EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ON POSTMEHOD PEDAGOGY IN HIGHER EDUCATION CONTEXT IN INDONESIA

Ani Fiani[1]
STKIP-PGRI Lubuklinggau

Syaprizal[2]
STKIP-PGRI Lubuklinggau

anifiani051187@gmail.com[1]

ABSTRACT

This current study is aimed to investigate EFL teachers' perception on postmethod pedagogy proposed by Kumaravadivelu. To achieve the aim, the research method used here is a qualitative case study with nine doctoral students from various universities in Indonesia. The data collection tools are a questionnaire and structured interview. The result revealed that most of the EFL lecturers have already implemented postmethod pedagogy perspective divided into four parts: teaching interaction, teaching strategy, teaching objective, and teaching content although they were not aware yet about the concept. It was indicated that they theorized what they do and did what they theorize. For further researchers, postmethod pedagogy should be investigated in real condition of teaching and learning process and the effect of this pedagogy on students' learning achievement so that it will be clearly found whether or not this pedagogy perspective is appropriate to be implemented in higher education in Indonesian context.

Keywords: *postmethod pedagogy, postmethod pedagogy framework, EFL teachers*

INTRODUCTION

In EFL contexts, most of teachers do not show yet successful in implementing the teaching methods into learning activity in their real classroom situation and rarely reflect their teaching to theorize what they do and to do what they theorize. Actually, they should be aware of their teaching reflection to develop their teaching quality in the classroom. Based on their reflection, they are able to develop their own teaching methods so that they can act as observers, evaluators, and so forth. Thus, Kumaravadivelu proposed a new term as a postmethod pedagogy. This new term is crucial for teacher growth involving

teachers constructing "classroom-oriented" theories of practice (Kumaravadivelu, 1994:29) and values teachers' potentials by emphasizing their experiences as teachers (Prabhu, 1990:172). The development of this new concept is a widespread dissatisfaction of the expert with the conventional concept of teaching and learning method. Various methods, such as oral approach, audiolingual method, content-based teaching, communicative approach, flourish. Each new teaching and learning method is part of the old, however at the same time the new one benefits and takes some positive aspects of the previous perspective. Most of the well-established method claims that they are better than previous ones (Brown, 2002:11).

Postmethod pedagogy allows to go beyond and cope the lacks of method-based pedagogy. Kumaravadivelu visualized this pedagogy as a three-dimensional system that includes three pedagogic parameters such as particularity, practicality, and possibility (2006:171). Based on these principles he presents the indicators (learners, teachers, and teacher educator). Towards a postmethod pedagogy, Kumaravadivelu developed macrostrategic framework in which consisting of ten macrostrategies (2006:201).

In the last two decades, research results showed that EFL teachers could not be successful in using the teaching methods into learning activity in real classroom situations (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:28) though actually they are able to achieve the learning outcomes. More specifically, the reseach results indicate that teachers who claim to follow a particular method do not practice its principles and procedures, those who claim to follow different methods often follow the same classroom procedures and vice versa. Lastly, teachers are found that they are improving and following their own activities without relating to any method (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:29).

This pedagogy are rarely conducted in Indonesia. The researcher did not yet find some journals refer to postmethod pedagogy in Indonesian context. However, there are several research studies conducted in Asia such as Chen's study (2014:302) showed that the study was set out to elicit a comprehensive understanding of the status quo of a junior middle school English teaching. the study was conducted in Hangzhou, China; Saksit Saengboon's study (2013:89) indicate the qualitative multiple case interview study revealed that the participants had a sufficient level of understanding of postmethod pedagogy conducted in Thailand; and, Hazratzad and Gheitanchian's study (2014:407) aimed to explore EFL teachers' attitudes towards dominant teaching method and observe any existing relationship between EFL teachers ' attitudes towards postmethod and their students' achievement. However, this current study mentioned implicitly about postmethod pedagogy shown by the questionnaire and structured interview because this pedagogy is a new term for most of the EFL teachers in Indonesia.

Based on the explanation above, this study focuses on gaining the information of the EFL teachers' perception on postmethod pedagogy. This pedagogy promote the EFL instructors to reconceptualize or construct their own teaching practice based on their local situation. Their knowledge help the teachers develop their own teaching methods and act as observers, evaluators and so forth in their teaching. Theoretically, this pedagogy is a good alternative to method implemented in indonessian context, however this pedagogy is rarely implemented and investigated. Therefore, This is a primary way to conduct more reseach related postmethod pedagogy in higher education in Indonesia context.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Postmethod Pedagogy

Postmethod pedagogy is first proposed by Kumaravadivelu in 1994. It has as a main impetus the reconceptualization of the concept and relevance of teaching method (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:28). Regarding to this, it raised as a response to second language acquisition researchers' and classroom teachers' efforts in searching for fruitful and realistic ways to best manage teaching acts. For the existing teaching approaches and methods have received considerable complaints that they do not deliver what they seem to have promised. Kumaravadivelu (2003:28) indicated that " [n]ot anchored in any specific learning and teaching context, and caught up in the whirlwind of fashion, methods tend to wildly drift from one theoretical extreme to the other". The widespread dissatisfaction of the lack of teaching methods has led to the postmethod pedagogy as an exemplar of critical language pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2003: 29).

Prabu (1990:171) states that postmethod pedagogy puts the teacher at the center of language learning and teaching and values his/her belief, experiences, and knowledge. They shoul be appreciated by giving a value because they know their students and the best of their classroom context. The teachers are considered as a great sources as a result of their experience in the past as students, past experience of teaching, knowledge of one or more methods gained throughout their training as teachers, knowledge of other teachers' actions and opinions and their experience as parents or caretakers.

Therefore, postmethod teachers are supported to design and create their own teaching methods and approaches. As a result, the constructed method reflects teachers beliefs, values and experiences (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:14). In this sense, they are independent, good analysts, strategic researchers, and good decision makers. Such teachers are also reflective, for example, they observe their own teaching, evaluate the learning results, identify the learning problems, find the solutions, and try new techniques or strategies. Based on this, there is a

movement from "science-research conceptions" toward "art-craft conception of teaching" (Arikan, 2006:4) as well as a shift from top down process to bottom-up process as teachers "theorize what they practice or practice what they theorize" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a:37). One should notice that postmethod does not disregard the knowledge of existing methods and approaches because these methods make the teachers aware of their beliefs and principles and provide inexperiences teachers or instructors with some initial knowledge that are valuable for them.

Kumaravadivelu (2006:171) presents the basics of postmethod pedagogy are pedagogic parameters (particularity, practicality, and possibility) and pedagogic indicators (the learner-active and autonomous, the teacher-autonomous, and the teacher educator- authority and autonomy).

The Pedagogic Parameters

The postmethod pedagogy as coined by Kumaravadivelu (2006:171) describes three types of parameters or principles such as *the parameter of particularity, the parameter of practicality,* and *the parameter of possibility.*

The parameter of particularity is concerned, postmethod pedagogy emphasizes the key aspect of local context or what Kumaravadivelu calls "situational understanding" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:171). From the perspective of this parameter, L2 policy makers and administrators will pay attention to local contingencies and, most probably, make do with whatever is amenable to teaching effectiveness.

For the parameter of practicality, postmethod pedagogy provides a suggestion that rather than being overly focused on what the outside experts have to say relating to the teaching efficacy, local teachers should themselves begin to seek avenues that will help them in teaching and their students are able to learn in a most successful way. In other words of Kumaravadivelu:

> (t)he parameter of practicality, then, focuses on teachers' reflection and action, which are also based on their insights and intuition. Through prior and ongoing experience with learning and teaching, the teachers gather an unexplained and sometimes explainable awareness of what constitutes good teaching (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:173).

Parameter of possibility aims at providing a more comprehensive context for the language teaching in terms of its political accountability and social engagement. From this perspective, postmethod pedagogy regards second language teaching and learning not as holding new cultural and linguistic knowledge, however as a link of struggling between the old and new identities for teachers and students alike. It means that, second or foreign language teaching refers to more as a tool to help students come to develop their own identity and as

a vehicle to study other peoples and cultures. In other words, the students are able to adopt a critical mindset towards their second or foreign langauage learning experiences. Moreover, they attempt to acquire not only a new linguistic experience, but also more importantly a new lens to appreciate the world out there and the world inside.

In short, the boundaries of these three parameters are unclear and the characteristic features overlap. They are interrelated among others and interact with among other. They together are the conceptual basics for the pedagogy. As Kumaravadivelu said (2006:176), the three pedagogic parameters are as the conceptual foundation for a postmethod pedagogy. They have potential functions as operating principles, guiding various aspects of second or foreign language learning and teaching. These operating principles manifest themselves in what may be called pedagogic indicators.

The Pedagogic Indicators

The indicators of postmethod pedagogy are the learner, the teacher, and the teacher educator. From the postmethod pedagogy perspective, the learner (student) is active and independent. Kumaravadivelu (2001:545) argues that the three aspects of the learner autonomy such as academic, social, and liberatory. Then, in 2006, he proposes two types (academic and liberatory).

Kumaravadivelu (2006:178) described the academic view as a narrow view which tries to improve in the student him/herself (a capacity to learn), while liberatory as the broad view which tries to goes beyond (including a capacity to learn to liberate) at the same time. He stated that learning to learn as learning to implement appropriate learning strategies to achieve the desired learning objectives. By by using the appropriate strategies, the students are able to regulate their learning process and maximally develop their learning capacities. If the academic autonomy enables the student to be effective, the libaratory autonomy empowers him/her to be a critical thinker. Therefore, liberatory autonomy goes further actively helping learners reflect on themeselves and their social world, form thier learning communities, and provide them opportunities and possibilities for exploration. Thus, learners will be more prepared for better solutions to problems in their learning. However, they will only be able to gain such a goal with others help, especially their teachers.

For the teachers, they are as autonomous teachers. This autonomy is central and the heart of postmethod pedagogy (kumaravadivelu, 2006: 179). Postmethod pedagogy recognizes the teacher's previous and current knowledge, and their potential to teach and act autonomously, which promotes the ability of the teacher to know how to improve a reflective approach to his/her own teaching,

how to analyze and evaluate the teaching practices, how to regulate the effects of such changes (Wallace, 1991:89).

Those abilities are able to develop only if the teachers have a motivation to maintain a fair degree of autonomy in making a pedagogic decision. They have to focus on their prior and developing personal knowledge of learning and teaching to break away from the dissatisfaction of the conventional concept of method. This knowledge not only includes particular classroom handling, but also includes connecting thinking with action. This develops through determined efforts by the teachers. Because of these processes, the teachers develop over time will eventually lead them to improve their own theory of teaching practice (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:181).

Therefore, the task of the teacher educator is to create potential conditions for the prospective teachers to gain necessary authority and autonomy that will enable them to reflect on, shape their own teaching experiences, and transform such experience (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:182). Through the dialogic interactions, links of communication between students-teachers and teachers-educators open up and actively exchange ideas. The teacher educators will then show a willigness to use the student teachers' value, beliefs, and aknowledge as an interrelated aspect of the learning process. The entire process of teacher education eventually becomes reflective and rewarding.

Postmethod Strategic Framework

The postmethod strategic frmework for language teching consists of macrostrategies and microstrategies. Kumaravadivelu (2003:38) describes the macrostrategies as guide principles. They are derived from historical, theoretical, empirical, and experiential insights in relation to second/foreign language learning and teaching. Actually, a macrostrategy is a broad guideline that is able to lead the teachers to generate their own location-specific or classroom procedures.

The strategic framework includes ten macrostrategies. They are:

1. *Maximize learning opportunities*, this strategy facilitates teaching as a process of creating and utilizing learning opportunities. The teacher is seen both as a creator of learning opportunities for his learners and the utilizer of learning opportunities created by learners.
2. *Minimize perceptual mismatches*, this strategy focuses on regarding the potential perceptual mismatches between intentions and interpretations of the student, the teacher, and the teacher educator.
3. *Facilitate negotiated interaction,* this strategy means the meaningful student and student, student and teacher classroom interaction where students are encouraged to propose topic and initiate talk, not merely react or respond.

4. *Promote learner autonomy,* this strategy deals with encouraging students learn how to learn, adjusting them with the means necessary to self-direct and self-monitor thier own learning.
5. *Foster language awareness,* this strategy consists of any attempt to draw learners' attention to the formal and functional properties of their L2 in order to increase the degree of explicitness required to promote L2 learning.
6. *Activate intuitive heuristics,* this strategy involves the potential of providing rich textual data to help students infer and internalize the underlying rules governing grammatical usage and communicative use.
7. *Contextualize linguistic input,* this strategy focuses on how language usage use are formed by linguistic, extralinguistic, situational and extrasituational contexts.
8. *Integrate language skills,* this strategy deals with the need to holistically integrate the language skillsin which they are traditionally separated and sequenced as listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
9. *Ensure social relevance,* this strategy stresses the need for the teacher to be aware to the societal, political, economic, and educational environment in which second/foreign language learning and teaching take place.
10. *Raise cultural consciousness,* this strategy focuses on treating the students as cultural informants so that they are encouraged to engage in a process of classroom participation that puts a premium on their power/knowledge.

The macrostrategies introduced above are general guiding principles for classroom teaching, and are to be implemented in the classroom through the microstrategies designed to realize the goals of a particular macrostrategy. One macrostrategy may have many microstrategies. Microstrategies refer to "classroom procedures that are designed to realize the objectives of a particular macrostrategies. Any type of microstrategy depends on the local learning and teaching situation. The possibilities are endless" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 208). He stated microstrategies are associated with different local situations and conditioned by the national, regional, or local language policy and planning, curricular objectives, institutional resources, and learners' needs, wants, lacks and even their current level of language knowledge/competence, and a great many other possible factors.

As for detailed microstrategies following each macrostrategy, he mentions (1) opportunities outside classroom, (2) learner training and learner perception, (3) intensive teacher-learner communication, (4) learner autonomy and learning preferences, (5 and 6) language use and language awareness, (7) contextualizing linguistic input, (8) utilizing all sorts of raw materials, (9 and 10) ensuring social and cultural relevance. In fact, Kumaravadivelu has demonstrated a

comprehensive picture of how to design valid microstrategies in a specific context under the guidance of each macrostrategy (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:208).

In concusion, the postmethod pedagogy encourages local teachers to develop their teaching more effectively through theorizing what they do and to practice what they theorized. Teaching method which was implemented by local teachers according to their real specific situation based on learners' situation, it is called a postmethod pedagogy. In this sense, the local teachers construct or innovate their teaching by their experiences through their reflection. Saengboon was interested in conducting the research because he wanted to find out how local teachers construe pedagogical innovations such as postmethod pedagogy. The postmethod pedagogy is an alternative to method so that teachers can innovate their teaching experiences as an buttom-up approach in which theorising what they do and practicing what they theorize.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research design of this study utilized a qualitative case study. According to Ary (2002:27) a case study is an in-depth study of a single unit, such as one individual, one group, one organization, one program, and so on. The objective of this research design is to arrive at a detailed description and understanding the entity. Moreover, a case study can result in data from which generalizations to theory are possible. Therefore, a qualitative case study is to gain descriptive interpretation without using statistical analysis. In this study, the case study aimed to arrive at a detailed description about EFL teachers' perception on postmethod pedagogy.

The participants consists of nine EFL teachers of doctoral degree in UPI (November 27-December 2, 2014) from several universities in Indonesia. The teachers indicate that they have comprehensive knowledge and reflect their teaching practice effectively. The reflection is an essential aspect of postmethod pedagogy. Then, this study used a questionnaire and structured interview as data collection tools.

FINDING

EFL Teachers' Perception on Kumaravadivelu's postmethod pedagogy

Based on the questionnaire consists of fifteen statements, this study gained the information. The results were here presented in the four parts (teaching interaction, teaching technique, teaching objective, and teaching content).

Table 1. The Percentation Data of Teaching Interaction

No.	Statements	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1.	You maximize learning opportunities in your classes	8/89%	-	1/11.1%	-	-
2.	You do not give learners a voice in your classes	-	-	1/11.1%	2/22.2%	6/66.7%
3.	You do not really listen when your learners speak and build on what they say.	-	-	1/11.1%	-	8/89%
4.	You give your students an opportunity to take up on something a teacher or another learner has said and make it into a new topic.	2/22.2%	4/44.4%	2/22.2%	1/11.1%	-

The table consists of four questions from the first number until the fourth. For the first statement, it revealed that eight teachers (89%) claimed that they always maximize learning opportunities in their class and only one teacher (11.1%) claimed sometimes. Then, Six teachers (66.7%) stated that they never do not give the learners a voice in their classes. Two teachers (22.2%) argued rarely. Then, one teacher (11.1%) claimed sometimes. Besides that, eight teachers (89%) answered they never do not really listen when their learners speak and build on what they say and one teacher (11%) merely answered sometimes. And for the last statement, four teachers (44.4%) stated that they usually give their learners an opportunity to take up on something a teacher or another learner has said and make it into a new topic. Two teacher (22.2%) answered always as well as two other techers argue sometimes. One teacher, then (11,1%) mentioned rarely.

Table 2. The Percentation Data of Teaching Technique

No.	Statements	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
8.	You help your students to notice the gap between student's own knowledge and correct use of language.	5/55.5%	2/22.2%	2/22.2%	-	-
9.	You introduce language in context, not in isolation.	6/66.7%	2/22.2%	1/11.1%	-	-
10.	You integrate a variety of skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) in your classes.	6/66.7%	1/11.1%	2/22.2%	-	-
11.	You promote general language awareness as well as critical language awareness in your students	5/55.5%	3/33.3%	-	1/11.1%	

The table showed four questions numbered eight to eleven. For the first statements, five teachers (55.5%) mentioned that they always help their learners to notice the gap between learner's own knowledge and correct use of language and two teachers (22,2%) claimed usually and two other teachers stated sometimes. The second, six teachers (66.7%) claimed that they always introduce language in context, not in isolation. Two teachers (22.2%) claimed usually and another teacher mentions sometimes. The third, six teachers (66.7%) stated that they always integrate a variety of skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) in their classes. Two teachers (22.2%) mentioned sometimes and one teacher claimed usually. Finally, four teachers (44.4%) claim that they always promote general language awareness as well as critical language awareness in their learners. Three teachers (33.3%) mentioned usually. One teacher (11.1%) claimed sometimes and another teacher (11.1%) stated rarely.

Table 3. The Percentation Data of Teaching Objective

No.	Statements	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
5.	You promote learner autonomy in your classes.	8/89%	-	1/11.1%	-	-
6.	You use a method(s) of teaching that allows your students to learn by discovering things for themselves and learning from their own experience.	7/77.8%	-	2/22.2%	-	-
7.	You enhance to input through consciousness-raising activities	2/22.2%	5/55.5%	2/22.2%		

The teaching objective deals with three questions which consists of number five to seven. The findings showed that for the first, eight teachers (89%) claimed that they always promote learner autonomy in their classes. Then, one teacher (11,1%) mentioned sometimes; the second, five teachers (55.5%) claimed that they always use a method(s) of teaching that allow(s) their learners to learn by discovering things for themselves and learning from their own experience. Two teachers (22.2%) mentioned sometimes. Then one teacher (11.1%) stated rarely as well as another teacher claims usually. The last, five teachers (55.5%) claim that they usually enhance to input through consciousness-raising activities. Two teachers (22.2%) mentioned sometimes as well as two other teachers stated always.

Table 4. The Percentation Data of The Teaching Content

No	Statements	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
12.	You do not include target culture, own culture and international culture in classroom materials.	1/11.1%	-	3/33.3%	2/22.2%	3/33.3%
13.	You do not allow some L1 in your	-	1/11.1%	3/33.3%	4/44.4%	1/11.1%

	classroom.				
14.	You do not help students to recognize other varieties of English.	1/11.1%	-	-	3/33.3%	5/55.5%
15.	You raise students' global cultural consciousness, not just an awareness of English culture.	6/66.7%	-	3/33.3%	-	-

In teaching content, there are four questions from number twelve until fifteen. The findings revealed that: the first statement involved three teachers (33.3%) stated that they never do not include target, own culture and international culture in their classroom materials. Three other teachers (33.3%) mentioned sometimes. Two teachers (22.2%) claim rarely. Then, one teacher states always; the second, four teachers (44.4%) claimed that they rarely do not allow some L1 in their classes. Three teachers (33.3%) mentioned sometimes. One teacher (11,1%) stated usually and one last teacher (11.1%) mentioned never; The third, five teachers (55.5%) mentioned never do not help their students to recognize other varieties of English. Three teachers (33.3%) claimed rarely. Then, one teacher (11.1%) stated always; Finally, six teachers, 66.7%, stated that they always raise their learners' global culture consciousness, not just an awareness of english culture. Three teachers (33.3%) mentioned sometime.

DISCUSSION

Concerning to the teaching interaction, the results indicated that the teachers have already maximized learning opportunities, facilitated negotiated interaction, and minimized perceptual mismatches. Most of the teachers have already done good teaching interaction with their students. They (89%) claimed that they always maximize learning opportunities. This was supported by interview data in which they stated that they provided learning practices such as games, questions and answer sessions among students, discussions, etc. As Kumaravadivelu stated (2006:201) that maximizing learning opportunities means that teaching as a process of creating and utilizing learning opportunities. In this regard, teachers have two roles, first as creators of learning opportunities, and second, as utilizers of learning opportunities (created by learners). The teachers are willing to modify their lesson plans based on feedback to suit the needs of target learners and should not ignore contributory discourse from learners.

Moreover, the teachers seemed to facilitate negotiated interaction. From the result, it was shown that the teachers give the learners a voice in their classes (66.7%) and really listened when their learners speak and build on what they say (89%). It deals with meaningful learner-learner, learner-teacher interaction in class where the leareners have the freedom and flexibility to initiate and navigate talk, not just react and respond to it (Kumaravadivelu, 2006: 202). It means that the learners are actively involved in interaction. Based on interview data, this statement had been justified that they tried to encourage their students to be actively involved in learning. When their students did not understand their explanations, they provided opportunities to ask and clarify about their understanding. In this case, the teachers minimized perceptual mismatches through communication or interaction. The communication is a gradual reduction of uncertainty. In second/foreign language classroom communication, every piece of human communication has the prosperities to contain ambiguities between teacher intention and learner interpretation. Therefore, most of the EFL teachers here (44.4%) usually give their learners an opportunity to take up on something a teacher or another learner has said and make it into a new topic. In interview session, they stated that they tried to minimize their students' misunderstanding during learning process by communicating it.

The second, in terms of the teaching technique, the findings showed that the teachers have already activated intuitive heuristics, contextualized linguistic input, and integrated language skills. The teachers (55.5%) always help or activate their learners to notice the gap between learners' own knowledge and correct use of language, however the others stated usually and sometimes do it. It indicated that they activate intuitive heuristics (i.e. modifying input in terms of form and meaning). For example: they help them to use correct English and inform them if they have several mistake in using English. Kumaravadivelu states "one way of activating heuristics of the learners is to provide enough textual data so that the learner can infer certain underlying rules of form and function"(2006:204). In educational contexts, heuristics deals with the process of self-discovery on the part of the learner (2003:176).

Moreover, teachers have already contextualized linguistic input as shown that they (66.7%) always introduced language in context, not in isolation, however the other teachers mentioned usually and sometimes. Contextualizing linguistic input as Kumaravadivelu (2006:205) said "the feature of language as discourse" so that the learners can benefit from the interactive effects of systemic as well as discoursal components of language. One of them stated that she tried to find the similarities of the language input in L1 and relate them into the context to be easily understood by their students.

In addition, the data showed that the teachers (66.7%) always integrate a variety of skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) in their classes, but the others stated usually and sometimes. All of them have already done it although not all who always integrate the skills. For example, most of them stated that when they teach reading skills, they encourage their students to develop other language skills (listening, speaking, and writing). They also argued that language skills could not separately taught, they are always integrated. It informs that the nature of L2 learning involves not only an integration of linguistic components of language, but also an integration of language skills as kumaravadivelu (2006: 206) said "language skills are essentially interrelated and amutually reinforcing". For promoting general language awareness as well as critical language awareness in students, most of the EFL teachers here (55.5%) always promote general language awareness and critical language awareness in their students. They stated that students be aware of not only English but also general language awareness such as Indonesian language, local language, etc.

The third, focusing on the teaching objective, the data indicates that most of the teachers promoted learner autonomy in their classes, used a method(s) of teaching that allows their students to learn by discovering things for themselves and learning from their own experience. The teachers (89%) always promoted learner autonomy and foster language awareness. Most of them tried to encourage their students to learn independently not only in but also outside the classroom. Kumaravadivelu states that it involves helping learners learn how to learn, adjusting with the metacognitive, cognitive, social, and affective strategies necessary to self-direct their own learning processes, making the strategies explicit and systematic, thus those strategies are available to develop the language-learning abilities of other students as well, and so forth (2006:206). It is supported as the second answer that most of the lecturers (77.8%) always use a method(s) of teaching that allow(s) their learners to learn by discovering things for themselves and learning from their own experience although only two teachers stated that they sometimes do it. Then, the third statement showed that some of the teachers (55.5%) usually enhance to input through consciousness-raising activities indicated as fostering language awareness. Language awareness is based on strategies that emphasize understanding, general principles, and operational experience (kumaravadivelu, 2006:403, 2003:302).

Finally, regarding to the teaching content, the findings showed that the teachers were aware of raising cultural consciousness and ensuring social relevance. Some of them (33.3%) sometimes and never do not include target, own culture and international culture in their classroom materials. They tried to enhance students' local or national cultural awareness such as Sundanese, Javanese, etc. Cook (1992:583) states "the learner is not becoming an imitation

native speaker, but a person who can stand between the two languages, using both when appropriate". Moreover, some of them allow some L1 in their classes. It showed that most of the lecturers (89%) consider the proficiency or level of their students in order to make their students are able to understand more and compare with their culture and social relevance, and only one teacher stated she usually does not allow some L1 in her classroom. They tried to mix and match L1 (Indonesian language or local language) and L2 (English) to help their students easily in understanding the target language.

To raise cultural consciousness, some of the teachers (55.5%) mentioned never do not help their students to recognize other varieties of English and raise their learners' global culture consciousness. It simplifies not just an awareness of English culture. Culture teaching has always been an integral aspect of second/foreign language teaching. Although in Indonesia, English is as a foreign language, it is important to be learned by Indonesian students. According to a review by Stern (in Kumaravadivelu, 2006:207), 'culture teaching has included a cognitive component in terms of the target culture to world civilization, knowledge about differences in the way of life as well as an understanding of values and attitudes in the second/foreign language community. Then, the last statement, most of the lecturers (66.7%) stated that they always raise students' global cultural consciousness, not just an awareness of English culture, and the others mentioned they sometimes did it. In the teaching and learning processes, most of the EFL teachers sometimes share and inform their students about various culture in the world.

In conclusion, based on the postmethod pedagogy framework divided into four aspects: learning interaction, learning technique, learning objective, and learning content. In the learning interaction, most of the teachers have already maximized learning opportunities, facilitated negotiated interaction, and minimized perceptual mismatches in the teaching and learning processes. In the second aspect, most of the teachers have already activated intuitive heuristics, contextualized linguistic input, and integrated language skills. The third aspect, the learning objective, most of the teachers have already promoted learner autonomy in their classes, used a method(s) of teaching that allows their students to learn by discovering things for themselves and learning from their own experience. Finally, the last aspect, most of the teachers have already been aware of raising cultural consciousness and ensuring social relevance.

CONCLUSION

This study discussed EFL teachers' perspective on postmethod pedagogy proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2003; 2006). The result revealed that most of the lecturers have already implemented the postmethod pedagogy framework

although they do not aware yet of the principles of this pedagogy. It could be seen from four parts: teaching interaction, teaching technique, teaching objective, and teaching content. Therefore, it can be concluded that most of the EFL lecturers have already used teaching reflection as an important aspect of postmethod pedagogy although they do not consider it so that it is needed to re-conceptualize the best teaching practice based on constructing "classroom-oriented" theories of practice (Kumaravadivelu, 1994: 29). Moreover, it was indicated that the EFL teachers theorized what they do and practiced what they theorize in their classrooms. For further researchers, this pedagogy will be better and broader in interpreting the research results through investigeting the real situation in Indonesian context. Therefore, Kumaravadivelu's strategy can be seen whether or not it is appropriate implemented in higher education in Indonesian context.

REFERENCES

Arikan, A. (2006). Postmethod condition and its implementations for english language teacher education. *Journal of Language and a Linguistics Studies*, 2(1), 1-11.

Ary, Donald., Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavieh. 2002. *Introduction To Research In Education*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Brown, D. (2002). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. In J.C. Richards & W.. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching*, 9-18. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, Mingyao. (2014). Postmethod Pedagogy and its influece on EFL teaching strategies. *English language Teaching*, 7 (5), 17-25.

Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557-591.

Freeman, D. (1991). Mistaken constructs: Re-examining the nature and assumptions of language teacher education. *Linguistics and Language Pedagogy: The state of the art*, 25-39, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Hazratzad, A. And Mchrnaz Gheitanchian. EFL teachers' attitudes towards postmethod pedagogy and their students' achievement. Proceeding of the 10th METU ELT Convention. Accessed on Monday, December 22nd, 2014. (http://dbe.metu.edu.tr/convention/proceedingsweb/Attitudes.pdf)

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

_____. 2001. Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 537-560.

_____. 2003. Critical language pedagogy: a postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes,* 22 (4), 539-550. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00317.x

_____. 2003a. *Beyond Method: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching* . New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

_____. 2006. *Understanding Language Teaching From Method To Postmethod*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

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

Richard, J.C. & Rodgers, T. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Saengboon, S. 2013. Thai English Teachers' Understanding of "postmethod pedagogy": case study of University lecturers. *Canadian Center of Science and education, 6*, 156-166

Wallace, M. J. 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.