



EFL Teachers' Views and Needs on In-service Training as a Part of Professional Development: A Case Study in Turkish Context

Okan ÖNALAN^{*a}, Esim GÜRİSOY^b

Article Info

DOI: 10.14686/buefad.713100

Article History:

Received: 05.01.2020

Accepted: 29.04.2020

Published: 05.06.2020

Keywords:

EFL Teachers,
In-Service Training,
INSET Needs.

Article Type:

Research Article

Abstract

In-service training (INSET), as one of CPD activities, is an indispensable part of any organized effort to enhance language teachers' field knowledge as well as their practical skills. However, there are still concerns regarding the effectiveness and sufficiency of INSET programs in Turkey. One of the reasons for any possible inefficiency might be the abundance rather than scarcity in quantity, where content has long been repetitive around similar and currently monotonous topics with limited quality. Therefore, more data-driven research that investigates language teachers' actual needs and views on in-service training should be conducted in different contexts. Thus, the present study aims to investigate INSET needs and views of 249 private school teachers working at different campuses of the same institution. Designed as a mixed methods research, quantitative data was collected via a questionnaire developed by the researchers which is then followed by focus group interviews of 20 head teachers and team leaders from the same institution. The findings suggest characteristics of a good INSET by underlining teachers' needs in a training program with implications for teacher trainers and policy makers.

İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Hizmet İçi Eğitimlere Yönelik Görüşleri ve İhtiyaçları: Türkiye Bağlamında Bir Durum Çalışması

Makale Bilgisi

DOI: 10.14686/buefad.713100

Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş: 05.01.2020

Kabul: 29.04.2020

Yayın: 05.06.2020

Anahtar Kelimeler:

İngilizce Öğretmenleri,
Hizmet İçi Eğitim,
HİE İhtiyaçları.

Makale Türü:

Araştırma Makalesi

Öz

Sürekli mesleki gelişim çalışmaları kapsamındaki hizmet içi eğitimler, öğretmenlerin hem alan bilgilerini geliştirmede hem de pratik becerilerini ilerletmede vazgeçilmezdir. Ancak, Türkiye'de yürütülen hizmet içi eğitimlerin etkinliği ve yeterliliği ile ilgili çeşitli kaygılar dile getirilmektedir. Bu düşüncelerin temelinde hizmet içi eğitimlerin sayıca azlığı değil, aksine benzer ve sıkıcı konular üzerinde çokça ve tekrar tekrar yapılan düşük kalitedeki eğitimler yatmaktadır. Bu nedenle, farklı bağlamlarda öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitimlere yönelik görüşlerini ve ihtiyaçlarını araştıran veriye dayalı daha fazla çalışmanın yürütülmesine ihtiyaç vardır. Bu kapsamda mevcut çalışma, Türkiye'de bir özel okul zincirinin farklı kampüslerinde çalışan 249 İngilizce öğretmenin hizmet içi eğitimlere yönelik görüş ve ihtiyaçlarını araştırmaktadır. Karma yöntem çalışması olarak tasarlanmış bu çalışmada, nicel veriler araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen bir anket yoluyla toplanmıştır. Bu veriler, aynı okul zincirinde görev yapan 20 zümre başkanı ile yürütülen odak grup görüşmeleri vasıtasıyla toplanan nitel verilerle desteklenmiştir. Bulgular, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin iyi planlanmış hizmet içi eğitimlerin taşıdığı özellikler hakkındaki görüşlerini ve hizmet içi eğitimlere yönelik ihtiyaçlarını ortaya koymakla beraber hem planlayıcılar hem de öğretmen eğitimcilerine yönelik sonuç ve öneriler sunmaktadır.

*Corresponding Author: okanonalan@gmail.com

^a Dr., Independent Researcher, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4015-0903>

^b Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludağ University, Faculty of Education, ELT Dept., Bursa, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3715-4583>

Introduction

The broad concept of professional development for teachers connotes a continuous process that begins with pre-service education at the educational faculties and extends primarily into novice years and subsequently to more experienced phases of teaching careers. From this perspective, continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers is an endeavor that emphasizes a career-long development and improvement. Especially upon graduation, CPD can be perceived as a paradigm where teachers play an active role in improving their instruction not only through learning from their own experiences by means of reflective practice, but also through attending further training activities according to their perceived needs and challenges. In this respect, the latter, namely in-service training (INSET), is theoretically an invaluable asset for teachers in CPD efforts. INSET is essential mostly because theory-based courses in the pre-service period usually fall short in reflecting the complicated nature of instruction that awaits the teachers in actual classrooms. Naturally, teachers become more aware of their own context-specific professional needs during the in-service period. Therefore, as an indispensable part of CPD, INSET contributes to teachers' professional development attempts not only in improving their instructional skills, but also in keeping them up-to-date in terms of field and methodological knowledge (Çimer, Çakır & Çimer, 2010; Saiti & Saitis, 2006; Sokel, 2019).

INSET programs aim to serve multiple significant purposes under CPD framework. One of the primary goals of INSET is to increase the quality of instruction by improving teachers' knowledge, sharpening their skills (Hustler, McNamara, Jarvis, Londra & Campbell, 2003), developing positive attitudes (Bolam, 1982; Joyce & Showers, 2002) and increasing their ability to change (Fullan, 2001). By participating in INSET programs, teachers may enrich their instructional repertoire, which is then expected to transform into enduring educational and professional advantages (Hayes, 1995; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Other targeted benefits of INSET might include establishing a reflective mindset, engaging in collaborative learning with other colleagues and refreshing professional motivation. Eventually, majority of INSET efforts aim at accomplishing improved instructional performance with an ultimate purpose of achieving better education.

The perception that INSET should play numerous crucial roles in the educational realm has caused researchers to verify this notion through empirical studies. Although many studies have reported positive impact of INSET both on teachers and eventually on students (Gibbs & Coffey 2004; Grieve & McGinley 2010; Rajabi, Kiany & Maftoon, 2012), some researchers have concluded that INSET programs can demonstrate ineffectiveness, which may hamper their potential to produce intended outcomes (Atay 2008, Emery, 2012; Hamid 2010; Kennedy 2016). In other words, some INSET activities prove to be inefficient due to certain reasons. One of the reasons might be the narrow approach in the preparation phase of trainings, during which teachers' views and actual needs are neglected. This may cause a serious inconsistency between teachers' expectations from INSET and program objectives (Emery, 2012; Yan, 2005). Therefore, more data-driven research that investigates language teachers' actual needs and views on in-service training should be conducted in different contexts. The present study takes this necessity as its primary motive with the premise that exploring language teachers' stated views and needs towards INSET will facilitate the efforts to develop more effective programs for teachers.

Literature Review

Factors that increase the effectiveness of INSET programs have long been discussed in CPD literature for teachers. In one of the earlier studies, for example, Vukelich and Wrenn (1999) assert that INSET programs can achieve effectivity as long as they are continuous, subject-specific and responsive to teacher needs. Similarly, Burns and Richards (2009) argue that the efficiency of INSETs increase when such programs present collaborative and reflective opportunities to their participants through meaningful and practical content. Sokel (2019) correspondingly maintains that coherence, active participation and collaboration are significant elements that INSET designers should take into consideration in achieving efficient outcomes. In general, one of the common points raised by studies on the issue in teacher professional development literature is that there is a strong necessity to place teachers' views and needs as well as their specific contexts and realities at the center of the INSET design and implementation (Atay, 2008; Bax, 1997; Fullan, 1995; Hayes, 2000; Mede & Işık, 2016; Sandholtz, 2002; Uysal, 2012; Wolter, 2000).

In spite of the efforts to sustain positive impact, there is still considerable criticism regarding ineffectiveness and insufficiency of INSET programs. The first point of concern echoed by literature is related to the content of trainings. Although studies show that practical trainings are more effective than theory-based ones (Elyas & Al Grigri, 2014; Hockly, 2000), research shows that most INSET activities prove to be too theoretical and superficial

with limited reference to practical challenges faced by teachers in actual classrooms (Kiely & Davis, 2010; Paine & Fang, 2006; Wedell, 2011). In other words, although one of the main expectations of participant teachers from trainings might be to refresh on content-field knowledge and methodological theory, the efficiency of INSETs tends to decrease when sessions are given via traditional techniques where theory-based knowledge is conveyed through mere lecturing (Gökmenoğlu, 2012; Koç, 2016).

Additionally, it has been asserted that the organization of INSET sessions is another cause of inefficiency when lecture-based delivery is at the center with limited opportunities for collaboration and collective work (John & Gravani, 2005). To put it in another way, it can be argued that INSETs that encourage pair/group work in a comfortable and open atmosphere where participants share ideas freely prove to be more effective for teachers (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Yoon, 2001; Guskey, 2003; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). What is more, successful INSET programs are recognized to include trainees in the learning process via active participation opportunities using a variety of methods such as kinesthetic practice and reflection (Joyce & Showers 1980; Sandholtz, 2002). Some studies have shown that the quality and specificity of training materials as a part of INSET organization play a crucial role, as well (Bayrakçı, 2009; Hayes, 2000). Therefore, should designers aim to achieve higher effectivity levels and more positive impact, it can be concluded that organizational choices while designing and implementing INSETs are a significant factor to take into consideration, and teachers' views and context-specific needs are essential here, too.

As a third point, trainers play a significant role on the efficiency of INSET programs. Studies show that not only overly theory-oriented INSET trainers, but also ill-prepared or incompetent teacher educators have a negative impact on the effectiveness of trainings (Öztürk & Aydın, 2019). Focusing on the trainer qualities that will bring positive outcomes, Wallace (1991) maintained much earlier that successful teacher trainers should assume a number of roles, among which are transmitting information, awareness-raising, facilitating, and mentoring. In terms of bridging the gap between theory and practice, Ellis (2010) has put forward that trainers should be able to find ways to mediate between their own methodological expertise and teachers' practical knowledge. Furthermore, Concannon-Gibney and McCarthy (2012) assert that trainers should be able to create plenty of opportunities for discussion and reflection during INSET sessions. Additionally, recognizing teachers' actual needs (Hayes, 2000; Howell & Buck, 2012; John & Gravani, 2005) and providing meaningful and constructive feedback (Waters & Vilchez, 2000; Waters, 2006) are important trainer skills in conducting effective INSETs.

INSET activities in the Turkish context reportedly have similar points yet to be improved if planners aim to achieve sustainable efficiency. According to Bayrakçı (2009), for example, in-service training in Turkey usually lacks collaborative aspect, technology use, appropriate evaluation or sufficient practical elements. Similarly, Altun (2011) asserts that state-held INSET programs tend to overwhelm participant teachers because trainers merely transfer theoretical information without necessary emphasis on practical aspect of teaching. Correspondingly, a recent study conducted in Turkish non-formal education settings has shown that Turkish language teachers prefer INSET programs that address instructional challenges using practical ideas in an environment where participants reflectively share experiences through need-oriented, authentic instructional activities (Arslan, Mirici, & Öz, 2019). However, INSET programs for Turkish EFL teachers in particular receive criticisms on the grounds that they neglect teachers' needs, opinions and specific challenges (Balbay, Pamuk, Temir & Doğan, 2018; Daloğlu, 2004; Küçüksüleymanoğlu, 2006; Uysal, 2012; Uztosun, 2018). Therefore, the current study aims to investigate Turkish EFL teachers' views and needs on INSET programs with the motivation that the findings might help design more effective INSETs for language teachers in the coming years.

Method

Research Design

This is a case study designed as a sequential mixed-method research (quan-qual). Both quantitative and qualitative data have been collected to answer the following research questions:

1. What types of professional development activities are the EFL teachers involved in?
2. What are the EFL teachers' perceptions on INSET?
3. What are the views of EFL teachers on characteristics of an INSET program?
4. What are the EFL teachers' views regarding the content of an INSET?
5. How do EFL teachers determine their INSET need(s)?

6. What are the EFL teachers' perceptions regarding their assessment during INSET and the assessment of the INSET?

Participants

Purposive sampling is used in the selection of the school for the case study. 249 EFL teachers working at different campuses of a relatively big private school contributed to the study. The reason for the selection of this specific private school is due to their high reputation in EFL teaching in Turkey as well as the intense importance they give to in-service training of their teachers. Thus, except for one teacher, all the teachers that participated in the study had a previous INSET experience. Having an experienced group of participant teachers, the researchers hoped that the findings regarding the characteristics of an INSET would make the data more reliable. Moreover, the informed knowledge and information they will provide might prove to be relatively more helpful in terms of implications when compared to a group of teachers who do not have any expectations from such a program. These 249 teachers answered a questionnaire to communicate their views and needs. Later on, after a custom-made INSET prepared for the 20 head teachers of the participant group, focused-group interviews were conducted for a deeper understanding of their views. Thus, a within-case sampling strategy is used for the interviewees.

As this is a case study that involved all the available teachers, an equal distribution of genders was not possible. Considering the female dominance in the field of ELT, the majority of the participants (n= 240) were females and only nine were males. The participants were also divided into three groups according to their teaching experience. Accordingly, 122 participants (49%) were considered as novice teachers (0-5 years of experience); 93 teachers (37,3 %) had 6-11 years of teaching experience, and 34 of them (13,7 %) had 12 years or more experience.

Data Collection and Tools

Quantitative data is collected via a questionnaire developed by the researchers. The statements required responses regarding teachers' perceptions on INSET (1, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21), content of INSET (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16) and assessment in INSET (8, 9, 10, 11, 12). For content validity, the questionnaire is given to five expert teacher trainers and content validity ratio (CVR) for each item was taken. Four items having lower CVR values from 0,99 were discarded and thus the final instrument constituted 21 items. The same experts also evaluated the questionnaire for face validity and necessary changes were made accordingly. As a next step, the questionnaire was piloted on 35 EFL teachers working at state and private institutions. The reliability of the pilot study was found to be ,80. Finally, the online instrument was shared with the participants. The Cronbach alpha value of the main study was found ,82 and the measurement was considered reliable.

As a last step of the data collection process, 20 head teachers of the same institution were invited for focus group interviews after a teacher training session conducted by the researchers. The first focus group had 11 and the second focus group had nine participants. All the answers were recorded and transcribed. The interviewees were asked the following nine questions relevant with the items in the questionnaire:

1. What are some activities that you're engaged in for your Professional development?
2. How do you determine your INSET need(s)?
3. What should be the general characteristics of an IST? (How would you define a good INSET?)
4. What are your expectations from an INSET?
5. Do you reflect on what you have learnt in INSET?
6. What are your criteria when evaluating the training?
7. Do you ask for feedback from your fellow colleagues?
8. How should the content of an INSET organized?
9. What is your expectation regarding the content of a training?

In terms of the duration of the data collection process, the questionnaire phase took place between October 2018 and June 2019 whereas the INSET session and focus group interviews were conducted in August 2019.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of the questionnaire data. Normality values were determined by checking the Skewness and Kurtosis values. As a result, 15 items (2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21) were found to be normally distributed; thus, parametric tests were used for these items. For those that were not normally distributed (1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 18), non-parametric tests were used. However, as the gender distribution and the distribution of those who took an INSET before were not equal or similar, dual comparisons (independent samples t-test for parametric and Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric) did not reveal statistically significant results. Thus, means, standard deviations were taken and frequency analyses were made on the items.

For the verbal data gathered during the focus group interviews, content analysis was conducted. Categories and sub-groups were formed. To provide inter-rater reliability, each researcher first did the categorization individually, and then they compared it with each other. The categories were formed upon agreement of both researchers.

Ethical Considerations

To collect data from this specific group, the researchers contacted the school's head office for their consent. After the approval of the head office, the head of the ELT department was contacted and necessary permissions were received for the distribution of the questionnaire. For the focus group interviews, written consent of the participants was asked. All of the head teachers agreed to participate in the interviews. Moreover, the name and location of the school and its campuses as well as the participants' identities were kept anonymous.

Findings

The quantitative and qualitative results are reported together when they provide an answer to a research question to facilitate comparison. Other questions posed as part of the focus group interview and aimed to delve more into the answers are reported separately in this section. The first research question (RQ) inquired about the participants professional development (PD) activities. The question was answered during focus group interviews. A total of 11 different activities were mentioned by the participants as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Preferred PD activities

Activities	N
Attending ELT Conferences/Seminars	19
Attending INSETs	19
Sharing experiences with colleagues	16
Visiting ELT websites	11
Watching TED talks and YouTube	11
Reading resource books/articles	8
Attending courses with personal and professional benefit	6
Observing team leaders	5
Furthering education (M.A, Ph.D.)	3
Attending Webinars	2
Joining in EU projects	1

As seen from the table, the participant group has different experiences in terms of their PD, which justifies the reason for the selection of this specific school and its teachers for the investigation. Among their answers, INSET has been preferred by all participants except one. Participant group's previous experiences and involvement in INSET makes their views and perceptions on INSET worthwhile when compared to a group with no experience.

Next, the participants were asked to state the PD activities they found beneficial. Among the 11, they stated that they find six of these activities helpful: INSETs, talking and sharing experiences with colleagues, watching activity videos on YouTube, furthering education, visiting ELT websites and reading articles. Although not asked as a question, eight of the participants stated that they found resource books not beneficial as the information is too theoretical and not transferrable to the classroom. Moreover, without being asked, they also stated disadvantages of INSETs as follows:

- Too lecture-based
- Audience is mostly passive,

- Content is too theoretical,
- Sessions are over-crowded,
- Content is repetitive in nature,
- Usually given by the same trainers,
- Topics are the same
- Topics are sometimes irrelevant with the teachers' needs.

During the interviews the participants were asked to explain how they determine their INSET needs (RQ 4). Accordingly, they decide they need INSET;

- After identification of weaknesses and strengths via reflection
- Upon others' ideas, suggestions (colleagues, students, parents)
- After peer assessment/collaboration
- As a result of the need for practical ideas
- Due to the need for being up-to-date
- Because of the desire for perfection
- To meet the needs of the students
- In a random manner

The second RQ aimed at investigating the EFL teachers' perceptions on INSET. The answers to the items related to this question are provided in table 2 in terms of frequencies, means and SD.

Table 2. Perceptions on INSET

No	Item	Disagree %	No Idea %	Agree %	M	SD
1	I think in-service trainings help me renew my theoretical knowledge.	86,7	-	13,3	1,13	,33
17	I think the in-service trainings are essential for professional development.	8,8	24,5	66,6	3,86	,99
18	I enjoy attending in-service trainings.	2,1	11,6	86,3	4,32	,80
19	I think in-service training should be regular.	5,6	17,3	77,1	4,08	1,00
20	I think in-service training should be voluntary for all teachers.	11,6	25,7	62,6	3,79	1,13
21	I think the Ministry of National Education should provide regular in-service training for the teachers.	15,6	17,3	67,1	3,85	1,19

One striking finding related to the second RQ is that the majority of the participants (86,7 %) do not think that the INSETs help renew and refresh their theoretical knowledge which they learned at the faculty. Considering the fact that one of the aims of INSET is to help teachers refresh their knowledge and enrich it with practice, the answer requires significant attention. According to the participants' responses, only a little more than the half think the INSETs are essential for continuous professional development, but they still enjoy attending them. However, nearly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the participants are dubious regarding the issue. Although they seem to agree that the INSETs should be organized regularly, nearly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the teachers tend to question the voluntary participation.

The third RQ asked about the views of EFL teachers on characteristics of an INSET program. The participants' responses were taken during the interviews and the answers were first divided into categories then into groups.

Table 3. Characteristics of an INSET

	Category	Group
Characteristics of an INSET	Content	to the point informative transferable up-to-date relevant with the needs innovative practical concrete examples of how theory can be put into practice
	Organization	interactive fun in small groups lots of activities and materials
	Trainers	experienced providing feedback

Second group of items in the questionnaire (items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16) and the eighth question of the interview aimed to learn about participants' views on INSET content. Table 4 below shows the participants' answers on related items:

Table 4. Views on the Content of an INSET

No	Item	Disagree %	No Idea %	Agree %	M	SD
2	I think practical information should be integrated in the content of the in-service trainings.	4,4	14,4	81,6	4,19	,88
3	I need to see examples of how theory can be implemented in the classroom.	1,2	11,2	87,5	4,39	,74
4	The instructors of the in-service trainings should be experts in their fields.	2,8	10,8	86,3	4,41	,82
5	I would like the instructors to share in-service trainings materials.	1,2	7,6	91,2	4,53	,72
6	I would like discussions on theoretical topics.	1,2	8	90,7	4,43	,74
7	I would like discussions on classroom implementations of suggested activities.	9,6	29,7	60,6	3,81	1,02
13	I prefer group work in the in-service trainings.	34,2	30,1	35,8	3,00	1,26
14	I prefer working alone in the in-service trainings.	13,6	16,1	70,3	3,83	1,07
15	I enjoy kinesthetic activities in-service trainings.	41,8	28,5	29,7	2,81	1,27
16	I like hands-on activities in the in-service trainings.	7,6	18,5	73,9	4,05	1,00

As the results demonstrate, the participants have agreed that they need practical content in the trainings. However, the literature in the Turkish context state that the INSETs highly rely on theoretical information and this has become one of the criticisms towards the content.

The interview results regarding the content of INSET was arranged under three categories. As seen in table 5, the participants mentioned about the organization of the content, physical environment and the time the INSET is given. Moreover, the interviewees were asked to give a percentage on theory-practice balance in the INSET content. The majority of the participants (n=15) suggested a 70% practice, 30% theory balance; four of the participants suggested 60% practice and 40% theory, and only one of the participants claimed that a 50-50%

distribution of theory and practice would be more beneficial. As seen from the frequencies the majority asked for practice-based and practice-integrated trainings.

Table 5. Content of an INSET

	Category	Group
Content of an INSET	Organization of content	ice-breakers/warm-up activities purpose/outline of the training theory/information presented interactively contain practical content (variety of ex. Activities)
	Organization of the physical environment	seating of the participants arrangement of the room spaciousness, lighting pair/group activities
	Time of INSET	on a separate day avoiding after-work hours

The final RQ inquired about participants' perceptions regarding their assessment during INSET and their assessment of the INSET. Teachers' perception of the INSET was determined according to their answers in the last part of the questionnaire (8, 9, 10, 11, 12) and their criteria for evaluating the training is identified as a result of the interviews.

Table 6. Views on Assessment during INSET

No	Item	Disagree %	No Idea %	Agree %	M	SD
8	I think there should be an evaluation of the training in the end.	1,2	8,4	90,4	4,36	,70
9	If there will be an evaluation, I would prefer self-evaluation.	10,8	25,3	63,8	3,84	1,09
10	If there will be an evaluation, I would prefer peer-evaluation.	9,2	29,3	61,4	3,78	,99
11	If there will be an evaluation, I would prefer whole class evaluation.	27,8	36,5	35,8	3,09	1,20
12	If there will be an evaluation, I would prefer pen and paper evaluation.	19,6	28,5	51,8	3,45	1,23

During the interviews, the participants were asked whether they are involved in self-evaluation as a form of reflection. The majority (n=18) said that they do, one participant reported doing it most of the time and only one replied negatively. Next, they were asked about their ways of reflection. Their answers and the frequencies are given in table 7.

Table 7. Methods of Reflection

Methods	N
Talking with colleagues	9
Talking with the self	8
Checking notes taken during the INSET	7
Conducting further study	7
Implementing the provided information in the classroom	4

Finally, the participants were asked about their criteria for evaluating the INSET they attended. Accordingly, their criteria for success are categorized under two points (table 8).

Table 8. Criteria for the Evaluation of an INSET

	Category	Group
Criteria for the Evaluation of an INSET	Content	functional/applicable
		informative
		containing new information
		having an interesting topic
	Trainers	audience-friendly
		presentation skills
		being open for interaction

Discussion

The present study aimed at identifying private school EFL teachers' views and needs towards INSET. The quantitative data looked for views and perceptions regarding the three issues embedded in the items of the instrument: views/perceptions on INSET, content of the INSET and assessment in INSET. The qualitative data gathered during focus group interviews enabled to explore participants' practices as well as thoughts and needs on INSETs. Thus, "why" and "how" questions related to the issue were answered.

There are several important findings that need to be discussed. It is found out that this specific group of teachers in the case study are engaged with a wide array of PD activities, yet the most preferred ones are seminars and INSETs. In addition, they also consider sharing experiences with colleagues as a PD activity. This finding is interesting as it indirectly suggests the importance and the effectiveness of collaboration they have within their institution, justifying our reason to select this school for the case study. It is also noteworthy that among the most frequently preferred PD activities, they claimed to find INSETs as beneficial. However, they also mentioned that the INSET might be ineffective and carry some disadvantages. Their complaints were mostly in line with the literature conducted in the Turkish context (Altun, 2011; Balbay, Pamuk, Temir & Doğan, 2018; Bayrakçı, 2009; Daloğlu, 2004; Küçüksüleymanoğlu, 2006; Uysal, 2012; Uztosun, 2018) and focus on the content of the training as well as the trainers. The primary concern was that the trainings are usually too theoretical, lecture-based and usually about the same topics. The participants were unhappy with the dull, repetitive, sometimes irrelevant content during which they are kept passive in overcrowded sessions. It seems that although they feel the need to attend INSETs, they don't feel satisfied as they view such training as transmission of knowledge rather than sharing ideas or classroom practices. The limited/lack of involvement of the participants in the learning process emphasized the traditional nature of the training.

The results from the interview also showed that these teachers are using multiple methods to decide whether they need INSET. Their answers point to the fact that they have increased awareness on their professional needs, they give importance to collaboration and ideas of others, they are reflecting on their job and teaching and finally they give precedence to their students' needs. None of the answers involved compulsory participation or institution

forced engagement in INSET activities. This might be due to the school climate that they are in and frequent support they receive from each other. This finding suggests a need towards creating a similar school atmosphere in state schools as well. The value given to cooperation and collaboration suggests the fact that professional development is not merely an individual activity, but rather brings mutual benefits for the administration and the teachers alike.

Another striking finding is that although the INSET organized in the Turkish context rely on theory, the majority of the participants claimed that trainings do not help renew their theoretical knowledge and they demand more practical content. This finding is in line with the previous research (see, Kiely & Davis, 2010; Paine & Fang, 2006; Wedell, 2011). This suggests that the INSETs they have attended so far do not reach their aim, which is the “transfer of knowledge”, nor do they meet the needs of the participants as they have limited or no practical content. On the contrary to the negative perceptions toward the content, the participants claimed that they still enjoy attending INSETs, indicating a need for professional development. However, they have moderately high agreement on voluntary participation of INSET. This might be because they think training is necessary for PD, whether voluntary or not.

Regarding the characteristics of a good INSET, the teachers focused on three primary issues: the content of the training (see, (Elyas & Al Grigri, 2014; Hockly, 2000; Kiely & Davis, 2010; Paine & Fang, 2006; Wedell, 2011), the trainers (see, Öztürk & Aydın, 2019) and the organization (see, John & Gravani, 2005). of the training. As seen in their answers, they value practical, applicable, interactive trainings over theoretical and traditional ones. As opposed to the boring nature of traditional and theoretical content, they stated that they would like to enjoy and have fun, which could be provided by experienced trainers who are ready to give feedback.

Regarding the organization of the content of the INSET, teachers stated that they do not want group activities although they claimed just the opposite during the interviews. The interview findings suggested the value they give to collaboration that requires group work (see, Garet, et al., 2001; Guskey, 2003; Guskey & Yoon, 2009). One explanation of this finding might be that the interviews were only conducted by department heads, but the questionnaire was answered by all teachers. Thus, it can be argued that the head of the departments may be more inclined towards cooperation than the rest of the teacher group. Similarly, 2/3rd of the participants stated that they do not prefer kinesthetic activities during the training sessions. The result is contradictory to what the literature suggests (see, Joyce & Showers 1980; Sandholtz, 2002). This claim also contradicts with the fact that they like practical ideas that are transferable to the classroom presented in an interactive way. Since current techniques for teaching languages require a lot of physical activities such as drama, games, TPR, songs, etc., practical information that they claimed as necessary in INSETs would also involve different uses of such activities. Their reluctance to participate in kinesthetic activities during INSETs is definitely a reflection of their hesitance to use them in their own classes. This conflict might also be due to their former learning experiences. It is highly likely that, being in the Turkish context, they were exposed to traditional language learning, which may have them end up with the belief (conscious/unconscious) to refrain from such kinesthetic activities due to classroom management issues, focus on form etc. Therefore, there seems to be a need to delve more into teachers’ cognition to learn about why they do what they are doing.

In relation with the assessment in INSET, although they claimed that there should be an assessment at the end, they only moderately agreed that they prefer self and peer-evaluation but not whole class evaluation. This finding suggests that they value individualized feedback. Moreover, only half of the participants stated they would like pen and paper evaluation, which can be interpreted that they are open to other types of evaluation. However, this finding also suggests that, though the participants claimed to prefer practical content, half of them is in favor of traditional assessment. Again, this point also requires a deeper understanding of their ideas by focusing on their cognition.

Finally, when the participants were asked about their criteria to evaluate the quality of an INSET they focused solely on the training content and the trainer although they mentioned about the organization of the physical environment and timing as two of the criteria necessary to be considered when setting up INSETs.

Conclusion and Implications

Aiming to focus on private school EFL teachers' views on and needs regarding INSETs, the study displayed some thought-provoking findings. First of all, teachers' previous experiences and concerns fell in line with the previous literature in the same context. Accordingly, the results showed that the participants' former experiences describe INSETs as traditional, theory-oriented that aims at information transfer. It is apparent from the answers that the teachers require practical content with suggestions for classroom implementations. Thus, when organizing such PD activities content should be prepared according to teachers needs in specific and they should contain activities that could be transferred to real classroom. Moreover, the organization of the content should encourage active and cognitive participation of the teachers to help them engage with the process and to facilitate the internalization of the information. Features of experiential learning can also be implemented during the process.

Another conclusion is that a collaborative school climate can have positive impact on teachers' professional development. Thus, support from the colleagues and the institution is necessary to create a cooperative environment. However, a comparison of the questionnaire and interview findings implies that the required collaborative climate is more in use with the department heads rather than the teachers in general. Therefore, in order to spread the benefits of cooperation and collaboration, head teachers' support and organization is necessary.

Finally, the contradiction between what teachers claimed to be necessary during the presentation of the content such as collaborative group activities and kinesthetic activities and their hesitance to be a part of such activities raises questions regarding the teacher cognition development. Thus, suggesting to solve this problem via furthering research in teacher cognition. It is no doubt that, unless the teachers start implementing what they think to be effective by being a part of it themselves, the transfer of these techniques to their classes will be more difficult or lefthanded.

The results of the study have implications for policy makers, institutional leaders, teachers and teacher trainers when organizing and conducting trainings. However, the limitations of the study should also be taken into consideration. Being a case study, the participants are teaching at different campuses of a private school. As reported by the ELT department head of the institution, the teachers receive INSETs once a month on a regular basis. Hence, this group of teachers is quite experienced with high awareness regarding the issue, which was also one of the reasons for the selection of this case. Due to this reason, the results cannot be generalized to other school types or teachers. However, with regards to the concerns on INSET, the answers fell in line with the literature proposing that INSETs prepared both by private organizations and the state suffer from similar disadvantages. Thus, the suggestions made by the teachers for the betterment of INSETs are worth considering.

Statement of Publication Ethics

The research has no unethical problems and research and publication ethics have been fully observed. No ethical committee approval information has been established since the quantitative data for the study were collected between the dates October 2018 – June 2019 and focus group interviews were conducted in August 2019.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Researchers' Contribution Rate

Authors	Literature review	Method	Data Collection	Data Analysis	Results	Conclusion
Okan Önalın	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Esim Gürsoy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

References

- Altun, T. (2011). INSET (In-service Education and Training) and professional development of teachers: A comparison of British and Turkish cases. *Online Submission. US-China Education Review A*6, 846-858.
- Arslan, S., Mirici, İ. H., & Öz, H. (2019). In-service training needs of EFL teachers in non-formal education settings. *SEFAD*, 42, 223-244.
- Atay, D. (2008). Teacher research for professional development. *ELT Journal*, 62(2), 139–147.
- Balbay, S., Pamuk, İ., Temir, T., & Doğan, C. (2018). Issues in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs for university English instructors in Turkey. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(2), 48-60.
- Bayrakçı, M. (2009). In-service teacher training in Japan and Turkey: A comparative analysis of institutions and practices. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34, 10-22.
- Bax, S. (1997). Roles for a teacher educator in context-sensitive teacher education. *ELT Journal*, 51(3), 232-241.
- Burns, A., & Richards, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Concannon-Gibney, T. & McCarthy, M. J. (2012). The explicit teaching of reading comprehension in science class: a pilot professional development program. *Improving schools*, 15(1), 73–88.
- Çimer, S. O., Çakır, İ., & Çimer, A. (2010). Teachers' views on the effectiveness of in-service courses on the new curriculum in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 31–41.
- Daloğlu, A. (2004). A professional development program for primary school English language teachers in Turkey: Designing a materials bank. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24, 677-690.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language teaching*, 43(2), 182–201.
- Elyas, T., & Al Grigri, W. H. (2014). Obstacles to teaching English in Saudi Arabia public schools: Teachers' and supervisors' perceptions. *International Journal of Language Teaching*, 2(3), 74-89.
- Emery, H. (2012). A global study of primary English teachers' qualifications, training and career development. (ELT Research Paper No.12-08). British Council. Retrieved from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/B487_ELTRP_Emery_ResearchPaper_FINAL_web_V2.pdf
- Fullan, M. (1995). The limits and the potential of professional development in education. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.). *Professional development in education: New paradigms & practices* (pp. 253-268). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Garet, M., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman B. F., & Yoon K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, (38)4, 915–45.
- Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5(1), 87–100.
- Gökmenoğlu, T. K. (2012). *Teachers' reports of their in-service training needs and design preferences*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Grieve, A. M., & McGinley, B.P. (2010). Enhancing professionalism? Teachers' voices on continuing professional development in Scotland. *Teaching Education*, 21(2), 171–184.
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappan*, (84)10, 748–50.
- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, (90)7, 495–500.

- Hamid, O. (2010). Globalization, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: language policy discourses and realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 289–310.
- Hayes, D. (1995). In-service teacher development: Some basic principles. *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 252–61.
- Hayes, D. (2000). Cascade training and teachers' professional development. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 135–45.
- Howell, G. F. & Buck, J. M. (2012). The adult student and course satisfaction: What matters most? *Innovative higher education*, 37(3), 215–226.
- Hustler, D., McNamara, O., Jarvis, J., Londra, M., & Campbell, A. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of continuing professional development (Department of Education and Skills, Research Report No. 429). Retrieved from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4754/1/16385164-58c6-4f97-b85b-2186b83ede8c.pdf>
- Hockly, N. (2000). Modeling and 'cognitive apprenticeship' in teacher education. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 118-125.
- John, P. D. & Gravani, M. N. (2005). Evaluating a 'new' in-service professional development programme in Greece: The experiences of tutors and teachers. *Journal of In-service Education*, 31(1), 105-125.
- Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving in-service training. *Educational leadership*, 37(5), 379–385.
- Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (2002). *Designing training and peer coaching: Our needs for learning*. VA, USA: ASCD.
- Kiely, R. & Davis, M. (2010). From transmission to transformation: Teacher learning in English for speakers of other languages. *Language teaching research*, 14(3), 277–295.
- Kennedy, M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945–80.
- Koç, E. M. (2016). A general investigation of the in-service training of English language teachers at elementary schools in Turkey. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(3), 455–466. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1096582.pdf>
- Küçükşüleymanoğlu, R. (2006). In service training of ELT teachers in Turkey between 1998-2005. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(2), 359-369.
- Mede, E., & Işık, M. (2016). The needs of primary English teachers for an in- service teacher training program. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)*, 7(2), 1-30.
- Öztürk, G., & Aydın, B. (2019). English Language Teacher Education in Turkey: Why Do We Fail and What Policy Reforms Are Needed? *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 9(1), 181-213.
- Paine, L. W. & Fang, Y. P. (2006). Reform as hybrid model of teaching and teacher development in China. *International journal of educational research*, 45(4–5), 279–289.
- Rajabi, P., Kiany, G. R., & Maftoon, P. (2012). ESP in-service teacher training programs: Do they change Iranian teachers' beliefs, classroom practices and students' achievements? *Ibérica*, 24, 261-282.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Saiti, A., & Saitis, C. (2006). In-service training for teachers who work in full-day schools –evidence from Greece. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(4), 455–470.
- Sandholtz, J. H. (2002). In-service training or professional development: Contrasting opportunities in a school /university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 815-830.
- Sokel, F. (2019). The effectiveness of a professional development course: teachers' perceptions. *ELT Journal*, 73(4), 409–418.
- Uysal, H. H. (2012). Evaluation of an in-service training program for primary-school language teachers in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(7). Retrieved from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol37/iss7/2>
- Uztosun, M. S. (2018). In-service teacher education in Turkey: English language teachers' perspectives. *Professional Development in Education*, 44(4), 557-569, Doi: 10.1080/19415257.2017.1374989

- Vukelich, C., & Wrenn, L. C. (1999). Quality professional development: What do we think we know? *Childhood Education*, 75(3), 153-160.
- Wallace, M. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waters, A. (2006). Facilitating follow-up in ELT INSET. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 32-52.
- Waters, A. & Vilches, M. L. C. (2000). Integrating teacher learning: the school-based follow up development activity. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 126-134.
- Wedell, M. (2011). More than just 'technology': English language teaching initiatives as complex educational changes. In H. Coleman (Ed). *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. London: British Council, 213-234.
- Wolter, B. (2000). A participant-centered approach to INSET course design. *ELT Journal*, 54(4), 311-318.
- Yan, C. (2005). INSET participation and certification: A case study from China. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 31(3), 471-484.

Appendix 1



Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education
The Ethical Issues Declaration Form For Authors

Article Title	EFL Teachers' Views and Needs on In-service Training as a Part of Professional Development: A Case Study in Turkish Context
Discipline	English Language Teaching
Type of Article	Research Article
Year of Data Collection	October 2018 – August 2019

As the author of the article, I declare in this form that scientific and ethical rules are followed in this article and that the article does not require the permission of ethical committee for the reason that **the quantitative data was collected between the dates October 2018 – June 2019, and focus group interviews were conducted in August 2019.**

Date: 07 May 2020

Authors' Info and Signatures

Authors	Institute	Title	Name	Signature
1.	Independent Researcher	Dr.	Okan ÖNALAN	
2.	Bursa Uludağ University	Prof.Dr.	Esim GÜRSOY	
3.				

Correspondent Author's Info

Institute	Independent Researcher (Dr. Okan ÖNALAN)
Postal address	Aşağı Dikmen Mah.588. Sokak No:8/5 Çankaya - ANKARA
E-mail	okanonalan@gmail.com
Phone	00905326777909