

MALTEPE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

AN ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITY FOREIGN LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS AND THE
INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION AND RELEVANCE

MASTER OF ARTS THESIS

LEVENT BALCIOĞLU

071113205

Supervisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Yıldıray ÇEVİK

Istanbul, October 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher training programs in general and also intends to find out how much instructors who work at both public and private universities benefit from these trainings.

I would like to thank everybody who contributed to this study until the end. First of all, I owe to thank my advisor Yıldıray Çevik, MA, PhD for his great support. He was a complete back up at the times of fear and stress. Secondly, I would like to thank my professors at the department of English Language Teaching throughout master's program for their contribution to my development in the field. Last but not the least; I thank Okan Ünalın, MA, PhD for proof reading my study. I also owe special thanks to my beloved, Özlem Alagöz during all those sleepless nights for her patient company.

ABSTRACT

Teacher education has always been the main concern in English Language Teaching (ELT) domain. Starting from the very beginning of educating student teachers from their freshman years, the ELT departments want to show their students who are prospect language teachers, the best of new techniques and approaches in ELT. Thus, the ELT departments design their curriculum according to the ultimate developments so that their students can benefit utmost and apply their academic knowledge in their future teaching career. This issue brings into mind the concept of continuous learning and development in teachers' careers. Teacher training programs are held in order to remedy this issue. The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of these teacher training programs, how much instructors who work at universities both public and private ones benefit from these trainings, and finally attempts to find out if there is any other factor that influences the effectiveness of these programs.

Key words: teacher training programs, effectiveness of teacher training programs, continuous learning and development.

ÖZET

Öğretmen eğitimi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi camiasının her zaman en öncelikli gündemini oluşturmuştur. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi (ELT) bölümleri daha eğitim programlarının ilk başlarından itibaren öğrencilerine en çağdaş teknik ve metotların gösterildiği bir eğitim modelini amaçlamışlardır. Dahası, ELT bölümleri her yıl ders programlarını bu gelişmeleri dikkate alarak daha fazla fayda sağlamak amaçlı olarak yeniden düzenlemektedir. Bu durum ELT bölümlerinden mezun öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme ve kişisel gelişim ihtiyaçları gerçeğini akla getirmektedir. Bu ihtiyaca istinaden öğretmen eğitimi programları (teacher training programs) doğmuş ve bu doğrultuda düzenlenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın amacı bu eğitim programlarının ne ölçüde fayda sağladığının araştırılmasına yöneliktir. Araştırmada vakıf ve devlet üniversitelerinden İngilizce okutmanlarına ne ölçüde fayda sağladığı, bu sonucu etkileyen diğer faktörlerin ne olduğu ve okutmanların nihayetinde ne kadar kendi gerçeklerine yönelik olarak faydalandıklarının ortaya çıkarılmasına yönelik bir çalışma yapılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: öğretmen eğitimi programları, öğretmen eğitimi programlarının faydaları, yaşam boyu öğrenme ve kişisel gelişim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.....	1
1.2 WHAT IS TEACHER DEVELOPMENT.....	4
1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	10
1.4 HISTORY OF TTPs IN TURKEY.....	12
1.5 WHAT IS TEACHER TRAINING.....	15
1.6 WHY SHOULD TEACHERS CHANGE IN THEIR CAREER.....	17
CHAPTER 2.....	24
METHODOLOGY.....	24
2.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	24
2.2 POPULATION AND SAMPLING.....	25
2.3 SUBJECTS.....	26

2.4 DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT.....	27
2.5 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE.....	28
2.5.1 Occupational and Personal Information Form.....	28
2.5.2 Effectiveness of the Teacher Training Scale.....	28
2.6 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE.....	30
2.7 FACTOR ANALYSIS AND RELIABILITY OF THE SCALE.....	35
CHAPTER 3.....	46
RESULTS.....	46
3.1 RESULTS OF THE QUESTION ITEMS.....	52
3.2 RESULTS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....	61
3.2.1 Results of the Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Gender Differences	63
3.2.2 Results of the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Graduation.....	65
3.2.3 Results of the Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Educational Levels.....	67
3.2.4 Results of the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Occupational Seniority.....	70
CHAPTER 4.....	73
DISCUSSION.....	73
4.1 DISCUSSIONS ON INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS ON TTPs IN TERMS OF ITEMS INDIVIDUALLY.....	73
4.2 DISCUSSIONS ON THE RESULTS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....	83
4.3 DISCUSSIONS ON THE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF THE FACTORS REGARDING THEIR GENDER DIFFERENCES.....	84
4.4 DISCUSSIONS ON THE SUBJECTS' PERCEPTION OF THE FACTORS REGARDING THEIR GRADUATION.....	86

4.5 DISCUSSIONS ON THE INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF THE FACTORS REGARDING THEIR EDUCATIONAL LEVELS.....	87
4.6 DISCUSSIONS ON THE SUBJECTS' PERCEPTION OF THE FACTORS REGARDING THEIR OCCUPATIONAL SENIORITY.....	89
4.7 CONCLUSION.....	90
4.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	94
4.9 SUGGESTIONS FURTHER RESEARCH.....	94
CHAPTER 5.....	96
REFERENCES.....	96
APPENDICES.....	101
APPENDIX 1.....	101
APPENDIX 2.....	107
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	109

ABBREVIATIONS

ELT: English Language Teaching

TTPs: Teacher Training Programs

TT: Teacher Training

TD: Teacher Development

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

FL: Foreign Language

CLT: Communicative Language Testing

CPD: Continuous Professional Development

SPSS: Statistical package for Social Sciences

ANOVA: One way Analysis of Variance

(N): Frequency

(%): Percentage

(\bar{X}): Mean scores

(sd): Standard deviation

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Sample.....	26
Table 2 Means and Standard Variation Values of the Items.....	29
Table 3 KMO and Bartlett's Test.....	35
Table 4 Rotated Factor Matrix.....	37
Table 5 Factor 1 Item-Total Statistics.....	38
Table 6 Factor 2 Item-Total Statistics.....	39
Table 7 Factor 3 Item-Total Statistics.....	40
Table 8 Factor 4 Item-Total Statistics.....	40
Table 9 Factor 5 Item-Total Statistics.....	41
Table 10 T-test For the Discrimination Value of the Items.....	42
Table 11 Correlation Between the Factors.....	43
Table 12 Summary Table of the Factor and Item-Total Correlation Analyses.....	44
Table 13 Frequencies of the Question Items.....	46

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics for Instructors' Perception of the Factors.....	61
Table 15 T-test Summary Table Comparing Instructors' Gender Groups on Scores of the Factors.....	63
Table 16 T-test Summary on Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Graduation.....	65
Table 17 One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Instructors' Educational Levels on Scores of the Factors.....	67
Table 18 Post-Hoc Test on Instructors Educational Levels.....	67
Table 19 One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table in the Perception of the Subjects' Occupational Seniority.....	70
Table 20 Scheffe Test on Perception of the Subjects' Occupational Seniority.....	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, background of the study, what teacher development is, statement of the problem, research questions of the study, history of teacher training programs, and what a teacher training program is as well as the issue of why a language teacher should need to change in their careers have been outlined and some specific examples from the previous studies to support the rationale behind the practice have been given.

1.1 Background of the Study

The world of education is getting more and more technical and more complex day by day and that is why teacher education is paid utmost attention to meet the needs of the issue of raising competent educators to be able to follow the latest innovations as well as being creative when tailoring the curriculum according to the needs of their learners. To raise a competent teacher is an issue for faculties of education. However, no matter how feasible a curriculum for prospective teachers is designed during their university education, the need for a lifelong learning and continuous improvement for teachers stays as a necessity since there are rapid and comprehensive innovations in the world of teaching.

In the world of English Language Teaching (ELT), teachers often feel the need of refreshing themselves with the new teaching techniques and approaches to make the most of their teaching for their learners. In today's ELT world it seems almost impossible to stick with one approach or technique for every kind of learner. The

innovations are vast, and keeping up with them is thus sheer hard work, if teachers do not have the notion of how to benchmark and implement new ideas and teaching approaches into their classrooms and teaching philosophies. To make the teachers of English have the relevant notion and to raise awareness in them is the fundamental concept to achieve the aim of approaching the concept of ELT in an eclectic way both for teachers and curriculum designers alike. A language teacher is required not only to be proficient in using the target language, but also to be knowledgeable about the rules and conventions that govern its use in an authentically communicative context (Liyanage&Bartlett, 2008, p. 1829).

As mentioned above, Teacher Development (TD) as a whole is considered to be one of the main goals in ELT domain. “Much of the impetus for change in approaches to language teaching came about from changes in teaching methods. For this reason, the quest for better methods was a preoccupation of many teachers and applied linguists throughout the twentieth century” (Richards&Rodgers, 2001, p. 1). Therefore, to train creative and eclectic type of teachers in this world of ELT, a lifelong process of TD is needed in order for better outcomes in terms of teaching at different environments. Teachers should be willing to evaluate and reform their form of teaching under the concept of TD. TD is crucial in regard to following latest innovations in their domain, designing and evaluating their curriculum, and finally being a reflective type of educator. This is the reason why being a “reflective” and creative teacher is the desired outcome of the teacher training programs (TTP). The answer on a quest for one’s own personal and integrated understanding of how people learn a second language is eclectic. In a clear manner, “there is no single theory or hypothesis which will provide a magic formula for all learners in all contexts. Teacher will be urged to be as critical as he can in

considering the merits of various models and theories and research findings” (Brown, 2000, p. x). However, as Brown suggests “the problem of raising capable teachers who are creative enough to tailor their lessons according to their learner needs still remains unsolved” (p.x). Teachers learn as pedagogic content knowledge at university programs may not be readily viable in the actual teaching world (Liyanage&Bartlett, 2008, p. 1829). At this point, a well designed TT program to suit the needs of the teachers holds a vitally important role. For this reason, a teacher can only attain the creativity in teaching when he internalizes the habit of asking the right questions while planning a lesson.

These questions are; who does the learning and teaching? Where do they (learners) come from? What are their levels of education and socioeconomic levels? What sort of personalities do they have? (Brown, 2000, p. 2).

Brown within the first phase of questions raises the issue of qualities of learners that must be considered by the teacher during the planning process.

What is language? What are the linguistic differences between the first and the second language? How does learning take place? How can a person ensure success in language learning? What cognitive processes are utilized in second language learning? What kinds of strategies does the learner use? What is the optimal interrelationship of cognitive, affective, and physical domains for successful language learning? (Brown, 2000, p. 2).

Brown takes the issue into the cognitive learning process which must equally be taken into the consideration by the teacher during planning process.

When does second language learning take place? Why does the age of learning make a difference? Is the learner exposed to three to five or ten hours a week in the classroom? Or are they focusing on a foreign language context in which the second language is heard and spoken only in an artificial environment, such as the modern language classroom in a University or High School? How might the sociopolitical conditions of a particular country affect the outcome of a learner’s mastery of the language? Finally, why are learners attempting to acquire the second language? What are their purposes? Are they motivated by the achievement of a successful career? Or by passing a foreign language

requirement? Or by wishing to identify closely with the culture and people of the target language? Beyond these categories, what other affective, emotional, personal, or intellectual reasons do learners have for pursuing this gigantic task of learning another language? (Brown, 2000, p. 3).

As it is seen, the awareness of these issues is the key element for the improvement during a teacher's career. Therefore, the area of concern for this study is to examine how the instructors of English Language at University Preparatory Schools perceive the concept of TT programs as a whole during their careers.

1.2 What is Teacher Development?

Teacher education has always been the main concern in English Language Teaching (ELT) domain. Starting from the very beginning of educating student teachers from their freshman years, the ELT departments want to show their students, who are prospect language teachers, the best of new techniques and approaches in English Language Teaching. Thus, ELT departments design their curriculum according to the ultimate developments in the ELT world so their students could benefit utmost and can use their academic knowledge in their future teaching career. It is the primary objective of departments to keep students updated. After four years of studying at ELT departments, the graduates are expected to be able to apply their academic knowledge into their own working environments.

However, the case is not as easy as it seems. Being able to learn the ultimate techniques and approaches along with the theories does not necessarily mean that they were internalized properly up to the desired level in order to actualize them in the classroom atmosphere for a novice teacher. "In clear terms teacher development is the process of becoming the best teacher you can be. It means becoming a student of learning, your own as well as that of others" (Scrivener, 1994, p. x). This brings

into mind the concept of continuous learning and, therefore, it should be a part of a teacher's life. "One of the most invigorating things about teaching is that teachers should never stop learning so as to be beneficial to their learners" (Brown, 2001, p.426). The results also reveal that teachers exercising more advanced types of behaviour in their classrooms have better student outcomes. Advanced types of behaviour mean the skills concerned with new teaching approaches and differentiation (Kyriakides, Creemers & Antoniou, 2009, p. 12).

The complexity of the dynamic triangular interplay among teachers, learners and subject matter continually raises an infinite number of questions, problems to solve and issues to ponder. "Every time a teacher walks into a classroom to teach they face some of these issues" (Brown, 2001, p. 426). It means taking a step back to see the larger picture of what goes on in learning, and how the relationship between students and teachers influences learning. It also means attending to small details which can in turn change the bigger picture of teaching. In broader terms, "teacher development is a continuous process of transforming human potential into human performance, a process that is never finished" (Underhill, 1986, p. 1).

The act of teaching is essentially a constant processing of options. "At every point in each lesson a teacher [is required to conduct a great array of options and fulfilments], they can decide to do something, to do something else, or to do nothing at all. In order to become a better qualified teacher it seems crucial to be aware of as many options as possible" (Scrivener, 1994, p. 1). As Davis (cited in Scrivener, 1994) puts forward in his unpublished paper, teacher development is a voluntary process. Moreover, he defines that process as holistic, long term, ongoing and continual. During that process there is an internal agenda along with awareness

based, angled towards personal growth and the development of attitudes and insights. It is definitely non-compulsory and a bottom-up approach. Furthermore, teacher professional development might be of help with the dynamic character of effectiveness since not only they move to a higher level but also help refresh the ones who drop to a lower level for several reasons including burnout (Kyriakides et al., 2009, p. 13). On the other hand, teacher development as learning is carried out by practitioners in collaboration with their colleagues. As many related studies suggest “teachers must rethink their teaching role in order to facilitate communicative situations suited to the peculiarities of various interactions” (Guasch, Alvarez & Espana, 2010, p. 199).

The term teacher development was coined in the 1980s as something separate and different from teacher training and in reaction against over-rigid and over-behavioristic models of teacher training. The distinction is of initial pre-service (training) versus continuing in-service (development). Today, the two terms are often used with more specific, contrasting meanings; implying differing approaches to the nature of professional learning (Finocchiaro, 1988, p. 2).

In TD there is no pre-set syllabus, time-structure or external assessment. Teachers themselves decide what and how they want to learn. They get together to do research and share experience and knowledge and they evaluate the results themselves. It is teacher’s own experience that counts in profession. New information is sought and shared rather than being imposed. It is then learnt by being reflected on, tried out processed in terms of personal experience and finally owned by the teachers in whatever from they find appropriate (Freeman, 1989, p. 28).

In TD there is considerable stress on the development of the whole person rather than just a teacher. TD is more flexible than TT; it is even a lifelong process. Unlike TT, in TD the teachers are more involved in decision-making. As a result, the sole leadership characteristic of a teacher comes into mind. TT is a process that comes from outside from a course and from a trainer or a group of trainers. TD, on the other hand, comes from within the individual and requires a commitment from that individual to move forward in some way as a teacher (Bowen, 2010, p. 1). TD can be regarded as more or less a voluntary activity.

Continuous learning as Brown coins, takes form in several ways. It can either be through in-service training or special courses which are held by the worldwide recognized institutions. The process of continuing to develop professional expertise as a teacher is sometimes difficult to manage alone. In a similar point of view, Brandl (2000) states that “having a second method course would further support the notion that becoming a teacher is a long-term process that requires ongoing training and that it constantly changes according to trainees’ developmental stages.” (p. 368). The challenges of teaching in a rapidly changing profession almost necessitate collaboration with other teachers in order to stay on the cutting edge (Brown, 2001, p. 426). Brown (2001) also suggests five forms of collaboration of teachers learning from each other.

The first one is *peer coaching*. Peer coaching is a systematic process of collaboration in which one teacher observes and gives feedback to another teacher, usually with some form of reciprocity. Observers need not technically be peers, in every sense of the word but as colleagues, observer and the teacher engage in a cooperative process of mutual communication. Feedback is offered and received as information for the enhancement of one’s future teaching, not as data for summing up one’s competencies as a teacher (p. 427).

Peer observation is a very effective method to reflect on oneself since during the observation teacher puts herself or himself in the shoes of the observee and that process of introspective is educational to come up with different ideas.

The second form is *team teaching*. Several models are common; (1) two teachers are overtly present throughout a class period, but divide responsibility between them; (2) two teachers take different halves of a class period, with one teacher stepping aside while the other performs; and (3) two or more teachers teach different consecutive periods of one group of learners and must collaborate closely in carrying out and modifying curricular plans. Teachers are encouraged to collaborate, to consider respective strengths, and to engage in reflective practice (Brown, 2001, p. 440-443).

Here is the idea of sharing and exchanging ideas for the same group of learners to arrive at different approaches.

The third form is *action research*. Research in the language classroom offers another opportunity for you to collaborate with other teachers in creative and ultimately rewarding ways. Other form is *collaborative curriculum development and revision*. Growing, dynamic language programs are a product of an ongoing creative dialogue between teachers and among teachers and those that are assigned to compile curricula. As teachers consult with them on lesson design, textbook adaptation, and pedagogical innovations, new curriculum is born every day. Finally, the last form is *teacher support groups*. It is important to have times when a staff of teachers gets together to cover a number of possible issues: student behaviour problems, teaching tips, curricular issues, and even difficulties with administrative bureaucracy. When teachers talk together there is almost a sense of solidarity and purpose (Brown, 2001, p. 440-443).

As it is seen the key term is collaboration and sharing the ideas among peers to arrive at variations of teaching approach in the pursuit of getting better student outcomes.

In both ways the teachers can benefit and keep themselves up-to-date in the ever changing ELT world. It is acknowledged that a technique or an approach in teaching, which is seen as ultimate, can no longer be regarded as such after several years of experimentation; hence, it needs to be revised for future purposes arise. In this regard, as Brown states, continuous learning becomes so predominant that

teachers are obliged to keep abreast of the latest developments in ELT world, either from journals or forums.

Much has been said and written about the importance of continuous learning in teachers' career. In language teaching, where there are intensive and head spinning developments of various senses, there is no doubt that teaching professionals need to 'refresh' and revise their teaching styles throughout their professional lives. When teachers are exposed to methods and asked to reflect on their principles and actively engage with their techniques, they can become clearer about why they do what they do. They become aware of their own fundamental assumptions, values, and beliefs (Freeman, 2000, p. x). In a similar point of view, Prabhu (1990) states that (cited in Freeman, 2000) interacting with others' conceptions of practice helps keep teachers' teaching alive. Interaction in this way helps prevent it from becoming stale and overly routinized. Such continuous refreshment should be made regardless of the experience they have acquired (p. x).

As Arends (1998) summarizes (cited in Freeman, 2000) "knowledge of methods helps expand a teacher's repertoire of techniques. This in itself provides an additional avenue for professional growth, as some teachers find their way to new philosophical positions, not by first entertaining new principles, but rather trying out new techniques"(p. x). All in all, teacher development is for everybody who wishes to keep themselves up-to-date regardless of their working experience. The last but not the least, Larsen-Freeman (1991), sums up that "teachers are not mere conveyor belts delivering language through inflexible prescribed and proscribed behaviours but they are professionals who can, in the best of all worlds, make their own decisions" (Freeman, 2000, p. x).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Teacher education has always been the main concern in English Language Teaching (ELT) domain. Starting from the outset of teacher education ELT departments are to teach their students, who are prospective language teachers, the best of new techniques and approaches in English Language Teaching. Thus, The ELT departments design their curriculum according to the ultimate developments in ELT world so their students could benefit utmost and can use their academic knowledge in their future teaching career. After four years of hard work to graduate from ELT departments, the graduates are expected to be able to apply their academic knowledge into their own working environments. However, the case is not as easy as it seems. Being able to learn the ultimate techniques and approaches along with the theories does not necessarily mean that they were internalized properly up to the desired level to actualize them in the classroom atmosphere for a newly graduate. In his research Borg (2006) nicely puts forward why being a foreign language (FL) teacher is different to that of teachers of other subjects.

To start with, being a foreign language teacher is in many ways unique within the profession of teaching. “FL teaching is the only subject where effective instruction requires the teacher to use a medium the students do not yet understand” (p. 5). Second, effective FL teaching requires interaction patterns which mean group work or pair work is essential. Third, there is always a “challenge for teachers of increasing their knowledge of the subject” (p. 5). Fourth, in some institutions FL teachers may experience the feeling of isolation more than that of teachers of other subjects because of the absence of colleagues teaching the same subject. It is widely accepted that “FL teachers have to find ways of providing

extracurricular activities through which naturalistic learning environments can be created” (Borg, 2006, p. 5).

At that moment the term “continuous learning” comes into mind, and, therefore, should be part of a FL teacher’s life. “Continuous learning” takes form in several ways. It can either be through in-service training or special courses which are held by the worldwide recognized institutions (Brown, 2001, p. 429).

What is more, oral production plays a central role unlike any other subjects. Furthermore, the field of ELT is more advanced and innovative in its approach to teaching and learning. As it is seen from the citation of Borg (2006) ELT is quite unique in its own way and that is the reason why the key term continuous learning plays a major role in FL teachers’ professional life. At that point the issue of “how” comes to mind. Although there can be many ways to count among several others, teacher training programs (TTPs) play the key role in order to meet the requirements of such an issue. Due to the reasons mentioned above, TTPs can really be beneficial as the contents of the sessions are designed according to the needs of the FL teachers (p. 27).

First of all, classroom management is a major issue since giving instructions is central in any activity. The problem is, as mentioned earlier in the study, that the teacher uses a medium the learners do not yet understand and TTPs deal with this at every stage of sessions. On the other hand, group work and pair work activities are mainly discussed in TTP as effective FL requires interaction. There is also a challenge for FL teachers of increasing their knowledge of the subject, and TTPs may provide them some kind of environment that they can be exposed to the language during discussions within sessions.

Another advantage of TTPs can be counted as the occasion of getting together with the field professionals since FL teachers feel isolated due to the lack of colleagues teaching the same subject. Finally, FL teachers must find ways of creating good teaching and learning environments and creating a good learning environment through tasks is the major concern of TTPs (Borg, 2006, p. 5). All in all, TTPs, if designed according to the principle of fit-for-purpose, may well contribute a lot to the development of ELT professionals.

Various reasons have been mentioned above why a continuous learning must take place in FL teachers' career. Therefore, this study aims to shed light on the outcome of TTPs from FL teachers' point of view which means the study tries to find out how FL language teachers benefit from these TTPs, why they do not feel satisfied after attending those TTP sessions, and if they really feel that there has been any enhancement after attending TTPs.

1.4 History of TTPs in Turkey

The early in-service-training programs date back in 1960s when they were effectively supported by The Ministry of Education. The very first in-service-training programs held by the Ministry was in the year of 1961 with 32 participants for a week program and from that year onwards the number of in-service-training programs has increased year by year in different parts of the country at different times of the year. The main objectives of these in-service-training programs were to compensate for the inequalities between the experienced teachers with sound backgrounds and those with less experience in the field of teaching. Such trainings conceptually aimed to standardize the less proficient teachers into the acceptable

norms of proficiency defined by the Ministry (Atay, 2003, p. 108) (Own translation).

Here are some of the key principles of ELT in Turkey as expected by the Ministry:

1. It is central to develop four skills.
2. In ELT, the flow of the lesson should systematically be led from what is known towards what is unknown as inductively.
3. L1 should be avoided in the classroom.
4. The aims and objectives of the lesson should be clear and set.
5. The best way of learning is through involvement, so this should be the case while teaching.
6. Only one item should be taught at a time.
7. Every activity should be seen as an opportunity for cultivating L2 and thus teacher should be well equipped with necessary tools to do so.
8. Authentic materials should be extensively used in the classroom.
9. Teacher should create a learning friendly atmosphere.
10. Teacher should consider the variety of teaching while planning a lesson.
11. Teacher should encourage group and pair work and these activities should meet the needs of the learners.
12. Errors should be seen as an opportunity, not as a threat.
13. At intermediate and advanced levels errors should be corrected at the end of the student oral activity because instant error correction would be discouraging for students at those levels.
14. Only major errors should be corrected not minor ones.
15. As a method of teaching, “eclectic” approach should be adapted.
16. Teacher should not stick to one single method or approach/technique but be creative and bring variety to teaching milieu.
17. The best way of remembering would be through collocations and lexical uses; thus teacher should bear those in mind to pay attention to do so.
18. Classroom activities should be focused on the points which seem to be problematic for the learners.
19. Grammar is not an aim without meaning in itself, so contextual grammar teaching should be supported through meaning and form.
20. There is no perfect method for all learners, so fit-for-purpose principle should not be forgotten and be paid utmost attention.
21. Using audio-visual teaching aids is central, so using technological devices or/and bringing magazines, photos, videos, brochures, into the classroom is crucial for multiple intelligence theory.
22. Age, level and interest of students should be considered while choosing the right material for different type of learners.
23. Homework should be fit-for-purpose.
24. At higher levels, homework should be based on researches (T.C. Milli Eğitim Geçlik ve Spor Bakanlığı, Tebliğler Dergisi , 13 August 1984 – M. Vehbi Dinçerler- Minister).

According to the Ministry, these training programs ought to be conducted by the specialist academics as well as the British Council and under the supervision of the relevant specialists who work for the Ministry (Atay, 2003, p. 108) (Own translation). On the other hand, the British Council defined their perception of designing a course as follows:

This course aims to encourage teachers to analyze their own teaching situations and to establish patterns of self towards long term professional development. Together we will reflect on language learning theories and ELT methodology and consider their significance on our work here in Turkey (Nugent, 1995, p. 8). We do not think that there is a “better” or “worse” method except in so far as it is “best” for a specific teacher in a specific situation and, as we all know, the best method often changes with the situation. Therefore, this will not be an evaluative course but rather one of discovery of the alternatives through “experimenting”, “trailing” or “researching”, where each person is valued for his/her own personal discoveries. The important thing, we feel, is looking at ways, old or new, with a view to finding out what works well or badly, thus giving ourselves a personal security on which to base our own teaching philosophy. Change can often be desirable but is not always so, but awareness of what we do and why we do it should, we hope, lead us to discover our personal strengths on which we can base our teaching theories (Nugent, 1995, p. 9).

The content of trainings constructed by the school administration as well as teacher trainers at the British Council (Atay, 2003, p. 108) (Own translation). “A greater need to be as non-prescriptive as possible with an emphasis now on the concept of exploring, thus emphasizing the personal nature of the work” (Nugent, 1995, p. 10).

The content was mainly built upon the improvement of the teachers. However; since the individual needs were largely neglected, the desired level of success did not turn out as expected. The seminars were addressing to too large a group of participants, whose actual needs were all different from one another in English teaching, which was another issue to explain the reason why the desired results were not attained (Atay, 2003. p, 108) (Own translation). 50 in-service-

trainings were held by the ministry between the years of 2009 and 2005 in various parts of the country. For some of those trainings, ministry hired teacher trainers from other universities and institutions at certain times (see Appendix 2).

1.5 What is Teacher Training?

Teacher training (TT) refers to the preparation of teachers for professional practice through formal courses, usually university or college based, with results in accreditation. TT is based on a set of syllabus and has a course structure and system of assessment. In TT programs teaching/learning is based on a transmission model which the trainer informs, models and advises and the trainees to take on board the information and skills they are taught. TT underlies the cognitive development of trainees and their knowledge and skills as professionals (Wallace, 1990, p. 60). TT programs take form of one-off courses, beginning and ending at predetermined times and taking place at pre-set locations. Unlike TD they are not flexible or continuous. As Bowen (2010) perceives, “TT programs as the process of equipping an individual with the means to carry out the job of teaching” (p. 3). This is done by a trainer that presents the individual with the series of skills that meet the requirements of different aspects of teaching. In the specific field of ELT, these are the skills and techniques to teach grammar, lexis, pronunciation, reading, writing, listening and speaking and classroom management.

Freeman&Richards put forward that neither model on its own is entirely satisfactory. TT provides a structure, systematic syllabus and clear criteria for evaluation; however, it may be over- rigid and out of touch with participants’ needs. It ensures that incoming teachers do not have to reinvent the wheel and that they benefit from contribution of more experienced and knowledgeable practitioners and

academics; but it under-uses the teachers' own experience and reflection (Freeman&Richards, 1996, p. 69). In a FL teacher's career not just the concept of teacher development (TD) on its own would be enough, but also TT programs would be needed in order to reach an optimum lifelong learning.

On the other hand, TD has other advantages. It gives teachers the choice of what and how to study and thereby ensures the learning of meaningful and relevant content; it also stresses the importance of reflection on experience, and the ongoing, cumulative nature of professional pride and confidence (Richards&Nunan, 1990, p. 78). The distinction today has outlived its usefulness. The issue is not the difference between the two but rather their integration. A model needs to be evolved which combines the best of both in order to design optimally effective professional courses, both initial and continuing. When it comes to combining these two, "Continuous Professional Development" (CPD) comes to mind. CPD implies both the commitment of the individual and the commitment of the institution. In this case TD can be regarded as more or less a voluntary activity but CPD is much more a requirement for all employees of a given organization. Thus, the aim of this is to benefit not only the individual but also the organisation and ultimately the profession as a whole (Bowen, 2010, p. 3). Concrete examples of such development can be attending workshops, seminars, conferences or following a specialized course.

Another outcome of this particular aspect is the teacher efficacy which is of vital importance. "Professional interest was found out to be the most important factor due to its ability in predicting teachers' efficacy perceptions. The more activities an EFL teacher got involved in, the more efficacious they felt" (Yavuz, 2005, p. 77, 78). This finding points out the positive correlation between teacher

efficacy and openness to professional development revealed by earlier research conducted by Guskey and Smylie (1988) and it seems quite reasonable as teachers would naturally be expected to grow greater efficacy as they take part in more activities in professional development, learn and share with their colleagues. Thus, teachers need to take part in the professional development courses, namely TTPs.

Literature survey can be another “cure” for the problem to keep teachers updated to a certain extent, but one may as well wonder if all the teachers are willing, conscious and sensitive enough to the issue of getting updated (Scrivener, 1994). As Scrivener (1994) suggests, “even though the answer might be a “yes”, there is a potential risk that teachers might fall short of their expectations in the practice of career development” (p. 199).

1.6 Why Should Teachers Change in Their Career?

The study of past and present teaching methods continues to form a significant component of teacher preparation programs. Richards & Rodgers cite the reasons as follows:

The study of approaches and methods provides teachers with a view of how the field of language teaching has evolved. Approaches and methods can be studied not as prescriptions for how to teach but as a source of well-used practices, which teachers can adapt or implement based on their own needs. Experience in using different teaching approaches and methods can provide teachers with basic teaching skills that they can later add to or supplement as they develop teaching experience (p. 16).

As it is described here study of the new literature allows teacher to realize how to break from the prescribed method to a more eclectic type of teaching.

There are three broadly different categories of teacher. The first one is the *explainer*. These teachers know their subject very well but have limited knowledge

of teaching methodology. “This kind of teacher relies mainly on explaining or lecturing as a way of conveying information to the students; but their students are mostly not being personally involved or challenged” (Scrivener, 1994, p. 7). The second type of teacher is the *involver*. “This teacher also knows the subject matter and familiar with teaching methodology and able to use appropriate teaching and organizational procedures and techniques” (p. 7). This teacher has still clear control over the classroom and what is going on in it (Scrivener, 1994). The third type of typology is called the *enabler*. “This teacher also knows about the subject matter and methodology, but also has an awareness of how individuals and groups are thinking and feeling within his class” (p. 7). While planning the lesson and working on methods, he takes into consideration of how to build an effective working relationship and a good classroom atmosphere. His own personality and attitudes are an active encouragement to learning (Scrivener, 1994). Such teacher sees no harm in sharing the control with the learners or letting them have it completely.

In this typology, teaching is seen of a person whose job is to create the conditions that enable the students to learn for themselves. This looks like less traditional teaching and may become a guide or a counsellor or a resource of information when needed. This teacher is also hardly visible in the classroom when autonomous learning take place (Scrivener, 1994). As is seen the need for change from the explainer to the enabler is an issue for ELT teachers to bear in mind during their career. In order to lead a self- development a teacher should be:

...critically aware of his/her belief system and of his/her theory-in-use. Secondly, should be aware of a possible mismatch between their espoused theory and theory-in-use. What is more, should be aware of the relationship between him/her and the learners and how this affects learning. Also, should be able to analyze new theories, methods materials etc. and assess how they are related to their teaching practice and teaching practice. Furthermore, a teacher should be able to analyze how theories,

methods materials etc. may require them to change their teaching practice and the consequences of this for the teaching/learning situation. Finally, a teacher should be able to analyze how new theories, methods, materials may need to be adapted to suit their context specific teaching situation (Özdeniz, 1993, p. 6).

As it is seen here, an ideal teacher is depicted as the one who is aware of how to conduct a research and should be the one who internalized the concept of learning.

When teachers develop their teaching ability, they also gain confidence in their teaching skills. This is not just the concern of novice teachers but also of experienced teachers. This is simply because when they meet new challenges which seem to threaten their long-standing values and beliefs about learning and teaching. Gaining confidence and developing one's teaching ability are closely related to each other (Valazza, 2010). As Valazza argues (cited in Rossner, 1992) "teacher development is not just to do with the language or even teaching, it is also about counselling skills, assertiveness training, confidence building, cultural broadening-almost anything , in fact"(p. 4).

Considering how to realize teacher change, there are various ways to build confidence throughout teaching career. As is suggested by Valazza (2010) teachers should aim to develop their knowledge of the subject matter they teach. They should also aim at deepening their understanding of the theories underpinning learning and teaching practices. This can be achieved through attending seminars, workshops and TTPs in general. In addition to professionally satisfactory on subject matter, theories of learning and teaching teachers should also aim at improving teachers' ability to put all the acquired knowledge into practice and by doing so, to become more skilful at teaching (Valazza, 2010). As it is seen, TTPs, which include all basic traits of teaching profession, can be very efficient, if followed as it should be, for the ones who attend. On the other hand, TTPs have

another benefit, which is to raise awareness of such professional development through publicity among peers that take part in them. During the sessions of TTPs, trainees also observe the trainers' behaviours and benchmark them. Taken from this perspective TTPs are also beneficial for raising awareness for teaching professionals and create an atmosphere in pursuit of excellence in terms of profession.

As from the learners' points of view, the most recalled teachers are the ones who listened to them, encouraged them, and respected their views and decisions. And also those who helped students most were the ones who did least teaching of the subject matter and was seemingly technique-free, being basically himself in class (Scrivener, 1994). Therefore, an effective teacher is

The one who really listens to his students, shows respect, gives clear positive feedback, has a good sense of humour, is patient, knows his subject, inspires confidence, trusts people, empathizes with students' problems, is well-organized, paces lesson well, does not complicate things unnecessarily, is enthusiastic and inspires enthusiasm, can be authoritative without being distant, is honest, is approachable (Scrivener, 1994, p. 6).

Scrivener (1994) puts forth the traits of an ideal teacher profile above.

As Allen (1980) sums up nicely the list of down-to-earth characteristics of good FL teachers (cited in Brown, 2001, p. 429). He suggests that good teachers should be competent in preparation leading to a degree in TESL, have a love of English Language, critical thinking, be self-subordinated, have readiness to go the extra mile, cultural adaptability, have professional citizenship and have a feeling of excitement about one's work. In the same tone, Brown (2001) agrees with the idea and concludes the characteristics of a good language teacher into four categories;

and these are technical knowledge, pedagogical skills, interpersonal skills and personal qualities.

In a similar point of view Scrivener summarizes the issue that “Learning teaching is an aware and active use of the experiential learning cycle in one’s own life and work. Learning teaching is a belief that creativity, understanding, experience and character continue growing throughout one’s life” (Scrivener, 1994, p. 195).

Teacher training (TT), briefly expressed, is keeping hold of track in the ever-changing methodologies, techniques and approaches in the world of ELT. The main purpose of TT is to analyze the needs of the professionals in a certain teaching atmosphere, and determine the skills needed to be cultivated, and design a course accordingly to enable the maximum effectiveness that student-teachers can benefit to the full. “Benefiting to the full” means that, after the TT sessions, how much of that abstract knowledge turns into the concrete forms of teaching in the actual teaching environment. The major objectives of TTPs are to create awareness in instructors so that they can feel interested in the latest learning and teaching developments in their domain.

In consideration of teachers’ qualities flexibility also should be kept in mind “which is an important characteristic of successful classroom teachers, is strongly linked to teachers’ professional growth and the way in which they develop as individuals and as professionals” (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992, p. 42). McClaughlin (1997) argues that professionalism “must be rebuilt around the challenges to practice” (p. 80). Professionalism, in a situation of rapid change, requires that teachers redefine their roles according to social, moral and emotional contexts.

Tomlinson states that (1995) because of the “idea and ideals of a profession in the post-modern world” and also because of the need for teachers to become professionals and act like professionals at a time of constant change (p. 60). Day (1999) puts forward that it is necessary to reconstruct teacher professional development for teachers’ professionalism (cited in Tomlinson, 1995, p. 60). In the same regard, Barber (1995) argues for a reconstruction of teachers’ professional development so that priority is given to teachers, their skills and to their development in areas which enable them to confront new challenges. It is important, therefore, to discuss the different forms of professionalism, which either limit or promote teachers’ professional development. Another study administered by Iqbal and Zafar (2010) reveals that teachers trained through specially tailored TTPs perform better and operate efficiently in all domains of academic activities. The trainees in this way behave more creatively, analytically and critically in their approach, become more research-minded and independent in their pursuit of knowledge. It should be kept in mind that there is always more to the subject matter of language teaching to contribute and enhance through teaching a foreign language.

In conclusion, FL teachers need to keep hold of track with the latest innovations, methodologies in ELT. This issue first brings into mind the concept of TD. TD as a concept means that FL teacher takes the initiative and feels the urge to enhance during their career. This can either be done through literature survey or self study if known how to make research. However, TTPs are still needed to supply FL teachers about the current teaching trends as well as letting them have a point of view how to apply the current methodologies and innovations into their own settings. To make the most TTPs, at the very beginning of the design of them, a very detailed needs analysis is a must to have the best outcome for the ones who attend to get

some useful tips at the end of the TTPs. This may not take place if a TTP is designed according to a top down approach which means that the sessions do not fit for purpose as it is planned without including the FL teacher opinion. On the other hand a bottom up approach seems to be a lot more beneficial while designing TTPs so as to make the most of them.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the method of the study including research questions, population and sampling, subjects, data collection instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis procedure will be covered.

2.1 Research Questions

The aim of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher training programs. This study, in particular intends to investigate how much teachers of English as a foreign language benefit from these training sessions, and in which direction their perception improves in accordance with the relevance of these trainings. This study also attempts to find out if some specific factors such as gender, experience and education level influence the effectiveness of the training sessions.

The study, therefore, seeks to find answers to the following questions:

1. Do the instructors who have attended teacher training programs (TTPs) feel that they have benefited from these programs?
2. Do the instructors, given new trends and approaches, benefit from TTPs in terms of four skills teaching; reading, listening, writing and speaking?
3. Do certain variables such as gender, experience and education level affect subjects' attitudes towards teacher training programs?

2.2 Population and Sampling

The population of this study comprises 306 English Language Instructors (all non-natives) selected from 25 University Preparatory Schools in Turkey. In this study the subjects have been chosen from 25 Participant Universities both private and public as the population of the study. These universities are as follows:

Arel University, Ankara University, Atılım University, Başkent University, Beykent University, Boğaziçi University, Çankaya University, Dokuz Eylül University, Erciyes University, Hacettepe University, İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul Commerce University, İstanbul University, Izmir University, Kavram Vocational School, Karadeniz Technical University, Maltepe University, Marmara University, Melikşah University, Okan University, Özyeğin University, Sabancı University, TOBB University of Economics and Technology, Yeditepe University and Air Force Academy.

Convenience sampling method was used to choose the appropriate sample for the current study. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher. The subjects are selected just because they are easiest to recruit for the study. As Castillo puts forth this sampling method is also used when it seems that the researcher is unable to access to a wider population, for example, due to time or cost constraints. Thus, convenience sampling generally assumes a homogeneous population, and that one person is pretty much like another, since the sample was colleagues and work at similar environments (Castillo, 2009).

2.3 Subjects

The sample of the study was chosen through convenience sampling method from University Preparatory School Instructors in Turkey and Table 1 presents the instructors involved in the study.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

Variable	Groups	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Female	204	66,7
	Male	102	33,3
Graduation	Faculty of Education	175	57,2
	Faculty of Art and Sciences	131	42,8
Education	BA	159	52,0
	MA	126	41,2
	Ph. D.	21	6,9
International Certificate	Holders	125	40,8
	None holders	181	59,2
Occupational Seniority	1-5 year	100	32,7
	6-10 year	109	35,6
	11-15 year	54	17,6
	16 year and above	43	14,1
Working Hours (Weekly)	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>
	4	35	20,1

As is seen from the table above, 66.7% of the foreign language instructors are female and 33.3% of them are male. While 57.2% of the instructors graduated from a Faculty of Education, 42.8% of the instructors are from a Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Participants of the study work between 4 to 35 hours weekly with a mean of 20.1 hour.

2.4 Data Collection Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire with two main parts was designed to obtain data about university preparatory school instructors' attitudes towards teacher training programmes (TTP) at both public and private universities. In the questionnaire a 5-likert scale was applied. The questionnaire is comprised of two parts: the part of subjects' academic and personal background and the one with 50 questions specifically designed to elicit relevant answers and their attitudes towards their TTPs. All of questionnaires were pilot tested with 20 English Language Instructors. The layouts of the questionnaires were designed accordingly before the actual study. Before the questionnaires were handed out to the instructors, a cover sheet explaining the purpose of the study, asking for their cooperation and assuring that their responses would be confidential added in order to make the study meaningful for the subjects.

At the beginning of the research process, a questionnaire consisting of 45 questions was prepared by the researcher and necessary adjustments were made by the advisor. A pilot study was conducted at a private university preparatory school in Istanbul before circulating the questionnaires among the whole sample. The questionnaire was administered among instructors at that institution. After the reception of the pilot study questionnaires, it was found out that 5 extra questions had to be added in order to cover all research questions. Out of 50 questions, 16 of them are reverse questions and the rest are direct questions. The questions in the questionnaire were all mixed up in order to elicit the true attitudes and feelings of those who attended teacher training programs. The reverse questions were also included with the same reason during the design of the questionnaire.

2.5 Data Collection Procedure

After making the necessary adjustments in the questionnaire, which was prepared by the researcher, the participant universities were selected according to the convenience sampling method. The heads of departments were contacted via phone and asked for the permissions to circulate the questionnaire at their institutions. 25 Universities were found to be available to circulate the questionnaires to be answered by the instructors. After that, the questionnaires were printed out and sent via post to the addressees throughout Turkey. After a couple of weeks' time the institutions started to post the envelopes back to the researcher's address. A total number of 306 subjects answered the questionnaires genuinely and sent to the researcher. The participation number for each institution differed. Out of 25 Universities some contributed to the study with 30 subjects, whereas some sent 15 or so back because the questionnaires were completed on a voluntary basis. Some of the instructors failed to complete questionnaires due to various reasons.

2.5.1 Occupational and Personal Information Form

In this form, instructors' gender, faculty of graduation, educational degree, international certificates (if there is), occupational seniority and working hours (weekly) were asked (Table 1).

2.5.2 Effectiveness of the Teacher Training Scale

In the second part of the questionnaire, instructors were asked the effectiveness of the teacher training programmes, seminars and/or workshops in their profession. 50 questions were asked on a 5 type likert scale (1=totally disagree

agree/never to 5=totally agree/always). Scale's items, mean scores and standard values calculated for them were given below, in Table 2.

Table 2 Means and Standard Variation Values of the Items

ITEMS	<i>X</i>	<i>sd</i>
1. I feel adequate in reading analysis	4,30	0,68
2. I feel competent in the conduct of reading in-class activities.	4,15	0,75
3. I give reading homework as follow-ups to be used in reading courses.	3,59	0,84
4. I utilize authentic materials in reading courses.	3,59	0,87
5. I do "warm-up" activities in reading courses.	4,47	0,75
6. I prefer audio-lingual method in grammar teaching.	3,14	1,13
7. I use teacher-centred approach in reading courses.	3,51	1,06
8. I use content-based teaching.	3,83	0,74
9. I give homework for writing as the follow-up of reading courses.	3,36	0,87
10. I do grammar-based activities in reading courses.	3,40	0,94
11. I hold "student-centred" teaching approach in reading courses.	3,80	0,78
12. I give homework for pre-reading activities.	3,10	1,15
13. I use grammar-translation method in grammar courses.	3,52	1,01
14. I conduct speaking activities as follow-ups in reading courses.	3,84	0,72
15. I practise "step-by-step" method in writing courses.	3,96	0,78
16. I do not consider the necessity of doing "schemata" in reading courses.	3,31	1,52
17. I do "warm-up" activities prior to reading courses.	4,28	0,85
18. I hold the necessity of "schemata" in listening courses.	4,40	0,77
19. I explain the rubrics in listening courses.	4,09	0,96
20. I give homework in the aftermath of reading courses.	3,21	0,91
21. I do not consider "student-centred" activities necessary in listening courses.	3,40	1,45
22. I hold the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading courses.	4,64	0,59
23. I feel competent about the various activities learned to be used in listening courses.	3,84	0,82
24. I ask students to do synonym, antonym, vocabulary and phrasal words activities in reading courses.	4,03	0,76
25. I ask the students to do writing works during the writing courses.	2,97	0,95
26. I extend the post-listening activities into speaking and writing courses.	3,68	0,80
27. I utilize schemata activities in writing courses.	4,01	0,85
28. I believe in the necessity of Q&A, role plays and related in-class activities as a part of speaking courses.	4,29	0,85
29. I don't consider process-oriented approach as proper in writing courses.	3,46	1,52
30. I conduct activities for the improvement of essay-writing.	4,05	0,81
31. I conduct activities for sentence-construction in writing courses.	3,57	0,90
32. I consider that student studies be evaluated as "holistic" in writing courses.	2,45	1,04
33. I do not take "culture-gap" into consideration in speaking courses.	3,48	1,45
34. I think sentence-construction is enough for paragraph-making in writing courses.	3,61	1,24
35. I utilize adequate authentic materials in speaking courses.	3,45	0,80
36. I hold that students' studies be "analytically" corrected in writing courses.	3,87	0,77
37. I evaluate speaking course activities within pronunciation, fluency, word selection and content criteria.	3,85	0,87
38. I find the writing correction much time wasting.	2,79	1,32
39. I use error correction symbols in the control of students' writings.	3,63	1,16
40. I extend post-speaking activities into writing homework as follow-up.	3,56	0,94
41. I believe that writing skills learned in L1 could well be utilized in English writing practices.	3,53	1,05
42. I get students to do speaking practices in compliance with lexical competence.	3,68	0,78
43. I feel adequate in great variety of activities that I have learned through workshops, and/or on the job and in-service trainings.	3,99	0,81
44. I conduct student-centred approach in speaking courses.	4,04	0,76
45. I feel adequate in various activities that I have learned to utilize in speaking courses.	3,90	0,76
46. I have gained a creative teaching philosophy in the aftermath of TTPs that I have so far attended.	3,86	0,89
47. I can create a variety of activities, apart from those already learned, for speaking courses.	4,03	0,77
48. I am open to different activities even while I hold a student centred approach in writing courses.	4,32	0,77
49. I change the flow of the course, as I find necessary, to draw students' attention.	4,42	0,63
50. I believe that there has been development in my teaching philosophy as the result of TTPs.	4,11	0,98

Mean scores of the items were found to be between 2.45 and 4.64. The lowest mean score was calculated for the item 32 *“I consider that student studies be evaluated as “holistic” in writing courses”*. The highest mean score was given to the item 22. *“I hold the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading courses.”* Instructors’ perceptions for this item were found to be in ‘totally agree to always’ level.

2.6 Data Analysis Procedure

For this study quantitative data were gathered via a questionnaire. The data gathered via questionnaires were coded and entered to the SPSS 17.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Afterwards, the descriptive analysis was used to investigate the demographic characteristics and background information of the subjects. Through descriptive statistics frequencies, means, percentages and standard deviations were calculated. The reliability of each scale and sub-scales were calculated as well as the analyses of each research question.

In quantitative research, the “reliability” concerns about the replicability of the findings of the research (Yıldırım & Simsek, 2005, p. 94). Similarly, Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) explain reliability in quantitative research by paying attention to the “consistency of scores or answers provided by an instrument” (p. 173). Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) emphasize the need for referring to the reliability coefficients of the past uses of instruments as well as instrument’s test-retest outcomes.

The term “validity” is different for qualitative and quantitative research. However, for both type of research, validity is used for checking the degree of excellence of the data and the results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007, p. 133).

Moreover, Merriam (1998) sums up as the trustworthiness of a research is related to the efforts made for validity and reliability concerns (cited in Tufan, 2008).

As Seliger&Shohamy (1989) puts forth “any research can be affected by different kinds of factors which can invalidate the findings” (p. 95). They also suggest that “if the terms are not consistently defined and used in the research, the validity and the reliability of the results may be called into question” (p. 95). Findings can be internally invalid because they may have been affected by other factors. Another reason could be the lack of clearly supportive interpretation of the data. On the other hand, sometimes the findings cannot be extended or applied to contexts outside those in which the research took place and this causes them to be externally invalid. Subject variability, size of the population, time allotted for data collection or the experiment treatment, comparability of subjects, history, attrition or maturation, instrument/task sensitivity are the major factors thought to be affecting the findings that can be problematic as internal validity (Seliger&Shohamy, 1989, p. 95). “There may be some situations in which randomization will still produce a result which will not be representative. This is especially true where small numbers of subjects are used” (Seliger&Shohamy, 1989, p.96). In this study the subject number is 306 instructors from various preparation departments of universities. This number enabled the study to be quite valid when applied to the profession. In a similar point of view Seliger&Shohamy (1989) state that, history refers to the possible negative effects of the passage of time on the study. Furthermore, they suggest that another problem to be is attrition which can arise when studies are conducted over an extended period of time. In this very study, the questionnaires were sent via post and only two to three weeks were allocated to submit the documents back to the researcher. The time allotted was not

only enough to get the results back but also did not let lose control of the findings. As important as this, maturation can be another problematic issue influencing the factors during the study. In this study the questionnaire was conducted rather evenly among experienced and less experienced instructors. The term instrument refers to any tool employed by the researcher to obtain information on the status of the subjects. In non experimental research, as it is the case in this very study, instruments are used to establish a base-line or norm (Seliger&Shohamy, 1989). While creating the instrument the questions were all neatly reflected on before and after the pilot study so as to establish a norm that tries to elicit the real attitudes of the subjects towards the research question.

Quantitative research may be classified as either experimental or non-experimental. Experimental research involves a study of the effect of the systematic manipulation of one variable on another variable. The manipulated variable is called the experimental treatment or the independent variable. The observed and measured variable is called the dependent variable (Fraenkel&Wallen, 2003, p. 71). In non-experimental quantitative research, the researcher identifies variables and may look for relationships among them but does not manipulate the variables. Major forms of this research are ex post facto, correlational and survey research; also known as descriptive research. It uses instruments such as questionnaires and interviews to gather information from groups of subjects. Survey allows the researcher to summarize the characteristics of different groups or to measure their attitudes and opinions toward some issue. Thus, researchers in education use surveys more common in order to collect raw data (Taylor, 2005, p. 91).

The main aim of quantitative research is to make valid and objective descriptions on phenomena in a research. Through manipulating the variables, the

researcher attempts to show how phenomena can be controlled. The researcher attempts to achieve objectivity by not interfering into any personal biases to influence the analysis and interpretation of the data. Therefore, the researcher should keep distant from the subjects as much as possible so that researchers could obtain objectivity by isolating and examining the interrelationships among and between variables in a controlled setting. Considering this, quantitative research cannot successfully evaluate the full range of human behaviour. In this regard Charles puts forward that quantitative research methods include historical, descriptive, correlational, casual-comparative, experimental, action research and development. These methods yield numerical data evaluated by utilizing descriptive or influential statistics. Statistical treatment of data, through the use of descriptive or influential means, is to test hypotheses and determine if any significant relationships or differences exist. After compiling the raw data, the findings are generated to the population. (Charles, 1988, p. 91).

Descriptive research describes and interprets the present. Its primary purpose is to analyze trends that are developing as well as current situations. Thus, data derived can be used to diagnose a problem. For this reason, it can be inferred that descriptive research is designed to solve present day problems. Information relevant to the present condition is a prerequisite in solving problems (Taylor, 2005, p. 93). That's why this study is descriptive study which tries to describe the present issues of FL teachers' perceptions of TTPs. Under various headings they were asked to show their attitudes towards the sessions they had attended. In connection with its scientific analysis, as McNamara puts forth descriptive research follows the scientific method. In other words, it involves more than collecting and tabulating data. Statistics such as frequencies, percentages, averages, graphs,

sometimes variability and correlations are used to analyze and interpret data delivered through scientific method. Hence, these statistical procedures are conducted to provide meaning, understanding, and solutions to present day problems. Sources of data are numerous in descriptive methods. They include surveys, case studies, comparative studies, time-and-motion studies, document analyses, follow-up studies, trend studies and predictive studies (Taylor, 2005, p. 94).

In this study, survey method was used to gather data from the sample. The data obtained from the instructors were analyzed with SPSS 17.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The below statistical techniques were used to summarize the findings:

1. Demographics of the sample summarized with frequency (N) and percentage (%).
2. In order to see foreign language instructors' perception of effectiveness of the teacher training programs on factors, mean scores (\bar{X}) and standard deviation (sd) were calculated.
3. Independent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine if gender and faculty of graduation of the instructors, significantly affect their level of perception of effectiveness of the in TTPs.
4. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to see if educational degree and occupational seniority of the instructors significantly affect their level of perception of effectiveness of the teacher training programs. When a significant difference was found with ANOVA, a post-hoc Scheffe test was conducted to determine between which groups there was a significant difference.

Occupational seniority's groups were re-arranged as; '1-5 years', '6-10 years' and '11 years and above. The significance level for all statistical analysis was found to be .05. Since the significance level stayed at lower than .05, the differentiations between independent variables were accepted "significant" and results were evaluated accordingly.

2.7 Factor Analysis and Reliability of the Scale

After researching literature, interviewing professionals about the subject and conducting a pilot study with the foreign language instructors, whether the developed scale was consisted of a single or multiple dimensions was tested with an explanatory factor analysis.

Table 3 KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0,778
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3858,510
	df	1081
	<i>p</i>	0,000

Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) test showed that the data obtained with the scale was sufficient and reliable to conduct a factor analysis ($KMO=.778$ ve $p<0,001$).

After Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test, the conducted Principal Component Analysis and Varimax with Kaiser Normalization statistics indicated that 50 items of the scale gathered under 5 factors. In order to determine in which factor the items are gathered, minimum loading value accepted was 0.30 or greater (Leech, Barrett&Morgan, 2005, p. 83-86).

Seeing items 8, 14, 25, 32 and 36 of the scale were not gathered under any factors, they were omitted from the further analyses and the factor analysis was

repeated with the remaining 45 items. After the second factor analysis, it was found that item 49 was loading more than two factors, thus it was omitted in this stage from the other analyses too. It was also found that after the third factor analysis all the remaining 44 items of the scale were loading under 5 factors (dimensions) (Table 4).

Table 4 Rotated Factor Matrix

Items	Factors				
	Factor 1 Writing	Factor 2 Reading	Factor 3 Speaking	Factor 4 Listening	Factor 5 Efficiency of the TTPs
S9	0,567				
S11	0,551				
S27	0,546				
S29	0,539				
S34	0,538				
S30	0,536				
S41	0,529				
S39	0,497				
S38	0,486				
S12	0,479				
S15	0,465				
S31	0,456				
S48	0,425				
S13	0,423				
S1		0,710			
S4		0,645			
S10		0,640			
S16		0,587			
S2		0,531			
S3		0,514			
S22		0,513			
S20		0,501			
S5		0,453			
S7		0,404			
S24		0,372			
S37			0,629		
S44			0,594		
S28			0,589		
S35			0,569		
S33			0,461		
S45			0,426		
S47			0,407		
S40			0,401		
S42			0,390		
S18				0,648	
S19				0,617	
S6				0,602	
S17				0,572	
S23				0,541	
S21				0,484	
S26				0,352	
S46					0,764
S50					0,622
S43					0,619

As is gathered from the table, the first factor has 14; second factor 11, third factor 9, fourth factor 7 and the fifth factor has 3 loadings (items) (Table 4).

In order to find out the internal consistency reliability of the items loaded within the factors, Cronbach's coefficient alpha values were calculated. Internal consistency reliability of the factors was determined according to the alpha (α) values as follows;

$0.00 \leq \alpha < 0.40$: the scale is not reliable,

$0.40 \leq \alpha < 0.60$: the scale's reliability is low,

$0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$: the scale is reliable, and

$0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$: the scale's reliability is high (Kalaycı, 2008, p. 405).

Table 5 Factor 1 Item-Total Statistics

Item	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
S9	0,684	0,905
S11	0,561	0,923
S27	0,559	0,918
S29	0,673	0,913
S34	0,737	0,917
S30	0,597	0,917
S41	0,681	0,908
S39	0,666	0,874
S38	0,740	0,877
S12	0,761	0,914
S15	0,728	0,915
S31	0,681	0,914
S48	0,684	0,916
S13	0,218	0,941

Since Cronbach's Alpha value for the first factor was .925, the internal consistency reliability of the factor accepted high. Corrected Item-Total Correlations were

ranging from .218 to .740. However, since it was found that item 13. “*I use grammar-translation method in grammar courses*” was decreasing the internal consistency reliability of the factor from .941 to .925 and it was decided to be omitted from the factor.

Table 6 Factor 2 Item-Total Statistics

Item	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted
S1	0,597	0,901
S4	0,681	0,888
S10	0,673	0,902
S16	0,566	0,804
S2	0,651	0,901
S3	0,787	0,898
S22	0,799	0,898
S20	0,509	0,895
S5	0,422	0,878
S7	0,448	0,876
S24	0,447	0,906

For the second factor, reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s Alpha) was found to be .902 which indicates a good internal consistency. Corrected Item-Total Correlations were ranging from .422 to .799. Since none of the items were decreasing the internal consistency of the factor, all the items were used together.

Table 7 Factor 3 Item-Total Statistics

Item	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
S37	0,765	0,821
S44	0,597	0,827
S28	0,666	0,874
S35	0,740	0,817
S33	0,737	0,827
S45	0,681	0,814
S47	0,614	0,823
S40	0,799	0,898
S42	0,681	0,812

For the third factor, reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) was found to be .882, which indicates high internal consistency. Item-Told Correlations were ranging from .597 to .799. Since none of the items were increasing the internal consistency of the factor, all the items were used together.

Table 8 Factor 4 Item-Total Statistics

Item	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
S18	0,673	0,813
S19	0,737	0,817
S6	0,639	0,802
S17	0,634	0,802
S23	0,666	0,774
S21	0,740	0,817
S26	0,637	0,813

For the fourth factor, reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) was found to be .842, which indicates high internal consistency. Correlated Item-Told Correlations were ranging from .634 to .740. When used together with the 7th item

of the fourth factor, whose coefficient is .842, and since this coefficient was decreasing when any item was deleted, 7th item of the factor was used together.

Table 9 Factor 5 Item-Total Statistics

Item	Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
S46	0,761	0,714
S50	0,673	0,702
S43	0,787	0,698

For the third factor, reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) was found to be .725, which indicates high internal consistency. Correlated Item-Told Correlations were ranging from .673 to .787. When used together with the 3rd item of the fifth factor, whose coefficient is .725, and since this coefficient was decreasing when any item was deleted, the 3rd item of the factor was used together.

**Table 10 T-test For the
Discrimination Value of the Items**

Item	T-test (Bottom27%- Top27%)	Sig.
S1	-4,265**	<i>p</i> <.001
S2	-8,473**	<i>p</i> <.001
S3	-8,031**	<i>p</i> <.001
S4	-11,719**	<i>p</i> <.001
S5	-9,789**	<i>p</i> <.001
S6	-8,419**	<i>p</i> <.001
S7	-10,898**	<i>p</i> <.001
S9	-7,572**	<i>p</i> <.001
S10	-10,278**	<i>p</i> <.001
S11	-12,596**	<i>p</i> <.001
S12	-13,524**	<i>p</i> <.001
S15	-12,758**	<i>p</i> <.001
S16	-9,477**	<i>p</i> <.001
S17	-7,495**	<i>p</i> <.001
S18	-12,813**	<i>p</i> <.001
S19	-11,542**	<i>p</i> <.001
S20	-11,88**	<i>p</i> <.001
S21	-12,322**	<i>p</i> <.001
S22	-7,333**	<i>p</i> <.001
S23	-12,05**	<i>p</i> <.001
S24	-5,091**	<i>p</i> <.001
S26	-8,309**	<i>p</i> <.001
S27	-6,179**	<i>p</i> <.001
S28	-4,576**	<i>p</i> <.001
S29	-3,373**	<i>p</i> <.001
S30	-5,068**	<i>p</i> <.001
S31	-6,439**	<i>p</i> <.001
S33	-4,944**	<i>p</i> <.001
S34	-5,306**	<i>p</i> <.001
S35	-3,827**	<i>p</i> <.001
S37	-6,555**	<i>p</i> <.001
S38	-4,925**	<i>p</i> <.001
S39	-4,182**	<i>p</i> <.001
S40	-2,463**	<i>p</i> <.001
S41	-3,23**	<i>p</i> <.001
S42	-2,298**	<i>p</i> <.001
S43	-2,883**	<i>p</i> <.001
S44	-2,104**	<i>p</i> <.001
S45	-2,245**	<i>p</i> <.001
S46	-2,837**	<i>p</i> <.001
S47	-10,758**	<i>p</i> <.001
S48	-5,744**	<i>p</i> <.001
S50	-7,176**	<i>p</i> <.001

***Significant at 0,001 level.*

In order to see if the remaining 43 items of the scale were measuring significantly foreign language instructors' perception of effectiveness of the teacher training programs an independent t-test was conducted with the scores calculated (bottom 27% and top 27%) from the scale. It was found that every one of the remaining 43 items were distinctive from each other.

Table 11 Correlation Between the Factors

Factors		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Factor 1	<i>r</i>	1	,761**	,814**	,742**	,727**
	<i>p</i>		0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Factor 2			1	,826**	,706**	,722**
				0,000	0,000	0,000
Factor 3	<i>r</i>			1	,662**	,718**
	<i>p</i>				0,000	0,000
Factor 4	<i>r</i>				1	,713**
	<i>p</i>					0,000
Factor 5	<i>r</i>					1
	<i>p</i>					

**Correlation is significant at 0,001 level

In order to determine the relationship between the factors of the scale, Pearson Moment Correlation statistics were conducted. As can be seen from the Table 11, there was significant correlation between the factors ranging from $r=.662$ to $r=.826$ at .001 level, which means that the items individually related to each other.

The items in the questionnaire have internal consistency which means none of the items in the study are irrelevant to the main topic. This simply shows that the design of the survey serves in line with revealing the perceptions of the FL teachers in order to elicit their real attitudes towards four skills and efficiency of TTPs under each factor.

Table 12 Summary Table of the Factor and Item-Total Correlation Analyses

Factor/Item	Factor Loadings	Explained Variance of the Factor (%)	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)
Factor 1			
S9	0,567		
S11	0,551		
S27	0,546		
S29	0,539		
S34	0,538		
S30	0,536		
S41	0,529	27,22	0,941
S39	0,497		
S38	0,486		
S12	0,479		
S15	0,465		
S31	0,456		
S48	0,425		
Factor 2			
S1	0,710		
S4	0,645		
S10	0,640		
S16	0,587		
S2	0,531		
S3	0,514	17,14	0,902
S22	0,513		
S20	0,501		
S5	0,453		
S7	0,404		
S24	0,372		
Factor 3			
S37	0,629		
S44	0,594		
S28	0,589		
S35	0,569		
S33	0,461	12,24	0,882
S45	0,426		
S47	0,407		
S40	0,401		
S42	0,390		
Factor 4			
S18	0,648		
S19	0,617		
S6	0,602		
S17	0,572	9,68	0,842
S23	0,541		
S21	0,484		
S26	0,352		
Factor 5			
S46	0,764		
S50	0,622	9,35	0,725
S43	0,619		
Total Variance Explained (%)		75,63	
Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO):		0,778	
<i>p</i> value:		0,001	

After factor analyses and item-total correlations, it was found that the scale's 43 items are loading in 5 factors (dimensions). The factors of the scale, together, explain 75.63% of the total variance. While the internal consistency reliability for the scale was found $\alpha=.917$, factors' reliability coefficients were found to be ranging from .725 to .941. Considering shared meanings of the items that loaded under the factors, they were called as;

- Factor 1: Writing,
- Factor 2: Reading,
- Factor 3: Speaking,
- Factor 4: Listening and,
- Factor 5: Efficiency of the teacher training programs.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter consists of statistical analysis along with the objectives of subjects' view points and attitudes in the scopes of writing, reading, speaking and listening as the results of TTPs that the instructors of preparation departments of the universities included in the survey.

Table 13 Frequencies of the Question Items

ITEM 1 I feel adequate in reading analysis	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	2	0,7
Somehow agree	21	6,9
Mostly agree	157	51,3
Totally agree	124	40,5
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 2 I feel competent in the conduct of reading in-class activities	N	%
Totally disagree	3	1
A little agree	3	1
Somehow agree	39	12,7
Mostly agree	160	52,3
Totally agree	101	33
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 3 I give reading homework as follow-ups to be used in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	3	1
A little agree	21	6,9
Somehow agree	113	37
Mostly agree	129	42,3
Totally agree	39	12,8
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 4 I utilize authentic materials in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	29	9,5
Somehow agree	104	34,1
Mostly agree	128	42
Totally agree	42	13,8
TOTAL	305	100

ITEM 5 I do “warm-up” activities in reading courses	N	%
A little agree	8	2,6
Somehow agree	23	7,5
Mostly agree	91	29,7
Totally agree	184	60,1
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 6 I prefer audio-lingual method in grammar teaching	N	%
Totally disagree	19	6,3
A little agree	77	25,5
Somehow agree	89	29,5
Mostly agree	78	25,8
Totally agree	39	12,9
TOTAL	302	100
ITEM 7 I use teacher-centred approach in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	11	3,6
A little agree	42	13,7
Somehow agree	91	29,7
Mostly agree	104	34
Totally agree	58	19
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 9 I give homework for writing as the follow-up of reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	5	1,6
A little agree	36	11,8
Somehow agree	138	45,2
Mostly agree	97	31,8
Totally agree	29	9,5
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 10 I do grammar-based activities in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	8	2,6
A little agree	40	13,1
Somehow agree	114	37,3
Mostly agree	110	35,9
Totally agree	34	11,1
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 11 I hold “student-centred” teaching approach in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	11	3,6
Somehow agree	84	27,6
Mostly agree	155	51
Totally agree	52	17,1
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 12 I give homework for pre-reading activities	N	%
Totally disagree	22	7,2
A little agree	77	25,2
Somehow agree	98	32
Mostly agree	65	21,2
Totally agree	44	14,4
TOTAL	306	100

ITEM 13 I use grammar-translation method in grammar courses	N	%
Totally disagree	7	2,3
A little agree	46	15
Somehow agree	83	27,1
Mostly agree	120	39,2
Totally agree	50	16,3
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 15 I practise “step-by-step” method in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	12	3,9
Somehow agree	51	16,7
Mostly agree	172	56,4
Totally agree	68	22,3
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 16 I do not consider the necessity of doing “schemata” in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	46	15,3
A little agree	72	23,9
Somehow agree	32	10,6
Mostly agree	46	15,3
Totally agree	105	34,9
TOTAL	301	100
ITEM 17 I do “warm-up” activities prior to reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	8	2,6
Somehow agree	42	13,8
Mostly agree	102	33,6
Totally agree	150	49,3
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 18 I hold the necessity of “schemata” in listening courses	N	%
Totally disagree	1	0,3
A little agree	10	3,3
Somehow agree	18	5,9
Mostly agree	113	37
Totally agree	163	53,4
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 19 I explain the rubrics in listening courses	N	%
Totally disagree	1	0,3
A little agree	19	6,2
Somehow agree	63	20,7
Mostly agree	90	29,5
Totally agree	132	43,3
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 20 I give homework in the aftermath of reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	9	3
A little agree	57	18,9
Somehow agree	116	38,4
Mostly agree	103	34,1
Totally agree	17	5,6
TOTAL	302	100

ITEM 21 I do not consider “student-centred” activities necessary in listening courses	N	%
Totally disagree	36	11,9
A little agree	74	24,4
Somehow agree	24	7,9
Mostly agree	72	23,8
Totally agree	97	32
TOTAL	303	100
ITEM 22 I hold the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading courses	N	%
A little agree	2	0,7
Somehow agree	12	3,9
Mostly agree	81	26,5
Totally agree	211	69
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 23 I feel competent about the various activities learned to be used in listening courses	N	%
Totally disagree	5	1,6
A little agree	11	3,6
Somehow agree	68	22,2
Mostly agree	165	53,9
Totally agree	57	18,6
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 24 I ask students to do synonym, antonym, vocabulary and phrasal words activities in reading courses	N	%
Totally disagree	1	0,3
A little agree	9	3
Somehow agree	50	16,4
Mostly agree	166	54,4
Totally agree	79	25,9
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 26 I extend the post-listening activities into speaking and writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	3	1
A little agree	18	5,9
Somehow agree	90	29,4
Mostly agree	158	51,6
Totally agree	37	12,1
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 27 I utilize schemata activities in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	3	1
A little agree	8	2,6
Somehow agree	66	21,7
Mostly agree	134	44,1
Totally agree	93	30,6
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 28 I believe in the necessity of Q&A, role plays and related in-class activities as a part of speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	13	4,3
Somehow agree	28	9,2
Mostly agree	114	37,4
Totally agree	148	48,5
TOTAL	305	100

ITEM 29 I don't consider process-oriented approach as proper in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	36	12
A little agree	74	24,6
Somehow agree	34	11,3
Mostly agree	31	10,3
Totally agree	126	41,9
TOTAL	301	100
ITEM 30 I conduct activities for the improvement of essay-writing	N	%
A little agree	11	3,6
Somehow agree	61	20
Mostly agree	136	44,6
Totally agree	97	31,8
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 31 I conduct activities for sentence-construction in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	7	2,3
A little agree	23	7,6
Somehow agree	103	34
Mostly agree	130	42,9
Totally agree	40	13,2
TOTAL	303	100
ITEM 33 I do not take "culture-gap" into consideration in speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	42	13,7
A little agree	54	17,6
Somehow agree	30	9,8
Mostly agree	76	24,8
Totally agree	104	34
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 34 I think sentence-construction is enough for paragraph-making in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	17	5,6
A little agree	49	16,2
Somehow agree	64	21,1
Mostly agree	79	26,1
Totally agree	94	31
TOTAL	303	100
ITEM 35 I utilize adequate authentic materials in speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	24	7,9
Somehow agree	140	46,1
Mostly agree	110	36,2
Totally agree	28	9,2
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 37 I evaluate speaking course activities within pronunciation, fluency, word selection and content criteria	N	%
Totally disagree	4	1,3
A little agree	19	6,3
Somehow agree	61	20,1
Mostly agree	156	51,3
Totally agree	64	21,1
TOTAL	304	100

ITEM 38 I find the writing correction much time wasting	N	%
Totally disagree	61	20,2
A little agree	74	24,5
Somehow agree	78	25,8
Mostly agree	46	15,2
Totally agree	43	14,2
TOTAL	302	100
ITEM 39 I use error correction symbols in the control of students' writings	N	%
Totally disagree	23	7,6
A little agree	29	9,5
Somehow agree	55	18,1
Mostly agree	126	41,4
Totally agree	71	23,4
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 40 I extend post-speaking activities into writing homework as follow-up	N	%
Totally disagree	12	3,9
A little agree	26	8,5
Somehow agree	80	26,2
Mostly agree	153	50,2
Totally agree	34	11,1
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 41 I believe that writing skills learned in L1 could well be utilized in English writing practices	N	%
Totally disagree	18	5,9
A little agree	23	7,5
Somehow agree	95	31
Mostly agree	118	38,6
Totally agree	52	17
TOTAL	306	100
ITEM 42 I get students to do speaking practices in compliance with lexical competence	N	%
Totally disagree	4	1,3
A little agree	22	7,2
Somehow agree	65	21,4
Mostly agree	188	61,8
Totally agree	25	8,2
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 43 I feel adequate in great variety of activities that I have learned through workshops, and/or on the job and in-service trainings	N	%
Totally disagree	1	0,3
A little agree	9	3
Somehow agree	68	22,3
Mostly agree	142	46,6
Totally agree	85	27,9
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 44 I conduct student-centred approach in speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	11	3,6
Somehow agree	37	12,2
Mostly agree	175	57,8
Totally agree	78	25,7
TOTAL	303	100

ITEM 45 I feel adequate in various activities that I have learned to utilize in speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	3	1
A little agree	7	2,3
Somehow agree	64	21,1
Mostly agree	173	56,9
Totally agree	57	18,8
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 46 I have gained a creative teaching philosophy in the aftermath of TTPs that I have so far attended	N	%
Totally disagree	10	3,3
A little agree	5	1,6
Somehow agree	68	22,4
Mostly agree	155	51
Totally agree	66	21,7
TOTAL	304	100
ITEM 47 I can create a variety of activities, apart from those already learned, for speaking courses	N	%
Totally disagree	4	1,3
A little agree	6	2
Somehow agree	44	14,4
Mostly agree	174	57
Totally agree	77	25,2
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 48 I am open to different activities even while I hold a student centred approach in writing courses	N	%
Totally disagree	2	0,7
A little agree	5	1,6
Somehow agree	30	9,8
Mostly agree	125	41
Totally agree	143	46,9
TOTAL	305	100
ITEM 50 I believe that there has been development in my teaching philosophy as the result of TTPs	N	%
Totally disagree	10	3,3
A little agree	6	2
Somehow agree	53	17,4
Mostly agree	108	35,5
Totally agree	127	41,8
TOTAL	304	100

3.1 Results of the Question Items

Of the participants took part in the study, for the item 1 “*I feel adequate in reading analysis.*” 157 of them (51.3%) marked as mostly agree, 124 of them (40.5%) responded as totally agree, 21 of them (6.9%) were somehow agree, 2 of them (0.7%) marked as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 2 “*I feel competent in the conduct of reading in-class activities.*” 160 of them (52.3%) were mostly agree, 101 of them (33%) were totally agree, 39 of them (12.7%) marked as somehow agree, 3 of them (1%) responded as a little agree and 3 of them (1%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 3 “*I give reading homework as follow-ups to be used in reading courses.*” 129 of them (42.2%) responded as mostly agree, 113 of them (37%) were somehow agree, 39 of them (12.8%) marked as totally agree, 21 of them (6.9%) responded as a little agree and 3 of them (1%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 4 “*I utilize authentic materials in reading courses.*” 128 of them (42%) marked as mostly agree, 104 of them (34.1%) responded as somehow agree, 42 of them (13.8%) were totally agree, 29 of them (9.5%) marked as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 5 “*I do “warm-up” activities in reading courses.*” 184 of them (60.1%) were totally agree, 91 of them (29.7%) mostly agree, 23 of them (7.5%) responded as somehow agree and 8 of them (2.6%) were a little agree.

For the item 6 “*I prefer audio-lingual method in grammar teaching.*” 89 of them (29.5%) were somehow agree, 78 of them (25.8%) marked as mostly agree, 77 of them (25.5%) responded as a little agree, 39 of them (12.9%) indicated as totally agree and 19 of them (6.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 7 “*I use teacher-centred approach in reading courses.*” 104 of them (34%) indicated as mostly agree, 91 of them (29.7%) responded as somehow agree, 58 of them (19%) marked as totally agree, 42 of them (13.7%) were a little agree and 11 of them (3.6%) indicated as totally do not agree.

For the item 9 “*I give homework for writing as the follow-up of reading courses.*” 138 of them (45.2%) responded as somehow agree, 97 of them (31.8%) mostly agree, 36 of them (11.8%) were a little agree, 29 of them (9.5%) responded as totally agree and 5 of them (1.6%) indicated as totally do not agree.

For the item 10 “*I do grammar-based activities in reading courses.*” 114 of them (37.3%) responded as somehow agree, 110 of them (35.9%) indicated as mostly agree, 40 of them (13.1%) were a little agree, 34 of them (11.1%) responded as totally agree and 8 of them (2.6%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 11 “*I hold “student-centred” teaching approach in reading courses.*” 155 of them (51%) were mostly agree, 84 of them (27.6%) responded as somehow agree, 52 of them (17.1%) indicated as totally agree, 11 of them (3.6%) marked as and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 12 “*I give homework for pre-reading activities.*” 98 of them (32%) marked as somehow agree, 77 of them (25.2%) were a little agree, 65 of them (21.2%) mostly agree, 44 of them (14.4%) marked as totally agree and 22 of them (7.2%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 13 “*I use grammar-translation method in grammar courses.*” 120 of them (39.2%) mostly agree, 83 of them (27.1%) somehow agree, 50 of them (16.3%) totally agree, 46 of them (15%) were a little agree and 7 of them (2.3%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 15 “*I practise “step-by-step” method in writing courses.*” 172 of them (56.4%) indicated as mostly agree, 68 of them (22.3%) marked as totally

agree, 51 of them (16.7%) were somehow agree, 12 of them (3.9%) indicated as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 16 *“I don’t consider the necessity of doing “schemata” in reading courses.”* 105 of them (34.9%) indicated as totally agree, 72 of them (23.9%) a little agree, 46 of them (15.3%) indicated as mostly agree, 46 of them (15.3%) marked as totally do not agree and 32 of them (10.6%) were somehow agree.

For the item 17 *“I do “warm-up” activities prior to listening courses.”* 150 of them (49.3%) marked as totally agree, 102 of them (33.6%) were mostly agree, 42 of them (13.8%) indicated as somehow agree, 8 of them (2.6%) responded as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 18 *“I hold the necessity of “schemata” in listening courses.”* 163 of them (53.4%) indicated as totally agree, 113 of them (37%) marked as mostly agree, 18 of them (5.9%) were somehow agree, 10 of them (3.3%) responded as a little agree and 1 of them (0.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 19 *“I explain the rubrics in listening courses.”* 132 of them (43.3%) indicated as totally agree, 90 of them (29.5%) responded as mostly agree, 63 of them (20.7%) somehow agree, 19 of them (6.2%) marked as a little agree and 1 of them (0.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 20 *“I give homework in the aftermath of reading courses.”* 116 of them (38.4%) responded as somehow agree, 103 of them (34.1%) indicated as mostly agree, 57 of them (18.9%) were a little agree and 9 of them (3%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 21 *“I don’t consider “student-centred” activities necessary in listening courses.”* 97 of them (32%) indicated as totally agree, 74 of them (24.4%) were a little agree, 72 of them (23.8%) marked as mostly agree, 36 of them (11.9%) responded as totally do not agree and 24 of them (7.9%) indicated as somehow agree.

For the item 22 *“I hold the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading courses.”* 211 of them (69%) indicated as totally agree, 81 of them (26,5%) responded as mostly agree, 12 of them (3.9%) marked as somehow agree and 2 of them (0.7%) responded as a little agree.

For the item 23 *“I feel competent about the various activities learned to be used in listening courses.”* 165 of them (53.9%) indicated as mostly agree, 68 of them (22.2%) marked as somehow agree, 57 of them (18.6%) responded as totally agree, 11 of them (3.6%) were a little agree and 5 of them (1.6%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 24 *“I ask students to do synonym, antonym, vocabulary and phrasal words activities in reading courses.”* 166 of them (54.4%) were mostly agree, 79 of them (25.9%) responded as totally agree, 50 of them (16.4%) somehow agree, 9 of them (3%) indicated as a little agree and 1 one of them (0.3%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 26 *“I extend the post-listening activities into speaking and writing courses.”* 158 of them (51.6%) responded as mostly agree, 90 of them (29.4%) were somehow agree, 37 of them (12.1%) indicated as totally agree, 18 of

them (5.9%) responded as a little agree and 3 of them (1%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 27 *“I utilize schemata activities in writing courses.”* 134 of them (44.1%) indicated as mostly agree, 93 of them (30.6%) marked as totally agree, 66 of them (21.7%) responded as somehow agree, 8 of them (2.6%) were a little agree and 3 of them (1%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 28 *“I believe in the necessity of Q&A, role plays and related in-class activities as a part of speaking courses.”* 148 of them (48.5%) indicated as totally agree, 114 of them (37.4%) responded as mostly agree, 28 of them (9.2%) somehow agree, 13 of them (4.3%) responded as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 29 *“I don’t consider process-oriented approach as proper in writing courses.”* 126 of them (41.9%) indicated as totally agree, 74 of them (24.6%) responded as a little agree, 36 of them (12%) were totally do not agree, 34 of them (11.3%) marked as somehow agree and 31 of them (10.3%) indicated as mostly agree.

For the item 30 *“I conduct activities for the improvement of essay-writing.”* 136 of them (44.6%) indicated as mostly agree, 97 of them (31.8%) marked as totally agree, 61 of them (20%) responded as somehow agree and 11 of them (3.6%) were a little agree.

For the item 31 *“I conduct activities for sentence-construction in writing courses.”* 130 of them (42.9%) indicated as mostly agree, 103 of them (34%)

responded as somehow agree, 40 of them (13.2%) marked as totally agree, 23 of them (7.6%) were a little agree and 7 of them (2.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 33 *“I don’t take “culture-gap” into consideration in speaking courses.”* 104 of them (34%) indicated as totally agree, 76 of them (24.8%) marked as mostly agree, 54 of them (17.6%) were a little agree, 42 of them (13.7%) marked as totally do not agree totally do not agree and 30 of them (9.8%) responded as somehow agree.

For the item 34 *“I think sentence-construction is enough for paragraph-making in writing courses.”* 94 of them (31%) marked as totally agree, 79 of them (26.1%) responded as mostly agree, 64 of them (21.1%) were somehow agree, 49 of them (16.2%) indicated as a little agree and 17 of them (5.6%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 35 *“I utilize adequate authentic materials in speaking courses.”* 140 of them (46.1%) indicated as somehow agree, 110 of them (36.2%) marked as mostly agree, 28 of them (9.2%) responded as totally agree, 24 of them (7.9%) were a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 37 *“I evaluate speaking course activities within pronunciation, fluency, word selection and content criteria.”* 156 of them (51.3%) marked as mostly agree, 64 of them (21.1%) were totally agree, 61 of them (20.1%) responded as somehow agree, 19 of them (6.3%) indicated as a little agree and 4 of them (1.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 38 *“I find the writing correction much time wasting”* 78 of them (25.8%) marked as somehow agree, 74 of them (24.5%) responded as a little

agree, 61 of them (20.2) indicated as totally do not agree, 46 of them (15.2%) responded as mostly agree and 43 of them (14.2%) were totally agree.

For the item 39 *“I use error correction symbols in the control of students’ writings.”* 126 of them (41.4%) marked as mostly agree, 71 of them (23.4%) indicated as totally agree, 55 of them (18.1%) marked as somehow agree, 29 of them (9.5%) were a little agree and 23 of them (7.6%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 40 *“I extend post-speaking activities into writing homework as follow-up.”* 153 of them (50.2%) marked as mostly agree, 80 of them (26.2%) were somehow agree, 34 of them (11.1%) responded as totally agree, 26 of them (8.5%) were a little agree and 12 of them (3.9%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 41 *“I believe that writing skills learned in L1 could well be utilized in English writing practices”* 118 of them (38.6%) responded as mostly agree, 95 of them (31%) marked as somehow agree, 52 of them (17%) were totally agree, 23 of them (7.5%) marked as a little agree and 18 of them (5.9%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 42 *“I get students to do speaking practices in compliance with lexical competence.”* 188 of them (61.8%) were mostly agree, 65 of them (21.4%) marked as somehow agree, 25 of them (8.2%) responded as totally agree, 22 of them (7.2%) indicated as a little agree and 4 of them (1.3%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 43 *“I feel adequate in great variety of activities that I have learned through workshops, and/or on the job and in-service trainings.”* 142 of

them (46.6%) responded as mostly agree, 85 of them (27.9%) indicated as totally agree, 68 of them (22.3%) were somehow agree, 9 of them (3%) indicated as a little agree and 1 of them (0.3%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 44 *“I conduct student-centred approach in speaking courses.”* 175 of them (57.8%) were mostly agree, 78 of them (25.7%) responded as totally agree, 37 of them (12.2%) indicated as somehow agree, 11 of them (3.6%) marked as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) were totally do not agree.

For the item 45 *“I feel adequate in various activities that I have learned to utilize in speaking courses.”* 173 of them (56.9%) indicated as mostly agree, 64 of them (21.1%) responded as somehow agree, 57 of them (18.8%) were totally agree, 7 of them (2.3%) marked as a little agree and 3 of them (1%) responded as totally do not agree.

For the item 46 *“I have gained a creative teaching philosophy in the aftermath of TTPs that I have so far attended.”* 155 of them (51%) marked as mostly agree, 68 of them (22.4%) responded as somehow agree, 66 of them (21.7%) indicated as totally agree, 10 of them (3.3%) were totally do not agree and 5 of them (1.6%) marked as a little agree.

For the item 47 *“I can create a variety of activities, apart from those already learned, for speaking courses.”* 174 of them (57%) marked as mostly agree, 77 of them (25.2%) indicated as totally agree, 44 of them (14.4%) responded as somehow agree, 6 of them (2%) were a little agree and 4 of them (1.3%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 48 “*I’m open to different activities even while I hold a student centred approach in writing courses.*” 143 of them (46.9%) responded as totally agree, 125 of them (41%) indicated as mostly agree, 30 of them (9.8%) were somehow agree, 5 of them (1.6%) responded as a little agree and 2 of them (0.7%) marked as totally do not agree.

For the item 50 “*I believe that there has been development in my teaching philosophy as the result of TTPs.*” 127 of them (41.8%) marked as totally agree, 108 of them (35.5%) indicated as mostly agree, 53 of them (17.4%) were somehow agree, 10 of them (3.3%) responded as totally do not agree and 6 of them (2%) marked as a little agree.

3.2 Results of Descriptive Statistics

Table 14 Descriptive Statistics for Instructors’ Perception of the Factors

Factors	<i>N</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	\bar{X}	<i>sd</i>
Writing	293	3	5	3,64	0,40
Reading	297	3	5	3,84	0,42
Speaking	299	2	5	3,79	0,42
Listening	295	3	5	3,84	0,49
Efficiency of TTPs	303	2	5	3,98	0,67

<u>OPTION</u>	<u>OPTION</u>	<u>SCORE RANGE</u>
Totally disagree	Never	1,00-1,80
A little	Seldom	1,81-2,60
Somehow	Sometimes	2,61-3,40
Mostly	Often	3,41-4,20
Totally agree	Always	4,21-5,00

Instructors’ attitudes toward effects of trainings on writing, reading, speaking, listening and efficiency of TTPs were summarized in the Table 13. As

shown in the table, instructors' evaluations about the factors were in 'Mostly agree/often' level.

Subjects evaluated highest t mean value for the question of "the benefit from TTPs" with 3.98. Hence, it is seen that subjects consider themselves all the more adequate as the result of the TTPs they have received ($\bar{X}_{\text{Effectiveness of teacher training}} = 3.98$).

As is seen from the analysis, subjects developed a positive attitude towards reading skill with the mean of 3.84 as the result of the TTPs they have received. The effect of TTP towards reading was around "mostly agree/often".

In a similar way, the subjects, according to the statistical analysis, developed a positive attitude towards listening with the mean of 3.84 as the result of the TTP they have received. The effect of TTP on listening was seen in or around "mostly agree/often".

According to the responses given by the subjects in connection with their attitude towards speaking skill, it is seen that their attitude was around positive with the mean score of 3.79. The effect of TTP on speaking was seen at "mostly agree/often" level.

Lastly, the responses of the subjects to the questions connected to the writing skill revealed that they developed a somewhat positive attitude towards TTP with the mean score of 3.44. It can be drawn from the analysis that the least positive effect was on writing among the other skills.

In a general perspective, it is seen that the general attitude of the subjects in the survey was positive; however, the attitude did not reveal the "totally agree"

level. It can also be seen that at no sub-category “always/totally agree” response was given.

3.2.1 Results of the Instructors’ Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Gender Differences

Table 15 T-test Summary Table Comparing Instructors’ Gender Groups on Scores of the Factors

Factors	Gender	n	\bar{X}	sd	t-test		
					t	df	p
Writing	Female	198	3,95	0,37	2,65	291	0,008*
	Male	95	3,33	0,45			
Reading	Female	196	3,86	0,41	0,31	295	0,760
	Male	101	3,81	0,44			
Speaking	Female	201	4,02	0,42	2,56	297	0,012*
	Male	98	3,55	0,41			
Listening	Female	195	3,83	0,48	0,62	293	0,536
	Male	100	3,86	0,51			
Efficiency of in-service training	Female	202	4,13	0,69	2,24	301	0,016*
	Male	101	3,82	0,63			

*Significant at .05 level.

It is found out that there was a significant differentiation between male and female attitudes towards writing and that the differentiation was in favour of females with ($t=2.65$ and $p<.05$). The statistical analysis revealed that female subjects developed a more positive attitude towards TTP and that such programs were believed to develop their efficiency in writing ($\bar{X}_{Female}=3.95$ and $\bar{X}_{Male}=3.33$).

It was found that there was no significant differentiation as regards reading between male and female subjects ($t=0.31$ and $p>.05$).

The data analysis showed that there was a significant differentiation as regards speaking between male and female subjects and that the differentiation favours female subjects ($t=2.56$ and $p<.05$). From the data analysis it becomes apparent that female subjects agreed that they considered the relevance of the TTP higher than male subjects ($\bar{X}_{Female}=4.02$ and $\bar{X}_{Male}=3.55$).

In the analysis there found to be no significant differentiation as regards listening between male and female subjects ($t=0.62$ and $p>.05$).

Thus, it was found out that both subject groups revealed similar attitudes towards listening ($\bar{X}_{Female}=3.83$ and $\bar{X}_{Male}=3.86$).

Lastly, it was also found that there was a significant differentiation as regards the effectiveness of TTP between female and male subjects and that this differentiation favoured female subjects with ($t=2.24$ and $p<.05$). The data analysis also revealed that female subjects considered the effectiveness of the TTP higher than male subjects ($\bar{X}_{Female}=4.13$ and $\bar{X}_{Male}=3.82$).

3.2.2 Results of the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Graduation

Table 16 T-test Summary on Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Graduation.

Factors	Educational Degree	n	\bar{X}	sd	t-test		
					t	sd	p
Writing	Faculty of Education	169	3,63	0,37	1,68	291	0,095
	Faculty of Arts and Science	124	3,67	0,43			
Reading	Faculty of Education	170	3,85	0,40	1,94	295	0,054
	Faculty of Arts and Science	127	3,84	0,44			
Speaking	Faculty of Education	173	3,98	0,38	2,07	297	0,039*
	Faculty of Arts and Science	126	3,60	0,46			
Listening	Faculty of Education	167	4,12	0,48	2,11	293	0,036*
	Faculty of Arts and Science	128	3,56	0,50			
Effectiveness of TTPs	Faculty of Education	175	3,97	0,68	0,94	301	0,166
	Faculty of Arts and Science	128	4,00	0,67			

*Significant at .05 level.

Subjects' perception of the effectiveness of TTP and of whether there is a significant differentiation regarding their education degrees as a result of the t-test conducted on the subjects is considered to be a significant reason for difference (Table 16).

As can be seen from the table 16, no significant difference between Education Faculty and Arts and Sciences faculty graduates was found ($t=1.68$ and $p>.05$). It is also understood from the table 15 that the subjects adapted similar attitudes as regards their perception of writing as the result of TTP they received ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 3.63$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 3.67$).

Subjects' perception of the effectiveness of TTP on reading sub-scale factor are not significantly different ($t=1.94$ and $p>.05$).

Statistical data reveals that graduates of Education faculty and Arts and Sciences Faculty displayed a significant difference in their perceptions of speaking sub-scale factor and that the difference favours the graduates of Education Faculty ($t=2.07$ and $p<0.5$).

As can be seen from the Table 16, Education Faculty graduates benefited from TTP they received and their responses were in or around “often agree” ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 3.98$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 3.60$).

It is also found out that graduates from Arts and Sciences Faculty displayed a significant difference regarding their perceptions of listening sub-scale factor and this difference favours the graduates of Education Faculty ($t=2.11$ and $p<.05$). It is seen from the table 16 that the subjects benefited better from listening parts of TTPs, and their perception in this regard had a significant difference with “often agree” response ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 4.12$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 3.56$).

Lastly, the Table 16 shows that there is no significant difference between the graduates of Education Faculty and Arts and Sciences faculty regarding the effectiveness of TTP ($t=0.94$ and $p>.05$). It is derived from the table that subjects’ perceptions of the effectiveness of TTPs in connection with their graduation level is not significantly different ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 3.97$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 4.00$).

3.2.3 Results of the Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Educational Levels

Table 17 One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing Instructors' Educational Levels on Scores of the Factors

Factors	Groups		\bar{X}	sd	ANOVA		Post-hoc Scheffe
	Educational Degree	n			F	p	
Writing	BA (1)	150	3,62	0,38	0,86	0,424	-
	MA (2)	123	3,68	0,42			
	PhD (3)	20	3,63	0,41			
Reading	BA (1)	154	3,76	0,43	6,43	0,002*	1 and 2, 3
	MA (2)	124	3,93	0,39			
	PhD (3)	19	3,95	0,38			
Speaking	BA (1)	155	3,79	0,39	0,88	0,416	-
	MA (2)	123	3,77	0,45			
	PhD (3)	21	3,81	0,43			
Listening	BA (1)	152	3,72	0,50	10,11	0,000**	1 and 2, 3
	MA (2)	123	3,96	0,45			
	PhD (3)	20	4,02	0,44			
Efficiency of in-service training	BA (1)	158	3,97	0,64	0,91	0,403	-
	MA (2)	124	3,97	0,73			
	PhD(3)	21	4,01	0,60			

*Significant at .05 level & **Significant at .001 level.

Table 18 Post-Hoc Test on Instructors Educational Levels

Dependent Variable	(I) Education	(J) Education	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Reading	BA (1)	MA (2)	-,16825*	0,003
		Ph. D. (3)	-,37685(*)	0,000
	MA (2)	BA (1)	,16825*	0,003
		Ph. D. (3)	-0,017	0,986
	Ph. D. (3)	BA (1)	,37685(*)	0,000
		MA (2)	0,017	0,986
Listening	BA (1)	MA (2)	-,23732*	0,000
		Ph. D. (3)	-,30056*	0,030
	MA (2)	BA (1)	,23732*	0,000
		Ph. D. (3)	-0,063	0,858
	Ph. D. (3)	BA (1)	,30056*	0,030
		MA (2)	0,063	0,858

*Mean difference is significant at .05 level.

The ANOVA test shows us that education level is a significant predictor for two factors ($F_{Writing}=6.43$ and $p<.05$ & $F_{Listening}=10.11$ and $p<.001$). In order to inspect the significant differences among the groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was conducted. It was found that for the both factors, instructors with BA have scored lower than the other two education groups (Table 17).

A statistically significant difference was not found among the three levels of instructors' education on writing factor ($F=0.86$ and $p>0.05$).

Table 17 shows that the mean scores in reading for instructors with BA were lower than instructors with MA and instructors with a PhD degree ($F=6.43$ and $p<0.05$). The post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 18) shows us that there is a significant differentiation between the Group 1 and Group 1-2. Instructors with BA degree has a lower level of positive perception of the effectiveness of the TTPs on reading than the other two education groups ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.76$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.93$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=3.95$).

As for the speaking factor, table 17 shows that the mean scores in speaking for the education did not predict any significant difference ($F=0.88$ and $p>0,05$).

In connection with their education, subjects' perception of the effectiveness of the TTPs displayed a very similar attitude on speaking ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.79$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.77$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=3.81$).

Table 18 shows that subjects' perception of listening in connection with their educational degree is found significantly different ($F=10.11$ and $p<0.001$). In accordance with the Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 18), subjects with BA (Group 1), subjects with MA and PhD graduates display a significant differentiation regarding listening. The mean scores in listening for subjects with BA displayed a lower level

of perception about the effectiveness of the TTPs on listening than the other two education groups ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.72$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.96$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=4.02$).

Lastly, it was found that education level did not reveal a significant differentiation in the perception of the effectiveness of the TTPs ($F=0.91$ and $p>0.05$). In other words, in connection with their education levels, the perception of the subjects' for the effectiveness and benefits of the TTPs stayed very close to one another ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.97$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.97$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=4.07$).

3.2.4 Results of the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Occupational Seniority

Table 19 One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table in the Perception of the Subjects' Occupational Seniority

Factors	Groups		\bar{X}	sd	ANOVA		Post-hoc Scheffe
	Occupational Seniority	n			F	p	
Writing	1-5 Year (1)	97	3,55	0,35	4,01	0,019*	1 and 2, 3
	6-10 Year (2)	104	3,70	0,43			
	11 Year and above (3)	92	3,68	0,40			
Reading	1-5 Year (1)	100	3,71	0,35	8,00	0,000**	1 and 2, 3
	6-10 Year (2)	107	3,90	0,47			
	11 Year and above (3)	90	3,92	0,39			
Speaking	1-5 Year (1)	99	3,76	0,37	0,60	0,552	-
	6-10 Year (2)	107	3,82	0,44			
	11 Year and above (3)	93	3,78	0,44			
Listening	1-5 Year (1)	97	3,71	0,46	5,63	0,004*	1 and 2, 3
	6-10 Year (2)	106	3,89	0,48			
	11 Year and above (3)	92	3,92	0,50			
Effectiveness of the TTPs	1-5 Year (1)	100	3,92	0,61	1,13	0,324	-
	6-10 Year (2)	109	3,95	0,72			
	11 Year and above (3)	94	4,01	0,69			

*Significant at .05 level &. **Significant at .001 level.

Table 20 Scheffe Test on Perception of the Subjects' Occupational Seniority

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupational Seniority	(J) Occupational Seniority	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Writing	1-5 Year (1)	6-10 Year (2)	-,14850*	0,030
		11 Year and above (3)	-,13360*	0,044
	6-10 Year (2)	1-5 Year (1)	,14850*	0,030
		11 Year and above (3)	0,023	0,920
	11 Year and above (3)	1-5 Year (1)	,13360*	0,044
		6-10 Year (2)	-0,023	0,920
Reading	1-5 Year (1)	6-10 Year (2)	-,19048*	0,004
		11 Year and above (3)	-,21040*	0,002
	6-10 Year (2)	1-5 Year (1)	,19048*	0,004
		11 Year and above (3)	-0,020	0,943
	11 Year and above (3)	1-5 Year (1)	,21040*	0,002
		6-10 Year (2)	0,020	0,943
Listening	1-5 Year (1)	6-10 Year (2)	-,18661*	0,023
		11 Year and above (3)	-,21233*	0,011
	6-10 Year (2)	1-5 Year (1)	,18661*	0,023
		11 Year and above (3)	-0,026	0,932
	11 Year and above (3)	1-5 Year (1)	,21233*	0,011
		6-10 Year (2)	0,026	0,932

*Mean difference is significant at $p < 0.5$

In accordance with the ANOVA test, which was conducted in order to find out if there is significant differentiation in the perception of the subjects' occupational seniority, a significant difference was found out in the three sub-scale factors (Table 19).

To begin with, it is understood from table 19 that there was a significant difference in writing factor regarding subjects' occupational seniority ($F=4.01$ and $p>0.05$). According to Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 20), for subjects with 1-5 years of experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of occupational experience (Group 2) and for the subjects with 11 years and more experience (Group 3), a significant difference was discovered in the perception of writing factor regarding their occupational seniority. The mean score in writing reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTP in writing than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5\text{ year}}=3.55$, $\bar{X}_{6-10\text{ year}}=3.70$ and $\bar{X}_{11\text{ year and above}}=3.68$).

It is understood from table 19 that there was a significant difference in reading factor regarding subjects' occupational seniority ($F=8.00$ and $p>0.001$). According to Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 20), for subjects with 1-5 years of experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of occupational experience (Group 2) and for the subjects with 11 years and more experience (Group 3), a significant difference was discovered in the perception of reading factor regarding their occupational seniority. The mean score in reading reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTP in reading than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5\text{ year}}=3.71$, $\bar{X}_{6-10\text{ year}}=3.90$ and $\bar{X}_{11\text{ year and above}}=3.92$).

Table 19 displays that occupational seniority has not produced a significant differentiation in speaking factor ($F=0.60$ and $p>0.05$). In connection with occupational seniority, subjects' perception of speaking as the result of TTPs they received displayed a very similar attitude on speaking ($\bar{X}_{1-5 \text{ year}}=3.76$, $\bar{X}_{6-10 \text{ year}}=3.82$ and $\bar{X}_{11 \text{ year and above}}=3.78$).

Table 19 also displays that occupational seniority has produced a significant differentiation in listening factor ($F=5.63$ and $p>0.05$). In accordance with the Post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 20) there has been a significant differentiation in the perception of listening factor among the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of experience (Group 2) and the subjects with 11 years and more occupational experience in the listening factor. The mean score in listening reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTP in listening than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5 \text{ year}}=3.71$, $\bar{X}_{6-10 \text{ year}}=3.89$ and $\bar{X}_{11 \text{ year and above}}=3.92$).

Lastly, it was found out that occupational seniority did not produce a significant differentiation in the perception of the effectiveness of TTPs ($F=1.13$ and $p>0.05$). As is gathered from the table 19, the perception of the subjects about the effectiveness of TTPs in connection with their occupational seniority remained almost similar ($\bar{X}_{1-5 \text{ year}}=3.92$, $\bar{X}_{6-10 \text{ year}}=3.95$ and $\bar{X}_{11 \text{ year and above}}=4.01$).

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this chapter the overall results of the study have been discussed item by item to uncover the real perceptions of the subjects through their answers given in the questionnaire. After this detailed discussion the next step is to discuss the sub scales in order to put forward whether there is a connection between each variable and the perceptions of subjects. After each paragraph recommendations have been put before eyes to see evaluations and discussions.

4.1 Discussions on Instructors' Perceptions on TTPs In Terms of Items Individually

Research Question: Do the instructors, given new trends and approaches in TTPs, benefit in terms of four skills teaching; which are reading, listening, writing and speaking?

For the item 1 "*I feel adequate in reading analysis*". 281 subjects said they found themselves adequate in reading analysis. With this item a general question was asked and the responses seemed to be fairly satisfactory for the subjects who participated in TTPs in terms of reading skill.

For the item 2 "*I feel competent in the conduct of reading in-class activities*". Right after the first item, this item investigates the competence in the conduct of reading activities in class and the number of subjects who find themselves competent drops to 261. Although there seems to be a slight drop in

number, 261 is still a high frequency which reveals that instructors feel competent in terms of the conduct of reading activities in class.

For the item 3 *“I give reading homework as follow-ups to be used in reading courses”*. Only 39 instructors say that they assign homework as reading course follow-ups. This may reveal that reading courses are perceived as an activity with no follow up to be dealt after the lesson by instructors. TTPs should include some reading follow-up activities in their curriculum.

For the item 4 *“I utilize authentic materials in reading courses”*. 166 subjects seem to have believed the need to use authentic material in reading classes. 104 of them stay somewhere in the middle without particular impression.

For the item 5 *“I do “warm-up” activities in reading courses”*. 184 subjects claim that they totally agree on this item along with a number of 91 mostly agree show that TTPs were successful enough to have the instructors a habit of getting the lessons started with a warm-up. What’s more, no subjects marked as totally do not agree, which is also meaningful.

For the item 6 *“I prefer audio-lingual method in grammar teaching”*. The high frequencies of subjects seem to be distributed more between somehow agree and totally agree. Only 19 subjects say that they totally do not agree. This situation reveals that TTPs should include in their pacing a more communicative approach of teaching grammar. This item was designed to reveal the distribution of instructors’ perception of using communicative approach in terms of grammar teaching. Otherwise it did not aim to arrive at a conclusion of whether audio-lingual method is inferior to communicative approach. It is well known that any method can be very efficient at certain times of any course.

For the item 7 “*I use teacher-centred approach in reading courses*”. They either did not understand the term teacher centeredness in a reading class or they did not quite follow what student-centeredness should be. On the other hand 114 of the subjects gained the perception of student centred approach in a reading class after attending TTP.

For the item 9 “*I give homework for writing as the follow-up of reading courses*”. Generally, after a reading class instructors in the study assign writing tasks as a follow-up, but still subjects who are totally agree are only 29 who put forward that the follow-up for reading is writing principle does not seem to have been internalized by the subjects in the aftermath of TTPs.

For the item 10 “*I do grammar-based activities in reading courses*”. Doing grammar based activities in a reading class contradicts with the idea of a reading session. Instructors in this study seem to have not realized to make a distinction between the two after TTPs. Reading is not a process to teach grammar only.

For the item 11 “*I hold “student-centred” teaching approach in reading courses*”. 207 subjects marked as mostly and totally agree. While grammar teaching a student centred approach have been chosen. That is to say, a top down approach of grammar teaching has been abandoned by the instructors in this study after attending TTPs.

For the item 12 “*I give homework for pre-reading activities*”. A perception of demanding from students to come to a reading lesson prepared does not seem to be common among subjects. 197 subjects do not believe this to be of that much importance.

For the item 13 *“I use grammar-translation method in grammar courses”*. Then again another item that reveals grammar teaching seems to be handled in another way rather than to be more communicative approach. This data shows that this situation should be dealt in detail in TTPs.

For the item 15 *“I practise “step-by-step” method in writing courses”*. A step by step method is very much student-centred approach and TTPs in that sense seem to have worked well for the instructors in this study.

For the item 16 *“I don’t consider the necessity of doing “schemata” in reading courses”*. 150 of the subjects believe in the effectiveness of activating students schemata. Pre-reading, activating the schemata is very central in a reading class. TTPs seem to have provided that awareness for some subjects. On the other hand, 105 of the subjects think that activating the schemata is not that much of importance. This brings into mind if it is because the term activating schemata is a new term for some of the instructors who take part in this study. Thus, TTPs should take this piece of data into consideration before designing the program.

For the item 17 *“I do “warm-up” activities prior to listening courses”*. Prior to a listening activity, doing the warm-ups is very common among the subjects in this study. This situation reveals that TTPs seem to be more effective for the instructors in this study in developing their perceptions in terms of listening than reading warm-ups as the data shows above.

For the item 18 *“I hold the necessity of “schemata” in listening courses”*. 276 of the subjects agree on activating the schemata prior to a listening activity. Unlike the reading items, this item was approved almost the entire population in terms of listening skill.

For the item 19 *“I explain the rubrics in listening courses”*. During a listening activity explaining instructions is crucial. Given a listening activity was not understood properly by the students, then there would not be an effective listening activity. The teacher should explain the instructions prior to the very start of the listening activity because the learners need to catch up with what is going on about the activity itself. Otherwise it would be too late for everything since the activity would be finished before the students concentrated on the task which is held in a limited time. More specifically the instructors took part in the study seem to have gained the awareness of giving clear instructions during listening activities after attending TTPs.

For the item 20 *“I give homework in the aftermath of reading courses”*. After a reading course 120 of the subjects say they assign homework, but the rest does not seem to be supporting the reading activities through homework.

For the item 21 *“I don’t consider “student-centred” activities necessary in listening courses”*. In listening lessons student centred approach is preferred.

For the item 22 *“I hold the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading courses”*. Almost the whole population of subjects agrees on the necessity of the activities for guessing meaning from context and vocabulary from context in reading lessons. This illustrates that vocabulary sessions of TTPs have provided the skill for instructions take part in the study. This item also reveals that score within the entire questionnaire.

For the item 23 *“I feel competent about the various activities learned to be used in listening courses”*. This item seeks an overall attitude towards listening

sessions held in TTPs. 222 of the subjects feel that they are competent which also reveals that they have benefited from the TTPs in terms of listening.

For the item 24 *“I ask students to do synonym, antonym, vocabulary and phrasal words activities in reading courses”*. According to this item, it can be said that lexical studies are held effectively in class and TTPs helped instructors gain such a skill to implement this kind of vocabulary teaching in reading lessons.

For the item 26 *“I extend the post-listening activities into speaking and writing courses”*. The majority of subjects put forward that they extend the listening activities through speaking and writing activities. Up to this point there does not seem to be any trouble in terms of follow-up concept during both implementation and awareness stage among the instructors took part in this study.

For the item 27 *“I utilize schemata activities in writing courses”*. This item shows that the subjects, who are sensitive enough to pay attention on activating the students’ schemata before writing activities, do not seem much sensitive doing the same before reading activities. This situation should be taken into consideration before designing the prospective TTPs in terms of reading sessions.

For the item 28 *“I believe in the necessity of Q&A, role plays and related in-class activities as a part of speaking courses”*. 262 of the subjects believe the necessity of question and answer as well as role play activities in speaking lessons.

For the item 29 *“I don’t consider process-oriented approach as proper in writing courses”*. 140 of the subjects are aware of the terms of process writing and believe it to be of importance in writing classes; whereas 126 of the subjects think

otherwise. This piece of information brings into mind that future writing sessions should cover more on product versus process writing techniques in upcoming TTPs.

For the item 30 *“I conduct activities for the improvement of essay-writing”*. The instructors took part in this study say that they conduct activities for the improvement of essay writing. This means that they see the ultimate goal of writing classes up to the level of essay writing.

For the item 31 *“I conduct activities for sentence-construction in writing courses”*. After taking a close look at what this item brings to surface, 170 of the subjects perceive the writing skill to be taught as a step by step skill. On the other hand 133 of the subjects do not seem to be aware of the fact that writing develops through stages from sentence to paragraph. TTPs should include this concept in future trainings.

For the item 33 *“I don't take “culture-gap” into consideration in speaking courses”*. If culture gap were not taken into consideration, there could be a danger of selecting topics irrelevant to students which makes it difficult to participate in the activity due to the lack of content knowledge. Therefore it would lead us to the conclusion that students' competence is low since their performance is not at the desired level, but this is wrong. Irrelevant topics lead the instructors to arrive at a wrong conclusion upon their students' performance because the selection of the topic was not very successful. All in all culture gap issue should be included in future TTPs as this seems to produce somewhat problems among the instructors who took part in the study.

For the item 34 *“I think sentence-construction is enough for paragraph-making in writing courses”*. Then again 173 of the subjects believe that sentence

construction is enough for paragraph construction. In reality writing a well organized paragraph is somewhat different to making a sentence. In future writing sessions of TTPs this issue should be taken into consideration.

For the item 35 *“I utilize adequate authentic materials in speaking courses”*. According to this item it can be inferred that authentic materials are not that much utilized by the subjects. 166 of them marked themselves on the contrary of the usage of authentic material in speaking lessons. This means that their attitude towards authentic material usage in speaking lessons have not changed to a positive way.

For the item 37 *“I evaluate speaking course activities within pronunciation, fluency, word selection and content criteria”*. It can be concluded by looking at this item that the majority of the subjects evaluate speaking performance according to a criteria which is an effective way of evaluation.

For the item 38 *“I find the writing correction much time wasting”*. Only 89 of the subjects find the writing correction time wasting. The majority think the otherwise.

For the item 39 *“I use error correction symbols in the control of students’ writings”*. It seems to be quite common to use error correction symbols, which is a commonly used technique in Communicative Language Testing (CLT) and which is mostly used in TTPs

For the item 40 *“I extend post-speaking activities into writing homework as follow-up”*. The majority perceives the follow-up of speaking as writing. As it has been mentioned above, the concept of follow-up does not seem to be problematic

since the instructors with a great majority claim they implement follow-ups into their teachings.

For the item 41 *“I believe that writing skills learned in L1 could well be utilized in English writing practices”*. The students who are capable of writing organized essays are the ones who can be taught the same skill in the target language. The majority of the subjects consider likewise.

For the item 42 *“I get students to do speaking practices in compliance with lexical competence”*. TTPs seem to provide some positive aspect in teaching of speaking lessons since 213 of the subjects claim that they do speaking practices in line with their students’ lexical competence.

For the item 43 *“I feel adequate in great variety of activities that I have learned through workshops, and/or on the job and in-service trainings”*. Of the 306, 227 of them indicate that they feel adequate in great variety of activities that they have learnt through workshops, seminars or in-service trainings. Finally, TTPs in general worked well with instructors’ professional development, which further consolidates subjects’ philosophy in line with latest improvements.

For the item 44 *“I conduct student-centred approach in speaking courses”*. 253 of the subjects claim that they prefer a student-centred approach in speaking courses. As it is seen up to this point TTPs seem to have reinforced instructors’ positive attitudes in terms of teaching speaking.

For the item 45 *“I feel adequate in various activities that I have learned to utilize in speaking courses”*. The attitudes of the subjects reflect positive outcomes for the activities they learnt after TTPs.

For the item 46 *“I have gained a creative teaching philosophy in the aftermath of TTPs that I have so far attended”*. 221 of the subjects claim with a deep content that they have gained a creative teaching philosophy in the aftermath of TTPs. On the other hand, by taking a closer look at the statistics not all of the subjects are very content with TTPs. The reason why some of the subjects have been left out might be because of not taking fit-for-purpose principle into consideration.

For the item 47 *“I can create a variety of activities, apart from those already learned, for speaking courses”*. Another item reveals that the speaking sessions of TTPs have reached the desired outcome for the instructors took part in the study as 251 of the subjects indicate that they can create a variety of activities apart from those already learnt when it is necessary in speaking classes.

For the item 48 *“I am open to different activities even while I hold a student centred approach as well as process writing in writing courses”*. Although it can be inferred from the statistics that the subjects claim that they have benefited from the writing sessions of TTPs the least compared to the other skill sessions, the key words of process writing and student-centred can create an enthusiasm in carrying out class teachings.

For the item 50 *“I believe that there has been development in my teaching philosophy as the result of TTPs”*. 235 of the subjects indicate with a marked composure that they believe there is a development in their teaching philosophy as the result of TTPs while 53 of them indicate that they feel a little development in their teaching. Although the subjects have marked low mean scores with some of

the items in terms of sub-skills, on the whole it is understood that they feel competent after TTPs.

4.2 Discussions on the Results of Descriptive Statistics

Research Question: Do the instructors who have attended TTPs feel that they have benefited from these programs?

Subjects evaluated highest t mean value for the question of “the benefit from TTPs” with 3.98. Hence, it is seen that subjects consider themselves all the more adequate as the result of the TTPs they have received (\bar{X} Effectiveness of teacher training =3.98). As it is seen, after attending TTPs the instructors who took part in the study have a belief that they have benefited from the sessions.

Subjects also developed a positive attitude towards reading skill with the mean of 3.84 as the result of the TTPs they have received. The effect of TTP towards reading was around “mostly agree/often”. In a similar way, the subjects, according to the statistical analysis, developed a positive attitude towards listening with the mean of 3.84 as the result of the TTPs they have received. The effect of TTPs on listening was seen in or around “mostly agree/often”. According to the responses given by the subjects in connection with their attitude towards speaking skill, it is seen that their attitude was around positive with the mean score of 3.79. The effect of TTPs on speaking was seen at “mostly agree/often” level. Lastly, the responses of the subjects to the questions connected to the writing skill revealed that they developed a somewhat positive attitude towards TTPs with the mean score of 3.44. It can be drawn from the analysis that the least positive effect was on writing among the other skills. This may bring the issue into mind that during writing sessions in TTPs the instructors who took part in the study could not find writing

activities in line with their home contexts. This could be the result of why they claim that they have not much benefited from writing sessions.

In a general perspective, it is seen that the general attitude of the subjects in the survey was positive; however, the attitude did not reveal the “totally agree” level. It can also be seen that at no sub-category “always/totally agree” response was given.

4.3 Discussions on the Instructors’ Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Gender Differences

Research questions: Do certain variables such as gender, experience and education level affect subjects’ attitudes towards TTPs?

It is found out that there was a significant differentiation between male and female attitudes towards writing and that the differentiation was in favour of females with ($t=2.65$ and $p<.05$). The statistical analysis revealed that female subjects developed a more positive attitude towards TTP and that such programs were believed to develop their efficiency in writing ($\bar{X}_{Female}=3.95$ and $\bar{X}_{Male}=3.33$). The data analysis showed that there was a significant differentiation as regards speaking between male and female subjects and that the differentiation favours female subjects ($t=2.56$ and $p<.05$). From the data analysis it becomes apparent that female subjects agreed that they considered the relevance of the TTP higher than male subjects ($=\bar{X}_{Female}4.02$ and $\bar{X}_{Male} = 3.55$). It was also found that there was a significant differentiation as regards the effectiveness of TTP between female and male subjects and that this differentiation favoured female subjects with ($t=2.24$ and $p<.05$). The data analysis also revealed that female subjects considered

the effectiveness of the TTP higher than male subjects ($\bar{X}_{Female}=4.13$ and $\bar{X}_{Male} = 3.82$). It was found that there was no significant differentiation as regards reading between male and female subjects ($t=0.31$ and $p>.05$). In the analysis there was found to be no significant differentiation as regards listening between male and female subjects ($t=0.62$ and $p>.05$).

Thus, it was also found out that both subject groups revealed similar attitudes towards listening ($=\bar{X}_{Female}3.83$ and $\bar{X}_{Male} = 3.86$).

As study reveals, gender difference plays a major role in terms of instructors' perceptions on TTPs. Female subjects developed a more positive attitude in terms of writing, speaking and general effectiveness of the TTPs. In studies it was found out that gender was a socio demographic aspect that could predict variations in EFL teachers' efficacy. Female teachers showed greater efficacy than their male counterparts. As the study by Evans (1986) shows, female pre-service teachers display greater efficacy as compared to their male counterparts. In another study Yavuz (2005) claims that female EFL teachers displayed greater efficacy than males because of a common belief that language teaching is a feminine task since this field was mainly dominated by female language teachers (p. 81). A similar study conducted in England also reveals that female applicants (70 %) to teacher training are more successful on average (Smith&Gorard, 2007, p.466). Although some of the studies reveal such data, this might still not be the reason why female instructors display greater efficacy since EFL teaching is not only a feminine but also a masculine task.

4.4 Discussions on the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Graduation

Research questions: Do certain variables such as gender, experience and education level affect subjects' attitudes towards TTPs?

Subjects' perception of the effectiveness of TTPs and of whether there is a significant differentiation regarding their education degrees as a result of the t-test conducted on the subjects is considered to be a significant reason for difference (Table 16).

Statistical data reveals that graduates of Education Faculty and Arts and Sciences Faculty displayed a significant difference in their perceptions of speaking sub-scale factor and that the difference favours the graduates of Education Faculty ($t=2.07$ and $p<0.5$). As can be seen from the Table 16, Education Faculty graduates benefited from TTP they received and their responses were in or around "often agree" ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 3.98$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 3.60$). It is also found out that graduates from Arts and Sciences Faculty displayed a significant difference regarding their perceptions of listening sub-scale factor and this difference favours the graduates of Education Faculty ($t=2.11$ and $p<.05$). It is seen from the table 16 that the subjects benefited better from listening parts of TTPs, and their perception in this regard had a significant difference with "often agree" response ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 4.12$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 3.56$).

As known clearly, two departments are different to each other in terms of their curricula. Those graduated from arts and science faculties are literature graduates and those from the education faculties are graduates of ELT. This information reveals that, ELT graduates claim that they have benefited more in

speaking and listening sessions of TTPs than their literature graduate counterparts. After taking a close look, literature graduates study during their university years a great deal of texts from various periods in time including poetry, short story, fiction and plays; whereas ELT graduates mainly deal with the methodology books and few examples of literary works of English or American literature. After graduation, literature graduates may have felt the need on how to implement listening and/or speaking activities in class since reading or writing are two skills that they deal mainly throughout their school years. The need for the approaches and techniques concerning speaking and listening may have pushed the literature graduates to keep their expectations high during TTPs. If their need had not been met to the full according to their point of view, it could be said that they walked out of TTP sessions dissatisfied.

It is derived from the table that subjects' perceptions of the effectiveness of TTPs in connection with their graduation level is not significantly different ($\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Education} = 3.97$ and $\bar{X}_{Faculty\ of\ Arts\ and\ Science} = 4.00$).

4.5 Discussions on the Instructors' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Educational Levels

Research questions: Do certain variables such as gender, experience and education level affect subjects' attitudes towards TTPs?

The ANOVA test shows us that education level is a significant predictor for two factors ($F_{Writing} = 6.43$ and $p < .05$ & $F_{Listening} = 10.11$ and $p < .001$). In order to inspect the significant differences among the groups, a post-hoc Scheffe test was conducted. It was found that for the both factors, BA instructors have scored lower than the other two education groups (Table 17).

Table 17 also shows that the mean scores in reading for instructors with BA were lower than that of instructors with MA and instructors with a PhD ($F=6.43$ and $p<0.05$). The post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 18) displays us that there is a significant differentiation between the Group 1 and Group 1-2. Instructors with a BA degree has a lower level of positive perception about the effectiveness of the TTPs on reading than the other two education groups ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.76$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.93$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=3.95$). Table 17 shows that subjects' perception of listening in connection with their educational degree is found significantly different ($F=10.11$ and $p<0.001$). In accordance with the Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 18), subjects with BA (Group 1), graduate subjects (Table 2) and PhD graduate display a significant differentiation regarding listening. The mean scores in listening for subjects with BA displayed a lower level of perception about the effectiveness of the TTPs on listening than the other two education groups ($\bar{X}_{BA}=3.72$, $\bar{X}_{MA}=3.96$ and $\bar{X}_{PhD}=4.02$).

It can be drawn from this data that the more educated the subjects, the better they benefited from reading/listening sessions in TTPs. This may also prove, just like the data on perceptions of subjects regarding their graduation, the subjects who hold masters and PhDs may not have had high expectations before attending TTPs because they may have thought that they did not have more to learn from those reading/listening sessions. It can also be concluded that the TTPs which subjects attended may have lacked the necessary needs analysis for the BA holders who may have had other needs than that of the topics they had been lectured. All in all, as mentioned several times in this study, without a seriously conducted needs analysis it is less likely that TTPs can reach the desired outcome for anyone.

4.6 Discussions on the Subjects' Perception of the Factors Regarding Their Occupational Seniority

Research questions: Do certain variables such as gender, experience and education level affect subjects' attitudes towards TTPs?

In accordance with the ANOVA test, which was conducted in order to find out if there is significant differentiation in the perception of the subjects' occupational seniority, a significant difference was found out in the three sub-scale factors (Table 19).

It is understood from table 19 that there was a significant difference in writing factor regarding subjects' occupational seniority ($F=4.01$ and $p>0.05$). According to Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 20), for subjects with 1-5 years of experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of occupational experience (Group 2) and for the subjects with 11 years and more experience (Group 3), a significant difference was discovered in the perception of writing factor regarding their occupational seniority. The mean score in writing reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTP in writing than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5\text{ year}}=3.55$, $\bar{X}_{6-10\text{ year}}=3.70$ and $\bar{X}_{11\text{ year and above}}=3.68$).

It is also understood from table 19 that there was a significant difference in reading factor regarding subjects' occupational seniority ($F=8.00$ and $p>0.001$). According to Post-hoc Scheffe test (table 20), for subjects with 1-5 years of experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of occupational experience (Group 2) and for the subjects with 11 years and more experience (Group 3), a significant difference was discovered in the perception of reading factor regarding their

occupational seniority. The mean score in reading reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTPs in reading than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5 \text{ year}}=3.71$, $\bar{X}_{6-10 \text{ year}}=3.90$ and $\bar{X}_{11 \text{ year and above}}=3.92$).

Table 19 also displays that occupational seniority has produced a significant differentiation in listening factor ($F=5.63$ and $p>0.05$). In accordance with the Post-hoc Scheffe test (Table 20) there has been a significant differentiation in the perception of listening factor among the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience (Group 1), those with 6-10 years of experience (Group 2) and the subjects with 11 years and more occupational experience in the listening factor. The mean score in listening reveals that the subjects with 1-5 years of occupational experience have a lower perception of the effectiveness of TTPs in listening than those of other two groups of subjects ($\bar{X}_{1-5 \text{ year}}=3.71$, $\bar{X}_{6-10 \text{ year}}=3.89$ and $\bar{X}_{11 \text{ year and above}}=3.92$).

4.7 Conclusion

To start with, some problematic areas may stem from the lack of needs analysis to be carried out prior to designing the TTPs. Sessions should be relevant to the instructors' home context and also they need to be included in the designing process unless the trainers or department heads want the training go over the instructors' head. Teachers are less likely to be convinced with the knowledge which is irrelevant to their local context. They want it to be specific, contextualised, observable, and testable. This may recall that the TTPs that the instructors took part in the study did not pay attention to the concept of fit-for-purpose.

TTPs need to be trainee-centred and be as close a bearing as possible on their teaching concerns and contexts. English Teacher education should be designed to achieve contextually responsive outcomes. Teacher educator should adopt a contextually teacher education. Session goals and structure of activities in TTPs should be explicit in order to make a session coherent. Trainees must be encouraged to make decisions about specific classroom practices and discussions during a session which must relate to trainees' working contexts.

Course readings should be educational issues prevalent in the teacher-trainees' home countries and that course assignments ought to be flexible enough to allow trainees to produce content that is contextually responsive. It can be concluded from these remarks that TTPs should be trainee-centred as well as including discussions of teaching methods and their applicability in the trainees' teaching context. There are also other examples which were of no use for the trainees due to some fundamental differences to the Western world. In some non-English speaking countries implementation of teaching activities may be problematic even just because of generic differences in class size. To conclude, a seriously conducted needs analysis is seen as an inescapable necessity along with the down to earth activities which should match the situation in their home context so as to get the desired outcome from TTPs.

The concept of being competent from the instructors' point of view is to be able to adjust themselves into the new contexts as well as peculiarities. It can be drawn that the instructors may have not felt that much competent and that could be the reason why they were never at a totally agree level in this study. Then again they might have attended the TTPs which were way beyond their home context or lacked the concept of adjusting the activities with new situations. This configuration

as a whole can be summoned to act effectively on certain demands from social practice, external social demands, capabilities; individual disposition and context are all part of the complex nature of competency. Understanding how teachers learn and grow should be an important goal for any trainer so that the TTPs can be adjusted to the trainees' home context. Trainers need to discover how their trainees perceive their training. They need to provide activities which allow trainees to examine these perceptions and their possible impact on teaching. When planning a TTP and determining what training elements to include program coordinators need to take into account a variety of individual factors such as trainee's developmental stage and her or his cultural background and personality.

Trainees referred to TTPs in a very positive way only when they were included in the course design process and they reported during their interviews practical implications and concrete examples of teaching to be most helpful. It can be drawn as another conclusion that TTPs should focus more on the practical side of the teaching rather than the theory on its own. On the other hand, an incident reported by trainees seemed to focus exclusively on negative rather than positive issues regarding learning and teaching English language. What is more trainees found it easier to recall negative incidents more quickly and spontaneously than to recall positive incidents. It may be evaluated from these findings that trainees may have recalled the negative aspects and implementations easily and that could be the reason why the general attitude was not at 'totally agree' level. This may also be due to the perfectionist attitudes of the instructors.

As it is seen from above statistics, the instructors who have less experience than others claim that they have not much benefited from listening, reading and writing sessions in TTPs in comparison with those who have more than 6 years and

above field experience. There are two conclusions that can be drawn from this fact. Given the instructors who have less than 6 years of experience, considered as younger instructors than the other subjects in the study, it can be concluded that they have graduated from their schools with the latest innovations, techniques and/or approaches since they had the ultimate ELT education so far. If these subjects had the ultimate techniques, then one can ask the question if the TTPs they attended failed to keep up with the latest innovations in the profession and could not convey these new approaches to the sessions or if these TTPs did not conduct any needs analysis prior to sessions. In either case it can be seen that younger ones may not have been covered as significant target group in TTPs, according to the statistics. Hence, TTPs should be able to keep up with the latest innovations in the profession and keep their programs flexible as well as conducting needs analysis for particular audiences.

This means that trainers' role is central in this case. Teacher trainers should keep hold of track of latest developments and techniques in the profession, so they need to study and cover the area a lot and take part in researches in the practice and they should also be in a close contact with language teachers and their working environments so that they can reflect on what is best to cover in TTPs. Taken from this perspective, there does not seem to be any prejudice against TTPs from any age group. The core of the discussion is that sessions should cover the needs of the audience. Stating briefly the ones who have less than 6 years of experience should be considered as the most important group to cover since they may need somewhat serious clues and approaches they may need within the profession. The second important group to take into consideration prior to designing TTPs is the ones who have more than 11 years of experience since this group of language teachers may

have lost the latest track of the profession due to not having taken part in any research or academic study.

All in all, while designing the programs instructors should be included in the process of selection of the topics. Needs analysis is also central to reach a desired outcome for TTPs. As it is seen, TTPs should be designed right from the beginning as a bottom-up approach rather than top-down.

4.8 Limitations of the Study

Although in this study it has been stated on the front page of the questionnaires circulated, it still stays a little ambiguous whether the instructors who took part in this study already knew a lot about the ELT classroom activities and approaches prior to the TTP sessions. In other words, it stays blurry that the topics of the TTP sessions were new to the subjects of the study. Then again, to cross match this issue towards the very end of the questionnaire there are attitude questions to elicit the perception whether the instructors took part in this study benefited or not. If the answers were positive then it has been assumed that the TTP sessions were new to the subjects and made a change in them or in a similar point of view if the answer was a negative attitude and declared that there was not much of a benefit then this may lead to a conclusion that the subjects already had knowledge about these input sessions and did not make that much change in them.

4.9 Suggestions For Further Research

For a further research rather than convenience sampling method, purposeful random sampling method should be conducted to assign the ones who have attended TTPs recently and have a say for the feedback of TTPs since these subjects

have been identified among the ones who claim they had no prior knowledge about the subject matter. This time another study could elicit results from the ones who attended TTPs quite recently and can now say more about the outcomes of the TTPs. On the other hand, a further study is needed after a needs analysis to elicit the real needs for experienced teachers' classroom practice. This time the study should aim to assign the ones who have more than 16 years and above experience in the profession.

CHAPTER 5

REFERENCES

- Allen , H.B.(1980). *What it means to be a professional in TESOL*. Lecture presented at the conference of TEXTESOL.
- Atay, Y.D.(2003) . *Öğretmen Eğitiminin Değişen Yüzü*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Aydemir. N. (2005). *The Effects of Training and Ongoing Support on Teachers' Perceptions and Their Application of An Innovative Practice*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.
- Barber, M.(1995). *Reconstructing the Teaching Profession*. Journal of Education for Teaching, 21(1), 75-85.
- Bax , S. (1997). *Roles for a teacher educator in context-sensitive teacher education*. ELT Journal, 51(3), 232-241.
- Belchamber, R.(2006). *Interviewing Candidates for pre-service training courses*. The Trainer, Pilgrims Publication, 20(3), 3- 4.
- Borg, S. (2003). *Teacher Cognition in language teaching : A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do*. The UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Borg, S. (2003). *Research Education as an objective for Teacher Learning* . IATEFL, 41-48.
- Borg, S. (2006). *The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers*. Language Teaching Research , 10(1) , 3-31.
- Bowen, T. (2010). *Professional Development: Continous Professional Development. 1-3*. Downloaded on July, 10, 2010 from http://www.onestopenglish.com/professional_development/continous_professional_development
- Brandl, K,K. (2000). *Foreign Language TA's Perceptions of Training Components: Do we Know How They Like to Be Trained?* The Modern Language Journal, 84(3), 355-371.
- Brown, D.H. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education. p.x, 2-5.

- Brown, D.H.(2001)*Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. p. 426,429,440–443.
- Büyükcan, Y. (2008). *İlköğretim Okullarındaki Hizmet içi Eğitim Seminerlerinin Öğretmenlere Yararlılığı*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Canagarajah , A.S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castillo, J. J. (2009). *Convenience Sampling Retrieved* [Date of Retrieval] from Experiment Resources: <http://www.experiment-resources.com/convenience-sampling.html>)
- Charles, C. M. (1998). *Introduction to Educational Research*. New York: Longman Publishing Company.
- Creswell, J. W. & V.L. Plano Clark (2007). *Mixed Method Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Çalgan P.S. (2008). *Özel İlköğretim Okullarında Çalışan İngilizce Öğretmelerinin Hizmetiçi Eğitim Çalışmalarına Bakışları*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Beykent University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Davis, P. (1992). *What is Teacher Development And Is It Different to Teacher Training*. Unpublished Paper.
- Day, C. (1997). *Teachers in the Twenty-First Century: Time to Renew the Vision*, in Hargreaves, A. and Evans, R. (Eds) *Beyond Educational Reform. Bringing Teachers Back*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 44-61.
- Dörnyei, Z.& Csizer, K.(1998).*Ten Commandments. For motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study*. Language Teaching Research. 2, 203-229.
- Evans, E.D. (1986). *Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy and commitment to teaching among pre-service teachers*. Journal of Educational Research, 80(2), 81-85.
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2008). *Critical incidents in ELT initial teacher training*. ELT Journal, 62(1), 3-10.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1988). *Teacher Development- a developmental process*. English Teaching Forum, 26(3), 2-3.
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Francis, D. (1995). *The reflective journal: a window to pre-service teachers' practical knowledge*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 11(3), 229-241.

- Freeman, D. (1989). *Teacher Training, Development and Decision Making: a Model of Teaching and Related Strategies for Language Teaching Education*. TESOL Quarterly, 23(1), 27-46.
- Freeman, D. & Richards, J.C. (1996). *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, L.D.(2000).*Techniques and principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p,ix, x.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *Teacher Development and Educational Change*, in Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds) *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. London: The Falmer Press, 1-9.
- Guasch, T., Alvarez, I. & Espana, A. (2010). *University teacher competencies in a virtual teaching/learning environment: Analysis of a teacher training experience*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26, 199-206.
- Guskey, T.R.(1988). *Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes foward the implementation of instructional innovation*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4(1), 63-69.
- Gümüř, C. (2006). *Milli Eđitim Bakanlıđına Bađlı İlköđretim Okullarında alıřan Öđretmenlerin Zorunlu Olarak Katıldıkları Mesleki Eđitim alıřmasının Deđerlendirilmesine İliřkin Uygulamalı Bir Arařtırma*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Niđde University, Niđde, Turkey.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Herbert, W.S. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holliday, A.(1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (1997). *Six Lessons: Cultural Continuity in Communicative Language Teaching*. Language Teaching Research, 1(3), 212-238.
- Iqbal, Z. & Zafar, Y. (2010). *Contours of the teacher training course: An empirical investigation into the teaching and professional needs of the newly-inducted university teachers at the Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan (Pakistan)*. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2, 5238-5241.
- Kalaycı, ř. (2008). *SPSS Uygulamalı ok Deđerkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dađıtım.
- Khan, R. & Cornwell, S. (2006). *Training Around the World*. The Teacher Trainer, 20(3), 8-11.

Koç, H., Yazıcıoğlu, I, & Hatipoğlu, H. (2009). *Öğretmenlerin İş Doyum Alguları ile Performansları Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma*. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 28, 13-22.

Kyriakides, L., Creemers, B.P.M., & Antoniou, P. (2009). *Teacher Behaviour and student outcomes: Suggestions for research on teacher training and professional development*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25, 12-23.

Leech, L.N., Barrett, C.K., & Morgan, A.G. (2005). *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Liv, D. (1998). *Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students*. ELT Journal, 52(1), 3-10.

Liyanage, I. & Barrett, J. B. (2008). *Contextually Responsive Transfer: Perceptions of NNES on an ESL/EFL teacher training programme*. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24, 1827-1836.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Hizmetiçi Eğitim Dairesi Başkanlığı.
<http://hedb.meb.gov.tr/plan.html>

McLaughlin, M.W. (1997). *Rebuilding teacher professionalism in the United States*, in Hargreaves, A. and Evans, R. (Eds) *Buying Teachers Back*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Nat, B. (2005). *Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education*. Boston: Springer Publishing.

Neil, P. & Morgan, C. (2003). *Continuing Professional Development for Teachers. From Induction to Senior Management*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Nugent, B. (1995). *Teacher Development in Contemporary Turkey*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Aston, Aston, England.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Özdeniz, D. (1993). *Action Research on Implementing Action Research*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Aston, Aston, England.

Prabhu, N.S.(1990). *There is no best method-Why?* TESOL Quarterly, 24(2), 161-176.

Prabhu , N.S.(1992). *The dynamics of the language lesson*. TESOL Quarterly, 26(2), 225-241.

Richards, J.C. & Nunan, D. (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards ,C,J. & Rodgers , S.T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p.viii,1,16.

- Rossner, R. (1992). "Where there is a will-facilitating teacher development". *Teacher Development Newsletter*, 18, 4-5.
- Rourke, L. & Anderson, T. (2004). *Validity in Quantitative Content Analysis*. *ETR&D*, 52(1), 5-18.
- Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann Publishers. p.v, vi, 6,7,195,199.
- Seliger, W.H. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, E. & Gorard, S. (2007). *Who succeeds in teacher training?* *Research Papers in Education*, 22(4), 465-482.
- Smylie, M.A. (1998). *The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 1-30.
- Stevick, E.W. (1993). *Social meanings for how we teach* in Atalis, J.E.(ed).(1992). *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press.
- T.C. Milli Eğitim Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi. 13 Ağustos 1984 2170(47), M. Vehbi Dinçerler, Bakan.
- Taylor, R.G. (2005). *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research*. Maryland: University Press of America.
- Thomas, A. (2007). *Self-report data in cross-cultural research: issues of construct validity in questionnaires for quantitative research in educational leadership*. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(2), 211-226.
- Tomlinson, J. (1995). *Professional Development and Control: The Role of the General Teaching Council*. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 21(1), 59- 68.
- Townsend, T.& Bates, R.(2007).*Globalization, Standars and Professionalism in Times of change*. Handbook of Teacher Education. The Netherlands: Springer Publishing.
- Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tufan, D.(2008).*Critical Thinking skills of Prospective Teachers: Foreign Language Education Case at the Middle East Technical University*. Case at The Middle Thesis, the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Underhill, A. (1986). *Editorial in Teacher Development Newsletter*, 9, 4.

Valazza, G. (2010). Professional Development teacher development and confidence. 1-3. Downloaded on 10 July, 2010 from [http://www.onestopenglish.com/professional development/teacher development and confidence](http://www.onestopenglish.com/professional%20development/teacher%20development%20and%20confidence).

Wallace, M.S. (1990). *Training Foreign Language Teachers :A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, T. (1991). *Models And Metaphors in Language Teacher Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yavuz, Ş.(2005). *İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Yeterlilik Algularındaki Değişimleri Öngören Sosyo-Demografik ve Kurumsal Etkiler*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Sevgili Meslektaşlarım,

Hizmet İçi Eğitimlerle ilgili siz okutmanların görüşlerini araştıran bir Yüksek Lisans tezi hazırlıyorum. Aşağıda değerli görüşlerinizi belirtmeniz için oluşturduğum anketi size en uygun seçenekte işaretlemenizi rica eder ve çalışmalarınızda başarılar dilerim.

Levent Balcıoğlu

Kişisel Bilgiler

Cinsiyet

- a) Kadın
- b) Erkek

Mezun Olduğunuz Yüksek Okul

- a) Eğitim Fakültesi
- b) Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi

Eğitim Durumunuz

- a) Lisans
- b) Yüksek Lisans
- c) Doktora

Aldığınız Uluslar arası Sertifikalar

- a) Celta
- b) Delta
- c) Tefl
- d) Diğer

Mesleki Hizmet Yılı

- a) 1 – 5 yıl b) 6 – 10 yıl
- c) 11 – 15 yıl d) 16 – üstü

Haftalık Ders Yüğü

..... saat

Almış olduğunuz hizmet içi eğitim ve/veya katıldığınız seminer, çalıştay vb. İngilizce eğitim metotları konulu çalışmalardan sonra, aşağıdaki başlıklar altındaki kazanımlarla ilgili görüşlerinizi lütfen belirtiniz.

Almış olduğum hizmet içi öğretmen eğitimleri, seminerler ve/veya çalıştaylar sonrası sonrasında;

1. Okuma incelemesinde kendimi yeterli hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
2. Okuma derslerinde kullanılmak üzere edinmiş olduğum çeşitli sınıf içi aktiviteleri konusunda kendimi yeterli hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
3. Okuma derslerinde kullanılmak üzere edinmiş olduğum ev çalışmalarını (takip amaçlı) veriyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
4. Okuma derslerinde yeterince özgün (otantik) malzeme kullanıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
5. Okuma derslerinde “warm-up” çalışması yapıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
6. Dilbilgisi çalışmalarında audio-lingual metodunu tercih ediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
7. Okuma derslerinde öğretmen merkezli bir yaklaşım izliyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
8. Dilbilgisi çalışmalarında konuya dayalı (content-based) eğitim yapıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
9. Okuma dersleri sonunda “follow-up” aktivitesi olan konuyla ilgili yazma çalışmaları yaptırıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
10. Okuma derslerinde dilbilgisi ağırlıklı çalışmalar yaptırıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
11. Dilbilgisi çalışmalarında öğrenci merkezli eğitim yapıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
12. Okuma dersleri öncesi öğrencilere ev çalışması veriyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
13. Dilbilgisi çalışmalarında grammar/translation metot kullanıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

14. Okuma dersleri sonunda “follow-up” aktivitesi olan konuyla ilgili konuşma çalışmaları yaptırıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
15. Yazma derslerinde “step by step” (aşamalı) bir yaklaşım uyguluyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
16. Okuma derslerinde metni okuma öncesi “schemata” (öğrencinin konuyla ilgili önceden bildikleri) canlandırması yapılması gerektiğini düşünmüyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
17. Dinleme derslerine başlamadan önce “warm-up” aktivitelerini uyguluyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
18. “Schemata” (öğrencinin konuyla ilgili önceden bildikleri) aktivitelerinin dinleme derslerinde faydalı olduğunu düşünüyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
19. Dinleme derslerinde alıştırmaların talimatlarını açıklıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
20. Okuma dersleri sonrası öğrencilere ev çalışması veriyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
21. Dinleme derslerinde öğrenci merkezli alıştırmaların gerekliliğine inanmıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
22. Okuma derslerinde bilinmeyen sözcüklerin anlamlarını bulmaları için öğrencilere “Metinden tahmin etme” (Guessing meaning from the context) ve/veya “Bağlam içinde sözcük anlamını bulma” (Vocabulary in context) çalışmaları yapılması gerektiğine inanıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
23. Dinleme derslerinde kullanılmak üzere edinmiş olduğum çeşitli aktiviteler konusunda kendimi yeterli hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
24. Okuma derslerinde kelime, deyim, eş/karşıt anlamlı sözcük alıştırmaları yaptırıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
25. Yazma ödevlerini ders esnasında yaptırıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
26. Dinleme derslerinden sonra yapılan çalışmaları konuşma ve yazma alıştırmalarıyla devamlılığını sağlıyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
27. Yazma derslerinde schemata aktivitelerini uyguluyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

28. Konuşma derslerinde sınıf içi aktiviteleri olarak Q&A (soru-cevap/dialog), role play (canlandırma) faaliyetlerinin gerekliliğine inanıyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

29. Yazma derslerinde süreç odaklı bir yaklaşımın uygun olduğunu düşünmüyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

30. Kompozisyon (essay) yazımı gelişimine yönelik çalışmalar yapıyorum.

- a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

31. Yazma derslerinde cümle yapılarını öğreten alıştırmalar yapıyorum.

- a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

32. Yazma derslerinde öğrenci çalışmalarının bütünsel “holistic” olarak değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

33. Konuşma derslerinde “culture gap” (kültür farkı) dikkate alınmasının gerekliliğine inanmıyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

34. Yazma derslerinde cümle oluşturabilmenin paragraf oluşturmak için yeterli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

35. Konuşma derslerinde yeterince özgün (otantik) malzeme kullanıyorum.

- a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

36. Yazma derslerinde öğrenci çalışmalarının belirli bir ölçüt dâhilinde “analytical” olarak düzeltilmesine inanıyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

37. Konuşma derslerinde telaffuz, akıcılık, kelime seçimi ve içerik çeşitliliği ölçütlerine göre konuşma değerlendirmesi yapıyorum.

- a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

38. Yazma ödevlerini kontrol etmeyi çok zaman alıcı buluyorum.

- a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

39. Yazma çalışmalarını kontrol ederken önceden belirlemiş olduğum ve öğrencilerimle paylaştığım “Düzeltilme Simgeleri” (error correction symbols/codes) kullanıyorum.

- a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman

40. Konuşma derslerinden sonra yapılan çalışmayı yazma alıştırmalarıyla (follow-up) devamlılığını sağlıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
41. Öğrencilerin ana dilde (Türkçe) edindikleri yazma becerilerini İngilizce yazma çalışmalarında kullanabileceklerine inanıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
42. Konuşma derslerinde "lexical competence" (uygun kelime seçimi) dikkate alarak konuşma çalışmaları yaptırıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
43. Katılmış olduğum çalıştay, eğitim ve/veya seminerler sonrasında derslerimde kullanmak üzere edinmiş olduğum çeşitli aktiviteler konusunda kendimi yeterli hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
44. Konuşma dersleri boyunca öğrenci merkezli bir yaklaşım uyguluyorum.
a) her zaman b) çoğu zaman c) bazen d) nadiren e) hiçbir zaman
45. Konuşma derslerinde kullanılmak üzere edinmiş olduğum çeşitli aktiviteler konusunda kendimi yeterli hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
46. Katılmış olduğum TTP 'ler sonrasında öğretmenlik anlayışında yaratıcı öğretim bakış açısına sahip olduğumu hissediyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
47. Konuşma derslerinde elimdeki malzemeler haricinde farklı aktiviteler üretebiliyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
48. Yazma derslerinde süreç odaklı ve öğrenci merkezli bir çalışma yaparken bile farklı uygulamalara açığım.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
49. Gerekliliğini hissettiğim yerde öğrenci ilgisini sağlamak için dersin akışını değiştiriyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum
50. TTP sonunda öğretmenlik anlayışında olumlu yönde genel bir değişim olduğuna inanıyorum.
a) tam olarak katılıyorum b) çoğunlukla katılıyorum c) orta katılıyorum
d) biraz katılıyorum e) hiç katılmıyorum

APPENDIX 2

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF ELT IN-SERVICE-TRAININGS HELD BY THE MINISTRY BETWEEN 2009 AND 2005.

2009

PLACE	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Bilecik	5 Days	50
Karaman	5 Days	20
Mersin	5 Days	50
Balıkesir	5 Days	50
Çanakkale	5 Days	50
Kahramanmaraş	5 Days	40
Antakya	5 Days	50
Rize	5 Days	40

2008

PLACE	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
İstanbul	5 Days	50
Kırşehir	5 Days	50
Çorum	5 Days	50
Tokat	5 Days	50
Burdur	5 Days	50
Samsun	5 Days	50

2007

PLACE	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Isparta	5 Days	60
Kocaeli	5 Days	60
Erzurum	5 Days	60
Bursa	5 Days	60
Eskişehir	5 Days	60
Amasya	5 Days	50
Ankara	5 Days	40
Erzurum	5 Days	41

2006

PLACE	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Nevşehir	5 Days	20
Hatay	5 Days	20
Muğla	5 Days	20
Kayseri	5 Days	20
Kırklareli	5 Days	30
Rize	5 Days	50
Sinop	5 Days	30
Erzincan	5 Days	20
Gümüşhane	5 Days	40
Aksaray	5 Days	110
Bayburt	5 Days	30
Giresun	5 Days	25
Malatya	5 Days	30

2005

PLACE	DURATION	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Adana	5 Days	22
Batman	5 Days	30
Bartın	5 Days	30
Çankırı	5 Days	30
Şanlıurfa	5 Days	30
Zonguldak	5 Days	30
Kastamonu	5 Days	30
Konya	5 Days	25
Rize	5 Days	50
Yalova	5 Days	50
Ordu	5 Days	30
Afyon	5 Days	25
Kars	5 Days	35
Diyarbakır	5 Days	30
Rize	5 Days	24

(<http://hedb.meb.gov.tr/plan.html>).

CURRICULUM VITAE

LEVENT BALCIOĞLU

EDUCATION

LCCI, London Chamber of Commerce and Industry, BET (Business English Teacher) Diploma, 2010.

Cambridge University, DELTA (Diploma of English Language Teaching for Adults), 2009- present

Maltepe University English Language Teaching, Master's Degree, 2008 – 2010
Maltepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
Linguistics, Testing and Evaluation, Teaching Young Learners, Statistics, Literature-
Language and Culture, New Approaches in ELT, Applied Linguistics, Second Language
Acquisition Theories, Sociolinguistics.

Business Administration, Master's Degree, 1999-2001.
Başkent University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
Economics, Operational Research (MIS), Turkish Health Insurance Systems, Accounting
Applications, Statistics, and Human Resources Management courses .
Master's Thesis: Home Health Care and Can it Work in Turkey?
GPA: 3, 25 / 4, 00

English Language and Literature, Bachelor's Degree, 1994-1998.
Ankara University, DTCF, Ankara.
Translation from Turkish to English, 20th Century Drama and Novel, Textual Analysis
courses along with Essay Writing, Lexical Studies and German as a foreign language.
Furthermore, a paper on the Great Depression between 1929 and 1941 in the US.
Graduation Thesis: Discourse Analysis.
GPA: 82 / 100. (With honours; second rank)

Ankara Atatürk Anatolian High School, Ankara 1991-1993.

Homefield High School, Bournemouth, England 1990-1991.

The first grade of High School was studied.

EXPERIENCE

Maltepe University, Istanbul, English Language Instructor 2004 - present
Teaching English at the Prep School for university freshman is the main responsibility.
Instructing both General English and Four Skills lessons. Apart from these tasks, taking
part as the English Instructor at the Continuing Education Centre of Maltepe University
(MASEM) at the weekends. In these courses being responsible for teaching General
English, Business English and teaching Young Learners.
Furthermore, giving support to the testing office when needed. Apart from teaching at
university, holding workshops for the staff at the in-service-training programme as a
Teacher Trainer has been another responsibility throughout the academic year. As being the
Teacher Trainer, I also take part at the in-service-training programme for the Education of
Ministry, which is held throughout the country. The training programmes have been for the
primary as well as high school teachers on the methods of teaching English for different
teaching environments.

Marmara University, Istanbul, English Language Instructor 2003-2004.

Teaching both at the Prep School and at the Undergraduate English Courses at the university. Instructing General English at the Continuing Education Centre of Marmara University (MÜSEM) at any levels of English throughout the academic year.

Kuleli Military High School, Istanbul, Teacher of English 2001-2002.

Teaching English at the Prep School of Kuleli Military High School (Four Skills). Also being the coordinator of the English Knowledge Contest in order for the students to gain their self esteem and practice their English. This contest was prepared by a team of English Teachers and broadcast at the cable network system within the school premises live. Furthermore, giving support for the testing office at the preparation of the four skills lesson exams.

SEMINARS, COURSES AND CERTIFICATE PROGRAMMES

- Maltepe University Faculty of Education and Department of Foreign Languages 2nd International ELT Conference on Teacher Education and Development. **Presenter** “An Analysis of Teacher Training Programs: A Sample Study”, 2010
- Kuleli Military High School ELT Seminar. **Presenter** “ How To Use a Reading Text”, 2008
- British Side “Teacher Trainer” course, 2007
- Maltepe University ELT Conference; “Across Borders: Intercultural Communication in EFL and Teacher Development”, 2007
- Ministry of Education In-Service-Training Department, Aksaray. **Presenter** “Young Learners” methodology.
- Maltepe University ELT Conference; “Changing Attitudes in ELT”, 2006
- Maltepe University ELT Conference; “ New Academic Waves “ , 2005
- Bodrum Marmara Private High School ELT Conference; **Presenter** “ELT through Literature. (2004) / This article later on was published in İstanbul University Hasan Ali Yücel Education Faculty Journal, 2006.
- Longman – Pearson Teacher Development Courses on Writing and Listening, 2006
- Longman – Pearson Teacher Development Courses on Listening and Reading, 2005
- Kuleli Military High School ELT Seminar, 2002

HOBBIES

Maltepe University Dance Club founder and consultant. Dancing, playing tennis and cycling.

COMPUTER ACCURACY

Office Software Programs, Windows Quantitative Systems for Business (QSB), Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

English: Advanced

German: Intermediate