

English Language Teaching in Multilevel Classrooms: Challenges and Opportunities

Dr. Pitri Raj Banstola

Abstract

ELT classes in the schools of Nepal greatly vary in terms of number of the students in classroom. Large classes become multilevel and can have both challenges and opportunities for English language teachers. Therefore, this paper aims at exploring the challenges and opportunities of teaching English in large multilevel classes. Selecting five classes from five different schools in Pokhara city purposively, I observed ELT classes and interviewed the English language teachers to collect information. It has been found that teaching English in large multilevel classes is challenging though it has brought opportunities for English teachers. Engaging students in the lessons, correcting huge amounts of written work, evaluating students and keeping their records, paying equal attention to all the students and getting the quiet students active are the challenges. However, having enough students for interaction and collecting new experiences from the large classes to develop professional competence are opportunities for English teachers.

Keywords : challenges, ELT, multilevel classrooms, opportunities

Introduction

Nepal is a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-racial, and multilingual country. Therefore, the classes in schools in Nepal have a rich diversity in terms of culture, ethnicity, religion, and language which makes the classes multilevel. In terms of ownership, investment and management, the schools of Nepal are categorized into two types: community schools and institutional schools. In addition to these two types of schools, there are a few other types of religious schools such as Sanskrit schools, Missionary schools, Gumbas and Madarsa. Institutional schools and missionary schools are supposed to offer English Medium Instructions (EMI) which was introduced from the Durbar High School (Duwadi, 2018).

Increasing parents' interest to admit their children to English medium schools, decreasing

Article History

Submitted 14 Jan 2023

Reviewed 15 May 2023

Accepted 30 July 2023

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Pitri Raj Banstola

Email:

pitrirajbanstola@yahoo.com

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.3126/eltp.v8i1-2.57858>

Copyright information:

Copyright 2023 Author/s and Department of English Education, FoE, P.N. Campus

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- Non Commercial 4.0 International License



Publisher

Department of English Education
Faculty of Education, P. N. Campus,
Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Email: enged@pncampus.edu.np
URL: www.pncampus.edu.np

trend of student enrollment and increasing students' dropout rate because of the medium of classroom instruction can be the major reasons for most of the community schools to be shifting to EMI in Nepal. Observing the current trend of a medium shift in schools in Nepal, Caddell (2009, p. 130) writes, "English medium instruction emerged as a key dimension of the selling of dream...use of English even for a poor level is considered to connect students ...". Caddell expresses worries that the schools in Nepal are exposing the students to EMI without examining the level of the students and the requirements of the schools.

These days, some community schools, mostly in urban areas, advertise for students' admission to EMI schools and enroll a higher number of students without preparing fundamental requirements. The schools enroll students without any entrance test, as a result, the classes become large and large classes are multilevel in terms of the age of students and their knowledge. In this regard, Jones (2007) says, "In many ways, every class is a mixed ability class. It is obvious that a large class is a multilevel class " (p. 5). Therefore, it can be concluded that all classes are multilevel to some degree but a large class is multilevel.

In large classes, students vary in terms of gender, age, interest, attitude, ethnicity, religion and family background. Such a variation in large classes influences the classroom activities, therefore, large classes are complex. Regarding the complexity of a large multilevel class, Hess (2001, p. 2) writes, "It is not easy to provide an exact definition of what constitutes a large multilevel class." He also adds that students in many of our classes vary in terms of gender, maturity, occupation, ethnicity, culture, family background and personality. And in large classes, students may differ in language acquisition ability, age, motivation, intelligence, self-discipline, literary skill, attitude, and interest. As a result, the teacher enjoys some opportunities while teaching in large multilevel classes and they also face some challenges. Therefore, this study aims at exploring the challenges and opportunities of teaching English in large multilevel classes. And it is found that teachers feel difficulty in engaging and activating students and keeping a record of students' evaluations in a large class and they frequently feel out of control in large classes. The teacher collects rich experience through interaction with enough students for professional development. While reviewing Hess (2001), I found Hess discussing on challenges and opportunities of teaching language in large multilevel classes. The finding of this discussion and my experience of teaching English and observing my student teacher' teaching in large multilevel classes in led me to undertake this study.

Review of Literature

The class is, generally, a heterogeneous group of students who represent various genders, cultures, socio-economic groups, casts, and linguistic communities possessing different proficiency levels, qualities, attitudes and ways of motivation as Hess (2001, p.5) Writes, "Students not only differed in language acquisition ability but also in age, motivation, intelligence, self-discipline, literacy skills, attitude, and interest". Combinations of mixed abilities which is not only the property of a large class but also the property of a small class. Therefore, the background of the students influences their classroom performance and the whole environment of the class.

The students in a classroom can have different styles and strategies. For example, they can be extroverts, introverted, motivated, demotivated, intelligent, dull, active and passive. But on the same issue contrasting with Hess (2001), Jones (2007, p. 5) writes, "In many ways, every class is a mixed-

ability class". Lutz (1981 as cited in Halliday 2010, p. 31 mentions, "... a classroom may be observed as a cultural system".

The language of communication and the negotiation of meaning in a context is deeply influenced by the culture of the communicators. In this regard, Corbett (2003, p. 40) claims, "the learner is ... linguistically adept ... to identify cultural norms and values ... and behavior of the groups he or she meets, and can articulate and negotiate a position with respect those norms and values". Hence, by going through, Hess et al, it is concluded that every class is a mixed ability class and the diversity of large classes highly affects the classroom environment.

The size of a class has been an issue for discussion in Nepal because of its great variation. In terms of the number of students, a class is categorized as very large, large, moderate, small and very small. All these terms are relative because how large is large? And how small is small? and what is the moderate number? is difficult to define. A certain number of students can be small in one situation and moderate in another situation.

Harmer (2008) identifies two extremes of class size, "one-to-one teaching and large class" (p.121). Similarly, on the same issue, Hess (2001) says, "Chinese colleagues ... taught groups of sixty or more students in classes where students ... differed in language acquisition ability ... age, motivation, intelligence, self-discipline, literacy skills, attitude, and interest and ... situation was not at all unusual for them" (p.1). In addition, Hess (2001), writing about the extremely large classes with 600 students, further says, "classes of sixty to seventy-five students are not so exceptional around the world" (p.1) In the same way, Harmer (2008, p. 122) says, "A large class might be the classroom of 20, 40, 60 or 80 students ". Likewise, Jones (2007, p. 4) suggests, " only twelve students in a student-centered language class". But in Nepal, some classes especially, in community schools are surprisingly very large, consisting of more than eighty students. However, some institutional schools, language schools, and even some community schools, nowadays, have few students, i.e. around ten and below than this. So, there is no uniformity in class size in the schools of Nepal.

We can observe some challenges in a large class. The study of Jones (2007) shows, "... will have swivel chairs on wheels ... for pair work ... to face the teacher ... for a whole class discussion. But ... most classrooms have furniture that is not easily moveable; students have to seat in rows ... facing the fronts" (p .8). He further says, "Real classrooms are often crowded. In a crowded classroom, we may not even be able to reach some students as we circulate" (p.8). As Jones says the English classrooms in schools of Nepal are large and sets of furniture are arranged in orderly rows.

Writing in favour of large multilevel classes, Hess (2001) highlights two advantages, always having enough students for interaction and natural professional development opportunities for teachers. Teachers' frequent feelings of being out of control in the classroom and difficulties in activating the quiet student are the major challenges of large multilevel classes for Hess. Writing about the benefits of knowing all the students in the class, he suggests some techniques to learn students' names such as name toss and formal introductions.

The success and failure of classroom interaction depend upon the roles of student and teacher and the relationship between them. In ELT class, the selection of the approach either teacher-centred or student-centred determines the role of the teacher and the students. Following the teacher-centred way of teaching is practicing power in the class, on the other hand, choosing student-centred ways of

teaching is empowering the students. On this issue, Jones (2007, p.2) opines "In the student-centred classroom, the teacher's role is more that of a facilitator than instructor". On the other hand, Freeman & Anderson (2017, p.18) say, the teacher is the authority in the classroom. Similarly, showing integrated roles of a teacher and students to the content in a method, Richards and Rodgers (2001, p.245) write, "A method contains the detailed specification of context, roles of teachers and learners and teaching procedures and techniques '.

The term language and teaching method mean a coherent set of links between actions and thoughts in language teaching (Freeman 2009). It means that methods link thoughts and actions and teachers should practice them in the classrooms by choosing the appropriate methods. Likewise, many language teachers lack an understanding of how language learning theory and common teaching practices are linked with broader socio-political forces (Tollefson 1995). There is a sense in the words of Tollefson that teachers should understand the link between language learning theory and common teaching practices with broader socio-political forces.

After going through all these views, it is concluded that classroom teaching supposes the teacher as the authority in the classroom who plays power in everything where supplying every bit of information to the students is considered an important process of teaching-learning. In addition to this, they also view that the teachers need to be flexible so that students learn. So, in this case, the teacher is just a helping member of the class who participates in the learning process and provides the students with enough time to interact as Harmer (2008, p. 38) summarizes, "a good teacher maximizes STT and minimizes TTT. However, Law & Eckes (2010) criticize the teacher's role as, "the traditional roles of the classroom teacher and the language teacher- the former teaching content and the latter teaching language are rigid, artificial, inefficient and inexcusable" (p.77). They blame teachers to be rigid, artificial, inefficient, and inexcusable.

Regarding the relationship between teachers and students, Pace & Hemmings (2008) said, "classroom relations are negotiations between teachers and students that may develop into tactics for peaceable coexistence at the cost of serious involvement in education" (p.15). They mean that the teacher and students should have cordial relation that brings negotiation on any issue immediately.

The Issues of Using L1 or L2 as Medium Language

English is learned as L1, a foreign language and a second language all over the world. The use of the first language (L1) of learners in EFL/ESL classes is one of the current global debatable issues. On the issue of bilingual education, Edward (2010, p.250) writes, 'In bilingual education teaching through two languages is a permanent or semi-permanent feature in the classroom'. Therefore, EFL/ESL classrooms in the world are either in bilingual or monolingual contexts. ELT classrooms in Nepal are in both monolingual and bilingual contexts, however, the context of most of the classrooms is monolingual where the Nepali language is commonly used by the students and teacher. In some of the cases, Nepali is understood as the L1 of all the students. In this case, Jones (2007, p. 6) says, "in monolingual class, the students may more be tempted to speak in their common native language rather than in English when working together in pairs or groups". Opposing, Richards & Renandya (2010) and Freeman & Anderson (2017, p.20) suggest, "the native language should not be used in the classroom."

As Ellis (1985, p. 20) claims, "Up to the end of the 1960s, the views of language learning were

derived from a theory of learning in general." He adds, there were few studies of SLA. Therefore, the GTM, DM, and ALM that were developed on the behaviorists' background highly promoted the use of L1 in ESL and EFL classrooms.

Theoretical Framework

Introducing the 'Banking Model of Education' based on his own lived experiences that produced oppressors and oppressed in the society which dehumanized the human being, Freire (2005) said that the teachers were oppressors and the students were the oppressed. It was believed that if students were not able to transform their lived experiences to unveil new knowledge, they would never be able to participate in a dialogue. Therefore, according to Freire (2005), the students are depositories and the teacher is the depositor. The more the teacher deposits things into the students, the less students develop critical thinking skills. The teacher knows everything and the students receive everything from their teacher but they know nothing themselves. The teacher expresses and the students listen meekly. The teacher acts and the students are being acted upon. The teacher chooses content, and the students adopt it. Against the banking model, Freire developed the 'Problem Posing System of Education' to produce the citizens who could break the silent culture in the societies believing that education must begin with teacher-student interaction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students. They interact instead of transforming knowledge through the teacher. It is a social theory but it has direct implications in classroom teaching.

During the 1950s and 1960s, language teaching and learning were influenced by the process of behaviorism. imitation- repetition – habit formation which aims at forming language habits through intensive practice. The behaviorists believed that L1 knowledge influences L2 learning and L1 and L2 are learned through the same process. Therefore, GTM, DM, and ALM were developed on the ground of behaviorism. Criticizing Behaviorists' process of language learning, the cognitive approach was introduced in the 1970s with the view that learners are credited with creatively using their cognitive abilities. They construct rules, try them out and alter them if they prove to be inadequate.

Ellis (1985) claims that 'Krashen's Monitor Model has enjoyed considerable prominence in SLA research' (p.261). And he also presents five hypotheses of The Monitor Model such as the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis. Moreover, he presents other factors such as aptitude, role of L1, routines, and patterns, individual differences, and age. Explaining the Affective Filter Hypothesis, Ellis (1985) writes, "...learners with high motivation and self-confidence and with low anxiety have low filters and so obtain and let in plenty of input. Learners with low motivation, little self-confidence, and high anxiety have the high filter" (p.163).

By going through these facts it is obvious that learners with high motivation and self-confidence and with low anxiety have a low filter to obtain a huge amount of information and they learn more. But the learners with low motivation, little self-confidence, and high anxiety have a high filter receive little information and learn little. Opposing the view that the L1 interferes with SLA, Krashen focuses on the use of the L1 as a performance strategy. He, denying the individual difference in the process of acquisition, indicates three types of monitor users such as over users, under users, and optimal users (Ellis 1985). Hence, Freire's Banking Model of Education and Problem Posing System and Krashen's Monitor Model in general and The Effective Filter Hypothesis and Role of the First Language and

Individual Differences, in particular, were the major theories applied in my research. Devkota (2012 B) found that novice teachers were facing so many problems while teaching in the Nepalese context in comparison to experienced ones.

Methodology

I followed an ethnographic research design under the qualitative approach. In an ethnographic study, multiple realities were reflected in the classroom interactions where the role of participants was valued (Creswell, 2014). Five classes from five schools in Pokhara City were selected through a telephone conversation. The names of participants used in the study were pseudo. Students of Grade nine Section 'A' of Himalayan Secondary School (HSS) and Vakti Secondary School (VSS), section 'C' of Laxmi Secondary School (LSS), grade nine of Bhimsen Secondary School (BSS), grade eight of Shanti Secondary School (SSS) and the teachers Hira, Bhakta, Lalan, Bimal and Sahana respectively of these classes were the participants of the research. The primary information was collected from the selected classrooms through observation and interviews. After going through all the transcribed information, codifying them and grouping similar codes to form different categories, I developed themes based on the information obtained.

Results

Reviewing the collected information, two broad themes: teachers' experiences in large and multilevel classes and challenges and opportunities were developed out of the information.

Teachers' Experiences of Teaching at Large and Multilevel Classes

The lowest number of students in a class that Lalan, an English teacher of LSS had ever taught in his 23 years of teaching experience was 38 students. He taught 74, 78, 81 and up to 105 students in a class and he had been teaching 75 students in a class at the time. In his view, a larger class was better than smaller one. For him teaching 20 to 25 students in a class was monotonous and 60 to 65 students in a class was a moderate number of students.

In the same way, in his 15 years of teaching experience, Bimal, a teacher of BSS, taught 30 to 78 students and he was teaching 70 students in a class at the time but in his view, a smaller class was better than a larger one. Likewise, Hira, an English teacher of HSS, taught 35 to 78 students in his 23 years of teaching experience. He was teaching 63 students in a class at the time and 40 to 45 students in a class would be the moderate number of students in a class for him.

Similarly, Bhakta, a teacher of VSS, taught 40 to 96 students in a class in his 33 years of teaching experience and he was teaching 70 students at the time. He preferred teaching in smaller classes to teaching in larger classes because, in his experience, the large classes can be noisy, difficult to control, impossible to tick all the work and difficult to finish the course timely but no such problems in the small class (Interview). He added, 'If students are active, the large class can be competitive' (Interview)

In the same way, Sahana, a teacher of SSS with 10 years of teaching experience, taught 22 to 72 students in a class and she was teaching 69 students in grade eight at the time. She shared her bitter experience of teaching in a large class as I have faced so many challenges while teaching large classes. The course demands interactive teaching. There may not be problems in the class where there are adult students but the students of my class are mischievous (Interview). Her experience shows that students' maturity influences classroom activities.

Reminding an event in her class during my observation, she said, for example, you observed, I was forcing a student to change her seat because ignoring the lesson she was busy with non-academic work. (Interview). She also expressed her difficulties while checking classwork, when I give some assignments in class, all completed quickly but I cannot check all t a time (Interview). However, giving a lecture on a general topic was more effective in a large class as she said, to explain on a general topic large class is better (Interview).

Challenges and Opportunities

Large classes were found multilevel and heterogeneous with active, passive, talents and geniuses and dulls. These classes were found both challenging and welcoming as they explored problems and opportunities. The participants of the study perceived teaching in multilevel classes as challenging and a way of reaching up with opportunities... Responding to a question “In 23 years of teaching experience you might have taught different level classes. In your opinion, which type of ELT class (large or small) is more effective “? Lalan said, It also depends upon the nature of the students. If the students are active... large class is better. If they remain passive,... small class is better. Expressing his views in favor of large classes, he also added, in the context of Nepal it is said that a small class is better but I say a large class is better for me because I am teaching large classes. Teaching 20/22 students in a class is monotonous.

Lalan's opinions were found inconsistent, irrelevant and illogical. His expression large class is better because I am teaching a large class that lacks consistency, relevancy and logic. In the same way, teaching small class is monotonous in contrast with his behavior and the real context of the classroom because during class observation it was found that even the normal voice of the teacher and students' reading was not heard by other students in the classroom, therefore, the teacher was frequently shouting as Read loudly! Loudly! Loudly! many times. he was ignoring three of his students' dozing on the desk. He was found shouting to ensure that all of his students were listening Are you listening to me all of you? No...?

Likewise, Lalan's response, it is not a problem but there can be cheating and noise to question does the number of students matter in conducting language games and activities contrasts within itself. His words, it is not a problem contrasts with his expressions such as there can be cheating and noise, the teacher cannot pay equal attention to all the students, students do not work honestly, so it is not fruitful and we can not watch it all (interview excerpt)

Therefore, though he did not express himself explicitly, controlling mischief of the students and paying equal attention to all the individual students were the real challenges for Lalan in a large class.

In the same way, responding to a question you have a long experience of teaching English... In your opinion which size of class would be more effective Bimal opined, as per my experience, teaching a small class is easier because we can check homework and classwork properly and pay attention to all the students individually. People may say different talents and expertise can be found in large classes but I don't think so. To control and evaluate a small class is better than a large class in my opinion. (Field notes)

Because of a growing trend of shifting students to community schools from institutional schools in class nine every year, this class was found larger than other classes in every school. Therefore, the class became multilevel which is supported by Bimal's sharing, extra talented and extra dull students

in the same class (Field notes). The practice of elf-repetition in the same class brought age variation in the class, however, it was not found as a greater challenge in comparison to cultural and linguistic diversity. In Hira's class, some students were found well-performing because the school enrolled students having grades of A or above from other schools. Therefore, the newcomers were found better performing than those who were upgraded from the same school. However, Hira did not experience a wider difference, there are not very weak students who can not do anything (Field notes) .

Based on the classroom performance , Vhakta categorized his students as active students and passive students (Field notes). Shhana made several attempts to engage her students in the lessons. She shifted a girl to the second bench from her bench to control noise. For warning her students, she shouted don't talk, keep silent, Nabin, hello Nabin? Hey, don't talk! frequently. While presenting also repeatedly shouted to Nabin, hey! Don't you hear me?. Hey? Hey? Boys? Hello everyone, what happened?! Where are you looking to? What are you talking about? Boys, don't cry and any confusion. To concentrate on their writing she persuaded her students, please, everyone, pay your attention to your writing. Further, she continuously guided her students in, a very low voice, which is very low voice, and read louder. Despite her optimum efforts, Sahana couldn't control her class. Therefore, it is obvious that such frequent and sometimes unusual expressions showed that the teacher was facing a great challenge to engage her students completely in her lesson.

Hira's opinion is conditional as, I think if students are good and active, if they have basic knowledge, if the teacher can cover by the lecture method and if they have a competitive culture, the large class would be better. In the same way, Bhakta's view also is conditional as if the students are good, the large class can be competitive. In Sahana's opinion, a large class is better than a small class to explain a generic topic. Therefore, going through all the views and experiences of the teachers it is found that teaching large classes with a greater number of passive students is a real challenge for teachers. Therefore, it can be concluded that teaching in a large class has more challenges and few opportunities.

Discussion

Lalan's view, teaching 20/25 students in a class is monotonous and a moderate number is 60 to 65 students in a class contrasts with his views there can be cheating and noise, and the teacher can't pay equal attention to all students do not work honestly, and we cannot watch all. In view of Bimal, a small class is better than a large class. Similarly, Hira opines, teaching 40 to 45 students in a class is good. Likewise, Bhakta prefers teaching small classes to teaching large classes. In the same way, teaching in a large class is an immensely frustrating experience for Sahana whose words I have faced so many challenges while teaching in large classes express the bitter experience of dealing with a large class. Besides Lalan's controversial expression, teaching in a large class is challenging for all the participant teachers.

There is a wide variation in the views towards the size of the class (Harmer 2008). A large class might be a classroom of 20, 40, 60 or 80 students. A large class varies from 22 in US classrooms up to 150 in African classrooms. Jones (2007, p.4) suggests, " only 12 students in a student-centered classroom" and Hess (2001, p. 1) writes ... "60-75 students in a class is not so exceptional around the world". Therefore, opinions, experiences and practices on the size of the classrooms vary greatly.

Therefore, compared to the global trend, the practice of teaching 63 to 75 students in a classroom

in Pokhara city is not extreme. Lalan's view of teaching 60-65 students in a class is moderate and the view of Hess (2001) matches the trend of class size in community schools in Pokhara City.

Hence, there is a common consensus among teachers and theorists that large classes are multilevel and heterogeneous. In Lalan's class, some students are very good, some cannot read passages properly and some write 'd' in place of 'b'. Similarly, in Bimal's class, there are abnormally talented and dull students. Similarly, in Sahana's class, half of the students are outstanding and others are passive. Hence, these common knowledge-based heterogeneities resemble Hess's (2001, p.1) claim "students differ in motivation, intelligence ...".

While searching for the reason for the knowledge-based diversity from teacher perspectives, Lalan viewed that the family background of the students caused this diversity but Bimal opined that newly admitted students were talented and the students who were promoted from the same school were dull. The teachers also believed that the caste, religion, culture, and ethnicity of the students highly influenced their classroom performance.

According to the participant teachers, revising previous lessons, checking students work, encouraging students for reading and conducting student-centered activities were the real challenges of the large classrooms. It was found that the students were almost out of control during these activities in the classes, therefore, avoiding such activities, the teachers were found lecturing in their classes. However, Bimal revised the previous lesson before beginning the new lesson. Likewise, Lalan and Bhakta checked students' homework every day before starting the new lessons. Unlike other teachers, Sahana began her new lesson without revising previous lessons and checking homework. Differing from all other teachers, Bhakta encouraged his students to news reading before the start of the new lesson which was one of the features of interactive teaching as Harmer (2008, p. 38) says, a good teacher maximizes STT and minimizes TTT. High TTT in all the classes shows the culture of the teacher-centered way of teaching that Freire (2000) named the Banking Model of Education which contrasts with Freeman & Anderson's principle (20017) the teacher is the authority in the classroom.

Despite their optimum attempts, the teachers failed to make their teaching student-centered as guided by the concept of Freire's (2000), Problem Posing. Focusing on translation techniques, Lalan, Bimal, Bhakta, and Sahana while teaching the passages, encouraged the students on word translation as guided by the concept that the student should be able to translate each language into another Freeman & Anderson (2017). Hira's inductively way of grammar teaching, One of the students complain our class is disturbed and they disturbed us when there was some disturbance at the door and another student's suggestion his mates talk in English showed Hira's attempts to maintain an English environment in his class by applying the idea 'native language should not be used in the classroom', 'purpose of language learning is communication' and 'grammar should be taught inductively' (Freeman & Anderson, 2017, p. 29). The Lalan, Bimal, Bhakta, and Sahana focused on the teacher-centered way of teaching authorized them to promote teacher-student interactions in the class. Therefore, only a few student-teacher interactions were observed. And none of the teachers was found to promote student-student interaction in their classes.

Hence, in a large class, the teacher has enough students for interaction, therefore, the teacher never gets bored. The teacher can empower some active students with the role of the teacher. However, sometimes, the teacher feels out of control in a large class. Teachers were found frustrated, by the

overloaded task of correcting students' work, evaluating the students and keeping their records. Paying individual attention to all the students in a large class was another real challenge for teachers.

Conclusion and Implications

The data from interview and observation enable me to conclude that large classes are both opportunities and challenges for English teachers. They have enough students for interaction and they also get the opportunity for professional development while teaching in large classes. On the other hand, the teachers may feel out of control in large classes. They are frustrated by the students' noise and a huge amount of written work to be corrected. They also feel difficulty to provide individual attention to all the students. Activating the quiet students and conducting interactive activities are the major challenges for English teachers while teaching in large classes.

Since the study has found excessive noise as a challenge to the teacher, the ELT classrooms should be soundproofed to avoid external disturbances. Similarly, the fixed rows of furniture should be replaced with swivel chairs on wheels to enable the students to face each other for interaction. Rather than controlling the students, the teacher should motivate, inspire, engage and facilitate the students and the teacher should know all the students in the class individually. In the same way, teachers should construct teaching materials and use them appropriately for effective teaching. Using the rich diversity of large classes as an opportunity, the teachers should promote various interactive activities such as debate, talk, discussion, project work, pair work, and group work. In addition to, teacher-student interaction and student-teacher interaction, the teachers should maximize student-student interactions in the classrooms.

References

- Banstola, P. R. (2018). *English language teaching activities adopted by student teachers of Janapriya Multiple Campus, Pokhara* [An unpublished research report]. Janapriya Multiple Campus.
- Caddell, M. (2009). Private schools as battlefields: Contested visions of learning and livelihood in Nepal. In Bhatta, P. (Ed.), *Education in Nepal* (pp. 121-148). Martin Chautari.
- Corbett, J. (2003). *An intercultural approach to English language teaching*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Devkota, K. (2011). Punishment in an English language class in a second or foreign language context. *The Educator Journal*, 1 (1) 153-167.
- Devkota, K. (2012a). Classroom dynamics: a study on English language classroom in Nepalese context. *The Educator Journal*, 2 (2) 67-79.
- Devkota, K. (2012b). How experienced teachers interact with the problems that novice teachers see in EFL classrooms? *The Educator Journal*, 2 (3), 143-155.
- Dhakal, H. R. (2014). *Classroom discourse in Nepalese schools: a cultural perspective* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tribhuvan University.
- Duwadi, E. P. (2018). Historical development in the teaching and learning of English in Nepal. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language Teaching in Nepal: Research, Reflection and Practice* (pp. 179-184). British Council Nepal.
- Edwards, J. (2010). *Language diversity in the classroom*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

- Freeman, D. L. & Anderson, M. (2017). *Techniques & principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum.
- Halliday, A. (2010). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2008). *how to teach English*. Pearson.
- Harmer, J. (2008). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson.
- Hess, N. (2001). *Teaching large multilevel classes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, L. (2007). *The student-centered classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2010). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Law, B. C. & Eckes, M. (2010). *The more than just shivering handbook*. Portage Main Press.
- Lutz, F.W. (1981). Ethnography – the holistic approach to understanding schooling. In J. D. Green & C. Waller (Eds.), *Ethnography and Language in Educational Setting* (51– 63). ABLEX.
- Pokhrel, S. (2018). *Perceptions and practices of teachers to promote learner autonomy in school education of Nepal* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kathmandu University School of Education.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2010) *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1995). *Power and equality in language education*. Cambridge University Press.

Dr. Pitri Raj Banstola is a lecturer of English Education in Tribhuvan University, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara, Nepal. He has earned PhD in Dynamics of English Language Teaching Classrooms in Schools of Nepal. He has published some research articles in journals. He has also published a few books. He is interested in ELT, academic writing and research.