An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of KAKDS in an FFC Context

Vahid Hassani, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
vahid_hassani38@yahoo.com
Mohammad Khatib*, Associate Professor, Department of English, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran
Mkhatib27@yahoo.com
Massood Yazdani Moghaddam, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran
Mym1300@gmail.com

Abstract
Kumaravadivelue's (2012) language teacher education for a global society known as KARDS has gathered little momentum in the context of Iran due to scarcity of studies on it. To fill this gap, the present research investigated Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to variables including teaching context, gender, and teaching experience. To this end, a KARDS questionnaire was designed, constructed, and validated by the researchers, and the results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses confirmed the validity of the questionnaire. Later, it was administered to 400 English teachers in Tehran. Then, 20 participants volunteered for follow-up interviews, and their verbatim interview transcripts were content analyzed. The results of descriptive statistics and MANOVA indicated that teachers' perceptions were positive for the majority of items except theorization, observation of colleagues' classes, and needs analysis done by outsiders, and there were significant differences in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their teaching context, gender, and teaching experience. Also, the qualitative investigation of teachers' perceptions confirmed the findings of the quantitative part.

Keywords: KARDS, language teacher education, teachers' perception

Introduction

Teacher education as the aggregate of all experiences or activities by means of which individuals learn to become language teachers (Freeman, 2001) has undergone and witnessed different epistemological and philosophical paradigm shifts in the course of its development.

The knowledge-centered approach, including model-based learning and applied-science model, and the person-centered approach, encompassing humanistic and constructivist (individual/social) approaches, are two main perspectives to language teacher education which vary from each other in their theoretical basis, view of knowledge, view of person, view of teacher, perspective, and methods (Roberts, 1998).

Since the 1980s, teacher education has moved away from knowledge transmission to knowledge construction where teachers combine theory and research with experiential and reflective study of their own classroom practices (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). The emphasis has shifted away from content, to teacher, to the process of learning or education (Freeman, 2001).

Teacher education needed to change itself and shift its paradigm away from traditional master-apprentice model towards a model which intended to enable teachers to examine their context and needs with critical looks and create their own local methodologies in post method era (McMorrow, 2007).

The inability of reflective models of teaching with orientations in constructivism to succeed in considering the political, ethical, and emancipatory aspects of teaching (Akbari, 2007; Jay & Johnson, 2002) resulted in a need to go beyond the concept of teachers as 'reflective practitioners' who can make theories out of their teaching practices and put into practice their personal theories (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Griffiths, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003; Wallace, 1995) to the concept of teachers as 'transformative intellectuals' (Giroux, 1992) and 'cultural workers' (Freire, 2005) who can reflect critically and function transformatively. This inability resulted in the emergence of a critical and sociopolitical approach in TESOL teacher education.

Driven by globalization as a driving force for language teacher education to change its main assumptions along with its roots in post method and post transmission perspectives, a new approach to language teacher education by Kumaravadivelu (2012) that is the theoretical framework underlying this study and in line with the critical, sociocultural, and sociopolitical approach to language teacher education emerged.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Kumaravadivelu (2003, 2006) felt a dire need for teacher education to focus on developing more independent, critical, and transforming intellectuals who can resolve local problems with local solutions. It was imperative for language teacher education to change its underlying assumptions because of globalization (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Rejecting a transmission method of teaching, he presented a modular model for pre-service teachers culminating in the use of critical pedagogy in the classroom. According to sociocultural perspective, pre-service teachers should ponder over their own personal teaching styles and cultural beliefs rather than specific methodology that has been effective for others in the past (King, 2013). Using ideas from post-transmission and post-method perspectives, Kumaravadivelu presented three operating principles of particularity (contextual understanding), practicality (theory-practice praxis), and possibility (sociopolitical consciousness brought about by critical pedagogy) to make his teacher education model operational. According to Kumaravadivelu, local contextual factors should determine both the goal and content of teacher education programs, and local practitioners should "take up the challenge, build a suitable model, and change the current ways of doing language teacher education" (2012, p. 129).

His modular model consists of five modules: knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing (KARDS). Knowing deals with how to develop a professional, personal, and procedural knowledge base. Analyzing concerns how to analyze learner needs, motivation, and autonomy. Recognizing is about how to recognize one's own identities, beliefs, and values as a teacher. Doing emphasizes how to teach, theorize, and dialogize. Seeing deals with how to see one's teaching from the perspectives of learners, teachers, and observers. These five non-sequential modules are independent and interdependent, and the relationship between them is both symbiotic and synergistic.

Since KARDS model has been recently published and it is new to the realm of language teacher education, it has been scarcely investigated Iran wide and worldwide.

The study by Sadler and Dooly (2016) depicted the development of a telecollaborative project between two universities that lasted for over 12 years. The project concentrated on two teacher training courses that combined in-class dialogic learning and flipped classroom materials. The scholars first outlined the first years of the project through which student-teachers moved towards professional teacher knowledge. Then, they followed the KARDS model as criteria for their teacher education program goal and as a means of evaluating the program itself to discuss

the most recent year in which telecollaboration with flipped class materials made the basis of the shared course. There was also interaction on the basis of all the experience and knowledge attained over this long-term collaboration. The result was twofold: there was a remarkable shift in teachers' mindset and students were more responsible for their own learning.

Hunter, Watson, Adams, Robinson, and McKee's (2015) study dealt with the way to prepare pre-service teachers with efficient classroom language skills and the investigation of the use of code-switching to enhance the delivery of lessons. To better practice KARDS model in pre-service teacher education programs and to better use it in middle school classrooms, they put forth four guiding tenets: (a) confidence, (b) interest, (c) re-interpretation, and (d) legitimation. Teacher confidence, linked to teacher efficacy, built the pre-service teacher's ability to engage in knowing, analyzing, and seeing. The interest principle trained teachers to identify student knowledge and interests; as a result, it integrated analyzing and recognizing. The principle of re-interpretation which related to recognizing, doing, and seeing employed code-switching as a source of learning and stated that standardization of language is not universal. The legitimation principle directly connects to each module of the KARDS since it supports language diversity. Applying these principles, pre-service teacher experiences can improve the development of instructional effectiveness in multiple disciplines, content subjects, and cultures. The strength of the principles is that teachers should use both conventional and cultural language to strengthen students without devaluing the grandeur of communities or weakening the quality of education.

Talebinezhad and Shahidi Pour (2015) assessed the efficacy of CLIL (content and language integrated learning) on the basis of KARDS. Their study was an endeavor to assess how CLIL could meet the criteria of KARDS model. The results revealed that CLIL met most criteria of KARDS model except recognizing as well as seeing language as ideology.

Adopting a critical approach to the study of language teaching practice, Erfanian Jalali and Talebinezhad (2014) tried to assess how CBLT (content-based language teaching) could meet the criteria of KARDS to meet the socio-ideological and communicative needs of language learners. The result of their analysis showed that CBLT meets the standards of KARDS if more conscious attention is given to some of its practices. The implication of their study is that we should practice more moderation not reject all the previous techniques and practices in language teaching. Instead, we should opt for a more experiential and empirical view to better our pedagogy quality.

Rashidi and Mohammadineku (2015) investigated the "knowing", a module of the KARDS model, of Iranian EFL or non-EFL teachers of learner autonomy. Some teachers were interviewed, and on the basis of the results of the interviews and the data collected from the literature a questionnaire including the social, political, psychological and personal facets of learner autonomy was developed. Teachers were asked to fill out the questionnaire and then through negative case analysis some were interviewed. The result indicated that learner autonomy was a psychological construct to the participants, and it traced back to their personal knowledge.

Reviewing the literature indicated that few scholars have conducted studies on KARDS Iran wide and worldwide. However, it is unfortunate that no research has been carried out so far to address this issue in the context of Iran. Hence, the present study intended to qualitatively and quantitatively examine teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to variables including teaching context, gender, and teaching experience. This study was an attempt to answer the following research questions.

RQ 1. What are Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS?
RQ 2. Is there any significant difference in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their teaching context?

RQ 3. Is there any significant difference in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their gender?

RQ 4. Is there any significant difference in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their teaching experience?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the study were 400 EFL teachers teaching at different language institutions in Tehran. They majored in TEFL (teaching English as a foreign language), English literature, and English translation. The participants were selected using both convenient and stratified sampling. Stratified sampling was used since the population comprised a number of subgroups, or strata that were different from each other in their characteristics. They were both males ($n = 237$) and females ($n = 163$) whose ages ranged from 20 to 55. Their years of teaching experience ranged from 1 to 30 and were classified into five categories. The context of teaching included two groups of teachers teaching at (1) different branches of Islamic Azad University and University of Applied Science and Technology, and (2) some language institutes. Some university teachers were MA holders while the others were Ph.D. candidates. They both were teaching General English courses, non-technical courses, to students majoring in English. Teachers teaching at language institutes had either BA or MA in English, and a few teachers were Ph.D. candidates.

Instrumentation

In order to explore Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS, it was imperative to first design, construct, and validate an appropriate questionnaire. Thus, the researchers drew on the KARDS model and related literature and created an initial item pool which consisted of 54 items. Then, five applied linguistics experts with language teacher education background and relevant publications were asked to comment on the clarity and coverage of the items to ensure its face and content validity (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). This resulted in some slight changes in the wording of a few items. The researchers distributed 453 questionnaires in hard copies, e-mail attachments or online among Iranian EFL teachers for the validation process of the questionnaire. The number of returned questionnaires was reduced to 300 after discarding the questionnaires that were either incomplete or carelessly completed. Afterwards, 300 Iranian EFL teachers were recruited to go through a pilot study in which they commented on the clarity of the questions and also filled out the pilot questionnaire. The questionnaire was made up of two sections: demographic information of the teachers; and key questions on KARDS. This questionnaire using a six-point (1–6) Likert scale of 'strongly disagree', 'disagree', 'slightly disagree', 'slightly agree', 'agree', and 'strongly agree' consisted of 54 items grouped within five dimensions. The dimensions, each with a different number of items, included (1) knowing, (2) analyzing, (3) recognizing, (4) doing, and (5) seeing.

The data gathered from the teachers were used to polish item wording and clarity and to examine the structural validity of the questionnaire through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (EFA & CFA).

To run the EFA, the researchers made use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 25). Principal axis factoring and varimax were run as the method of extraction and the method of rotation respectively. Skewness and kurtosis values did not go beyond +1.0/-1.0; therefore, they confirmed the normality of the distribution. Furthermore, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) with a value of .82 (the cut-off being .5 as a bare-minimum) confirmed the

adequacy of sampling. Last but not least, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi2 =$ 5298.218, df = 1431, p < .001); thus, it indicated the suitability of the correlation matrix for factor analysis.

The items which bore a loading of less than .3 or cross loading(s) of less than the absolute value of +.10 were deleted from the questionnaire (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). This resulted in the deletion of 20 items. Then, the 'after rotation eigenvalues' table was checked to help with factor retention. This table revealed 8 factors with eigenvalues over Kaiser's criterion of 1 which in combination accounted for 37% of the variance. The scree plot, however, supported keeping only 5 of these factors which accounted for 31% of the total variance. As each of the remaining factors only explained a rather small amount of variance, a decision was made to follow the scree plot and keep only 5 factors.

The next step was an attempt to confirm the obtained factor structure through carrying out CFA. The SPSS add-on package AMOS (Arbuckle, 2017) was employed for this analysis. Due to the normal distribution of the data, the maximum likelihood method of estimation was used. All of the obtained loadings were significant at $p < .01$ level with values ranging from .36 to .81. Then, two classes of indices, the absolute fit indices and the comparative fit indices, were used to evaluate model fit. The absolute fit indices used in this study incorporated the chi-square per degree of freedom statistic (i.e., $\chi2$ /df whose acceptable values should be < 3.0; Bryne, 2001), the root mean square error of approximation (i.e., RMSEA with values ≤.05 showing good fit and between .05 to .08 demonstrating adequate fit; Pituch & Stevens, 2016), and the standardized root mean square residual (i.e., SRMR whose acceptable value should be ≤ .08; Brown, 2015). On the other hand, for the comparative indices the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI) and the comparative fit index (CFI) were applied. According to Pituch and Stevens (2016), they should be close to .9 or above to indicate adequate fit. The obtained results from the CFA were all in line with the required values ($\chi2$ /df = 1.9; RMSEA = .05; SRMR = .06; TLI = .90; CFI = .91), thereby confirming the factor structure of the new questionnaire. In addition, the internal consistency of each factor, based on Cronbach's alpha, were .70, .75, .72, .83 and .74 respectively.

The result of the validation process is a 34-item questionnaire with five modules. The 'knowing' module includes items one through seven. Items eight through twelve make the 'analyzing' module. 'Recognizing' module incorporates items thirteen through nineteen. Items twenty through thirty two make the 'doing' module. 'Seeing' embraces items thirty three and thirty four.

Interview was a secondary tool for exploring Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS in the qualitative part of the study. Based on an in-depth review of literature, Kumaravadivelu's (2012) model of language teacher education was chosen as the basis of the interview. Based on the framework, a number of questions were developed and grouped. Five teacher educationists reviewed the first draft of the interview framework and made slight revisions (Appendix 1).

Procedure

A mixed method research design, an amalgamation of both quantitative and qualitative research design, was used to conduct this research. For the quantitative part of the study that dealt with the investigation of Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS, a descriptive survey research, a questionnaire that was designed, constructed, and validated by the researchers, was used. Also, twenty interviews were conducted voluntarily to deepen the results of quantitative analysis of the research. After administering the questionnaire, descriptive and inferential statistics were run to analyze the collected data. Descriptive statistics were conducted to calculate

means and standard deviations. To provide answers to the research questions, MANOVA and post hoc tests were run. Also, participants' verbatim interview transcripts were content analyzed.

Results

The first research question dealt with Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS. To investigate their perceptions, 400 EFL teachers responded to the questionnaire.

The percentage of the teachers' responses to different modules and sub-modules of the KARDS questionnaire is taken into account as an evidence to teachers' positive or negative perceptions (Table 1).

Table 1. *Percentage of the Teachers' Responses to the KARDS Questionnaire*

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I read books/articles on language teaching to improve my classroom performance.	.5	.5	3	19.5	47.5	29
2. I look at journal articles or surf the internet to see what the latest developments in my profession are	-	2.5	5.5	30.3	43	18.8
3. I use management strategies that encourage students'engagement in academic tasks.	.3	1.8	1.5	25.8	49.3	21.5
4. I promote the development of my students' social skills and self-regulation.	-	-	3.5	23.5	45.5	27.5
5. I manage the content of classroom talk and the structure of information exchange.	.3	1.5	5	25.3	44.3	23.8
6. My observations and experiences make my own personal knowledge.	.5	.8	3	17.8	53	25
7. I always think about how to build my own language teaching knowledge.	.3	.3	3.8	15.3	39.3	41.3
8. I talk with my learners to learn about their specific needs, wants, and lacks in any particular context.	.8	2.3	7.2	27.5	36	26.3
9. I talk with my learners to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests, and abilities.	.8	2.8	10	33.3	**35**	18.3
10. I think about the needs analysis done by outsiders carefully and give it a new shape by considering the particularity of my teaching situations.	2.8	2.5	7	44	**38**	5.8
11. I create an autonomous classroom that is sensitive to learners' sense of self and agency.	.5	1	5.5	30.5	45.3	17.3
12. I try to ready my learners to become	-	.5	6.3	33.8	46.5	13

autonomous in
  my classes and in larger out of class society.

13. I think my biography and background affect the way I define myself as a teacher.	.5	3.8	5.3	25	41	24.5
14. I think the books and the articles I read in the past affect my teaching beliefs.	.3	2.3	3.5	23.3	50.7	20
15. I construct my identity on an ongoing basis.	-	.5	4.3	27.8	42	25.5
16. I invent and reinvent my identity to reach my goals.	.3	2	1.8	21.3	54.3	20.5
17. I question my identities (beliefs and values).	.5	1.5	4.5	30	48.5	15
18. I think my identity is fluid, dynamic, and incomplete.	2	5.5	6	25.5	36.5	24.5
19. I have critical engagement and negotiations with others to develop my identities (beliefs & values).	1.5	4.5	6.8	34.8	39.3	**13**.3
20. I teach to promote the independence of my learners.	.3	-	1.5	18.5	50	29.8
21. I teach to integrate all four language skills.	-	.8	2	9	45.5	42.8
22. I teach to cultivate in my learners the culture of using their experiences to find answers to questions about in class and out of class events.	-	-	2.5	15.5	43.8	38.3
23. I teach to make linguistic input appropriate for the context where I teach.	-	.8	2.8	20.5	51.7	24.3
24. I teach to relate my classroom events to social events.	.3	.8	3.8	18.5	46.8	30
25. I think of writing articles on the basis of my classroom experiences.	4.5	5	15	34.8	**33.5**	**7.2**
26. I think my classroom events are potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.	1.5	3.3	11.3	28.5	**46**	**9.5**
27. I try to create opportunities for my colleagues and for myself to voice our voices through journals and conferences.	2.8	7.8	15	42.8	**20**.8	**11**
28. I have critical conversations about my classroom experiences with my evolving self.	.3	1.3	5.3	26.8	46.3	20.3
29. I discuss practical and theoretical issues with my colleagues and look for their advice and feedback.	.5	4	4.5	35.3	38.5	17.3
30. I have conversations with texts on language learning/ teaching issues.	.5	1.5	9	27.5	42.5	19
31. I construct a personal theory of practice through collaboration and dialog with my	.5	4	9	36.8	**39**.8	**10**

colleagues.

32. I respect my colleagues' feedback, advice, and point of views given on my classroom experiences.	-	.5	4.3	19.5	50.2	25.5
33. I observe my colleagues' classes to learn about/from their efficient practices.	1.5	5	18	33.3	32	10.3
34. I think carefully about and cope with sociocultural and socio-political structures that shape the character and content of classroom discourse.	1	.3	3.3	28.3	54.5	12.8

As regards 'knowing', the percentage of the teachers' responses demonstrated that the majority of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the items of this module.

On the contrary, although teachers' perceptions of 'analyzing' was to some extent positive, teachers were not very much interested in needs analysis done by outsiders (item 10) and talks with their learners to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests, and abilities (item 9). 43.8% of teachers either agreed (38%) or strongly agreed (5.8%) with item 10 that is very much lower than the percentage of other items of the module. 53.3% of teachers either agreed (35%) or strongly agreed (18.3%) with item 9 that is lower than the percentage of other items of the module. Also, 10 % of teachers slightly disagreed with item 9.

With regard to 'recognizing', teachers' perceptions were mostly positive though the teachers did not like to have critical engagement and negotiations with others to develop their identities (beliefs & values) (item 19). 52.6 % of teachers either agreed (39.3%) or strongly agreed (13.3%) with item 19 that is lower than the percentage of other items of the module.

Regarding 'doing', teachers' perceptions were positive for the majority of items except theorizing (items 25, 26, 27, 31), a sub module dealing with theory construction on the part of teachers. 40.7 % of teachers either agreed (33.5%) or strongly agreed (7.2%) with item 25 that is low. 55.5 % of teachers either agreed (46%) or strongly agreed (9.5%) with item 26. 31.8% of teachers either agreed (20.8%) or strongly agreed (11%) with item 27 that is terribly low. 49.8 % of teachers either agreed (39.8%) or strongly agreed (10%) with item 31.

And finally, teachers were not very much interested in observing their colleagues' classes (item 33) though they believed in self-observation. 42.3 % of teachers either agreed (32%) or strongly agreed (10.3%) with item 33.

To sum up, the results indicated that the majority of the participants had positive perceptions of KARDS.

The findings of interviews which made the qualitative part of this research corroborated the findings of the quantitative part. The themes extracted from teachers' words are as follows:

1. Interviewees believed that they know how to improve their professional, procedural, and personal knowledge through reading technical books, attending conferences and workshops, and joining communities of practice. They also held that they should update their knowledge to survive in the realm of language learning and teaching.

2. They mentioned that it is incumbent upon them to analyze their learners' needs, motivation, and autonomy. But, they did not like the needs analyses done by outsiders. They maintained that needs analysis should be mostly done by practicing teachers. They added that they should motivate their learners and turn them into autonomous individuals in classrooms and out of classrooms.

3.The interviewees posited that they should recognize their own identities, beliefs, and values and look at identity as something that is dynamic, multiple, and fluid.

4.They maintained that they dialogize with their colleagues and put into practice some of the teaching macro-strategies put forth by Kumaravadivelu on the basis of their teaching context. But, they confessed that they do not know how to theorize.

5.The interviewees held that they do not like it when other colleagues, supervisors, and mentors observe their classes. They believe in self-observation and learners' observations.

6.The interviewees expressed that they believe in power sharing in their classes. They also maintained that learners should have voice in their classes.

7.The majority of teachers posited that they were consciously or un/subconsciously familiar with KARDS and applied some parts of it.

The second research question concerned whether or not there was any significant difference in the perceptions of Iranian institute EFL teachers and Iranian university EFL teachers with regard to the KARDS model. To carry out statistical procedures, the researchers used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 25). A one-way between groups MANOVA was carried out to answer this question. The independent variable was the teachers' teaching context and the five dependent variables were teachers' perceptions of each component of the KARDS model. The results are presented in the following tables.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Context*

	Context	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Knowing	Institute	33.4750	3.78431	200
	University	35.5300	3.10925	200
	Total	34.5025	3.60868	400
Analyzing	Institute	21.7400	3.35689	200
	University	24.1300	3.01472	200
	Total	22.9350	3.40364	400
Recognizing	Institute	31.6000	3.84368	200
	University	34.6350	3.52475	200
	Total	33.1175	3.98414	400
Doing	Institute	58.4750	7.09585	200
	University	64.4650	5.93506	200
	Total	61.4700	7.18841	400
Seeing	Institute	8.9200	1.56391	200
	University	8.9450	1.36060	200
	Total	8.9325	1.46400	400

Table 2 displays the descriptive statistics relating to the teachers' teaching context.

Table 3. *Multivariate Tests for Teaching Context*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Context	Pillai's Trace	.260	27.736[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.260
	Wilks' Lambda	.740	27.736[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.260
	Hotelling's Trace	.352	27.736[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.260

Roy's Largest Root .352   27.736[b] 5.000   394.000 .000 .260

The main analyses (Table 3) demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between institute and university EFL teachers' perceptions on the combined dependent variables F (5, 394) = 27.73, p = .001; Wilk's Lambda = .74; partial eta squared = .26.

Table 4. *Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Teaching Context*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Context	Knowing	422.303	1	422.303	35.209	.000	.081
	Analyzing	571.210	1	571.210	56.118	.000	.124
	Recognizing	921.123	1	921.123	67.735	.000	.145
	Doing	3588.010	1	3588.010	83.855	.000	.174
	Seeing	.063	1	.063	.029	.865	.000

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, differences across 4 components of the KARDS model (i.e., knowing, analyzing, recognizing, and doing) reached statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .001 (Table 4).

The third research question concerned whether or not there was any significant difference in the perceptions of KARDS among Iranian EFL teachers with regard to their gender. A one-way between groups MANOVA was run to answer the third question. The independent variable was the teachers' gender and the five dependent variables were their perceptions of each component of the KARDS model. The results are presented in the following tables.

Table 5. *Descriptive Statistics for Gender*

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Knowing	Male	34.0928	3.11500	237
	Female	35.0982	4.16365	163
	Total	34.5025	3.60868	400
Analyzing	Male	22.3966	3.43876	237
	Female	23.7178	3.20399	163
	Total	22.9350	3.40364	400
Recognizing	Male	33.1899	3.98432	237
	Female	33.0123	3.99380	163
	Total	33.1175	3.98414	400
Doing	Male	61.1224	6.50015	237
	Female	61.9755	8.07981	163
	Total	61.4700	7.18841	400
Seeing	Male	8.8734	1.52410	237
	Female	9.0184	1.37200	163
	Total	8.9325	1.46400	400

Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics relating to the teachers' gender.

Table 6. *Multivariate Tests for Gender*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.056	4.693[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.056
	Wilks' Lambda	.944	4.693[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.056
	Hotelling'sTrace	.060	4.693[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.056
	Roy's Largest Root	.060	4.693[b]	5.000	394.000	.000	.056

The main analyses (Table 6) revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between male and female EFL teachers on the combined dependent variables F (5, 394) = 4.7, p = .001; Wilk's Lambda = .94; partial eta squared = .05.

Table 7. *Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Gender*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	Knowing	97.610	1	97.610	7.620	.006	.019
	Analyzing	168.574	1	168.574	15.064	.000	.036
	Recognizing	3.046	1	3.046	.192	.662	.000
	Doing	70.287	1	70.287	1.361	.244	.003
	Seeing	2.030	1	2.030	.947	.331	.002

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, gender differences reached statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .001, only across the 'analyzing' component of the KARDS model (Table 7).

The fourth research question concerned whether or not there was any significant difference in the perceptions of KARDS among Iranian EFL teachers with regard to their teaching experience. A one-way between groups MANOVA was used to answer this question. The independent variable was the teachers' teaching experience and the five dependent variables were their perceptions of each component of the KARDS model. The results are presented in the following tables.

Table 8. *Descriptive Statistics for Teaching Experience*

	Experience	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Knowing	1-5	34.0909	3.74581	77
	6-10	34.2952	3.94414	105
	11-15	34.7500	3.25499	80
	16-20	35.3974	3.19634	78
	20+	33.9000	3.63924	60
	Total	34.5025	3.60868	400
Analyzing	1-5	21.3117	3.80533	77
	6-10	22.8952	3.27556	105

		Mean	SD	N
	11-15	23.7500	3.14018	80
	16-20	23.7051	3.31509	78
	20+	23.0000	2.84635	60
	Total	22.9350	3.40364	400
Recognizing	1-5	31.6623	4.47981	77
	6-10	32.5524	4.21759	105
	11-15	33.5375	3.54338	80
	16-20	35.3205	3.34390	78
	20+	32.5500	2.90193	60
	Total	33.1175	3.98414	400
Doing	1-5	58.0519	7.16882	77
	6-10	60.6476	7.96867	105
	11-15	62.6875	6.54989	80
	16-20	63.4359	5.70620	78
	20+	63.1167	6.71222	60
	Total	61.4700	7.18841	400
Seeing	1-5	9.1039	1.34345	77
	6-10	8.8381	1.58189	105
	11-15	8.6875	1.71068	80
	16-20	8.8718	1.28284	78
	20+	9.2833	1.19450	60
	Total	8.9325	1.46400	400

Table 8 displays the descriptive statistics relating to the teachers' teaching experience.

Table 9. *Multivariate Tests for Teaching Experience*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Experience	Pillai's Trace	.227	4.734	20.000	1576.000	.000	.057
	Wilks' Lambda	.786	4.893	20.000	1297.750	.000	.058
	Hotelling'sTrace	.257	5.005	20.000	1558.000	.000	.060
	Roy's Largest Root	.177	13.920^c	5.000	394.000	.000	.150

The main analyses (Table 9) revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between the EFL teachers with regard to their experience on the combined dependent variables F (20, 1297) = 5, p = .001; Wilk's Lambda = .78; partial eta squared = .05.

Table 10. *Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Teaching Experience*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Experience	Knowing	106.707	4	26.677	2.070	.084	.021
	Analyzing	302.725	4	75.681	6.921	.000	.065
	Recognizing	608.570	4	152.143	10.497	.000	.096
	Doing	1553.336	4	388.334	8.046	.000	.075

Seeing	15.672	4	3.918	1.844	.120	.018	

When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, differences across 3 components of the KARDS model (i.e., analyzing, recognizing, and doing) reached statistical significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .001 (Table 10).

As the independent variable had multiple levels, follow-up post-hoc Tukey tests were conducted to know exactly which groups differed from one another. The results are presented in Table 11 under the mean differences tab (all the values with an asterisk are significant at .05 level).

Table 11. *Tukey Multiple Comparisons*

Dependent Variable	(I) Experience	(J) Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Analyzing	1-5	6-10	-1.5835*	.49616	.013	-2.9432	-.2239
		11-15	-2.4383*	.52794	.000	-3.8851	-.9915
		16-20	-2.3934*	.53125	.000	-3.8493	-.9376
		20+	-1.6883*	.56946	.027	-3.2489	-.1278
	6-10	1-5	1.5835*	.49616	.013	.2239	2.9432
		11-15	-.8548	.49076	.410	-2.1996	.4901
		16-20	-.8099	.49432	.474	-2.1645	.5447
		20+	-.1048	.53517	1.000	-1.5714	1.3618
	11-15	1-5	2.4383*	.52794	.000	.9915	3.8851
		6-10	.8548	.49076	.410	-.4901	2.1996
		16-20	.0449	.52621	1.000	-1.3972	1.4869
		20+	.7500	.56476	.674	-.7977	2.2977
	16-20	1-5	2.3934*	.53125	.000	.9376	3.8493
		6-10	.8099	.49432	.474	-.5447	2.1645
		11-15	-.0449	.52621	1.000	-1.4869	1.3972
		20+	.7051	.56786	.727	-.8510	2.2613
	20+	1-5	1.6883*	.56946	.027	.1278	3.2489
		6-10	.1048	.53517	1.000	-1.3618	1.5714
		11-15	-.7500	.56476	.674	-2.2977	.7977
		16-20	-.7051	.56786	.727	-2.2613	.8510
Recognizing	1-5	6-10	-.8900	.57119	.525	-2.4553	.6753
		11-15	-1.8752*	.60778	.018	-3.5407	-.2096
		16-20	-3.6582*	.61159	.000	-5.3342	-1.9822
		20+	-.8877	.65558	.657	-2.6842	.9089
	6-10	1-5	.8900	.57119	.525	-.6753	2.4553
		11-15	-.9851	.56498	.408	-2.5334	.5632
		16-20	-2.7681*	.56907	.000	-4.3276	-1.2086
		20+	.0024	.61611	1.000	-1.6860	1.6908
	11-15	1-5	1.8752*	.60778	.018	.2096	3.5407
		6-10	.9851	.56498	.408	-.5632	2.5334
		16-20	-1.7830*	.60579	.028	-3.4431	-.1229
		20+	.9875	.65017	.551	-.7942	2.7692

	16-20	1-5	3.6582*	.61159	.000	1.9822	5.3342
		6-10	2.7681*	.56907	.000	1.2086	4.3276
		11-15	1.7830*	.60579	.028	.1229	3.4431
		20+	2.7705*	.65374	.000	.9790	4.5620
	20+	1-5	.8877	.65558	.657	-.9089	2.6842
		6-10	-.0024	.61611	1.000	-1.6908	1.6860
		11-15	-.9875	.65017	.551	-2.7692	.7942
		16-20	-2.7705*	.65374	.000	-4.5620	-.9790
Doing	1-5	6-10	-2.5957	1.04234	.095	-5.4521	.2608
		11-15	-4.6356*	1.10910	.000	-7.6750	-1.5961
		16-20	-5.3839*	1.11605	.000	-8.4424	-2.3255
		20+	-5.0647*	1.19633	.000	-8.3432	-1.7863
	6-10	1-5	2.5957	1.04234	.095	-.2608	5.4521
		11-15	-2.0399	1.03100	.278	-4.8653	.7855
		16-20	-2.7883	1.03847	.058	-5.6341	.0576
		20+	-2.4690	1.12430	.183	-5.5501	.6120
	11-15	1-5	4.6356*	1.10910	.000	1.5961	7.6750
		6-10	2.0399	1.03100	.278	-.7855	4.8653
		16-20	-.7484	1.10547	.961	-3.7779	2.2811
		20+	-.4292	1.18647	.996	-3.6806	2.8222
	16-20	1-5	5.3839*	1.11605	.000	2.3255	8.4424
		6-10	2.7883	1.03847	.058	-.0576	5.6341
		11-15	.7484	1.10547	.961	-2.2811	3.7779
		20+	.3192	1.19297	.999	-2.9500	3.5885
	20+	1-5	5.0647*	1.19633	.000	1.7863	8.3432
		6-10	2.4690	1.12430	.183	-.6120	5.5501
		11-15	.4292	1.18647	.996	-2.8222	3.6806
		16-20	-.3192	1.19297	.999	-3.5885	2.9500

Based on observed means.
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 48.264.
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

As shown in Table 11, there were only significant differences between teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience and all other four groups regarding the analyzing variable. As for the recognizing variable, there were significant differences between 1-5 and 11-15/16-20 groups, 6-10 and 16-20 groups, 11-15 and 16-20 groups, and 16-20 and 20+ groups. Finally, regarding the doing variable, significant differences were only observed between 1-5 group and all the other groups except the 6-10 group. This finding showed that the perceptions of rookie teachers (1-5) were significantly different from those of experienced ones.

Discussion

The present study intended to examine Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of KARDS which were investigated through a number of variables including teaching context, gender, and teaching experience. The descriptive and inferential statistics provided interesting findings.

There were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their teaching context. There were significant differences in knowing, analyzing, recognizing, and doing components in favor of university teachers. This finding seems logical

since university teachers are to keep their knowledge which is their academic medium of communication updated to survive in academic settings. As a result of their updated professional and personal knowledge, they are expected to have such more positive perceptions. The circulation of knowledge transmission and knowledge construction, the routine exchange of knowledge, and the accessibility to the latest findings among academicians might justify this difference.

There was a statistically significant difference between female and male participants' perceptions of KARDS. There was a significant difference in analyzing component in favor of female teachers. It indicated that the gender of participants affected teachers' perceptions and that KARDS is gender-bound. The findings of this study are in line with the study of Eret-Orhan, Ok, and Capa-Aydin (2017) who investigated pre service teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of their teacher education in Turkey and found out that the pre service teachers' teaching subject, college, orientation towards teaching, the adequacy of program components and gender (in favor of females) played significant roles in affecting their perceptions of teacher education. The finding of this study is not in line with the study of Mohammadi, Karimian, and Talebinejad (2015) in which they investigated the attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers towards the current in-service education programs. The results of their study indicated that gender did not have any effects on teachers' perceptions.

Similarly, there were statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their teaching experience. The results of MANOVA tests for teaching experience revealed that teachers with different years of teaching experience perceived KARDS differently. This result suggests that teachers' teaching experience may influence teachers' perceptions of KARDS.

As this independent variable had multiple levels, the researchers carried out follow-up post-hoc Tukey tests to know exactly how significantly different the groups were from each other. The results revealed that the perceptions of teachers with 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, + 20 years of teaching experience were significantly different from that of teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience with regard to analyzing. The perception of teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience was significantly different from those of teachers with 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, + 20 years of teaching experience with regard to recognizing. The perception of teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience was significantly different from those of teachers with 11-15, 16-20 years of teaching experience with regard to recognizing. Also, the perceptions of teachers with 11-15, 16-20, + 20 years of teaching experience were significantly different from that of teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience with regard to doing. The findings indicated that rookie teachers (1-5) were significantly different from experienced ones in terms of their perceptions of KARDS in three modules of analyzing, doing, and recognizing respectively.

The results are in line with those of Fatima and Zamir (2015) who found that teachers who have different teaching experiences have significantly different perceptions towards pre-service teacher education program at higher secondary level. They are also in accord with the findings of Torff and Sessions (2008) who found that teachers with different experiences had significantly different ideas from each other. The results of this study also accord with the studies done by Torff and Byrnes (2011), Yüksel and Kavanoza (2015), and Gianina-Ana (2013). In a study by Torff and Byrnes, the attitudes of teachers toward professional development were assessed. The results of their study revealed that the attitudes of participants were different among teachers of different subjects and levels. Yüksel and Kavanoza scrutinized the influence of prior experiences on pre-service language teachers' perception of teaching and concluded that extended prior experience helped student teachers to develop personal beliefs and knowledge

about teaching. Gianina-Ana investigated kindergarten teachers' perceptions of in-service training and its effect on classroom practice and concluded that there was a significant difference between novice teachers' perception and those with more than 10 years of teaching experience. Novice teachers heeded the visibility and status to the profession while the experienced teachers paid more attention to professionalization.

The results are not in line with the findings of Lowe (2012) who compared the perceptions of teachers with varying years of teaching experience to identify how years of teaching experience affect teachers' perceptions of their initial teacher training program. The study showed no statistical significance. In another study, Mohammadi, Karimian, and Talebinejad (2015) investigated the attitudes of Iranian EFL teachers towards the current in-service education programs. The results of their study indicated that teachers' teaching experience did not have any effects on teachers' perceptions. Unlike the studies by Lowe and Mohammadi et al., the findings of the present research show that teachers' teaching experiences affect their perceptions.

Conclusion

Despite the limitations of this study, it revealed that teachers' perceptions were positive for the majority of items except theorizing, observing colleagues' classes, and analyzing needs by outsiders, and it showed that teachers were consciously or unconsciously familiar with this model and applied some parts of it which might prepare the ground for a long-waited paradigm shift (Leather & Motallebzadeh, 2015; Safari & Rashidi, 2015) in teacher education in Iran. Teachers' positive perceptions of KARDS and their un/conscious familiarity with it might be indicators of a prepared ground for language teacher education to undergo a modular teacher education program.

There were significant differences in teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to their gender, teaching experience, and teaching context. As teachers' teaching experiences increased, the extent of teacher perception increased as well. The perceptions of university teachers were significantly different from language institute teachers, and they may show the need to support and inform language institute teachers of the latest findings in the realm of language teacher education.

Even though there seemed to be determination in teachers' positive mindset to KARDS and its implementation in their own local classrooms, there is still a long way to develop a KARDS-oriented language teacher education in Iran since the current system is encountering some inherent structural difficulties. The top-down and transmission approaches are major impediments to the implementation of KARDS Iran-wide.

Since there was a dearth of research figuring out EFL and ESL teachers' perceptions of KARDS worldwide, and no research has been conducted in this regard, and no instrument has been constructed for this purpose so far in EFL context in Iran, this research as a pioneering effort can contribute to the body of language teacher education literature, fill a big gap, and prepare the ground for further studies in this area. Further research should explore teachers' perceptions of KARDS with regard to variables including teachers' age, educational degree, and major in EFL and ESL contexts.

Iranian EFL teachers were not interested in theorizing, observing colleagues' classes, and analyzing needs done by outsiders. To put an end to these weaknesses, policy makers and curriculum developers should prepare the ground and cultivate the seeds for their inclusion in teacher education programs in Iran.

The teacher education inventory within the framework of KARDS and the results of this study could be suitable for teacher education policy makers and professionals, language teacher

education materials and curriculum developers, student teachers, practicing teachers, cooperating teachers, mentors, mentees, supervisors, and teacher educators and might broaden their insights.

References

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

Arbuckle, J. L. (2017). *IBM® SPSS® Amos™ 25: User's guide*. New York: IBM Corporation.

Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Byrne, B. M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with Amos: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. New York: Routledge.

Eret-Orhan, E., Ok, A., & Capa-Aydin, Y. (2017). We train, but what do they think? Preservice teachers' perceptions of the adequacy of their teacher education in Turkey. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*. doi: 10.1080/1359866X.2017.1355050

Erfanian Jalali, M., & Talebinezhad, M. R. (2014). Critical theory in social sciences and evaluation of content-based approaches to language teaching. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 5*(3), 380-389.

Fatima, F., & Zamir, Sh. (2015). Teachers' perception towards pre-service teacher education program at higher secondary level. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 12*, 66-75.

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.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 397-417.

Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to teachers who dare teach*. Cambridge: Westview Press.

Gianina-Ana, M. (2013). Kindergarten teachers' perceptions on in-service training and impact on classroom practice. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 76*, 481-485. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.150

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. NY: Routledge.

Griffiths, V. (2000). The reflective dimension in teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 33*(5), 539-555.

Hunter, S. M., Watson, M., Adams, T., Robinson, D., & McKee, W. (2015). Preparing pre-service teachers with effective classroom language skills: Examining the utility of code-switching for enhancing lesson delivery. *North Carolina Association for Middle Level Education Journal, 29*(1).

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 73-85.

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. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

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*. London: Routledge.

Leather, S., & Motallebzadeh, Kh. (2015). Effecting methodological change through a trainer-training project: A tale of insider-outsider collaboration. In Ch. Kennedy (Ed.), *English language teaching in the Islamic Republic of Iran: Innovations, trends and challenges* (pp. 161-169). London: British Council.

Lowe, D.Y. (2012). *Teacher perception of their initial traditional or alternative teacher training program.* PhD dissertation 796, The University of Southern Mississippi. https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/796

McMorrow, M. (2007). Teacher education in the postmethod era. *ELT Journal, 61*(4), 375-377. doi:10.1093/elt/ccm057.

Mohammadi, Sh., Karimian, K., & Talebinejad, M. R. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' attitudes towards in-service professional development programs. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(3), 48-60.

Pituch, K. A., & Stevens, J. (2016). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences: Analyses with SAS and IBM's SPSS*. New York: Routledge.

Rashidi, N., & Mohammadineku, H. (2015). A Comparison of Iranian EFL vs. non-EFL teachers' "knowing" of learner autonomy. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies, 7*(1), 129-150.

Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. London: Arnold.

Sadler, R., & Dooly, M. (2016). Twelve years of telecollaboration: What we have learnt. *ELT Journal, 70*(4), 401-413. doi:10.1093

Safari, P., & Rashidi, N. (2015). Teacher education beyond transmission: Challenges and opportunities for Iranian teachers of English. Issues in Educational Research, 25(2), 187-203.

Tabachnhick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics: Pearson new international edition*. Harlow: Pearson.

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.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing young minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* New York: CUP.

Torff, B., & Byrnes, K. (2011). Differences across academic subjects in teachers' attitudes about professional development. *The Educational Forum, 75*(1), 26.

Torff, B., & Sessions, D. (2008). Factors associated with teachers' attitudes about professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 123-134.

Wallace, M. (1995). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yüksel, H. G., & Kavanoza, S. (2015). Influence of prior experiences on pre-service language teachers' perception of teaching. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 777-784. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.611

Appendix 1
Interview Questions
1. Should teachers improve their professional, procedural, and personal knowledge? Why? Why not?
1.1.   How do you improve your professional knowledge?

1.2.   How do you improve your procedural knowledge?
1.3.   How do you improve your personal knowledge?
2. Should teachers analyze their learners' needs, motivate them, and raise autonomous learners? Why? Why not?
2.1.   How do you analyze your learners' needs?
2.2.   How do you motivate your learners?
2.3.   How do you raise autonomous learners?
3. How do you recognize your identities, beliefs, and values?
3.1.   Is your identity fixed and singular? Is it dynamic, multiple, or fluid? Elaborate upon it.
4. How do you teach language skills?
    How do you relate your teaching to out of class events?
    What do you do when there are mismatches between you and your learners?
    How do you promote the language awareness of your learners?
    How do you maximize learning opportunities?
    How much and what types of interaction do you have with learners in your classes?
    How do you raise your learners' cultural and sociopolitical awareness?
4.1.   How do you dialogize with your colleagues?
4.2.   How do you theorize?
        How do you perform teacher research and action research in your classrooms?
5. How do you see observation?
5.1.   Do you like observing other teachers' classes? Why? Why not?
5.2.   Do you like being observed by other teachers, mentors, and supervisors? Why? Why not?
5.3.   Do you like being observed by your learners? Why? Why not?
6. How do you share power in your class? Who has authority in your classrooms?
    How do you give voice to your students in your classes?
7. How have you applied KARDS in your classes?