

## TEACHER-CENTERED AND LEARNER-CENTERED PRACTICES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Asad,

BS English, Khushal Khan Khattak University, Karak, [asadeng37@gmail.com](mailto:asadeng37@gmail.com)

**Dr. Intikhab Alam,**

Assistant Professor Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology (KUST) Kohat. [intikhab@kust.edu.pk](mailto:intikhab@kust.edu.pk) (corresponding author).

**Muhammad Ishtiaq,**

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Government Degree College Takhte Nasrati, Karak, [ishtiaqm48@yahoo.cm](mailto:ishtiaqm48@yahoo.cm)

### ABSTRACT

*The present study attempts to investigate how English is taught at Government Degree College (GDC) Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak, Pakistan, with particular emphasis on the use of teacher-centered and learner-centered instructional approaches. Adopting a qualitative research design, the study employs classroom observations of undergraduate English classes conducted by the researcher, along with semi-structured interviews with both teachers and students to gain a comprehensive understanding of prevailing teaching practices. The findings reveal that English language teaching at the college is predominantly characterized by traditional, lecture-based methods, resulting in limited student participation and a largely passive learning role. Nevertheless, the data also indicate that both teachers and students express a strong interest in more interactive, learner-centered pedagogical practices that encourage engagement and communicative competence. Based on these findings, the study recommends targeted teacher training initiatives and a balanced integration of teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches to enhance the effectiveness of English language instruction in similar public-sector college contexts.*

**Keywords:** *English language teaching, teacher-centered approach, learner-centered approach, classroom observation, higher education, Pakistan.*

### INTRODUCTION

Teaching methods play a big role in how students learn and perform in school/college/university. In English language classrooms, two main teaching approaches are commonly used and observed: teacher-centered and learner-centered. In teacher-centered classrooms, the teacher does most of the talking and explaining. Students mainly listen to and take notes. In learner-centered classrooms, students are more actively engaged and participate in the process of learning. They take part in discussions, group work, and problem-solving tasks. The teacher acts more like a guide or helper (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

In Pakistan, English is an important subject taught from early grades up to college/university level. At the Government Degree College (GDC) Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak, located in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, English is taught to many students each year. However, like many other colleges in Pakistan, teaching methods often depend on the teacher's preferences, training, or the environment of the institution concerned. Sometimes, teachers rely more on traditional, teacher-centered methods. Other times, they try never, learner-centered ways of teaching. This study looks at how both of these methods are used in this specific college and what teachers and students think about them.

### Statement of the Problem

There is not much research work done on how English is taught in small-town colleges located in a rural area like GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. Most studies focus on big cities or private schools. As a result, students, researchers, and scholars don't fully understand how language is taught in public colleges in rural areas. Also, learners don't know how much teachers use teacher-centered or learner-centered methods in these classrooms, or which

method works better for the students. This lack of information makes it hard to improve the quality of teaching in such areas.

### **Research Questions**

The present article aims to answer the following questions:

1. What teaching methods (teacher-centered or learner-centered) are commonly used in English classrooms at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak?
2. How do students and teachers feel about these teaching methods?
3. Which method is seen as more effective for student learning in this context?

### **Significance of the Study**

The main purpose of the current study is to explore the teaching methods used in English classrooms at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. It focuses on how often teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches are used, and how students and teachers feel about these methods. The study also aims to find out which method helps students learn better in this specific setting.

This study is important for a few reasons. First, it will help teachers and school leaders understand which teaching methods are actually being used and how they affect students. Second, it will give a voice to both teachers and students, allowing them to share their experiences and opinions. Third, the results of this study can be useful for teacher training programs and education policymakers. It can also help other colleges in similar areas to reflect on their teaching practices and improve student learning.

### **Delimitations of the Study**

This present work focuses only on English language classrooms at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. It does not include other subjects or other colleges. The study is limited to the opinions and experiences of the teachers and students currently studying or teaching there. Because of this, the findings may not represent all schools or colleges in Pakistan.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This part reviews what other researchers have said about teaching methods, especially teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches, in English language classrooms. It looks at how these methods are used in different parts of the world and in Pakistan. It also explores how these methods are used in various educational contexts worldwide and specifically within Pakistan. The goal is to understand the benefits and problems of each method and to find out what research is still missing, especially in small-town local rural area colleges such as GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. It specifically explores the pedagogical strengths and limitations of each method and identify gaps in the literature, particularly regarding under-researched rural institutions like Government Degree College (GDC) Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. By examining both global and local perspectives, this review lays the foundation for analyzing current teaching practices in Pakistani public colleges and justifies the need for the present study.

### **Teacher-Centered Approach**

The teacher-centered approach, often termed the "traditional method," positions the teacher as the central authority in the classroom. In this method, teachers deliver lectures, control the flow of information, and expect students to passively absorb content through listening, note-taking, and rote memorization. According to Brown (2007), this approach is particularly common in large classrooms where individual student engagement is logistically challenging. Teachers plan lessons in advance, leaving little room for flexibility or student input. In the teacher-centered approach, the teacher does most of the talking. Students are expected to listen, take notes, and follow instructions. This method is often called the "traditional" way of teaching. It has been used for a long time, especially in large classes where it's hard to give

every student individual attention (Brown, 2007). In this method, lessons are usually planned ahead, and students rarely work in groups or ask many questions.

One of the practical advantages of this approach is efficiency. It allows instructors to manage time effectively, maintain classroom discipline, and cover extensive syllabi within limited instructional periods. For institutions facing teacher shortages or overcrowded classrooms, this method appears to be the most manageable (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

However, its drawbacks are widely noted in recent educational discourse. Nunan (2013) argues that teacher-centered methods can lead to student passivity and a lack of motivation. Students often struggle with long-term retention and critical thinking when learning is reduced to memorization. Furthermore, such methods may disadvantage students who require differentiated instruction, scaffolding, or opportunities for interaction to fully grasp complex language concepts (Harmer, 2007).

### **Learner-Centered Approach**

Contrary to the traditional model, the learner-centered approach emphasizes student autonomy, participation, and collaboration. In this method, the teacher acts more as a facilitator or guide rather than the sole source of knowledge. Classroom activities often include group discussions, peer teaching, presentations, problem-solving tasks, and project-based learning. Freeman and Freeman (2004) argue that such methods promote deeper engagement and foster learner responsibility.

The learner-centered approach focuses more on students. In this method, students are active participants. They work in pairs or groups, share their ideas, and solve problems together. The teacher acts more like a guide, facilitator or helper instead of giving long lectures. This method is based on the idea that students learn better when they are involved and interested (Freeman & Freeman, 2004).

A key benefit of this approach is its focus on the development of communicative competence, especially valuable in language classrooms. According to Richards (2006), students gain not only linguistic skills but also confidence, critical thinking abilities, and interpersonal skills. Learner-centered techniques provide meaningful contexts for language use, helping students internalize grammar and vocabulary more naturally (Littlewood, 2007).

One benefit of this approach is that it helps students become more confident and independent. It also improves speaking and critical thinking skills, especially in language classes (Richards, 2006). However, it can be challenging to use this method in large classes or when students are shy or not used to working on their own.

### **Use of Teaching Methods in Pakistan**

In many Pakistani classrooms, especially in public colleges, the teacher-centered approach is still common. This is often because of large class sizes, limited resources, and exam-focused teaching (Rahman, 2004). Teachers may not have enough training in learner-centered methods or may feel pressure to cover a lot of material in a short time.

In Pakistani educational institutions, particularly public-sector colleges, the teacher-centered approach remains dominant. Rahman (2004) attributes this trend to structural limitations, such as high student-teacher ratios, exam-oriented curricula, and limited access to training in modern pedagogies. These constraints make it difficult for teachers to implement interactive or student-centered lessons, even if they are theoretically aware of their benefits.

However, recent reforms and teacher development programs have introduced some learner-centered practices in select urban schools and private institutions. Khan (2011) reports that in certain metropolitan areas, English teachers have begun to adopt blended teaching models that incorporate both lecture-based and interactive methods. These hybrid approaches aim to balance syllabus coverage with student engagement.

Despite these developments, rural and semi-urban colleges remain largely untouched by such reforms. According to Ali and Tahir (2020), rural educators face systemic challenges, including inadequate infrastructure, minimal digital resources, and infrequent access to professional development workshops. As a result, traditional teacher-centered methods continue to dominate, even when teachers express interest in alternative strategies.

However, some schools and colleges have started using learner-centered approaches, especially where teachers have received training or have smaller class sizes. According to Khan (2011), some English language teachers in urban areas of Pakistan are now trying to mix both methods to keep students engaged while still covering the syllabus.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The present research study is guided by two main learning theories. The first is Behaviorism, which supports teacher-centered teaching. It sees learning as a result of practice and repetition, where the teacher gives information and students memorize it (Skinner, 1957). The second is Constructivism, which supports learner-centered teaching. It says students learn better when they build their own knowledge through interaction and experience (Piaget, 1973; Vygotsky, 1978).

In the present work, the researcher draws upon two foundational theories of learning to frame the analysis of classroom practices: Behaviorism and Constructivism. Behaviorism, associated with scholars like Skinner (1957), underpins teacher-centered methods. It views learning as a result of stimulus-response conditioning, where the teacher provides structured input and the student responds through repetition and reinforcement. This model supports direct instruction, drill exercises, and teacher-led assessment.

On the other hand, Constructivism advocates for learner-centered environments where knowledge is constructed through interaction, reflection, and personal experience. Piaget (1973) emphasizes the role of cognitive development in learning, while Vygotsky (1978) introduces the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), highlighting the importance of social interaction in scaffolding student learning. Constructivist principles support methods such as collaborative learning, project work, and discussion-based classes.

These two theoretical paradigms provide contrasting but complementary lenses to analyze teaching practices. Understanding where and why each is applied helps to explain teacher behavior and student outcomes in real-world classrooms, especially in contexts like GDC Takht-e-Nasrati. These two theories help explain why some teachers prefer to lead the class while others try to involve students more actively.

### **Gaps in the Literature**

Most research on teaching methods in Pakistan has focused on big cities or private schools. There is little or no information about how English is taught in rural or small-town colleges like GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. Also, not many studies have asked both teachers and students what they think about teacher-centered and learner-centered methods. This study aims to fill that gap. While the body of literature on pedagogical approaches in English language teaching is substantial, it disproportionately focuses on urban contexts and elite educational institutions. There is a notable absence of empirical studies examining teaching practices in rural colleges of Pakistan. Most research overlooks small-town institutions where infrastructural constraints, cultural factors, and limited teacher training shape distinct classroom realities (Shamim, 2008). Recent studies in applied linguistics and discourse analysis in Pakistan have explored a wide range of topics, such as syntactic theory, sociolinguistic attitudes, and the educational impact of language. For instance, Ali et al. (2020) examined Pakistani students' perceptions of standard British and American English, revealing the intricate sociolinguistic and identity issues that can arise during language



learning. These challenges are often heightened by gender, as male and female students may encounter different expectations and opportunities in educational settings.

Arshad et al. (2024) conducted a comparative analysis of ad-positional phrase structures in English and Urdu using X-Bar Theory and the Theta Criterion, identifying both commonalities and distinctions between the two languages. The emotional dimensions of language learning have also been investigated; Adeel and Ishtiaq (2025) studied language anxiety among undergraduate English learners, finding that anxiety levels and attitudes toward English can vary by gender and influence academic outcomes.

Ismael and Ishtiaq (2025) explored students' perspectives on code-switching in higher education, highlighting both the benefits and challenges of bilingual practices in the classroom. Collectively, these studies underscore the adaptable and dynamic nature of language use in educational contexts, where gender can shape linguistic choices and participation.

The intersection of language, literature, and philosophy is evident in Gill et al. (2024), who analyzed themes of love and spirituality in Elif Shafak's *The Forty Rules of Love* through the lens of Sufi philosophy, demonstrating how literature can address complex semantic and philosophical issues. Majid and Ishtiaq (2019) used stylistic analysis to reveal the syntactic and thematic richness of E.E. Cummings' poetry, while Majid et al. (2020) assessed how primary-level English textbooks present and teach syntactic structures. These analyses also provide insight into how male and female students may engage differently with literary texts and grammar instruction.

Critical discourse analysis has been a key focus in recent research. Gill, Ishtiaq, and Khan (2025) examined the portrayal of Reham Khan in digital media from a feminist perspective using the transitivity framework, while Gill et al. (2025) performed a corpus-based genre analysis of the inaugural speeches of Donald Trump and Joe Biden, uncovering rhetorical and structural strategies in political language. These studies highlight the importance of gender as a lens for analyzing language use and representation.

Raza et al. (2025) contributed to syntactic theory with a cross-linguistic analysis of the null-subject parameter in English and Pashto. However, their study lacks detailed methodological information and does not sufficiently address educational implications; clearer explanations of sample selection and data collection would enhance the research. Nevertheless, it provides a strong basis for further comparative syntactic studies.

Ismael et al. (2025) effectively investigated student attitudes toward code-switching in higher education, emphasizing both its advantages and drawbacks. The study's focus on pedagogical implications is a strength, offering practical suggestions for educators. However, by only considering student perspectives, it misses the views of teachers and administrators; including more stakeholders would make the findings more comprehensive.

Ullah et al. (2025) examined gender-based differences in English language achievement, providing valuable comparative data for educational policy. However, their binary approach overlooks non-binary identities and deeper sociocultural factors. A more nuanced analysis would improve the research, but the study still highlights an important area for further exploration.

Luqman et al. (2025) investigated the use of computer-assisted learning in English language education, reflecting the growing role of technology in classrooms. While their case study offers practical insights, its focus on a single institution limits its generalizability. Broader or mixed-methods research could provide a wider perspective, but the study remains relevant for similar educational contexts considering technology integration.

Gill et al. (2025) conducted a critical discourse analysis of Reham Khan's representation in digital media from a feminist viewpoint, using the transitivity framework. The study's

strength lies in its combination of feminist theory and linguistic analysis, offering detailed insights into gendered media portrayals. However, it could be improved by including a wider range of digital sources and discussing broader societal implications. Overall, it makes a significant contribution to feminist discourse analysis in the digital era.

On the theoretical side, Ishtiaq and Gill (2024) applied Chomsky's X-Bar Theory to Pakistani languages, comparing Urdu, Pashto, and English, and enhancing understanding of universal and language-specific grammar rules. Similarly, Ishtiaq et al. (2022c) examined parallel syntactic patterns in English, advocating for a unified approach to internal linguistic systems. Ishtiaq et al. (2022b) addressed the challenges of teaching and pronouncing transliterated words, identifying English-to-Urdu transliteration as a major source of pronunciation errors for Urdu speakers and emphasizing the need for targeted teaching strategies. Additionally, Ishtiaq et al. (2021a) compared the semantic density of religious texts, showing how syntactic and lexical choices influence meaning in translation and highlighting the importance of syntax in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural communication.

Moreover, existing studies tend to examine teacher perspectives exclusively, ignoring the voices of students who are equally impacted by classroom methods. This creates a skewed understanding of pedagogical effectiveness. The current study aims to address this gap by incorporating both teacher and student viewpoints from a rural public college setting. In doing so, it contributes to a more inclusive and representative body of research on language education in Pakistan.

The above section has reviewed two contrasting approaches to language teaching—teacher-centered and learner-centered highlighting their respective strengths, limitations, and theoretical foundations. It examined how these methods are applied in different educational settings globally and in Pakistan. The literature shows a growing awareness of learner-centered pedagogy but also acknowledges persistent barriers in resource-limited contexts. The chapter also identified a gap in existing research concerning rural public colleges and the inclusion of student voices. Addressing this gap is the central motivation behind the present study. The chapter explained the two main teaching approaches: teacher-centered and learner-centered. It discussed their advantages, disadvantages, and how they are used in different places, especially in Pakistan. The chapter also introduced the learning theories behind these methods. Lastly, it pointed out that there is not enough research on teaching practices in smaller colleges, which is what this study focuses on.

## METHODOLOGY

This part explains how the study was carried out. It describes the type of research, where and how the data was collected, who took part in the study, and how the information was analyzed. The goal was to understand the teaching practices at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak by focusing on both teacher-centered and learner-centered methods.

### Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design. This means it focused more on people's ideas, experiences, and feelings instead of numbers or statistics. This type of research is useful when the goal is to explore opinions or behaviors in a detailed way (Creswell, 2014). The main tools used for data collection were interviews and classroom observations.

### Research Setting

The study was carried out at Government Degree College (GDC) Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak, which is located in a small town in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The college offers higher secondary and degree-level education. English is a compulsory subject for many students at the college.

### **Participants**

The participants of the study included five English language teachers (all males) who teach at the college level and 15 students from different English classes (mostly in their 2nd or 3rd year of study). All participants were selected through purposive sampling. This means they were chosen on purpose because they had experience with English teaching or learning in that college (Etikan et al., 2016).

### **Data Collection Methods**

The study used two main tools:

#### **a. Semi-structured Interviews**

Teachers and students were asked open-ended questions about their teaching or learning experiences. For example:

How do you usually teach or learn in your English class?

Do you prefer teacher-led lessons or student activities?

What helps you understand English better?

Each interview lasted about 20–30 minutes and was recorded with permission.

#### **b. Classroom Observations**

The researcher observed six English classes without interrupting the lessons. A simple observation sheet was used to record:

Who was talking more (teacher or students)?

What kind of activities were used (lecture, group work, etc.)?

How involved were the students?

These observations helped support or compare the interview data.

### **Data Analysis**

After collecting the interviews and observation notes, the researcher read through everything several times to find common themes or patterns. This is called thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). For example, if many students said they liked group work, this would be noted as a major theme. Similar answers or behaviors were grouped together and then explained in the findings section.

### **Limitations of the Methodology**

This study was limited to one college and a small number of participants. The findings may not represent all colleges in Pakistan. Also, since the data was collected through interviews and observations, it may include personal opinions or behaviors that are not always consistent.

The above section explained the research process, including the design, setting, participants, data collection, and analysis methods. The study used a qualitative approach to explore how teacher-centered and learner-centered methods are used at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. The next part will present the findings based on the interviews and classroom observations.

## **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

This section presents and analyses what was found during classroom observations and interviews with both teachers and students. The goal was to understand how teacher-centered and learner-centered methods are used in English language classrooms at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. The findings are grouped into main themes that came up often during the data analysis.

### **Classroom Observation Findings**

Six English classes were observed over two weeks. The classes were taught by five different teachers. The focus was on who was more active during the lessons, what teaching techniques were used, and how students participated.

### **High Use of Teacher-Centered Methods**

In most classes, teachers did most of the talking. Lessons started with a lecture, and students were expected to listen quietly and take notes. Teachers explained grammar rules, vocabulary, and reading passages. Only a few students asked questions, and there were few opportunities for student interaction. This is typical of a teacher-centered classroom.

Example: In one observed class, the teacher spoke for nearly 25 minutes without asking the students to respond. Students copied notes and rarely made comments.

This dominant presence of the teacher in classroom talk reflects a didactic approach, where knowledge flows one-way—from teacher to students. While this method is efficient for content delivery, especially in time-constrained environments, it often leads to passive learning. Students may internalize knowledge but are rarely given the opportunity to construct meaning, practice language, or negotiate understanding, all of which are crucial in language acquisition. The example of a 25-minute uninterrupted lecture suggests a monologic teaching style, which may reduce student motivation and engagement over time. In communicative language teaching (CLT), the emphasis is on interaction, yet such classrooms remain monologically bound, potentially limiting language practice opportunities for learners.

### **Limited Use of Learner-Centered Activities**

In only two classes did teachers try to include group or pair work. In these classes, students were asked to read short texts in pairs or discuss answers before sharing them with the whole class. However, time was short and students seemed unsure about how to work together.

Example: One teacher asked students to make small groups, but most of them waited for further instructions and seemed confused.

The rare inclusion of learner-centered activities, even when attempted, was undermined by poor classroom dynamics and unclear implementation. The confusion among students suggests a lack of scaffolding—students may not be familiar with collaborative formats or may lack the linguistic resources and confidence to initiate peer interaction. This points to a larger issue: transitional failure from teacher-centered to learner-centered modes. For such a shift to succeed, students need to be gradually introduced to autonomous practices, and teachers require strategies for managing active classrooms without losing control or focus. The hesitancy displayed by students in group work is not a reflection of resistance but a sign of under preparedness in participatory learning.

### **Interview Findings: Teachers' Views**

Five teachers were interviewed about their teaching style, preferences, and challenges.

#### **Preference for Traditional Methods**

Most teachers said they prefer to use lectures and written exercises because these are easier to manage, especially in large classes. They felt this method helped them cover the syllabus quickly and prepare students for exams.

“We have limited time and a heavy syllabus. It’s easier to lecture and give notes”, said one teacher.

The above quote reflects a pragmatic attitude among teachers who feel bound by institutional constraints. The pressure to “complete the syllabus” often takes precedence over pedagogical innovation. While their reasoning is understandable, it shows how curricular pressure overrides pedagogical best practices. Moreover, this approach may reinforce exam-oriented rote learning, which is not effective for language skill development. A dependency on lectures and written exercises might prepare students for exams but not for real-life language use, which demands active participation and communicative competence. This suggests a systemic issue rather than individual reluctance.



### **Awareness of Learner-Centered Methods**

All teachers said they had heard about learner-centered methods, like using group work or discussions. Some had tried these methods but felt they were not very successful due to large class sizes or students' lack of interest.

"I tried group activities once, but the students just talked about unrelated things," one teacher explained.

The above comment reveals a mismatch between teacher intention and classroom culture. While the teacher attempted a shift to interactive methods, the lack of student discipline and task adherence discouraged them. However, this outcome indicates a need not to abandon such methods but to train both teachers and students in managing and participating in interactive tasks. The students "talking about unrelated things" could be reframed as a failure of task design and classroom management rather than a flaw in the method itself. Teachers may benefit from action-based workshops where they learn how to design goal-oriented group activities with clear structure and monitoring strategies.

### **Need for Training and Support**

Several teachers mentioned they would like to use more interactive methods but needed more training or support.

"If we had workshops or resources, I think we could use better techniques," said another teacher.

The quote above reflects an openness among teachers to evolve their practice, which is a positive finding. It highlights that resistance to learner-centered methods is not ideological but logistical. The willingness to learn is present, but the lack of institutional support, training, and resources becomes a barrier. This underscores the importance of continuous professional development (CPD) and supportive teaching environments. Institutions need to provide not only workshops but follow-up mentorship and peer-sharing platforms so that innovative methods can be sustained. This also reflects that pedagogical reform is as much a systemic change as it is an individual choice.

### **Interview Findings: Students' Views**

Fifteen students shared their experiences and opinions about how they are taught English.

#### **Passive Role in the Classroom**

Most students said they usually sit and listen during class. They rarely speak up unless called by the teacher. Many found the lessons boring or hard to follow.

"We mostly copy from the board. Sometimes I don't even understand but just write," said one student.

The above statement is a clear indicator of surface-level engagement. When students "just write" without comprehension, the classroom becomes an exercise in mechanical transcription rather than cognitive learning. It reflects a failure in instructional clarity and feedback. In language classrooms especially, understanding should precede production. This kind of passivity can lead to learned helplessness, where students depend solely on teacher input and fear independent language use. It suggests a pressing need for interactive questioning techniques and low-stakes speaking opportunities to draw students into active participation.

#### **Desire for More Involvement**

Some students said they would like to do more activities, group discussions, or speaking practice in class.

"We want to speak English, but we don't get the chance," one student shared.

The above statement/quote reveals latent motivation among learners. Despite limited opportunities, students express a desire to engage and practice—a key ingredient in successful language learning. Their frustration indicates that the classroom structure does not

align with their learning goals. This is a missed opportunity; had this motivation been nurtured through speaking tasks, role plays, or group projects, students might have developed both fluency and confidence. The comment also reflects a disconnection between student aspiration and classroom practice, one that can be addressed by integrating short, student-led speaking activities in every lesson.

### **Fear of Making Mistakes**

A common reason for staying quiet was the fear of being laughed at or corrected in front of others.

“If I make a mistake, other students laugh, so I keep quiet”, said another student.

This is a critical affective barrier to language learning: fear of ridicule. It reflects a classroom environment that may be low in psychological safety, where mistakes are penalized socially rather than used constructively. Such fear discourages risk-taking and reinforces silence, especially among less confident learners. Teachers need to actively create a supportive atmosphere, where mistakes are normalized as part of learning. Peer sensitization, positive reinforcement, and modeling respectful feedback can gradually eliminate this fear and encourage student voice.

### **Summary of Findings**

While most English classes remain teacher-centered, the present study shows a genuine interest among both teachers and students to adopt more interactive methods, though they are hindered by structural limitations such as large class sizes, time constraints, and lack of training. Students demonstrate both motivation and awareness of what they miss out on, especially in speaking opportunities and interactive tasks. Teachers, while preferring traditional methods for practical reasons, express a desire for professional development. The findings point toward a system ready for change, but one that needs institutional will, capacity-building, and a shift in classroom culture to truly adopt learner-centered pedagogy. Most English classes at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak use teacher-centered methods. Teachers prefer traditional methods due to time limits, large class size, quite over lengthy syllabus material to be covered, lack of students interest in class participation, exam pressure etc. Learner-centered methods are rarely used, and when they are, they face challenges. Students want more involvement but often feel shy or afraid of making mistakes. Both teachers and students see the value of learner-centered teaching but feel limited and constrained by the current system and insufficient time and resources.

### **Discussion of Findings**

#### **Teacher-Centered Approach Still Common**

The results showed that most teachers at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak still use teacher-centered methods. This supports earlier research that found traditional teaching is still popular in many Pakistani public colleges (Rahman, 2004; Khan, 2011). Teachers said they prefer lectures and note-taking because it helps them finish the syllabus on time and prepare students for exams. While this method may be efficient, it can limit students’ speaking and thinking skills (Brown, 2007).

#### **Limited Use of Learner-Centered Methods**

Although all teachers had heard of learner-centered teaching, very few used it often. This is similar to what Nunan (2013) and Richards (2006) found—that using interactive methods can be hard in large classes or when students are not trained to work independently. In the observed classes, students showed confusion or stayed quiet during group work, suggesting they need more guidance and practice.

### **Students Want More Interaction**

Many students said they enjoy classes more when they are asked to speak, work in groups, or share their ideas. This matches findings from previous studies where learner-centered classrooms improved motivation and communication skills (Freeman & Freeman, 2004; Richards, 2006). However, fear of making mistakes and being judged by others kept many students silent. This suggests a need to build a more supportive environment in the classroom.

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This part discusses the meaning of the findings shared in section 4. It connects the results to earlier studies, answers the research questions, and offers some final thoughts and suggestions. The aim is to help improve English language teaching at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak and similar colleges in Pakistan.

The study explored how English is taught at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak by looking at teacher-centered and learner-centered methods. It found that:

Teacher-centered methods are mostly used.

Learner-centered activities are rare but desired.

Teachers feel limited by large classes and lack of training.

Students want to be more involved but are often too shy or unsure.

The study shows that while there is interest in changing how English is taught, both teachers and students face challenges that need to be addressed.

Teaching English in public colleges in Pakistan can be challenging, especially with large classes and limited resources. However, small changes—like encouraging student talk or adding short group tasks—can make a big difference. This study hopes to inspire teachers and education planners to think about better ways to teach English, making it easier and more enjoyable for students to learn.

#### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings, the following steps are recommended to improve teaching and learning at GDC Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak and similar colleges:

##### **Provide Teacher Training**

Workshops and training sessions should be arranged to help teachers learn how to apply learner-centered methods effectively, even in large classes.

##### **Use a Mixed Approach**

Teachers can try using a mix of both methods. For example, they can start with a short lecture and then give students a chance to discuss or practice in small groups.

##### **Encourage Student Participation**

Teachers should create a friendly classroom environment where students feel safe to speak and make mistakes. Simple encouragement and peer support can help reduce fear.

##### **Update Teaching Materials**

Colleges should provide teaching resources that include group activities, speaking tasks, and other learner-friendly tools.

##### **Conduct More Local Research**

More studies should be done in rural and small-town colleges to understand what works best in these settings and to share successful teaching strategies.

### **REFERENCES**

- Adeel, D., & Ishtiaq, M. (2025). Language Anxiety among Undergraduate English Learners: An Exploratory and Empirical Study. *ASSAJ*, 4(02), 2256-2270. 4(02), 2256–2270. Retrieved from <https://assajournal.com/index.php/36/article/view/1154>
- Ali, R., & Tahir, M. (2020). Challenges to implementing learner-centered teaching in rural Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 37(1), 45-58.

- Ali, S. S., Ishtiaq, M., & Shahid, M. (2020). Perceptions of Pakistani learners of English about standard British and American English: An exploratory approach. *sjesr*, 3(2), 99-106.
- Arshad, H., Gill, A., Ishtiaq, M., & Ali, S. S. (2024). The Syntax of ad-positional phrases in English and Urdu: Insights from x-bar theory and theta criterion. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review* 2(4) 429-451.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (2004). *Essential linguistics: What you need to know to teach reading, ESL, spelling, phonics, and grammar*. Heinemann.
- Gill, A., Gul, N. & Ishtiaq, M. (2025). Ecological Discourse Analysis (2012) of the Notion of War in Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms. *International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)* 4(1) 117-139
- Gill, A., Ishtiaq, M., & Gul, N. (2024). Love and Spirituality in *The Forty Rules of Love* by Elif Shafak: A Textual Analysis through the Lens of Sufi Philosophy. *International Journal of Politics & Social Sciences Review (IJPSSR)* 3(3) 492-506
- Gill, A., Ishtiaq, M., & Khan, I. (2025). Critical discourse analysis of Reham Khan's representation in digital discourse: a Feminist perspective using transitivity framework (2025). *Research Consortium Archive*, 3(1), 152-174. <https://doi.org/10.62019/ccgr5w52>
- Gill, A., Raza, S., & Ishtiaq, M. (2025). CORPUS-BASED GENRE ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP AND JOE BIDEN'S INAUGURAL SPEECHES. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(1), 813-826.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.).
- Ishtiaq, M. & Gill, A. (2024). Application of Chomsky's x-bar theory to Pakistani languages: A syntactic analysis of Urdu and Pashto with reference to English. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 2(5), 550–560.
- Ishtiaq, M., Gul, N., & Haq, I. U. (2021a). Comparative componential analysis of semantic density of lexical items in surah al fatiha (the Holy Quran) with special reference to various translations in English. *Global Language Review* 06(II), 317-325.
- Ishtiaq, M., Gul, N., & Khan, Y. (2022b). English to Urdu transliteration as a major cause of pronunciation error in L1 & L2 Urdu speakers of English: A pedagogical perspective. *Global Language Review*, VII, 282-298.
- Ishtiaq, M., Kamal, Z., & Iqbal, S. W. (2022c). Parallel structural patterns in internal linguistic systems of English: An integrated approach. *Journal of Humanities, Social and Management Sciences (JHSMS)*, 3(1), 447-456.
- Ismael, M., & Ishtiaq, M. (2025). Student Attitudes Toward Code-Switching in Higher Education: Benefits, Concerns, and Pedagogical Considerations. *ASSAJ*, 4(02), 2193-2208. Retrieved from <https://assajournal.com/index.php/36/article/view/1148>



- Khan, I. A. (2011). Challenges of teaching/learning English and management. *Language in India*, 11(7), 172–183.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249.
- Longman. Khan, S. (2011). Innovation in English language teaching in Pakistan. *ELT Voices*, 1(2), 20–28.
- Luqman, M., Ishtiaq, M., & Bibi, R. (2025). Integrating Computer-Assisted Learning in English Language Education: A Case Study of Undergraduate Students at Government Degree College Takht-e-Nasrati, Karak. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 3(4), 1521-1539.
- Majid, A. & Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Stylistic analysis of the Poem “Humanity i love you” By EE Cummings. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 3(II), 15-26.
- Majid, A., Rasool, S. H., & Ishtiaq, M. (2020) Content analysis of 5th grade textbook of English by Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Textbook Board. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 4(I), 95-113.
- Nunan, D. (2013). *Learner-centered English language education: The selected works of David Nunan*. Routledge.
- Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. Grossman Publishers.
- Rahman, T. (2004). *Denizens of alien worlds: A study of education, inequality, and polarization in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.
- Raza, S., Ali, A., & Haleem, M. A. (2025). Null-subject parameter in English and Pashto: A cross-linguistic syntactic study. *International Premier Journal of Languages & Literature*, 3(2), 880–892. <https://ipjll.com/ipjll/index.php/journal/article/view/252>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(3), 235–249.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Ullah, K., Ishtiaq, M., & Aftab, S. (2025). GENDER-BASED PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACHIEVEMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MALE AND FEMALE. *International Premier Journal of Languages & Literature*, 3(4), 348-368.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.