

## The Use of Modern Teaching Technologies in Pedagogical Staff Training as a Key Factor in the Quality Indicators of University Instructors

**Zeynalli Aysel Shahin**

*Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, Faculty of History and Geography, Baki, Azerbaijan  
ayselzeynallikx@gmail.com*

### Abstract

In the 21st-century digital era, higher education institutions must not only transmit theory but also prepare future teachers as technologically competent professionals. This article examines how integrating modern teaching technologies into teacher education affects university instructors' quality indicators. Through a systematic analysis of recent literature (2010–2025), international case studies, and educational statistics, we explore frameworks like TPACK, innovative teaching methods (project/problem-based learning), and emerging digital tools (AI, VR/AR). The findings indicate that teachers with strong TPACK and who employ student-centered methods tend to create more engaging, effective learning environments. For example, AI-driven adaptive systems can personalize training, and VR simulations allow safe practice of classroom management, but both raise ethical and infrastructure challenges. We conclude that increasing technology integration in pedagogy can improve teacher quality by developing digital, pedagogical, and ethical competencies. Key recommendations include mandatory TPACK-based coursework (including AI ethics), sustained reflective professional communities (PLCs), updated quality metrics (e.g., digital resource creation, VR usage), and modernizing infrastructure. Implementing these measures will align Azerbaijan's teacher training with global best practices.

**Keywords:** TPACK, teacher education, educational technology, professional development, teacher quality.

### Introduction

The rapid digitalization of society demands that universities evolve beyond traditional lecturing and cultivate educators who are digitally savvy and pedagogically innovative. Global education reforms have introduced new standards for teacher preparation, placing the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) model at the forefront. Mishra and Koehler (2006) define TPACK as the intersection of technology, pedagogy, and subject content knowledge, arguing that “thoughtful pedagogical uses of technology require the development of a complex, situated form of knowledge”. In practice, a high TPACK level means teachers skillfully integrate tools (like multimedia or online platforms) into effective, student-centered instruction.

Concurrently, modern curricula emphasize 21st-century competencies (the “4Cs”: Critical thinking, Communication, Creativity, Collaboration). Project-based and problem-based learning (PBL) are widely recommended to develop these skills in future teachers. For example, incorporating real-world problem-solving tasks with digital tools encourages critical thinking and teamwork. International literature indicates that educators who employ PBL and similar active learning approaches are viewed as having advanced professional competence. However, the pervasive use of technology also introduces challenges: pedagogical training must now address issues like AI ethics, data privacy, and digital equity.

This study investigates the necessity and impact of modern teaching technologies in teacher training on university instructors' performance indicators. We synthesize findings from academic research and educational reports (2010–2025) to assess the current state of technology integration in teacher education. Our goal is to evaluate how these innovations influence teaching quality and to provide concrete recommendations for updating the teacher training system. By examining both opportunities (adaptive learning, VR simulations, micro-credentials) and obstacles (infrastructure gaps, ethical concerns), we aim to chart a path for aligning national teacher education with international best practices.

### Aim

The primary aim of this research is to analyze how modern teaching technologies affect the quality indicators of university instructors in teacher education. Specific objectives include:

- 1) evaluating the current integration of technologies (e.g. TPACK framework, AI tools, VR/AR, PBL methods) in pedagogical staff training;
- 2) identifying the impacts of these technologies on teaching effectiveness and teacher competencies;
- 3) formulating evidence-based recommendations for modernizing teacher training curricula and evaluation systems.

These objectives directly address the desired outcomes of improved pedagogical innovation and competitive teacher training. By clarifying how technology use correlates with instructor quality, the study seeks to inform educational leaders and policymakers on where to focus reforms.

### Significance

This study contributes to educational research and practice by filling a gap in understanding the role of digital pedagogy in teacher preparation. As nations seek to revitalize education through technology, it is crucial to know how such changes translate into teacher performance and student learning. Our findings will inform curriculum designers, university administrators, and policymakers. For example, aligning teacher education with UNESCO's ICT Competency Framework or national digital literacy standards requires evidence on effective strategies. By systematically reviewing literature and statistical data, we offer practical insights into how enhancing instructors' technological competencies can raise overall education quality.

The work also offers theoretical advancement by connecting TPACK and 21st-century skills frameworks to measurable outcomes. It highlights novel indicators (such as educators' creation of digital content or mastery of AI tools) that extend traditional faculty evaluation criteria. Ultimately, this research underscores the urgency of integrating pedagogy, technology, and ethics in teacher training, thereby supporting the development of a future-ready educator workforce.

### Theoretical Framework

The core theoretical lens for this study is the TPACK framework. Building on Shulman's Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Mishra and Koehler (2006) introduced TPACK to explain the specialized knowledge teachers need for technology-integrated instruction. In this model, three primary knowledge domains intersect: Content Knowledge (CK), Pedagogical Knowledge (PK), and Technological Knowledge (TK). The overlaps of these domains define subareas like Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) and Technological Pedagogical Knowledge (TPK). TPACK itself represents the center where all three overlap, embodying the ability to select and use technology in pedagogically sound ways. This study uses TPACK as a conceptual map to assess educators' competencies.

Another theoretical foundation is the concept of 21st-century skills education. Frameworks from the Partnership for 21st Century Learning emphasize the "4Cs" (Critical thinking, Communication, Creativity, Collaboration) as essential competencies for modern learners. Teacher education programs thus adopt project-based learning (PBL) and problem-based learning to cultivate these skills. In our context, we treat development of 4C competencies as both a goal of training and an indicator of effective teaching. For instance, Sunardi and Doringin (2020) found that a "4Cs" focused PD model increased teachers' enthusiasm and technology use, highlighting the interlink between pedagogy, skills, and tech.

For professional development, we draw on continuous improvement theories. The literature on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and reflective practice (e.g. Fullan's coherence model) suggests that collective, ongoing learning cultures improve teaching quality. Dufour and Eaker's PLC model proposes elements like a collaborative learning culture and a commitment to continuous improvement. We adopt this as a guiding principle: that sustainable teacher development requires institutionalized communities of practice. Micro-credentialing and MOOCs are seen as extensions of adult learning theory – providing competency-based, self-directed learning opportunities (constructivist and andragogical underpinnings).

Together, these frameworks (TPACK, 21st-century skills pedagogy, continuous PD theory) shape our analysis. They inform which variables to examine (e.g., teacher tech knowledge, classroom strategies, community practices) and how to interpret their influence on instructor quality.

### Literature Review

TPACK and Teacher Quality: Research consistently shows that higher TPACK levels correlate with more effective technology use in teaching. Chai et al. (2013) reviewed dozens of studies and concluded that TPACK-based approaches significantly enhanced teachers' ability to integrate ICT into instruction. In practice, instructors with well-developed TPACK design learning environments that are more student-centered and cognitively engaging. For example, they might employ interactive simulations or adaptive software aligned with lesson content (the Technological Pedagogical Content intersection), rather than using tech as an add-on. Conversely, a narrow focus on technology without pedagogical context often fails to improve outcomes. Thus, literature emphasizes professional development that blends tech skills with content-specific pedagogy.

**Project-Based and Problem-Based Learning:** Active learning methods like PBL have been championed for promoting 21st-century skills. A substantial body of work (e.g., PBLWorks, ConceptSchools guides) describes how involving pre-service teachers in projects builds their capability to guide real-world, inquiry-driven learning. Project/problem-based tasks require communication, collaboration, and creativity. Recent studies in teacher PD have adopted a “4Cs” model and found it accelerates teachers’ comfort with technology and deepens their instructional skills. In one case, Indonesian researchers showed a 4Cs-focused PD significantly boosted teachers’ tech integration competence and classroom performance. The implication is that universities should incorporate hands-on, tech-rich projects into teacher education curricula. Educators who model these methods in their courses are thus seen as highly competent, since they are building these critical skills in future teachers.

**Artificial Intelligence and Adaptive Learning:** A frontier in educational technology is the use of AI to personalize learning. Adaptive Learning Systems (ALS) use algorithms to adjust content delivery to each learner’s pace, style, and performance. In teacher training, AI tools can diagnose a trainee’s strengths/weaknesses and suggest customized modules. For instance, if a future teacher struggles with classroom management theory, an AI tutor might provide targeted simulations or readings. Holmes et al. (2019) describe myriad AI applications (from intelligent tutoring to predictive analytics) that promise more individualized learning. These tools also track massive data, which could help instructors refine their teaching strategies (a data-driven pedagogy). However, the literature cautions about ethical challenges: AI use raises issues of data privacy, bias in algorithms, and academic integrity (e.g. plagiarism via generative AI). Studies note that many educators lack experience in digital ethics, so teacher quality increasingly depends on professors’ ability to teach responsible AI use. Thus, universities must address not only technical competence but also digital responsibility.

**Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR):** Immersive technologies offer transformative opportunities for practice and visualization. VR allows future teachers to rehearse classroom scenarios in a safe, controlled environment. For example, Alvarez et al. (2024) developed a VR classroom simulation (Didascalia Virtual-ClassRoom) where pre-service teachers manage disruptive student behavior. Their study found participants quickly recognized the tool’s usefulness and potential to improve classroom management skills. Similarly, Bailenson (2018) and others argue that realistic VR experiences can build novices’ confidence and empathy without risk to real students. On the content side, AR can enhance understanding of complex subjects: 3D models in science or art lessons reduce cognitive load and make abstract concepts concrete. Buchner et al.’s systematic review (2021) concludes that AR often imposes *lower* cognitive load than traditional methods and tends to improve learning performance. Thus, instructors who integrate AR/VR into their teaching are leveraging cutting-edge methods for deeper learning.

**Professional Development Models:** Given rapid tech evolution, one-off training is insufficient. Experts like Fullan (2016) and Dufour et al. argue for ongoing, reflective PD. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are widely advocated: they bring educators together to apply new methods, share outcomes, and iterate on practice. Dufour et al. list core PLC elements: shared learning goals, collaborative culture, collective inquiry, action orientation, continuous improvement, and results focus. Research shows that when faculty form technology-focused PLCs (even online via forums or MOOCs), adoption rates of new pedagogy increase. Micro-credentials and MOOCs represent another trend: short, competency-based courses allow teachers to upskill flexibly. For example, platforms like Coursera or EdX now offer MOOCs on gamification or data analytics for education, often aligned with micro-credentials (digital badges or certificate programs). Luo and Chen (2023) found that micro-credentials can “effectively meet the needs of working professionals in higher education for teacher professional development” by being competency-based and flexible. The NEA similarly promotes micro-credentials as personalized, performance-based recognitions of mastery. Thus, the literature suggests that sustained, personalized PD systems (not one-time workshops) are key to raising teacher quality.

**International Models – Finland and Estonia:** Comparative studies highlight best practices abroad. Finland famously prepares teachers with intensive research-based training; technology is woven into education early so that Finnish trainees “perceive technology as a natural learning tool” (Sahlberg, 2011). Jokinen (2010) notes Finnish programs emphasize reflective practice and content mastery alongside tech integration. In Estonia, national policy has driven digital competence. Since the 1990s, the Tiger Leap initiative ensured every school had internet and computers. Today, Estonia’s lifelong learning strategy includes a digital transformation program to continuously develop teachers’ tech skills. Official reports emphasize providing devices, building e-learning materials, and integrating digital literacy standards for educators. The result is an ecosystem where Estonian professors regularly create and use digital content. These international examples show that systemic support (beyond individual willingness) is crucial: strong government and institutional policies can normalize technology use in pedagogy and elevate teacher quality on a national scale.

In summary, the literature consistently finds that technology-rich pedagogies, supported by adequate infrastructure and PD models, lead to higher teacher effectiveness. Gaps remain, however, in evaluating these innovations: few studies track quantitative outcomes like student test gains or teachers' digital portfolios. This review highlights the need to integrate technology-focused metrics into quality assurance (see Section 4).

### Methodology

This study employs a qualitative analytical approach, primarily a systematic literature review complemented by analysis of international education reports and statistical indicators. Key methodological steps include:

- **Research Scope and Sources:** We collected scholarly and policy publications from 2010–2025 on teacher training and educational technology. Sources included peer-reviewed journals (e.g. *Teachers College Record*, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*), conference proceedings (e.g. ED-MEDIA, AACE), and reports from UNESCO/OECD. We also examined national documents (Estonia's e-education strategy, Finnish education white papers) and case studies (e.g. micro-credentials in higher ed). Databases like ERIC, Web of Science, and Google Scholar were searched with terms: "TPACK", "teacher education technology", "AI in education", "VR teacher training", etc.
- **Selection Criteria:** Included works focused on university-level teacher preparation or professional development in technology integration. Interventions ranged from curriculum design to PD programs. Both empirical studies (surveys, experiments) and conceptual analyses were reviewed. We prioritized recent publications (especially 2020–2025) to capture cutting-edge trends, while foundational works (e.g. Mishra & Koehler 2006) provided theoretical grounding.
- **Data Analysis:** Content from the selected sources was coded thematically around our research questions (e.g. TPACK impact, AI applications, PD models). We synthesized findings under the conceptual framework outlined above. Quantitative data (where available) on technology adoption rates or student outcomes were noted but not analyzed statistically due to heterogeneity of measures. Instead, we critically compared qualitative results and meta-analyses (such as Chai et al. 2013) to identify consensus findings.
- **Limitations and Ethics:** As a desk review, the study did not involve human subjects. We ensured intellectual honesty by citing all sources. Limitations include the reliance on published results and the potential for publication bias (studies showing positive technology outcomes are more likely published). However, by covering diverse geographies (Europe, Asia, North America) and methodologies, we aimed for a balanced perspective.
- **Validation:** To enhance credibility, we cross-referenced findings from multiple sources. For example, claims about AI benefits were supported by both theoretical treatises (Holmes et al., 2019) and practitioner reports (ElearningIndustry 2024). Divergent views (e.g. on AR's cognitive load) were noted from systematic reviews. This triangulation strengthens confidence in the conclusions.

### Findings and Discussion

1. **Enhancing Teacher Competence through TPACK:** Across the literature, higher TPACK among instructors is linked with improved teaching quality. Chai et al. (2013) reported that TPACK-based training "yielded positive results in enhancing teachers' capability to integrate ICT" into practice. In real-world terms, this means students in TPACK-informed courses experience more interactive, project-based learning, which boosts engagement and 21st-century skills. For example, a science professor using AR simulations (merging content and pedagogy with tech) can present chemistry molecules in 3D, making abstract concepts concrete and memorable. Anecdotally, faculty who embrace such methods often note that students exhibit deeper understanding and problem-solving ability.

Quantitative studies (though scarce) support this trend. Where measured, classes taught by high-TPACK teachers show higher gains on assessments of critical thinking and collaboration. Thus, we recommend institutions adopt pre/post testing on specific learning outcomes (critical thinking tests, STEM concept inventories) to gauge the impact of tech integration. Over time, tracking such metrics will validate the role of TPACK in raising learning outcomes.

2. **Developing 21st-Century Skills with Active Methods:** The incorporation of PBL and problem-solving tasks in teacher education fosters crucial skills. Sunardi and Doringin (2020) show that embedding a 4Cs framework in PD accelerated teachers' tech competency. In practice, students guide a project from planning to digital presentation, learning communication and creative use of media in the process. Professors who routinely use PBL report that their cohorts demonstrate better teamwork and digital literacy. As a result, instructors using these methods tend to have higher student satisfaction and attainment of soft skills. We therefore consider mastery of PBL methods a quality indicator: professors trained to design and facilitate such projects embody modern pedagogical competence.

3. **AI and Adaptive Technologies:** The review indicates that AI-driven tools can greatly enhance personalization in teacher training. Adaptive platforms monitor a trainee’s responses and immediately adjust content difficulty, much like an intelligent tutor. This approach can boost efficiency; eLearningIndustry (2024) notes AI-driven adaptive learning “enhances learner motivation through customized challenges and rewards”. For example, if a teacher candidate quickly masters a topic, the system can skip basic review and advance them, whereas struggling learners receive extra practice. However, we emphasize a key finding: the effectiveness of AI hinges on ethical use. Multiple sources highlight concerns about algorithmic bias and data privacy. In line with Holmes et al. (2019), faculty must be trained in digital ethics so they can guide students on responsible AI use. Thus, while AI can improve learning outcomes, teacher quality also depends on instructors’ awareness of these new challenges.

4. **VR/AR in Teacher Practice:** Immersive technologies are confirmed as valuable for teacher training. VR simulations enable pre-service teachers to practice classroom management in a realistic yet risk-free setting. In the Didascalia VR study, trainees reported that the immersive experience allowed them to confront common classroom conflicts and immediately reflect on decisions. This kind of “deliberate practice” is otherwise hard to provide in teacher programs. Consequently, instructors who integrate VR into methods courses tend to produce graduates with higher self-efficacy in classroom management. Augmented reality, meanwhile, serves as a visualization aid in subject matter teaching. Systematic reviews (e.g. Buchner et al., 2021) find that well-designed AR can *reduce* cognitive load for learners, making complex science and math content easier to grasp. Thus, faculty who employ AR/VR tools can be judged as innovating effectively: their students learn more deeply and confidently.

5. **Continuous Professional Development:** The dynamic nature of educational technology means professors must keep learning. Our literature review underscores the efficacy of PLCs and other collaborative PD models. When teachers form learning communities around subjects or technologies, they collectively experiment and improve. For example, a university computer science department might hold weekly sessions where faculty demonstrate new educational apps, discuss student feedback, and adjust their practice. Such a PLC aligns with Dufour’s six elements (continuous improvement, collaborative inquiry). The presence of active PLCs can therefore be an institutional quality indicator.

In parallel, micro-credentials and MOOCs offer flexible skill-building. Luo & Chen (2022) observe that credit-bearing micro-courses (like a postgrad certificate in teaching and learning) allowed faculty to integrate new strategies and tools into their classrooms. Educators benefit from choosing bite-sized courses on topics like gamification or data analysis for teaching. The NEA highlights that micro-credentials are personalized and performance-based. We suggest that tracking faculty engagement with such credentials is a modern metric of professional growth. A professor who has earned micro-credentials in AI ethics or AR pedagogy demonstrates initiative in meeting contemporary demands.

6. **International Comparisons:** Finland’s model shows that deeply integrating tech and pedagogy from the start produces teachers who see technology as natural in instruction (Sahlberg, 2011). Estonian examples illustrate the importance of state support: national initiatives (like Tiger Leap in the 1990s) ensured universal connectivity, and current policies provide devices and training to educators. The outcome in Estonia is a resilient, digitally literate teacher corps—evidenced by rapid pivot to remote learning during crises. These cases reveal that institutional backing (e.g. funding, standards, infrastructure) greatly amplifies the impact of pedagogical technology use. In Azerbaijan, this suggests a need for coordinated efforts (see Recommendations).

7. **Quality Indicators and Challenges:** Traditional faculty evaluation (publications, teaching hours, supervision) does not capture digital innovation. New quantitative indicators should include: (a) measured impact of technology-enhanced teaching on student skills (using pre/post tests of critical thinking, problem-solving); (b) volume and quality of digital teaching resources authored by instructors (video lectures, interactive modules, MOOC content); (c) scholarly output in educational technology (number of relevant publications and citations). For instance, Najdawi & Shwede (2025) argue for linking bibliometric metrics (H-index on ed-tech topics) to teaching competence.

Nonetheless, we also identify organizational obstacles. In line with Larry Cuban’s insights, even enthusiastic teachers face “technological resistance” if infrastructure is poor. Outdated computers, slow internet, or lack of licensed software can nullify individual efforts. For example, a professor might design an innovative online lab simulation, but if students cannot access it, the potential is lost. Administrative support is thus crucial. Incentives (such as grants for developing digital projects or recognition for innovative teaching) play a decisive role. Without institutional commitment, investments in teacher tech skills will have limited effect.

In summary, our analysis confirms that effectively using modern technologies is strongly linked to higher teacher quality. The review of literature and case studies consistently shows that integrating TPACK, fostering 21st-century skills, and providing ongoing PD lead to more competent, adaptive instructors. However, success depends on supportive policies and culture. The next section turns these insights into actionable recommendations.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

This study underscores that technological competence is a core component of contemporary teaching quality. By raising instructors' TPACK levels and embedding innovative methods, higher education institutions can produce teachers who are ready to educate digital-age learners. Our findings show that blended pedagogies (combining technology, sound pedagogy, and rich content) result in more engaging, outcome-focused education. Moreover, tools like AI and VR, when used thoughtfully, can greatly enhance learning. These advances develop not only technical skills but also ethical and reflective dimensions of teaching.

To align with international standards and national goals, we recommend the following concrete measures:

**Structured TPACK-based Courses:** Teacher education curricula should include mandatory, practice-oriented modules on TPACK. These courses would train future professors in selecting and applying educational technologies as part of their pedagogy. Specific topics should cover integrating AI (including hands-on use of tools like ChatGPT), as well as didactic issues such as detecting AI-generated plagiarism and ensuring data privacy. By formalizing TPACK education, institutions ensure all graduates reach a baseline digital fluency.

**Continuous Reflective PLCs:** Universities should facilitate ongoing Professional Learning Communities. This could involve allocating time and resources for faculty groups (by subject area or technology interest) to meet regularly. These PLCs would share best practices (e.g. new software, VR exercises) and peer-review each other's teaching materials. Providing support (such as small grants or credit) for these communities emphasizes collective reflection on instructional innovation. Evidence shows that such collaborative cultures lead to more sustained improvements than isolated training sessions.

**Innovation-Focused Quality Assurance:** Institutional evaluation systems must evolve. Annual reviews should credit faculty contributions to digital pedagogy. For example, instructors could report on newly created online modules, interactive simulations, or successful use of VR in lectures. Evaluation rubrics might include indicators like "integration of educational technology in teaching portfolio" or "student 21st-century skill development outcomes". Celebrating these achievements (through awards or promotion criteria) will incentivize technology adoption. This aligns with the notion that micro-credentials and MOOCs earned by faculty reflect their commitment to growth.

**Modernizing Infrastructure:** To remove barriers, institutions must invest in up-to-date equipment. Computers and devices should be refreshed at least every 5 years; high-speed internet should be guaranteed campus-wide. Software licenses for key educational tools (e.g. VR platforms, AI analytics) should be procured. Administrative policies should ensure technical support is available for faculty. If the groundwork is laid, professors will be far more willing and able to implement innovative methods. This addresses the "technological resistance" noted in the literature (Cuban, 2015) by ensuring the environment facilitates rather than impedes change.

Implementing these recommendations will accelerate the digital transformation of teacher preparation in Azerbaijan. It will help bridge the gap between current practice and global benchmarks exemplified by leaders like Finland and Estonia. In the long run, higher TPACK levels and a culture of innovation will produce university instructors who can deliver future teachers with the skills needed in a digitalized world.

### References

- Álvarez, I. M., Manero, B., Romero-Hernández, A., Cárdenas, M., & Masó, I. (2024). Virtual reality platform for teacher training on classroom climate management: Evaluating user acceptance. *Virtual Reality*, 28, Article 78.
- Buchner, J., Buntins, K., & Kerres, M. (2021). The impact of augmented reality on cognitive load and performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(1), 285–303.
- Chai, C. S., Koh, J. H.-L., & Tsai, C.-C. (2013). A review of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Educational Technology & Society*, 16(2), 31–51.
- e-Estonia. (n.d.). *Digital Education in Estonia: Building an inclusive digital society*. Retrieved from [https://e-estonia.com/solutions/e-education-and-research/research\\_information\\_system/](https://e-estonia.com/solutions/e-education-and-research/research_information_system/)
- eLearning Industry. (2024, December 20). *Adaptive learning with AI: Revolutionizing personalized education*. Retrieved from <https://elearningindustry.com/understanding-adaptive-learning-how-ai-is-revolutionizing-personalized-education>

- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Luo, L., & Chen, J. (2023). Using micro-credentials to promote effective teacher professional development: A case study from Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University. *Proceedings of the Asian Adult Education Conference*, 2023.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.
- National Education Association. (n.d.). *Micro-credentials*. Retrieved from <https://www.nea.org/professional-excellence/professional-learning/micro-credentials>
- Sunardi, S., & Doringin, F. (2020). The 4Cs learning model in teacher professional development program. *Humaniora*, 11(2), 153–159.