Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning

University of Tabriz

Volume 17, Issue 35, 2025

An Innovative Standards-Based Post-Graduate Computer-Assisted-Language-Learning Program in a Women's University in Iran

Reza Rezvani (Corresponding Author)

Department of English Language and Literature, Yasouj University, Yasuj, Iran. Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran. E-mail: rezvanireza@gmail.com

Ahmad Izadi

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: Ahmadizadi20@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO:

Received date:
2025.01.07
Accepted date:
2025.01.27

Print ISSN: 2251-7995
Online ISSN: 2676-6876

Keywords:

Computer-Assisted Language Learning, Intended Curriculum, Syllabus, Assessment

Abstract

The emergence of technological advances dramatically changed the status of foreign language teaching forever, making computer-assisted language learning (CALL) into a key area in foreign language teaching and later a distinct academic discipline at higher education level. The present study describes the intended curriculum of a two-year post-graduate technology-enhanced language teaching program launched at Al-Zahra University, a women's university in Tehran, Iran, as well as the national context within which the program was developed. It begins with a background on the significance of technology in education followed by a brief history of education in Iran. The main part of the paper describes the intended curriculum of the program from different perspectives including the aims and rationales, significance of the program, student profile (who takes it) and sources of the M.A. admission examination, abilities intended for graduates, courses of the program, syllabus and recommended readings, and assessment of the course outcomes. The paper finally concludes by discussing what is not included in the curriculum as well as the implications for teacher educators and suggestions for further research.

Citation: Rezvani, R & Izadi, A. (2025). An Innovative Standards-Based Post-Graduate Computer-Assisted-Language-Learning Program in a Women's University in Iran. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 17 (37), 301-324. DOI: 10.22034/elt.2025.65338.2739

Introduction

Today, new digital technologies have permeated all areas of life and education. It is hard to conceive a student learning or a teacher teaching in the absence of any digital devices or services. Back, towards the turn of the new millennium, the rapid growth and spread of information technology and digital media increasingly challenged higher education to responsively find ways to integrate them in education. The revision of regular curricular contents or introduction of curricular innovations is not, by and large, dependent on the will or desire of professors. Such curriculum innovations, particularly at large scales, need the approval or support of decision makers in higher education institutions or government policy makers in more centralized educational systems.

In centralized education systems, like Iran's higher education, the introduction of new curricular programs is mainly undertaken through new policies translated into curriculum policy documents or standards mandated nationally (Alptekin & Tatar, 2011; Kayaoglu, 2015; Rezvani et al., 2021). These teacher-proof, national curriculums reflect the developers' ideas about schooling, teaching, and learning, and are intended to promote uniformity across education systems, improve financial effectiveness, and develop a sense of national identity (Kridel, 2010), despite numerous critical perspectives (see for example Biesta & Burbules, 2003; Mazon et al., 2020).

These top-down curriculum policy documents are distilled in texts available publicly for teachers and professors and also for martials developers to accordingly design their teaching and martials. These policy documents and standards like any texts need to be accurately written, understood, and systematically planned and implemented. They should also be subject to ongoing analysis and evaluation (Hall, 2014) before and after introduction for any flaws or improvements. The analysis of a curriculum document involves breaking it into its components and examining each part closely to see "the way they fit together to make a whole, to identify the beliefs and ideas to which the developers were committed and which either explicitly or implicitly shaped the curriculum, and to examine the implications of these commitments and beliefs for the quality of the educational experience" (Posner, 2004, 14).

Curriculum and Curriculum Analysis

The term curriculum has numerous definitions. Sometimes it simply refers to the courses listed in a program, but generally it encompasses the whole process of education for a degree including a description of educational goals, content, instruction, and assessment of learning outcomes (Elmas et al., 2020). Different stakeholders in higher education may have varying interpretations of curricula. In a study conducted by Stark and Lowther (1986), definitions of curricula were gathered from faculty members, administrators, graduate students, and observers of higher education. The study highlighted that these definitions often revolved around concepts such as "the purpose of learning", "experiences that students should learn", "courses offered to students", "courses which students elect from", "the content of a particular discipline", "the time and credit frame in which an education center provides education", as well as "their own views of learning and their personal philosophy of education" as fundamental components of curriculums.

Lattuca and Stark (2011) proposed the concept of "academic plan" in order to remedy the lack of an inclusive definition of curriculum, and believed that "an academic plan should involve decisions about (at least) the following elements:

1. Purposes: knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be learned

2. Content: subject matter selected to convey specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes

3. Sequence: an arrangement of the subject matter and experiences intended to lead to specific outcomes for learners

4. Learners: how the plan will address a specific group of learners

5. Instructional processes: the instructional activities by which learning may be achieved

6. Instructional resources: the materials and settings to be used in the learning process

7. Evaluation: the strategies used to determine whether decisions about the elements of the academic plan are optimal

8. Adjustment: enhancements to the plan based on experience and evaluation" (p. 4-5).

In Lattuca and Stark's view, every curriculum addresses all the elements of the plan sketched above providing a heuristic encouraging a meticulous process of decision-making and includes a blueprint for defining objectives, designing activities, and evaluating the success of a curriculum. In other words, the plan can be understood as decisions about intended, implemented, and attained curriculums.

From a different viewpoint, an educational system typically comprises three crucial components: objectives, instruction, and assessment (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). These components have also been referred to as intended, implemented, and attained (Aikenhead, 2006; Kurz et al., 2010; Thijs & van den Akker, 2009; van den Akker, 2003). The intended curriculum, as the focus of this study, is a set of formal documents which formally stipulates what education authorities or expert educators expect students to acquire in terms of knowledge, understanding, skills, values, and attitudes. Based on the specified objectives, it may also set the content of the courses, syllabi, textbooks, and the assessment of the outcomes of the teaching and learning process. The implemented or enacted curriculum is the realization of the intended curriculum through actual instruction which happens in the context of classrooms. In other words, it is the intended curriculum translated into practice; However, the implemented curriculum may not mirror exactly what is purported in the intended curriculum because of instructors' interpretations and adaptions in response to the contextual factors (Fullan, 2007; O'Sullivan, 2004; Smith & Southerland, 2007). Finally, attained or achieved curriculum refers to the assessment of the acquired knowledge and skills through various means and/or demonstration in practice. The degree of agreement among these three curriculum components and the extent to which they work together harmoniously in order to facilitate student learning is a serious concern and a topic of research in alignment evaluation studies (see for example Amiri & Rezvani, 2021; Rezvani et al., 2016; Rezvani et al., 2021; Rezvani & Farsimadan, 2025).

As with higher education curriculums, it is widely agreed that curriculums should align with societal goals and incorporate the latest skills required in a rapidly evolving world. To ensure that curriculums meet the needs of society and adequately equip students for their future endeavors, it is imperative that they undergo thorough analysis and evaluation, with necessary revisions made as needed. More practical approaches to curriculum analysis or evaluation usually, as indicated above, seek to break a curriculum into its components in order to understand the "anatomy of a curriculum" (Zais, 1976) informed by theoretical frameworks. The Tyler Rationale (1949), for example, is a framework for curriculum planning and analysis which encompasses four questions concerning the selection of educational purposes, the determination of educational experiences, the organization of these experiences, and the evaluation of the attainment of the purposes, presuming that any curriculum needs to answer these four key questions. Since its publication in 1949, this framework has influenced educators from a wide range of orientations and helped curriculum analysts for approximately seven decades to date. For example, to name but a few, Posner and Rudnitsky (1994) and Barnes (2018) drew on it to develop course-planning guides and Popham and Baker (1970) explicitly turned to the framework for the selection of assessment objectives. There have also been alternative paradigms, like John Dewey's (1916) philosophies, enriching curriculum inquiries and discussions.

Intended Curriculum Analysis

Since this study is concerned with an intended curriculum recently introduced in Iran's higher education, this section elaborates further on this type of curriculum. Intended curriculums are the most basic element in formulating educational experiences purported as objectives, contents, and resources. In fact, enacted and attained curriculums follow from the specifications or even prescriptions laid down in intended curriculums, and their success largely depends on the extent to which intended curriculums are legitimately developed. That is why, there has been extensive literature on the analysis of intended curriculums and how they are reflected in actual classroom practices. In other words, in most of curriculum studies analysis of intended curriculums are foregrounded, and then their relationships with the implemented or assessed curriculums are investigated (for example, Polikoff, 2015; Webb, 1999, 2002).

Science is considered a prominent area of education, with numerous studies conducted worldwide to determine the objectives it aims to achieve. Focusing on the learning content of the curriculum, Matsubara et al. (2016), for example, investigated the characteristics of the intended curriculum for Japanese primary science. Their research indicated that compared to the international average, two topic areas of "Human Health" and "Changes in Environments" showed less coverage in the Japanese primary science curriculum. This highlights potential areas for improvement in science education in Japan.

In another study, using Bloom's revised taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) Wei and Ou (2019) compared junior high school science curriculum standards in Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao. The findings of the study revealed that lower-order cognitive processes and knowledge types comprised the majority of the curriculums in all the regions. Thus, some recommendations were made to paying more attention to higher-order knowledge types and cognitive processes and the link between them. Many other studies have investigated

the intended chemistry curriculums of different educational settings (e.g., Elmas et al., 2020; Wei, 2020) as well as other major's curriculums such as mathematics (e.g., Jayathirtha, 2018; Lee et al., 2019), history (e.g., Hues, 2011), nursing (e.g., Friedel & Treagust, 2005) etc.

Several studies have delved into the relationship between the intended curriculum and other curriculums or components of curriculums. Webb (1997) developed a model for the alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and science and later used it to analyze the alignment of standards and assessments in mathematics and science in four states of America (Webb, 1999). He finally offered some valuable suggestions for the improvement of the alignment between the two. In another study, Polikoff (2015) investigated the alignment of fourth-grade mathematics curriculum standards with the materials in the U.S. and concluded substantial areas of misalignment.

Khaddoor et al. (2017) investigated the intended secondary chemistry curriculums of seven Arabic countries represented by their chemistry textbooks. The results of their study revealed that Algeria, Kuwait and Palestine's curriculums were purely traditional and focused only on chemistry, while Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan's textbooks represented more modern approaches to teaching chemistry. They finally concluded that there is not a clear relationship between the intended chemistry curriculums of these countries and their regional background, the level of economic strength, and the degree of traditionalism.

Analysis of the intended curriculums of foreign language areas has also received considerable attention in Iran. For example, Atai and Mazlum's (2013) study focused on the planning and implementation of the English language teaching curriculum within Iran's Ministry of Education. To do so, they examined both junior and high school ELT curriculum documents, gave questionnaires to ELT teachers, and conducted interviews with ministry officials, material developers and head teachers. Their research highlighted the following key points:

> *Results attested to the lack of any ELT-specific document for material development and absence of research-based needs assessment as the foundation of the programmes. Also, there are no pre-defined linguistic and professional criteria for evaluating teachers, and planning for students' assessment is limited to a set of general guidelines. Moreover, there is neither a programme evaluation nor an ELT evaluation model and national-level policies are not re-examined at planning level. Results also indicate that politico-ideological beliefs of material developers are as important as their expertise and communication channels between planning and practice levels are of a top-down nature. It is argued that the gap between planning and practice results from a highly centralized policymaking process in which local policymakers (i.e. teachers) are not involved (*Atai and Mazlum's, 2013, 389).

In another study, Kiany et al. (2011) investigated the public national policy documents of Iran such as The 20-year National Vision, The Comprehensive Science Roadmap, The National Curriculum, Policies of the 5th 5-year Development Plan, The National Document of Education, Philosophy of Education in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Fundamental Principles in Islamic Education, and Roadmap of the Official and General Educational System in order to explore the extent to which foreign language education is reflected in these official documents.

Their research revealed a lack of coherent policies concerning foreign language education, with discrepancies evident among the various documents. Several studies have also been conducted specifically on language education policies in Iran. (e.g., Atai, 2002a; Atai, 2002b; Narafshan & Yamini, 2011; Rezvani et al., 2021). For instance, Rezvani et al. (2021), utilized Bloom's revised taxonomy to analyze the official curriculum standards for Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages (TPSOL) at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels. They first looked into the educational objectives represented in the policy documents of the courses at both levels and then examined the degree of the vertical statistical alignment between the educational objectives targeted in the two sets of course standards. The results of their research highlighted a predominant focus on lower-order cognitive processes and knowledge types while higher-order cognitive processes were largely overlooked. Regarding the vertical alignment between the two curriculums, the results indicated that they were significantly aligned with one another in terms of educational objectives.

Integration of Technology into Education

Education serves as a powerful force for change or as a preserver of the status quo. It is constantly influenced by societal shifts and advancements in research and theory. The emergence of information technology and digital devices has revolutionized the educational landscape, providing new avenues for learning and fostering innovative approaches to teaching (Siau, 2018). The COVID-19 pandemic, initially a global crisis of unprecedented proportions, has accelerated the adoption and integration of technology in education, ushering in a new era of learning (Riazi & Rezvani, 2021; Xie et al., 2020). Technology has become an indispensable component of education across all disciplines, with technology-enhanced instruction becoming commonplace in higher education. It is now inconceivable to imagine educators and students in higher education not utilizing essential technological tools such as email, e-textbooks, and educational platforms like Google Classroom and Adobe Connect. The widespread use of technology in education and daily life has necessitated the implementation of technology-focused training programs and courses. Consequently, it is not surprising that higher education institutions are increasingly offering subject courses that focus on the integration of technology in various academic fields (Hsu & Hargrave, 2000). The demand for technology-oriented education is a testament to the pivotal role that technology plays in shaping the future of learning and teaching.

The integration of technology into primary education is primarily achieved through teacher preparation programs and the development of training courses, whether preservice or in-service (Lu, et al., 2011; Pope et al., 2002). As a result, it is becoming increasingly common to find individual courses designed to equip teachers with the necessary skills to effectively incorporate technology into their instruction (Hargrave & Hsu, 2000). It is not far-fetched to anticipate that these individual courses will evolve into comprehensive programs, considering the rapid advancements in instructional technology and its immense potential to enhance the quality of instruction. Over the past three decades, extensive research has been conducted to enhance the knowledge and skills of future teachers in incorporating technology into their teaching practices. The integration of technology has become a crucial aspect of teacher training programs worldwide (Davis & Falba, 2002; Dawson et al., 2003). Despite the

significant efforts made to equip teachers with the necessary skills, research indicates that many educators still struggle to effectively integrate technology into their teaching methods (Rodrigues, 2003). Selinger (2001) suggested that the reason for this inefficacy lies in the fact that basic technology skills are often taught in isolation, without considering the pedagogical context. Hew and Brush (2007) identified various barriers faced by K-12 schools when integrating technology into the curriculum, including limited resources, institutional constraints, subject culture, attitudes and beliefs, assessment practices, as well as knowledge and skills.

The integration of new technologies into foreign language curriculums has also sparked interest among researchers. Extensive research has delved into the impact of these technologies on both teachers and learners. For instance, van Olphen (2007) conducted a study analyzing the attitudes of preservice teachers towards the incorporation of technology into foreign language classes. The focus was on web-based instruction environments, with the conclusion that preservice teachers found these tools to be highly beneficial in their teaching process. In another study, Kost (1999) explored the influence of the World Wide Web on enhancing students' communicative language skills. The study highlighted the web's pivotal role in language learning, emphasizing its vast array of applicable materials for language lessons. While acknowledging the potential for inexperienced users to become overwhelmed, Kost noted that mastering the web's resources is essential for educators. Several other studies have examined various aspects related to technology integration in foreign language education. These include investigations into learners' behaviors (Fischer, 2007; Hwu, 2003), activities for L2 teachers (MacDonald, 2003), modification devices used by non-native students (Lee, 2002), learner autonomy (Hubbard, 2013), and language assessment (Suvorov & Hegelheimer, 2013). Each study contributes valuable insights into the evolving landscape of technology in foreign language education.

With the integration of technology into language studies at the higher education level, scholars in Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) (For instance, Borrás & Lafayette, 1994; Oliva & Pollastrini, 1995) have increasingly focused on it as no longer just an accessory but an essential component. Bax (2003, 2011) has outlined the evolution of CALL from a Restricted to Open to Integrative approach, culminating in normalization where technology seamlessly blends into everyday teaching practices. This shift has prompted curriculum developers to create CALL courses that help language teachers grasp the theoretical foundations of CALL and implement them effectively in the classroom. As an example, a graduate course entitled "Information Literacy for Research on Language and Culture" was developed for students of Japanese as a foreign language (JFL) on CALL teacher education. Susser (2005) described objectively described this course and argued that he selected four aspects to be covered including basic computer literacy, tutor and tool software applications, evaluation of learning materials, and online instruction with regard to the role of the course in the curriculum, students' needs, and recognition of valuable aspects of CALL. Aside from this descriptive study, far too little attention has been paid to describing or analyzing an intended CALL curriculum at higher education level so far. In order to fill this gap in the literature, the present study attempted to describe the intended curriculum of a newly-developed postgraduate CALL program launched at an Iranian university.

The integration of technology into foreign language studies at the higher education level has also paved the way for the development and implementation of an innovative technology-oriented M.A. program in Iran, a developing country with a top-down education system. This study aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the intended curriculum of this two-year program as outlined in the official policy document developed by the Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology (MSRT). To begin, we will provide an overview of Iran's education system and the context in which this study is situated. Subsequently, we will detail the specifics of Iran's first Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) intended curriculum.

Education in Iran

Education in Iran is highly centralized and is divided into levels both in K-12 and higher education. Primary school is a six-year-period starting at the age of six, followed by junior high school which lasts for three years. The subjects are the same for all the students during these nine years. In the last three years of senior high school, however, students' subjects may differ depending on their areas of study including mathematics, natural sciences, and humanities. The Ministry of Education is in charge of educational financing, planning, curriculum and materials development, and teacher education for this 12-year schooling, mandating the same programs across the country. In order to pursue their education into higher levels, students need to pass a competitive, nationwide exam, and are admitted to universities based on their ranks on this high-stakes exam. The exams are nationally and annually commissioned and administered by a state center for test assessment called the National Organization of Educational Testing.

In higher education, degrees are offered at associate (two years), bachelor's (four years), master's (two years), and doctorate (four years) levels. Universities and higher education institutions are supervised by MSRT for non-medical programs (humanities, sciences, engineering, agriculture and arts) and the Ministry of Health and Medical Education for medical programs. These two ministries are hierarchically in charge of determining the educational visions and planning the curriculums of the specific programs. The required number of credits and courses for each program is also stipulated by the ministries; however, the choice and offering of elective courses, from among the ones authorized, are made by universities and departments. As regards materials and course assessments, recommendations are usually made in policy standards and professors might introduce or cover materials based on their own preference. It is worth noting that attempts have been made to design and develop textbooks on various courses of human sciences including English for Specific Purposes courses by a state publication center known as the Organization for Researching and Composing University Textbooks in the Humanities officially commissioned to serve learning and scholarship in higher education of Iran based on the content of the same official textbooks covered across the country.

Higher Education Foreign Language Studies in Iran

Since Iran has been a juncture between the East and the West, Iranians have been into direct contact with other cultures and their languages such as Sumerian, Akkadian, Greek, Elamite, Aramaic, Arabic, Turkish, etc. for centuries (Yarshater, 1983). Iranians' exposure to western culture and languages mainly started in the nineteenth century, when some students were sent to Europe to be educated during the Qajar dynasty, and foreign language teaching in Iran started

following the establishment of 'Dar-al-Fonoon' in 1851 (Zarrinabadi & Mahmoudi-Gahrouei, 2018). The study of foreign languages in Iranian universities, however, dates back to the mid-1930s with teaching Arabic and French at the University of Tehran. Ever since language studies have continued to be offered at different universities.

In addition to Persian language and literature and ancient Iranian languages, the foreign languages, that is, English, French, Spanish, German, Russian, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Turkish and Urdu are taught at Iranian universities at Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), M.A., and Ph.D. levels. The students of these languages can major variously in language and literature, translation, and language teaching. Linguistics is also offered at both graduate and postgraduate programs without reference to any specific languages, although the medium of instruction and course materials are mainly English or Persian.

Technology and Language Studies

In recent decades, higher education has been significantly affected by technology, and language studies majors have been no exception. The major influence of computers on linguistics led to the appearance of computational linguistics in the mid-twentieth century, some branches of which such as corpus linguistics revolutionized both linguistics and applied linguistics. The advent of machine translation was also a considerable impact that technology had on translation studies. Technology has also been reforming language teaching and learning, adding a through-technology alternative to every aspect of language teaching, from teaching language skills and components to language testing. This gradually led to the development of a new area in foreign language teaching and learning known as computer-assisted language learning (CALL).

The term CALL was coined by Davies and Steel (1981) and has been defined by many researchers since then, but the definition which seems to have withstood the test of time is the one proposed by Levy defining CALL as "the search for and the study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning" (Levy, 1997, 1). However, despite the appearance of the term, CALL is not limited to computers and encompasses any information and technological means serving language education. The considerable advances in technology and the rapid growth of CALL around the world prompted books, conferences, and scholarly journals in different areas of language teaching and learning.

This growth has been so significant in recent years that CALL made its way into applied linguistics curriculums as a course in both M.A. and Ph.D. programs throughout the world. The ever-growing prominence of technology in language education further elevated the status of CALL from a course into an independent major in several universities in the world. Similarly, these advancements in CALL led to the inclusion of an elective course in post-graduate TEFL curriculums in Iran under the names of technology in language teaching (for M.A. level) and technology-enhanced language learning (for Ph.D. level), and finally prompted Al-Zahra women's University to launch an M.A-level program. The present study is motivated to describe the intended curriculum of this newly-developed postgraduate program officially termed as technology-enhanced language teaching.

The Present Study

This study aimed at objectively describing the intended curriculum of technology-enhanced language teaching, an M.A. level program launched at Al-Zahra University. The program was approved by the Higher Education Development and Planning Council in 2019 and was implemented at Al-Zahra University the following year. The study utilized document analysis method, a qualitative method which entails analyzing documents that contain valuable information about the phenomena of interest (Bailey, 1994) by finding, selecting, interpreting, and synthesizing data contained within them (Bowen, 2009). Document analysis, initially not created for research purposes, is now a widely used approach to investigate and extract insights from written documents (Payne & Payne, 2004). It is an unobtrusive, innovative approach prevalent in qualitative case studies, and particularly in policy research for collecting and assessing data (Berg, 2001) to provide detailed descriptions of a specific program, event, etc. (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2018).

To describe this intended curriculum, the official policy documents of the program developed by MSRT were carefully examined as such official documents are regarded as "social facts which are produced, shared, and used in socially organized ways" (Atkinson & Coffey, 1997, 47). The documents were examined in terms of various issues including aims and rationales, the significance of the program, student profile and sources of the M.A. university entrance examination (UEE), the abilities intended for graduates, the courses of the program, the syllabus and readings recommended, and assessment of what students have obtained.

Aims and Rationales

The aim of this program is to train English language teachers and researchers to reach a reasonable level of competence in using modern technologies in language learning and teaching. At the end of this programs, they are expected to be able to "establish a connection between current theories of language learning and capabilities of the latest digital technologies, develop virtual and multimedia contents which are context-bound and culture-specific, and finally make a fundamental change in the field of English language teaching in Iran" (MSRT, 2019, 3).

These objectives reflect the current significance of integrating modern technologies into language education and the transformative potential of technology in language learning contexts. According to Warschauer and Healey (1998), technology can enhance language learning by providing interactive and engaging platforms for students to practice their language skills. Furthermore, Hubbard (2017) stressed the significance of aligning technology use with pedagogical approaches to ensure effective language learning outcomes. The program's objectives also emphasize the incorporation of virtual and multimedia content, which aligns with the principles of constructivist learning theories. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory emphasizes the role of cultural context in learning, suggesting that culturally specific materials can enhance students' understanding and engagement (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Additionally, the concept of situated learning, proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991), supports the idea of context-bound learning experiences that promote a deeper understanding and application of language skills. Moreover, by bridging current language learning theories with the capabilities

of digital technologies, English educators can create innovative learning environments that cater to diverse learning styles and preferences. The potential for technology to revolutionize English language teaching in Iran is evident, given the global trend towards digitalization in education as highlighted by the OECD's reports on digital learning environments (OECD, 2015). This shift towards technology-enhanced language education not only improves pedagogical practices but also prepares students for the digital demands of the 21st century. Overall, the integration of modern technologies in language teaching, as envisioned by the program, holds immense promise for reshaping English language education in Iran. By combining theoretical insights with practical applications of digital tools, the prospective teachers and teacher educators targeted by this program can empower students to navigate language learning in a dynamic and culturally relevant manner, fostering a paradigm shift in the field of English language teaching.

The Significance of the Program

Given the growing significance of both the English language and technology, as well as their integration, there are compelling reasons to introduce a computer-assisted language learning program at the higher education level in Iran. Firstly, this field of study is offered at numerous prestigious universities worldwide, at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels. This presents an opportunity to attract international students and foster healthy competition between Iranian English teachers and educators from other countries.

Secondly, there exists a symbiotic relationship between the English language and the digital realm. The integration of new technologies in English language instruction is increasingly crucial. Unlike traditional face-to-face courses, where English classrooms were isolated cultural environments for language practice, the emergence of information and communication technologies (ICT) has revolutionized foreign language education. This shift has enabled English learners to collaborate and engage with one another beyond the confines of the classroom. Therefore, a higher education program is imperative to equip English language educators with the necessary skills to effectively utilize modern technologies in language instruction.

Thirdly, this program aims to bring about a fundamental change in Iran's language education and redefine the concept of literacy to include technological proficiency. This perspective is endorsed by numerous scholars (e.g., Hutchinson, 2012; Leander, 2007; Stolle, 2008) who argue that the incorporation of technology into literacy instruction has been largely overlooked, despite being a crucial aspect of teachers' professional growth.

Furthermore, given its interdisciplinary nature, a computer-assisted language learning program can establish strong ties with industry and society, opening up opportunities for remote work for individuals interested in language instruction. With the continuous advancement of technology, the demand for online language education has surged, and a program that seamlessly integrates language teaching and technology can effectively meet this demand. Additionally, the integration of technology in language learning can foster entrepreneurship and self-employment in the field of language instruction. The program can equip language educators with the necessary skills to develop and deliver online courses, create language learning applications, or offer online tutoring services. This not only broadens

employment prospects for language educators but also enables them to reach a wider audience both domestically and internationally. By embracing technology and entrepreneurship in the realm of language education, the program can address the evolving needs of learners and pave the way for new opportunities for language teaching professionals, ultimately contributing to the advancement of language education in Iran and beyond.

Student Profile and Sources of the M.A. Admission Examination

This program is designed for students who are proficient in English and possess a strong theoretical foundation in the field of English language teaching. Therefore, graduates with a B.A. in English language teaching, English language and literature, or English translation are ideal candidates for this program. The program's focus on attracting students with a strong theoretical foundation in English language teaching and related fields, such as English language and literature or English translation, reflects a strategic approach to ensuring that participants are well-equipped to navigate the complexities of English language education. Graduates with a background in these areas are likely to possess a solid understanding of language structures, teaching methodologies, and literary analysis, providing them with a foundation for advanced study in English language teaching assisted by technology.

While the program prioritizes candidates with specific academic backgrounds, it also welcomes students from other majors, albeit with additional course requirements. This inclusive approach is consistent with the principles of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI), which regards diversity in learners as the norm and is on the premise that "the planning and delivery of instruction as well as the evaluation of learning can incorporate attributes that embrace heterogeneity of learners without compromising academic standards" (McGuire & Scott, 2006, 22). By offering supplementary courses tailored to the needs of students from diverse backgrounds as required by the curriculum, the program aims to support their successful transition into the specialized domain of English language education assisted by technology.

It is noteworthy that this program uses the TEFL M.A. admission exam as the admission examination to the program. This highlights its current strong connection with TEFL and underscores a dedication to upholding industry standards to ensure that graduates are fully equipped for the challenges of English language teaching. Standardized assessments, such as the TEFL university admission exam in Iran, play a crucial role in evaluating candidates' language proficiency and pedagogical knowledge, providing a benchmark for quality assurance in English language teaching programs (Weir, 2005). By utilizing the same sources and assessment criteria, the program not only prepares students for the challenges of the exam but also signals its adherence to industry standards and best practices in English language teaching education. However, over time, as the program evolves and gains further recognition, there should be opportunities to create a customized exam that aligns more closely with the

program's unique objectives and aspirations. This will pave the way for future differentiation and specialization, allowing the program to further distinguish itself in the field.

The Abilities Intended for Graduates

Graduates of this program are expected to "be eligible for teaching courses related to English language, using modern technologies appropriately, and producing digital language educational contents. They are also supposed to do research on a range of interdisciplinary topics related to their field of study. These research studies can also lead to the production of products" (MSRT, 2019. 3).

The skills and competencies acquired by graduates of a program are essential in shaping their future career prospects and academic pursuits. As Jackson et al. (2023) pointed out, the abilities obtained during a graduate program have a significant impact on graduates' employability and success in their chosen field. In this context, graduates are expected to possess a diverse set of abilities that enable them to navigate the complexities of modern educational practices. One key ability that graduates are expected to have is proficiency in teaching courses related to the English language using modern technologies. Research emphasizes the importance of integrating technology into language teaching to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes (Yu et al., 2020). Graduates who are well-versed in utilizing modern technologies in language education are better equipped to create dynamic and interactive learning experiences for their students. Another essential ability that the graduates are expected to possess is the skill of producing digital language educational content. The demand for digital educational resources has been on the rise, especially in the context of remote and online learning. Such digital language learning materials can effectively improve students' language proficiency and motivation. Graduates who can create high-quality digital language educational content are well-positioned to meet the new and evolving needs of learners in the digital age.

Furthermore, it is expected that graduates will actively participate in research on interdisciplinary topics relevant to their area of study. Research plays a crucial role in advancing knowledge and fostering innovation in the field of education. Interdisciplinary research is highly recommended as it addresses complex educational challenges and promotes collaboration across various disciplines (Bossio et al., 2014). Graduates who possess the skills to conduct interdisciplinary research can offer valuable insights and solutions in the realm of language education. Research focused on English education, particularly within the context of Iran's educational system, has the potential to generate practical applications that can enhance teaching practices and improve student learning outcomes (Yao et al., 2021). Graduates who are able to translate their research findings into tangible products, such as educational materials or tools, have the opportunity to make significant contributions to the field of language education. By doing so, they can enrich the learning experiences of students and further advance the field as a whole.

Curriculum structures: The Courses of the Program

The new curriculum is structured into a total of 44 course credits, comprising 12 credits for core courses, 14 credits for elective courses, up to 12 credits for compensatory courses, and a

6-credit thesis. The table below outlines the different types of courses and the corresponding number of credits assigned to each course type.

Table 1. *Types of Courses Offered in Technology-enhanced Language Teaching at M.A. Level*

Course Type	Number of Credits
Compensatory courses (if necessary)	Up to 12 credits
Core courses	12
Elective courses	14
Thesis	6

The compensatory courses of the program are "Principles and Approaches in Language Teaching," "Research Methods," "An Introduction to Linguistics," "Language Assessment," "Academic Writing," and "Technology-Enhanced Language Learning." Depending on their B.A. field of study, students may have to take up to 12 credits from these courses.

The core courses of the program are "Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods in Language Teaching at a Digital Age," "Principles and Methods of Language Teaching," "Methods of Teaching Language Skills and Components," "Language Testing and Assessment," "CALL Principles," and "CALL Seminar." In order to take the CALL Seminar, students need to have passed "Principles and Methods of Language Teaching" and "CALL Principles" as its prerequisite courses. The other courses do not have any prerequisites.

In addition to compensatory and core courses, students have to choose 14 credits from elective courses. These elective courses are "Multimedia Authoring for CALL," "Computer-Assisted Language Assessment," "Using Corpora in Language Teaching," "Mobile-Assisted Language Learning," "Simulation and Immersive Technologies in Language Teaching," "Principles and Theories of Distance Learning," "Robot-Assisted Language Learning," "Intelligent CALL (iCALL)," "Social Networking and Teaching/Learning Languages," "Teaching Language Skills and Components through Technology," "Internship," "CALL Teacher Education," and "Critical CALL." Finally, students are supposed to finish and present a six-credit thesis at the end of the program.

An essential aspect that needs to be taken into consideration in developing a curriculum is careful attention to the courses of the program (ENQA, 2005) as the quality of a program is entirely dependent on the quality of its courses. As Gomez et al. (2007) suggested, the first step to evaluate the courses of a program is the relevance of the courses of the program to the major objectives specified at the start of its development. This requirement is squarely met for this curriculum as the objectives of the present program are faithfully reflected in the courses; however, this is not the only aspect of quality as the coherence of the objectives, content, and assessment of a course are of paramount importance from the quality perspective (Biggs et al., 2022).

The Syllabus and Readings Recommended

This section of the document outlines information regarding each course within the program. It encompasses general details, course objectives, syllabus, assessment criteria, and recommended readings. The first section, course information, provides specific aspects such as

course credits, type (core, compensatory, elective), theoretical or practical nature, teaching hours, and prerequisites. Following this, detailed course objectives are provided, which are concise for some courses and more elaborate for others. The explicit delineation of course objectives is considered indispensable as they need to align with the primary objectives of the program (Toohey, 1999). Additionally, these objectives serve as a foundation for syllabus design and the evaluation of instruction and learning outcomes (Gomez et al., 2007). The subsequent section presents the course syllabus, which enumerates the essential areas to be covered. Lastly, a comprehensive list of relevant books, book chapters, and papers is recommended to instructors as course materials.

Assessment of the Course Outcomes

The assessment of course outcomes is a crucial component of the educational process. This section focuses on various methods of assessment, including formative assessments, midterm exams, and final exams. It also considers the type of assessment, whether written or practical/project-based, as well as the necessary equipment required for evaluation. Assessment plays a crucial role in measuring the effectiveness of teaching and learning in higher education (Turner & Purpura, 2016). In higher education, assessment serves as a tool for not only gauging students' knowledge and skills but also promoting deeper learning and critical thinking. O'Donovan et al. (2006) argue that assessment should be designed to encourage students to engage with the material at a higher level, rather than simply memorizing facts for an exam. This can be achieved through a variety of assessment methods, such as formative assessments, as recommended in the document, that provide ongoing feedback and opportunities for improvement. Formative assessments are especially valuable in higher education as they help students monitor their progress and identify areas for growth. Additionally, formative assessments can inform instructional decisions and allow educators to adapt their teaching strategies to better meet students' needs.

The document also recommends that both midterm and final exams be given. These are also important components of assessment in higher education, providing students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding of the course material. These exams can take the form of written assessments or practical/project-based evaluations, depending on the nature of the course and learning objectives. Given that the nature of the program is associated with technology, the document also outlines the equipment to be available and used for the assessment of students' gains from the course. In order to effectively assess students in higher education, educators must have access to the necessary equipment and resources. This may include access to computers for online assessments, specialized software for language assessment, or materials for hands-on projects and experiments.

What Is Not Included?

This paper aimed to provide an objective description of the intended curriculum of a CALL program at M.A. level in Iran. It is important to note that the purpose of this paper is not to evaluate the program, but rather to analyze its key components. However, there are several critical points that necessitate further discussion. One significant issue that must be addressed is the lack of alignment between the sources used in the M.A. exam and the objectives of the CALL program and its courses. As the CALL program is a subset of TEFL, students are

required to take the same UEE as M.A. TEFL candidates. This lack of coherence between the exam sources and the program's goals has the potential to impede students' motivation to engage with the program's content (Schunk et al., 2012). To ensure the success of the CALL program, it is imperative to address this issue and make necessary adjustments to the UEE sources to better reflect the program's objectives. By doing so, students will be more inclined to actively participate in the program and achieve successful outcomes.

Alternatively, efforts should be made to develop and administer a specific entrance examination exclusively based on the relevant sources, knowledge, and skills areas as soon as possible. This will help ensure that students entering the program are adequately prepared and motivated to succeed. The introduction of new high-stakes tests can have a significant and far-reaching impact on educational policies and practices. While there is ongoing debate over the precise terminology, researchers generally agree that tests, particularly high-stakes tests like those used in Iran for UEE, have a powerful washback or impact on the curriculum, teaching materials, and classroom activities (Alderson & Wall, 1993; Shohamy, 2001). Policymakers can drive changes towards the intended goals in the new program by leveraging the potential of a new standardized high-stakes exam, which is considered a key driver of change in educational policies and practices at all levels (Hamilton et al., 2002; Saif, 2006).

An essential component of any academic plan which, according to Lattuca and Stark (2011) needs to be discussed in detail and has been overlooked in this program is the curricular arrangement or the sequence of the contents of a curriculum. Although the prerequisites for each specific course are clear, and it is consequently obvious which courses precede the others, these mechanical and bureaucratic devices are only a superficial understanding of sequencing, and what is of immense importance is the underlying assumptions about how knowledge is conveyed and learned. Lattuca and Stark believed that educational benefits and instructional rationales should drive curriculums' sequencing, and it is this aspect which is missing from the present document.

Furthermore, instructional processes as a core element of any curriculum have completely been neglected in this official document. Although instructional processes are sometimes discussed separately from curriculums, they must be included in academic plans since methods of instruction significantly affect student learning. As Lattuca and Stark (2011) argued, most of the instructors at higher education settings are unfamiliar with effective teaching strategies other than lecturing, and the inclusion of such learning activities will expand faculty members' repertoire of teaching strategies if they are consciously recognized as a component of curriculums.

Finally, although the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education is already pervasive, and artificial intelligence has brought revolutionary innovations and developments to education, no mention of it has been made in the present CALL curriculum. With the incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies into educational settings, AI-powered tools are increasingly being utilized in different areas of foreign language teaching. For instance, the use of AI-powered writing tools is increasing rapidly in EFL classes, and a considerable amount of research has confirmed the positive effects of AI on students' writing quality (e.g., Marzuki et al., 2023; Hsiao & Chang, 2023). In the area of

language assessment, the incorporation of AI technology in test validation (Hannah et al., 2023), assessment delivery (Al-Ghezi et al., 2023), automated scoring of performance-based tasks (Yan et al., 2020), and score reporting and feedback (Jin & Fan, 2023) has marked a transformative shift in how linguistic capabilities are evaluated. Therefore, it is suggested that AI-related courses be incorporated into this CALL curriculum as they can help future EFL teachers cultivate the necessary skills and expertise to excel in this technologically advanced landscape. Moreover, incorporating AI into the curriculum provides students with hands-on experience vital for comprehending the principles and practical applications of AI. By actively engaging with AI tools and platforms in their studies, students can acquire valuable experience that will serve them well in both their academic pursuits and future careers. This exposure not only gives them a competitive advantage in the job market, but also ensures they are well-prepared for the myriad career opportunities that require proficiency in AI. Accordingly, although the introduction of new courses into a program might not be possible for university educators in a centralized education system like Iran's higher education, police makers are recommended to propose slight amendments to the present document to encompass an AI-related course.

Conclusion

In light of the increasing importance of technology in language education, numerous prominent universities worldwide have introduced technology-enhanced language teaching programs in recent years. This study attempted to describe the intended curriculum of one of these recently-developed programs prompted at Al-Zahra University in Iran. The description of the program commenced by outlining its objectives and rationale, highlighting its alignment with current methodologies that seek to integrate modern technologies into foreign language instruction. It further discussed the program's significance, emphasizing its goal of preparing English language educators with the requisite skills to effectively leverage modern technologies in language teaching, broaden the scope of literacy to encompass technological proficiency, and forge strong connections between computer-assisted language learning and industry. Subsequently, the study analyzed the ideal candidates for the program, detailing the competencies they are expected to develop and the criteria for admission. The various courses offered within the program were then delineated, with courses' objectives, syllabi, assessment criteria, and recommended readings provided for clarity. Finally, assessment of the course outcomes was reviewed and some critical points about several shortcomings in the program such as lack of attention to AI were discussed. By shedding light on the curriculum of this technology-enhanced language teaching program, this study aimed to contribute to the ongoing discourse on the integration of technology in language education.

It is important to acknowledge that the description provided offers an objective analysis of the intended curriculum of the program. However, decisions regarding the quality of the program should not be based solely on this description. Further empirical research is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the program, which may lead to revisions of the official standards. Additional studies, as suggested by Rezvani et al. (2021), should focus on the relationship among the intended, implemented, and assessed curriculums. These studies can provide insights into how the intended curriculum is put into practice in the classroom, as well

as the level of knowledge and skills acquired by students as a result of the instruction. Furthermore, it is advised that further research be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the program by tracking the graduates and prospective teachers' utilization of CALL in their instruction. This research can also help identify any challenges they encounter, allowing for future and further revisions and improvements to the program.

References

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). *Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice*. Teachers College Press.

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied linguistics*, *14*(2), 115-129. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/14.2.115

Al-Ghezi, R., Voskoboinik, K., Getman, Y., Von Zansen, A., Kallio, H., Kurimo, M., ... & Hildén, R. (2023). Automatic speaking assessment of spontaneous L2 Finnish and Swedish. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 20(4-5), 421-444. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2023.2292265

Alptekin, C., & Tatar, S. (2011). Research on foreign language teaching and learning in Turkey (2005–2009). *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 328-353. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144481100005X

Amiri, A., & Rezvani, R. (2021). A Tale of Three Official English Textbooks: An Evaluation of Their Horizontal and Vertical Alignments. *Language Related Research, 12*(3), 51-79. https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.3.3

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *Taxonomy of leading, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

Atai, M. R. (2002a). EAP curriculum development in Iran: An incoherent educational experience. *Special Issue of the Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Teacher Training University*, 9(33), 17-34.

Atai, M. R. (2002b). Iranian EAP programs in practice: A study of key methodological aspects. *Sheikhbahaee Research Bulletin*, 1(2), 1-15.

Atai, M. R., & Mazlum, F. (2013). English language teaching curriculum in Iran: Planning and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24(3), 389-411. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2012.744327

Atkinson, P. A. & Coffey, A. (1997). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice (pp. 45-62). Sage.

Bailey, K., (1994). *Methods of social research, Fourth Edition*. The Free Press.

Barnes, D. (2018). *Practical curriculum study*. Routledge.

Barro, R. J. (2001). Human capital and growth. *American Economic Review*, 91(2), 12-17. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2677725

Barro, R. J., & Lee, J. W. (2013). A new data set of educational attainment in the world, 1950-2010. *Journal of Development Economics*, 104, 184-198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2012.10.001

Bax, S. (2003). CALL—past, present and future. *System*, 31(1), 13-28. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00071-4

Bax, S. (2011). Normalisation revisited: The effective use of technology in language education. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, 1(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.2011040101

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for social sciences*. Allyn and Bacon.

Biesta, G. J., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Biggs, J., Tang, C., & Kennedy, G. (2022). *Teaching for quality learning at university 5e*. McGraw-hill education (UK).

Borrás, I., & Lafayette, R. C. (1994). Effects of multimedia courseware subtitling on the speaking performance of college students of French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 61-75. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/329253

Bossio, D., Loch, B., Schier, M., & Mazzolini, A. (2014). A roadmap for forming successful interdisciplinary education research collaborations: A reflective approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(2), 198-211. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.832167

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Clark, C. M. & P. L. Peterson (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 255-296). Macmillan.

Clark-Wilson, A., & Hoyles, C. (2019). From curriculum design to enactment in technology enhanced mathematics instruction—Mind the gap! *International Journal of Educational Research, 94*, 66-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2018.11.015

Davies, G., & Steel, D. (1981, April 8-10). *First steps in computer-assisted language learning at Ealing College of Higher Education*. [Paper Presentation]. CAL 81 Symposium, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.

Davis, K. S., & Falba, C. J. (2002). Integrating technology in elementary preservice teacher education: orchestrating scientific inquiry in meaningful ways. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 13*(4), 303–329. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022535516780

Dawson, K., Pringle, R., & Adams, T. L. (2003). Providing links between technology integration, methods courses, and school-based field experiences: a curriculum-based and technology enhanced microteaching. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 20(1), 41–47. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:153224441

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. Macmillan.

Eberwein, D. H. (2011). The role of technology in transforming higher education. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(4), 61–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jls.20192

Eisner, E. W. (1994). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. Prentice Hall.

Elmas, R., Rusek, M., Lindell, A., Nieminen, P., Kasapoğlu, K., & Bílek, M. (2020). The intellectual demands of the intended chemistry curriculum in Czechia, Finland, and Turkey: a comparative analysis based on the revised Bloom's taxonomy. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 21(3), 839-851. https://doi.org/10.1039/D0RP00058B

ENQA. (2005). *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area*. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

Eryaman, M. Y. & Genc, S. Z. (2010). National curriculum. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*. (pp. 600-601). Sage Publications.

Fischer, R. (2007). How do we know what students are actually doing? Monitoring students' behavior in CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(5), 409-442. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701746013

Friedel, J. M., & Treagust, D. F. (2005). Learning bioscience in nursing education: perceptions of the intended and the prescribed curriculum. *Learning in Health and Social Care*, 4(4), 203-216. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-6861.2005.00104.x

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Routledge.

Gómez, P., González, M. J., Gil, F., Lupiáñez, J. L., Moreno, M. F., Rico, L., & Romero, I. (2007). Assessing the relevance of higher education courses. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30(2), 149-160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2007.01.005

Hall, C. E. (2014). Toward a model of curriculum analysis and evaluation-Beka: A case study from Australia. *Nurse Education Today*, 34(3), 343-348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.04.007

Hamilton, Laura S., Brian M. Stecher, and Stephen P. Klein. (2002). *Making Sense of Test-Based Accountability in Education*. Rand Corporation.

Hamm, C. M. (2003). *Philosophical issues in education: An introduction*. Routledge.

Hannah, L., Jang, E. E., Shah, M., & Gupta, V. (2023). Validity Arguments for Automated Essay Scoring of Young Students' Writing Traits. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 20(4-5), 399-420. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2023.2288253

Hanushek, E. A., & Kimko, D. D. (2000). Schooling, labor-force quality, and the growth of nations. *American Economic Review*, 90(5), 1184-1208. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.90.5.1184

Hare, S., Howard, E., & Pope, M. (2002). Technology integration: Closing the gap between what preservice teachers are taught to do and what they can do. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 10(2), 191-203.

Hargrave, C., & Hsu, Y. (2000). Survey of instructional technology courses for preservice teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, *8*(4), 303–314.

Hew, K. F., & Brush, T. (2007). Integrating technology into K-12 teaching and learning: Current knowledge gaps and recommendations for future research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 55(3), 223-252. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-006-9022-5

Hsiao, J. C., & Chang, J. S. (2023). Enhancing EFL reading and writing through AI-powered tools: design, implementation, and evaluation of an online course. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2207187

Hsu, Y. S., & Hargrave, C. P. (2000). Survey of instructional technology courses for preservice teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 8(4), 303-314. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/8039/

Hubbard, P. (2013). Making a case for learner training in technology enhanced language learning environments. *Calico Journal*, 30(2), 163-178. https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.30.2.163-178

Hubbard, P. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning L2 listening. In C. A. Chapelle, & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 93-106). Wiley Blackwell.

Hues, H. (2011). "Mandela, the terrorist": Intended and hidden history curriculum in South Africa. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 3(2), 74-95.

Hutchison, A. (2012). Literacy teachers' perceptions of professional development that increases integration of technology into literacy instruction. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 21(1), 37-56. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2012.659894

Hwu, F. (2003). Learners' behaviors in computer-based input activities elicited through tracking technologies. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16(1), 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1076/call.16.1.5.15529

Jackson, V., O'Brien, V., & Richards, A. (2023). Investigating the impact of experiential learning on employability skill development and employment outcomes: a UK case study of MBA students from the Indian Subcontinent. *Journal of Education and Work*, 36(6), 476–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2023.2231366

Jayathirtha, G. (2018). An Analysis of the National Intended Geometry Curriculum. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 15(2), 143-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0973184918783291

Jin, Y., & Fan, J. (2023). Test-taker engagement in AI technology-mediated language assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 20(4-5), 488-500. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2023.2291731

Kapur, D., & Crowley, M. (2008). Beyond the ABCs: Higher education and developing countries. *Center for Global Development Working Paper*, No. 139.

Kayaoglu, M. N. (2015). Teacher researchers in action research in a heavily centralized education system. *Educational Action Research*, *23*(2), 140-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2014.997260

Kemmis, S., & Edwards-Groves, C. (2018). *Understanding education. History, politics and practice*. Springer Texts in Education.

Khaddoor, R., Al-Amoush, S., & Eilks, I. (2017). A comparative analysis of the intended curriculum and its presentation in 10th grade chemistry textbooks from seven Arabic countries. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 18(2), 375-385. https://doi.org/10.1039/c6rp00186f

Kiany, G. R., Mirhosseini, S. A., & Navidinia, H. (2011). Foreign Language Education Policies in Iran: Pivotal Macro Considerations. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(222), 49-71.

Kost, C. R. (1999). Enhancing communicative language skills through effective use of the World Wide Web in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(3), 309-320. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/89471/

Kridel, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (Vol. 1). Sage.

Kurz, A., Elliott, S. N., Wehby, J. H., & Smithson, J. L. (2010). Alignment of the intended, planned, and enacted curriculum in general and special education and its relation to student achievement. *The Journal of Special Education*, 44(3), 131-145. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466909341196

Lattuca, L. R., & Stark, J. S. (2011). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.

Leander, K.M. (2007). 'You won't be needing your laptops today': Wired bodies in the wireless classroom. In M. Knobel & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *A new literacies sampler* (pp. 25– 48). Peter Lang.

Lee, L. (2002). Synchronous online exchanges: A study of modification devices on non-native discourse. *System*, 30(3), 275-288. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00015-5

Lee, N. H., Ng, W. L., & Lim, L. G. P. (2019). The intended school mathematics curriculum. In: Toh T., Kaur B., Tay E. (Eds), *Mathematics education in Singapore Mathematics Education – An Asian Perspective* (pp. 35-53). Springer.

Levander, L. M., & Mikkola, M. (2009). Core curriculum analysis: A tool for educational design. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, *15*(3), 275-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13892240903069785

Levy, M. (1997). *Computer-assisted language learning: Context and conceptualization*. Oxford University Press.

Lu, L., Johnson, L., Tolley, L.M., Gilliard-Cook, T., & Lei, J. (2011). Learning by design: TPACK in action. Technology integration preparation for preservice teachers. In C. D. Maddux et al. (Eds.), *Research highlights in technology and teacher education*, (pp. 47-54). The Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education.

MacDonald, K. (2003). Internet technology and second/foreign language education: Activities for the classroom teacher. *Canadian modern language review*, 59(3), 455-462. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.59.3.455

Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(2).

Matsubara, K., Hagiwara, Y., & Saruta, Y. (2016). A statistical analysis of the characteristics of the intended curriculum for Japanese primary science and its relationship to the attained

curriculum. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 4(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-016-0028-0

Mazon, G., Ribeiro, J. M. P., de Lima, C. R. M., Castro, B. C., de Andrade, J. B. S. O., & Guerra, A. (2020). The promotion of sustainable development in higher education institutions: top-down bottom-up or neither? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education,* 21(7), 1429-1450. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-02-2020-0061

McGuire, J. M., & Scott, S. S. (2006). An approach for inclusive college teaching: Universal design for instruction. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *14*(1), 21-32. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:150879137

MSRT. (2019). The intended curriculum of technology-enhanced language teaching. https://hes.msrt.ir/GetFile.php?ClassName=Education&FileIndex=_1579087491&URL=/T_Education/_1579087491_1.pdf

Narafshan, M. H., & Yamini, M. (2011). Policy and English language teaching (ELT) in Iran. *Iranian EFL journal*, 7(5), 179-189.

O'Sullivan, M. (2004). The reconceptualisation of learner-centered approaches: A Namibian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(6), 585-602. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(03)00018-X

O'Donovan, B., Price, M., & Rust, C. (2001). The student experience of criterion-referenced assessment (through the introduction of a common criteria assessment grid). *Innovations in education and Teaching international*, *38*(1), 74-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/147032901300002873

OECD (2015). *Students, Computers and Learning: Making the Connection*, PISA, OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264239555-en

Oliva, M., & Pollastrini, Y. (1995). Internet resources and second language acquisition: An evaluation of virtual immersion. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(4), 551-563. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1995.tb00828.x

Payne, G. & Payne, J., (2004). *Key Concepts in Social Research*. Sage Publications.

Peters, R. S. (2015). *Ethics and Education (Routledge Revivals)*. Routledge.

Peters, R. S. (Ed.). (2010). *The concept of education (international library of the philosophy of education volume 17)* (Vol. 17). Routledge.

Polikoff, M. S. (2015). How well aligned are textbooks to the common core standards in mathematics? *American Educational Research Journal*, *52*(6), 1185-1211. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215584435

Pope, M., Hare, D., & Howard, E. (2002). Technology integration: Closing the gap between what preservice teachers are taught to do and what they can do. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10*(2), 191–203.

Popham, W. J., & Baker, E. L. (1970). *Systematic instruction*. Prentice Hall.

Posner, G. J. (2004). *Analyzing the curriculum*. McGraw-Hill Humanities Social.

Posner, G. J., & Rudnitsky, A. N. (1994). *Course design: A guide to curriculum development for teachers*. Longman.

Rezvani, R., & Farsimadan, D. (2025). The Alignment of Intended, Enacted, and Assessed Curricula: The Case of Shiraz University TEFL B.A. Curriculum. *Applied Research on English Language*, *14* (1), 1-28. https://doi: 10.22108/are.2024.142877.2373

Rezvani, R., Sayyadi, A., & Izadi, A. (2021). Official Postgraduate Curriculums of TPSOL in Iran: Evaluation of Educational Objectives and Vertical Alignment. *Journal of Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages*, *10*(21), 51-74. https://doi.org/10.30479/jtpsol.2021.14982.1517

Rezvani, R., Mihankhah, Z., & Haghshenas, B. (2016). An Alignment Study of English Achievement Tests, Contents of Instruction, and Iranian EFL Seventh Grade Textbook. *Journal of New*

Approaches in Educational Administration, *7*(27), 179-192. https://doi.org/20.1001.1.20086369.1395.7.27.10.3

Riazi, A., Rezvani, R. (2021). Special Issue Editorial. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, *40*(3). https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2021.6282

Rodrigues, S. (2003). Experiences from the partnership in primary science project: Teacher professional development involving ICT and science pedagogical content knowledge. *Science Education International,* 14(2), 2-11.

Saif, S. (2006). Aiming for positive washback: A case study of international teaching assistants. *Language testing*, 23(1), 1-34. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532206lt322oa

Sánchez, A., & Singh, A. (2018). Accessing higher education in developing countries: Panel data analysis from India, Peru, and Vietnam. *World Development*, *109*, 261-278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.04.015

Schunk, D. H., Meece, J. R., & Pintrich, P. R. (2012). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Pearson Higher Ed.

Selinger, M. (2001). Learning Information and Communications Technology skills and the subject context of the learning. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education,* 10(1&2), 143-154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759390100200108

Shohamy, E. (2020). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. Routledge.

Siau, K. (2018). Education in the age of artificial intelligence: How will technology shape learning? *The Global Analyst*, 7(3), 22–24.

Smith, L. K., & Southerland, S. A. (2007). Reforming practice or modifying reforms?: Elementary teachers' response to the tools of reform. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 44(3), 396-423. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20165

Stark, J. S. & Lowther, M. A. (1986). *Designing the Learning Plan: A Review of Research and Theory Related to College Curricula*. University of Michigan, National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Stolle, E. (2008). Teachers, literacy, & technology: Tensions, complexities, conceptualizations & practice. In Y. Kim, V. Risko, D. Compton, D. Dickinson, M. Hundley, R. Jimenez, K. Leander, & D. Wells Rowe (Eds.), *57th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 56–69). National Reading Conference.

Susser, B. (2005). CALL and JFL teacher education in Japan: A course description. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 1(3), 3-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v1n3.14

Suvorov, R, & Hegelheimer, V. (2013). Computer-Assisted Language Testing. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed), *The Companion to Language Assessment*, (pp. 594–613). John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Thijs, A. & Van den Akker, J. (Eds.) (2009). Curriculum in development. SLO.

Toohey, S. (1999). *Designing courses for higher education*. McGraw-hill education (UK).

Turner, C. & Purpura, J. (2016). 16. Learning-oriented assessment in second and foreign language classrooms. In D. Tsagari & J. Banerjee (Ed.), *Handbook of Second Language Assessment* (pp. 255-274). De Gruyter Mouton.

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.

Van den Akker, J. (2003). Curriculum perspectives: An introduction. In J. van den Akker, W. Kuiper, & U. Hameyer (Eds.), *Curriculum landscapes and trends* (pp. 1-10). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Van Olphen, M. (2007). Perspectives of foreign language preservice teachers on the use of a web-based instructional environment in a methods course. *CALICO Journal*, 25(1), 91-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/cj.v25i1.91-109

Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.

Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language teaching*, 31(2), 57-71. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800012970

Webb, N. L. (1997). Criteria for alignment of expectations and assessments in mathematics and science education. *Research Monograph No. 6*.

Webb, N. L. (1999). Alignment of Science and Mathematics Standards and Assessments in Four States. *Research Monograph No. 18*.

Wei, B. (2020). The change in the intended senior high school chemistry curriculum in China: Focus on intellectual demands. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 21(1), 14-23. https://doi.org/10.1039/C9RP00115H

Wei, B., & Ou, Y. (2019). A comparative analysis of junior high school science curriculum standards in Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macao: Based on revised Bloom's taxonomy. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 17(8), 1459-1474. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10763-018-9935-6

Weir, C. J. (2005). Language testing and validation. *Palgrave McMillan*.

Xie, X., Siau, K., & Nah, F. F. (2020). COVID-19 Pandemic-online Education in the New Normal and the Next Normal. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research, 22*(3), 175-187. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2020.1824884

Yan, D., Rupp, A. A., & Foltz, P. W. (Eds.). (2020). *Handbook of automated scoring: Theory into practice*. CRC Press.

Yao, C. W., Collins, C., Bush, T., Briscoe, K. L., & Dang, N. L. T. (2022). English as a 'double barrier': English medium instruction and student learning at Vietnamese transnational universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(4), 1372-1386. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1896485

Yarshater, E. (1983). *The Cambridge history of Iran. Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Yu, Z., Yu, L., Xu, Q., Xu, W., & Wu, P. (2022). Effects of mobile learning technologies and social media tools on student engagement and learning outcomes of English learning. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 31(3), 381-398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2022.2045215

Zais, R. S. (1976). *Curriculum: Principles and foundations*. Ty Crowell Company.

Zarrinabadi, N., & Mahmoudi-Gahrouei, V. (2018). English in contemporary Iran. *Asian Englishes*, 20(1), 81-94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1389147