



POSTMETHOD EDUCATION: ITS APPLICABILITY AND CHALLENGES IN IRAN

Parisa Naseri Kaimvand^{1†} --- Gholam Reza Hessamy² --- Fatemeh Hemmati³

¹Payame Noor University of Tehran, Shahnaz Alley, Mahmoud Nourian St., North Dibaji St., Tehran, Iran

^{2,3}Payame Noor University of Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

The present study endeavored to unveil the perception of Iranian EFL teachers on the applicability of postmethod, also the facilitative and deterrent factors in implementing it. To fulfill the purpose of this study, after selecting 23 male and female teachers, as the quantitative phase, a piloted questionnaire was distributed among them and the results were analyzed through Chi-Square, which showed that 36% of the respondents considered incorporating the parameter of particularity into their teaching practice as 'moderately important', and 18% regarded it as 'greatly important'. The data analysis of the importance of teacher's active involvement in postmethod procedure showed that 37% of the respondents considered this involvement 'moderately important', and 19% regarded it as 'very important'. Also, Descriptive analysis of the factor of possibility shows that 37% of the respondents considered following the parameter of possibility in their teaching 'rarely possible', and 18% regarded it as 'impossible'. Also, to fulfill the qualitative phase, the participants were interviewed by some standardized structured interview questions. The analysis of the results revealed that language center and supervisors are among the facilitative factors and time limitation and students' lack of interest are among the challenges.

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Keywords: Postmethod pedagogy, Challenges, Possibility, Applicability, Particularity, Iranian EFL teachers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Finding solutions to the problems in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) has facilitated constant movement and change from method to postmethod (PM), during the last two decades (Bell, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). Among the reasons behind this change was a gradual shift in the TESOL community's perception of the concept of method in that they began to realize that the method paradigm was not as helpful as it had long seemed to be (Mackey, 1965; Smith,

† Corresponding author

DOI: 10.18488/journal.1/2016.6.1/1.1.21.34

ISSN(e): 2224-4441/ISSN(p): 2226-5139

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

1970; Stern, 1985; Prabhu, 1990; Rivers, 1991). As a consequence of repeatedly articulated dissatisfaction with the limitations of method, the L2 profession encountered an imperative need to go beyond these limitations and present an alternative which came to be called postmethod.

Pennycook (1989) defines postmethod as a reaction to the dominance of interested knowledge in the area of second language education. It is linked to power and dominance with the purpose of reducing and rectifying social inequalities. Kumaravadivelu (2006) defines postmethod based on three factors: a search for an alternative to method instead of the search for alternative method, focus on the teacher's role as an autonomous practitioner, and an attempt at accounting for principled pragmatism. On the whole since postmethod can be referred as shift of paradigm in the world and Iranian teaching context, in comparison with the global context, lacks implementing new paradigms, this topic can be in the center of the attention of many Iranian teachers who always want to use up-to-date methods and techniques in their classrooms.

As Akbari (2008) points out, what postmethod pedagogy requires for its progress at this point may be vague and hidden in the classrooms of the countries like Iran. The concept of method still remains strong in the literature, and Teaching Methods classes and method-based teacher training are a tradition in raising ELT teachers in most of the institutional curricula (Bell, 2003). Therefore, to help implementing the postmethod, policy makers' and practitioners' awareness of the existing challenges and opportunities should be raised. One of the most effective ways in which this awareness can be enhanced is through conducting research in the local context where postmethod can be practiced. This study would be able to contribute to raising the awareness of TESOL community in Iran of postmethod, in general, and their understanding of the present barriers and facilitating factors for its practice, in particular, through providing insights based on empirical data. Hopefully, this heightened awareness will pave the way for effective and locally appropriate implementation of postmethod principles in the context of EFL institutes in Iran.

In order to facilitate the process of implementing postmethod in L2 education in Iran, there should be an in-depth understanding of the status quo and the extent to which the dominant approach to ELT is in line with and welcoming to the promises and principles of postmethod. The second benefit of the present study is that it helps deepen and expand this understanding on the part of EFL Iranian teachers, teacher educators, and policy makers. It will do so through shedding light on the ways in which teachers' voices are incorporated into or removed from policies and decisions of English instruction in Iranian institutes, and how they are provided with or deprived of opportunities for reflection on their professional activities in teacher education programs as student teachers and in classroom as teachers. By way of summary, the significance of this study lies in the fact that it heightens the stake-holders' awareness of barriers and opportunities involved in implementation of postmethod in Iranian EFL context as well as how the status quo in this context may contribute to facilitation or hindrance of its implementation.

The overarching purpose of this study was to reveal the perception of Iranian EFL teachers on the applicability of postmethod, also the facilitative and deterrent factors in implementing postmethod. Therefore, the present study endeavored to investigate and analyze the Iranian EFL teachers' approach regarding implementing postmethod techniques in their classes.

1.1. Research Questions

With conducting the present research study the following questions are bound to be answered:

- a. What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of applicability of the postmethod underlying parameters of practicality, particularity, and possibility in their teaching practice?
- b. What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of teacher active involvement in learning to teach?
- c. What factors facilitate the practice of postmethod in EFL institutes in Iran from EFL teachers' perspective?
- d. What are the challenges involved in practicing postmethod in EFL institutes in Iran from EFL teachers' perspective?

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants and Setting

A. Qualitative Phase: The Interviews with EFL Teachers

Twenty three EFL teachers, teaching in 16 language centers in Isfahan, Tehran, and Mashhad, were chosen through convenience data sampling. Thirteen of the language teachers were female and 11 were male. Their age range was between 19 and 42 years old, and their teaching experience ranged from three to 15 years. Twenty of the participants had graduate degrees in TEFL, English translation, or English literature and the rest had undergraduate degrees.

2.2. Instrumentation

Since structured interviews consist of rigorous sets of questions that do not allow one to divert (Braun and Clarke, 2006) a semi-structured interview was utilized for data collection in this part of the study. The interview questions were open, allowing new ideas to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewees said which provided the researcher with the chance of collecting rich data. The questions were developed in two versions of Persian and English, and the participants were free to choose the language of the interview. The researcher provided the option of the first language so that the interviewees would feel relaxed and, therefore, would focus on the content rather than the language of their answers to the interview questions.

Based on a review of the literature on second language teacher education and postmethod, eight questions were developed focusing on factors which facilitate or hinder practicing the postmethod. The first draft of the interview questions was reviewed by three experienced researchers who had published qualitative research in the areas of teacher education and critical pedagogy. Then the questions were piloted with three participants and further changes were incorporated, including omissions, additions, modification of content or wording, and making questions less leading. In the rest of this part, the different sets of interview items are presented, and the theoretical rationales behind the questions are presented.

1. Have you ever attended a teacher training course? If yes, please explain the course and a typical session of it.
2. How long (how many days and hours each day) was the course?
3. What were the main topics and issues focused on in the course? Give examples please.

The first section of the interview consists of a screening question to see if the teacher who was approached could be the right participant (question 1), followed by an opening question which would encourage the teachers to talk about the training courses they had attended without the researcher's prompts, Question three and four focus on materials and ways of teaching in teacher training courses and the extent to which they are in line with a postmethod perspective.

4. What were the main activities and procedures followed in the course? How did the teacher educator teach those topics? Give examples please.

The literature on postmethod suggests a recent focus on challenges involved in implementation of this critical perspective in ELT as well as what can be done to facilitate the practice of postmethod (Bell, 2003; Akbari, 2008). To address this issue, the following research questions had been developed:

c. What factors facilitate the practice of postmethod in EFL institutes in Iran from EFL teachers' perspective?

d. What are the challenges involved in practicing postmethod in EFL institutes in Iran from EFL teachers' perspective?

To answer these questions, a part of the interview was allocated to a number of questions exploring teachers' perceptions of how possible it is to incorporate principles of postmethod into their classroom practice and what factors serve as catalysts for or hindrances to incorporation of a postmethod perspective into ELT policies and classroom practices where they teach. These questions focus on the degree to which it is possible for teachers to use alternative approaches and techniques of teaching introduced by others, act autonomously, adopt a reflective approach to teaching, factor contextual variables into their decisions, establish connections between classroom content and students' real life concerns, heighten learners' self-awareness and critical consciousness, and foster their own and their students' transformative potential as well as what factors affect their feasibility (Ennis, 1996; Kellner, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; 2006; Hawkins, 2004; Hawkins and Norton, 2009).

5. Can you apply experts' viewpoints in the classroom? How? Why?

5.1. What factors help you do so?

5.2. What are the challenges involved in doing so?

5.3. How useful is it to do so? To what extent do you think experts' views can help you with different aspects of your teaching?

6. Can you develop and follow your own ways of teaching? How?

6.1. What factors help you do so?

6.2. What are the challenges involved in doing so?

7. Are you as a teacher given the chance to consider the following issues into your decisions about your teaching style and class materials? How? If yes, what factors help you do so? What are the challenges involved in doing so?

7.1. Your students' particular language needs

7.2. Their purposes of learning English

7.3. Their cultural, linguistic, family, economic etc. background

7.4. Their individual features, e.g. learning styles and personality types

- 7.5. Their gender
 - 7.6. The sociocultural atmosphere of where you teach
 - 7.7. The teaching styles you personally prefer to follow and your personality type
8. Are you allowed to make changes in classroom materials or bring materials of your own choice to the class? If yes, how? What factors help you do so? What are the challenges involved in doing so?

2.3. Setting and Participants

B. Quantitative Phase: Questionnaires

The participants in the piloting and validation phases were 137 EFL teachers respectively. They were teaching in language centers in different cities of Iran, namely Isfahan, Mashhad, Tehran, Sari, Yazd, and Ahwaz. They came from different academic backgrounds, namely TEFL, English Translation, and English Literature with academic degrees ranging from B.A. to Ph.D. Not mention the fact that this questionnaire was used to answer the first and send questions of this research study:

- a. What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of applicability of the postmethod underlying parameters of practicality, particularity, and possibility in their teaching practice?
- b. What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of teacher active involvement in learning to teach?

2.4. Instruments

The questionnaire items were developed based on an in-depth review of literature on teacher education and postmethod. The first draft of each questionnaire was reviewed and commented on by three EFL teacher education experts. The content, wording, and order of some of the items were revised. Then, it was piloted with 137 participants. Item analysis and analysis of reliability were conducted, and, based on the results, further changes were made in the items. Afterward, the questionnaire was validated. The structure of the questionnaire is as follows.

The first section asks about participants' background. The questionnaire focused on teachers' perceptions of the applicability and importance of the teachers' active involvement in the process. The questions scale ranged from Not Important to Very Important, and Impossible to Very Possible.

2.5. Procedure

The following steps were gone through to collect data through distributing the questionnaire:

1. Selecting the participants through convenience sampling for interviews with EFL teachers
2. Developing and validating interview questions
3. Translating the questions into Farsi
4. Piloting and revising the interview questions and preparing final version of the interview questions
5. Conducting and recording the interview
6. Analyzing results of the interviews
7. Selecting the participants through convenience sampling for interviews with teacher trainers

8. Developing and validating the interview questions
9. Translating the interview questions into Farsi
10. Conducting the interviews with teacher trainers
11. Analyzing results of the interviews with teacher trainers
12. Selecting three teacher training courses through convenience sampling
13. Developing and validating the observation checklist
14. Doing three times of observation for each teacher training course and recording the observations
15. Analyzing results of the observations
16. Selecting the participants through convenience sampling for the questionnaires
17. Developing, piloting, validating and revising the interview questions
18. Distributing final version of the questionnaire through the participants
19. Using different statistical tests for data analysis such as: t-test for item discrimination and corrected item-total correlation, Principal Components Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation for validation of the questions, Chi-Square for analyzing the data in order to answer the research questions.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Teachers' and Teacher Educators' Perceptions of Facilitating Factors

3.1.1. Qualitative Report

Based on the interviewees' answers, there are factors which facilitate practice of postmethod in language institutes. The researcher categorized these factors based on Kumaravadivelu's parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility.

A few participants believed that some language centers pave the way for following postmethod through development of a context-sensitive pedagogy or what [Kumaravadivelu \(2001\)](#) called the principle of particularity. Instead of requiring teachers to follow a set of predetermined procedures and objectives, these participants believed, the centers encourage teachers to teach based on students' language needs, goals, and background. For instance, in Shokufeh's words "Supervisors of the center always suggest conducting needs analysis before starting the class". Teachers would conduct it in different ways. Teachers' informal talks with the students about their language needs in or out of class were mentioned as one such way, especially during the early sessions.

While not necessarily encouraged by language centers, teachers' perceptions of students' ability to understand their teachers' talk during the early sessions helped them conduct ongoing needs analysis during instruction. This would tell them how good their students were at comprehending aural input compared to written input.

In addition, some of the language centers would encourage the interviewed teachers to explore their students' language background in order to develop their syllabuses based on this information. Mohammad, for instance, was among the teachers who reported "All the teachers in the institute were asked to prepare a written report about their students' language background and purpose of language learning during the first sessions". Some of them kept these reports with themselves and some delivered them to the language centers where they were working. These teachers believed

that information about students' language background could be used to identify the context of language instruction effectively. In this regard, Nasim explained: "For example, knowing that how many English terms my students have passed, what English books they have studied, and what scores they received can help me choose appropriate materials and methods of teaching". Gaining an accurate and in-depth understanding of the context where one teaches lies at the heart of the principle of particularity and helps teachers take appropriate decisions and actions in their teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Analysis of the interviews with the teachers also revealed that a few of them would practice the principle of practicality in their teaching. For instance, a few of the participants talked about the benefits of applying second language experts' ideas in teaching. Of course, it is worth mentioning that their definitions of "language experts" were not necessarily the same. For example, some believed that language experts are authors of textbooks about language teaching. Some others referred to observers in language centers, heads of language centers, more experienced colleagues, or those who post comments on language teaching on the Internet as experts.

They believed that using experts' ideas and findings is useful only when they are at the service of developing teachers' personal teaching practices. Arman, for example said "I follow experts' ideas only when I can use them for solving problems in my class; otherwise, they're nonsense". Majid also reported "I think a teacher should develop their personal teaching method based on experts' guidelines, and this is the only point in which experts' ideas are useful". Generally the interviewees believed that acceptance of the language experts' ideas by itself would not be useful in their teaching if it does not facilitate their developing their own personal theories.

The interviewees suggested a number of reasons behind developing and following their own method of teaching rather than merely following experts' viewpoints. Arezoo, for instance, said "The main reason in this regard is teachers' personal interest in adding variety to their teaching".

The rest of the participants' explanations about the factors which facilitate postmethod practice were categorized under the parameter of possibility. Giving priority to sociocultural aspects of language teaching over the linguistic factors was one such factor. A few of the teachers believed in encouraging students to reflect and decode cultural and social denotations of the reading texts through critical thinking. They reasoned that focusing on the sociocultural aspects of language teaching and helping foster students' critical thinking skills would deepen and enrich their understanding of their surroundings which would help them become responsible citizens. Fatemeh, for instance, talked about how reflection on the concept of honesty in EFL classroom may help her students in their personal life: "Exploring positive effects of honesty in the society through group discussions encourages students to practice honesty in their personal lives. And this is very good and important for them. It is even more important than learning English". The teachers mentioned different ways of encouraging students to focus on these aspects. Laleh for instance said: "I encourage my students to challenge each other's ideas about social and cultural gaps in their first and second language". Most of the participants believed that classroom discussions in this regard were often useful in developing students' sociocultural awareness. Sharifeh, for instance, said "I always focus on introducing social and cultural aspects of L2 assigning interesting topics of discussion to different groups of students in my class".

The teachers mentioned different reasons behind their interest in developing students' sociocultural awareness. In some of the teachers' words, students' interest in developing their sociocultural awareness, availability of up to date materials, and use of real life materials from sources like the Internet or magazines were among the factors that motivated them to put more emphasis on this aspect of teaching. Ali, suggesting that his students were highly interested in having dialogs about events reflected in media around the world, said: "It is impossible to use up to date Internet sources like daily hot news of the country and the world and not do follow up discussions". Ahmad also said: "Students often enjoy expanding topics of the readings or listening in their class discussions. It seems they like to present their ideas and share their experiences".

The way some of the participants defined their roles as language teachers was another factor which encouraged them to follow the principle of possibility in their teaching. Some of the interviewees believed a teacher's main responsibility is helping students develop a better understanding of themselves and the world around them so that they can make appropriate decisions for their lives. In this regard, Ali said: "I am a teacher [stated emphatically] only when I help my students know themselves better". Nasim also believed: Now that I am labeled as a teacher, I have certain roles. The most important ones are developing sociocultural awareness of my students and helping them understand what is good and what is bad, and what are right or wrong choices.

3.2. Teachers' and Teacher Educators' Perceptions of Stifling Factors

3.2.1. Qualitative Report

In addition to the factors which facilitate postmethod practice, data analysis of the teachers' interviews also yielded some challenges in this regard, which the researcher categorized as teacher-related, student-related, and institutional. The literature suggests that language teachers' lack of autonomy for making decisions in their classes is one of the main limitations in the way of following postmethod (Holec, 1988).

The teachers' answers showed this to be true about the context where they taught. Some of the teachers believed that this lack of autonomy was partially rooted in their professional identity, since they believed it is not their duty to plan their teaching and decide about classroom management. Some of them like Ali believed "A language teacher is somebody who is coming to the class to teach English language not to decide about the way of teaching and handling the class.

These things should be decided on by the language center in advance". Some of them also did not want autonomy in teaching because they thought it would put extra responsibilities on their shoulders and make their job more difficult.

Arezo, for instance, said "it is good that I can't make personal decisions for my class because it takes the risk of making wrong decisions away from me". Mohammad also believed that "Performing predefined steps of teaching correctly is very difficult, risky, and time consuming. Why should I make it extra difficult through adding variety on my own?"

Based on the interviewees' ideas, another challenge in the way of practicing postmethod was students' lack of interest in following postmethodic strategies of learning, like sharing ideas and experiences in groups, making joint decisions for the class, and involvement in goal setting and

materials selection. Saeed, for instance, argued “most of the students feel more comfortable following traditional methods of learning rather than playing active roles in the class”. Considering this to be a result of learners’ past positive experiences with traditional teaching methods, Mansureh said “previously my students made some achievements with traditional methods of learning so they prefer to follow the same methods and they don’t want to experience new methods”.

Language centers were also believed to pose some challenges in the way of implementing postmethod in EFL classroom. Time limitation was one of the most common concerns mentioned by the teachers.

They believed limited time would deprive them of opportunities to focus on conducting critical tasks, such as analyzing texts critically, discussing social and cultural aspects of the materials, and taking students’ different needs into consideration in classroom decisions. Mohammad, for example, said “The time provided for us in each session is one hour and a half. I can’t put an effective teaching method into action in such a short period of time”.

Finally, prepackaged syllabuses and materials that language centers require teachers to follow was also mentioned by the interviewed teachers as another barrier in the way of following postmethod. The participants’ answers showed that this strict preplanning would take their freedom away and change them into robots that perform orders. Majid, for example, said “sometimes I feel like I am a robot because I have no freedom in the class”.

3.3. Teachers’ Perceptions of Feasibility of Practicing Postmethod Parameters in Their Teaching

3.3.1. Quantitative Analysis

As discussed above, the questionnaire which focused on the participants’ perceptions of the status quo of ELT in Iran was validated, and the factor analysis yielded three factors, each reflecting one parameter of postmethod, namely particularity, practicality, and possibility.

Through the first Likert scale, the respondents were asked to rate the extent to which it is possible to incorporate each of these parameters into their teaching practice on a scale of *Impossible*, *Rarely possible*, *Reasonably possible*, and *Very possible*. In this section, the results of analysis of this data are reported.

3.4. Parameter of Particularity

Descriptive analysis of the factor of particularity shows that 38% of the respondents considered following the parameter of particularity in their teaching ‘rarely possible’ within the context where they teach, and 14% regarded it as ‘impossible’.

Looking at the items grouped in this factor, we realize that this means half of the respondents believed that they were not provided with enough space for factoring their students’ personality types, language needs, learning styles, and social and cultural background and the wider sociocultural context into their decisions about classroom content and procedures (items 6-10, 12, and 14).

Table-1. Descriptive statistics related to the ‘perceived feasibility of practicing parameter of particularity’

How possible	Frequency	Percent
Rarely possible	131	38.32
Reasonably possible	109	31.78
Very possible	54	15.71
Impossible	47	13.87
Total	341	100%

To see if the differences between the categorical variables, here the descriptors of the Likert scale used for the questionnaire, are significant, the researcher performed Chi-square. The main value that was checked from the output was the first chi-square value, headed Pearson Chi-Square. In the table, the value was 79.715, with an associated significance level of .000. Since to be significant, the Sig. value needs to be .05 or smaller, and in this case, the value of .000 is less than the alpha value of .05, the result was significant, meaning that the respondents selecting ‘Rarely possible’ significantly outnumbered those selecting the other descriptors (see Table 2).

Table-2. Chi-square test for parameter of particularity

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	79.715 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	80.974	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	73.650	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1364		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5.
The minimum expected count is 85.25.

3.5. Parameter of Possibility

Descriptive analysis of the factor of possibility shows that 37% of the respondents considered following the parameter of possibility in their teaching ‘rarely possible’ within the context where they teach, and 18% regarded it as ‘impossible’.

Looking at the items grouped in this factor, we understand that 45% of the respondents believed there were not enough opportunities for them to involve students in making decisions about classroom content and procedures (items 1, 11, and 13) and contribute to their critical consciousness and enable them to identify social problems and develop solutions (items 16-19).

Table-3. Descriptive statistics related to ‘Frequency and percent with reference to encouraging teachers to foster learners’ autonomy and critical consciousness’

How possible	Frequency	Percent
Rarely possible	126	36.81
Reasonably possible	106	30.88
Impossible	63	18.47
Very possible	46	13.57
Total	341	100%

To check whether the difference between the categorical variables was significant, Chi-square was run (Table 4). The value of Pearson Chi-Square from the output was 64.543 with an associated

significance level of .000. Therefore, it was concluded that the result was significant, meaning that the participants who believed it is almost impossible to follow the parameter of possibility in their teaching practice significantly outnumbered the rest.

Table-4. Chi-square test for parameter of possibility

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.543 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	65.989	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	62.585	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1364		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5.
The minimum expected count is 85.25.

3.6. Parameter of Particularity

Descriptive analysis of the questionnaire data shows that 36% of the respondents considered incorporating the parameter of particularity into their teaching practice as ‘moderately important’, and 18% regarded it as ‘greatly important’.

Table-5. Descriptive statistics related to ‘Frequency and percent with reference to teachers’ active involvement in learning to teach’

How important	Frequency	Percent
Moderately important	122	35.58
Slightly important	107	31.45
Greatly important	61	17.80
Not at all important	51	14.87
Total	341	100%

To see if the difference between the categorical variables is significant, Chi-square was run (Table 6). The value of Pearson Chi-Square from the output was 56.066 with an associated significance level of .000. We can conclude that the result was significant, which means that the participants who believed it is relatively important to follow the postmethod parameter of particularity in their teaching significantly outnumbered the rest.

Table-6. Chi-square test for parameter of particularity

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	56.066 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	56.931	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	52.420	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1364		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 85.25.

3.7. Teacher Active Involvement in Learning to Teach

Descriptive analysis of the participants’ perceptions of how important it is to be actively involved in the process of learning to teach shows that 37% of the respondents considered this involvement ‘moderately important’, and 19% regarded it as ‘very important’.

To see if the difference between the categorical variables was significant, Chi-square was run (Table 8).

Table-7. Descriptive statistics related to ‘Frequency and percent with reference to teachers’ active involvement in learning to teach’

How important	Frequency	Percent
Moderately important	127	37.25
Slightly important	102	30.03
Greatly important	64	18.56
Not at all important	48	14.01
Total	341	100%

The value of Pearson Chi-Square from the output was 60.414 with an associated significance level of .000. This indicates that the result was significant, meaning that the participants who believed it is relatively important to have involvement in different aspects of teacher education programs they attend significantly outnumbered the rest.

Table-8. Chi-square test for teacher active involvement in learning to teach

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	60.414 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	61.239	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	59.096	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1364		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5.
The minimum expected count is 85.25.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study tried to reveal the perception of Iranian EFL teachers on the applicability of postmethod, also the facilitative and deterrent factors in implementing it and the results were discussed above. Not mention the fact that obtained data and results could be affected by the prejudice of some participants or not being honest in answering questions for any reasons they could have. There are some research studies conducted in Iran, which their results are in line with the results of the present study. For instance, Razmjoo *et al.* (2013) conducted a study to investigate the practicality of implementing postmethod in Iran and the findings showed that that there is a long distance to the actual manifestation of post-method principles, especially its possibility and practicality parameters.

Also Birjandi and Hashamdar (2014) did a survey to develop some micro-strategies for macro-strategies proposed by Kumaravadivelu’s post-method framework. While teaching Kumaravadivelu’s Post-method framework, the participants (English teachers) were requested to propose some micro-strategies for each macro-strategy. The micro-strategies should have met the criteria needed for Post-method language teaching in Iranian context. In their study, the researchers decided to propose the micro-strategies the students suggested with some modifications their suggestions needed. Therefore, English teachers can easily use these micro-strategies in English classes all over Iran.

5. CONCLUSION

All in all, having analyzed the obtained data, it could be concluded that regardless of how important scholars and theoreticians believe it is to practice postmethod, teachers' own beliefs play a significant role in preparing the ground for postmethod to be introduced into ELT curriculum. Also, descriptive analysis of the questionnaire data shows that 36% of the respondents considered incorporating the parameter of particularity into their teaching practice as 'moderately important', and 18% regarded it as 'greatly important'. It means that the participants who believed it is relatively important to follow the postmethod parameter of particularity in their teaching significantly outnumbered the rest. Also, descriptive analysis of the factor of possibility shows that 37% of the respondents considered following the parameter of possibility in their teaching 'rarely possible' within the context where they teach, and 18% regarded it as 'impossible'; it means that participants who believed it is almost impossible to follow the parameter of possibility in their teaching practice significantly outnumbered the rest.

The facilitative factors which help teachers are believed by some participants to language centers. These participants believed that the centers encourage teachers to teach based on students' language needs, goals, and background. In addition, some of the language centers would encourage the interviewed teachers to explore their students' language background in order to develop their syllabuses based on this information.

The challenges that participants revealed were Students' lack of interest in following postmethodic strategies of learning, like sharing ideas and experiences in groups, making joint decisions for the class, and involvement in goal setting and materials selection. Time limitation was one of the most common concerns mentioned by the teachers. Finally, prepackaged syllabuses and materials that language centers require teachers to follow was also mentioned by the interviewed teachers as another barrier in the way of following postmethod.

Finally, descriptive analysis of the participant's' perceptions of how important it is to be actively involved in the process of learning to teach shows that 37% of the respondents considered this involvement 'moderately important', and 19% regarded it as 'very important'.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to all the participants and supervisors in several cities of Iran, namely Isfahan, Mashhad, Tehran, Sari, Yazd, and Ahwaz, whose kind support paved the way for fulfillment of this research study.

7. CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

The paper's primary contribution is finding the perception of Iranian EFL teachers on the applicability of postmethod, also the facilitative and deterrent factors in implementing it. Also, this study is one of very few studies which have investigated implementing the postmethod, and policy makers' and practitioners' awareness of the existing challenges.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R., 2008. Postmethod discourse and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(3): 641–652.

- Bell, D.M., 2003. Method and postmethod: Are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2): 325-335.
- Birjandi, P. and M. Hashamdar, 2014. Micro-strategies of postmethod language teaching developed for Iranian EFL context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(9): 1875-1880.
- Braun, V. and V. Clarke, 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.
- Ennis, R.H., 1996. Critical thinking. *Argumentation*, 14(1): 48-51.
- Hawkins, M. and B. Norton, 2009. Critical language teacher education. In A. Burns and J. Richards (Eds.). *Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hawkins, M.R., 2004. Social apprenticeships through mediated learning in language teacher education. In Hawkins. M.R. (Eds.), 2010. *Language learning and teacher education: A sociocultural approach*. Multilingual matters. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Holec, H., 1988. *Autonomy and self-directed learning: Present fields of application*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Kellner, D., 2000. Multiple literacies and critical pedagogies. In P. Trifonas (Ed.). *Revolutionary pedagogies: Cultural politics, instituting education, and the discourse of theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B., 2001. Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4): 537-560.
- Kumaravadivelu, B., 2003. Critical language pedagogy: A postmethod perspective on english language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4): 539-550.
- Kumaravadivelu, B., 2006. TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1): 59-81.
- Mackey, W.F., 1965. *Language teaching analysis*. New York: Longman.
- Pennycook, A., 1989. The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(6): 589-618.
- Prabhu, N.S., 1990. There is no best method-why? *TESOL Quarterly*, 2(4): 161-176.
- Razmjoo, S.A., H. Ranjbar and H.M. Hoomanfar, 2013. On the familiarity of the Iranian EFL teachers and learners with postmethod and its realization. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 4(1): 1-12.
- Rivers, W., 1991. *Teaching foreign language skills*. 2nd Edn., New York: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, W.F., 1970. Language learning laboratory. *Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education*, 2(1): 191-237.
- Stern, H.H., 1985. Review of J. W. Oller and P. A. Richard-Amato's methods that work [Book Review]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(4): 249-251.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.