

Lesson Planning Training in English Language Teaching: A Comparative Analysis between Public and Private Schools in Peshawar



Spogmay Nazir	PhD Scholar Department of English, Islamia College Peshawar, spogmaynazir@gmail.com
Dr Muhammad Umer	Assistant Professor Department of English, Islamia College Peshawar Corresponding author email: mummer@icp.edu.pk
Mehran Ali	Research Scholar, Mphil English (Linguistics), City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar, mehranalam89@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article reports the training in lesson planning received by Pakistani public and private school English teachers, the implementation of the training in classrooms, and the differences, if any, in their teaching practices in the two settings. The data were collected from male and female English teachers of 40 public and 40 private schools through a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The data were subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The findings revealed that the public school teachers received more training in lesson planning than the private school teachers; however, public school teachers' implementation of lesson planning was found highly deficient. In addition, the results showed that the increased amount of training received by the public school teachers was mainly associated with the promotion factor, not with the quality improvement of their teaching. The results further revealed that the private school teachers were better equipped with modern teaching gadgets and tools as compared with the public school teachers which resulted in marked differences in the teaching practices of the two settings. Therefore, it is recommended that the government should improve the quality of public school lesson plan training and develop a monitoring system that can ensure the implementation of training in the classroom. It is also suggested that public school teachers be provided with adequate resources and modern teaching technology.*

Keywords: English Language Teaching, Lesson Plan, Government School, Private School, Training of lesson Plan, Teaching Methodology

Introduction

English being an internationally recognized language spoken by around 1.6 billion people worldwide (Tunariu, 2020) requires effective teaching where it is a second or foreign language. Research is going on to improve the quality of ELT worldwide. Teacher training and lesson planning is a crucial facet of every ELT training program. Research on ELT in Pakistan indicates serious issues in the domain of teaching and assessment. Public schools in Pakistan, have apparently failed so far to adequately develop their learners' English

language proficiency. Students have very poor English speaking skills in the public schools (Khan, 2013). The researchers associate this issue with the training of lesson plans in the public schools. Lesson plan plays a key role in enhancing the teaching-learning process at schools and institutes. Mohan (2007, p. 227) defines a lesson plan as 'an outline of the important points of a lesson arranged in the order in which they are to be presented to students by the teacher'. Writing a lesson plan includes incorporating content, implementing

teaching strategies, outlining resources, and planning assessments (Kammanee, 2001). All teachers are required to have it, regardless of their expertise, experience, or area of training. A lesson plan is a guide map that helps teachers decide what to teach and how to teach to make the teaching and learning process highly effective. Derin et al., (2020) and Batubara et al., (2020) argue that a teacher can easily develop activities, strategies, and feedback through his/her lesson planning for effective teaching. Training in Lesson plans helps teachers to organize and reflect upon their teaching methods, techniques, and activities. School teachers should be trained in a way that directly benefits learners (Gülten 2013). Also, they can develop pedagogical activities or methods that can help students understand the topic better (Shen, Poppink, Cui, & Fan, 2007). They can easily achieve their goals and objectives through it. It can help them to either solve the problem or avoid it (Houston & Beech, 2002). In Peshawar, there are many public and private schools of different levels. It is generally assumed that the private schools' English language teachers are trained in lesson planning and are ensured to apply that training in their teaching, whereas public school teachers are either not given proper training in lesson planning, or do not apply it in their classrooms which results in unplanned lessons and students' weak proficiency. It is generally assumed that, in the context of Pakistan, there are mismatches between teachers' lesson plan training and its implementation. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, not enough empirical evidence is available in this regard. Hence, this study attempted to investigate English language teachers' training in lesson planning in public and private schools and to examine the extent to which the lesson-plan training was implemented in both contexts in Peshawar. The research was significant in uncovering the teaching methodologies employed by English teachers in private and public schools in Peshawar. By examining these aspects, the study was expected to provide invaluable insights into the English language education

landscape in Peshawar.

1. Literature Review

This section provides a critical review of relevant literature on the comparison between private and public schools' English language teachers' training of lesson plan. Previous studies have attempted to compare English language teachers' training and both private and public schools. Habibi (2020) has argued that lesson planning is an essential element of teaching. During the planning phase, the teacher decides the lesson objectives, activities, materials, timing, grouping, and other elements of the lesson. Habib (ibid) examined that language teaching is sometimes reduced to teaching students how to master language structures, ignoring the enormous opportunities that language instruction offers to engage students in the debate and evaluation of topics that impact their daily lives. Therefore, he has urged for effective English language teaching, teachers training programs must be considered throughout the planning stage.

In educational literature, teacher-student interaction has long been emphasized. Dayan et al. (2018) investigated the experiences and problems of novice teachers moving into actual schools and classroom teaching in Pakistan. The research recommended developing partnerships between training institutions and schools, as well as need-based in-service training and refresher courses every year. Many people believe that getting children enrolled in a good school is the most significant aspect of an individual's success in life. Scheper (2013) attempted to identify the primary elements influencing the decision to attend school. He found out that public school instructors received greater professional development training than teachers in the private schools but it is not certain if the additional training enhances the public school English teachers' teaching methods and techniques.

Nadeem (2013) studied the mechanisms for educating teachers in the public and private sectors to teach English effectively at the elementary level.

The study found that whereas private sector training integrates learner-centered strategies, as indicated by both trainers and trainees, government sector training centers use the traditional approach of preparing teachers to teach English by using their native tongue. Moreover, Khan (2011) conducted a thorough analysis of the pre-service teacher education programs, concentrating on the B. Ed at Peshawar and the PGCE at Bradford in terms of their development, length, and proportion of theory to practice. It comparatively assessed the effectiveness of both programs equipping the teachers with the requisite practical skills for teaching. The study indicated that prospective teachers learn to teach by copying their instructors in general and teacher educators at the education college. Student teachers would look up to teacher educators as role models if they were progressive in their interactions and used various teaching techniques that they favored.

Shah (2003) studied provided in-service training (PIT) and not provided in-service training (NIT) of English teachers. Shah investigated trained primary school teachers lesson planning and their classroom performance with and without in-service training. The results showed a considerable discrepancy in the effectiveness of PIT and NIT teachers. This shows that the PIT teachers delivered their lessons following the strategy they acquired during their in-service training. The study was limited to government primary schools (male and female), primary school teachers with secondary school certificates and PTC, trained primary school teachers with at least two weeks of in-service training after 1995, and only those schools where one teacher had the required in-service training. Holm and Horn (2003) examined the attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers toward lesson planning based on their teaching experience and location. Most of the teachers do not use lesson planning. According to (Richards & Bohlke, 2011), experienced teachers teach from a mental map and do not write a detailed lesson plan, whereas novice teachers write a detailed lesson plan. Similarly, Mishra (2008)

argued that experienced teachers reduce lesson plans and teach from a mental map; however, new teachers find detailed lesson plans to be helpful. The study assessed teachers 's attitudes toward lesson planning in class. To improve the teaching process, EFL teachers' views toward lesson preparation appeared to be somewhat overlooked. Considering the current knowledge gap, the primary goal of the study was to explain English teachers' views regarding lesson plans depending on their teaching experience and location of employment.

The literature review shows that previous research with variable designs has yielded varying findings. Some researchers compared trained and untrained teachers while others compared teachers' training in Pakistan and UK or Turkey. Other researchers have compared teachers' training in lesson planning in private and public schools but they are either at primary level schools or in countries other than Pakistan; no research with the given design has been conducted it at the middle level in Pakistan. Moreover, the researchers have discussed the importance of lesson planning and its effect on learning, but no research has been conducted on lesson planning. Very little literature was available on the comparison of private and public school teachers' training in lesson planning in Pakistan. Therefore, this study attempted to compare the training of lesson planning of both private and public schools in Peshawar. It focused on the different teaching approaches used by both private and public school teachers, whereas in previous studies the focus was on finding the difference between the trained and untrained teachers.

2. Research Design

It is a mixed-methods research study and employs an exploratory research design for a deeper understanding of the research problem (Creswell, 1999). The data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, the data were collected through a questionnaire with closed questions and analyzed through SPSS for qualitative insights. In the second

phase, the data were collected through semi-structured interviews which were analyzed thematically (Braun & Clarke, 2006), as semi-structured interviews do not adhere to a rigid and formalized list of questions, they are effective for gathering qualitative and open-ended data by allowing for deeper exploration of the issue (Hatch, 2002). This integrated approach was expected to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the topic, combining both methodologies for richer information.

This study was conducted in Peshawar. The total number of schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is 36,666. Out of which government schools are 27,638 functional schools are 27,524 and non-functional schools 114 while the number of registered private schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa is 8983. Out of the 22,006 schools, the number of government schools at the middle level is 2622 of which 1436 are for boys and 1186 are for girls. The total number of private schools at the middle level is 3274 (PSRA, 2022). The number of teachers in registered private schools is 112,689 out of which 30,249 are working in Middle Schools. The total number of working teachers in government schools is 155,838 (99,030 male teachers + 56,808 female teachers), out of which 17,432 are in middle level (KP, 2020-2021).

The study employed simple random sampling technique for the data collection. Slovin's formula is applied to determine the sample size (n) from the targeted population (N). It is given as

$$n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$$

To calculate the sample size of a population for a study, figuring out the margin of error is also required. The most common confidence level or error of tolerance is 95%. That means error margin was 0.05. Applying the formula by using the statistics, it gave the following results.

$$n = 704 / (1 + 704 * 0.05^2)$$

$$n = 704 / (1 + 1.76) \quad n = 704 / 2.76$$

$$n = 255$$

For collecting the data through semi-structured interviews, a purposive sampling technique was used. For finalizing the respondents of the study, certain characteristics had to be accounted, namely, job role, job description, relevancy and Purpose.

The data have been collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews. Both private and public school teachers in Peshawar participated in the study. From private schools, the data were collected from elite schools, namely, Beaconhouse, City School, Bloomfield, etc. The targeted population of the study was English teachers of grades 6, 7, and 8.

Furthermore, contact numbers of the private schools were retrieved from their respective websites for collecting data, whereas the list of teachers of the public schools is retrieved from the Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Personal sources were also used to contact the respondents. In addition, the researchers took help from Tanzem-i-Asatiza (a teacher association) to get access to the teachers. Axiological issues were addressed at every stage of this research from designing interview guides to the analysis of the data. Before conducting the interviews and questionnaires, consent of the participants was secured.

3. Results and Discussion

The data were collected through questionnaires that included statements regarding lesson planning training and teaching methodologies. A total of 100 English teachers responded. The survey covered 41 male and 59 female English teachers from public and private schools

A total of 80 public and private school English teachers were contacted analyzed. 70% of the public school English teachers revealed that they have received induction training whereas, 30% revealed that they have not received any induction training provided by the government. Furthermore, 45% of the private teachers revealed that they have not received induction training whereas, 55% of teachers revealed that they have received induction

training provided by the schools, because some of the large private schools have established their own teachers training programs and have access to specialized private institutions (Chudgar, Chandra, & Razzaque, 2014). Therefore, very few private teachers have undergone any pre-service training (Farah, Fauzee & Daud, 2016). The findings show a higher percentage of public school English teachers receiving training in lesson planning compared to private schools. One of the reasons for a higher percentage of public school teachers is that the government teachers must attend the seven to nine months long induction training organized by the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Education authority upon their selection.

With regard to teaching experience, 30% of the public schools teachers reported to have more than 12 years of teaching experience, 17% reported to have 1-3 years of experience, 25% had 3-6 years of experience, 12% had 6-9 years of experience, and 15% had 9-12 years of experience. From the private schools, 40% of the English teachers reported to have 1-3 years of experience, 25% claimed 3-6 years of experience, 8% had 6-9 years of

experience, 12% had 9-12 years of experience, and 15% reported to have more than 12 years of experience. It is interpreted from the percentage that public schoolteachers have more teaching experience than the private school teachers, which may be possible due to the high employee turnover ratio of the private schools. 85% of the public school English teachers revealed that they had received lesson plan training whereas, 15% revealed that they had not received any training in lesson planning. It can be deduced that the government provides different trainings and workshops to the public school teachers but most of the teachers attend those trainings as a formality.

Alternatively, 70% of the private school English teachers reported to have received lesson plan training whereas, 30% have not received any training in lesson planning. It is deduced that a large amount of private school English teachers are not trained in lesson planning. It is interpreted from the percentage of both private and public school teachers that government English teachers are more trained compared to the private English teachers.

Table1: Comparative Mean of Lesson Planning Training

School Type		I have attended several trainings of lesson plan.	I need more training on lesson planning to learn the best methods of teaching English.	I attend teachers' training because it is compulsory for me.	I always learn something new in training about lesson planning.
Private	Mean	1.90	1.67	1.73	1.55
	N	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	0.783	0.672	0.599	0.552
	Variance	0.613	0.451	0.358	0.305
Public	Mean	1.95	1.60	1.93	1.13
	N	40	40	40	40

	Std. Deviation	0.810	0.764	0.679	0.622
	Variance	0.656	0.584	0.461	0.387
Total	Mean	1.92	1.64	1.73	1.60
	N	80	80	80	80
	Std. Deviation	0.716	0.716	0.636	0.587
	Variance	0.627	0.513	0.404	0.344

The figures Table 1 show a relatively small difference between each other and within the group which means that the results are consistent with the findings of the study. Since the first objective of the study relates to which sector of teachers is more trained in lesson planning, it can be seen that the mean value of public schools is on the higher side than that of private schools. So it can be deduced that government teachers are more trained in lesson planning than private school teachers. However, this is mainly because of the compulsory induction that is being imparted to government teachers upon their induction into government service. This finding supports the findings of Scheper (2013) and Matilde (2009).

Moreover, 55% of the public school English teachers agreed that they attended training. It was made compulsory for them and only 20% of the private school English teachers agreed that they received training because it was compulsory for them. A majority of the private school teachers did so to improve their teaching skills. It indicates that the government needs to improve its training and

also provide resources to teachers so that teachers can apply the training in classrooms. The implementation of lesson plan training in public schools is 22%-35% while in private schools, it ranges from 25%-40%. This shows increased implementation of lesson planning training in private schools compared with the public schools. 35% of the public school English teachers strongly disagreed with the statement that all the training they received improved their teaching skills whereas; only 22% strongly agreed that teachers' training improved their teaching skills.

Alternatively, 40% of the private school English teachers agreed that the training they received had improved their teaching skills whereas, only 10% reported otherwise. It shows that private school teachers apply their training in their classrooms which makes their teaching successful. Furthermore, it indicates that the private school teachers attended training to improve their teaching skills. On the other hand, the public school teachers considered burden.

Table 2. Comparative Mean of Implementation of Lesson Planning

School Type		All teachers' trainings that I have received have improved my skills.	I apply in classroom whatever I have learnt in my lesson plan training.	Lesson planning makes my whole teaching more effective	My lesson plan helps me to motivate my students.
Private	Mean	2.38	1.83	1.40	1.58

	N	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	1.148	0.640	0.545	0.636
	Variance	1.317	0.410	0.297	0.404
Public	Mean	2.35	1.68	1.38	1.35
	N	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	1.099	0.572	0.540	0.533
	Variance	1.208	0.328	0.292	0.285
Total	Mean	2.36	1.60	1.39	1.46
	N	80	80	80	80
	Std. Deviation	1.117	0.608	0.539	0.594
	Variance	1.247	0.370	0.291	0.353

Table 2 shows the statistical analysis of the implementation of lesson planning training in classroom by government and public sector schools' English teachers. It is noted that only 10% of public school English teachers revealed that they applied their learning from classroom training. However, 60% of the teachers revealed that they did not apply their training in the classroom. One reason is that these teachers are not exposed to actual classrooms during training due to which they do not know what problems they can face during actual classroom teaching. Similarly, 55% of the private school English teachers strongly agreed that they implemented their training in the classroom, and only 10% disagreed. Therefore, it is interpreted that although private school English teachers are less trained still they implement their training more in their classrooms compared to public school English teachers confirming the findings of Arshad and Akram Naseem (2013). Only 33% of the public school English teachers believed that lesson planning made their teaching more effective whereas, 65% believed otherwise. It is probably

because they take lesson planning as an extra burden. After all, they face many issues like a large number of students in the classroom, lack of resources, and heavy workload due to which they cannot apply their lesson planning in their classrooms.

Two third of the private school English teachers strongly agreed that lesson planning made their teaching more effective; only 3% of them disagreed and believed otherwise. The reason is that private schools have a specific number of students in each class which makes it easy for teachers to implement student-centered pedagogies. Similarly, they also have a proper monitoring system, which not only helps teachers to improve their lesson planning but also helps them in better implementation of their lesson planning in the classroom. On the other hand 68% of the government teachers believed that their lesson plan did not motivate their students. One reason could be that most teachers cannot give proper attention to students due to a large number of students because of which, students cannot understand properly. However, one big reason

could be the lack of facilities provided to both teachers and students due to which teachers cannot motivate students to learn better. 50% of the private teachers strongly agreed that their lesson plan helped them to motivate their students. This is because private schools have less number of students in every class in addition to the facilities and resources available to them. It not only helps them in motivating the student to learn better but also makes teaching easy and enjoyable for them.

The results showed that 28% of the public school English teachers used activity-based lesson plans whereas, 60% revealed otherwise whereas 45% of the private school English teachers strongly agreed and 55% agreed that they made activity-based lesson plans. This indicates that private school English teachers teach activity-based learning compared to government school English teachers. It also indicates that private schools emphasize learner-centered teaching as Hashim (2008) noted that teachers' teaching methodology influences students. The results, in additin, revealed that the private schools were more equipped in terms of facilities and resources compared to government schools. Only 10% of the public teachers revealed that they used worksheets and AV aids in their lesson plans. It indicates that government school teachers use fewer resources. The reason is the lack of availability of resources.

This finding confirms the observations of Nadeem (2013) who suggested that teachers should be trained to prepare low-cost teaching material so that they do not face any issues regarding activity-based teaching.

Regarding reflection on the success of lesson plans, 55% of the private school teachers responded positively. The private school teachers believed in activity-based learning whereas the public school teachers believed they could not conduct activity-based lessons which they thought was difficult. Moreover, 10% of the public school teachers accommodated students' individual needs in their lesson plans. However, 68% of the public school teachers revealed that they could not accommodate individual needs due to a large number of students in classes. More than half of the private school teachers (55%) agreed that they accommodated the individual needs of students in their lesson plans. Therefore, it is argued that private school teachers tend to treat students on an equitable basis by giving them equal time and attention in classroom. However, it is evident from the analysis that public school teachers pay less attention to the individual needs of students during their lesson planning and teaching in classroom. This is an important variable that public school teachers tend to ignore though it is fundamental feature of a strong lesson plan (Curran, 2016).

Table3: Comparative Analysis of Teaching Methodology

School Type		I try to make my lesson plan activity based.	I use different resources such as; Worksheets and AV aids in my lesson plan.	I reflect upon my class activities that I plan for my students.	I accommodate students' individual learning needs during my teaching process.
Private	Mean	1.55	1.68	1.77	1.65
	N	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	0.504	0.694	0.660	0.580
	Variance	0.254	0.481	0.435	0.336

Public	Mean	1.21	1.53	1.68	1.35
	N	40	40	40	40
	Std. Deviation	0.526	0.707	0.526	0.474
	Variance	0.276	0.500	0.276	0.225
Total	Mean	1.61	1.71	1.72	1.66
	N	80	80	80	80
	Std. Deviation	0.515	0.697	0.595	0.526
	Variance	0.266	0.486	0.354	0.277

The comparative analysis provided in Table 3 indicates that private school English teachers make their lesson plans more student-centered. It also shows that their teaching methodology is comparatively better than that of public school English teachers. This might be because public school teachers have to manage a class comprised of more than fifty students whereas private schools usually have 20-25 students per class. Similarly, because of the permanent nature of the job of government employees, they tend to care less about students' individual needs. Additionally, private school teachers do not have any job security and hire teachers without any pre-service training (Memon, Joubish, & Khurram, 2010). Similarly, in government school teachers' training there is a gap between theory and practice due to which teachers cannot apply what they have learned in their training. Furthermore, in private schools, the teacher's job depends upon their performance, so they are pushed to accommodate students' individual needs to get better reviews for the sustainability of their jobs.

1. Conclusion

The present study investigated the differences between the training in lesson planning received by public and private school English teachers in Pakistan. Furthermore, an attempt was made to

examine the extent to which teachers in both the contexts implemented the training they received practically in classroom and the variation in the implementation if any. The researchers also looked at the differences in the teaching methodologies employed in both the settings.

The findings indicated significant variations across all the areas stated above. The private school teachers claimed effective implementation of their training, possibly owing to better resources whereas the public school teachers often struggled to create activity-based lesson plans which they argued was due to the unavailability of adequate resources. Another important difference found in this research between the two contexts was the lack of reflection on their lesson plans by the public school teachers who considered it as a formality and an additional burden. In fact they believed it a waste of work on lesson plans as they believed due to the large number of students in classrooms the use of lesson plan was impossible. Despite public school English teachers being more experienced, it is suggested that private school teachers employ better teaching methodologies. Furthermore, employee turnover is higher in private schools compared to public schools. Therefore, it is concluded that public teachers are more trained but private teachers are better at preparation and implementation of lesson plans. The training of English teachers in public and

private schools is a subject of discussion with various viewpoints. It is argued that public school English teachers undergo more extensive training than their private school counterparts because it is mandatory for teaching job in the public sector. However, concerns are raised regarding the relevance of training for teachers of unrelated subjects in public schools who end up teaching English.

Based on the research outcomes it is recommended that the government should improve the quality of training imparted to teachers on induction and during service. Moreover, private schools should motivate the teachers in terms of monetary benefits and career development so that their employee turnover is less and their training is better implemented. Similarly, the government should provide more facilities and resources to the schools for teaching English through modern techniques. Also, there should be frequent classroom observations of government teachers to assess their ability to be retained in the long term or otherwise. Furthermore, the government should increase the strength of teachers and schools so that not more than 30 students are forced to sit in the same classroom. This will enhance the performance of the teacher and he/she will give equal importance and time to every student. The recommendations of this research are in congruence with the suggestions given by other researchers, namely, Arshad and Akram Naseem (2013), Khan et al., (2016), Mahnaz Hassan (2015), and Khan and Saeed, (2009). Therefore, it is necessary to see what exactly goes on 'inside of the black box' as argued by Black and Wiliam (1998) and explore further the ways and means to raise the standards English language teaching and learning.

References:

Arshad, M., & Akramnaseem, M. (2013). Comparison between the Performance of Trained and Untrained Teachers in Lahore. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Linguistics & Education*, 13(3), 86-96. Retrieved on 5 March 2024 from

https://globaljournals.org/GJHSS_Volume13/10-Comparison-between-the-Performance.pdf

- Batubara, F., Derin, T., Putri, N. S., & Yudar, R. S. (2020). Five factors influencing the students' motivation to learn English as a foreign language: A closer look into Montessori classroom environment. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 2(2), 76-84. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v2i2.3165>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Thematic Analysis*. Retrieved from The University of Auckland, New Zealand: <https://www.thematicanalysis.net/>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment*. Phi Delta Kappan, 80, 139-148.
- Chudgar, A., Chandra, M., & Razzaque, A. (2014). Alternative forms of teacher hiring in developing countries and its implications: A review of literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 37, 150-161.
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). *Mixed-method research: Introduction and application*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln: Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Curran, B. (2016). *Better lesson plans, better lessons* (1sted.). London: Eye on Education.
- Dayan, U., Perveen, S., & Khan, M. I. (2018). Transition from pre-service training to classroom: Experiences and challenges of novice teachers in Pakistan. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 48-59.
- Derin, T., SusiloPutri, N., Nursafira, M.S., & Hamuddin, B. (2020). Discourse Analysis (DA) in the Context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL): A Chronological Review .

- Elsya: Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v2i1.3611>
- Farah, A. M. S., Fauzee, O., & Daud, Y. (2016). A Cursory Review of the Importance of Teacher Training: A Case Study of Pakistan. *Middle Eastern Journal of Scientific Research*, 21(6), 912-917.
- Government of Pakistan, Academy of Educational Planning and Management (AEPAM), Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training. (2016). Pakistan education statistics 2014-15. Islamabad: AEPAM.
- Gülten, A. Z. (2013). Am I Planning well? Teacher Trainees' Voices on Lesson Planning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93(2010), 1409–1413. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.053>
- Habibi, K. (2020). Effectiveness of lesson planning in Teaching EFL (English Foreign Language). *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN:*, 9(6), 999–1003. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.21275/SR20612151857>
- Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hashim, C.N. (2008). The Teaching and Learning Approaches of Prophet Muhammad (Peace Be Upon Him). Paper Presented in the *International Conference on Teacher Education in Muslim World (ICTEM)*, Crown Princess Hotel, Kuala Lumpur.
- Holm, L., & Horn, C. (2003). Bridging the Gap Between Schools of Education and the Needs of 21st Century Teachers. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(5), 376-380.
- Houston, B., & Beech, M. (2002). *Designing Lessons for the Diverse Classroom: A Handbook for Teachers*. Florida: Center for Performance Technology.
- Kammanee, T. (2001). *Innovations for Learning for Teachers at the Era of Educational Reforms*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.
- Khan, F., Omar Fauzee, M., & Daud, Y. (2016). Qualitative analysis of the teacher's performance in private and public sector schools: a developing country's experience. *Educational Research International*, 5(4), 33–39.
- Khan, S. H., & Saeed, M. (2009). Effectiveness of Pre-service Teacher Education Programme (B.Ed) in Pakistan: Perceptions of Graduates. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 83-98.
- Khan, S.M. (2011). *Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education Programmes in Pakistan and UK*. Peshawar: Sarhad University of Science & Information Technology .
- Khan, H. I. (2013). *An investigation of two universities' postgraduate students and their teachers' perceptions of policy and practice of English medium of instruction (EMI) in Pakistani universities*. PhD Thesis, College of Social Sciences, University of Glasgow. <https://eleanor.lib.gla.ac.uk/record=b2983959>
- KP. (2021). *Annual School Census Report for Settled Districts*. Peshawar: Khyber Pakhtunkhuwa Elementary and Secondary Education Department: Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
- Matilde, C. (2009). *A comparative Study of English Language Learners and Non-English Language learners*. Balgaria: University of Polvdiv.
- Memon, G.R., Joubish, M.F, & Khurram, M.A. (2010). Education in Pakistan: The key issues, problems and the new challenges. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 6 (6), 672- 677. Retrieved 16th March, 2016 <http://idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr6%286%29/22.pdf>

Mishra, R.C. (2008). *Lesson Planning for Language Teaching in R.C. Mishra, Lesson Planing*

New Dehli: A.P.H. Publishing Corporation.

Mohan,R.(2007). *Innovative Science Teaching: for Physical Science Teachers* (3rded.). Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Nadeem, M.(2013). *Learner-Centered English Language Teaching (An Observation: Public & Private Teachers ' Training Systems At Primary Level .* 114–120.

PSRA. (2022). *Private Schools Regulatory Authority Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa*. Retrieved Febuary24,2022, from <https://psra.gkp.pk/>

Qayyum, A., Hassan, S. M., Sheikh, A., & Mustafa, N. (2015). Comparative study of teaching effectiveness of trained and untrained teachers at school level working in private sector. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 27, 1571-1577. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281062059>

Richards, J.C., & Bohlke, D. (2011). *Creating Effective Language Lessons*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scheper, E. (2013). *Comparing Public and Private Schools*. Honors College at WKU. Western Kentucky University: Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects.

Shah, S.M. (2003). *Comparative Study of the Performance of Trained Primary School Teachers with and Without In-service Training and Development of a Strategy for Future*.

Islamabad: Alama IqbalOpen University.

Shen, J., Poppink, S., Cui, Y., & Fan, G. (2007). Lesson Planning: A Practice of Professional Responsibility and Development. *Educational Horizons*, 85, 248-258.

Tunariu, M. (2020). *Why is it important to speak English?* Retrieved March 02, 2021, from Malta University Language School: <https://www.universitylanguageschool.com/student-blog-why-is-it-important-to-speak-english/>