



Available online at:
<http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/eltrj/>
*International Association of Research
in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics*
ELT Research Journal
2019, 8(4), 200-220
ISSN: 2146-9814

Post-Method Pedagogy vs. Conventional Language Teaching Methods: Are They Compensating or Competing?

Görsev Sönmez Boran¹

Hasan Kalyoncu University, Gaziantep, Turkey

Serkan Gürkan

Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey

Abstract

The present study aims to investigate the perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers regarding the conventional methods and post-method pedagogy in Turkey. The participants of the study consist of 107 pre-service teachers from 14 different universities and 53 in-service teachers from different cities all over Turkey. An online questionnaire (Tıgılı, 2014) was used for data collection in this study. The data derived from the questionnaire were analyzed to reveal the frequencies, means, and standard deviations. The results of the study yielded that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Total Physical Response (TPR) are the most highly favored teaching methods among pre-service and in-service language teachers. Even though they are supporting the idea of using language teaching methods in the classroom, they consider that there is not only single and best method. They agreed that methods might vary depending on the local needs, and teachers might mix a number of methods for a better teaching. With these results, they appear to support the fundamental idea of post-method pedagogy and autonomy of the teacher.

Keywords: Post-Method; pedagogy; teacher education; pre-service teaching; in-service teaching

¹Corresponding Author. Email: gorsevi@gmail.com

Introduction

John Adams, one of the noteworthy figures of the United States of America and its second president, claimed that ‘English is destined to be the language of the world than Latin was in the last or French is in the present age’ (Adams, 1852). Not surprisingly, his prediction turned out to be real in the second half of the twentieth century. Therefore, as the language of the world, English language has been accepted to have a key role in various fields. As an expected result of this situation, English Language Teaching has started to develop continuously in the last century. This situation has led to various methods (i.e. Oral Approach, Audio lingual Method, Content-based Teaching, and Communicative Approach) in the field of language education. As stated by Kumaravadivelu (2006, p. 163), these methods might be considered to have distinctive features that lead to a better language teaching, in fact, many of them are known to have commonalities in theory and practice. The founder and the proponents of each method claimed to be better than the earlier ones. However, none of them was proved to have the optimal quality and was recommended as the best method for ELT persuasively. As a result, each of these methods has been criticized as being unproductive and misguided (Stern, 1983), being just a label without substance, and not being helpful (Allwright, 1991, p. 1) and even not being a method anymore (Allwright, 1991; Brown, 2002, p. 11). The concept of the method has also been explained not to have enough theoretical validity and practical utility by Kumaravadivelu (2006). Therefore, in the last decade of the 20th century, practitioners and scholars in the field of language teaching apprehended the fact that there was no single teaching method that would result in ultimate success in foreign language teaching (Brown, 2002). These problems regarding quality, validity and unsuccessful language learning outcomes forced language teachers and scholars to look for new alternatives in the field. In order to respond to the demand for a better way of language teaching that is not dependent on method-based rules, post-method pedagogy was proposed by Kumaravadivelu in 1994. A number of different teaching methods in EFL were suggested and teachers have been adopting these in their own classrooms as they are curious about recent trends in the field. They started to consider how to make the teaching environment more effective and therefore seek for perfection. In this vein, post-method pedagogy offers us new perspectives in overcoming the limitations of regular method-based pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Literature Review

In the field of language teaching, the concern of how to teach languages has received much attention from the researchers. As Bell (2007) stated, for a vast number of teachers, methods constituted a crucial component of the teaching process. Actually, since the beginning of the formal language education in the world, a variety of methods were applied in language instruction (Tıǧlı, 2014). Over the years, due to many different reasons stated in the previous section, dissatisfaction regarding the application of methods in classrooms was conveyed. Findings of research studies (e.g. Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Swaffer, Arens, Morgan 1982; Nunan, 2003; Thomas, 1991) revealed that teachers did not apply only one particular method in the classroom, or they did not make use of different classroom techniques as suggested by methods, on the contrary to their claims. Instead, they were likely to apply “delineated task-hierarchy, a weighted sequence of activities” which have no connection to methods (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p. 29-30). This tendency of the teachers was also supported by many researchers such as Widdowson (1990), Richards and Rodgers (2001), and Clarke (1994). They all agreed that teachers tended to rely more on their intuitive abilities, own judgments and opinions instead of utilizing methods that change depending on the current trend.

Therefore, as a solution to the above-mentioned problems, post-method pedagogy was proposed as an alternative to the ideas of the traditional methods in language teaching. On the contrary to Nunan’s (2003) definition of method as a set of guidelines that describes how the language should be taught, (p.5); post-method consists of procedures which are shaped within the classroom by the teachers depending on their previous experiential knowledge and some basic strategies (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, p.29). This does not mean that post-method denies applicability of these methods completely. It validates the language teachers’ efforts and wills to modify and adjust any method according to the context in which they are teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), which supports teacher autonomy and democracy in the classroom.

Kumaravadivelu (2001, p.538) divided this term into a “three-dimensional system consisting of three pedagogic parameters”. He claimed that these parameters namely ‘pedagogy of particularity’, ‘pedagogy of practicality’, and ‘pedagogy of possibility’ were the ways to overcome the limitations and problems faced during the applications of the conventional methods. These three pedagogic parameters are in continuous interaction with each other. The parameter of particularity necessitates any language pedagogy to be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners following particular

objectives within a particular institutional context inserted in a particular sociocultural environment (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). The parameter of practicality, on the other hand, is stated to refer to the relationship between theory and practice, and the practice of classroom teaching. It aims for a teacher-generated theory of practice. This statement is based on a straightforward suggestion: No theory of practice can be useful and usable unless it is generated through practice (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Finally, the parameter of possibility takes its roots from the educational philosophy of the Brazilian critical pedagogue Paulo Freire. He claims that any pedagogy is closely associated with power and dominance, and is implemented to sustain social inequalities. He mainly focuses on respecting learners' and teachers' subject-positions such as social class, race, gender, and ethnicity. He argues that these distinctions should be respected in the process of education as well and their impact on education should always be considered.

Depending on these pedagogical parameters, the roles of language learners, teachers and teacher educators are revised by Kumaravadivelu (2001). The post-method learner is an autonomous one who is willing and able to take charge of his/her own learning (Holec, 1988) by the help of a set of cognitive, metacognitive, and affective techniques provided by their teachers that lead to successful learning. Secondly, the post-method teacher, as it is the case with the post-method learner, is an autonomous individual. Teacher autonomy, in this context, requires competence and confidence to create and implement a peculiar theory of practice that is appropriate to a particular educational context and its sociopolitical conditions. Last, teacher education programs need to give significance to teachers' voices and visions, and help them improve their critical capabilities. Thus, post-method teacher educator is required to help student teachers think critically so that they may relate their personal knowledge to the professional knowledge they are being exposed to and s/he needs to create conditions for pre-service teachers to acquire basic skills in classroom discourse analysis that will help them hypothesize pedagogical principles from their classroom practice and thereby demystify the process of theory construction. Therefore, post-method pedagogy both challenges the concept of method completely and offers a great chance for improved teacher and learner autonomy in language classrooms. Briefly, "post-method pedagogy recognizes teachers' prior knowledge as well as their potential to know not only how to teach but also how to act autonomously within the academic and administrative constraints imposed by institutions, curricula and textbooks" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006, p. 178). In addition, post-method involves certain frameworks such as Stern's three-dimensional framework and Kumaravadivelu's macro-strategic framework. All these frameworks provide teachers with

significant guiding principles which they can base their teaching on. They also raise the awareness of teachers in their teaching process (Can, 2009).

In the field of English Language Teaching, this particular topic has been researched widely both nationally (e.g. Arıkan, 2006; Can, 2009; Dağkiran, 2015; Tekin, 2013; Tıgılı, 2014; Tosun, 2009) and internationally (e.g. Bell, 2003; Chen, 2014; Delpont, 2010; Hazratzad&Gheitanchian, 2009; Huq, 2015; Saengboon, 2013; Scholl, 2017). All these studies generally focused on the EFL teachers' and pre-service teachers' perceptions of conventional methods and the post-method pedagogy, and the implications of the post-method pedagogy for language teacher education and professional development of language teachers.

To illustrate, Arıkan (2006), Can (2009), Tosun (2009), Chen (2014) discussed the possible implications of post-method pedagogy for language teacher education. Can (2009) agreed that post-method pedagogy was necessary for teacher development owing to the fact that it involves teachers' constructing their own practice for a particular classroom which is underestimated in the application of the conventional methods. Moreover, Tosun (2009, p.6) claimed that "unlike the method concept, the post-method condition is not trying to create a new waving for a current subject as language teaching, instead, it is a mimesis of what is waving on the globe for the time being". He also added that creating a ground for a new course did not and should not mean to assault to the accumulations of the past. Chen (2014), additionally, stated that teachers needed to create more learning opportunities for the students. Teachers were also supposed to minimize perceptual misunderstandings through more communication and understanding. Regarding teaching techniques, teachers were advised to give students more encouragement before an activity, more autonomy during an activity, and more praise after it. Contextualizing linguistic input was also believed to be crucial for language practice.

There were some other studies that investigated the perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers about post-method pedagogy. In Dağkiran's (2015) study, results revealed that Turkish EFL teachers did not have resistance towards the post-method condition and they also seemed to be open to changes with regard to altering the current methods in line with the needs of the students. Moreover, Hazratzad and Gheitanchian (2009) indicated that EFL teachers had different attitudes towards dominant teaching methods. However, no relationship between the teachers' attitudes towards post-method and their students' achievement was found. Hazratzad and Gheitanchian (2009, p.6) also stated that, in order to meet the challenges of the 21st century, "pre-service teachers have to be provided with the skills and techniques needed to understand contemporary educational developments as well as to gain

extensive linguistic and cultural knowledge so that they may build up the confidence for successful delivery of communication-oriented language classes”.

Results of another study (Tıgılı, 2014) revealed that third- and fourth-year ELT students in Turkey preferred Communicative Approaches. Furthermore, these students appeared to reveal negative perceptions regarding the earlier methods of teaching English. Regarding the post-method condition, the results indicated that Turkish ELT students still have a tendency towards the recent methods, and they were “unwilling to abandon the guidance that these ELT methods provided them”. Last but not the least, the findings of Huq’s study showed that most teachers paid conscious efforts to make use of the features of this newly emerged phenomenon in their practices but failed to establish exclusively the characteristics and strategies associated with it in their classrooms (2015).

In the light of this literature review and discussion, the present study aims to investigate the perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers regarding the conventional methods and post-method pedagogy in Turkey.

Research Questions

By examining the status of ELT in the Turkish context, this study concentrates on the perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers concerning the conventional methods and post-method pedagogy. Accordingly, it aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the language teaching method preferences of Turkish pre-service and in-service ELT teachers?
2. What are Turkish pre-service and in-service ELT teachers’ perceptions of conventional ELT methods and post-method pedagogy?

Method

Setting and participants

The participants of the study consist of 107 pre-service teachers from 14 different universities and 53 in-service teachers from different cities all over Turkey. The study aimed at nationwide demographics. Therefore, 20 universities from different geographical regions were selected. Then, academic staff members from these universities were contacted via e-mails or phone calls. Finally, 14 universities which are believed to represent the population of the country were included in the study. 12 of them were state universities and 2 of them were private ones. With the same belief, 53 in-service teachers from the same cities with the universities participated in the study. See Table 1 for more details.

Table 1

Demographic Information of the Participants

Background Information	N	%
<i>Sex</i>		
Female	130	81.2
Male	30	18.8
<i>Level of Teaching</i>		
Pre-service	103	64.4
In-service	57	35.6
<i>Grade Level (Pre-service)</i>		
Freshman	3	2.91
Sophomore	15	14.56
Junior	42	40.77
Senior	43	41.74
<i>Years of Experience (In-service)</i>		
1-5	23	40.35
6-10	12	21.05
11-15	11	19.29
16+	11	19.29
	57	

While 130 of the participants were female, 30 were male. According to grade levels of pre-service teacher participants, while only 3 freshmen participated in the study, this number increased to 15 in sophomores, 42 in juniors and 43 in senior student teachers. As for 57 in-service, 23 in-service teachers with 1-5 years of experience, 12 in-service teachers with 6-10 years of experience, 11 in-service teachers with 11-15 years of experience and 11 in-service teachers with 16+ years of experience participated in the study.

Table 2 demonstrates the distribution of participants who took part in the study according to their universities. The name of the universities and participants were not revealed for predetermined confidentiality policy. Pseudonyms were used for each of them (e.g. University 2, Participant 23).

Table 2

Distribution of Participants in terms of Universities

Background Information	N	%
University		
1	54	50.5
2	27	25.2
3	2	1.9
4	1	.9
5	1	.9
6	2	1.9
7	1	.9
8	9	8.4
9	1	.9
10	2	1.9
11	1	.9
12	3	2.8
13	2	1.9
14	1	.9

Instrument

According to Rowley (2014), using a questionnaire is one of the practical and influential ways of collecting data from large number of participants. It necessitates minimum time for implementation, preparation and evaluation. Therefore, an online questionnaire (Tıgılı, 2014) was used for data collection in this study.

There are four sections in the questionnaire. The first section consists of 6 questions regarding demographic information of the participants. The second section includes 9 items [Methods Preference Questionnaire (MPQ)] for determining methodological preferences of participants in their teaching practices. The third section includes 20 items and it [Methods Questionnaire (MQ)] examines the perceptions of participants regarding conventional methods. The fourth section contains 25 items for identifying perceptions of participants regarding the post-method pedagogy [Post-method Questionnaire (PMQ)].

As for the second section, nine major methods, Grammar Translation Method, Audio-Lingual Method, Direct Method, Silent Way, Total Physical Response, Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, Communicative Language Teaching and Eclectic Method were listed and participants were asked to pick from their favorite ones from the list offered. In this part they were free to choose more than one method.

The third section includes 20 items regarding practices of the methods given in the previous section. There are 9 methods in this section, 8 of them include 2 items but the only method which corresponds to 4 items is Communicative Language Teaching. The methods and their corresponding items are as follows; Grammar Translation Method (5,7), Audio-Lingual Method (14,20), Direct Method (2,6), Silent Way (12,17), Total Physical Response (1,16), Community Language Learning (8,18), Suggestopedia (3,13), Communicative Language Teaching (9,10,11,15) and Eclectic Method (4,19).

This section enabled the triangulation of the preferences ticked in the previous section because the participants were expected to mark the best choice among 20 Likert scale items in accordance with the methods they favor. The participants graded the items on a scale ranging from one to six, 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Somewhat Disagree, 4-Somewhat Agree, 5-Agree, and 6-Strongly Agree.

The last section PMQ was constructed to identify how participants perceive post-method pedagogy with no referrals to post-method condition directly in any of the items. It includes 25 Likert scale items with identical item labels given above ranging from one to six. Kumaravadivelu (2003) postulated three operating principles as particularity, practicality, possibility. The items in PMQ correspond to these principles. While there are 8 items for particularity principle (3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 19, 20), there are 12 items related to the principle of practicality and (1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 21, 22, 23) and there are 5 items for the principle of possibility (15, 17, 18, 24, 25). The survey provided a reliability value of .65 (Cronbach α = .65) for the MQ, and .88 (Cronbach α = .88) for PMQ.

Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaire mentioned above was constructed in an online platform and a link was created. Then the link was sent to 14 universities and in-service teachers in the same cities. ELT professionals and academics were contacted and asked to share the link with their students and any in-service teachers they may possibly know. In order to gather data, convenience sampling method was used. The main reasons of applying this method are the convenient accessibility of the participants and their proximity to the researchers.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data obtained from the online platform were transferred to SPSS 21. The data analysis of the first section covering demographic information of participants was done via SPSS frequency and descriptive statistics.

In order to answer the first research question (What are the language teaching method preferences of Turkish pre-service and in-service ELT teachers?), the data derived from the

questionnaire were analysed via frequencies, means and standard deviations. The same procedures were also applied to answer the second research question (What are Turkish pre-service and in-service ELT teachers' perceptions of current ELT methods and post-method pedagogy?).

Results

In order to answer the first research question, ELT method preferences of the participants were investigated. Results are as follows; CLT (N=114, 41 (in-service), 73 (pre-service)), TPR (N=66, 21 (in-service) 45 (pre-service)), Eclectic Method (N=50, 32 (in-service), 18 (pre-service)), ALM (N=41, 24 (in-service) 17 (pre-service)), GTM (N= 37, 18 (in-service) 19 (pre-service)), DM (N=35, 16 (in-service) 19 (pre-service)), Community LT (N=35, 11 (in-service) 24 (pre-service)), Suggestopedia (N=17, 6 (in-service) 11 (pre-service)), Silent Way (N=7, 5 (in-service) 2 (pre-service)).

After investigating the methods preference of the participants, their perceptions regarding current teaching methods were investigated through descriptive analysis. In Table 3, most highly and least highly preferred items by in-service teachers and in Table 4, preferences of pre-service teachers are listed.

Table 3

In-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Current Teaching Methods

Items	N	M	SD
<i>Most Highly Rated Items</i>			
3. Students' anxiety should be lowered in classroom by providing comfortable surrounding facilities.	57	4.5536	.76085
4. I think that the best method to teach English is a combination of the existing methods.	57	4.3750	.96413
9. I make use of activities which require the use of more than one skill.	57	4.2857	.77961
15. Students learn better when they interact in the target language.	57	4.8214	.50837
19. My teaching methods and strategies change with each different classroom's dynamics.	57	4.6786	.54296
<i>Least Highly Rated Items</i>			
5. I teach vocabulary as isolated words.	57	.2857	1.10724
6. I ask students to translate passages from English to Turkish.	57	2.1250	1.16092

7. My students work together to identify the language aspects they will learn next.	57	3.4643	1.20551
14.I ask students to repeat each line of the new dialogue several times.	57	2.5893	1.15643
17.I try to avoid interfering in the learning process of my learners as much as possible.	57	3.6071	1.13904
Valid N (listwise)	57		

Table 4

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions of Current Teaching Methods

Items	N	M	SD
<i>Most Highly Rated Items</i>			
3. Students' anxiety should be lowered in classroom by providing comfortable surrounding facilities.	103	4.6505	.66729
10.I use authentic texts in my classes.	103	4.3883	.66026
13. Instead of analyzing grammar in a directive manner, I would introduce teaching materials in playful and fun ways.	103	4.5243	.62379
15. Students learn better when they interact in the target language.	103	4.5534	.80108
<i>Least Highly Rated Items</i>			
5. I teach vocabulary as isolated words.	103	2.4272	1.03471
6. I ask students to translate passages from English to Turkish.	103	2.3689	.97004
14. I ask students to repeat each line of the new dialogue several times.	103	2.8058	1.21315
16.I think that language is learned primarily through listening.	103	3.6311	.92874
Valid N (listwise)	103		

The results in the above tables showed that both groups agreed that comfortable surrounding facilities help lowering students' anxiety. Moreover, they both agreed that interaction in target language results in better learning in the language classroom. On the other hand, participants all disagreed with the idea of teaching vocabulary as isolated words, asking students to do translation and repetition in the language classroom. Contrary to the common

items, there are some items they disagree with each other. To illustrate, in-service teachers preferred applying eclectic method, and changing their strategies and activities depending on the classroom dynamics in their instruction, pre-service teachers generally preferred making use of strategies of communicative language teaching such as making use of fun and playful activities, and authentic materials. In addition, in-service teachers did not prefer their students' working together to identify language aspects. And they stated they sometimes interfere with the learning process of the students.

After investigating the method preference of the participants, their perceptions regarding post-method pedagogy investigated through descriptive analysis are shown in tables 5 and 6. According to these results both groups agreed that students' anxiety should be lowered and they should interact in the classroom. They also both disagreed with the idea of repetition and translation.

Table 5

In-service Teachers' Perceptions of Post-method Pedagogy

Items	N	Mean	St D
<i>Most Highly Rated Items</i>			
11. There is not a single, ideal method for teaching English.	57	4.7857	.52964
12. Methods may be altered to suit local needs.	57	4.6607	.54861
16. Teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes.	57	4.7857	.45584
24. Teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic and educational environment they are teaching.	57	4.5357	.80824
25. Teachers should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms.	57	4.8750	.33371
<i>Least Highly Rated Items</i>			
1. Methods are not significant for teaching English.	57	2.1250	1.07977
7. ELT undergraduate students at universities should not be instructed on methods.	57	2.0179	1.10357
9. Methods are irrelevant to ELT classes.	57	1.9464	.92283
19. Popular methods such as Communicative Teaching are not applicable for Turkish language learners	57	1.7679	.89425
20. Popular methods such as Communicative Teaching are not convenient for Turkish language learners	57	1.9286	1.00647
Valid N (listwise)	57		

Table 6

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions of Post-method Pedagogy

Items	N	Mean	SD
<i>Most Highly Rated Items</i>			
11. There is not a single, ideal method for teaching English.	103	4.2330	1.15643
12. Methods may be altered to suit local needs.	103	4.2233	.79128
16. Teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes.	103	4.5437	.72459
24. Teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic and educational environment they are teaching.	103	4.3398	.81112
25. Teachers should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms	103	4.5146	.85019
<i>Least Highly Rated Items</i>			
1. Methods are not significant for teaching English.	103	2.2427	1.18376
9. Methods are irrelevant to ELT classes.	103	1.9903	.99504
10. Methods are not applicable in language classrooms.	103	2.0291	1.06141
19. Popular methods such as Communicative Teaching are not applicable for Turkish language learners	103	2.0971	1.12472
20. Popular methods such as Communicative Teaching are not convenient for Turkish language learners	103	2.0680	1.08702
Valid N (listwise)	103		

Regarding the participants' perceptions of post-method pedagogy all the most highly rated items revealed to be the same. In other words, they all considered that there is not a single and ideal method for teaching English, the methods can change according to the local needs. They also agreed that teachers should make use of a combination of methods, be sensitive to societal, political, economic and educational issues, and they should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms. Not surprisingly, they also disagreed with the same items such as methods are not significant and applicable.

Participants' perception of post-method pedagogy was also analysed under three operating principles of the post-method condition (i.e. particularity, practicality and possibility). Table 7 displays survey responses grouped under Kumaravadivelu's (2003) particularity, practicality and possibility operating principles:

Table 7

In-service and Pre-service ELT Teachers' Attitudes towards the Particularity, Practicality and Possibility Principles

Questionnaire Items		In-service Teachers			Pre-service Teachers		
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
<i>Particularity</i>							
3	Teachers are resourceful enough to produce their own teaching methods.	57	3.33	1.20	103	3.41	1.04
5	Method is what emerges over time as a result of the interaction among the teacher, the students, and the materials and activities in the classroom.	57	4.22	.68	103	4.02	.82
6	Teachers should not follow a certain method in their classes.	57	4.21	1.06	103	3.58	1.24
10	Methods are not applicable in language classrooms.	57	2.17	1.05	103	2.02	1.06
12	Methods may be altered to suit local needs	57	4.66	.54	103	4.22	.79
14	Every English teacher has his/her own methodology.	57	4.33	.89	103	4.18	.94
19	Popular methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are not applicable for Turkish language learners.	57	1.77	.88	103	2.09	1.12
20	Popular methods such as Communicative Language Teaching are not convenient for Turkish language learners.	57	1.92	1.00	103	2.06	1.08
<i>Practicality</i>							
1	Methods are not significant for teaching English.	57	2.12	1.07	103	2.24	1.18
2	Methods can never be realized in their purest form in the classroom according to their core principles.	57	3.28	1.01	103	2.96	.96
4	The assumption that teachers are the consumers of knowledge produced by theorists is wrong.	57	3.29	1.06	103	3.15	.89
7	ELT undergraduate students at universities should not be instructed on methods.	57	2.01	1.10	103	2.45	1.10
8	Methods are artificially designed constructs.	57	2.96	1.03	103	3.04	.99

9	Methods are irrelevant to ELT classes.	57	1.94	.92	103	1.99	.99
11	There is a not a single, ideal method for teaching English	57	4.78	.52	103	4.23	1.15
13	Method is just a tool of instruction for language teachers which helps them deliver their lesson better.	57	4.26	.89	103	4.00	.85
16	Teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes.	57	4.77	.46	103	4.54	.72
21	I agree that the era of methods is over.	57	2.24	.91	103	2.66	1.19
22	Methods are not derived from classroom practice.	57	2.49	1.11	103	2.57	.95
23	Teachers should not follow the principles and practices of the established methods.	57	2.28	.97	103	2.46	1.01
<i>Possibility</i>							
15	Methods are Western concepts which ignore the local needs of language learners.	57	2.85	1.17	103	2.85	1.16
17	Methods should not concentrate on native speakers' values.	57	3.12	1.07	103	2.52	1.19
18	ESL/EFL speakers should lead methods design processes since ESL/EFL speakers outnumber those who are native speakers.	57	3.21	.83	103	3.34	.83
24	Teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic, and educational environment they are teaching.	57	4.53	.80	103	4.33	.81
25	Teachers should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms.	57	4.87	.45	103	4.51	.85

As seen in Table 7, regarding Kumaravadivelu's (2003) particularity principle, Turkish pre-service and in-service ELT teachers disagreed with the ideas stating that popular methods such as CLT are not applicable and convenient in language classrooms. On the other hand, both groups agreed that teachers are resourceful enough to produce their own methods; methods may change depending on local needs, language teachers have their own teaching methodology so they do not need to follow a certain methodology in their classes.

In addition, with specific relation to practicality principle, both Turkish pre-service and in-service teachers disagreed that methods are not necessary and ELT undergraduates should not be instructed on methods. They do not think that methods are irrelevant to ELT

classes. On the contrary, both of the groups perceived that there is not a single, ideal method for teaching English, and method is just a tool of instruction for language teachers which helps them deliver their lesson better, and teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes.

Regarding the last principle which is possibility, results showed that both groups believed that ESL/EFL speakers should take active role in method design processes. Since ESL/EFL speakers outnumber native speakers, teachers should be sensitive towards the societal, political, economic, and educational environment they are teaching and they should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms. There is only one item which they disagree with each other. While pre-service teachers did not believe that methods should not concentrate on native speakers' values ($M=2.52$), in-service teachers were more positive about this idea ($M=3.12$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study aimed to investigate the perceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers regarding the conventional methods and post-method pedagogy in Turkey. Results showed that interactive teaching methods namely; CLT and TPR were favoured by both in-service and pre-service teachers. When their perceptions were analysed, both groups perceived that students' anxiety should be lowered and interaction in target language in the classroom should be encouraged which supports their methods preferences. This result is in line with the findings of the previous studies (Morgan, Swaffer and Arens (1982), Thomas (1991), Nunan (2003) and Kumaravadivelu (1994)). On the contrary to the common items, they disagreed with each other for some items. While in-service teachers preferred applying eclectic method, and changing their strategies and activities depending on the classroom dynamics, pre-service teachers generally preferred making use of fun and playful activities, and authentic materials in every context. In addition, in-service teachers did not prefer using group work. They also stated that they sometimes interfere with the learning process of the students.

Moreover, with specific relation to the participants' perceptions of post-method pedagogy, they all considered that there is no single and ideal method for teaching English and the methods can change according to the local needs. They also agreed that teachers should make use of a combination of methods, be sensitive to societal, political, economic and educational issues, raise cultural awareness in their classrooms. With this result, the present study revealed parallel results with Dağkiran's (2015) and Tıǧlı's (2014) studies showing that

Turkish EFL teachers do not have resistance towards the post-method 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. As Hazratzad and Gheitanchian (2009) indicated EFL teachers have different attitudes towards dominant teaching methods. Pre-service and in-service teachers in Turkey commonly perceived that methods can change depending on the necessities of the students and the classroom atmosphere.

Finally, results about Kumaravadivelu's (2003) particularity principle showed that Turkish in-service and pre-service teachers have similar ideas to particularity principle. They believe that methods can change according to the needs of the students and the environment. They also thought that teachers are resourceful enough to produce their own strategies. These findings are conflicting with the findings of Tıǧlı (2014). In addition, results regarding practicality principle revealed that both groups thought that methods are necessary and ELT undergraduates should be instructed on methods even though both groups perceived that there is not a single, ideal method for teaching English. In addition to this clashing result, they also thought that teachers should combine a variety of methods in their classes showing the autonomy of the teachers in the language classroom.

Results about the possibility principle demonstrated similar findings to Tıǧlı's (2014) study. To illustrate, instead of concentrating on native speakers' values, ESL/EFL speakers had better take role in methods design processes because of the fact that the number of ESL/EFL speakers are more than the number of native speakers, teachers should take the societal, political, economic, and educational situation of the environment they are teaching into consideration, and they should raise cultural awareness in their classrooms.

To conclude, among the current language teaching methods, both of the participating groups favoured CLT and TPR as language teaching methods. As the general idea, both groups preferred interaction in target language for better learning and agreed with the idea of comforting effect of surrounding facilities on language learning. Despite their support for using language teaching methods in the classroom, they consider that there is not only one and only method. The general idea showed that both participating groups considered that methods might change depending on the local needs and teachers can mix a number of methods for a better teaching. With these results, both groups appear to support the fundamental idea of post-method pedagogy; autonomy of the teacher.

Implications

The study has many implications for both teachers and students in ELT and curriculum / program designers. The findings of the study reveal that existing methods and

techniques may not be sufficient all the time and fit for all learning situations therefore, it is important to reflect the existing picture of English language education in Turkey and present a recent approach to gain better learning outcomes. Post-method pedagogy can be an alternative way to achieve this. Therefore, curriculum designers may put more emphasis on post-method pedagogy while making decisions on educational programs. Considering the results of the study, they may go for more context-specific pedagogies that take societal, political, economic and educational issues into account, and raise cultural awareness in their classrooms.

As many teachers mostly complain that not all of the conventional methods are good enough to fit for all learning environments, they may take advantage of post-method pedagogy to evaluate and design their own teaching pedagogies once again. Thus, reevaluation of existing methods and adapting them with a more context-specific form that takes into account of learners' needs more might give more efficient and successful learning outcomes. The aforementioned implications for teachers are also valid for the prospective ELT teachers. It may motivate them to reflect on their perceptions of conventional methods as well as giving them a chance to avoid pedagogical dilemmas they might encounter when they start teaching.

Limitations of the Study

The study reveals a number of limitations as well. Firstly, as the number of universities and participants is limited, the generalizability of the findings is not high. It could have given more insight into the problem with more teachers, students and students from different grades, and decision makers from different universities.

Another limitation is that the study does not include qualitative data. Semi-structured interviews could have been conducted to triangulate and complement quantitative data, and to give a better insight into the problem stated.

Suggestions for Further Research

In the light of the findings and limitations of the current study, the following suggestions for further research might be given. The number of studies on post-method pedagogy should be increased and more studies should focus on local research based on post-method pedagogy.

In the present study, only junior and senior year student teachers participated. In another study, student-teachers in all four grades can take part and understandings of student teachers across grade levels can be compared. Comparison of these grades might give curriculum designers a different perspective on making their decisions on educational programs. Moreover, the coverage of the sampling might be extended to more participants

from all grades, teachers and professors from different universities where the medium of instruction is English. Another study might focus on qualitative data as well as quantitative data to have a more complementary and fuller picture of existing practices of methodologies.

Finally, more action research might be conducted to search the dynamics of the classroom environment as well as pros and cons of post-method pedagogy versus conventional methods.

References

- Adams, J. (1780). Letter to the President of Congress (5September 1780). In C. F. Adams, *The works of John Adams*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1852
- Allwright, R. L. (1991). The death of the method (Working Paper #10). The Exploratory Practice Center, University of Lancaster, England.
- Arikan, A. (2006). Post-method condition and its implications for English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Bell, D. M. (2003). Method and post method: Are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 325–36.
- Bell, D. M. (2007). Do teachers think that methods are dead? *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 135-143.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the “Post-Method” era: Towards better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 9-18). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Can, N. (2009, May). Post-method pedagogy: Teacher growth behind walls. Paper presented at the 10th METU ELT convention, Ankara.
- Chen, M. (2014). Post method Pedagogy and Its Influence on EFL Teaching Strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 7(5), 17-25.
- Clarke, M. A. (1994). The dysfunctions of the theory/practice discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 9-26.
- Dağkırın, İ. (2015). Post method Pedagogy and Reflective Practice: Current Stance of Turkish EFL Teachers. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Bilkent University.
- Delpont, S. (2010). Exploring post-method pedagogy with Mozambican secondary school teachers. Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand.

- 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.
- Holec, H. (Ed.). (1988). *Autonomy and self-directed learning: Present fields of application*. Council of Europe.
- Huq, R. (2015). *Post-method pedagogy: a survey of the English medium schools in Dhaka* (Doctoral dissertation, BRAC University).
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The post-method condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003a). *Beyond methods: Macro strategies for language teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Post-method*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowley, J. (2014). Designing and using research questionnaires. *Management Research Review*, 37(3), 308-330, <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2013-0027>.
- Saengboon, S. (2013). Thai English Teachers' Understanding of "Postmethod Pedagogy": Case Studies of University Lecturers. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 156-166.
- Scholl, J. (2017). Reconceptualizing post-method pedagogy. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 15(3), 96-101.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swaffar, J., Arens, K., Morgan, M. (1982). Teacher classroom practices: Redefining method as task hierarchy. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 24-33.
- 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).
- Thomas, J. (1991). You're the Greatest!. *Principal*, 71(1), 32-33.
- Tiğli, T. (2014). Method vs post-method!: 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 post-method era. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 5(2), 1-8.

Widdowson, H.G (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.