



Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of ELT Pedagogy in Nepali Secondary Schools

Bhakta Raj Bhatt (*MPhil*)

Far Western University, Gokuleshwor Multiple Campus, Darchula, Nepal

Email: bhattabraj2@gmail.com

Abstract

The pedagogy of English language teaching has undergone a significant shift in recent times, reflecting the global trends favoring communicative and student-centred approaches. This qualitative research study aims to explore the perceptions and practices of English language teachers on ELT pedagogy in Nepali secondary schools. The participants of this study were purposively selected four English language teachers who teach at the secondary-level in public schools in Kanchanpur district, Nepal. I used interview protocols and class observation notes for the collection of data and the data were analyzed through thematic analysis. The findings of the study showed that secondary-level English language teachers have been shifting their pedagogical practices from traditional teacher-centred approaches to modern innovative approaches. The study also revealed that English teachers employ mixed way of pedagogy of methods and techniques, and translanguaging as a medium of instruction in the classroom. The implication of the study is that English language teachers need to focus on student-centred pedagogical approaches in their real teaching practices. They have to create more English-learning activities in the classroom to keep the students motivated and engaged in learning so that they get more learning and practising opportunities.

Keywords: English language teaching, observation, student-centred, translanguaging

Introduction

English language is often perceived as being very important in relation to global communication. In Nepal, English language teaching is an essential part of educational system from school level to university level, emphasizing the significance of the language for both local educational achievements and

Copyright 2025 ©Author(s) This open access article is distributed under a *Creative Commons*



Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

international communication. Proficiency in English is a necessity for students to obtain higher education and better employment opportunities both nationally and internationally. As a result, there is a great emphasis on creating effective ELT programmes and pedagogical strategies in secondary schools to increase students' competence and performance in English. This emphasis also aligns with broader goals of education and nation's efforts to enhance its competitiveness in the global marketplace.

As ELT pedagogy has shifted world widely towards communicative and student-centred approaches to learning, Ministry of Education, Nepal has also implemented communicative language teaching as teaching methodology since 1995 and has emphasized on learner-centred pedagogy (Tin, 2014). Similarly, Secondary Education Curriculum of English (2014) prioritized promoting child-friendly learning facilitation and stated that teaching strategies should meet different learning needs and scaffold students' learning so that they develop and consolidate the required knowledge and skills. Teaching of English language, in this sense, has been given due priority regarding instructional strategies to be made learner-centred in Nepalese school education curriculum. The recent Secondary English Education Curriculum of Nepal (2021) also aims learners to be able to communicate with confidence in the English language and states that the primary focus of learning English is for communication for which it suggests that "an English class should provide a rich and responsive learning environment with lots of real life communicative activities" (p. 49). It further states that "students should be given maximum exposure to the target language with a variety of written and spoken texts, for this, the teacher needs to provide students with the opportunity to learn English by speaking and by providing a language-rich environment" (p. 49). Similarly, National Curriculum Framework for School Education (2019) has also emphasized the adoption of student-centred teaching methodology in its strategy to implement newly devised curriculum. It has emphasized techno-friendly, project based and participatory teaching learning. It says that use of participatory, interactive, exploratory, practical and problem-solving teaching methods should be used for classroom pedagogy for result oriented learning (SSRP, 2021-2030). These curricular provisions of English language teaching pedagogy at secondary level provide a guideline to adopt student-centred pedagogical approaches in classrooms.

Recent developments in the field of language teaching and learning have modified teaching-learning styles and have made a paradigm shift in second language teaching and learning. Due to the drawbacks of traditional approaches to teaching, there is a noticeable change towards more interactive and communicative pedagogical strategies (Bhattarai, 2021). In this context, Bastola (2021) asserts,

“there has been a paradigmatic paradigm shift in techniques and methodologies of teaching” (p. 45). These academics’ assertions suggest that there have been significant changes in pedagogical methods and approaches over time. These changes include the use of communicative language teaching, problem solving techniques, content and language integrated learning, collaborative teaching learning that involve and engage students in task-based learning, role playing, presentations, discussions as well as other meaningful activities and provide them various learning opportunities to use the language in real-life contexts (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These innovative pedagogical approaches not only enhance students’ language proficiency but also develop critical thinking and collaboration among them (Thapa, 2021). These approaches also promote Vygotsky’s ideas of collaborative learning environment and student-centered teaching-learning in which students actively participate in collaborative learning and problem-solving tasks (Zhou & Brown, 2017). Vygotsky emphasizes that social interaction (classroom teaching) and peer collaboration in learning in the classroom enrich students’ linguistic and communicative competence. He states, “A teacher or more experienced peer is able to provide the learner with ‘scaffolding’ to support the student’s evolving understanding of knowledge domains or development of complex skills” (1978, p. 85). This assertion suggests that, students construct meanings and understanding, and develop individual learning when they involve and engage in interactions and activities with peers and groups in the classroom.

Despite the significant changes and innovations in English language teaching pedagogy world widely, ELT pedagogy in Nepal has still been encountering with several challenges. Bhandari (2020), in this context, states “many English language teachers are still using solely the text books and grammar-translation method for teaching and learning English” (p. 10). Similar to the context, Bashyal (2018) states “many teachers are still applying traditional grammar translation method, teacher centered techniques and activities like question- answer, demonstration, drill and dictation” (p. 229). These classroom pedagogical methods and techniques focus on rote learning, explicit grammar teaching and translation of texts and exercises, which impede students’ ability to use English in real-life communication and high order thinking (Harmer, 2015). Scholars have also identified a number of disparities like mismatch between curricular objectives and classroom practice, training inputs, professional skills, technology access, etc. In this context, Gnawali (2018) asserts that, “there is mismatch between training input, ELT methodology books and classroom reality” (p. 263). In line with the same, Bashyal (2018) states that, “the practice of ELT methods and techniques in Nepalese classrooms is not compatible with the curricular expectation of developing communication skills” (p.

229). Likewise, Duwadi (2018) elucidate the situation that the outcome of teaching and learning English cannot achieve the expected curricular goal, developing communicative competence in the language because Nepalese learners lack sufficient practice in speaking and at the same time there is no proper balance among all language skills in classroom practices (p. 182). Similarly, Sah (2015) states “Nepalese EFL teachers do not often seem to find themselves professionally skilled and are also not given opportunities for professional development” (p. 17).

Based on the above mentioned assertions of scholars that report Nepalese secondary level ELT pedagogy under the satisfactory level, and based on my own experience of teaching English for years to the students of undergraduate level who come with very poor basic knowledge in English, I am concerned that many of the teachers teaching English at secondary level are not employing student-centred pedagogy properly in their classroom practices. In this despicable condition of Nepalese ELT pedagogy and globally evolving teaching trends, it requires a thoughtful approach to address these challenges, and integrate modern innovative and engaging pedagogical strategies that could ensure students’ learning of English. Considering the significance of the issue, the purpose of the paper is to explore the present ELT pedagogical practices in Nepalese secondary schools, with a focus on how English language teachers perceive and practice pedagogical approaches and methods in their classroom teaching.

Methods and Procedures

This is a qualitative narrative study based on primary information. In order to explore the perceptions and practices of ELT pedagogy, the researcher selected four English language teachers from four different public schools of Kanchanpur district, who have been teaching at secondary level for more than ten years. I selected Kanchanpur district, Nepal as a research site and four schools from different locations on the basis of convenience in data collection as I belong to the same district. I employed purposive sampling procedure to select participants from the research site. The rationale behind purposive sampling of participants depends entirely on the researcher’s subjective judgment, putting the study’s purpose into consideration. Likewise, to maintain the gender equality among participants and to get representative data from the participants, I selected two male teachers and two female teachers so that the data obtained from them could be more reliable and trustworthy. For the purpose of collecting data for research topic, I designed a flexible, informal, in-depth narrative interview protocols that included a number of open-ended questions. Likewise, taking the consent from the school administration and research participants, making them assured for privacy and secrecy of the

audio and video records, I collected the data by observing real classroom teaching of research participants. I met the participants in person and took their interview. Before taking interview, I took permission from them to audio record their voices. To make it easier for them to share their experiences openly, I conducted the interview in Nepali language and later transcribed the audio records into printed form and translated transcriptions into English language. After transcribing and translating all data into English, I read and re-read the data several times to generate the themes. Based on the purpose my study, I organized the data into different themes. I triangulated the data obtained from interview and class observation to make the research findings more trustworthy and reliable. Finally, I analyzed and interpreted themes based on the process of thematic analysis developed by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarizing the data, coding, generating themes, reviewing themes, naming themes and writing up, aligning with the research purpose of exploring perception and practices of ELT pedagogy of secondary English classrooms. As ethical considerations are inevitable in social science research studies, the researcher maintained and followed all necessary ethical and quality standards during every step of the study process, from data collection to interpretation.

Results and Discussion

Data collected using in-depth open-ended interview and class observations were analyzed and interpreted under the following three main themes.

Shifting from Traditional to Modern Innovative Learner-Centered Pedagogy

Generally, shift in pedagogy denotes a change in teaching learning process. On the basis of the role the teachers play and the way they present their class teaching, they are categorized as traditional pedagogy and modern innovative pedagogy. The traditional pedagogy is teaching of content and teacher-centered whereas modern innovative pedagogy creates learning opportunities for the students, therefore, is called student-centered, in which a teacher plays the role of a facilitator, a guide in the classroom. The traditional pedagogical approach emphasizes one way teaching of explaining the content from the part of the teacher where students become passive listeners in the classroom which Lyer (2013) states “Docile and Obedient Bodies” (p. 171). But, student-centered pedagogical approaches provide enough learning opportunities to the students in the classroom. In this context, my teacher participant Krishna recalled during his interview, about the way he was taught in his schooling. He stated,

Teachers used to be mostly active and students used to be inactive/ passive in the classroom. It was one way delivery of messages like someone was delivering speech in front of the class.

This statement of Krishna indicates that teachers employing this style of teaching lack to consider the interests and learning needs of the students deprive them from opportunities for learning in the classroom. And teachers continue to have central role in traditional pedagogy. Similar to Krishna, Binita said,

When I first started teaching, I used to explain content in the class. I wanted to keep the class silent and if any of the students spoke there, I used to scold them. Finishing the course in time was primary job of the teachers what I also used to do. However, in more recent years, I have modified my teaching style. Though there is noise in the class, I let the students speak freely in the the classroom and attempt to make my class student-centred.

This story of Binita demonstrates that English learning environment during her initial years of career was not student-friendly. As she shared, she made the use of GT method for teaching English in her classrooms. Her story also indicates that her years of experience of teaching brought transformation upon her that she started employing student-centered pedagogy in her classrooms. In the very context of shifting pedagogical approaches Dikshya narrated that,

During my earlier teaching career years, I used to explain content in students' mother tongue language, providing them bilingual word lists, making them write answers of questions given in the text, giving home works, etc.

Dikshya's story also indicates that she learnt pedagogical approaches from her experience and modified her way of teaching. Similar with the context Deepak, another research participant, stated,

I realized that I was not considering and addressing students' learning needs and interests in the class. Noticing it, I changed my teaching style and started focusing on students' learning.

The story of Deepak also shows that he brought transformation in his pedagogical style learning from his years of experience in teaching. These above mentioned stories of research participants demonstrated that long-term practice and experience in the same field of teaching brought perceptual and attitudinal change upon them and their teaching style (Prettyman, 2018). Their stories also showed that shift or change occurs from one's own experience as they shared they have shifted their teaching from traditional mode of teaching to student-centered teaching as Mezirow (1996) states that learning is understood as the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of one's experience in order to guide future actions.

I observed real teaching of research participants to verify whether the data in interview match with their real classroom teaching. As he entered one of the participants Binita's class at grade nine,

She taught the lesson "Surprising Customs" on the day I observed her class. She started the class asking a few title-related questions to the students randomly. Some students answered, some attempted to answer and majority of students remained silent. The discussion happened for a while in the class in the initial phase. She attempted to involve students in interaction. Then, she explained the concept meaning of title and further asked a student to read the first paragraph, while reading she facilitated the student. Then she discussed on new vocabulary of the paragraph and moved ahead and explained the concept of the paragraph. She asked some questions related to the paragraph while explaining. Similar to this, she concluded her lesson.

Although Binita made good effort to involve students in teaching learning activities, most of the activities were simply of interaction in the form of question-answer and reading. As students read the passage they needed support and guidance in pronunciation and word meanings what Vygotsky called 'scaffolding' in learning. Vygotsky (1978) says, "The teacher or more experienced peer is able to provide the learner with 'scaffolding' to support the student's evolving understanding of knowledge domains or development of complex skills" (p. 85). In the classroom, Binita helped her students wherever they needed assistance. However, she took her more time in explanation. I observed the real teaching of another participant Krishna who also found employing similar like practice of teaching in his classroom. As I entered his class,

He was teaching the topic 'Sky Burials' under teaching unit 'Customs and Culture'. He initiated his teaching with asking some questions and clarifying the title meaning. Further, he asked one of the girls to read the paragraph and facilitated her during reading. Then he discussed on difficult word meanings and try to elicit their meanings from the students, and during explaining the concept of the paragraph, he interrogated with students which made the class interactive.

This observation of Krishna's class showed that English language teachers in the classroom are making efforts to involve students in teaching learning activities. Due to different reasons, they are limited to a few activities like interaction in the form question-answer, reading activities. Students, most of the time, found silent in the classroom and teachers were found practicing traditional teaching techniques like explanation, translation, etc which hinder students ability to use language in real-life context and high order thinking (Harmer, 2015).

Further, as I observed the real class teaching of Dikshya and Deepak, I did not find much difference in their pedagogical techniques, too. They also, except slight difference in process during teaching, made the use of explanation more in the classrooms. Student-centered techniques were used in limitation only. For example, in Dikshya's class, I found teaching word meanings like 'bury' means 'khaldo ma gadnu'. They were found attempting to involve students in some activities but in random way which does not make students compel to participate. This indicates that teachers have knowledge of how to involve and engage students in the classroom but they are not keeping much concern of their participation. These all interviews and class observations of research participants demonstrated that they are currently in transitional phase of pedagogy. Since experience is transformed to develop knowledge (Kolb, 1984), the pedagogical shift research participants underwent within self. They have adopted student centered teaching approaches in their minds. However, in practice, they were found still more on teacher-centered teaching, and making efforts to employ student-centered teaching in their classrooms. Though they were confined to few teaching learning activities in their classrooms, they attempted to involve their students in teaching-learning activities. In this sense, paradigm shift in ELT pedagogy is still in evolving situation and hasn't fully permeated in Nepalese classrooms.

Integration of Pedagogical Methods and Techniques

In recent years, there has been a significant change in pedagogical approaches and methods. New and innovative techniques have been developed to enhance learning effectively. These innovative approaches and methods focus on engaging students and making learning more interactive and relevant to the real world situations. As a result, English language teaching also shifted from traditional way of teaching about language to modern language teaching learning status. Teaching methods emerged one after another claiming itself the best one for classroom pedagogy. If we go through the history of language teaching methods in foreign language teaching context, along with Grammar translation method, there can be seen several methods emerged and practiced one after another in different time period and situations, but no method could sustain for long time without any alternates. In this context, Richards and Rodgers (2014) aptly remark that "the history of language teaching in the last hundred years has been distinguished by a search for more operative ways of teaching the second or foreign languages" (2014, p. vii). So, language teaching field has been utilizing and experimenting newly emerging methods and techniques.

Since the single method of teaching cannot meet the demands of the class in terms of learning because prescribed methods and techniques impose theories

on teachers and students instead of providing them freedom and autonomy. In this context, one of the research participants Binita talked about how she found it challenging to meet the objectives of her teaching when she employed a specific method of teaching. She said,

In my early teaching career years, I spent a lot of time to using lesson planning. I used to make written lesson plans based on specific teaching methods but was unable to achieve objectives of teaching. I realized that I could not consider the learning needs of the students. Therefore, these days while teaching in the classroom, I do not follow any particular method. I use teaching techniques from different teaching methods according to the need of the class.

The story Binita demonstrated that teachers cannot compel students to learn without considering their learning needs and classroom environment. She further added, “the classroom teaching strategies should be determined on the basis of how students understand.” In this context, another research participant Krishna told that “situations in the classroom demand the way of delivery and in my opinion using single teaching method teachers cannot deal with the immediate situations of the classroom.” Krishna’s opinion emphasizes on not to be rigid regarding pedagogical methods in the classroom because no method can be appropriate for every student and situation. In this context, Banjade (2020) states, “the need for more efficient practice in ELT has triggered a shift away from searching out a perfect one-size-fits-all teaching method towards focusing on certain learners in particular backgrounds” (p. 9). Similar to this, Bhandari (2021) argues that, “a method that works best in one context may not work effectively in other contexts, a teacher should select methods and techniques that are contextual and culture-sensitive” (p. 4). The experience of research participants and the arguments of scholars indicated that ELT teachers need to be skilled to determine teaching methodology according to the situation and students’ linguistic and cultural background and status.

Regarding employing classroom pedagogical methods, Deepak stated, “I mainly think about how students learn and always make efforts to make them learn. I use techniques from CLT, GT method, TPR, CLL, problem solving, etc.” Similarly, Dikshya said that she modifies her ways of teaching on the basis of immediate classroom situation and learning speed of the students. She stated,

While teaching, I acknowledge the students’ speed of understanding and learning. If they feel complexity to understand me, I change my way of teaching. To make students understand the subject matter well, if I have to use Nepali and other languages in the classroom also, I use sometimes as necessary.

The experience of Deepak and Dikshya demonstrated that they have been employing pedagogical methods in their classrooms in their own way. Their experience also showed that to deal with the immediate classroom situations integrated form of pedagogical methods become more easy and comfortable. In this context, Richards and Rodgers (2014) state “as the teacher gains experience and knowledge, he or she will begin to develop an individual approach or personal method of teaching and adds, modifies and adjusts the approach or method to the realities of the classroom” (p. 251). In this way, the research participants of this study from their years of experience in teaching career, found practising classroom teaching methodology in blended way.

Regarding methodological practice in the classroom, I observed participants real class teaching to find out how they employ delivery methods in the classroom. As I noted in Binita and Krishna’s class, they made the class delivery almost in the same way. They made the class interactive through interrogation, gave conceptual meaning through explanation, teach vocabulary using translation to students native language, involved students in reading activity, etc. While teaching, one process I minutely noted in Binita’s class that she wrote some difficult vocabulary from the paragraph with their meanings on the whiteboard and instructed students to note down. Then she just read out meaning of words, told their meanings in Nepali and moved further. Similarly, the researcher noted one interaction from Krishna’s class,

T: Why our cultures are important?’ ‘hamra sanskritiharu kina mahattwapurna hunchhan?

Ss: No reply

T: kinaki ‘cultures are our identity’, ‘hamra sanskritiharule hamro parichaya dinchhan.

T: kina important raichhan?

Ss: hamra sanskritiharule hamro parichaya dinxan’.

T: Our cultures give our identity.

In this interaction, though the teacher encouraged students to speak English, students very rarely spoke English. With the similar way of discussion he made interaction in the class.

Furthermore, I observed real class teaching of Dikshya and Deepak to verify whether articulation in interview matches with their classroom practices. As noted in Dikshya’s class, she started her teaching from questioning; asked questions, explained title meaning and later text meaning, gave word meanings mostly in exact translation like ‘bury’ means ‘*khaldo ma gadnu*’, asked to read the text, etc. She attempted to make the class interactive but only by asking them questions. Similar to other research participants, Deepak also made the use of pedagogical methods in

his classroom. He made the use techniques like explanation, translation, interaction, discussion, elicitation, reading aloud, interrogation, facilitation, etc. during his teaching in the classroom which are related to different teaching methods. In Deepak's class, one, more traditional way of teaching the researcher noted was, line by line translation of text in Nepali during teaching paragraphs.

In this way, all teacher participants' class observation result shows that they are flexible in terms of using teaching methodology especially regarding the use of students' native language and employing a blended way of teaching i. e. using teaching techniques from different methods, but more or less they are still in teacher centered and traditional Grammar-translation method based teaching therefore their claim of using learner centered teaching only partially meets with their classroom practices. The findings regarding teaching methodology match to the findings of Tiwari (2021), as he asserts "teachers often dominate, control and initiate teaching to create interaction in the form of short textual questions" (p. 384), the participants, in this study, too, found practising similarly. In this sense, in Nepalese context of ELT pedagogy, teachers have adopted student-centered teaching approaches in their minds but in real practices they are in-between teacher-centered teaching and student-centered teaching, and using techniques in a blended form from traditional and modern innovative teaching methods.

Translanguaging as Medium of Classroom Delivery

Translanguaging is an innovative classroom pedagogical approach which adopts and gives space to students' native languages in the classroom during teaching to incorporate them into teaching learning activities. Cenoz and Gorter (2021), in this context, state that "pedagogical translanguaging is a theoretical and instructional approach that aims at improving language and content competences in school contexts by using learner's whole linguistic repertoire" (p. 1). Similarly, Williams (1994) asserts that "translanguaging maximizes learner's and teachers linguistic resources in the process of problem solving and knowledge construction" (cited in Li, 2017, p. 15). According to Sah and Li (2020), translanguaging creates a dynamic hybrid and flexible space of language use (p. 2). The scholars' arguments indicate that translanguaging in the classroom has been taken positively during teaching. In this context, one of the research participants of this study Binita stated, "when I use Nepali or students' native language in the classroom during teaching they become happy and say that they understand the subject matter well." Similarly, Dikshya, the another research participant said, "during teaching if we use English only, students say, they understand nothing and then we become compel to use Nepali and other students' native languages." These statements of Binita and Dikshya indicated that students feel easy to understand the subject matter if their native languages are

used in the classroom during teaching. Similar to their experience, Larsen-Freeman (2000) states, “The native language of the students is used in the classroom in order to enhance the security of the students. She further states, “It is used to provide the bridge from the familiar to unfamiliar and to make the meaning of the target language” (pp. 101-102). In this context, the research participant Krishna shared his experience of using students’ native language in the classroom. He mentioned,

Most of the students afraid of English subject because of their weak base in it. They hesitate to speak and do not want to take part in teaching learning activities. Their poor base makes us compel to use Nepali and other their native languages in the classroom during teaching.

The experience of Krishna indicated that students feel comfortable to take part in teaching learning activities if they are allowed to speak their mother tongue in the classroom. His narrative also indicated that according to the need of the class, students’ native language has to be used during teaching. Saud (2023), in this context states that “translanguaging serves as a translation tool to reinforce classroom instructions so that students can better understand the instructions” (p. 71). Similar to the context, Tiwari (2020) states that, “if L1 is used judiciously, there is no harm; it helps develop students’ participation in interaction” (p. 91).

Different scholars have argued in favor of using students’ native languages in the foreign language teaching classrooms that supported the experiences my participants shared with me. They stated that students feel more secured and confident with their first languages in the classrooms and that also facilitates their learning better and fast in comparison to English-only medium of instruction. Sharma (2023), in this context states that “using home language implies the need for alternative use of English and home language when the English-only instruction could not be conversational and affecting to the students due to its unintelligibility to them either due to their low proficiency level in English or the inherent difficulty of the content required to be understood” (p. 203). In the context of using students’ L1 in the classroom during teaching, Dikshya shared her experience. She stated,

Because of weak competence and performance in English, some, very rare number of students only show their interest for taking part in activities. Therefore, to make students understand the subject matter well and make them participate in learning activities I use sometimes Nepali and other languages in the classroom.

Dikshya’s experience pointed out that students having weak base in English need scaffolding through their native language use which motivates them towards learning, and encourage them to involve in teaching leaning activities. Their native

language has to be included during discussion and/or interaction in the classroom otherwise they remain silent in the class. Similar to Dikshya, Deepak also shared his experience in regards to students L1 use, in the classroom. He said, “our students’ basic knowledge in English is so poor. So, we need to explain the concept in their mother tongue (Nepali, Doteli, Tharu, etc.), otherwise they do not understand well.” Deepak’s view also indicated that students remain in need to be facilitated through the use of their native languages in the classrooms to enhance their learning. In this sense, the research participants’ experiences regarding L1 use in Nepalese context of ELT pedagogy signaled towards translanguaging as medium of instruction.

To verify the interview data with their real practice in the classroom, I observed the class teaching of research participants. Regarding the medium of instruction, as I noted in Binita’s class, from the initiation of the class, she made the use of English and Nepali languages simultaneously. While teaching vocabulary first she told its meaning in simple words in English and then translated the word into Nepali. Similarly, during teaching paragraph also, first she explained in English and then same thing she told in Nepali. For example, she was teaching and clarifying the concept of surprising customs in the class; she did like this, “every society has different customs, *harek samaj ya samudayaka aafna aafna customs, cultures or ceremonies hunchhan, ritiriwajharu hunchhan.*” During whole time in the class, she used both English and Nepali as medium of teaching.

Similarly, as I noted in Krishna’ class, He explained like this, ‘Sky Burials’ is one of the ways of permeation of dead bodies of Tibetan Buddhists. Permeation means? Students replied: *dahasanskaar*. Tibetans Buddhists *haru k garchhan vane* dead bodies *lai euta dadomalagne*, cut into pieces and leave there. *Vulturesharule khaun vanera chhodchhan*. That is their death permeation. *Jastai hamile kasko death ritual dekhyaxaun ta?* in our culture?, in our society? What is our death permeation? Ss replied: *polne, jalaune*. T: yes. We put the dead body in the fire. Fire means? Ss: *aago, chita*, T: yes. Then we wear white clothes *seto luga lagauchhau*, that is our death rituals. *Tyasaigarera* Sky Burials *pani euta* death rituals *ho*. With the similar practice, he taught new vocabulary and concept of the paragraph, as well.

Furthermore, I observed the real class teaching of Dikshya and Deepak to verify their interviews with their classroom practicing. They were also found practicing English and Nepali in their classrooms. As noted in Dikshya’ class, she, while teaching vocabularies from the book, asked question, ‘what is atmosphere? Students replied: *vayumandal*. She asked Ecosphere means? She herself answered: *prayawaran, watawaran*, that we find up to four thousand meter from the sea level. Then she asked ‘hydrosphere’ means? She herself said, layer of water, you can see in the picture, its blue, *nilonilo chhani*. Similarly, I noted in Deepak’s class as he

asked, what is the meaning of title words surprising? No students replied. He himself answered, ‘ the things that are wonderful *achamma lagne chalchalanharu*, customs means traditions, cultures/ *ritiriwaj/chalchalan*. Students also replied the same. Further, he made the students read the paragraphs. When they finished reading, he himself also read and explained the concept. He did more on line by line translation. He asked, ‘is there any unique custom in your culture?’ *Tapaiharuko samudayama kunai tyasta achammalagne khalka customs haruchhan?*. In this way, Deepak also found using students’ mother tongue during his delivery of content in the classroom.

The above mentioned observation results vividly showed the teaching learning events/process of the classroom utilizing English and Nepali as medium of instruction. Though teachers couldn’t express openly during interview that they use both languages, they only said they use students native language sometimes according to the need in the class. But observation showed that they made use of both languages around equally. One thing I felt during observing was that, in some contexts, teachers made use of Nepali language without finding the necessity of using it and/or of students’ need. They often used Nepali language as Tiwari (2021) asserts “to convey the meaning quickly to the students” (p. 380). In this way, our secondary ELT classrooms have been employing translanguaging as medium of instruction.

Conclusion

This research study aimed to explore the perceptions and experiences of English language teachers about ELT pedagogy in Nepali secondary schools. It also attempted to examine the pedagogy teachers employ in their real classroom practices. The study found that English language teachers have been shifting their pedagogical practices from traditional teacher-centred ways of teaching to innovative learner-centred teaching. They have adopted student-centred teaching approaches in their minds but in practical, found still practicing many teacher-centered techniques in the classroom. They were found having positive attitude of employing student-centred pedagogy in their classrooms but challenges like students’ poor English base, lack of proper seating arrangement and lack of technological access and facility hamper them implementing learner-centred pedagogy. Therefore, student-centered classroom practices were found with very limited activities and concern. The study also revealed that English language teachers of secondary-level employ classroom pedagogical methods and techniques in integrated/ blended form i.e. techniques combined from traditional teacher-centred and from new methods. The study further revealed that secondary-level English classes are employing translanguaging as the medium of delivery in the classroom. It showed that teachers and students both made the use of Nepali and other students’ native languages more than necessary during teaching. This study, in this way, explored the mismatch between participants’

perceptions and practices regarding ELT pedagogy.

As the study found mismatch between perceptions and classroom practices, it suggests English language teachers that they need to focus and work hard to implement student-centred pedagogical approaches in their real teaching practices. They have to create more English-learning activities in the classroom to keep the students motivated, active and engaged in learning so that they get more learning and practicing opportunities. English teachers also need to modify and adjust their real teaching practices to address the necessity of students individually as well in the classroom. This research study has some limitations like; it is a small-scaled study, confined to only four English teachers of public secondary schools of Kanchanpur district, Far Western Region of Nepal. The study employed only interview protocols and class observation for the collection of data. Therefore the generalizations of the results may not be applicable in every situation across the country. However, the English teachers of secondary-level could find the study insightful. Similarly, the study could be helpful and beneficial for the researchers who wish to conduct research on classroom pedagogy.

References

- Banjade, N. (2020). Learner-centered English teaching: Premises, practices, and prospects. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 8(1), 7-27. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.8.1.01>
- Bashyal, G. P. (2018). ELT methods and techniques in Nepali secondary schools. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research reflection and practice* (pp. 221-236). British Council.
- Bastola, G. K. (2021). Project-based learning (PBL) in Nepalese EFL classrooms. *Dristikon: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 11(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.3126/dristikon.v11i1.39133>
- Bhandari, B. L. (2020). Methods and techniques used by English teacher educators in Nepal. *Journal La Edusci*, 1(4), 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.37899/journallaedusci.v1i4.211>
- Bhattarai, P. (2021, May). What makes English language teaching effective? *ELT Choutari*. <https://eltchoutari.com/2021/04/what-makes-english-language-teaching-effective/>
- Bhattarai, P. (2021). English language teachers' perceptions and practices on learner autonomy in the Nepalese context. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 3(1), 17-25. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.6064>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). Pedagogical translanguaging. *TESOL in Context*, 32. <https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2023vol31no2art1799>
- Curriculum Development Centre, (2071). *Curriculum of secondary education*. Bhaktapur, Nepal: Author
- Curriculum Development Centre. (2078). *Curriculum of secondary education*. Bhaktapur, Nepal: Author.
- Curriculum Development Centre. (2076a). *National curriculum framework*. Bhaktapur, Nepal: Author.
- Duwadi, E. P. (2018). Historical developments in the teaching and learning of English in Nepal. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research reflection and practice* (pp. 177-186). British Council.
- Gnawali, L. (2018). Teaching English in under-resourced environments. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *English language teaching in Nepal: Research reflection and practice* (pp. 255-266). British Council.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Li, W. (2017). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Lyer, S. (2013). An ethnographic study of disciplinary and pedagogic practices in a primary class. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 10, 163-195.
- Mezirow, J. (1996). Contemporary paradigms of learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 158-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171369604600303>
- Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology. (2021a). *Education sector plan 2021–30*. Government of Nepal.
- Prettyman, A. (2018). Perceptual learning. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1489>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Sah, P. K., & Li, G. (2022). Translanguaging or unequal languaging? Unfolding the plurilingual discourse of English medium instruction policy in Nepal's public schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(6), 2075-2094.
- Saud, D. S. (2023). Translanguaging Practices in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Perspectives from Darchula. *KMC Journal*, 5(2), 59-73.

- Sah, P. K. (2015). Nepalese EFL teachers' professional development: Present practices, realities, and looking forward. *IATEFL Teacher Development SIG Newsletter*, 73, 15-17.
- Sharma, U. (2023). Home language use in Nepalese EFL classes: Lived experiences of teachers and students. *Research Gate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370414303>
- Thapa, R. (2021). Innovative teaching methods in English language education. *Nepalese Journal of Education*, 8(1), 112-128.
- Tin, T. B. (2014). A look into the local pedagogy of an English language classroom in Nepal. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(3), 397–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813510387>
- Tiwari, T. D. (2021). Classroom interaction in communicative language teaching of public secondary schools in Nepal. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 373-386.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Zhou, M., & Brown, D. (2015). *Educational learning theories* (2nd ed.). Education Open Textbooks. <https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/education-textbooks/1>