



## Perceptions of ELT Teachers about B.Ed. English Language Curriculum Regarding the Development of Students' Speaking & Writing Skills

Neelofar Shaikh PhD. Scholar, Department of Education, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science and Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.  
Email: [gul.neelofarshaikh@gmail.com](mailto:gul.neelofarshaikh@gmail.com) (Corresponding Author)

S. Khurram Khan Alwi Associate Professor, Department of Education, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science and Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan.

**Abstract:** *Effective communication in the English language is important for the academic, professional and social needs of B.Ed. students/pre-service teachers. Previous research had inferred that B.Ed. students felt difficulty in communication for which methods and modules were suggested; however, the curriculum has not been evaluated for its effectiveness. The present study has explored ELT teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of the B.Ed. (Hons) 4 year curriculum's (2012) two English core courses regarding students' speaking and writing skills in public universities and colleges of Sindh, Pakistan, using Stufflebeam's CIPP model. The data was collected from four purposively selected samples through focus group discussion (FGD) and analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed that the curriculum needs revision through the inclusion of objectives, an evaluation scheme and a balanced focus on language skills. The identified challenges and issues were students' weak language learning background, lack of teachers' training, lack of time and lack of infrastructure.*

**Key Words:** B.Ed. English Language Curriculum, B.Ed. Students, Effective Communication, Preservice Teachers, Speaking Skills, Writing Skills

### Introduction

English language proficiency is needed in the present era for its' international status ([Abbas et al., 2018](#)) and its importance in education ([Isadaud et al., 2022](#)). Effective communication with proficiency in the English language is essential to determine an individual's professional and economic growth due to the globalization of the English language (Anidi, 2018; Le, 2016). Effective spoken and written communication in the English language is important for pre-service teachers as it is indispensable for their academic, professional and social needs. The Curriculum of Education of Pakistan for B.Ed. (Hons.) Elementary (2012) aims to develop English language proficiency and confidence among pre-service

teachers to use language skills ([HEC, 2012, 39](#)) and to develop effective communication and presentation skills with language proficiency among the pre-service teachers ([HEC, 2012, p.88](#)).

Pre-service training of teachers is important to initialize the professionalization of teaching. Therefore, its evaluation is important for quality improvement (Demir, 2015). Accurate and fluent use and maintenance of the target language in the classroom are some essential competencies for language teachers but many teacher training programs lack target language proficiency development ([Richards, 2010](#)). Pre-service teachers' lack of language mastery, particularly in speaking skills, affects their self-respect,

**Citation:** Shaikh, N., & Alwi, K. K. S. (2022). Perceptions of ELT Teachers about B.Ed. English Language Curriculum Regarding the Development of Students' Speaking & Writing Skills. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VII(II), 229-241. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022\(VII-II\).22](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022(VII-II).22)

confidence, future classroom teaching, and professional position (Cullen, 1994, as cited in [Gan, 2012](#)). Teachers' effective communication skills play a pivotal role in achieving the academic success of their students ([Khan et al. 2017](#)). The demand for accountability in education is increasing with the passage of time, in particular, the teaching of second and foreign languages which needs to investigate the effectiveness of course design ([Michael, 2005, p.1](#)). Effectiveness of core courses in the B.Ed. English language curriculum is essential to determine whether these courses are helping to develop language skills of students for written and oral communication as programs for teacher education are supposed to offer proper courses with the proper and balanced alignment of theory and practice ([Rashid et al., 2019](#)).

The development of spoken and written communication skills among students interrelates three aspects, i.e. curriculum planning, instruction, and outcomes (Su, 2012). Supporting the notion, Yasmeen et al. (2018) confirm that language proficiency is affected by improper syllabus, inadequate teaching practices, and the use of improper teaching approaches. The existing relevant research has focused the aspects such as the roles of teachers and managers in English language curriculum implementation ([Waseem & Kazmi, 2019](#)), the suggestion of a teaching method for Functional English course using action research for students' practical use of English ([Moghal & Kazi, 2019](#)), and grammatical problems of B.Ed. students in a public university ([Ahmed et al., 2020](#)). The researches show that students' performance is not satisfactory and the curriculum faces challenges in implementation. When there are unsatisfactory performance and curriculum implementation challenges, then analysis and revision of the curriculum are essential for its improvement (Butler 2004, cited in [Hwang & Kim, 2019](#)).

[Ulla and Winitkun \(2017\)](#) advocate that students' achievement is connected to curriculum and instruction; therefore, useful learning experiences are necessary to be

included in the curriculum to boost English language learning. Ulla and Winitkun argued that the curriculum must be assessed regarding students' linguistic needs and the development of English language skills. The existing literature indicated a knowledge gap that the existing B.Ed. English Language Curriculum of Pakistan (2012) has not been evaluated regarding the development of B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication using the opinions and lived experiences of ELT teachers of public universities and colleges who teach B.Ed. core courses. [Ellili-Cherif & Hadba \(2016\)](#) advocate that teachers' participation in curriculum development increases the effectiveness of the curriculum. In addition, teachers' perspectives are important to explore the curriculum's effectiveness as teachers are actual practitioners, implementers and evaluators of the curriculum ([Darama et al., 2018](#)).

The present study aims at filling up a knowledge gap for the purpose of curriculum improvement through exploration of ELT teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of the present B.Ed. English language curriculum (2012) about its strengths and weaknesses regarding the development of B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication.

---

## Research Question

What are ELT teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of the B.Ed. English language curriculum regarding the development of B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication?

---

## Review of Literature

---

### Definitions of Curriculum

The curriculum is a multifarious term in respect of purpose, dimension, and level which can be constructed, negotiated and renegotiated ([Goodson, 1994, p.111](#)). It is a faculty produced artefact for an institution's students and its essential aspects for its design are "faculty responsibility, specialized knowledge, intended outcomes, negotiated relationships,

and learning plan” ([Toombs and Tierney, 1993](#)). The curriculum is the selection process for courses or content (Beuchamp, 1977) offered by an institution for students (Wood and Davis, 1978, p.16). A curriculum is a teaching or instructional plan (Tom, 1984, p.89) for a sustainable teaching-learning process (Pratt, 1994, p.5). A curriculum is a documented course outline of a program (Brady, 1995) for officially published funded projects (Barrow and Milburn, 1990, p.84). The curriculum is an amalgamated set of plans for students' inside and outside classroom learning experiences and activities through the provision of school guidance ([Marsh, 1997, p.5](#)). It can be inferred that curriculum is a multifarious term as it is an official written document, set of objectives, course or content selection process, instructional/ teaching plan, and a program focusing inside and outside classroom learning experiences for students.

### **Curriculum Evaluation**

---

Curriculum documents can be evaluated time by time to ensure their effectiveness as curriculum evaluation is an instrument which helps to investigate a curriculum's effectiveness regarding the achievement of the planned goals using decisions of the stakeholders who actually apply the curriculum in the field (Usun, 2008). The purpose of the investigation is to identify the weaknesses of the curriculum with the intention to develop a renewed and improved curriculum and to ensure the verification of its success (Rosenbusch, 1991 as cited in [Darama et al., 2018](#)).

### **Context, Input, Process, and Output (CIPP) Model**

---

The CIPP model was proposed by Stufflebeam in 1971. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) advocate that the CIPP model is a comprehensive framework used to systematically review and assess organizations, staff, projects such as educational projects, products, and systems of evaluation in a formative and summative manner. CIPP model can be used to evaluate Bachelors and Masters level programs ([Allahviridiyani, 2011](#)) and it is

one of the extensively used models for the evaluation of curriculum ([Vishnupriyan, 2017](#)).

The present study has employed Stufflebeam's CIPP Model (1971) to evaluate the existing B.Ed. English language curriculum with a special focus on the development of B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication. This model has been used in many ESL/EFL curriculum studies focusing on learners' communication, such as [Darama et al. \(2018\)](#), who employed a semi-structured interview technique to explore the curriculum effectiveness from the teachers' perspectives for the reason that they are practitioners, implementers and evaluators of the curriculum.

The components of the CIPP model assist the evaluators using four dimensions:

#### **Context Evaluation**

---

Context evaluation focuses on whether the objectives address the needs.

#### **Input Evaluation**

---

Input evaluation focuses on the strategies and the procedures supposed to achieve the required outcomes.

#### **Process Evaluation**

---

Process evaluation focuses on the difficulties and the feedback on changes for improvement and evaluates other decisions.

#### **Product Evaluation**

---

Product evaluation focuses on the achievement of required outcomes through the curriculum.

The evaluation concept of the CIPP Model is that the evaluations must focus on the assessment and reporting of an entity's quality, its worth to meet the target audience's needs, its probity, i.e. integrity and freedom from fraudulence, its significance beyond the time frame and setting, and presence of learned lessons (Stufflebeam (2007) as cited in [Vishnupriyan, 2017](#)).

## Components/Elements of Curriculum

Curriculum elements/ components are determinants of its productivity, for which their exploration is essential to be done prior to, during and after implementation of the program (Zohrabi, 2011). There are various curriculum models with different components. Taba's (1962) curriculum formulation relies on need diagnoses, objectives formulation, content selection, content organization, learning experience selection, learning experience organization and evaluation. Nunan (1988) advocates the analysis of needs, identification of goals, objectives, materials, activities, mode of learning and learning environment, and evaluation as curriculum's elements. Brown (1995) proposed to need analysis, objectives and goals, test construction, and evaluation as elements of the curriculum. Richards (2001) argues that need analysis, situation analysis, planning learning outcomes, course organization, selecting and preparing teaching materials, providing for effective teaching, and evaluation as curriculum elements. The four models i.e. Taba (1962), Nunan (1988), Brown (1995) and Richards (2001), include a need analysis and evaluation in common. Regarding goals and objectives, the three models (Taba, 1962; Nunan, 1988; Brown, 1995) are similar. The element planning learning outcomes in Richards' (2001) model somehow serves the same purpose as that of goals and objectives. Taba's (1962) content selection and organization matches approximately to course organization in Richards' (2001), Nunan's (1988), Brown's (1995) and Richards' (2001) models have similarities in material development/selection. More or less, Taba's (1962) learning experience selection and learning experience organization match to activities in Nunan (1988), Brown (1995) and Richards (2001) have the element of teaching in common. Learning mode and environment in Nunan (1988) somehow match to situation analysis in Richards' (2001) model. Testing is mentioned only in Brown's (1995) model.

The models' summary explains that need analysis, goals/objectives/outcomes, selection

and organization, of course, material development, selection of activities, effective teaching, learning environment and resources, and evaluation can be considered as components for curriculum development. Moreover, Scott (2001) mentions that the Curriculum Theory proposes four major dimensions of curriculum i.e. Aims/ Objectives, Content/ Subject Matter, Methods/ Procedures, and Assessment/ Evaluation (p. 3195-96).

## Speaking Skills

Speaking is the skill required to acquire foreign language competence (Kurum, 2016). According to Chaney and Burk (1998), speaking is a process that intends to build and share meaning in various contexts by using symbols that can be verbal or non-verbal (p.13). Speaking is a dual way process to communicate information, feelings and ideas properly (Howarth, 2001, as cited in Torkey, 2006). Most of the language learners face difficulty in speaking (Bueno et al., 2006, as cited in Rao, 2019, p.8) for the reason that usually, in real life situations, speakers and listeners have less time for planning and production for what to say and how to understand respectively. Speaking is a complete process for the production of utterances with meaning construction, receiving and processing information (Brown, 1994) confidently (Bygate, 1987 as cited in Ashour, 2014). Speaking is a skill which is not limited to grammatical accuracy but includes function, mechanics, pragmatics, and social interactions (Kurum, 2016).

## Writing Skills

Boals (2012) defines writing as a meaning-making process through interrelated textual activities to convert ideas into sentences. Writing is the activity for finding and expressing ideas through words' arrangement for making statements and paragraphs for the purpose of clear communication (Nunan, 2003, p.88). Writing activity involves the writer's mental process for expression of ideas through planning, writing, modifying and editing the

text till the finalization of a written product ([Harmer, 2004](#), p.8). Presenting a realistic perspective about writing, [Langan \(2013\)](#) expounds that 'Writing is a skill, not a natural gift'. (p.13). Starkey (2004) argues that an effective piece of writing requires the writer to consider the language, diction, proper organization, clarity and coherence. Writing is a source of communication. A clear conception about the transmitted knowledge is essential for effective written communication (Byrne, 1993, as cited in [Yusuf et al., 2019](#)).

### Effective Communication

Effective communication is a process of clear, correct, complete, precise and reliable exchange of thoughts, ideas, and information, and views between speaker/sender and listener/receiver, with consideration of audience and purpose ([Prachi, 2018](#)). The ability to effective communication in speech and writing is on demand and highly regarded as an ability ([Johnson, 2001](#), as cited in Diaz, 2011). Communication is a learning source which aims learning of course content and achievement of behavioral objectives through the provision of communicative opportunities for learning e.g. discussions, group work, and speaking in public (Palmerton.1988, as cited in [Morello, 2014](#)).

### Theoretical Background of the Study

The study employs two theories as a theoretical background, i.e. Hilda Taba's (1962) theory and Lev [Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory \(1978\)](#). The present study involves teachers in curriculum evaluation which is favored by Taba's (1962) theory as it is based on an inductive approach which proposes the involvement of actual teacher practitioners in the curriculum development process. [Ellili-Cherif & Hadba \(2016\)](#) advocate that teachers' participation in the curriculum development process can help in increasing the effectiveness of the curriculum. Teachers' roles are of '*change agents*' in the process of curriculum development as they observe and evaluate the changes in students' needs during the formulation of practice which is required to be

inducted into the curriculum to fulfil those required changes ([Nyamai, 2020](#)).

Socio-Cultural Theory by [Vygotsky \(1978\)](#) for second language learning is also applicable to the present study as [Johnson \(2009\)](#) advocates that sociocultural perspective is related to content as well as the process of Second Language Teacher Education. Vygotsky's approach has an advantage over other approaches in that it links theory with practice through an explanation of the learning process' mechanism in actual sociocultural contexts and it also focuses the follow-up support to sustain the effectiveness of teacher education (Shabani, 2016). The Sociocultural Theory best suits the present study as it lenses the phenomenon of the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication in English as a second language in the context of undergraduate teacher education as a social process. Moreover, the philosophy of social constructivism is prevalent in the theory in which social interactions act as language development agents. Furthermore, reciprocal teaching, collaborative learning through the use of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding technique are the main propositions of the Vygotskian theory which stress language use. A curriculum can be termed as '*eclectic curriculum*' when it integrates '*basics*' with functions and purposes of language for '*social use*' can be termed as ([Gardner, 2017](#)).

### Methodology

In the present study, ELT teachers' opinions about the effectiveness of the curriculum in developing B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication have been extracted from their opinions and lived experiences to explore the phenomenon as this kind of essence extraction is the aim of phenomenology (Teherani et al. 2015). The data was collected through Focus Group Discussion (FGD) as this technique extracts opinions and perspectives of a focused group to measure the service or product with respect to the population's needs ([Mack, et al., 2005](#)). It

is necessary to mention that the study has selected two core courses English-I and English-II only because the 'Curriculum of Education' by [HEC \(2012\)](#) has provided the syllabus and course guides for these courses and for English-III the same has not been provided.

The study has employed the purposive sampling technique to select only those male and female teachers who have at least Masters degree in English with at least five years' experience of teaching either or both of the two compulsory courses, i.e. English-I 'Functional English' and English-II 'Communication Skills' at B.Ed. (Hons.) Elementary level in public universities and colleges of Sindh, Pakistan. [Mack et al. \(2005\)](#) confirm that purposive sampling is suitable when selection criteria are predefined (p.5). The data was collected through four focuses including 5 participants per group. FGD1 and FGD2 utilized public university teachers' perspectives, while FGD3 and FGD4 utilized public college teachers' perspectives. The study did not allow more FGDs due to achievement of the data saturation as [Fusch & Ness \(2015\)](#) suggest that data saturation is obtained in a study when it yields enough new and additional information that can be replicated and when there is no feasibility for further coding. The study used online FGDs as these are an adaptation of the traditional methods through internet usage ([Nyumba et al., 2017](#)). The Zoom app was used for online discussion as this app is appropriate for convenient, easy and secure use due to interactive features such as screen sharing, video recording etc. ([Archibald et al., 2019](#)).

The study used the CIPP model as a base for curriculum evaluation as the same model was used by Darama et al. to evaluate the fifth grade English language curriculum for communication purposes from the teacher's perspective. Keeping in view the CIPP model, the data collection tool for the present study was comprised of five questions: 1 for context evaluation, 1 for input evaluation, 2 for process evaluation, 1 for product evaluation. The tool was an adapted and modified version of the interview questions from Do Le and Tran

(2021) as their study was related to the evaluation of the English language training curriculum at the university level and mainly addressed 5 components of the curriculum, i.e. content, methodology, materials, objectives, and assessment. The tool was modified as per the expert's advice, after which it was pilot tested and found helpful to achieve the objective of the present study.

Thematic analysis has been employed for focus group discussion analysis as it helps to get a rich description of information (Braun & Clarke, 2012, p.58). The study followed the guided steps for thematic analysis by Braun & Clarke (2012), i.e. data familiarization, coding, themes' generation, themes' revision, themes' naming and definition, and write up. The trustworthiness of qualitative data has been ensured through guidelines by Lincoln and Guba (1985, 2000). Ethical considerations, such as official permissions and informants' consent, have been obtained for data collection. Informants' confidentiality and anonymity have been ensured through pseudonyms and coding.

## Findings

### Context Evaluation

The context section aimed to extract the ELT teachers' perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum with reference to the aims, objectives and outcomes of the core courses in the curriculum regarding the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication. The first question of the focus group discussions was that "What is your opinion about the aims, objectives, and outcomes of the present curriculum regarding the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication? The responses of the focus groups revealed some strengths and a few weaknesses in the curriculum.

### Strengths

#### Need-specific Aims

All of the focus groups pointed out that the aims of the curriculum specify students' needs.

Referring to 'course description', a participant from FGD4 commented that *'Proficiency in English language and development of language skills are some of the aims of the compulsory English courses.* Moreover, all the focus groups opined that social use of language such as interaction and communication in the English language are also the aimed in the curriculum.

### **Need-based Course Learning Outcomes**

FGD1 and FGD3 were of the view that the course learning outcomes cater to students' needs for communication in speech and writing in the English language. The focus groups pointed out that the course learning outcomes present knowledge based outcomes and skill based outcomes to develop students' speaking and writing skills. The Focus groups have similar views that the English language core courses aimed at students' oral and written skills for communication in the English language. A participant of FGD2 mentioned that *'Students need confidence, vocabulary, grammar and language skills to communicate which are included in the course outcomes'.*

### **Weaknesses**

#### **Unavailability of Objectives**

All of the four focus groups were of the view that the curriculum does not contain any heading with the word 'Objectives'. The groups have similarities on the point that there should be the provision of clear general and specific objectives in the curriculum to facilitate teachers and students to use the curriculum effectively as a participant of FGD4 opined that *'Clear and specific objectives provide necessary guidance to teachers and students'.*

### **Input Evaluation**

The Input section aimed to extract the participants' views about the 'content' or 'outline' of the core courses in the curriculum regarding the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication. For this purpose, the second question of the FGDs was that "What is your opinion about the present curriculum's content

to develop students speaking and writing skills for effective communication?" The FGDs pointed out some strengths and a few weaknesses in the curriculum.

### **Strengths**

#### **Focus on Accuracy and Fluency**

The FGDs were of the view that the curriculum content focuses B.Ed. students' speaking and writing skills for communication as they opined that the topics mentioned in the course outlines focus on accuracy and fluency in speech and writing. One of the participants from FGD3 exemplified as *'The topics such as oral presentations, public speaking, announcements etc. is written in course outline of English-II'.* In terms of writing skills, participants from FGD4 exemplified that *'Syllabus contains sentence formation, paragraphing etc.'* Participants of FGD3 were of the view that the curriculum has more focus on accuracy than fluency in writing.

#### **Focus on Audience and Purpose**

It was revealed in the discussions that the course outlines include the audience specific and purpose oriented topics. FGD1's participant said: *'English-I includes speaking topics introductions, social interactions such as greetings and invitations etc.'* In terms of writing skills, FGD4's participant opined: *'Paragraph writing, letter writing, report writing show use of texts for different audience and purposes'.* Participants of FGD2 commented: *'Writing different texts such as argumentative and persuasive texts are included in course contents'.*

### **Weaknesses**

#### **Improper Focus on Language Skills**

All of the FGDs opined that the development of receptive skills (reading and listening) are important for the development of productive skills (writing and speaking). Most of the teachers had a viewpoint that a good focus on the listening and reading skills helps to enhance the speaking and writing skills of the learners in English as a second language. The teachers confirmed that although the

curriculum content includes the topics which require listening and reading practice but in fact the reading skills in general and listening skills in particular have been less focused on in the curriculum which affects the development of writing and speaking skills of students. FGD4s' participant commented: *'Listening is the most ignored skill'*.

## Process Evaluation

---

The process section aimed to extract the participants' perspectives about the suggested 'methodology' through question No. 3 and about the prescribed 'materials and resources' through question No.4 regarding the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication. In response to the third question, i.e. "What is your opinion about the teaching methodology recommended in the curriculum for the development of students' speaking and writing skills?" teachers shared some strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum.

## Strengths

---

### Collaborative and Cooperative Learning Strategies

---

All of the FGDs opined that the curriculum recommends collaborative and cooperative learning strategies such as pair and group work which are helpful in the development of students' speaking and writing skills. Moreover, the participants of FGD2 and FGD4 opined that these strategies demand trained and competent teachers to use these strategies in the classroom.

## Weaknesses

---

### Prohibition of Native Language

---

All of the FGDs opined that code-switching is prohibited in the B.Ed. English language courses. Their participants informed that sometimes, English and Urdu both the languages are used in the English language classrooms. An FGD1 participant explained: *'Teachers bother to use national or native language to make clear the concepts and ideas of*

*the students about the topics'*. An FGD3 participant argued: *'Code-switching cannot be avoided in our context, so it should be used in the second language teaching-learning process.'*

In response to the fourth question, i.e. "What is your opinion about the materials and resources prescribed in the curriculum for the development of students' speaking and writing skills?" the FGDs shared their perspectives about the strengths and weaknesses of the materials and resources.

## Strengths

---

### Authentic Materials

---

All of the FGDs opined that the materials suggested in the curriculum are authentic as they focus on language use. Exemplifying the point, an FGD2 participant said: *'Magazines, audio and video materials are useful for language learning.'* An FGD1 participant argued: *'The materials are useful but most of the materials are difficult to be arranged and it puts an extra physical and financial burden on teachers, especially if the teacher is untrained.'* The similarity of opinions among the FGDs at this point indicated that the teachers realize the usefulness of the prescribed materials to develop spoken and written communication skills among students, but the recommended materials might not be used practically in their classrooms.

## Resources

---

The FGDs shared their views about the prescribed resources, such as textbooks and online links which intend to enhance the speaking and writing skills of students. Regarding the use of the books, some of the participants from the four FGDs opined that they do not necessarily follow the recommended books. Some of the participants shared that they have found other books to better develop the speaking and writing skills of students. Moreover, some teachers showed their concerns that the given links could not sometimes open, due to which they could not utilize the resources properly.

## Weaknesses

---

### More Time Consuming Activities

---

All of the four FGDs have similar views that whatever activities and methodologies are provided in the curriculum cannot achieve the course targets in a single semester. A FGD2 participant commented: *'If we employ the suggested activities, we need one or two more semesters to complete each core course'*. This point reveals that syllabus completion might not be done properly due to time constraints in B.Ed. classes.

### Requirement of Highly Developed Infrastructure

---

All of the four FGDs have similar opinions that the suggested materials, activities and resources require highly developed infrastructure which is difficult to be managed most of the time. An FGD1 participant said: *'we're not highly developed in infrastructure such as we do not have well-equipped language labs to enhance oratory skills, and particularly the listening skills'*. An FGD3 participant said: *'There are no recommended books and textbooks available in our library'*. Some of the participants shared that uninterrupted power supplies, internet connectivity, interactive boards, and language laboratories are prerequisite to performing most of the speaking and writing activities and their unavailability or partial availability hurdles the conduction of the prescribed activities in the classroom.

### Product Evaluation

---

The fifth question of the discussion, "What are your opinions about the evaluation criteria suggested in the curriculum to assess students' speaking and writing skills?" had a focus on product evaluation. The participants shared their strengths and weaknesses about the evaluation criteria to gauge students' speaking and writing performances.

## Strengths

---

### Bimodal Evaluation

---

The participants of all the FGDs revealed that

the curriculum's grading policy advises the teachers to assess and evaluate their students' performances with the allocation of 50% marks for classroom assignments and 50% marks for mid-semester and end of semester examinations. FGD3 participant said: *'This reminds students to get their assignments completed carefully'*.

## Weaknesses

---

### Lack of Focus on Speaking Skills

---

All the FGDs shared their views about the lack of focus on skills other than writing, such as speaking, listening, and reading, regarding evaluation through mid-semester and end of the semester examinations. The majority of the participants in the FGDs demanded some proper criteria to evaluate all the skills rather than focusing only on the writing skills.

### Lack of Comprehensive Evaluation Scheme

---

The four FGDs shared their concerns regarding the lack of a comprehensive evaluation scheme in the curriculum such as types of questions and a questions-wise marking scheme. Moreover, some of the teachers opined that there are no instructions to evaluate skill demonstration and skill-wise marking in the curriculum.

## Discussion

---

The present study aimed to explore ELT teachers' perspectives regarding the effectiveness of present B.Ed. English language curriculum of Pakistan (2012) regarding the development of students' speaking and writing skills for effective communication to fill a knowledge gap in the existing literature. The findings showed similarities between the perspectives of the university teachers and college teachers' perceptions regarding the evaluation of the curriculum from the context, input, process and product dimensions.

The context dimension revealed that the curriculum aims and outcomes are need-specific for communication through speech and writing but the objectives are missing.

Objectives are important as identification of the learning objectives should be the foremost component of lesson planning as it guides what the learners will know or be able to do after learning ([Nodirovna & Temirovna, 2022, p.10](#)).

The input dimension divulged that the curriculum content includes the topics that boost oral and written communication but it lacks proper and balanced focus on all the four language skills which may cause less skill development for students. Proper focus and development of all the language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) is necessary as all these skills are important like a heart for a second language class ([Karataş & Tuncer, 2020, p.3](#)).

The process dimension discovered that the curriculum provides a methodology and a useful lesson planning through the course guides but it is difficult to implement for the teachers due to lack of time, lack of resources, lack of funding, lack of proper infrastructure, students' weak background and teachers' training. The difficulties that teachers are facing in curriculum implementation match to [Rashid et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Siddiqui et al. \(2021\)](#) in the context of B.Ed. program implementation challenges. Many of the planned activities in course guides require proper infrastructure which was mostly not available in the public universities and colleges such as facilitated building, library, furniture, textbooks, additional materials etc. It was revealed that fully equipped language labs are not available for B.Ed. students which affects the process. Language labs are helpful for listening and sound pronunciation, reduce the native language's influence, increasing learner motivation and participation, and help to develop communication skills through the provision of interactive learning environment ([Krishna, 2022](#)).

The product dimension revealed that the curriculum provides a grading policy for bimodal evaluation but it lacks a comprehensive evaluation scheme which may include types of questions, a questions-wise

marking scheme and evaluation criteria for skills' demonstration. The focus group discussions indicated curriculum revision through making improvements in the curriculum as design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the assessment methods determine the achievement of curriculum objectives and goals ([Islam et al., 2022](#)).

## Conclusion

---

The present study concludes that the present curriculum needs to be revised through the inclusion of objectives and a comprehensive evaluation scheme, proper and balanced focus on all the language skills in the content area and in evaluation criteria. Moreover, the useful lesson planning in the course guides is difficult to be implemented in public universities and colleges due to some contextual constraints such as students' language learning background, teachers' training, lack of time, lack of proper infrastructure such as fully equipped language laboratories.

## Practical Implications

---

The present study has practical implications, such as the curriculum designers can review the existing B.Ed. English Language Curriculum and make revisions to improve it for its effectiveness in developing students speaking and writing skills for effective communication in the English language.

## Limitations and Future Research

---

This study used a qualitative method for data collection, i.e. focus group discussions. Some quantitative methods such as surveys can also be employed. Furthermore, the study has explored teachers' perceptions about the curriculum, however, the exploration can also be done using students' perceptions. The data collection is limited to Sindh province, however, the data collected from other provinces can be done to add useful information and insights to the existing literature.

## References

- Abbas, F., Pervaiz, A., & Arshad, F. (2018). The competing status of Urdu and English after declaration of Urdu as official language in Pakistan. *Journal of Research(Urdu)*, 34(1), 142-158.
- Ahmed, G., Shah, S. S. A., & Nisar, M. (2020). Problems in Grammatical Structure: A Case Study of B.Ed. Students at the Education Department. *sjesr*, 3(2), 420-425. [https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss2-2020\(420-425\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss2-2020(420-425))
- Allahviridiyani, K. (2011). Evaluate Implemented Academic Advisor of Shahed Students in Tehran State Universities Through CIPP Evaluation Model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2996–2998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.229>
- Archibald, M. M., Ambagtsheer, R. C., Casey, M. G., & Lawless, M. (2019). Using Zoom Videoconferencing for Qualitative Data Collection: Perceptions and Experiences of Researchers and Participants. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919874596>
- Boals, A. (2012). The Use of Meaning Making in Expressive Writing: When Meaning is Beneficial. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 31(4), 393–409. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2012.31.4.393>
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach development*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Darama, E., Karaduman, F., Kahraman, K., & Gündoğdu, K. (2018). Evaluation of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade English Curriculum According to Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) Model. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 73-86.
- Díaz Larenas, C. (2011). Exploring knowledge of English speaking strategies in 8th and 12<sup>th</sup> graders. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 13(2), 85-98.
- Le, T. D., & Tran, T. N. T. (2021). English Language Training Curriculum: An Evaluation from Learner's Perceptions. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(03), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2021.93004>
- Ellili-Cherif, M., & Hadba, H. M. (2016). Fidelity to and satisfaction with prescribed curriculum in an Arab educational context: ESL teachers' perspective. *The Curriculum Journal*, 28(3), 367-388. DOI: [10.1080/09585176.2016.1240885](https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2016.1240885)
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408-1416. <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/OR/OR20/9/fusch1.pdf>
- Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 Speaking Problems: Implications for ESL Curriculum Development in a Teacher Training Institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n1.4>
- Gardner, P. D. (2017). Worlds Apart: A comparative analysis of discourses of English in the curricula of England and Australia. *English in Education*, 51(2), 170–187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eie.12138>
- Goodson, I. F. (1994). *Studying curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. England: Pearson Education.
- HEC. (2012). Curriculum of Education, B.Ed. (Hons.) Elementary & ADE (Associate Degree in Education), Higher Education Commission, Islamabad.
- Hwang, H., & Kim, H. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of EFL Students' Needs and Evaluation of English Curriculum: A Case Study from Korea. *English Teaching*, 74(4), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.74.4.201912.3>

- Islam, M. S., Hasan, M. K., Sultana, S., Karim, A., & Rahman, M. M. (2021). English language assessment in Bangladesh today: principles, practices, and problems. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00116-z>
- Isadaud, D., Fikri, M., & Bukhari, M. I. (2022). The Urgency Of English In The Curriculum In Indonesia To Prepare Human Resources For Global Competitiveness. *DIAJAR: Journal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.54259/diajar.v1i1.177>
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Karataş, T. Z., & Tuncer, H. (2020). Sustaining Language Skills Development of Pre-Service EFL Teachers despite the COVID-19 Interruption: A Case of Emergency Distance Education. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 8188. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198188>
- Khan, A., Khan, S., Zia-Ul-Islam, S., & Khan, M. (2017). Communication Skills of a Teacher and Its Role in the Development of the Students' Academic Success. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 18-21.
- Krishna, D. (2021). Importance of Language Laboratory in Developing Language Skills. *JURNAL ARBITRER*, 8(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.8.1.101-106.2021>
- KÜRÜM, E. Y. (2016). Teaching Speaking Skills. *AP Solak, Teaching Language skin prospective English Teachers*, 45-64.
- Langan, J. (2013). *College writing skills with readings*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- Mack, N., Woodson, C., MacQueen, K., Guest, G. & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. Fhi, North California, USA.
- Marsh, C. J. (ed.) (1997). *Perspectives: Key concepts for understanding curriculum 1*. London Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Michael, L. H. (2005). *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moghal, S. & Kazi, A. S. (2019). Teaching Functional English Through Tasks At The Undergraduate Level: An Action Research. [10.13140/RG.2.2.36481.61287](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36481.61287).
- Morello, J.T. (2000) Comparing speaking across the curriculum and writing across the curriculum programs, *Communication Education*, 49:1, 99113, DOI: [10.1080/03634520009379196](https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379196)
- Nyumba, T. O., Wilson, K., Derrick, C. J., & Mukherjee, N. (2017). The use of focus group discussion methodology: Insights from two decades of application in conservation. *Methods in Ecology and evolution*, 9(1), 20-32.
- Nodirovna, N. N., & Temirovna, P. M. (2022). Principles of designing lesson plans for teaching ESL or EFL. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 5, 10-12.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NYAMAI, D. V. (2020). *Teachers'influence In Curriculum Development In Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University Of South Wales).
- Porter, A. (2004). *Curriculum assessment. Complementary Methods for Research in Education.*: Washington DC: AERA.
- Prachi, M. (2018). What is Effective Communication? <https://theinvestorsbook.com/effective-communication.html>
- Rashid, S., Rasool, S., & Hussain, S. (2019). Effectiveness of Four years Teacher Education program B. Ed Honors in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 39(3).
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press: United Kingdom.
- Siddiqui, K. A., Mughal, S. H., Soomro, I. A., & Dool, M. A. (2021). Teacher Training in Pakistan: Overview of Challenges and their Suggested Solutions. *IJORER* :

- International Journal of Recent Educational Research*, 2(2), 215–223.  
<https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v2i2.91>
- Su, S. W. (2012). The Various Concepts of Curriculum and the Factors Involved in Curricula-making. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.1.153-158>
- Toombs, W. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1993). Curriculum Definitions and Reference Points. *Journal of curriculum and supervision*, 8(3), 175-95.
- Ulla, M. B., & Winitkun, D. (2017). Thai Learners' Linguistic Needs and Language Skills: Implications for Curriculum Development. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(4), 203–220.  
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10412a>
- Vishnupriyan, M. (2017). Curriculum Evaluation: Using the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) Model for Decision Making. *Indian Journal of Continuing Nursing Education*, 18(2), 12-18.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34-41.
- Waseem, N., & Kazmi, H. H. (2018). Implementing english courses in b.ed/ade: the role of educational managers and teacher educators. *Jssir*, 7(2), 98-109.
- Yusuf, Q., Jusoh, Z., & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2019). Cooperative Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1399-1412.
- Zohrabi, M. (2011). An Investigation of Curriculum Elements for the Enhancement of the Teaching-learning Process. *Higher Education Studies*, 1(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v1n1p67>