

TEFL IN THE POST METHOD ERA

Klicheva Nafisa Toshevna
English Teacher

Abstract. This study aims to review the implementation of steps in teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) from a post method point of view. The research is an analytical study using a literature review approach to describe the results and to draw conclusions. The results of the literature analysis show that basically there is no fundamental theoretical difference between the method and post method. Regarding the implementation of teaching English from the post method point of view, there is no fundamental difference found in the steps of teaching English in methods that existed before the era of the post method. Therefore, the energy of debate between proponents of method and post method can be directed to find the best and appropriate steps in teaching English to students.

Keywords: TEFL, Post Method Era.

Introduction

The theory of teaching second and foreign languages has long been studied by teaching experts and is still a hot debate among them. The term method was first introduced by Edward Anthony in 1963 when he proposed three different kinds of concepts in teaching a foreign language, i.e. approach, methods, and technique (Purwoko, 2010; Soto, 2014; Tasnimi, 2014) which are considered as a hierarchy. Anthony emphasizes that the source of practice and principles in teaching foreign languages is the approach. Plans in teaching foreign language material based on the approach chosen are called a method, while techniques are certain strategies or procedures used to achieve goals. Then these three concepts were modified by Richards and Rodgers (1982) and the sequence changed to approach design and procedure. Then, the method is used as a philosophical concept covering approach, design, and procedure (Purwoko, 2010; Tasnimi, 2014). 52 saga, Vol.3(1), February 2022 This debate continues when Prabhu (1990) in line with what Richards and Rodgers expressed (1982), states that the method is a class activity and the theory that underlies it. Then Bell (2003) distinguishes between methods with “m” and Methods with “M”. The former (method) shows the practices in the class, while the latter (Method) refers to a set of practices in the class that are already standard which is considered as a reference and cannot be changed or modified (Tasnimi, 2014). The debate heated up in the 1990s to 2000s when Kumaravadivelu (1994) and followed by Richards and Rodgers (2001) issued a new concept that spoke of the post method era. Looking back to the history of criticism of teaching methods, it has started since the 1960s. Many

experts, such as Allwright (1991), Kelly (1969), Kumaravadivelu (2006), Mackey (1965), Pennycook (1989), Prabhu (1990), and Stern (1983) have criticized and doubted the existence of methods of teaching language. However, the post method era terminology (post method condition) was first used by Kumaravadivelu (1994). In response to the post-method concept, experts mostly criticize his statement that the method is dead. One of those who criticize the most was Bell (2007) who states that in the minds of teachers, methods never die as also cited by Shakouri (2012). This claim is supported by Hall (2011). He states that teachers cannot be completely free of choosing the way they teach since they are influenced by social conventions, student expectations, and school policies, especially about how to teach and what methodologies to use. Furthermore, Hashemi (2011) also states that the post method concept without methods is just a theory. It cannot be implemented without practices. In other words, it is just a way of thinking, not a way of acting. In addition, Vishwanathan (2014) also says the same thing in the conclusion of his research. It is premature to say that methods no longer exist, even though they exist by themselves when teachers need structured support to communicate with their students. Even Mozayan (2015) emphasizes again that the idea of a method does not seem to be completely lost. However, if deeply examined, these scientists do not disagree with all of Kumaravadivelu's (1994) post method concepts. Rather than that, they provide critiques of existing post method concepts and provide their own views on the concept of the post method era as did Richards and Rodgers (2001). This research uses a literature review approach to describe the results and draw conclusions. Results and conclusions are made based on the references read by the authors. Sugiyono (2012) provides a definition of literature study as a theoretical study related to activities to collect information relevant to research topics through books, scientific papers, theses, dissertations, encyclopedias, the internet, and other sources. There are 18 sources of relevant information to the topic of this research consisting of books, journals, and internet sources used by the author to explain the results and conclusions of this research.

The findings of this study are presented in three sessions covering different concepts of approach and methods from the standpoint of post method principles of foreign language teaching in the post method era, the implementation of the principles post method in foreign language teaching, and classroom practice view.

The debate between supporters of the method and the post-method era is common in academia. However, being trapped in endless debates and differences of opinion will certainly not be of any benefit to the development of the world of foreign or second language teaching. Therefore, one thing that practitioners and theorists should be aware of, namely both method and post-method aims to make learning a foreign or second language more enjoyable for students, especially in English majors

in improving their communication skills according to the required context. From that, it can be concluded that there is no inappropriate method if the method is used according to its specific context in learning.

References

1. Allwright, D. (1991). The death of the method. CRILE Working Paper 10. Centre for Research in Education, University of Lancaster . Bell, D. M. (2003).
2. Method and post method: Are they really so incompatible? TESOL Quarterly, 37(2), 325–336. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3588507> Bell, D. M. (2007). Do teachers think that methods are dead? ELT Journal, 61(2). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228811090_Do_teachers_think_that_methods_are_dead
3. Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the postmethod era: Toward better diagnosis, Treatment, and Assessment.
4. In J. C. Richard & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), Methodology in language teaching. Cambridge University Press. Drożdżał-Szelest, K. (2013). Methods in language teaching: Do we still need them? In K. Drożdżał-Szelest & P. Mirosław (Eds.), Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspective on second language learning and teaching. Springer. Ellis, R. (1991).
5. Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford University Press. Fat'hi, J., & Khatib, M. (2012). Postmethod pedagogy and ELT teacher. Journal of Academic and Applied Studies, 2. Hall, G. (2011). Exploring English language teaching: Language in action.
6. Routledge. Hashemi, S. M. R. (2011). Postmethodism: Possibility of the impossible? Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2(1). <https://doi.org/doi:10.4304/jltr.2.1.137-145> Kelly, L. (1969). 25 centuries of language teaching.
7. Newbury House. Kharaghani, N. (2013). Learner autonomy and language curriculum development in the postmethod era. The Global Summit on Education.