## EDUC4161 Developments in Language Teaching Methodology



[1]

Baecher, L. et al. 2014. The challenges of planning language objectives in content-based ESL instruction. Language Teaching Research. 18, 1 (Jan. 2014), 118–136. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813505381.

[2]

Batstone, R. 2012. Language form, task-based language teaching, and the classroom context. ELT Journal. 66, 4 (Oct. 2012), 459–467. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs058.

[3]

Bell, D.M. 2007. Do teachers think that methods are dead? ELT Journal. 61, 2 (Apr. 2007), 135–143. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm006.

[4]

Cenoz, J. et al. 2014. Critical Analysis of CLIL: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. Applied Linguistics. 35, 3 (Jul. 2014), 243–262. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt011.

[5]

Choo, J.P.L, Too, W.K. 2012. Teachers' Perceptions in Using Task-Based Instruction for the Teaching of Grammar. Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Education (JIRE). 2, 1 (2012).

[6]

Echevarria, J. et al. 2011. Using the SIOP Model to Promote the Acquisition of Language and Science Concepts with English Learners. Bilingual Research Journal. 34, 3 (Oct. 2011), 334–351. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2011.623600.

[7]

Ellis, R. 2009. Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. 19, 3 (Oct. 2009), 221–246. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x.

[8]

Feryok, A. 2008. An Armenian English language teacher's practical theory of communicative language teaching. System. 36, 2 (Jun. 2008), 227–240. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.09.004.

[9]

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2003. Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching: Macro-strategies for Language Teaching. Yale University Press.

[10]

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2006. TESOL Methods: Changing Tracks, Challenging Trends. TESOL Quarterly. 40, 1 (Mar. 2006). DOI:https://doi.org/10.2307/40264511.

[11]

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Anderson, M. 2011. Techniques and principles in language teaching. Oxford University Press.

[12]

McDevitt, B. 2004. Negotiating the syllabus: a win-win situation? ELT Journal. 58, 1 (Jan. 2004), 3–9. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.1.3.

[13]

Mikulec, E. and Miller, P.C. 2011. Using Project-Based Instruction to Meet Foreign Language Standards. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas. 84, 3 (Mar. 2011), 81–86. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2010.516779.

[14]

Pica, T. 2000. Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. System. 28, 1 (Mar. 2000), 1–18. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00057-3.

[15]

Richards, J.C. 2013. Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, Central, and Backward Design. RELC Journal. 44, 1 (Apr. 2013), 5–33. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293.

[16]

Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. 2014. Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

[17]

Robinson, P. 2011. Task-Based Language Learning: A Review of Issues. Language Learning. 61, (Jun. 2011), 1–36. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00641.x.

[18]

Savignon, S.J. 2007. Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? Journal of Pragmatics. 39, 1 (Jan. 2007), 207–220. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.09.004.

[19]

Shaw, P.A. 2009. The Syllabus is Dead, Long Live the Syllabus: Thoughts on the State of Language Curriculum, Content, Language, Tasks, Projects, Materials, Wikis, Blogs and the World Wide Web. Language and Linguistics Compass. 3, 5 (Sep. 2009), 1266–1283. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2009.00154.x.

[20]

Spiro, J. and MyiLibrary 2013. Changing methodologies in TESOL. Edinburgh University Press.

[21]

Woods, D. and Çakır, H. 2011. Two dimensions of teacher knowledge: The case of communicative language teaching. System. 39, 3 (Sep. 2011), 381–390. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.010.