17th Year of Publication, No.2
December 2025

BRIDGING PEDAGOGICAL THEORY AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PRACTICE: A COHERENT FRAMEWORK FOR ASSISTANT TEACHER PREPARATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE US AND ALBANIA

Vilma Tafani, Dhurata Lamçja*

*Department of Education and English, Albanian University

Abstract

This paper synthesizes prevailing theoretical frameworks and empirical observations to clarify two interrelated barriers to technology-mediated learning: (i) the disjunction between pedagogical best practices and entrenched, teacher-centric classroom routines, and (ii) the deficit of reliable infrastructural support.

We use a conceptual synthesis anchored in the principle that effective instruction—both about and through technology—should originate from learners' needs and intrinsic motivations. The analysis critically engages policy and research evidence (including a National Education Policy Center brief and Mathis & Enyedy's work) and adopts a comparative lens between the United States and Albania to identify leverage points in teacher preparation and system design.

Four research-aligned intervention tracks are proposed: (1) strategic strengthening of technological infrastructure; (2) iterative, context-embedded professional learning for in-service educators; (3) preservice curricular reforms that embed technology–pedagogy integration; and (4) cultivation of reflective methodological mindsets that privilege student agency and diverse learning practices.

This is a synthesis/review paper and does not report original experimental statistics.

Across contexts, technology improves learning when it is designed as part of student-centred pedagogy, supported by sustained professional learning and dependable infrastructure—rather than introduced as a stand-alone "innovation."

The paper offers a concise, actionable roadmap to align theoretical imperatives with classroom realities, with specific relevance to assistant-teacher preparation and inclusive practice for learners with special educational needs.

Keywords: *teaching practice; assistant teacher; training; students with special needs; theoretical framework.*

1. Introduction

Educational technology has expanded rapidly, yet its impact frequently underdelivers relative to the expectations attached to digital devices, platforms, and connectivity. A persistent pattern appears across many systems: hardware and software arrive, but classroom practice remains strongly shaped by teacher-centred routines (e.g., direct instruction and tightly controlled pacing), leaving "technology integration" as a superficial layer rather than a pedagogical transformation. This concern is echoed in research and policy critiques showing that the presence of digital tools does not automatically displace conventional instructional paradigms.

This paper focuses on two barriers that reinforce each other:

- **Pedagogical inertia:** research-informed approaches that emphasize student agency, active learning, and meaningful participation are often not enacted in daily routines.
- **Infrastructure fragility:** inconsistent access (devices, connectivity, maintenance, technical support) makes it difficult for teachers to plan reliably and for learners to engage consistently.

When these barriers interact, they produce a familiar outcome: teachers "use technology," but learning remains organised around the same instructional logic. The central argument here is that bridging the theory–practice gap requires a **system view**, where infrastructure, teacher learning, preservice preparation, and reflective practice are aligned as a coherent design.

2. Theoretical grounding for technology-mediated learning

2.1 Learner-centred design as a first principle

The abstract frames an essential axiom: effective instruction—whether teaching about technology or teaching through technology—should begin from learners' needs, interests, and motivations. This matters because digital tools amplify whatever pedagogy they are attached to: if instruction is teacher-controlled and compliance-driven, technology often becomes a faster method of delivering the same model (e.g., digitised worksheets, automated quizzes).

2.2 Teacher knowledge for integration (TPACK)

A practical explanation for weak "translation" from theory to classroom use is that teachers need integrated forms of knowledge—not only content and pedagogy, but also how technology changes what is teachable, how it is teachable, and what evidence of learning looks like. The **TPACK** framework explicitly conceptualises this integration and is widely used in teacher education to structure technology-pedagogy development.

2.3 Inclusion and variability (UDL)

Because the abstract explicitly highlights assistant teachers and students with special needs, an inclusive design lens is essential. **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** offers a planning framework to address learner variability by designing multiple means of engagement, representation, and action/expression—so that participation is built into the design rather than added as an afterthought.

2.4 System capacity (policy and professional learning)

Technology integration is not only a classroom-level issue; it is shaped by policy, professional learning infrastructure, and organisational support. International work emphasises that professional learning needs sustained, job-embedded structures (not one-off workshops), and that systems must create enabling conditions for teachers to learn, practice, and improve.

3. Why devices don't automatically change pedagogy

A key contribution of the abstract is its explicit engagement with evidence that widespread tools do not necessarily alter instructional paradigms. In the U.S. context, a National Education Policy Center brief associated with Mathis & Enyedy (2014) argues that "personalized instruction" rhetoric often rebrands older instructional ideas without changing the underlying teacher-centred structure.

Three mechanisms help explain why the shift stalls:

1. **Risk and reliability:** If infrastructure is unreliable, teachers reduce risk by reverting to known routines.
2. **Time and cognitive load:** Meaningful integration requires redesigning tasks, assessment, and classroom management—not just "learning a tool."
3. **Misalignment of incentives:** Systems may reward coverage and compliance over deeper learning, making student-centred experimentation costly.

This is why the paper positions **university-level teacher education** as a critical leverage point: it is where integrated knowledge, design habits, and reflective routines can be formed early—before classroom norms harden.

4. A comparative lens: the United States and Albania

The abstract proposes a cross-national comparison to surface both shared patterns and context-specific constraints. A comparative lens is valuable because it discourages "one-size-fits-all" solutions: what counts as a feasible intervention depends on infrastructure maturity, procurement cycles, teacher preparation models, and ongoing support capacity.

Common challenge across systems: pedagogy frequently remains teacher-centred even as technology availability grows.

A context note relevant to Albania: Albania has pursued initiatives to expand ICT capacity in schools (e.g., smart labs), illustrating active policy interest in infrastructure expansion. But infrastructure alone does not guarantee learning impact; the benefit depends on whether teacher learning and curriculum design co-evolve with the infrastructure.

A context note relevant to the broader European environment: the EU's Digital Education Action Plan (2021–2027) emphasises building a high-quality, inclusive digital education ecosystem—again signalling that the agenda is systemic, not merely technical.

5. Four intervention tracks to close the gap

5.1 Strategic strengthening of infrastructure

Infrastructure is not "just hardware." It includes connectivity, device availability, maintenance cycles, technical support, cybersecurity, classroom-level usability, and equitable access. Teacher practice becomes conservative when the environment is unpredictable; planning innovative lessons is rational only if technology can be trusted to work.

A practical infrastructure strategy typically includes:

- minimum standards for connectivity and device-to-student ratios,
- dependable technical support and maintenance,

- procurement aligned with pedagogical goals (not marketing),
- accessibility features and assistive technology availability to support learners with special needs.

This aligns with policy positions that highlight equity, technical support, and reliability as prerequisites for functioning digital classrooms.

5.2 Iterative, context-embedded professional learning for in-service educators
The abstract calls for "iterative, context-embedded professional learning." The key shift is from *training as events* to *professional learning as routines*.

Effective in-service models often include:

- coaching and co-planning cycles tied to real lessons,
- peer observation focused on learning design (not tool usage),
- short experimentation loops ("plan–teach–review–revise"),
- local communities of practice that solve immediate classroom problems.

International evidence repeatedly points to a need for stronger teacher preparation for digital teaching and continued support during careers, not just initial exposure.

5.3 Preservice curricular reform: embedding technology–pedagogy integration

The abstract explicitly positions preservice programs as a leverage point and calls for curricular reforms that embed technology–pedagogy integration modules. Rather than isolating "educational technology" as a standalone course, integration is stronger when technology is embedded across pedagogy, assessment, subject methods, and practicum.

A preservice curriculum aligned with TPACK would typically ensure candidates can:

- design learning tasks where technology enables new forms of inquiry, collaboration, and representation,
- select tools based on learning goals and evidence,
- assess learning beyond click-level metrics,
- adapt instruction to diverse learners (especially in inclusive classrooms).

UNESCO's ICT Competency Framework for Teachers provides a system-level reference for how teacher training can be structured across competencies and career stages, supporting both preservice and in-service development.

5.4 Cultivating reflective methodological mindsets (student agency + diversity)
Finally, the abstract calls for a reflective methodological mindset that privileges student agency and diversity of learning practices. This is the "glue" that keeps technology integration from collapsing into tool adoption.

A reflective integration mindset includes:

- routinely asking "What learning problem are we solving?" before choosing a tool,

- evaluating whether technology increased agency, collaboration, feedback quality, or access,
- noticing which learners were amplified and which were excluded,
- iterating based on evidence (student work, observation, and learning outcomes—not only platform analytics).

6. Specific implications for assistant teachers and learners with special needs

Because assistant teachers frequently operate at the intersection of classroom instruction and inclusive support, they are essential actors in bridging the theory–practice gap—especially where technology can reduce barriers to participation.

6.1 Designing access and participation (UDL-aligned practice)
UDL reframes inclusion as *design*, not remediation. In technology-mediated learning environments, assistant teachers can co-lead planning that ensures:

- multiple ways to access instructions (visual, audio, simplified text),
- multiple ways to show understanding (oral response, visual products, scaffolded writing),
- multiple ways to engage (choice, relevance, assistive supports).
-

6.2 Avoiding "digital segregation"

A common failure mode is using technology to separate learners with special needs into parallel tasks ("different worksheet, different app"). A reflective model prioritises *shared learning goals* with differentiated pathways so that technology supports participation in the same intellectual work.

6.3 Assistant teachers as co-designers, not only implementers
To achieve sustainable inclusion, assistant teachers need preparation that includes:

- learning design and task adaptation,
- collaboration routines with classroom teachers,
- competence with accessibility tools and assistive technology,
- evidence-based reflection on what improved participation and learning.

This is exactly why the paper's leverage points—preservice integration and context-embedded professional learning—matter for assistant-teacher preparation.

7. A concise roadmap for implementation

To translate the four tracks into action, a phased approach can reduce overload and increase coherence.

7.1 Phase 1: Establish reliability and minimum conditions

- Define minimum infrastructure standards (connectivity, devices, support).
- Audit readiness and remove predictable failure points (maintenance, logins, classroom set-up).

7.2 Phase 2: Build professional learning routines

- Implement coaching and co-planning cycles linked to real lessons.
- Establish peer learning communities focused on design and evidence.

7.3 Phase 3: Reform preservice programs for integrated competence

- Align coursework with TPACK-style integration across subject methods and practicum.
- Embed inclusive design and UDL principles explicitly in technology-mediated lesson design.

7.4 Phase 4: Institutionalise reflection and evidence use

- Make small-cycle inquiry ("design–test–reflect–revise") routine.
- Evaluate success using learning evidence: student work quality, participation patterns, and inclusive outcomes—not only usage statistics.

8. Conclusion

The theory–practice gap in educational technology is not primarily a problem of insufficient tools; it is a problem of **misaligned systems**. As the abstract argues, entrenched teacher-centred routines and unreliable infrastructure reinforce each other, preventing technology from supporting genuinely learner-centred instruction.

A practical solution requires coordinated action across four tracks: strategic infrastructure strengthening, iterative in-service professional learning, preservice curricular integration of technology and pedagogy, and cultivation of reflective methodological mindsets that prioritise student agency and diverse learning practices.

By treating teacher education—especially assistant-teacher preparation—as a leverage point, and by organising infrastructure and professional learning as enabling conditions rather than add-ons, systems can move beyond "technology presence" toward technology-enabled learning that is reliable, inclusive, and instructionally meaningful.

References:

1. Boninger, F., Molnar, A., & Saldaña, C. M. (2019, April 30). *Personalized learning and the digital privatization of curriculum and teaching*. National Education Policy Center. http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/personalized-learning

2. CAST. (2018). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2* [Graphic organizer]. Author. https://udlguidelines.cast.org/static/udlg2.2-text-a11y.pdf

3. Enyedy, N. (2014, November). *Personalized instruction: New interest, old rhetoric, limited results, and the need for a new direction for computer-mediated learning*. National Education Policy Center. http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/personalized-instruction

4. European Commission. (2020). *Digital education action plan 2021–2027: Resetting education and training for the digital age* (COM(2020) 624 final). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/

EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0624

5. Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2013). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education, 193*(3), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741319300303

6. Minea-Pic, A. (2020). *Innovating teachers' professional learning through digital technologies* (OECD Education Working Papers No. 237). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/3329fae9-en

7. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (n.d.). *Teacher professional learning and development*. Retrieved December 26, 2025, from https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/teacher-professional-learning-and-development.html

9. UNESCO. (2016). *Teacher training institutions: Guidelines for ICT in education management and sustainability*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265421

10. UNESCO. (2018). *UNESCO ICT competency framework for teachers (ICT-CFT): Version 3*. UNESCO. https://teachertaskforce.org/sites/default/files/2020-07/ict_framework.pdf

11. Western Balkans Investment Framework. (2023, January 13). *Albania, establishment of smart labs – network of ICT laboratories for the pre-university education system*. https://www.wbif.eu/investmentgrants/WB-IG07-ALB-DII-01

12. World Bank. (2024). *Digital pathways for education: Enabling greater impact for all*. World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099102124103012716/pdf/P173530151854505218eb417834e0f954cd.pdf