KARDS MODEL: AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Santiana[1], Alexis Enriquez[2], Abdul Gafur Marzuki[3], Rashed Mahmud[4], Abdul Ghofur[5]
*santiana@unsil.ac.id
Universitas Siliwangi, Indonesia[1]
Abra State Institute of Science and Technology, Phlippines[2]
UIN Datokarama, Indonesia[3]
Dhaka International University, Bangladesh[4]
IAIN Madura, Indonesia[5]

ABSTRACT

Students can be motivated by making them aware of their intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Guiding the student could include addressing the subject's goals, the nature of the activities, and the techniques used to complete the tasks, including supporting them in determining the best ways to learn. Providing learning facilities indicates that the instructor should be able to facilitate and simplify learning. This is essentially characterized as creating and establishing suitable learning settings and providing learning resources. This piece of paper will emphasise a literature review on the KARDS Model as an alternative conceptualization for language training. The review is based on journal papers, conference proceedings, and book chapters that explore Kumaravadivelu's KARDS Model. The scope of this discussion is limited to the following points: (1) presenting Postmodernism as a relevant theoretical framework in the context of language teacher education and (2) presenting the KARDS model as an alternative conceptual outline that can help language teachers address teaching issues more effectively. This finding demonstrates that teachers must keep their knowledge, which serves as their academic medium of communication, up to date in order to survive in academic contexts. Their enhanced professional and personal knowledge are projected to lead to more positive perceptions. This distinction may be justified by the circulation of knowledge transfer and building, the routine exchange of knowledge, and academicians' access to the most recent results.

Keywords: Alternative Approach**,** KARDS Model, Language Education

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education has always been one of the least considered and overlooked aspects of language training. Educators are frequently instructed by authorities to employ a particular technique of instruction. However, Pennycook (1989) said that teachers become dissatisfied with training on how to conduct since they see a lack of unity between what the concept purports to describe and what occurs in their classes. These methodology-instructing instructors undermine teachers' autonomy and diminish their significance. They are intended

*Corresponding author
Santiana
Email: santiana@unsil.ac.id

solely to function as couriers for global educational strategies. Even though many EFL teachers mistrust the applicability of purported approaches to their teaching contexts and dislike their imposition by foreign specialists, many teacher educators continue to employ the methodology (Pennycook, 1989). Ignorance of abstract, objective, linear, globally generalizable, and ideological approaches render teachers ineffective in the classroom. Their preferences are disregarded, and their creativity is stifled, converting them to mere human robots carrying out the orders of faceless specialists.

In the late 1970s, various linguists examined and analyzed the impact of this unease among language teachers, particularly with the thought of experts trying to prescribe teaching practices (Akbari, 2007). In the field of language instruction and educational theory, postmodernism represents a substantial divergence from traditional approaches that frequently prioritise authority, hierarchy, and rigid techniques. Postmodernism, which emerged in the late twentieth century, calls into question the dominant ideologies in educational discourse, pushing for a more heterogeneous and dynamic understanding of teaching and learning.

Postmodernism rejects the idea of a single, objective reality, instead emphasising the diversity of viewpoints, experiences, and interpretations. In the context of language instruction, this translates into a rejection of standardised techniques that strive to enforce a single way for teaching languages. Postmodernism acknowledges the intrinsic diversity of learners, languages, and cultural contexts, arguing that no single technique or theory can fully capture the complexities of language learning and communication.

Furthermore, postmodernism calls into question the authority of experts and the power relations that underpin established educational organisations. It emphasises the subjective character of knowledge production and the impact of social, cultural, and historical settings on educational processes. In language instruction, this entails recognising the agency of both teachers and students in setting the learning environment and co-constructing knowledge.

Postmodernism also challenges the concept of a fixed curriculum, suggesting that education should respond to learners' changing needs and interests. This viewpoint is strongly aligned with the concept of post-method situations, in which educators are urged to use a flexible and adaptive approach to teaching that draws on a wide range of theories, methods, and technology.

In post-method conditions, instructors are viewed as reflective practitioners who are constantly engaged in critical inquiry and experimentation. Rather than rigorously following to a prescribed set of teaching principles, teachers are encouraged to innovate, cooperate, and customise their approach to their students' specific needs and settings. This emphasis on flexibility and responsiveness is consistent with the ideas of learner-centered pedagogy, which prioritises learners' empowerment and autonomy in the educational process.

To summarise, postmodernism in language instruction and post-method situations represents a paradigm shift away from authoritarian, one-size-fits-all approaches and towards a more inclusive, participative, and dynamic vision of education. By embracing diversity, reflexivity, and experimentation, Postmodernism creates new opportunities for enriching and empowering language teaching and learning practices in a rapidly changing global world.

In addition, the relevant research has produced Postmodernism in language instruction and post-method circumstances. On the one hand, the term postmodernism in language teaching refers to methods for enhancing the profession of language teaching by employing key components of postmodern thought. The post-method condition, on the other hand, relates to the current characteristics of language education. Every formerly reliable procedure is subjected to intensive scrutiny. A collection of approaches and techniques compiled from all prior plans and procedures is being applied pragmatically in the belief that such a diverse process promotes success (Arikan, 2006).

Based on this understanding, teachers and researchers knew that no single study conclusion or method of language instruction would result in complete success (Arikan, 2006). Therefore, a comprehensive collection of ideas, tactics, and strategies from critical viewpoints and techniques must be united by a pragmatic perspective. There is a need for a design to

promote teachers' independence and boost their confidence in and out of the classroom. An approach that allows for and values the teachers' originality and experience. Consequently, language instruction has changed toward practices based on principles instead of processes. It does not provide teachers with static frameworks but rather broad concepts to let them build distinctive classroom practices and procedures that are context-based and address the social, political, and cultural needs of the learners.

To ensure that the teaching and learning process runs smoothly, it must be reinforced in several areas, one of which is the use of specialized learning models or tactics. Kumaravadivelu (2012) popularized Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing, and Seeing (hereafter KARDS) as one of these models that may improve the teaching and learning process. Hassani (2019) said the professional identities of high school teachers saw three distinct shifts before, during, and after the introduction of KARDS. There is a shift occurring in KARDS-oriented teachers from having to practise uncertainty to having to practise certainty, from having fewer macro-strategies to having more macro-strategies, and from having linguistic and technical views of language teaching to having critical, educational, and transformative approaches to language teaching. Furthermore, Lestariningsih (2018) claims that the K (Plus One) ARDS model for improving English teachers' skills is a thorough model that must be verified to see whether it is relevant and appropriate. Furthermore, Hassani (2019) believes that his study's findings may be valuable to language teacher education policymakers and materials creators, teacher educators, practising teachers, supervisors, mentors, mentees, and other stakeholders in the field of language teacher education.

In addition, Passmore (2020) argues that Kumaravadivelu's Seeing model can be a realistic, long-term, and effective observation practice. She said, to begin, this essay has discussed the significance of action research as a component of reflective practice, where observation plays a vital role in data collecting. Herefore, observation has been established to cultivate self-awareness and self-improvement in rookie and experienced teachers when welcomed as a learning opportunity. The relationship between Kumaravadivelu's Macrostrategies (KARDS) and his Seeing model can be explored in terms of language teaching approach and reflective practice. KARDS, developed by Kumaravadivelu in his seminal work "Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching," provides a complete framework for language teachers to negotiate the challenges of language education. KARDS stands for:

1. Knowledge: The comprehension of theoretical ideas, pedagogical practices, and contextual elements related to language education.
2. Awareness: This entails being attentive of learners' requirements, cultural backgrounds, learning methods, and social realities.
3. Responsibility entails assuming responsibility for one's teaching decisions, actions, and professional development.
4. Dialogue: Highlights the value of collaboration, communication, and critical reflection among language teachers and other stakeholders.
5. Sensitivity: Emphasises being aware of the changing nature of language learning and teaching environments, including linguistic, cultural, and educational variety.

The Seeing model, on the other hand, is a subset of Kumaravadivelu's overall framework that focuses on classroom observation and reflective practice. The Seeing approach encourages instructors to conduct systematic observations of both their own and their colleagues' teaching methods in order to gain insights into the teaching-learning process.

In this case, the relationship between KARDS and the Seeing model is articulated as followsWhile Kumaravadivelu's KARDS framework serves as a macrostrategic guide for efficient language teaching, his Seeing model gives a specific way for integrating reflective practice in the classroom. The Seeing model, which is nested within the larger KARDS framework, emphasises the value of systematic observation as a technique of increasing self-awareness, supporting professional growth, and promoting successful teaching methods. Language teachers who include the ideas of the Seeing model into their pedagogical approach can use observation as a valuable instrument for ongoing development and creativity in

language training. In summary, while the Seeing model is not specifically identified as a KARDS component, it can be viewed as a complementing part that resonates with Kumaravadivelu's broad ideals of reflective practice and professional development.

METHODS

The research design and data collection and analysis procedures used in this review are critical to ensuring systematic information gathering and synthesis from peer-reviewed journal publications, conference proceedings, and book chapters. This review uses a systematic approach to gather and synthesise relevant literature on two topics: postmodernism as a theoretical framework in language teacher education and the KARDS model as an alternative conceptual framework for addressing teaching challenges. The design includes components of a literature review and content analysis to investigate and evaluate the scholarly discourse on these issues.

The followings are the techniques for data collection employed in this study:

1. Selection Criteria
    Establish explicit criteria for selecting peer-reviewed journal papers, conference proceedings, and book chapters that are related to the themes being investigated. Criteria may include publication date, connection to postmodernism and the KARDS paradigm, and academic rigour.
2. Computer Database Folder Organisation
    Create a computer database folder to organise collected articles and documents according to word order. This folder acts as a central repository for storing and organising the sources discovered throughout the literature search.
3. Literature Search Strategy
    Implement a systematic literature search strategy to find peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and book chapters on postmodernism and the KARDS model in language teacher education. Use academic databases, library catalogues, and search engines to find relevant sources.
4. Document retrieval
    Retrieve and download articles, papers, and book chapters that fulfil the specified selection criteria. Access a variety of materials from respected publications and academic institutions to ensure broad literature coverage.

Data analysis approaches include content analysis, which involves carefully examining and categorising information from various sources.

1. Identify major themes, concepts, and arguments concerning postmodernism and the KARDS model in language teacher education.
2. Thematic Coding
    Using thematic coding, organise the data into relevant categories and subcategories based on reoccurring themes and patterns found in the literature. Use coding systems to classify and analyse text data taken from the chosen sources.
3. Comparative Analysis
    Compare the facts and perspectives offered in the literature to discover commonalities, divergences, and areas of agreement or disagreement on postmodernism and the KARDS model.
4. Synthesis of Findings
    Combine the findings from the evaluated literature to create cohesive narratives and arguments that support the research objectives and overall themes of the review. Integrate information from various sources to gain a thorough understanding of the theoretical and practical implications of postmodernism and the KARDS model in language teacher education.

The current review focuses on (1) presenting postmodernism as a relevant theoretical framework in the context of language teacher education and (2) presenting the KARDS model

as an alternative conceptual outline that can help language teachers address teaching issues more effectively. Peer-reviewed journal papers, conference proceedings, and book chapters serve as the review source.

All reports and documents are made in a computer database folder based on word order as a data collection by gathering articles pertaining to the argument. The analysis is carried out by gathering and describing information from various sources. The downloaded article or paper source contains detailed descriptions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Language training is founded on concepts rather than procedures. Language teacher education, defined as the totality of all lived experiences or activities through which learners are expected to become language teachers (Freeman, 2001), has witnessed epistemologies shift from positivist to interpretive (Johnson, 2009). It has evolved from a knowledge-centred strategy that combines framework learning and an applied-science model to a person-centred approach that incorporates humanistic and constructivist approaches in addition to critical, sociocultural, and sociopolitical points of view. Previously, it was a knowledge-centred strategy that combines framework learning and an applied-science model.

Both the knowledge-centred method and the person-centred approach have their own unique theoretical underpinnings, views of knowledge, views of people, views of teachers, perspectives, and pedagogical techniques (Roberts, 1998). The positivist epistemology that underpins the knowledge-centered stem (Roberts, 1998) might be summarised as follows: (Johnson, 2006). It emphasizes the transfer of teaching techniques and knowledge that have been externally described and pre-selected to language teachers (Richards, 2008; Richards & Farrell 2005). These teachers lack agency, beliefs, or prior experiences (Freeman, 1989; Johnson, 2006). According to Cochran-Smith, Shakman, Jong, Terrell, Barnatt, & McQuillan (2009), acquiring the skills necessary to teach is considered the same as studying the required content, and teachers are only required to put into practice the perspectives of subject matter experts that they have learned in teacher preparation programmes (Khatib & Miri, 2016; Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

In addition, Kumaravadivelu (2006) stated that teacher education should encourage the development of teachers who are more introspective, independent, analytical, and transformational, as well as instructors who are capable of developing and thinking of local solutions to local problems. Because of globalisation, the education of language teachers needs to encompass the fundamental concepts of the language they teach (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Moreover, Kumaravadivelu (2006) devised a modular approach for pre-service teachers that would lead to critical pedagogy in the classroom by employing a post-transmission teaching style. This model was intended to be used. Pre-service teachers are encouraged, following the sociocultural epistemology, to evaluate not a standardised method that has previously been proved to be useful to others but rather their own individual teaching strategies and cultural viewpoints (King, 2013).

Kumaravadivelu (2012) also offered three concepts of particularity, practicability, and the feasibility of making his modular teacher education model practical, based on ideas from post-transmission and post-method epistemologies. Furthermore, Kumaravadivelu (2012) stated, that the goal and substance of teacher education programmes should be determined by local contextual aspects. Local educators should address the issue, create an acceptable model, and improve current language instruction techniques.

Recent postmodernist research on language teaching and learning shows that curriculum design goals, instructional resources, classroom strategies, evaluation criteria, and language teachers' and learners' political, contextual, cultural, and social perspectives all have an indirect and direct impact on language education. As a result, any limiting system based on static principles focusing on certain social and cultural realities will never be able to handle varied language classroom situations around the world. Kumaravadivelu (2001)

developed a three-dimensional framework based on three principles: the principle of particularity, the principle of practicality, and the principle of possibility. The Principle of Particularity means Recognising the Diverse Language Classroom Realities. The principle of practicality means implementing feasible and effective language teaching strategies and Principle of Possibility means Promoting autonomy and innovation in language education. These ideas are meant to complement one another to empower language teachers by elevating their role in language acquisition and reframing their engagement as autonomous individuals.

Specialization Concept (The Principle of Particularity)

This principle emphasises the significance of recognising the various contextual variables, such as social, cultural, and political realities, that influence the language acquisition process. It emphasises the importance of language teachers tailoring their instructional approaches to meet their students' particular needs and identities within various institutional and sociocultural contexts. Language teachers must understand and address their students' unique needs, identities, and sociocultural settings. This includes recognising individual pupils' various origins, goals, and learning styles. Teachers can tailor their educational tactics, materials, and assessments to their students' language, cultural, and social contexts. This could include using real resources, adding cultural information, and encouraging student autonomy and agency in the classroom.

This perspective is focused on the particular's language instruction and the process of learning a new language. Kumaravadivelu (2001) stated that language education needs to be responsive to a specific group of teachers, who in turn instruct a specific group of learners who are working toward a specific set of goals inside a specific institutional environment that is immersed in a different sociocultural milieu. This principle rejects the idea that one set of pedagogic purposes and objectives may be fulfilled by one set of pedagogic principles and practises (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). It emphasises that language teachers cannot (and should not) ignore the social, ethnic, cultural, and political realities of their students. Ignoring these truths may cause learners to become irritated, resulting in partial or complete demotivation. It may also alter the target language's attitude. As a result, the classroom setting may become an impediment to language development. As a result, teachers must recognise the identities of their students and design appropriate strategies.

Concept of Usability (The Principle of Practicality: Integrating Theory and Practice in Language Teaching)

This principle emphasises the necessity of incorporating personal and professional ideas into language teaching practice, as well as focusing on the actual implementation of teacher-generated theories. Language teaching practices should be informed by both personal experiences and professional knowledge. Teachers require opportunities to develop and apply their own theories in real-world teaching settings. Teachers can engage in reflective practice by critically assessing their teaching techniques, trying out new ideas, and soliciting feedback from colleagues and students. This could include attending professional development workshops, taking part in action research initiatives, and working with peers to exchange insights and best practices. The link between language teaching strategies and guiding beliefs is discussed in this principle. Educators think that in order to become more efficient, theories and practices must be mutually informed. Personal and professional theories were differentiated. Personal theories are those that teachers develop by effectively implementing expert theories in real-life situations while on the job (O'Hanlon, 1993), as cited in Kumaravadivelu, (2001). Professional theories are those that are generated by experts and are generally transmitted from centres of higher learning. However, when it comes to putting these beliefs into reality, professional practitioner theories are typically favoured, while teacher-generated personal theories are frequently overlooked (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). As a result, the practicality principle stresses

overcoming these obstacles by allowing and encouraging instructors to theorise based on their experience and practise what they theorise (Kumaravadivelu, 2001).

Possibility Principle (The Principle of Possibility: Embracing Sociocultural Realities in Language Education)

This concept emphasises the significance of understanding and incorporating the various sociocultural and sociolinguistic aspects that influence language teaching and learning. Language education should recognise and embrace the various sociocultural and sociolinguistic factors that influence the teaching and learning process. This includes understanding the changing nature of language use and identity building. Teachers can foster inclusive and culturally responsive learning settings that acknowledge students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This could include embracing multicultural perspectives, encouraging intercultural competency, and raising critical awareness of linguistic ideologies and power dynamics.

This principle addresses the unsaid and, at times, unheard parts of the language classroom that operate as outside agents to make the teaching and learning process efficient, inefficient, or even ignored. The specifics of teaching a language and the steps involved in picking up a second language are the primary concerns of this point of view. According to Kumaravadivelu (2001), language education needs to be responsive to a specific group of teachers. These teachers, in turn, instruct a specific group of learners who are working toward a specific set of goals while residing in a specific institutional environment that is immersed in a different sociocultural milieu. Thus, educational approaches that incorporate language awareness into existing experiences might modify learners' sociocultural-social identities. As a result, language education and learning may be able to suit its members' social needs. The three key themes discussed above provide an overview of the basic concepts of postmodern pedagogy for language teachers. These principles ensure that language training is appropriate for the needs and perspectives of the students.

The Role of Language Teachers in the Postmodern Era

In contrast to earlier methodologies, the postmodern approach to language instruction is predicated on the idea that power should be distributed more evenly across the field. As a consequence of this, the empowerment of teachers is considered to be one of the most important aspects of postmodern language instruction. Strategies and techniques for the classroom will continue to be dictated by specialists who are frequently unaware of the realities of classroom teaching unless and until instructors are given more skills and the authority to use those skills. However, this won't happen unless and until instructors are given more skills and the authority to use those skills. The experts provide general prescriptions for made-up ailments without taking the specific concerns of each patient into account. As a result, KARDS is a model of language instruction that can assist teachers in expanding their understanding of language education and thinking of activities that are sensitive to the context of the classroom and situation-specific in nature. In the field of Language Teacher Education for a Global Society, Kumaravadivelu is credited with designing and conceptualising the paradigm (2012). It is a comprehensive model that covers the issues and problems associated with learner and teacher aid in postmodern language classrooms, as well as concerns regarding the education of teachers. In addition to this, it addresses the requirement of a comprehensive, all-encompassing, and uniform structure for the preparation of language teachers in this age of fast cultural, educational, and economic globalisation. According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), current methods of teacher education need to be fundamentally restructured since they do not address and are unable to address and solve global challenges.Furthermore, the foundation of this argument is made up of five interconnected assertions that are as straightforward as they are: (a) any purposeful, perspective pedagogic understanding can emerge mainly from the classroom;

(b) it should be the qualified professional teacher who is best placed to generate and apply new learning; (c) recent developments to language learning and teaching are primarily intended at preparing teachers to become consumers, not producers, of educational experience and understanding; and (d) the rapid worldwide society, with its constant and enhanced flow of people, goods, and ideas; and (e) the rapid worldwide society, with its constant and enhanced flow of people.

The explorations that have been mentioned above serve as a firm foundation for this methodology, which aims to transform aspiring teachers and practising teachers into successful potential researchers and transformative instructors (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). The model is composed of five separate modules, which are titled Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing, and Seeing respectively (KARDS). Its goal is to assist teacher educators in providing sufficient input to teachers so that the teachers can comprehend the following concepts, namely: (1) how to create a sustainable professional, personal, and procedural base of knowledge; (2) how to investigate students' learning needs, motivation, and independence; (3) how to realise their own identities, attitudes, and value systems; (4) how to demonstrate, theorise, and dialogize; and (5) how to put their teaching performs from the different points of view of different stakeholders.

KARDS Model

KARDS is an acronym that stands for Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, Doing, and Seeing, as was explained earlier. Participants in language learning and instruction are expected to fulfill specific prerequisites before moving on to the next dynamic verb. Knowing teaches instructors how to construct a foundation for their professional, personal, and procedural knowledge can be done by teaching them how to build on their personal experiences. Through analysis, one can establish methods for researching learner needs, motivation, and autonomy. Recognizing involves recognising one's own identities, concepts, and ideals as a teacher, as well as identifying and recognising those identities. The emphasis placed on doing places a strong focus on educating, developing theories, and communicating with or to other teachers or colleagues. The importance of seeing one's instruction as it is perceived by students, teachers, and observers cannot be overstated. These modules engage in interaction with one another in a fashion that is non-sequential, independent, interdependent, symbiotic, and synergistic (Hassani, et al., 2019; Hassani, 2021; Talebinezhad & Pour, 2015; Lestariningsih, 2018). Based on the previous description, including KARDS in the process of teaching and learning is something that should be considered appropriate. In this context, the KARDS model can serve as an alternate conceptual structure to aid language teachers in more successfully tackling instructional challenges.

1. Knowing

Knowing refers to three types of knowledge: professional knowledge, procedural knowledge, and personal knowledge. This knowledge interacts with language teaching practices, and teachers are expected to have and/or be aware of them to be good language teachers. Professional knowledge encompasses language knowledge, language teaching knowledge, and language of language learning knowledge. The planning and execution of professional knowledge in the classroom are procedural knowledge. It entails controlling the classroom and developing and sustaining a positive learning environment. Personal knowledge relates to instructors' awareness of their personality, such as what types of situations they operate best in, their personality qualities, their strengths and shortcomings as teachers, etc.

Rashidi and Mohammadineku (2015) investigated the level of knowledge of learner autonomy held by Iranian EFL and non-EFL teachers about the KARDS paradigm's learner autonomy module. Interviews were conducted with a few of the educators, and a questionnaire that covered the social, political, psychological, and personal components of learner autonomy was constructed based on the outcomes of the interviews as well as data

collected from the published research. The teachers were given a questionnaire to fill up, and some of them were questioned using the negative case analysis technique. Learner autonomy was shown to be a psychological construct for the participants, having its foundations in the participants' knowledge, as the results showed (Rashidi and Mohammadineku, 2015).

2. Analyzing

It is based on the premise that teachers cannot perform the task effectively unless they examine learners' requirements, motivation, and autonomy. Teachers must first thoroughly understand their students' social, political, and cultural contexts to assess these factors. It will not only assist them in selecting or developing acceptable materials, but it will also assist them in adequately using them. Kumaravadivelu (2012) emphasizes the importance of teachers distinguishing their students' needs, autonomy, and enthusiasm. He then adds the disclaimer that accomplishing such a task is difficult due to these features' dynamic, context-specific, and fluid character, dependent on a range of cultural, institutional, political, and human factors.

3. Recognizing

This refers to the concept that teachers must understand themselves and learners as well as their needs. They are intended to improve their knowledge as teacher and realize their own identity, views, and values in this module. A thorough comprehension of these factors is required for instructors to be more instrumental and active in carrying out their tasks. Instructors' identities, beliefs, and values must not be overlooked because they are the underlying social constructions that define teachers' capacity and willingness to teach in a specific classroom context. If these social structures function in tandem with other classroom dynamics, the teacher is more likely to be effective. On the other hand, if these constructions do not work as expected, teaching may not deliver the desired consequences.

Kumaravadivelu (2012) also highlights the fact that language teachers, by the requirements set out in their mission of teaching, must construct, reconstruct, and develop their teaching f, and do so, they must be able to recognize their identities, beliefs, and values as sub-parts of this module. The author then makes the critical point that effective and successful instructors reconstruct themselves and help their students shape themselves.

4. Doing

This module is based on the broad action range that postmodern language teachers should have. It consists of three parts: teaching, theorizing, and dialogizing. Unlike earlier courses, which focused on the doer, this module focuses on the doing. According to the three principles listed above, teaching does not refer to traditional methods of classroom education but instead focuses on optimizing opportunities to learn and guiding students' attaining enlightenment. The module's second component, theorizing, aims to maximize performance by rethinking their role as teacher concepts. Teachers are regarded as the most extraordinary people to generate academic and practical expertise in the classroom. The third component of the module, dialogizing, is not an action to be performed by language teachers but rather a technique to be utilized to do investigation for theorizing and teaching.

5. Seeing

This module acts as a thread that integrates all of the other modules, namely Knowing, Analyzing, Recognizing, and Doing. It plays a significant part in the language teaching process, and if given adequate attention, it contributes to professional growth for teachers. However, its significance is sometimes overlooked. It is built around three components: the learner's perspective, the teacher's perspective, and the observer's perspective.

As part of KARDS, the Seeing model is a new paradigm for language instruction worldwide (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Also, more statistical and empirical research is required

to argue its applicability in different teaching contexts and global understanding of the concept. It would be a more in-depth look into the benefits of seeing that (Kumaravadivelu, 2012) through videotaping lessons and closely evaluating both the classroom and post-lesson dialogue.

These factors urge teachers to accept feedback on their teaching and other classroom activities from various participants in the teaching-learning process. Learners, teachers, and observers investigate, analyze, and evaluate classroom experiences from multiple angles. Furthermore, if they collaborate as the module intends, their remarks, feedback, and gratitude can improve instructional strategies, increasing performance and learning-oriented.

In conclusion, the KARDS model offers language teachers a comprehensive framework for handling teaching challenges more effectively. By emphasising the principles of particularity, practicality, and possibility, the KARDS model encourages teachers to participate in reflective practice, adjust instructional tactics to fit the various needs of learners, and embrace the dynamic character of language teaching and learning. Teachers can gather useful feedback, analyse classroom experiences from many viewpoints, and continuously improve their instructional approaches by working collaboratively with learners, colleagues, and observers. Language teachers can improve their efficacy, promote learner-centered instruction, and create supportive learning environments that foster student success and growth by incorporating insights acquired from the KARDS model into their work.

CONCLUSION

This paper has presented an overview of the consequences of Postmodernism on the subject of language teacher education. It has also discussed postmodern principles as tools for empowering language teachers and proposed the KARDS modular model as a well-thought-out alternative conceptual outline to assist language teachers in more effectively addressing teaching challenges.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the effects of Postmodernism on language teacher education and to offer the KARDS modular model as an alternative conceptual framework for empowering language instructors to overcome instructional issues. It attempted to study how Postmodern concepts might influence language teacher education practices and how the KARDS model provides an organised method to navigating the challenges of language teaching.

The study of Postmodernism's impact on language teacher education demonstrated the significance of recognising many sociocultural, political, and contextual elements in language teaching and learning. Postmodern principles such as particularity, practicality, and possibility have emerged as effective tools for empowering language teachers to adjust their instructional practices and solve teaching issues in a variety of classroom contexts. The KARDS modular model established a systematic framework for incorporating Postmodern ideals into language teacher education methods, allowing teachers to improve their efficacy and responsiveness to learner requirements.

The study emphasises the need for language teacher education programmes to incorporate Postmodern principles and provide teachers with the necessary skills, knowledge, and tools to navigate the complexities of language teaching in various sociocultural contexts. By introducing the KARDS modular model into teacher training curricula, institutions can empower language teachers to teach in a reflective and adaptable manner, cultivate learner-centered instructional methods, and promote classroom inclusion and diversity.

There are suggestions for language teacher education programmes should incorporate Postmodern ideas, including cultural sensitivity, critical reflection, and adaptable teaching approaches. Meanwhile, Institutions should offer professional development opportunities for language teachers to become acquainted with the KARDS modular model and its application

in tackling teaching issues. Furthermore, researchers and practitioners should continue to investigate novel ways to language teacher education that encourage collaboration, reflexivity, and responsiveness to the changing demands of learners and society. Finally, the findings of this study illustrate the transformative potential of incorporating Postmodern ideas and the KARDS modular model into language teacher education practices, resulting in improved quality and efficacy of language teaching and learning experiences.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System, 35*(2), 192-207.

Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod Discourse and Practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(4), 641-652.

Arıkan, A. (2006). Postmethod condition and its implications for English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 2*(1), 1-11.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(1), 27-46.

Freeman, D. (2001). Second language teacher education. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 72-80). Cambridge: CUP.

Hassani, V., Khatib, M., Yazdani Moghaddam, M. (2019). An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of KARDS in an EFL Context. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 7*(28), 135-153.

Hassani, V., Khatib, M., Yazdani Moghaddam, M. (2019). Contributions of KARDS to Iranian EFL University Teachers' Professional Identity. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 11*(23), 127-156.

Hassani, Vahid. (2021). *Design, Construction, and Validation of KARDS Questionnaire for the Context of Iran Ph.D.*, in Applied Linguistics, Department of English, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran.

Hassani, Vahid & Khatib, Mohammad. (2019). *Kumaravadivelu's Language Teacher Education Modular Model (KARDS) to Professional Identity of High School Teachers in an EFL Context. Ph.D. in TEFL*, Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective.* New York: Routledge.

King, E. T. (2013). Review of language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing. *TESL-EJ, 16*(4).

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Post method Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35* (4), 537-560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching.* New Jersey: Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL Methods: Changing Tracks, Challenging Trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 59-81.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to post method.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing.* New York & London: Routledge.

Pennycook, Alastair. (1989). The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 23* (4), 589-618.

Pennycook, A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and second language education. *A system, 18*(3), 303-314.

Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 158-177.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). Professional development for language teachers. Strategies for teacher learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, J. (1998). Language teacher education. London: Arnold. Sardabi, N., Biria, R., & Ameri Golestan, A. (2018). Reshaping teacher professional identity through critical pedagogy-informed teacher education. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(3), 617-634.

Talebinezhad, M. R., & Shahidi Pour, V. (2015). A critical look at CLIL on the basis of KARDS model. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 9*(2), 254-271.