The Relationship between Post-method Pedagogy and Teacher Reflection: A Case of Iranian EFL Teachers

Jalil Fat'hi

PhD in TEFL, Faculty Member of University of Kurdistan

Rozhin Ghaslani

M. A. in TEFL, Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran

Katayoun Parsa

MA in TEFL, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch

Abstract

As far as the language teaching profession is concerned, reflective teaching is one of the terms widely referred to in today's accumulated body of literature dealing with language teaching. In fact, the rise of reflective teaching in English Language Teaching (ELT) is regarded as one of the ramifications of the post-method debate. Language educators and practitioners are nowadays encouraged to engage in reflective practices through the use of journals, diaries, and discussion of their daily classroom achievements and failures. The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationship between the extent to which Iranian English teachers show willingness and conformity to principles of post-method pedagogy and the degree of their reflection in their classrooms. The two validated instruments of the post-method pedagogy and reflective teaching were administered to 648 participants of the study. The result of Pearson Correlation analysis showed a meaningful positive relationship between the post-method attitudes of the participating English language teachers and their reflection in teaching. It was finally concluded that the five elements of teacher reflection can be related to the three post-method components in terms of the nature and the domain of the constructs.

Keywords: post-method, particularity, possibility, practicality, reflective teaching

INTRODUCTION

Since the last two decades, language teaching profession has witnessed a dramatic shift of attention and orientation. A glance at the titles and topics of recently published books and journals in ELT profession bears testimony to the fact that the field has designated a broader scope in terms of the number and the depth of issues addressed. In other words, one can conclude that language teaching profession has become more inclusive and comprehensive in the sense that more of the reality of the lives of students, and at

---

times those of teachers, are taken on board as significant in affecting the outcomes of teaching and learning (Tudor, 2003). Topics such as critical applied linguistics (Carlson, 2004; Pennycook 2001), critical discourse analysis (Kumaravadivelu, 1999), World Englishes (Kachru, 2005), ethnography of communication (Harklau, 2005), qualitative research (Davis, 1995; Richards, 2003a), and linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) have turned into common themes of discussion and research. Actually as Akbari (2008) puts it, one can say that the second language teaching profession has become politically more involved and socially more sophisticated.

One of these conceptual shifts which have received much attention is the disappearance of method (Allwright, 1991) from academic discussions and the rise of the post-method debate (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). The post-method debate has academically put an end to method discussions and the search for the good method (Allwright, 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Prabhu, 1990), although its practical counterpart, that is, methodology, is still a legitimate notion and very much alive to many teachers (Bell, 2007).

After the successive rise and fall of a series of methods and approaches in the early and mid-twentieth century, the English Language Teaching (ELT) researchers and practitioners came to realize that no single method or approach of language teaching would be the optimal framework to guarantee success in teaching a foreign language especially as it was seen that certain learners seemed to be successful regardless of methods or techniques of teaching (Brown, 2000). Moreover, as far as the history of language teaching has reported, it is clear that some approaches and methods were unlikely to be widely adopted because they were difficult to understand and use, lacked clear practical application, required special training, and necessitated major changes in teachers' practices and beliefs (Allwright, 1991). Nevertheless, the concept of method was harshly criticized in the 1990s for other reasons, and a series of limitations embedded in the notion of all-purpose methods were raised. In fact, in the 1990s, the profession witnessed a steady stream of critical thoughts on the nature and scope of method. Scholars such as Allwright (1991), Pennycook (1989), Prabhu (1990), and Stern (1992) had not only cautioned language-teaching practitioners against the uncritical acceptance of untested methods but they had also counseled them against the very concept of method itself (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a).

By the end of the twentieth century, mainstream language teaching no longer preserved methods as the crucial factor in elucidating success or failure in language teaching. When the notion of methods came under much criticism in the 1990s, some ELT practitioners and theoreticians began to express their dissatisfaction with the methods and approaches; hence the term post-method era was occasionally drawn upon. The early undocumented roots of post-method can be traced to what the profession has called *eclecticism.* The post-method condition questions the legitimacy of the concept of the method. In other words, post-method pedagogy, as proposed by Kumaravadivelu (1994) emerged as a response to a call for the most optimal way of teaching English that would free itself from the method-based stranglehold. The post-method pedagogy tries

to explore the instructional means for real life communication in the second language (L2) classroom and to get the learners not just to develop linguistic accuracy, but to expand their fluency. From this perspective, learners are assumed to be partners in a cooperative venture, and they are persuaded to move toward the fulfillment of their fullest potential (Brown, 2001; Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Although "post-method pedagogy" (Kumaravadivelu, 2001) has extricated ELT professionals and practitioners from many of the constraints of the concept of method and invigorated the classroom practices by providing new options to the classroom teacher, the post-method pedagogy has brought with it its own new constraints and has been criticized occasionally (Akbari, 2008; Bell, 2003; Block, 2001).

After the demise of the method, in the quest for something in lieu of method, the eclectic approach was put forth by practitioners, which set in motion a discord between theoreticians and practitioners. Amidst this clash between the two camps, reflective teaching was introduced because it promised to be the solution to the dilemma (Akbari, 2007). There have been many qualitative or case studies on reflective practices whose findings have been infused with enthusiasm on the part of trainee teachers and lecturers in favor of reflective approaches (Cornford, 2002). One reason lies in the fact that teachers don't find much in conventional approaches in terms of ways to tackle their practical problems (Richards and Lockhart, 1999), and reflective teaching has emerged as a response to the call for a substitute for the concept of method. According to Gimenez (1999) the heyday of reflection in teacher education was the 90's and it continues to be significantly dominant so that today nobody engaging in the field of teacher education can deny its ubiquitous role in this field. In effect, reflection has been of great importance and has received noticeable attention in teacher education and teachers' educational development in recent years and is a *key component* of teacher development (Clarke and Otaky, 2006; Griffiths, 2000; Jay and Johnson, 2002; Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Richards, 2000; Vieira and Marques, 2002). "Reflection has become an integral part of teacher education" (Jay and Johnson, 2002, p. 73), and as Tabachnick and Zeichner (2002) put it, "there is not a single teacher educator who would say that he or she is not concerned about preparing teachers who are reflective" (p. 13).

Given the significance of post-method and reflection in the current ELT debate, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between the extent to which Iranian EFL teachers show willingness and conformity to principles of post-method pedagogy and the degree of their reflection in ELT.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

As previously pointed out, the ELT profession has undergone a number of dramatic changes during the last three decades. These dramatic changes have taken many shapes from 1960s to the current decade. In 1960 and the early days of 1970s with the decline of the backbones of structuralism in linguistics and behaviorism in psychology, the pendulum of language teaching was swung to communicative approach and particular attention was directed towards the communicative language teaching (CLT). Saengboon

(2010) believed that 1980 was marked as the milestone of "soft revolution" when language teaching experts (Richards & Rodgers, 1986; Nunan, 1991) began to criticize the long-practiced grammar-translation and Audio-lingual methods, and proposed a modern teaching method, that is called CLT. However, from the late 1990s, the references made to CLT in the published journals and articles are few, if not any. In fact, we have passed a "century-old obsession" (Stern, 1985) with methods. As Stern (1983, p. 453) puts it, "The conceptualization of language teaching has a long, fascinating, but rather tortuous history", which Brown (2007) portrays as the "changing winds and shifting sands of language teaching". This history has been formulated mainly in terms of a variety of teaching methods, each of which has sought to find more effective and efficient ways of teaching languages and each of which has been based on different views of what languages are and of how they are taught in the best way.

The ELT profession has been always experiencing changes throughout history as the nature of science justifies and, basically, necessitates such changes. According to Akbari (2008) one dramatic recent shift which has not been unanimously agreed upon among scholars is the emergence of the "post-method condition" (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). This condition has pronounced "The Death of the Method" (Allwright, 1991) and emergence beyond the dark ages of methods (Brown, 2002, p. 17), as the search for the best method was in practice futile (Allwright, 1991; Brown, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Nunan, 1991; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu,1990), and has defined new roles and relationships for all involved in the process of learning or teaching the language, among them, learners and teachers (Kumaravadivelu, 1994). Kumaravadivelu (1994) as the true initiator of post-method maintains :

> If the conventional concept of method entitles theorizers to construct knowledge-oriented theories of pedagogy, the post-method condition empowers practitioners to construct classroom-oriented theories of practice. If the concept of method authorizes theorizers to centralize pedagogic decision making, the post-method condition enables practitioners to generate location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative practices. (p. 29)

Kumaravadivelu (1994) identifies three characteristics for post-method pedagogy. First, the post-method pedagogy looks 'for an alternative to method rather than an alternative method'. In other words, post-method pedagogy is a reaction against the method era. Kumaravadivelu (1994) calls for a necessity for teachers to move beyond the notion of method. The second characteristic of post-method pedagogy is the autonomy which it gives to practitioners. Post-method pedagogy provides opportunities for teachers to adopt a reflective approach to their own teaching. Post-method teachers are empowered to have their voices and there is no longer a hierarchy of power between theoreticians and practitioners in post-method pedagogy. Practitioners are allowed to theorize from their practice and practice what they have theorized" (Kumaravadivelu ,1994, p. 30). Teachers' autonomy in improving their teaching practice is considered so important that it lies in "the heart of post-method pedagogy" (Kumaravadivalu, 2001, p. 548 ;Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p. 178). The third defining feature which Kumaravadivelu

(1994) ascribes to the post-method condition is 'principled pragmatism'. This characteristics urges teachers not to be simple 'receivers' of methods but encourages them to be analyzers of their immediate context and be informed decision makers at the time of practice. This forms teachers' individual context-based knowledge of their classroom teaching.

In other words, the new context-sensitive post-method pedagogy 'demands a re-visioning of teachers' roles as post-method practitioners' Kumaravadivelu, 2001) in accordance with the parameters of practicality, particularity and possibility. Nevertheless, the actual and practical existence or emergence of such modified roles, traits, and behaviors, integral for any pedagogy to be called post-method, is open to debate (see, e.g., Akbari, 2008; Bell, 2003, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2005a; & Liu, 1995).

This newer understanding in foreign language teaching methodology has been described as the post-method condition because of its underlying beliefs and assumptions concerning foreign language teaching practices. As Kumaravadivelu (2006a) describes it:

> The post-method condition is a sustainable state of affairs that compels us to fundamentally restructure our view of language teaching and teacher education. It urges us to review the character and content of classroom teaching in all its pedagogical and ideological perspectives. It drives us to streamline our teacher education by refiguring the reified relationship between theory and practice.(p.170)

In contrast to the concept of method, post-method pedagogy does not have the commonly-referred-to limitations as it is not an alternative method but "an alternative to method" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p. 32). Post-method pedagogy puts the teacher at the center of language learning and teaching and values his/her beliefs, experiences and knowledge. The value given to teachers should be appreciated because it is the teachers who know their learners and the classroom context best.

Teachers are considered as great sources as a result of their experience in the past as students, past experience of teaching, knowledge of one or more methods gained throughout their training as teachers, knowledge of other teachers' actions and opinions and their experience as parents or caretakers (Prabhu, 1990). Therefore, post-method teachers are encouraged to develop and create their own methods as they gain experience based on their classroom context and knowledge of other methods and approaches. As a result, the constructed method reflects teachers' beliefs, values and experiences (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In this sense, post-method teachers are autonomous, analysts, strategic researchers and decision-makers. Such teachers are also reflective as they observe their teaching, evaluate the results, identify problems, find solutions, and try new techniques. Based on this, there is a movement from "science-research conceptions" towards "art-craft conception of teaching" (Arikan, 2006, p. 4) as well as a shift from top-down process to bottom-up process as teachers "theorize what they practice or practice what they theorize" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p.

37). One should notice that post-method does not disregard the knowledge of existing methods and approaches because these methods make you aware of your beliefs and principles and provide inexperienced teachers with some valuable initial knowledge (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

This dramatic shift and change from the method era to post-method era indicates a shift from a positivist-oriented perspective to a constructivist-oriented one and "a shift from transmission, product-oriented theories to constructivist, process-oriented theories of learning, teaching, and teacher learning" has been particularly conspicuous (Crandall, 2000, pp. 34-35). Brown (2000) maintains that constructivism sprang into being as a dominant paradigm only in the last part of the twentieth century. Similarly, he points out that constructivists conceive of reality as socially-constructed and it is now an accepted practice to hold various constructions of knowledge. Thus, this new conception of knowledge puts the act of learning in an entirely different context. As Cunningham (2001) explains, "constructivism views learning as an active process where learners reflect upon their current and past knowledge and experiences to generate new ideas and concepts" (p. 2). As a consequence, "a shift to a constructivist perspective of teaching and teacher learning makes teachers a primary source of knowledge about teaching" (Crandall, 2000, p. 35), and this, in turn, has paved the road for democratic approaches of teaching to come to the fore. As Akbari (2005) puts it, new avenues are being probed and language teaching is no longer seen as a mere technocratic enterprise. He sums it up "the shift in paradigm is due to the change of scope observed in modern language teaching literature and a concern for disciplines and issues previously regarded as irrelevant by both practitioners and theoreticians" (p. 14).

Apparently such a dramatic shift is bound to have some ramifications. As Akbari (2005) and Pica (2000) explicate the post method condition is typical of such transitions and is one of the concepts that echo the above-mentioned changes in language teaching. The recurring discontent with the notion of method and the technicist model of teacher education gave rise to post-method (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). The top-down criticism leveled against the *bogeyman* of method entails its being too prescriptive in the sense that teachers don't seem to have any voice in what to teach and how to teach it. And this is equally true about the roles of teachers and learners (Crandall, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Pennycook, 1989; Richards and Rodgers, 2002). In comparison with the traditional teacher education which "views teachers as passive recipients of transmitted knowledge rather than active participants in the construction of meaning … and which does not take into account the thinking or decision-making of teachers" (Crandall, 2000, p. 35), the post-method condition is a practice-driven construct which calls into question the traditional conceptualization of teachers as a channel of received knowledge (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2003a); it raises serious questions regarding the traditional dichotomy 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 this era "it is teachers who have to act as

mediators between theory and practice, between the domain of disciplinary research and pedagogy" (Widdowson, 1990, p. 22). As Kumaravadivelu (2001) holds all pedagogy is a politically-charged process in which particularity is embedded in active awareness of local conditions. Within the pedagogy of particularity as one of the constituents of the post-method debate, teachers are entrusted with "observing their teaching acts, evaluating their outcomes, identifying problems, finding solutions, and trying them out to see once again what works and what does not" (p. 539). In fact, teacher autonomy is a key component of post-method in a way that "it can be seen as defining the heart of post-method pedagogy" (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 548). To summarize, and borrowing on Akbari (2005):

> The post-method 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 libratory move which gives teachers more autonomy and confidence in the decisions they make in their classes. (p. 5)

In a nutshell, within this framework teachers play a pivotal role in language classes and the exponential increase and eagerness in taking teachers into account as the focal point of education is manifest in the strikingly increasing number of journal articles dealing with language teacher education (Clarke, 1994). Since post-method problematizes the traditional concept of method, there is a need for alternatives that can help teachers materialize the objectives set by post-method.

The post-method pedagogy is characterized by leaving methods-only arguments to find effective strategies to teach in the most appropriate and effective way while considering the practitioner's views and roles in preparing and teaching language materials. Hence, according to the general perception of this era, instead of looking for which language teaching method is the best to follow, the language teacher must find the most effective strategies and techniques to enrich her or his teaching repertoire. This understanding of the individual journey of the language teacher has grown in contrast to the mainstream and widespread model of language teacher education programs which were characterized by imposing methodological concerns rather than inviting the individual language teacher to find her or his way to best teaching practices.

The post-method pedagogy as proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2006) talks about three types of parameters or principles: *The Parameter of Particularity*, *The Parameter of Practicality* and *The Parameter of Possibility*.

As far as the parameter of particularity is concerned, post-method pedagogy emphasizes the key aspect of local context or what Kumaravadivelu calls "situational understanding" (p.171). From the perspective of this parameter, L2 policy makers and administrators will pay attention to local contingencies and, most probably, make do with whatever is amenable to teaching effectiveness.

With regard to the parameter of practicality, post-method pedagogy suggests that, rather than being overly concerned about what outside experts have to say regarding

teaching efficacy, local teachers should themselves begin to seek avenues that will help them teach and their students learn in a most successful way. They are not supposed to follow in the footsteps of any teaching "gurus". In the words of Kumaravadivelu:

> [t]he parameter of practicality, then, focuses on teachers' reflection and action, which are also based on their insights and intuition. Through prior and ongoing experience with learning and teaching, teachers gather an unexplained and sometimes explainable awareness of what constitutes good teaching. (p.173)

Parameter of possibility aims at providing a more comprehensive context for language teaching in terms of its social engagement and political accountability. From this perspective, post-method pedagogy considers L2 teaching and learning not as grasping new linguistic and cultural knowledge but as a site of struggling between the old and new identities for teachers and learners alike. That is to say, L2 teaching is seen more as a tool to help learners come to grips with their own identity and as a vehicle to explore other peoples and cultures. This parameter of possibility enables L2 learners to adopt a critical mindset towards their L2 learning experiences. In other words, an L2 they are attempting to acquire will be not just a new linguistic experience but, more importantly, a new lens through which to appreciate the world out there and the world inside, hence the global and local becoming part and parcel of the whole L2 experience.

As Kumaravadivelu (2006) maintains, there seems to be a shift toward a post-method era that defines a new relationship between teachers and theorizers, which is pushing teachers towards the world of skills, knowledge, and autonomy. Through empowerment and pedagogical insights gained, teachers are able to theorize based on their practice and practice theories. As a result, some renewed attempts are being made to explore new educational patterns in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). In this line, the relationship between post-method and reflection might be illuminating as far as language teacher education program is concerned. To accomplish the purpose of the current study, the following research question was formulated:

- Is there any relationship between the extent to which Iranian EFL teachers show willingness and conformity to principles of post-method pedagogy and the degree of their reflection?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants for the purpose of this study were 648 practicing English language teachers in Iran with different ages, genders, and educational backgrounds and teaching experience. In fact, the instruments were distributed to the sample of practicing English language teachers at different institutes, schools, and centers of higher education in Tehran, Karaj, Kermanshah, Sanandaj, Isfahan, Mashhad, Shiraz and Tabriz. Both face to face methods and emails were used for instrument distribution. Upon close inspection of the completed questionnaires, a number of the completed instruments were

discarded since they were either incomplete or carelessly completed (for example those questionnaires in which one response was systematically selected).

Instruments

Reflection

Reflective Teacher Instrument was developed by Akbari et al, (2010). This instrument is a questionnaire consisting of 29 items in the form of Likert scale. It was developed based on a five component model of second language (L2) teacher reflection, encompassing practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, and critical reflection, was triangulated with experts' opinion and a comprehensive review of the related literature.

Post-method

In order to measure the willingness and conformity of Iranian EFL teachers to post-method pedagogy, a questionnaire was developed and validated. In so doing, the three components of practicality, particularity and possibility as proposed by Kumaravadivelu were identified after (1) undertaking a comprehensive review of the literature on post-method pedagogy and (2) consulting the domain experts and practicing language teachers. Then, a draft version of post-method questionnaire consisting of 42 items was first piloted with 41 Iranian EFL teachers, after which the items were reduced to 40 items. The 40-item questionnaire was administered to 255 English teachers and the obtained data were submitted to exploratory factor analysis. The results showed that the questionnaire consists of a three-factor structure with 29 items (see Appendix I). Then the groupings of items being clustered together under the same factor were studied carefully to find out if there was any commonality among them and whether items grouped together could create new underlying construct for post-method pedagogy. After examining the factor loadings and finding the communalities between different items loading on the same factor, the resulting three factors were labeled as: *Teacher sense of social justice*, *Teacher autonomy*, and *Teacher sense of academic enthusiasm*. The subsequent confirmatory factor analysis of the data from another 648 Iranian EFL teachers indicated that the three-factor structure of the questionnaire can be statistically verified, meaning that the questionnaire's detected factor structure was not the result of random variance in the learners' responses.

Procedure

In order to measure the degree of go-togetherness between the participants' conformity and willingness to post-method and their level of reflection in teaching, the two instruments of post-method pedagogy and teachers' reflection were simultaneously administered to the participants of the study. In other words, in addition to the post-method pedagogy questionnaire, each participant also filled out and returned to the researcher the reflective teaching instrument. Moreover, the necessary instruction regarding how to fill each questionnaire was given before completing it by the respondents.

Data Analysis

Scores from each of the instruments were computed and entered into SPSS version 20. First, normality of the distributions was examined using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. After that, a correlational design using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to answer the research question of the study.

RESULTS

In order to investigate the research question of the study, first the normality of distribution for the scores was investigated. To check the normality assumption, one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was conducted on both post-method and reflection scores. In one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test, if the significance level is larger than .05, it shows that the data are normally distributed. As it is indicated in Table 1, the results of one-sample K-S test revealed that the data was normally distributed.

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Post-method	Reflection
N		648	648
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	99.5046	82.6182
	Std. Deviation	32.47503	27.37185
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.050	.021
	Positive	.034	.094
	Negative	-.050	-.012
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.284	1.446
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.074	.190

Then, to answer the research question of the study, correlation analysis was carried out between the validated instrument of post-method pedagogy (see Appendix I for the validated post-method pedagogy instrument) and the reflective teaching instrument developed by Akbari et al. (2010). However, before conducting this analysis, descriptive statistics and Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha reliability analysis were calculated on the data from the 648 reflective teaching instruments. The results of these descriptive analyses proved satisfactory and did not indicate any abnormality in the mean, standard deviation, and normality of distribution of the data. The reliability of the sum scale was also calculated to be 0.892, which is a very strong reliability index (see Table 2).

Table 2. Reliability Index of the Reflective Teaching Instrument

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.892	29

Afterwards, correlation analysis was carried out between the post-method pedagogy and reflective teaching instruments. Table 3 shows, the obtained P-value for this analysis was 0.01 which proves significant (P-value < 0.05). Thus, it can be argued that the two instruments, and by extension post-method pedagogy and reflection are inter-

related. In other words, the statistical analyses proved that the post-method attitudes of English language teachers correlates with their reflection in teaching, and vice versa. As Table 3 shows, the Pearson Correlation Index for the two instruments is 0.65, which indicates a relatively good degree of go-togetherness.

Table 3. Correlation between Post-method and Reflective Teaching Instruments

		Post-method Pedagogy	Reflection
Post-method Pedagogy	Pearson Correlation	1	0.65**
Reflection	Pearson Correlation	0.65**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The reason for the relatively good correlation between post-method attitude and reflection can be the relative proximity and similarity of constructs that exist between the two instruments. The post-method pedagogy was validated according to the three constructs of *teacher sense of social justice*, *teacher autonomy*, and *teacher sense of academic enthusiasm*. Teacher Reflectivity instrument has been designed based on five factors including *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, *affective*, *practical*, and *critical*. These five elements of teacher reflection can be related to the three post-method components in terms of the nature and the domain of the constructs.

Critical element of reflection instrument that refers to the socio-political aspects of pedagogy and reflections upon those deals with teachers' reflecting on the political significance of their practice and introducing topics related to race, gender and social class, and exploring ways for student empowerment (Bartlett ,1997; Day, 1993; Jay and Johnson, 2002; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). The nature and the domain of this construct corresponds to the domain and nature of *teacher sense of social justice* in post-method questionnaire, both of which incorporate critical pedagogy into language education.

Learner element (Affective) of the reflection instrument which is concerned with a teacher's reflecting on his/her students, how they are learning and how learners respond or act emotionally in their classes is somehow in line with particularity principle of post-method and the key notion of principled pragmatism. In post-method pedagogy, the teacher should recognize that fact that the students are unique and they should be taught in a unique manner. This gives the teacher the *sense of autonomy* to make instantaneous decisions based on the characteristics of his or her learners.

The other element of reflection instrument is cognitive element which is concerned with teachers' attempts aimed at professional development. Conducting small-scale classroom research projects, attending conferences and workshops related to one's field of study, and reading the professional literature are among the behaviors included in this domain (Farrell, 2004; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Obviously, this element is similar to the *teacher sense of academic enthusiasm* in the post-method instrument.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possible relationship between the extent to which Iranian EFL teachers show willingness and conformity to principles of post-method pedagogy and the degree of their reflection. The result of the data analysis carried out on the collected instruments of post-method pedagogy and reflective teaching showed a meaningful positive relationship between the post-method attitudes of the participating English language teachers and their reflection in teaching. The findings of the current study substantiated the compatibility and congruence of post-method and reflection. This might confirm the commonly used argument put forth by numerous scholars that the emergence of reflective teaching in ELT can be viewed as one of the consequences of the post-method debate (Prabhu, 1990; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). The assertion was that during the method era, the methods were not only the frameworks for language teaching but they were also models and points of reference for teacher training and teacher education.

For example, during Audiolingual method, Audiolingualism served also as a model or framework for training teachers. Then with the demise of the method and with the emergence of this so-called *post-method pedagogy*, the teachers were left alone. The method no longer existed to be adhered to as the framework for teacher education. This issue created a crisis and a gap in teacher education program. Afterwards, some scholars in applied linguistics borrowed the concept of *reflective teaching* from the mainstream education. Reflection was claimed to be able to compensate for the crisis created by post-method pedagogy. Language teachers were encouraged to engage in reflection practices through the use of journals, diaries, and discussion of their daily classroom achievements and failures. From this perspective, 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" (Braun & Crumpler, 2004, p. 61). In other words, it can be argued that both post-method and reflective debates are inextricable intertwined and interdependent both of which call for the emancipation of teachers from constraints and limitations imposed by the method and environmental variables and advocate the individual, informed decision of teachers triggered by reflection and reflective practices.

The findings of the study might offer some theoretical and practical implications as far as teacher education program is concerned. The findings might support the legitimacy and relevance of reflective teaching in this so-called post-method era. This study employed questionnaires as the instruments for data collection. However, questionnaires have some serious limitations, and some of these have led certain researchers have questioned the validity and reliability of data gathered by questionnaires.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R. (2005). 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*, 2, 192-207.

Akbari, R. (2008). Post-method 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*, 211-227.

Allwright, R. L. (1991). *The death of the method (Working Papers No. 10)*. Lancaster, England: The University of Lancaster, The Exploratory Practice Center.

Bartlett, L. (1997). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 202-214). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, D. (2003). Method and post-method: Are they really incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*, 325-336.

Bell, D. (2007). Do teachers think that methods are dead? *ELT Journal, 61,* 135–143.

Block, D. (2001). An exploration of the art and science debate in language education. In M. Bax & J.-W. Zwart (Eds.), *Reflections on language and language learning: In honour of Arthur van Essen* (pp. 63–74). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. (2ⁿᵈed.). NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

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* (9–18). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5thEd) NY: Pearson Education.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carlson, M. (2004). A critical look at the construction of power between applied linguistics and critical applied linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 167–184.

Clark, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth .*Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 947-967.

Clarke, M. A. (1994). The Dysfunctions of the Theory/Practice Discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 1, 10-27.

Crandall, J. A. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *20*, 34-55.

Cunningham, F. M. (2001). Reflecting Teaching Practice in Adult ESL Settings. *ERIC Digest*, 1-7.

Day, C. (1993). Reflection: A necessary but not sufficient condition for teacher development. *British Educational Research Journal, 19*(1), 83-93.

Dewey, J., (1933/1993). *How we think: a re-statement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process.* DC. Heath, & Co, Boston.

Farrell, T. (2004). *Reflective practice in action: 80 reflection breaks for busy teachers.* California: Corwin Press.

Fat'hi, J., & Behzadpour, F. (2011). Beyond Method: The Rise of Reflective Teaching. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *1*(2), 241-251.

Griffiths, V. (2000). The reflective dimension in teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 33,* 539-555.

Harklau, L. (2005). Ethnography and ethnographic research on second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 179–194). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hillier, Y. (2005). *Reflective teaching in further and adult education.* London: Continuum.

Hutcheon, L. (1989). *The politics of postmodernism.* London: Routledge.

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L., (2002). Capturing complexity: a typology of reflective practice for teacher education.*Teaching and Teacher Education, 18,* 73–85.

Johnson, K. E. (2000). Teacher education. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1999).*Encyclopaedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Johnson, L. E., & Reiman, A. J. (2007). Beginning Teacher Disposition: Examining the Moral/Ethical Domain. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*, 676-687.

Johnston, B. (1997). Do EFL teachers have careers? *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 681–712.

Kachru, B. (2005). Teaching and learning World Englishes. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 155–172). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Khatib, M., & Fat'hi, J. (2012). Post-method pedagogy and ELT teachers. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, *2* (2), 22-29.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1992). Macrostrategies for the second/foreign language teacher. *Modern Language Journal*, *76*, 41–49.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal*, *47*, 12–21.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The Post-method Condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(1), 27-48.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*, 453 – 484.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a post-method pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(4), 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003a). Critical language pedagogy: a post-method perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, *22*(4), 539-550.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003b). *Beyond methods: macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven, C. T.: Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). In defence of post-method*. ILI Language Teaching Journal*, *1*(1), 15-19.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006a). *Understanding language teaching: from method to post-method*. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006b). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59-81.

Larson-Freeman, D. (2005a).A critical analysis of post-method. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, *1*(1), 21-25.

Larson-Freeman, D. (2005b).On the appropriateness of language teaching methods in language and development. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, *1* (2), 1-14.

Liu, D. (1995). Comments on B. Kumaravadivelu's "The post-method condition: (E) merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching": "Alternative to" or "addition to "method? *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 174-177.

Luke, A. (1988). *Literacy, textbooks, and ideology*. London, England: Falmer.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *23*(4), 589-612.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

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

Phillipson, R. (2003). *English-Only Europe? Challenging language policy.* London: Routledge.

Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *System*, *28*, 1-18.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method-why? *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*(2), 161-176.

Prabhu, N. S. (1992). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2000). *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2003b). Communicative Language Teaching Today .

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, K. (2003a). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL.* Hampshire, England: McMillan.

Stern, H. H. (1985). [Review of the book Methods that work: A smorgasbord of ideas for language teachers]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *7*, 249–251.

Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Toolan, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Tudor, I. (2003). Learning to live with complexity: Towards an ecological perspective on language teaching. *System, 31,* 1–12.

Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: a reflective approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: an introduction.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.

APPENDIX

Post-method Survey

Name: ………………… Gender: ……………… Degree/ certificate: ………………

Teaching context: school/ institute ……………… (Please mention the name)

Years of teaching experience: ………………

Dear respondent: This questionnaire is devised with the aim of looking into your perceptions as a teacher about _post-method pedagogy_. To that end, your careful completion of the questionnaire will definitely contribute to obtaining real data which is crucial for more accurate findings. The information will be kept confidential and will be used just for research purposes. Thank you very much in advance for your time and cooperation.

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel I lack the knowledge and skill to construct my own theory of practice in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I think dialogues and topics based on learners' real experiences can help them develop their critical thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I try to use authentic teaching materials which are based on the local culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I rarely participate in workshops/conferences related to language teaching/learning issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have my own personal conceptualization of how my teaching leads to desired learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The materials which I use in my classes are chosen for the most part by me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I share my classroom experiences with my colleagues and ask for their advice /feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
In my teaching, I use my own methodology, guidelines, strategies and procedures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I reflect to explore what works and what does not work with a particular group of learners in a particular context.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I believe the knowledge about how to teach cannot be found in the books but the teacher himself/herself should, based on the context, generate such knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I try to relate what is happening in the classroom to what is taking place in the world outside the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I think the teacher is not supposed to help students bring about change in their lives in overcoming poverty, social and gender discrimination.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I read books/articles related to effective language teaching to improve my classroom performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I try to include issues of social injustice, poverty and discrimination as part of my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I look for ways to create opportunities for teachers like myself to have their voices through journals and conferences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I pay attention to the specific needs of my students in their specific context.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have the freedom to be creative in my teaching approach.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements.	1	2	3	4	5	6

I am not sensitive to the local educational, institutional and social contexts in which I am teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I rarely carry out classroom research to find local solutions to my students' local problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I try to relate the abstract theories to my own practice in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I write down significant aspects of my teaching in a journal as a source of teaching ideas and research.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have the authority in language teaching and use my personal judgment in making pedagogical decisions in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I employ different methods and different materials in my different classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am not willing to know about the lives of my students and use their life experiences in my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I try to test, interpret, and judge the usefulness of professional theories proposed by experts in the field of language teaching.	1	2	3	4	5	6
As a teacher, I am always thinking about how to develop my language teaching knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I don't try to create a sense of critical thinking towards social and political issues in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I believe in a location-specific pedagogy that is based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities of the language learner.	1	2	3	4	5	6