

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching

Alan P. Williams

The eclectic approach is considered by many to be the best methodological approach in the field of English language teaching. It is for many English teaching professionals, a pedagogic truism, an unassailable pedagogic creed that need not be subject to scrutiny. As one proponent of this approach writes, "Eclectic approaches, based on well-informed views of the nature of language, language learning, and language teaching, and a good analysis of the specific teaching-learning situation, are considered by many English teaching professionals to be the best."¹ Although subtle variations in how it is defined appear in the literature, a reliable sketch of the eclectic approach will underscore the following points :

- (1) Contrary to other methodological approaches in English teaching, it doesn't prescribe precise teaching techniques and strategies to be followed in the classroom.
- (2) The approach commends teachers to develop their own methodological approach that reflects their unique style and philosophy of teaching.
- (3) When devising their own methodology, teachers can pick and choose teaching strategies and learning activities from different methodological sources.
- (4) The criteria for incorporating and excluding different teaching strategies and learning activities should be based on an informed understanding about the

nature of language learning and teaching, and should also depend on whether or not they actually promote effective language learning.

- (5) Further changes and refinements must be made to their approach if it fails to promote effective language learning in new classroom situations.

The eclectic approach, not unlike other methodological approaches, is built upon a number of key assumptions about language learning and teaching that typifies its salient features. The purpose of this paper is to help elucidate the nature of this approach, to make the implicit explicit, by uncovering some of the more interesting and important assumptions. By way of illustrating how the eclectic approach departs from traditional English language teaching, differences between the two will be given when appropriate.

In the field of English language teaching, many have assumed that “if language learning is to be improved, it will come about through changes and improvements in teaching methodology.”² This time-honored assumption has always been a strong impetus for, and an important rationale behind, much theoretical work in the field for devising a single universal teaching method that will effectively and mechanically deliver the linguistic goods to learners. It has been thought that by carefully incorporating the empirical discoveries and theoretical insights made by such relevant fields like linguistics, psychology, and second language acquisition, a method that can work for all learners in all educational contexts can be constructed. Many teaching methods, claiming universal applicability, have been proposed. The Audiolingual Method, for example, typically invokes different types of teacher-controlled drilling exercises which, through positive reinforcement and oral repetition, enable learners to acquire the language like any other acquired habit. Those who advocate this method are convinced that because it is founded on sound pedagogical and psychological principles, it can engender effective language learning for all learners and all learning situations. Total Physical Response, to resort to another

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching (Williams)

example, requires learners to simply listen and physically respond to commands given by teachers in the imperative mode without initially engaging in productive tasks, not unlike how children first learn their first language by internalizing the commands given by their parents without speaking. Advocates of this method argue that it can be applied universally because its central pedagogical technique parallels how children almost without exception are successfully taught their first language. Our final example is the Grammar-translation method. Advocates of this method claim that it can help build the students' overall English reading ability by using written English as a means for understanding its grammatical structure, and by requiring students to engage in translation activities based on their comparative knowledge of the syntax of both English and their mother tongue. Examples can be multiplied. What these different methodological proposals have in common is the underlying assumption that the problem of learning English effectively can be rectified by inventing a single universal teaching method that teachers can successfully apply. As Nunan writes, "It was felt that somewhere or other there was a method which would work for all learners in all contexts, and that once such a method has been found the language teaching 'problem' would be solved once and for all."³

The eclectic approach, however, is predicated on the assumption that such a universal method does not exist. That is, its underlying premise is that "no one methodological approach can be assumed to be equally appropriate with all learners and in all contexts."⁴ First, the very fact that this approach doesn't prescribe a method binding for all English teachers presupposes that such a method doesn't exist in the first place. It commends teachers to use their creativity and experience to construct their personal teaching method because teachers can neither depend on nor hope for a single universal method that will yield effective language learning. Second, it would be illogical to commend teachers to form their teaching method by choosing teaching strategies and

learning activities from different methodological sources if there were a universal method that could be implemented in every educational context. The very fact that this approach favors an informed selection from the smorgasbord of methods means that it doesn't favor one particular methodological approach over another. "A particular method cannot, therefore, be a prescription for success for everyone."⁵

The second important assumption that undergirds the eclectic approach is the remarkably different instructional role it assigns to teachers compared to two standard models that have been used to construe the nature of effective teaching. The first model views effective teaching as a process whereby the techniques of experienced teachers are emulated and their advice is heeded. The novice teacher, not unlike those who serve their apprenticeship to become a carpenter or a toolmaker, learns the know-how of teaching by "imitating the expert's techniques, and by following the expert's instructions and advice."⁶ The art of teaching is a skill that each and every teacher inherits by somehow internalizing and then implementing the pedagogic wisdom teachers with many years of classroom experience impart. The surest way to good teaching is to learn from those who have mastered the art of teaching. The second model understands the teaching process as one in which teachers apply in their classes the relevant theoretical knowledge established by researchers working in different theoretical disciplines. As medical practitioners attempt to ameliorate their patients' physical conditions by applying the standardized medical knowledge established by researchers, those who belong to the teaching profession can teach best if they make use of the fruit of theoretical research established outside the classroom context by such divergent disciplines like psychology, linguistics, and sociology. If a language teacher, for example, wants to motivate her students to use more English in the classroom, she can refer to what the latest cutting-edge research has to say about motivation. Or if a teacher wants to improve the quality of her pupils' reading comprehension

skills, she may want to employ 'schema theory' from cognitive psychology by spending more time activating and eliciting her students' background knowledge during the pre-reading phase. Again, effective teachers attempt to solve the pedagogical challenges and problems they confront by applying the theoretical knowledge established by researchers working outside the classroom.

While both models assign a rather passive role to teachers, the eclectic approach assumes teachers to play a more active role in teaching. For the first two models, teachers are considered to be the passive recipients of what is thought to be integral to teaching. In the case of the first model, the teaching profession is conceived to be a craft where those without experience faithfully appropriate the experience and knowledge of those who have perfected the craft of teaching. Teachers develop professionally insofar as they approximate to the level attained by the masters of teaching. Effective teaching is the product of imitation and appropriation. The unique professional experience and knowledge the novice acquires in the classroom is thought irrelevant unless it is conducive to the attainment of the ideal stipulated for emulation. Likewise, the second model paints the teaching profession in a passive mode by construing effective teaching as tantamount to the faithful implementation of knowledge established outside the classroom context. This model doesn't value the professional knowledge about teaching and learning language teachers naturally acquire from their first-hand experience in teaching. Ultimately, answers to pedagogical issues can not be reliably found in the professional knowledge built upon concrete classroom experience. Effective teaching is the result of passively appropriating what research directly or indirectly informs teachers as viable theoretical knowledge. The eclectic approach, on the other hand, assumes teachers to be active and creative agents who are professionally responsible for how and what they teach. This approach, contrary to other methodological approaches, doesn't prescribe in a top-down fashion precise teaching strategies and techniques to be implemented in

the classroom. It, therefore, assumes that teachers are capable of identifying what is and isn't suitable for the particular learners they have by actively experimenting with different pedagogical approaches in the classroom. Further, the eclectic approach, by commending teachers to construct their personal approach to teaching, assumes that teachers are not passive recipients of pedagogical lore, but are active agents who are capable of creating through experience a unique and satisfying approach to teaching that helps facilitate and enrich the learners' language learning experience.

The third assumption that underpins the eclectic approach concerns the differences that exist between individual language learners. Much English language teaching in the past had the tendency to jettison these differences as being irrelevant for effective language learning. That is, in English language education, there was reluctance amongst both teachers and researchers to accept the variation between learners as a pedagogical fact to be reckoned with. Teachers were, for the most part, trained to adopt and impose a given method without seriously registering how their learners were responding differently to the method in question. If the variation between learners had been accepted, the standard ways in which English was taught would have remained unaffected. It was commonly thought that because the particular method was feasible in theory, learners, despite the variation, could somehow acquire the language if taught by the method. If students failed to acquire the language, it didn't necessarily mean that the method at hand was ineffective or at fault.

However, it is now commonly thought by both teachers and researchers that English language teaching is "far more diverse and is lived out amid a mass of details which are often untidy and difficult to put together into a coherent whole."⁷ The teaching of English is certainly a complex and dynamic process where a myriad of factors crisscrosses at different levels, making it difficult to accurately predict concrete learning outcomes in advance. The differences between learners

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching (Williams)

can be counted as one of these factors that contributes to the complexity of language teaching. Each and every language learner is significantly different from one another. One simply can not, without serious distortion, trivialize the subtle and multifarious differences learners manifest by categorizing them under a single frame of reference. If language teaching pedagogy doesn't want to degenerate into an ineffective and irrelevant field of inquiry, untouched by the reality and dynamics of the language classroom, it must realize and come to terms with the fact that though learners exhibit "inherently human traits of learning, every individual approaches a problem or learns a set of facts or organizes a combination of feelings from a unique perspective."⁸

Fortunately, language teaching pedagogy does currently pay heed to the many differences between learners. Any methodological approach that doesn't embrace this fact has fallen out of favor. What, then, are some of the more important variations existing between learners that are gaining wider acceptance in language teaching? First of all, because learners in most teaching situations have been exposed to language education in the past, they "do not start from scratch without any background or predisposition to learn language in one way or another."⁹ This implies, amongst other things, that learners have different expectations they bring with them into the classroom. These expectations can and do affect the way they fundamentally respond to and interpret their educational experience. For example, learners previously exposed to much traditional language teaching might expect teachers to play a more dominant and teacher-centered role. By contrast, learners taught by instructors who adopt a teacher-as-facilitator role might construe this as oppressive and authoritarian. Again, because traditional language education is geared more towards grammatical accuracy, learners used to this style of teaching might expect instructors to give detailed and immediate feedback on the structural errors they make, while those not sharing this learning experience might find it gratuitous unless the errors they make impede the process of meaningful

communication. Besides expectations, learners value significantly different styles of learning. It is not the case that learners all value identical styles of learning. For example, while learners equipped with a higher level of interpersonal intelligence might appreciate learning tasks that involve active collaboration with their peers, those who feel more comfortable working on their own might find such tasks both demanding and stressful. Furthermore, while learners naturally endowed with a keener auditory sense may find oral pattern practice meaningful and rewarding, those with a more developed visual sense may find such practice tiresome and repetitive. Thus, “learners have different learning styles...that need to be taken into consideration in developing language programs.”¹⁰ The third and last variation between learners that is attracting considerable interest in English language education concerns the range of attitudes different learners have toward the English language. Language education doesn’t take place in a socio-cultural vacuum. English is taught in very specific social contexts, and they can have a positive, neutral, or deleterious effect on how learners respond to their experience of learning English. Thus, “any individual teacher with a single class has to be seen in the wider context of the school and its educational and social environment.”¹¹ Learners naturally tend to inherit the socio-cultural values and norms they happen to be born and raised in. If learners live in a social environment that embraces a positive attitude towards what, in general, the English language represents, they may be more inclined to appropriate this image. This attitude may very well be absent if they happen to belong to a social environment that shares a negative perception of English. Because the learning of any language can and often does result in the “alteration in self-image, the adoption of new social and cultural behaviors and ways of being, and therefore has a significant impact on the social nature of the learner”¹², students who have inherited a negative image of English from society might conceive English language learning to be an unwelcoming threat to their personal identity. More

examples illustrating the variation between learners can be enumerated. But the point is that it is increasingly being recognized that such variations must be taken into serious consideration if English education is to have a lasting and valuable effect on learners.

Behind the eclectic approach is an understanding that presupposes that learners exhibit differences that need to be catered for. First, this approach to English teaching doesn't impose specific teaching strategies that are considered to be binding for all teachers. And this is partly because the difference amongst learners means that strategies that may work for one group of students may not work when applied to a different group of students. Particular styles of teaching would be binding if all students had similar learning styles or preferences. The fact that particular styles of teaching are not prescribed, therefore, assumes that learners are significantly different from one another. The second point is this: The eclectic approach both welcomes and urges teachers to develop their own personal teaching method that works for their learners. This approach contends that teachers should make changes to their method if they encounter new classroom situations where it fails to facilitate the language learning process. That is, the fact that an approach has worked in the past doesn't foretell the success it may have in the future. This is, again, partly because learners are not all alike. If they were, any approach that withstood the test of classroom teaching would bring similar results in the future, making it unnecessary for teachers to make drastic changes to the way they teach. Thus, by commending teachers to revise their personal approach to teaching when necessary, the eclectic approach assumes the variability that exists between learners.

The fourth assumption underlying the eclectic approach has to do with the importance it ascribes to reflective teaching. But before relating it to the eclectic approach, the more important elements of this increasingly valued form of teaching will be examined.

We rightly expect language teachers as professional educators to improve the quality of their teaching. We would seriously question the professionalism of a teacher whose style of teaching hasn't undergone any change for the better. Teachers are responsible for engaging in the process of professional development by acquiring a more sound and effective teaching philosophy. The best means for satisfying this requirement, therefore, becomes important. It may seem that first-hand teaching experience has to be the most effective way for teachers to develop professionally. After all, is it not through years of experience that teachers gradually become more enlightened in their overall understanding of education? There are, however, a number of problems with this contention. First of all, although experience is undoubtedly a valuable source to gain insight into the complexities of teaching, it "can teach [teachers] habits of bigotry, stereotyping, and disregard for significant but inconvenient information."¹³ The potential value of classroom teaching experience can be denied, depending on what teachers gain from their experience. Unfortunately, it is not uncommon for teachers to derive a skewed and unreasonable conception of their profession from their experience in teaching. Experience alone can not guarantee that teachers will gain an illuminating and reliable understanding of teaching that will have a positive effect on learners. Second, experience alone can fail to undermine the preconceptions teachers inevitably bring with them into the classroom. Instead of becoming a source for critically assessing what teachers take to be self-evident, years of classroom experience, depending on how teachers respond to and make sense of their experience, can halt professional growth by simply confirming their deep-seated preconceptions about teaching and learning. Third, first-hand teaching experience, though invaluable when reflected upon in an informed way, can result in professional complacency by closing the minds of teachers to new ideas and approaches. Teachers with experience can become very set in their ways, allowing little or no room for professional growth. As Scrivener writes,

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching (Williams)

“Repeated venturing down well-traveled roads leads sooner or later to boredom, to fossilization of routines, to increasing defensiveness and fear of change.”¹⁴

The mere fact of having first-hand experience in teaching is not conducive to professional development. This implies that experience must be complemented and enriched in some way. Those who champion reflective teaching in education argue that the surest way for professional growth is for teachers to, first, subject their professional practice to critical scrutiny in order to uncover the problematic areas in their teaching. As one proponent of reflective teaching writes, “The process of reflecting upon one’s own teaching is viewed as an essential component in developing knowledge and theories of teaching, and is hence a key element in one’s professional development.”¹⁵ Teachers are not impervious to pedagogical errors when teaching. By engaging in reflective analysis, they can deepen their self-awareness as teachers by identifying the pedagogical errors they commit. The identification of pedagogical shortcomings, however, is not an end in itself. Reflective analysis is not a mere practice in self-victimisation. Rather, critical reflection on professional practice is useful and fruitful insofar as teachers attempt to rectify the problems they learn to have. That is, it behoves teachers to seek recourse to some form of professional action to remedy the problems they face. By finding their faults and idiosyncrasies in teaching, and by revising their teaching in light of what they discover, teachers not only improve the overall quality of their teaching, but also develop their professionalism as educators. Reflective teaching therefore assumes that the quality of teaching can always be improved in light of critical reflection. “Engaging in the process of reflection is about admitting that practice can always be improved in some way.”¹⁶

In English language teaching, the art of reflective teaching is practiced in a number of interesting ways. First, teachers can and do gain important insight into their teaching by examining and analyzing it themselves. This can take various forms. For future reflection and reference, teachers can keep a reflective journal

where they record and comment on what they do in class ; they can tape record their lessons to gain, amongst other things, a better understanding of their oral delivery and the overall flow of each lesson ; they may even decide to videotape their lessons to gain a more visual representation of their mannerisms while teaching. Though important, there is a limit to the extent to which such reflective strategies can help teachers gain a critical insight into their own teaching. This is because it is, in general, an extraordinary feat for people to maintain an impartial and objective perspective on what they do themselves. To gain a more objective and balanced account of their own teaching, teachers can resort to perspectives not their own. As Brookfield argues, “Critically reflective teaching happens when we identify and scrutinize the assumptions that undergird how we work. The most effective way to become aware of these assumptions is to view our practice from different perspectives.”¹⁷ One such perspective instrumental for reflective teaching is the perspective shared by students. By referring to how students understand, value, and respond to their educational experience, immense light can be shed on various pedagogical points of great importance which might otherwise get neglected. It is therefore quite understandable why teachers value student feedback. Questionnaires and surveys completed by students can illuminate their strengths and weaknesses as teachers, and can therefore suggest areas for improvement. Another point of reference highly valued by teachers is the perspective their colleagues are equipped with. Receiving professional advice and guidance from colleagues is certainly a much appreciated source for professional growth. Being knowledgeable about issues in pedagogy, and having the experience in teaching themselves, colleagues can offer constructive criticisms that can have an important bearing on teaching. Teaching can, therefore, become more reflective by incorporating the insights gained through personal reflection, and by critically appropriating the perspectives of both students and colleagues. As Hedge writes, “It is the essential nature of professional development that

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching (Williams)

reflection on experience and the exploration of insights from other people are the primary ways [teachers] have of refining [their] professional practice.”¹⁸

In traditional English language teaching, reflective teaching received marginal significance. Teachers were not seriously expected to engage in critical reflection for the betterment of their students' language education. This was partly because the viability of the method used by teachers was assured on theoretical grounds by language researchers. Because the method was thought to be viable in principle, the exposing of methodological weaknesses and faults through critical reflection was thought unnecessary. Further, there was in traditional English teaching a rather persistent tendency to downplay the contribution and input from practicing teachers on pedagogical matters. They were assigned a rather passive and mechanical role of implementing the theories verified and tested by the experts. Reflective teaching was not encouraged because it was incompatible with the marginal role assigned to teachers.

The eclectic approach, on the other hand, assumes the importance of reflective teaching. For this approach, it is important for teachers to use their critical resources to improve their teaching by uncovering and rectifying the problems inherent in their professional practice. That is, this approach endorses the view that “as teachers, it is through reflection on our teaching, that we become more skilled, more capable, and in general better teachers.”¹⁹ It is not difficult to see why the eclectic approach presupposes the importance of reflective teaching. First of all, because it doesn't assume the existence of a universal teaching method effective for all learners and learning situations, it commends teachers to create their own style of teaching by making informed, eclectic choices from different methodological sources. Before forming a pedagogically sound and well-tested personal approach to teaching, novice teachers are expected to experiment with different teaching strategies and learning activities, incorporating into their repertoire those that work and jettisoning those that do not. This gradual and

painstaking process of developing a personal teaching method presupposes the significance of reflective teaching. This is because in order to form a personal approach, teachers must be able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the activities and strategies they implement in their lessons, and act on the basis of what they learn.

Second, any well-tested personal approach to teaching is bound to be provisional, for new classroom situations may very well question its effectiveness and suitability for promoting successful language learning. If the approach is shown to be ineffective, teachers are required to amend their style of teaching notwithstanding its effectiveness in the past. But this requirement assumes the importance of reflective teaching because it is through critical reflection that teachers can improve the standard of their teaching by rectifying the problems they identify in their professional practice.

The last assumption presupposed by the eclectic approach examined here is an assumption that has surfaced from time to time in our discussion thus far. Yet because of its importance, it will be treated separately. It will be argued that the eclectic approach has a strong pragmatic bent that gives it its distinctiveness.

As we have already seen, the eclectic approach does not prescribe predetermined and ready-made teaching strategies and learning activities to be used in the classroom. Teachers slowly construct their distinct style of teaching through knowledge and experience. During this process, teachers are advised to establish their repertoire of strategies and activities by picking and choosing from alternative methodological options. What gets included in the repertoire should be pedagogically sound. It shouldn't be discredited by cutting-edge research as being theoretically unviable or obsolete. Research that either directly or indirectly bears upon English language teaching can question standard teaching practice that has been taken for granted. It is therefore important for teachers to bear in mind the findings and discoveries made by relevant disciplines when

engaging in eclectic choices. Though the eclectic approach doesn't underestimate the importance theoretical research has for the eclectic choices teachers make, it stresses the significance of an even more important factor teachers must take into account when engaging in eclecticism. Though strategies and activities should preferably be viable in light of theoretical research, what ultimately matters is whether they in fact promote effective language learning. Strategies and activities must in some shape or form help facilitate the process of acquiring the English language. Thus, "the final criterion for accepting any pedagogical idea is not whether it is valid from a theoretical perspective, but whether it produces more effective practice."²⁰ In other words, the value of any pedagogical idea is measured in terms of its usefulness in bringing about effective language learning. Though being viable in theory is important, what really matters is whether the strategies and activities implemented in class actually work.

Another pragmatic line of thinking assumed by the eclectic approach has to do with its important pedagogical injunction to all practicing language teachers, namely that they should always amend their approach to teaching in light of new learners and teaching situations. With experience, teachers can become rather dogmatic in their ways of thinking about teaching. Knowing what works and doesn't work from first-hand teaching experience, they become committed to their personal style of teaching, becoming closed to new pedagogical ideas and approaches. As Senior writes, "The beliefs held by individual language teachers which are embedded in personal experience are remarkably stable and resilient to change."²¹ Or as Johnson laments, "Despite professional course work and practical field experiences, teachers' beliefs tend to remain unchanged regardless of the context within which they teach."²² Be that as it may, those who advocate the eclectic approach argue that changes and improvements must be made to any approach to language teaching when necessary. And changes must be made if it fails to promote effective language learning amongst students. Teaching is here

considered to be a provisional activity, where teachers must become more adaptive and flexible in their professional work. The underlying reason for any possible modification is a pragmatic one. Changes must be made if the approach fails to enhance effective learning.

The eclectic approach in English language teaching is currently embraced by many English teaching professionals for being the most credible and effective approach in language teaching. Not unlike other methodological approaches, the eclectic approach is founded upon a number of key presuppositions about teaching and learning. The purpose of this paper was to elucidate the nature of this approach by articulating some of the more interesting and important presuppositions. To reiterate, the following assumptions were uncovered :

- (1) The eclectic approach does not assume that there is a single universal teaching method that works effectively for all learners and learning situations.
- (2) It assumes teachers to be active, creative agents.
- (3) It assumes learners to be different, and language teachers are responsible for catering for the variation that exists between learners.
- (4) It assumes the importance of reflective teaching. Teachers are considered to be reflective practitioners.
- (5) It assumes a pragmatic approach in pedagogy. The pedagogical value of teaching strategies and learning activities is measured in terms of its ability to promote effective language learning.

Notes

- 1 Paul Davies and Eric Pearse, *Success in English Teaching*, Oxford University Press 2000, p.187.
- 2 Jack Richards and Theodore Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press 2005, p.15.

The Eclectic Approach in English Language Teaching (Williams)

- 3 David Nunan, *Language Teaching Methodology*, Prentice Hall International 1991, p.228.
- 4 Ian Tudor, *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*, Cambridge University Press 2002, p.48.
- 5 Diane Larsen-Freeman, *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press 2000, p.182.
- 6 Michael Wallace, *Training Foreign Language Teachers*, Cambridge University Press 2002, p.6.
- 7 Ian Tudor, *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*, Cambridge University Press 2002, p.30
- 8 H. Douglas Brown, *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Pearson Education 2007, p.118.
- 9 Vivian Cook, *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press 2001, p.9.
- 10 David Nunan, *Second Language Teaching and Learning*, Heinle & Heinle 1999, p.90.
- 11 Jo McDonough and Christopher Shaw, *Materials and Methods in ELT*, Blackwell 2003, p.202.
- 12 Marion Williams and Robert Burden, *Psychology for Language Teachers*, Cambridge University Press 1997, p.115.
- 13 Stephen Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, Jossey-Bass 1995, p.182.
- 14 Jim Scrivener, *Learning Teaching*, Macmillan 2005, p.375.
- 15 Jack Richards and Charles Lockhart, *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*, Cambridge University Press 1996, p.202.
- 16 Anthony Ghaye and Kay Ghaye, *Teaching and Learning through Critical Reflective Practice*, David Fulton Publishers 1998, p.3.
- 17 Stephen Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, Jossey-Bass 1995, p.xiii.
- 18 Tricia Hedge, *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*, Oxford University Press 2000, p.3.
- 19 Kenneth Zeichner and Daniel Liston, *Reflective Teaching*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates 1996, p.xvii
- 20 William Littlewood, *Foreign and Second Language Learning*, Cambridge University Press 1998, p.90.
- 21 Rose Senior, *The Experience of Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press 2006, p.268.
- 22 Karen Johnson, *Understanding Language Teaching*, Heinle & Heinle Publishers 1999, p.30.