

Alignment between Intended and Enacted Pedagogies: A Study of ELT Curriculum Innovation Implementation in Pakistan

Shahzad Karim & Nigel Harwood

Abstract

This study investigates the alignment between English language education (ELE) pedagogy in policy (the pedagogical practices outlined in the ELE national curriculum) and pedagogy in practice (the pedagogical methods implemented by teachers in the classroom) at the secondary level (grades 9-10) in public schools in Punjab, Pakistan. The study is contextualised within the framework of ELE reforms, which were vital components of the broader Education Sector Reforms programme, initiated in Pakistan between 2001 and 2005. As part of these ELE reforms, a revised curriculum for English language instruction was introduced, promoting a comprehensive set of pedagogical principles that prioritise communicative, learner-centred, and inductive teaching approaches. Thirty-six English language lessons by twelve teachers were observed to assess their adherence to the pedagogical practices stipulated by the national curriculum. Additionally, post-observation interviews were conducted with the teachers to explore their reasoning behind the pedagogical strategies they employed or avoided in their instruction. The findings reveal a low level of compliance (29%) with the recommended pedagogical policy. Key factors contributing to this compliance gap include exam-related pressures, institutional challenges, infrastructure limitations, and students' low proficiency in English. The study has important implications for education policymakers, curriculum developers, administrators, and teachers.

Keywords: Curriculum innovations; Communicative Language Teaching (CLT); Teachers' pedagogical practices; English Language Education (ELE); Pakistan

1. Introduction

Educational innovations or reforms—often defined as intentional and thoughtful decisions to implement changes (usually on a larger scale) to existing education policies, including curriculum, instructional materials, teaching methods, and assessment patterns (Hyland & Wong, 2013; Kennedy, 1996; Waters, 2009; Wedell, 2009)—and the evaluation of their implementation are well-researched areas both in mainstream education and in English language education (ELE). A review of studies in mainstream education over the past three decades uncovers numerous investigations into innovations across various educational settings. Noteworthy examples include Johnson et al. (2000), Levitt (2001), O'Sullivan (2004), and Smith and Southerland (2007). Johnson et al. (2000) explored whether and to what extent Egyptian science teachers applied innovative concepts following a 12-week training course in

England, analysing the reasons behind their choices of instructional methods. The findings derived from interviews and observations indicated that teachers faced difficulties in implementing even minor adjustments in their practices. O’Sullivan (2004) investigated the implementation of learner-centred approaches stemming from a three-year INSET programme that involved 145 unqualified teachers from various primary school subjects in Namibia. Introduced in 1990, the learner-centred curriculum in Namibia aimed to replace the teacher-centred methods from the apartheid era. The research revealed ineffective application of learner-centred approaches attributed to factors such as teachers’ lack of necessary training and qualifications, resource shortages, cultural influences, and students’ diverse backgrounds.

The global shift toward Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has prompted curricular reforms in various EFL and ESL contexts. Similar to the aforementioned research on mainstream educational innovations, various studies have examined the application of these contemporary language teaching approaches in diverse EFL and ESL settings. Noteworthy examples include the work of Al Nahar et al. (2024) in Bangladesh, Aljasir (2024) in Saudi Arabia, Carless (2003, 2004, 2007) in Hong Kong, Karavas-Doukas (1998) in Greece, Kirkgöz (2008) in Turkey, Li (1998) in South Korea, Orafi and Borg (2009) in Libya, Trang (2021) in Vietnam, and Zheng and Borg (2014) in China. Moreover, Wedell and Grassick (2018), in their edited volume *International Perspectives on Teachers Living with Curriculum Change*, present 11 studies focused on curricular innovation involving individual teachers from 10 countries: Argentina, China, Cuba, India, Kenya, Korea, the Philippines, Poland, Senegal, and Vietnam. These studies explore the implementation of “interactive classroom teaching and learning approaches” within these diverse educational systems (p. 247). Most of the above-mentioned studies, along with the individual teacher studies by Wedell and Grassick (2018), report broadly similar findings: limited implementation of innovations and stark discrepancies between policy intentions and classroom realities. These and other studies (e.g., Fullan, 2007; Wedell, 2009) suggest that the initiators of change (policymakers) often focus on the initial stages of the change process—developing new curricula and instructional materials—while how implementers (particularly teachers) apply these curricula and teaching materials in classrooms is often overlooked.

The literature review below critically examines this global pattern by reviewing key studies from various ESL/EFL contexts. It identifies a significant gap in research: although many studies employ qualitative methods and provide detailed descriptions of teachers’ practices, they do not offer quantitative results that reveal the extent to which teachers adhere to the intended curricular reforms. Moreover, many of these studies overlook the diversity of educational environments (i.e., encompassing both urban and rural schools), which hinders the capacity to draw broader conclusions or evaluate the overall impact of curriculum reforms across different contexts. The current study, which investigates the implementation of ELE reforms that promote communicative, learner-centred, and inductive pedagogy within the Pakistani educational context, addresses these research gaps.

1.1 Global Trends in CLT and TBLT-Based Curriculum Innovations

Li’s (1998) seminal study provided one of the earliest accounts of the perceived challenges that secondary school English language teachers faced in implementing CLT in South Korea.

Using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with 18 teachers participating in a Canadian teacher education programme, Li identified four major categories of difficulties in adopting CLT: teacher-related factors, student-related issues, systemic constraints, and the inherent challenges of CLT itself. The most frequently mentioned teacher-related issues included limited English communicative competence, inadequate training in CLT, and low self-confidence. Student-related factors included low English proficiency, a lack of motivation to improve their communicative skills, and a preference for teacher-centred instruction shaped by traditional norms. From a systemic perspective, Li critiqued issues such as large class sizes (often reaching 50 students), grammar-focused examinations, insufficient institutional support, and inadequate funding for materials and training. Additionally, Li raised concerns about the relevance of CLT in EFL contexts, such as South Korea, noting its inherent limitations when real-life communicative opportunities are scarce.

Carless (2003, 2004, 2007) highlighted the significance of teachers in implementing curricular reforms. Carless (2007) investigated teachers' perspectives on the suitability of introducing TBLT in secondary schools in Hong Kong. Through semi-structured interviews with 11 teachers and 10 teacher trainers, he analysed the tensions between TBLT principles and the local educational context. He identified several obstacles to implementation, including large class sizes, cultural norms that favour traditional teaching methods, and teachers' lack of familiarity with TBLT's emphasis on communication. Carless proposed the concept of a "situated task-based approach," advocating for a localised or "weaker" version of TBLT that aligns global pedagogical ideals with local conditions, such as integrating traditional grammar instruction with exam-oriented preparation. Carless's empirical research—particularly his 2003 case study of three primary school teachers and a subsequent 2004 case study of three secondary school teachers—demonstrates that innovations like TBLT are often interpreted through teachers' pre-existing beliefs and the contextual limitations they encounter. In the 2003 study, Carless identified six key factors influencing teachers' use of communicative tasks in the classroom: their attitudes towards task-based teaching, their understanding of tasks, time limitations, the influence of textbooks and topics, insufficient resources, and students' limited English proficiency. In his later work (2004), Carless presented a more comprehensive perspective by analysing the practices of three teachers who implemented TBLT-based curricular innovations in diverse ways, ranging from enthusiastic adoption to cautious integration, shaped by their beliefs and the practical challenges they faced in their schools. He found that the teaching practices of these educators aligned more closely with what he described as "task-supported teaching" rather than a purer form of TBLT. Carless pointed out three main challenges the teachers faced during task implementation: (1) students' consistent use of their native language, (2) difficulties in classroom management and discipline, and (3) limited use of the target language by students.

The theme of resistance to innovation recurs in Kırkgöz's (2008) longitudinal case study, which examined how 32 English language teachers in Turkish state primary schools implemented the Communicative Oriented Curriculum, introduced nationwide during educational reforms in 1997. The study revealed how teachers' prior training and understanding of communicative pedagogy influenced their classroom practices. Kırkgöz classified the teachers into three pedagogical categories: transmission-oriented (N=16), eclectic (N=10), and interpretation-oriented (N=6). Transmission-oriented teachers largely employed teacher-

centred methods that emphasised grammar, translation, and repetition. In contrast, interpretation-oriented teachers applied adaptable, communicative techniques, incorporating songs, games, and realia to create engaging learning environments. Teachers with eclectic methodologies displayed “attributes of both traditional and communicative approaches in their classroom practices, with traditional elements occurring more frequently” (p. 1870).

Orafi and Borg’s (2009) study in Libya demonstrated that curriculum innovations rooted in CLT often clash with teachers’ pre-existing beliefs and contextual realities. By analysing the classroom practices of three experienced secondary school teachers concerning the curriculum’s goals, the authors illustrated how intended pair work activities often transformed into individual or choral repetition directed by the teacher, thereby compromising the interactive aims of the curriculum. Furthermore, Arabic frequently replaced English, even during activities designed to enhance oral fluency in English, underscoring language limitations among both teachers and students. The study provided a thorough analysis of the teachers’ reasoning for their pedagogical choices and highlighted several constraints, such as their limited communicative competence, insufficient training, low student proficiency, misalignment with exam formats, and a lack of institutional support, which collectively hindered the successful implementation of CLT-based curricular reforms in Libya.

Zheng and Borg (2014) investigated how three secondary school teachers in China (Mr. Yang, Ms. Ma, and Miss Wu) managed the post-2003 curriculum, which required the implementation of TBLT. The study, based on two observations and two interviews per teacher, revealed complexities in curriculum implementation and local adaptations. The findings showed the teachers’ limited understanding of TBLT. For instance, Mr. Yang linked tasks with pair and group activities, whereas Ms. Ma associated the explicit instruction of grammar with TBLT, which contradicts the core principles of TBLT (see Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2004). The study also illustrated how teacher cognition affected classroom practices. It demonstrated how Mr. Yang and Ms. Ma, both experienced teachers influenced by their views on grammar and exam pressures, adapted to or resisted the curriculum, while Miss Wu, the youngest and least experienced, exhibited a greater commitment to TBLT despite challenges with student disengagement. These findings on pedagogical variations align with Kırkgöz’s (2008) and Carless’s (2004) classification of teachers into different categories concerning their level of fidelity with the proposed innovations. Finally, similar to other studies (such as Carless, 2003, 2007; Orafi & Borg, 2009), this research emphasised how contextual factors, including large classes, low student proficiency, time limitations, and exam pressures, hindered effective TBLT implementation in China.

In addition to the studies mentioned earlier, recent research on pedagogical innovations based on CLT and TBLT also highlights gaps between policy and practice. For instance, Aljasir’s (2024) qualitative study explored Saudi EFL teachers’ beliefs and practices concerning TBLT to understand how their beliefs influenced their teaching methods and the factors that either promoted or hindered TBLT implementation. Using data from 60 EFL teachers gathered through demographic questionnaires, reflective journals, lesson description prompts (which required teachers to describe four of their TBLT lessons and their impact on learning, one lesson for each of the four skills), and interviews, the study found that Saudi EFL teachers generally viewed TBLT positively, recognising its role in improving students’ English skills through meaningful communicative tasks. The teachers emphasised the importance of

TBLT in encouraging student-centred learning, applying language in real-world situations, and increasing learner motivation. Their beliefs closely matched their teaching practices, as they reported designing lessons with role-plays, authentic tasks, and collaborative projects aligned with TBLT. Factors that supported implementation included teachers' previous academic experience with TBLT, ongoing professional development, and institutional support. For instance, schools that provided supportive leadership, authentic materials, allowed for collaborative planning, and fostered pedagogical innovation were associated by teachers with the successful application of TBLT. However, the study also highlights ongoing challenges, such as the gap between TBLT principles and traditional grammar-focused assessments, large class sizes, limited technological and material resources, and a need for more comprehensive TBLT training.

Al Nahar et al. (2024) examined the implementation of CLT in Bangladeshi primary schools and found a stark mismatch between curriculum goals and classroom practices. The study, which involved systematic classroom observations and interviews with four primary school teachers, revealed that despite policy directives supporting CLT, teachers predominantly employed the Grammar Translation Method (GTM), driven by exam pressures, limited resources, and established teaching practices. Its findings echo those of Li (1998), Kırkgöz (2008), and Orafi and Borg (2009): successful reform requires not only new curricula but also systemic alignment and stakeholder investment.

In summary, global research on CLT and TBLT reforms reveals a consistent gap between policy and practice, often influenced by factors such as teachers' beliefs, contextual limitations, and systemic resistance. It highlights a pattern of only partial or superficial adoption of communicative reforms, as classroom practices frequently revert to traditional, teacher-centric methods. Notably, a significant limitation in much of the literature is the absence of rigorous quantitative evaluations of implementation. While many studies employ qualitative methods that provide detailed narratives of teacher practices, they often do not quantify the degree of adherence or deviation. Moreover, many of these studies overlook a broader range of settings, such as urban and rural schools. These methodological shortcomings hinder efforts to generalise findings or evaluate the effectiveness of reforms across different contexts.

This study aims to address these limitations. It examines the extent to which secondary school teachers in Pakistan adhere to a predominantly CLT-aligned curriculum innovation and explores the reasons behind their pedagogical choices. We assess teachers' compliance by assigning numerical ratings to the pedagogical policy mandated by the national curriculum, based on the 15 principles outlined in the national curriculum for English. This method systematically measures implementation fidelity, offering quantifiable insights into the alignment of policy and practice. Our study features 36 lesson observations from 12 teachers across 12 distinct urban and rural schools. We also provide detailed qualitative accounts of teachers' pedagogical practices, along with the reasons for their choices, gathered through post-observation interviews. Due to space constraints, we discuss teachers' reasons for their pedagogical choices and the barriers they face in implementing recommended pedagogical innovations in less depth. Our primary focus is on presenting teachers' adherence to the suggested pedagogy both quantitatively and qualitatively, thereby addressing a significant gap in the research and literature on ELE innovation.

Another key reason for conducting this study is the limited amount of in-depth research conducted to date within the Pakistani context. While some anecdotal and small-scale studies exist, none have examined curriculum implementation at the secondary level in public schools using observational and interview data. Additionally, these studies have not explicitly linked their findings to the 2006 English curriculum reforms, described in 1.3 below, which advocated for communicative, learner-centred, and inductive teaching methods. Furthermore, given the historical pattern of ambitious yet poorly implemented educational reforms in Pakistan—marked by weak implementation structures, insufficient feedback mechanisms, and a lack of sustained government commitment (Aly, 2007; Bengali, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2005; Nazir, 2010; Shamim, 2008)—this study is highly relevant to policy. It not only contributes to the global academic discourse on curricular reforms but also offers crucial evidence and insights for policymakers and educators, indicating that recent ELE innovations have been ineffectively implemented and have suffered the same fate as previous reforms in Pakistan. Thus, before detailing the research design and findings, it is essential to provide a brief overview of the Pakistani education system along with the CLT-based curricular innovations being examined.

1.2 Education System in Pakistan

Historically, prior to 2000, the teaching and learning culture in Pakistan was characterised by a teacher-led transmission model of education (Nazir, 2010), primarily due to the socio-political environment, which stifled critical thinking and questioning while fostering subservience to the authority of a superior entity, such as a teacher in the classroom context. The prevalence of such an orthodox instructional approach was common in classrooms. For example, Shamim's (1993) research on English language learning in government Urdu-medium and non-elite private English-medium schools demonstrated a strong reliance on teacher-led practices, which provided few opportunities for active student engagement. Similarly, Kanu (1996) observed the ongoing use of expository teaching methods and the notable absence of innovative, creative, or critical pedagogical strategies in both primary and secondary classrooms in Pakistan.

Over time, however, growing awareness of these outdated practices and systemic deficiencies led to calls for reform, particularly from liberal and progressive Pakistani educationists and scholars (e.g., Hoodbhoy, 1991; Rahman, 1999). These scholars critiqued the curricula and textbooks, asserting that they were outdated and ideologically driven. They emphasised the necessity of revising curricula, textbooks, and pedagogical practices to align with modern educational trends that advocate a liberal approach and promote learner-centred teaching methods (Barwell et al., 2007; Jamil, 2009). This intellectual critique gained traction within policy circles. For instance, the National Education Policy (1992) recognised that “the curricula, apart from being overloaded, have not kept pace with the advancement of knowledge” (cited in Bengali, 1999, p. 20). Similarly, the Eighth Five-Year Education Plan (1993–1998) noted that “the curricula lack relevance, and the methodologies of instruction and testing are outdated” (cited in Bengali, 1999, p. 22).

A major shift occurred following the September 11, 2001 (often referred to as 9/11) terrorist attacks in the USA, which led to increased global pressure on the Pakistani government to reform its education system (Lingard & Ali, 2009). The international community called for the

elimination of ideologically biased content in curricula and textbooks, along with the implementation of progressive, student-centred teaching methods (Leirvik, 2008; Lingard & Ali, 2009; Roof, 2015; Siddiqui, 2016). In response, the Ministry of Education launched the Education Sector Reforms Programme (2001–2005), a comprehensive initiative aimed at addressing systemic shortcomings and ensuring that educational practices adhere to contemporary international standards (Jamil, 2009; Ministry of Education, 2004). While these reforms encompassed the entire education system, this study specifically examines innovations in ELE in Pakistan. A brief overview of the key pedagogical reforms related to ELE is given in 1.3 below.

1.3 English Language Education Reforms in Pakistan

ELE reforms were introduced to enhance the quality of English language teaching and learning in response to widespread dissatisfaction with existing practices. Central to these reforms was a policy shift aimed at improving pedagogical methods, encompassing curriculum content, instructional materials, and classroom practices. As part of this initiative, a new national English language curriculum was introduced in 2006, emphasising communicative, learner-centred, and inductive pedagogy. This curriculum was formally implemented in schools in 2010, followed by the publication of new English textbooks aligned with these principles in 2013. These textbooks are still in use. Additionally, provisions were made for both pre-service and in-service teacher training to support the implementation of the revised methodologies.

However, the extent to which these pedagogical reforms translated into actual classroom practice remains unclear, as no formal evaluations have been conducted. This study, therefore, examines the implementation of these ELE reforms, with a focus on classroom-level practices. It is essential to note that although the 2006 English curriculum recommends the use of communicative, learner-centred, and inductive approaches, it does not articulate these pedagogical shifts systematically or explicitly. In this regard, Author 1 (2019, 2020) conducted a detailed qualitative content analysis of the curriculum, identifying 15 pedagogical principles that are mandated for incorporation into state-approved ELT textbooks and classroom instruction in Pakistan. These 15 pedagogical principles are given below. Furthermore, a fuller description of what each pedagogical principle entails is provided in Appendix A:

1. Promoting the use of a communicative approach
2. Developing learners' English language skills and knowledge
3. Encouraging learners' use of English for academic and social purposes
4. Materials adaptation (Supporting omission, editing, and reordering in the textbook according to learners' needs)
5. Materials supplementation (Supporting the use of instructional resources from sources beyond the textbook)
6. Incorporating integrated language teaching (Teaching the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and subskills (vocabulary and grammar) in an interconnected and holistic manner)
7. Encouraging collaborative learning
8. Fostering learner autonomy

9. Developing learners' higher-order cognitive skills
10. Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy
11. Judicious use of deductive pedagogy
12. Providing supportive facilitation and encouragement to learners
13. Reviewing learners' learning and progress
14. Setting and achieving learning objectives
15. Encouraging well-organised lesson planning

In this study, we investigate how teachers implement these pedagogical principles in their secondary-level (grades 9-10) English language lessons. Consequently, this study addresses the following research questions:

- RQ 1: To what extent do secondary-level English language teachers in Pakistan adhere to the pedagogical policy outlined in the national curriculum for English, and what other pedagogical practices do they employ ?
- RQ 2: What are teachers' reasons for the pedagogical practices they implement and those they resist in their English language lessons?

It is important to note that this study is part of a broader research project. Therefore, space constraints limit the depth of analysis for the second research question regarding teachers' rationales. The following section outlines the methodology employed in this study.

2. Methodology

In line with our interpretive, naturalistic approach, we aimed to collect reliable and authentic firsthand information by observing participants in their natural settings (Denscombe, 2017; Dörnyei, 2007). We also sought to understand their perspectives, reasoning processes, and diverse realities through direct interaction (Cohen et al., 2018; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Creswell & Poth, 2018). Consequently, to examine teachers' pedagogical practices and their adherence to prescribed approaches, we employed classroom observations, and to explore their justifications for the pedagogical practices they employed or avoided, we conducted post-observation interviews.

2.1 Participants and Research Site

The participants consisted of 12 teachers with varying levels of teaching experience, ranging from 3 to 35 years, who taught English to secondary-level (grades 9-10) classes in 12 different state schools located in one of the main districts, encompassing both urban and rural towns in Pakistan. The teachers were selected through purposive sampling to identify those who could provide rich and diverse insights into the phenomenon being studied, thereby enriching our findings (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 126). Six teachers were chosen from different urban schools (one from each) and six from various rural schools (one from each) located in different parts of the district. We ensured that the participants included both teachers with master's degrees in English and those in other subjects within the Arts, Humanities, or Social Sciences, since English

teachers in Pakistan include those who have studied English at master's level and those who hold other degrees¹. The learners in these secondary-level classes were typically aged between 15 and 17 and had studied English as a compulsory subject for the past 9 to 10 years (that is, since grade 1). Detailed demographic information about the teachers, including their educational backgrounds and TEFL experience, is presented in Table 1. Both male and female teachers were invited to participate; however, due to socio-cultural and religious constraints, observations of female teachers' classes in girls' schools were not permitted, resulting in the inclusion of only male English language teachers in this study. Next, we explain why we specifically chose the secondary level for the present study.

Table 1

Teachers' profiles.

Teachers	Educational Qualifications	TEFL Experience (Years)	Area
T1	M.A. English, Diploma in TEFL, B.Ed.	15	Urban
T2	M.Phil. English, M.A. English, B.Ed.	3	Urban
T3	M.A. English, M.Ed., B.Ed.	15	Urban
T4	M.A. English, M.A. TEFL, M.Ed., B.Ed.	15	Urban
T5	M.A. English, B.Ed.	4	Rural
T6	M.A. English, B.Ed.	5	Urban
T7	M.A. English, B.Ed.	5	Rural
T8	M.Phil. Islamic Studies, M.A. Islamic Studies, M.Ed., B.Ed.	3	Rural
T9	M.A. Islamic Studies, M.A. Economics, B.Ed.	34	Urban
T10	M.A. Pakistan Studies, B.Ed.	24	Rural
T11	M.A. English, M.A. Education, B.Ed.	4	Rural
T12	M.A. English, B.Ed.	9	Rural

2.2 Focus on the secondary level (grades 9-10)

The reason for selecting the secondary level (grades 9-10) for this study is that, at these levels, all schools—government Urdu medium, non-elite private English medium, and elite private English medium—follow the same state-mandated curriculum and textbooks for teaching English as a second language across the province. Students are also assessed using a uniform evaluation system aligned with this curriculum (Haidar, 2019). Thus, nearly 97% of students (approximately 3.3 million) at the secondary level follow the same state-mandated curriculum (Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, 2016). The only exception is 3% of students in elite private English medium schools pursuing 'O' Levels. In contrast, the

¹ In government schools in Pakistan, there are two categories of teachers who are assigned to teach English as a subject: (i) English Subject Specialists who hold a master's degree in English, and (ii) General Subject Specialists who possess a master's degree in any field of Arts and Humanities or Social Sciences, but who have studied English up to graduation (B.A.) level during their academic careers, as English is taught as a compulsory subject until graduation (B.A.) level in Pakistan. When there is a shortage of English Subject Specialists at a school, these General Subject Specialists are tasked with teaching English.

primary and middle levels follow much more diverse curricula: indeed, even among private schools at the primary and middle levels, there is a wide range of school systems with different syllabi, textbooks, and examination patterns, rendering systematic study to include all of these contexts impractical.

Additionally, the secondary level is of great importance in students' educational journey in Pakistan. Their marks and learning in grades 9-10 influence their future, particularly in choosing a field of study for higher education and their professional career. Furthermore, the marks obtained in grades 9-10 are often seen as a reflection of their learning in earlier grades (1-8), since, after being assessed by various institutions using different assessment patterns in grades 1-8, students are evaluated through a uniform assessment system at the secondary level (grades 9-10) across the entire province.

2.3 Collecting the classroom observation data

To examine teachers' pedagogical practices, 12 teachers' English language lessons were observed, with each teacher observed three times while teaching different language skills (reading, writing, speaking, or listening) or sub-skills (grammar and vocabulary), resulting in a total of 36 non-participant observations. They were evenly distributed between grade 9 (N=18) and grade 10 (N=18) classes to ensure data representativeness. Each teacher's lessons were observed over two to three consecutive days, organised at their convenience to avoid disrupting their regular teaching schedule. Given that classroom observations are notably 'time-consuming and labour-intensive' (Huntley, 2012, p. 63), 36 lessons were deemed sufficient to meet the study's aims.

Observing each teacher multiple times was essential for two reasons. First, it was unrealistic to expect a teacher to demonstrate all the features of curriculum innovations in a single lesson (Huntley, 2012). Observing a teacher for fewer than three lessons would have been inadequate to obtain an accurate picture of their pedagogical practices and would have called into question the validity of the collected data (see Rose et al., 2020), while observing teachers more than three times risked observation fatigue and participant attrition. Second, these repeated observations aimed to provide deeper insight into teachers' pedagogical approaches while mitigating the Hawthorne effect, where observees alter their behaviour due to being observed (Gass & Mackey, 2007; Mackey & Gass, 2005; Rozsahegyi, 2019). It was believed that repeated observations would help observees (teachers) feel more comfortable and behave more naturally, thereby enhancing the quality and authenticity of the data (Rozsahegyi, 2019). Additionally, as researchers (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Rozsahegyi, 2019) suggest, visiting the observation site prior to the actual observation may help habituate observees to the observer and lessen the observer's paradox effect; thus, the first author visited the teachers and their classes beforehand and interacted with them briefly.

While classroom observations are a common aspect of various studies implementing curricular innovations (see 1.1 above for examples), nearly all of these studies rely on qualitative observations. In contrast, our aim in this study was to provide thick descriptive accounts of the teachers' pedagogical practices not only in the verbal form but also in the form of systematic, numerical data to enhance the reader's understanding of the teachers' level of adherence to the prescribed pedagogy. With this rationale in mind and in alignment with recommendations from

the research methods literature (Dörnyei, 2007) and the literature on evaluating teachers' fidelity to the curriculum and textbooks (e.g., Huntley, 2012), we decided to utilise a combination of both unstructured and structured observation strategies. An unstructured observational strategy involves descriptively collecting and recording data using various techniques, including "note-taking, writing descriptive accounts, maintaining research journals, or audio or video recording" (Rozsahegyi, 2019, pp. 26-27) and produces qualitative data. Conversely, a structured observation involves entering the classroom with a specific focus and defined observation categories, often based on a pre-designed observation schedule or checklist (Dörnyei, 2007) and yields quantitative data. During the observations, data was collected via field notes, along with evidence of the application of the 15 identified pedagogical principles, and other emergent relevant practices. Further, to enhance precision, lessons were recorded for later review. One teacher declined video recording, so his three lessons were audio recorded.

2.4 Observation schedule

The observation schedule was designed to operationalise classroom observation data and measure how closely teachers adhere to the pedagogical principles outlined in the national curriculum. The schedule was based on Huntley's (2012) *Innovation Configuration Maps (IC Maps)*, which she employed in her study of mathematics curriculum and textbooks to evaluate the fidelity of their implementation. IC Maps serve as tools that translate the qualitative data gathered during classroom observations into actionable insights (Huntley, 2012). They are based on the premise that an innovation (such as a new curriculum and materials), when implemented, can take on various operational forms (or configurations) (Huntley, 2012, p. 50). This suggests that educators may adopt different teaching approaches and adjust the pedagogy intended by the curriculum designers and/or textbook authors. Consequently, IC Maps are useful for evaluating teachers' instructional methods and assessing how closely they align with the intentions of curriculum developers.

To understand the structure of an IC Map, refer to Table 2, which illustrates an IC Map for one of the 15 recommended pedagogical principles (Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy) from the Pakistani national curriculum. Of the three variants, the first variant (Operational form–A) exemplifies the ideal execution as outlined in the national curriculum, indicating optimal adherence to the pedagogical principle. The second variant (Operational form–B) shows a moderate divergence from the ideal operational form, while the third variant (Operational form–C) indicates significant deviation, representing little to no compliance with the suggested pedagogical principle.

Table 2
IC Maps example.

Innovation component/ Pedagogical Principle	Operational form–A (Ideal operational form)	Operational form–B (Variation 1)	Operational form–C (Variation 2)

Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy	- Teacher regularly involves learners in inductive learning processes (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, etc.) and asks questions to elicit knowledge and answers from them, which make them find out their own solutions by applying their previous knowledge. Further, to assess learners' understanding, teacher asks concept check questions also. - Teacher doesn't provide quick solutions to learners and gives them enough wait time to get on with the task and answer the questions	- Teacher sometimes involves learners in inductive learning processes (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, etc.) and asks some questions (when he could have asked more) to elicit answers from learners to explore their prior knowledge. Teacher sometimes asks concept check questions to assess learners' understanding. - Teacher sometimes hastens to provide quick solutions to learners without giving them enough wait time to get on with the task and answer the questions.	- Teacher makes no or minimal use of inductive learning processes (e.g., self-discovery and inquiry-based learning) and makes no or minimal use of questions to elicit answers from learners and explore their prior knowledge. Further, teacher asks no or only a few concept check questions to assess learners' understanding. - Teacher provides answers/solutions to learners without making them participate in the learning process inductively.
--	---	--	--

Based on this model, IC Maps were designed for all 15 pedagogical principles, resulting in a comprehensive observation schedule that facilitated the operationalisation and assessment of teachers' adherence to the macro-level pedagogical policy. For reference, the complete observation schedule, which shows how the researchers assessed teachers' levels of full, partial, or near non-compliance, is provided in Appendix B. The next stage involved data analysis, which was initially carried out qualitatively and then quantitatively.

2.5 Analysing the classroom observation data

Following classroom observations, the field notes were thoroughly reviewed twice and compared with lesson video/audio recordings to ensure that all critical information was captured. The next step involved coding and labelling the field notes both deductively and inductively (Dörnyei, 2007), based on the 15 pedagogical principles outlined in the observation schedule and any noteworthy pedagogical practices that emerged independently from the observation data. The deductive coding aligned with the 15 prescribed pedagogical principles, while two codes were developed inductively from the data: (i) the use of English/Urdu as the medium of instruction, and (ii) the application of the grammar-translation method. After coding, detailed observation notes were written for each lesson, documenting the pedagogical principles identified in the observation schedule, as well as any unexpected practices observed in the classroom data.

Based on the analysis of the field notes and observation notes, an operational form (A/B/C) was determined, reflecting the teacher's level of compliance for each of the 15 pedagogical

principles within the observation schedule. The A/B/C ratings indicated the extent to which the teacher adhered to or deviated from each pedagogical principle, resulting in 15 ratings for each observation, as a single observation schedule was used per session. However, in some instances, data for one or two pedagogical principles were missing. As previously mentioned, it is unreasonable to expect a teacher to demonstrate all aspects of curriculum innovations in every lesson (Huntley, 2012). Consequently, no operational form (A/B/C) was identified for those pedagogical principles in the lesson in question.

To operationalise the qualitative data, operational form A, indicating full compliance, was assigned a score of 2. Operational form B, showing some deviation, was scored 1, while operational form C, indicating significant deviation, was scored zero. Therefore, a higher score indicates greater compliance. The observation schedule comprised 15 pedagogical principles, each assigned a maximum score of 2 for ideal compliance. Thus, the total maximum score for a single observation was 30 ($15 \times 2 = 30$), while for a teacher's three observations, it was 90 ($30 \times 3 = 90$). Moreover, with 36 observations conducted and a consistent maximum score of 2 per pedagogical principle, the total maximum score for a single principle across all 36 observations amounted to 72 ($36 \times 2 = 72$). Once teachers' scores were calculated, their compliance was evaluated using the scale² in Table 3. We were thus able to determine the individual and collective adherence of teachers to the pedagogical policies outlined in the national curriculum.

Table 3

Scale to classify teachers' adherence to the recommended pedagogical policy.

Level of compliance with the recommended pedagogical policy	Score obtained by teachers in 36 observations	Score percentage	Total maximum score for a pedagogical principle in 36 observations
Excellent	65 and above	90% and above	72
Very good	54 - 64	75% - 89%	(36×2 = 72)
Good	43 - 53	60%- 74%	
Satisfactory	36 - 42	50% - 59%	
Unsatisfactory	Less than 36	Less than 50%	

The final step of the analysis process involved supplementing the quantitative results with descriptive and analytical accounts of the teachers' pedagogical practices, which feature in the findings (section 3.2) below.

2.6 Collecting and analysing post-observation interview data

² This scale is adapted from the Classroom Observation Evaluation Criteria used at the English Language Institute (ELI) at King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The first author, with several years of experience as a Professional Development Specialist, employed this scale during their work at the ELI and other reputable educational institutions in Pakistan. A trial of this scale demonstrated that it serves as a reliable overall measure of compliance for the current objectives.

In addition to observations, individual post-observation interviews were conducted with teachers to understand their reasoning behind the pedagogical strategies they employed or avoided in relation to the recommended pedagogy. Each interview took place the day after observing a teacher's three lessons to shorten the period between the observation and the observee's recall of their pedagogical practices, which enhanced the accuracy and reliability of the information collected. The interview questions were based on the practices demonstrated in the observed lessons. To assist the teachers and ensure precise information retrieval, excerpts from their lessons were used to prompt reflection on their actions and underlying motives. Each interview lasted between 40 and 70 minutes. Teachers were invited to communicate in either English or Urdu (the national and commonly spoken language in Pakistan) to express their thoughts more freely and comfortably. This flexibility enriched the depth and quality of the data collected (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Among the twelve interviewees, six chose English, while the other six preferred Urdu. The interviews were recorded and transcribed in the respective languages to preserve the accuracy and integrity of the data analysis.

The coding process began with pre-coding, involving a thorough review of the transcripts to identify significant data extracts (Dörnyei, 2007; Saldaña, 2013). This initial immersion provided a comprehensive understanding of the data. Next, during the code-labelling phase, the identified extracts were assigned pertinent codes (Dörnyei, 2007). The aim of analysing the interview data was to uncover themes associated with teachers' reasons for adhering to or deviating from recommended pedagogical principles and the contextual factors influencing their behaviours. Consequently, thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) was deemed the most effective method. To ensure inter-coder reliability, an inter-coder reliability check on 25% of the data (three out of 12 interviews) was performed with two external coders, achieving a 98.62% agreement rate, indicating high consistency. Minor discrepancies were discussed face-to-face to reach a consensus. After establishing an agreed coding framework, the interview data (12 interviews) were processed using MAXQDA. Following the coding phase, the next step involved identifying patterns and themes from the coded data. The broader themes that emerged from the interview data included:

1. Educational qualifications
2. TEFL experience
3. Teachers' pedagogical practices
4. Teachers' pedagogical beliefs
5. Constraints
6. Learners' practices

As we report below, these themes surfaced in our examination of teachers' rationales for adopting or avoiding the pedagogical principles.

3. Findings

First, we present the quantitative analysis of the classroom observation data, revealing teachers' collective and individual compliance levels with the pedagogical policy. We also examine the link between teachers' professional backgrounds—such as qualifications and TEFL experience—and their pedagogical approaches. Next, we provide descriptive accounts of the teachers' pedagogical practices related to the principles noted in the observation schedule and

those that emerged spontaneously. When relevant, we include brief explanations of the practices that teachers chose to adopt or avoid during their lessons.

3.1 Quantitative Findings

Table 4 illustrates the teachers' compliance levels with each of the 15 pedagogical principles across their 36 lessons and their overall adherence to the macro-level pedagogical policy. The results indicate that teachers exhibit an unsatisfactory level of compliance, scoring below 50% across all 15 pedagogical principles. For three principles—materials supplementation, setting and achieving learning objectives, and lesson planning—they obtained scores of between 41% and 44%. Additionally, they obtained scores of 38.9% on four other principles: the use of inductive pedagogy, deductive pedagogy, promoting learner autonomy, and reviewing learners' progress. In contrast, they received particularly low scores (below 10%) for four principles that are significantly emphasized in the macro-level pedagogical policy: the use of the communicative approach (2.9%), developing learners' English language skills (9.7%), promoting learners' use of English for various academic and social purposes (6.9%), and developing learners' higher-order cognitive skills (9.7%). Detailed descriptive accounts of teachers' practices connected to these pedagogical principles are provided in section 3.2 below.

Table 4

Teachers' collective score for each pedagogical principle across 36 lessons.

No.	Pedagogical principle	Score obtained by the teachers collectively	Score percentage
1	Promoting the use of a communicative approach	2 / 72 ³	2.8%
2	Developing learners' English language skills and knowledge	7 / 72	9.7%
3	Encouraging learners' use of English language for various academic and social purposes	5 / 72	6.9%
4	Materials adaptation	18 / 72	25%
5	Materials supplementation	30 / 72	41.7%
6	Incorporating integrated language teaching	23 / 72	31.9%
7	Encouraging collaborative learning	22 / 72	30.6%
8	Fostering learner autonomy	28 / 72	38.9%
9	Developing learners' higher order cognitive skills	7 / 72	9.7%
10	Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy	28 / 72	38.9%
11	Judicious use of deductive pedagogy	28 / 72	38.9%
12	Providing supportive facilitation and encouragement by the teacher	25 / 72	34.7%
13	Reviewing learners' learning and progress	28 / 72	38.9%
14	Setting and achieving learning objectives	30 / 72	41.7%
15	Encouraging well-organized lesson planning	32 / 72	44.4%
Total score obtained for 15 pedagogical principles in 36 lessons		313 / 1080⁴	29%

³ Recall that the total/maximum score for a pedagogical principle in 36 lesson observations was 72 since a teacher was awarded a score of 2 for showing maximum compliance with a pedagogical principle in a lesson ($36 \times 2 = 72$).

⁴ This is the total/maximum score for compliance with the 15 pedagogical principles in 36 lesson observations.

In addition to calculating the collective scores of teachers and their adherence to pedagogical principles, we also established the individual score for each teacher for each lesson, as well as the collective score for their three lessons. This demonstrates their individual level of compliance with the recommended pedagogical policy, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Teachers' observation scores.

Teachers	Score for lesson 1 observation	Score for lesson 2 observation	Score for lesson 3 observation	Total score obtained in three observations	Score percentage	Level of compliance with the pedagogical policy
T1	11 / 30 ⁵	16 / 30	18 / 30	45 / 90 ⁶	50%	Satisfactory
T2	6 / 30	5 / 30	19 / 30	31 / 90	34%	Unsatisfactory
T3	5 / 30	15 / 30	6 / 30	26 / 90	28%	Unsatisfactory
T4	23 / 30	4 / 30	18 / 30	45 / 90	50%	Satisfactory
T5	1 / 30	2 / 30	5 / 30	8 / 90	9%	Unsatisfactory
T6	3 / 30	2 / 30	3 / 30	8 / 90	9%	Unsatisfactory
T7	2 / 30	2 / 30	4 / 30	8 / 90	9%	Unsatisfactory
T8	18 / 30	20 / 30	19 / 30	57 / 90	63%	Good
T9	8 / 30	3 / 30	2 / 30	13 / 90	14%	Unsatisfactory
T10	8 / 30	4 / 30	1 / 30	13 / 90	14%	Unsatisfactory
T11	8 / 30	11 / 30	9 / 30	28 / 90	31%	Unsatisfactory
T12	18 / 30	6 / 30	8 / 30	32 / 90	35%	Unsatisfactory
Average compliance by all the teachers					29%	Unsatisfactory

Moreover, when teachers' individual compliance levels were cross-referenced with their professional profiles (educational qualifications and TEFL experience), some intriguing findings emerged, indicating a tentative relationship between their professional profiles and their pedagogical characteristics. Table 6 presents teachers' individual compliance levels in relation to their educational qualifications and TEFL experience.

Table 6

Teachers' educational qualifications, TEFL experience, and observation scores.

Teachers	Educational qualifications	TEFL experience (Years)	Score obtained in three observations	Score percentage
T1	M.A. English, Diploma in TEFL, B.Ed.	15	45	50%
T2	M.Phil. English, M.A. English, B.Ed.	3	31	34%
T3	M.A. English, M.Ed., B.Ed.	15	26	28%
T4	M.A. English, M.A. TEFL, M.Ed., B.Ed.	15	45	50%
T5	M.A. English, B.Ed.	4	8	9%
T6	M.A. English, B.Ed.	5	8	9%
T7	M.A. English, B.Ed.	5	8	9%

⁵ Total maximum score for a teacher's one observation is 30 ($15 \times 2 = 30$), where 15 stands for 15 pedagogical principles and 2 is the score allocated to a teacher in case of his maximum compliance with the pedagogical principle.

⁶ 90 is the total maximum score for a teacher's three observations ($30 \times 3 = 90$).

T8	M.Phil. Islamic Studies, M.A. Islamic Studies, M.Ed., B.Ed.	3	57	63%
T9	M.A. Islamic Studies, M.A. Economics, B.Ed.	34	13	14%
T10	M.A. Pakistan Studies, B.Ed.	24	13	14%
T11	M.A. English, M.A. Education, B.Ed.	4	28	31%
T12	M.A. English, B.Ed.	9	32	35%

Examining teachers' scores alongside their educational qualifications, T1 and T4, both attaining the second-highest scores of 50%, hold a Diploma in TEFL and an M.A. in TEFL, respectively. However, there is no evident link between teachers' scores and their years of experience. For instance, T5, T6, and T7, each with 4 to 5 years of TEFL experience, recorded a remarkably low compliance score of 9%. In contrast, T2 and T4, with 3 to 4 years of TEFL experience, achieved compliance scores of 34% and 31%. T8, despite having only 3 years of experience teaching grade 5 English and teaching secondary school English (grades 9-10) for the first time, earned the highest score of 63%. Moreover, T1 and T4, both having 15 years of TEFL experience, similarly scored 50% for compliance, whereas T9 and T10, with 34 and 24 years of TEFL experience, respectively, attained significantly lower scores of 14%.

The description above of the teachers' compliance regarding their educational qualifications and TEFL experience highlights various tentative relationships between teachers' profiles and emerging practices observed in the data, as well as an apparent lack of relationships—for instance, the correlation between compliance and years of teaching experience. Ours is not a correlational study; nevertheless, the data presented suggest that there are no straightforward and predictable correlations between teachers' professional profiles (educational qualifications and TEFL experience) and their compliance with the pedagogical policy.

3.2 Teachers' pedagogical practices and their rationale

Alongside the quantitative results for all 15 pedagogical principles highlighted earlier, we provide detailed descriptions of notable pedagogical practices observed in teachers' classrooms. However, due to space limitations, we focus on five of the 15 identified principles and two pedagogical practices that emerged spontaneously from the classroom observation data. The reason for choosing these principles for detailed descriptions is their close connection with the CLT principles, their higher relevance to the national curriculum-mandated pedagogy, and the marked variations in teachers' adherence to macro-level pedagogical policies demonstrated by the observation data. These narratives address research question 1, revealing which pedagogical practices teachers embraced or rejected while also identifying additional methods they integrated into their teaching. These descriptions also include insights from teachers' post-observation interviews, addressing research question 2 by clarifying their reasons for the strategies they chose to implement or avoid. We begin with findings related to principles exhibiting low compliance by teachers, followed by those associated with comparatively higher compliance scores.

3.2.1 Promoting the use of a communicative approach

Teachers received the lowest compliance score (2.8%) for this principle, indicating their limited application of the communicative approach in lessons. Each textbook unit featured one or two oral group activities, but nearly all were overlooked by the instructors. Only one teacher, T5, in lesson 3, engaged with a group work oral activity from the textbook. However, he modified the activity by changing it from group work to individual tasks. Additionally, he had students conduct the activity in Urdu instead of English, which undermined the purpose of the activity—providing students with opportunities to communicate in English and enhance their interpersonal skills (Ministry of Education, 2006).

In the 36 observed lessons, there were only two group activities, occurring in the classes of T1 and T2. During lesson 1, T1 encouraged students to form groups to answer the reading comprehension questions from the book, assigning two questions per group with a five-minute time limit for collaboration. In lesson 3, T2 similarly grouped students and provided each group with cue cards featuring five sentences. He instructed them to work together to identify transitive and intransitive verbs, as well as direct and indirect objects within those sentences. However, due to fixed desks, learners could not form proper groups; they were restricted to collaborating only with the student seated next to them. Therefore, the group activities effectively became pair work. Ultimately, all 36 lessons revealed a limited application of the communicative approach by teachers, with most student participation centred around individual tasks.

During the post-observation interviews, teachers cited several constraints regarding their limited incorporation of learner-centred activities in lessons: (i) large class sizes, (ii) disciplinary challenges, (iii) time constraints, (iv) students' low English proficiency, (v) students' disinterest in pair or group work, (vi) fixed seating arrangements, and (vii) insufficient resources, including the lack of handouts and absence of audio-visual equipment such as projectors and screens.

3.2.2 Developing learners' English language skills and knowledge

The teachers attained a low overall compliance score of 9.7% for this principle, highlighting their substantial deviation from it. Their primary emphasis was on enhancing learners' English language knowledge, with little regard for their language skills. This priority is evident as 13 out of 36 lessons were focused on grammar instruction—covering tenses, passive voice, narration, and parts of speech—while seven lessons were dedicated to teaching translation (from English to Urdu), and three lessons emphasised translation alongside vocabulary instruction.

Of the four language skills, reading received the most emphasis, with nine lessons devoted to reading comprehension. However, only four of these lessons were exclusively focused on teaching reading comprehension, while the rest only partially addressed the topic alongside translation and grammar instruction. Moreover, the reading skill was taught ineffectively: the teacher did not explain crucial sub-skills like skimming and scanning, nor did they encourage learners to practise these abilities. The sole strategy employed by the teachers involved providing students with answers to the comprehension questions, enabling them to earn marks in their exams⁷, since reading comprehension tasks are included in the assessment.

Out of the 36 lessons, only two (T6 lesson 3 and T11 lesson 3) focused on writing skills, specifically letter writing and summary writing. However, these lessons did not prioritise

⁷ Wherever the term 'exams' is used later in this paper, it refers to the national exams.

creative writing. Instead, students were required to write letters and summaries they had learnt via memorisation, as revealed by teachers during post-observation interviews. As for speaking, none of the 36 lessons centred on speaking skills. There were three brief instances of encouraging speaking abilities in lessons T5, lesson 3, and T4, lessons 1 and 3, each lasting only 3-4 minutes. For example, in lesson 3 of T5, the teacher prompted students to orally create sentences with five words that served as verbs and nouns from the textbook (see Figure 1).

C. Use the following words in sentences first as verbs and then as nouns.

Care, walk, surprise, request, need state

Examples

First, go straight, then **turn** left. (verb)

It is my **turn** now. (noun)

Fig. 1. A sentence-making work plan.

Source: ELT Textbook Grade 9 Unit 9 (Malik et al., 2018, p. 98)

In lesson 1, T4 asked learners to answer the reading comprehension questions orally. However, when doing so, his main goal was not to improve learners' speaking skills; rather, this was due to time limitations. The teacher explained in his post-observation interview that if he had had the time, he would have asked learners to answer the questions in writing. Additionally, it is important to emphasize that even these brief speaking opportunities lacked a communicative purpose. They did not immerse learners in real-life usage of English or facilitate any meaningful interaction, which is essential according to the CLT approach for enhancing learners' communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman and Anderson, 2011).

When questioned about their limited focus on enhancing students' English language skills, the teachers not only acknowledged this but also outlined three primary reasons for this lack of priority: (i) the limited importance of language skills for the exams, (ii) students' low English proficiency, and (iii) teachers' conviction that an improvement in learners' comprehension of English will lead to a natural development of skills. Regarding exams, the teachers indicated that a significant portion of the exam consists of questions focused on grammar, vocabulary, and translation. Listening and speaking skills are entirely ignored. While reading and writing skills are evaluated, students tend to answer these questions through memorisation rather than utilising their creative writing abilities.

3.2.3 Promoting learners' use of English for academic and social purposes

The teachers achieved a low compliance score of 6.9% related to this principle. Notably, learners had limited opportunities to use English in real-life situations during class, which restricted their ability to apply the language to various academic and social contexts. Only four lessons included instances of English being used for academic purposes, where teachers encouraged learners to respond to reading comprehension questions, granting them some limited engagement with English in an academic manner. There were no opportunities provided for students to use English for social purposes.

In the context of using English for academic purposes, each unit of the textbook featured two to three work plans tailored to improve students' academic and creative writing abilities.

Nevertheless, the teachers chose not to include these plans, claiming they were not relevant to the examinations. For example, in lesson 3, T4 omitted two academic writing assignments from the textbook: (i) write a summary of the unit and (ii) write a personal narrative (see Figure 2). Likewise, in lesson 1, T1 disregarded two creative writing tasks during the unit exercise that asked students to (i) create a character sketch using a mind map and (ii) write a review of a story.

B. Write a personal narrative focusing on the following points.

1. Include a choice of period in your life.
2. Include a clear statement of personality traits at that time.
3. Include significant details and an incident to portray personality.

Fig. 2. A writing task.

Source: ELT Textbook Grade 9 Unit 9 (Malik et al., 2018, p. 102)

Each unit in the textbook included one or two oral activities designed to encourage learners to use English in real-life situations. However, teachers frequently omitted these activities during lessons, arguing they were not relevant to the exams. For example, in lesson 1, T1 skipped an oral task that involved students collaborating in groups and delivering an oral presentation. Similarly, in lesson 3, T4 neglected a group work oral activity found in the textbook. In addition, during lesson 3, T5 had students perform the oral activity in Urdu rather than English, undermining the task's intent to improve learners' English-speaking and interpersonal skills.

When questioned about this, the teacher explained it was due to the students' limited English proficiency, suggesting they would not have been able to complete the task in English. Instances of avoiding writing and speaking tasks were also observed in T5 lesson 3, T7 lesson 1, and T12 lesson 3. Thus, these descriptions and examples suggest that the teachers did not focus much on encouraging students to use English for various academic and social tasks.

3.2.4 Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy

The teachers achieved an overall compliance score of 38.9% for this principle. In ten lessons, they significantly engaged learners in inductive learning processes, such as self-discovery and inquiry-based learning. They facilitated the exploration of prior knowledge by scaffolding and eliciting information related to the topic. To illustrate the application of inductive pedagogy by the teachers, an excerpt from the inductive pedagogy section of the observation notes written for T1 lesson 2 is provided below:

The teacher notably engaged learners in inductive learning processes. He invited learners in turn, had them translate the text from English to Urdu, and offered assistance only when necessary. While discussing grammar—differentiating between present and past tenses and explaining the use of the past participle in passive constructions—he regularly asked questions, elicited information from learners, and encouraged them to explore their prior knowledge. Similarly, while teaching vocabulary, the teacher drew out the meanings of English vocabulary items from the learners. (T1 lesson 2)

In eight lessons, teachers incorporated some form of inductive learning. For instance, during lesson 2 on passive voice, T11 used an inquiry-based approach by asking questions and drawing on students' existing knowledge. Similarly, T12 engaged his class in lesson 2 via the use of a

poem by prompting discussions about rhyming words and encouraging students to identify them. In lesson 3, T12 continued this approach by using inquiry techniques to tap into learners' prior understanding of collective nouns, conjunctions, and participles.

In 18 lessons, the use of inductive learning processes was very limited. During these lessons, teachers failed to prompt students to draw out their knowledge or allow them to complete tasks independently. For instance, in lesson 3, T5 demonstrated this by not permitting students to engage with the tasks. Instead, he dictated every aspect of the work—explaining vocabulary meanings, answering reading comprehension questions, and rearranging jumbled sentences into their correct order.

The interview data revealed that the teachers' views on inductive pedagogy aligned with their pedagogical practices. The teachers who employed inductive pedagogy in their lessons believed it was an appropriate instructional approach and considered it significant for learners' learning.

The use of inductive pedagogy was particularly prominent in grammar lessons. Inductive strategies were implemented in 12 of the 13 observed grammar lessons, while they were applied in 4 of the 9 reading comprehension lessons and 2 of the 7 translation lessons. When asked about the reasons for the increased use of inductive pedagogy in grammar lessons, teachers explained that this approach enhances learners' understanding of grammar concepts.

3.2.5 Judicious use of deductive pedagogy

The overall compliance score for deductive pedagogy (38.9%) matches that of inductive pedagogy. According to the curriculum guidelines for this principle in the observation schedule, the ideal approach requires teachers to use deductive pedagogy wisely, avoid making the class overly teacher-centred, and ensure that learners have sufficient opportunities to practise. Out of the 36 lessons observed, 10 utilised a selective and careful application of deductive pedagogy. In these instances, teachers provided explicit instruction and explanations only when necessary while allowing ample practice time for students. For example, in lesson 3, T3 used an inquiry-based learning method during the first 15 minutes to assess learners' prior knowledge of the present indefinite tense and noun-verb agreement. He then spent the next eight minutes on the presentation stage, using a deductive approach to clarify the rules for constructing affirmative, negative, and interrogative sentences in the present indefinite tense. In the final 12 minutes, he involved learners in practising the formation of sentences using the present indefinite tense, ensuring that the class remained focused.

In contrast, 18 lessons were completely centred around the teacher. During these sessions, instructors relied heavily on explicit instruction, offering limited chances for students to participate actively in the learning process. For example, in lesson 3, T7 conducted a teacher-led class without involving students or permitting them to complete any tasks independently. He took charge of everything, explaining vocabulary meanings, dictating answers for reading comprehension questions, and clarifying the use of subordinating conjunctions. Similarly, in lesson 3, T6 focused on letter writing, delivering explicit instructions about its structure and components without asking any questions to the learners. Additionally, despite having 15 minutes left in the lesson, he did not allow students to practise letter writing. He utilised only 20 minutes of the 35-minute session and ended the lesson 15 minutes early.

In the interviews, teachers not only affirmed their use of deductive pedagogy but also explained that their preference for this instructional method is mainly due to (i) time constraints,

(ii) learners' low proficiency in English, (iii) learners' inability to work independently, (iv) large class sizes, and (v) discipline issues.

Furthermore, in addition to the 15 pedagogical principles identified in the curriculum, data from classroom observations indicated two spontaneously emerging themes: (i) utilising Urdu as a medium of instruction and (ii) implementing the grammar-translation method. Both themes are examined below.

3.2.6 The use of Urdu as a medium of instruction by teachers

The teachers primarily used Urdu as the medium of instruction during their lessons, with minimal use of English. None of the teachers conducted an entire lesson in English. When asked about the reasons for this, the teachers mainly attributed it to the learners' low proficiency in English, explaining that they struggle to comprehend instructions delivered in English. One teacher (T11) even incorporated some Punjabi (the local ethnic language) into his lessons. When asked why, he explained that his school is located in a rural area, and some learners have difficulty understanding instructions in Urdu because it is not their native language.

The lesson observations revealed that teachers used Urdu not only to give instructions but also to teach reading comprehension. It was noted in all reading comprehension lessons that teachers first translated the text and the reading comprehension questions into Urdu, ensured that learners understood the meaning of both the text and the questions in Urdu, and then asked them to respond to the reading comprehension questions. When asked about this practice, the teachers attributed it to the learners' low proficiency in English, explaining that without translation, learners struggle to understand the text or answer the reading comprehension questions.

3.2.7 Use of the grammar-translation method

The lessons demonstrated a significant reliance on the GTM. For example, in ten lessons, translating text from English to Urdu was a key component. Additionally, the 13 lessons that emphasized grammar—covering topics like tenses, narration, passive voice, and parts of speech—largely utilized the GTM. Students received direct instruction on grammar rules and were expected to memorize them. Illustrative excerpts from field notes for T4 lesson 1 can be found in Figure 3:

Words	Meanings	
Commendable	قابل تعریف	Teaching vocabulary items by translating their meanings into Urdu.
Sovereignty	سلطنت	
Compromise	سکھوتہ	
Securing	تحفظ دینا	
Martyrdom	شہادت	
Foreign	غیر ملکی	
Native	آبادی	
Galvanize	اجکھارنا	
Embraced	قبول کیا	

Fig. 4. Field notes (T9 lesson 3) - teaching English vocabulary via translation method.

When asked why they employed the translation method to teach vocabulary, the teachers attributed this to the learners' limited proficiency in English and their exam requirements. For instance, three teachers (T3, T5, and T11) noted that target words in Urdu assist learners with translation (from English to Urdu and vice versa), which is the focus of two exam questions.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study finds a low compliance rate among teachers regarding macro-level pedagogical policy, at only 29%. These findings are not unexpected, given warnings in the literature about innovative education programmes often resulting in little to no implementation (e.g., Grassick & Wedell, 2018; Hyland & Wong, 2013; Waters, 2009; Waters & Vilches, 2005, 2008; Wedell, 2003, 2009). Similarly, findings regarding the limited implementation of CLT-based curricular reforms align with those of other studies on ELT reforms across various ESL/EFL contexts. Research by Al Nahar et al. (2024) in Bangladesh, Carless (2003, 2004, 2007) in Hong Kong, Karavas-Doukas (1998) in Greece, Kirkgöz (2008) in Turkey, Li (1998, 2001) in South Korea, Orafi and Borg (2009) in Libya, and Zheng and Borg (2014) in China indicates similarly limited implementation of ELT reforms. However, this study distinguishes itself from others examining curricular innovations by providing measurable quantitative scores detailing teachers' adherence to individual pedagogical principles and an overall compliance rate as well as qualitative descriptions of teachers' practices and the reasons for this non-compliance.

The teachers appeared to mostly follow established pedagogical practices rather than innovative approaches. They primarily used GTM and the presentation-practice-production (PPP) strategy for teaching languages. This aligns with Li (1998, p. 685), who noted that "all [18 participants] reported that the grammar-translation method, the audiolingual method, or a combination of the two characterised their teaching." Similarly, Carless (2007) found that both

teachers and teacher educators preferred explicit grammar instruction via the PPP method, despite being officially mandated to use TBLT in Hong Kong's secondary English classrooms. Kirkgöz (2008) also reported similar findings, noting that among the 32 teachers she observed, 16 extensively used the GTM and audiolingual method, 10 combined these traditional methods with the newly prescribed CLT approach, and only six demonstrated significant use of the communicative approach.

Similar to this study, Ali (2017) reported the prevalence of the teacher-centred transmission model in Pakistani schools, drawing upon classroom observations, post-observation interviews with teachers, focus-group discussions, and qualitative survey responses. The traditional teacher-centred methods in English and other subjects were also noted by Shamim (1993) and Kanu (1996) in classroom observation-based studies of primary and secondary schools in Pakistan. This suggests that, despite pedagogical reforms in the national curriculum, teachers' instructional practices in Pakistan have not significantly changed over time.

The studies on curriculum innovation discussed above reveal a reliance on a mechanistic/top-down model of innovation (Kennedy, 2013), where policies are designed at the national level and (theoretically) executed locally. However, the limitations of this model, highlighted by Kennedy (2013) and Wedell (2009), are evident across all these studies. Specifically, the policies designed to implement CLT or TBLT are formulated at the policymaking level without considering whether these innovations align with local socio-educational contexts. This misalignment results in inadequate implementation (cf. Holliday, 1994; Nunan, 2003; Wedell, 2003). Given this reality, numerous scholars (e.g., Holliday, 1994, 2016; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; McKay, 2003) urge policymakers and practitioners to adopt a culture-sensitive approach to pedagogy.

None of the aforementioned studies on ELT curriculum innovations demonstrates the application of innovation as outlined in Kennedy's (2013) ecological model, which emphasises decentralisation and the distribution of responsibilities—such as curriculum design and implementation—to change agents based on their expertise. However, some findings reflect aspects of Kennedy's (2013) individual model, which suggests that individual teachers may sometimes adhere to innovation guidelines more closely than their peers. For instance, in this study, one of 12 teachers exhibited a relatively high level of compliance (63%) with the national curriculum's pedagogical principles. And in Carless' (2003, 2004) case studies, one teacher adhered more closely to TBLT-based curricular innovations than the other two. Similarly, in Kirkgöz (2008), six of the 32 teachers appeared to integrate CLT-based pedagogical innovations in their classrooms.

The findings of these studies show that ESL/EFL contexts, especially in Asia, share notable similarities in socio-educational norms, such as a transmission model of language teaching, teacher-centred classrooms, exam-driven methods, and insufficient resources. Consequently, teachers in these settings typically adopt similar, exam-focused teaching practices and encounter similar obstacles that hinder the effective adoption of interactive, learner-centred teaching innovations. Additionally, the studies indicate that teachers should not be solely blamed for the limited incorporation of CLT-based innovations, as various contextual factors—including exam pressures, institutional limitations, and learner constraints—significantly contribute to this issue.

5. Implications

The study has important implications for all stakeholders, including education policymakers, curriculum developers, administrators, teachers, and teacher trainers. The effective participation of these stakeholders is essential for implementing innovations, with education policymakers and administrators playing vital roles. As initiators and managers of change, they establish the agenda for teachers and teacher educators. Implementing large-scale change requires learning for both implementers and policymakers (Wedell & Malderez, 2013). Thus, consistent engagement among all stakeholders—policymakers, curriculum developers, administrators, teachers, and teacher trainers—is crucial. This interaction enables policymakers to learn from the experiences and gain “awareness of existing cultural and material realities” (Grassick & Wedell, 2018, p. 266). It also “develop[s] the sense of stakeholder involvement in, understanding of, and perhaps even commitment to the change process” (Grassick & Wedell, 2018, p. 267), facilitating clarification of innovations, addressing implementation challenges, and successfully integrating those innovations. Therefore, it is advisable for change initiators and managers to maintain regular contact with implementers, gather their feedback, provide necessary support, and adjust strategies based on that feedback (Carless, 2001).

Additionally, this feedback can help understand teachers’ beliefs about prescribed innovative pedagogies and identify the training needed to equip them with the essential skills for effective implementation. In their study of an individual teacher’s CLT-based curricular innovations in Maharashtra, India, Padwad and Dixit (2018) found that multiple rounds of innovation-specific training helped deepen the teacher’s understanding and boost their confidence, leading to effective implementation and positive experiences associated with the innovation. Similarly, for innovations to be effectively realised in Pakistan, it is crucial to develop innovation-specific pre-service and in-service training programmes. Our recommendation is also in agreement with that of Khan (2025), who highlights a lack of harmony between ELE policy and teacher education and training programmes in Pakistan.

Similarly, developing an effective monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanism in government schools is essential in Pakistan. No such system existed previously (Aly, 2007; Jamil, 2009). The government has recently initiated a monitoring system in schools, but it only tracks teacher and student attendance. It does not include observing classroom lessons, assessing teachers’ pedagogical skills, or providing feedback for improvement. Classroom observations and constructive feedback are critical for implementing pedagogical policies and enhancing teachers’ skills. Furthermore, comprehensive records of these observations should be maintained to identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and to develop targeted training courses that address pedagogical shortcomings. Additionally, outstanding educators should become trainers and they should be encouraged to collaborate with their peers, such as through peer observations and feedback sessions, in order to more easily and effectively promote the implementation of innovative pedagogy via teamwork in the classroom. In this regard, a good example is found in Padwad and Dixit’s (2018) study, where teachers formed an English teachers’ club, which positively impacted their teaching and motivation to adopt necessary pedagogical changes. The lesson study approach should also be given serious consideration (see Arslan, 2019; Ustuk & De Costa, 2021 for examples of lesson study and reflective practice in action in other TESOL contexts). Certainly, this is not everything that needs to be done, but incorporating these

initiatives into the education system, along with other essential measures, will support the successful implementation of educational innovations.

6. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research

There are various limitations associated with this study, mainly due to time, logistical, and contextual constraints. However, these limitations suggest fruitful opportunities for future research. First, the study focuses solely on government schools, which educate 75% of Pakistani students (Ministry of Education, 2015). Besides these, Pakistan also has elite English-medium and private schools. Future research should incorporate these schools into their datasets to assess how and to what extent teachers in these institutions follow macro-level policies. Second, the study focused solely on the secondary level (grades 9-10). Examining other levels—primary (grades 1-5), elementary (grades 6-8), and higher secondary (grades 11-12)—is essential to understand how ELE reforms are applied across all educational stages. Third, the study included only male teachers; we were unable to secure permission to observe female teachers' lessons in girls' schools due to socio-cultural and religious reasons. Future research can explore female teachers' compliance with macro-level pedagogical policy. Fourth, this study did not include head teachers or teacher trainers. Future research could explore their perspectives on the factors influencing the implementation of pedagogical innovations in Pakistan. Additionally, future studies should evaluate Pakistan's teacher training programmes, focusing on how well they align with the pedagogy of the national curriculum and the messages they convey to teachers regarding textbook use and adaptation.

Appendix A: Description of the Pedagogical Principles

No.	Pedagogical principle	Description
1	Promoting the use of a communicative approach	The teacher engages students in various student-centred activities, such as pair and group work, that offer ample opportunities for learner-to-learner interaction and generate a significant amount of student talk time in the classroom.
2	Developing learners' English language skills and knowledge	The teacher primarily emphasises enhancing students' English language skills while also paying due attention to their English language knowledge. Furthermore, the teacher offers ample opportunities for students to practise their English language skills.
3	Encouraging learners' use of English for academic and social purposes	The teacher provides learners with sufficient opportunities for real-life-like use of English (in both spoken and written form) in class, which helps them develop their use of English for various academic and social purposes.
4	Materials adaptation	The teacher makes considerable adaptations (e.g., omission, editing, reordering, etc.) to the textbook based on the learners' needs.
5	Materials supplementation	In addition to using the textbook, the teacher makes substantial use of supplementary materials from sources other than the textbook.
6	Incorporating integrated language teaching	The teacher employs an integrated language teaching approach, that is, the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and subskills (vocabulary and grammar) are taught in an interconnected and holistic manner.
7	Encouraging collaborative learning	The teacher regularly involves learners in collaborative learning processes, including both teacher-learner and learner-learner interactions, such as peer correction and collaborative reading, writing, and grammar activities, in the class.
8	Fostering Learner autonomy	The teacher places responsibility on learners for their learning by consistently engaging them in independent and collaborative learning processes in the classroom. Additionally, the teacher takes into account learners' varying interests, abilities, and learning styles when assigning tasks in class.
9	Developing learners' higher-order cognitive skills	The teacher engages learners to utilise their higher-order cognitive skills [critical thinking and creative use of English (in either spoken or written modes or both)].
10	Promoting inductive pedagogy	The teacher regularly involves learners in inductive learning processes (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, etc.) and asks questions to elicit knowledge and answers from them, which helps them discover their own solutions by applying their previous knowledge. Furthermore, to assess learners' understanding, the teacher also asks concept check questions. The teacher doesn't provide quick solutions to learners and gives them enough wait time to engage with the task and answer the questions.
11	Judicious use of deductive pedagogy	The teacher does not make the class completely teacher-centred by explaining too much. However, whenever necessary, he employs explicit instruction methods, such as modelling, and allows learners to learn through practice.
12	Providing supportive facilitation and encouragement by the teacher	The teacher regularly encourages learners to engage with the tasks and assists them whenever they need support. The teacher appreciates learners for their correct answers, refrains from criticising them for their incorrect responses, and views learners' mistakes as a part of the learning process.
13	Reviewing learners' learning and progress	The teacher regularly reviews learners' learning and progress and utilises review exercises and activities to assess their understanding.
14	Setting and achieving learning objectives	The teacher clearly states the learning objectives (either from those provided in the unit or his own) at the beginning of the lesson. By the end of the lesson, the teacher successfully delivers a well-structured lesson and achieves most of the learning objectives.
15	Encouraging well-organised lesson planning	The teacher appears to have a well-organised lesson plan. He maintains a suitable lesson pace and allocates time appropriately to different stages of the lesson.

Appendix B: Identification of operational forms (full, partial, or near non-compliance) in the classroom observation schedule

No.	Pedagogical principle/ Operational feature	Operational form—A (Ideal form of pedagogical principle required to be implemented) (Score = 2)	Operational form—B (Some deviation from the ideal form) (Score = 1)	Operational form—C (Extreme deviation from the ideal form) (Score = Zero)
1	Promoting the use of a communicative approach	Teacher involves learners in various learner-centred activities (pair and group work) that provide sufficient learner-learner interaction opportunities and generate a large amount of student-talk- time in the class.	Teacher involves learners in a few learner-centred activities (pair or group work) that provide little learner-learner interaction opportunities and hence generate only a small amount of student-talk- time in the class.	Teacher doesn't involve learners in any learner-centred activity that consequently provides no opportunity for learner-learner interaction and student-talk- time in the class.
2	Developing learners' English language skills and knowledge	- Teacher primarily focuses on developing learners' English language skills and also pays due attention to developing their English language knowledge. - Teacher provides learners sufficient opportunities to practice their English language skills.	- Teacher primarily focuses on developing learners' English language knowledge and gives secondary importance to developing their English language skills. - Teacher provides learners some opportunities to practice their English language skills.	- Teacher focuses on developing learners' English language knowledge only and pays no or minimal attention to developing their English language skills. OR Teacher is neither concerned with developing learners' English language skills nor knowledge. - Teacher hardly provides learners any opportunity to practice their English language skills.
3	Encouraging learners' use of English for academic and social purposes	Teacher provides learners sufficient opportunities for real-life-like use of English (in both spoken and written form) in the class, which help them develop their use of English for various academic and social purposes.	Teacher provides learners some opportunities for real-life-like use of English (either in written or spoken or both) in the class, which provide them some opportunities to develop their use of English for various academic and social purposes.	Teacher hardly provides learners any opportunity for real-life-like use of English in the class, which consequently doesn't help them develop their use of English for various academic and social purposes.

4	Materials adaptation	Teacher makes considerable adaptations (e.g., omission, editing, reordering, etc.) in the textbook in accordance with the learners' needs.	Teacher makes some adaptations (e.g., omission, editing, reordering, etc.) in the textbook in accordance with the learners' needs.	Teacher makes no adaptation in the textbook, follows it as it is from one page to the next, and makes students work in the same order as is given in the book.
5	Materials supplementation	Along with using the textbook, teacher makes considerable use of supplementary materials from the sources other than the textbook.	Teacher mostly relies on the textbook, however some supplementation of materials from the sources other than the textbook is done.	Teacher uses only textbook as a teaching resource and hardly does any supplementation of materials from the sources other than the textbook.
6	Incorporating integrated language teaching	Teacher uses an integrated language teaching approach and connects one language skill /subskill to the other.	Teacher sometimes connects one skill/subskill to the other, however mostly teaches language skills /subskills individually.	Teacher teaches every language skill/subskill individually without integrating one language skill/subskill with the other.
7	Encouraging collaborative learning	Teacher regularly involves learners in teacher-learner and/or learner-learner collaborative learning processes (e.g., peer-correction, and doing reading, writing, grammar work, etc., collaboratively) in the class.	Teacher sometimes involves learners in teacher-learner and/or learner-learner collaborative learning processes (e.g., peer-correction, and doing reading, writing, grammar work, etc., collaboratively) in the class.	Teacher minimally involves learners in teacher-learner and learner-learner collaborative learning processes (e.g., peer-correction, and doing reading, writing, grammar work, etc., collaboratively) in the class.
8	Fostering Learner autonomy	- Teacher puts responsibility on learners for their learning by regularly involving them in independent and/or collaborative learning processes in the class. - Teacher regularly considers learners' differing interests, abilities, and learning styles while assigning them tasks in the class.	- Teacher mostly dominates the lesson and puts some responsibility on learners for their learning by providing them some opportunities for independent and/or collaborative work in the class. - Teacher sometimes considers learners' differing interests, abilities, and learning styles while assigning them tasks in the class.	- Teacher completely dominates the lesson, rarely involves learners in independent and collaborative work in the class, and hence doesn't put any responsibility on them for their learning. - Teacher doesn't pay any attention to learners' differing interests, abilities, and learning styles while assigning them tasks in the class.

9	Developing learners' higher order cognitive skills	Teacher involves learners to make use of their higher order cognitive skills [critical thinking and creative use of English (in either spoken or written or both)].	Teacher sometimes involves learners to make use of their higher order cognitive skills [critical thinking and creative use of English (in either spoken or written or both)].	Teacher hardly involves learners to make use of their higher order cognitive skills [critical thinking and creative use of English].
10	Promoting the use of inductive pedagogy	- Teacher regularly involves learners in inductive learning processes (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, etc.) and asks questions to elicit knowledge and answers from them, which make them find out their own solutions by applying their previous knowledge. Further, to assess learners' understanding, teacher asks concept check questions also. - Teacher doesn't provide quick solutions to learners and gives them enough wait time to get on with the task and answer the questions.	- Teacher sometimes involves learners in inductive learning processes (e.g., inquiry-based learning, problem-solving, etc.) and asks some questions (when he could have asked more) to elicit answers from learners to explore their prior knowledge. Teacher sometimes asks concept check questions to assess learners' understanding. - Teacher sometimes hastens to provide quick solutions to learners without giving them enough wait time to get on with the task and answer the questions.	- Teacher makes no or minimal use of inductive learning processes (e.g., self-discovery and inquiry-based learning) and makes no or minimal use of questions to elicit answers from learners and explore their prior knowledge. Further, teacher asks no or only a few concept check questions to assess learners' understanding. - Teacher provides answers/ solutions to learners without making them participate in the learning process inductively.
11	Judicious use of deductive pedagogy	Teacher does not make class completely teacher-centred by explaining too much. However, whenever necessary, he/she uses explicit instruction methods, e.g., modelling, and makes learners learn via practice.	Teacher sometimes explains too much, uses more than the required use of explicit instruction methods, and provides either more or less than required practice opportunities to learners.	Teacher uses only explicit instruction methods, explains too much, and provides either too much or very limited practice opportunities to learners.
12	Providing supportive facilitation and encouragement to learners	Teacher regularly encourages learners to get on with the tasks and facilitates them whenever they need assistance.	Teacher sometimes encourages and facilitates learners to get on with the tasks.	Teacher doesn't encourage and facilitate learners to get on with the tasks.

		Teacher appreciates learners for their correct answers, doesn't criticise them for their wrong answers, and takes learners' mistakes as a part of the learning process.		Teacher sometimes appreciates learners for their correct answers and sometimes criticises them for their wrong answers.		Teacher mostly discourages learners and criticises them for their wrong answers.	
13	Reviewing learners' learning and progress	Teacher regularly reviews learners' learning and progress, and also uses review exercises/activities to assess their learning and progress.		Teacher sometimes reviews learners' learning and progress, and also sometimes uses review exercises/activities to assess their learning and progress.		Teacher occasionally reviews learners' learning and progress, and also hardly uses review exercises/activities to assess their learning and progress.	
14	Setting and achieving learning objectives	- Teacher states learning objectives (either from the ones given in the unit or his own) clearly in the beginning of the lesson. - He delivers a good lesson and achieves most of the learning objectives by the end of the lesson.		- Teacher does not state learning objectives clearly in the beginning of the lesson. - He delivers a satisfactory lesson and is moderately successful in what he aims to teach.		Teacher neither states learning objectives nor is successful in delivering a good lesson and achieving what he aims to teach.	
15	Encouraging well-organized lesson planning	Teacher seems to have a well-organised lesson plan. He maintains a good lesson pace and allocates time appropriately to different parts/stages of the lesson.		Teacher seems to have a moderately-organised lesson plan. Lesson pace and time allocated to different parts/stages of the lesson is not appropriate.		Teacher does not seem to have an organised lesson plan. Lesson pace is either too slow or too fast and the teacher fails to allocate time appropriately to different stages/parts of the lesson.	

Classroom observation schedule designed with reference to pedagogical principles recommended in the macro-level policy documents [Drawing on the observation schedules of English Language Institute (n.d.) and Huntley (2012)]

References

- Ali, T. (2017). Raising teachers' voices: an in-depth qualitative inquiry into teachers' working conditions and professional development needs in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, a province of Pakistan. *Teacher Development*, 22(1), 1-28.
- Aljasir, N. (2024). Implementing task-based language teaching in Saudi EFL classrooms: An analysis of teacher beliefs and practices. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development*, 7(1), 1-21.
- Al Nahar, A., Hira, F. K., & Milon, M. R. K. (2024). From policy to practice: Evaluating the implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in Bangladeshi primary schools. *ICRRD Journal*, 5(3), 125-138.
- Aly, J. H. (2007). *The white paper*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan.
- Arslan, F.Y. (2019). The role of lesson study in teacher learning and professional development of EFL teachers in Turkey: A case study. *TESOL Journal* 10: e409.
- Barwell, R., Bishop, K., Erduran, S., Halai, A., Iyamuremye, D., Nyabanyaba, T., Rizvi, N. F., Roderiques, S. Rubagiga, J., & Uworwabaeho, J. (2007). *Implementing curriculum change: Literature reviews—South Africa, Rwanda and Pakistan*. EdQual working paper Retrieved from https://www.edqual.org/publications/workingpaper/edqualwp6.pdf/at_download/file.pdf
- Bengali, K. (1999). *History of educational policy making and planning in Pakistan*. Working paper series # 40. Sustainable Development Policy Institute.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Carless, D. (2001). A case study of curriculum implementation in Hong Kong. In D. R. Hall, & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 263-274). Routledge.
- Carless, D. (2003). Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools. *System*, 31(4), 485-500.
- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 639-662.
- Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *System*, 35(4), 595-608.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in Education* (8th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cowie, N. (2009). Observation. In J. Heigham, & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in Applied Linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 165-181). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Denscombe, M. (2017). *The good research guide for small-scale Social Science projects* (6th ed.): Open University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- English Language Institute (n.d). *Classroom observation evaluation criteria*. English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Routledge Falmer.
- Gass, S., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Grassick, L., & Wedell, M. (2018). Temporal dissonance, contextual confusion and risk: Learning from the experiences of teachers living with curriculum change. In M. Wedell, & L. Grassick (Eds.), *International perspectives on teachers living with curriculum change* (pp. 247-270). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haidar, S. (2019). Access to English in Pakistan: Inculcating prestige and leadership through instruction in elite schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(7), 833-848.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2016). Appropriate methodology: towards a cosmopolitan approach. In G. Hall (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 265-77). Routledge.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (1991). *Muslims and Science: Religious orthodoxy and the struggle for rationality*. Vanguard.
- Huntley, M. A. (2012). Using concerns-based adoption model theory to develop tools to examine variations in mathematics textbook implementation. In D. J. Heck, K. B. Chval, I. R. Weiss, & S. W. Ziebarth (Eds.), *Approaches to studying the enacted mathematics curriculum* (pp. 47-66). Information Age Publishing.
- Hyland, K., & Wong, L. L. C. (2013). Introduction: innovation and implementation of change. In K. Hyland, & L. L. C. Wong (Eds.), *Innovation and change in English language education* (pp. 1-10). Routledge.
- Jamil, B. R. (2009). Curriculum reforms in Pakistan – A glass half full or half empty? *Conference presentation: School Curriculum Policies and Practices in South Asia Countries*, Delhi, India. Retrieved from <http://www.itacec.org/document/nep09/NCERT%20Pakistan%20paper%20BRJ.pdf>
- Johnson, S., Monk, M., & Swain, J. (2000). Constraints on development and change to science teachers' practices in Egyptian classrooms. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26(1), 9–24.
- Kanu, Y. (1996). Educating teachers for the improvement of the quality of basic education in developing countries. *International Journal for Educational Development*, 16(2), 173-184.
- Karavas-Douksa, K. (1998). Evaluating the implementation of educational innovations: Lessons from the past. In P. Rea-Dickens, & K. P. Germaine. *managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges* (pp. 25-50). Longman.
- Karim, S. (2019). Investigating the pedagogical principles recommended to carry out English language education in Pakistan: an evaluation of the national curriculum for English language. Paper presented at The Future of Education (Edition 9) Conference, Florence, Italy.
- Karim, S. (2020). Investigating alignment between pedagogic policy and practice: An English language programme evaluation at secondary level in Pakistan (Unpublished doctoral thesis). United Kingdom: University of Sheffield.
- Kennedy, C. (1996). *MA TEFL/TESL open learning programme: ELT management*. University of Birmingham: Centre for English Language Studies.
- Kennedy, C. (2013). Models of change and innovation. In K. Hyland, & L. L. C. Wong (Eds.), *Innovation and change in English language education* (pp. 13-27). Routledge.
- Khan, M. R. (2025). *Investigating alignment between English language teaching policy and teacher education and training: An evaluation of English language education programme in Pakistan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of English, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.
- Kirkgöz, Y. (2008). A case study of teachers' implementation of curriculum innovation in English language teaching in Turkish primary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), 1859-1875.
- Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 199-212.

- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: Emerging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Leirvik, O. (2008). Religion in school, interreligious relations and citizenship: The case of Pakistan. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 30(2), 143-154.
- Levitt, K. (2001). An analysis of elementary teachers' beliefs regarding the teaching and learning of science. *Science Education*, 86(1), 1-22.
- Li, D. (1998). "It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Li, D. (2001). Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. In D. R. Hall, & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp. 149-166). Routledge.
- Lingard, B., & Ali, S. (2009) Contextualising education in Pakistan, a white paper: global/national articulations in education policy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(3), 237-256.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Malik, R. Z., Dar, F., & Bashir, Z. (2018). *English 9*. Punjab Curriculum and Textbook Board.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Ministry of Education. (2004). *Education sector reforms action plan 2001-2005*. Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan.
- Ministry of Education. (2006). *National curriculum for English language grade I-XII*. Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan.
- Ministry of Education. (2015). *Pakistan education for all: Review report 2015*. Government of Pakistan.
- Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. (2016). *Pakistan education statistics 2014-15*. Government of Pakistan.
- Mitchell, J., Humayun, S., & Muzaffat, I. (2005). Education reforms in Pakistan: Demand generation as an alternative recipe. In R. M. Hathaway, *Education reform in Pakistan: Building for the future* (pp. 107-122). Woodrow Wilson International College for Scholars.
- Nazir, M. (2010). Democracy and education in Pakistan. *Educational Review*, 62(3), 329- 342.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Orafi, S. M. S., & Borg, S. (2009). Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform. *System*, 37(2), 243-253.
- O'Sullivan, M. (2004). The reconceptualisation of learner-centred approaches: a Namibian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(6), 585-602.
- Padwad, A., & Dixit, K. (2018). Coping with curriculum change with limited support: An Indian English teacher's perspective. In M. Wedell, & L. Grassick (Eds.), *International perspectives on teachers living with curriculum change* (pp. 103-124). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parish, R., & Arrends, R. (1983). Why innovative programmes are discontinued. *Educational Leadership*, 40(4), 62-65.
- Rahman, T. (1999). *Language, education and culture*. Oxford University Press.

- Roof, D. J. (2015). Problems of common interest: The shaping of education in Pakistan, 1970-2014. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 9(1), 35-51.
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., & Briggs Baffoe-Djann, J. (2020). *Data collection methods in Applied Linguistics*. Bloomsbury.
- Rozsahegyi, T. (2019). Observations. In M. Lambert (Ed.), *Practical research methods in Education: An early researcher's critical guide* (pp. 23-34). Routledge.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Shamim, F. (1993). *Teacher-learner behaviour and classroom processes in large ESL classes in Pakistan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Leeds, UK.
- Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(3), 235-249.
- Siddiqui, S. (2016). *Education policies in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, L., & Southerland, S. (2007). Reforming practice or modifying reforms? Elementary teachers' response to the tools of reform. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(3), 396-423.
- Trang, B. (2021). Adoption of task-based language teaching at a primary school in Vietnam: A case study. *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 13(2), 1-11.
- Ustuk, O. & De Costa, P.I. (2021). Reflection as meta-action: Lesson study and EFL teacher professional development. *TESOL Journal* 12:e531.
- Waters, A. (2009). Managing innovation in English language education. *Language Teaching*, 42(4), 421-458.
- Waters, A., & Vilches, M. L. C. (2005). Managing innovation in language education: a course for ELT change agents. *RELC Journal*, 36(2), 117-136.
- Waters, A., & Vilches, M. L. C. (2008). Factors affecting ELT reforms: the case of the Philippines basic education curriculum. *RELC Journal*, 39(1), 5-24.
- Wedell, M. (2003). Giving TESOL change a chance: supporting key players in the curriculum change process. *System*, 31(4), 439-456.
- Wedell, M. (2009). *Planning for educational change: Putting people and their context first*. Continuum.
- Wedell, M., & Grassick, L. (Eds.) (2018). *International perspectives on teachers living with curriculum change*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wedell, M., & Malderez, A. (2013). *Understanding language classroom contexts*. Bloomsbury.
- Zheng, X., & Borg, S. (2014). Task-based learning and teaching in China: Secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(2), 205-221.