

# The Dogme Approach: A Radical Perspective in Second Language Teaching in the Post-Methods Era

Quang Nhat Nguyen<sup>1</sup>, Bui Phu Hung<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ho Chi Minh City University of Education

<sup>2</sup>University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Quang Nguyen Nhat, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, 280 An Duong Vuong Street, District 5, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.  
Email: [nhatquang.ed@gmail.com](mailto:nhatquang.ed@gmail.com)

This paper aims to critically discuss the Dogme approach, an innovative pedagogy in English language teaching that was first developed by Thornbury (2000). Dogme is rooted in a conglomerate of compatible theories in second language learning and teaching. The most noticeable perspective of the Dogme approach may be that language teachers should not rely solely on prescribed coursebooks, but should instead teach tasks based on learners' problems and interests. In this article, the authors first conduct a critical review of second language acquisition, pedagogical theories, and post-methods era perspectives to express the aims and significance of this article. After that, the authors discuss different aspects of Dogme and figure out the room for Dogme in English language teaching in the post-methods era. Finally, the authors figure out gaps in research and give further pedagogical recommendations for English language teachers and learners.

**Keywords:** Dogme, Teaching Unplugged, second language pedagogy, material relevance, post-methods era, communicative language teaching

## Introduction

A review of second language acquisition (SLA) and pedagogical theories has proven that SLA theories and pedagogical theories have significant and substantial impacts on perspectives and practices in language teaching. Mitchell and Vidal (2001) and Richards and Rogers (2001) believe that approaches and methods in second language teaching have both dynamics and diversity. In other words, advancements in socio-cultural theory (Van Boxtel, Van der Linden, & Kanselaar, 2000; Van de Pol, Mercer, & Volman, 2019), educational-psychological theory (VanPatten; Vallori, 2014; Wittwer & Renkl, 2008), neuroscience (Benati & Rastelli, 2018;), and technological advancements (Brown, 2009; Hartman, Townsend, & Jackson, 2019; Leutner, 2019; Rassaei, 2018) have made changes to human perceptions and conceptions of effective second language teaching. These advancements, eventually, turn into innovations in research and practices in second language teaching. All of these changes to the perspectives and practices in second language teaching have contributed to recent updates in second language teaching, especially with the introduction of Dogme.

Updates in second language teaching in the post-methods era have added teaching techniques that teachers should follow. Taking part in these tasks and activities, teachers can vary students' interaction patterns that facilitate a communicative environment for learners (Van de Pol, Mercer, & Volman, 2019). Teachers should also provide learning strategies to help learners become more confident and increase their autonomy (Almusharraf, 2018; Smith, 2008). Additionally, teachers should help students overcome their learning difficulties as this can help improve learner performance. Building a communicative and friendly learning environment may help encourage learners to speak out about their learning difficulties. Admittedly, certain methods may work best in certain situations only (Bell, 2003). As approaches and methods suggested in the past depend mainly on certain fixed beliefs about language teaching, they are challenged for their lack of practical application (Richards & Rogers, 2001). There exists a need for an innovative perspective for practice in which principles in second language teaching are well woven (Bell, 2003; Brown, 2014; Liu, 2004). Dogme,

which recommends critical pedagogy strategies, is not merely based on a single theory but a conglomerate of compatible perspectives in second language teaching. Meddings and Thornbury (2009) believe that Dogme is applicable in real language classes in different teaching and learning contexts.

This paper reviews the applicability of Dogme in the classroom. After the introduction of the purpose of the article, in the next part, the authors continue to describe the grounding theories as well as the fundamental concepts of Dogme. This article also suggests how to apply Dogme in the post-methods era after revisiting the arguments for and against the Dogme perspective. To conclude the review, the authors present research gaps as directions for further studies on Dogme.

### **An Introduction to Dogme – Teaching Unplugged**

Thornbury (2000) introduces the Dogme approach, which is also known as Dogme or Teaching Unplugged, to second language teaching (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). This method is intended to liberate teachers from the burden of an over-reliance on the coursebook industry and create in-class authentic communication, as well as help bridge the gaps between the language taught at school and the language in real-life conversations. Leaving room for individual teachers to apply all their competencies, Dogme can be considered a movement, an approach, or even a teaching philosophy (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). The name Dogme takes inspiration from the Dogma95 movement in the film-making industry, where the directors, actors, and actresses commit a «vow of chastity» to minimize their reliance on special effects that may create unauthentic feelings from the viewers. Although based on the same perception, Dogme is more of a liberated learning and teaching ideology that allows teachers to create the English teaching and learning environments where the learner's here-and-now needs are adequately satisfied (Thornbury, 2000).

### **Theoretical Grounding and Hypotheses of the Dogme Approach**

Dogme grew out of a conglomerate of compatible ideologies and theories. First, Dogme is based not only on theories of language teaching and learning but also on progressive, critical, and humanist educational theories. Adopting the Dialogic model, Dogme encourages students and teachers to communicate in order to exchange ideas (Thornbury, 2009), which is the prerequisite for education to occur. Stevick (1981) believes that the success of language learning and teaching does not depend mainly on materials and linguistic analyses, but on what is going on between students and teachers in their classroom. The nature of Dogme allows real conversations to take place in class. It enables teachers to truly teach and learners to access authentic incidental language occurring in real situations (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). From this point of view, Meddings and Thornbury (2009) propose that Dogme can shine a light upon embedded learning moments known as the “long conversation” (Mercer, 1995) to solve the inequity of power in the classroom. Only when both teachers and students value liberation in education will the process of learning and teaching language, particularly with Dogme, flourish.

In terms of second language teaching, Dogme shares the socio-constructivist grounding theory with several contemporary approaches, namely CLT, TBL, and CLIL. Dogme works on the radical idea that language develops through social communication and authentic interaction. Thornbury (2010) believes that Dogme teaching and learning should begin with students' here-and-now needs regardless of the influence of edu-business. This here-and-now need emphasizes the significance of people's personal experiences in a specific classroom. By realizing students' needs, teachers can scaffold the language learning process (Walqui & Lier, 2010). This collaborative process between teachers and students will gradually construct the learners' language interactively and communicatively (Breen, 1985). In other words, instead of relying on pre-made materials and books, teachers should identify students' needs right in the classroom and serve as the change agents. As McMullen and Hickendorff (2018) outline students' individual and learning variables, teachers are advised to understand such differences to stimulate students' interests and engagement in learning (Volet, Jones, & Vaurus, 2019). In reality, the practice of English language teaching shows that teachers should adapt to learners' differences and respond to students' needs consecutively.

Another significant milestone that led to the birth of Dogme was the introduction of Emergentism - beginning as a movement against the Stipulationism from the 1970s (Cangelosi, 2007). Language learning emerges through the interaction of social input and implicit linguistic patterns that create new connections between

neurons in human brains (Macwhinney, 1998). When learning a language, learners adapt their linguistic structures to the patterns of the conversation, through which language processing starts to rise. This processing is consistent with the perception that language acquisition means “learning to process language,” not just learning the language (McCauley & Christiansen, 2019). Dogme follows the same idea of language emergence through dialogs, which allows learners to enhance the effectiveness of communication. Later on, through the action of language awareness-raising activities and focus-on-form tasks, learners can refine the interlanguage and get more proximate to the target language (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). Rooted in the ideas of radical education, socio-constructivism, and Emergentism, Dogme aims to (1) decenter teachers and equalize the politics in the classroom, (2) increase the authenticity of language emergence in language classrooms, and (3) liberate teachers from the burden of coursebooks and pre-made global materials (McCabe, 2005).

### **The Three Pillars of the Dogme Approach/ Teaching Unplugged**

There are three underlying principles in Dogme, namely (1) conversational-driven teaching, (2) materials-light employment, and (3) emergent language (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). First, language teaching and learning should be communication-based and dialogue-based, which can result in a variety of interaction patterns. The fact that Dogme is conversational-driven means conversations are the course that creates intrinsic learning motivation coming from learners’ real experiences, mediates learning to center learners and decenter teachers, scaffolds linguistic and intercultural development, and promotes socialization to help learners step out of their comfort zone. Vygotsky (1978) hypothesizes that language learning is a socio-cultural process in which teachers and learners engage in interactivity, from which knowledge develops. Regarding the teacher’s roles in communication, Ratner and Bruner (1978) and Wass and Golding (2014) suggest that the tasks delivered by the teacher should match their students’ level of proficiency and support or scaffold students’ language development.

Second, Dogme advocates materials-light teaching practices. This deviation does not mean that Dogme is against the use of published materials and coursebooks. Still, it places learners in the center of the teaching and learning process. From the perspective of the communicative approach, Dogme welcomes materials that support the talk-mediated development of local discourse and foster the joint construction of knowledge in the classroom (Thornbury & Luke, 2001). This critical pedagogy was first proposed by Meddings and Thornbury’s (2009) observation that many coursebooks overtly focus on grammatical points, but are lacking in developing learners’ communicative competency. Although some published materials design tasks for students’ pair or group discussions, many such tasks are for controlled practice or suggest unauthentic situations. Dogme proposes that it is the practice itself that helps learners use language freely, which aligns with other perspectives in learner-centeredness and develops learners’ communicative competency.

Third, Dogme, in line with task-based learning, believes that language learning is a process in which language emerges from communication. As Ellis (2014) argues, similar to how toddlers learn their first language, second language learners mainly acquire the target language through incidental learning, not intentional learning. In particular, language emerges in two main inter-faceted ways: communicative activities and language production. Van de Pol, Mercer, and Volman (2019) also recommend that teachers provide students with opportunities to interact with peers with little control from the teacher. The teacher, in this circumstance, should facilitate language learning by leaving the room for the emergence of language and support students’ language development (Meddings & Thornbury 2009). It is an authentic English environment in class that inspires language emergence. The language produced by the students helps teachers understand what they should do next to assist students’ language development. Accordingly, learners should be allowed to challenge one another, suggest what they want and need to learn, ask questions, and judge the assigned tasks in a social-communicative setting. Ellis (2006) explains that Emergentism is supported by associative learning, probabilistic learning, and rational contingency. Ellis and Larsen-Freeman (2006, p. 577) also describe Emergentism saying:

Emergentists believe that simple learning mechanisms, operating in and across the human systems for perception, motor-action, and cognition as they are exposed to language data as part of a communicatively-rich human social environment by an organism eager to exploit the functionality of language, suffice to drive the emergence of complex language representations.

### **Criticisms of the Dogme Approach**

Under the umbrella of the communicative approach, Dogme receives similar criticisms since there is a lack of consensus on the classroom framework and methodology to conduct a standard lesson (McMeniman, 1992). Teachers who apply Dogme are susceptible to being labelled as lazy, inconsiderate, or industrial, due to the flexible structures of Dogme (McCabe, 2005). It is a perennial challenge for teachers, especially novice teachers who are not experienced enough to react to the spontaneity of a classroom that emphasizes the importance of students' here-and-now needs (Luke & Thornbury, 2009). Even if communication and interactions occur in class, the teacher still cannot guarantee that these talks are educational and informative as they are not sure what dialogic types of conversations may yield beneficial effects (Harmer, 2012).

Another problem that Dogme faces comes from its pillars since it continuously focuses on the here-and-now needs when the students have to create the target language frequently. The need to communicate all the time may, in turn, build up a significant amount of stress, frustration, and embarrassment. Particularly, in non-Eurocentric contexts or other low-resource contexts, there are questions concerning the applicability of Dogme if the learners' linguistic and communicative competence is low (McCabe, 2005).

There is also the concern that inexperienced and non-native teachers may feel threatened when adopting a communicative approach or, in particular, Dogme, especially in an exam-oriented class. In underprivileged teaching and learning contexts where the class sizes are large, the stress that teachers suffer from is much more alarming (McCabe, 2005). Whether Dogme is suitable for beginners or examination-based classes is a common question (Li, 1998; Meddings & Thornbury, 2009). In countries like Vietnam or Turkey where the university entrance exams still consist of multiple-choice questions, the effectiveness of Dogme is usually called into question as teachers show no interest in trying new approaches that do not explicitly show a direct connection with the results of the tests. Under time constraints, both students and teachers are emotionally threatened when they take a dialogic and communicative approach to teaching and learning languages.

In general, the criticisms and concerns that Dogme encounters revolve around several major issues: the theoretical foundation of the conversation-driven perspective (Harmer, 2012), the under-preparedness of lesson structure structures, and the potential pressure on teachers and students in various learning contexts. Dogme can challenge inexperienced teachers who have an inadequate pedagogical repertoire, and limited access to resources. It may also face challenges regarding its applicability in classes of students with low levels of proficiency. Low-level students cannot interact with the teacher and peers effectively in the target language.

### **Taking on the Criticisms of Dogme**

#### ***Teacher Liberation***

There have long been opposing views amongst academics regarding the use of textbooks in education. Traditionalists such as Fasso, Knight, and Knight (2014) believed that the use of textbooks could help maximize students' development. Horsley, Knight, and Huntly (2010) also claimed that textbooks were considered indispensable to students of science and business in Australia. However, there should be a change in the concept of materials used in a particular course (Knight, 2015). Richards (2000) criticized teachers' over-reliance on textbooks by outlining their four main shortcomings. In many respects, textbooks cannot provide the basis for a comprehensive language course. Teachers should help their students learn and acquire language rather than complete exercises prescribed in the textbook.

Moreover, textbooks usually reflect the culture of the place they are published. Teachers should not adopt but adapt the available materials to be relevant to their educational contexts. The dependence on textbooks also reduces learner-centeredness. In fact, classroom tasks and activities should aim to satisfy learners' needs and help them accumulate the knowledge and skills required to achieve the expected outcomes. The teaching and learning of a second or foreign language should not be textbook-centered, and good teachers should create their own materials. They should not depend on a selected textbook. In the digital age, internet users can access relevant materials easily and quickly to meet their academic needs. Technology tools can help teachers and students access available resources that satisfy the expected outcomes. The concern that teachers cannot access resources to design their lessons should be considered an issue of the past (Ito, 2010; Palfrey & Gasser, 2008; Panto & Comas-Quinn).

The rise of Dogme is a response to foreign language teachers' over-reliance on coursebooks (Allwright, 1981; Harwood, 2010; McGrath, 2002; O'Neil, 1982; Swan, 1992; Tomlinson, 2003; Tosun & Cinkara, 2018; Ur, 1996) rather than authentic communication (Thornbury, 2009). Dogme does not suggest that teachers must not use materials in the classroom, but it proposes that second language teachers should be allowed to use their own materials to adequately design their lessons to meet the requirements of the course and students' needs.

It is mistakenly believed that Dogme may disadvantage inexperienced and non-native teachers since it is materials-light. While teachers cannot get totally separated from the coursebooks and exam-based courses, most of them welcome the application of Dogme. Both native and non-native speakers agreed that Dogme might curb the burden of lesson planning and materials development (Coşkun, 2017). Additionally, Dogme can allow non-native teachers to both follow the textbooks and create the opportunity for them to communicate in English (Xerri, 2012). Furthermore, non-native teachers might be free from their over-reliance on coursebooks and thus able to play a proactive role in communicating with their students (Sayed, 2016).

Dogme, to a certain extent, provides the base for teachers to liberate themselves from the lesson planning burden (Xerri, 2012). Based on three principles of Dogme, Xerri, in his role as a teacher-researcher, instead wrote post-lesson plans and reflected on their strengths and weaknesses. Xerri realized that there was an increase in learners' agency and confidence when the teacher started to take a backseat.

### **The Dialogic Nature of Dogme**

To prove that the dialogues created in Dogme classes are more authentic than instructional, Chappell (2014) conducted qualitative research in the form of critical discourse analysis to consolidate the theoretical framework of the conversation-driven principle. The study also aimed to raise awareness among teachers about the significance of strategic management using different types of talk in the classroom to motivate the learners. The research results demonstrated that there were four types of talk in Dogme lessons: rote, recitation and elicitation, instruction/exposition, and discussion. Information-sharing activities that involved information exchanges and problem-solving were frequent in Dogme lessons. The inquiry dialogue type of talk in Dogme also created a large amount of cumulative knowledge-building as well as mutual respect among students. Additionally, the activities in the Dogme lessons created associations between grammatical forms and communicative functions through interpersonal exchanges among students. This testifies that Dogme creates incidentally learning opportunities through the four types of talk. The incidental learning process can facilitate students' natural language emergence and acquisition (Ellis, 1999). There was also a relationship between "Talk Dogme" and the linguistic developmental goals for both teachers and students to work towards. Chappell (2014) claimed that Dogme lessons promoted incidental spoken texts from both teachers and learners while creating clear linguistic goals for teachers and learners to achieve. Thus, Dogme could lead to increases in both the quantity and quality of incidental learning.

### **The Suitability of Dogme for Students at Various Levels**

Another concern about Dogme is how to teach English communicatively to lower-level students. This is a challenge not only for Dogme but also other approaches to English language teaching and learning, for example, task-based learning (Ellis, 2014). However, the concern does not come from the approach itself and teachers must prepare their students to adapt to the new approach to enhancing their competence. All foreign language learners need communication and foreign language learners' unwillingness to communicate is more strongly related to their anxiety and beliefs than their levels of proficiency (Sener, 2014; Tan & Phairot, 2015). Tan and Phairot (2015) discovered that some Thai students exposed their unwillingness to communicate as a result of their familiarity with pedagogical practices that required them to listen more than to interact, low motivation to learn, and psychological problems. However, students may turn out to be more willing to communicate when these problems fade (Liu & Jackson, 2008; Pawlak, Mystkowska-Wiertelak, & Bielak, 2016).

The application of a conversation-driven approach in the classroom allows teachers to adapt to students' levels of proficiency flexibly. Since the introduction of Dogme in 2000, various studies have been conducted to prove its utility for students with different linguistic levels (Coşkun, 2017; Sayed, 2016; Solimani, Ameri-Golestan, & Lotfi, 2019; Xerri, 2012). To prove that Dogme is suitable for beginners, a study by Sayed (2016) examined level-one students in two "Writing One" classes. The research was conducted with 48 EFL level-one male students,

aged 16-18, in Writing One course at the College of Education and Arts, Northern Borders University, Saudi Arabia. The researcher adopted a quasi-experimental qualitative design to compare the effectiveness of Unplugged teaching with that of the traditional approach. Following the idea of Dogme, in the experimental class, the teacher did not prepare any lesson plans and adopted conversation-driven process writing. After that, the learners sat the post-test to reassess their speaking and writing skills. The researcher found that teaching unplugged is promising for not only teaching speaking (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and interactional communication) but also writing skills (organization, mechanics, vocabulary and language use, ideas, and content). Teaching unplugged also helps students with language, self-development, and cooperative skills. Sayed's research is in line with the study of Coşkun (2017). In Coşkun's research, A2-level (CEFR) students were highly satisfied with the combination of Dogme and traditional lessons in their program, which means that lower-level students are less likely to feel threatened unless the teachers introduce the new approach too abruptly.

Concerning higher-level students, this unconventional teaching approach significantly surpassed the traditional method for developing students' skills. Take the English majors in Mohamad's study (2019), for example. Mohamed conducted a one-group pretest-posttest quantitative research project that revealed that Dogme could develop students' oral competence as well as efficacy. Unlike several other studies where researchers examined Dogme's effectiveness solely on learners' speaking performance on a test, this research underscored the psychological effects that Dogme had on learner's self-efficacy as it is closely related to how motivated learners were to study a new language. The researcher, therefore, sought answers to questions regarding Dogme's effects on developing English-major students speaking's skills and self-efficacy. The results showed that the students' scores improved significantly on both the speaking test and their self-efficacy levels. Additionally, the free nature of Dogme teaching suits the needs and desires of the students. This research also indicated that students could express themselves very confidently when they speak in a Dogme class.

To wrap up, although research projects about Dogme are small-scale, they signify that Dogme can meet the requirements of classes at different linguistic levels. (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009).

### **The Suitability of Dogme in Examination-Oriented Courses**

One issue that may concern teachers is whether Dogme can ensure the effectiveness of courses that prepare students for exams. This circumstance is a common challenge in non-English speaking countries, where both teachers and students are subject to traditional expectations about the content of an EFL course, examination pressures, and the large sizes of English classes.

To ameliorate the concerns regarding the compatibility in exam-preparatory courses using Dogme, Xerri (2012) pointed out the immeasurable advantages Dogme brings about in an examination course. Xerri believes that Dogme can yield tremendous benefits in examination classes for non-native English teachers thanks to the radical pedagogy of Dogme. By incorporating the Dogme/Teaching Unplugged lessons in an examination-based course, teachers and students can counterbalance the practice of learning English to pass a test. From the interviews, students claimed that the Dogme lesson was a rewarding experience where they could maintain conversations with other learners whom they did not know well. Many of them believed that the lessons knocked down the wall of inhibitions about using English. With adequate and reasonable amounts of time spent on Dogme, the students realized that, besides taking tests, it is of paramount importance that they could communicate in English.

Besides communication, Dogme can also enhance students' scores on an exam. Coşkun (2017) conducted a qualitative research project to inspect the effects of Dogme on discrete grammar points that the exam required students to achieve. The study took place at three universities in Turkey (one private and two state-funded). The participants were one native and two non-native EFL teachers, together with 38 students from three one-year intensive EFL classes to prepare for professional EMI courses in the future. Noticeably, all the students were at the beginner level (A2-CEFR). The results of the research indicate that Dogme increases students' agency in exam-oriented classes. Some teachers also suggested that the Dogme lessons be incorporated into the grammar-based syllabus. Students and teachers participating in the research agreed that teachers could integrate Dogme lessons into the grammar-based program to work together with the concrete items designed for the test.

All in all, action research indicates that Dogme can work as a medium to counterbalance examination-oriented pedagogy. Dogme allows teachers and learners to adhere to the structures that the exam will test, while it also engages students in real contents. Dogme also provokes personalization and helps interpersonal relationships between students bond in exam-oriented English courses. Even if the teachers cannot apply this approach exclusively in all their lessons, it is still able to help teachers become more proactive in their diverse teaching contexts.

### **How to Apply the Dogme Approach in the Post-Method Era**

One question proposed by many teachers and researchers is how to apply Dogme to technology-mediated learning when it also aims to encourage face-to-face communication. In fact, Dogme can also be applied to technology-mediated language learning while it still facilitates authentic conversations. Chapelle (2019) defines technology-mediated learning as an online or in-class learning mode in which students receive a digital task assigned by the teacher. Technology-mediated language learning has encouraged educators to develop online, offline, and blended programs. Technological advances allow for online socialization or interactions between the teacher and students and between students. This shows the possibility of spontaneous language use assisted by computers. It is Dogme that stresses the importance of spontaneous or incidental interpersonal communication. Advancements in technology have also provided teachers and learners with extensive inventories of materials from which they can select the ones most relevant to their teaching and learning purposes (Açıklan, 2009; Lin & Yang, 2011). Christie (2016) claims that language teachers should aim to help develop learners' spontaneous language use during incidental social interactions because it demonstrates learners' authentic communication competencies in naturalistic settings by setting situations for spontaneous talks to take place. To help learners achieve communicative competence, classroom activities should be interesting.

Teachers can employ role-plays, games, and group discussions to help enhance learners' spontaneous talk (Richards & Renandya, 2005). Spontaneous language use is a result of learners' ongoing exposure to pragmatic resources (Taguchi, 2015). However, it is irrefutable that pragmatic knowledge may be underestimated in most textbooks and the diversity of the speech acts included is rather inadequately presented (Ren & Han, 2016). Dogme can combine with different technological tools as our society is constantly changing, and this is called Dogme 2.0. Teachers can combine Dogme philosophy with the other methods such as flipped classrooms or e-learning environments. However, what matters is that Dogme, as critical pedagogy, is transformative and seeks social changes (Thornbury, 2009).

### **Research Gaps**

As a young teaching approach, there is a significant shortage of research projects on Dogme, although studies are still accessible here and there. It is, therefore, undeniable that most of these research articles on Dogme are small-scale and highly-localized, which opens up opportunities for further research projects that aim to explore the reliability and effectiveness of Dogme. It is also important to issue a call for additional empirical results as more studies are needed to test the hypotheses of Dogme and consolidate them further.

As an innovative perspective in English language teaching and learning, Dogme is a novel approach from which different aspects need to be investigated concerning students' and teachers' perceptions and experimental results should be collected in different contexts. This raises the question of how to develop students' reading skills if Dogme focuses on the here-and-now nature of the classroom. Whether Dogme can be applied to other courses in English such as English for specific purposes and English as a medium of instruction also needs investigation.

More research on the effects of Dogme in the digital age should be conducted. Researchers need to investigate how teachers can use social media resources as materials or if teachers can employ the spontaneity of Dogme in computer-assisted, mobile-assisted, and artificial intelligence-based settings. There is still a high demand for research on the necessity of written lesson plans and whether they can be replaced by post-lesson notes so that teachers can teach more freely (Greenhalgh, 2016).

## Conclusion

It is important to address the potential of Dogme. As a newly developed approach first proposed by Thornbury in 2000, there should be a vast amount of research on its different aspects, such as its effectiveness, and teachers' and learners' reflections. However, our critical review theoretically supports the practicality and applicability of Dogme in English language teaching and learning.

First, contemporary perspectives and approaches in SLA and second language teaching are well woven to support it in the post-methods era. Instead of depending on a single theory or approach for language teaching, Dogme provides teaching strategies to be realistic in practice. In other words, Dogme bridges the gaps between theory and practice in language teaching to orientate teachers and learners towards what they should do in the classroom, depending on learner differences, such as needs and interests. This coursebook-free perspective provides a pathway for English language classroom practices. Teachers can design tasks for learners, offer them activities that meet their interests, and help them overcome their problems via teacher-student informal conversations rather than adhering to what has been predetermined in chosen coursebooks. This review first shed light on the theoretical foundations of Dogme, its characteristics, and its criticisms. Then, the researchers multilaterally answered the main questions and concerns related to Dogme, ranging from its nature, philosophy, and practicality to its adaptability in the post-methods era. This research, therefore, aims to provide teachers, school administrators, and policy-makers with some insight into a new liberal approach in language teaching.

Dogme, also known as Teaching Unplugged, is an innovative teaching philosophy. Although it is challenging to bring up all the issues proposed to question the efficacy of this radical approach, Dogme is a new ideology that is promising in cater to different needs and teaching contexts. Dogme liberates the teacher from the burden of teaching and builds rapport between teachers and students. While there is no perfect method or approach to language teaching, Dogme underscores the role of the teacher as a communication facilitator who creates an environment where language can emerge. With the advancement of information technology, Dogme can transform and integrate with other ideas of language teaching. Thus, it can help students flourish in this new era.

Teachers should not rely heavily on coursebooks, and teachers should consider the three pillars of Dogme to initiate exchanges between students to facilitate learning. Dogme should be reconciled eclectically with other methods to counterbalance the weight of exam-oriented lessons.

School administrators should come to terms with the fact that teachers should not always come to class with detailed lesson plans. Instead, teachers should sensitize themselves to their students' needs. They should avoid taking extremist points of view; for example, Dogme is anti-material and anti-technology. Regarding teaching English communicatively, Dogme will be beneficial for helping students exchange ideas through interactions. The application of Dogme may also change the atmosphere of the class from monotonous to be more meaningful and exciting.

For administrators, requiring teachers to write complicated pre-lesson plans may be illogical as teachers should motivate students, adapt to their needs, and adjust the lesson contents. In short, Dogme is a convincing format of teaching that can be accepted as a substitute to liberate teachers in language schools.

The misconception that novice teachers with limited experience may not have the needed competencies to apply Dogme can be resolved. Teacher colleges, teacher trainers, educational administrators, and educators should aim to develop teachers' capacities to meet the requirements of the language teaching position according to their special teaching contexts rather than relying on the pre-made set of teaching guides. Internships and probation periods are essential to help pre-service teachers acquire sufficient knowledge, competencies, and experience to be prepared for their teaching (Snoek, Swennen, & Van der Klink, 2011; Srinivasan, 2019). Educational institutions also need to create an environment to help teachers develop professionally because teachers' professional development contributes significantly to their teaching performance. School administrators can set up formal training and mentoring programs (Timperley, 2011), facilitate informal idea exchanges between teachers (Little, 2012), and create an environment in which administration and other factors enhance teachers' ongoing development (Postholm, 2018). That means the



experience and capacity of teachers depend mainly on the pre-service training model and contextual factors of the educational institutions in which they work. Curriculum developers should also be open to this so that teachers can adopt different approaches to implementing lessons.

### Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

### References

- Açıklan, M. (2009). Pre-service elementary teachers' beliefs about the use of the Internet in the social studies classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 305-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760802553030>
- Allwright, R. L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal*, 36(1), 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/36.1.5>
- Almusharraf, N. (2018). English as a foreign language learner autonomy in vocabulary development: Variation in student autonomy levels and teacher support. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 11(2), 159-177. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-09-2018-0022>
- Barnes, B. D., & Lock, G. (2013). Student perceptions of effective foreign language teachers: A quantitative investigation from a Korean university. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 19-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.2>
- Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum*. Penguin.
- Bell, D. M. (2003). Method and post-method: Are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 325-336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588507>
- Benati, A., & Rastelli, S. (2018). The teaching and acquisition interface in neurocognition research. *Second Language Research*, 34(1), 3-17. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658317732616>
- Breen, M. (1985). The social context for language learning - a neglected situation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(2), 135-158. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100005337>
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827>
- Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bui, G., & Huang, Z. (2018). L2 fluency as influenced by content familiarity and planning: Performance, measurement, and pedagogy, 22(1), 94-114. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816656650>
- Burgos, E. G. (2017). Use of the genre-based approach to teach expository essays to English pedagogy students. *HOW*, 24(2), 241-259. <http://doi.org/10.19183/how.24.2.330>
- Cangelosi, A. (2007). The emergence of language: neural and adaptive agent models. *Connection Science*, 17(3), 185-190. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09540090500177471>
- Chappelle, C. A. (2019). Technology-mediated language learning. In J. W. Schwieter & A. Benati, *The Cambridge handbook of language learning* (pp. 575-596). Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/9781108333603.025>
- Chappell, P. (2014). Engaging learners: conversation - or dialogic driven pedagogy? *ELT Journal*, 68(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct040>
- Christie, C. (2016). Speaking spontaneously in the modern foreign languages classroom: Tools for supporting successful target language conversation. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(1), 74-89. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.836751>
- Coşkun, A. (2017). Dogme: What do teachers and students think? *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 6(2), 33-44. <http://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2016.1445>
- Ellis, N. C. (2008). The dynamics of second language emergence: Cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 232-249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00716.x>
- Ellis, R. (1999). Learning a second language through interaction. In *Studies in Bilingualism* (pp. 3-31). John Benjamins
- Ellis, R. (2014). Taking the critics to tasks: The case for task-based teaching. *Proceedings of CLaSIC* (pp. 103-117).

NUS.

- Fasso, W., Knight, B. A., & Knight, C. (2014). Development of individual agency within a collaborative, creative learning community. In M. Khosrow-Pour (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of information science and technology* (3rd ed., pp. 7519-7528). IGI Global Press.
- Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2013). Understanding student differences. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 94(1), 57-72. <http://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00829.x>
- Forbes, K. (2019). The role of individual differences in the development and transfer of writing strategies between foreign and first language classrooms. *Research Papers in Education*, 34(4), 445-464. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.1452963>
- Gao, J. (2007). Teaching writing in Chinese universities: Finding an eclectic approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20, 285-297.
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind*. Basic Books.
- Greenhalgh, K. (2016). *Eliminating unnecessary workload around planning and teaching resources*. Outwood Grange Academies Trust.
- Hao, S., & Johnson, R. L. (2013). Teachers' classroom assessment practices and fourth-graders' reading literacy achievements: An international study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 53-63. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.010>
- Harmer, J. (2012). *Essential teacher knowledge*. Pearson.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *How to teach English*. Pearson Education.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson Education.
- Hartman, R. J., Townsend, M. B., & Jackson, M. (2019). Educators' perceptions of technology integration into the classroom: A descriptive case study. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 12(3), 236-249. <http://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-03-2019-0044>
- Harwood, N. (Ed.). (2010). *English language teaching materials*. Cambridge University Press.
- Horsley, M., Knight, B. A., & Huntly, H. (2010). The role of textbooks and other teaching and learning resources in higher education in Australia: Change and continuity in supporting learning. *International Association for Research on Textbooks and Education (IARTEM) e-Journal*, 3, 43-61.
- Ito, M. (2010). *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning with the new media*. MIT Press.
- Knight, B. A. (2015). Teachers' use of textbooks in the digital age. *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1-10. <http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1015812>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2017). Just learning. *Language Teaching*, 50(3), 425-437. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000106>
- Leutner, M. M.-J. (2019). Does modality play a role? Visual-verbal cognitive style and multimedia learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 35(6), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12381>
- Li, D. (1998). "It's Always More Difficult Than You Plan and Imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588000>
- Lin, W., & Yang, S. (2011). Exploring students' perceptions of integrating Wiki technology and peer feedback into English writing courses. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 10(2), 88-103.
- Little, J. W. (2012). Professional community and professional development in the learning-centered school. In M. Kooy & K. van Veen (Eds.), *Teaching-learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 22-46). Routledge.
- Liu, J. (2004). Methods in the post-methods era Report on an international survey on language teaching methods. *International Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 137-152.
- Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00687.x>
- Luke, M., & Thornbury, S. (2009). *Teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching*. Delta Publishing.
- Macwhinney, B. (1998). The emergence of language. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 199-227. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.199>
- McCabe, D. (2005). Dogme. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 333-335. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci062>
- McCauley, S. M., & Christiansen, M. H. (2019). Language learning as language use: A cross-linguistic model of child language development. *Psychological Review*, 126(1), 1-51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000126>
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh University Press.
- McMeniman, M. (1992). Once more up the methodology road: A critical review of the communicative approach. *Asian Studies Review*, 15(3), 2-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.1992.9755374>

- McMullen, J., & Hickendorff, M. (2018). Latent variable mixture models in research on learning and individual differences. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 66, 1-3. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.05.008>
- Meddings, L., & Thornbury, S. (2009). *Teaching Unplugged*. Delta Publishing.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Multilingual Matters.
- Mitchell, C. B., & Vidal, K. E. (2001). Weighing the ways of the flow. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), 26-68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00095>
- O'Neil, R. (1982). Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal*, 36(2), 104-111. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/36.2.104>
- Palfrey, J., & Gasser, U. (2008). *Born digital: Understanding the first generation of digital natives*. Basic Books.
- Panto, E., & Comas-Quinn, A. (2013). The challenge of open education. *Journal of eLearning and Knowledge Society*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Pawlak, M. (2019). How teachers deal with individual difference in the language classroom: Results of a study. *Neofilog*, 52(1), 179-195. <http://doi.org/10.14746/n.2019.52.1.13>
- Pawlak, M., Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A., & Bielak, J. (2016). Investigating the nature of classroom willingness to communicate (WTC): A micro-perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(5), 654-671. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815609615>
- Postholm, M. B. (2018). Teachers' professional development in school: A review study. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1522781. <http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1522781>
- Purpura, J. E. (2016). Second and foreign language assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 100, 190-208. <http://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12308>
- Rassaei, E. (2018). Computer-mediated textual and audio glosses, perceptual style and L2 vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(6), 657-675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817690183>
- Ratner, N., & Bruner, J. S. (1978). Games, social exchange and the acquisition of language. *Journal of Child Language*, 5, 391-401. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900002063>
- Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 70(4), 424-434. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw010>
- Richards, J. C. (2000). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Center.
- Richards, J. C., & Rogers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sayed, O. H. (2016). Teaching Unplugged: Does it have the Potential to Improve EFL Students' Speaking skills in a Writing Class? *Journal of Research in Curriculum, Instruction and Educational Technology*, 2(3), 93-125. <http://doi.org/10.21608/jrciet.2016.24505>
- Sener, S. (2014). Turkish ELT students' willingness to communicate in English. *ELT Journal*, 3(2), 91-109.
- Smith, R. (2008). Learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, 62(4), 395-397. <http://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn038>
- Snoek, M., Swennen, A., & Van der Klink, M. (2011). The quality of teacher educators in the European policy debate: Actions and measures to improve the professionalism of teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(5), 651-664. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2011.616095>
- Solimani, E., Ameri-Golestan, A., & Lotfi, A. (2019). Flipped vs unplugged instructions: Sailing EFL learners' oral proficiency through virtual and real learning communities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(3), 459-480.
- Srinivasan, R. (2019). Towards an understanding of the work of teacher education professoriate in India. *Higher Education for the Future*, 6(1), 101-114. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2347631118802732>
- Stevick, E. (1981). *Teaching languages: A way and ways*. Newbury House.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are and should be ongoing. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1-50. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>
- Tan, K. E., & Phairot, E. (2015). Willingness to communicate among Thai EFL students: Does English proficiency matter? *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 15(3), 590-602. <http://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.2.590>
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2000). A dogma for EFL. *IATEFL Issues*, 153(2).
- Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach grammar*. Pearson Education.
- Thornbury, S. (2009). *Dogme: Nothing if not critical*. <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/dogme-nothing-if-not-critical>
- Thornbury, S., & Meddings, L. (2001). Using the raw materials. A Dogme approach to teaching language. *Modern English Teacher*, 10(4), 40-43.
- Thornbury, S., & Meddings, L. (2009). Dogme: A nest of NESTS? *IATEFL Global Issues SIG Newsletter* (pp. 15-19).

- <http://gisig.iatefl.org/resources/newsletters/15/GISIGNewsletter15.pdf>
- Timperley, H. (2011). *Realizing the power of professional*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Tosun, Ö. Ö., & Cinkara, E. (2019). Coursebook dependency in secondary and tertiary-level EFL teachers. *HOW Journal*, 26(1), 81-105. <https://doi.org/10.19183/how.26.1.445>
- Ur, P. (2012). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vallori, A. B. (2014). Meaningful learning in practice. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 3(4), 199-209. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v3n4a18>
- Van Boxtel, C. A., Van der Linden, J., & Kanselaar, G. (2000). Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge. *Learning and Instruction*, 10(4), 311-330. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(00\)00002-5](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(00)00002-5)
- Van de Pol, J., Mercer, N., & Volman, M. (2019). Scaffolding student understanding in small-group work: Students' uptake of teacher support in subsequent small-group interaction. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 28(2), 206-239. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2018.1522258>
- VanPatten, B. (n.d.). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 755-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00203>
- Volet, S., Jones, C., & Vaurus, M. (2019). Attitude-, group- and activity-related differences in the quality of pre-service teacher students' engagement in collaborative science learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 73, 79-91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.05.002>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society - the development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Walqui, A.d., & Lier, L. v. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise*. WestEd.
- Wass, R., & Golding, C. (2014). Sharpening a tool for teaching: A zone of proximal development. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(6), 671-684. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.901958>
- Wittwer, J., & Renkl, A. (2008). Why instructional explanations often do not work: A framework for understanding the effectiveness of instruction explanations. *Educational Psychologist*, 43(1), 4964. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00461520701756420>
- Xerri, D. (2012). Experimenting with Dogme in a Mainstream ESL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 59-65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p59>
- You, X. (n.d.). New directions in the EFL writing: a report from China. *Journal of Second*, 13, 253-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.09.002>