MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS
https://e-journal.uum.edu.my/index.php/mjoal

How to cite this article:
Rahman, K. A, & Rukanuddin, M. (2026). Context, critique, and change: Integrating post-method pedagogy in global ELT practices. *Malaysian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*, 32-42. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjoal2026.4.3

CONTEXT, CRITIQUE AND CHANGE: INTEGRATING POST-METHOD PEDAGOGY IN GLOBAL ELT PRACTICES

[1]Kh Atikur Rahman & [2]Mohammad Rukanuddin
[1]Bangladesh Maritime University, Bangladesh
[2]Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh

[1]Corresponding author: kardu2011@gmail.com

Received: 15/8/2025 Revised: 23/8/2026 Accepted: 27/9/2026 Published: 31/10/2026

ABSTRACT

English Language Teaching (ELT) has long been grappled with an elusive pursuit: discovering a universal method that guarantees effective language acquisition. This paper revisits the evolution of ELT methodologies, critiques the limitations of method-based paradigms, and positions Post-Method Pedagogy (PMP) as a transformative alternative. Anchored in Kumaravadivelu's three parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility, PMP advocates a context-sensitive, teacher-empowering, and critically engaged approach to language instruction. By examining historical trajectories, theoretical foundations, practical applications, and global challenges, the paper underscores PMP's potential to recalibrate ELT toward equity and responsiveness. The study also focuses on criticisms and implementation barriers, particularly in Global South contexts, and proposes pathways for sustainable integration of PMP into teacher education and educational policy.

Keywords: Post-Method Pedagogy (PMP), ELT, teacher autonomy, learner autonomy.

INTRODUCTION

Language instruction has experienced considerable changes over the centuries, mirroring alterations in linguistic theory, educational philosophy, and societal demands (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). The historical evolution of English Language Teaching (ELT) methodology illustrates the adoption of various ways to meet the changing needs of language learners (Jahan, 2014). Initial approaches, including the Grammar-Translation Method, focused on memorizing grammatical principles and translation tasks, favoring reading and writing abilities above vocal competency (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). This method faced criticism for its insufficient emphasis on practical language application, leading to the development more communicative approaches.

The Direct Method, established in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, promoted immersion in the target language, prioritizing listening and speaking abilities through engagement and discourse. This approach aimed to rectify the shortcomings of the Grammar-Translation Method; nevertheless, its rigid prohibition of the learners' home language and the requirement for very proficient instructors constrained its wider implementation (Brown, 2007; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Subsequent advancements resulted in the Audio-Lingual Method, shaped by structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology, which utilized drilling and repetition to cultivate language habits. This methodology encountered criticism for its mechanical characteristics and insufficient emphasis on substantive communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1970s signified a paradigm shift, emphasizing fluency, engagement, and the practical application of language in authentic contexts. Despite its extensive adoption, CLT frequently faced criticism for its inconsistent execution, disregard for grammatical precision, and inappropriateness in specific sociocultural contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

The increasing discontent with method-based methods to language instruction has been central to discussions in ELT. Critics contend that conventional approaches frequently endorse a "one-size-fits-all" paradigm that neglects the intricate and various requirements of learners, especially within varied sociocultural and institutional frameworks (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These approaches are criticized for their top-down approach, which relegates teachers to passive executors of predetermined methodologies, therefore limiting their autonomy and creativity (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

The notion of Post Method Pedagogy (PMP) arose as a solution to these issues, providing a more adaptable and contextually aware approach to language instruction. Kumaravadivelu (2006) proposed Post Method Pedagogy, which is based on three fundamental principles: particularity, focusing on context-specific strategies; practicality, linking theory and practice through teacher reflection; and possibility, considering the sociopolitical realities of language education. This framework aims to enhance teachers' ability to modify and create contextually appropriate methods, thereby addressing the limitations of conventional approaches and effectively tackling the intricacies of contemporary language acquisition (Kumaravadivelu, 2012).

This paper presents a critical analysis of PMP and its impact on ELT. Through an examination of its theoretical underpinnings, practical applications, and implementation challenges, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of PMP's transformative potential in language education (Canagarajah, 2005). By synthesizing key scholarly contributions and empirical research findings, the analysis highlights PMP's role in challenging rigid methodological paradigms and advancing more flexible, context-sensitive approaches to language instruction. The investigation particularly focuses on how PMP facilitates learner-centered teaching practices across diverse educational environments while addressing the complexities of real-world classroom implementation (Holliday, 2005). Ultimately, this critical examination aims to inform both contemporary ELT practices and future research directions in pedagogical innovation.

While doing so, this review advances PMP scholarship through two key contributions: first, it analyzes socio-political tensions in implementing PMP within neoliberal education systems, particularly its clashes with standardized testing regimes (Hamid, 2016); second, it synthesizes Global South perspectives on PMP adaptations, including evidence from underrepresented contexts like Bangladeshi (Jahan, 2014; Sharmin, 2021) and Sri Lankan (Halik & Nusrath, 2020) rural classrooms. By interrogating these dimensions, the paper not only critiques method-based ELT but also charts actionable pathways for PMP's integration amid globalization and educational inequity.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PMP

PMP signifies a substantial paradigm shift in ELT, providing a flexible and context-sensitive alternative to inflexible, method-based instructional approaches (Canagarajah, 1999; Akbari, 2008). Kumaravadivelu (2006) characterizes PMP as an approach that surpasses the constraints of prescriptive techniques by highlighting the necessity for localized, pragmatic, and reflective teaching approaches. It contests the uniformity of conventional approaches, promoting a more flexible and responsive framework that enables educators and students to navigate the intricacies of language acquisition within varied sociocultural environments (Benson, 2013).

Kumaravadivelu (2006) delineates PMP via a three-dimensional framework encompassing particularity, practicality, and potential. Each dimension emphasizes a unique yet interrelated notion that directs educators in formulating and executing effective language instruction.

Particularity: Attentiveness to Local Contexts

The principle of particularity underscores the necessity for language instruction to be attuned to the distinct sociocultural, political, and institutional settings in which it transpires (Holliday, 2005). Pedagogical methods must correspond with the requirements, ambitions, and obstacles of distinct learners and societies. PMP, in contrast to conventional approaches that enforce a standardized framework, advocates for teachers to tailor their practices to local contexts. A rural school in Bangladesh may emphasize distinct language abilities compared to an urban, multicultural classroom in Europe. Kumaravadivelu (2006) emphasizes that comprehending learners' cultural origins, learning styles, and educational objectives is essential for cultivating significant and effective language learning experiences.

Practicality: Connecting Theory and Application

Practicality bridges the divide between academic knowledge and classroom application, promoting a mutually beneficial interaction between the two (Edge, 2001). This principle designates teachers as reflective practitioners who actively analyze, adapt, and build instructional ideas informed by their classroom experiences. It contests the conventional top-down methodology, wherein theoretical frameworks are frequently enforced upon educators without regard for their practical ramifications. Kumaravadivelu (2006) contends that educators' views and experiences are essential for developing and enhancing theories, hence increasing their relevance and applicability to practical teaching contexts.

Possibility: Addressing Socio-political Inequities

The notion of possibility broadens the focus of language instruction beyond mere linguistic proficiency, highlighting its capacity to tackle wider sociopolitical and cultural concerns (Norton & Toohey, 2004). PMP acknowledges that language acquisition is intrinsically linked to power dynamics, identity, and social institutions. Kumaravadivelu (2006) contends that educators and students must be enabled to critically assess and contest injustices, including the supremacy of English as a global language and its effects on marginalized populations. This notion corresponds with critical pedagogy, promoting the use of language as a means for social reform among learners (Pennycook, 2001).

KEY PRINCIPLES AND FEATURES OF POST METHOD PEDAGOGY

The PMP signifies a transformative movement in ELT by departing from prescriptive approaches and adopting a flexible, adaptable approach that emphasizes teacher autonomy, learner-centeredness, and context-sensitive instruction (Canagarajah, 2006; Akbari, 2008). This section examines these fundamental ideas and evaluates their effectiveness in overcoming the shortcomings of conventional approaches.

Teacher Autonomy: Teachers as Decision-Makers

A fundamental principle of PMP is teacher autonomy, which regards instructors as empowered decision-makers instead of just implementers of predetermined procedures. Kumaravadivelu (2006) asserts that PMP empowers educators to evaluate their own teaching contexts, discern learner requirements, and formulate suitable instructional approaches. This contrasts with conventional methods that frequently advocate rigid, uniform techniques, allowing minimal scope for teachers' autonomy or innovation. PMP promotes autonomy, urging educators to engage in reflective practice, wherein they critically assess their teaching experiences and modify their methods to enhance learning outcomes (Farrell, 2015). For example, an educator in a resource-constrained rural classroom may adapt communicative exercises to fit the situation, emphasizing oral drills that use few materials. This versatility enables educators to address the evolving characteristics of language learning contexts, ensuring their education remains effective and pertinent.

Teacher autonomy also confronts the challenges of method-based instruction, which frequently presupposes a hierarchical relationship between theorists and practitioners. Conventional procedures designate researchers as the principal generators of information, whereas educators are anticipated to adhere to established protocols. This hierarchical approach overlooks the practical knowledge that educators acquire via their daily contact with students. The PMP addresses this disparity by acknowledging educators as co-creators of educational knowledge, adept at merging theory with practice (Freeman & Johnson, 1998).

Learner-Centeredness: Promoting Active Engagement and Agency

A fundamental aspect of PMP is its focus on learner-centeredness, which promotes the active engagement and autonomy of learners in the language acquisition process. This principle is based on constructivist learning theories, which assert that learners create knowledge through interaction, investigation, and reflection (Brown, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). PMP cultivates a more dynamic and engaging learning environment by prioritizing learners in the educational process. In a learner-centered classroom, the teacher's position transitions from an authoritative figure to a facilitator who guides and encourages students in their educational pursuits. Activities are structured to foster cooperation, critical thinking, and problem-solving, enabling learners to assume responsibility for their advancement. Task-based learning exercises necessitating collaborative group effort to address real-world challenges correspond with the tenets of learner-centeredness by fostering both linguistic and cognitive advancement (Nunan, 2004).

This notion also rectifies a notable deficiency of conventional methods, which frequently regard learners as passive absorbers of knowledge. Approaches such as the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audio-Lingual Method emphasize rote memorization and repetitious exercises, with minimal opportunity for creativity or interaction. In contrast, PMP recognizes the many learning styles, preferences, and objectives of individual learners, ensuring that training is customized to their particular requirements (Tomlinson, 2012).

Context-Sensitive Approaches: Adapting to Local Realities

The PMP emphasizes the importance of context-sensitive approaches, advocating for the adaptation of teaching methodologies to align with sociocultural, institutional, and learner-specific circumstances. Kumaravadivelu (2006) defines this concept as the "particularity" of language education, requiring educators to consider cultural norms, linguistic backgrounds, and available resources while developing teaching strategies.

An instructor in an urban classroom with multilingual students may employ translanguaging strategies that leverage the kids' native languages as resources for learning English (Garcia & Wei, 2014). In circumstances of limited technological access, educators may prioritize low-tech, participatory activities that foster meaningful communication independent of digital gadgets. This adaptability ensures that education remains effective and inclusive, regardless of external constraints.

Traditional methods often overlook these contextual factors, relying instead on universal frameworks that may be inappropriate or ineffective in certain settings. CLT assumes that learners are familiar with student-centered techniques and have access to valuable resources. In many developing countries, cultural norms and institutional structures frequently favor teacher-centered education, hence hindering the adoption of CLT (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Holliday, 2005). The PMP confronts these limitations by encouraging educators to adapt their strategies to the particular circumstances of their educational environments.

ADDRESSING CHALLENGES OF TRADITIONAL METHODOLOGIES

The concepts of PMP adeptly tackle numerous issues linked to conventional methodologies. Conventional approaches frequently dictate inflexible techniques that constrain educators' capacity to tailor their methods to particular settings. The PMP enables educators to create tailored strategies that cater to the distinct requirements of their students (Akbari, 2008). Moreover, conventional approaches frequently emphasize rote learning and memorization, resulting in disinterested learners. PMP promotes learner-centeredness, facilitating active engagement and significant interaction, hence improving motivation and retention (Norton & Toohey, 2004). Additionally, numerous methodologies, including CLT, stem from Western educational traditions and may not correspond with the cultural values or institutional norms of non-Western environments. The PMP emphasizes contextual sensitivity, guaranteeing that teaching techniques are culturally relevant and inclusive (Canagarajah, 1999). Most importantly, method-based instruction diminishes instructors to mere implementers, eroding their professional competence. The PMP reinstates agency for educators, acknowledging them as reflective practitioners and co-creators of pedagogical knowledge (Farrell, 2015; Freeman & Johnson, 1998).

APPLICATIONS OF PMP IN ELT

The PMP offers a transformational framework that redefines instruction and learning in ELT. The ideas of teacher autonomy, learner-centeredness, and contextual adaptation are implemented through practical applications that empower educators, promote learner independence, accommodate various circumstances, and utilize technology (Akbari, 2008; Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Teacher's Role: Reflective Practitioners and Decision-Makers

In PMP, educators serve as reflective practitioners who actively assess and modify their instructional practices to accommodate the distinct demands of their students and environments. Kumaravadivelu (2006) asserts that this approach liberates educators from strict compliance with prescribed methodologies, allowing them to make informed pedagogical choices grounded in classroom realities (Thomas, 2013).

Reflective practice prompts educators to critically evaluate their teaching methods, recognize opportunities for enhancement, and adopt creative approaches. Schon (1983) contends that reflective practitioners connect theory and practice by deriving insights from their experiences. A reflective teacher finds conventional lecture-based methods do not engage pupils in large courses and, consequently, implements interactive techniques such as peer discussions or role-playing (Farrell, 2015).

Canh and Barnard's (2017) research underscores the effective implementation of PMP in Vietnam, wherein teachers tailored their teaching to suit local conditions. Teachers employed reflective practice to tackle challenges including substantial class numbers, few resources, and students' deficiencies in confidence regarding English usage. By integrating activities suited to their students' cultural and educational contexts, these teachers established more interesting and effective learning environments (Matsuda, 2012).

Learner Autonomy: Strategies for Independent Learning

Learner autonomy is fundamental to Post Method Pedagogy, highlighting the active engagement of students in their educational processes (Little, 2007). Methods to promote autonomy encompass project-based learning, self-evaluation, and cooperative endeavors. Project-based learning fosters student autonomy in education through engagement in authentic projects that necessitate critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity (Thomas, 2000). Students may investigate local environmental issues and report their results in English, thereby blending language proficiency with subject matter expertise.

Collaborative learning activities, including group discussions and peer teaching, promote autonomy by facilitating mutual learning among students. These activities foster a conducive environment for kids to enhance language abilities and cultivate social competencies (Oxford, 1997). These initiatives not only improve language competency but also foster confidence and motivation.

Self-assessment, on the other hand, allows learners to evaluate their progress, recognize strengths and limitations, and establish personal learning objectives. Brown (2007) asserts that self-assessment enhances metacognition, enabling learners to oversee and manage their own learning processes (Andrade & Du, 2007). Instruments such as reflective journals, linguistic portfolios, and peer feedback sessions might enhance this process.

Contextual Adaptations: Localized Applications

The PMP emphasizes the necessity of customizing teaching tactics to the distinct cultural, institutional, and learner-specific settings of ELT. Contextual modifications guarantee that language education remains pertinent and efficient across many environments (Holliday, 2005). In India, where huge class sizes and little resources are prevalent, educators have modified CLT techniques to align with their circumstances. Group activities necessitating minimum resources, such as storytelling or role-playing, have been employed to enhance speaking skills (Stern, 2013). In Bangladesh, educators have included local cultural elements into reading and writing exercises to enhance relatability and engagement for children (Khan, 2020; Hamid & Honan, 2012).

The PMP recognizes the socio-political aspects of language instruction. In nations where English correlates with social advancement and privilege, educators can utilize language teaching to strengthen disenfranchised communities (Pennycook, 1994). By integrating themes of social justice and equality into the curriculum, educators can facilitate critical engagement with societal concerns while enhancing language proficiency (Norton & Toohey, 2004).

Technology Integration: Facilitating Post Method Approaches

Digital resources provide novel options for the implementation of PMP by augmenting instructor autonomy, fostering learner-centeredness, and facilitating contextual modifications (Hockly, 2012). Flipped classrooms, for example, reverse conventional teaching paradigms by enabling students to interact with educational materials (e.g., video lectures, online readings) outside of class, thereby concentrating on interactive activities during class time. This methodology enables educators to utilize classroom time for

significant interactions and collaborative activities, along with the tenets of PMP (Bergmann & Sams, 2012; Lage et al., 2000). Students may view a video instruction on grammatical structures at home and subsequently apply their knowledge in collaborative writing exercises during class.

Adaptive learning platforms, including Duolingo and Rosetta Stone, customize education by evaluating learners' progress and delivering specific feedback. These technologies allow learners to progress at their own speed, promoting independence and addressing personal requirements (Godwin-Jones, 2014). Educators can include these platforms into their curriculum to enhance classroom education and accommodate varying competence levels among learners.

Platforms like Google Docs, Padlet, and Zoom enhance collaborative learning and engagement, especially in distant or hybrid environments. Students might utilize Google Docs for collaborative essay writing or engage in virtual discussion forums to enhance their speaking abilities (Reinhardt, 2019). These tools enhance the potential of language instruction, rendering it more adaptable and accessible.

Although technology presents various benefits, its implementation must be contextually aware. In resource-constrained environments, educators may have to depend on low-tech alternatives, such as mobile learning applications or offline digital materials. Furthermore, educators necessitate training to proficiently integrate technology into their teaching, underscoring the significance of professional development in PMP (Howard & Mozejko, 2015).

CHALLENGES AND CRITICISMS OF PMP

While PMP has garnered significant attention for its innovative and flexible approach to ELT, it is not without challenges and criticisms. Implementing this framework in real-world settings often reveals systemic, practical, and theoretical limitations that educators and policymakers must address (Breen, 2001).

Resource Constraints

A significant issue of PMP is its reliance on resources, especially in under-resourced environments. Majority of educational institutions in underdeveloped nations have significant deficiencies in teaching resources, infrastructure, and technology tools, hindering the adoption of context-sensitive and learner-centered methodologies (Wedell, 2009). Teachers in rural or economically deprived regions may encounter difficulties in tailoring classes to accommodate students' varied requirements due to insufficient textbooks, digital resources, or proper classroom facilities (McConkey & Mariga, 2014). Kumaravadivelu (2006) emphasizes that the idea of contextual sensitivity requires instructors to devise and execute techniques specific to their distinct educational contexts. Resource shortages frequently result in dependence on conventional, rote-based techniques, compromising the flexibility and creativity fundamental to PMP. A recent study by Halik and Nusrath (2020) in Sri Lanka revealed that English educators in rural schools were deficient in fundamental teaching resources, including operational blackboards and printed materials. This compelled them to implement lecture-based pedagogies, constraining options for interactive or student-centered engagements. Addressing these difficulties may entail utilizing economical teaching techniques, such as locally sourced materials, or implementing community-oriented educational projects that promote resource sharing (Pennycook, 2010). Nevertheless, these techniques necessitate policy endorsement and continuous investment in educational infrastructure.

Institutional Barriers

The adaptability provided by PMP frequently conflicts with institutional frameworks, like standardized curricula, inflexible assessment systems, and hierarchical administrative organizations (Littlewood, 2007). Many educational systems promote standardized assessments as indicators of success, emphasizing consistency and quantifiable results over originality and adaptation. Kumaravadivelu (2012) contends that this emphasis is at odds with the tenets of PMP, which promote teacher autonomy and contextually tailored techniques. Inflexible curriculum constrains educators' capacity to tailor teachings to the distinct cultural and language backgrounds of their students. Richards and Rodgers (2014) observe that institutional opposition to change frequently arises from an adherence to conventional approaches that correspond with current evaluation procedures. In Bangladesh, for example, teachers often articulate dissatisfaction with curricula that emphasize grammar and vocabulary exercises at the expense of communicative proficiency. This compromises the implementation of learner-centered and participatory methodologies (Khan, 2020). Overcoming these obstacles necessitates systemic transformation, encompassing adaptable curricula that permit localized modifications and the integration of formative assessments that adhere to Post Method principles (Holliday, 2005).

Teacher Training Gaps

The PMP imposes considerable expectations on educators, necessitating their role as reflective practitioners and the constant adaptation of instructional practices. Nevertheless, many educators lack the requisite training and professional growth to execute these ideas effectively (Borg, 2011). In numerous areas, teacher training programs predominantly concentrate on conventional methods, with little focus on the critical thinking, creativity, and adaptability essential for Post Method approaches (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Educators frequently lack the necessary skills to create contextually relevant lessons or to participate in reflective practice.

Pre-service training frequently overlooks the intricacies of actual teaching environments, whilst in-service programs are either few or poorly structured. Kumaravadivelu (2012) underscores the significance of empowering educators via continuous professional development encompassing workshops, peer cooperation, and reflective practices. Teacher trainers and education officers should prioritize professional development efforts that correspond with the tenets of PMP. This may encompass training in reflective practice, strategies for contextual adaptability, and the utilization of digital tools (Edge, 2011).

Ambiguity and Misinterpretation

A primary critique of PMP is the perceived ambiguity regarding its implementation. Critics contend that the framework is devoid of explicit instructions, rendering it difficult for teachers to implement theory in practice (Ur, 1996). Kumaravadivelu's (2006) three-dimensional framework—particularity, practicality, and possibility—offers general ideas but lacks concrete approaches or procedures. This ambiguity may result in confusion among educators, especially those familiar with methodical procedures.

On the other hand, the focus on flexibility and teacher autonomy may occasionally lead to inconsistent or inefficient practices, although advocates of PMP contend that its flexibility is an asset, enabling educators to tailor the framework to their specific situations (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Critics argue that this adaptability necessitates a degree of skill that many educators, especially in under-resourced or inflexible educational systems, may not possess (Waters, 2009). Richards and Rodgers (2014) assert that, in the absence of sufficient training and support, educators may find it challenging to reconcile autonomy with instructional rigor, resulting in misinterpretations of the framework.

To counter this critique, teacher education programs must include real examples and case studies of effective implementation. Moreover, collaborative networks, in which educators exchange experiences and strategies, can facilitate the connection between theories and practice (Burns & Richards, 2009).

IMPLICATIONS FOR ELT PRACTICE AND POLICY

PMP offers transformative potential for ELT by emphasizing contextual sensitivity, teacher autonomy, and learner-centered approaches. Its implementation requires significant changes across three key areas: teacher education, curriculum development, and policy frameworks. In teacher training, PMP necessitates a departure from traditional method-based instruction toward fostering reflective practitioners capable of adapting to diverse classroom contexts (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Training programs should incorporate classroom action research, case-based discussions, and collaborative planning to develop teachers' ability to create context-specific methodologies, as emphasized by Kumaravadivelu (2006). Furthermore, integrating Schon's (1983) reflective practice model through tools like reflective journals and peer feedback sessions can enhance pedagogical decision-making (Farrell, 2015). Equally important is addressing the socio-political dimensions of ELT, including discussions on linguistic imperialism and educational equity, to align with PMP's principle of possibility (Phillipson, 2009).

Regarding curriculum design, PMP challenges rigid, standardized frameworks by advocating for adaptable, context-responsive models. Effective curricula should balance local relevance with global perspectives, incorporating learners' lived experiences while developing communicative competence (Akbari, 2008). Richards and Rodgers (2014) highlight the importance of learner-centered approaches such as project-based learning and self-assessment techniques that promote student autonomy. The curriculum's flexibility can be achieved through modular designs that allow teachers to modify content based on specific classroom needs (Graves, 2000).

At the policy level, implementing PMP requires systemic changes, particularly in assessment practices, resource allocation, and professional support. Moving beyond standardized testing toward formative assessment and portfolio evaluation better aligns with PMP's learner-centered philosophy. Policymakers must prioritize funding for teacher development programs, teaching materials, and infrastructure, especially in underserved regions (Borg, 2011). Equally crucial is establishing frameworks that empower teachers as decision-makers by reducing bureaucratic constraints and fostering professional collaboration networks (Burns & Richards, 2009). Ultimately, PMP presents a paradigm shift in ELT by promoting responsive, inclusive education systems. Its successful implementation depends on coordinated reforms across teaching practices, curricular structures, and policy directives.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH

Despite growing interest in PMP, significant research gaps remain, particularly in empirical validation, sociocultural adaptation, and long-term efficacy. Limited empirical studies assess PMP’s effectiveness across diverse educational settings (Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Akbari, 2008). Future research should compare outcomes in urban vs. rural or public vs. private institutions to clarify its contextual adaptability (Canagarajah, 2005). Moreover, current PMP research relies on short-term or anecdotal evidence. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess its long-term impact on teacher development, student proficiency, and institutional practices (Canh & Barnard, 2017; Nguyen, 2019). Large-scale evaluations can determine sustained benefits in engagement, language skills, and teaching methodologies (Borg, 2011). Additionally, PMP emphasizes contextualization but lacks sufficient exploration in non-Western settings. Studies should evaluate its application in regions like Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, considering local educational policies, social structures, and learner backgrounds (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Holliday, 2005; Pennycook, 2010).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal, 62*(3), 276–283. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn025

Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 32*(2), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801928

Benson, P. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Autonomy in language learning* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. ISTE.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System, 39*(3), 370–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009

Breen, M. P. (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research*. Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

Burns, A., & Richards, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 197–218. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000109

Canh, L. V., & Barnard, R. (2017). Building teacher capacity for ELT in Vietnam. In L. V. Canh, R. Barnard, & H. T. M. Nguyen (Eds.), *Building teacher capacity in English language teaching in Vietnam* (pp. 44–61). Routledge.

Edge, J. (2001). Teacher development. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 166–172). Cambridge University Press.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. Bloomsbury.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 397–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Godwin-Jones, R. (2014). Emerging technologies: Language learning and technology: Where are we now, and where are we going? *Language Learning & Technology, 18*(2), 2–11. https://doi.org/10125/44367

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Heinle & Heinle.

Halik, M. A. M., & Nusrath, A. M. F. (2020). Challenges faced by ESL teachers in teaching English to the students in rural schools: A study based on five rural schools in the Kinniya Education Zone, Trincomalee, Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling, 5*(36), 100–113.

Hamid, M. O. (2016). ELT research in Bangladesh: Why and how? In A. Ahmed, M. O. Hamid, & H. B. Baldauf Jr. (Eds.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 93–110). Springer.

Hamid, M. O., & Honan, E. (2012). Communicative English in the primary classroom: Implications for ELT policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 25*(2), 139–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2012.678854

Hockly, N. (2012). Digital literacies. *ELT Journal, 66*(1), 108–112. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr077

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.

Howard, S. K., & Mozejko, A. (2015). Teachers: Technology, change and resistance. In M. Henderson & G. Romeo (Eds.), *Teaching and digital technologies* (pp. 307–317). Cambridge University Press.

Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Jahan, R. (2014). *Postmethod pedagogy and English teachers' classroom practices in Bangladesh* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Macquarie University.

Khan, S. H. (2020). *Pedagogical change in rural Bangladesh: Postmethod pedagogy in practice*. Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. Routledge.

Lage, M. J., Platt, G. J., & Treglia, M. (2000). Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment. *The Journal of Economic Education, 31*(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220480009596759

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt040.0

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters.

McConkey, R., & Mariga, L. (2014). *Inclusive education in low-income countries: A resource book for teacher educators, parent trainers and community development workers*. Disability Innovations Africa.

Nguyen, H. T. M. (2019). Preparing English teachers for the post-methods era: Towards a more contextualised teacher education curriculum. *Asian Englishes, 21*(2), 170–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1544702

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). *Critical pedagogies and language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(4), 443–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05510.x

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2010). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203857175

Reinhardt, J. (2019). *Social media in second and foreign language teaching and learning: Blogs, wikis, and social networking*. Routledge.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Sharmin, S. (2021). *Teachers' perspective on implementing Post Method Concept at the primary level in Bangladesh.* [Unpublished master's thesis]. BRAC University.

Stern, H. H. (2013). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Thomas, S. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. The Autodesk Foundation.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 143–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Waters, A. (2009). Advances in language teacher education. *Language Teaching, 42*(2), 241–253. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480999005X

Wedell, M. (2009). *Planning for educational change: Putting people and their contexts first*. Continuum.