

EXPLORING THE DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS
OF IN-SERVICE TRAINERS

A MASTER'S THESIS

BY

EBRU GAGANUŞ

THE DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN

LANGUAGE

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

JANUARY 2012

Dedicated to My Beloved Sister, Elif...

Exploring the Desired Characteristics and Behaviors
of In-Service Trainers

The Graduate School of Education
of
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

Ebru Gaganuş

In Partial Fullfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Art

in

The Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University
Ankara

January 2012

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

January 6, 2012

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education for
the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Ebru Gaganuş

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Exploring the Desired Characteristics and Behaviors
of In-Service Trainers

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe
Bilkent University MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı
Bilkent University MA TEFL Program

Asst. Prof. Dr. Emily Wilson
Bilkent University, Graduate School of Education

ABSTRACT

EXPLORING THE DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS AND BEHAVIORS OF IN-SERVICE TRAINERS

EBRU GAGANUŞ

MA Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

January 2012

This study explored the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in the Schools of Foreign languages as viewed by EFL instructors at Turkish universities. The variables affecting the EFL instructors' choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors were also investigated.

The study was conducted with 125 EFL instructors who were surveyed for their expectations and attitudes towards in-service trainers. The participants worked at the Schools of Foreign Languages at the following state universities: Kocaeli University (in the city of Kocaeli), Ankara University, Gazi University, and Middle East Technical University (METU), in the city of Ankara. Five of the participants were also interviewed to investigate their opinions about what variables affect their choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors.

The data were collected via a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. The questionnaire had three parts. In the first part, questions related to the instructors' personal information and professional background were asked. The other questions in the remaining two parts were directly related to the desired

characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. In the second part, each question included a set of items to be rank ordered by the participants. In the third part, five-item Likert- scale questions were organized. In the semi-structured interview, three guiding questions were asked to the interviewees. The participants were also prompted to answer additional questions raised during the interviews.

The results of the quantitative analysis revealed that the EFL instructors give more importance to the trainers' communication and pedagogical skills rather than their higher academic degrees. The results also indicated that according to the instructors, a trainer should be able to provide practical knowledge to be used in the classrooms. In addition to these, the qualitative analysis revealed that previous experiences with in-service trainers, the conditions and circumstances at home institutions, the instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics, and the instructors' previous experiences with their former professors in the BA programs were the factors which affected their choices in relation to the these desired characteristics and behaviors.

Key Words: In-service training, in-service trainer, internal and external in-service trainers.

ÖZET

HİZMET İÇİ EĞİTİM GÖREVLİLERİNDEN İSTENİLEN VASIFLAR VE DAVRANIŞLARIN ARAŞTIRILMASI

EBRU GAGANUŞ

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

Ocak 2012

Bu çalışmada hizmet içi eğitim görevlilerinden istenilen vasıflar ve davranış biçimleri Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin Yabancı dil okullarında çalışan İngilizce okutmanlarının bakış açıları değerlendirilerek araştırılmıştır. Ayrıca bu vasıflar ve davranış biçimleri ile ilişkili olarak İngilizce okutmanlarının seçimlerini etkileyen değişkenler incelenmiştir.

Çalışmaya Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Gazi Üniversitesi ve Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller İngilizce Bölümü'nden hizmet içi eğitim görevlilerine karşı tavır ve beklentileri araştırılan 125 okutman katılmıştır. Katılımcıların beşi ile bu vasıflar ve davranış biçimleri ile ilişkili olarak, seçimlerini etkileyen değişkenler hakkında fikirlerini araştırmak amacı ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın verileri bir anket ve yarı planlanmış görüşme kullanılarak elde edilmiştir. Anket üç bölüm oluşturulmuştur. İlk bölümde, okutmanların kişisel bilgilerine ve eğitim geçmişine ilişkin sorular sorulmuştur. Geriye kalan iki bölümdeki sorular doğrudan hizmet içi eğitim görevlilerinden istenilen vasıflar ve

davranış biçimleri ile alakalıdır. İkinci bölümde, her bir soru katılımcılar tarafından sıraya konulacak bir dizi maddeden oluşmaktadır. Üçüncü bölümde, beş maddelik Likert ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Yarı planlanmış görüşmelerde katılımcılara üç soru sorulmuştur. Katılımcılar görüşmeler sırasında ortaya çıkan soruları cevaplamaları için de teşvik edilmiştir.

Verilerin nicel analizi okutmanların hizmet içi eğitim görevlilerinin en çok yüksek akademik dereceden ziyade iletişim ve eğitim becerilerine önem verdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Sonuçlar ayrıca, okutmanlara göre, bir görevlinin sınıflarda kullanılabilecek pratik bilgileri temin edebilmesi gerektiğini göstermiştir. Bunlara ek olarak, nitel veri analizleri konuyla ilgili olarak okutmanların seçimlerini belirleyen etkenlerin hizmet içi eğitim görevlileriyle yaşanmış önceki tecrübelerin, çalışılan kurumlardaki şartların, kendi profesyonel vasıfları ve davranış biçimlerinin ve okutmanların lisans eğitimi sürecindeki profesörleri ile geçmiş deneyimlerinin olduğu belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Hizmet içi eğitim, hizmet içi eğitim görevlisi, kurum içi çalışan ve misafir hizmet hizmet içi eğitim görevlisi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to offer my thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe for her support and guidance. This thesis would have never been completed without her help and care.

I would also like to acknowledge the help provided by Asst. Prof. Dr. Maria Angelova and I wish to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Matthews-Aydınlı, the director of MA TEFL Program, for her precious feedback and help. I am also thankful to Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters for her support.

Above all, I would like to express my very great appreciation to Asst. Prof. Dr. Phillip Durrant for his invaluable guidance and patience. He was always there, in this journey with me, with his greatest knowledge and support whenever I needed. I also owe much to his help with statistical analysis. I would like to express my gratitude to him once more since this thesis would not have been possible without him.

I am also grateful to the former director of Kocaeli University School of Foreign Languages, Prof. Dr. Sadettin Hülügü and the former chair of the Department of Basic English, Int. Derya Akı for giving me permission to attend the MA TEFL program.

I would also like to thank Kocaeli University, Ankara University, Gazi University, and Middle East Technical University (METU) and their staff for their support and contributions to this research. I owe my special thanks to Int. Evren Köse Yuca for her invaluable friendship, support, and encouragement.

I wish to thank my all friends at the MA TEFL program for their friendship. I am especially grateful to Ayça Özçınar Durrant, Ebru Öztekin, Figen İyidođan , Nihal Yapıcı Sarıkaya, and Zeynep Erşin for their help and support.

I owe much to Salih Aydın, who supported me with his great computer skills. I would also like to show my gratitude to him not only for his help but also for his presence in my life. I also wish to thank Mahmut Maviş and especially Mert Konak for his invaluable support and being understanding.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest love and gratitude to my beloved family. I would have never succeeded without their love and support. I owe much to my mother, Fatma and my father, Osman.

And my sister, Elif, to whom this thesis was dedicated, was always with me with her endless love, support and care. I cannot imagine a life without her...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ÖZET..... | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | ix |
| LIST OF TABLES | xii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xiii |
| CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Background of the Study | 2 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 4 |
| Research Questions | 5 |
| Significance of the Study | 5 |
| Conclusion | 6 |
| CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| Introduction..... | 7 |
| Teachers’ Professional Development and Teacher Training | 7 |
| In-Service Training | 12 |
| What is In-Service Training?..... | 12 |
| Characteristics of In-service Programs..... | 13 |
| In-service Trainers | 18 |
| Who is an in-service trainer and what are the roles of in-service trainers? | 18 |

| | |
|--|----|
| The studies determining the characteristics of in-service trainers according to teachers' opinions and interests..... | 20 |
| Conclusion | 25 |
| CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY | 26 |
| Introduction..... | 26 |
| Participants..... | 26 |
| Instruments..... | 29 |
| Procedure | 31 |
| Data Analysis | 33 |
| Conclusion | 34 |
| CHAPTER IV - DATA ANALYSIS | 35 |
| Introduction..... | 35 |
| Quantitative Data | 36 |
| Results regarding the 2 nd part of the questionnaire | 36 |
| Results regarding the 3 rd part of the questionnaire | 45 |
| Qualitative Analysis..... | 53 |
| What variables affect the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers?..... | 54 |
| Conclusion | 66 |
| CHAPTER V – CONCLUSION..... | 68 |
| Introduction..... | 68 |
| Findings and Discussion | 69 |
| The desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in general | 69 |
| Internal and External In-Service Trainers | 74 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Variables affecting these desired characteristics and behaviors.... | 77 |
| Pedagogical Implications | 80 |
| Limitations of the Study..... | 81 |
| Suggestions for Further Research | 82 |
| Conclusion | 83 |
| REFERENCES..... | 85 |
| APPENDIX A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE (IN TURKISH)..... | 90 |
| APPENDIX B : THE QUESTIONNAIRE (IN ENGLISH)..... | 95 |
| APPENDIX C: A SAMPLE INTERVIEW (IN TURKISH)..... | 100 |
| APPENDIX D: A SAMPLE INTERVIEW (IN ENGLISH)..... | 101 |

LIST OF TABLES

Table

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Distribution of the participants according to the universities | 27 |
| 2. Distribution of the participants according to educational background | 28 |
| 3. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Competency and Skill Important in the Selection of a Trainer | 37 |
| 4. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Roles of a Trainer | 38 |
| 5. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Pedagogical Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate..... | 40 |
| 6. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Communication Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate..... | 41 |
| 7. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Content Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate | 43 |
| 8. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for a Trainer's Skills to Achieve An Appropriate Atmosphere During the Sessions..... | 44 |
| 9. The Overall Perceived Benefit of Sessions with Trainers | 46 |
| 10. Having Input in Choosing the Trainer to Work with..... | 47 |
| 11. The Use of Turkish or English During Training Sessions | 48 |
| 12. The Way Training Sessions Are Organized and Presented | 49 |
| 13. Trainers' Education and Experience | 51 |
| 14. Being Observed by a Trainer | 52 |

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Differences between training and development..... | 9 |
| 2. Teacher Training- teacher development association..... | 10 |
| 3. Criteria for effective INSET..... | 15 |
| 4. Supervisors' definable roles..... | 19 |

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

Introduction

To enhance the quality of education, teachers, as important members of this process, are in need of continuing professional development, which is an ongoing process of education, training, learning and supporting activities aimed mainly at promoting learning and development of their professional knowledge, skills and values (Early & Bubb, 2004). In-service training (hereafter INSET) courses provide good opportunities for teachers to educate their students more effectively by bringing teachers of TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) up to date about changes in education and society. INSET is defined as: “the whole range of activities by which teachers can extend their professional education, develop their professional competence and improve their understanding of education principles and techniques” (Report, as cited in Early and Bubb, 2004, p. 4). The effectiveness of INSET programs depends on the teachers’ satisfaction with the course content and trainers who are directly involved in the in-service training (Avalos, 2011; Wong, 2002). Therefore, in order to help teachers gain additional knowledge which would be satisfying, these programs must meet the needs of the participants by providing appropriate content and qualified trainers (Anderson, 1995; Gültekin, 2007).

Since the quality of education depends on the quality of educators, INSET trainers’ competencies and their characteristics should be evaluated (Özen, 2004). The purpose of this is to investigate what EFL instructors want from in-service trainers, second, to explore the desired characteristics and behaviors of these trainers to help to improve the quality of in-service training.

Background of the Study

In the changing EFL field, continuing education is the only way to keep up with these changes in order to develop. Teachers are obviously critical members in the process of education and they should continuously be trained and develop themselves (Altun & Gök, 2010). In-service training programs are seen as essential for teacher development since they inform teachers of new developments in the field and contribute to their professionalism (Gültekin, 2007).

In the view of the importance of in-service programs in ELT, characteristics of effective in-service education programs have been the concern of a great deal of research. While determining the characteristics of these programs, knowledge of teachers' expectations and needs has come to be considered as greatly important since teachers are the individuals who take part in the process directly (Altun & Gök, 2010; Şentuna, 2002). As a result of the growing awareness of this issue, considerable research has been devoted to the investigation of teachers' expectations from in-service training programs (Alan (2003), Duzan (2006), Karaca (1999), Kervancıoğlu (2001), Korukçu (1996), Özen (1997), Şentuna (2002) as cited in Gültekin (2007)).

A review of the literature reveals that investigating the opinions of teachers about in-service training has great importance for designing effective in-service programs which meet teachers' needs and expectations. However, few studies have focused on teachers' wants and expectations regarding trainers' profiles, which is also another important aspect in designing in-service education programs.

A study conducted by Gültekin (2007) suggests that trainers who work with tertiary level teachers need to be experts in their field. The results of another study by

Altun and Gök (2010) reveal that the participants who were EFL teachers at primary and secondary schools wanted trainers who have PhD degrees and experience.

Similarly, Öztaşkın's study (2010) on INSET programs for Social Studies lessons at primary schools suggests that the participating teachers wanted specialist trainers in the field. However, these studies appear to focus mostly on the characteristics of in-service training programs as opposed to questioning the characteristics of in-service trainers in detail as a part of INSET programs. Therefore, the findings are limited in terms of understanding trainees' expectations from in-service trainers since the data collected did not seem to be adequate to reach valid findings.

Apart from the study mentioned above, in the relevant literature, there are some other studies which directly aim to examine the perceptions of INSET participants in relation to the competencies of INSET program instructors. In a series of studies conducted in 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2005, Özen investigated the issue. He searched for the opinions of teachers to find out the teaching competencies of the instructors who are in charge of giving training for primary school teachers. He reached similar results which showed that INSET instructors are mostly required to give importance to using different teaching methods, participants' attention, and appropriate learning environment. Considering that INSET training and program instructors are provided by Ministry of National Education, it might be said that the needs of primary schools teachers depend on this context.

Since INSET training programs are also organized by the administrations of the universities, the contextual differences between Ministry of National Education and Higher Education Council should be taken into account. Considering these, it would seem that further investigation which is thought to have an effect on providing

teachers with quality in-service education programs is needed in order to examine what EFL instructors expect from in-service trainers because there might be variation about trainees' expectations, and that variation might depend not only on the trainees themselves but also on certain factors related to trainers, too. For example, whether the trainer is a local colleague or an outside visiting expert might be a factor to be evaluated.

Statement of the Problem

In order to provide professional development for their teachers, universities organize in-service training programs. It is important that these programs meet teachers' needs and expectations. Needs analyses should be done prior to designing these courses to ensure their effectiveness. Since many institutions and researchers are aware of the importance of the issue, many studies like the ones conducted by Altun and Gök (2010), Gültekin (2007), and Şentuna (2002) investigate what teachers want from these programs. However, although INSET trainers also have a significant role for INSET programs which aim to be effective, little attention has been given to what EFL instructors expect from in-service trainers. It would seem, therefore, that further investigation is needed in order to address the question in a detailed way.

Since Kocaeli University is one of the institutions which give importance to in-service training, it is trying to establish a teacher training unit which also includes some internal trainers. However, because this unit is a new one and the trainers chosen among the teachers have limited experience, they may have some difficulties knowing what to do as trainers. Also, the administration may need to find out teachers' opinions while appointing a teacher as a trainer or while hiring an external

trainer in order to enhance the quality of in-service programs. Therefore, this study aims to explore the English language teachers' expectations from INSET trainers at Turkish universities.

Research Questions

- 1) What are the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in the Schools of Foreign Languages at Turkish universities as viewed by EFL instructors?
- 2) What variables affect EFL instructors' choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors?

Significance of the Study

To make in-service programs more effective, the targeted teachers' own perceptions of their needs for professional development should be taken into consideration. Regarding INSET trainers as an important part of these programs, teachers' expectations from those trainers must also be taken into account, which will help in-service education programs be more effective for teachers. It is hoped that this study will provide useful data on one group of teachers' ideas on this issue and the findings of the data analyses will contribute to the current literature by addressing the question from the EFL instructors' perspectives who work at the School of Foreign Languages at Turkish universities. INSET program designers and administrators may use the results of the current study to help them to decide what kind of trainers to hire for their INSET programs in order to be most helpful for teachers' development. Also, trainers may use the results of this study to develop themselves to be more effective trainers. Finally, the findings might be used to prepare guidelines for the training of trainers.

The results of this study will also be valuable for institutions, like Kocaeli University, which are planning to establish a teacher training unit. The School of Foreign Languages is determined to have teacher trainers and through them to help its instructors' professional development. The findings of this study may give useful ideas for the administration while hiring an external trainer or deciding on whom to select an internal trainer. Moreover, the internal trainers in the institution might use the results of the study for themselves to become more effective trainers.

Conclusion

In chapter 1, the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and significance of the study have been presented. The next chapter is the literature review, which presents the relevant literature on teacher development, teacher training, in-service training, and in-service trainers. The third one is the methodology chapter and it presents the participants, instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis of this study. The following chapter aims to present the results and findings of the analyses of the data. The conclusion chapter as the fifth one consists of the discussion of the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter provides background on the relevant literature by starting with the definitions of teachers' professional development and teacher training. This will be followed by the explanation of in-service training and the examination of the characteristics of in-service training programs. Then, in-service trainers will be examined and their profiles will be described. Lastly, the characteristic and behaviors of in-service trainers will be discussed.

Teachers' Professional Development and Teacher Training

To be identified as a professional, one should learn throughout their career. For teachers, commitment to self-improvement and development makes them professionals and this leads to continuing professional development which is widely used as a term to express ongoing education and training (Early & Bubb, 2004).

To better understand the term 'professional development', we should look at the definitions of this concept. Eraut defines professional development as a "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" (as cited in Jaworski 1993, p.37). Ur (1996) defines teacher development as a progress in which teachers go on learning about their profession by reflecting on their experiences and by being in communication and cooperation with other colleagues.

Lange (as cited in Nunan et al., 2001) agrees that the term is used to describe a process of continual intellectual, experiential, and attitudinal growth of teachers. Similarly, Bell and Gilbert (as cited in Evans, 2002) describe teacher development as teachers' learning, developing their beliefs and ideas, improving their classroom practice, and attending to their feelings associated with change.

Despite different definitions in the literature, the term has common particular qualities and regarding these qualities, for the purposes of this study professional development of teachers might be defined as their "learning, learning how to learn and transforming their knowledge into practice for the benefit of their students' growth" (Avalos, 2011, p. 10).

The other term related to teacher development is teacher training, but it is defined differently and the differences between the terms are pointed out by researchers and authors. For instance, in her study, Türkay (2000) summarizes the shared views on the issue and states that according to Freeman (1982, 1989) and Ur (1996) training differs from development in terms of fundamental differences, which introduces the idea that while training is more trainer-based, development is done by peers. She also covers Kennedy's ideas (1993) which state that since training has a fixed program which consists of a set of sessions dealing with certain immediate needs, it can be distinguished from development which has long-term concerns and is continuing.

Freeman (1989) explains that training which is a process supported by a trainer and implemented by a teacher aims to improve classroom practice by dealing with specific aspects of teaching. On the other hand, development focuses more on the individual teachers' development of a 'theory' which might be achieved by

developing awareness. Ur (1996) also contrasts training with development and states the differences by listing these in a table (Ur, 1996, pp 10-11).

| <u>Training</u> | <u>Development</u> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Imposed from 'above' | Initiated by 'self' |
| Pre-determined course structure | Structure determined through process |
| Not based on personal experience | Based on personal experience |
| Externally determined syllabus | Syllabus determined by participants |
| External evaluation | Self- evaluation |
| Input from experts | Input from participants |
| Unthinking acceptance of Information | Personal construction of knowledge |
| Cognitive, cerebral | Cognitive and affective, whole person |
| Isolated | Collaborative |
| Stresses professional skills | Stresses personal development |
| Disempowers individual teacher | Empowers individual teacher |

Figure 1. Differences between training and development

Woodward (1991) points out all the differences between teacher training and teacher development mentioned above in a bi-polar scale in Figure 2 (p.141).

| Teacher Training | Teacher Development |
|--|---|
| Compulsory | Voluntary |
| Competence based | Holistic |
| Short-term | Long-term |
| One- off | Ongoing |
| Temporary | Continual |
| External agenda | Internal agenda |
| Skill/technique and knowledge based | Awareness based, angled towards personal growth and the development of attitudes/insights |
| Compulsory for entry to the profession | Non-compulsory |
| Top-down | Bottom-up |
| Product/certificate weight | Process weighted |
| Means you can get a job | Means you can stay interested in your job |
| Done with experts | Done with peers |

Figure 2. Teacher Training- teacher development association.

Many other authors also point out the difference between training and teacher development with different explanations. Özen (1997) represents the term as a means to provide ongoing professional development. Türkay (2000) says that ‘development is the upper level of training’ (p.25). Şentuna (2002) describes in-service education

and training as one of the methods of on-going teacher development. Alan (2003) explains that in-service training is a form of providing teacher development. Altun and Gök (2010), Arıkan and Turhan (2009), Gültekin (2007), and Hişmanğolu (2010) also agree that teacher professional development includes in-service training. Based on these explanations, it might be concluded that training is sometimes defined as a practice which supports teacher development or as a concept that might be used under teacher development.

In other studies focusing on the different aspects of teachers' development, training is mentioned as a model which is a part of teacher development. Lovett et al. (2008) investigate what frames effective professional development for teachers and they include in-service training in the overview of the professional teacher development models. Mitkovska (2010) questions the current situation of professional development of teachers (PTD) including the problems or the treatment of the issue and concludes that PTD is "a process that is realized in different ways, which involves training of teachers with new knowledge, skills, strategies in the respective areas of competence and application of appropriate technology" (p. 2926). In her study, Avolos (2011) reviews the publications related to teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years and she states that there have been some other models which are applied for teacher development apart from traditional in-service teacher training model. In light of these studies, it might be said that continuing professional development is essential for teachers and it includes improving one's skills through training programs which help them to keep up to date on recent developments and changes in the field and as a result of this enables them to improve their classroom practice in a better way.

In-Service Training

Although the two terms, training and in-service training, are very close to each other and sometimes used interchangeably, Gültekin (2007) and Şentuna (2002) make a distinction between them. In her study Gültekin (2007) tries to identify the professional needs of instructors to determine the preferred instructional methods of an INSET (in-service training) program. While Gültekin (2007) includes in-service training as one of the headings under the models of teacher training, Şentuna (2002) places in-service training between teacher training and teacher development.

What is In-Service Training?

Desmarais (1992) states that in-service training was first used to compensate for the novice educators' poor skills when they first started their career. However, it has become the norm of continuing education, which leads teachers to keep up with the constant changes in the field. Koç (1992) defines in-service training in a more detailed way and explains the term as:

creating a caring and sharing atmosphere in which teachers share and exchange their experience in their teaching, discuss their problems and practical solutions to their problems with academic help from educators in improving their skills in applying recent methodology, approaches, classroom management strategies, gain experience in developing and applying an effective curriculum, in evaluating the effectiveness of their teaching as well as their students' performance on courses they teach and according to the feedback they get, they make necessary changes in their style of teaching and suggest ways of reorganizing the contents of the book they are teaching from

in accordance with the new developments in their specific fields of study in line with advances in technology (p.48).

The definitions of INSET in the recent literature are all similar and support Desmarais's (1992) views. According to Türkay (2000), "INSET is an atmosphere where teachers exchange their ideas, experiences, and problems in an academic situation" (p.9). Alan (2003) states that "INSET programs are also necessary for more experienced teachers to increase job satisfaction and to prevent burnout" (p.11). Ur (2006) defines INSET programs as a way of continuing teacher development and through in-service courses which are held locally teachers can find remedies for their problems which arise in the first years or later. In addition to these, Gültekin (2007) explains "in-service training programs are a means for some teachers to keep track of the recent developments in the field, and for some, an opportunity to brush up on their previous knowledge and add to it" (p.27). According to Fransson, Van Lakerveld and Rothma (2009), in-service training which is carried out by teacher educators is an organized intentional learning process. Based on these definitions, in-service training is known to be the programs which are held in home institutions or outside aim to improve both novice and experienced teachers' knowledge, skills and classroom practice for a better classroom environment for both teaching and learning.

Characteristics of In-service Programs

In-service training programs are needed to enhance the quality of education. As long as effective or fruitful training programs are applied, training can reach its goals. Yıldızlar and Kargı (2010) share the view by stating that providing effective in-service education helps to enhance teachers' professional knowledge and develop

their professional skills. Therefore, many authors in the field deal with the issue and they offer some principles for INSET programs.

Siedow, Memory and Bristow (as cited in Gültekin, 2007) offer some steps for an effective model of INSET. The steps are as follows: “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” (p.31).

Hayes (1995) suggests some principles for INSET programs:

- Teacher should not be expected to change their teaching strategies quickly.
- Activities related to in-service training should have some connections directly to the teachers’ everyday school situations.
- Trainers are expected to be teachers.
- Trainees’ prior knowledge should be taken into consideration.
- Training sessions should help teachers to draw generalizable conclusions about the topic which is being discussed.
- Teachers should be given opportunities to apply their new knowledge and skills in a non-judgmental environment.
- Teachers should be able to share their opinions and knowledge in the sessions.
- Follow-up courses should be held in participants’ local institutions.

In his study, O’Sullivan (2001) summarizes the effective INSET strategies in the literature as follows:

- School-based and school-focused programs
- Based on teachers’ needs
- Related to classroom realities
- Series of courses rather than one shot courses

- Opportunities to try out new skills
- Adequate supervision and follow-up
- Planned and formal in nature (p.95).

In his study, Lamie (2005) suggests several criteria including five main elements for effective in-service training programs: 1) defining the goal 2) planning and application 3) determining the length and mode of delivery 4) methodology 5) follow-up work activities. The author also puts the emphasis on considering the needs of the trainees as well as providing them with what they want according to their individual differences and the criteria is shown as below (Lamie, 2005, p.96).

| Procedure | Participant | Activity | Content | General |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Part of overall scheme and clearly articulated rationale | Continual involvement | Share information | Good Practice | Focus on Individual |
| Planning implementation evaluation | Individual difference | Demonstrations | Interactive | Appropriate form |
| Length and mode of delivery | Needs awareness | Trials | Relevant | Government support |
| Methodology | Motivation | Feedback | Coherent | Credible trainers |
| Follow-up work | Researcher | Relevant | Supporting materials | Cultural awareness |

Figure 3. Criteria for effective INSET

In another study conducted by Al-Wrekiat and Bin Abdullah (2010), the effectiveness of in-service training courses was evaluated in terms of the techniques being used and teachers' needs. After collecting data via questionnaires given to

Jordanian EFL teachers-respondents and performing qualitative and quantitative analysis, the results revealed that in-service courses weren't evaluated as effective. The reasons suggested by the participants were related to the content, the timing, and organization of the courses. Taking the results and teachers' expectations into consideration, according to teachers, an effective in-service training might be interpreted as the one which:

- a) has the content that is determined by the teachers' needs.
- b) includes feedback discussion sessions between trainers and trainees.
- c) enables teachers to participate through discussions and brainstorming.
- d) sets the time effectively.
- e) is relevant to the recent developments and classroom realities.
- f) takes participants' educational background into consideration.
- g) has the content that is determined by the teachers' needs.
- h) includes feedback discussion sessions between trainers and trainees.
- i) enables teachers to participate through discussions and brainstorming.
- j) sets the time effectively.
- k) is relevant to the recent developments and classroom realities.
- l) takes participants' educational background into consideration.

Considering all the elements constituting effective in-service training mentioned above in this part, it is obvious that INSET programs have common characteristics. The content which is relevant to teachers' needs, teachers' participation, follow-up sessions, good organization regarding timing and setting, and caring for participants' needs and interests are the basis of effective in-service training.

In light of these studies, it might be concluded that meeting teachers' needs is one of the most important principles of fruitful in-service training programs. Some researchers are of the same idea that the effectiveness of INSET programs depends on teachers' satisfaction who are directly involved in the in-service courses (Avalos, 2011; Wong & Yeung, 2002). Malderez and Wedell (2007) agree that if teachers' needs and wants (defined as 'learners' subjective needs', p.47) are taken into consideration seriously, since it helps them feel comfortable and motivated, they are likely to be engaged with learning. However, teachers' needs are not limited to the content of in-service education. In these programs trainers' qualifications and their profiles should also meet teachers' expectations (Armutçuoğlu, 1992). This view is supported by other researchers. According to Anderson and Bagnole (1995) and Gültekin (2007), in-service training which aims to meet teachers' needs and expectations with its content should also meet teachers' needs and expectations with its trainers' qualifications.

These views also indicate the importance that should be given to in-service trainers. Armutçuoğlu (1992) states that achieving the goals of in-service training programs relies on the importance given to trainers since trainers are considered as the factors which also have an effect on the quality of in-service training and influence the process. Sabaz (2004) shares the same view in his paper related to perspectives to in-service education and points out that the success of in-service training programs depends on the importance of the staff that are going to provide training.

Based on these views, trainers' qualifications and desired characteristics seem to be very important for beneficial training. Therefore, many resources focus on the competencies, roles, or skills that a trainer should have.

In-service Trainers

Who is an in-service trainer and what are the roles of in-service trainers?

Based on the many definitions for in-service trainers in the literature, briefly an in-service trainer can be defined as the person who “supports the learning of adult learners who have a career in teaching” (Fransson, Van Lakerveld & Rothma, 2009, p.78). Resources not only define trainers but also describe their roles in details and sometimes this is done within these definitions.

For example, for a better quality of in-service training, trainers of the programs are “expected to follow the educational assumptions and guiding principles, as well as the set of prescribed teacher competencies” (Reznich 1985, p.13) In his study, Reznich lists the roles of a supervisor (trainer) as follows; 1) communicator 2) trainer 3) observer 4) evaluator 5) administrator. (See Figure 4 ,adapted from Reznich 1985, p.37).

| |
|--|
| Communication : a process of self-expression and delivery of meaning through symbols |
| Training : structured teacher development activities, usually within a group leader context |
| Observation : a process of classroom visitation and related activities by the supervisor and the teacher aimed at teacher development |
| Evaluation : a process of self-assessment and judgment of performance |
| Administration : supervisor program support activities |

Figure 4. Supervisors' definable roles

In his paper presented at a conference, Kocaman (1992) points out the importance of teacher educators and he expresses the qualifications of a trainer by saying “teacher educators well informed about theory and practice, about fashion and tradition in the job, and those who dedicate themselves to this hard task and who love teaching and humans at large will change a lot in the profession in the long run” (p.23).

Armutçuoğlu (1992) emphasizes that the quality of training programs depends on the quality of trainers because the success of the programs depends on the knowledge and skills of trainers who are the ones that are going to carry out training. In her study, where she aimed to provide some more theoretical knowledge on the issue through reviewing the relevant literature, she categorizes the qualifications into two groups: competencies related to a trainer's personality and competencies related to a trainer's professional aptitudes. It is mentioned that a trainer should demonstrate understanding and sensitivity to teachers, should be a good guide and a researcher, should be able to work within a team, should be open to

criticisms, should create an appropriate environment for learning, should be experienced in INSET programs, should know what trainees need in terms of their teaching practice, should be able to provide practical knowledge based on theories.

Wallace (2002) defines a trainer as a supervisor. Accordingly, a supervisor is someone who is in charge of monitoring. In addition to this, a supervisor is also responsible for improving the quality of other colleagues' teaching in a specific educational context.

Wright and Bolitho (2007), as trainers themselves, summarize their views about trainers by expressing that trainers are the ones who are responsible for professional learning of teachers and they express that trainers' main role is being a facilitator in the process of teachers' professional learning. In addition, they point out that in order to affect trainees in a positive way, trainers need to do their job well.

Fransson, Van Lakerveld, and Rothma (2009) agree that an in-service trainer need to be a facilitator of learning while helping them to develop their knowledge and skills, and point out that trainers have different tasks and roles. They list the roles of in-service trainers as: catalysts (who inspire teachers about change), experts, problem solvers, process helpers, and developers (learning environment, materials, and, tools).

The studies determining the characteristics of in-service trainers according to teachers' opinions and interests

Although many other researchers also define some roles for in-service trainers, trainers' roles should be evaluated from teachers' perspectives and teachers' expectations as mentioned before. The studies related to the evaluation of in-service training or determining the characteristics of INSET according to teachers' opinions

and interests suggest some solutions on the issue. However, since these studies mainly focus on the content of INSET programs, little attention is given to what instructors expect from in-service trainers.

One of those studies conducted by Gültekin (2007) aimed to identify the professional needs of instructors and to determine preferred instructional methods in in-service training programs at TOBB University of Economics and Technology. The participants were 39 instructors. Data were collected through questionnaires, video recordings and interviews analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the qualitative analysis, content analysis was used and for quantitative analysis, SPSS program was used and mean scores were given. In addition, for some of the items on the questionnaire, an independent sample t-test was conducted to identify statistical significant differences by comparing means of the two groups in the study, the novice and experienced instructors. The results of the study revealed that the trainees see the INSET program as necessary for improvement and they need training on various issues like teaching speaking skill, classroom management, and reflecting on their own practice. The findings about the teacher trainees revealed that trainers are expected to be experts and experienced ones. However, since expectations from trainers were questioned with only two items in the questionnaire and because the results are limited to analysis of the responses given to these two questions, they did not reveal any unexpected or detailed results.

Another study by Altun and Gök (2010) similarly investigates what kind of in-service teacher training program teachers want. Randomly selected 131 teachers from different elementary schools in Ankara, responded to a questionnaire. The questionnaire items were based on the teachers' opinions and the related sources in

the literature to determine of the features of the in-service teacher training programs. The conjoint analysis was used to interpret the results of the study. The results were also examined according to the participants' gender and experience level. The findings of this study indicate that the teachers gave importance to the place and the time of the training as well as who provides the training, what kind of training it should be, and how the topics should be determined. The findings related to the trainers revealed that trainees want expert trainers with PhD or MA degree. However, the authors did not define 'conjoint analysis' clearly and the explanations related to the term led to confusion. Therefore, since it was not stated explicitly, the data analysis does not seem reliable, which makes the results questionable. In addition, the findings related to the qualifications of in-service trainers seem to be limited since this research seems to have failed to consider the investigation of other characteristics of in-service trainers from instructors' perspectives.

There are some other studies which aimed to investigate the desired characteristic features of in-service trainers by evaluating them from teachers' perspectives. Özen (2004) summarizes his early studies on the issue. In his study which was conducted in 1999, he investigated the perceptions of primary school English language teachers in relation to the professional skills of instructors of possible future INSET programs. The results of this study showed that in-service trainers are expected to be able to create an appropriate environment for learning, to be able to give instructions and feedback clearly, be able to use different methods, techniques and approaches, to be able to use audio and visual aids effectively, be able to be accessible to solve teachers' professional problems, and to be able to care for teachers' professional needs. In addition, Özen conducted another study in 2001

which was similar to the one mentioned above. That time he aimed to examine academicians' perceptions in relation to teaching skills of instructors of INSET programs for primary schools' English language teachers. The study yielded similar findings to the previous one and the results also revealed that arousing interest during training, giving importance to teachers' participation, and carrying out the activities in a logical order were the skills that the target trainers in this study should have.

Another study by Özen (2004) investigated the perceptions of INSET participants in relation to the competencies of INSET courses trainers. The study was conducted with 67 participants after they attended an INSET program organized by the Ministry of National Education. The data were collected via a questionnaire and analyzed with the SPSS 10.0 program, and percentages, frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviation were calculated. The findings of the study revealed that the instructors of INSET programs should have some characteristics as follows:

- being subject specialists,
- being an academician,
- being educated on how to teach adults,
- having teaching competencies like required behavioral and communication skills

Özen (2005) continued to examine teachers' perceptions on the teaching competencies of in-service trainers. In his latest study on the issue, the participants who were 130 primary school teachers responded to a questionnaire, a 5-point Likert scale, which aimed to learn their attitudes towards in-service trainers of INSET programs for primary schools teachers. The findings indicated that the instructors of the INSET programs are expected to give explanations clearly, to be able to use

audio and course materials effectively, to give sessions on the latest developments in the field, to increase motivation and interest, to make a connection between the subjects and real-life situations, and to be competent on the subjects that would be presented. These findings seem to support the results of his previous studies related to teaching competencies of INSET program instructors. As the results of the analyses related to variables affecting their perceptions, a significant difference appeared only between female and male teachers' perceptions in relation to the teaching competencies of INSET program instructors in favor of female teachers.

However, these studies aim to examine the teaching competencies and professional skills of the instructors of INSET programs which are held and organized by the Ministry of National Education. In addition, these programs intend to train primary school teachers who are either English language or subject-matter teachers. Moreover, these studies mostly focus on INSET program instructors' teaching skills although there are some other skills and competencies that an in-service trainer should demonstrate.

Considering the differences in the EFL context of the Schools of Foreign Languages at Universities, more research needs to be done in this area. Nowadays these institutions form in-service training units in their own setting and they try to improve the qualifications of their instructors and the quality of their education as well. In-service trainers can be classified into two groups. As Armutçuoğlu (1992) suggests, internal trainers are the ones who are chosen among the instructors who work in that institution. In addition, in-service programs are also carried out by other in-service trainers who are invited as guest speakers to institutions from other places (Armutçuoğlu, 1992). Based on the concepts of internal and external trainers, EFL

instructors' expectations from in-service trainers might differ. Personal relationships between instructors and the conditions of institutions might lead different wishes in relation to behaviors that in-service trainers should demonstrate.

In addition, regarding the differences between the conditions of Ministry of National Education and Higher Education Council, INSET program instructors might differ in terms of their characteristics that they should have in terms of their educational background, and their attitudes towards trainees.

It would seem, therefore, that further investigations are needed in order to examine the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers who work for EFL instructors at universities. New studies might lead to differences in results that might introduce new aspects to the issue.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the literature on teacher development, teacher training and in-service training were reviewed and trainers' profiles were discussed. According to the literature, it is clear that teachers' professional development is essential and teacher training is an important part of teachers' ongoing education. In the process of teachers' training, in-service programs are needed to help teachers to keep up with the changes and developments in the field. Trainers' characteristics and behaviors also play an important role as well as effective characteristics of INSET programs while designing these programs. For more effective in-service education, more research is needed to investigate trainers' profiles in the EFL context of universities.

CHAPTER III – METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This descriptive study focuses on EFL instructors' expectations of in-service trainers. The study aims to explore the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. This research also investigates what variables affect the instructors' wants. This chapter of the study presents the participants and instruments, as well as the data collection, and data analysis procedures. The research questions to be examined are as follows:

- 1) What are the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in the Schools of Foreign Languages at Turkish universities as viewed by EFL instructors?
- 2) What variables affect instructors' choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors?

Participants

There were two groups of participants in this study: the first was a group of EFL instructors from the Foreign Languages Departments of four state universities in Turkey, and the second included both a small additional group of EFL instructors and some in-service trainers from various institutions. The second group was only used to get help to develop the questionnaire.

The first group, 125 EFL instructors who were surveyed for their expectations and attitudes towards in-service trainers, worked at the Schools of Foreign Languages at the following state universities: Kocaeli University, Ankara University,

Gazi University, and Middle East Technical University (METU). These universities were chosen because they have training units and in-service trainers. Although Kocaeli University, Ankara University and METU regularly organize trainings and work with both internal and external trainers, Gazi University had just begun training its in-service trainers during the 2010-2011 academic year, in preparation for them to start giving sessions in 2011-2012.

The distribution of the participants according to universities is given in Table 1. The distribution of the participants according to teaching experience is also presented in the same table.

Table 1. *Distribution of the participants according to the universities*

| University | Total | Experienced | Inexperienced |
|--------------------|-------|-------------|---------------|
| Kocaeli University | 29 | 24 | 5 |
| Ankara University | 64 | 39 | 24 |
| Gazi University | 25 | 10 | 15 |
| METU | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Missing | 1 | | |

The teachers were grouped according to their teaching experience as ‘experienced’ and ‘inexperienced’ according to Freeman’s (2001) suggestions for the length of teaching experience. As he states, experienced teachers are regarded as the ones who have five or more years of work year experience and inexperienced teachers are considered as those with fewer than five years of experience. In the table above, since one of the participants did not give any information related to this part, some information is missing.

Participants also differed in terms of degrees and majors that they have completed. Table 2 presents the distribution according to educational background.

Table 2. *Distribution of the participants according to educational background*

| Majors and Degrees | KOU | Ankara U | Gazi U | METU |
|------------------------------|-----|----------|--------|------|
| ELT Graduates | 12 | 14 | 20 | 6 |
| BA | 9 | 10 | 12 | 1 |
| MA | 3 | 4 | 8 | 5 |
| PhD | - | - | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - |
| Literature Graduates | 14 | 39 | 5 | - |
| BA | 13 | 23 | 3 | - |
| MA | 1 | 14 | 2 | - |
| PhD | - | 2 | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - |
| Translation Graduates | 1 | 4 | - | 1 |
| BA | - | 2 | - | - |
| MA | - | 2 | - | 1 |
| PhD | - | - | - | - |
| Other | 1 | - | - | - |
| Linguistic Graduates | 2 | 7 | - | - |
| BA | 2 | 5 | - | - |
| MA | - | 1 | - | - |
| PhD | - | 1 | - | - |
| Other | - | - | - | - |

Although no calculations were done to investigate the differences in instructors' views resulting from their differences related to their experiences, degrees, and majors, this information was used to choose the participants for the qualitative part of this study.

Three trainers also participated in this study. At the time of the study Kocaeli University had a new in-service training unit and one of the members of this unit participated in the study. This trainer had attended a two-week teacher training course in England and has been a trainer for nearly seven months. She was a non-native EFL instructor. The other two in-service trainers were native speakers and work as external trainers conducting workshops but not teaching at a university. They were invited to universities as guest speakers. They were also in charge of some other duties in different institutions. One of them was involved in teacher training in different countries. The other one did not take any special teacher training courses to be a teacher trainer. The trainers were interviewed informally about their views on the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers.

The other participants in this group were three additional EFL instructors from other Turkish universities not being surveyed in this study. These instructors were the friends of the researcher. Since they were accessible and they differ in their majors, it was thought that their views on the issue might be helpful for the researcher while designing the actual data collection tool of this study, the questionnaire. Therefore, they were interviewed informally.

Instruments

Two data collection instruments were used in this study: a questionnaire and interviews with EFL instructors.

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) has three parts. In the first part, questions related to the instructors' personal information and professional background were asked. The other questions in the remaining two parts were directly

related to the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. In the second part, each question included a set of items to be rank ordered by participants. The measure of order was important. In the third part, five-item Likert- scale questions were organized. The options in the scale were: “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “neither agree nor disagree”, “agree”, and “strongly agree”. They were numbered from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire was prepared in the non- native EFL instructors’ first language, which is Turkish, to make them feel more comfortable.

The interviews were held with five of the instructors to address the second research question of the study. Firstly, the interviewees were chosen from the three universities out of the four which were surveyed in this study considering that they represented the majority since the participants from these universities answered all of the items in the questionnaire. In addition, the differences in their work experiences, degrees, and majors were taken into account. The researcher chose the participants who had these properties in a mixed way and in the selection, representing a broad range of educational and work experience was considered. In brief, they were selected on the basis of variety of background and willingness to participate in the interviews. The interview was prepared as semi-structured. The researcher prepared some questions before the interviews in order to collect data for the second research question, which aimed to examine the variables affecting instructors’ choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors. The questions were; a) while answering the questionnaire what were the variables affecting your choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors?, b) what do you think about your experiences with in-service trainers?, c) do you think that your own professional

views may have affected your choices?. They were also prompted to answer the questions raised during the interviews to obtain more qualified data. As the participants were non-native EFL instructors, all interviews were conducted in their native language which is Turkish.

Procedure

As the first step of the procedure in this study, to design the questionnaire, firstly the relevant literature was reviewed and informal interviews were held with some instructors and with both internal and external in-service trainers for the purpose of selecting and preparing the items of the questionnaire. The instructors and the trainers were contacted via telephone and e-mail. Then, the meetings were arranged and the interviews were held. The interviews were recorded. However, since the researcher took some notes as important points and themes during the interviews, the interviews were not transcribed. As the second step, next, the questionnaire was designed. Then, it was examined by experts in the field for the overall content and wording. After that, it was piloted with 17 EFL instructors from the researchers' home institution. The questionnaire was revised according to their comments about the layout, and the final version of the questionnaire was prepared. Since the content of the questionnaire was not changed, the participants of the piloting were also included in the rest of the study.

Later, written consent forms were secured from the heads of the departments to ask for their permission for the survey to be carried out in their institutions. After sending the forms and getting administrative permission, the questionnaires were prepared. For each participant's confidentiality, informed consent forms were prepared and attached to the first page of the questionnaire. Since the researcher's

home institution was far from the place where the researcher lived, the questionnaires were delivered via mail and they were distributed and collected with the help of a colleague in the institution. After that, the questionnaires were mailed back to the researcher. For the other two institutions in Ankara, the researcher herself went to the schools. In one of them, unit coordinators in the institution distributed the questionnaires and then collected them. Then, the researcher went to the institution to take the collected data. In the other, the researcher was invited to attend a local meeting in the institution to do her survey. She distributed the questionnaires and she collected the forms. In addition, for the other institution in Ankara, a friend of the researcher who works there helped by delivering the questionnaires and collecting them. That friend also brought the data to the researcher. The numbers of the participants in each university surveyed in this study represent a sample. The researcher prepared a total of 180 questionnaires, 125 of them were returned, reflecting the total number of teachers actually present on the days of data collection. The data collection procedure was completed after all the questionnaires were received from the institutions.

The final data collection procedure ended with semi-structured interviews with five of the instructors from different universities which were surveyed. The instructors were chosen according to their different types of undergraduate degrees and the degrees obtained during the years they have worked and also their willingness. The interviews aimed to obtain more detailed data, since they provide interviewees with the opportunity to elaborate on their reasons related to the responses given in the questionnaires. They were contacted through telephone and e-mail, then the meetings were arranged to hold the interviews. The interviewees

responded to the open-ended questions individually. The interviews, which were held in Turkish, were recorded and the researcher transcribed the necessary parts which were related to certain themes that all participants focused on as common points. Since the participants had all signed the informed consent form on the questionnaire, they were not asked to sign a new form again.

Data Analysis

In this study, a questionnaire and interviews were used to collect data and the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. According to the responses to the questionnaires provided by the EFL instructors, the data were analyzed quantitatively and statistical analyses were used. Descriptive analyses were applied, and percentages and mean scores were calculated to present the results. For the second part of the questionnaire, the analyses were about what teachers want from in-service trainers and for the third part of the questionnaire, the analyses were about whether the expectations from internal and external trainers differ in terms of characteristics and behaviors they should have. For the third part, in order to compare the two sets of data (expectations from internal versus external trainers); firstly, Kolmogorov- Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were carried out to determine if the data were normally distributed or not. After it was seen that the data were non-parametric, meaning the data were not distributed normally, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Tests were done. In this section, considering the first question of this part which looks for the opinions of instructors in relation to evaluation of trainers' work, the tests were done for the three universities, Kocaeli, Ankara and METU, since their training units and trainers were actively functioning at the time of the investigation. However, because the in-service trainers at Gazi University had not yet started

training and giving sessions, it was felt that the teachers could not accurately respond to the comparison questions, and data from this university were not considered for this particular question. Finally, qualitative analysis was conducted on the follow-up interviews to address the second research question. The researcher searched for the common themes that the participants focused on during the interviews. The researcher listened to the recordings over and over. In addition, she got help from the notes she took while talking to the interviewees.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology of the study was presented and information about the participants, the instruments, the data collection procedures and the data analysis were given. The next chapter will discuss the results of the various analyses in detail.

CHAPTER IV - DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This study was designed to explore the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. Data from 125 EFL instructors on such characteristics and behaviors were gathered through quantitative and qualitative methods. The EFL instructors were working at different Schools of Foreign Languages at four state universities in Turkey.

The study aimed to examine the answers to the following research questions:

- 1) What are the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in the Schools of Foreign Languages at Turkish universities as viewed by EFL instructors?
- 2) What variables affect instructors' choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors?

The data were collected through a) a questionnaire (see Appendix A and for English version Appendix B) which was analyzed quantitatively, and b) semi-structured interviews which were analyzed qualitatively. The questionnaire consisted of three different parts. In the first part, information related to the participants' personal and educational backgrounds was collected. In the second part, the participants were asked to respond to six items by ranking the statements related to each item according to their importance. Items, 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 each, contained four statements which were required to be ranked from 1 (the most important) to 4 (the least important). Item 2 had six statements to be ranked from 1 (the most important)

to 6 (the least important). This part aimed to examine the participants' expectations from in-service trainers in general. In the third part of the questionnaire, the subjects responded to 10 items through a five-point Likert scale. Each item asked for the participants' opinion in terms of their expectations from internal and external trainers. The answers in this scale were assigned values from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Quantitative Data

The quantitative data were gathered through the second and the third part of questionnaire to address the first research question. The first part of the questionnaire aimed to gather some information related to the participants' personal and educational background and the findings coming from this part are already presented in the sample section. Therefore, this section will only present the findings coming from the second and the third parts as well as the interviews.

Results regarding the 2nd part of the questionnaire

The second part of the questionnaire aimed to examine the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in general. Each item in this part included different statements which represent the different competencies of trainers, for example; pedagogical and communication skills were considered (see Appendix A and for English version Appendix B). The participants were required to rank the statements for each item according to their perceptions of degree of importance of each statement. The results are reported in the tables which present the percentages and mean scores for each statement. Based on the mean scores, the competencies are rank ordered from that competency/skill which is considered the most important to that considered the least important. Table 1 shows the analysis of the first question in

the second part of the questionnaire which represents the important skills of a trainer to be considered while being selected.

Table 3. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Competency and Skill Important in the Selection of a Trainer

| Item | 1 st % | 2 nd % | 3 rd % | 4 th % | Mean Score | Sd. | Imp. |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------|----------|
| Pedagogical Skills | 48.8 | 33.6 | 13.6 | 4 | 1.73 | .84 | 1 |
| Communication Skills | 32.8 | 35.2 | 25.6 | 6.4 | 2.05 | .91 | 2 |
| Academic Degree | 16 | 19.2 | 33.6 | 31.2 | 2.8 | 1.05 | 3 |
| Organizational Skills | 2.4 | 12 | 27.2 | 58.4 | 3.42 | .79 | 4 |

Note. The ordinal numbers in the first row represent the importance of the statements from 1st (the most important) to 4th (the least important). The numbers in the last column represent the ordinal scales based on the mean scores where the most important item receives the lowest score and the least important receives the highest.

(N= The number of people who answered the question. N=125)

Table 3 shows the means for each statement related to the competencies of a trainer that should be considered while being selected. According to the mean scores, a trainer's pedagogical skills had the lowest mean value (1.73) which means that it is the most important competency for the instructors. 'Communication skills' is considered the second important competency. Academic degree ($M=2.8$) is the third most important item. It seems that trainers that have practical experience and are able to communicate that experience well are preferred over the simple existence of a higher degree. On the other hand, it appears that the instructors still give some importance to such titles since they place academic degree higher than the more pragmatic 'organizational skills' (which had the highest mean value of 3.42

indicating that it was the least important). The instructors might have thought that trainers' being organized in presentations or in their approaches does not change what a trainer tells and how well a trainer conveys his/her message in a session. Therefore, it might not be one of the main concerns in the selection of a trainer.

Data showing the expectations from in-service trainers in terms of the possible roles that a trainer might assume are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Roles of a Trainer*

| Item | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | 5 th | 6 th | Mean | Sd. | Imp. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|------|----------|
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | Score | | |
| Being good at guiding teachers | 41.6 | 24.8 | 13.6 | 10.4 | 8 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.38 | 1 |
| Providing practical knowledge | 32.8 | 21.6 | 20.8 | 12.8 | 8.8 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.44 | 2 |
| Being a Consultant | 8.8 | 24 | 14.4 | 25.6 | 20 | 7.2 | 3.4 | 1.45 | 3 |
| Being a mentor | 10.4 | 11.2 | 17.6 | 19.2 | 16 | 25.6 | 3.9 | 1.66 | 4 |
| Evaluating teachers | 3.2 | 8 | 14.4 | 22.4 | 31.2 | 20.8 | 4.3 | 1.34 | 5 |
| Providing theoretical knowledge | 3.2 | 10.4 | 19.2 | 9.6 | 16 | 41.6 | 4.5 | 1.57 | 6 |

Based on the results given in Table 4 above, it might be concluded that the most prioritized roles of trainers seem to be related to being able to provide practical knowledge over theoretical knowledge. This might be because instructors do not find theoretical knowledge useful since they think that theories are general but each class

and each setting differ in terms of their needs and the things that might be beneficial to them. In addition, considering that theoretical knowledge can be constructed and generated from research which is academicians' job, the results also indicate that instructors prioritize experience which might result from practice over academic degree. In addition, being a consultant ($M=3.4$) and being a mentor who looks out for the instructors' professional development ($M=3.9$) ranked third and fourth. These two items had close mean scores, maybe because they represent similar concepts. In other words, both of these roles require doing similar jobs as a trainer such as being accessible only when an instructor needs or wants to be given advice or to be guided. Also, it seems that the instructors did not give much importance to trainers' evaluating them since it was the fifth most important item according to them. This might be mostly because of the fact that the instructors feel that they have already been educated to be a teacher and they are already experienced, which might mean that their teaching is good and there is nothing to be evaluated. In addition, they may think that evaluating means having reported only negative things in their classroom practice, so since they might not want to experience being reported on in this way, they might not see it as an important role of a trainer.

Table 5 shows how a trainer's pedagogical skills were rank ordered with percentages and mean scores.

Table 5. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Pedagogical Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate

| Item | 1 st % | 2 nd % | 3 rd % | 4 th % | Mean Score | Sd. | Imp. |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|------|----------|
| Giving instructions and explanations clearly | 32.8 | 36 | 22.4 | 8.8 | 2.07 | .95 | 1 |
| Arousing interest and motivation | 30.4 | 24 | 24 | 21.6 | 2.36 | 1.13 | 2 |
| Conducting lessons using a variety of teaching methods | 22.4 | 27.2 | 37.6 | 12.8 | 2.4 | .97 | 3 |
| Giving appropriate feedback | 15.2 | 12 | 16.8 | 56 | 3.13 | 1.13 | 4 |

Table 5 illustrates a mean value of 2.07 for the item ‘giving instructions and explanations clearly’ and this makes the item the most important pedagogical skill of a trainer according to the teachers. It seems that the instructors need explicit instructions to gain more from training. The second most important item is that trainers are expected to arouse interest and motivation throughout the training ($M=2.36$). ‘Conducting lessons using a variety of teaching methods’ ranks the third, though the mean scores of these two items are very close to each other, and making them nearly equal in importance. The reason for this might be that interest and motivation can be easily aroused by trainers when they use different techniques or methods during training sessions. On the other hand, ‘giving appropriate feedback’ was ranked as the lowest which means that it is the least important item to the instructors. The reason might be that ‘giving feedback’ is usually done after observation whereas the other three items in this table might have been related to a

trainer's actual performance during training sessions or workshops by the instructors. The instructors might have thought that training sessions are more beneficial to improve their classroom practice rather than by being observed and improving themselves according to feedback given after observation. Therefore, they might have ranked the items related to training sessions higher. Also, this might be related to their low ranking of a trainer's role as an evaluator. It appears that since they do not give importance to this role much, they do not give importance to this skill which can be demonstrated as a part of this role.

Table 6 examines the frequencies in percentages and mean scores of the item which is related to the communication skills of a trainer.

Table 6. *Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Communication Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate*

| Item | 1 st % | 2 nd % | 3 rd % | 4 th % | Mean Score | Sd. | Imp. |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----|----------|
| Demonstrating sensitivity to the teachers' feelings and needs | 78.4 | 15.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 1.31 | .68 | 1 |
| Working flexibly and cooperatively within a team | 16 | 58.4 | 16.8 | 8.8 | 2.18 | .80 | 2 |
| Using body language | 3.2 | 16.8 | 50.4 | 29.6 | 3.06 | .76 | 3 |
| Having a sense of humor | 1.6 | 9.6 | 30.4 | 58.4 | 3.45 | .73 | 4 |

Based on the results in Table 6, demonstrating sensitivity to the teachers' feelings and needs is the most important skill of a trainer according to the instructors ($M=1.31$). Considering the very low mean score for this item, it might be said that

caring teachers' needs and feelings is as important as experience and professional degrees, which are usually prioritized as trainers' expected characteristics. The instructors might have thought that as long as a trainer provides what instructors need, beneficial training is possible. 'Working flexibly and cooperatively within a team' had the mean value of 2.18 and it was ranked as the second important role of a trainer. Such characteristics like these two, 'flexibility' and 'cooperativeness', might be linked to being sensitive to teachers' feelings and needs since if these are provided by a trainer, a trainer might already be considered as demonstrating sensitivity. The last two items seem to be not considered as very important competencies by the instructors since "using body language" had the mean value of 3.06 and instructors seem to consider "having a sense of humor" the least important ($M= 3.45$). These two least important items, were ranked this way maybe because the instructors thought that these two skills are related to a trainers' individuality and these skills do not affect the quality of training very much.

Table 7 shows the results of the analysis of the item which examined the importance of a trainer's knowledge of subject matter.

Table 7. Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for the Content Competencies a Trainer Should Demonstrate

| Item | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | Mean | Sd. | Imp. |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-----|----------|
| | % | % | % | % | Score | | |
| Relating the subjects to real life situations | 58.4 | 24.8 | 12 | 4.8 | 1.63 | .87 | 1 |
| Being a subject specialist | 29.6 | 36.8 | 25.6 | 8 | 2.12 | .92 | 2 |
| Being experienced in teaching on INSET programs | 10.4 | 29.6 | 40 | 20 | 2.69 | .90 | 3 |
| Delivering sessions on a wide range of topics | 2.4 | 8.8 | 20.8 | 68 | 3.54 | .75 | 4 |

According to Table 7, it is very important that a trainer should demonstrate the ability of relating the subject to be studied during training to real life situations ($M=1.63$). This indicates that instructors need practical knowledge to use in their classes and it is supported by the results from Table 4, which shows that providing practical knowledge is prioritized by the instructors. These results once again highlight the importance given by the teachers to pragmatic, real-life information that they can turn around and use in their classrooms. The items “being a subject specialist” ($M=2.12$) and “being experienced in teaching in INSET programs” ($M=2.69$) were rank ordered as the second and third important competencies. It seems that instructors give importance to specialists. Although it may seem to conflict with their previous low rankings for people with degrees, this may be because they consider “specialist” as people with particular expertise in an area of

teaching, not necessarily theoretical specialists. Lastly, delivering sessions on a wide range of topics had a mean value of 3.54 which indicated that this was the least important skill that a trainer should have according to the teachers.

The last item in this part of the questionnaire was related to how a trainer should create an appropriate environment for training. Table 8 shows the results of the analysis for this part.

Table 8. *Percentages and Mean Scores for Each Statement for a Trainer's Skills to Achieve An Appropriate Atmosphere During the Sessions*

| Item | 1 st % | 2 nd % | 3 rd % | 4 th % | Mean Score | Sd. | Imp. |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------|------|----------|
| Using audio and course materials effectively | 43.2 | 24.8 | 23.2 | 8.8 | 1.97 | 1.01 | 1 |
| Organizing participans for active participation in training activities | 24 | 38.4 | 20 | 17.6 | 2.31 | 1.02 | 2 |
| Creating a friendly atmosphere | 27.2 | 18.4 | 25.6 | 28.8 | 2.56 | 1.17 | 3 |
| Provide different types of training materials not limited to power point presentations | 4.8 | 18.4 | 31.2 | 45.5 | 3.17 | .89 | 4 |

Table 8 shows that in order to create appropriate atmosphere during the training sessions, using audio and course materials effectively was the most important skill according to the instructors while providing different types of training materials not limited to power point presentations was the least important skill of a trainer ($M=3.17$). According to these results, it might be said that for the instructors a trainer should know what materials to use and how to use them in order to provide a

beneficial session. However, it seems that variety of materials is not a must for the instructors. The item “organizing participants in different types of groups for active participation” ($M=2.31$) might be related to teachers’ views about their own classroom practice. They may think that as long as any participants are involved in the process, they can gain more, so if they participate in the sessions as trainees, they can benefit more from trainings.

Results regarding the 3rd part of the questionnaire

In the third part of the questionnaire, the participants responded using a five-point Likert scale to respond to ten items about the desired characteristics of internal and external in-service trainers. The results of the analysis are presented according to items which are grouped based on their relevance to common issues about trainers and training. Items 3 and 4 are grouped together because they ask the teachers’ opinions about the use of Turkish or English during training sessions. Items 5, 7 and 10 are grouped together since they are all related to the way training sessions are organized and presented. Items 6 and 8 are grouped according to their relevance to the trainers’ education and experience. The remaining items, 1, 2 and 9 are reported individually. For a more easily understandable analysis that provides broader pictures of agreement, disagreement, or neutrality, the scores for ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ are combined and they are presented as one score, the score of ‘neutral’ is presented alone, and the scores of ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ are combined and presented as one score.

Table 9 shows the results of the frequencies and the mean scores for Q1 which examined the overall perceived benefit of sessions with trainers. Also presented in the table are the findings of the Wilcoxon Signed- Rank test, which

revealed whether there were any significant differences in opinion about the perceived benefit of sessions with trainers based on whether the trainer was from within or outside institution. As mentioned in Chapter 3- Methodology, only for this item, the number of the participants is 100 since there were only 100 participants whose institutions organize regular sessions with both internal and external trainers.

Table 9. *The Overall Perceived Benefit of Sessions with Trainers*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|--|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|
| Q1. Finding trainers' sessions beneficial | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 85 | 10 | 5 | 4.2 | .88 | √ |
| External Trainers | 65 | 15 | 20 | 3.64 | 1.17 | |

Note. (The five possible Likert scale answers were as follows: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)
(√ means there is a significant difference.)
N=100 (The number of the people who answered the question.)

Table 9 shows that there is a significant difference in the instructors' opinions about the benefits they felt they gained from internal ($Mdn = 4, IQR=1$) and external trainers' sessions ($Mdn = 4, IQR=1.75, T = 345, p$ (two tailed) = <0.001). There was a medium effect size ($r = -.30$). Based on these results, the instructors seem to be satisfied with both internal and external trainers' work. However, it seems that the instructors consider the work done by internal trainers to be more beneficial. This may be because internal trainers work in the same setting with the instructors and since they know more about the institution's or department's immediate challenges; they can provide beneficial sessions which meet the instructors' needs.

Q2 aimed to investigate if instructors would like to have input in choosing the trainer who will train them. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. *Having Input in Choosing the Trainer to Work with*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|
| Q2. Choosing the trainer | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 71.2 | 17.6 | 11.2 | 4 | 1.25 | X |
| Q2 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 62.4 | 27.2 | 10.4 | 3.89 | 1.24 | |

Note. (The five possible Likert scale answers were as follows: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)
(X means there is *not* a significant difference.)
N=125

The results in Table 10 reveals that the instructors wanted to have input in choosing the trainer who will train them. There might be two things affecting teachers' opinions in relation to their responses in this way. Firstly, they might want to work with a trainer they know before and this might lead them to feel more comfortable considering personal relationships. Second, this may be related to their own self-awareness of their needs and wants and therefore the desire to have a say in the types of trainings they will receive. Table 8 also indicates that there was no difference in the instructors' opinion as to whether the trainers should be from the same institution or invited speakers from other institutions. The desire to choose internal trainers ($Mdn = 4, IQR=2$) was not significantly more than to choose external trainers ($Mdn = 4, IQR=2, T = 582.50, p$ (two tailed) = 0.324). There was a small effect size ($r = -.06$).

The next items, Q3 and Q4, aimed to examine the teachers' expectations for the language being used during training. Table 11 shows the analysis of Q3 which

investigated the teachers' preferences for the trainers' use of the instructors' native tongue and Q4 investigated the preference for trainers as native speakers.

Table 11. *The Use of Turkish or English During Training Sessions*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|--------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|
| Q3. Native Tongue | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 34.4 | 25.6 | 40 | 2.81 | 1.28 | √ |
| Q3 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 25.6 | 28.8 | 45.6 | 2.59 | 1.37 | |
| Q4. Native Speaker | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 24.4 | 35.2 | 42.4 | 2.61 | 1.35 | √ |
| Q4 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 45.6 | 30.4 | 24 | 3.26 | 1.42 | |

Table 11 shows that the instructors did not want either internal or external trainers to use the instructors' L1 ($M=2.81$) and ($M=2.59$). Since in sessions a specific terminology needs to be used related to this field, the instructors might feel that using the L2 would be easier for better understanding. For example, TPR which stands for Total Physical Response is a term used in methodology. When it is directly translated into Turkish, some more explanation might be needed. The expectations related to L1 or L2 use was significantly different when comparing teachers' ideas about internal trainers ($Mdn = 3, IQR=3$) and external trainers ($Mdn = 3, IQR=3, T = 42, p$ (two tailed) = 0.005). There was a small effect size ($r = -.18$). The results also show that the teachers preferred to have external trainers who were native speakers ($M=3.26$), but they preferred internal trainers to be native speakers of the instructors' mother tongue. Considering that this study was conducted in the state universities, the results are not surprising since mostly non-native speakers of English work as

instructors and internal trainers in the state universities. The desire for non-native speakers as internal trainers ($Mdn = 3, IQR= 2$) was significantly higher than for external trainers ($Mdn = 3, IQR=2, T = 6.50, p$ (two tailed) = <0.001). There was a medium effect size ($r = -.34$).

Table 12 illustrates the results of the percentages and the mean scores of the descriptive analysis for Q5, Q7, and Q10 which are all related to the characteristics and behaviors of the trainers that need to be demonstrated in training sessions.

Table 12. *The Way Training Sessions Are Organized and Presented*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|
| Q5. Improving trainees' English | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 49.6 | 19.2 | 31.2 | 3.24 | 1.45 | X |
| Q5 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 52 | 17.6 | 30.4 | 3.33 | 1.48 | |
| Q7. Holding follow-up sessions | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 88 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 4.48 | .91 | √ |
| Q7 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 80.8 | 13.6 | 5.6 | 4.29 | 1.00 | |
| Q10. Making the participants active | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 71.2 | 16.8 | 12 | 4.04 | 1.15 | X |
| Q10 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 66.4 | 20.8 | 12.8 | 3.96 | 1.18 | |

According to the analysis of Q5 which aimed to investigate how much the instructors wanted trainers to hold sessions to improve the instructors' English, it seems that the instructors wanted these sessions from both internal ($Mdn=3, IQR=3$) and external ($Mdn=4, IQR=3, T=42, p$ (two tailed) = 0.085) trainers. There was no

significant difference for this item. There was a small effect size ($r = -.11$). The analysis of Q7 reveals that the instructors would like to have follow-up sessions and there is a significant difference between internal trainers ($Mdn = 5, IQR = 1$) and external trainers ($Mdn = 5, IQR=1, T = 28, p$ (two tailed) = 0.002). There was a medium effect size ($r = -.20$). The reason internal trainers were valued in this way ($M=4.48$) might be that it is easier to reach internal trainers since they work in the same institutions with instructors and it is easier for trainers to design their follow-up sessions according to the instructors' wishes. Table 10 also shows the analysis of Q10. The results, not surprisingly, indicated that teachers not only wanted to participate actively in training sessions but also they wanted to do this in all trainers' sessions, internal ($Mdn= 4, IQR = 2$) and external ($Mdn = 4, IQR=2, T = 23.50, p$ (two tailed) = 0.057). There was a small effect size ($r = -.12$). Considering the means given for Q10 in this table, it might be said that the participation is important for the instructors and this may be because when they join the sessions and become active in the sessions, they think that they gain more from the training.

The next table, Table 13 includes the analysis of Q6 and Q8. Q6 asks to what degree the instructors want trainers to have similar teaching experience to them. Q8 examines the importance of trainers' academic degree from the instructors' point of view.

Table 13. *Trainers' Education and Experience*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|
| Q6. Experience | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 81.6 | 9.6 | 8.8 | 4.26 | 1.07 | √ |
| Q6 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 72.8 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 4.06 | 1.20 | |
| Q8. Academic degree | | | | | | |
| Internal Trainers | 55.2 | 18.4 | 26.4 | 3.44 | 1.47 | √ |
| Q8 | | | | | | |
| External Trainers | 62.4 | 16.8 | 20.8 | 3.67 | 1.44 | |

According to the results in Table 13, the instructors want trainers to have similar teaching experiences to them. These similar experiences might be related to similar settings such as institutions or students groups in terms of age and proficiency level. The instructors might feel that having been in similar settings and having had similar experiences would be helpful to recognize the problems and to provide training which would be most useful in finding solutions to these problems. The results indicated the importance of internals ($Mdn = 5, IQR= 2$) having this certain characteristic more than they care about externals having that ($Mdn = 5, IQR=1, T = 24, p$ (two tailed) = 0.002). There was a medium effect size ($r = -.21$). However, it should be mentioned that these results might be suspected considering teachers' reality in institutions. Namely, the teachers might have responded to this question regarding the situation where it is more likely that internals will have similar teaching experience to the trainees. Therefore, although that was not actually what was intended with that question, it might be how they responded. The instructors also want trainers to have a higher academic degree than they do. In addition, there was a significant difference between the expectations from internal trainers ($Mdn = 4, IQR$

= 3) and external trainers ($Mdn = 4, IQR = 2, T = 13, p$ (two tailed) = 0.001). There was a medium effect size ($r = -.22$). In other words, they placed more emphasis on external trainers' having higher degrees than they did on internal trainers' having them. Since internal trainers and instructors work in the same institutions and they have similar opportunities, according to the teachers it might be less likely that internals will have more advanced degrees. This might be the reason of emphasis. In addition, when these results are considered overall by looking at the percentages and mean scores, it might be said that they support the previous ones about the desire to not have trainers with advanced degrees. It seems that academic degree is important for instructors, but it is not the main concern for them.

The last table in this section is Table 14 and it shows the results of the analysis of Q9 which investigated the instructors' perceptions of being observed by a trainer.

Table 14. *Being Observed by a Trainer*

| Item | % agree | % neutral | % disagree | Mean Score | Sd. | Sig. |
|--|---------|-----------|------------|------------|------|------|
| Q9. Observation Internal Trainers | 66.4 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 3.78 | 1.29 | √ |
| Q9 External Trainers | 55.2 | 20.8 | 24 | 3.38 | 1.41 | |

As Table 14 presents, the instructors agreed that being observed in their classes by a trainer did not bother them. When their expectations for being observed by internal and external trainers were compared, the results indicated that they preferred being observed by internal trainers ($Mdn = 4, IQR = 2$) significantly more

than by external trainers ($Mdn = 4$, $IQR=2$, $T = 53.50$, p (two tailed) = 0.002). There was a small effect size ($r = -.20$). These results might be considered as a bit surprising since some previous results indicated teachers' negative feelings towards anything resembling evaluation (which might come after observation). It would have been thought that if they are generally against evaluation, observations would be found less threatening when done by externals. On the other hand, the reason the teachers responded to this question in this way might be that they thought they would feel more comfortable with internal trainers since they might know each other well and they are colleagues who work in the same environment.

Qualitative Analysis

This section presents the analysis of qualitative data gathered via semi-structured interviews with five of the teachers who were also respondents to the questionnaire. This part aims to address the second research question of the study which examines the instructors' views about the variables that affect these desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. The instructors who were interviewed were chosen based on their personal and educational background information which differs in terms of their experiences (number of years working as EFL teachers), academic degrees, and majors. In the interviews, first; each participant was informed about the answers they gave in the questionnaire in order to remind them of the items and the responses given to them. Then, they were asked about the factors which affected their responses. Some themes were identified by the researcher based on the analysis of the responses. The themes were categorized according to the common points focused on by the participants in their responses.

Each participant was given a pseudonym and in this section these names will be used.

What variables affect the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers?

The analysis of the interviews showed that there were four categories regarding the variables affecting the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. They were as follows: experiences with trainers, setting, the instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics, and the instructors' observations experiences with their former teachers in the BA programs.

Previous experiences with trainers

All of the respondents firstly talked about their experiences with their former trainers. Those trainers who they worked with were mentioned as having been both internal and external. Depending on their experiences, the instructors mentioned the characteristics and behaviors of those trainers and it seems that these experiences strongly affected their perceptions of desired characteristics in in-service trainers.

One of the instructors who is a novice teacher said:

Last year, we had consultants and now they work as trainers in our institution.

Based on my observations of them, I gave these responses. (Elif)

Another teacher Şebnem commented on her own experiences:

I have been working with (an internal trainer is being named here) as my observer. She is a nice person and we get along well, however; I have some concerns related to the training sessions given by external trainers. I find (an external trainer is being named here) 's sessions very

general. It seems to me that she has been talking about the same things all the time.

She went on with some more experiences:

But, there are some very good external trainers like (an external trainer is being named here). I met her in the seminars. She is an open-minded person and she uses very different methods and techniques in trainings. She has a very good sense of humor and I think I am impressed by her a lot. Also, she can tell a boring story as if it were an enjoyable one.

She also added what she knew about her colleagues' experiences who work in other similar institutions as instructors:

As far as I know, at some schools, some trainers patronize the instructors and they cannot communicate well, not at all, and they do not demonstrate positive attitudes towards teachers especially to the novice teachers. They suffer from this situation a lot. It is not very often but I hear the similar things from my friends working at other schools.

Another teacher, Deniz, said similar things about trainers' behaviors towards instructors:

In a training session in the morning, if there are 30 people as the audience, after seeing that the trainer is treating us as if we were all novice teachers, after break, at least ten or twelve people leave the session. Her/his communication skills and personality should be like a teacher's.

She went on talking about communication skills and added:

For some trainers, I see that although the person has a lot of knowledge and a lot of experiences, she/he is very modest. I attend her/his sessions as much as I can. However, if the person boasts about himself because of his position as a trainer and looks down on us, I leave the session after ten minutes it starts and I never go to his training sessions again. Therefore, I am not interested in his degree or diplomas, not other things like these. The trainers who have MA or PhD degrees see themselves as different people from us, but I am not sure if they are right or not and if these degrees are important or not. Maybe these people are advantageous in terms of advanced academic degrees, but I have met a lot of trainers who have PhD degrees, and I don't know how they managed to get those degrees with that mindset.

Another interviewee expressed her ideas based on her past experiences with trainers by saying:

I don't think that conveying information in a way I expect is related to a trainer's academic degree. For example an external trainer coming from a well-known university gathered us here on a day, but I didn't find her training beneficial. She has her own academic knowledge, but if she cannot convey it to me, she is not beneficial to me as a trainer. (Çiçek)

She also said:

What you know belongs to you. The important thing is how you share it with me.

Another instructor commented on the academic knowledge of trainers in this way:

When I compare internal trainers with external trainers, I have realized that we gain more academic, more theoretical, and more discussible knowledge from native speakers as external trainers, but when we work with internal trainers, I see that they organize their sessions in a way that we don't talk much and they base their sessions on practical knowledge to be used in classrooms and directly related to solutions to our problems. (Merve)

These excerpts show how the instructors frequently seem to base their opinions about the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers on their previous experiences with actual trainers. In addition to this general observation, according to their comments, it might be said more specifically that 'communication skills' are very important for the instructors. The participants also pointed out the importance of pedagogical skills of trainers whereas they did not value trainers' academic degrees. These are supported by the results given in Table 1, which showed that according to the instructors, pedagogical and communication skills are the two most important competencies to be taken into account in the selection of trainers. Also, based on the instructors' expressions, it might be summarized that the teachers do not give importance to trainers' advanced academic degrees due to their negative experiences with the trainers who have these degrees. This view is supported by the overall results indicating that academic degree is not one of the most desired characteristics of a trainer in teachers' perspectives.

Moreover, it might be said that since internal trainers seem to be more familiar with the situations that instructors face, they give more importance to

practical knowledge and they try to provide sessions based on this kind of knowledge. These results are supported by the other given in Table 2, which showed that providing practical knowledge is one of the most important roles that a trainer should demonstrate.

Setting

The instructors pointed out the importance of the setting by expressing their ideas mainly about the institution, the student groups, and the trainers they work with. Merve indicated the benefit from the sessions when they were given by trainers who have similar teaching experiences to them:

On the other hand, when a trainer is a person who gives education in English under similar conditions with us, she/he finds solutions to our problems since she/he can understand us better and can find practical solutions.

She also added her comments based on her experiences with trainers related to setting:

We have had training sessions which were based on practical knowledge and finding solutions to our problems. Those were provided by the trainers in our institution since they work in our institution and they understand us and they know our problems here.

Elif shared her ideas on the same issue by saying:

A trainer should work here, in Turkey. If trainers are the ones who work in my home institution, we already work under the same circumstances. I'd like external trainers to work under the same circumstances, as well. For instance, (an external trainer being named here) came to our institution and

told us that they had similar conditions and similar problems in his/her own institution. However, I don't agree with the person. The workload is different, so you cannot have your students do the things that can be done with their students. I'd prefer a trainer coming from a state university. What is valuable to me is the universities that are similar to mine. Considering that(a state university being named here) is similar to my university, maybe it would be more beneficial for me if a trainer came from that university.

The other instructor, Şebnem indicated the importance of trainers' having similar teaching experiences to theirs by saying:

Without knowing the atmosphere in a classroom, trainers cannot find solutions to our problems in one or two sessions. If they do not teach, they cannot internalize our problems or they cannot have empathy with us. I believe that at least they should be teaching in classes for five or ten hours.

These comments are supported by the results presented in Table 11 which also indicated that the instructors want trainers to have similar teaching experiences to them. In addition, it seems that the instructors value internal trainers' work more and they seem to be more beneficial to the instructors since they can understand their situation better. This is also supported by the results given from Table 7, which showed that the instructors seem to be more satisfied with internal trainers' work.

Another concern related to setting mentioned by the instructors was the use of L1 or L2 during training sessions. Çiçek expressed her ideas related to the issue by saying:

I find it very artificial. In a place where everybody can speak Turkish and also if the person who gives the session is also Turkish and this person's native tongue is Turkish, just because we are doing something related to English, I think that holding those sessions in English does not make any sense.

Şebnem commented that:

In some sessions, after a while, people started to use L1. In training sessions held in home institution, an artificial atmosphere is created. While discussing some subjects in the field like skills or methodology, it is a good idea not to discuss in L1, OK. let's use L2, but for example if we discuss something about classroom management, it is like sharing our problems. Depending on the subjects, L1 can be used.

She also commented on the benefit of having native speakers as external trainers:

I have been attending seminars since 2006. I also learnt a lot from external trainers. The trainers whose mother tongue is English can be creative a lot about the language and activities to carry out in classes with students.

Merve also talked about external trainers and their being native speakers:

Generally, external trainers are native speakers and it affects my views on the issue.

Another instructor Deniz also pointed out that:

For external trainers, speaking the native tongue is already essential. The place they come from like the States or England is important for us.

Based on the views related to the use of L1 in the sessions expressed by the instructors, it might be said that the results contradict the ones presented in Table 9, which showed that the instructors want internal trainers to use L2 in the sessions. One of the reasons might be that the instructors want to feel that trainers are more experienced and expert to them and using L2 might be one of the characteristics of being competent. Another one may be because of the fact that using L2 leads to better communication in sessions since it might prevent misunderstandings due to using some terms related to the field.

In addition to these, it seems that institutions usually invite native speakers as external trainers. Based on the results given in Table 9, which showed that external trainers are wanted to be native speakers and internals as non-native speakers, it might be said that the reason of responding to this question in this way is more likely that is related to the instructors' reality in institutions rather than their desires for this characteristics.

The instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics

It seems that the instructors are also affected by their own practices in their classrooms when they think about the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers.

Şebnem said that:

When you are a teacher, the important thing is not what you know; it is how well you can teach. Do you have the ability of conveying your knowledge? What is your attitude? Are you too strict or too easy going? You should balance all these things. For me, attitude is very important. It does not mean

that theoretical knowledge is not important, of course it is a must but if you are able to tell what you know, this is more important from my point of view.

She went on by giving an example from a session she attended and made a connection between this example and classroom practice. She said:

For example, when handouts are given in training sessions, even if I am distracted, I start to pay attention to what is going on due to the handouts because I have a material which is visual. If an activity which involves you is prepared..... You know this is the case in our classrooms.

Deniz also mentioned her own classroom practice:

In my own classes, I teach according to my audience. I don't teach the same thing in the same way to everyone. Sometimes I use cartoons. Some of them understand the subject very well, while some don't. Method is very important and so is the setting. If trainers cannot shape their sessions according to their audience, they cannot find anyone in their sessions to train and if they cannot do this, will there be audience interested in what they are talking about?

She points out the importance of paying attention to the needs of the audience in training sessions. These comments are supported by the results presented in Table 4, which indicated the importance of caring about the teachers' needs and feelings.

Elif compared herself with trainers and expresses her ideas by saying:

For me, there are criteria for being a good teacher. I should demonstrate the abilities related to the criteria. I also want my trainers to demonstrate the same abilities.

She also mentioned what she does in her classes:

At the beginning of the lessons, I try to do different things. For example, if you can arouse motivation with warm-ups, the rest of the lesson goes well. If you cannot do this, forget about having a good lesson. That is what I try to do.

Based on her comments, it is seen that what she does in her classes and she thinks what is useful might be the same things as what she expects from trainers. It seems that she believes that she can gain more from training when she is motivated and interested by a trainer. These comments reflect the results shown in Table 3, where a majority of teachers ranked this item as the second most important competency of a trainer in terms of pedagogical skills to be demonstrated.

Making the connection again with their own practices, but this time from another angle, some instructors also pointed out their own weaknesses as teachers. They indicated that a trainer should be someone who is already superior to them in these areas and someone who can help the instructors to cope with those weaknesses. In this sense, Merve talked about the use of audio and course materials in training sessions:

If the person who is going to train me uses these things, I can be inspired and I can get some ideas on what to use and how to use because I have weaknesses about this issue. It was the first most important item for me. We can say that I am planning to make use of my own weaknesses in this way.

Deniz also said similar things:

We want to have trainers who can provide us with concrete things (knowledge). Otherwise, we know the theory. What is theory? The reality is something different.

Çiçek summarized her ideas by saying:

In order to be my trainer, a person should know what I don't know or know the things that I need to spend a lot of time to learn.

She also talked about her experiences related to her position in the institution:

It is about the testing unit. For a teacher who only attends the lessons, it might not differ, but for me, I felt that I have weaknesses as a member of testing unit.I thought that if we had had the chance to receive some training on testing, the training should have been continuous.

It is seen that the instructors make some connections with their own professional practices. These connections seem to affect the instructors' views about the characteristics and behaviors that an in-service trainer should have.

The instructors' observations of their former teachers in BA

The instructors also mentioned the characteristics and behaviors of their own teachers from when they were in the BA programs. It seems that based on their observations of their teachers, they build impressions of what they want trainers to do or not to do. Elif said:

I am not an ELT graduate. However, I have observed a lot of teachers. I observed successful and unsuccessful or not good teachers. And I know the qualifications of a good teacher. The qualifications I should have or a good teacher should have are the same as the ones a trainer should have.

She added that:

I had a teacher who had a PhD degree. She/ he used to have us write something all the time and never spoke English. On the other hand, I had a teacher who was just a lecturer (no academic degree). Although she/he had a lower academic degree than the other, she/he knew a lot and she was able to teach what she knew. Therefore, when I compare those two, what was important to me was being able to communicate.

Deniz commented on one of her teachers:

..... (a lecturer being named here) has high quality knowledge, but does not look at you while speaking. It doesn't matter how qualified she/he is, in other words; how much she/he knows is not important. I said to myself I would never become like them.

Şebnem talked about her friends' experiences with their teachers:

I know that in (a university is being named here) there are teachers who have academic degrees but aren't loved by their students since they cannot demonstrate the abilities of teaching or they cannot be understood.

She also commented on her teachers' use of slides in lessons and made a connection with trainers' use of slides in the sessions. She said:

You might remember from your BA education. A presentation starts, the person reads and reads and reads the slides, then the presentation finishes and the reading finishes. It is kind of a listening and reading activity. Therefore, I think that those slides should be used appropriately.

Çiçek made similar comments and said:

My BA teachers have been very effective in my decisions. I had a lot of teachers, who graduated from very good universities and were subject specialists; however, I couldn't learn anything from them.

Although the instructors mentioned their former teachers' characteristics and behaviors, they went on pointing out the importance of pedagogical and communicational skills. These results are supported again by the results of the quantitative analysis which were presented in Table 1, which showed the importance of these skills in the instructors' opinions since they ranked these items as the first and the second important characteristics of trainers.

Conclusion

This study aimed to explore the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers. The data were collected through two instruments. A questionnaire was used to gather data to investigate the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers from instructors' points of view. In addition, interviews with some of the instructors were held in order to address the second research question of the study which aimed to investigate what variables affected these desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers.

The results of the analysis of the quantitative part show that in-service trainers are expected to have solid pedagogical and robust communicational skills as the most important competencies whereas their academic and theoretical knowledge is less important according to the instructors. In addition, it was seen that the instructors value those trainers who can provide them with practical knowledge which might be used in their classrooms. Also, trainers who give importance to instructors' motivation and interests are, not surprisingly, desired. When internal and external trainers were compared in terms of expectations from them, the results indicated that internal trainers seem to be valued more since they seem to be perceived as better able to provide what the instructors want. In addition, the results also reveal that external trainers are desired to be native speakers of the target language.

Considering the analysis of the qualitative part, it was seen that there were some common factors affecting instructors' desired characteristics and behaviors from their in-service trainers. The themes were the instructors' past experiences with trainers, the particular setting in which they worked, the instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics, and the instructors' observations of their former teachers in their BA programs.

The next chapter presents the conclusions and findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and areas for further research.

CHAPTER V – CONCLUSION

Introduction

The present chapter introduces the summary of the findings and discussion, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

The study was conducted with 125 EFL instructors who work at the Schools of Foreign Languages at four state universities in Turkey. It aimed to explore the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers who the participants might work with.

The study aimed to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What are the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in the Schools of Foreign Languages at Turkish universities as viewed by EFL instructors?
- 2) What variables affect instructors' choices in relation to these desired characteristics and behaviors?

The instructors' perceptions in relation to this issue were examined via a questionnaire which answered the first research question. What instructors want from in-service trainers in general and what they want from internal and external trainers were focused on to address this question. In addition, the variables affecting the instructors' choices related to these desired characteristics and behaviors were examined through the interviews held with five of the instructors to address the second research question of the study.

Findings and Discussion

This section will present the summary of the findings as well as the discussions of them in three parts. The first and the second part will be related to the first research question, presenting the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in general and the differences between internal and external trainers in terms of the expectations from them, respectively. The third and the last part will be related to second research question of the study and it will discuss the findings about the variables affecting these desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers.

The desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers in general

In order to examine the desired competencies and skills of in-service trainers in general, the participants were asked to respond to the items in the second part of the questionnaire. This part consisted of six items and each item had some statements for each one to be rank ordered considering the degree of importance according to the EFL instructors. Each item represented a different competency or a skill that an in-service trainer should demonstrate. In order to reach the results of the survey, the percentages and mean scores for each item were calculated. The findings and related discussions for each item will be presented individually in the next paragraphs.

In the selection of in-service trainers, according to the EFL instructors, the results revealed that a trainer's most important skill to be considered is pedagogical skills, whereas communication skills and academic degree were ranked as the second and third most important competencies, respectively. Organizational skills had the highest mean value ($M = 3.42$), which indicated that it is the least important criterion. These results support Özen's (2005) study by suggesting that the pedagogical skills

of the trainers, in other words their teachings skills, are very important to EFL instructors. This mostly results from the fact that since EFL instructors are teachers themselves, they might think that an in-service trainer who is supposed to train other teachers should be good at teaching. In other words, for the participants of this study being a trainer should mean more than having the content knowledge. This view can also explain why communication skills are in the second place. The reason may be because it is not possible to teach something without communicating. Considering trainers' organizational skills of, it might be said that since institutions usually organize the setting and the time of training, it might not have been taken into account as a trainers' skill according to the instructors. This view is supported by Turhan and Arıkan (2009) since they see the administration of institutions as responsible authorities who are in charge of delivering in-service training. Therefore, it seems normal that the item was ranked as the last skill.

When the instructors were asked about the roles of an in-service trainer, the results revealed that in-service trainers are mostly expected to be a guide for teachers to construct knowledge. This might mean that EFL instructors think they still need more knowledge to improve themselves and their teaching although they are professionals and in service. This finding concurs with the view that teachers find in-service training beneficial (Özer, 2004). The next three most important skills are found to be "providing practical knowledge", "being a consultant", and "being a mentor." It seems that EFL instructors not only look for a new gain in their knowledge but also they want to be assisted in their own learning process. This view is shared by researchers' ideas which express a trainer's role as a facilitator in the journey of teachers' professional development (Fransson & Van Lakerveld &

Rothma, 2009; Wright & Bolitho, 2007). However, being evaluated by trainers and getting theoretical knowledge from them does not seem to interest EFL instructors. Reznich (1985) suggests that one of the roles of a trainer is evaluation, however; based on these results and considering that being an evaluator does not seem to be given much importance by EFL instructors, it seems that it is not an important role of a trainer. The reason might be that EFL instructors see in-service trainers as their colleagues and they might not feel comfortable when they are evaluated by a colleague. They might also see themselves as qualified teachers who do not need to be examined in terms of their teaching.

When a trainer's roles were questioned in terms of pedagogical competencies, the results revealed that an in-service trainer's most important role is being able to give instructions and explanations clearly, which is supported by Özen's study (2005) where it was stated that in-service trainers are mostly expected to provide clear explanations during training sessions. Arousing interest and motivation was ranked second in the current study and these results are supported by the findings of Özen's study in 2004. However, the results of his other study in 2005 indicate some differences as they reveal that only 65.4% of teachers (n=85) valued "being interested and motivated" as an important skill, which makes it not so important. As a result, the teachers who worked in primary schools and participated in Özer's (2004) study do not seem to care about the issue as much as the EFL instructors who were the subjects of the current study did. It seems that since universities hold training sessions both with internal and external in-service trainers, the number of the sessions might be more than the ones which are organized by the Ministry of National Education. Therefore, since the EFL instructors seem to attend more

training sessions, they might think that they can only get some benefit as long as their attention is attracted and they are motivated. This difference in the views might be also based on the EFL instructors' experiences encountered in training sessions which they attended. Considering that they attend more sessions, it is possible that they might have attended more uninteresting or not motivating sessions. The findings related to "using different methods" and "giving feedback" seem to be similar to the results of Özen's studies (2004, 2005) since these items are seen as less important roles that an in-service trainer should take care of. It seems that according to the instructors the most important thing is to learn something via the instructions and explanations given in training sessions and as long as they are provided with that knowledge, the method used does not seem to be important. Alternatively, the method used by the trainer does not change anything as to whether the trainer can demonstrate the most important skills mentioned above. For the other skill, "giving feedback", it might have considered as a role which is not directly related to the practice of teaching.

In-service trainers' desired characteristics and behaviors were also examined in terms of their communication skills. The findings showed that according to the EFL instructors, demonstrating sensitivity to teachers' feelings and needs is the most important competency of a trainer in relation to their communication skills. Considering teachers' needs should be met in any aspect, the view is supported by many researchers in the literature who suggest that teachers' benefit from in-service training depends on whether their needs are met (Anderson & Bagnole, 1995; Gültekin, 2007). It seems that the EFL instructors in this study give importance to whether their needs are met. Working flexibly and cooperatively within a team may

require being patient with the teachers and considering them as colleagues. These competencies are also stated as important by the teachers in Özen's study (2004) who noted that while working with teachers, in-service trainers should be patient and understanding.

The results of the analysis related to in-service trainers' content competencies revealed that relating subjects to real-life situations seems to be the first most important skill of a trainer. Also, "being a subject specialist" was ranked second and "being experienced" was ranked third. These results are supported by Altun and Gök's study (2010) and Gültekin's study (2007) since the teachers in those studies also give importance to expertise and experience. Fransson, Van Lakerveld, and Rothma (2009) and Wright and Bolitho (2007) also point out the importance of these two characteristics by stating them in their definitions of in-service trainers. However, in spite of the importance given to these characteristics in the relevant literature, it is seen that neither of these two items was ranked the first important characteristic of an in-service trainer. The EFL instructors might have thought that even if an in-service trainer is an expert and experienced one, without providing practical knowledge to be used in real life, in classroom practice, being an expert and experienced is not helpful to carry out beneficial training. Based on the analysis of qualitative data, it might be summarized that the instructors mostly care about a trainer's ability to provide practical knowledge to be used in real classroom situations, which supports these findings.

It is seen that teachers attach importance to an appropriate environment for beneficial training. In order to achieve this environment, the EFL instructors stated that using audio and course materials effectively should be in the first place for an in-

service trainer to be considered. In addition, “creating a friendly atmosphere” does not seem to interest the EFL instructors much since the item was ranked third and it became the second important item after “being involved in training sessions”. These results are similar to the findings of Özen’s study (2005). The teachers in his study seem to give more importance to in-service trainers’ using course materials effectively than their demonstrating friendliness. Considering that if audio and course materials are used effectively, they can serve for the aim which is to make training beneficial for participants. However, it seems that according to the teachers and the EFL instructors, being in a friendly atmosphere is not sufficient itself to provide a successful training. These similar results might also indicate that trainees believe they can gain more from the training sessions as long as some supplementary materials are provided.

Internal and External In-Service Trainers

Whether the expectations from internal and external trainers differ in terms of their desired characteristics and behaviors was examined via a 5-point Likert scale. The results revealed that for seven out of ten items in the scale, there are some desires preferred to be fulfilled more by internal trainers and others preferred to be fulfilled by external trainers. However, the analysis also revealed that this difference based on this preference were not significant considering the results of the analysis done by calculating the effect size. For the remaining three items in the scale, no significant differences were seen in terms of the preference between internal trainers and external trainers.

The results can be grouped into the two parts mentioned above: the desires preferred to be fulfilled by internal trainers more and the desires preferred to be

fulfilled by external trainers more. The next two paragraphs will cover the issue according to this grouping.

For the first part, the findings revealed overall that according to the EFL instructors, internal trainers' work seems more satisfying than external trainers'. In addition, internal trainers are expected more to hold follow-up sessions after the training they provided. Also, it seems that the EFL instructors give more importance to internal trainers' being more experienced. The reason the EFL instructors value these characteristics might be that since internal trainers work at the same institutions with instructors, they might be well informed about the conditions and circumstances in the institution, so they can provide the desired practices such as providing practical knowledge. As a result, the EFL instructors might think that external trainers might not be competent in these areas. Armutçuoğlu (1992) and Moswela (2006) support this argument pointing out that external trainers might not be capable of providing practical knowledge while trying to find some solutions to instructors' problems since those external trainers do not have enough information about the institution and the needs and interests of the instructors who work there. In addition to these, the results show that internal trainers are preferred more as observers in the classrooms. As Kennedy (1993) states, those are close to the trainers and are known by them, and are preferred by the instructors. Based on this view, it might be concluded that the EFL instructors seem to be more comfortable with internal trainers since they are familiar with them. Moreover, internal trainers are expected to use the target language during training. This seems to be a surprising result considering the participants of training sessions and the internal trainers are usually the same nationality because most of the state universities cannot afford hiring non-

native speakers as instructors and internal in-service trainers. As a result, although the participants and the in-service trainers speak the same mother tongue which might help them feel more comfortable, such a desire can be considered as unexpected.

For the second part, it might be concluded that when internal and external trainers are compared in terms of expectations from them, external trainers are expected more to be native speakers of English and they are preferred to have higher academic degrees than instructors do. The results are supported by Altun and Gök's study (2010) which revealed that teachers wanted to work with in-service trainers who have M.A. or Ph. D. degrees. The reason that the EFL instructors cared about the issue more for the external trainers might be related to their experiences with external trainers. They might have worked with external trainers with these degrees, so they might want to go on working with these kinds of trainers. The qualitative data also confirms the view with the instructors' expressions on the issue which suggests that they usually work with the externals who have higher academic degrees.

The results of the analysis which showed no significant differences in instructors' opinions were related to the remaining three items in the scale. These items examined the instructors' expectations from internal and external trainers in terms of "choosing the trainer", "having extra sessions to improve proficiency in English", and "opportunities for active participation". The instructors might have thought that these characteristics are directly related to training sessions or the activities that can be done in training sessions, and both internal trainers and external trainers should provide the items mentioned above.

Variables affecting these desired characteristics and behaviors

The analysis of the teacher interviews revealed that there are some basic themes that affect instructors' views about the desired characteristics and behaviors of the in-service trainers. These can be listed as follows:

- previous experiences with in-service trainers
- the conditions and circumstances at home institutions
- the instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics
- the instructors' previous experiences with their former professors in the BA programs

Considering teachers' experiences with their former trainers, it might be stated that both their positive and negative experiences influence their views. If they attend a training session and they are satisfied with the trainer's characteristics and behaviors, they want to work with those kinds of trainers who can demonstrate the same skills or competencies. On the other hand, depending on the negative experiences (e.g. being trained by unqualified in-service trainer in terms of communication skills), they think that an in-service trainer should not be someone like the person they worked with. In addition, it seems that the EFL instructors feel more comfortable and satisfied when they work with a trainer from their home institution. This view is supported by Kennedy (1993) who indicates that trainees prefer working with somebody they know. This might be related to their feelings which let them feel more comfortable. Also the findings confirm the questionnaire data which revealed that the instructors would like to work with internal trainers more than external trainers.

The conditions and circumstances at institutions are the other factors influencing the instructors' opinions. Since they know what the institutions can do and cannot do, they determine the characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers accordingly. For example, because they work in state universities and they know that state universities hire non-native instructors, they prefer internal trainers as nonnative instructors. In addition, instructors seem to want to work with in-service trainers who have similar teaching experiences. In other words, they believe that if they work with in-service trainers who have experiences in similar conditions, setting, and experiences with similar kinds of students, those trainers can be more beneficial to them since those trainers can understand their problems and needs. This is supported by the questionnaire data again which revealed that the instructors preferred working with internal trainers who have similar teaching experiences to them to working with external trainers. The instructors also believe that those trainers can be more helpful in finding solutions to the problems as well as providing them with practical skills.

As the other factor, the instructors' own professional behaviors and characteristics affect their views. If they think that they are successful in conveying their message by demonstrating a particular professional skill in their classroom practice, they believe that in-service trainers can be regarded as successful, too if they demonstrate the same kinds of skills. To illustrate, they think that active participation creates a positive environment for learning. Therefore, they want in-service trainers to create opportunities for active participation during the sessions. The conclusions above are supported by Beijaard. et al. (2000) as they suggest that teachers' judgments and behaviors are affected by their perceptions related to their own professional identity. Yaman (2010) also states that teachers shape their

teaching in time and their own professional acts which are formed during this time affect their own beliefs.

The last theme is the instructors' observations of their former teachers in BA programs. The results are similar to the ones which are about the instructors' experiences with trainers. They compare their former teachers in BA program with in-service trainers. They want to see the same characteristics and behaviors with in-service trainers if they were influenced positively by their former lecturers when they were students. However, if the instructors have negative feelings and attitudes towards the lecturers because of their characteristics and behaviors, they do not want to work with in-service trainers who have those kinds of typical traits. The findings point out the importance of observation and teachers' educators as role models. The view concurs with Koster and Dengerink (2001, as cited in Smith, 2005) and Lunenberg et al. (2007) as the researchers state that teacher educators are considered as model teachers. Day (1990) also states that student teachers can get help from observations to determine some techniques and practices related to teaching. Based on these views, it can be suggested that the instructors' views can easily be shaped by their observations of their former teachers.

When the instructors' views were compared among themselves, it might be said that their educational background in general does not have a strong effective on their views. The little differences seem to be related to their majors and being experienced or not. Carter and Doyle (1996, as cited in Lunenberg et al., 2007) support the view by stating that teachers' biographies affect their understandings and this kind of biography can include prior education. The instructors who graduated from literature departments seem to give more importance to an in-service trainer's

pedagogical skills more because they take the in-service trainer as a model and they think that they can gain new skills by observing the trainer. Also, novice teachers seem to be influenced by their former BA teachers more and to be less affected by their own professionalism, which might be considered as normal since they are not experienced teachers. According to Lunenberg et al. (2007) and Zanting et al. (2001), experienced teachers improve their own professionalism in terms of practices and knowledge in time, which leads them to consider themselves as fully educated or/and competent teachers who do not need to be told how to teach (Gebhard et al., 1990). Therefore, in contrast to novice teachers, experienced teachers may not need to examine their former BA teachers' behaviors and characteristics since they seem to rely on their own professionalism.

Pedagogical Implications

Considering the findings of the analysis of the data collected for this study, there are some implications for universities, INSET trainers, and also for educators of in-service trainers.

The three most important implications are related to universities. Firstly, institutions need to take into account instructors' views, expectations, wants, and needs to provide more beneficial training. It seems that in order to satisfy the instructors, in the first place, the administrators at universities should consult their instructors about the choice of people who should be trainers especially for the ones that will be internal trainers since these trainers are supposed to work with instructors much more than external trainers. There are some other concerns to be focused on regarding the importance of consulting the instructors about their choices. Namely, the use of L1 and L2 during the training sessions should be asked the instructors

since they stated that this should not be determined by administrators. Next, the administrators at universities need to make sure that trainers can connect to real life context because it seems that the instructors give much importance to practical knowledge to be used in their classrooms. Considering this, administrators should be able to select the qualified trainers who are able to demonstrate this skill.

Teachers need qualified in-service trainers to benefit from the training provided by them; in-service trainers should develop themselves considering what EFL instructors want from them (Armutçuoğlu, 1992; Özer, 2004). If they can demonstrate the characteristics and behaviors that are desired for them, they might be regarded as qualified trainers, which means being successful.

The course designers who educate in-service trainers should also give importance to the results of this study. They should guide their in-service trainer candidates through the skills and competencies they are expected to have. In-service trainers need to know how much importance to give and to what, so they need to be informed by their educators.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations to be noted. As far as the questionnaire is concerned, due to the time constraints, the pilot test could not be conducted with a lot of participants but only 17. The reliability tests were not also applied due to the design of the questionnaire.

Regarding the interviews held with the instructors, the number of the participants is at the minimum level. More insightful results could have been obtained by interviewing more teachers. Also the interviews could have been

transcribed verbatim. Unfortunately, because of the time limitations, the researcher was able to transcribe and translate only the relevant parts.

There are also some chances that for some questions for internal and external trainers the instructors might have subconsciously reported on ‘what happens’ or ‘what is more realistic’ for the situations they had already experienced with trainers rather than expressing an actual preference as what they desired to happen. Although it was aimed to get responses regarding the instructors’ actual preferences, the instructors might have stated their opinions by considering the case in their institutions.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study aimed to examine the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers from EFL instructors’ perspectives who work at state universities in Turkey. However, only four state universities could be reached for this study. More universities could be involved to gather more data for more reliable results and to generalize the results. Also, regarding contextual differences, the same study could be conducted with the EFL instructors who work at private universities.

In addition, considering that there were four universities participating in this study, the EFL instructors’ views about the issue could be investigated individually in terms of the universities they work at and the results could be analyzed separately.

In-service trainers could also be the participants of another study. Their views about themselves could be investigated and then the results could be compared with the findings of this current study.

Conclusion

The instructors of the INSET programs have an important role in the effective administration of these programs since the success of these programs depends on the qualifications of in-service trainers. Considering that teachers are the people who are directly involved in the training process, their views, needs and interests should be taken into account so that they can benefit from these programs. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the desired characteristics and behaviors of in-service trainers from EFL instructors' perspectives. The results of the study mainly indicate that the EFL instructors give more importance to the trainers' communication and pedagogical skills rather than their higher academic degrees. If this is taken into account by the administrations of the universities, the best choices can be made while appointing in-service trainers, especially for the ones who will be the internal trainers since internal trainers are preferred more than externals.

The findings also revealed that the EFL instructors clearly expressed their views on the importance of practical knowledge to be used in the classrooms. Although it seems that the issue is related to the content of an in-service training session, a trainer should be able to provide this knowledge and make connections with real life classroom practices. Besides, many issues like the trainers' use of L1 or L2, being humorous, or using body language which seem to be minor issues have stood out to be important according to the findings of this study. As a result, it is hoped that in-service trainers may find many answers to their questions concerning their jobs and they can make shape themselves to be desired trainers.

The findings of this study, besides shedding light on the teachers' expectations from the inset trainers, also serve in-service trainer educators since they

can guide their trainees according to the characteristics and behaviors that the participating teachers claimed to desire from the trainers.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N. J. & Bagnole, W. J. (1995). Remote ELT training: client centeredness as a bridge from theory to practice. *TESL-EJ*, 1(3).
- Alan, B. (2003). *Novice Teachers' Perceptions of an In-Service Teacher Training Course at Anadolu University*. (MA TEFL Thesis), Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Al-Wrekiat, Y. A. A. S. & Bin Abdullah, M. K. K. (2010). An evaluation of Jordanian EFL teachers' in-service training courses teaching technique effectiveness. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 18-27.
- Altun, A. & Gök. B. (2010). Determining in-service training programs characteristics given to teachers by conjoint analysis. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1709-1714.
- Armutçuoğlu, G. (1992). Hizmetiçi eğitimde görev alan öğretmenlerde bulunması gereken nitelikler. *Eğitim Dergisi*, 1(2), 86-117.
- Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10-20.
- Beijaard, D., Verloop, N. & Vermunt, D. J. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: an exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(7), 749-764.
- Bailey, M. K., Curtis, A. & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursuing Professional Development*. Heinle & Heinle: Thomson Learning.
- Bagnole, W. J. & Anderson, J. N. (1995). Remote ELT training: Client-Centeredness as a bridge from theory to practice. *TESL- EJ*,1(3).
- Day, R. R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp.43-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- De Segovia, L. P. & Hardison, M. D. (2009). Implementing education reform: EFL teachers' perspectives. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 154-162.
- Desmarais, J. (1992). Teachers' opinions of the characteristics of good in-service programs as suggested in current research. *Eric Document Reproduction*.
- Early, P. & Bubb, S. (2004). *Leading and Managing Continuing Professional Development*. Wiltshire: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Evans, L. (2002). What is teacher development? *Oxford of Education*, 28(1), 123-137.
- Fransson, G., Van Lakervels, J. & Rothma, V. (2009). In-service trainers as facilitators. In A. Swennen & M. van der Klink (Eds.) *Becoming a Teacher Educator: Theory and Practice for Teacher Educators* (pp.75-88). Science and Business Media B.V.
- Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 27-45.
- Freeman, D. (2001). Second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp.72-79). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gabhard, G. J., Gaitan, S. & Oprandy, R. (1990). Beyond prescription: the student teacher as investigator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp.16-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gültekin, İ. (2007). *The analysis of the perceptions of English Language instructors at TOBB, University of Economics and Technology regarding INSET content*. (MA Thesis), Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Hayes, D. (1995). In-service teacher development: some basic principles. *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 252-261.

- Hişmanoğlu, M. (2010). Effective professional development strategies of English language teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 990-995.
- Jaworski, B. (1993). The professional development of teachers: The potential of critical reflection. *Professional Development in Education*, 19(3), 37-42.
- Jovanova-Miskovska, S. (2010). The need of continuous professional teacher development. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 2921-2926.
- Kennedy, J. (1993). Meeting the needs of teacher trainees on teaching practice. *ELT Journal*, 47(2), 157-165.
- Kocaman, A. (1992). Beyond the surface: training the teacher trainers. *Tradition and Innovation -- ELT and teacher training in the 1990s*. Ankara: British Council, 18-23.
- Koç, S. (1992). Teachers on-line: An alternative model for in-service teacher training in ELT. *Tradition and Innovation -- ELT and teacher training in the 1990s*. Ankara: British Council, 47-53.
- Malderez, A. & Wedell, M. (2007). *Teaching Teachers: Processes and Practices*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Lamie, J.M. (2005). *Evaluating Change in English Language Teaching*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lovett, M. W., Laceranza, L., De Palma, M., Benson, N.J., Steinbach, K.A. & Frijters, J.C.(2008). Preparing teachers to remediate reading disabilities in high school: What is needed for effective professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(4), 1083-1097.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F. & Swennen, A. (2007). The teacher educator as a role model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 586-601.
- Moswela, B. (2006). Teacher professional development for the new school improvement: Botswana. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 25(6), 623-632.

- O'Sullivan, M. C. (2001). The inset strategies model: an effective inset model for unqualified and under qualified primary teachers in Namibia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21, 93-117.
- Özen, G. (1996). *A needs assessment of In-service Teacher Training Programs for Professional Development at the Freshman Unit of Bilkent Univeristy*. (MA TEFL Thesis). Bilkent, Ankara.
- Özen, R. (2004). *Hizmet içi eğitim programlarında görev alan öğretim elemanının yeterliliklerine ilişkin kursiyerlerin görüşleri*. Paper presented at the XIII. National Educational Sciences Congress, İnönü University, Malatya.
- Özen, R. (2005). Teachers' perceptions about the teaching competencies of INSET programs instructors' instructors. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30(136), 68-76.
- Özer, B. (2004). In-service training of teachers in Turkey at the beginning of the 2000s. *Journal of In-service Education*, 30(1), 89-100.
- Öztaşkın, Ö. B. (2010). Identifying the in-service training needs of the social studies teachers within the context of life-long learning. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3036-3042.
- Reznich, C. (1995). *Teaching Teachers: An Introduction to Supervision and Teacher Training*. Published by the Consortium.
- Sabaz, S. (2004). Hizmetiçi eğitime bakış. *Çagdaş Eğitim*, 307, 58-59.
- Smith, K. (2005). Teacher educators' expertise: what do novice teachers and teacher educators say? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 177-192.
- Şentuna, E. (2002). *The Interests of EFL Instructors in Turkey Regarding Inset Content*. (MA TEFL Thesis), Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Turhan, İ. E. & Arıkan, A. (2009). English language teacher development with or without a teacher trainer: ELT instructors' perceptions. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 4(2), 1-13.

- Türkey, A. F. N. (2000). *The Fullfilment of Trainees' Expectations in In-service Teacher Training Programs*. (MA TEFL Thesis). Bilent University, Ankara.
- Ur, P. (1996). *Teacher Training and Teacher Development: Is there a really difference?* A paper presented at International Conference on Teacher Training and Teacher Development at Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Ur, P. (2006). *A course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, J. M. (2002). *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, K. P. E. & Yeung, S. A. (2002). Evaluation of teacher development programs: Participant satisfaction and recommendation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 29(1), 57-66.
- Woodward, T. (1991). *Models and Metaphors in Language Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, T. & Bolitho, R. (2007). *Trainer Development*. Self Published: Lulu Enterprices UK Ltd.
- Yaman, Ş. (2010). Conceptual change of pre-sevice teachers: A longitudinal action researh study in ELT. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 227-236.
- Yıldızlar, M. & Kargı, E. (2010). Pre-school teacher expectations ans evaluations on the feccts of in-service teachers education in the Turkish Republic of Northen Cyprus. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1951-1954.
- Zanting, A., Verloop, N. & D Vermunt, J. (2001). Student teachers eliciting mentors' "practical knowledge and comparing it to their own beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(6), 725-740.
- Zeichner, K. (2005). Becoing a teacher educator: a personal perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 117-124.

APPENDIX A: THE QUESTIONNAIRE (IN TURKISH)

Hizmetiçi Eğitimde Görevli Öğretim Elemanları Anketi

Bilkent Üniversitesi, MA TEFL 2011

Değerli Öğretim Elemanları,

Bu anket Bilkent Üniversitesi MA TEFL bölümü Yüksek Lisans tez çalışmamın bir parçası olup üniversitelerin Yabancı Diller Bölümü'nde görevli okutmanların 'Hizmetiçi Eğitimde Görevli Öğretim Elemanlarının Sahip Olması Gereken Özellikler' konusundaki fikirlerini almak üzere düzenlenmiştir.

Bu anket üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölüm kişisel bilgileriniz ile ilgili olarak düzenlenmiştir. İkinci bölüm genel olarak hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanları ilgili olarak düzenlenmiştir. Üçüncü bölüm kurum içinde hizmetiçi eğitim veren öğretim elemanları ile kurum dışından gelen ziyaretçi öğretim elemanları ile ilgili olarak düzenlenmiştir.

Bu çalışma için verdiğiniz cevaplar ve kimliğinizle ilgili bilgiler gizli tutulacaktır.

Bu ankette hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanının, diğer öğretim elemanlarını seminer, konferans, atölye çalışmaları ve ya dil öğretimine ilişkin her hangi bir program aracılığıyla eğiten kişi anlamına geldiğini göz önünde bulundurunuz. Kurum içi görevliler şu andaki kurumunuzda çalışan ve hizmetiçi eğitim veren kişilerdir. Kurum dışından gelen görevliler, sizin kurumunuzda çalışmayan ama davet edilerek ya da ziyaretçi olarak gelen ve hizmetiçi eğitim veren kişilerdir.

Vereceğiniz cevapların bu çalışma için çok değerli olduğunu hatırlatarak ayırdığınız vakit ve emek için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Araştırmacı: Ebru Gaganuş
Bilkent Üniversitesi
MA TEFL

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

İmza: _____
Tarih: _____

1. Bölüm- Kişisel Bilgiler

Öğretmenlikte kaç yıldır deneyimlisiniz? _____

Şu anda çalıştığınız kurumun adı nedir? _____

Üniversiteden mezun olduğunuz bölüm nedir? Lütfen işaretleyiniz.

- a) İngilizce Öğretmenliği
- b) İngiliz ve ya Amerikan Dili ve Edebiyatı
- c) Mütercim Tercümanlık
- d) Dilbilimi Bölümü
- e) Diğer _____

Akademik dereceniz nedir? Lütfen işaretleyiniz.

- a) Lisans
- b) Yüksek Lisans
- c) Doktora
- d) Diğer _____

2. Bölüm- Hizmetiçi Eğitimde Görev Alan Öğretim Elemanlarından Beklentiler

Aşağıdaki ifadeleri her bir soru için konuyla ilgili fikrinize göre önem sırasına koyunuz. En önemli olan ifadenin yanındaki kutuya "1" yazarak başlayınız. Daha az önemli olan ifadelerin yanına "2, 3, 4, 5, 6".... yazarak devam ediniz. Aşağıdaki sorularda sadece 2. soru için 6 kutu vardır. Diğer sorular için 1'den 4'e kadar numaralandırma yapınız.

| En önemli | | | | | | En önemsiz |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |

ÖRNEK SORU:

Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanı olmalıdır.

- a) arkadaş canlısı
- b) cana yakın
- c) samimi
- d) içten biri

1. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanı göre seçilmelidir.

- a) akademik derecesine
- b) iletişim becerilerine
- c) nasıl bir eğitimci olduğuna
- d) organizasyon becerilerine

2. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanın görevi

- a) sınıf içinde kullanılacak pratik bilgiler vermektir.
- b) alandaki son araştırmalarla ilgili teorik bilgi sağlamaktır.
- c) pratik ya da teorik bilgiye ulaşmakta yol gösteren bir rehber olmaktır.
- d) öğretmenliğimin zayıf ve güçlü yönlerini değerlendirmektir.
- e) danışman olmaktır.
- f) profesyonel gelişim sürecinde akıl hocası olmaktır.

3. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanın pedagojik yeterlilikleri ile ilgili olmalıdır.

- a) bilgilendireceği konuya ilişkin ilgi ve merak uyandırabilmesi
- b) eğitim vereceği konuya ilişkin farklı anlatım metotları seçip uygulayabilmesi
- c) uygun şekilde geri bildirim verebilmesi
- d) bilgi vermeyi ve açıklamayı net bir şekilde yapabilmesi

4. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanın iletişim becerileri açısından gibi özellikleri olmalıdır.

- a) hocaların ilgi ve ihtiyaçlarına duyarlılık gösterebilmek
- b) vücut dili kullanabilmek
- c) esnek davranarak takım halinde çalışabilmek
- d) espri yapabilmek

5. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanının alanda yeterliliği açısından önemlidir.

- a) anlatacağı konuda uzman olması
- b) hizmetiçi eğitimde deneyim sahibi olması
- c) bir çok farklı konuda eğitim verebilecek olması
- d) teorik bilgisini gerçek hayatta kullanılacak pratik bilgilerle birleştirebilmesi

6. Hizmetiçi eğitimde görevli öğretim elemanı eğitim için uygun bir atmosfere ulaşabilmelidir.

- a) görsel ve işitsel materyalleri etkili bir şekilde kullanarak
- b) eğitim sırasında öğretmenlerin aktif katılımlarını sağlamak için gruplar organize ederek
- c) cana yakın bir ortam sağlayarak
- d) slayt gösterimleri dışında farklı materyallerle de eğitim vererek

3. Bölüm- Hizmetiçi Eğitimde Görevli Kurum İçi ve Kurum Dışı Öğretim Elemanı

Aşağıdaki ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı ilgili kutuyu işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Kurum içinde görevli öğretim elemanı ve kurum dışından gelen öğretim elemanı için ayrı ayrı işaretleme yapınız, işaretleme belirlenen fikirlere katılma derecenize göre farklı olabilir.

ÖRNEK SORU:

Görevli öğretim elemanının yapmasını istiyorum.

| Kurum İçi | | | | | Kurum Dışı | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum

2 = kısmen katılmıyorum

3 = ne katılıyorum

ne de katılmıyorum

4 = kısmen katılıyorum

5 = kesinlikle katılıyorum

Şu andaki kurumunuzda çalışan hizmetiçi eğitim veren öğretim elemanları

Kurumunuza başka yerlerden gelen hizmetiçi eğitim veren öğretim elemanları

| | Kurum İçi | | | | | Kurum Dışı | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. Görevli öğretim elemanın çalışmalarını verimli buluyorum. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Görevli öğretim elemanın kim olacağı konusunda seçim hakkım olmasını isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Görevli öğretim elemanın eğitim sırasında anadilimi kullanmasını tercih ederim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Görevli öğretim elemanın anadilinin İngilizce olmasını isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Görevli öğretim elemanın alan bilgisi haricinde İngilizce yeterliliğimi geliştirecek oturumlar da düzenlemesini isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Görevli öğretim elemanın benimle paralel koşullarda İngilizce eğitim veren biri olmasını isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Görevli öğretim elemanın verdiği eğitimin devamlılığını getirmesini isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Görevli öğretim elemanın akademik derecesi benden daha iyi olmalıdır. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Görevli öğretim elemanın dersime gözlemci olarak katılması beni rahatsız etmez. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Görevli öğretim elemanın verdiği eğitimde beni aktif olarak sürece dahil etmesini isterim. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Bu çalışmaya ayırdığınız vakit ve harcadığınız emek için tekrar teşekkür ederim.

Araştırmacı: Ebru Gaganuş - ebrugaganus@gmail.com
Bilkent Üniversitesi / MA TEFL

APPENDIX B : THE QUESTIONNAIRE (IN ENGLISH)

In-service Training Programs' Instructors Questionnaire

Bilkent University, MA TEFL 2011

Dear Instructors,

This questionnaire, which is a part of my study in MA TEFL Department, Bilkent University, was designed to find out EFL instructors' perceptions of their expectations from in-service trainers.

This questionnaire consists of three parts. The first part was designed to get your background information. The second part was designed to investigate your expectations from in-service trainers in general. The last part was designed to investigate your expectations from internal and external in-service trainers.

Your responses to this questionnaire and any information given to me will remain strictly confidential.

Please note that in this questionnaire in-service trainers mean the people who train instructors via seminars, workshops, conferences, and programs related to the language teaching. In addition, internal trainers mean the instructors who work in your current institution and external trainers mean the instructors who are invited to your institution from other work places.

I'd like to remind you that your responses will be of value to my research and I'd like to thank you for your participation and cooperation in advance.

Researcher: Ebru Gaganuş
Bilkent University
MA TEFL

Informed Consent

I,, have read and understood the information given above and I agree to take part in this study.

Signature: _____
Date: _____

1. Part- Background Information

Years of work experience in teaching: _____

The name of your current institution: _____

The department you graduated from. Please tick the appropriate choice.

____ English Language Teaching

____ English or American Literature

____ Translation

____ Linguistics

Other _____

Academic Background. Please tick the appropriate choice.

____ BA

____ MA

____ Ph D

Other _____

2. Part- Expectations from In-Service Trainers in General

Complete the following by ranking the items in each question according to their degree of importance. For the most important item in your opinion, write "1" in the box next to it, and for the items which are less important, go on with the numbers "2, 3, 4, 5 and 6". For the following questions, only for the second question, there are six items. For the others, rank the items from "1" to "6".

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Most important | | | | | | Least important |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |

SAMPLE QUESTION:

An- service trainer should be someone who is

e) friendly

f) cute

g) sincere

h) honest

1. A trainer should be selected according to her/his

- e) academic degree
- f) communication skills
- g) pedagogical skills
- h) organizational skills

2. The role of a trainer is

- g) to provide practical knowledge to be used in my classrooms
- h) to provide theoretical knowledge generated from research
- i) to be good at guiding teachers to construct knowledge
- j) to evaluate my teaching in terms of my strengths and weaknesses
- k) to be a consultant
- l) to be a mentor who looks out for my professional development

3. In terms of pedagogical competencies, a trainer should be able to

- e) arouse interest and motivation throughout the training
- f) conduct lessons using a variety of teaching methods determined by the topic
- g) give feedback appropriately
- h) give instructions and explanations clearly

4. In terms of communication competencies, a trainer should be able to

- e) demonstrate sensitivity to the teachers' feelings and needs
- f) use body language
- g) work flexibly and cooperatively within a team
- h) have a sense of humor

5. In terms of content competencies, a trainer should

- e) be a subject specialist
- f) have enough experience in teaching on INSET programs
- g) deliver sessions on a wide range of topics
- h) relate the subjects to be studied during the training to real life situations

6. A trainer should to achieve an appropriate environment for training.

- a) use audio and course materials effectively
- b) organize participants in different types of groups for active participation in training activities
- c) create a friendly atmosphere
- d) provide different types of training materials not limited to slide presentations

3. PART- Internal and External In-Service Trainers

Complete the following by placing a tick in the box that best represents your opinion. Please tick the boxes on the scale for both internal and external trainers. Your choices may be different.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| I'd like the in-service trainer to do..... . | Internal 1 2 3 4 5 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | External 1 2 3 4 5 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|--|

- 1** = strongly disagree
- 2** = disagree
- 3** = neither disagree nor agree
- 4** = agree
- 5** = strongly agree

The instructors who work in your current home institution and give training sessions

The instructors who are invited to your home institution to give training sessions

| Items | Internal Trainers | | | | | External Trainers | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I find in-service trainers' work beneficial. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. I'd like to have input in choosing the trainer who will train me. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. I prefer the trainer to use my native tongue. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. I prefer the trainer's first language to be English. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. I'd like the trainer to organize additional sessions to help me improve my English. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. I'd like the trainer to have similar teaching experience to mine. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. I'd like the trainer to hold follow-up sessions after the training they provided. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. I'd like the trainer to have a higher academic degree than mine. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. It doesn't bother me to be observed in my class by a trainer. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. I'd like the trainer to make me participate actively in the training session. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Once again, thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Researcher: Ebru Gaganuş
ebrugaganus@gmail.com
Bilkent Üniversitesi
MA TEFL

APPENDIX C: A SAMPLE INTERVIEW (IN TURKISH)

Researcher : Anketi cevapladınız. Bunları bu şekilde düşünürken, cevaplarken, örneğin; bir trainer şyle olmalıdır, en önemli özelliği budur, bu daha az önemlidir derken hangi faktörler etkiledi seni?

Interviewee: Yani geçen sene biz başladığımızda danışmanlarımız vardı. Sonra onlar trainer oldular. Onlardan, onları gözlemlediğim kadarıyla cevap verdim aslında. Trainer'da en önemli olan şey benim için iyi iletişim kurabilmesiydi, bir de benimle aynı koşullarda çalışıyor olması lazım. Akademik rütbe olarak yüksek olması şart değil, ama aynı kurumda çalışıyor olmamız gerekiyor, aynı koşullarda çalışıyor olmamız lazım. Eeee.., daha faydalı olacağını düşünüyorum sorunları anlamada ve bana yardımcı olmada. Eeee..., daha sonra organizasyonun iyi olması lazım.

Researcher: Peki neden böyle düşünüyorsun, verdiğin cevaplar neden böyle?

Interviewee: Yani şöyle düşünüyorum; trainer evet çok bilgili olabilir, evet çok tecrübeli olabilir, eeeee ..., kendini çok iyi yetiştirmiş olabilir ama bunu eğer karşısındakine yansıtamıyorsa çok da etkili değil bu, çok da işe yaramıyor. Dolayısıyla çok tecrübeli olması çok bilgili olması o kadar da key point değil benim için. En önemli olan şey bildiğini bana geçirebiliyor mu, bu önemli. Hem bilgi açısından, hem de kişisel ilişkiler açısından da aynı şekilde.

Researcher: Peki bir trainer iyi iletişim kurabilmelidir, bana aktarabilmelidir derken, sen böyle mi yapıyorsun, kendin bir hoca olarak?

Interviewee: Evet, aslında bir yansıması. Yani benim için iyi hoca profilinde şu kriterler vardır. Ben de olması gereken özellikler budur. Trainer'da da onu görmek isterim. Yani şimdiye kadar yaptığım şey aslında şuydu; ben İngilizce öğretmenliği okumadım. Ama şu ana kadar çok fazla hocayı gözlemledim. Hangi hoca benim için iyi hangi hoca, eeee....., hangi hoca başarısız ya da iyi değil diyelim onları gözlemledim ve iyi hocada olması gereken özellikleri şu ana kadar kafamda oturttum. Şimdi ben öğrencilerime karşıda aynı şekilde...

APPENDIX D: A SAMPLE INTERVIEW (IN ENGLISH)

Researcher : You have responded to the questionnaire. Which factors have affected your responses regarding the features of a trainer? While responding to the questions, have you considered some features, such as “a trainer should possess this characteristic, this very characteristic is less and/or more important”

Interviewee: Well, when we started last year, we had mentors. Later, they became teacher trainers. As far as I observed, ability to communicate was the most important factor. In addition to it, working under the same conditions is another important feature. Seniority and academic rank are not that important, but it is vital that we work at the same place. Err., I believe that a trainer will be more helpful to us if she knows our conditions. Err... good organization skills is also important.

Researcher: Well, why do you think that way, why do you have such responses?

Interviewee: As a matter of fact, a trainer can be knowledgeable and experienced. She may have a very good educational background. However, unless she passes her skills to the person she is working with, it is of no use. To me, being knowledgeable is not a key point. It is vital that a trainer teach what she has to teach in terms of both knowledge and personal relations.

Researcher: Do you practice what you preach? I mean, in terms of such skills as you mentioned above.

Interviewee: Well, yes.. In fact, it is a reflection. In my opinion, a good teacher should possess certain criteria. I am also the one who has to have such criteria. I want to see the same criteria in a trainer. I am not an ELT graduate, but I have observed quite a lot of teachers and, in a way, established some criteria in my mind regarding the qualities of a good teacher. Now...