

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## Practice of ELT Methods, Approaches and Techniques in Higher Secondary Level Education in Nepal

**Keshab Kumar Sijali**

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education and Psychology, Mewar University, Rajasthan, India

### **Abstract:**

*The purpose of this study is to explore the practice of ELT methods, approaches and techniques in higher secondary level education in Nepal. The subject of this study comprises 579 among them 552 were grade 12 students from 22 higher secondary school of Bara district of Nepal in the academic year of 2015/6 and 27 were ELT teachers engaged in teaching +2level. The data obtained with the instrument of questionnaire were analyzed using mean and Mann-Whitney U-test of non-parametric test. The result showed that ELT teachers of higher secondary level education in Nepal were high practitioners of practicing traditional and ineffective grammar translation method, deductive approach and teacher-centered techniques.*

**Keywords:** Practice of ELT methods/approaches, practice of techniques, higher secondary level education

### **1. Introduction**

An approach is assumption and axiomatic in nature including the theory of language and language learning that gives the description of the nature of the subject matter to be taught (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). It is the philosophical level at which assumptions and beliefs about language and language learning are specified (Sharma, 2010). Method is an overall and systematic planning for the presentation of contents to be taught. A technique refers to the activity whatever a teacher actually does in the classroom. It carries out a method which adopts a particular approach. There is a substantial body of literature carried out in the effect of methods and techniques in the field of ELT. However, no research has been carried out in revealing the practice of ELT methods and techniques in context of higher secondary level education in Nepal especially in the marginalized area of Bara district. Hence, the purpose of this study is to accomplish the task of exploring the practice of ELT methods, approaches and techniques in the aforementioned area.

### **2. Literature Review**

#### *2.1. The Grammar Translation Method*

Grammar translation (GT) method, the “brainchild of German scholars” (Saraswathi, 2005, p. 65) like Johann Seidenstucker, Karl Plotz, H.S Ollendorf and Johann Meidinger, is known as different name as “bilingual method” (Mukalel, 2007, p. 45), “Prussian method” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 5) and “classical method” (Chastain, as cited in Freeman, 2000). Classical in the sense that “it was first used in the teaching of the classical languages Latin and Greek” (Newby, 2013, p. 287). It was initially called the “grammar method and later the translation method or reading method” (ibid, p. 287), which is a foreign language teaching method that “consists exclusively of the formal teaching of grammar and translation from and to the mother tongue of the learner” (Mukalel, 2007, p. 45). It was introduced in a reform of the German Secondary School system in the 1780s. This method dominated European and foreign language teaching for a century i.e. 1840s to the 1940s. It is still found to be widely accepted in teaching learning practice “in a modified form in some parts of the world today” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 6). According to Freeman (2000), this method was used earlier “for the purpose of helping students read and appreciate foreign language literature” (p. 11). It is used to teach foreign language with the reference of mother tongue of learners (Graham, 1997). According to this method, emphasis is given to conscious understanding of grammar and awareness of the connection between the L1 and target language (Cook, 2013). This means, after the conscious learning or memorization of the rules or grammatical system and vocabulary, the practice is conducted to translate L1 into second language and vice versa (Harmer, 2008; Ohmaye, 1988) Such process of translation in this method is presupposed to “enable the student to master the syntax, phraseology, idioms etc of the second language” (Verghese, 2007, p. 57) since the “accuracy of resulting translations into and from English were a mark of proficiency and competence in mastering a language” (Grenfell & Harris, 1999, p. 11). The major focus of this method tended to be reading and writing with very little attention paid to speaking and listening (Reppy & Adames, 2013; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Zhu, 2010; Griffiths, 2008). In GT method, the students listen to the grammar rules with illustration as explained and memorize bilingual lists of words that contain the vocabulary needed for the day’s exercises presented by teacher and translate the text applying the rules and the knowledge of vocabulary as a practice (Sharma, 2010; Harmer,

2008; Ohmaye, 1988). Even an untrained teacher can handle it easily and the students of having poor linguistic background in the target language are also equally benefited. However, there are serious criticisms on this method. It is criticized to be “teacher-driven method” (Tarone and Yule, as cited in Griffiths, 2008, p. 256) requiring learners to focus on individual grammar points which are taught deductively (Hall, 2011; Grenfell & Harris, 1999). Translation encourages students to keep their native language in mind so it produces interference and interrupts thinking in the language being learnt (Berlitz, as cited in Malmkjaer, 2010, p. 186). One of the biggest criticisms of grammar translation method is that “its sentence based nature requires the use of isolated, artificial, unnatural sentences” (Wheeler, 2013, p. 117). Mukalel (2007) states that “reading and writing in the classical language as well as formal explanation of grammar do not lead to the mastery of the skills of the language” (p. 52). In a nutshell, this method may produce such students who may translate even the work of Shakespeare but may not ask for a single cup of tea in the target language since it neglects the communication skills (Sharma, 2010).

### 2.2. *The Direct Method*

Direct method is also known as “reform method, natural method, phonetical method, anti-grammatical method” (Arora, 2012, p. 146). Verghese (2007) calls it “a logical extension of the natural method and an offshoot of the behaviorists school of psychology” (p. 57). According to Weihua (2013), this method is “based on the linguistic principles of inductive analogy, experimental psychology and naturalistic method of education” (p. 200). According to him, the name of this method is reported to have come along with an official documentary of MoE of French government issued in 1901. Along with the emergence of capitalism at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century, “countries needed to expand their markets through trade and communication” (Zhu, 2010, p. 61) which caused teachers to realize the inadequacy of traditional GT method to meet their need and as a result the direct method was introduced in practice of language teaching. The reform movement in the 1880s initiated by Henry Sweet from England, Wilhelm Viator from Germany and Paul Passy of France in opposition to the assumption of GT method was also equally responsible for the emergence of this method (Macaro, 2010; Saraswathi, 2005). In other words, the direct method as an approach to language teaching grew out of a reaction to GT method (Weihua, 2013; Macaro, 2010; Dash & Dash, 2007) being “incapable of preparing students to use the target language communicatively” (Reppy & Adames, 2011, p. 77). It was German scholar F. Franke who provided “a theoretical justification for a monolingual approach to teaching language” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 11) since language is made “meaningful by being directly associated with elements of the situation and with actions” (Steinberg & Sciarini, 2013; Arora, 2012; Verghese, 2007; Wilkins, 1990). The ultimate instructional goal of the direct method was “learning how to use a foreign language to communicate” (Reppy & Adames, 2011; Leonardi, 2010; Dash & Dash, 2007; Skela, 1998). The followers of this methods claim that language can be taught to the students directly and naturally without the reference of the mother tongue of learners (Saraswathi, 2005; Macaro, 1997). However, “it is not the most effective method especially for the students who have not acquired the acquisition factors yet” (Lee, 2001, p. 113) since “the direct method was designed for adult learners” (Howatt, 2009, p. 476). This method is more productive at the zero level as “it provides an initiation to the language by eliminating psychological barriers and promoting easy speaking with minimal knowledge of the language” (Aslanyan, 1998, p. 133). However, it is criticized to have lacked a proper methodological basis since there is not sufficient provision for systematic practice of structures in a planned sequence. The direct method “requires very resourceful and proficient teachers which most countries where English as an L2 is taught pitifully lack” (Mukalel, 2007, p. 84). Despite the influence of the direct method’s monolingual dogma, “translation was never completely banned and in higher education of many countries, translation has remained important up to the present time” (House, 2008, p. 145). Ebong (2004) states that the “direct method was not well accepted in public education where the constraints of budget, classroom size, time and teacher background made such a method difficult” (p. 8).

### 2.3. *Communicative Language Teaching*

Communicative language teaching is an approach emerged with the rejection of the linguistic theory underlying the audio-lingual method in the mid 1960s in America mainly “due to the influence of Noam Chomsky’s work” (Sharma, 2010, p. 61). In other words, CLT has been influenced by Chomsky’s view of language as a cognitive faculty that allows humans to develop an internalized model of the target language through exposure to it and interaction with its speakers (Corbett, 2003). This method proposed to produce genuine or natural rather than ‘typical’ classroom communication (Seedhouse, 1996). The primary goal of this approach is to develop the learners’ communicative competence (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 41) which entails four competences namely “grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence” (Alptekin, 2002, p. 57). The notion of communicative competence was originally coined in the early 1970s by Hymes and later developed by Canale and Swain (Sreehari, 2012) considering the “inadequacy of the Chomskyan notion of linguistic competence” (McConachy, 2009, p. 116). It focuses on communication skills or functional use of a foreign language to express ideas and feelings according to demand of situation (Wang, Ma & Zhang, 2011). According to Harmer (2008), language is more than “patterns of grammar with vocabulary slotted in” (p. 50). Thus, he shows the need of exposure to language and language use for appropriateness in performing language function using a variety of language exponents in the given situation. Despite the widespread adoption of this approach in textbooks (Griffiths, 2011) and commitment of teachers in the use of it, Karavas-Doubkas (1996) blames that most of the teachers are still found to be following more structural approaches in their classrooms. So, Morrow & Schocker (1987) suggest for using texts in a way which encourages the possibility of students’ personal involvement and is thus more truly communicative. For this, Hu (as cited in Beaumont & Chang, 2011) suggests to provide learners “with ample opportunities to use the target language for communicative purposes” (p.292). However, it has been difficult to apply this approach in many of the contexts due to large classes, inappropriate materials, grammar oriented examinations, time constraints, lack of training, lack of teacher confidence in their own language skills are the practical

constraints that stand in the way of the introduction of more communicative approaches (Sakui, 2004). Beside this, in the culturally different context, it seems more difficult. For the suitability of CLT in such context like in Asia, Ellis (1996) shows the needs of cultural familiarity and cultural acceptance focusing the role of mediating that entails “teacher’s ability to filter the method to make it appropriate to the local cultural norms and to re-define the teacher student relationship in keeping with the cultural norms embedded in the method itself since CLT means expecting too much from the teacher” (Thompson, 1996, pp. 10-13). Ellis (1982) introduces informal and formal communicative approach as the former promotes second language acquisition and the latter learning. In spite of its good points, Swan (1985b) criticizes that this approach is failure in taking account of learners’ linguistic knowledge and skills of their L1 brought along with them. It is blamed to be neglecting the context which is one of the crucial aspects of language pedagogy (McConachy, 2009; Bax, 2003).

#### 2.4. Content-Based Approach

Content based approach refers to “the holistic and global approach” (Stryker & Leaver, 1997, p. 3) or genre based approach (Chen & Su, 2011) of teaching language through content that “aims at eliminating the artificial separation between language instruction and other subject matter” (Brinton, as cited in Fechter, 1996, p. 114) in which “teaching is organized around the content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 204). More specifically, it refers to “the concurrent study of language and subject matter” (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, as cited in Jarvinen, 2005, p. 434). In other words, it is the integration of academic content with language teaching objectives (Duarte, 2011; Wesche & Skehan, 2002). The intent of content based instruction (CBI) is to help learners to be proficient in language who learn it for various purposes (Crandall & Tucker, as cited in So, 2002) that might be “appropriate to the needs of specific groups of students” (Stryker & Leaver, 1997, p. 5). However, it is different from that of English for specific purposes (ESP) since “ESP grew of commercial ventures, whereas CBI grew out of academic needs” (Master, 1997, p. 26). It is based on the assumption that “language can be effectively taught through the medium of subject matter content” (Gaffield-Vile, 1996, p. 114). Brinton, Snow and Wesche (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001) state that Saint Augustine was an early proponent of content based language teaching and quote his recommendation to “focus on meaningful content in language teaching” (p. 204). One of the notable aspects of CBI is that “language acquisition occurs within a natural context and has real meaning” (Williams, 2008, p. 18). In other words, CBI provides a naturalistic learning context and the possibility of form-focused activity involving intensive exposure to the target language (Wesche & Skehan, 2002). Contemporary CBI, that gained prominence in the 1960s with experiments in elementary and secondary education in the former Soviet Union and Canada, gives primary focus on “sociolinguistic and strategic competence-language use” (Stryker & Leaver, 1997, pp. 13-15). CBI encourages learners providing authentic materials to use as a means of communication from the very beginning (ibid) that provides them comprehensive input which is “essential for foreign language acquisition” (Krashen, as cited in Lee, 2001 p. 128). Due to this comprehension based approach, low level of learners get more benefit from it. Giving priority to all the language skills to practice in CBI, “learning is boosted by the interest and motivation generated by the subject matter” (Shaw, 1996, p. 319). Georgiou (2012) identifies content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in which “a non-language subject is taught through a foreign language, with the dual focus being on acquiring subject knowledge and competences as well as skills and competences in the foreign language” (p. 495). What is major difference between CLIL and CBI is that “former is dual focused whereas the latter on only language” (Cenoz, 2009, p. 111). CBI consists of linguistic as well as psychological basis. The linguistic theory of this approach is based on the assumption that language is purposeful which is used for specific purpose. The psychological basis of this approach is based on the assumption that “learners learn a second language most successfully when the information they are acquiring is perceived as interesting, useful and leading to a desired goal” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, pp. 209-211). There are no specific techniques or activities associated with CBI. However, the activities are “geared to stimulate students to think and learn through the use of target language” (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, as cited in Marco, 2002, p. 180). The classroom procedure is designed in such a way in which there is the utilization of “authentic materials as a medium of instruction at the same time that it promotes the learning of new information along with the acquisition of language skills” (Leaver & Stryker, as cited in Fechter, 1996, p. 114). Jarvinen (2005) describes three models for CBI namely theme based courses, sheltered instruction and adjunct instruction. In the first model, both subject matter and language is taught; in the second model, designed subject matter is given to learners by the content specialist and in the third model, learners are engaged in learning language course and content course concurrently. CBI is beneficial for ELT learners since “it provides students with meaningful content that is input rich because of its relevance to students’ lives” (Creese, 2005, p. 146). Along with the enhancement of learners’ motivation, it accelerates “students’ acquisition of language proficiency to broaden cross-cultural knowledge” (Stryker & Leaver, 1997, p. 5). However, one of the challenges with CBI is “how to evaluate the outcomes, especially the growth in students’ oral proficiency skill”(ibid, p.23). It is criticized to focus on teaching the subject matter rather than on teaching the language skills demanding such a teacher who is not only a language expert but also a content area expert. It is also blamed of not telling us anything about the balance of language and content teaching.

#### 2.5 .Task-Based Approach

Task based approach to language teaching (TBLT) is an approach which is based on the theory of Long’s focus on form in interaction, Skehan’s cognitive theory of L2 learning and the Robbinson’s complexity hypothesis (Ellis & Shintani, 2013). According to this approach, learners learn language while accomplishing task which may be “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending , manipulating, producing or interacting , in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form” (Nunan, as cited in Boston, 2010, p. 165). TBLT is generally based on “naturalistic language use” (Skehan, 2002, p. 293) in which communicative activity is placed at the heart of a list of task which is to be performed by learners. Therefore,

concerning the usefulness, the task based approach is “similar to the situation with regard to the communicative approach” (Littlewood, 2004, p. 325). This approach is based on the assumption that language is primarily a means of communication and is best learnt through the exposure and negotiation that takes place while performing communicative in a stress free and supportive learning environment (Ur, 2013; Bourke, 2006). TBLT focuses on the process of achieving things with the support of language. For this teachers should “set up learning environments which afford opportunities for students to develop as readers through engaging in dialogue with texts” (Wilson, 2008, p. 367). It emphasizes on “purposeful communication and skill integration” (Evans, 2013, p. 291). Therefore, pedagogical tasks presented in the classroom should “aim to create an environment that promotes interactive learning” (Rivers, 2010, p. 270). Hadi (2013) states that “TBLT provides learners with authentic and meaning based materials, real life communicative activities and motivating feedback, and promotes actual language use” (p. 103). Task completion requires certain structure like task naturalness, task utility and task essentialness (Lochky and Bley-Vroman, 1993 as cited in Boston, 2010). Long (as cited in Jacobs & Ball, 1996,) proposes three types of task for groups namely planned or unplanned, closed or open and one way or two way and advocates in favor of planned task, close task and two way task since the “planned tasks increase the quantity and quality of the language learners generate; closed tasks enhance the negotiation of meaning among group members and two way task are better for promoting negation of meaning” (p. 166). It places the “focus of the lesson on the task rather than on the language” (Boston, 2008, p. 66). In other words, in TBLT “meaning focused tasks are performed by learners without a predetermined focus on discrete grammar points” (Hawkes, 2012, p. 327). It is suggested to repeat or create similar type of task for completion so that “learners might be able to build upon what they have already done” (Ahmadian, 2012, p. 380). But the “task assigned to the learners should be chosen according to their needs” (Skehan, 2002, p. 293) since tasks based on learner-imposed needs may “improve learners’ retention of the language processed on task through elaboration and association with existing knowledge” (Laufer and Hulstijn, as cited in Lambert, 2004, p. 23). This approach is considered to be “ideal for demonstrating the potential for dialogical learning between teacher and students” (Moser, Harris & Carle, 2012, p. 87). Willis (as cited in Foster, 1999) presents a detailed practical framework of for the accomplishment of task “through cycles of task planning, performance, repetition and finally comparison with native speaker norms” (p. 69). However, these stages can be summarized as pre-task activities, task activities and post task activities (Skehan, 2002). The tasks to be performed while learning language may be “listing , ordering and sorting , comparing ,problem solving , sharing personal experiences, creative tasks, information gap task, opinion gap task and a reasoning gap task” (Nunan, as cited in Ellis & Shintani, 2013, p. 137). Green (2005) proposes extensive reading in a task based approach for learners “to increase cross-cultural understandings since it aids cognitive development and promotes learning through interaction” (p. 311). In order to exploit tasks fully for learning, Crabbe (2007) suggests to engage learners in “understanding, identifying and taking up the learning opportunities” (p. 124). Such engagement of learners with tasks helps them know “how task might be approached” (Storch, as cited in Bastone, 2012, p. 460). Despite the seemingly impressive theoretical arguments put forward to promote task based learning, “it remains to be proven that task based interaction is more effective than other varieties of classroom interaction” (Willis, as cited in Seedhouse, 1999, p. 155). Feeney (2006) states that the term TBLT was a “far less familiar concept in the late 1980s and is completely absent, for example, from texts such as Richards and Rodgers’ 1986 review of the current language teaching approaches” (p. 199). It is one of the challenging issues “to choose, sequence and implement tasks in ways that will combine a focus on meaning with a focus on form” (Foster, 1999, p. 69). The danger in a task based approach to teaching is that “learner might be encouraged to prioritize a focus on meaning over a focus on form, and thus be led to use fluent but unchallenging or inaccurate language” (ibid, p. 69). The suitability of task based teaching for schools seems to be “less clear-cut” (Carless, 2008, p. 331).

### 2.6. Humanistic Approaches

Humanistic approaches, “not synonymous with humane but rather opposed to cognivistic” (Brown, as cited in Knibbeler, 1989, p. 7) emerged in the 1970s and 1980s associating with the works of Charles Curran, Earl Stevick, Caleb Gattegno and Georgi Lozanov (Christison & Murray, 2014). This approach is concerned about the development of human values, growth of self-awareness and in the understanding of others, sensitivity to human feelings and emotions, active student involvement in learning (Richards, 2008; Johnson, 2013). Anyway, humanistic language teaching “embodies a set of progressive educational values and beliefs about learners, learning and the purpose of education more generally” (Hall, 2011, p. 90). It possesses three dimensions namely centrality of the learner, learner autonomy and the independence in the classroom and concern about the process of learning which make it different from others (Sarswathi, 2005). It emphasizes on affective components for learning. In other words, the intellectual, emotional, social, artistic, and the practical lives along with the spiritual needs are considered in this approach (Nagaraj, 1996) which aims at enhancing learners’ autonomy (Christison & Murray, 2014; Tudor, 2001) through “positive, supportive, encouraging, praising, valuing and relaxing comment rather than negative, deprecating, harsh, attacking, dominating and anxiety-provoking” (Kyriacou, 2003, p. 49). Confluent education, based on the philosophy of Gestalt psychology, silent way, community language learning, suggestopedia approach are the humanistic approaches that pay more attention to “affectivity and interpersonal relations” (Knibbeler, 1989, p. 11). Chiba & Morikawa (2011) emphasize the learners’ feeling as the critical thing to be considered for learning. Christison & Murray (2014) present the principal features of this approach as “learner choice and control , learner concerns and interests, the whole person, self-evaluation, collaboration, teacher as facilitator, emphasis on the natural desire of everyone to learn, focus on the need for learners to feel empowered and to have control over their learning process” (pp. 193-197). In other words, humanistic approaches address the 'whole' learner and “emphasize the value of individual development” (Mishan, 2005, p. 1) “placing the learner at the centre of learning” (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p. 229). Therefore, it is suggested to “create a warm and supportive atmosphere in the classroom so that students would feel confident to express their deeper personal feelings without fear of judgment or rejection” (Tudor, 2001, p. 66).

### 2.7. Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning (CL) is an approach to teaching and learning in which classroom is organized in such a way where the students can work together in small cooperative teams “towards a common goal” (Agarwal & Nagar, 2011, p. 20). The idea of CL emerged with John Dewey’s ideas of group activities in which learners work together in small groups cooperating each other “instead of competing for acknowledgement” (Alharbi, 2008, p. 1). In other words, it is a systematic, structured and diverse group of instructional methods in which small groups of students work together and aid each other in completing academic tasks (Jacob, 1999). The context in CL is carefully structured in which learners are “cognitively , physically, emotionally and psychologically actively involved in constructing their own knowledge” (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1995, p. 10) that “promotes learning, higher level thinking, prosocial behavior , and a greater understanding of learners with diverse learning , social and adjustment needs” (Cohen, as cited in Gillies & Ashman, 2003, p. 13). In this approach, teacher helps students how to work together more effectively and learners can “improve their self-esteem, their attitude toward school and their ability to work with others while learning with CL” (Farmer, 1999, p. 1). Learners in this approach are provided opportunities to enhance social strategies and foster a high degree of autonomy (Jacobs & McCafferty, 2006). Learners can increase retention and improve their problem solving ability as CL focuses on problem solving in a structured form of group work (Millis, 2012; Adams, Carlson & Hamm, 1990). Learners in this approach are found to be intrinsically highly motivated with “high commitment to achieve and high persistence with maximum strategies to deal with anxiety and stress” (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1995, p. 18). CL consists of five basic elements namely positive interdependence, individual and group accountability, face to face promotive interaction or opportunity, requirement of interpersonal and small group skills and engagement of cooperative groups (Cottel, 2012; Agarwal & Nagar, 2011; Weidner, as cited in Giepen, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2009; Farmer, 1999). According to them, the sense of positive interdependence is structured through mutual goal, complementary roles, and a shared identity; individual and group accountability is for contributing in group work, face to face promotive interaction or opportunity for promoting each other's success by supporting and encouraging each other, helping, encouraging and praising each other's effort to achieve, requirement of interpersonal and small group skills for decision making, and conflict management and engagement of cooperative groups is for group processing for the accomplishment of task. Beside these elements, Johnson & Johnson (as cited in Dyson & Casey 2012) have added other two elements as academically and socially equitable learning environment learning and promotion of cultural sensitivity. Farmer (1999) has presented key elements of CL as heterogeneous groups, academic objective, distributed leadership, group autonomy, group accountability and individual accountability. Morton Deutsch's theory of cooperation and competition also gives high priority to cooperation rather than competition in learning (Agarwal & Nagar, 2011). The underlying premise of CL is based on “consensus building through cooperation by group members in contrast to competition in which individuals pursue their learning negotiating, initiating, planning and evaluating together” (Agarwal & Nagar, 2011, pp. 20-22). It develops the “spirit of positive interdependency among students and discourages the notion of individuality and competition creating a positive classroom climate” (Ghaith & Kawtharani, 2006, p. 76). Besides it, opportunities to work together with people different from themselves, social interdependence, teaching the social skills such as acknowledging another’s contribution, asking others to contribute and keeping the conversation calm are other principal features of CL. Adams, Carlson & Hamm (1990) present four different CL methods as the teams-games-tournaments (TGT), student teams and achievement division (STAD), team assisted instruction (TAI) and cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC) that “incorporate concepts of individual accountability , team rewards and equal opportunities for success” (p. 17). Learning together (LT) is another method of cooperative learning developed by David Johnson & Rodger Johnson (Jacob, 1999). Farmer (1999) suggests to consider several factors while applying this approach like classroom management, clear definition of the specific tasks, group assignment, instruction on group processing and monitoring and assessment. One of the notable things to be considered in the application of CL is grouping students. While grouping learners for CL, Murdoch & Wilson (2007) suggest different ways like teacher selected, students selected, long term 'base' groups. Generally, students are to be placed in “an all-win atmosphere” (Farmer, 1999, p. 1). The strategy of think, pair and share (TPS) of cooperative learning technique is found to have improved significantly on the students’ achievement (Sumarsih & Sanjaya, 2013). A great strength of cooperative learning is that “it provides teachers with many opportunities to instruct children in the social, emotional or moral domains at a time when such instruction is immediately relevant” (Battistich & Watson, 2003, p. 25). According to Jolliffe (2007), classrooms diversity where each member of the group contributes in varied ways to a common goal is considered as strength of CL; however, peer-mediated model of learning is criticized to be a “failure to address the needs of the more able pupil who may require more independent learning and flexibility” (p. 14).

### 2.8. Post Method Pedagogy

Method is the established, conceptualized and expert constructed procedures of teaching but it is criticized to have been failure to recognize eclecticism and pragmatism (Creese & Leung, 2010). This limitation of method is considered to be serious since classroom teachers find any of the predetermined and established method ineffective to address their immediate problems. Hence, the approach that suggests to apply any of the methods whatever is effective and beneficial to address the local needs to overcome the immediate problem instead of being blind and strict follower of prescribed and predetermined method is called post method approach. Eclecticism is a condition of post method pedagogy which doesn't mean the selection between the available possibilities but to use the practical and intellectual resources instead of roaming for impractical methods. This condition leads teachers to move away from the existed method opening the new horizon of teaching practice in which they construct personal theory of practice which is practically applicable and suitable in the practical situation. Other dimension for post method pedagogy is principled pragmatism that “encompasses both practice and theory in an integrated and mutually reinforcing way” (Kumaravadivelu, as cited in Liddicoat & Searino, 2013, p. 6). The post method condition “rejects the imposition of any pre-conceived method on local teaching contexts”

(Canagarajah, as cited in Appleby, 2010, p. 39). However, the established methods are not ignored (Sharma, 2012). But, this pedagogy suggests teachers to be well known to the principles and procedures of them so that they can implement their procedures what the context requires. This means, teachers can use the suitable method which is appropriate to address the immediate problem of practical situation in the given context of classroom. Post method pedagogy condition possesses three attributes. The first attribute is that it is alternative to method rather than alternative method and “empowers the teacher to theorize from their practice and to be more autonomous” (Zeng, 2012, p. 70). The second attribute associated with this approach is teacher autonomy which refers to “the teachers’ ability to know the process of developing a critical approach to self-observe, self-analyze and self-evaluate their won teaching practice” (Cattell, 2013, p. 159). The third attribute related to this pedagogy is principled pragmatism which asserts the “practice that sees the teacher responding to the immediacy of the local teaching context” (ibid,p. 159). This approach requires teachers to be autonomous, innovative and context sensitive. The teachers may not search for the method granted for them but they innovate the new one on the basis of their practice and experience which is appropriate, effective and suitability to the context. It seeks to depart from communicative approach “in favor of reflective practices that consider learner needs first and that engage teachers as researchers in the construction of their own theories of practice” (Cattell, 2013, p. 157). Bell (as cited in Jarvis & Atsilarat, 2006), hence, characterizes this pedagogy as a more holistic and redefined communicative language teaching. Post method pedagogy is a three dimensional system consisting of three pedagogic parameters namely a pedagogy of particularity, a pedagogy of practicality and a pedagogy of possibility (Sharma, 2012). The pedagogy of particularity is concerned with the selection of pedagogy which is sensitive to particular group to facilitate them to achieve their particular goal in the particular context of teaching and learning activities. The pedagogic practicality is concerned with the teachers’ autonomy in the enhancement of their practical knowledge in language teaching. The parameter of pedagogic possibility indicates the teachers’ innovation to select “the most suitable methodology according to the possible socio-political and ideological conditions of the learners” (ibid, p. 144). While applying this pedagogy for teaching language, the teacher doesn’t follow any of the “pre-existed, established and conceptualized procedures but follow the procedures of ‘eclecticism pragmatism’” (Liddicoat & Searino, 2013, p.6). This means, the teacher teaches language innovating the appropriate and suitable method that is context sensitive in order to solve the immediate problem.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Research Question

The research question to facilitate the objective of this study is as below:

3.1.1 What is the practice of ELT methods, approaches and techniques in context of higher secondary level education in Nepal?

#### 3.2. Participants

The study consists of 579 participants among whom 552(95.33%) were students of grade 12 and 27(4.66%) were ELT teachers engaged in teaching higher secondary level education in Nepal. The participants were selected from 22 higher secondary level schools. The participants were sampled using multi-stage cluster sampling and the schools were sampled using fish bowl procedure.

#### 3.3. Instruments

The instrument of the study is a questionnaire comprising 10 items for the practice of methods or approaches and 6 items for techniques consisting of 5-point Likert scale with their specific value ranging from Always =1; Often= 2; Sometimes = 3; Rarely = 4 and Never =5. The items were well designed coping the major areas of ELT methods/approach and techniques in order to establish content validity.

#### 3.4. Results

##### 3.4.1. Indicator of Determining the Level of Practicing Methods/Approaches and Techniques

Indicator of determining the level of practicing methods and techniques has been grouped into three categories namely high, average and low or less. As presented in the Table 1, the mean score of response that falls between 1.00-2.33 will be categorized as high; the mean score that falls between 2.34-3.66 will be categorized as average and between 3.67-5.00 will be as low.

Position	Mean
High	1.00-2.33
Average	2.34-3.66
Low	3.67-5.00

Table 1: Indicator of Determining the Level of Practicing Methods/Approaches and Techniques

##### 3.4.2. Practice of Methods/Approaches

Regarding the practice of Grammar Translation method (GTM), the grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that practicing GT method was high ( $M = 1.4801$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of GT method ( $U = 1675.000, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 279.53 for students and 503.96 for teachers.

Respondents		GTM	DM	CLL	TBLA	IA	DA	CA	HA	CBA	PMP
Students	Mean	1.4094	3.7319	4.6721	2.7627	2.6938	1.9964	3.9239	2.3949	3.8170	2.1957
	N	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552	552
Teachers	Mean	2.9259	2.1852	1.8519	1.9630	1.4815	3.0000	2.0000	1.6296	2.4444	1.5556
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Grand Mean	Mean	1.4801	3.6598	4.5406	2.7254	2.6373	2.0432	3.8342	2.3592	3.7530	2.1658
	N	579	579	579	579	579	579	579	579	579	579

Table 2: Practice of Different Methods/Approaches

\*Note: GTM here stands for grammar translation method; DM for direct method; CLL for cooperative language learning; TBLA for task based learning approach; IA for inductive approach; DA for deductive approach; CA for communicative approach; HA for humanistic approach; CBA for content based approach; PMP for post method pedagogy.

Regarding the practice of direct method (DM), the grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that practicing direct method was average ( $M = 3.6598$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of direct method ( $U = 2877.000, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 298.29 for students and 120.56 for teachers. Regarding the practice of cooperative language learning in the classroom (CLL), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that practicing cooperative language learning was less ( $M = 4.5406$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of cooperative language learning in the classroom ( $U = 405.000, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 302.77 for students and 29.00 for teachers.

Variables	Respondents	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
GTM	Students	552	279.53	154303.00
	Teachers	27	503.96	13607.00
	Total	579		
DM	Students	552	298.29	164655.00
	Teachers	27	120.56	3255.00
	Total	579		
CLL	Students	552	302.77	167127.00
	Teachers	27	29.00	783.00
	Total	579		
TBLA	Students	552	294.78	162720.50
	Teachers	27	192.20	5189.50
	Total	579		
IA	Students	552	295.71	163233.00
	Teachers	27	173.22	4677.00
	Total	579		
DA	Students	552	283.64	156570.50
	Teachers	27	419.98	11339.50
	Total	579		
CA	Students	552	300.75	166012.50
	Teachers	27	70.28	1897.50
	Total	579		
HA	Students	552	293.90	162232.50
	Teachers	27	210.28	5677.50
	Total	579		
CBA	Students	552	297.82	164398.50
	Teachers	27	130.06	3511.50
	Total	579		
PMP	Students	552	292.43	161424.00
	Teachers	27	240.22	6486.00
	Total	579		

Table 3: Mean Rank of Different Methods/Approach Practiced by ELT Teachers

Regarding the practice of task based learning approach in the classroom (TBLA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that practicing task based learning approach was average ( $M = 2.7254$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing task based learning approach in the classroom ( $U = 4811.500, p = .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 294.78 for students and 192.20 for teachers. Regarding the practice of inductive approach while teaching grammar in the classroom (IA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the practice of inductive approach while teaching grammar in the classroom was average ( $M = 2.6373$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing inductive approach while teaching grammar in the classroom ( $U = 4299.000, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 295.71 for students and 173.22 for teachers. Regarding the practice of deductive approach in teaching grammar in the classroom (DA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the practice of deductive approach of teaching grammar was high ( $M = 2.0432$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of deductive approach in teaching grammar in the classroom ( $U = 3942.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 283.64 for students and 419.98 for teachers.

	GTM	DM	CLL	TBLA	IA	DA	CA	HA	CBA	PMP
Mann-Whitney U	1675.000	2877.000	405.000	4811.500	4299.000	3942.500	1519.500	5299.500	3133.500	6108.000
Wilcoxon W	154303.000	3255.000	783.000	5189.500	4677.000	156570.500	1897.500	5677.500	3511.500	6486.000
Z	-8.624	-5.641	-11.582	-3.189	-3.840	-4.417	-7.383	-2.632	-5.376	-1.693
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.008	.000	.091

a. Grouping Variable: Respondents

Table 4: Statistic Test for Practicing Different Methods/Approaches

Regarding the practice of communicative approach in the classroom (CA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the practice of communicative approach was less ( $M = 3.8342$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and the learners in the practice of communicative approach ( $U = 1519.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 300.75 for students and 70.28 for teachers. Regarding the practice of humanistic approach in teaching English in the classroom (HA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the practice of humanistic approach in the classroom was average ( $M = 2.3592$ ). The statistic test resulted in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing humanistic approach in the classroom ( $U = 5299.500, p = .008$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 293.90 for students and 210.28 for teachers. Regarding the practice of content based approach in the classroom (CBA), grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the practice of adopting content based approach in the classroom was less ( $M = 3.7530$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of content based approach in the classroom ( $U = 3133.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 297.82 for students and 130.06 for teachers. Regarding the practice of post method pedagogy in the classroom, grand mean resulted in Table 2 showed that the trend of practicing post method pedagogy was high ( $M = 2.1658$ ). The statistic test in Table 4 showed that there was not statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of post method pedagogy ( $U = 6108.000, p = .091$ ) with the mean rank (Table 3) 292.43 for students and 240.22 for teachers.

### 3.4.3. Practice of Techniques

The mean resulted in Table 4 showed that the practice of teaching English through lecture or explanation and through illustration or demonstration was found average ( $M = 2.4145$ ). Total grand mean of teaching through teacher centered techniques was also average ( $M = 2.4145$ ).

Respondents		Lecture	Demonstration	Grand Mean
Students	Mean	2.4457	2.4457	2.4457
	N	552	552	552
Teachers	Mean	1.7778	1.7778	1.7778
	N	27	27	27
Grand Mean	Mean	2.4145	2.4145	2.4145
	N	579	579	579

Table 5: Use of Teacher Centered Techniques

The statistic test in Table 6 showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing teacher centered techniques ( $U = 5283.000, p = .008$ ) with the mean rank (Table 5) 293.93 for students and 209.67 for teachers.



Variable	Respondents	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Teacher Centered Techniques	Students	552	293.93	162249.00
	Teachers	27	209.67	5661.00
	Total	579		

Table 6: Comparison of Mean Rank of Teacher Centered Techniques

	Teacher Centered Techniques
Mann-Whitney U	5283.000
Wilcoxon W	5661.000
Z	-2.642
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.008
a. Grouping Variable: Respondents	

Table 7: Statistic Test for Teacher Centered Techniques

Grand mean resulted in Table 7 showed that the practice of teaching English giving focus on pair or group work, through dramatization, task and project work to be performed and through the techniques and discovery was found extremely less ( $M = 4.3333$ ).

Respondents		Group work	Dramatization	Project work	Discovery	Grand Mean
Students	Mean	4.4293	4.4293	4.4293	4.4293	4.4293
	N	552	552	552	552	552
Teachers	Mean	2.3704	2.3704	2.3704	2.3704	2.3704
	N	27	27	27	27	27
Grand Mean	Mean	4.3333	4.3333	4.3333	4.3333	4.3333
	N	579	579	579	579	579

Table 8: Practice of Students Centered Techniques

The statistic test in Table 9 showed that there was statistically significantly different between the perspective of ELT teachers and students in practicing students centered techniques ( $U = 1128.500$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with the mean rank (Table 8) of 301.46 for students and 55.80 for teachers.

Variable	Respondents	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Students Centered Techniques	Students	552	301.46	166403.50
	Teachers	27	55.80	1506.50
	Total	579		

Table 9: Comparison of Mean rank in the Use of Students Centered Techniques

	Students Centered Techniques
Mann-Whitney U	1128.500
Wilcoxon W	1506.500
Z	-8.851
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
a. Grouping Variable: Respondents	

Table 10: Statistic Test for the Use of Students Centered Techniques

#### 4. Discussion

Grand mean showed that ELT teachers' practice of GT method was high ( $M = 1.4801$ ). The statistic test also showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of GT method ( $U = 1675.000$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with the mean rank of 279.53 for students and 503.96 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that ELT teachers of higher secondary level in Nepal were statistically significantly high practitioner of GT method. However, their practice of direct method was found average ( $M = 3.6598$ ). The statistic test showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of direct method ( $U = 2877.000$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 298.29 for students and 120.56 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that they were still not absolute practitioner of direct method. Their practice of cooperative language learning was found less ( $M = 4.5406$ ). The statistic test also showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of cooperative language learning in the classroom ( $U = 405.000$ ,  $p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 302.77 for students and 29.00 for teachers which is an evidence to prove that they were statistically significantly less practitioner of cooperative language learning. Their practice of task based learning approach was found average ( $M = 2.7254$ ). The statistic test showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in

practicing task based learning approach in the classroom ( $U = 4811.500, p = .001$ ) with the mean rank 294.78 for students and 192.20 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that they were still not absolute practitioner of task based learning approach in the classroom. Their practice of inductive approach was found average ( $M = 2.6373$ ). The statistic test showed that there was statistically significantly difference between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing inductive approach while teaching grammar in the classroom ( $U = 4299.000, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 295.71 for students and 173.22 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that they were still not absolute practitioners of practicing inductive approach while the practice of deductive approach of teaching grammar was found high ( $M = 2.0432$ ). The statistic test also showed that there was statistically significantly different between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of deductive approach in teaching grammar in the classroom ( $U = 3942.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 283.64 for students and 419.98 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that they were statistically significantly high practitioners of adopting deductive approach in teaching grammar in the classroom. Their practice of communicative approach was found less ( $M = 3.8342$ ). The statistic test also showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and the learners in the practice of communicative approach ( $U = 1519.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 300.75 for students and 70.28 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that they were statistically significantly highly less practitioner of communicative approach. The practice of humanistic approach in the classroom was found average ( $M = 2.3592$ ). The statistic test showed that there was statistically significantly different between the perspective of ELT teachers and students in practicing humanistic approach in the classroom ( $U = 5299.500, p = .008$ ) with the mean rank 293.90 for students and 210.28 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that ELT teachers were still far behind in the high practice of humanistic approach in the classroom. The practice of adopting content based approach in the classroom was found less ( $M = 3.7530$ ). The statistic test showed that there was statistically significant difference between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of content based approach in the classroom ( $U = 3133.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank 297.82 for students and 130.06 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that ELT teachers were statistically significantly highly less practitioner of content based approach. However, the trend of practicing post method pedagogy was found high ( $M = 2.1658$ ). The significant test in also showed that there was not statistically significance different between the response of ELT teachers and learners in the practice of post method pedagogy ( $U = 6108.000, p = .091$ ) with the mean rank 292.43 for students and 240.22 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that ELT teachers were statistically significantly high practitioner of post method approach in the classroom. Regarding the practice of techniques, teaching English through teacher centered techniques was found average ( $M = 2.4145$ ) while teaching English through students centered techniques was found extremely less ( $M = 4.3333$ ). The statistic test also showed that there was statistically significantly different between the response of ELT teachers and students in practicing students centered techniques ( $U = 1128.500, p < .001$ ) with the mean rank of 301.46 for students and 55.80 for teachers which is an evidence to conclude that ELT teachers of higher secondary level in Nepal were extremely less practitioner of students centered techniques in the classroom

## 5. Conclusion

On the basis of discussion made above, conclusion can be drawn that higher secondary level ELT teachers of Bara district in Nepal are high practitioners of traditional and ineffective GT method, deductive approach and teacher centered techniques in the classroom. Therefore, it is recommended to adopt the effective and practical method so as to enhance learners' success in learning English.

## 6. References

- i. Adams, D., Carlson, H., & Hamm, M. (1990). Cooperative Learning & Educational Media: Collaborating with Technology and Each Other. USA: Educational Technology Publication.
- ii. Agarwal, R., & Nagar, N. (2011). Cooperative Learning. India: Kalpaz Publications.
- iii. Ahmadian, M. J. (2012). Task Repetition in ELT. *ELTJ*, 66 (3), 380-382.
- iv. Alharbi, L. A. (2008). The Effectiveness of Using Cooperative Learning Method on ESL Reading Comprehension Performance Students' Attitudes Toward CL and Students Motivation Toward Reading of Secondary Stage in Saudi Public Girls' Schools. PhD Thesis, West Virginia University, West Virginia.
- v. Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT. *ELTJ*, 56 (1), 57-64.
- vi. Appleby, R. (2010). ELT, Gender and International Development . *Multilingual Matters*.
- vii. Arora, N. (2012). English Language Teaching Approaches and Methodologies. India: Tata McGraw Hill Education Pvt. Ltd.
- viii. Aslanyan, S. A. (1998). Teaching Armenian to Foreigners an dthe Diapora. In *Modern Language Learning and Learning in Central and Eastern Europe : Which Diversification adn How can it be Achieved?* Germany: Council of Europe Publishing.
- ix. Batstone, R. (2012). Language Form, Task Based Language Teaching and the Classroom Context. *ELTJ*, 66 (4), 459-467.
- x. Battistich, V., & Watson, M. (2003). Fostering Social Development in Pre-School and the Early Elementary Grades through Cooperative Classroom Activities. In R. Gillies, & A. Ashman (Eds.), *Cooperative Learning: The Social and Intellectual Outcomes of Learning in Groups* (pp. 19-35). NY: Routledge Falmer.
- xi. Bax, S. (2003). The End of CLT: A Context Approach to Language Teaching. *ELTJ*, 57 (3), 278-287.
- xii. Beaumont, M., & Chang, K. S. (2011). Challenging the Traditional/Communicative Dichotomy. *ELTJ*, 65 (3), 291-299.
- xiii. Boston, J. S. (2008). Learner Mining of Pre-task and Task Input. *ELTJ*, 62 (1), 66-67.
- xiv. Boston, J. S. (2010). Pre-task Syntactic Priming and Focused Task Design. *ELTJ*, 64 (2), 165-174.
- xv. Bourke, J. M. (2006). Designing a Topic Based Syllabus for Young Learners. *ELTJ*, 60 (3), 279-286.
- xvi. Carless, D. (2007). Student Use of the Mother Tongue in the Task Based Classroom. *ELTJ*, 62 (4), 331-338.

- xvii. Cattell, A. (2013). Reflective Curriculum Construction in the Postmethod Era. In J. L. Plews, & B. Schmenk (Eds.), *Tradition and Transitions: Curricula for German Studies* (pp. 157-174).
- xviii. Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xix. Chen, Y.-S., & Su, S.-W. (2012). A Genre-Based Approach to Teaching EFL Summary Writing. *ELTJ*, 66 (2), 184-192.
- xx. Chiba, S., & Morikawa, Y. (2011). From Oral Test Interview Test to Oral Communication Test. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, & T. Suthiwan (Eds.), *FLT in Asia and Beyond: Current Perspectives & Future Directions* (pp. 289-314). Walter de Gruyter: Boston.
- xxi. Christison, M. A., & Murray, D. E. (2014). *What English Language Teachers Need to Know (Vol. III)*. Routledge.
- xxii. Cook, V. (2013). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. NY: Routledge.
- xxiii. Corbett, J. (2003). *Languages for Intercultural Communication and Education*. UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- xxiv. Cottell, P. G. (2012). Cooperative Learning Accounting. In B. J. Millis (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 11-34). Stylus Publishing.
- xxv. Crabbe, D. (2007). Learning Opportunities: Adding Learning Value to Tasks. *ELTJ*, 61 (2), 117-125.
- xxvi. Creese, A. (2005). *Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classroom*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- xxvii. Creese, A., & Leung, C. (2010). Introduction. In A. Creese, & C. Leung (Eds.), *English as an Additional Language : Approaches to Teaching Linguistics Minority Students* (pp. I-XXVI). London: SAGE Publication.
- xxviii. Dash, N., & Dash, M. (2007). *Teaching English as an Additional Language*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors Pvt. Ltd.
- xxix. Duarte, J. (2011). *Bilingual Language Proficiency*. Munster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- xxx. Dyson, B., & Casey, A. (2012). Cooperative Learning as a Pedagogical Model in Physical Education. In B. Dyson, & A. Casey (Eds.), *Cooperative Learning in Physical Education : A Research Based Approach* (pp. 1-14). NY: Routledge.
- xxxi. Ebong, B. (2004). *The Use of Indigenous Techniques of Communication in Language Learning: The Case of Cameroon*. Gottingen: Cuvillier Verlag.
- xxxii. Ellis, G. (1996). How Culturally Appropriate is the Communicative Approach? *ELTJ*, 50 (3), 213-218.
- xxxiii. Ellis, R. (1982). Informal and Formal Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching. *ELTJ*, 36 (2), 73-81.
- xxxiv. Evans, S. (2013). Designing Tasks for the Business English Classroom. *ELTJ*, 67 (3), 281-193.
- xxxv. Farmer, L. S. (1999). *Teacher Ideas Press: US Cooperative Learning Activities in the Library Media Center*.
- xxxvi. Fechter, S. A. (1996). *The Testimony of Rigoberta Menchu in the Foreign Language Curriculum*. (A. Carey-Webb, & S. Benz, Eds.) Albany: State University of New York Press.
- xxxvii. Feeney, A. (2006). Task Based Language Teaching. *ELTJ*, 60 (2), 199-201.
- xxxviii. Foster, P. (1999). Task Based Learning and Pedagogy. *ELTJ*, 53 (1), 69-70.
- xxxix. Freeman, D. L. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. OUP.
- xl. Gaffield-Vile, N. (1996). Content Based Second Language Instruction at the Tertiary Level. *ELTJ*, 50 (2), 108-114.
- xli. Georgiou, S. L. (2012). Reviewing the Puzzle of CLIL. *ELTJ*, 66 (4), 495-504.
- xl. Ghaith, G., & Kawtharani, A. (2006). Using Cooperative & SL Learning with Primary School Students. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning & SL Teaching*. Cambridge Language Education.
- xliii. Giepen, M. (2010). *Cooperative Learning in Elementary School*. Grin Verlag.
- xliv. Gillies, R., & Ashman, A. (2003). Learning Groups: An Historical Review. In R. Gillies, & A. Ashman (Eds.), *Cooperative Learning : The Social and Intellectual Outcomes of Learning in Groups* (pp. 1-18). NY: Routledge.
- xl. Graham, S. (1997). *Effective Language Learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- xlvi. Green, C. (2005). Integrating Extensive Reading in the Task Based Curriculum. *ELTJ*, 59 (4), 306-311.
- xlvii. Grenfell, M., & Harris, V. (1999). *Modern Languages and Learning Strategies in Theory and Practice*. NY: Routledge.
- xlviii. Griffiths, C. (2008). Lesson from Good Language Learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Teaching Learning Method and Good Language Learners*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xlix. Griffiths, C. (2011). The Traditional/Communicative Dichotomy. *ELTJ*, 65 (3), 300-308.
- l. Hadi, A. (2013). Perception of Task Based Language Teaching : A Study of Iranian EFL Learners. *elt*, 6 (1), 103-111.
- li. Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring ELT : Language in Action*. NY: Routledge.
- lii. Harmer, J. (2008). *How to Teach English*. London : Pearson Longman.
- liii. Harmer, J. (2006). *How to Teach English*. India: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd.
- liv. Hawkes, M. L. (2012). Using Task Repetition to Direct Learner Attention and Focus on Form. *ELTJ*, 66 (3), 327-336.
- lv. House, J. (2008). Investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning, Teaching and Testing. (E. A. Soler, & A. Martinez-Flor, Eds.) USA: Multilingual Matters.
- lvi. Howatt, A. P. (2009). Principles of Approach. In K. Knapp, B. Seidlhofer, & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *Handbook of Foreign Language Communicative and Learning*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- lvii. Jacob, E. (1999). *Cooperative Learning in Context: An Educational Innovation in Everyday Classroom*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- lviii. Jacobs, G. M., & Ball, J. (1996). An Investigation of the Structure of Group Activities in ELT Coursebooks. *ELTJ*, 50 (2), 99-107.

- lix. Jacobs, G. M., & McCafferty, S. G. (2006). Connection Between Cooperative & SL Learning. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning & SL Teaching*. Cambridge Language Education.
- lx. Jarvinen, H.-M. (2005). Language Learning in Content Based Instruction. In A. Housen, & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Die Deutsche Bibliothek.
- lxi. Jarvis, H., & Atilarat, S. (2006). Shifting Paradigms: From a Communicative to a Context Based Approach. In P. Roertson, & R. Nunn (Eds.), *The Study of SLA in the Asian Context*. The Asian EFL Journal Press.
- lxii. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). The Importance of Social and Emotional Learning. In P. R. Leblane, & N. P. Gallavan (Eds.), *Affective Teacher Education: Exploring Connections Among Knowledge Skill* (pp. 1-26). The Association of Teacher Education.
- lxiii. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1995). Cooperative Learning and Individual Student Achievement. In J. Pedersen, & A. D. Digby (Eds.), *Secondary Schools and Cooperative Learning: Theories, Models and Strategies* (pp. 3-54).
- lxiv. Johnson, K. (2013). *An Introduction to FL Learning and Teaching*. NY: Routledge.
- lxv. Jolliffe, W. (2007). *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom: Putting it into Practice*. London: SAGE Publication Company.
- lxvi. Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using Attitudes Scales to Investigate Teachers' Attitudes to the Communicative Approach. *ELTJ*, 50 (3), 187-198.
- lxvii. Knibbeler, W. (1989). *The Explorative Creative Way: Implementation of a Humanistic Language Teaching Model*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- lxviii. Kyriacou, C. (2003). A Humanistic Views of Discipline. In B. Rogers (Ed.), *Teacher Leadership and Behaviour Management*. SAGE Publication Company.
- lxix. Lambert, C. (2004). Reverse Engineering Communication Tasks. *ELTJ*, 58 (1), 18-27.
- lxx. Lee, C. B. (2001). *Thoughts on Foreign Language Education Introduction to Babble Training Method*. Bloomington: Author House.
- lxxi. Leonardi, V. (2010). The Role of Pedagogical Translation in Second Language Acquisition from Theory to Practice. *Die Deutsche National Bibliothek*.
- lxxii. Liddicoat, A. J., & Searino, A. (2013). *Intercultural Language Teaching and Learning*. The Atrium, Southern Gate: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- lxxiii. Littlewood, W. (2004). The Taskbased Approach : Some Questions and Suggestions. *ELTJ*, 58 (4), 319-326.
- lxxiv. Macaro, E. (2010). *The Continuum Companion to Second Language Acquisition*. NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- lxxv. Malmkjaer, K. (2010). *Handbooks of Translation Method Studies (Vol. 1)*. (Y. Gambier, & L. V. Doorslaer, Eds.) Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- lxxvi. Master, P. (1997). ESP Teacher Education in the USA. In R. Howard, & G. Brown (Eds.), *Teacher Education for LSP*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- lxxvii. McConachy, T. (2009). Raising Sociocultural Awareness through Contextual Analysis: Some Tools for Teachers. *ELTJ*, 63 (2), 116-125.
- lxxviii. Millis, B. J. (2012). Why Faculty should Adopt Cooperative Learning Approaches. In B. J. Millis (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 1-10). Stylus Publishing.
- lxxix. Mishan, F. (2005). *Designing Authenticity into Language Learning Materials*. UK: Intellect Books.
- lxxx. Morrow, K., & Schocker, M. (1987). Using Texts in a CA. *ELTJ*, 50 (3), 248-256.
- lxxxi. Moser, J., Harris, J., & Carle, J. (2012). Improving Teacher Talk through a Task Based Approach. *ELTJ*, 66 (1), 81-88.
- lxxxii. Mukalel, J. C. (2007). *Approaches to English Language Teaching*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- lxxxiii. Murdoch, K., & Wilson, J. (2007). *Cooperative Learning : Little Books of Big Ideas*. Curriculum Cooperation.
- lxxxiv. Nagaraj. (1996). *Approaches, Methods, Technique*. Hyderabad: Oriented Longman Pvt. Ltd.
- lxxxv. Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classroom: Integrating Form-Focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. NY: Routledge.
- lxxxvi. Newby, D. (2013). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. (M. Byran, & A. Hu, Eds.) USA: Routledge.
- lxxxvii. Ohmaye, E. (1988). Simulation Based Language Learning: An Architecture and a Multi-media Authentic Tool. In R. C. Schank (Ed.), *Multimedia Case Based Instruction*.
- lxxxviii. Reppy, J. M., & Adames, J. (2013). English as a Second Language. In J. W. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of Undergraduate Second Language Education*. NY: Routledge.
- lxxxix. Richards, J. C. (2008). Theories of Teaching in Language Teaching. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthropology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xc. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xci. Rivers, D. J. (2010). An Exploration of on-task Language Policy and Student Satisfaction. *ELTJ*, 64 (3), 261-271.
- xcii. Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing Two Pairs of Shoes: Language Teaching in Japan. *ELTJ*, 58 (2), 155-163.
- xciii. Saraswathi, V. (2005). *English Language Teaching Principles and Practice*. India: Orient Longman Private Limited.
- xciv. Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom Interaction : Possibilities and Impossibilities. *ELTJ*, 50 (1), 16-24.
- xcv. Seedhouse, P. (1999). Task Based Interaction. *ELTJ*, 53 (3), 149-156.
- xcvi. Sharma, B. (2012). *Readings in Advanced English Language Teaching Methodology*. Kathmandu: Sunlight Publication.

- xcvii. Sharma, U. N. (2010). *A Course in ELT Methods*. Kathmandu: Highland Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- xcviii. Shaw, P. A. (1996). *Voices for Improved Learning: The Ethnographer as Co-agent of Pedagogic Change*. In K. M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xcix. Skehan, P. (2002). *A Non-marginal Role for Tasks*. *ELTJ*, 56 (3), 289-295.
- c. Skela, J. (1998). *The Role of the Native Language in Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. In R. D. Beaugrande, M. Grosman, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Language Policy and Language Education in Emerging Nations (Vol. Lxiii)*. USA: Ablex Publishing Cooperation.
- ci. So, S. (2002). *Form Meaning Intercase*. In J.-A. H. Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the Second Language Learner*. USA: Information Age Publishing.
- cii. Sreehari, P. (2012). *Communicative Language Teaching: Possibilities and Problems*. *elt*, 5 (12), 87-93.
- ciii. Steinberg, D. D., & Sciarini, N. V. (2013). *An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. NY: Routledge.
- civ. Stryker, S. B., & Leaver, B. L. (1997). *Content Based Instruction : From Theory to Practice*. In S. B. Stryker, & B. L. Leaver (Eds.), *Content Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education : Models and Methods*. USA: Georgetown University Press.
- cv. Sumarsih, M. P., & Sanjaya, D. (2013). *TPS as an Effective Technique to Enhance the Students' Achievement on Writing Descriptive Text*. *elt*, 6 (12), 106-113.
- cvi. Swan, M. (1985b). *A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach*. *ELTJ*, 39 (1), 2-12.
- cvii. Thompson, G. (1996). *Some Misconceptions about Communicative Language Teaching*. *ELTJ*, 50 (1), 9-15.
- cviii. Tschurtschenthaler, H. (2013). *Drama Based Foreign Language Learning*. Waxmann Verlag.
- cix. Tudor, I. (2009). *The Dynamics of the Language*.
- cx. Ur, P. (2013). *Language Teaching Method Revisited*. *ELTJ*, 67 (4), 468-474.
- cxii. Verghese, C. P. (2007). *Teaching English as a Second Language*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- cxiii. Wang, D., Ma, Z., & Zhang, X. (2011). *The Research on English Learning for PE Majors*. In Y. Wang (Ed.), *Education and Educational Technology*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- cxiiii. Weihua, Y. (2013). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. (M. Byram, & A. Hu, Eds.) NY: Routledge.
- cxv. Wesche, M. B., & Skehan, P. (2002). *Communicative, Task Based, and Content Based Language Instruction*. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Applied Linguistics*. OUP.
- cxvi. Wheeler, G. (2013). *Language Teaching through the Ages*. NY: Routledge.
- cxvii. Wilkins, D. (1990). *Second Languages: How they are Learned and Taught*. In N. E. Collinge (Ed.), *An Encyclopedia of Language*. NY: Routledge.
- cxviii. Williams, C. (2008). *Mid and Late Language Immersion*. In J. Osmond (Ed.), *Creating a Bilingual Wales*. Institute of Welsh Affairs.
- cxviiii. Wilson, K. (2008). *Facilitator Talk in EAP Reading Classes*. *ELTJ*, 62 (4), 366-374.
- cxix. Zeng, Z. (2012). *Convergence or Divergence? Chinese Novice EFL Teachers' Beliefs about Postmethod and Teaching Practices*. *elt*, 5 (10), 64-71.
- cxx. Zhu, Z. (2010). *A Historical Perspective of Teaching as a Second Language*. In J. Chen, C. Wang, & J. Cai (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning Chinese : Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 33-69). Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association.