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Abstract. This research aimed at investigating the impacts of knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing (KARDS) on Iranian English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers’ professional identity reconstruction in the context of high schools. Purposive sampling and KARDS questionnaires used to choose participants and to classify them into a more KARDS-oriented group (n=10) and a less-KARDS oriented group (n=10). The researchers employed pre-course and post-course interviews, teacher educator’s and teachers’ reflective journals, and class debate as data gathering tools. Following the pre-course interview, there was an implementation phase of KARDS using which teachers were acquainted with it. Then, Grounded Theory used for data analysis. Findings revealed there were three big shifts. It started from “uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice,” “the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies,” and “linguistic and technical view of language teaching to the critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching” in teachers’ professional identities in both groups. The changes were similar in quality but not in quantity, and they should incorporate in teacher education programs. The findings may encourage stakeholders to welcome uncertainty and confusion, to underline more macro-strategies, and to take a critical and transformative view of language teaching in language classrooms.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Language teacher education as the sum of lived experiences or activities utilizing which individuals learn to become language pedagogues (Freeman, 2001) has been witness to shifting epistemologies from a positivist perspective. It is to an interpretive viewpoint (Johnson, 2009) during its development. It has endured shifts away from a knowledge-centered approach, to a person-centered approach, to critical, socio-cultural, and sociopolitical approaches. The knowledge-centered approach and the person-centered approach differ from each other in their theoretical basis, view of knowledge, view of the person, view of the teacher, perspective, and methods (Roberts, 1998).

The knowledge-centered approach (Roberts, 1998) conforms to positivist epistemology (Johnson, 2006) and emphasizes transmission of pre-described and pre-chosen pedagogical techniques and knowledge to language teachers (Richards, 2008; Richards & Farrell, 2005) whose agencies, beliefs, and past experiences overlooked (Freeman, 1989; Johnson, 2006). Learning how to teach is construed as learning the imposed content (Cochran-smith, Shakman, Jong, Terrell, Barnatt, &McQuillan, 2009),
and teachers solely invited to implement experts’ theories passed to them in teacher preparation programs (Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

The constructivist (individual/social) approach (Roberts, 1998), a subcategory of the person-centered approach, complies with interpretive epistemology and sees teachers as reflective individuals who can make theories out of their teaching practices and implement their theories (Griffiths, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Wallace, 1995). Teachers do not deem as empty containers or passive technicians to supply with knowledge and skills of teaching. Rather, they have the background knowledge and prior lived experiences and personal beliefs and ideas which strongly affect their pedagogical knowledge and practice (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Teachers judged as active individuals who employ complex, effective, real, subjective, and context-sensitive systems of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs to make pedagogical choices (Borg, 2003). Teacher education programs must inform teacher cognition, which would, in turn, culminate in a shift in teachers’ practices (Borg, 2011). This new understanding arouses interest among researchers in teacher cognition (Borg, 2003) and teacher professional identity (Nguyen, 2008; Sutherland, Howard, & Markauskaite, 2010; Tsui, 2007).

From the 1980s on, teacher education has shifted away from the transmission of knowledge to the construction of knowledge where teachers combine theory and research with an experiential and reflective study of their classroom practices (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). The movement has shifted away from content, to the teacher, to the process of education (Freeman, 2001). Teacher education should restructure and rethink itself and its paradigm away from the traditional master-apprentice model towards a model that aims to authorize teachers to look into their context and needs critically and invent and reinvent their local methodologies in the post method era (McMorrow, 2007). The constructivist approach overlooks the political, ethical, and emancipatory aspects of teaching (Akbari, 2007; Jay & Johnson, 2002). Consequently, a critical, socio-cultural, and sociopolitical approach within which teachers do not consider any more reflective individuals but as “transformative intellectuals” (Giroux, 1992) and “cultural workers” (Freire, 2005) emerged.

Newly, a novel approach to language teacher education by Kumaravadivelu (2012) that is strongly affected by globalization, ingrained in post method and post transmission perspectives, and closely in conformity and harmony with the critical, socio-cultural and sociopolitical approach to language teacher education has come out. This approach, which is the theoretical framework underlying this study, aims to create critical, reflective, strategic, and transformative practitioners. Kumaravadivelu (2006) holds that teacher education should emphasize the development of more reflective, autonomous, analytical, and transformative teachers who can make and think of local solutions for local problems. Language teacher education needs to shift its basic principles because of globalization (Kumaravadivelu, 2012).

Complying with a post transmission approach towards teaching, he offered a modular model for pre-service teachers leading to the employment of critical pedagogy in the classroom. According to socio-cultural epistemology, pre-service teachers should ponder over their teaching styles and cultural ideologies rather than a specific methodology that has worked fruitfully for others in the past (King, 2013). Taking ideas from post-transmission and post-method epistemologies, Kumaravadivelu offered three principles of particularity, practicality, and possibility to make his modular teacher education model operational. According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), local contextual factors should determine both the goal and content of teacher education programs, and
local pedagogues should meet the challenge, plan a suitable model, and change the current ways of doing language teacher education.

Knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing (KARDS) are five parts of the model. Knowing empowers teachers to learn how to make a base for their professional, personal, and procedural knowledge. They are analyzing concerns on how to study learner needs, motivation, and autonomy. Recognizing is about how to identify and accept one’s own identities, beliefs, and values as a teacher. Doing underscores how to teach, make theories, and dialogize with other teachers or colleagues—seeing underlines how learners, teachers, and observers look at one’s teaching. These modules are non-sequential, independent, interdependent, and symbiotic and synergistic in their interactions.

As it aired earlier, the ways scholars see teacher function, teacher role, and teacher professional identity in teacher education programs have changed with the emergence of different schools of thought. It was within the era of constructivism and later in a critical, socio-cultural, and sociopolitical approach to language teacher education that teacher professional identity came into vogue and built up momentum. Teacher professional identity (TPI) is about how teachers describe themselves as teachers, assess their pedagogical abilities and skills, motivate themselves and acknowledge responsibility concerning their profession and factors influencing their motivation, define different facets of their job, and view their career progress (Kelchtermans, 1993).

TPI, complex, dynamic, multiple, and fluid in nature (Barret, 2008) has significant contributions to teachers’ growth and performance (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). Even, from a socio-cultural perspective, learning how to teach is not a matter of acquisition of knowledge, but it is mostly a process of professional identity construction (Nguyen, 2008; Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005) and a priority in teacher education programs (Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004). Therefore, it believed that teacher education leads to positive shifts, and these changes depend on identities teachers take with them to language classrooms and how they are constructed and reconstructed during teacher education (Singh & Richards, 2006).

Deeming teachers as “transformative intellectuals” (Giroux, 1992) and “cultural workers” (Freire, 2005) has been examined in several kinds of research including critical and transformative teacher education (Hawkins & Norton, 2009) contribution to student teachers’ critical consciousness of the formation and function of power relations in society (Hawkins, 2004), encouragement of future teachers’ critical thinking on their own identity and status in society (Stein, 2004), and kinds of pedagogical connections between teacher educators and prospective teachers (Toohey & Waterstone, 2004).

Recently, TPI has extensively been investigated in EFL contexts. The impacts of critical teacher education programs (Abednia, 2012; Goljani Amirkhiz, Moinzadeh, & Eslami Rasekh, 2018; Sardabi, Biria & Ameri Golestan, 2018), KARDS (Hassani, Khatib, & Yazdani Moghadam, 2019a, 2020), reflective debate (Biria & Haghighi Irani, 2015), a Cambridge English teachers professional development-based in-service teacher education program (Ahmad, Latada, Nubli Wahab, Shah, & Khan, 2018), CAN (critical autoethnographic narrative) (Yazan, 2018), and observation-based learning (Steenekamp, van der Merwe, & Salieva Mehmedova, 2018) on the reconstruction of teachers’ professional identity have indicated the usefulness of interventions in EFL contexts.

Despite these studies, the effects of KARDS on teachers’ professional identity reconstruction have scarcely explored in EFL/ESL (English as a foreign/second
language) contexts to the best knowledge of the researcher. Shortage of investigation in this specific area in the context of Iran, the big amount of significance given to professional identity reconstruction in teacher education, and the globalized crisis to restructure and rethink teacher education programs encouraged the researchers to research the impacts of a critical, socio-cultural, sociopolitical, and transformative teacher education course (KARDS) on Iranian EFL teachers’ professional identity (re)construction in the context of high schools. A stronger reason behind this study is the reality that EFL teacher education in Iran is greatly transmission-based and overlooks teachers’ voices, beliefs, and ideas.

The narrow this gap, this research is an effort to answer the following questions.
1. In what ways does KARDS contribute to Iranian EFL high school teachers’ professional identity (re)construction?
2. What features mainly characterize Iranian EFL high school teachers’ professional identity before the implementation of KARDS?
3. What features mainly characterize Iranian EFL high school teachers’ professional identity after the implementation of KARDS?
4. What are major shifts made in Iranian EFL high school teachers’ professional identity during the implementation of KARDS?

2. METHOD
2.1 Participants
Twenty out of thirty-six in-service EFL high school teachers teaching at different schools with the following demographic data (Table 1) made the participants of the study in the context of Tehran, the capital city of Iran. The participants chose using purposive sampling. The researchers purposefully chose high school teachers who had participated in pre-service and in-service teacher education programs.

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|-----------|-----------|------------|------|
| Age       | LKO       | 42.0       |      |
|           | MKO       | 47.6       |      |
| Gender    | LKO       | 9 (Male) - 1 (Female) | 90% - 10% |
|           | MKO       | 9 (Male) - 1 (Female) | 90% - 10% |
| Degree    | LKO       | 6 (BA) - 4 (MA) | 60% - 40% |
|           | MKO       | 3 (BA) - 7 (MA) | 30% - 70% |
| Major     | LKO       | 6 (Te) - 4 (O) | 60% - 40% |
|           | MKO       | 8 (Te) - 2 (O) | 80% - 20% |
| Experience| MKO       | 26.3       |      |

A quartile-based technique labeled visual binning (Pallant, 2016), available within SPSS, was used to group EFL high school teachers into less (n=10) and more (n=10) KARDS-oriented groups.

| Table 2. Less and More KARDS-oriented School Teachers |

2.2 Instruments
| Groups            | Participant Number | Frequency | Score Range |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Less oriented KARDS- | 88, 87, 95, 99, 93, 98, 108, 83, 86, 102 | 10        | 146-151     |
| More oriented KARDS- | 79, 104, 77, 94, 101, 109, 78, 100, 105, 111 | 10        | 168-174     |

The researchers used the KARDS questionnaire (Hassani, Khatib, Yazdani Moghaddam, and 2019b), semi-structured pre-course and post-course interviews, teachers’ reflective journals, class, and self-assessment portfolios, and teacher educator’s reflective journal to do this research in the context of Tehran.

### 2.3 Procedure

The researchers administered the KARDS questionnaire and grouped twenty participants into a more KARDS-oriented group (n=10) and a less KARDS-oriented group (n=10) on the bases of their scores.

An interview framework (Abednia, 2012) embracing several questions raised and grouped based on Kelchtermans’s (1993) conceptualization of teacher (professional) identity along with a few questions taken from the reviewed studies by Abednia used to collect data. The semi-structured interviews continued from 1 to 1:30 hours. Some interviews were carried out in two sessions, not to tire interviewees. Interviews were finishing in English. In a few cases in which Farsi spoke, the researchers translated participants’ sentences without making any changes to interviewees’ ideas and intentions.

A critical, socio-cultural, sociopolitical, and transformative teacher education course based on KARDS made the implementation phase of the study. The researchers described the nature of the study to participants. The treatment was, in fact, the implementation phase of KARDS in which the teacher educator held (transformative) courses for participants to (a) acquaint them with the principles of KARDS; (b) equip them with a critical look towards KARDS in particular and second language teacher education in general, and (c) authorize them to analyze it for and in the context of Iran.

Since the researchers aimed at interviewing teachers before and after the implementation phase of KARDS, a semi-structured post-course version of the interview framework constructed by Abednia (2012) was applied to gather data. Drawing on grounded theory, the researchers employed pre-course and post-course interview results, the juxtaposition of pre-course and post-course interview results, teachers’ reflective journals, hours of class and group debate, teachers’ class assessments on program procedures and self-assessments of their progress, and teacher educator’s reflective journal to identify and extract changes which happened to teachers’ professional identities.

The researchers made use of grounded theory to analyze the data. They broke and turned the collected data into meaningful units of analysis through open coding. Axial coding used to reassemble the data to find meaningful relations between the codes derived in open coding. The extracted categories went through selective conceptual
analysis in selective coding. During selective coding, a table draws to juxtapose the obtained categories from the first interview and other data gathered from each teacher early in the course with those of their second interview and other data collected late in the course. Hence, the researchers were capable of comparing codes that referred to the same facet of each teacher’s professional identity in two interviews. As a result, they found out the process of professional identity (re)construction experienced by each teacher. The researchers used memo writing, theoretical sampling, and constant comparison during this process to make his analysis stronger and deeper. They used corrective listening, within-method triangulation, and investigator triangulation to make sure that the data was reliable.

2.4 KARDS Implementation

KARDS whose intention is to develop strategic thinkers, exploratory researchers, and transformative intellectuals by creating future teachers opportunities to (1) think about their past experiences and current teaching practices, (2) be sensitive and responsive to local demands and global issues, and (3) invent and reinvent their identities was practiced in a “Teacher Education Course” for high school teachers in Tehran. The class was held twice a week for seven weeks.

The teaching materials of the course mostly took from Kumaravadivelu’s teacher education model, and there were also analytical readings (Appendix A). Although there were some sessions of fixed and pre-chosen academic content on teacher education in general and Kumaravadivelu’s teacher education model in particular at the beginning, the teacher educator and teachers gradually started to negotiate and renegotiate the rest of the course to consider and value teachers’ different needs, interests, styles of development, and pedagogical purposes. Sometimes, the choice of topics depended on ideas that originated from class debates, whereas others were introduced independently by the researchers.

The teacher educator, posing problems, took part in the learning process as a participant among teachers. He was clear about the philosophy underlying his way of educating teachers. He made clear the pedagogical nature of the course at the very beginning. At the same time, he supplied some possibilities for teachers to find some other aspects of teacher education for them so that they had more ownership in the course and did not merely conform to the teacher educator’s style, which would culminate in a banking concept of education.

Teachers were involved in decision making. They demanded to read the materials thoughtfully to analyze issues concerning their real-life experiences. They talked with each other over main issues in class through group and class discussions. We did the readings critically and created links between readings and the teachers’ real-life experiences and worries. After the debates, the teacher educator asked them to write journals on one or more dimensions of the discussed topics to construct their perspectives. Teachers were requested to write two class-assessments on course procedures and two self-assessments on their progress to materialize the dialogical, critical, and transformative promises of the course better.

3. RESULT
High school teachers’ professional identity underwent the following three shifts during and after the implementation of KARDS. There were shifts from “uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice,” “the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies,” and “linguistic and technical view of language teaching to a critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching” in both less KARDS-oriented teachers and more KARDS-oriented teachers who presented in the following parts.

3.1 A Shift from “Uncertainty of Practice to Certainty of Practice”

There were shifts in teachers’ professional identities from “uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice” in less KARDS-oriented teachers. Early in the course, five out of ten teachers’ interview transcripts showed that they had been un/subconsciously applying some of the tenets of KARDS in their classrooms. However, they were not familiar with their equivalent technical terms.

Shirin, Peyman, Hamid, and Masoud maintained, “We have been unconsciously applying some of the tenets of KARDS in our language classes.”

Shirin, Peyman, Naser, and Masoud paid attention to teaching context, learner voice, power-sharing, and interaction. Hamid paid attention to interaction.

They posited

The teaching context makes a big difference. At the time of teaching, we should teach based upon the context we are. So, our teachings vary from context to context. In some contexts, we should be stricter, whereas we should be more lenient in other contexts.

Hamid said, “There are student-student interaction and student-teacher interaction in my classes. Students learn from these interactions. Teachers can learn from their learners, as well.”

Shirin and Masoud underscored intuitive heuristics. They stated, “Sometimes, learners must discover the grammatical rules of the language they are learning on their own.”

Hamid, Masoud, and Shirin believed, “Teachers should always develop their knowledge through reading books and articles, attending workshops, or joining virtual communities.”

Peyman, Naser, Hamid, and Masoud underlined sociopolitical, socio-cultural issues and integration of skills. They held, “It makes sense to speak about socio-cultural issues in language classes.” Teachers believed, “Learners should learn them one day to survive in their lives. The sooner, the better.”

Peyman, Hamid, and Masoud believed in dialogizing. They held, “Sometimes, we talk to/with our close coworkers about the problems we have with our students or books. We can learn from each other when we dialogize with our colleagues.”

Peyman said, “Teachers are co-learners.” He added, “There is no end to learning. If you want to stay updated, you should always be a learner.”

Shirin believed, “Observing other teachers’ classes is fruitful since you can learn from them.” She also added, “Teachers are not interested in theorizing since they do not have the expertise, passion, and the required knowledge.”

Naser maintained that he emphasized learner motivation and autonomy. He believed, “We must motivate our learners to make their learning easier.” He added, “We can turn our learners into independent individuals by putting some responsibility on their shoulders. That can come in different forms.”

After the implementation phase of the course, there were shifts to “certainty of practice.” The teachers expressed that the implementation phase has played the role of a mediational consciousness-raising tool and strengthened their previously held ideas.
since teachers now believe that there has been strong theoretical evidence behind whatever they have been doing un/subconsciously in their classes. They said, “We will apply them with more certainty in the future.”

Shirin, Peyman, Naser, and Masoud posited, “We will pay more attention to teaching context, learner voice, power-sharing, and student-student/student-teacher interaction.” They added, “We create contexts in which learners easily dare to express their ideas about their learning experiences.” They also believed, “Teachers should not be the sole source of authority. Students should have power, as well. The amount of that power depends on the context and the managerial power of the teacher.”

Hamid, Masoud, and Shirin maintained, “Teachers should always develop their knowledge. It can be done by attending local workshops and conferences, joining virtual communities, and reading books, magazines, and papers.”

Peyman, Naser, Hamid, and Masoud held, “They will pay more attention to sociopolitical, socio-cultural issues and integration of skills.” They said, “Since students live in a society in which there are sociopolitical and socio-cultural issues everywhere, they should learn how to deal with them. Schools are safe places where they can learn how to express their ideas logically.’’

Peyman, Hamid, and Masoud stated, “They should dialogize with their colleagues to find solutions to their problems.”

Peyman believed, “Teachers should pursue their jobs as co-learners. A teacher is dead if s/he does not continue to learn.”

Shirin said, “I will observe other teachers’ classes learn from observations. Observations teach me so much and familiarize me with new ways to deal with class problems.”

Naser held, “I should pay more attention to learner motivation and autonomy.” Masoud believed, “I should pay more attention to learner needs.” He added, “Learners’ needs vary. A clever teacher is one who can analyze his learners’ needs and try to meet them.”

There were shifts in teachers’ professional identities from “uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice” in more KARDS-oriented teachers. Early in the course, seven out of ten teachers’ interviews indicated that they had been un/subconsciously using some of the tenets of KARDS in their classrooms. However, they were not familiar with their equivalent technical terms. This shift was more tangible and significant in more KARDS-oriented teachers.

Sohrab, Manouchehr, Saeed, Akbar, Khosro, Naser, and Mahmoud stated, “Although they have not been familiar with the technical terms of this model, they have been unconsciously/unknowingly applying some of the tenets of KARDS in their language classes.”

Sohrab believed, “I am creative, up to date, transformative, and flexible. I am a co-learner and a lifelong learner as well. He said, “I am highly interested in learning new things about how to teach, learn, and behave towards students.” He added, “I try different methods and approaches in my classes. I never teach the same material in the same way. I look for changes in my students and me.”

Manouchehr maintained, “My methodology is eclectic. I am critical, reflective, and transformative.” He added, “I think deeply about any new ideas I face for the first time. I do not accept them blindly. Rather, I take a critical look.”

Saeed said, “I have been looking for a singular identity and a unique method for ages.” He believed, “Identity fixed, and it does not change.”

Akbar held, “I have paid attention to the integration of skills, power-sharing, teaching context, socio-cultural awareness, macro-strategies, development of
knowledge, learner needs, learner autonomy, interaction with colleagues and learners, dialogizing, social relevance, action research, observation, teacher as co-learner, and learner’s voice.”

Mahmoud said, “I know that learners are not solely receptive/empty vessels to filled with knowledge. I know that the learner-teacher relationship is interactive, and teachers can learn from their learners.”

The majority of teachers underscored power-sharing, teaching context, learner autonomy, dialogizing, learner voice, learner needs, and interaction.

Flexibility was important to Sohrab, Saeed, and Mahmoud. They said, “We are flexible in teaching in our classes. We try different strategies, techniques, and tactics at the time of teaching because we are teaching different students with different needs in different teaching contexts.”

Identity was important to Sohrab, Manouchehr, and Saeed. Saeed believed in fixed/singular identity, Whereas Sohrab and Manouchehr stated that identity is multiple, dynamic, and fluid. They believed in different identities in different institutions.

Sohrab, Saeed, and Khosro underlined transformation. They believed, “It is our commitment to change ourselves and the others for the better.” They said, “We have to prepare learners for life in the future.” Mahmoud, Khosro, and Manouchehr emphasized learner motivation. Manouchehr, Saeed, and Akbar heeded observation. They said, “Observations help us to review our teaching practices and to learn from the person we are observing.”

The integration of skills was essential to Saeed, Akbar, and Khosro. They believed, “It happens in few high school classes where students have learned to speak English in institutes.”

Khosro, Naser, and Mahmoud emphasized post-transmission. They said, “We are not just supposed to transmit our knowledge to learners. Rather, our prime duty is to bring about change in both learners and ourselves.”

Saeed and Mahmoud paid attention to post-method. They maintained, “One single method or a mix of methods will not save you in your classes. The way one teaches depends on a countless number of factors.”

Akbar and Saeed emphasized professional development and development of knowledge. They believed, “We can update our knowledge through attending workshops and conferences, reading technical books, and reading articles on learning/teaching.”

After the course, there were shifts to “certainty of practice.” Teachers were happy and proud that the path they had taken has been an acceptable one. Teachers expressed that they would practice their previously held ideas and teaching practices. This practice is aligned with the model with certainty since this model raised their consciousness and ensured that whatever teaching behaviors and practices they have had in their classes are theoretically justifiable and solid.

The majority of teachers said they would pay more attention to power-sharing, teaching context, learner autonomy, dialogizing, learner voice, and interaction.

Saeed, who posited that Kumaravadivelu’s ideas are not very new, but they are well-organized, said, “It built my self-confidence.”

Saeed said, “Now, I believe that a single method does not work for every context, and one’s identity should be multiple, dynamic, and fluid. I was looking for a singular character and a unique method in the past. Also, I look for transformation both in myself and my learners. I believe that a teacher is a co-learner. I look at language as an ideology now.”
Khosro believed, “Kumaravadivelu’s ideas are not very much new though they are well-organized.” He said, “I have read all these things put forth through the lens of other scholars.” Likewise, Naser expressed, “It is a comprehensive model, and I have studied it in different books.”

As the number of teachers who underwent the shifts show, this shift was higher in more KARDS-oriented teachers.

3.2 A Movement from “the Use of Fewer Macro-strategies to the Use of more Macro-strategies.”

There were shifts in teachers’ professional identities from the “use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies” in less KARDS-oriented teachers. Early in the course, teachers’ speeches revealed that they were employing a few macro-strategies. Teachers did not speak about macro-strategies very much during the first interview as if they were not familiar with them, or they did not use them very often. After the course, there were shifts to the “use of more macro-strategies.” The teachers said they would use them more in their classes.

Shirin, Peyman, Hamid, and Mahmoud expressed, “We have had a little interaction in our language classes.” They believed, “A class is no longer dynamic without interactions. There should be student-student interaction and teacher-student interaction.”

Shirin and Mahmoud paid a little attention to intuitive heuristics. They said, “We will heed it more in the future.” They said, “A teacher should not expect to provide students with everything. Something should be left unread for students to discover it.” They said, “It is good to let students discover rules that are in a language.”

Peyman, Mahmoud, and Naser sometimes integrated skills in their classes. They said, “We will put more emphasis on it in the future.” They said, “It is just possible in a few classes in which students can speak English.”

Peyman, Naser, Hamid, and Mahmoud believed that they paid attention to sociocultural and sociopolitical issues and tried to relate classroom events to out of class events in the past. They said, “We will heed these issues more in the future since they will give learners critical looks.” Mahmoud posited, “I will try to maximize learning opportunities as far as I can.”

There were shifts in teachers’ professional identities from “the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies” in more KARDS-oriented teachers. Early in the course, nine out of ten teachers’ speeches showed that they were employing a few macro-strategies. Teachers did not speak about macro-strategies very much during the first interview as if they were not familiar with them, or they did not use them very often.

After the course, there were shifts to the “use of more macro-strategies.”

Sohrab, Manouchehr, Khosro, Naser, and Mahmoud paid attention to interaction. They stated, “Interaction will change classes into more dynamic ones.” They also added, “Students can learn very much in interactive classes. Through the interactions, students will learn how to express their ideas.”

Sohrab, Manouchehr, Khosro, Naser, Akbar, and Mahmoud emphasized dialogizing. They believed, “Dialogizing can help them find solutions for the problems they have.”

Khosro, Saeed, and Akbar underscored the integration of skills. They said, “Integration of skills is possible in a few classes in which students know how to speak English.”
Akbar and Mahmoud paid attention to socio-cultural awareness and social relevance. They said, “If we raise students’ awareness in language classes which are small communities representative of larger communities, we will prepare them to learn how to deal with problems in the future.”

As the number of the teachers who experienced the shift from “the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies” shows, this shift was more significant in more KARDS-oriented teachers.

### 3.3 A Shift from “Linguistic and Technical View of Language Teaching to Critical, Educational, and Transformative View of Language Teaching”

There were shifts in less KARDS-oriented teachers’ professional identities from “linguistic and technical view of language teaching to the critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching.” Early in the course, teachers’ speeches indicated that the majority of teachers had a linguistic and technical view of language teaching. Teachers were not aware of the critical, educational, and transformative aspects of language teaching. Teachers did not pay attention to sociopolitical issues and ideological and political facets of education.

After the course, there were shifts to the “critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching.” As the course went on, the participants started to change their previous perceptions and started to deal with a social and educational approach to ELT.

Shirin, Peyman, Naser, and Masoud believed, “Students should have a voice, and power should share in a classroom.” They said, “Interaction should abound in language classes.”

Peyman, Naser, Hamid, and Masoud stated, “They will pay more attention to socio-cultural and sociopolitical issues, and they will raise their learners’ socio-cultural awareness.” They said, “They will promote social relevance in their language classes.” They added, “How can a student survive in the future if he does not know and does not learn how to deal with socio-cultural and sociopolitical issues in his classroom now?”

Peyman, Hamid, and Masoud stated, “They will pay more attention to dialogizing.” They said, “Dialogizing can help us to solve our problems not only in the class but also in out of the class real-life situations.”

Peyman also maintained, “A teacher is a co-learner, and he is not the authority.” He believed, “Power should share in the classroom between the teacher and the students.”

Naser believed, “I will pay more attention to post-transmission.” He stated, “It is not my duty to transfer my knowledge. Rather, it is my ultimate commitment to bring about good changes not only in my students but also in myself.”

Hamid said, “I will pay more attention to interaction.” He said, “A class should be interactive, full of energy, full of speech, full of movement, and full of noise.”

There were shifts in more KARDS-oriented teachers’ professional identities from “linguistic and technical view of language teaching to the critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching.” Early in the course, teachers’ speeches demonstrated that many teachers had a linguistic and technical view of language teaching. Teachers did not know enough about the critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching. After the course, there were shifts to the “critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching.”

Sohrab, Saeed, Akbar, and Mahmoud said, “They will pay more attention to power-sharing.” They said, “The age of authority is gone. Now, as teachers, we should
share power with our learners. Students should have voice and power to express their ideas.”

Akbar asked, “Is it possible for you to live in a place in which one and only one has power? Can you tolerate dictators? Do not you believe in democracy?”

Sohrab, Saeed, Akbar, Manouchehr, Naser, and Khosro held, “They will pay more attention to learner autonomy.” They said, “We must educate independent individuals in society. If we internalize autonomy in their minds, we will guarantee the success of our society. One way to this end is to put the responsibility on their shoulders.”

Sohrab, Akbar, Manouchehr, Naser, Mahmoud, and Khosro stated, “Interaction, dialogizing, and learner voice will receive more attention in our classes.” Besides, Saeed heeded the learner’s voice. They said, “We should give them the right to express their ideas and defend themselves. It can be done through interaction and dialogizing.”

Mahmoud, Naser, and Khosro said, “We will emphasize post transmission and transformation in our classes.” Sohrab and Saeed heeded transformation. They said, “We are not supposed to teach the materials we have learned. We are to educate them to change.”

Naser, Manouchehr, Sohrab, and Saeed posited, “We will heed teacher identity more.” They believed, “Teachers' identities should change through their experiences and interactions.”

Sohrab, Saeed, and Mahmoud maintained, "We will emphasize flexibility and adaptability." They said, "If you do not adapt yourself as a teacher, you will fail.”

Both Saeed and Akbar believed, "Teachers are co-learners." They said, "There is no end for their learning." They added, "They will pay more attention to professional development and development of knowledge that can finish through workshops, conferences, books, journals, and articles.”

Both Akbar and Mahmoud stated, "They will give more importance to socio-cultural awareness, social relevance, and cultural consciousness to prepare their learners for real-life situations." 

Akbar said, "I will pay more attention to action research, and I try to do it in practice though it looks a bit difficult at the beginning.”

Saeed and Mahmoud posited, "We will emphasize post-method." They said, "No single method or even a collection of methods will guarantee our success in classes. We try to practice whatever we have learned from this model based on our unique teaching contexts.”

To sum up, the shift from "linguistic and technical view of language teaching to a critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching” was more tangible and significant in more KARDS-oriented teachers based on interview results and teachers' feedback.

As the results of the research demonstrate, three significant shifts are similar but not in quantity to teachers' professional identities in both groups. Teaching is undeniably uncertain (Flodden & Clark, 1988). Uncertainty is a significant and integral part of the teaching process. It is, in fact, an impetus that cannot and should not be eradicated (McDonald, 1986). Uncertainties of knowledge and action are unavoidable since teaching involves changeable and impossible to know humans and tensions that make one's choice of action difficult (Flodden & Clark, 1988). Teacher education programs can lessen the uncertainty of pre-service teachers by providing them with more knowledge, skills, routines (tools that raise one's certainties), and enhancing teachers' awareness of uncertainty moderately. They should narrow attention down to the most significant uncertainties for immature teachers in pre-service programs, introduce and
present remaining uncertainties in in-service programs, and aid teachers in recognizing the causes of uncertainty. In-service education may only enhance teachers' knowledge of uncertainty and offer further strategies for coping with it (Flodden & Clark, 1988). Since KARDS aims at arming teachers with knowledge and skills of teaching, boosting teachers' cultural, political, and social awareness, and providing them with macro-strategies of teaching, it can use to diminish teachers' uncertainties of knowledge and action.

Teachers can reduce their uncertainties through dialogizing with other teachers and colleagues and boosting their knowledge and skills. In-service teachers may also take advantage of instruction or field research in their classrooms created to assist them in seeing, understanding, and dealing with uncertainty (Flodden & Clark, 1988). Teacher candidates should not dodge moments of confusion, but rather acknowledge them as essential parts of their learning process (Gordon, 2006). Teachers must have "double consciousness" (Scheffler, 1984), which authorizes them to take action and to restructure and rethink their practice in the light of empirical and normative consequences. KARDS intends to construct and enhance teachers' professional, procedural, and personal knowledge and skills through dialog, action research, and teacher research and stimulates teachers to revise their teaching practices based on three principles of particularity, possibility, and practicality. KARDS can be used to lessen the uncertainties of teachers.

Teacher educators should assess and acknowledge any source of valuable ideas in teacher education contexts and move confidently forward after sizing up the possibilities (Flodden & Clark, 1988). KARDS can be an alternative to this end for its principle of possibility, which emphasizes power-sharing under which teachers can voice their voices. Teacher educators should familiarize teachers with infinite uncertainties they may encounter in their work to call their attention to more far-off. However, inspiring aims, assist teachers in learning to make judgments when it may be worthwhile to increase certainty and persuade teachers to view remaining uncertainties as a vital driving force in teaching (Flodden&Bauchmann, 1993). They should help teachers to attach importance to and underline the importance of confusion and uncertainty and model uncertainty in their teaching (Gordon, 2006). Embracing confusion and uncertainty in our language classes is essential for educating citizens who are analytical and independent thinkers (Gordon, 2006). This goal accords with the principle of possibility.

The findings of this study are in agreement with the results of the studies carried out by Ebadi and Gheisari (2016), Maseko (2018), and Johnson and Golombek (2011). Ebadi and Gheisari maintained that teachers' understandings of teaching and classroom behavior could be altered and reconstructed through awareness-raising and critical thinking on their teaching behaviors. Maseko (2018) posited that it is quite possible to realize pre-service teachers' role as change agents and rebuild teachers' professional identity through transformative praxis influenced by critical consciousness. Also, the findings corroborate the findings of Johnson and Golombek. Their studies revealed that the process of professional development for in-service teachers in their conceptualization of present thinking and re-contextualization of their classroom practice must back up by supplying repeated and suitable dialogic mediation using such tools as consciousness-raising and critical thinking.

The findings also accord with the results of studies conducted by Hassani, Khatib, and Yazdani Moghaddam (2019a, 2020). They investigated the contributions of KARDS to the professional identity of university teachers in the context of Iran and
concluded that there were two shifts to teachers' professional identities. There were, in fact, shifts from "uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice" and "the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies." In addition to these two shifts, there were two other shifts from "linguistic and technical view of language teaching to a critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching," and "conformity to nonconformity to dominant ideologies" in professional identity of teachers in the context of language institutes. The shift from "the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies" is in line with the findings of a study done by Birjandi and Hashamdar (2014). They found out that macro-strategies of teaching by Kumaravadivelu (2003, 2006) can be applied if teachers change them into micro-strategies based on the context in which they are teaching.

The shift from "linguistic and technical view of language teaching to a critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching" accords with the findings of the studies done by Abednia (2012) and Sardabi, Biria, and AmeriGolestan (2018). The study by Abednia showed that there were shifts from "linguistic and technical view of language teaching to educational view" and "conformity to and romanticization of dominant ideologies to critical autonomy" in teachers' professional identities who underwent a critical EFL teacher education course in Iran. The research by Sardabi, Biria, and AmeriGolestan (2018) indicated that there were two major shifts from "an attitude of conformity to development of voice" and "a narrow view of EFL teaching to a humanistic view of teaching" to teachers' professional identities. They recommended the application of dialogic discussions and written reflective tasks in teacher education programs to sow the seeds of critical ideas in immature EFL teachers.

4 CONCLUSION

Shifts from "uncertainty of practice to the certainty of practice," "the use of fewer macro-strategies to the use of more macro-strategies," and "linguistic and technical view of language teaching to critical, educational, and transformative view of language teaching" are three significant changes to teachers' professional identities which should underscore and incorporated into teacher education programs. Teacher educators and teacher education programs should enhance the consciousness of practicing teachers' teaching behaviors, ponder critically on their teaching behaviors, apply transformative praxis strongly influenced by critical consciousness, lessen but not remove teachers' uncertainties, enhance inexperienced teachers' knowledge of uncertainties moderately and offer extra strategies for in-service teachers, make room for confusion and uncertainty in language classrooms, aid teachers to have a voice and a broader view of ELT, stimulate teachers to employ more macro-strategies, and raise teachers' critical autonomy to bring about changes in teachers' professional identities.

The findings of this research may supply some valuable sagacity for language teacher education policymakers and materials developers, teacher educators, practicing teachers, supervisors, mentors, mentees, and other stakeholders in the realm of language teacher education.
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