Large Classes in the Context of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Basmah Ali Abu-ghararah
College of Education, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract—The purpose of this study is to explore the techniques used by teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) in teaching the four language skills to students in large classes in Madinah, Saudi Arabia. This study also seeks to determine the most effective technique to teaching large classes by examining teachers' experiences. Additionally, this study investigates the teachers' use of language techniques for language classes with respect to gender, qualification, years of experience, and level of teaching. The subjects of the study were 307 EFL teachers from Saudi schools. This study used descriptive statistical methods to examine the teachers' preferred techniques in teaching the four central English skills in a large class setting. The results show that EFL teachers use a variety of language techniques in teaching graphic skills rather than aural ones. Further, gender and level of teaching shape their preferences for using certain techniques when teaching language skills in large classes. The study raised some questions for further research.

Index Terms—language skills, teaching techniques, large classes, English language teaching

I. INTRODUCTION

English as a foreign language (EFL) is introduced in the fourth grade at primary schools in Saudi Arabia by the Ministry of Education, and it has become a compulsory subject in Saudi schools. It is common for classes in Saudi public schools to have more than 35 students. The nature of the impact of large class sizes depends on many factors, such as the quality of the school, the level of discipline, and even the character of the class (Mulryan-Kyne, 2010). That class size has a significant impact on learning makes good intuitive sense: smaller classes offer the potential for more individual attention, more time per pupil for feedback and differentiation, fewer classroom management issues, and closer interpersonal relationships. However, such a commonsense idea has rarely been investigated by high quality research on any scale, although issues of teacher workload and wellbeing provide reasons for reducing class sizes. While Filges et al.'s (2018) review included a wide range of studies, which were all demonstrated to be of high quality, with the scope of the review being limited to intervention studies using experimental designs and the generation of quantitative data. This approach is clearly suited to a large-scale systematic review that is narrowly focused on the impact of class size on student attainment, but it neglects the lived experience of teaching and learning in a large class. This is neatly summed up by Devi (2016), who points out that there are particular challenges when teaching aural skills, giving individual feedback, and developing rapport with students. However, Devi's own research is limited by an overly simplistic interview approach and data analysis that does not explore the issue in sufficient detail. A more comprehensive and rigorous study found that many of these challenges could be overcome through social approaches to learning (Yang et al., 2018). However, the conclusions of the study came with the caveat that they applied to older students who had sufficient access to technology and to teachers proficient in designing tasks for virtual learning environments.

Other studies similarly suggest that the pedagogical norms of EFL mean that class size may be a particular issue. The effects of class size may be evident in these contexts in ways that are not sufficiently captured in quantitative measures of language development. For instance, a study in Iran focused on the impact of class size on students' willingness to communicate, arguing that large classes limit a teacher's ability to use communicative language teaching pedagogies (Khazaei et al., 2012). In this case, classroom observation data revealed a quantifiable impact of class size on the time that students spent using the target language. A similar study with a group of students learning Arabic demonstrated that willingness to communicate has a direct impact on language acquisition (Mahmoodi & Moazam, 2014). Despite a willingness to communicate being commonly cited as an important factor in successful second language acquisition, a recent systematic review by Zhang et al. (2018) found that class size had been considered as a variable of interest in only one study—the aforementioned study by Khazaei et al. (2012). The implication is, therefore, that if a willingness to communicate is important for language development, and if students are more willing to communicate when in smaller classes, then class size does, indeed, have an impact on language learning. It also appears that class size has a bigger impact on the motivation and interactions of younger EFL learners than on older, self-motivated students (Carpenter, 2006; Yang et al., 2018).

In addition to those studies that have examined features of EFL classes such as willingness to communicate, other studies have focused solely on teacher perceptions. The logic is that if teachers find it easier to do something that they think is beneficial for their learners in a smaller class, then class sizes should be reduced to help teachers carry out their

work. Although her work has so far been published only as a master's dissertation, Garcia found, after interviewing EFL teachers, that the pace of learning and the level of attention paid to individual students were both improved in smaller classes (Garcia, 2016). There are other examples in the literature of teachers being able to take more creative approaches to teaching because of reduced class sizes, one example being an EFL teacher in Indonesia who was more easily able to facilitate educational games and outdoor learning (Hadi & Arante, 2015). However, the same limitations apply to the studies by Hadi and Arante (2015) and Garcia (2016): student outcomes were not measured, the studies have not been subject to rigorous peer review, and the link between these more interesting teacher activities and gains in student learning can only be implied, rather than demonstrated objectively. Contradicting the view that smaller classes are always better, there are examples of large classes enabling teachers to benefit from economies of scale. For example, a larger class can make it worthwhile for a teacher to invest time in designing effective online learning tasks (Yang et al., 2018). In addition, small classes may result in a greater reliance on teacher-centered learning, while examples in both Devi (2006) and Yang et al. (2018) point to some benefits when teachers can draw upon large groups of students to engage in tasks like formative peer feedback.

Hattie (2005) offers one way of interpreting what seems to be a contradiction in the literature by arguing that class size has an impact only when it changes teaching and learning strategies. This may seem to be an obvious point but is one that is often overlooked because most teachers have been found not to vary their teaching methods between smaller and larger classes. Coupled with this is the challenge of comparing teacher groups of differing quality. The results of studies using teacher groups of different levels of skill appear to lead to different conclusions. A questionnaire and observation study in Kenya, for instance, found that teachers reported that teaching large classes was a problem (Ndethiu et al., 2017). However, the study also found that the principals of the schools studied were unaware of the specific techniques that teachers used when teaching large classes. The researchers discovered that the majority of teachers were simply lecturing and "spent little lesson time on demonstration, question and answer time, pair or group work, or class discussion" (p. 76). In their study, Hunt et al. (2003) found that team-learning methods resulted in positive learning outcomes. Carpenter (2006) suggested that "faculty teaching large classes should attempt to include constructive, active teaching methods in their courses whenever possible. Structured, controlled collaboration (e.g., jigsaw, case study) would probably be most comfortable to students as opposed to uncontrolled, unstructured experiences (i.e., team projects)" (p.19).

A. Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore the techniques used by teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) in teaching the four language skills to students in large classes in Madinah, Saudi Arabia. This study also seeks to determine the most effective technique to teaching large classes by examining teachers' experiences.

B. Research Questions

In harmony with the above stated purposes, the following research questions were addressed:
1. To what extent do EFL teachers use teaching techniques for large classes?
2. What are the dominant teaching techniques used by EFL teachers for large classes?

C. Research Hypotheses

Based on the aforementioned research questions, these four null hypotheses were formatted:

H.1

*T*here were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to gender.

H.2

There were no statistically significant differences in the mean between EFL teachers (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to their qualification.

H. 3

There were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with

H. 4

There were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to the level of teaching,

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

In this study, 307 EFL teachers from Saudi schools in Madinah participated. As seen in Table 1, the distribution of participating EFL teachers according to gender was 28.66% male, while female EFL teachers accounted for 71.34% of respondents. The majority of the respondents, 86.97%, hold a bachelor's degree while 13.03% hold a master's degree. Of the EFL teachers, 36.48% had more than 15 years of experience in teaching, 28.35% had 5-10 years of experience,

26.38% had 10-15 years of experience, and 8.79% had less than five years of experience. Almost 60% of the EFL teachers teach in secondary school, and the rest in intermediate school.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Gender				Qualification				Teaching Experience								Level of Teaching			
M		F		BA		MA		Less than 5 years		5-10 years		10-15 years		More than 15 years		Intermediate		Secondary	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
88	28.66	219	71.34	267	86.97	40	13.03	27	8.79	87	28.35	81	26.38	112	36.48	124	40.39	183	59.61

B. Research Instrument

A list was made of teaching techniques used in teaching English language skills for intermediate and secondary classes. It consisted of 22 teaching techniques that were grouped into four sections, each dealing with a particular language skill. The compiled list was given to a panel of experts in the domain of teaching English as a second language and applied linguistics, which consisted of five teachers and two lecturers. They were instructed to point out the teaching techniques that could be used for intermediate and secondary schools in the Saudi language learning context. The addition and deletion of some techniques were recommended. Teaching techniques such as chorus methods, total physical responses, and instructional games were considered not to be appropriate tools in the teaching of language skills at intermediate and secondary schools in the Saudi educational context. This is because learners were reluctant to participate and actively engage in language learning due to their age factors and peer influence.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results of Research Questionnaire

The results from Table 2 clearly indicate that the overwhelming majority of EFL teachers tend to always use listening to conversation (94.78%), reading aloud (92.83%), and listening to the discussions (90.88%) as language techniques when teaching listening to their large classes. They ranked these techniques in their uses as 1, 2, and 3 respectively. In regard to the least/most rarely used techniques in teaching listening, it is found that only around 24% of teachers used dictation and storytelling and 18% used interview, auditory memory, and video types. These results imply that listening skills were de-emphasised in teaching. Little attention was paid to these skills in language examinations. It is also found that in the prescribed language materials, there exist no classroom activities on listening skills.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT THE USE OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES IN LISTENING

Teaching Techniques in Listening	Rating Scale								All Cases			
	Always		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Always and Sometimes		Never and Rarely	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
(Listening to) Conversation	161	52.44	130	42.35	11	3.58	5	1.63	291	94.78	16	5.22
(Listening to) Discussion	148	48.21	131	42.67	27	8.79	1	0.33	279	90.88	28	9.12
(Listening to) Interview	87	28.34	165	53.75	48	15.64	7	2.28	252	82.08	55	17.92
Dictation	81	26.38	140	45.60	61	19.87	25	8.14	221	71.99	86	28.01
Reading Aloud	203	66.12	82	26.71	21	6.84	1	0.33	285	92.83	22	7.17
Auditory Memory	74	24.10	178	57.98	45	14.66	10	3.26	252	82.08	55	17.92
Telling Stories	56	18.24	162	52.77	70	22.80	19	6.19	218	71.01	89	28.99
Video Tapes	142	46.25	111	36.15	34	11.08	20	6.52	253	82.41	54	17.59
Recorded Materials (play, speech)	158	51.46	103	33.55	33	10.75	13	4.23	261	85.02	46	14.98

As is evident in Table 3, the vast majority of the EFL teachers preferred to use conversation (91.53%), presentation (88.93%), and description (88.60%) in teaching speaking to language students in large classes. These techniques are highly ranked 1, 2, and 3 respectively. However, the participating teachers claim that they rarely used chain stories (41.69%), miming (37.13%), lecturing (32.57%), problem solving (24.43%), or interviewing (22.80%) when teaching speaking. These results imply that the majority of teachers spent their lesson time lecturing and spent little time using language communication teaching techniques.

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT THE USE OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES IN SPEAKING

Teaching Techniques in Speaking	Rating Scale								All Cases			
	Always		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Always and Sometimes		Never and Rarely	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Presentation	181	58.96	92	29.97	23	7.49	11	3.58	273	88.93	34	11.07
Role-Playing	124	40.39	140	45.60	26	8.47	17	5.54	264	85.99	43	14.01
Interview	67	21,82	170	55.37	52	16.99	18	5.86	237	77.20	70	22.80
Conversation	166	54.07	115	37.46	19	6.19	7	2.28	281	91.53	26	8.47
Description	135	43.97	137	44.63	23	7.49	12	3,91	272	88.60	35	11.40
Chain Story	37	12.05	142	46.25	84	27.36	44	14.33	179	58.30	128	41.69
Mime	66	21.50	127	41.37	72	23.45	42	13.68	193	62.87	114	37.13
Problem Solving	91	29.64	141	45.93	57	18.57	18	5.86	232	75.57	75	24.43
Lecturing	60	19.54	147	47.88	74	24.10	26	8.47	207	67.43	100	32.57

The data detailed in Table 4 show that the majority of the subjects (about 80%) indicated that they always used a variety of techniques in teaching reading to their language classes. These techniques included scanning (85.02%), skimming (84.04%), intensive reading (82.08%), and extensive reading (80.45%). However, approximately (35.50%) of EFL teachers rarely used diaries and (23.45%) rarely used book reviews. These results imply that they used numerous teaching techniques to enhance their presentation of the reading texts. Reading skills were considered to be the most important skills in the teaching of language in large classes.

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT THE USE OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES IN READING

Teaching Techniques in Reading	Rating Scale								All Cases			
	Always		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Always and Sometimes		Never and Rarely	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Book Reviews/Summaries	124	40.39	111	36.16	52	16.94	20	6.51	235	76.55	72	23.45
Diaries	54	17.59	144	46.91	75	24.42	34	11.07	198	64.50	109	35.50
Intensive Reading	107	34.85	145	47.23	41	13.36	14	4.56	252	82.08	55	17.92
Extensive Reading	81	26.38	166	54.07	45	14.66	15	4.89	247	80.45	60	19.55
Scanning	170	55.37	91	29.64	35	11.40	11	3.58	261	85.02	46	14.98
Skimming	141	45.93	117	38.11	38	12.38	11	3.58	258	84.04	49	15.96

It was found from the data presented in Table 5 that the vast majority of EFL teachers placed great emphasis on the use of teaching techniques in their writing classes. These language techniques encompassed making up questions (89.25%), description (86.97%) and composition (85.34%). The results also indicated that nearly 79% of participating teachers always used dictation, note taking, and letter writing. However, the lowest-rated techniques in use for large classes were essays (54.40%) and emails (49.84%). These results imply that writing is given a high priority in language teaching and examination.

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ABOUT THE USE OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES IN WRITING

Teaching Techniques in Writing	Rating Scale								All Cases			
	Always		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Always and Sometimes		Never and Rarely	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Dictation	107	34.85	135	43.97	36	11.73	29	9.45	242	78.82	65	21.18
Email	47	15.31	107	34.85	71	23.13	82	26.71	154	50.16	153	49.84
Note Taking	106	34.53	133	43.32	43	14.01	25	8.14	239	77.85	68	22.15
Letter Writing	94	30.62	144	46.91	48	15.63	21	6.84	238	77.52	69	22.48
Making up Questions	165	53.75	109	35.50	26	8.47	7	2.28	274	89.25	33	10.75
Description	139	45.28	128	41.69	28	9.12	12	3.91	267	86.97	40	13.03
Composition	113	36.81	149	48.53	33	10.75	12	3.91	262	85.34	45	14.66
Essay	42	13.9	98	31.8	67	21.8	100	32.5	140	45.60	167	54.40

B. Results of Research Hypotheses

H.1

To check the hypothesis postulating that there were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to gender, the mean

scores and standard deviations were calculated. Two independent samples (t-test) were used, and the results are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF GENDER MEAN SCORES

Gender	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Male	88	91.3409	17.44343	1.85948
Female	219	101.2100	11.72317	.79218

The mean score of male EFL teachers in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes was 91.3409 with a standard deviation of 17.44343. For female EFL teachers, the mean score was 101.2100, with a standard deviation of 11.72317. Evidently, the female teachers' mean score was higher than that of the male teachers.

Table 7 shows that the calculated value of T reached -5.749 at the degree of freedom (305), and the value of significance (.000) was less than 0.05, indicating that the difference is statistically significant.

TABLE 7
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailled)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	18.939	.000	-5.749	305	.000	-9.86914	1.71680	-13.24740	-6.49087
Equal variances not assumed			-4.883	119.870	.000	-9.86914	2.02119	-13.87099	-5.86728

H.2

To verify the hypothesis assuming there were no statistically significant differences in the mean between EFL teachers (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to their qualification, the mean scores and standard deviations were calculated. Two independent samples (t-test) were used, and the results are shown in Tables 8 and 9.

TABLE 8
RESULTS OF QUALIFICATION MEAN SCORES

Qualification	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Bachelor's	267	98.9588	14.13237	.86489
Master's	40	94.5250	14.96661	2.36643

The mean score of EFL teachers with a bachelor's degree was 98.9588 with a standard deviation of 14.13237, while the mean score of EFL teachers with a master's degree was 94.5250 with a standard deviation of 14.96661. Evidently, EFL teachers with a bachelor's degree mean score was higher than EFL teachers with a master's degree.

TABLE 9
RESULTS OF THE T-TEST

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailled)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.433	.511	1.836	305	.067	4.43380	2.41461	-31761	9.18521
Equal variances not assumed			1.760	49.984	.085	4.43380	2.51953	-62686	9.49446

It is obvious from Table 9 that the level of significance is 0.067, which is higher than 0.05, indicating that there are no statistically significant differences between the average scores in the qualification of sample research.

H. 3

To test the third hypothesis, which postulated that there were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to years of experience, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed. The means and standard deviation for the years of experience are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10
RESULTS OF MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION FOR YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Years of Experience	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
< 5	27	98.5926	11.54676	2.22217	94.0248	103.1603	76.00	124.00
5-10	87	96.4368	11.81023	1.26619	93.9197	98.9539	48.00	121.00
10-15	81	97.6914	17.39946	1.93327	93.8440	101.5387	48.00	123.00
>15	112	100.3393	14.09974	1.33230	97.6992	102.9793	47.00	128.00
Total	307	98.3811	14.29685	.81596	96.7755	99.9867	47.00	128.00

The results of ANOVA show that there were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to years of experience (F= 1.305, df=3, p< 0.05). The level of significance is .273, which is bigger than 0.05. Accordingly, this hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 11
RESULTS OF ANOVA

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	798.099	3	266.033	1.305	.273
Within Groups	61748.312	303	203.790		
Total	62546.410	306			

H. 4

To investigate the fourth hypothesis, which assumed there were no statistically significant differences in means between EFL teachers at (a<0.05) in their use of language teaching techniques for large classes with respect to the level of teaching, the means and standard deviations of the study were calculated. A T-test was also used to measure the significance of the differences. Table 12 shows the mean and standard deviations for the teaching variable.

It appears from Table 12 that the mean of the intermediate variable was reached (98.8065) with a standard deviation (14.62689), while the mean for the secondary variable scores was 98.0929 with a standard deviation (14.10195).

TABLE 12
GROUP STATISTICS

Level of Teaching	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intermediate	124	98.8065	14.62689	1.31353
Secondary	183	98.0929	14.10195	1.04245

The data detailed in Table 13 reveal that the level of significance is 0.669, which is higher than 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences between the average scores with respect to the teaching variable. Accordingly, this hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 13
INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

Variables	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.229	.632	.429	305	.669	.71356	1.66515	-2.56308	3.99019
Equal variances not assumed			.426	257.656	.671	.71356	167692	-2.58866	4.01577

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this research, the following conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, EFL teachers prefer to use listening to conversations, reading aloud, and listening to discussions when teaching listening skills to their large classes. However, they rarely use dictation, telling stories, auditory memory, or video tapes in teaching listening skills. These results imply that listening techniques are not emphasized in large classes, which depend mainly on forum language teaching techniques. Secondly, EFL teachers tend to use conversation, presentation, and description extensively in teaching speaking to their large classes. However, they seldom use chain story, mime, lecturing, problem solving, or interview language techniques. These results denote that they place little emphasis on oral communication. In sum, aural language skills, that is, listening and speaking, are not adequately emphasized in large classes. Thirdly, EFL teachers use scanning, skimming, and interviewing when teaching language students. However, they rarely use diaries or book reviews. These results connote that reading skills are highly emphasized in large classes. Fourthly, when

teaching writing, EFL teachers emphasize the use of making up questions, composition, dictation, note taking, and letter writing. However, they infrequently use essays or emails. These results imply that there is a great priority placed on using a variety of teaching techniques in writing classes. This study generally concludes that graphic language skills, that is, reading and writing, are greatly emphasized in large language classes. Fifthly, the results of the research hypotheses indicate that there were statistically significant differences in the mean between EFL teachers in their use of language teaching techniques in large classes with respect to their gender and level of teaching. However, there were no differences in the teachers' use of teaching techniques with regard to their qualifications and years of experience. The results imply that gender and level of teaching shape their preferences in the use of teaching techniques to their language students in large classes.

The current study has raised some questions for further research, for instance: Will the same results be obtained by repeating this study at other institutions or other grade levels? To what extent will language specialists contribute and incorporate the results of teaching techniques into the language pedagogy syllabus? To what extent will university language instructors enhance and motivate pre-service teachers to adopt a variety of teaching techniques in their classes, particularly the neglected ones? What are the negative consequences for the limited use of some language techniques in large classes? What causes language teachers to neglect certain techniques when teaching language skills in large classes? These and other questions may constitute topics of interest for researchers in the future.

REFERENCES

[1] Buckingham, J. (2003). Class size and teacher quality. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *2*(1), 71–86.
[2] Carpenter, J. M. (2006). Effective teaching Methods for Large Classes. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, *24*(2), 13–23.
[3] Devi, R. B. (2016). Problems Faced by the Teachers of a Large Class in Imparting Writing Skills at the Tertiary Level. *Language in India*, *16*(4), 165–173.
[4] Filges, T., Sonne-Schmidt, C. S., & Nielsen, B. C. V. (2018). Small class sizes for improving student achievement in primary and secondary schools: a systematic review. In *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Oslo: The Campbell Collaboration.
[5] Garcia, C. N. (2016). Effect of Class Size on Teaching Middle School English Language Learners. Dominican University of California.
[6] Hadi, M. J., & Arante, L. T. (2015). Barriers in Teaching English in Large Classes: Voice of an Indonesian English Language Teacher. *Online Submission*, 2012, 1–7.
[7] Hattie, J. (2005). The paradox of reducing class size and improving learning outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *43*(6), 387–425.
[8] Hunt, D., Haidet, P., Coverdale, J., & Richards, B. (2003). The effect of using team learning in an evidence-based medicine course for medical students. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine,* 15(2), 131-139.
[9] Khazaei, Z. M., Zadeh, A. M., & Ketabi, S. (2012). Willingness to Communicate in Iranian EFL Learners: The Effect of Class Size. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(11), 181–187.
[10] Mahmoodi, M.-H., & Moazam, I. (2014). Willingness to communicate (WTC) and L2 achievement: The case of Arabic language learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1069–1076.
[11] Mulryan-Kyne, C. (2010). Teaching large classes at college and university level: challenges and opportunities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *15*(2), 175-185.
[12] Ndethiu, S. M., Masingila, J. O., Miheso-O'Connor, M. K., Khatete, D. W., & Heath, K. L. (2017). Kenyan Secondary Teachers' and Principals' Perspectives and Strategies on Teaching and Learning with Large Classes. *Africa Education Review*, *14*(1), 58–86. Retrieved August 21, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2016.1224573.
[13] Wiliam, D. (2010). Teacher quality: why it matters, and how to get more of it. Spectator 'Schools Revolution' Conference (March). Retrieved January 13, 2020, from https://www.dylanwiliam.org/Dylan_Wiliams_website/Papers_files/Spectator%20talk.doc.
[14] Yang, N., Ghislandi, P., & Dellantonio, S. (2018). Online collaboration in a large university class supports quality teaching. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *66*(3), 671–691. Retrieved May 22, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9564-8.
[15] Zhang, J., Beckmann, N., & Beckmann, J. F. (2018). To talk or not to talk: A review of situational antecedents of willingness to communicate in the second language classroom. *System*, *72*, 226–239.

Basmah Ali Abu-ghararah is an assistant professor of language pedagogy and translation who obtained her MA and PhD from the University of Leeds, UK. Her professional interests include second language acquisition, language testing, and applied translation.