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ABSTRACT

THE ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS AT TOBB UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND TECHNOLOGY REGARDING INSET CONTENT

Gültekin, İnci

M.A., Department of English Language Education
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Betül Eröz

September 2007, 137 pages

The purpose of this study was to analyze the extent of instructors at TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Department of Foreign Languages regard in-service training programs crucial for their professional development. Another aspect of the study was to identify the professional needs of the instructors teaching preparatory classes as well as to determine the preferred instructional methods of an INSET program. The final aim of the study was to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between novice and experienced instructors regarding their needs and expectation of an in-service training program. The study was conducted among thirty-nine instructors who are teaching preparatory classes at TOBB ETU, DFL. The chairperson of the DFL also took part in the study.

Data from the 39 instructors were collected through questionnaires which were developed to uncover the opinions of instructors in terms of the characteristics of effective in-service training programs, to identify the needs of the instructors and determine the instructional methods preferred in-service training program. The questionnaires included both Likert scale and open-ended items. Moreover, 50-minute lessons of 10 instructors were video recorded. Video recordings aimed to identify the needs of the instructors that
should be addressed through an in-service training program. Finally, interviews were conducted with 10 instructors whose classes were video recorded. The aim of the interviews was to enable the instructors to reflect on the findings of the questionnaires and the video recordings. Another interview was conducted with the chairperson of the DFL to uncover to what extent his perceptions about in-service training activities correlate with those of the instructors.

Data collected through the instruments were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Close-ended items were analyzed via the SPSS program and mean scores for each item were calculated besides an independent sample t-test. The qualitative data were analyzed through content analysis.

The results of the study revealed that the instructors believe INSET is crucial for their professional development, they would like to keep on track with new developments in the field of ELT and participate in seminars and conferences as part of INSET programs. In terms of the professional needs, it was found that instructors need to be trained on teaching speaking skills and pronunciation, written and oral correction, promoting student autonomy, dealing with classroom management problems, teaching mixed-ability groups, raising language awareness of students and reflecting on their own experience. The t-test results demonstrated that there was a statistical significance between the answers of novice and experienced instructors concerning being trained in ‘teaching vocabulary,’ ‘teaching grammar’ and ‘improving in written and oral correction strategies.’ It was found that experienced teachers are particularly interested in training sessions on teaching grammar, teaching vocabulary, and improving written and oral correction strategies.

As a result of the findings, an ongoing INSET program model was proposed for the Department of Foreign Languages at TOBB ETU.
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ÖZ

TOBB EKONOMİ VE TEKNOLOJİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ HIZMET İÇİ EĞİTİM İÇERİĞİNE İLİŞKİN
ALGILAMALARININ İNCELENMESİ

Gültekin, İnci

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Betil Eröz

Eylül 2007, 137 sayfa


Veriler, hizmet içi eğitimin özelliklerine ilişkin okutman görüşlerini, okutmanların ihtiyaçlarını ve okutmanların tercih ettikleri öğretim yöntemlerini belirlemeye yönelik maddelerin yer aldığı anket yoluya 39 okutmandan elde edilmiştir. Ankette Likert ölçeği maddeleri ve açık uçlu sorular yer almaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra, 10 okutmanın 50-dakikalık derslerinde video kaydı yapılmıştır. Video kayıtları hizmet içi eğitim sırasında üzerinde durulması gereken okutman ihtiyaçlarını gözlemlemek için yapılmıştır. Son olarak, dersleri kayıt edilen 10 okutman ile birbir
görmüşler yapılmıştır. Görüşmelerin amacı okutmanların anket ve video kaydına ilişkin bulgular üzerinde yorum yapmalarını sağlamaktır. Okutmanların hizmet içi eğitime ilişkin görüşleri ile ne ölçüde paralellik gösterdiğini öğrenmek açısından, Yabancı Diller Bölümü Başkanı ile de ayrıca görüşme yapılmıştır.

Veri kaynaklarından elde edilen bilgiler nicel ve nitel olarak incelenmiştir. Kapalı uçlu maddeler SPSS programı aracılığıyla analiz edilmiş ve her bir madde için ortalama değerler hesaplanmıştır. Deneyimli ve deneyimsiz okutmanlar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamalı bir fark olup olmadığını belirlemek için, bağımsız olmayan t-testi hesaplanmıştır. Nitel veri içerik analizi yoluyla incelenmiştir.


Bulguların sonucunda, TOBB ETÜ Yabancı Diller Bölümü için sürdürülebilir bir hizmet içi eğitim programı modeli önerilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hizmet içi eğitim, öğretmen yetiştirme, profesyonel gelişim
To my dear husband and unborn baby
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

International channels of communication have expanded due to globalization; hence, the need to learn another language and foreign language instruction has gained significant popularity. As English is the most frequently used language in trade, international relations, science and technology, emphasis has been given to English Language Teaching (ELT) in Turkey so that Turkish citizens may be able to keep up with the technological, scientific and educational developments in the world (Ortaköylüoğlu, 2004).

As the demand for learning English as a foreign language has increased in Turkey, it has become necessary to hire larger numbers of English language teachers. In order to meet the increasing demand, the Higher Education Council has not only opened new faculties of education at various Turkish universities, but now also offers students in the departments of English Language and Literature, Translation and Interpretation, American Language and Literature, and Linguistics teaching certificates, provided that they complete additional courses. Owing to the fact that teachers with different educational background are being hired at universities, there is a growing need to train these teachers in ways that meet their diverse needs and minimize the discrepancies in their professional performance.

Meeting the need for English language teachers involves more than just increasing numbers. It is also crucial to keep currently practicing foreign language teachers in their profession, ie. to increase their level of job satisfaction and to provide them with skills that promote their effectiveness.

Due to the changing roles of educators in the last quarter of the 20th century, foreign language teachers (hereafter EFL) are generally not the
dominant classroom figures they used to be; rather, they act as facilitators who provide students with strategies to function well in terms of using the language (Murdoch, 1994). As English has become the world language, EFL are now expected to be more competent in their professions, and to apply new techniques and methodologies that will enhance their professional skills. The need to increase the effectiveness of EFL teachers in such student-centered classrooms has hastened the establishment of professional development programs for teachers in Turkey.

Learning a foreign language has become vital for many types of people in Turkey; and the purposes and profiles of these learners vary in terms of their needs and aims. Keeping up with all the developments in English Language Teaching usually enhances teachers’ ability to meet the diverse needs of their students. Indeed, further training via in-service training programs aims at maximizing the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process.

Fullan (1991) states that professional development is the sum of total formal and informal learning experiences throughout one’s career from pre-service education to retirement. Teachers may develop themselves, expand their knowledge and improve their skills via formal professional development programs, namely by means of teacher training and teacher development seminars (p.326).

Pre-service and in-service programs are unique professional development opportunities for teachers. Lange (1990) describes teacher development as a continual process of intellectual, experiential and attitudinal growth. She regards pre-service and in-service programs as important for pre-professional and professional development. Language teachers’ continued education and professional development are closely linked to their teaching performance; indeed, they establish a bridge between knowledge in the field and classroom practice (Şentuna, 2002). Like language learners, language teachers have a variety of needs. Their expectations of professional development programs vary in terms of knowledge and attitudes. It is essential that these needs and expectations are catered to in pre-service and in-service programs, for taking teachers’ needs into consideration not only increases program effectiveness,
but also empowers participants and increases the likelihood that they will become more effective teachers.

The utmost aim of all teacher training programs is to promote teacher standards and enhance the quality of education and teaching. Due to the increasing need to educate and employ effective teachers, most educational institutions encourage their teachers to take part in teacher training programs which aim at enhancing the quality of teaching in their own settings. Wallace (1991) states that language teachers must assume responsibility for their own development, and that for this reason, they should take part in in-service training programs (hereafter INSET).

As a consequence of recent changes in perceptions of teacher development and efficacy, in-service training programs have been designed frequently by the In-service Training Department of Ministry of Education, state and private universities and some foundations like the English Language Education Association (INGED/ İngilizce Eğitim Derneği) and the British Council. To this end, several state and private universities have set up their own INSET units. Associations like INGED and the British Council provide short and long term INSET courses for language teachers. Publishing companies also sponsor and host many national and international seminars and conferences conjointly with universities, due to the new emphasis on promoting instructional efficiency.

INSET programs are especially important because pre-service preparation does not always lead to the expected positive outcome. Furthermore, rapid changes in the field of education – for example, the establishment of new methods like Collaborative Language Teaching and Web-based Instruction – force institutions and teachers to keep up-to-date via INSET programs. INSET programs also stimulate and maintain teachers’ morale, as cooperation among the participants creates a more positive working environment in institutions (Harris & Bessent, 1994).

Altun (1992) summarizes the major purpose of in-service education as aiding schools when they attempt to improve teacher instruction by implementing new educational programs and by helping teachers acquire skills
and attitudes essential to the roles they are to play in the new programs (p.96). Another function is to supplement teachers’ pre-service preparation and to facilitate their professional growth during their productive years.

Teacher training programs are particularly essential for novice teachers. Drape et al. (1997) warn that if teachers’ work places do not support or generate a positive attitude to continuing learning during the early years of occupation, this bodes ill for the future development of the profession, especially in times characterized by fast technological, social and curricular change. Thus, the rationale behind many pre-service and in-service programs is to ease teachers’ adaptation to this dynamic, continuous and exhausting teaching process and to help teachers overcome obstacles on their own.

The fact that many Turkish universities employ quite a number of novice teachers in the departments of foreign languages has led them to set up their own in-service training units. Several universities, such as Bilkent University, Middle East Technical University, Çukurova University, Sabancı University, and Başkent University, have set up their own teacher training units to empower their teachers and enhance their skills. Concern for providing a better quality education and improving teacher quality is the underlying reason for the establishment of these in-service training units.

Ur (1996) states that continuous teacher development and progress can forestall or solve problems caused both by first-year stress and later burn-out. Thus, it can be inferred that in-service training programs are as crucial for experienced teachers as they are for novices.

The aim of teacher development programs is to increase teachers’ awareness of their competencies and professional skills and generate positive changes in behaviors of teachers-learners (Şentuna, 2002). Identifying and taking into account the perceptions and needs of the teachers taking part in in-service programs is essential for ensuring positive developments in teacher attitudes and knowledge.

Dubin and Wong (1990) emphasize that INSET usually takes place for a specific purpose; therefore, gathering information at the outset in order to
obtain a meaningful analysis of needs is crucial. Koç (1992) suggests that organizers should first determine the needs of the teachers and then select the teachers to participate in in-service training. Such a needs analysis procedure should be conducted before the training program.

With the aim of meeting the demand for language teachers, universities hire new instructors every academic year. Because some of these instructors are novices and still others lack teaching experience at the university level, training sessions which ease these teachers’ adaptation to that particular university’s system are necessary. INSET programs aim to enhance teacher skills by providing resources which render teachers competent in the classroom. Furthermore, INSET programs are considered essential as they inform teachers of new developments in the field and contribute to their professional development. Still, it is of utmost importance to take teacher-participants’ needs into account in order to maximize the effectiveness of such training programs.

1.2. Background to the Study

TOBB University of Economics and Technology (hereafter TOBB ETU) is a university that recruits instructors every year. In the last two years, forty new instructors have been hired in TOBB ETU’s Department of Foreign Languages (hereafter DFL). The teaching experience of most of these instructors is not more than five years. The DFL is currently composed of 45 instructors, one chairperson, one academic coordinator and one administrative coordinator, a Curriculum Development Unit (CDU), a Testing and Evaluation Unit (TEU) and an Information Technologies Unit (ITU) Instructors support instructors with different purposes. The DFL offers an intensive English preparatory program for incoming students at three different levels. DFL instructors are contracted to teach 20 hours per week.

Currently, there is no in-service training unit in the department. In the 2004-2005 academic year, a Certificate of Teaching for English Language Teachers (CERTELT) program was offered to instructors in the department.
Program attendance was compulsory. Yet, the training program did not prove to be very successful as it was a standard program in terms of the course design and objectives. Its design took into account neither the trainee teachers’ individual needs and expectations nor the English language preparatory program and curriculum at the time.

Although INSET unit has not been established yet, a project named “Collaborative Training” was carried out in January, 2006 by the administration to promote professional development and create a path to teacher autonomy. In this project 36 English instructors were involved. First, during the needs analysis step, informal interviews were held with the instructors. Secondly, administration came up with possible topics to be studied in the area of English Language Teaching. These topics were cooperative learning, constructivism, active learning, multiple intelligences, creative thinking, computer-based learning, web-based learning, and NLP. Instructors were asked to choose one of these topics, do research on it and modify a lesson which is placed in the curriculum keeping to the theory they were expected to present. It took two months to prepare the presentations. During this period, teachers worked in different groups and they developed group dynamics as well as cooperative learning. Then, the presentations were given in terms of regular sessions. This project gave the instructors the opportunity to be a trainer and a trainee at the same time, which fostered teacher autonomy accordingly. Besides this in-house training practice, DFL sent 3 instructors to Pilgrims Teacher Training courses abroad and 12 instructors to Bodrum to participate in teacher training programs organized by Pearson-Longman in the summer of 2006.

The chairperson of the department is aware of the need to establish an INSET unit in the department, as professional development is crucial for the commitment of the teachers to the workplace and to their fields. However, until now there has been no attempt on the part of the department to explore its instructors’ needs for an in-service training program. Fortunately, the DFL recognizes the importance of keeping abreast of trainee values, professional
needs, expectations and preferences so that the preparatory program accomplishes its aims and the degree of staff satisfaction can be maximized.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The current study proposes to pinpoint the needs and perceptions of the instructors recruited to TOBB ETU’s DFL as pertains to the concept of teacher training, teacher training activities, and the scope and sequence of an INSET program.

The study attempts to gather information about the current professional needs of all the instructors, in addition to their expectations of an INSET program planned to be implemented in the Department. Regardless of the extent of their teaching experience, all 39 instructors teaching preparatory classes in the DFL participated in this study. This is due to the fact that an INSET program is expected to address the needs of instructors at all levels.

As Celce-Murcia (1991) assert, it is necessary to be familiar with the teaching staff’s attitude towards the changing perceptions of accepted roles for teachers, since novice and experienced teachers may have different views of professional development and INSET program attendance. If the similar and differing perceptions of novice and experienced instructors are determined and catered to as a result of this study, it is believed that the effectiveness of the INSET programs can be maximized. Therefore, another aspect of the study is to identify any differing views of novice and experienced instructors, as it is believed that the diverse needs of both groups should be taken into consideration in an INSET design.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study aims to investigate the needs and perceptions of the instructors in the DFL at TOBB ETU for the establishment of an in-service training unit. The researcher believes that identifying the needs of teachers is of utmost importance, as the results will form the basis of the guidelines used to prepare
the objectives, scope and sequence, duration and outline of the INSET program that will follow this study.

Instructors’ needs, expectations and perceptions should be catered to and must be given priority in the design of the INSET programs. The researcher decided to obtain information from the instructors recruited to TOBB ETU’s DFL by means of this study. Since the researcher intended to demonstrate that the instructors’ ideas are valued and appreciated in determining the baseline of the INSET unit, getting input from the instructors was of utmost importance.

The researcher believes that the results of this study reflect the current opinions of teachers in TOBB ETU’s DFL, and that they might also be beneficial for other universities that do not yet have teacher training departments. Likewise, universities that have their own teacher training units might also benefit from the results and make alterations in their current programs. Furthermore, senior students of foreign language departments might benefit from reading the study, hence raising their awareness of issues related to their prospective profession.

1.5. Research Questions

For the purpose of this study, three research questions have been formulated:

1- What are the opinions of instructors and administrators at TOBB ETU Department of Foreign Languages concerning in-service teacher training, in terms of its scope, instructional methods and trainer profile?

2- What professional needs do instructors at TOBB ETU, DFL have that should be addressed by an in-service training program?

3- Is there a difference between novice and experienced instructors in terms of their needs and expectations from an in-service training program?
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

This chapter examines the literature related to this particular study. First of all, terms such as “language teaching,” “teacher education,” “teacher development,” “teacher training” and “in-service training” are discussed as they constitute the focus of this study. Then, several teacher training models are described in order to decide which model reflects the characteristics of the INSET model to be proposed based on the findings of the study. Finally, related research studies and their findings are summarized.

2.2. Language Teaching

Learning involves a change in behavior, it involves some form of practice and it is relatively permanent but subject to forgetting. Teaching cannot be defined apart from learning. Teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the conditions for learning (Brown, 2000, p.7).

Grenfell (2003) maintains that learning about language learning theories facilitates the development of language teaching. Understanding how languages are learnt and discovering the intricacies of professional development language training processes could lead to overall improvements in education.

Language teaching necessitates incorporating the knowledge and skills required to be competent in the language teaching profession. It is not always a straightforward task to be a language teacher. Wright (2002) mentions that becoming a language teacher involves making connections between the
linguistic and methodological components of language teaching. In order to form the link between theory and practice, language teachers need further education and training. Pennington (1989) states that education and training are crucial for language teachers.

Due to the developments in language teaching approaches, the role of the language teacher has shifted. In the late twentieth century, several new language teaching approaches, like Communicative Language Learning, replaced earlier approaches, such as audio-lingualism and the structural-situational approach. Regardless of the approach adopted, new methods were regarded as top-down, and the roles of teachers and learners were prescribed beforehand. Learners were often viewed as passive recipients. Therefore, the focus moved to the processes of learning and teaching rather than ascribing a central role to teaching (Richards, 2001, p.5). This indicated that learners would have a more central role in teaching-learning process and teachers would no benefit the methods in accordance with the individual needs and differences of their students.

According to Richards (2001), the many changes in the teacher’s role shifted educators’ attention to questions of how teachers could develop and explore their own teaching through reflection. In the 1990’s, teacher development became a central educational issue. Establishing long-term goals, facilitating the teacher’s understanding of teaching and of himself or herself as a teacher, identifying the different styles of teaching, and determining learners’ perceptions of classroom activities are some of the essential components of teacher development.

Roe (1992) states that language teaching is a lifetime career, and that career development, like language teaching, is a life-long process. He also mentions that continual professional development is the sum of internalizing new ideas, sharing and exchanging ideas and experiences with colleagues, and reflecting on one’s own experience (p.1). For a language teacher to develop professionally, it is essential that s/he incorporates the aforementioned processes into his or her teaching. Roe believes that language teachers should continue learning and should seek opportunities to better themselves by
exchanging ideas with their colleagues in the context of professional development programs.

As teacher education allows for continuous development of teachers and teacher training enables teachers to improve their skills and knowledge, teacher education, training and development are means for teachers to develop professionally.

2.3. Teacher Education, Development and Training

2.3.1. Teacher Education

In the late twentieth century, new emphasis was placed on the role of teachers. This new perspective requires teachers to be active, to explore and reflect on their teaching and their students’ learning. They are expected to be autonomous practitioners who combine knowledge and skills to make decisions. This can be best achieved by teacher education, which can be defined as the general term that includes both teacher development and teacher training. The new role of teachers necessitated teacher education to be crucial part of teachers’ development.

Doyle (1990) states that effective teacher education prepares candidates in the prevailing norms and practices of classroom and schools (p. 5). For an effective teacher education, Doff (1987) proposes that a new methodology should be adopted in language teacher education. This new methodology should bear the teachers’ own classroom experience in mind. Teachers should be provided with a clear rationale of the changes in the methodology; new teaching techniques should be demonstrated; and teachers should be guided to put into practice the new methods they have learnt. Doff (1987) believes that the application of these principles in teacher education will enhance teacher quality.

The emphasis made on teaching and teacher education in the late twentieth century dictated a new focus on effective teacher education as the most important way of enhancing teacher quality. As Freeman (1989)
mentions, language teacher education serves as the link between what is known in the field and what is done in the classroom (p.30). For him, the purpose of language teacher education is to create a change in the teacher’s decision making process, which centers on his/her knowledge, skills, attitude, and awareness of him or herself, the students, and the innovations in the field. He views defining the content of language teacher education, understanding the processes of effective language teaching, and conveying how to teach language teaching as essential. He adds that language teacher education deals mainly with the process of language teaching; yet, other subject areas help to define and articulate the knowledge and skill base of language teaching.

Besides language teacher education, Freeman (1989) focuses on language teaching itself. It is defined as a decision-making process based on four constituents: knowledge, skills, attitude, and awareness. Knowledge includes what is being taught, namely the subject matter; to whom it is being taught – the students, their backgrounds, learning styles, language levels- and where it is being taught- the socio-cultural, institutional and situational contexts. Skills define what qualities the teacher has to possess: the ability to present materials, give clear instructions and correct errors in various ways. Knowledge and skills form the knowledge base of teaching. Attitude is the stance one adopts toward oneself, the activity of teaching and the learners as one engages in the teaching and learning process. Awareness, on the other hand, is the capacity to recognize and monitor the attention one is giving or has given to teaching. Awareness as a constituent integrates and unifies the previous three constituents. If teachers are aware of their knowledge and skills and they have positive attitudes towards their students and developing themselves, they are more likely to grow and change (Larsen-Freeman, 1983).

In addition to the four constituents suggested by Freeman, Thomas (1987) argues that teachers should also possess language competence to a greater degree than that expected of their learners. They should also be competent in the teaching of language, i.e. possess pedagogical competence.

The design of teacher education programs should take care to incorporate the aforementioned constituents. Doyle (1990) believes that teacher education
programs should be constructed in a systematic way. This means that the program should hold to some basic beliefs about methods, delivery of information, and interaction between the participants. These beliefs should serve as an organizing theme for the selection of the program’s content.

Freeman (1998) points out that the teacher is no longer regarded as the centre of all teaching and learning activities; nor are learners seen as passive recipients or empty vessels to be filled with the language items being presented. Therefore, it is no longer possible for teachers to be trained to operate within an explicit, fixed framework of principles or to follow the principles specified for a particular method, as was the case earlier, when it was believed that learners learn what teachers teach and that teaching, if done according to the rules, necessarily causes learning to occur. The starting point of education for teaching could be the teaching act itself, moving in a linear fashion from ‘theory’ to ‘practice’ (p. 401).

Freeman (1998) proposes a descriptive model for teaching which incorporates the four constituents of language teaching:
The Constituents

AWARENESS triggers and monitors attention to:

ATTITUDE

a stance toward self, activity, and others
that links intrapersonal dynamics with
external performance and behaviors

SKILLS
the how of teaching:
method
 technique
 activity
 materials / tools

KNOWLEDGE
the what of teaching:
subject matter
 knowledge of students
 socio-cultural /
 institutional context

View of Language Teacher Education

Figure 1. Descriptive Model of Teaching (Freeman, 1998).

As the model indicates, language teacher education tries to link
intrapersonal dynamics with external performance and behaviors of teachers.
Additionally, teachers should be trained to use effective methods, techniques,
activities and materials. These skills should be combined with the training on
the subject matter, namely knowledge improvement.

Richards and Crookes (1988) also argue that it is a misconception to
believe that language teacher education is generally concerned with the
transmission of knowledge, more specifically, knowledge of applied linguistics
and language acquisition, and of skills in methodology and related areas. They
believe, namely, that transmission of knowledge does not always lead to
effective practice.
2.3.2 Teacher Development

The changes in teachers’ role due to the developments in educational sciences, rising expectations of parents and students, and growing awareness of the dynamic structure of teaching and learning, demand that teachers renew themselves (Duzan, 2006). In order to cope with all these dynamic processes, teachers need to develop professionally.

One component of professional development is teacher development. This term needs to be clearly defined to facilitate in-depth understanding. Ur (1996) defines it as the means by which teachers learn, by reflecting on their own current classroom experiences. Eraut (1977) defines teacher development as the natural process of professional growth in which a teacher gradually acquires confidence, gains new perspectives, increases in knowledge, discovers new methods, and takes on new roles.

Wallace (1991) proposes that there is a distinction between teacher education and teacher development. Teacher education is managed by others, and is power-coercive and rational-empirical in focus; whereas teacher development is managed by oneself, and hence, the normative re-educative-change strategy is encouraged (p. 3). In the same vein, Ur (1996) believes that teacher development takes place when teachers, working as individuals or in a group, consciously take advantage of resources to increase their own professional learning. Teacher development programs provide the teachers with opportunities to adapt to their new roles.

Richards and Nunan (1990) focus on the changes that take place in teachers; and they point out that intellectual, experiential and attitudinal changes in teacher behavior may occur as a result of teacher development through professional in-service programs. Teachers improve their ability to use, adapt and apply their crafts via teacher development programs. Like Richards and Nunan, Sergiovanni (1983) focuses on the change in teachers through professional teacher development. He suggests that teachers change as a result of development programs by polishing their existing teaching skills or keeping up with the latest teaching developments.
Ur (1996) draws attention to both novice and experienced teachers’ need for constant teacher development. She states that the first year of teaching can be very stressful, and that difficult first years may even cause some new teachers to abandon the profession. Conversely, some teachers face professional survival challenges in the later years of their career, due to a phenomenon known as ‘burn-out.’ This is a feeling of boredom, or loss of momentum. Burn-out usually comes on gradually and may sometimes be conquered only by retirement or a change of profession. Constant teacher development and progress can forestall or solve problems caused by first-year stress and later burn-out (p. 318).

Tetenbaum and Mulkeen (1986) propose a continuing, integrated model of teacher development. Such a teacher development program should be field-based, problem-centered, technology-driven, based on experimental sharing, competency-based, expertly-staffed, and open-ended, namely never ending. They claim that a continuing, integrated teacher development program will bring success to the teacher and the institution.

In brief, teacher education and teacher development have distinct characteristics, in the sense that teacher education, which is neither managed by teachers nor problem-driven, does not trigger intrinsic motivation of teachers. Teacher development, on the other hand, facilitates teachers’ adaptation process by providing them with opportunities for hands-on experience.

In addition to teacher education and teacher development, teacher training is essential for the professional development of teachers.

2.3.3. Teacher Training

Teacher training (hereafter TT) is another component of language teacher education. Şahin (2006) defines training as a form of gaining knowledge in order to perform better at a particular job.

Kocaman (1992) states that there are many variables involved in teaching, but that TT is an important aspect of ELT education and teacher education and
thus, involves a well-planned, continuous process. Effective TT implies having well-qualified teacher educators and likewise, well organized and implemented programs (p.19). Kocaman argues that TT programs should not simply focus on classroom methodology and techniques and to try to improve only these. In order to improve the quality of TT, he suggests a broader perspective, as he believes that language education is not a static undertaking, but rather, a dynamic process which takes into account the future needs of the society as well as the present day requirements and considers them in light of societal tradition.

Lamie (2005) specifies the broader perspective of TT referred to by Kocaman and proposes a trainee-centered methodology which gives way to self-examination rather than transmission of knowledge. This is significant because language teaching has started putting emphasis on learner-centered and problem solving methodologies. In terms of the content of TT programs, Wallace (1991) proposes that trainees should be exposed to a variety of learning contexts in which they can explore and develop their learning strategies. He states that the aim of the teacher training program is to encourage teachers to become ‘reflective practitioners.’ He believes in the necessity of presenting different teaching and learning modes to trainees, for several reasons. First, trainees’ learning styles, and this diversity should be reflected in the palette of teaching strategies. Also, trainees ought to be encouraged to experiment with a variety of learning strategies. A second reason is that different teaching modes add variety and makes teaching more interesting for both tutors and trainees. In addition, the tutor gets to know her trainees better and is better able to evaluate them fairly (p.29).

It is also believed that a training program is more likely to succeed if there is a sizeable practical component as well as theory. Practice needs to be regular and frequent enough to permit reappraisal, readjustment and repetition over a substantial period of time. If the trainees incorporate the new techniques in their subsequent practice, they may then reevaluate them in light of that practice.
Besides discussing the methodology and content of teacher training programs, scholars have commented on the characteristics of well-designed teacher training programs. Evans (1988) points out that in planning a teacher training program, the needs of the trainees should be analyzed as the initial step. Once the needs are determined, they should be categorized in terms of skills, knowledge and attitudes. Then, realistic aims should be set, bearing in mind the participants’ knowledge and experience, previous training, the workload, practical and financial constraints. As the next step, the trainers are selected; and finally, the decisions about course content are made.

Apart from the aforementioned characteristics of TT, Bamber (1987) emphasizes the role of an effective teacher trainer in the success of a teacher training program. He states that a teacher trainer must display language competence and flexibility of approach. In addition, he or she must be sympathetic to the non-specialist’s problems and establish a mutual trust between himself or herself and the non-specialist. Above all, she must be aware of what is feasible (p.120). In order to establish an environment in which trainees and trainers share experiences on the basis of trust, it is essential that the teacher trainer bear these qualities.

Doff (1987) believes that TT should be designed in a way that exerts long term influence on the whole system of English education. Effective TT produces effective teaching and influences immediate classroom behavior of individual teachers. Doff visualizes his figure as follows:
In the figure above, what begins as low-level input from an outside system becomes absorbed into the system itself and may emerge as an indigenized product, with greatly enhanced influence on educational attitudes and behavior (p.71). The interaction between the trainers and the trainees contributes to the change in classroom behavior.

Kennedy (2005) criticizes teacher training programs in which knowledge is generally ‘delivered’ to the teacher by an ‘expert,’ with the agenda determined by the deliverer while the participant remains in a passive role. While the training can take place within the institution in which the participant works, it is most commonly delivered off-site and is often subject to criticism about its lack of connection to the actual classroom context in which participants work. According to Kennedy, placing the participants in a more active role and ensuring in-house practices or ensuring that the trainees connect the input they received from outside to their actual teaching practices will contribute to the success of TT programs.

Although the terms “teacher training” and “teacher development” are used interchangeably in some contexts, some authors emphasize the difference among them, as they believe that these two phenomena reflect different
approaches to how teachers should be educated. For example, Wallace (1991) mentions the distinction between teacher training or education and teacher development. Training or education is something that can be presented or managed by the others; whereas development is something that can be done only by and for oneself (p. 3). Freeman (1989) considers training a strategy for direct intervention by the collaborator, to work on pre-determined goals and strategies in a given period of time. Effectiveness in the classroom is based on the improvement of specific aspects of skills and knowledge. Both Freeman and Wallace focus on the time constraints in teacher training and the external factors in the teaching process. Wallace’s ‘other’ and ‘collaborator’ refer to trainers in teacher training activities who are the decision makers in the design and sequence of the program. Freeman (1989) believes, however, that trainees are more independent in teacher development, self reflection and evaluation of teachers that is guided by the trainers. In addition, Freeman’s concept of development deals with more complex and integrated aspects of teaching, rather than merely focusing on specific skills, as in teacher training. The effects of teacher development can be seen over a longer period time. It is understood that training and development are two basic educating strategies that share the same purpose: achieving change in what the teacher does and why he or she does it. They differ in the means that they adopt to achieve that purpose.

Woodward (1991) emphasizes the bi-polar scale for the purpose of illustrating the difference and the continuum between teacher training and teacher development. She maintains that there should be some kind of a balance between the two ends of the continuum in designing a teacher training course. Such in-service programs compose some sections from both parameters. The below scale displays how teacher training and teacher development differ from each other:
Table 1. The Teacher Training and Teacher Development Associations Scale (Woodward, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER TRAINING</th>
<th>TEACHER DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency-based</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-off</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Continual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agenda</td>
<td>Internal Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill/Technique and Awareness-based, angled towards skills</td>
<td>Knowledge Based- personal growth&amp; the development of attitudes/insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory for entry to the profession</td>
<td>Non-compulsory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/certificate weighted</td>
<td>Process weighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means you can get a job</td>
<td>Means you can stay interested in your job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done with experts</td>
<td>Done with peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Models of Teacher Training

As of yet, several teacher training models have been applied; and some have evolved over the course of time. Wallace (1991), Wolter (2000), Palmer (1993) and Ur (1996) propose the following models for teacher training programs.

2.4.1. Wallace’s Training Models

Wallace (1991, p. 5-14) categorizes three training models as follows:

a) In the ‘Craft model’, the young trainee learns by imitating the expert’s techniques and by following the instructions and advice. Expertise in the craft is passed from generation to generation. It is assumed that the expert or master
is responsible for passing his or her craft and knowledge to new generations. The following figure explains how trainees become professionals. In this model, as mentioned in the below figure, apprentices learn from a practitioner; they follow his/her instructions and demonstration and they gain professional competence after they begin to practice.

![Figure 3. The Craft Model of Professional Education (Wallace, 1991, p.6).](image)

Stones and Morris (cited in Wallace, 1991) argue that this technique is basically conservative and is contingent on an essentially static society. However, today schools exist in a dynamic society, geared to change. The limitations of this model produced a demand for more dynamic and developmental models.

b) The ‘Applied Science Model’ (Wallace, 1991, p. 8) was proposed by Schön. According to it, the findings of scientific knowledge and experimentation are conveyed to the trainee by those who are experts in the field. It is up to the trainees to put conclusions from the scientific findings into practice. Thus, this method also assumes that professional development can be achieved through transmission of knowledge (Özen,1997). An applied science model would be to teach the subjects in their own right and expect the trainees to somehow apply the findings in these areas of knowledge to their teaching situation. This model, like the ‘craft model,’ is traditional. There is no two-way interaction in this model; the knowledge is transmitted by the experts, and the trainees receive no guidance as to how to implement this knowledge in their classes. Furthermore, trainers might not always be autonomous enough to internalize and put into practice what knowledge they have acquired from their
experts. The figure below displays the lack of interaction in the nature of this model:

![Diagram of Applied Science Model](image)

Figure 4. Applied Science Model (Wallace, 1991, p.9)

c) In the ‘Reflective model’ (Wallace, 1991) a compromise exists between the received knowledge, which refers to the theoretical concepts, facts, data, etc., and the experiential knowledge, which is ‘knowing-in-action’ by practice
of profession, and which relates to the professional’s ongoing experience (p.12). Ways should be found to make the relationship reciprocal, not one-way, so that the trainee can reflect on the ‘received knowledge’ in light of the classroom experience, and so that the classroom experience can feed back into the ‘received knowledge.’ The trainees are expected to interact and reflect on what they have learnt; and this indicates that there is two-way interaction between the trainers and trainees.

Wallace (1991) believes that these two knowledge types are an indispensable feature of professional development. The reflective model emphasizes the role of the trainees and what they bring to the training/development process. The following figure illustrates this model:

![Reflective Model](image)

Figure 5. Reflective Model (Wallace, 1991, p.15)

2.4.2. Participant Centered Approach

Wolter (2000, p.315) proposes that participant-centered approach encourages a higher degree of fit to real-life situations, as the program progresses from theoretical toward practical concerns. This approach invites the participants to share their expertise with the course instructors, which
encourages changes in the perspectives of the participants. The rationale behind this approach is that since only the participants have a sufficiently rich knowledge of their own learning/teaching situation, they are in the best position to determine how the innovation can function within it. The end result is a program that shifts from being a more or less one-way transfer of information to encouraging and fostering a two-way exchange of ideas. The participant-centered approach shares some characteristics with student-centered teaching. In student centered teaching, planning, teaching and assessing revolve around the needs and abilities of the students. Topics which are relevant to the students’ lives, needs and interests are chosen. Students are actively involved in connecting the knowledge to their own settings, and they are given ample opportunity to experiment and discover on their own (McCombs and Whistler, 1997). If trainees are provided with similar opportunities in their own training programs, they will easily put the principles of student-centered learning into practice.

2.4.3. Palmer’s approaches

Palmer (1993) suggests three approaches in terms of training input styles in an in-service training program. The transmission approach is a one-way-model: the-trainer-as-knower approach. The trainers provide the input; the participants have no investment in the idea; and therefore, may have little commitment to using it. In the problem-solving approach, trainers and participants cooperate on both the design and the development of a given program. The participants contribute by relaying personal teaching problems and recounting personal experience; the trainers contribute by suggesting possible solutions based on their experience and knowledge. This type of negotiated program is more context-based and teacher-specific. Finally, the exploratory approach views (Breen et al., 1989) training as classroom decision-making and investigation. The trainers are simply facilitators to teachers exploring their own classroom and resources, finding their own solutions to individual problems with the help of others in the group, ie. either
participants or trainees. The trainer functions more as a colleague whose input is no more and no less valid than that of the other participants.

2.4.4. Ur’s Model

Ur (1996) suggests a teacher training model in which the trainer is a facilitator who has a very important function of guiding the trainees, but not prescribing what they should be doing. The trainers should encourage the trainees to produce new ideas on their own, provide relevant input to the trainees, and help them acquire the habit of processing input from various sources by using their own experience, so that they will eventually assume ownership of the resulting knowledge. In terms of the content, Ur proposes the incorporation of a variety of components to enrich the repertoire of the trainees. Ur’s model displays similar characteristics with the exploratory model of Palmer (1993). In both models, the trainees are central to the program; they are expected to be autonomous, and the trainers act as mere facilitators.

2.5. In-service Training

Teaching has gained great importance in the last two decades; and thus, it is of great importance for teachers, educators and educational authorities to find effective ways of teaching. That is one of the main underlying reasons for in-service training programs. The rationale behind any teacher training program is to enhance the quality of teaching.

Dave (as cited in Goad, 1984) states that when education is seen as a lifelong process, and, in this context, when the school is treated as only one among many structures by means of which learning is acquired, the role and functions of the school and the teacher need to be reviewed and reformulated. The institutions of teacher education must inculcate new skills, attitudes and insights in teachers through their in-service education programs.

Bezzina (2007) argues that professional development should take place at school in order to cater to the learning needs of teachers and their students. She
suggests organizing in-house and site-based managed programs to foster the interaction among teacher educators and teachers by enabling them to discuss teaching and learning outcomes for students and teachers. In-service training programs are good opportunities for the institutions to provide this interaction among teachers.

Day (1999) adds to Bezzina’s definition of INSET, describing it as a planned event, series of events or extended program of accredited or non-accredited learning, in order to distinguish it from less formal in-school development work and extended partnerships and interschool networks. In-service training programs are a means for some teachers to keep track on with the recent developments in the field, and for some, an opportunity to brush up on their previous knowledge and add to it. In both cases, participation in in-service training programs is crucial. As instructional technology advances, the need to change and improve becomes increasingly vital for professionals.

According to Duzan (2006), INSET is a program which provides teachers with a variety of activities and practice sessions for the purpose of helping them develop professionally by broadening their knowledge, improving their teaching skills and increasing their self-awareness and reflective abilities. Teachers participate in INSET programs after their initial education to enhance their effectiveness in teaching. It is clear from the definitions that there is a close link between INSET programs and professional development. INSET programs are also an essential means to becoming effective teachers. For experienced teachers, they are a way to overcome, or at least minimize, teacher burn-out. According to England (1998, p.18), the motivation of some teachers to take part in in-service training programs, is related to their personal satisfaction with the occupation. She is of the idea that most teachers intrinsically want and need to participate in ongoing development to better understand the complexity of their task and to minimize burn-out.

The characteristics of INSET programs have attracted the attention of some authors. For Waxman et al. (2006), professional development for English language teachers must be comprehensive and systematic at all levels; fragmented, short-term in-service training is ineffective. Professional
development should include demonstration of theories of language, sustained coaching, and evaluation programs measuring teacher implementation and impact. A holistic approach emphasizing teacher cooperation and ongoing analysis of what makes school and teachers successful is more useful in professional development than emphasizing specific teaching skills (p.189).

Koç (1992) states that in-service training is creating a caring and sharing atmosphere, in which teachers share and exchange their experience in teaching. They discuss their problems and find practical solutions to their problems with academic help from educators. This help is aimed at improving their skills in applying recent methodology, approaches, and classroom management strategies, and at gaining experience in developing and applying an effective curriculum. In addition, they evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching, as well as their students’ performance in courses they teach; and according to the feedback they get, they make necessary changes in their teaching style and suggest new ways of reorganizing the contents of the book they are teaching from, in accordance with the new developments in their specific fields of study and in line with advances in technology (p.48). In the same vein, Ekmekçi (1992) emphasizes the importance of the promotion of teacher independence in INSET programs. Responsibility is given to teachers by guiding them to evaluate their own work and by not prescribing the procedures to be followed. Ekmekçi (1992) mentions two divergent approaches of teaching. One approach of teaching is to assign the learners the observant role so that they would only watch the process realized by the teacher. In the other approach, the teacher involves the learners in the process and provides them opportunities to make generalizations, analyses or to use their intuition in deciding what action to take to actualize the process. If the second approach is followed in a teacher training program, the supervisor or trainer guides the teachers to develop their own way of teaching, rather than prescribing the process of teaching for them, which often leads to the failure of training programs.

In terms of the content of INSET programs, Veenman (as cited in Capel, 1998) identifies eight problems encountered most often by new teachers: classroom discipline, motivating pupils, dealing with individual differences,
assessing pupils’ work, relationships with parents, organization of class work, insufficient and/or inadequate teaching materials and supplies, and dealing with the problems of individual pupils. He proposes that these issues should be considered in the design of the programs. Doff (1987) emphasizes the role of extrinsic factors in the design of INSET programs. He states that large and overcrowded classes, lack of equipment and resources, lack of preparation time, a rigid syllabus etc. affect the design of a training program (p. 68). Furthermore, the attitude of teachers to teaching and learning will not only influence the content and design of the training material but also the overall effectiveness of the training program.

Bezzina (2007) lists a number of challenges novice teachers encounter at the beginning of their career. To start with, taking on full-time teaching in a school is exhausting for them. They are overwhelmed by non-teaching duties like invigilation, marking, and paper work. In addition, they do not possess enough knowledge about the curriculum and they have problems about what and how much to cover. They aren’t flexible enough to adapt the lessons to the realities of their classrooms. Addressing different students at the same time is another challenge for them. Classroom management issues, like large number of students as well as disruptive and unmotivated students, are another concern for them. They need support from experienced teachers and the administration in terms of the teaching responsibilities and school policies; but, they do not always have the courage to ask for help. According to a study conducted by Bleach (1999), novice teachers need to spend time with experienced teachers or mentors and establish relationships with them. An INSET program that includes both novice and experienced teachers should cater to these issues raised by Bezzina and Bleach.

It is apparent that many researchers share the idea that INSET programs should be interactive, cover a variety of content and be based on the individual needs of the trainees as well as their students. These commonalities exist because normally there is an underlying desire for changes in teaching practice and behavior behind every in-service teacher education program. These changes may be either obligatory by the imposition of the school, local
authority and government, or optional due to personal reasons, like the need for renewal or brushing up on existing knowledge (Palmer, 1993, p. 166). Participants should have intrinsic motivation towards INSET; otherwise, the outcome of the programs will not be effective or fruitful as projected. Hayes (2000), for example, emphasizes the motivational factor towards change, arguing that teachers’ own personal disposition towards change may be a key variable. The widest possible perspective should be taken on all INSET activities. The processes of INSET can only be fully understood if teachers’ social and educational context is considered (p. 137).

In another study, Lamie (2005) determines the criteria for effective in-service training programs. It is essential that an INSET program consider the elements below to be effective. Lamie categorizes the criteria under five main points: Setting the aim, planning and implementation, determining the length and mode of delivery, setting the methodology and follow-up work activities constitute the procedure of the INSET program. Awareness of the needs of the participants and catering to their individual differences are important as well. Trainer expertise, focus on individuals and provision of feedback are some other essential points in INSET design. Lamie summarizes the criteria as follows:
According to Kaufman (1995), in-service training experiences might be selected on the basis of maintaining and reinforcing teacher abilities. If teacher competence is maintained, performance will not decline below expected levels. The best way to identify the competence of the teacher-learners is to perform a needs assessment. Kaufman’s needs assessment tool reveals the gaps between actual and desired results, prioritizes these gaps, and selects the most important needs to be addressed.

Conducting a needs analysis is a crucial step in determining the content, methodology, duration etc. of the INSET programs. Siedow, Memory and Bristow (1985) suggest a model for INSET that contains the following steps: 1) assess staff needs 2) determine in-service objectives 3) plan content 4) choose methods of presentation 5) evaluate the effectiveness 6) provide follow-up assistance and reinforcement.

Harland and Kinder (1994) suggest that INSET has a varied influence on individual teachers and that participants follow a unique outcome route. They emphasize the importance and impact of attitudes, arguing for the identification of needs and the design of in-service training experiences based on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of overall scheme and clearly articulated rationale</td>
<td>Continual involvement</td>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>Good practice</td>
<td>Focus on individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Implementation Evaluation</td>
<td>Individual difference</td>
<td>Demonstrations Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length &amp;mode of delivery</td>
<td>Needs awareness</td>
<td>Trials</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Government support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Coherent</td>
<td>Credible trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up work</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Supporting materials</td>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Criteria for effective INSET (Lamie, 2005, p. 96)
individual’s learning perspective, rather than on global prescriptions of systematic needs and forms of provision.

Waxman et al. (2006) point out that professional development should begin with the needs of the teachers, not administrators. Staff developers should carefully assess what teachers and their students need and include classroom-based training sessions, with a focus on implementation of knowledge gained through professional development (p.193).

2.6. Why INSET Programs Fail

Iredale (1996) explains that it is generally assumed teachers who have attended a teacher training course and who are, therefore, “qualified,” are more effective in classroom than those who have not. However, this may not always be the case. There is increasing recognition that initial teacher training methods in many places are so ineffective that they add little value to the ability of a future teacher to operate effectively in classroom. Thus, scepticism about the relevance and effectiveness of initial teacher training has led to general agreement that in-service teacher education is the most effective way of ensuring that teachers adapt to changing demands (p.15).

Contrary to expectations, INSET programs do not always prove to be successful in achieving their aims, due to several reasons. In general, researchers attribute INSET programs’ lack of effectiveness to: lack of feedback, discrepancy between theory and practice, short duration, insufficient opportunities for practice teaching, distance from classroom realities, and lack of a language improvement component. Cullen (1994, p. 163), one researcher who has reservations about the efficiency of INSET programs, asserts that few teacher training courses feature either the time or the resources to provide a sufficiently intensive language improvement course which stands a reasonable chance of achieving its purpose, that is, to improve the trainees’ communicative command of the language, rather than their theoretical knowledge about it. In most countries where English is not the medium of instruction, the main concern of teachers, in particular primary and secondary
school teachers, is the need to improve their command of the language so that they can use it more fluently and more confidently in the classroom. Thus in-service programs should include this component either directly or indirectly.

Wolter (2000) criticizes INSET programs’ tendency to not provide enough feedback to the participants. He argues that INSET courses have not been satisfactory because they have failed to incorporate participant feedback and to offer activities in a continuum; they are generally one-off basis.

Apart from the lack of a language improvement component and sufficient feedback, Palmer (1993) and Breen et al. (1989) criticize INSET programs for being distant from classroom realities and for not providing a chance for participants to internalize the input they have received. Palmer (1993) states that there is usually a large gap between what happens in an in-service course and what happens subsequently in the classroom. Most trainers expect that the new ideas they present will be adapted by the teacher before they are used in a particular context. However, in-service programs are, by their very nature, usually intensive, allowing trainers little opportunity to help teachers explore the implications the innovation will have on their previously-established classroom routines and behaviors, and thus, adapt it to their particular circumstances. As a result, the full benefit of in-service program may not be attained (p.166). In the same vein, Breen et al. (1989) point out that there is a significant gap between what teachers think and do together in workshops, and what an individual teacher thinks and does in the classroom (p.126).

Miller (1998) believes that the effectiveness of INSET programs cannot be maximized due to the fact that such programs are generally short and one-shot. Other issues raised by Miller are that participants aren’t autonomous in selecting the topics of the in-service sessions, and furthermore, that knowledge is transmitted by outside experts, which could possibly render the sessions irrelevant for the trainees. Kumar (1992) focuses on another aspect of the issue, arguing that in-service courses provide teachers with insufficient opportunities to practice teach, as they are too brief, abrupt and superficial. He also claims that the topics are not specific enough to help trainees cope with their individual teaching situations.
Oser et al. (2006) draw attention to an important issue related to INSET content. They state that for several decades, teacher training programs have been designed basically around knowledge transfer or/and transfer of traditional how-to-do concepts about what works in the classroom. Such a design, they argue, lacks a fundamental core idea, namely that each teaching situation itself demands a certain competence profile of the acting profession that calls for specific professional performances and a synthesis of practical know-how and theoretical knowledge. Because these performances require spontaneous synthesis of theory and practice (p.1), the link between theory and practice must be part of the content of in-service sessions.

In addition to the aforementioned criticisms, Wolter (2000) believes that INSET courses will be more successful in affecting changes in accordance with the principles of innovation if the conditions necessary for change to occur are examined in broader context. Most INSET courses begin with rhetorically-structured arguments in favor of the innovation, before gradually progressing to more hands-on activities which encourage the participants to put what they have learnt into practice. However, theoretically sound and well-presented innovations can still fail to produce the desired effect. This is due to that fact that when dealing with practical issues, it becomes increasingly difficult to shift away from innovation-inherent aspects toward situation-specific aspects (p. 313). According to Wolter, the static structure of INSET programs becomes an obstacle to their effectiveness. Innovative content should be taught in light of the link between theory and practice.

2.7. INSET Programs abroad

A three year in-service program consisting of two-week courses with preparation and follow-up meetings in Norway was run at the Norwegian Study Centre at the University of York. The courses were intended to introduce teachers to ways of applying methodology to classroom teaching. In the first year, input sessions included aspects of teaching, such as communication skills and the use of authentic materials. This was accompanied by some material
production. In the second year, the model was modified to allow teachers a greater opportunity to familiarize themselves with new ideas and adapt them to their teaching contexts and styles. Pre-course meetings were held to acquaint participants with each other and prepare them for the course itself via awareness-raising and problem-solving activities. Finally, the time allowed for provision of input was decreased, and the workshop session was handed over to the teachers so that they might better explore where and how ideas might be applied to their own course books and programs. Hence, the INSET program was a combination of transmission, problem-solving and exploratory approaches (Palmer, 1993, p.168-171). The model was found to be advantageous in promoting innovation in the classroom by means of experiencing, reflecting, adapting and evaluating.

In the United States, a reflective model for the professional development of teachers has been applied. The American professional development school model offers possibilities for creating new ways of knowing (Darling&Hammond, 1995). In this model, the responsibilities of practicing teachers extend into areas previously considered the domain of school administrators or university faculty. Those directly involved in the school/university ventures report benefits for experienced teachers, such as increased knowledge, greater efficacy, enhanced collegial interaction, and leadership skills (Sandholtz, 2001). Teachers act as reflective practitioners, constantly evaluating their values and practices in this model (Schön, 1987). Additionally, another study conducted among 199 American teachers in four secondary schools explored the range of professional development opportunities for teachers. It was found that like students, teachers appreciate opportunities to explore, reflect, collaborate with peers, work on authentic learning tasks and engage in hands-on active learning. Thus, professional development should aim to meet the needs of each individual teacher and move beyond the traditional model (Sandholtz, 2001).

An American INSET course which began in the early 1980s was conducted in Hungary during the teachers’ summer holidays. The program featured three goals: (1) the academic specialists’ goal of enhancing the
participants’ professional skills; (2) the US government’s goal of promoting American culture; and (3) the participants’ own need to develop their individual English language proficiency. From the TEFL perspective, the goal was to present current findings on language acquisition and pedagogy. For the teacher-participants, who came from a wide spectrum of teaching situations and social classes, the American course has been one of the few opportunities to use otherwise inaccessible materials. The INSET course designing experience also helped the designers realize how important pre-planning and ongoing information gathering can be in providing a program with a high degree of relevance to the local situation (Dubin & Wong, 1990).

The Sri Lankan Primary English Language Project (PELP) aims to improve the quality of instruction of basic English language skills in primary schools in Sri Lanka by establishing a training cadre with the sustainable capacity to implement improved local-based training for English teachers. The cadre consists of the project manager and two project coordinators trained by him, who then work with him to train the 120 staff of 30 Regional English Support Centres (RESC’s). RESC staff conduct in-service courses for teachers in their localities, which should lead to improvement in classroom teaching and to improved learning for children. The results of the training revealed that children taught by RESC-trained teachers perform better than children taught by non-RESC trained teachers. Moreover, the teaching style of teachers who have participated in RESC courses is more learner-centered and activity-based than that of teachers who have not had such training.

2.8. Related Research Studies on Teacher Training in Turkey

As a result of the growing awareness and need for professional expertise, several Turkish universities such as Middle East Technical University, Başkent University, Bilkent University, Hacettepe University, Çukurova University, and Gaziantep University, have set up their own in-service training units. Several needs analysis studies and program evaluations have been conducted

Duzan (2006) conducted a study on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the in-service training program implemented for the newly hired teachers in the School of Foreign Languages at Middle East Technical University. Data were collected through questionnaires and interviews and analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The results of the study revealed that the trainees especially need to improve their practical teaching skills which are immediately necessary in the new setting. Their degree of satisfaction was also found to be high. The results about the experienced teachers showed that they did not feel the need to enroll in an in-service training program. The findings about the teacher trainers revealed that they are generally happy with the program although they listed some suggestions for improvement.

Alan (2003) conducted another study related to INSET programs, exploring in particular novice teachers’ perceptions of in-service training. The study was not a needs analysis, but rather an evaluation of an existing INSET program conducted at Anadolu University. He employed two data collection instruments: a survey and semi-structured interviews. He examined to what extent novice teachers perceived the INSET courses as valuable and in what areas of teaching they perceived INSET courses as valuable for their teaching practices. The study revealed that the participants’ perceptions of INSET workshops were generally positive. Participants found the workshop sessions on classroom management, teaching grammar and testing speaking particularly beneficial. Furthermore, they expressed the need to gain contextual knowledge about classroom management, textbook use and testing.

Another study was conducted by Şentuna (2002) in order to investigate the INSET content interests of EFL instructors working in the preparatory schools of Turkish state universities, and to determine whether or not EFL instructors feel the need for different content in in-service training programs at different points in their careers. The participants of this study were 530 instructors from a variety of Turkish universities: Akdeniz University, Anadolu University, Ankara University, Boğazici University, Celal Bayar University, Çukurova University, Dokuz Eylül
University, Ege University, Erciyes University, Hacettepe University, Karadeniz Technical University, Marmara University, Mersin University, Middle East Technical University, Muğla University, Osmangazi University, Sakarya University, Yıldız Teknik University. Data were collected through questionnaires; and quantitative data analysis techniques were used to analyze the data. The results of the data analysis revealed that the instructors are at least fairly interested in attending INSET courses on all the items asked in the questionnaire. They were found to be most interested in having further training on motivating students and raising students’ language awareness. The instructors also expressed interest in having further training on new teaching methods, using new materials, raising their students’ awareness of their goals and objectives, teaching vocabulary, speaking and reading, promoting interaction, ways of determining students’ needs, and ways of evaluating the effectiveness of teaching. The results also indicated that the novice teachers are more interested than the experienced teachers in most of the topic areas related to INSET content.

Kervancioğlu (2001) conducted a needs analysis study to investigate the in-service training needs assessment of the instructors of English in the Department of Foreign Languages at Gaziantep University. The subjects of the study were the instructors and the students of the institution. The data collection tool was a questionnaire administered to both instructors and students. General opinions of the instructors regarding in-service training programs were explored. The second aim of the study was to identify any significant differences in the perceptions of the instructors of English and the preparatory school students in terms of the subject matters that teachers should improve. 67% of the instructors marked either ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ indicating that they consider it necessary to implement in-service training programs in their departments and that they expect an improvement in their teaching performance following such programs. The study revealed statistically significant differences between the two groups’ perceptions of in-service training’s purpose and outcome. Teaching reading and speaking skills, using audio-visual aids, giving clear instructions, using various materials, motivating the students, and giving feedback were some of the points found to be
statistically significant, and hence, areas to be further trained. Kervancioğlu (2001) contends that whatever the focus or format of the INSET program is, the basic purpose of the program should be to determine what learners want and need to learn.

Another study was conducted by Karaca (1999) in twenty schools in which the medium of instruction is English, including Anatolian High Schools, Anatolian Vocational High Schools and private schools featuring English preparatory classes in Eskişehir, Sivrihisar, Çiftelex and Bozüyük. He found that in-service training is a means to build professional development in the teaching and language development process. He suggested that the in-service teacher training activities and programs should be based on what language teachers think about ELT and on how they apply it in their own classes.

Özen (1997) conducted a study investigating the perceived in-service teacher training program needs of the Freshman Unit teaching staff of Bilkent University and the question of whether implementing in-service training programs would serve in the long term to the professional development of the Freshman Unit teaching staff. Seventeen teachers were involved in the study. Questionnaires and interviews were the two data collection instruments. A questionnaire was distributed to the instructors; and the head of the department was interviewed. The results of the study indicated that Freshman Unit teachers as well as the Head of the Department perceived a need for in-service teacher training programs as a means of professional development, but that there were constraints to the implementation and development of such training programs, such as participants’ workloads, funding and access to relevant programs. The main areas to be improved were found to be: materials preparation and assessment, skills improvement, testing, curriculum design and development, classroom management, methodology, and giving feedback. Özen concluded that teachers of the Freshman Unit and the administration are enthusiastic about the benefits of in-service teacher training programs.

Finally, Korukçu (1996) carried out a study among eight English medium universities in Turkey that have both Departments of Basic English that provide a one year intensive program of English and English Language
Teaching departments. The participants were 67 ELT students in their fourth year of pre-service education and 28 beginning teachers. The data were collected through questionnaires. The aim of the study was to determine the problems of beginning teachers and the opinions of the fourth year students about the possible problems they will encounter when they start teaching. In addition, the skills and areas to be covered in an induction program were investigated as part of the study. The results indicated that teaching methods, classroom management, lesson planning and motivating the students are the most problematic areas for beginning teachers. On the other hand, the fourth year ELT students believed that they will encounter problems in terms of classroom management, lesson planning, and motivating the students when they start teaching. The experiences of beginning teachers and the opinions of ELT students revealed similar characteristics. It was also found that an induction program should provide beginning teachers with information mainly on different teaching methods, classroom management, lesson planning and motivating the students.

2.9. Reflective Teaching

Reflective teaching provides teachers with the opportunity to think critically about their own performances. Therefore, it is crucial to integrate reflective teaching as a component of INSET programs so that teachers determine their own strengths and weaknesses and the programs maximize their effectiveness.

Reflective teaching has been the concern of several authors. Richards and Nunan (1990) define teaching as an interactive process among a group of people learning in a social setting, usually described as a ‘classroom’. Reflection in teaching involves the relationship between an individual’s thought and action, and the relationship between an individual teacher and his or her membership in a larger collective called society.

Lange (1990) sees an intimate relationship between reflective teaching and teacher development: The reflective process allows developing teachers
latitude to experiment within a framework of growing knowledge and experience. It gives them the opportunity to examine their relations with students, their values, abilities and their successes and failures in realistic context. It begins the developing teacher’s path toward becoming an ‘expert teacher’ (p.240-250).

Farrel (1998) describes reflection-in-teaching as teachers subjecting their beliefs and practices of teaching to a critical analysis. ESL/EFL language teachers can benefit from reflective teaching in four main ways: (1) It helps free the teachers from impulse and routine behavior. (2) It allows teachers to act in a deliberate, intentional manner and avoid the ‘I do not know what I will do today’ syndrome. (3) It distinguishes teachers as educated human beings since it is one of the signs of intelligent action. (4) As teachers gain experience in a community of professional educators, they feel the need to grow beyond the initial stages of survival in the classroom to reconstructing their own particular theory from their practice. Reflective teaching facilitates the construction of such theory (p. 9).

Pennington (as cited in Farrel, 1998) states that there are two components of change: innovation and critical reflection. Critical reflection refers to an activity or process in which a past experience is recalled, considered and evaluated. Pennington (1992) defines reflective teaching as ‘deliberating on experience, and that of mirroring experience.’ A reflective/developmental orientation is a means for improving classroom processes and outcomes and developing confident, self-motivated teachers and learners.

Richards (1987) sees reflection as a key component of teacher development. Self inquiry and critical thinking can help teachers move from one level where they may be guided largely by impulse, intuition or routine, to a level where their actions are guided by reflection and critical thinking.

According to Schön (1987) reflection-in-action is concerned with thinking about what we are doing in the classroom while we are doing it; this thinking is supposed to reshape what we are doing.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This research project investigates the in-service teacher training needs of English language instructors at TOBB University of Economics and Technology, DFL and explores which professional skills they need to develop for their betterment as teachers. Furthermore, this study seeks to determine the scope and methodology of the teacher training unit to be set up based on the findings of the study.

This chapter is composed of four sections. The first section is an introduction which provides basic information about the study. The second section presents information concerning the number of instructors presently employed in the DFL and the number of instructors involved in this study. Factual data about the participants’ education level, teaching certification, age, gender, work experience in the field of ELT and work experience at TOBB ETU, DFL will be discussed. The third section includes information about the instruments used in data collection; and information about validity and reliability and database related to the study will be presented in the fourth section.

3.2. Participants of the Study

This study was carried out at TOBB ETU, DFL in the second semester of the 2006-2007 academic year. Although there are currently forty-five instructors in the department, this study was conducted with the cooperation of only the thirty-nine instructors teaching preparatory classes. The remaining six instructors were not included in this research project, as they teach
departmental English courses and their scope of needs might not reveal similar characteristics.

The participants signed “Subject Consent Forms” (see Appendix B), stating that they participated in the study voluntarily. The participants were assured that their names would be kept confidential and that their responses would not be used for other studies.

The number of females outweighs the number of males employed in department. The table below displays the gender distribution of the participants.

Table 3: Gender distribution of the participant instructors (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No of instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the participants were native speakers of Turkish and graduates of departments related to language. TOBB ETU’s DFL has a policy of hiring staff who are graduates of English Language or related departments. The undergraduate degrees of the instructors are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Undergraduate (BA) degrees of preparatory unit staff (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments of Graduation</th>
<th>No of Instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language and Literature</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Translation &amp; Interpretation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Culture and Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the thirty-nine instructors to whom the questionnaires were administered, are graduates of an English Language Teaching department. The remaining eighteen instructors hold a degree related to English Language.
The majority of the instructors employed in the DFL are pursuing master’s or doctorate degrees. Table 5 summarizes the educational status of the participants.

Table 5: Educational Background of the preparatory unit staff (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>No of Instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts (completed or pursuing)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phd (completed or pursuing)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2005-2006 academic year, the number of students attending preparatory classes increased and the DFL administration recruited thirty new instructors, some of whom were recent university graduates. Table 6 indicates the distribution of the participants according to their teaching experience in general.

Table 6: Total teaching experience of participants (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience (in general)</th>
<th>No of Instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than a year-1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data reveals, the number of novice instructors who have taught less than four years outweighs the number of experienced instructors in this study. The teachers with a minimum of four-years of experience are regarded as experienced in this study. As the data reveals, the number of novice instructors that have taught less than a year and at most 3 years outweigh the number of experienced instructors in this study. Day (1999) proposes that professional life cycle of a teacher passes consists five stages: launching a career, stabilization, new challenges and new concerns, reaching a professional plateau and disenchantment. The first stage is between 1-3 years of teaching experience
and during this stage, teachers go through easy or painful beginnings to their career and they are committed and enthusiastic. Taking into consideration the above mentioned professional life cycle of teachers, the teachers with a minimum of four-year experience are regarded as experienced in this study as they have passed through ‘launching a career’ stage. Therefore, it can be inferred that there are twenty novice instructors and nineteen experienced instructors who participated in this study.

In addition to the general teaching experience of the instructors hired to teach preparatory classes, their teaching experience in TOBB ETU’s DFL was considered. Table 7 reveals data concerning participants’ teaching experience at TOBB ETU.

Table 7: Teaching experience at TOBB ETU (N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience (at TOBB ETU)</th>
<th>No of Instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than a year-1 year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 1 instructor has been working in the department for 4 years, i.e. since the establishment of the university in the 2004-2005 academic year. The majority of the participants have been working in the DFL for 2-3 years.

As previously stated, this study aims at exploring the perceptions of instructors regarding in-service training programs. However, their familiarity with and involvement in a previous in-service training has potential impact on the findings. Table 8 summarizes whether or not the instructors had participated in other INSET programs:
It was expected that most of the participants would not have attended other INSET programs, as 51% are novice instructors. The findings related to involvement in a previous INSET program were contradictory to the expectation. Although more than half of the staff is composed of novice instructors, 64% claim to have taken part in an in-service program prior to this research project.

The participants of this study were also asked whether or not they had obtained a formal teaching certificate. Table 9 reveals the number of instructors who had obtained at least one certificate:

Table 9: Distribution of participants possessing a formal teaching certificate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Certificate</th>
<th>No of Instructors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal that although 54% of the instructors have graduated from departments other than English Language Teaching, a dominant majority of them possess a formal teaching certificate. Most of the participants obtained the certificates before graduation from university in their senior years. 15% of the participants attended Certificate of English Language Teaching (CERTELT) or Diploma in English Language Teaching (DIPLET) programs pursuant to their undergraduate degrees.

The Chairperson of the department also participated in this study. He holds both a BA and a MA degree in English Language Teaching as well as another MA degree and a PhD degree in Curriculum and Instruction. He has an extensive educational background in language teaching, which is an advantage to understand the needs of the instructors teaching English. He has taught general
English courses at all levels, offered English for Specific Purposes courses at his previous workplaces, and trained some teachers in INSET courses.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

By means of this study, the researcher aimed to determine the perceptions and needs of the preparatory class instructors in terms of teacher training and she decided that the study could prove its concurrent validity by triangulation. Triangular techniques in the social sciences attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint (Cohen et al., 2000, p.112). Therefore, this study employs both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments such as questionnaires, interviews and class video recordings.

Rossman and Wilson (cited in Miles&Huberman, 1994) suggest three broad reasons for why there is a need to link qualitative and quantitative data: 1) to enable confirmation or corroboration of data via triangulation; 2) to elaborate or develop analysis, providing richer detail; and 3) to initiate new lines of thinking through attention to surprises and paradoxes, “turning ideas around”, providing fresh insight (p. 54). For this reason, this study aimed to gain insights about the viewpoints of the instructors by providing rich details concerning the scope of the study.

3.3.1 Questionnaires

A questionnaire was designed for this study with the purpose of determining the needs of the instructors with respect to in-service teacher training. The questionnaire also gathered information about the perceptions of instructors regarding the establishment of a Teacher Training Unit in the department, and the scope and the methodology of the teacher training unit that will be set up in the 2007-2008 academic year were investigated. The questionnaire administered to the instructors was prepared with the guidance of
the research method books by Cohen, Lawrence and Morrison (2000) and the studies of Tevs (1996), Türkay (2000), Alan (2003), Özen (1997) and Kervancioğlu (2001). The sample questionnaires were compared and common important items which related to identifying the needs of the participants were selected. The related items were then modified to fit the context of this research project.

The initial data were collected by means of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) administered to 39 instructors teaching the preparatory classes in the second semester of the 2006-2007 academic year. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part consisted of 42 Likert-scale items. Items 1-14 aimed to determine the perceptions of the instructors concerning the characteristics of in-service teacher training programs. Items 15-33 included statements to determine the needs of the instructors in terms of professional development. Items 34-42 focused on determining the ideal methodology for an in-service training program. The second part of the questionnaire included one open-ended question and a section requesting further comments on in-service training practices at TOBB ETU, DFL. Some of the answers to open-ended questions were quoted by using pseudonyms for anonymity purposes and they were presented in the Results chapter. Participants were also asked to suggest a name for the teacher training department that is to be established in the 2007-2008 academic year. Upon determining the suggestions, a poll was undertaken to choose the best name for the Unit. This question was added to the questionnaire with the aim of demonstrating the value given to the participants’ input into the decision making process. The third part of the questionnaire collected personal data about the participants.

3.3.1.1 Reliability

After the first draft of the questionnaire was completed, alterations were made to both the format and the content, pursuant to consultation with three colleagues in the DFL and the thesis advisor.
Pre-testing is crucial for the success of any questionnaire. Pilot studies are used primarily to increase the reliability, validity and practicality of the questionnaire (Oppenheim, 1992; Wilson and McLean, 1994). As the second step of this research project, a pilot study was conducted at Gazi University’s Department of Foreign Languages, among sixteen preparatory class teachers. This university was chosen for the pilot study because this department, like TOBB ETU’s DFL, does not have an in-service training unit.

Afterwards, the results were computed in SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) 13 version and Cronbach Alpha Analysis was calculated to find the reliability coefficients of the questionnaire. A value of .85 was found. The results of the pilot study indicated that the questionnaire was reliable.

3.3.2 Class Video Recordings

Video recordings of lessons held by the participants were utilized as a second data collection tool. The 50-minute lessons of ten instructors who completed the questionnaire were videotaped for this study. Although data based on direct observations allows the researcher to have first hand information, direct observation was not used as a means of data collection in this study. Due to the administrative position of the researcher in TOBB ETU’s DFL, her presence in the classroom could have influenced the attitude and teaching of the instructors. Thus, instead of participant-observation by the researcher, class sessions were recorded by one of the instructors in the department and these recordings were utilized as data collection tool in this study.

Five of the instructors whose classes were videotaped by one of the instructors in the DFL were novice instructors whereas the remaining five instructors were experienced. The main purpose of recording the classes of both novice and experienced instructors was to determine whether their practical needs determined via the questionnaire correlated to the findings of the video recordings.
The videotaped lessons were then transcribed and analyzed via a structured observation tool (see Appendix C). The observation tool consisted of subcategories like self-presentation and classroom persona, classroom management, classroom procedures and lesson planning, giving feedback, error correction and giving instructions. The subcategories were determined based on the findings of the questionnaire. The sub-section of the questionnaire which aimed at identifying the perceived needs of the instructors was thoroughly examined to determine the points to be observed via videotape. The findings concerning classroom management, classroom procedures and lesson planning, giving feedback, error correction and giving instructions were some of the skills determined as less problematic, according to the results of the questionnaire analysis. Several items, such as ‘teaching mixed ability groups’, ‘promoting collaboration among students’, ‘motivating the students’ and ‘raising language awareness of the students’ on the questionnaire were further explored during the class video recordings. The reason why the researcher focused on these items was their mean scores. To clarify, giving instructions, error correction, giving feedback, and lesson planning were the items for which the instructors reported the lowest need for additional training. As for classroom management, the slight difference between the mean scores of the novice and experienced instructors on the questionnaire raised the need to explore whether this difference was the same in a real classroom environment. Therefore, issues of classroom management were analyzed on the class videotapes. The subcategory of self-presentation and classroom persona was particularly essential, as the teacher’s attitude and behavior are closely related to the ability to manage the class.

3.3.3. Interviews

Pursuant to the video recordings, the final data collection tool administered in this study was interviews. As interviews are a crucial means of qualitative research which complement quantitative data, the participants were
interviewed so that they have the opportunity to personalize issues stated in the questionnaires and observed in the video recordings.

The research interview serves three purposes. First, it is used as the principal means of gathering information having direct bearing on the research objectives. Second, it is utilized to test hypotheses or to suggest new ones; or as an explanatory device to help identify variables and relationships. And third, the interview is used in conjunction with other methods in research undertaking (Cohen et al., 2000, p.268).

An interview guide is used in this study as the interview format. This approach allows the interviewer to specify a range of questions to be covered in advance which facilitates formulating the wording and the order of the questions. However, the interviewer has the flexibility to modify the pre-determined questions according to the individuals to create a natural conversation (Lynch, 1996, p.128). With a view to encompass the previously used data collection instruments, interview questions were determined on the basis of the results of the questionnaire and the class video recordings. Interviews were held with 10 instructors whose classes were videotaped. Appointments were made with the instructors individually and the interviewees were handed the questions beforehand. There were some common questions like ‘How do you evaluate the findings of the questionnaire about classroom management? Do you think novice teachers encounter more classroom management problems than experienced teachers?’, ‘What should be the scope of an INSET program?’, ‘How do you evaluate the findings of the questionnaire about giving instructions, teaching mixed ability groups?’, ‘Do you prefer to be trained by external trainers or by one of your colleagues in the Department? Why?’. The above mentioned questions were asked to each interviewee but several question items were based on the individual questionnaire responses and the findings of the videotapes. The researcher conducted a semi-structured interview because although the questions were predetermined, some instant questions arose during the interviews.

The interviewees were asked to reflect on their own responses in the questionnaire as well as the general findings of the triangulated data.
Furthermore, they were requested to elaborate on the findings of the video recordings. As the participants were asked to look backwards and to deal with their experiences, this study bears the characteristics of a retrospective study. All interviews were videotaped and transcribed. Some answers of the interviewees were quoted with pseudonyms for anonymity purposes. Then, the interviews were analyzed and interpreted by coding the recurring themes under pre-determined headings, obtained via interview questions.

The basic codes in the analysis were concerning giving feedback, error correction, teaching mixed ability groups, teaching pronunciation, giving instructions, classroom management, the need for an external trainer, the scope and sequence besides the methodology of the in-service training programs, classroom interaction, the need to be trained on language proficiency, and finally the common points with respect to the needs of both novice and experienced instructors and whether novice and experienced instructors need to be trained in the same in-service training programs.

Apart from the interviews held with 10 instructors, an interview was conducted with the Chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages at TOBB ETU, with a view to ascertain to what extent the perceptions of the instructors concerning INSET design and the professional needs correlate with the perception of the administration. The interview lasted approximately one hour and was tape recorded. The questions were handed to the Chairperson beforehand, and he was directed similar questions that the instructors elaborated on. His answers were also analyzed qualitatively and the findings are presented under the related research question. The interview was transcribed and the answers were compared with those of the teaching staff to specify the areas of similarities and differences between the Chairperson and the teaching staff.

3.4. Database

A comprehensive research has been conducted for this study. Relevant literature on teacher training and the studies alike were scrutinized so as to
prepare questionnaire items. Eight different questionnaires of related research projects were overviewed. A total number of 211 items were thoroughly examined. After the questionnaire items were determined, a pilot study was conducted among sixteen instructors at Gazi University, Department of Foreign Languages. The pilot study was administered on February 26th, 2007.

Pursuant to the pilot study, the participants at TOBB ETU, DFL were distributed the questionnaire and the “Subject Consent Forms” (see Appendix B). The questionnaires and the forms were collected on March 30th, 2007. As the second step of the research, an observation analysis sheet (see Appendix C) has been designed with reference to Eröz’s observation tool (2007) with an additional overview of five other tools. Video recordings were carried out by one of the English language instructors in the DFL. 50-minute lessons of 10 instructors were videotaped and the recordings lasted 8,5 hours. Some essential points from the videotaped lessons were first noted down and the findings were transferred to the structured observation tool. The transcriptions lasted 15 hours.

Upon pursuing the questionnaires and class video recordings, interviews were held with ten instructors. Each interview lasted approximately 1 hour and a total of 10 hours were spent for the interviews. Interviews were conducted from April, 30th to May, 4th 2007 and were transcribed in 20 hours. Following the instructor interviews, an appointment was arranged with the Chairperson of the department in advance and an interview was conducted on April 19th, 2007. The interview was audio taped and then transcribed in 2 hours. A total of 55,5 hours were spent for the data collection and analysis of this research project.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

4.1. Introduction

This study gathered data concerning the needs of the instructors employed in the preparatory program of the DFL at TOBB ETU, pertaining to the concept of professional development. All thirty-nine instructors teaching preparatory classes and the Chairperson of the DFL were involved in this study which sought primarily to identify the needs and viewpoints of the instructors. The results were analyzed to determine whether the views of experienced and novice teachers differed. Furthermore, this study sought to ascertain the essential qualities of an effective teacher training program and the best practice methods to be implemented in the training sessions.

For the purpose of this study, three research questions have been formulated:

1- What are the opinions of instructors and administrators at TOBB ETU Department of Foreign Languages concerning in-service teacher training, in terms of its scope, instructional methods and trainer profile?

2- What professional needs do instructors at TOBB ETU, DFL have that should be addressed by an in-service training program?

3- Is there a difference between novice and experienced instructors in terms of their needs and expectations from an in-service training program?

In the subsequent sections of this chapter, the results obtained from data analysis will be presented and discussed.
4.2. The opinions of instructors and administrators at TOBB ETU
Department of Foreign Languages concerning in-service teacher training, in terms of its scope, instructional methods and trainer profile.

The first research question seeks to determine to what extent the instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL believe in-service training programs are essential for their professional development. Moreover, it aims to analyze the opinions of the participants regarding the characteristics, scope and instructional methods of INSET programs. In order to accomplish this aim, data were collected through questionnaires, class video recordings and interviews.

As shown in Table 10 below, the mean scores of the answers given to items 1-14, which are related to the characteristics of INSET programs, vary between 2.85 and 4.67 and the mean scores of items 34-42, which are concerned with the methodology of INSET programs, vary between 2.64 and 4.21. Item 7 stating that INSET programs should guide the trainee teachers to reflect on their own teaching received the highest mean score (M=4.67) whereas item 39 which was about benefiting from diary studies as part of the INSET programs received the lowest mean score (2.64).

The following table displays the items 1-14 and 34-42 with the mean scores and standard deviations:
Table 10: Items Related to Characteristics and Instructional Methods of INSET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It.7 INSET programs should guide the trainee teachers to reflect on</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.13 Administrators should allocate budget to staff to attend</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.6 INSET programs should keep the trainee teachers up-to-date on</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recent methods, theories etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.1 INSET as professional development</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.5 INSET programs should encourage follow-up activities such as</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferences, seminars etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.2 INSET maintains a balance between the teacher and the</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.3 INSET should provide the teachers with practical teaching</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.8 INSET programs should be conducted by external trainers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.40 INSET programs should include discussions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.36 INSET programs should include workshops</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.41 The delivery of information needn’t be trainer-centered</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.14 I would regularly attend the INSET program at TOBB ETU, the</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFL, if conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.42 The flow of information should be trainee-centered</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.12 All teachers, novice and experienced, needn’t take part the</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same INSET programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.37 INSET programs should include dialog journals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It. 11 All teachers, novice and experienced, should take part in</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.38 INSET programs should include audio/video recordings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.35 INSET programs should include microteaching</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.4 INSET should introduce activities that increase language</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiency of the trainee teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.10 INSET programs shouldn’t be compulsory</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.34 INSET programs should include peer observations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It. 9 INSET programs should be conducted by the Teacher Training</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.39 INSET programs should include diary studies</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Among the items 1-14, the highest mean score (M= 4.67) was found for item 7 which stated that in-service training programs should guide the trainee teachers to reflect on their own teaching. Based on this finding, it can be interpreted that the INSET model which will be prepared pursuant to this research project should encompass Wallace’s (1991) Reflective Model in which the effectiveness of INSET courses depend on how well they relate to trainees’ own reflection and practice.

In addition, participants would like INSET programs to encourage the teachers to follow activities such as participating conferences and seminars and reading recent articles. Indeed, the mean scores of item 5 (M=4.44) and item 6 (M=4.59) indicate that instructors are eager to be kept up-to-date on recent methods, theories and trends in the field of English Language Teaching, and to be encouraged to attend conferences and seminars and read the most recently written articles. Koç (1992) and Palmer (1993) suggest that INSET programs should keep the trainees up-to-date on new developments and methodology. The findings related to item 5 and item 6, supports the viewpoints 87% of the instructors stated that INSET programs should encourage trainee teachers to follow activities such as conferences, seminars, recent articles. 95% of the group agreed that INSET programs should keep the trainee teachers up-to-date on recent methods, theories and trends in the field of ELT.

Because a decision about the scope might influence the whole program, the researcher asked the participants to state their opinions about the scope and sequence of the INSET program, both on the questionnaires and in the interviews. In the first item of the questionnaire, instructors were asked if they perceived INSET programs as a means of professional development. Taking into consideration the mean score of item 1 (M=4.5), it was noted that instructors were interested in attending INSET programs. The participants with whom interviews were conducted were also asked to comment on the relationship between INSET programs and professional development. Nine out of ten instructors reported in the interviews that they believed INSET programs are essential for the improvement of teaching performance and that they would like to participate in the INSET program that will be designed in the 2007-2008
Taking into consideration the results of the data collection instruments, it can be inferred that 95% of the participants regard INSET programs as a means of professional development.

In addition to the instructors, the Chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages was consulted via an interview to determine whether or not his perceptions of INSET programs resembled the teachers’ perceptions. Identifying the opinions of the Chairperson was particularly essential, as he is the main decision maker in the department and his ideas will directly impact the structure of the INSET programs to be implemented in the 2007-2008 academic year. When asked to elaborate on the meaning of professional development, the Chairperson suggested that professional development requires improving and looking for more and encouraged the attainment of new ideas and perspectives. He stated that in-service training programs are an integral part of professional development. He added that the basic aim of in-service training is to equip instructors and administrators with changing and developing educational perspectives and to provide them with the necessary knowledge and skills to perform efficiently during this process. The viewpoint of the Chairperson confirms the instructors’ opinion that it is crucial to design INSET programs as part of professional development.

Item 3 (M=4.26), the need to be trained on practical teaching skills, item 4 (M=3.18), the desire to improve on language proficiency, item 5 (M=4.44), the desire to follow activities such as conferences, seminars and recent articles, and item 6 (M=4.59), the desire to be kept updated with recent methods, theories and trends in the field of ELT, in the questionnaire aimed to identify the preferred content of the in-service training program to be offered in TOBB ETU’s DFL in the 2007-2008 academic year. According to the responses to the questionnaire item 3 (M=4.26), 85% of the thirty-nine instructors believed that INSET programs should provide them with practical teaching skills, such as classroom organization, skills integration, giving instructions, error correction and the like. When the 10 instructors were asked in the interviews to state their opinions regarding the scope of INSET programs, on the whole, they said they did not want to be trained on skills or strategies that are unnecessary for them.
and their students. Similarly, the interviewees mentioned that the number of participants might vary in every session, as the number of people who have the need for that specific course might also differ. The participants of each session could be determined via a needs analysis questionnaire or one-to-one conversations. One of the novice instructors stated that there should be some sessions on how to improve classroom management. Another interviewee pointed out that the recent trends in English language teaching, like web-based or collaborative teaching had better be incorporated into the program. The mean score of item 4 (M=3.2), the desire to improve on language proficiency, revealed that some instructors like to have training on improving their language proficiency. According to Cullen (1994, p.163), in most countries where English is not the medium of communication, the main concern of teachers is the need to improve their command of the language so that they can use it more fluently and more confidently in the classroom. Thus, in-service programs should include this component, either directly or indirectly.

Dubin and Wong (1990) emphasize that INSET usually takes place for a specific purpose; therefore, gathering information at the outset to obtain a meaningful needs analysis is crucial. It can be deduced from the findings related to item 3 that that this needs analysis study matches the expectations of the participants who like to focus on their individual needs based on a needs analysis in an INSET program.

The responses to item 4 (M=3.18) revealed that some instructors do not want the training programs to introduce activities that increase the trainee teachers’ language proficiency. This item was further analyzed in interviews and Çınar expressed that participants do not need to improve their language skills:

Çınar: At TOBB ETU, we have really qualified teachers. Some of them are not very experienced but they all have great certificates diplomas for teaching English and I do not think they need to be trained on how to improve their language skills.

As this statement exemplifies, when the interviewees were asked to comment on whether there is a need for the instructors to be trained on improving language proficiency, participants agreed that they did not need further training on this
subject. Only one out of ten instructors stated that INSET programs should incorporate activities related to improving the trainees’ language proficiency:

Derya: *I once attended a program held at our university, but there was not a workshop on language proficiency for example. Maybe people think that it’s not necessary for a teacher at first; but, I think it is necessary, because we sometimes make mistakes. That’s why I believe we should be trained on improving our language proficiency.*

Taking into consideration the above statement and the percentage (38%) of the participants who indicated on the questionnaire that they would like to participate in program activities related to improving language proficiency, it can be interpreted that the participants have divergent opinions on this item. Dubin and Wong (1990) suggest, however, that improving trainees’ language proficiency is crucial; in fact, they designed an INSET course with this purpose in Hungary, which proved to be successful in accomplishing their aims. Language teachers should display constant effort to improve their language skills, be it through reading, watching films in the target language, participating in a weekly or daily conversation group, hanging out with native speaker friends, keeping a diary or writing essays, stories in the language, or traveling regularly to places where the language is spoken by natives. Considering that all of the teachers in the DFL are non-native speakers, INSET programs aimed at improving language proficiency could be very productive especially for those who emphasized their need to improve their command of language.

In order to identify the expectations of the instructors in terms of the trainer profile, two items were included in the questionnaire. The mean scores of item 8 (M=4.26) and item 9 (M=2.85) revealed that the instructors who participated in this study believe that the in-service training programs that will be organized in the institution subsequent to this study would be better organized by external trainers. However, the mean scores of the experienced (M=3.8) and novice instructors (M=4.7) demonstrated that the opinions of both groups diverged. Six out of ten instructors who took part in the interviews commented further on this item. It was noted in the interview that four
instructors had serious reservations about being trained by one of their department colleagues:

Elif: *We’re all colleagues here. For example, if somebody from this school is assigned to give training, and he or she gives feedback or criticizes, individuals might take it personally. In order to avoid interpersonal clashes, it’s better to use external trainers.*

Another participant explained the disadvantage of being trained by one of their colleagues in the DFL differently:

Feyza: *And if we have an internal trainer, well, if you ask me, it wouldn’t be really exciting for me to attend the classes... If someone tells me, so-and-so is going to give a presentation, I know what I’m going to get from that person. But if someone tells we’ll have a guest, and he or she is going to give a presentation about such-and-such topic, I would be really interested in hearing it, because I do not know anything about this person.*

The above statements revealed that some instructors are more willing to be trained by experts outside the institution than by one of their colleagues in the DFL. However, two instructors stated that their criterion is to be trained by professional, experienced trainers instead of making a choice between being trained by an insider or outsider. They added that they would not mind having internal trainers if one of their peers had 10-15 years experience and expertise in training teachers and designing INSET programs and was appointed as a teacher trainer.

One of the experienced instructors stated that he was undecided about whether it would be better to be trained by an internal or an external trainer. He suggested that the staff would feel more relaxed and might be more open if somebody from the institution was assigned for this position. He added that, on the one hand, an external trainer might not be knowledgeable enough about the DFL’s resources and needs to be effective; but, on the other hand, s/he might be more knowledgeable about ELT practices and agendas at other universities and share his/her knowledge and experiences, which might be an advantage for the institution. This instructor maintained that both alternatives had advantages and
disadvantages; and he proposed that an internal trainer work in collaboration with experts outside the institution:

Çınar: I said “neutral,” because I believe this could be a blend of two alternatives, O.K, both somebody in the faculty, in-house training, and, of course, people from outside. They could work together in collaboration, and this could be more beneficial for us also.

In addition to being addressed via the Likert scale items on the questionnaire and instructors’ interview statements, the trainer profile was emphasized by some instructors’ in the open-ended section of the questionnaire. Semra drew attention to the importance of assigning an experienced and well-equipped trainer like this:

Semra: I believe setting up a teacher training unit requires a highly organized and planned attempt and a teacher trainer should be well-equipped, highly experienced and someone who will be able to meet the needs of the trainees.

Similarly, Ayşe expressed the necessity to appoint experienced and qualified trainers in the following way:

Ayşe: The teacher trainer should be quite experienced and be someone who has been in the business for a long time. I do not want to be trained by an inexperienced teacher or trainer who doesn’t have the required qualifications that a trainer should have.

It can be interpreted from the above three statements that a teacher trainer should be competent in terms of qualifications, be able to address the needs of the trainees upon determining them, and be experienced enough to present his/her expertise to trainees. The comments elicited from the instructors revealed that they have some reservations about assigning somebody within the institution this responsibility. Indeed, an environment based on trust and sincerity is required when an internal trainer is in charge with teacher training programs.

Apart from obtaining information about the instructors’ viewpoints regarding the trainer profile, the researcher asked the Chairperson’s opinion of potential
trainers for the Unit. He stated that both internal and external trainers might be appropriate for such a program, depending on the context, as both might address different aspects of professional development. For example, an internal trainer who knows the trainees in person might monitor their needs better. But, guest speakers would bring a new perspective to the department by sharing their experiences with the trainees. Inviting guest speakers with different backgrounds and fields of expertise to the DFL would provide a variety of INSET opportunities for the instructors. Hence, the opinions of the instructors and the Chairperson indicate that benefiting from the experiences of various professionals as well as assigning a trainer within the department will satisfy more trainees and increase the motivation of the trainees.

The Likert scale questionnaire analysis for item 10 (M=3.33), stating that attendance to INSET programs shouldn’t be compulsory, demonstrated that 46% of the group believed that participation to the INSET programs should be optional. An additional 28% of the instructors were undecided about compulsory attendance. This item was further analyzed through interviews. One of the instructors expressed her reservation about compulsory participation to the in-service training programs, stating that she would feel under pressure if they were compulsory. Yet, still another instructor believed that such programs should be compulsory, stating that the program would be more standardized and address all teachers at the same time. Another point of view from one of the respondents was that the instructors should be free to decide which program s/he will attend, as some instructors might have been trained on similar topics before. The findings of the interview verified the point of view that INSET programs should not be compulsory for every instructor. This finding confirms the recommendation of England (1998) that INSET programs should provide a list of elective options selected by the teacher. The most acceptable view obtained from this study is to design interest groups and train the instructors based on their individual needs, and also, to ask the instructors whether they would like to participate or not. The findings of this study indicate that some of the instructors do not want to be involved in all the sessions, as they have studied some of the subject matter in their master’s or doctoral courses, and
hence requested that the sessions have optional attendance. Likewise, being trained on some of the topics in a previous teacher training program affected their decision. The final reason is that they would like to make decisions autonomously. The findings related to attendance to INSET programs were different from the findings of Özen’s (1997) study. In her study, there was a divergence in the responses of teachers regarding compulsory attendance to INSET programs.

4.2.1.1. The Name of the Training Unit

In the second section of the questionnaire, instructors were asked to suggest a name for the Teacher Training Unit to be set up in TOBB ETU’s DFL. The purpose of including such a question was to emphasize the value of the instructors’ input in the decision making process. Out of thirty-nine instructors, twenty-three responded to this item. Some suggestions were as follows:
- ETU Teachers’ Guide
- Professional Development Center
- Lifelong Learning Unit
- TESL (Training for English as a Second Language)
- TOBB Trainees
- CTC (Cooperative / Collaborative Teachers / Teaching Center )
- Teacher Updating Center (TUC)
- In service Training Unit
- Teachers in Training (TIT)
- Support Center for Teachers
- TTDU
- Training Unit for DFL Teachers at TOBB ETU
- TOBB TETU
- Teaching to Learn, Learning to Teach
- Energy Unit
- Teacher Training Unit
- Happy Hour
- Learning To Teach
- TOBB IDC (Instructor Development Center)
- In-service Training Unit
- Center of Caring and Sharing (CCS)

After collecting the suggested names, a poll was taken and the best name was chosen. Two instructors did not mark any options. Out of thirty-seven respondents, thirteen marked “Professional Development Center.” The selection of this name for the in-service training unit that will be set up in DFL completely coincided with the answers to the first research question; i.e., the results of the poll confirmed that “professional development” is crucial for the instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL.

Besides the names suggested above, one of the participants explained in one of the open-ended questions of the questionnaire that the name should remind one that this is an opportunity to “develop” and that it ought to stress the need for “caring and sharing.” Another instructor pointed out that the name could be decided after needs were identified; and still another rejected the concept of a “unit,” stating that the trend is the contrary; in-service training practices are held with the coordination and collaboration of all the staff, rather than being managed by particular people employed in such a Unit.

Item 12 (M=3.64) of the questionnaire, stating that all novice and experienced teachers needn’t take part the same INSET programs revealed that participants mainly liked to be offered different trainings for novice and experienced instructors. This item was also further analyzed through interviews, since one part of this study is to determine differing viewpoints of novice and experienced instructors. When asked in the interviews if attendance to the program should be dependent on the level of experience, participants expressed some varying points of view. One of the novice instructors stated that she wouldn’t like instructors to be classified as novice or experienced during training sessions. Similarly, one of the experienced instructors stated that the groups should not be categorized as “novice” and “experienced,” but
should be categorized according to instructors’ needs. She also stated that there are some very important reasons why novice and experienced instructors should not be trained separately:

Neslihan: I believe in learning from each other. So if you separate teachers in 2 different groups as novice and experienced, you immediately introduce a clear cut distinction. So... instead of building a sense of community, you are actually separating two groups, and therefore, hindering the interaction which will be very beneficial. During the sessions, people learn from each other. I mean, the interaction should not be only from the presenter to the audience, but also, participants are interacting. So I think, having the whole group, novice and experienced, in one place will foster a lot of interaction; and this in turn, will produce, you know, experience brought into the situation. Sometimes experienced teachers are really burned out. They think, ‘O.K., I do not want to do it anymore, or I know this already.’ But seeing the younger ones and their enthusiasm, their motivation and what they do, they might also become, you know, curious again about improving themselves. So they learn from each other.

The above statement implies that interaction of novice and experienced instructors enhances group dynamism and collaboration among colleagues, and helps to build a sense of community among the group of teachers. Conversely, two experienced instructors highlighted the importance of giving separate training to novice and experienced instructors; but their rationales differed. One of them stated there would not be many common points to be learned by both groups, and that the training would bore the experienced instructors, as they would most likely already know the subject matter to be trained. The other experienced instructor highlighted the fact that placing novice and experienced instructors into the same training seminar might produce an unfair competitive environment, where peers try to prove themselves to each other.

In order to compare the viewpoints of the instructors and the Chairperson concerning the target group of the teacher training activities, the Chairperson was requested to express his opinion about whether all instructors, novice and experienced, should all attend the INSET activities. He stated that the target group of training should be all the instructors, including both novice and experienced individuals. He suggested that designing interest groups and
identifying the individual needs of the instructors will possibly minimize problems.

After stating that the groups can be categorized based on the needs of instructors, the Chairperson categorized some of the programs that should be offered to trainees according to their profiles: pre-service training, job definition and adaptation training and on the job training are essential for novice teachers and newly recruited staff in order to ease their adaptation to the workplace and inform them about the policies of the institution. Furthermore, he said, it is necessary for the coordinators to be trained on management science and technology, research and development, problem-solving, total quality management, change management, crisis management, organizational development, synergy and time management, stress management, conflict management and project management, as they are the main decision makers in their units and in the DFL and have to solve numerous problems. The Chairperson stated that the above mentioned seminars will contribute to coordinators’ professional development, and in turn, will help them to better carry out their responsibilities.

When the Chairperson was asked to comment on the scope of the INSET program planned to be implemented in the department in the 2007-2008 academic year, he stated that teachers should be trained on practical teaching skills such as teaching the language skills, classroom management which will enable them to be more competent in their jobs by improving their professional skills and addressing the needs of their learners. Furthermore, training on technology use is an important subject to include in INSET programs, according to the Chairperson. He elaborated on this point, stating that TOBB is “the university of technology,” and that this requires the integration of technology into language teaching. He attaches particular importance to web based and computer based instruction in language teaching. Currently, a software program is used for materials development in the department. The Chairperson would like to enlarge the scope of such materials development activities. He mentioned the project-based study of the teachers in TOBB ETU’s DFL that was granted an award by The Center for European Union Education and Youth Programs in 2006. He added that INSET
programs should incorporate the preparation of new projects that will enable the teachers to work collaboratively, contribute to their professional development, and enhance overall teacher quality. Finally, he focused on the importance of learner centered instruction as part of the INSET programs. He believes teachers become better qualified by putting the principles of learner centered instruction into practice during the teaching-learning process of in-service training programs. According to this principle, the student is the focus of attention and the learner is an active and engaged participant in activities that arouse interest and encourage student learning. Students are encouraged to become responsible, independent and reflective learners who continue learning throughout their lives. It is essential for the chairperson that INSET programs train teachers to learn about the individual differences of students through observation and interaction. In the same vein, instructors stated that they would like to learn how to better address their students’ needs and expectations which implies that learner centered instruction is essential both for the administration and the instructors.

On the whole, the findings were all related to the first research question, confirming that instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL attach importance to INSET programs as part of their professional development, and that they would like these programs to have a variety of components and to add value to their professional development. The viewpoint of the administration confirms the findings obtained from the instructors. But, having different ideas about the scope of the INSET program activities, the Chairperson draws attention to the integration of web-based learning and project-based activities, and the principles of learner centered instruction.

Taking into consideration of the role and content of INSET programs in the professional development of teachers, Dubin and Wong (1990) also emphasize the role of the INSET programs of higher education institutions in the professional development of teachers. The eagerness of their study’s participants to be kept up-to-date on recent methods or to be encouraged to follow activities such as conferences and seminars indicated that professional development is essential for instructors. In terms of the scope of INSET programs, Waxman (2006, p.189-193) points out, professional development must be comprehensive and systematic at all
levels. Similarly, Ur (1992) proposes that INSET programs feature varied content so that trainees gain a multidimensional perspective and will learn activities different from the repetitive activities they use in their actual classrooms.

Incorporating all the above mentioned items to in-service programs will render the program comprehensive. The findings of this study coincided with Alan’s (2003), Özen’s (1997) and Kervancioğlu’s (2001) studies indicating that teachers regard INSET programs essential for their professional development.

4.2.1.2. Instructional Methodology for INSET

Besides collecting information about the instructors’ thoughts on the scope of the INSET program, this study seeks to determine the types of methods instructors regard as essential for benefitting in teacher training programs. It is believed that the instructors would feel more involved in the process of INSET design if their ideas were taken into consideration, and that this would ensure the establishment of a positive atmosphere during training sessions. Questionnaire items 34-42 were designed with this purpose in mind. They focused on determining the methods which were frequently preferred by the instructors.

The findings of the questionnaire revealed that workshops and discussions, items 36 (M=4.15), workshops, and 40 (M=4.21), discussions, were the most favoured instructional methods for an in-service program. It was observed that using discussions to exchange ideas in INSET programs in item 40 (M=4.3) received the highest mean score among novice instructors. As for experienced instructors, they most often marked workshops (M=4.3) as their preferred method. When the least favorite methods were explored, it was found that diary studies in item 39 were the least preferred method (M=2.7 for novice and M=2.6 for experienced), compared to the other items. Furthermore, the mean score of item 34 (M=3.00) indicated that some instructors were less enthusiastic about peer observations. Concerning the preferred instructional methods, interview findings confirmed the questionnaire results. During interviews, the instructors were asked to reflect on their responses, taking the questionnaire results on the methodology of INSET programs into
consideration. All the interviewees expressed their eagerness to participate in workshops and discussions, as these formats enable participants to interact, share and exchange ideas while doing hands-on activities. One of the instructors pointed out the importance of interaction, particularly among novice and experienced instructors. She added that this might bring dynamism and energy to experienced teachers, particularly if there are any teachers suffering from burn out.

Furthermore, peer observations in item 34 (M=3.00) received the second lowest mean score among items 34-42 which were related to instructional methods. When two instructors were asked to comment on using observations, mainly peer observations as a method in an INSET program, the novice instructor, Feyza, stated that she disliked being observed either by the administration or by a peer. Being observed made her feel very uneasy, and it distracted her during the lesson. When asked why she felt so uneasy about being observed, she confided that she had had a very difficult experience in her CELTA course abroad, and that her trainers had criticized her very unfairly. She was hardly ever praised by the trainers in the feedback sessions and this discouraged her to a large extent. A second, more experienced instructor, Neslihan, explained the reasons for her reservation:

Neslihan: Well, it’s good. I mean, the intention is good and people do it with goodwill. But it really has to be perfectly structured and the person who is doing it should really know what he or she is doing. It might destroy the positive, supportive atmosphere in the institution. People might feel threatened. So the person who’s observing really should know what he or she should observe and have very good relationships with people. People should trust him or her. Well, all these conditions are really challenging. It’s very difficult. So peer observation should be done very carefully.

It can be inferred from the above statement that peer observation should be well-structured. Peers should be trained on how to give feedback so as not to destroy the positive, supportive atmosphere in the institution. Otherwise, observation cannot accomplish its aim.

One of the instructors suggested recording as an alternative for peer observation. Another instructor stated that observations should be optional. He
was not completely against observations; but, he recommended systematic observations at fixed intervals, for example, three times a year. He stated that this helps to monitor the progress of the teachers. He mentioned that if the observations were conducted for evaluation, they could turn out to be an exam and put pressure on the observed teacher. However, if such regular observations were for developmental purposes, they would be more productive for the teachers.

Diary studies in item 39, (M=2.64) were regarded as the least favorite method likely to be used during trainings. As for diary studies, there was a unanimous agreement that they are not preferable when compared to other methods, due to several reasons. To start with, there is some concern about diary studies’ subjectivity. Several instructors stated that no one can be critical towards himself or herself; and thus, diaries are subjective data. Furthermore, Neslihan stated that even though the aim of keeping diaries is to enable the teacher to reflect on his or her own experience, the result is mainly pages of paper full of factual data. In her opinion, keeping a diary does not serve its purpose, as it does not guarantee reflection. Derya reflected on her experience during her bachelor years, revealing why she had some reservations about keeping diaries. Her teacher had made her and her classmates keep teaching diaries and the outcome hadn’t been very productive or beneficial for her.

Pennington (1989), suggests that INSET courses should include “individual and group experiences involving case studies, problem solving, video viewing and analysis, direct observation, role play and micro teaching. As one component of the first research question, the conclusion can be drawn that participants prefer hands-on experience and like to exchange ideas with their peers during INSET courses. Peer observation can be used as an instructional method, however, teachers should be trained on how to give constructive feedback to their peers beforehand.

Besides determining the preferred methods of an INSET program as part of the first research question, three open-ended items were included in the questionnaire to gain some insight into the teachers’ perceptions of in-service training practices. In the first open-ended item, the participants were given the statement “In-service training programs should be continual and ongoing.” and
were asked to state their opinions regarding the duration and frequency of teacher development programs. Out of thirty-seven instructors who responded to this statement, eleven instructors wrote that INSET programs should be conducted weekly or bi-weekly. Nine instructors believed that in-service training programs should be conducted every year before the new academic year begins. Furthermore, three instructors elaborated on their answers, stating that in-service training practices might be held two or three days per week, depending on the experience of the participants and the subject matter. Only two instructors stated that such programs should be held during a couple of days every month. Two instructors reported that they did not think teacher development should be continual and ongoing. Six instructors emphasized that the frequency should be determined depending on the needs of the instructors as well as their profile, experience and the expectations of the institution, the time remaining from the daily workload, resources available and the load of the in-service program. One participant mentioned that INSET programs should be of sufficient length but did not specify the length. One of the striking responses was that INSET programs should be held every 3 to 5 years. This answer was further explored during the interview, and it was found that the respondent was a newly recruited novice instructor who did not have much theoretical background in English Language Teaching. She stated that it was the first time she had worked at a university and that she hadn’t participated in in-service training programs before. These factors might have affected her answer. On the whole, the responses related to the frequency of the INSET program to be designed demonstrated that participants’ viewpoints diverged. However, whatever the frequency, instructors stated that the timing of the sessions should be decided by taking into account their workload. It can be inferred from the findings that designing bi-weekly sessions will be realistic on the condition that they are rescheduled depending on the workload of the instructors.

The Chairperson was also asked to state his opinion on the appropriate duration and frequency of INSET programs. He said that teachers should be offered continuous and regular training programs. He stated that sessions should be linked to each other and every session should build on the previous one.
Furthermore, there shouldn’t be long intervals between the sessions to enable the sustainability of the programs as well as to promote the efficiency of the program in general. He agreed with the idea that one-shot teacher training programs without follow-up do not enable the teachers to internalize and synthesize what they have learned from training programs.

Taking into account the participants’ viewpoints on the frequency of INSET programs, it can be concluded that most of the participants prefer ongoing and regular training. This finding confirms England’s (1998) idea that most teachers are intrinsically motivated to participate in ongoing development, because they understand the complexity of their profession. Even so, this study’s results revealed that expectations of the institution, and the needs and workload of the trainees should be considered when determining the frequency of the INSET program to be designed in the 2007-2008 academic year. In addition, a follow-up of the trainees is crucial in order to monitor to what extent they put into practice what they have learned in training sessions.

In order to better understand the viewpoints of instructors regarding the teacher training practices at TOBB ETU, instructors were asked to elaborate on past teacher training activities in TOBB ETU’s DFL. As mentioned earlier in chapter I, a project called ‘Collaborative Training’ was conducted in the DFL in 2006. Besides this in-house training session, DFL sent three instructors to Pilgrims Teacher Training courses abroad and 12 instructors to Bodrum to participate in teacher training programs organized by Pearson-Longman in the summer of 2006.

Four out of twenty-five instructors reflected on the teacher training practices in the questionnaire. Three of them expressed their satisfaction with the teacher training activities in the department to date. To illustrate:

Derya: *The one that was held in 2005 was very beneficial for me. Because I graduated from Linguistic department, I sometimes feel that I do not know enough teaching techniques because of that it was very beneficial for me.*

It is apparent from the above statement that the teacher training session in 2005 enabled Derya to learn more about teaching techniques. However, Ada
who answered this item negatively, highlighted the inefficiency of the collaborative teacher training activity that was held in the department in 2006, saying that it did not provide the teachers with enough opportunities to reflect on their experiences:

*Ada: Teachers tried to inform each other about methods in ELT. Some of these attempts led to some problems. As a result, the sessions lacked accuracy, reflection and perspective. The TT unit should tap into the participants’ abilities and guide them in mixing and expanding their abilities. To sum up, it should appeal to all teachers, but ours did not.*

It can be inferred from the above statements that instructors have divergent viewpoints regarding the in-house INSET session in 2006. The statements also reveal that trainees have different expectations from an INSET program, and that their individual needs and expectations should be taken into consideration in the design of the program. According to Fullan (1991), most INSET programs fail because they rarely address individual needs and concerns of the participants. Therefore, to guarantee the success and maximum efficiency of the INSET program, it is essential that instructors’ individual needs be catered to.

**4.2.1.3. Aim of the prospective INSET program**

Another aspect of the first research question was to investigate the opinions of the participants about what the aim of in-service training sessions should be. The analysis of the responses to the open-ended section of the questionnaire and the interview revealed that some instructors thought the primary aim of in-service training practices should be to motivate the instructors. One of the participants stated that an INSET program in TOBB ETU’s DFL should not be a burden for the teachers, but rather, should motivate the teachers by encouraging them to improve in every aspect of ELT. Another participant suggested organizing conferences and meetings to motivate the teachers.
According to three instructors, interaction among peers and a cozy, relaxing atmosphere are of great importance when seeking positive outcomes from teacher training activities:

Eylül: A teacher development program should be run in a relaxing and friendly atmosphere. All the teachers should enjoy learning how to teach English. We should always bear in mind that the information we acquire in an enjoyable environment will always be more easily remembered than the information we learn under pressure.

The Chairperson emphasized interaction between all the parties, namely the administrators, teacher trainers and the trainees in the Department. He stated that the instructors’ ideas about INSET design should be taken into account when making decisions. Teacher trainers should act as facilitators and form a bridge between the expectations of the staff and the administration. In his opinion, it is essential for trainers to make sure everybody’s opinions are considered, at least to a certain extent. The findings confirm Koç’s (1992) idea that it is essential to create an atmosphere in which teachers share and exchange their teaching experiences, discuss their problems and find practical solutions to their problems with academic help from educators (p. 48). Indeed, the findings mentioned above, obtained from all participants, demonstrated that motivational factors and establishment of a sincere atmosphere are essential for the effectiveness of INSET programs.

Analysis of the different components of the first research question revealed that INSET is crucial for the instructors at TOBB ETU. Instructors would like INSET programs to have a variety of components in terms of scope. They prefer to be kept up-to-date on the recent developments in the field and to be encouraged to take part in seminars and conferences as part of INSET programs.

In general, instructors agree that an INSET unit should be set up in the DFL at TOBB ETU. Although instructors’ views diverged in terms of compulsory attendance at INSET programs, the dominant view is that they would like to choose which program to participate in. As for attending INSET programs organized according to work experience level, the general finding is that
instructors would like to be grouped according to their interests and needs, rather than being separated into novice and experienced groups.

In addition to gathering the participants’ opinions about the characteristics, scope and instructional methodology of INSET programs, another aspect of this study was to investigate the professional needs of the instructors who participated in this study.

4.3. The professional needs of the instructors at TOBB ETU, DFL that should be addressed by an in-service training program.

The second research question aims to determine the professional needs of instructors at TOBB ETU, DFL. Specifying the perceived needs of the instructors was of vital importance as they will constitute the basis of the INSET program design that will follow this study. To identify the needs of the instructors, five-point Likert scale questionnaire items were used as mentioned earlier in this chapter. In addition to the questionnaire, class video recordings were implemented in order to monitor what the actual needs of the instructors. Apart from the findings of the questionnaire and the class video recordings, interviews were held with ten instructors to elaborate on the findings of the above mentioned data collection instruments.

The first data collection instrument was the questionnaires. When the instructors’ responses to the Likert scale items were analyzed, it was found that the instructors generally did not indicate a high degree of need for most of the items 15-33 which were related to determining the professional needs of the instructors. To clarify, none of the items received a mean score higher than 3.85. Item 33, which was about the need to set up a ‘Teacher Training Unit’ at TOBB ETU’s DFL, received the highest mean score (M=3.85). This finding is parallel to the finding of the first research question that the participants regard INSET programs essential for their development. The mean score (M=3.85) of this item revealed that the participants are aware of their needs and they would like to be a part of INSET program.
When the overall responses of instructors were examined closely, teaching mixed-ability groups (M=3.59); teaching pronunciation (M=3.41), teaching speaking skills (M=3.33); and promoting student autonomy (M=3.33) were found to be among the ones that received high mean scores. The instructors reported the lowest need for giving instructions (M=2.62). Richards (1990) believes that INSET should incorporate linguistic and methodological elements for practice. The highest and lowest mean scores of this study indicated that although instructors did not feel much need to improve their skills teaching subjects like grammar, listening, reading and writing, they would like to be further trained on teaching speaking skills and pronunciation.

Instructors’ responses to the questionnaire items related to their professional needs were computed in SPSS 13 program and the mean scores of the responses were determined. The following table displays the mean scores of the responses to the questionnaire items which were prepared to identify their perceived needs of the instructors:
Table 11: Items Related to the Needs of Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It.33 the need to set up a “Teacher Training Unit” at TOBB ETU, DFL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.28 the need to improve in teaching mixed-ability groups</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.29 the need to improve on raising language awareness of students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.21 the need to improve in teaching pronunciation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.19 the need to improve in teaching speaking skills</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.26 the need to improve on promoting student autonomy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.16 the need to improve in teaching listening skills</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.30 the need to improve on promoting collaboration among students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.32 the need to improve on motivating students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.18 the need to improve in teaching writing skills</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.20 the need to improve in teaching vocabulary</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.17 the need to improve in teaching reading skills</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.31 the need to improve in determining students’ needs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.27 the need to improve on dealing with classroom management problems</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.15 the need to improve in teaching grammar</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.25 the need to improve in lesson planning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.22 the need to improve in giving oral and written feedback to students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.24 the need to improve in written and oral correction</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.23 the need to improve in giving instructions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1. Teaching Mixed-ability Groups

One aspect of the second research question was to determine whether the instructors at TOBB ETU, DFL need to be trained on teaching mixed ability groups. The item related to teaching mixed ability groups received the second highest mean score (M=3.59) among the questionnaire items 15-33. Novice and experienced instructors reported exactly the same degree of need (M=3.59). Therefore, this item was further analyzed through interviews. All the interviewees who were asked to elaborate on the reasons why this item was perceived as the highest need expressed similar opinions. Four instructors commented on this issue during the interviews, and they all found the results of the questionnaire for this item realistic. They stated that it is challenging for the teacher to be able to address all students with different levels and learning abilities. They also mentioned that every learner is unique and that it is essential for a teacher to be competent in dealing with each student individually. Ece attested to the difficulty of addressing all the students at the same time, using multiple intelligences to attract the attention of the students and designing the class accordingly. As the interview findings verified the questionnaire findings, it can be concluded that the INSET program should include a component like dealing with students with different abilities.

4.3.2. Teaching Pronunciation and Teaching Speaking Skills

Teaching pronunciation was found to be significantly challenging for the instructors according to the questionnaire results. Item 21, which was related to the necessity to improve in teaching pronunciation, received one of the highest mean scores (M=3.41). The mean scores were 3.2 for novice instructors and 3.6 for experienced ones. Although pronunciation was not a sub-category of the observation tool designed to analyze the class videotapes, the researcher took notes of the frequency of pronunciation errors the instructors made during the video recorded class sessions. Five of the instructors made pronunciation errors in these sessions:
Ege: *We prefer* /prefər/ to use ‘should’ in that case.

Elif: *What’s your comment* /kəmənt/ on this question?

Ece: You can see the *vocabulary* /vəkəbjuələri/ items on the list.

Feyza: You’ll show you a *presentation* /prɪzəntəʃən/ about these phrases.

Derya: *Do you know what* /ɛkətuːrizəm/ is?

Taking into consideration the results of the questionnaire and class video recordings, the researcher decided to explore the relationship between teachers’ pronunciations and their opinions about the need to be trained on teaching pronunciation. Furthermore, the interviewees were asked why the majority of the group expressed a need to be improved on teaching pronunciation. The observation findings coincided with the questionnaire results. The instructors need to be trained on how to improve their own pronunciation and on how to teach pronunciation. Some of the interviewees stated that the underlying reason might be that the instructors are not native speakers of English. They are all native speakers of Turkish who do not have many opportunities to study abroad and be exposed to the language in its natural environment. Ege stated that he obviously needed to be trained on teaching pronunciation, as he did not find himself competent in pronunciation. He hadn’t had the chance to practice the language in a native environment, and he wanted to take INSET courses on improving his oral fluency:

Ege: *I generally can say that I need, maybe some kind of training in terms of pronunciation skills or let’s say oral fluency or whatever you say as we haven’t had the chance to practice the language so much.*

In contrast to Ege, Ece, who was an experienced teacher, claimed that she did not need to better her pronunciation, because she believed there is no need to talk like a native speaker. She further stated that other instructors might have expressed such a need because they want to talk like a native speaker.

Most of the interviewees reported that all of the instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL are non-native speakers of English, and that they do not feel
competent enough in teaching speaking and pronunciation. The underlying reason is that all of them were educated in Turkey and have spent only short periods of time abroad for educational purposes. Hence, they suffer from a lack of confidence when it comes to speaking and pronunciation. This finding confirms Cullen’s (1994) idea that it is essential for INSET programs to improve trainees’ command of language, particularly in countries where the medium of instruction is not English. Based on the triangulated data, a conclusion can be drawn that ‘teaching pronunciation’ and ‘improving oral skills’ of the instructors should be one component of the INSET courses that will be designed pursuant to this study.

4.3.3. Promoting Student Autonomy

In addition to the above finding, the mean scores of item 26 (M=3.33), promoting student autonomy, and item 28 (M=3.59), teaching mixed-ability groups, indicated that instructors consider the needs of their students to be important. It is apparent that these instructors would like to be autonomous in deciding which INSET activity to participate in, and that they also value their students’ autonomy by encouraging them to take on their own responsibilities. In terms of answering the second research question, the findings demonstrated that the INSET program should incorporate sessions on promoting student autonomy and teaching mixed-ability groups.

Şentuna (2002) found in her study that instructors are fairly interested in promoting student autonomy. She commented on the finding that instructors may not feel able to promote autonomy based on the curricular issues in their institutions. Based on this inference, it can be interpreted from the results of this study that instructors believe that curricular issues enable their students to be autonomous.
4.3.4. Instruction Giving Strategies

The needs of the instructors in terms of being improved on giving instructions were further analyzed in order to answer the second research question of this study. When the responses to the questionnaire item 23 which was about the need to improve on giving instructions were analyzed, it was found that this item received the lowest mean score (M=2.62) among items 15-33. This indicated that almost half of the instructors felt competent in giving instructions. Again, this item was further analyzed both via class videotapes and interviews. According to the class videotape findings, the instructors used the appropriate instructional language for the level of the students and employed a variety of strategies like reading, writing or demonstrating the instructions. However, it was observed that a few instructors hardly ever checked the students’ understanding of the instructions:

Ege: (signing the course book) ‘I want you to check the grammar box and check whether we have new information or whether we know all this information or not.’

In the above instance, the teacher did not clarify to the students what he meant by “new information” after he gave the instruction. It was understood from the facial expressions of some students that they did not comprehend what to do. In addition to this, five of the instructors most often gave instructions without first getting the attention of the students. When the instructors were asked to elaborate on the findings of the questionnaire and class videotapes during the interviews, five out of seven instructors agreed that giving instructions could somehow be learned easily, either by means of books or by trial and error. Deniz argued that there is no need to be trained on giving instructions and found the questionnaire findings realistic, stating that a teacher does not have to be creative while giving instructions, just applying some strategies is enough:
Deniz: *I think that giving instructions or giving feedback, oral or written, is not or does not include anything productive in it. So this has nothing to do with creativity. Maybe there are some strategies you may use to enrich or you may use to make it more motivating for the students or for yourself as well but it’s easy to learn and it’s easy to practice it.*

Two of the interviewees had some reservations about the findings related to giving instructions. To exemplify, Neslihan pointed out the relationship between giving instructions, classroom management and teaching in general. For her, telling the instructions to the students does not mean that a teacher applies the relevant strategies or that the instruction is understood. Using poor strategies can even lead to classroom management problems for the teachers:

Neslihan: *I must tell you that I’m a bit surprised because I would expect just the opposite results because giving instructions and giving written and or oral feedback are very important components of class management and teaching in general. .....So they just think telling the Ss ‘O.K, get into groups, get into pairs, do it’ is giving instruction. Maybe what they understand from giving instruction is different, so I think the keyword here is ‘awareness’.*

Similarly, Çınar found the result interesting and stated that this might be because the instructors had had previous training on how to give instructions in their undergraduate years, and thought that they possessed the required knowledge and applied the relevant strategies in class. Ege mentioned that he used repetition, paraphrasing and exemplification strategies; whereas another instructor said that she used clarification, rephrasing, modification of the language, and sometimes even drama when there are ambiguous points in the instruction. The triangulated data concerning giving instructions confirmed that the instructors did not think they really need to improve their ability to give instructions. The reason why teachers did not report high degrees of need to be further trained on how to give instructions is that experienced teachers have been engaged in giving instructions at least for four years and novice teachers have had enough formal training during their undergraduate studies. However, it can be inferred from the analysis of class video recordings that some strategies, such as checking the understanding of the students and getting their attention before giving instructions, could be improved.
4.3.5. Error Correction Strategies

After the analysis of the needs of the instructors to take INSET courses on instruction giving strategies, their interests concerning error correction strategies were examined. The mean score for the questionnaire item 24 which aimed to determine the degree of the need to be trained on error correction strategies was 2.7 out of 5. This revealed that instructors in general do not regard this item as a crucial point to be improved. But, the analysis of the videotapes indicated different findings. It was observed in the videotapes that most of the 10 instructors avoided correcting errors and some even did not notice the errors of the students:

Barış: (student) *I came here two years ago, I did not think that I’ll have problems here.*

Elif: ………

Hülya: (student) *It do not force to learn English.*

Elif: ………

Similar to Elif, Nilgün also avoided frequent error correction:

Tuna: (student) *I just looking for the summer’s coming.*

Nilgün: ……………

Atakan: *This have two advantages. One of them, I’m learning ……… in the work in the daily life.*

Nilgün: ………

In terms of the strategies employed in error correction, instructors mainly corrected the error and stated the right form or gave the rule about language.

Doğukan: (student) *When I was a child, I afraid of….*

Derya: *I was afraid of.*

Deniz was one of those instructors who gave the right form of the expression for correction:
Kartal: (student) *She tried to move to the house.*

Deniz: *moving to the house.*

Deniz, however, used elicitation for error correction:

Deniz: *Find an adjective from the text synonymous with*

Bekir: *Utterly.*

Deniz: *Is ‘utterly’ an adjective?*

Bekir: *No, it’s an adverb.*

In contrast to the above mentioned examples, one of the experienced instructors, Çınar, hardly ever corrected the errors. In the below example, Çınar didn’t prefer to restate the correct form of the student’s incorrect sentence and acknowledged his answer:

Efe: (student) *Lack of money doesn’t suffer people a lot.*

Çınar: *Good, very good.*

The rest of the instructors corrected errors to some extent, depending on the type of lesson and the subject matter in concern. Most often, they stated the right form or gave the rule about the error.

When the instructors were asked to elaborate on the findings of the questionnaire and the analysis of the videotapes, six out of seven instructors who responded to this item stated that they avoided correcting errors in order not to deflate the students’ enthusiasm for learning. They stated, moreover, that the need to correct errors depended on the type of error and the subject matter being taught at that particular moment. One of the novice instructors, Elif, mentioned that the source of error should be sought initially, because some of the errors might be performance errors like the slip of the tongue. She added that she avoided explicit correction in order not to interfere with the students while they are speaking. However, when the videotape of this particular instructor was analyzed, it was observed that she avoided correcting almost all the errors. Another novice instructor, Feyza, expressed similar opinions and
stated that she avoided correcting errors in class and made implicit correction, if necessary.

Ege stated that he was against immediate error correction and added that immediate feedback might be demotivating for the students. He further argued that error correction depends on the priority between accuracy and fluency:

Ege: *I believe that in the beginning, fluency is more important than accuracy. When students improve their speaking skills, they can also improve accuracy later on, depending on the input they get from different sources.*

From the above expression, it can be understood that Ege assigns more importance to fluency rather than accuracy. Therefore, he doesn’t prefer immediate correction. In addition to this, Çınar pointed out that error correction might have a negative effect on the students. He mentioned that he had some reservations about correcting every mistake as he believed that students become reluctant to speak when they are corrected all the time.

Çınar: *I believe as a teacher, I should not always, all the time, be correcting all the mistakes because some students are really offended when they’re corrected all the time by the teacher. Especially in Turkey, when you correct all the mistakes that are made by the students, students then become more reluctant. They do not want to take part in the activities and speak.*

The above mentioned two comments confirmed the class video recording findings of these two instructors. They chose not to correct all the errors in their recorded classes.

Neslihan was critical about the findings of the questionnaire item related to error correction and giving feedback mentioning that giving written and oral feedback and error correction as well as giving instructions are very important components of class management and teaching in general. Therefore, she did not find the low mean score of this item realistic. The findings of this study demonstrated different results from Duzan’s (2006) study. In her study it was found that instructors liked to be trained on using different techniques for error correction. On the other hand, this study indicated that the instructors need to be
trained on error correction strategies and the timing of error correction even though the mean score was at the moderate level.

4.3.6. Feedback Giving Strategies

Instructors’ feedback giving strategies were one of the sets of practical teaching skills examined as part of the second research question. The mean score (M=2.74) of item 22, the need to improve written and oral feedback giving strategies, revealed that the instructors feel much need to be trained on feedback strategies. This item was also further analyzed through class videotapes and interviews. According to the overall findings of the video recordings, the instructors were found to be generally competent in giving oral feedback. Eight out of ten instructors gave feedback to let the students know how well they performed and acknowledged a correct answer by positive reinforcement:

Deniz: *What are the reasons for the failure of the boy?*
Etengü: *He overreacted to his family because of his prejudice.*
Deniz: *Congratulations! That was what I was looking for.*

Like Deniz, Ege used positive reinforcement in giving feedback:
Ege: *How did the family overcome their problems?*
Jülide: *They tried to communicate each other by asking for advice from each other.*
Ege: *Well done, what else?*

Neslihan was one of those instructors who gave feedback to trigger motivation:
Alp: *Teacher, do we use gerunds after ‘had better’?*
Neslihan: *A very good question. We use an infinitive verb without ‘to’ after ‘had better’. And that’s a good point, by the way.*
Apart from the above mentioned strategies, some of the instructors gave feedback by summarizing what the students have said whereas some others indicated an incorrect answer. The manner and the form of language while giving feedback were generally positive as mentioned above. Even so, analysis of videotapes and interviews demonstrated that two instructors needed to be trained on how to give feedback. To exemplify, Nilgün believed that giving feedback was essential to appraise the students almost all the time to trigger motivation. Thus, she put great emphasis on giving positive feedback and reinforcement. She repeatedly said, “Good! Good job!” to the students although they sometimes made mistakes that needed to be corrected. The feedback was not effective as it misled the students and no correction was made at all. Moreover, it was observed during the analysis of the videotapes that one of the experienced instructors hardly ever used positive reinforcement. Ece did not thank the students for the right answers; and instead of calling students by their names to solicit answers, she just asked the questions without naming the students and the volunteering students responded the questions. The lesson was carried on as a series of questions and answers without any feedback.

After the analysis of class videotapes, six out of ten instructors evaluated the findings of the questionnaire and videotapes related to giving feedback in interviews. The interviews revealed that some instructors regard giving feedback only as correcting errors. They did not differentiate between giving feedback and error correction. Ece mentioned that she agreed with the questionnaire findings because she thought the instructors at TOBB ETU were quite competent in giving especially written feedback. Four instructors stated that they found the results of the questionnaire realistic because giving feedback is easy to learn and the teacher’s style might be improved in due course and depending on his/her rapport with students. Feyza was one of those instructors who thought giving feedback is not a difficult task for a teacher and it becomes easier once rapport with the students is established:
Feyza: Giving written and oral feedback is no problem. It’s just easy, if you just know what the problem is, what kind of a problem a student has, you can talk to him or give him written feedback. But day by day, you get to know students, then, it becomes easier to talk to them or to give written and oral feedback. It depends on the rapport with the students.

Despite this ease, some instructors believed that giving feedback is very important for students’ improvement. Ege stated that he preferred to use confirmation sentences in his lessons, whereas Nilgün stated that she used positive reinforcement frequently to give some kind of inspiration to the students and to motivate them:

Nilgün: If the student makes lots of mistakes, he will correct his mistakes and if he’s doing a good job, really good job, he’ll be proud of himself. O.K.? And sometimes I give them some kind of feedback like “You’re doing a good job”, they are very proud of themselves and they know that they are doing a good job and that they are on the right path....

Deniz believed giving feedback is not a strategy that requires comprehensive training in an INSET program. Yet, some strategies could be improved if a training session is planned for this purpose:

Deniz: Your style may be improved because you may be very strict or you may be very harsh in your feedback whether it is oral or written. The way you use the language or the way you respond to the student may be affected from the courses. But I do not know if there are very different specific strategies to improve giving feedback.

Serkan was a bit critical about the findings because he argued that the best way to identify shortcomings in feedback giving strategies is to be observed:

Serkan: Well, it’s not always easy to talk about oneself, everybody can believe “Hey, I’m really good at giving feedback and, when I give them feedback they understand it.” How can you be sure about whether you’re doing the right thing? So again a second person or even a third person can notice and observe things.
Hence, the analysis of the questionnaire, video recordings and interviews demonstrated that improving feedback giving strategies did not emerge as an urgent professional need for either novice or experienced instructors. The qualitative data verified the findings of the quantitative data in this respect. In the study of Şentuna (2002), however, a significant difference was found between novice and experienced instructors’ interest in taking INSET courses on feedback giving strategies. It can be inferred from the findings of the present study that experienced teachers in TOBB ETU’s DFL apply a variety of feedback giving strategies. To exemplify, İrfan repeated the students’ answers, Deniz explained orally why the student has given an incorrect response, Neslihan gave feedback by summarizing what the student has said. Most novice instructors in the department are continuing their studies at the graduate level and taking methodology courses; most likely, that is why they did not report a high degree of need for taking courses on feedback giving strategies.

4.3.7. Lesson Planning

The mean score (M=2.87) of item 25, which aimed to determine to what extent the instructors needed to be trained on how to plan and implement their lesson plans, was not high in the questionnaire, which meant instructors did not report an urgent need to be trained on lesson planning. Both novice and experienced instructors felt competent enough to reject more practice on lesson planning.

This finding was also further analyzed through class videotapes because lesson planning is an essential part of classroom management in general. In addition, it was assumed that novice instructors would feel the need to be trained on lesson planning as they lack experience, however, the mean score for this item revealed that it is not an urgent need both for novice and experienced instructors. The analysis of classroom procedures and lesson planning via video recordings revealed that the instructors generally plan their lessons in an organized way and manage time efficiently. Before the video
recordings, all of the instructors were asked what they would cover during that lesson; and all of them completed their lessons on time, as planned for in the pacing of that week. They kept transitions between the activities that aimed at activating students’ schemata in order to analyze the text better. Furthermore, most of them tried to focus on raising students’ awareness of the topic and structure; hence, tried to promote autonomy in learning. Except for one instructor, nine instructors were prepared to implement contingency activities, should the lesson end early.

Unfortunately, almost half of the observed instructors failed to use a variety of teaching techniques, such as role plays, peer teaching, discussion, and group work. Depending on the subject matter, they employed only one or two of the above mentioned techniques. The instructors who had more classroom management problems did not check the understanding, attention and interest of the students as often as the ones who were more skilled at classroom management. Almost all the instructors whose classes were videotaped somehow related the subject matter either to previously learned material or to future topics. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that lesson planning isn’t an urgent need that should be incorporated into INSET courses. However, the integration of a variety of teaching techniques into lesson planning and execution should be included into the program. The fact that in the DFL there is a fixed syllabus, which tells the teacher what material to cover in every single lesson, and the fact that instructors must adhere to the pacing of the syllabus strictly must be taken into consideration. As the fixed curriculum forces instructors to be organized in their lesson planning, this policy of the DFL affected the results of the questionnaire and video recordings.

4.3.8. Classroom Management

The questionnaire item 27 (M=2.97) concerning the classroom management was further analyzed via class videotapes and interviews. When the class videotapes were analyzed in terms of classroom management, it was found that
seven of the instructors did not have much difficulty in dealing with classroom management problems:

Neslihan: *Cem, what are you doing?*

Cem: ………

Neslihan: *You’re supposed to be on page 40.*

Evren: (another student) *Shame on you!* (other students laugh)

Neslihan: *You see, he said shame on you.*

‘Shame on you’ was one of the expressions the teacher had taught in that lesson and she used the same expression both to warn the chatty student in a kind way and to recap the usage of the word phrase without humiliating the student. Neslihan applied another strategy in a different instance:

Neslihan: (tries to elicit the meaning of ‘perfectionist’)

Atakan: *A person who tries to make things perfectly is a perfectionist.*

Neslihan: (applauds the student) *Very good. Although you’re drinking tea, I’ll forgive you, because this was a very good example.*

In the DFL, the students are not allowed to drink tea, according to an administrative class code. In the above instance, the teacher reminded the student of the rule indirectly, without offending him, while at the same time acknowledging his correct answer to the question. Similarly, Cem dealt with one of his chatty and disruptive students in an appropriate way:

Cem: (notices that Furkan and Zafer aren’t listening to his instructions and walks towards them after the other students start the pair work activity) *Gentlemen, were you talking about the activity? If you have any questions, I’m here to help you.*

Furkan and Zafer: *Sorry teacher. We were talking about something else.*

Cem: *Never mind, now that you know what to do, you can start doing it O.K.?* 

Furkan and Zafer: *Yes, teacher.* (Students are then engaged in the lesson)

In the above instance, the teacher preferred to warn the two chatty students by warning them privately and kindly, after the others had started doing their
activities. The students understood their mistake and started to participate in the lesson.

Still, it was noticed that three out of ten instructors need to develop strategies for dealing with non-participant and chatty students. This can be accomplished by helping them to reflect on the video recording of their classes as part of INSET sessions. By this means, they can observe appropriate and inappropriate reactions to students’ behavior and reflect on their own experiences.

The novice instructors, Nilgün and Derya, hardly ever tried to engage the non-participant students in the lesson; in fact, they preferred to ignore them. Nilgün remained apathetic toward some of the chatty students and to the ones who were using their laptops for irrelevant purposes during instruction. Derya, however, lost her control over the students when she was faced with a technical problem during the power point presentation. She lost the attention of the students when faced with a conflict.

In contrast to the novice instructors, the five experienced instructors generally employed appropriate strategies to maintain classroom control and discipline, such as organizing the class effectively, trying to engage as many students as possible in the lesson, and warning the chatty students indirectly by using humor or attracting their attention to involve them in the lesson without humiliating them in front of the class. However, a few experienced instructors preferred to continue the lesson only with the participating students.

The instructors were asked to elaborate on the findings on classroom management during the interviews. Eight instructors responded to the question in the interview and most of their responses showed similar characteristics. One of the experienced instructors, İrfan, pointed out the need for a mentor, particularly for novice instructors. He stated that many teachers receive theoretical knowledge on how to manage a class during their undergraduate studies. However, in practice they lack guidance by an experienced mentor. He added that individual instructors might perceive the term ‘class management’ in different ways, which would affect the results of the questionnaire. To give an example, one teacher might regard class management as keeping the students silent by shouting at them, whereas another might believe it is getting the class tasks done. Therefore, they stated that
they did not really need to be trained on improving their classroom management skills thinking that they were competent according to their point of view. Taking into consideration the triangulated data, it is found that classroom management should be one aspect of the INSET program and regardless of experience, all instructors will benefit from the training sessions.

Richards (1987) suggests that teacher development activities should provide activities to develop teachers’ awareness and principles about effective planning, organization, classroom management and delivery of instruction. In light of the triangulated data analysis, it can be concluded that instructors in this study feel the need to be trained on the following skills:

1- Teaching mixed-ability groups
2- Raising language awareness of students
3- Teaching pronunciation
4- Teaching speaking skills
5- Promoting student autonomy
6- Written and oral error correction
7- Dealing with classroom management problems

The questionnaire analysis demonstrated that 64% of the instructors have been involved in an INSET program before and 62% either hold their MA or Ph degrees or currently pursuing their degree programs. Therefore, it can be interpreted from the findings that the instructors regarded themselves competent in the above mentioned teaching skills or strategies and the mean scores of some items were unexpectedly low because of their experiences, such as previous involvement in an INSET program, master’s or PhD courses taken. On the other hand, some items did not emerge as urgent needs that should be improved for the instructors in general:

1- Giving instructions
2- Giving written and oral feedback to students
3- Lesson Planning
Apart from determining the general needs of the instructors regardless of their teaching experience, this study also focused on identifying how these needs differed according to teachers’ classroom experience, and on whether a statistically significant difference between the novice and experienced groups exists. The third research question aimed to find the answer to this question.

4.4. The difference between novice and experienced instructors in terms of their needs and expectations from an in-service training program.

The third research question investigates whether or not the professional needs of the novice and experienced instructors in the DFL differ. To this end, questionnaire items 15-33 were analyzed quantitatively to determine whether or not a significant mean difference in the novice and experienced instructors’ needs exists. An independent sample t-test was computed to compare the means of these two groups. The reason why the above mentioned items were analyzed was that the prospective program will address the professional needs of the participants of this study. Therefore, pinpointing the differences between novice and experienced instructors was particularly crucial to determine the scope of the program.

Of the novice and experienced instructors’ responses, three items show a significant difference between the two groups. The t-test resulted in a p-value less than 0.05 (p <0.05) for item 20 (P= 0.00). For item 15, the need to improve in teaching grammar, and item 24, the need to improve in written and oral correction strategies, p-value was determined to be 0.05. The p-values of these items revealed that there is a significant difference in terms of the degree of their need to improve their skills in teaching vocabulary, teaching grammar and using written and oral error correction strategies. The analysis of items 15, teaching grammar, item 20, teaching vocabulary, and item 24, improving in written and oral correction strategies, revealed that experienced teachers are particularly interested in training sessions on teaching grammar, teaching vocabulary, and improving written and oral correction strategies. It can be inferred from the
comparison of the t-test results that all instructors’ expectations of the INSET course are generally homogeneous. Hence, the INSET program can be designed in a way that addresses both novice and experienced instructors.

According to Bezzina and Stanyer (2004), teachers’ main challenges include coping with mixed-ability groups, class discipline, curriculum implementation and physical exhaustion. In the present study, when the overall mean scores of 18 items were compared and statistically significant items were analyzed, it became evident that the mean scores of experienced instructors were higher than those of the novice instructors, with the exception of four items: lesson planning, dealing with classroom management problems, teaching mixed ability groups and raising the language awareness of students.

Although the t-test results for these items were not found to be statistically significant, it is clear that novice instructors feel the need to be trained on lesson planning. According to the results of a study conducted by Richards and Li&Tang (1998) among ten novice and ten experienced teachers at City University of Hong Kong, novice teachers follow a methodology lesson plan format with pre-, while-, and post-reading activities. These lesson plans were not learner-oriented; students did not activate their schema in order to comprehend the text better. In contrast, the lesson plans of experienced teachers were prepared in shorter time, focused on raising students’ awareness of the topic, and engaged students in the lesson by having them predict and interpret the reading text, and integrate it with other skills and knowledge. The study demonstrated that novice teachers need to be trained on improving their lesson planning more than the experienced teachers. Based on this finding, it can be inferred that novice teachers who participated in the present study felt similar needs and reported to have a higher need to be trained on their lesson planning strategies. Korukçu’s (1996) study had similar results related to lesson planning. Her study, conducted among 67 senior students in English Language Teaching departments and also among 28 beginning teachers at 8 different universities, revealed that both prospective and novice teachers believed that organizing and managing lesson plans were among the most problematic areas for them. Furthermore, Şentuna’s (2002) study confirmed
that novice teachers have a higher degree of interest in further training on lesson planning.

The results of the present study’s comparison are different results from those of Şentuna’s (2002) study. Although her study was quite similar, it found that novice teachers are more interested than experienced teachers in all the items related to INSET content. The underlying reason why novice instructors participating in the present study stated that they did not need to improve as much as the experienced instructors is, however, that 80% of these novice instructors are continuing or have completed their MA degrees. Thus, in comparison to the experienced instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL, the novice instructors do not believe that the INSET content will necessarily improve their theoretical or practical teaching skills. The experienced instructor-participants, who have four or more years of teaching experience, may feel they have lost academic touch, even though they have been teaching for a long time. In this study, novice instructors appear to feel more confident than their experienced peers.

The following table displays the mean scores and independent sample t-test results:
Table 12: T-test results for the comparison of novice and experienced instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Novice N</th>
<th>Novice M</th>
<th>Novice Sd</th>
<th>Experienced N</th>
<th>Experienced M</th>
<th>Experienced Sd</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teaching Grammar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teaching Listening</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teaching Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teaching Writing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teaching Speaking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teaching Vocabulary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>*0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Teaching Pronunciation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Giving Written and Oral Feedback</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Giving Instructions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Written and Oral Error Correction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lesson Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Promoting Student Autonomy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dealing with Classroom Management Problems</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Teaching Mixed-ability Groups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Raising Language Awareness of the Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Promoting Collaboration among Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Determining the Students’ Needs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Motivating the Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Need to set up a ‘Teacher Training Unit’</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=number of participants  M=mean  St= standard deviation  t=t-test  *=p≤0.05
When the perceived needs of the novice and experienced instructors were analyzed individually, it was discovered that the overall average of the experienced instructors’ mean scores (M=3.3) was higher than that of the novice instructors (M=3.0). In terms of teaching skills, item no 29, raising language awareness of their students, received the highest mean score (M= 3.7) among the novice instructors. Although it was not the highest mean score among the experienced instructors, the mean score of item 29 (M=3.2) revealed that they also need to take INSET courses on this issue. It can be inferred that both groups of teachers do not feel competent at raising the language awareness of their students, perhaps because they are all non-native English teachers. Item number 33 (M=3.85), the need to set up a ‘Teacher Training Unit’ in TOBB ETU’s DFL received the highest mean score among the experienced instructors; whereas item no 19 (M=3.33), teaching speaking skills, received the highest mean score.

Although the responses of instructors to item 27, the need to improve ability to deal with classroom management problems, were not found to be statistically significant, the mean difference (Md=0,16) between novice and experienced instructors was statistically noteworthy. Novice instructors were expected to be more willing to improve their ability to deal with classroom management. However, the mean difference indicated that there was only .16 difference between both groups, which meant that there was only a slight difference between the perceived needs of both groups. After taking the questionnaire results into consideration, this item was further analyzed through videotapes and interviews. The analysis of videotapes demonstrated that, in general, the experienced instructors seemed to have fewer classroom management problems than the novice instructors.

When the interviewees were asked to comment on the findings of the questionnaire and the question of whether or not a difference in novice and experienced instructors’ ability to manage the classroom exists, all four experienced instructors unanimously agreed that novice teachers are likely to experience more classroom management problems than do experienced
instructors. They reflected on the classroom management problems they encountered when they were beginning their careers. The four novice instructors who responded to this question had diverse opinions. Feyza and Derya did not find the .2 difference between the mean scores of experienced (M=2.9) and novice instructors (M=3.1) realistic, and agreed that novice instructors are likely to experience more classroom management problems. They also reflected on their own experiences and claimed that they have improved their classroom management skills and strategies over the past few years:

*Feyza: Well, I think, I do not find this result realistic because there cannot be that little difference. Novice teachers, when they start to teach, I think they have many different problems in the class. But day by day, they get used to the environment in the class and they get used to different types of people. That’s why your problems lessen. I do not think these results are realistic.*

*Derya: I do not find it realistic because experience is .... I am not a very experienced teacher, but even though I have only two years of experience, when I compare my experiences today with those of the first months, there is, of course, a difference. Maybe after two or three years I’ll be more experienced, and when I compare those years to my first year, I think that there will be a great difference. So I do not agree with this finding.*

It is clear from the above statements that some novice teachers believe that the first years of teaching include a lot of classroom management problems. Such problems only dwindle when teachers get used to teaching and different types of students.

In contrast to Feyza and Derya, the remaining two instructors agreed with the questionnaire finding and added that the difference is not due to experience, but rather, to personality. They believe it is most important to be able to motivate students, and that experience doesn’t make any difference if the teacher has the ability to accomplish this:
Nilgün: *I think it depends on the personality of the instructor. It depends on his or her ability and his skills. I’m a novice teacher, but if I’m more energetic, if I can motivate the students, and if I am more knowledgeable, what is the difference between an experienced teacher and me?*

Although Elif accepted the factor of experience in dealing with class management problems, she referred to the slight difference between the mean scores found between novice and experienced instructors, and stated that being an experienced teacher doesn’t necessarily mean that one can overcome all class management problems:

Elif: *I think both novice and experienced teachers may face some classroom management problems. But experienced teachers have some kind of an advantage, thanks to their experience. Being an experienced teacher does not necessarily mean that you’re a perfect teacher or that you have finished everything in your profession. In this job you have always something to learn. This may be the underlying reason.*

The results of the triangulated data demonstrated that novice teachers have a higher interest in being trained on dealing with classroom management problems than do the experienced instructors. The findings of this study proved similar to those of Capel’s (1998) study. He conducted a study among 49 novice teachers in the United Kingdom to explore what sort of problems they encounter in their first year of teaching. The study indicated that initial teacher training hadn’t prepared them for the school’s realities, and that they encountered numerous class management problems when they started teaching. Likewise, Korukçu (1996) found that classroom management is a significant challenge for teachers in their first years of teaching, and that novice teachers need help in dealing with classroom management skills. Furthermore, Alan’s (2003) study on determining novice teachers’ perceptions of an in-service teacher training course at Anadolu University revealed that the instructors regarded the sessions on dealing with class management problems as most beneficial. The present study demonstrated, however, that novice teachers perceive classroom management as a problem only to a certain extent; they do not view it as a very crucial issue that must be addressed.
When the responses of novice and experienced instructors related to items concerned with self-presentation and classroom persona were compared via analysis of class videotapes, it was found that there are not many striking differences. Yet, some of the novice instructors need time and training to appear more self-confident and establish closer rapport with the students. For instance, two instructors hardly ever moved around the classroom during the lesson and three instructors failed to project their voices sufficiently. Moreover, one of the instructors did not use positive reinforcement at all. However, it was found in the class video recordings that almost all the instructors tried to establish and maintain rapport with the students. Even so, the observation results showed that instructors need to be trained on using body language, gestures and tone of voice effectively. This conclusion was drawn because several instructors just stood in front of the class while students were sitting in their rows and did not walk towards the back rows, whereas some others preferred to remain seated throughout almost the entire lesson.

In general, the instructors were found to be fairly interested in improving teaching skills such as teaching writing, speaking, listening, and reading skills. However, experienced instructors were found to be more interested in getting further training on skills teaching. The fact that the mean scores of the novice instructors’ responses to these items are not very high reveal that they do not feel a higher need than the experienced instructors. This leads to the conclusion that novice instructors feel more confident in skills teaching, since their theoretical knowledge is still fresh. Indeed, for most, it has been only a couple of years since they graduated from a university.

Of the novice and experienced instructors’ responses to 19 items, three items displayed statistically significant differences (p≤ 0.05), indicating that the experienced instructors have a higher need to be trained on:

1- Teaching Grammar ( p= 0.05)  
2- Teaching Vocabulary ( p= 0.00)  
3- Improving written and oral error correction strategies ( p= 0.05)
Conversely, the analysis revealed that novice instructors are more interested than their experienced peers in improving the following 4 items:

1- Dealing with Classroom Management Problems
2- Raising Language Awareness of their Students
3- Lesson Planning
4- Teaching Mixed-ability Groups

The analysis of the interview answers revealed that almost all the instructors who reflected on the professional needs of novice and experienced instructors accepted that these two groups’ professional needs differ, and that novice teachers have higher degrees of need in terms of professional skills. The fact that most novice teachers who responded to the questionnaire did not feel the need to improve any more than the experienced teachers was quite surprising, because the general assumption is that novice instructors have higher degrees of professional need than do experienced instructors. Karaasslan (2003) states that since novice teachers are in the beginning of their careers and generally seek to improve their knowledge and skills, INSET and subsequent professional development programs are more important for them. He also points out that novice teachers make use of these programs more frequently than experienced teachers do. Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that the novice instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL, who more confident than the experienced instructors, pose a new exception to the rule.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This study was conducted in the Department of Foreign Languages at TOBB University of Economics and Technology to investigate English instructors’ and administrators’ opinions of in-service training programs and to explore the perceived needs of the instructors teaching English preparatory classes in terms of teaching strategies and skills. In this chapter, a summary of the findings and conclusions drawn from these findings will be presented with reference to the research questions. Furthermore, the limitations of the study, suggestions for implementation of results, and suggestions for further research will be discussed in this chapter.

5.2. Summary of the study

This study gathered information about the viewpoints of English preparatory class instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL on in-service training programs. Not only were the instructors’ attitudes towards INSET analyzed, but also their perceived needs were identified. Moreover, possible methods to be implemented in in-service training programs were explored while determining the areas to be further improved for the instructors. One of the aims of the study was to determine whether the professional needs of the instructors differ with respect to their experience.

In order to answer the research questions in this study, three data collection instruments were utilized: questionnaires, class video recordings and interviews. The data collected were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. A t-test
was conducted on the questionnaire to identify which items displayed statistically significant differences among novice and experienced instructors’ responses.

As a result of the study, ample data answering the research questions was collected. The following section will present the findings obtained through the study.

5.3. Findings

This section discusses the findings of the study with reference to the research questions and the relevant review of literature. Each section refers to one of the research questions.

5.3.1. The opinions of instructors and administrators at TOBB ETU Department of Foreign Languages concerning in-service teacher training, in terms of its scope, instructional methods and trainer profile.

The aim of the first research question was to determine whether instructors believed in-service training programs are part of their professional development. Their preferences regarding the characteristics of INSET programs as well as its scope, and instructional methods were further analyzed as part of the first research question.

The analysis of the data collection instruments revealed that INSET programs are essential for all the participants in the study. Instructors believe INSET is crucial for their professional development; and they would like to keep up-to-date on new developments in the field of ELT and participate in seminars and conferences as part of INSET programs. It is believed that the academic backgrounds of the participants had an impact on their eagerness to participate in such a program. 62% of the instructors are either enrolled in a Master’s or PhD program or they are already holding their degrees. Thus, they are open to the idea of professional development; and they spend a lot of time and energy for this purpose. This finding confirms the finding that all participants believe INSET programs should be regular, continual and ongoing.
The chairperson would like INSET programs to train effective and autonomous teachers who are well-equipped with developing educational perspectives. He views the establishment of a democratic environment in which both teacher and trainers, as well as administrators, express and share their ideas openly and in a democratic way as extremely important.

The findings yielded to the conclusion that although the instructors have varying needs and expectations from an INSET program, they would like to be a part of it. In addition, they would like to attend the INSET programs but they like to be given the option to decide which session to attend as some of them might have had previous training on some of the topics and might not have an individual need. Another conclusion drawn from the analysis of the first research question is that instructors prefer to attend session based on their individual needs instead of being categorized as “novice” and “experienced”. This finding correlates with the point of view of England (1998) that INSET programs are a way to overcome, or at least minimize the teacher burn-out. Placing novice and experienced instructors together will help to revive the teaching skills of teachers if they are suffering from burn-out.

In terms of the scope of INSET programs, the findings indicated that participants prefer a variety of activities which incorporate theoretical knowledge and practical issues. As the administration put emphasis on learner-centered instruction, project-based learning and web-based instruction, these methods will be integrated to the INSET program.

The study revealed that workshops and discussions were preferred as the instructional methods of INSET programs. Diary studies and peer observations found to be the least popular among the participants. Observations were accepted as important to some extent; however, the findings indicated that trainees should be trained on observation and feedback giving strategies in order to preserve a cooperative working atmosphere.

The analysis of the data collection instruments revealed that both the instructors and the administrator prefer the collaboration of internal trainers with outside professionals in the field of ELT. The dominant view among the
participants is that guest speakers should be invited to the institution as part of INSET programs.

5.3.2. The professional needs of the instructors at TOBB TU, DFL that should be addressed by an in-service training program.

The second research question aimed at pinpointing the needs of the instructors. The analysis of the triangulated data revealed that participants did not indicate a high degree of need for most of the items in the questionnaire. In light of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis, it was found that the below mentioned items should be addressed in INSET programs that will be designed in the 2007-2008 academic year:

1- Teaching speaking skills
2- Teaching pronunciation
3- Written and oral error correction
4- Promoting student autonomy
5- Dealing with classroom management problems
6- Teaching mixed-ability groups
7- Raising language awareness of students
8- Reflecting on their own experience

Items that hold lesser priority for the instructors include:
1- Giving written and oral feedback to students
2- Giving instructions
3- Lesson planning

Schön (1987) states that teachers must change and develop their practice in reflective and constructive ways to keep pace with change. Professional development is expected to be a career long feature of teaching. Likewise, the questionnaire analysis revealed that the instructors would like to be trained on
how to reflect on their own teaching in order to better themselves as professionals.

5.3.3. The difference between novice and experienced instructors in terms of their needs and expectations from an in-service training program.

The third research question focused on determining whether the professional needs of instructors differ in terms of experience. According to Dubin and Wong (1990), novice and experienced teachers benefit differently from INSET courses. Experienced teachers may benefit from actually trying out new methods in a simulated situation before taking them back to their classrooms. However, their need for practice is directed toward other matters than is inexperienced teachers’ need.

The t-test results revealed that there was a statistical significance between the answers of novice and experienced instructors concerning ‘teaching vocabulary,’ ‘teaching grammar’ and ‘improving in written and oral correction strategies.’ It was found that experienced teachers are particularly interested in training sessions on teaching grammar, teaching vocabulary, and improving written and oral correction strategies. A comparison of the t-test results demonstrated, however, that instructors’ needs and expectations show homogenous characteristics; this, in general, INSET content should address both groups at the same time.

The analysis also revealed that novice instructors are more interested than experienced instructors in improving in the following four items, even though the mean scores of these were not found to be statistically significant:

1- Dealing with Classroom Management Problems
2- Raising Language Awareness of their Students
3- Lesson Planning
4- Teaching Mixed-ability Groups
5.4. A Proposed Model for an Ongoing INSET program in TOBB ETU’s DFL

In-service programs should be planned with the active participation of those who are to be the benefactors. Interest surveys should be one approach to determining the needs and interests. Leaders should recognize the need to stimulate interest and assist staff members in recognizing needs (Harris & Bessent, 1994). Therefore, the findings of the study will shed light on the design of the INSET program.

This study, which was carried out to explore the professional needs of instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL, indicates that instructors consider in-service training programs to be a part of their professional development and that they would generally like to attend the program. In light of the literature review and the results of the study, a model for the INSET design of the prospective In-service Training Unit in TOBB ETU’s DFL is proposed below.

The findings of the study reveal that INSET programs should cater to the individual needs of the trainees and should provide the staff with an ongoing in-service opportunity. As some of the instructors stated that they did not want INSET programs to be a burden on their shoulders, the instructors should be thoroughly informed about the following aims of the INSET model:

1- to enhance teacher quality
2- to provide continual teacher development activities
3- to maximize the job satisfaction level of the teachers
4- to sustain student success by enabling the teachers to put into practice what they have gained from INSET programs and by making use of the principles of learner-centered instruction.
5- to equip the teachers with theoretical knowledge to a certain extent and focus on practical teaching skills that can be used in actual classroom environment.
6- to enable the teachers to be reflective practitioners
7- to provide the trainees with knowledge about recent developments in the field and to encourage them to participate in seminars, conferences and the like.

Based on the findings, the researcher recommends the organizational structure of TOBB ETU, DFL in the below figure:

![Organizational Structure](image)

**Figure 6. The organizational structure of INSET design for TOBB ETU, DFL**

As seen in the above figure, the program will focus on the individual needs of the instructors and every party will have a say in the decision-making process. Similarly, there will be interaction between all the parties. Trainees, trainers and the administration will provide input to the program in different ways. Trainees will contribute with their classroom experiences, reflections and interactions. Trainers will share their expertise with the trainees and transmit their knowledge to them. Administration will provide support and finance for the professional development of the instructors. Moreover, different programs will be designed for different purposes, i.e. a program for the Curriculum and Materials Development Unit, for the Testing and Evaluation Unit or orientation programs for newly hired instructors, to name a few.
According to Woodward (1991), the organizing principle of ongoing teacher development programs should be bottom-up. When program content is designed by taking consideration of the expectations of teachers in a bottom-up manner, the effectiveness of the program increases. This model proposes that there will be a democratic compromise between teachers, trainers and the administration in determining the areas to be addressed. By this means, rapport between the parties will be increased; for teachers will acknowledge the importance and the value of INSET practices if their ideas are taken into consideration. In this sense, the proposed model adopts the principles of Woodward.

The findings of the study demonstrated that, the program should be based on the principles of reflective teaching proposed by Nunan (1989). According to this principle, INSET programs should be experiential; problem-centered, developmental and open-ended. Schön (1987) also put forwards the reflective model that enables the trainees to reflect on their teaching practices. By taking into consideration Nunan’s (1989) and Schön’s (1987) models, the researcher proposes a reflective model which integrates the exploratory model of Palmer (1993). Reflection and feedback sessions will be implemented after the activities like workshops, discussions and observations.

An additional finding of the study was that the instructors would like to be in the center of the program. As seen in the below figure, trainees and their classroom needs are in the center of the model. Hence, discussions, workshops and observations will be the preferred instructional methods. These three types of activities will constitute the practical side of the program. Still, instructors reported that they like the incorporation of theory and practice in INSET sessions. Theory input will be provided by internal trainers and guest speakers. In addition, instructors will be encouraged to take part in both in-house seminars and conferences and those organized by other universities or English teaching institutes.

The below figure visually displays the model proposed by the researcher:
Observations will be conducted twice an academic year. One of them will be trainer observation whereas one will be done by peers but both will be for developmental purposes. Trainees will learn from each other, share ideas and will be trained on feedback giving strategies. Observations will not be used for evaluation purposes.
In the above figure, trainers act as facilitators and try to help trainees explore their own classrooms and resources. Group discussions based on trainees’ observation of lessons and consequent reflection upon their experiences will be held. Ongoing feedback is a crucial part of the INSET model as it facilitates learning and improvement of the trainees. In addition, regular feedback is essential to determine to what extent trainees’ needs are met and to monitor their degree of satisfaction with the program.

As part of the training practices there will be regular follow-up feedback sessions to enable the trainees to reflect on their own performances or to check to what extent they have internalized the input they received. As the trainees and their classroom experiences will constitute the core of the program, trainees will be active in the sessions via discussions and workshops. The instructors will have the opportunity to examine their classroom challenges, identify their problems and find solutions to the problems.

Woodward (1991) proposes that attendance at ongoing teacher development programs should be non-compulsory. Based on the findings of the data collection instruments, it is suggested by the researcher that there be an understanding between the administration, Teacher Training Unit and the instructors concerning attendance. As some of the instructors might have attended various training programs with similar topics before, the instructors will be asked whether they would like to attend that particular session. Otherwise, the training programs cannot fully satisfy or benefit some of the instructors who reported that they preferred the sessions to have optional attendance due to not having an individual need for some of the topics that will be dealt in the INSET programs.

As the proposed program is for developmental purposes, it will be regular and continual. Throughout the academic year, there will be teacher training activities at least three hours a week. The type of activities will change regularly; and alterations to the schedule and duration will be made according to emerging needs. There will be no certification or exam at the end of the program, as the aim is not to make the trainees compete, but rather, to help them develop.
It is clear from the findings of this study that the administration is willing to allocate a budget for the professional development of instructors within the resources available. Therefore, it would be appreciated if the administration continuously provided the opportunity for the instructors to attend national/international seminars and workshops and to subscribe to journals related to ELT. These gestures will, in turn, contribute to the enhancement of teacher quality and an increase in personnel satisfaction.

The researcher believes that this model will appeal to the needs of the instructors and expectations of the administration. The instructors will have a chance to internalize the input they receive from the INSET program. By this means, they will be more effective teachers developing continuously.

5.5. Implications for Further Study

This study was designed to explore the professional needs of the instructors in TOBB ETU’s DFL, to examine their perceptions of in-service training programs, and to the ideal methodology for in-service training programs. In light of the findings, a further study could be conducted on the question of what models best reflect the philosophy and the objectives of the INSET program that will be designed in 2007-2008 academic year.

The current study included only the instructors teaching the preparatory classes. A more comprehensive study involving all the English language instructors at TOBB ETU could be conducted in order to determine the overlapping and differing needs of instructors offering departmental English courses and those teaching preparatory classes. If such a study were undertaken, the prospective INSET program could address all the instructors in the DFL.

When the Teacher Training Unit is established in the 2007-2008 academic year, another study could be carried out to explore the trainers’ perceptions and expectations of professional development, the scope and
sequence of the INSET programs’ design, and ideal methods to be implemented.

Furthermore, the findings of this study might be beneficial for other institutions that would like to establish an in-service training unit similar to the prospective unit at TOBB University of Economics and Technology. Also, institutions that already have such a unit might benefit from the findings of the study and make modifications to their own programs, if necessary. By this means, the scope of this study could be enlarged to incorporate other contexts.

5.6. Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of this study was that the plentiful data obtained through this study was limited to the number of participants (N=39). Therefore, although the data obtained from this study could shed light on similar studies, this study only provides data about this particular setting.

Another limitation is that only 10 instructors could participate in all three stages of the study, although there were 39 instructors who completed the questionnaire. There were some discrepancies between the questionnaire results, the analysis results of class video recordings, and those of instructors’ interview statements.

5.7. Conclusion

By means of triangulation of data, the study demonstrated that both the staff and head administrator of TOBB ETU’s view INSET programs as essential components of teacher development. Providing sustainable INSET programs that aim to enhance teacher quality and personnel satisfaction, will contribute to the success of the institution as well as to the success of the students. Incorporating project-based studies and new developments in the field of ELT, like web-based or learner-centered instruction, will add value to the INSET programs. Personnel satisfaction will be best ensured by taking into consideration instructors’ needs
and expectations. Arranging the frequency and the duration of INSET programs according to the workload of the instructors will enable the instructors to be more committed to their profession and to the workplace. Furthermore, positive changes in teachers’ attitudes will lead to the establishment of a better working environment and also will enhance the intrinsic motivation of the staff. An INSET program could be designed at TOBB ETU based on the findings of this study.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

PART I-

Please tick the appropriate choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions about in-service training</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service teacher training programs are a means of professional development at the Department of Foreign Languages.</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An in-service teacher training program maintains a balance between the needs of the institution and the individual teacher.</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should provide me with practical teaching skills such as classroom organization, skills integration, giving instructions, error correction etc.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should introduce activities that increase the trainee teacher’s language proficiency</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should encourage trainee teachers to follow activities such as conferences, seminars, recent articles.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should keep the trainee teachers updated with recent methods, theories and trends in the field of ELT.</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should guide the trainee teachers to reflect on their own teaching.</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training programs should be conducted by an external trainer</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In-service training programs should be conducted by the ‘Teacher Training Unit’ in the University. 3.0 2.7 2.8

10. In-service training programs shouldn’t be compulsory. For professional development, all teachers, novice and experienced, should take part in in-service programs. 3.5 3.2 3.3

11. All teachers, novice and experienced, needn’t attend the same in-service programs. 3.5 3.6 3.6

12. Administrators, within the resources available, should allocate budget for staff to attend in-service teacher training programs. 4.7 4.6 4.6

13. I would regularly attend the in-service training program in the Department of Foreign Languages, if conducted. 4.0 4.0 4.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Needs of instructors</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching grammar.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching listening skills.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching reading skills.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching writing skills.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching speaking skills.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching vocabulary.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching pronunciation.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It’s necessary for me to improve in giving oral and written feedback to my students.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It’s necessary for me to improve in giving instructions.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It’s necessary for me to improve in written and oral error correction.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. It’s necessary for me to improve in lesson planning.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. It’s necessary for me to improve on promoting student autonomy.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve on dealing with classroom management problems.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve in teaching mixed-ability groups.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve on raising language awareness of my students.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve on promoting collaboration among my students.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve on determining my students’ needs.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>It’s necessary for me to improve on motivating my students.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>There is a need to set up a ‘Teacher Training Unit’ in TOBB ETU, the Department of Foreign Languages.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional Methodology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Experienced</th>
<th>Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include peer observations.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include microteaching activities.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include workshops.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include dialog journals.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include audio/video recordings.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include diary studies.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>In-service training programs should include discussions.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The delivery of information in in-service training programs needn’t be trainer-centered.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The flow of information in in-service training programs should be trainee-centered.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) **Microteaching**: A teaching method whereby the teacher reviews a videotape of the lesson after each session. Teachers find out what has worked, which aspects have fallen short, and what needs to be done to enhance their teaching technique.
(2) **Workshops:** Teachers work individually or in groups to prepare something, such as classroom materials, teaching aids or lesson plans and try these in their lessons.

(3) **Dialog journals:**
1- Teacher and students write to each other to interact about classroom matters.
2- Teacher analyzes these to gain more insights about his/her classroom practices and the students

(4) **Audio/video recordings:**
1- Teacher selects an aspect of his/her teaching
2- S/he videotapes classroom interaction
3- S/he transcribes the relevant parts
4- S/he analyzes the transcribed parts
5- S/he decides what changes in his/her teaching are required

(5) **Diary Studies:**
1- Teacher keeps a personal diary over a period of time (e.g one semester )
2- S/he analyzes it to learn more about classroom teaching/ learning

(6) **Discussions:**
1- Teachers supply their findings from classroom investigations
2- Teachers share ideas in groups about how to solve problems

**Part II**

“In-service training programs should be continual and ongoing.”

(Woodward, 1991)

1. Considering the above mentioned statement, what is your opinion of the frequency of an ideal in-service training program?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Could you please suggest a name for the ‘Teacher Training Unit’ to be set up in TOBB ETU, the Department of Foreign Languages? ( 

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Please add any other comments you have about the in-service teacher training practices at TOBB ETU, the Department of Foreign Languages?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Part III - Personal Information

Please tick the appropriate option for yourself.

1. Gender
   a. ( ) Female   b. ( ) Male

2. Department of Graduation
   a. ( ) Department of English Language Teaching
   b. ( ) Department of English Language and Literature
   c. ( ) Department of Translation and Interpretation
   d. ( ) Department of Linguistics
   e. ( ) Other (Please mention)
   ……………………………………………………………

3. Educational Background
   a. ( ) Bachelor of Arts
   b. ( ) Master of Arts completed or in progress
   c. ( ) PhD completed or in progress

4. Teaching Experience (in general)
   a. ( ) 0-1 year
   b. ( ) 2-3 years
   c. ( ) 4-5 years
   d. ( ) 6-10 years
   e. ( ) 11 years and more

5. Teaching Experience (in TOBB ETU)
   a. ( ) 0-1 year
   b. ( ) 2-3 years
   c. ( ) 4 years

6. Have you ever attended an in service teacher training program in ELT?
   a. ( ) Yes.   b. ( ) No
   (If yes, please explain location, date and duration)
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

6. Do you have any teaching certificates?
   a. ( ) Yes. (If yes, please specify)   b. ( ) No
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
Değerli Öğretim Elemanları,


Ekli belgdede bulunan anket cevaplarınız tez sonuçlarını doğrudan etkileyecek ancak verileriniz hiçbir şekilde başka bir çalışma için kullanılmayacaktır.

Katılımcı olarak haklarınız korunacaktır.
Bütün sorulara samimiyette cevap vermeniz sağlıklı sonuçlar elde edebilmek açısından önemlidir.
Cevaplarınız ve kimliğiniz gizli tutulacaktır.
Katılımınız yaklaşık olarak 25 dakika olacaktır.

Bir sorunuz olması durumunda 0 312 292 41 86 no’lu telefondan benimle irtibata geçebilirsiniz. Bu çalışmaya zaman ve emek harcadığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Araştırmacı: İnci GÜLTEKİN
TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi
Yabancı Diller Bölümü

Ben, ……………………………, yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılımını kabul ediyorum.

İmza: ____________ Date: __________

What’s In-service Teacher Training?

In-service Teacher Training (INSET) programs provide life-long support for teachers when appropriately designed. They offer a way for ongoing teacher development, which one can find remedies for the problems resulting from first year stress or later burnout. These programs are seen as a pre-requisite for job satisfaction and career development. Teachers attend INSET programs for several reasons:

- to improve their command of English
- to cope with professional crisis
- to learn theory
- to learn techniques
- to experience new approaches to teaching

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
APPENDIX C

OBSERVATION TOOL FOR IDENTIFYING TEACHERS’ NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>3-Neutral</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self presentation and classroom persona:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T established and maintained rapport with the Ss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used positive reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T appeared self-confident and prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T moved around the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used his/her tone of voice, body language, gestures effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used grammar and vocabulary correctly and acceptable forms of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T dealt with disruptive, non-participant and chatty students skillfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used appropriate strategies to maintain classroom control and discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T managed to remain calm but firm when faced with a conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T managed to cope with all sorts of problems (technical problems, pacing etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Procedures and lesson planning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T uttered the aim of the lesson clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used a variety of teaching tools (audio-visual aids, handouts, print materials, board etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used a variety of teaching techniques (role plays, peer teaching, discussion, group work, pair work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T checked student understanding, attention, and interest constantly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T followed the lesson plan and managed time efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T used sufficient, meaningful and clearly illustrated instructional examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T related new material to previously learned material (or to future topics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were interested in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giving feedback:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback to let the Ss how well they performed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback to acknowledge a correct answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback to indicate an incorrect answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback to indicate an incorrect answer yet sometimes not appropriate to the context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T did not give feedback in the right form / manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback by repeating the Ss’ answers or sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback by summarizing what the students have said</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback by criticizing the Ss for the kind of response they provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback by explaining orally why the given response was incorrect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave feedback by making fun of the students for the kind of response they provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T did not give feedback at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Error Correction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T corrected errors yet some are not in the right time and form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T gave the correct form and passed on to the next point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T indicated error and tried to elicit correction from the S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T indicated error and tried to elicit correction from other Ss in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T did not indicate error but asked the S to repeat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T indicated error and gave the rule about language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T did not correct errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Giving Instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T used appropriate instructional language for the level of the Ss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T got the Ss’ attention before giving the instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T read the instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T wrote the instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T acted out/ demonstrated the instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T asked comprehension questions to check understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T repeated the instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Interview Questions
(Chairperson of the Department of Foreign Languages)

1- Mr. Şahinel, what is your academic and professional background including your experience in TOBB ETU?

2- How do you perceive the concept of ‘professional development’?

3- What is currently being done in the department in terms of teacher development? How do you feel about what has been done so far?

4- Do you think there is a need to set up a ‘teacher training unit’ in the department?

5- What kind of challenges in terms of the practices, do you think there will be, if an in-service training unit is set up?

6- What should be the scope of the teacher training programs in the department? (theories, methods and new trends, teaching practical skills, classroom management etc…)

7- Who should be the target group of training all teachers, novice, experienced or all together?

8- Do you think teachers should volunteer to participate in teacher training programs or should the administration decide it?
APPENDIX E

Sample Interview Transcription of an Instructor

Note: The names mentioned below interview are pseudonyms.

**Beren**: Neslihan, when the needs of the instructors were analyzed, it was found in the questionnaire that the highest average belonged to ‘teaching mixed ability groups’.(3,6) and teaching pronunciation whereas the lowest mean scores were about giving instructions (2,6) and ‘giving written and oral feedback’ (2,7). How do you evaluate these findings?

**Neslihan**: Well, actually, I must tell you that I’m a bit surprised because I would expect just the opposite results because giving instructions and giving written and or oral feedback is a very important component of class management and teaching in general. So hum, the reason why people thought that they needed that much might be because people do not have the opportunity to observe themselves as teachers. Maybe they are not aware that their way of giving feedback is not sufficient enough. So we tend to …. You know, as teachers jump into correct errors just say ‘No! That’s wrong, sht like that’. So I think the reason could be that the teachers are not aware of the importance of it. So they just think telling the Ss ‘O.K. get into groups, get into pairs, do it’ is giving instruction. Maybe what they understand from giving instruction is different, so I think the keyword here is ‘awareness’ and the same I’m going to say about ‘teaching mixed ability groups’. This is a really hot topic nowadays, you know learning styles and everything. So every teacher knows a bit about it. So they might be curious about it, they might want to improve themselves about it. So, as for pronunciation, I remember when I go back to my bachelor years, nobody told me how to instruct pronunciation so I will also think you know. Maybe I should be more informed about it. So I think the keyword here is in short, to cut it short “awareness”. So if you are aware of your weaknesses, you seek solution for it but if you aren’t aware of it, you just say you do not need it.

**Beren**: If you go through the questionnaire items again, which ones do you think were supposed to be highly needed in your opinion? Do you think they differ among novice and experienced instructors?

**Neslihan**: O.K, when I … I’m just going through the points here to remember it but I couldn’t find it …. This one right … Hmm … O.K. So in my point of view, the … hmm improving oneself in listening skills, reading skills etc. In four skills and the subskills which are grammar and vocabulary, are not so important compared to some other things like class management, motivating Ss, and giving feedback to students because I think we learn this already in bachelor years, so we’re all ELT graduates, we know how to do it.
Beren: At least most of us…

Neslihan: …. but these things like, you know, class management, motivating and feedback …. These are things that you cannot be instructed at school. You just learn it by doing and unfortunately by trial and error. So … of course, it shouldn’t be left to trial and error but we’ll come to that but the INSET program should focus most on those and as far novice and experienced teachers, I do not see a different strengths and weakness so it depends on the teacher.

Beren: The mean score about classroom management about the questionnaire was 3,0 (novice:3,1 ; exp:2,9) Do you find these results realistic? Why? Why not? Please refer to observation findings.

Neslihan: So meaning that the novice teachers thought they needed less class management. Right?

Beren: They needed more because 5 is the highest need.

Neslihan: O.K. Well, when I … there’s no of course a huge difference. Well I think I find it realistic. You know why, 3 out of 5 shows that they are somewhere in the middle and they’re aware that they need sth. But maybe they did not diagnose exactly what they need. So I think, it is O.K, it’s realistic. Again I will come to the term ‘awareness’ because this is a really key term in this issue.

Beren: You’ve mentioned in your questionnaire that novice and experienced instructors should attend the same INSET programs. Why?

Neslihan: Well, humm I believe in learning from each other. We, in all areas, in all professions but especially in teaching, we learn from each other and we should interact. So if you separate teachers in 2 different groups as novice and experienced, you immediately introduce a clear cut distinction. So… instead of building a sense of community, you are actually separating two groups and humm, therefore, hindering the interaction which will be very beneficial because also during the sessions, people learn from each other. I mean the interaction should not be only from the presenter to the audience but they are also interacting so I think, having the whole in one place, novice and experienced will humm, foster a lot of interaction and this in turn will produce, you know, experience brought into the situation and sometimes experienced teachers are really burned out. They think ‘O.K., I do not want to do it anymore, or I know this already.’ But seeing the younger ones and their enthusiasm, their motivation and what they do, they might also become, you know, humm, curious again about improving themselves. So they learn from each other.

Beren: What kind of an INSET design do you expect to find in terms of scope and sequence when the unit is set up?

Neslihan: Well, scope is a nice word, first of all. Whom should we include? To what extent etc. as I told before the group should not be separated but depending on the needs, of course, you can make up smaller groups or whole group. I mean, all the
instructors, if it’s a general topic or including, let’s see, only the materials office, only the testing office depending actually on the content and also depending on the needs, because you can have regular workshops on generals topics. Hıı… in which all of the people participate but you can also have some needs for specific group of teachers, let’s say, newcomers etc., who have orientation problems, so you can have a session for only them. But it all, I mean … we should do a needs analysis and decide on the syllabus of the training and well …. that’s all I guess.

**Beren :** What about the methodology of training? What methods should/not be incorporated? Why? Why not?

**Neslihan :** O.K. Let me start from the ‘not’ part. O.K, now the peer observation. Peer observation is one of the ‘IN’ topics, you know, for the last 10 years. Everybody, each institution has tried some of the peer observation techniques. Well, it’s good. I mean, the intention is good and people do it with goodwill. But it really has to be perfectly structured and the person who is doing it should really know what he or she is doing. But it might, hummm, destroy the positive, supportive atmosphere in the institution. People might feel threatened. So the person who’s observing really should know what he or she should observe and he or she should have very good relationships with the people. The people should trust him or her. Well, those are really challenging things, what I’ve just listened. It’s very difficult. So peer observation should be done very carefully.

……And the second ‘do not’ for me is again, diary journals. It is a wonderful technique in reality. But we have done it in my previous institutions and it turned out to be a really dull activity where teachers are just writing ‘I did this today, I did that today.’ I mean, that’s not the aim of it. You should be reflecting and etc. So humm, the teachers gather pages of sheets for a weekly schedule ‘I did this today, I did that today.’ But when you look at that, you just find facts. You do not see any reflections. But this should be like, you know, portfolio thing.

**Beren :** Then, we should start by improving them about how to reflect on their own teaching.

**Neslihan :** Exactly! Exactly. So you know, step by step and therefore, you know, it needs a huge effort, investment and the investment and also investing in people. So if it’s done properly, it’s great but unfortunately, so far I haven’t seen such a practice.

**Beren :** I hope we can accomplish this. What about the things that should be incorporated?

**Neslihan :** I’m in favor of workshops, because due to the design of the workshops, you have a lot of hands-on activities. You should also consider our colleagues as learners who have mixed abilities, learning styles and multiple intelligences so when you have workshop, you have him…. You are catering for linguistics, verbal, spatial, kinesthetic. Everybody has sth. to like in such environments. So I like workshops. They’re more active not just like listening and nodding you know.
And recording is wonderful, you know, I asked you whether I could, after your study, take my recording and have a look at it, because I’m really curious. It must be a wonderful feeling to see yourself. When, I’m really looking forward to it actually. That recording thing, in my point of view, would work best.

**Beren**: Some instructors mentioned that they did not want INSET programs to be a burden on their shoulders. How do you evaluate this comment?

**Neslihan**: Well, I do not want to be too harsh but I’m speechless. I mean, it is not a burden on their shoulder. On the contrary, it is a means to get …. that will enable you to get rid of your burdens on your shoulder because you learn techniques and you get materials and you know how to deal with your problems. Forget about all the academic staff, you share with your colleagues, your problems. Even that, just a psychological aspect is a great deal of thing and this feeling of community. This feeling of belonging and you know, if there was a teacher training unit there, if I had a problem with my class, that unit would be the address to go first. Even when I need a shoulder to cry on. You know, that’s very important. So, I was very surprised that, to hear that people really said sth like that

**Beren**: I hope after the establishment of the Unit, people will change their minds. It would be wonderful, wouldn’t it?
APPENDIX F

Sheet for the Poll about the INSET Unit Name

Name :

Dear Instructor,

21.05.2007

You were previously handed a questionnaire as part of a thesis study conducted to determine needs and expectations of the instructors concerning the establishment of a Teacher Training Unit. In this questionnaire, you were asked to suggest a name for the Teacher Training Unit to be set up in TOBB ETU, the Department of Foreign Languages. The below mentioned expressions are the suggested names found out as a result of the questionnaires. Please **rank the name** which you like most. Upon this poll, the most favorite name will be determined.

| ETU Teachers’ Guide                      |
| Professional Development Center          |
| Lifelong Learning Unit                   |
| TESL ( Training for English as a Second Language) |
| TOBB Trainees                           |
| CTC ( Cooperative / Collaborative Teachers / Teaching Center ) |
| Teacher Updating Center ( TUC )          |
| In service Training Unit                 |
| Teachers in Training ( TIT )             |
| Support Center for Teachers              |
| TTDU                                    |
| Training Unit for DFL Teachers at TOBB ETU |
| TOBB TETU                               |
| Teaching to Learn, Learning to Teach     |
| Energy Unit                             |
| Teacher Training Unit                    |
| Happy Hour                              |
| Learning To Teach                       |
| TOBB IDC ( Instructor Development Center ) |
| In-service Training Unit                 |
| Center of Caring and Sharing ( CCS )     |

Thank you for your participation and cooperation.