ELT in Asia
in the Digital Era:
Global Citizenship
and Identity

Editors
Suwarsih Madya
Fuad Abdul Hamied
Willy A. Renandya
Christine Coombe
Yazid Basthomi

ROUTLEDGE

Table of contents

Part II: Exploring the relationship between the knowledge-based
era and TEFL development

Organizing committee

PATRON

Sutrisna Wibawa

CHAIR

Suwarsih Madya

VICE CHAIRS

Widyastuti Purbani
Sugirin √
Sukarno

COMMITTEE

Joko Nurkamto
HyoWoong Lee Asia
Haixiao Wang
Masaki Oda
Fuad Abdul Hamied
Gunakumaran Subramaniam
Hung Soo Lee
Sisilia Halimi S.
Didi Sukyadi
Margana
Edi Purwanta
Sumaryanto
Senam

Moch. Brury Triyono
Satoto Endar Nayono
Joko Priyana
Maman Suryaman
Andy Bayu Nugroho
Asruddin B. Tou
Susana Widyastuti
Basikin
Samsul Maarif
Suhaini M. Saleh
Anita Triastuti
Ashadi
Erna Andriyanti

ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity

Editors

Suwarsih Madya
Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

Fuad Abdul Hamied
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

Willy A. Renandya
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Christine Coombe
Dubai Men's College, the United Arab Emirates

Yazid Basthomi
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

Jointly Organized by
Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Asia (Asia TEFL), The Association for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia (TEFLIN), and English Language Education Department, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

Teachers' accountability in the post-method era: Balancing freedom and responsibility

Sugirin
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This paper aims to formulate a way of coupling the post-method teachers' freedom with the responsibility it entails. As Kumaravadivelu (2006) claims, educational change is a systemic change involving both challenges and opportunities. The post-method concept allows teachers freedom to take whichever teaching path as long as they are responsible for the achievement of the students' learning outcomes. However, Akbari (2008) re-minds us that the application of the concept is not plausible by novice teachers. Even experienced teachers are not all prepared to accept the concept—to base their teaching on the honest reflection of what aspects have made their teaching effective or unsuccessful. Youssef and Dahmani (2008) even see that institutional policy may hold up teachers' freedom. This paper proposes that English language teachers implement the post-method pedagogic parameters with caution to ensure that their decisions and actions suit the stakeholders' expectations (Levitt, Janta & Wegrich 2008).

1 INTRODUCTION

Within the history the English language teaching methods, from the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) to the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), the teacher has full control over classroom instruction. The teacher is an authorized instructor who determines what will happen in the classroom, how it will happen, and what the desired outcome will be like. The advent of the Communicative Approach to Language Teaching (CALT) and the Designer Nonmethods (Kumaradivelu 2006) recognizes that learners are human beings, not robots, so that humanizing them is a must. Learners have the right to enjoy services fully in line with their individual interests, values, abilities, and their learning needs, which are certainly diverse. The post-method era allows the teacher freedom to decide what is best to do to achieve the instructional objectives.

This poses a challenge for the teacher who has been accustomed to following the neatly prescribed classroom procedures of the method era. Despite the freedom allowed, as Madya (2013) suggests, changes in teaching methodology or a paradigm shift in language pedagogy do not alter the demand for language instruction. The teacher must be responsible for the achievement of the instructional objectives. This is in line with Nilufer's (2009) claim that when teachers should decide on their own way of teaching, it does not mean that they are completely free in their decision. They have to consider salient principles in carrying out effective lessons. However, Baker (2017) warns us that balancing freedom and responsibility is not easy. One can easily get caught up in freedom and forget the responsibilities attached.

This paper attempts to elaborate the challenges in balancing the teachers' post-method pedagogic freedom with responsibilities it entails to ensure their accountability. This attempt is urgent to avoid misunderstanding of the post-method pedagogic concepts and to provide a guide for their implementations.

2 METHOD

To achieve the aim of the study, the paper presents the shifts of approaches in English language teaching approaches, the concepts of post-method pedagogy with their related challenges, and teachers' accountability as a proposed solution.

3   THE SHIFT OF APPROACHES IN ELT INSTRUCTION

The history of methods in English language teaching (ELT) has shown that the shift from one method to another did not happen by chance. As Brown (2001) neatly elaborates, the Direct Method (DM) succeeded the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) due to the demand for the learners' ability to communicate with people speaking the target language. The DM which emphasized communication in the target language better fitted the need of the learners who wanted to benefit directly from the booming industry which entailed more opportunities in international trade and travel. The DM soon enjoyed popularity in Europe, but it did not gain the same period of support from public education in the US. The Coleman Report published in 1929 concluded that focusing on oral foreign language mastery was considered irrelevant. What the US public school graduates needed was the ability to comprehend reading passages through silent reading and discuss the passages in English. This was the basis for the so-called Reading Method. However, with the advent of the World War, this method did not meet the needs of US soldiers and other related parties who urgently demanded speaking proficiency in the language of their enemies and allies. Hence, they developed a language training program which was later known as the Army Method. After the World War, support from Structural linguists and the Behaviorist psychologists made the method (e.g., pattern drills) theoretically sound—the patterns were based on the work of the Structuralists while the drills (aiming at habit formation) were based on stimulus-response of the Behaviorists. Under the name of the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), this method gained world-wide acceptance. However, the ALM then received strong criticism from a notable cognitivist, Chomsky.

Chomsky (1965), as reiterated by Nordquist (2017), believed that grammar has recursive rules allowing one to generate grammatically correct sentences over and over. Our brain has a mechanism which can create language by following the language principles and grammar. Hence, language learning is not merely a process of habit formation.

However, Hymes (1972) asserts that communicative competence is not only a matter of generating grammatically correct sentences but also as the ability to use those correct sentences in a variety of communicative situations. Hence, this brings Hymes' sociolinguistic perspective into Chomsky's linguistic view of competence (Bagaric 2007). Within the method history, the teacher' roles have been rigidly prescribed. In the GTM the teacher is an authorized instructor providing texts, glossary and grammar rules, translation practice, and functions as a translation assessor. In the DM the teacher serves as the director of class activities, motivator, error corrector, and learner's partner. In the Reading Method (Blair, Rupley & Nichols 2007) the teacher acts as a reading expert and a reading coach who strategically, in a variety of ways, helps learners to comprehend the texts. In the ALM, one of the teacher's major roles is that of a model of the target language and of an error corrector (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). In the Communicative Approach to Language Teaching (CALT) the teacher's major role is of a facilitator enabling the learners to use the language in the real-world communication. In all these methods, the teacher's roles have been prescribed so that his/her task is making an effort to understand and implement them in the teaching acts. The shift from the GTM, DM and ALM to the CALT is part of the struggle based on the myths of the method concept.

Related to these concerns, Kumaravadivelu (2006) sees the concept of method carrying the myths that (1) there is a best method out there ready and waiting to be discovered; (2) method constitutes the organizing principle for language teaching; (3) method has a universal and a historical value; (4) theorists conceive knowledge, and teachers consume knowledge; and (5) method is neutral, and has no ideological motivation. Richards (2001) already predicted that the quest for the best method would remain a preoccupation of language teaching for the next twenty years. However, in reality there has never been any best method. Hence, Allwright's (1991) contentious talk has slowly but surely and ultimately been applauded, followed by a shift from method to the post-method era.

4 POSTMETHOD CONCEPTS

Pennycook (1989) argues that methods represent interested knowledge and they serve the dominant power structures in society, leading to "a de-skilling of the role of teacher, and greater institutional control over classroom practice." No wonder that Allwright (1991: 1) deliberately gave his plenary paper a contentious title "The Death of the Method" to emphasize "the relative unhelpfulness of the existence of methods".

Rivers (1991) had already pointed out that the different methods listed previously were merely variants of the existing methods with considerable overlap in their theory and practice. What became her concern was the myth surrounding the concept of method. The concern turns more serious when method is defined as "a fixed set of classroom practices that serve as a prescription and therefore do not allow variation" (Bell 2003).

4.1 Method versus post-method

It is important to have a clear understanding of the distinction between the concept of method and post-method. While method is defined to "consist of a single set of theoretical principles derived from feeder disciplines and a single set of classroom procedures directed at classroom teachers" (Kumaravadivelu 1994), post-method can be defined as the construction of classroom procedures and principles by the teacher himself/herself based on his/her prior and experiential knowledge and/or certain strategies. In other words, the concept of method involves theorizers constructing "knowledge-oriented" theories of pedagogy and post-method involves practitioners constructing "classroom-oriented" theories of practice (Kumaravadivelu 1994). Therefore, post-method is totally different from the existing methods, emerging as a result of the limitations of the methods and, thus, another method cannot aim to overcome the limitations of the concept of method. Hence, the concept of post-method comes into existence. One of the characteristics of the post-method era is the teachers' autonomy, freedom with attached responsibility.

4.2 Teachers' autonomy

While method-based pedagogy relies on *the professional theories*, post-method pedagogy allows freedom for teachers to decide what best to do based on the reflection of their prior knowledge, their experience as teachers as well as their experience as learners. This reflection will allow them to analyze what has made their own learning and their teaching acts successful or fail. As McIntosh (2010) claims, reflection can be used to create depth of knowledge and meaning, both for self and for those practiced upon.

The ability to make reflections will enable them to initiate changes in their teaching, to monitor the effects of the changes made, and to decide what to do next. In other words, post-method teachers are required to generate their *personal theories* of pedagogy, making a decision on what works best to achieve the ultimate goals of the teaching and learning process. Citing Little's (1995) words, Smith (2000) describes teacher autonomy as having a strong sense of personal responsibility for their teaching, exercising via continuous reflection and analysis the highest possible degree of affective and cognitive control of the teaching process, and exploring the freedom that this confers.

However, as Madya (2013) suggests, despite changes in teaching methodology or paradigm shifts in language pedagogy, the demand for language instruction—the achievement of the instructional objectives remains the same and that becomes the teacher's responsibility. However, in achieving the instructional objectives the teacher should no longer rely on top-down teaching prescriptions of the past, the method. He/she has to reflect honestly on what aspects have made the teaching successful or fail Teachers are asked to honestly theorize their practice and implement their theories into practice. This is the core of the post-method concept that has stirred reactions from some authors.

4.3   *Reactions towards the post-method concepts*

A number of authors have argued that lay teachers are not prepared for theorizing their practice and practicing the theory conceived as it is not a simple undertaking. Reiterating Akbari's claim (2008), Masouleh (2012) holds that in the concept of theorizing practice of post-method perspectives, the whole system must be touched upon, not just a teacher as the key feature of post-method. And if it is said there should be an attempt to find an alternative to method, not an alternative method, it is really illogical to imagine that even a novice teacher must seek for it. Responding to this objection, Richards & Rodgers (2001) suggest that applying procedures and techniques developed by others should be an essential starting point for inexperienced teachers. However, as teachers gain more experience, they had better try to develop an individual approach, reflecting their beliefs, principles and experiences. This kind of transition is not only allowed but suggested in the spirit of the post-method pedagogy.

4.4   *The post-method pedagogic parameters*

What is needed in entering this post-method era is the construction of the post-method pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu 2006). For this purpose, he proposed three pedagogic parameters: particularity, practicality, and possibility.

The parameter of *particularity* claims that a meaningful pedagogy must be constructed with a holistic interpretation of particular situations, particular teachers, particular learners, particular learning objectives, etc. A teaching innovation that works well for a particular group of learners in a particular situation may not work for another group of learners in a different situation. A study by Özbilgin & Tannacito (2011) shows the need to encourage teaching sensitive to the particularities of aim, student, and milieu.

The parameter of *practicality* suggests the shift of the teaching foundation from top-down professional theories to bottom-up personal theories which demands teachers to develop their own theories gained from theorizing their own teaching practice and learning experience. They are required to reflect on their practice and using their insights and intuition to act on what is considered to best serve the achievement of the instructional goals. McIntosh (2010) claims that reflection and reflexivity through recognizing their inherent qualities is central to becoming a practitioner-researcher. In this regard, Richards & Rodgers (2001) suggest that applying procedures and techniques developed by others should be an essential starting point for inexperienced teachers. However, as teachers gain more experience, they had better try to develop an individual approach, reflecting their beliefs, principles and experiences. In other words, they need to develop their own theories of successful instruction. These theories are needed as theoretical perspectives can provide consistency in their efforts (Lafortune et al. 2009). Lafortune & Deaudelin (2001) suggest that in order to bring about change, the persons involved should work in collaboration so that each can contribute to developing the collective model. This will build the sense of ownership so that each will adapt it to his or her own way of achieving the instructional goals.

The parameter of *possibility* demands the understanding of what is possible from both the internal and external factors of the teachers and the learners. This parameter recognizes how the teachers and learners are brought up, which social, economic, and political environment they are in. Teachers' ideal conception of teaching must consider whether the environment allows them to practice what they conceive. Teachers are required to be creative but they must also be sensitive towards the existing situations so that their creativity is acceptable. However, in the 1960s when English language teaching meant to consider learners' motivation, the atmosphere had not allowed so that teachers still focused on how learners learned (Richards 2001). This illustrates how teachers' accountability is being tested.

5   SEARCHING FOR A SOLUTION THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS' ACCOUNTABILITY

Following Bovens (2005), Levitt, Janta & Wegrich (2008) define accountability as the methods by which the actor may render an account (i.e. justify their actions and decisions) to

the stakeholders and by which the stakeholders may hold the actor to account (i.e. impose sanctions or grant permissions). Hence, teachers must insure that their actions and decisions suit the expectations of the stakeholders (those with a particular interest in the work of the teachers, including the teachers' conduct, perceptions, attitudes and the outcomes of their activities) and by which the stakeholders may impose sanctions if the teachers do not meet their expectations.

5.1 *Types of accountability*

Accountability can be classified into five types: organizational, political, legal, professional, and moral/ethical (Ferlie, Lynn & Pollitt 2005). In the educational context, organisational accountability defines the relationship between schools' organisational characteristics and teachers' empowerment, measured as the experience of individual teachers. Teachers are professionals so that they must be professionally accountable, in the sense that they have to conform to standards and codes of conduct checked by professional peers, through their institutions. As teachers do not only teach but also educate, they have an ethical obligation and moral responsibilities. In addition, they have to comply with government regulations, especially those pertaining to education policy.

As Levitt, Janta & Wegrich (2008) claim, a key challenge for public services in general and professionals working in schools in particular is how to combine two imperatives: (a) a performance orientation (in the sense of measurable performance against published targets) that satisfies the principal stakeholders, and (b) maintenance or revival of broader professional values. Doing their best to ensure that the students pass the national exam satisfies the school principals and the parents. However, helping the students to develop the skills excluded from the national exam but which are paramount in the job market, such as speaking skill, is a value worthy of appreciation though not many teachers may be interested in doing so. Levitt, Janta & Wegrich (2008) further state the levels of teachers' autonomy or control by the public in any given situation usually reflect the level of trust the public has on the teachers. If the trust is low, the public control will be strong but when the trust is high, teachers' autonomy will most probably be strong.

However, Youssef & Dahmani (2008) find there are contradictory results in the empirical literature due to the lack of organisational change which holds up teachers' autonomy. In countries such as Australia where Action Research Planner (McTaggart 1979) was written, implementing Kumaradivelu's (2006) parameter of *possibility* sounds easier as the country has long empowered teachers' autonomy by encouraging them to make reflections on their teaching and learning activities. In countries where education is still centrally controlled by the government, the condition is different. Teachers who are used to following a top-down policy in their day-to-day job description find it difficult to work the other way round. For example, the 2013 Indonesian school curriculum, known as the 2013 Curriculum, demands that in order to promote learners' creativity every teaching and learning process should use the scientific approach, following the steps of *observing – questioning – experimenting – associating – networking* (*Wakil Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan R.I. Bidang Pendidikan,* 2014). It is prescriptive in nature and may not always suit the teaching learning process of every aspect of language. This demand may discourage English language teachers from developing their initiative to draw up theories from what is successful and unsuccessful in their instructional practice as suggested for the post-method teachers (Kumaravadivelu 2006).

However, as learners' creativity, one of the goals of the 2013 Curriculum, is in line with autonomy allowed for the post-method learners, it is the teachers' creativity that plays an important role in responding to the *parameter of possibility*. As Madya (2013) suggests, rather than complaining about the change, teachers should try their best to adapt to the change as 21st century teachers are those who are effective adaptors to the changing world. The approach prescribed by the 2013 Curriculum should be treated as a guideline so that teachers' autonomy in deciding the best way to achieve the instructional goals matches the learners' autonomy in achieving their learning goals.

5.2 *Learners' autonomy*

Though learners' autonomy was commonly seen in terms of strategies for independent and individual learning (Borg & Al-Busaidi 2012), it includes capacity and willingness of learners to take responsibility for their own learning (Sinclair 2000). In a similar spirit Benson (2011) defines learner autonomy as the capacity to take charge of one's own learning, a natural product of the practice of self-directed learning in which the objectives, progress and evaluation of learning are determined by the learners themselves. While the narrow view of learners' autonomy treats learning to learn a language as an end in itself, the broad view treats learning to learn a language as a means to an end, the end being learning to liberate. The former stands for academic autonomy, and the latter stands for liberatory autonomy. The *academic autonomy* enables learners to be effective learners and *liberatory autonomy* empowers learners to be critical thinkers (Kumaradivelu 2006).

While teachers' autonomy earns centrality in the post-method pedagogy, educating post-method learners becomes the responsibility of the post-method teachers. What does it mean? As Little (2000) claims, teachers can only develop learner autonomy if they themselves are autonomous. This means that they must be able to autonomously reflect on their own self-managed learning processes and apply them in helping the learners to manage their own learning, to build their learning autonomy. The teacher has a commitment to empowering his/her learners by creating appropriate learning spaces and developing their capacity for autonomy. La Ganza (2008) admits that learner autonomy is constantly being negotiated within the teacher-learner relationship which depends upon the capacity of the teacher and the learner to develop and maintain a condition in which the teacher holds back from influencing the learner, and the learner holds back from seeking the teacher's influence.

6 CONCLUSION

It has been pointed out that throughout the method history there has never been any best method. The post-method teachers do not seek an alternative method but an alternative to method. As Richards & Rodgers (2001) suggest, applying procedures and techniques developed by others should be an essential starting point for inexperienced teachers. However, as teachers gain more experience, they need to develop their own experience-based approach, reflecting their beliefs, principles and practices as teachers and as learners. They have to reflect on what has made their teaching a success or a failure, and decide what is best to do in their own classroom independently but responsibly. Other than managing to achieve the students' learning outcomes, they have to ensure that the learners' achievement comes from their own effort to take charge of their own learning. It is the teachers' reflection-based creativity in designing tasks or generating a conducive atmosphere that will help learners to be responsible for their own learning. To maintain the sustainability of the success, the teachers should make collaborative efforts in constructing a collective instructional approach which allows each teacher to contribute to the development of the approach. This way, each has the sense of belonging which will insure the sustainability of its implementation.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R. 2008. Postmethod discourse practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 42(4).

Allwright, R.L. *The death of method* (Working Paper #10). Lancaster: The Exploratory Practice Centre, The University of Lancaster.

Baker, Q. 2017. Balancing freedom and responsibility at school. *The Ontarion.* Accessed 12/10/2017 from https://www.theontarion.com/2017/09/balancing-freedom-and-responsibility-at-school/ Bell, D. M. 2003. Method and postmethod: Are they really so incompatible. *TESOL Quarterly* 37(2): 325–336.

Benson, P. 2011. *Teaching and researching autonomy* (2nd Ed.). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Blair, T.R., Rupley, W.H. & Nichols, W.D. 2007. The effective teacher of reading: Considering the "what" and "how" of instruction. *International Reading Association*: 432–438. doi:10.1598/ RT.60.5.3.

Brown, H.D. 2001. Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd Ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Coleman, A. 1929. *The teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States: A report prepared for the modern language study.* New York: Macmillan.

Ferlie, E., Lynn, L.E. & C. Pollitt. 2005. *The Oxford handbook of public management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2006. *Understanding language teaching: from method to postmethod*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 1994. The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(1): 27–48.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2001. Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly* 35: 537–560.

La Ganza, W. 2008. Learner autonomy—teacher autonomy: Interrelating and the will to empower. In Jiménez Raya, M., Lamb, T.E. & Vieira, F. 2007. *Pedagogy for autonomy in language education in Europe: towards a framework for learner and teacher development.* Dublin: Authentik.

Lafortune, L. & Deaudelin, C. 2001. *Accompagnement socioconstructiviste. Pour s'appropier une reforme en education.* Quebec City: Presses de I'Universite du Quebec.

Lafortune, L., Lapage, C., Persechino, S. & Aitken, A. 2009. *Professional competencies for accompanying change: A frame of reference.* Quebec: Presses de I'Universite du Quebec.

Levitt, R., Janta, B, & Wegrich, K. 2008. *Accountability of teachers: Literature review.* Cambridge: Rand.

Little, D. (2000). We're all in it together: exploring the interdependence of teacher and learner autonomy. In *All together now, papers from the 7th Nordic conference and workshop on autonomous language learning, Helsinki, September 2000*, L. Karlsson, F. Kjisik & J. Nordlund (eds), 45–56. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Language Centre.

Madya, S. 2013. *Metodologi pengajaran bahasa dari era prametode sampai era pascametode* (Language teaching methodology from premethod era to postmethod era). Yogyakarta: UNY Press.

Masouleh, N.S. 2012. From method to post method: A panacea! *English Language Teaching* 5(4). Accessed 12 April 2017 from *www.ccsenet.org/elt*.

McIntosh, P. 2010. *Action research and reflective practice.* London & New York: Routledge.

Nilüfer, C. 2009. Post-method pedagogy: Teacher growth behind walls. *Proceedings of the 10th METU ELT Convention,* 22–23 May.

Nordquist, R. 2017. *Transformational grammar (tg) definition and examples.* Accessed on 25/06/2017 from https://www.thoughtco. com/ transformational-grammar-1692557.

Özbilgin, A. & Tannacito, D.J. The parameter of particularity: A critical analysis of a supervisory observation of an EFL teachers's classroom in Turkey. Accessed 12/09/2017 from https://www. academia. edu/4173068/The_Parameter_of_ Particularity_A_Critical_Analysisof_a_SupervisoryObservation_ of_an_EFL_Teacherss_Classroom _in_Turkey?auto=download.

Pennycook, A. 1989. The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 23(4): 589–618.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J.C. 2001. *Curriculum development in language teaching.* Cambridge: CUP.

Rivers, W.M. 1991. Mental representations and language in action. *The Canadian Modern language Review* 47: 249–265.

Smith, R.C. 2000. Starting with ourselves: teacher-learner autonomy in language learning. In Sinclair, B., McGrath, I., & Lamb, T. (eds.). *Learner autonomy, teacher autonomy: Future directions.* Harlow: Longman.

Wakil Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan R.I. Bidang Pendidikan (Vice Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia). 2014. *Konsep dan implementasi kurikulum 2013 (Concept and implementation of the 2013 curriculum).* Accessed 20-09-2015 from https:// kemdikbud.go.id/kemdikbud/dokumen/Paparan/ Paparan%20Wamendik.pdf.

Youssef, A. B. & Dahmani, M. 2008. The impact of ICT on student performance in higher education: direct effects, indirect effects and organisational change. *RUSC* 5(1) (2008) ISSN 1698-580X.

Author index