

Research article

Senior and Junior EFL Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge: Levels and Areas of Mastery and Non-mastery

Suharyadi*, Gunadi H. Sulistyono

Universitas Negeri Malang

ORCIDSuharyadi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3255-4959>**Abstract.**

This study is intended to investigate the levels and areas of mastery and non-mastery of senior and junior EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge (PK) in the Indonesian context. Involving 60 participants consisting of 24 senior EFL teachers of junior high schools and 36 junior EFL teachers who joined *PPG*, this study made use of a set of a questionnaire comprising 25 items. The data were analyzed quantitatively by employing Descriptive Statistics and T-Test. The data analysis shows that there is no statistically significant difference/level between senior and junior EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. Although their scores are not significantly different, senior EFL teachers know not better than those of junior EFL teachers. There are more aspects of PK they do not know. Senior EFL teachers are fully weak in dealing with the teaching profession, ELT theory, and research, while junior EFL teachers are fully weak in the teaching profession and ELT theory. Based on these findings, EFL teachers are suggested to join more workshops, training, and seminar to improve their pedagogical knowledge. Reading and writing activities are also useful to strengthen their knowledge and understanding of PK.

Keywords: senior and junior, EFL teachers, pedagogical knowledge

Corresponding Author:

Suharyadi; email:

suharyadi.fs@um.ac.id

Published 28 March 2022

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Suharyadi, Gunadi H.

Sulistyono. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the iNETAL Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

To conduct effective classroom teaching, teachers should possess knowledge. According to Shulman [1] there are several types of knowledge teachers need to have: content knowledge; pedagogical knowledge; curriculum knowledge; knowledge of learners; knowledge of contexts; knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values; and pedagogical content knowledge. Among those types of knowledge, pedagogical knowledge (PK) is fundamental as it is associated with knowledge about teaching. Tseng [2] states that PK is specific on how teachers teach the subject matter (pedagogical aspects), and it takes years to develop [3]. With strong PK, teachers can help students be familiar with instructional materials and know what to do and how to do in the classroom teaching for better teaching and learning [4, 5, 6]. They further say that

OPEN ACCESS

the development of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) relies on their PK. Some other researchers have also claimed that teachers' content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical knowledge (PK) do not operate individually yet cooperatively to yield effective teaching [7, 8, 9], including CK and PK in the development of TPACK [10]. In other words, PK is pedagogically needed by teachers to guide students in learning.

To date, plenty of research on the issue has been given adequate attention. Some researchers have examined the components of PK contributing to teachers' effective teaching and students' better learning. For example, Tseng [2] considered three important components of teachers' PK, starting from lesson planning, classroom management, and learning assessment. Ball et al. [11] state that PK consists of general content knowledge, specific content knowledge, knowledge about students, and knowledge about teaching. In the ELT context, Moradkhani et al. [12] have successfully mapped out eight macro-categories of English teachers' PK, namely language and related disciplines; ELT theories, skills, and techniques; context and social relations; class, time, and learning management; research and professional development; practicum; teachers and their assessment; and reflective and critical teaching. Some other researchers have focused on other aspects of PK. For instance, Jones & Vesilind [13] are interested in changes and factors that influence preservice English teachers' PK about teaching. They report that teachers redevelop their PK during experiencing teaching. Cerbin & Kopp [14] propose a model of developing teachers' PK and enhancing the quality of teaching through Lesson Study (LS).

In the recent trend, more researchers are concerned with comparing novice and experienced teachers' PK. Both novice and experienced teachers are reported to be significantly different in several aspects, including their pedagogical knowledge. For example, Nazari et al. [15] demonstrate that experienced teachers got better scores of their PK than novice teachers. A similar study carried out by Akbari & Tajik [16] reveals that experienced teachers are capable of yielding approximately 5 pedagogical ideas within a minute, while less experienced teachers can produce 3 pedagogical ideas at the same amount of time. Similarly, Karimi & Norouzi [17] found out that experienced teachers are better at producing pedagogical insights than those novice teachers as their sources of classroom teaching. Further studies also indicate that both types of teachers are significantly different in terms of making the tasks interesting and introducing students about values related to L2 to encourage students in learning [18], of pedagogical beliefs as reflected in their teaching [19, 20], of activities in developing their teaching profession [21], and of levels of support and collaboration from colleagues in schools [22]. Another study carried by Wolff et al. [23] also finds out that expert teachers and novice teachers are different in interpreting the common classroom problems. Expert teachers tend to provide deeper elaboration or reasoning, while novice teachers

are shallow or superficial in explaining the classroom problems. Stahnke & Blömeke [24] and Akbari & Moradkhani [25] also find out that experienced teachers are better than novice teachers in terms of global efficacy level and types of efficacy such as student engagement, classroom management, and teaching strategies.

PK is complex as it comprises some components that are needed by pre-service/in-service and experienced/expert/novice teachers to deliver their subject matters to students effectively. PK is also claimed to be closely intertwined with other kinds of knowledge such as CK, PCK, and TPACK and therefore they cannot be separated. Another focal point is that most of the comparative studies claim that experienced teachers are better than novice teachers in any aspect and context. However, little information has been provided in the existing studies about senior and junior EFL teachers' levels and their areas of mastery and non-mastery of PK, which particularly involve EFL teachers at state junior high schools (senior) and EFL teachers (fresh graduates/junior) who joined *Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru* (PPG) or Teacher Professional Education Program. Until now, we do not even know what teachers understand and what teachers do not understand in their PK. Such information, as the implication, is required by teachers to plan or join appropriate professional programs relevant to their needs and teacher educators to prepare the candidates of teachers. Second, the use of "senior and junior" to refer to one having different years of teaching experiences in existing studies is rare. In literature, a senior is defined as the one who is older and has more experience. Junior is defined to describe a person who is younger and has fewer experiences. In the current study, senior English teachers (also called experienced teachers or expert teachers) are those who have teaching experience more than 5 years, while junior English teachers (also called novice teachers) are those who are still being trained, and therefore they possess no or very little experience of teaching [26, 27]. In the school context where teachers teach, these two categories also exist and are commonly used to address teachers with different ages and teaching experiences. The aim of this study is, therefore, to investigate senior and junior EFL teachers' levels and their areas of mastery and non-mastery of PK.

2. Method

2.1. Respondents

This study employed a quantitative research design by making use of Descriptive Statistics and T-Test in analyzing the data. This study involved sixty (60) participants consisting of 24 senior EFL teachers of state junior high schools and 36 junior English teachers

(fresh graduates) who joined *Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru (PPG)* or Teacher Professional Education Program. The senior English teachers were purposely selected from state junior high schools based on the determined criteria: they have a bachelor certificate from the English department; they are permanent and certified English teachers; and they have at least 5 years of teaching experience. The junior English teachers were those who were nationally selected to participate in the PPG program. They are fresh graduates of the English department and have or have little no teaching experience. The PPG is a pre-service teacher professional education program given in one year whose purpose is to develop their competencies as teachers [28]. Thus, all of them were involved in the study.

2.2. Instruments

To obtain data on EFL teachers' pedagogical knowledge, a set of questionnaires with open-ended questions was developed comprising 25 items as presented in Table 1. The items were adapted from Shulman [1], Ball et al. [11], Tseng [2], and Moradkhani et al. [12]. The instrument was administered to 60 participants consisting of 24 senior EFL teachers of state junior high schools and 36 junior English teachers (fresh graduates) who joined *Program Pendidikan Profesi Guru (PPG)* or Teacher Professional Education Program. The senior English teachers were purposely selected from state junior high schools based on the determined criteria: they have a bachelor certificate from the English department; they are permanent and certified English teachers, and they have at least 5 years of teaching experience. The junior English teachers were those who were nationally selected to participate in the PPG program. They are fresh graduates of the English department and have or have little no teaching experience. The PPG is a pre-service teacher professional education program given in one year whose purpose is to develop their competencies as teachers [28]. Thus, all of them were involved in the study. For the data collection, we made appointments to meet the teachers face to face. They were given approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

2.3. Data analysis

The data were analyzed quantitatively by employing Descriptive Statistics and T-Test. Two categories were made to level their knowledge: Mastery (M) and Non-Mastery (NM). A teacher is marked M if she/he has mastered the items in the questionnaires with a minimum passing grade of .75 or P-value > .75. Meanwhile, a teacher has marked NM if she/he has not mastered the items in the questionnaires as indicated with their grade

TABLE 1: Items developed in the questionnaire.

No	Variables	No	Variables
1	Required competences for a professional status (Teaching Profession)	14	Learning theories in practice (ELT Theory)
2	Professional competence (Teaching Profession)	15	Knowledge of instructional materials (ELT Theory)
3	Areas of teaching a language (Language)	16	Selecting of learning strategies (Method of Teaching)
4	Language skills (Language)	17	Selecting assessment techniques (Assessment)
5	Role of indicators of basic competence achievement (Curriculum)	18	Use of appropriate instructional media (Lesson Planning)
6	Theories of learning (ELT Theory)	19	Use of technology in classroom activities (Technology)
7	Instructional media (Lesson Planning)	20	Selection of appropriate tasks (Lesson Planning)
8	Cooperative learning structures (Method of Teaching)	21	Motivating supports (Student)
9	Assessment of practical skills (Assessment)	22	Effective communication strategies (Method of Teaching)
10	Pragmatic competence (Curriculum)	23	Areas of competences to be assessed (Assessment)
11	Identification of students' characteristics (personality) (Student)	24	CAR: Solution to learning problems (Research)
12	Knowledge of language features (Language)	25	CAR: Solution with learning strategies (Research)
13	Identification of learning problems (modals) (Student)		

less than .75 or - P-value < .75. The passing grade .75 is adopted since it has been used nationally to measure English teachers' competence, so it is already accepted.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Findings

3.1.1. EFL teachers' levels of pedagogical knowledge

The results of analyses of senior and junior EFL teachers' levels of mastery and non-mastery of their PK can be seen in Table 2. Both types of teachers have the same lowest score of PK, .36, which is below the passing grade. On the other hand, the two categories of teachers have the same highest score of their PK, .89, which is above the passing grade of .75. On average, Table 2 shows both senior and junior teachers

possess similar scores, implying that there is no difference among them about their mastery and non-mastery levels.

TABLE 2: Descriptive Statistics.

		Senior	Junior
N	Valid	25	25
	Missing	0	0
Mean		.6472	.6540
Std. Deviation		.17971	.18209
Variance		.032	.033
Minimum		.36	.36
Maximum		.89	.89

The result of inferential statistics as presented in Table 3 reveals that the mean difference in PK indicates the value Sig (2. tailed) = .895. This observed sig. is greater than .05 (.895>.05). This means that the null hypothesis stating that ‘there is no difference between the mastery level of senior EFL teachers on PK and that of junior EFL teachers on PK cannot be rejected, implying that the alternative hypothesis stating that ‘there is difference between the mastery level of senior EFL teachers on PK and that of junior EFL teachers on PK cannot be accepted. In other words, senior EFL teachers’ PK and that of junior EFL teachers’ PK levels do not statistically differ. The elaboration of teachers’ mastery and non-mastery of PK are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3: Inferential Statistics.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Resp	Equal variances assumed	.005	.942	-.133	48	.895	-.00680	.05117	-.10968	.09608
	Equal variances not assumed			-.133	47.992	.895	-.00680	.05117	-.10968	.09608

3.1.2. EFL teachers' areas of mastery and non-mastery

What items the senior EFL teachers have mastered and have not mastered can be seen in Table 4. There are 16 (64%) items they do not master and 9 (36%) items they master. Their scores on 16 items are far below the minimum passing grade or P-value $< .75$. Overall, their score of PK is 0.36, which is below the minimum score and therefore belongs to NM. The table also apparently presents the areas/items senior English teachers have not mastered which include: required competencies for professional status, professional competence, language skills, theories of learning, assessment of practical skills, pragmatic competence, identification of students' characteristics (personality), knowledge of language features, identification of learning problems (modals), learning theories in practice, knowledge of instructional materials, selection of learning strategies, selection of assessment techniques, use of appropriate instructional media, CAR: solution to learning problems, and CAR: solution with learning strategies.

The second category is associated with 36 junior EFL teachers' mastery and non-mastery of the items. Table 5 shows that there are 13 (52%) items they have not mastered and 12 (48%) items they have mastered. The overall score of their PK is 0.48, which is also below the minimum score and therefore categorized NM. The table also informs the areas/items they have not mastered which comprise: required competencies for a professional status, professional competence, language skills, theories of learning, assessment of practical skills, identification of students' characteristics (personality), knowledge of language features, learning theories in practice, knowledge of instructional materials, selection of learning strategies, selection of assessment techniques, use of appropriate instructional media, and CAR: solution with learning strategies.

In combination, the mastery and non-mastery of senior and junior EFL teachers' PK are displayed in Table 6. Sixty English teachers have not mastered 12 (48%) items and have mastered 13 (52%) items of their PK. Their overall score falls within 0.52, which is again below the minimum score and therefore classified NM. The table also provides details of the areas/items they have not mastered as follows: required competences for a professional status, theories of learning, assessment of practical skills, pragmatic competence, identification of students' characteristics (personality), knowledge of language features, learning theories in practice, knowledge of instructional materials, selection of learning strategies, selection of assessment techniques, use of appropriate instructional media, and CAR: solution with learning strategies.

TABLE 4: Senior EFL Teachers.

Item	P value	Mastery Category	Areas
1	0.36	NM	Required competences for a professional status
2	0.67	NM	Professional competence
3	0.89	M	Areas of teaching a language
4	0.72	NM	Language skills
5	0.75	M	Role of indicators of basic competence achievement
6	0.56	NM	Theories of learning
7	0.81	M	Instructional media
8	0.89	M	Cooperative learning structures
9	0.56	NM	Assessment of practical skills
10	0.42	NM	Pragmatic competence
11	0.61	NM	Identification of students' characteristics (personality)
12	0.61	NM	Knowledge of language features
13	0.78	NM	Identification of learning problems (modals)
14	0.36	NM	Learning theories in practice
15	0.39	NM	Knowledge of instructional materials
16	0.42	NM	Selection of learning strategies
17	0.58	NM	Selection of assessment techniques
18	0.44	NM	Use of appropriate instructional media
19	0.81	M	Use of technology in classroom activities
20	0.78	M	Selection of appropriate tasks
21	0.89	M	Motivating supports
22	0.83	M	Effective communication strategies
23	0.83	M	Areas of competences to be assessed
24	0.72	NM	CAR: Solution to learning problems
25	0.5	NM	CAR: Solution with learning strategies

3.2. Discussion

There are two interesting issues by the findings. First, both categories of teachers are under different ages and experiences of teaching, yet they are not statistically different in the items measured for their pedagogical knowledge. Second, both categories have their mastery and non-mastery of their PK. They are discussed in the following section.

TABLE 5: Junior EFL Teachers.

Item	P value	Mastery Category	Areas
1	0.36	NM	Required competences for a professional status
2	0.67	NM	Professional competence
3	0.89	M	Areas of teaching a language
4	0.72	NM	Language skills
5	0.75	M	Role of indicators of basic competence achievement
6	0.56	NM	Theories of learning
7	0.81	M	Instructional media
8	0.89	M	Cooperative learning structures
9	0.56	NM	Assessment of practical skills
10	0.42	M	Pragmatic competence
11	0.61	NM	Identification of students' characteristics (personality)
12	0.61	NM	Knowledge of language features
13	0.78	M	Identification of learning problems (modals)
14	0.36	NM	Learning theories in practice
15	0.39	NM	Knowledge of instructional materials
16	0.42	NM	Selecting of learning strategies
17	0.61	NM	Selecting assessment techniques
18	0.44	NM	Use of appropriate instructional media
19	0.83	M	Use of technology in classroom activities
20	0.81	M	Selection of appropriate tasks
21	0.89	M	Motivating supports
22	0.86	M	Effective communication strategies
23	0.83	M	Areas of competences to be assessed
24	0.75	M	CAR: Solution to learning problems
25	0.53	NM	CAR: Solution with learning strategies

3.2.1. EFL teachers' levels of pedagogical knowledge

Regarding the first issue, a lot of researchers have qualitatively and quantitatively explored teachers' pedagogical knowledge within two categories of teachers. In general, there are two groups of findings. One group (majority) concludes that novice teachers and experienced teachers are different (see [15 – 25]), and the other group (minority) summaries the opposite results. Interestingly, the current finding undergirds the minority group stating that senior teachers and junior teachers are not statistically different in terms of their pedagogical knowledge. It can be seen from their average scores below the passing grade, .75 (senior with .6472 and junior with .6540). From the overall scores, the senior EFL teachers are scored 0.36, which belongs to the

TABLE 6: Combined Data (Senior and Junior EFL Teachers).

Item	P value	Mastery Category	Areas
1	0.25	NM	Required competences for a professional status
2	0.78	M	Professional competence
3	0.87	M	Areas of teaching a language
4	0.77	M	Language skills
5	0.82	M	Role of indicators of basic competence achievement
6	0.6	NM	Theories of learning
7	0.82	M	Instructional media
8	0.92	M	Cooperative learning structures
9	0.55	NM	Assessment of practical skills
10	0.4	NM	Pragmatic competence
11	0.7	NM	Identification of students' characteristics (personality)
12	0.63	NM	Knowledge of language features
13	0.85	M	Identification of learning problems (modals)
14	0.47	NM	Learning theories in practice
15	0.38	NM	Knowledge of instructional materials
16	0.5	NM	Selecting of learning strategies
17	0.52	NM	Selecting assessment techniques
18	0.52	NM	Use of appropriate instructional media
19	0.85	M	Use of technology in classroom activities
20	0.8	M	Selection of appropriate tasks
21	0.92	M	Motivating supports
22	0.9	M	Effective communication strategies
23	0.9	M	Areas of competences to be assessed
24	0.83	M	CAR: Solution to learning problems
25	0.5	NM	CAR: Solution with learning strategies

Non-Mastery category. Similarly, junior EFL teachers' knowledge falls within the same category: Non-Mastery with 0.48.

The studies parallel with the current findings include the one reported by Gatbonton [29] that novice and experienced ESL teachers' PKs, particularly in terms of their language management, procedural matters, and student reactions and attitudes management are the same. Similarly, Melnick & Meister [30] compare beginning teachers and experienced teachers within four areas. The results reveal that both categories are not significantly different in terms of academic preparation or time management, except in classroom management and parent interaction. This finding can also be indirectly portrayed in a study carried out by Sumarsono [31]. He found out that the English

teachers' competence (combination of abilities, knowledge, and skills) in Indonesia is low as indicated by their national average score reaching 56.02 out of 100, which is below the minimal national passing grade, 75. In terms of English teachers' professional competence, their average score is 32 and their pedagogical competence is 17. In another set of studies, Kömür [32] measures pre-service EFL teachers' knowledge of teaching and the result shows that their knowledge was not applied in their teaching.

This reflects that the levels of senior and junior EFL teachers' PK are comparable to those of ESL teachers. In other words, both possess similar understanding regardless of their teaching experiences. It can also be said teachers with longer experiences of teaching do not guarantee their higher levels of pedagogical knowledge and vice versa. This claim is supported by Hoz et al. [33] that there is no connection between the length of teaching experience and knowledge of subject matter/pedagogy. Another study by Chen & Goh [34] focusing on teachers' knowledge about spoken English teaching also shows that there is no considerable difference in terms of knowledge among teachers with various teaching experiences and involvements in training. A more surprising research finding also reveals that teachers with more years of teaching tend to have less PK [35]. Other researchers also see that teachers' teaching experiences and educational background do not contribute to the escalation of their knowledge. Moradkhani & Rahimi [36] detect that L2 teachers who graduated with a bachelor's degree and a master's degree are comparable in their PK. Akbari & Moradkhani [25] also conclude that teachers with academic titles in English are not happy with higher levels of efficacy. It means that teachers' knowledge is complex, as it is determined not only by years of teaching, educational backgrounds, but also other factors such as beliefs, positive attitudes, etc. For this purpose, more studies are needed in the future.

3.2.2. EFL teachers' areas of mastery and non-mastery

Another finding of the study is concerned with senior and junior EFL teachers' areas of mastery and non-mastery of their PK. As presented in the overall scores, senior EFL teachers fall within 0.36, categorized as NM and junior EFL teachers' overall score of their PK is 0.48, also categorized NM. Although their scores are not significantly different, senior EFL teachers seem to have more aspects of PK they do not know than those of they know as summarized in Table 7. Senior EFL teachers have not mastered 16 (64%) items and junior EFL teachers have not mastered 13 (52%) items. In particular, senior EFL teachers do not know 2 out of 2 items about the teaching profession, 2 out of 3 in language, 3 out of 3 in ELT theory, 2 out of 3 in assessment, 1 out of 2 in curriculum, 2 out of 3 in student, 1 out of 3 in the method of teaching, 1 out of 3 in lesson planning, and 2 out of 2 in research. Meanwhile, junior EFL teachers are problematic within 2 out

of 2 items of the teaching profession, 2 out of 3 in language, 3 out of 3 in ELT theory, 2 out of 3 in assessment, 1 out of 3 in student, 1 out of 3 in the method of teaching, 1 out of 3 in lesson planning, and 1 out of 2 in research. From those classifications, senior EFL teachers are fully blank in all items in the teaching profession, ELT theory, and research. Different from senior, junior EFL teachers have completely no idea of the teaching profession and ELT theory.

In the mastery aspects, senior EFL teachers know nine items, namely 1 out of 3 items in language, 1 out of 2 in curriculum, 2 out of 3 in lesson planning, 2 out of 3 in the method of teaching, 1 out of 1 in technology, 1 out of 3 in student, and 1 out of 3 in assessment. In a similar vein, junior EFL teachers know twelve items: 1 out of 3 items in language, 2 out of 2 in curriculum, 2 out of 3 in lesson planning, 2 out of 3 in the method of teaching, 2 out of 3 in students, 1 out of 1 in technology, 1 out of 3 in assessment, and 1 out of 2 in research. In a detailed comparison, senior EFL teachers have a complete mastery in the item of technology only, while junior EFL teachers are in technology and curriculum.

In the research context, those areas have partially been covered by several researchers in their studies of PK such as Tseng [2], including lesson planning and learning assessment, Ball et al. [11], inserting specific content knowledge, knowledge about students, and knowledge about teaching, and Moradkhani et al. [12], involving language, ELT theories, skills, and techniques, research and professional development, and assessment. Those areas of mastery and non-mastery reflect teachers' understanding/knowledge about how they teach the subject matter. The more aspects they know, the better their teaching performance will be. Their teaching performance will surely help learners to easily grasp instructional materials [4, 5, 6].

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

This study concludes that senior EFL teachers and junior EFL teachers are not statistically different, particularly in terms of their mastery and non-mastery levels of pedagogical knowledge. Although their scores are not significantly different, senior EFL teachers know lesser than those of junior EFL teachers. In fact, there are more aspects of PK they do not know. Senior EFL teachers are fully weak in dealing with teaching profession, ELT theory, and research, while junior EFL teachers are fully weak in teaching profession and ELT theory. Based on these conclusions, EFL teachers are suggested to join more workshop, training, and seminar to improve their pedagogical knowledge. Reading and writing activities are also useful to strengthen their knowledge and understanding about their PK. For future researchers, more qualitative and quantitative data and analyses

TABLE 7: Summary of Mastery and Non-Mastery Aspects.

Aspects of Mastery		Aspects of Non-Mastery	
Senior EFL Teachers	Junior EFL Teachers	Senior EFL Teachers	Junior EFL Teachers
Areas of teaching a language (Language)	Areas of teaching a language (Language)	Required competences for a professional status (Teaching Profession)	Required competences for a professional status (Teaching Profession)
Role of indicators of basic competence achievement (Curriculum)	Role of indicators of basic competence achievement (Curriculum)	Professional competence (Teaching Profession)	Professional competence (Teaching Profession)
Instructional media (Lesson Planning)	Instructional media (Lesson Planning)	Language skills (Language)	Language skills (Language)
Cooperative learning structures (Method of Teaching)	Cooperative learning structures (Method of Teaching)	Theories of learning (ELT Theory)	Theories of learning (ELT Theory)
-	Pragmatic competence (Curriculum)	Assessment of practical skills (Assessment)	Assessment of practical skills (Assessment)
-	Identification of learning problems (modals) (Students)	Pragmatic competence (Curriculum)	-
Use of technology in classroom activities (Technology)	Use of technology in classroom activities (Technology)	Identification of students' characteristics (personality) (Students)	Identification of students' characteristics (personality) (Students)
Selection of appropriate tasks (Lesson Planning)	Selection of appropriate tasks (Lesson Planning)	Knowledge of language features (Language)	Knowledge of language features (Language)
Motivating supports (Students)	Motivating supports (Students)	Identification of learning problems (modals) (Students)	-
Effective communication strategies (Method of Teaching)	Effective communication strategies (Method of Teaching)	Learning theories in practice (ELT Theory)	Learning theories in practice (ELT Theory)
Areas of competences to be assessed (Assessment)	Areas of competences to be assessed (Assessment)	Knowledge of instructional materials (ELT Theory)	Knowledge of instructional materials (ELT Theory)
-	CAR: Solution to learning problems (Research)	Selection of learning strategies (Method of Teaching)	Selection of learning strategies (Method of Teaching)
-	-	Selection of assessment techniques (Assessment)	Selection of assessment techniques (Assessment)
-	-	Use of appropriate instructional media tasks (Lesson Planning)	Use of appropriate instructional media tasks (Lesson Planning)
-	-	CAR: solution to learning problems (Research)	-
-	-	CAR: solution with learning strategies (Research)	CAR: solution with learning strategies (Research)

on this topic need to be well prepared so that they can obtain more comprehensive findings.

References

- [1] Shulman, L. “Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform.” *Harvard Educational Review* 1987;57 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>.
- [2] Tseng, J. J. Developing an instrument for assessing technological pedagogical content knowledge as perceived by EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 2016;29(2):302-315
- [3] VanPatten, B. How language teaching is constructed. Introduction to the special issue. *Modern Language Journal*, 1997;18:1-5.
- [4] Chan, K. K. H., & Yung, B. H. W. Developing Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teaching a New Topic: More Than Teaching Experience and Subject Matter Knowledge. *Research in Science Education*, 2018;48(2):233–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9567-1>
- [5] König, J., & Pflanzl, B. Is teacher knowledge associated with performance? On the relationship between teachers’ general pedagogical knowledge and instructional quality. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 2016;39(4):419–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2016.1214128>
- [6] Sanders, L. R., Borke, H., & Lockard, J. D. Secondary science teachers’ knowledge base when teaching science courses in and out of their area of certification. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 1993;30(7):723–736. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660300710>
- [7] Krepf, M., Plöger, W., Scholl, D., & Seifert, A. Pedagogical content knowledge of experts and novices-what knowledge do they activate when analyzing science lessons?: Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Experts and Novices. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 2018;55(1):44–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21410>
- [8] Nilsson, P., & Loughran, J. Exploring the Development of Pre-Service Science Elementary Teachers’ Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 2012;23(7):699–721. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9239-y>
- [9] Banks, F., Leach, J., & Moon, B. Extract from *New understandings of teachers’ pedagogic knowledge* * 1. *The Curriculum Journal*, 2005;16(3):331–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170500256446>

- [10] Fransson, G., & Holmberg, J. Understanding the Theoretical Framework of Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A collaborative self-study to understand teaching practice and aspects of knowledge. *Studying Teacher Education*, 2012;8(2):193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2012.692994>
- [11] Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. Content Knowledge for Teaching: What Makes It Special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2008;59(5):389–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108324554>
- [12] Moradkhani, S., Akbari, R., Ghafar Samar, R., & Kiany, G. English Language Teacher Educators' Pedagogical Knowledge Base: The Macro and Micro Categories. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 2013;38(10):123-141 <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n10.7>
- [13] Jones, M. G., & Vesilind, E. M. Putting Practice Into Theory: Changes in the Organization of Preservice Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1996;33(1):91–117. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312033001091>
- [14] Cerbin, W., & Kopp, B. Lesson Study as a Model for Building Pedagogical Knowledge and Improving Teaching. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 2006;18(3):250–257. <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- [15] Nazari, N., Nafissi, Z., Estaji, M., Marandi, S. S., & Wang, S. Evaluating novice and experienced EFL teachers' perceived TPACK for their professional development. *Cogent Education*, 2019;6(1):1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1632010>
- [16] Akbari, R., & Tajik, L. Teachers' Pedagogic Knowledge Base: A Comparison between Experienced and Less Experienced Practitioners. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 2009;34(6):52-73 <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2009v34n6.4>
- [17] Karimi, M. N., & Norouzi, M. Scaffolding teacher cognition: Changes in novice L2 teachers' pedagogical knowledge base through expert mentoring initiatives. *System*, 2017;65:38–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.015>
- [18] Hosseini, E. Z., Nasri, M., & Afghari, A. Looking Beyond Teachers' Classroom Behaviour: Novice and Experienced EFL Teachers' Practice of Pedagogical Knowledge to Improve Learners' Motivational Strategies. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2017;4(8):183–200. www.jallr.com
- [19] Mehrpour, S., & Moghaddam, M. Exploring novice and experienced Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs representations: A more vivid picture. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 2018;12(2):17–50.
- [20] Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2007;23(6):944–956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003>

- [21] Mahmoudi, F., & Özkan, Y. Exploring Experienced and Novice Teachers' Perceptions about Professional Development Activities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015;199:57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.487>
- [22] Caspersen, J., & Raaen, F. D. Novice teachers and how they cope. *Teachers and Teaching*, 2014;20(2):189–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.848570>
- [23] Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. A. See and tell: Differences between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2017;66:295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.015>
- [24] Stahnke, R., & Blömeke, S. Novice and expert teachers' situation-specific skills regarding classroom management: What do they perceive, interpret and suggest? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2021;98(2021):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103243>
- [25] Akbari, R., & Moradkhani, S. Iranian English Teachers' self-efficacy: Do Academic Degree and Experience make a difference? *Psychology*, 2010;56(special):25–47.
- [26] Ingersoll, R. , & Smith, T. The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 2003;60(8):30-33.
- [27] Tsui, A. B. Expertise in teaching: Perspectives and issues. In Johnson, K. (Ed), Expertise in second language learning and teaching (pp. 167-189). New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2005.
- [28] Widiati, U., & Hayati, N. Teacher Professional Education in Indonesia and ASEAN 2015: Lessons Learned From English Language Teacher Education Programs. In *ASEAN Integration and the Role of English Language Teaching* (pp. 121–142). IDP Education (Cambodia); 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/ASEAN_Integ_ELt
- [29] Gatbonton, E. Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 2008;12(2):161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086286>
- [30] Melnick, S. A., & Meister, D. G. A Comparison of Beginning and Experienced Teachers' Concerns. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 2008;31(3):39–56.
- [31] Sumarsono, P. Model Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Guru Bahasa Inggris di Indonesia dari Hulu hingga Hilir. *Journal of Educational Innovation*. 2015;3(1):10-23
- [32] Kömür, Ş. Teaching knowledge and teacher competencies: A case study of Turkish preservice English teachers. *Teaching Education*, 2010;21:279–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2010.498579>

- [33] Hoz, R., Tomer, Y., & Tamir, P. The relations between disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge and the length of teaching experience of biology and geography teachers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*. 1990;27(10):973–985.
- [34] Chen, Z. & Goh, C. “Teacher Knowledge about Oral English Instruction and Teacher Profiles: An EFL Perspective.” *Teacher Development*. 2014;18(1):81–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2013.854270>.
- [35] Asl, Esmail Safaie, Nader Safaie Asl, and Akbar Safaie Asl. “The Erosion of EFL Teachers’ Content and Pedagogical-Content Knowledge Throughout the Years of Teaching Experience.” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2014;98(May): 1599–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.583>.
- [36] Moradkhani, S., & Rahimi, M. The impact of students’ English proficiency level and teacher education on L2 teachers’ pedagogical knowledge: A mixed-methods study. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Journal*, 2020;11(2):1-15 <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.496>