasnimi, M. (2014). The role of teacher in the postmethod era. *Express: An International Journal of Multi Disciplinary Research*, 1(3), 1-8.
- Tatış, H. (2010). *An investigation into the effects of keeping journals of*

- preparatory class instructors on teaching paragraph writing within the notion of reflective practice*. Unpublished master's thesis. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.
- Tekin, M. (2013). An investigation into novice English teachers' views and beliefs about method and post-method pedagogy in Turkish EFL context. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 4(4), 55-69.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2002). The changing winds and shifting sands of the history of English Language Teaching. *Retrieved from* www.englishclub.com/teflarticles/history-english-language-teaching.htm
- Tıgılı, T. (2014). *Method vs postmethod! : A survey on prospective EFL teachers' perspectives* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Tosun, B. C. (2009). A new challenge in the methodology of the postmethod era. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 5(2), 1-8.
- Vieira, F., & Marquez, I. (2002). Supervising reflective teacher development practices. *ELTED*, 6(1), 1-18.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A-The Online Survey

Dear colleagues,

This study is designed with the aim of looking into your actual teaching philosophy and teaching practices as a professional teacher. To that end, your careful completion of the questionnaire will definitely contribute to obtaining real data which is crucial for more accurate findings.

All the information will be kept strictly confidential and will be used just for research purposes. Thank you very much in advance for your time and cooperation.

Section I- Demographic Information Questionnaire (DIQ)

Please choose the appropriate response for each item

1) Gender

Female	
Male	

2) Age

21-25	
26-30	
31-35	
36-40	
41-45	
46- +	

3) Years of experience in teaching English

1-5	
6-10	
11-15	
16-20	
21-25	
26- +	

4) Department graduated from

English Language Teaching	
---------------------------	--

Linguistics	
English Language Literature	
Translation and Interpreting	
Culture studies (American)	
Other (Tourism, etc.)	

5) Most recent graduate degree related to language studies	
B.A.	
M.A.	
Ph.D.	

6) Please choose the region your institution is located in	
Marmara region	
Aegean region	
Black Sea region	
Central Anatolia region	
Eastern Anatolia region	
South Eastern Anatolia region	
Mediterranean region	

Section II- Postmethod Questionnaire (PMQ)

7) Please read the following items below and choose the appropriate response which suits best to your teaching philosophy.						
	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Somewhat Disagree	4 Somewhat Agree	5 Agree	6 Strongly Agree
1.Methods are NOT significant for teaching English						
2.Methods can never be realized in their purest form in the classroom according to their core principles						
3.Teachers are resourceful enough to produce their own teaching methods						
4.Teachers are the consumers of knowledge produced by theorists						
5.Method is what emerges over time as a result of the interaction among the teacher, the students, the materials and activities in the classroom						
6.Teachers should NOT follow a certain method in their classes						
7.Students who are trained to be English teachers at universities should be instructed on methods						
8.Methods are artificially designed constructs						
9.Methods are irrelevant to ELT classes						

10.Methods are NOT applicable in language classrooms						
11.There is NOT a single, ideal method for teaching English						
12.Methods may be altered to suit local needs						
13.Method is just a tool of instruction for language teachers which helps them deliver their lesson better						
14.Every English teacher has his/her own methodology						
15.Methods are Western concepts which ignore the local needs of language learners						
16.Teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes						
17.Methods should NOT concentrate on native speakers' values						
18.Since ESL/EFL speakers outnumber those who are native speakers, EFL speakers should lead methods' design processes						
19.Popular methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are NOT applicable for Turkish learners of English						
20.Methods are NOT derived from classroom practice						
21.Teachers should follow the principles and practices of the established methods.						
22.Teachers should be sensitive toward the societal, political, economic, and educational environment they are teaching						
23.Teachers should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms						

Section III- Reflective Practice Questionnaire

8) Please read the following items below and choose the appropriate response which suits best to your teaching practice.					
	1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	5 Always
1.I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes					
2.I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback					
3.After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/failures of that lesson					
4.I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues					
5.I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices					
6.I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance					
7.I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance					
8.I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues					
9.I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences					

10.I look at journal articles or search the Internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are					
11.I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes					
12.I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them					
13.I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences					
14.I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities					
15.I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not					
16.As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching					
17.I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher					
18.I think of the meaning or the significance of my job as a teacher					
19.I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction					
20.I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher					
21.I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice					
22.I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice					
23.I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes					
24.I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias					
25.In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty					
26.I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views					
27.I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general					
28.I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements					
29.I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class					