A Reflection on the Undergraduate Teaching English as a Foreign Language Curriculum at Farhangian University from TPACK Perspective

Mojtaba Maghsoudi
(corresponding author)
Assistant Professor, English Language Department, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran
Email: maghsudi@cfu.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The teaching-learning process during the Covid¬ 19 pandemic proved that education needs not only capable teachers in content and pedagogy knowlwdge, but also strongly needs teachers who are proficient in technology, and this concept in teacher education is explained in the form of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to critically reflect on the current BA curriculum of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) at Farhangian University regarding technological, pedagogical and content knowledge model. Accordingly, objectives, materials, structure, assignments, resources and assessment activities set for 103 units (credit hours) of the curriculum were studied using content analysis. The results showed that the most recent curriculum of TEFL at Farhangiann University is mainly based on the old pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) model rather than TPACK. Considering the fact that the largest part of the curriculum (58 units) is dedicated to developing student-teachers' content knowledge (CK), the second largest part (27 units) is devoted to building up the candidates' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), and 18 units are allotted to raising the student-teachers' pedagocical knowledge (PK), only 3 units are dedicated to technological pedagogical (TP) knowledge. The most serious shortcoming of the curriculum is that no room was considered for flourishing technological knowledge (TK) and technological content knowledge (TCK) and TPACK, in particular. The results revealed that in order to further improve the current curriculum for TEFL at Farhangian University, specified issues on TK, as one of the major qualifications, have to be embodied in theoretical and practical courses to cover both analog and digital technologies. In addition, it has to be in harmony with TC and TP to form a coherent whole. Last but not least, online teaching and assessment tools also have to be emphasized in the revised curriculum.

* Mojtaba Maghsoudi, is Assistant Professor of TEFL in English Department, Farhangian University. He has been teaching English for more than 20 years.

1. Introduction

It is necessary to empower and support English teachers considering the rapid developments of technology, in general, and educational technology, in particular, because our personal experience justifies its importance and necessity in terms of teaching-learning process during the COVID-19 epidemic. Therefore, student-teachers at Farhangian University is required to address technological knowledge in their curricula, and Farhangian University, which is one of the official institutions of teacher education in Iran, has an important mission to empower student-teachers in this field (Monfaredi Raz, Abbasi Joshaqan, Soleymanpour Omran & Sang-sefidi, 2015). For this reason, researchers in the field of teacher education in Iran and other parts of the world realized that there is a need for a reform in the teacher education system and its curriculum, and without such a reform, capable teachers with specialized qualifications will not enter the educational systems (Karami, 2015; Turgut, 2017)

Educational technology experts believe that most of the existing teacher education programs are in line with traditional goals and are appropriate for the off-world, and although these goals are desirable, they cannot meet the needs of the twentieth century education (Szeto & Cheng, 2017). Traditional patterns of knowledge for teachers, such as Shulman (1986), did not discuss

technology and its relationship to subject knowledge or pedagogical knowledge. But since the growth of technology and its impact on education cannot be ignored, various researchers have tried to add the technological component to Shulman's model. In this way, the combined Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) was proposed by Mishra and Koehler (2006) and it was more welcomed than other models.

Research shows that teachers' level of technological knowledge is not good and teachers are not really prepared to teach with the help of technology (Jahanban Isfahlan & Seifouri, 2020). The root of this fact must be found in the teaching-learning process and curriculum of student-teachers of English language teaching, which has limited their familiarity with technology and their unpreparedness (Dashtestani & Karami, 2019; Esfandiari, 2019). This is also emphasized in the Fundamental Transformation Document of Education (Solution 9-11). Considering that the undergraduate curriculum of English language teaching at Farhangian University was revised in 2015 and was approved and announced for teaching English language teachers and students in 2016, this key question arises that "does this new curriculum, in addition to addressing the needs of student-teachers in the field of subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, also cover technological knowledge? If yes, to what extent? This study tried to review

the status of the curriculum approved in 2016 for English language teaching at Farhangian University in terms of technological, pedagogical, content and pedagogic-content knowledge and to answer the following question:

What is the current status of the curriculum approved in 2016 in the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University, in terms of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge?

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1. English Language Teaching Curriculum at Farhangian University

The English language teaching curriculum at Farhangian University (former Teacher Training Center) was approved for the first time in 1969 as a part of curricular reform for higher education students and was revised in 1979, 1996 and 2007. The program approved in 2007 included 133 courses (5 general units, 12 units of Islamic education courses, 18 units of training courses, and 98 units of specialized courses). This program was last revised in 2016. The new curriculum of this field includes 150 courses (25 units of general courses, 19 units of Islamic education courses, 18 units of pedagogicc courses, and 87 units of specialized courses). It is worth mentioning that out of 133 credits in the old English language curriculum, only 2 general physical education units were

practical and the rest of the courses were presented theoretically, but in the new curriculum, 37 credits are practical and 11 credits are practical (offered as workshops). The new curriculum of English language teaching emphasizes the use of technology in teaching English, and accordingly, 3 15-hour workshops, entitled Application of Information and Communication Technology (1, 2 and 3) in teaching English for Student-teachers were included. This curriculum tries to train teachers who have the necessary professional qualifications to teach English by making the most changes compared to previous programs (Maghsoudi & Khodamoradi, 2020).

2.2. Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge and Pedagogicall Content Knowledge of Language Teachers

The advent of new technology in the field of computer and digital science led to the revision of the traditional model of pedagogical content knowledge of Schulman (1986) so that a technological component was added to it and a Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) was introduced by Mishra and Koehler (2006) (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK) proposed by Mishra and Koehler (2006)

This model has three basic dimensions and four interactive dimensions and

includes a total of seven dimensions. The technological dimension of knowledge is the knowledge that indicates the use of technology, from simple technologies, such as chalk and blackboard to more advanced technologies such as computers and the Internet by the teacher (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). This dimension is now deeply intertwined with the concept of information and communication technology (ICT) (Baran, Canbazoglu Bilici, Albayrak Sari & Tondeur, 2019; Joo, Park & Lim, 2018). Content technology knowledge is an expanded and interactive form of content knowledge and technological knowledge, followed by knowledge of presenting a subject (such as English) with the help of technology (Yurdakul, 2018). This structure illustrates how a particular subject matter is interrelated with technology. In fact, the teacher should not only know about the subject he is teaching, but also how the subject matter changes according to the need of technology (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Pedagogical technological knowledge is an extended and interactive form of technological knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and indicates the use of technology to effectively implement teaching-learning methods (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Pedagogical technological knowledge expresses the time and method of application of technology and also shows how the use of technology affects the teaching-learning process (Drajati, Tan, Haryati, Rochsantiningsih & Zainnuri, 2018;

Turgut, 2017). Technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge focuses on how to develop specific teaching-learning strategies and the subject matter with the help of technology to facilitate learning, and therefore goes beyond the three main constructs. In fact, technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge provide a useful framework for defining what English teachers need to effectively combine technology with pedagogical content knowledge (Habibi, Yusop & Razak, 2020).

Numerous studies have been conducted in Iran and other parts of the world to measure the structures of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge of English language student-teachers. For example, Fathi and Yousefifard (2019) showed that Iranian teachers need to strengthen their knowledge of pedagogical technology and content technology so that they can move beyond the traditional classrooms. Raygan & Moradkhani (2020) examined the impact of school environment, technological, peadagogical and content knowledge, and teachers' attitudes on the use of ICT in English classrooms and found that technological, pedagogical and content knowledge significantly affects the use of ICT. In this regard, Nazari, Nafissi & Estaji (2020) stated that this knowledge should be taught during online service courses to both new teachers and experienced English teachers.

Tseng, Cheng & Yeh (2019) in a case

study examined the nature of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge and analyzed how this knowledge was applied by six English teachers. Using the content analysis method, they showed that the performance of these teachers is basically based on the traditional pedagogical and content model and has no obvious dependence on pedagogical technological knowledge. Turgut (2017) also showed in a qualitative study that the growth of educational technology and thematic knowledge of English language students in the third and fourth year of undergraduate education follows an unbalanced and non-linear trend. Akmal (2017) in a small study studied English language students and teachers in Indonesia and concluded that they suffer from unbalanced growth of knowledge in the fields of technology, pedagogy and content. He concluded that in order to improve their competencies, there should be a change in their curriculum as well as the teaching-learning methods of teacher training courses. Habibi, Yasuk and Razak (2020) examined the relationship between technological, pedagogical and content knowledge of student-teachers and the use of ICT, and their research results showed that the use of this model by student-teachers while teaching is very necessary. Sariçoban, Tosuncuoğlu & Kirmizi (2019) examined the ability of English language students and teachers in Turkey and found that although they have good knowledge in the fields of technology, content and pedagogy, they suffer from asymmetric integration of these components.

3. Method

This research is a content analysis and is based on qualitative analysis. In addition, the nature of this research should be considered practical because the results of qualitative data analysis can help English language curriculum planners and policy makers to identify the current status of the approved curriculum in terms of TPACK. The field focus of this research is on the curriculum approved in 2016 for English language teaching at Farhangian University. The research tool was a researcher-made list based on the review of available theoretical sources of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge model (Herring, Koehler & Mishra, 2016; Reyes, Reading, Doyle & Gregory, 2017; Schmid, Brianza & Petko, 2020; Sobern, Henderson, Heinrich & Redmond, 2020), as shown in Table 1. In order to determine the validity of this tool, the extracted indicators were given to five experts (2 assistant professors of curriculum studies and 3 assistant professors of English language teaching) and they were asked to compare each item with the purpose of the study. According to the experts, the tool was modified and the modified version was provided to them and approved. In order to check the reliability, the same five experts were asked to express their views on the two-

point scale of agreement and disagreement, and finally their agreement coefficient was calculated based on the ratio of agreed components to the total components. The obtained result showed a 93 percent agreement, which indicated a significant validity of the instrument. Subsequently, the agreed components were considered as the final components (Table 1) in this study and 7 percent of the controversial components of all 5 experts were not examined in this study. Thus, the content analysis in this study was performed based on a predetermined framework based on TPACK model (Mishra & Kohler, 2006).

In this study, qualitative data were extracted manually from the undergraduate English language curriculum of Farhangian University. It should be noted that for data analysis, the qualitative content analysis model proposed by Downe (1992), Kandracki (2002), and Patton (2002) was used. The stages of analysis were:

1- Determining the overt and covert content,

2- Determining the unit of analysis,

3- Determining the unit of meaning,

4- Compressing,

5- Separating and summarizing,

6- Determining the content area,

7- Coding,

8- Explain the category and

9- Explain the theme.

In this research, both explicit and implicit content have been considered. In other words, both observable and hidden aspects as well as interpretable and communicative aspects were considered. In this study, the analysis unit was the title of each of the undergraduate language courses of Farhangian University approved in 2016 (for example, the title of the two-unit theoretical course on Documents, Laws and the Education Organization in the Islamic Republic of Iran). The unit of meaning also included sentences and during the compression and summarization process, the size of the data volume was reduced without compromising its quality, and only sentences and passages for the next step were added to one or more elements. He dealt with the pillars of the technological, educational, thematic and educational-thematic knowledge model. For example, in the introduction to the lesson and the rationale section of the above-mentioned course, it is stated as follows: Sentence (1) It is one of the characteristics of formal and general education to be law-abiding; Sentence (2) Therefore, the teacher, as an agent who conducts training in this context, needs to be aware of this context. During the purification and compression process, the first sentence was discarded and the second sentence was analyzed in the next step. Then, the semantic nucleus of each unit was extracted and

placed together in a larger batch. For example, in sentence (2), the semantic core was "pedagogy", which was included in the field of pedagogical knowledge. Then, a group of topics that had a common element in one of the pillars of this research model and had internal coordination and external heterogeneity were considered as a category, so that they can form a comprehensive and comprehensive umbrella. This means that no relevant data could be excluded from the category with the intention of the researcher. In addition, no data were entered in more than one category. For example, the above extracted core ("pedagogy") fell under the category of pedagogical knowledge. Finally, the data theme, which was a repetitive principle created within the categories, was explained.

Table 1: Main indicators and final components based on TPACK model

Component Indicators

Technological Knowledge (TK) (1) Knowledge of simple educational technology (such as using a blackboard),

(2) Knowledge of computer programs (such as the Internet or digital movie plyers),

(3) Knowledge of operating systems,

(4) Knowledge of hardware and technology tools,

(5) Knowledge of software (such as Microsoft Word),

(6) Knowledge of managing online learning and teaching,

(7) Knowledge of comprehensive online training courses,

(8) knowledge of installation and maintenance of educational equipment,

(9) Familiarity with evaluation and measurement tools,

(10) Familiarity with new teaching aids (such as smart boards),

(11) Familiarity with social networks,

(12) Information Technology (IT) knowledge for storage and transmission of educational information,

(13) Knowledge of technology for designing, producing, managing and evaluating learning processes and resources,

(14) Knowledge of Internet security issues, operating systems and software.

Technological Content Knowledge (TCK)(1) Knowledge of combining technology with language skill training,

(2) Knowledge of selecting the appropriate technology to teach a language skill or sub-language skill;

(3) Knowledge of the use of appropriate computer environments and software packages for the content production of each language skill;

(4) Knowledge of the ability to change the content or method of presenting a language skill with regard to technological requirements;

(5) Knowledge of using appropriate tools for each language skill to assess student (such as video conferencing, smart boards, or social media).

Technological Pedagogical Knowledge (TPK)(1) Knowledge of combining or changing technology and training methods to effectively implement different teaching methods;

(2) The ability to use creatively the teaching aids and technology available in an educational field;

(3) Knowledge of the ability to combine existing computer software according to pedagogical needs and goals,

TPACK (1) Knowledge of the simultaneous combination of the content, pedagogical methods and technology and their integration

(2) Knowledge of how to reinforce a linguistic content using technology,

(3) Knowledge of how to use technology for teaching-learning language skills and sub-skills for deep understanding, knowledge to stimulate teachers' perceptions about enhancing learning using technology,

(4) Knowledge of teaching and practicing learning strategies of different language skills using new technologies in order to facilitate

343

learning and solve students' learning problems.

4. Results

After ensuring the validity of the research tool, the content analysis was performed accordingly. Based on this, the entire approved curriculum of English language teaching at Farhangian University in 2016 was reviewed sentence by sentence. All units were extracted and coded. Then sub-categories and indicators related to the model of TPACK were extracted.

A look at the courses offered in the curriculum approved in 2016 for the undergraduate student-teachers of English language teaching (Figure 2) shows that they are required to pass 11 general units, 16 units of Islamic education, 19 units of Islamic education, There are 18 units of educational knowledge, 27 units of educational-thematic and 58 units of thematic knowledge. It should be noted that in the mentioned curriculum, 3 units of technological knowledge are included in the section of "pedagogical content" units. Therefore, the present study focused on 103 units of the courses that these students are required to pass at Farhangian University. As shown in Figure 2, it can be said that 8, 13 and 11 percent of the courses offered in this curriculum are general courses, Islamic courses and Islamic education, respectively, which are included in the definitions of TPACK. Thus, 68 percent of the remaining courses were analyzed

(Figure 2).

Figure 2: Distribution of the undergraduate curriculum for student-teachers of English language teaching

The research question of the study was what is the current status of the curriculum approved in 2016 in the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University, in terms of technological, pedagogical and content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge?

Based on the analysis of the qualitative data in the content of English language courses at Farhangian University, the researcher achieved following findings in terms of technological knowledge:

(1) This curriculum deals with Internet literacy, computer literacy, information literacy, media literacy, digital literacy and technology literacy.

(2) The components of ICT knowledge are presented in the form of an introduction to common educational and special hardware in the field of English language teaching, introduction of operating system, introduction of Microsoft Word, e-mail, and storage of online and offline information.

(3) The components of ICT in the form of appropriate software training for monitoring and evaluation of student projects and, in general, the management and support of students using online environments are covered.

(4) The components of organizing and managing participatory groups by network are introduced.

(5) The component of teacher professional learning is covered by relying on digital literacy and managing Internet security issues.

(6) The teaching profession is taught through consultation with experts outside the workplace and the use of online environments and digital literacy.

Based on the model of TPACK, the shortcomings of the curriculum approved in 2016 for English language teaching student-teachers at Farhangian University were identified as follows:

(1) The knowledge of technology in this curriculum is only in the form of 3 workshop units which in fact requires the use of workshops, and some theoretical training has been ignored. In other words, technological knowledge has not been emphasized as a competency. A good example is the lack of coverage of ICDL skills in separate courses.

(2) Due to the lack of attention to educational technology in the mentioned courses, the use of educational technology (analog and digital) in the curriculum has practically diminished.

(3) There is no emphasis on teaching and online teaching methods.

Based on the analysis of qualitative data

in the content of English language courses at Farhangian University, the researcher achieved the following in terms of technological content knowledge:

(1) The process of searching for written and Internet (online) resources or classroom activities that can reinforce this issue in practice is not emphasized.

(2) None of the objectives of the course emphasizes the use of ICT in the design of classroom activities for better English language teaching.

(3) Creating innovations in educational policies and designing and implementing educational reform programs in schools using ICT are not considered.

(4) Utilization of existing software and use of ICT in introducing basic concepts and processes of language skill assessment are not emphasized. In this regard, instructions for using ICT products for evaluation has not been introduced.

(5) ICT has not been used to acquaint students with learning strategies and how to practice them. Also, the design of language learning activities with the help of ICT to strengthen and increase knowledge and establish linguistic/verbal communication has been neglected. Similarly, there is no emphasis on enhancing thoughtful learning, teamwork, knowledge and language skills, and communication, as well as methods of encouraging students

345

to use ICT.

According to what was raised in response to the research question, it can be concluded that the curriculum approved in 2016 for English language students at Farhangian University is largely based the same traditional pedagogical content knowledge model (Schulman , 1986) with a slight change, the technological-pedagogical structure has been added to it (Figure 3). In other words, by comparing Figure 1 and Figure 3, it can be seen that the new curriculum of English language teaching at Farhangian University has fundamental shortcomings in the field of cultivating and promoting technological-content knowledge for better education of student-teachers of English and suffers from the following shortcomings:

(1) Technological-content knowledge has not been considered as one of the types of course objectives and various teaching methods such as using image, audio file and video have not been well considered. More specifically, in combining technology and subject matter into components such as changing the content structure of the curriculum using technology or meeting technological requirements with the help of content production software to provide skills and subtleties. Different language skills have not received enough attention, either.

(2) The development of language skills in environments such as websites,

social networks, and cyberspace in general has not been well addressed.

Based on the analysis of qualitative data in the English language teaching courses on the components of technological pedagogical knowledge, the researcher found the following shortcomings:

(1) the courses neglect to improve teachers' educational skills in using ICT to create and strengthen creativity and lifelong learning skills and educating them how to use resources to design e-learning topics for innovation and creativity.

(2) In order to hold a standard class, issues such as the use of ICT to perform and organize individual and group class activities (small group or whole-class) have not been addressed. Thus, student-teachers during this period did not organize classes to provide students with fair access to classroom equipment.

(3) Website-based curriculum design in which the school plays a role using ICT is not emphasized and introducing a virtual environment for an effective teaching-learning process and increasing knowledge and understanding of curriculum and enhancing online and reverse learning were ignored.

(4) Combining ICT with educational purposes has been ignored. That is, topics such as how ICT can be used for classroom activities or teaching in specific learning situations or in improving teaching-learning strategies

by using are not emphasized. The introduction of right software and digital resources have been ignored.

(5) Problem-oriented tasks and group projects have not been designed and implemented with the help of ICT. Similarly, applications for classroom activities that enhance students' ability to reason, talk, participate, and solve complex problems have been neglected.

(6) Similarly, students' self-management is not considered in the design and implementation of various learning situations to help students apply and use their skills using ICT. Also, strategies are not included to guide students towards collaborative multimedia production and the production and dissemination of student projects, as well as communication with other audiences and peers.

Accordingly, the shortcomings of the curriculum approved in 2016 in the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University are very important in terms of pedagogical technology knowledge, so that technological pedagogical knowledge is considered as one of the objectives of this course. Above all, different teaching-learning methods using different technologies were not considered.

Based on the analysis of qualitative data in the English language teaching courses mentioned above based on the components of TPACK, the researcher

came to the following findings:

(1) The main factors of the teaching-learning process, including the design, evaluation and modification of educational activities using software applications and hardware, and other digital resources in the classroom have received less attention.

(2) The design and implementation of problem-based situations in which ICT can be used has not been emphasized. For example, no attention was paid to the electronic content production process to promote student innovation.

(3) To evaluate language skills, the standard evaluation methods available for ICT composition have not been considered. Thus, the use of relevant computer environments inside and outside the classroom as well as ICT-based test design strategies have not been considered.

(4) In connection with the curriculum and evaluation, the use of ICT to find appropriate solutions to students' problems and also to evaluate their performance has not been considered.

(5) No attention has been paid to providing learner-centered group and participatory discussions with the help of technology.

(6) In connection with the creation of smart classrooms and schools, the implementation and use of digital literacy and ICT as a resource for improving language skills and

347

increasing professional productivity (such as research or essay writing) are not considered.

Based on the above findings, the curriculum approved in 2016 for the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University suffers from the following shortcomings in terms of TPACK.

(1) The integrated combination of the content, pedagogical and technological knowledge has not been well-considered. In other words, although each of these components has been emphasized to csome extent, the use of technology and software to meet educational needs in a balanced way was neglected.

(2) The choice of efficient teaching methods as well as how to help solve students' problems and correct their mistakes with the help of technology have been neglected.

(3) There is no training in using software for producing content and teaching language skills and sub-skills. Also, very little attention has been paid to preparing the appropriate content using technology and teaching English testing software.

Figure 3: The emerged teacher knowledge model after analyzing the current curricum for the student teachers of English at Farhangian University

5. Conclusion

Review of the curriculum approved in 2016 in the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University in terms of TPACK is of importance due to the role of this curriculum in training English language teachers in schools across the country. Therefore, the findings of this study showed that the current curriculum is mainly based on the pedagogical content knowledge model of Schulman (1986) because the purpose stated in this this curriculum includes content, pedagogical, and content-pedagogical competencies, and technological knowledge is marginally presented in this curriculum as technological content-pedagogical competencies in the form of three courses on the use of ICT in English language teaching whereas the model of TPACK (Mishra & Kohler, 2006) identifies seven areas of knowledge required by teachers. Therefore, it can be concluded that in the new curriculum of English language teaching at Farhangian University, technological knowledge and related components are not sufficienctly included. As other researchers (Maghsoudi & Khodamradi, 2020; Molazehi, Rostminejad & Kikha, 2017; Monfaredi et al., 2015) also pointed out, this lack of attention may be due to the fact that the new curriculum is a revision of the previous curriculum issued in 2007 and in fact the new curriculum has not been developed according to the needs of future English teachers. Another reason for this lack of attention, as shown in Figure 2, is the allocation of only 2% of the courses in

the new curriculum of Farhangian University to the teaching of technological knowledge. On the other hand, in the new curriculum, the seven ICDL skills are part of the compensatory courses, and it has been assumed that English language student-teachers should be taught these skills separately whereas the interactive approach to TPACK requires combined instruction these skills (Karami, 2015).

It seems that in the new curriculum, technological pedagogical knowledge is considered equivalent to ICT. Although this area is still emphasized, technological knowledge, which includes digital categories, the Internet, online teaching tools, online English language teaching and designing cyber-space tools, as well as online assessment tools, has also been neglected. Of course, in this area, we should not neglect the teaching of various non-digital teaching aid technologies, such as tutoring and educational packages. Therefore, it would not be unfair to claim that, according TPACK model, the potential capacities of this curriculum for the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University is is not stong enough. Of course, this situation is not unique to this curriculum and Farhangian University. As stated in other studies in other countries (e.g. Darajati, Tan, Hryati, Roxantingings and Zainnuri, 2018; Sariçoban, Tosuncuoğlu & Kirmizi, 2019; Turgut, 2017), English language curriculum in teacher training

institutions and centers are only able to meet the needs of student-teachers some of these components. Specifically with regard to teacher training courses in Iran, previous research (Mashhadi, Sharifian, Liaqatdar & Rastegarpour, 1396; Molazehi, et al., 2017; Razavi, Mansouri & Shahi, 2017) showed the content of the curriculum in Farhangian University is not very favorable for training technological teachers. This research also showed that the lack of knowledge of teachers, which is due to curriculum problems, is one of the important obstacles to the use of ICT in smart schools.

According to previous results and findings (Baran, Canbazoglu Bilici, Albayrak Sari & Tondeur, 2019; Joo, Park & Lim, 2018; Yardakul, 2018), in order to design a curriculum based on TPACK and to prepare student-teachers, the understanding of integrated TPACK should be emphasized and it is suggested that instead of teaching technology in teacher education programs conceptually, there should be a focus on advanced and applied technology education and on how to use them in teaching, evaluation, task assignment, creativity, and problem-solving in pre-service and in-service courses for teachers. In this way, TPACK is manifested in a practical way and in the form of practical technology. Therefore, practical experiences in supportive environments and in the form of student-teacher educational program are

available (Harvey & Caro, 2017). In the results of this study, it was stated that the integration of technology with other components of the TPACK model is not established properly and in a balanced way, and as a result, it can be expected that technology is not properly incorporated in teaching English. This claim has been reiterated in the results of previous research (Valtonen, Leppänen, Hyypiä, Sointu, Smits, & Tondeur, 2020; Wang, Schmidt-Crawford & Jin, 2018). Therefore, it is worthwhile to pay attention to the development of students' beliefs and attitudes of English language teachers about technology knowledge during the undergraduate course. Findings of comparative research such as Molaynejad and Zakavati (2008) showed that in comparison with Japan, France, England and Malaysia, no special action has been taken in Iran to take advantage of technology in teacher training centers. However, based on the findings (Gill & Dalgarno, 2017; Habibi, Yasup & Razak, 2020), it should be said that most of the countries that include new educational technologies in the curricula of training centers have acted very slowly in combining it with teacher training programs.

This research was not without limitations and the most important of them could be not to address the opinion of stakeholders, policy makers and planners of undergraduate English language courses at Farhangian University regarding the inclusion of

technological pedagogical knowledge in the curriculum approved in 2016. Therefore, this issue can be addressed quantitatively and/or qualitatively in future research. Based on the findings of this study and considering the existing research background, it is recommended that, in view of the impact of technology on the teaching-learning process as well as the emphasis mentioned in the National Curriculum Document and the Document of Fundamental Transformation Education (Solution 9-11), teaching technological knowledge to teachers in the curriculum approved in 2016 for the field of English language teaching at Farhangian University is reformed in accordance with the latest model of TPACK.

Refefrnces

Akmal, A. (2017). Local culture and morality attachment to TPACK framework of pre-service English teachers within the chalenge of the 21st century skills. International Journal of Education, 9(2), 113-119.

Baran, E., Canbazoglu Bilici, S., Albayrak Sari, A., & Tondeur, J. (2019). Investigating the impact of teacher education strategies on preservice teachers' TPACK. British Journal of Educational Technology, 50(1), 357-370.

Dashtestani, S., Karami, H. (2019). An analysis of Iranian online EFL teachers' technological, pedagogical, and evaluation skills. Foreign Language Research Journal, 9(3), 815-830.

Downe, W. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and Issues. Health Care for Women International, 13(3), 32-48.

Drajati, N. A., Tan, L., Haryati, S., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Zainnuri, H. (2018). Investigating English language teachers in developing TPACK and multimodal literacy. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5(2), 575-582.

Esfandiari, R. (2019). Iranian EFL Teachers' Digital Literacy in Academic Settings: Teacher Professionalism in the Digital Age. Foreign Language Research Journal, 9(3), 691-720.

Fathi, J., Yousefifard, S. (2019). Assessing language teachers' technological tedagogical Content knowledge (TPACK): EFL students' perspectives. Research in English Language Pedagogy, 7(2), 255-282.

Gill, L., & Dalgarno, B. (2017). A qualitative analysis of pre-service primary school teachers' TPACK development over the four years of their teacher preparation programme. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 26(4), 439-456.

Habibi, A., Yusop, F. D., & Razak, R. A. (2020). The role of TPACK in affecting pre-service language teachers' ICT integration during teaching practices: Indonesian context. Education and Information Technologies, 25(3), 1929-1949.

Harvey, D. M., & Caro, R. (2017). Building TPACK in preservice teachers through explicit course design. TechTrends, 61(2), 106-114.

Herring, M. C., Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (Eds.). (2016). Handbook of technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) for educators. Routledge.

Jahanban Isfahlan, H., Seifoori, Z. (2020). The Comparison of Tabriz High School EFL Teachers' Attitudes toward Integrating Technology in The Classroom based on their Demographics. Foreign Language Research Journal, 10(3), 526-541.

Joo, Y. J., Park, S., & Lim, E. (2018). Factors influencing preservice teachers' intention to use technology: TPACK, teacher self-efficacy, and technology acceptance model. Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 21(3), 48-59.

Karami, Z. (2015). Teaching technology in teacher education. Teacher Development 12 (1), 6-8.

Kondracki, N. (2002). Content analysis: Review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 3(4), 17-26.

Maghsoudi, M., Khodamoradi, A. (2020). A Critical Analysis of the Latest Curriculum for English Language Teacher Education at Farhangian University. Critical Studies in Texts &

Programs of Human Sciences, 19(11), 273-297.

Mashhadi, H., Sharifiyan, F., Liyaghatdar, M., Rastegarpour, H. (2018). The Study of Current and Desired Curriculum Content for Educating Technology-oriented Teachers from Viewpoints of Experts, Faculty Members and University Students. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12(47), 37-68.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers college record, 108(6), 1017-1054.

Molaynejad, A. & Zakavati, A. (2008). A comparatison of the teaching education curricula in England, France, Japan, Malaysia and Iran: ICT-based eeducation revisited. Educational Innovations, 7 (4), 35-62.

Molazehi, A., Rostaminejad, M. & Kikha, H. (2017). Commparison of the new primary education curriculum at Farhangian University with the ICT needs of student teachers. The First National Conference on ICT oppurtunities and advances. Tehran: Farhangian University.

Monfaredi Raz, B. Abbasi Joshaqan, E., Soeymanpour Omran, M. & sang-sfidi, R. (2015). The role of Farhangian University in training thoughtful teacher with ICT oriented curriculum approach. New Strategies for Teacher Education, 1(1), 15-36.

Nazari, N., Nafissi, Z., & Estaji, M. (2020). The impact of an online professional development course on EFL teachers' TPACK. Journal of Language Horizons, 4(1), 59-86.

Patton, M. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Thousand Oask, California: Sage Publication.

Raygan, A., & Moradkhani, S. (2020). Factors influencing technology integration in an EFL context: investigating EFL teachers' attitudes, TPACK level, and educational climate. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 3(2), 1-22.

Razavi, S., Mansouri, A., Shahi, S. (2017). A Study of Status of Communication and Information Technology Application at Elementary Smart Schools at Shush City. Journal of Educational Scinces, 24(2), 129-150.

Reyes Jr, V. C., Reading, C., Doyle, H., & Gregory, S. (2017). Integrating ICT into teacher education programs from a TPACK perspective: Exploring perceptions of university lecturers. Computers and Education, 11(5), 1-19.

Sariçoban, A., Tosuncuoğlu, İ., & Kirmizi, Ö. (2019). A technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) sssessment of pre-service EFL teachers learning to teach English as a foreign language. Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi, 15(3), 1122-1138.

Saubern, R., Henderson, M., Heinrich, E., & Redmond, P. (2020). TPACK–time to reboot? Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 36(3), 1-9.

Schmid, M., Brianza, E., & Petko, D. (2020). Developing a short assessment instrument for Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK. xs) and comparing the factor structure of an integrative and a transformative model. Computers & Education, 1(5), 103-127.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

Szeto, E., & Cheng, A. Y. N. (2017). Pedagogies across subjects: What are preservice teachers' TPACK patterns of integrating technology in practice? Journal of Educational Computing Research, 55(3), 346-373.

Tseng, J. J., Cheng, Y. S., & Yeh, H. N. (2019). How pre-service English teachers enact TPACK in the context of web-conferencing teaching: A design thinking approach. Computers & Education, 128, 171-182.

Turgut, Y. (2017). Tracing preservice English language teachers' perceived TPACK in sophomore, junior, and senior levels. Cogent Education, 4(1), 136-152.

Valtonen, T., Leppänen, U., Hyypiä, M., Sointu, E., Smits, A., & Tondeur, J. (2020). Fresh perspectives on TPACK: pre-service teachers' own appraisal of their challenging and confident TPACK

areas. Education and Information Technologies, 3(1), 1-20.

Wang, W., Schmidt-Crawford, D., & Jin, Y. (2018). Preservice teachers' TPACK development: A review of literature. Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 34(4), 234-258.

Yurdakul, I. K. (2018). Modeling the relationship between pre-service teachers' TPACK and digital nativity. Educational Technology Research and Development, 66(2), 267-281.