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Evaluating the Inservice Training Programme Provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates in Regards to Contemporary Trends

Abstract

This study aimed at evaluating the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in the light of contemporary trends. It focused on identifying the strengths and weaknesses in the current programme through trainees and trainers’ perceptions, reactions and points of views. Furthermore, it aimed at suggesting a practical framework for a future inservice training programme for English language teachers.

To fulfill the aims of the study, the researcher followed the descriptive analytical approach. Three tools were used to collect the needed data involving:

1. A document analysis of 43 lists distributed into four categories to formulate a set of 15 contemporary principles which are used to evaluate high quality INSET programmes.
2. A six-domain questionnaire to find out trainees’ views and reactions towards the current inservice training programme
3. A focused group interview to gather data on trainers’ levels of satisfaction of the inservice training programme.

Several procedures and statistical tests were used to ensure tools validity and reliability. The study whole community consisted of 20 female and 26 male teachers who were enrolled in the INSET programme within the last two years 2008, and 2009 along with 8 English supervisors.

Based on the analysis of data, the following were the most important findings:

1. A list of 15 contemporary principles was formulated; this list included comprehensive, recent and practical guidelines for those who are concerned with evaluating and designing inservice training programmes.
2. Through trainees and trainers’ reactions to the current INSET programme, it was found that:
   - The whole programme was perceived with an overall moderate satisfaction of about 61.54%.
   - Programmes’ resources and timing proved to be the most frequent cited shortcomings from both trainers and trainees’ point of views.
   - Programmes’ main strengths involve trainers, coherence and specific skills improvement.
   - There were no statistically differences in trainees’ responses due to gender or years of teaching experience variables.
   - There were statistically significant differences due to the educational district in favor of trainees in Gaza district.

Based on the results provided by the current study, the researcher proposed a suggested framework for a future INSET programme. This framework was inspired by the study findings, the 15 contemporary principles, the theoretical framework and previous studies’ recommendations. Other recommendations for main stakeholders as EDC policy makers, English teachers and supervisors were provided. Furthermore, recommendations for further studies were included too.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>National Centre for Education Statistics</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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Chapter I
Study Statement and Background

This chapter provides a preliminary introduction to the research problem. It introduces the potential need for conducting this study. In addition, it presents the questions of the study, the statement of problem, the purpose, the significance, the limitations and the definitions of the terms used within this study.

1.1 Introduction

*Read in the name of Allah who created. Created man from a clot. Read and Allah is the Most Honorable, Who taught to write with the pen. Taught man what he knew not* (The Holy Quran, Al-Alaq, 96; 1-5)

With these highly adored Quranic words, Muhammed, Peace Be Upon Him (PBUH), was honored to be the last prophet. Reciting these verses of the Holy Quran, for the first time, he turned from an illiterate who never attended schools to the greatest leader of the magnificent Islamic civilization. This is the essence of Islam, a religion which liberates mankind from their first enemy, ignorance, a religion which celebrates knowledge and considers it a sacred duty upon both men and women. The Holy Qur’an confirms that, “Allah elevates to high positions those from amongst you who are faithful and those who have acquired knowledge”. (Al-Mujadilah, 58:11). Also, Almighty Allah questions humans, "Are those equal, those who know and those who do not know?" (Al-Zumr: 9), "Allah grants wisdom to whom He pleases and to whom wisdom is granted indeed he receives an overflowing benefit." (Al-Baqarah: 269). Furthermore, our Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) tells Muslims that seeking knowledge is an obligation for believing men and women even if that means traveling far away. Moreover, the Prophet says: "Whoever follows a path in the pursuit of knowledge, Allah will make a path to Paradise easy for him.” (Al-Bukhaari, p.54).
The Quranic celebration of knowledge and holiness of learning has resulted in considering teaching a holy mission; it is placed on the highest rank of nobility as close to the level of prophets. Prophet Muhammed, (PBUH), proudly declared that teaching is a prominent part of his prophethood. He has been sent to be the ideal teacher of all mankind "We have sent thee (O Muhammed) but as a universal teacher to all mankind, to give glad tidings and warn (mankind) against sin, but most men understand not" (Saba, 34:28).

The knowledge that Islam praises is of a constantly changing nature. The Holy Quran repeatedly asks Muslims to think, learn, and reflect upon every action and creation. Our Prophet Muhammed (PBUH) asks Allah for increase in nothing but, "Oh, Lord, increase my knowledge!" (Taha, 20:114). Thus, it is important for Muslims to update their knowledge and engage in continuous learning as Prophet Muhammed says in one of his Hadiths "seek knowledge from cradle to grave".( Al-Bukhaari, p.58)

Knowledge primacy and the sanctity of teaching profession, praised by Islam hundreds of years ago, are recognized today as key markers on nations’ reform agendas. In the new millennium, with globalization and rapid technological advancements, education is viewed as a human investment, a key determiner of nations’ economic, social developments; hence, countries all over the world are currently engaged in serious educational reform initiatives and allocating tremendous budgets for such purposes. (Reimers, 2003, p.7)

Despite the fact that plenty of policies, philosophies, agendas, and theories, have been proposed by researchers and policy makers within educational reform initiatives, nearly all of these initiatives share a common focus which is, the urgent demand for creating high quality teachers. Therefore, the recognition of teacher's crucial role in bringing out positive changes is, nowadays, a widely spread and a dominant phenomenon.
Recently, teachers are not viewed as only one of the variables that affect the success of reform initiatives; rather, they are "the most significant change agents within these reforms" (Reimers, 2003, p.7). According to MacDonald (1991, p. 3 cited in Lamie 2002, p.150) "It is the quality of the teachers themselves and nature of their commitment to change that determine the quality of teaching and the quality of school improvement".

Equally, Idris; Cheong; Razak; and Saad, (2007) highlight the impact teachers have as key factors in every successful education reform initiative. They ascertain that:

No matter how good is the curriculum, infrastructure, or teaching aids at the end of the day, it is the teacher who can make a difference….Teachers are valuable human resources that a nation can count upon to mould and nurture its young minds.(p. 102)

In this fashion, the success of educational reforms depends to a large extent on the effectiveness of the teachers’ involvement as agreed on by Corcoran 1995, 1998, 2007; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Remeirs 2003;and Dayag 2006.

This widely spread recognition of teachers’ effective roles in education reform initiatives has led educational scholars, researchers, and policymakers to prioritize all opportunities which may contribute to creating such teachers. This serious prioritization has initiated a vital demand for reconsidering all issues related to teacher making as, initial training, induction programmes and most importantly, inservice training (INSET) or what is known today as professional development (PD) or continuing professional development (CPD).

Currently, inservice training, or professional development has gained much attention and is a key stone in every single reform initiative in different parts of the world. It is considered a national urgent target in several countries. The Australian Government Department of Education (cited in Philips, 2008, p. 1) states that the government key priority is to raise the quality of professionalism and status of teachers and confirms that "professional development for teachers is a vital component of policies to enhance the quality of teaching and learning in schools." In a similar vein, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT, 2002, p.2) recognizes
Continuous high quality professional development is essential to nation’s goals of high standards learning for every child. Furthermore, AFT, (2002) confesses that:

The nation can set for visionary scenarios, compile the best research about how students learn, change text books and assessment …change all elements involved in systematic reforms but without professional development, school reform and improved achievement for all students will not happen… the dream will not be realized. (p.2)

In addition, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2005, p.4) which reviewed teacher training policies in twenty five countries states that the policy priority within these countries “was to improve the provision of professional development since teachers are the most stated significant sources”.

Having acknowledged such priority, educationalists, and researchers have come to admit that "the relationship between educational reforms and teachers professional development is a two-way or reciprocal relationship", (Remeirs, 2003, p.24), and “if there is a chance for professional development, there is a great potential for school, classroom improvement” (Muijs, &Lindsay, 2005, p.4). In addition, Desimone and Smith (2006) argue that:

Professional development is considered an essential mechanism for deepening teachers' content knowledge and developing their practices, thus the lasting success of standard based, reform initiatives hangs in large part on the qualifications and effectiveness of teachers, consequently, teachers professional development is a major- focus of current systematic reform- initiatives. (p.119)

In the same way, Alwan (2000, p.33) clarifies that "professional development is the answer to the pressing demands of the teaching profession". Also, Guskey (1995, p.1) states that, "never before in the history of education has there been greater recognition of the importance of professional development". Guskey (2002, p.4) further emphasizes that, “at the core of each and every successful improvement effort, is a thoughtfully conceived well- designed and well-supported professional development components.".
1.2 Need for the Study

With the universal recognition of INSET (Inservice Training) or PD (Professional development) as a key marker on educational reform agendas, conducting the current study is strongly needed. This need springs from two main facts; firstly; INSET faulty perceptions; with many teachers, educators, and theorists who still delimit INSET to the attendance of one-shot workshops or one or two-day training sessions. INSET is not seen as a continuous, broad and a systematic process where it acts as expressed by Henderson, (1978, p. 125) “like a tonic or an injection which gives life, continuity and renewal to most of the teaching practices”. Thus, this study attempts to present a more valid, comprehensive and innovative concept of INSET.

Secondly, this study is strongly needed since, as far as the researcher knows, no real attempt was taken to evaluate any INSET programme for UNRWA Gaza English teachers in particular. This study may be the first in this field; moreover, the intended evaluation is just a means to an end which is suggesting an effective framework for future English in-service training in the light of teachers' needs and expectations.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Working as a teacher in UNRWA schools in Gaza for more than twelve years, the researcher notices that English teachers, particularly, novice ones are experiencing a sort of dilemma in their journey of establishing a stable professional identity. Even experienced teachers seem so desperate in looking for opportunities to grow professionally, to handle their difficulties and to improve their teaching effectiveness. They always reflect a kind of inability to cope with real challenges in the field, especially, with the implementation of the new curriculum English for Palestine where experiencing the full potentials of this curriculum can never be achieved in the absence of highly qualified, competent and well-trained teachers. Hence, this
study attempts to explore the reality of the current in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers. It aims to find out the programm’s main strengths and weaknesses. Thus, the problem of the study can be stated in the following main question:

- What are the main strengths and weaknesses found in the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in regards to the contemporary trends?

1.4 Research Questions

The above-mentioned question encompasses the following sub-questions which this study attempts to answer:

1. What are the main aims and features of the current in-service training programme available for UNRWA English teachers?

2. What are the stated principles for evaluating inservice training programmes in the light of the available contemporary trends?

3. To what extent does the in-service training programme meet trainees' needs from their own perspectives?

4. Are there statistically significant differences at (α ≤ 0.05) level between the trainees’ levels of satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to gender, educational district, and years of teaching experience variables?

5. To what extent are trainers satisfied with the current in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers?

6. What are the main features of the suggested inservice training programme in the light of the cited weaknesses?
1.5 Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of the study is to evaluate the currently used INSET programme available for UNRWA English teachers through Educational Development Centre (EDC). To achieve this overall purpose, the study seeks:

1. To describe the main aims and features of the current in-service training programme available for UNRWA teachers.
2. To formulate a set of main principles for evaluating in-service training programmes in the light of the current contemporary trends.
3. To evaluate the current in-service training programme through trainees’ views and reactions.
4. To find out to what extent trainers are satisfied with the current in-service training programme.
5. To measure if there are statistically significant difference between averages in levels of satisfaction regarding the in-service training programme due to trainees’ gender, years of teaching experience and the educational district variables.
6. To propose a practical framework for a future in-service training programme in the light of the study findings.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study is significant due to the following factors:

1. It is the first and the only study, as far as the researcher knows, which focuses on evaluating in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in Gaza Strip.
2. It presents a set of comprehensive and well detailed contemporary principles for evaluating inservice training programmes.

3. It presents a practical framework for evaluating PD programmes, at the time where most of evaluations are done in random, simple and superficial forms.

4. It helps in investigating teachers' real needs and expectations for INSET.

5. It suggests a practical framework for effective future training programmes.

The study is significant for:

- English language teachers in voicing their real needs, perceptions, and expectations.
- English language supervisors who will tailor any forthcoming training to satisfy their teachers' needs and expectations.
- Pre-service and higher education institutions including universities and colleges in gaining insights of main pre service insufficiencies.
- Stakeholders and decision makers in UNRWA, Educational Development Centre and in the Ministry of Education when designing future training programmes.

1.7 Context of the Study

This study is concerned with evaluating the current in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in Gaza. The INSET programme investigated is run by Educational Development Centre (EDC) which belongs to the Institute of Education in Jordan. Chapter four presents a full description of EDC main goals, policies and the strategies by which the INSET programmes are planned and carried out.
1.8 Scope of the study

The limitations of the study can be outlined in the following points:

1. The study involved UNRWA English teachers who participated in the in-service training programme in the last two years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009.
2. The study is conducted through the scholastic year 2009 -2010
3. The evaluation is done in the light of 15 principles presenting the contemporary trends in INSET literature.

1.9 Definitions of the Operational Terms

In-Service Training (INSET), Professional Development (PD) or Continuous Professional development CPD

The concept of INSET or what is known today as PD or CPD has been defined differently by scholars. Traditionally, INSET is confined to one-shot workshops or training courses. Friedman and Philips (2004, cited in Fraser et al. 2007, p. 156) indicate that, "professional development activities are often perceived in terms of training courses linked to work or gaining a qualification". Innovatively, INSET, PD or CPD is dealt with today as a systematic and intentional process characterized with broadness, and continuity. Craft (2000) clarifies that professional development refers to:

A broad range of activities designed to contribute to the learning of teachers or … all types of professional learning undertaken by teachers beyond the point of initial training. (p.15)

Throughout this study, the researcher uses INSET term as it is the term employed by UNRWA to describe the current training programme. This term is operationally defined as “a set of structured activities involved in one year training course aiming at enhancing teacher's performance and skills.”
Evaluation

Evaluation can be defined as “the systematic gathering of information for purposes of making decisions” (Richards, 1985, p.286) Similarly, Weir and Roberts (1994) define evaluation as:

The systematic collection and analysis of all relevant information necessary to promote the improvement of the curriculum, and assess its effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the participants' attitudes within a context of particular institutions involved. (p.4)

The researcher adopts the definition provided by Barzaq, (2007, p. 13) who defines evaluation as "The systematic acquisition and assessment of information to provide useful feedback about some object, programme or activity".

UNRWA

United Nations Relief and Works Agency was established in 1949 as one of UN main agencies. This agency is concerned with Palestinian refugees, mainly in Gaza Strip, West Bank, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria. UNRWA main services include education, health care and social services. Education is UNRWA’s top priority in Gaza; it established the Educational Development Centre which is responsible for conducting inservice training programmes.

UNRWA English Teachers

Throughout this study, UNRWA English teachers are referred to as trainees. They are the teachers appointed by UNRWA through fixed term contracts to teach English for Palestine starting from grade one to the ninth grade in both primary and preparatory schools.

Contemporary Trends

Within this study, contemporary trends are used to refer to the description of the current scene of teachers’ inservice training. This scene involves a focus on up-to-date theories, principles, innovations, criteria and recent views of INSET. Tracing the contemporary trends within this study is done through surveying four main categories including, ten policy lists, ten researchers’ lists, twelve INSET studies, and eleven countries survey.
The 43 lists in the four categories are compared, analyzed, to formulate a final set of 15 principles which constitutes the common trends available in INSET literature today.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a relevant introduction to the research problem. Besides, it highlighted the indispensable necessity of carrying out this study. It also introduced the study statement of problem, the research questions, the purpose, the significance, and the limitations of the study. Throughout this preliminary introduction, it can be deduced that INSET is of a crucial impact on educational quality. It is a decisive change agent of an endless power. However, this power and changing ability are constrained by several misconceptions; an alternative innovative concept of INSET is needed. The following chapter is a step on the track; it aims to handle INSET misconceptions clarifying its importance, real identity and uniqueness.
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Introduction

Chapter two reviews the relevant literature which inspires the research work and provides the theoretical and the experimental background information that guides the presented study.

This chapter is presented into two sections, the theoretical framework and the previous studies relevant to the current study. The first theoretical section discusses several issues related to the concept of professional development (PD) or in-service training (INSET), its main trends, qualities, importance, goals, impact, models and INSET phases. It ends with presenting 15 contemporary principles of high quality INSET programmes. The second section in this chapter; deals with the previous studies which the researcher reviewed. It presents 47 studies grouped thematically into three categories. Each study’s main aims; participants, methodology, and results are briefly outlined and commented on.

Section I
Theoretical Framework

2.1 Trends in INSET

Given INSET a significant placement on educational reform agendas, a vast rich literature has been devoted to such concept. A broad spectrum of terms and a wide range of definitions have been suggested by researchers, organizations, policymakers, within several reference works, reports and research studies. With such broadness, finding one agreed upon definite concept or terminology for INSET might turn out to be a rather difficult task. Researchers as (Bolam et. al 1995, Muijs and Lindsy 2005; Fraser; Kennedy; Reid; Mckinney2007; Lee,1997) argue that the literature on INSET is led by a lack of agreed on concepts or terms, "It is not a clear cut concept" (Bolam et al. 1995, p.27), “It has always been left ill defined”
(Muijs and Lindsy, 2005, p.1), and "it is typified by conceptual vagueness" (Fraser et al. 2007, p. 155)

The difficulty of finding an agreed upon clear cut definition of INSET may be due to the unlimited number of terms used to describe this concept. Neil (1986, p. 58) made a list of these terms which are associated with INSET including terms as Inservice Education, Curriculum Innovation, Organizational Renewal, Staff Development, and Continuing Teacher Education.

Despite the problem of INSET conceptualization, it may seem quite clear that there are two main trends dominating these concepts, a traditional trend and a more innovative one as will be discussed below.

2.1.1 Traditional Trend

The traditional trend of INSET was prevalent since 1960 to 1990. It confines INSET to attending one-shot formal training sessions. These sessions aim to fix identified gaps or shortages in teachers’ skills and expertise.

Several researchers show that even teachers themselves are captured with such traditional trend. They always equate INSET with short training workshops (Bolam et al., 1995; Hustler et al., 2003; and Boyle et al., 2003). Accordingly, traditional INSET was perceived in the form of training sessions carried out for a few days of the school year. Teachers were chosen previously and pulled off from their classrooms into training centers after a long and hard school day, to be lectured on areas mainly out of their concerns and away from their harsh realities. When these training sessions are over, teachers were sent back to their unchanged realities without any chance for getting support in applying whatever skills or knowledge may be acquired (Guskey, 2002, p. 20-22).

Therefore, it seems that many educators called for a complete rejection of the traditional trend of INSET. In the last two decades, researchers have cautioned against working under
the umbrella of this trend (Abed Hagg 1996; Darling Hammond & McLaughlin 1995; Leiberman 1995; Craft 2000; Guskey 2002; Spark & Hirsh 1997; Clark 1992; Iemjinda 2007; Alwan 2000; Sarsar 2008, Spark 2003; Cohen & Hill 2000; Yoon et al., 2007). This rejection can be explained in the light of traditional INSET inadequacies. These insufficiencies go from being "one-size fits all.” to “being grounded in a disease mode.” Clark (1992, p.79 cited in Sarsar, 2008, p.5)

In other words, traditional trend of INSET limitations can be summarized as follows (Sparks and Hirsh 1997; Guskey, 2000- 2002; Craft, 2000; Iemjinda, 2007; Sandholtz, 2008; Sarsar, 2008)

1. The deficit model adopted in this trend with the assumption that “teachers have deficits in knowledge and skills that can be fixed by training.” Clark (1992, p.72 cited in Sarsar, 2008, p.5).

2. Top-down delivered topics which involve general theoretical instructional concepts and fragmented ideas, disconnected from teachers’ day to day classroom practices.

3. Passive roles assigned to the participating teachers. It is a process done to teachers not with them” (Sarsar, 2008,p.4) where teachers sit as expressed by (Sandholtz, 2008, p. 815) “silent as stones. Such decontextualization sends teachers to offsite courses to "sit and get” (Sparks and Hirsh, 1997, p.4).

4. Limited impact where no opportunities for follow up and support are provided.

In brief, the traditional trend of INSET has always been criticized as it is "intellectually superficial, disconnected from deep issues of curriculum and learning, fragmented and noncumulative " (Cohen& Hill, 1998, p.3-4) or as in Abed El-Hagg (1996, p.15) who illustrates that traditional inservice training is often criticized for being “fragmented, unproductive, inefficient, unrelated to practice and lacking intensity and follow up".
The previous shortcomings gave rise to an opposing innovative trend of INSET as illustrated below.

2.1.2 Innovative Trend

The innovative trend reconceptualizes INSET with more innovative terms as professional development (PD) or more recently as Continuous Professional Development (CPD). Several factors were behind such reconceptualisation as clarified by Craft (2000):

Due to rapid changes, demands for high standards; and calls for improving quality, teachers have a need for continuous updating of their knowledge and skills, through professional development or what was formerly known as inservice training or inservice education. (p.12)

This reconceptualization has been confirmed through several researchers (Bayrakci 2001; Conco 2005; Day 1999; Bolam et al., 1995; Gasky 2000, 2002; Muijs & Lindsy 2005, Remeirs 2003; Darling, Hummomd & Maclaughlin 1996; Craft, 2000). These researchers confirm that INSET is no longer perceived as one shot-size fits all workshops, rather, it is a broad, continuous and a systematic process which aims at improving teaching as a profession and teachers as professionals.

2.2 Qualities of INSET

INSET in the innovative trend is characterized with three determining qualities involving broadness, continuity and being a systematic intentional process. These qualities will be further discussed below.

2.2.1 Broadness

Broadness is one of the three key qualities of INSET innovative definitions. It assumes that INSET is not limited to forms of one-shot workshops. It rather includes a wide range of activities including formal, informal, individual, and organizational models. This quality has been proved through several definitions introduced through several researchers (Bayrakci
An example of these definitions is offered by Guskey (2000, p.6) who confirms that INSET occurs "every time a lesson is taught, an assessment is administered, a curriculum is reviewed or a professional journal or magazine is read". Also, Remeirs (2003, p. 11) clarifies that INSET includes formal experience such as attending workshops courses as well as informal experience as reading publication and watching T.V documentaries. Similarly, Ganser (2000) states that INSET is also a broader concept which includes both formal and "informal activities as reading professional publications meeting, and television watching". For Ganser, " make and take workshops of 1960-1970 are no longer beneficial" (p.5).

2.2.2 Continuity of INSET

The innovative trend shows that INSET is a continuous life-long learning process in which educators must engage to keep abreast of recent changes. A good deal of INSET definitions attempted describing INSET as a continuous life long process leaving behind one-shot traditional trend. (Conco, 2005; Bayrakci, 2009; Frazer et al., 2007; OBrein, 2009; Imijinda, 2007).

An example of such definitions is the one introduced by Abed-Haleem (2008, p.58) who defines INSET as: "An evolving process of professional self disclosure, reflection and growth that yields best results when sustained over time ". In a similar vein, Hammound and Macluaghlin (1996, p.203) define professional development as "deepening teacher's understanding about teaching and learning process which must begin with pre-service education and continue throughout teacher's career”.

2.2.3 Systematic and Intentional Process

This quality implies that INSET is not a haphazard process, it is a planned, purposeful, and an intentional process designed to achieve specific clear goals. Guskey (2002, p.15) clarifies that
INSET is not “a set of randomly chosen activities that have no clear direction or intent” rather INSET programmes "are systematic efforts to bring about changes in the classroom practices of teacher attitudes, and beliefs and in learning outcomes of students” (Guskey, 2002, p. 38).

To conclude, INSET prolonged journey started with a traditional trend limited to one-shot training workshops delivered in one or two days. From 1990s and onwards a shift was made concerning what is meant by INSET. Recently an innovative trend is prevalent which considers INSET a systematic, ongoing, and an intentional process. This process leads to improvements at all levels through employing broad range of recent models focusing on reflection, growth and feedback.

2.3 Importance of INSET

In recent times, INSET is considered an urgent priority, and an integral part of all attempts of educational reforms. Several factors discussed by several educators make INSET of a supreme importance. (Guskey, 2002; Lakshami, 2009; El-Saeed 1995; Bohi and Baumi, 2002; El-Khateeb 1998; Abu-Salem 2008; OECD 2005,2009; Remeirs 2003; Rashed, 2002). These factors can be summarized as follows:

1. Pre-service insufficiencies since many researchers; Southworth 1996; Richards and Farrel 2005; Yigit 2008; Cimer et al., 2010, believe that there is not any single teacher education programme which can equip teachers with all skills, values and knowledge they will need to cope with realities and challenges in their life-long career. Mohammed, (2006, p.4) admits that teachers should be provided regularly with chances to improve their knowledge on subject matter and teaching skills since "whatever knowledge or skills teachers acquire in their pre-service becomes stale as new challenges and realities emerge".

2. The dynamic nature of educational theories, everyday; educationalists come up with new knowledge, skills, theories and methods.
3. The rapid technological, economic and social changes which place education at the core of nation’s advancement.

4. Teachers assumed roles, expertise, responsibilities, stressful duties have changed respectively. Teaching has come to be a profession with several duties to accomplish, roles to play, new knowledges and skills to master and multiple urgent needs to meet. (Remeirs, 2003; Atay, 2004). The old scenario where teachers are seen as disseminators of knowledge is replaced with a new scenario in which teachers are seen as facilitators, researchers, reflective practitioners, and strategists. (Lackshami,2009, p.12)

As far as ELT is concerned, INSET for EFL or ELT teachers is an indispensable part of their professional identities for two main reasons: (Khanal, 2006, p.127)

1- Bridging the gap between non-native English teachers and native teachers in relation to language issues

2- The ever changing nature of ELT methodology and language learning theories.

Similarly, Richards and Farrell (2005, p.2) declare that “knowledge about language teaching and learning is in a tentative and incomplete state and teachers need regular opportunities to update their professional knowledge”. Also, Richards and Rodgers (2001 cited in Khanal, 2006, p.121) state that language teachers should try to expand their roles and responsibilities over time if they want to find “language teaching rewarding ", furthermore, they confirm that, “The quality of language teaching will improve if teachers use the best available approaches and methods.”

Finally, INSET programmes can help language teachers to improve their language proficiency, as well as catching up with all social, technological and knowledge changes in the educational world today as declared by Richards and Farrell (2005, p.1) “not everything teachers need to know can be provided at pre service level as well as the fact that the knowledge base of teaching constantly changes”
2.4 Goals of INSET

For many years, teachers and educators have counted on using training courses to improve their skills, meet certification requirements, attain salary increase and other several purposes. Recently, more focus and appreciation are given to INSET activities since their impact is not limited to individual levels, but also extends to involve overall school development and students achievement (Abdal-Haqq, 1996).

Several goal statements are proposed by many specialists. Below some of them are listed briefly:

Marsh (1987, p.56) outlines two main reasons for taking INSET courses as:

1. Personal reasons, guided by a need to recharge batteries, to have a break, or a needed change after so many years of teaching;
2. Professional reasons, aiming for keeping up-to-date, with new developments and new roles.

More recently, Ozer (2004, p.96) declares that teachers need INSET activities to fulfill the following purposes:

1. Enriching their views and understanding on general education;
2. Renewing and refreshing their knowledge in their specific teaching fields;
3. Increasing their professional respect and satisfaction;
4. Improving their knowledge and skills in methodology.

Besides, Yigit (2008, p.70) shows that INSET can help teachers to:

1. Reflect on their own performance;
2. Anticipate and prepare for change;
3. Improve their job-performance skills.

In the same way, Ulker & Tas (2009, p.275) summarize the main objectives of INSET as follows:
1. Informing teachers about changes in their fields;
2. Increasing teachers scientific, educational and individual qualifications;
3. Leading teachers to professional satisfaction;
4. Improving teachers’ performances.

Regardless of the endless numbers of goal statements and objectives that can be found in INSET literature today, it can be said that INSET targets two main aims:

Firstly, compensating for shortages or deficits in a particular teaching skill, curricular knowledge, or teaching expertise. INSET plays a vital role in handling pre service inadequacies since “pre service alone can never prepare teachers for a lifelong career" (AL-Shandawealy, 1990, p.3), in addition, "there is no pre-service education or training programme that can offer a codified body of knowledge or recipe to warrant success during the teaching career " (Cimer et al., 2010, p.31). Furthermore, Southworth (1996 citedin Yigit, 2008:70) declares that “school teachers do not come ready made from universities or other initial training routes”. This type of training as Southworth points out, "can only at best provide teachers with primary introduction to the skills and demands of class teaching."

Several reports and researchers have proved the insufficiency of initial training programmes, for example, a report by the National Centre for Education Statistics (NCES) in USA (1999) which concludes that the majority of teachers are underqualified to meet the demands of the profession. Such underqualification can be compensated only through INSET activities. In the same way, Al-Mutawa (1997, p59) confirms the inadequacy of EFL pr-eservice education in Kuwait and assumes that:

There is a need for several intensive inservice training courses and workshops to upgrade the linguistic and teaching competencies irrespective of EFL teacher’s type of qualification and teaching experience. (p.56)
Within the Palestinian context, Barzaq (2007) and Darweesh et al., (2009) have shown the insufficiencies of the pre service education programmes in Gaza. They recommend the inclusion of innovative training courses which should invest self-directed INSET models. These models help in creating high quality teachers who can keep abreast with the changing demands of the teaching profession. They also recommend the necessity of providing teachers with opportunities for discussion and self-reflection through innovative INSET. (Darweesh et al., 2009, p.4; Barzaq, 2007, p.222)

Secondly; INSET programs are also effective tools of bringing out positive changes and achieving development. They bridge the gap between the rapid advancing fields of knowledge in the world today and classroom realities, as clarified by Yigit (2008, p.69) "As world changes and evolves, upgrading the quality of pre-service and in-service is one central concern for educational systems of many countries".

In brief, INSET plays an important role in remedying inadequacies of pre service and providing teachers with needed skills, expertise, knowledge, and a repertoire of effective strategies that can enhance their teaching practices inside classrooms. Furthermore, INSET programmes help teachers to keep on track with the recent developments in their fields, to brush up on their previous knowledge and recharge their batteries. (Imijinda, 2007, p.16)

Thus, “the journey from a novice teacher into becoming an expert teacher will be facilitated, quickened and made less stressful by well-planned CPD” (Mohammed, 2006, p.6).

2.5 Impact of INSET

2.5.1 Impact on Teachers

INSET programmes are of high quality when they succeed in bringing about positive changes in teachers’ practices, skills, attitudes and beliefs. It is confirmed that the ultimate goal of any INSET programme is to maintain three main areas of changes:

1. Changes in teachers’ practices;
2. Changes in students’ learning outcomes;


Early theories on teacher change introduced a traditional model of this phenomenon as proposed by Lewin (1935 cited in Guskey, 2002, p.382). Within this model, changes in teacher's practices occur only after maintaining changes in teacher's beliefs and attitudes, finally, changes in students learning outcomes can occur as shown in Figure (2.1) below:

![Figure 2.1: Traditional Model of Teacher Change (Lewin, 1935 cited in Guskey 2002, p.382)](image)

This sequence may explain reasons of several INSET programmes insufficiencies. Such ineffectiveness may be attributed to the fact that these programmes tried to change teachers’ attitudes and beliefs, in a relatively short time. In addition, these programmes have failed in giving teachers the chance to be convinced of these programmes’ practical impact on students learning outcomes.
In contrast of the previous model, an alternative model was suggested by (Gusky, 2002: 386) as shown in Figure (2.2) below:

![Figure 2.2: The Alternative Model of Teacher Change. Proposed by Guskey (2002, p.386)](image)

As it is shown in Figure (2.2) above, this model presents a different sequence of the three areas of changes with change in teacher's attitudes and beliefs delayed at the end of process. Changes in teacher's beliefs and attitudes can occur only if teachers are convinced of the changes’ positive impacts on students learning outcomes. In other words, according to the sequence proposed in the previous model, the INSET programme changes teachers practices, but it will not lead to deeper changes in teachers beliefs and attitudes unless teachers have a clear evidence of changes ability in translating into improved students gains. According to Guskey (2002, p. 385) “Teachers believe it works because they have seen it wok “. In this way, the INSET programme alone cannot lead to positive changes, rather, the successful implementation and the improved students gains can.

Several implications can be induced in light of Guskey’s model as:

1. Teacher change as a result of INSET programmes is a difficult, gradual and painful process which needs extra time and support.

2. Changes cannot be imposed on teachers unless teachers themselves assume responsibility for their own growth and development. This premise may gain validity with what is cited in our Holy Quran, when Almighty Allah states that: ".Verily! Allah will not change the
(good) condition of a people as long as they do not change their state (of goodness) themselves …. " (Al-Rae'd; 11-12).

3. The importance of providing teachers with continuous and systematic feedback on their students’ improvements.

4. Focusing on teachers’ deep-seated beliefs and their prior experience and providing them with chances for reflection.

5. Providing teachers with chances to experience the changes before embracing them.

To sum up, teachers change through INSET programmes is a highly arguable issue in INSET literature, thus, it is no wonder that limited number of INSET studies attempted to evaluate the INSET impact in terms of teacher change as will be discussed in “Previous Studies” section.

### 2.5. 2 Impact on Students

The recent placement of INSET programmes at the heart of education reform initiatives and the universal admission of its key role in bringing about positive educational changes have led to increasing demands for clear-cut answers or proofs on the impact of INSET on students' learning outcomes. Several researchers (Cohen & Hill 1998-2000; Garet et al., 2001; Darling–Hummound, 1999, 2000, 2005, 2006; Guskey & Spark 1996, 2002; Kennedy 1998; Louks- Horsely 1996) have suggested that INSET programmes affect students’ achievements into three main ways:

1. INSET enhances teachers knowledge and skills;

2. Better knowledge and skills improve classroom teaching practices;

3. Improved teaching practices raise students’ achievements as shown in Figure (2.3) next page:
Figure (2.3) above illustrates one way simple relationship between INSET programmes and students' learning outcomes. Nevertheless, proving that certain improvements in students' learning outcomes have occurred as a result of INSET programmes only is a highly debatable issue and tremendously challenging task. Several researchers (Yoon et al., 2007; Guskey 2000; Guskey & Sparks 2002) argue that the relationship between INSET programmes and students' learning outcomes is a complex and multifaceted with indefinite number of variables involved where it is difficult to isolate these variables and institute a casual correlation between these two.

Several researches attempted to prove if INSET programmes can translate into positive gains in students' achievements, researchers as (Saxe et al., 2001; Tierken, 2003) have come to prove a positive correlation between these two, while a quite deal of other researchers (Carpenter et al., 1989 ; Yoon et al., 2007) have failed.

Constituting two-way relationship between INSET and students learning outcomes seems a tremendously challenging task. The debatable challenging task of constituting this correlation may be attributed to the endless numbers of variables involved, thus , it is no wonder that few researches and studies can be counted upon when investigating the correlation between INSET and students achievements as will be further discussed in "Previous studies" section.
In brief, the success of INSET programmes today is examined in terms of its impact upon teachers and improved students' achievements. Investigating the correlation between these phenomena is still a heavy burden. So far, limited proofs have been achieved in this concern, thus leaving the door open for further researchers and further studies.

2.6 Models of INSET

With the new realization of teachers as professionals and teaching as a life-long learning profession, traditional models of inservice training in forms of training courses and workshops are no longer fitting. Today, several alternative innovative models are proposed through several researchers (Alwan, 2000; Remeirs 2003; Desimone et al., 2002; Kennedy 2005; Guskey, 2000). These various models are grouped differently either through their settings, scopes or their adopted trends as illustrated below.

Several researchers classified INSET models according to the settings where they take place, for example, Liberman, (1996 cited in Rose and Reynolds, 2006, p.219) classifies INSET models into:

1. In-school models, such as peer coaching, critical friendships, mentoring, and action research;
2. Out of school models including networks, school visits, school-university partnership.

In a similar grouping, O’Brein (2004, p.23) states that most INSET models fall into three main categories as:

1. Outside models including formal training sessions or workshops;
2. Inside models including observation, action research, and study groups;
3. Outside-Inside models including schools-universities partnerships, and conferences.
A second set of researchers classifies INSET models according to their scopes; which involve either a small scope models at the level of teachers or a larger scope models involving the schools, universities and even the whole community.

An example of such grouping is introduced by Remeries, (2003, p.69) who classifies INSET models into two sections:

1. Organizational partnership models;
2. Small group or individual models as shown in the Figure (2.5) below;

![Figure (2.4): Models of INSET (Remeirs, 2003, p.70)](image)

Furthermore, a third set of INSET researchers groups INSET models according to the trend adopted either traditionally or innovatively. An example is presented by Desimone et al. (2002, p. 85) who divide INSET models into two types:

1. Traditional models including workshops and seminars.
2. Reform models including school-based activities, teaching communities, teachers’ networks, mentoring and peer coaching.

In parallel, Alwan (2000, p. 17-44) divides INSET models into two main categories:
1. Training with the traditional notion of INSET including courses, seminars or workshops.

2. Innovative self-directed developmental models including activities as reflection and peer observation, and journals writing.

Grouping INSET models in terms of their adopted traditional or innovative trends seems more common and is in accordance with what stated previously in INSET trends. Hence, in what follows, two main sets of INSET are chosen by the researcher as illustrated by Figure (2.6) below.

As shown in Figure (2.6) above, two categories of INSET models are chosen; including traditional models and innovative models. The innovative models are divided into two types; collaborative and self-directed models, furthermore, collaborative models are subdivided into small-scale and larger-scale. The figure also presents the three examples cited for each category involving study groups, school-university partnership and teaching journals. These models and examples are detailed below along with each model merits and demerits.
2.6.1 Traditional Models

They are the most common and dominant models of INSET. They typically involve a presenter, or team of presenters sharing their expertise through a variety of group-based activities. (Hayes, 2000). Training formats include large group presentation, discussions, workshops, seminars, simulations, lectures and microteaching. In Joyce and Showers (1995, cited in OBrein 2004, p. 25), effective training goes into the following steps:

1. Explanation of a theory including discussions, reading or lectures to assist trainees to understand the ideas being presented;
2. Demonstration or modeling of skills in the form of videotape or live setting that can be integrated with explanations of theory;
3. Simulated practice of the required skill under simulated conditions;
4. Feedback about performance on the required skills from peers or experts;
5. Coaching in the workplace following initial training involving a supportive community of teachers to provide support and collegiality.

**Traditional Training Merits**

Traditional models are favored since they are: (Al-Khateeb & Al-Khateeb, 1986, p. 126)

1. Effective means of transferring new ideas and achieving short term immediate goals
2. Suitable for training large numbers of trainees with less effort and cost
3. Useful for preparation to take on new teaching assignments or new responsibilities

**Traditional Training Caveats**

Limitations of traditional training can be summarized in the following:

1. The off-site delivery of most training makes it disconnected from classroom context and realities.
2. Limited opportunities for teacher participation, involvement, or individualization.
2.6.2 Innovative models

The innovative models suggested by INSET researchers (Guskey, 2002; Remeirs, 2003; O'Brein, 2004; Alwan, 2000; Craft, 2000; Desimone et al., 2002; Abed-Haleem, 2008; Sandholtz, 2002; Atay, 2006) can be classified into two types: Collaborative Models and Self-Directed Models as illustrated below:

A. Self-Directed Models

These innovative models are guided by the assumption that teachers can best determine their needs. They learn more efficiently when they initiate and plan their learning activities rather than spending time on activities designed for them by others and not necessarily relevant to their needs. (Sparks & Louks- Horsely, 1989, p. 235).

Self-Directed Models Merits involve

1. Flexibility
2. Individually-centered
3. Self analysis and personal reflection
4. Thoughtful decision making

Self-Directed Models caveats involve

1. Little collaboration entailed
2. Chosen needs may be not sufficiently challenging worthwhile or carefully specified

Self –Directed models involve a wide range of models including, teaching journal, video-audio-self assessment and the use of portfolios.

B. Collaborative Models

They are based on the collaborative work maintained either at a small scale as a group of teachers working together in one school, or at a larger scale involving organizations, institutions, universities and even countries. Accordingly; these models can be subdivided into two types: small-scale models and large-scale models.
Large-scale collaborative models are implemented at larger levels, implying a certain organizational or institutional partnership as school-university partnership and distant education. On the other hand, small scale collaborative models are implemented at small levels including a school, or a classroom. Examples of these models involve peer observation, peer coaching, mentoring, study groups and action researches.

Three examples of innovative models are detailed including study groups, school-university partnership and teaching journals.

1. **Study groups**

Study groups or what may be known as learning circles, study circles, quality circles, or wisdom circles refer to “a group of teachers who meet regularly over a specific period of time to learn about, discuss issues of importance concerning their teaching performance” (Abed-Haleem, 2008, p.78). Study groups consist of entire school staff working together to find a solution to a common problem. The school staff is divided into groups of four to six, each group handles a different aspect of the shared problem.

**Study groups Merits**

Study groups may offer the following potentials, (Guskey, 2000; Abed Haleem, 2008)

1. Participants can manage their own learning targets
2. Improving self-reflection and developing negotiation skills
3. Reinforcing the idea of school as a learning community and encouraging collaboration
4. Enhancing the continual ongoing nature of INSET.

**Study Groups Caveats**

Study groups main pitfalls may involve:

1. Establishing successful study groups is a time and effort consuming process
2. Some participants in the group may take over the group while other participants may remain uninvolved.

In short, study groups have great potential for being successful models of INSET. They facilitate the implementation of curricula and instructional innovations. They can lead to successful opportunities for INSET if they are well planned, well-supported, carefully-structured and most importantly with small numbers of participants in each group.

**School-university partnerships**

This model constitutes initiating a partnership between schools and higher education institutions as universities. This partnership is "similar to a network in that it connects all practitioners who share common interests and concerns" Miller (2001 cited in Remeirs, 2003, p.75). According to Miller (2001, p.105 cited in Remeirs, 2003, p.75) school-university partnerships have four core aims:

1. Establishing firm bases for two distinct cultures, school and university
2. Crossing institutional boundaries to respond to needs in the field
3. Ensuring inclusive decision making
4. Creating new venues for educators development

**School-university partnerships Merits**

Creating such partnership between schools and institutions of higher education is a great responsibility but a worthy experience if well-designed and balanced. It can offer the following merits:

1. Enriching teachers expertise and practices in relation to curriculum content and teaching skills
2. Leading to increased knowledge, greater efficacy, and enhanced colloquial interaction
3. Breaking the silence and demolishing walls of isolation between classroom harsh realities and the utopic world of higher education institutions
4. Establishing two ways or reciprocal relationship between theorists (university professors) and practitioners (teachers). This relationship entails benefits for the partners involved where practitioners keep up to date with recent innovations in their disciplines and the theorists may be offered a valued chance for real experimentation and practical experience in the field. (O’Brein, & Christie, 2008)

School-university partnerships Caveats may involve

1. Planning successful school university partnerships may be a difficult task due to several administrative constraints as setting timings, places, resources and deciding on responsibilities.

2. The natural tension and the sense of competition among members of these institutions may impede constructing mutual trust and a respectful relationship. (Remeirs, 2003, p. 78).

In brief, “School university partnerships offer means of expanding INSET opportunities for teachers and moving away beyond the traditional models”. (Sandholtz, 2002, p. 828)

3. Teaching Journals

Teaching journals or what may be known as “Diary Studies” can be defined as "written or recorded accounts of teaching experience" (Alwan, 2000, p. 24). They are one of the recommended self-directed models in enriching teacher's INSET. They are highly favored since they change teachers into reflective practitioners. Reflection is a teacher-initiated and a teacher-directed process in which teachers engage in observing themselves, collecting data about their own classrooms roles, and using the data as a basis for changing, refining and evaluating their professional practices. Richards and Lockhart, (1994 cited in Lakshami 2007, p. 12).
According to Lakshami (2009, p.14) many different topics from classroom experience can be explored through teaching journals as:

1. Personal reactions to things that happen in the classroom
2. Questions or observations about barriers that occur in teaching
3. Descriptions of significant aspects of lessons or events
4. Ideas for future analysis or reminders of things to take action

When starting these journals, teachers are recommended to make entries on a regular basis and review the basis systematically. Furthermore, teachers are recommended to share their journals with other colleagues and to discuss them together. Teaching journals are thus a means of recording teachers’ personal thoughts, daily experience, and evolving insights. They provide teachers with chances for reflective practice which is a key component of teachers’ INSET. (Alwan’s 2000; Lakshami, 2009)

To conclude, it seems clear that there are various models of INSET presented in the educational literature, with a variety of terms and categorization. According to Guskey (2000, p.22), these various models, provide educators with a variety of options and opportunities to enhance their INSET. Although many of these models are not new, they have become more widely accepted as valid and effective models of INSET. As a result, no single model can be said to be the most effective for all communities in all conditions, what may be appropriate in a certain context, may be unsuitable in another (Guskey 2000; Kennedy 2005; Remeirs, 2003). Therefore, it is suggested through literature to use INSET programmes that make use of a triangulation of several models together, as confirmed by Guskey (2000,p.29), “Combining models in thoughtful ways can provide highly effective means to professional growth and improvement".
2.7 Phases of INSET

Successful INSET programmes undergo three essential phases; planning, implementation and the evaluation phase. In what follows, the first and the second phases will be outlined briefly, and the third phase will fully be explained since evaluating INSET programmes constitutes the major concern of the current study.

2.7.1 The Planning Phase:

Planning INSET programmes can be defined as "an organized conscious process consisting of a set of procedures and specific steps to achieve a final goal or purpose" (Shouq and Mahmoud, 2001, p.210; El khateeb, 1987, p. 66)

Several factors should be taken into consideration to guarantee a successful INSET planning (Rashed, 2002, p.188; Al- Ahmed 2005, p. 203) such as:

1. Practicality
2. Variety
3. Accurate and continuous investigations of trainees' real levels
4. Recentness

Planning phase is a comprehensive one which considers the relationship between several components involved. It entails taking decisions on six major components of the INSET programme including: (Craft, 2000, p.50; El-khateeb and El-Aila 1998, p.121).

1. Programme goals
2. Training content
3. Training methods and techniques
4. Trainees and Trainers
5. Evaluative tools
6. Timing and resources
These six major components of the INSET will be practically detailed and applied later in the final chapters when the features of the suggested future INSET are discussed.

2.7.2 Implementation Phase

It is the second phase where programme planners move from theoretical prescriptions to practical examinations of these prescriptions in reality. Implementing INSET programmes may turn out to be a difficult task where a number of constraints or barriers can be encountered. Some of these barriers are relevant to the programmes’ main components previously mentioned in the planning phase. Examples of these barriers are illustrated below as cited by several researchers. (Robore, 1998, p.155 cited in Conco 2005, p. 59 ; Bohi and Baumi, 2002, p. 361 and Yussef, 1975, p. 26)

A. Training Content Barriers

A major constraint within training content is the theoretical focus of the training topics. Although contemporary trends call for employing recent and up-to-date training content, most of training programmes conducted, for example, in Arab countries are theoretical, they are mere repetitions of pre-service courses (Bohi and Baumi, 2002, p. 364). This theoretical and repeated content is used due to its simplicity and limited costs. It is relatively easy to gather a group of trainees, in a summer holiday or after school day and to lecture them on theoretical topics that are so far from their classroom realities.

B. Trainees Barriers

Some of implementation barriers are relevant to trainees themselves, these barriers involve:

1. Diversity of teachers qualities, levels and needs
2. Irregular trainees’ attendance
3. Lack of motivation
4. Resistance to change
5. Lack of employing the new learned competencies in classrooms and sticking to their old techniques (Rashed: 1990, p. 87)

C. Training Methods Barriers

These barriers may be attributed to the traditional training methods employed in INSET programmes. These methods include using mainly lecturing and theoretical presentations which are found to have several limitations as shown previously in INSET models. (Rashed, 1990)

D. Resources and Facilities Barriers

These are the most common cited barriers within INSET literature. These barriers may include:

1. Unqualified trainers
2. Insufficient funds
3. Lack of specified well-equipped training centres with sufficient facilities.

One of the most common cited barriers to training programmes is the lack of sufficient incentives whether moral or material ones. Such lack can negatively impact trainees’ motivation and enthusiasm. Dowling (1988, p. 180) declares that, “you can drag teachers to the water but you cannot force them to drink”. Providing trainees with sufficient incentives can motivate teachers and encourage them to try out training ideas and techniques whether these incentives are moral or material.

E. Evaluation and Follow up Barriers

These barriers can be summarized in two sets:

1. Using traditional tools of evaluation such as exams and questionnaires not portfolios or teachers’ reflective journals.
2. Lack of competencies and expertise needed in evaluation plans, implementing these plans and employing the generated feedback.
To conclude, overcoming all previously mentioned barriers can be achieved through considering the following: (Rashed, 2002, p.182)

1. Comprehensiveness of the training programmes
2. Careful consideration of trainees needs
3. Collaborative planning of training programmes
4. Highly qualified trainers and programme planners
5. Providing sufficient incentives for trainees to guarantee their involvement and active participation.
6. Systematic and valid planning of the evaluation process
7. Continuous, comprehensive evaluation
8. Employing recent evaluative tools based on objective and scientific data

2.7.3 Evaluation Phase

Programme evaluation is a systematic work that includes the collection, analysis and synthesis of information to reach a final judgment. It is seen as making judgments about the worth of a programme in order to bring about improvements in its practice. (Craft, 2000, p.98; Henderson, 1997, p.34).

A. Purposes of evaluation

Programme evaluation purposes may differ in a number of ways, nevertheless, any programme evaluation aims to achieve one of the following :(Craft, 2000; Puma & Raphael, 2001; Peacock, 2009; Goodall et al., 2005):

1. Providing accountability
2. Programme improvement
3. Providing information for policy, planning and decision-making
4. Evaluation as a means of ‘needs diagnosis’
5. Evaluation for exploration, and further understanding
In general, evaluation can serve many different purposes. It can help programme managers to determine what services they need to offer, how well they are providing these services, and the likely consequences of their efforts, therefore, evaluation in INSET programmes plays an essential role not only in judging the impact of these programmes, rather, in providing data for refining, adjusting these programmes to ensure continuous improvements.

B. Models for Evaluating INSET Programmes

Evaluating INSET programmes is not a recent trend. Educators and researchers have always attempted to evaluate such programmes. However, most of evaluation attempts have been cited as inadequate with several limitations. Craft (2000, p.85) argues that evaluation of inservice training has been a haphazard process focusing mainly on participant satisfaction. The favored method of evaluation in the form of questionnaires has often failed to get beyond ‘what did you like and dislike about the day?’ Similarly, Edmond and Lee (2002, cited in Muijis and Lindsay, 2005, p. 2) argue that, "in most cases evaluation took the form of feedback that was completed by teachers, including questions on delivery content and whether they felt the course met its objectives or not ".

Acknowledging such limitations of INSET evaluations, several alternative models were presented by several researchers as Tyler (1949); Metfessed and Michaels (1967); Scriven (1972); Stufflebeam (1971); Hammound (1975); Kirkpatrik (1978); and more recently Guskey (2000) and Muijs and Lindsay (2005). Two commonly used models will be explained including:

1. **Kirkpatrik Evaluative Model**

This model was developed by Kirkpatrik in 1978 to judge the effectiveness of a supervisory training programme. It consists of four levels as:

1. Participant reactions; information in this level focuses on examining how the participants feel about the programme;
2. Participant learning, which measures the skills and the knowledge acquired by the participants as a result of the training;

3. Participant behaviours and actions level which considers the extent to which the on-the-job behaviours of the participants changed due to the training;

4. Participant results level which focuses on assessing the overall improved productivity.

2. Guskey's Evaluation Model

Gusky’s (2000) model is one of the most accepted evaluation models today. It adopted similar ideas to those presented in the previously developed models as Kirkpatrik (1978) and Stufflebeam (1971); However, Guskey's model is assumed to be more comprehensive and specific. It gives a practical framework for evaluation where all parts of the whole scene can be brought under the same scope (Muijs & Lindsy, 2005, p.5)

This model consists of five levels which are hierarchically arranged from simple to complex involving:

1. Participants’ reactions

2. Participants’ learning

3. Organizational support and change

4. Participants' use of the new skills and knowledge

5. Students' learning outcomes

Moreover, Guskey suggests considering the following guiding notes when trying out his model of evaluating INSET. (Guskey, 2005, p.3)

1. Each level is important and provides different types of information which can be used in both formative and summative ways.

2. Each level builds and depends on the level before, in the sense that one level leads to the other, for example, teachers must have positive reactions to INSET before expecting them to learn anything new from it. Also teachers need to gain new
knowledge and skills before organizational change and support is sought, organizational support is necessary to gain high quality implementation of new changes, successful implementation leads to improvements in students' learning outcomes.

3. This model can be useful in planning INSET programmes if it is used in a reversed order; in other words, the first step in designing an INSET programme should be specifying the desired students' learning outcomes (level 5), then designers should consider what type of organizational support or change are needed to facilitate the implementation (level 4) and so on.

Table (2.1) next page summarizes the five levels main questions, tools of gathering information and purposes of evaluation. The first level will only be presented, because of its relevancy to the current study’s methodology in focusing on both trainers and trainees’ reactions.
Table (2.1)
Guskey’s Evaluative Model (Guskey, 2000, p. 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>What Questions Are Addressed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Gathered?</th>
<th>What is Measured or Assessed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participants’ Reactions</td>
<td>Did they like it? Was their time well spent? Did the material make sense?</td>
<td>Questionnaires administered at the end of the session.</td>
<td>Initial satisfaction with the experience</td>
<td>To improve program design and delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participants’ Learning</td>
<td>Did participants acquire the intended knowledge and skills?</td>
<td>Paper-and-pencil instruments Simulations Demonstrations</td>
<td>New knowledge and skills of participants</td>
<td>To improve program content, format, and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization Support &amp; Change</td>
<td>What was the impact on the organization? Did it affect organizational climate and procedures?</td>
<td>District and school records Minutes from follow-up meetings. Questionnaires</td>
<td>The organization’s advocacy, support, accommodation, facilitation, and recognition.</td>
<td>To document and improve organizational support To inform future change efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participants’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills? (How are participants using what they learned?)</td>
<td>Questionnaires Structures interviews with participants and their supervisors</td>
<td>Degree and quality of implementation</td>
<td>To document and improve the implementation of program content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>What was the impact on students? Did it affect student performance or achievement? Did it influence students’ physical or emotional well-being?</td>
<td>Student records School records Questionnaires Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators Participant portfolios</td>
<td>Student learning outcomes:</td>
<td>To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level 1: Participants’ Reactions

It is the most common and easily collectable form of evaluative evidence. There are three main types of questions at this level:

1. Content questions; (ideas, skills presented were relevant, useful.)

2. Process question; were the trainers well-prepared, highly-qualified, whether the training materials appropriate, useful

3. Context questions; was the room in the right size or were chairs comfortable. Main data collection tool at this level is a participant questionnaire, which consist of combination of rating scale items and open ended responses to collect personal comments.

Participants reactions level is referred to by some researcher as "happiness quotients” since they reveal participants entertainment in the INSET. Despite the assumed subjectivity entailed within this level, it is still the most widely accepted level and the most common form of INSET evaluation in various evaluative studies (Guskey, 2000, p. 94). Guskey also confirms that a carefully constructed questionnaire or a well crafted interview at this level can measure far more than participants’ simple delight. Thus, when evaluation is done well at this level, it can lead to crucial and profound valid data that informs other levels in the INSET evaluation.

Briefly, many efforts are introduced under the umbrella of INSET, However, "a lot of rotten things also" (Guskey, 2002, p.92). Hitherto, comes the importance of evaluation to provide the key distinctions on what can be counted as successful INSET programmes and what cannot.
2.8 Contemporary Principles of High Quality INSET

The universal recognition of INSET essentiality in many countries has led policy makers to demand a decisive consensus on what exactly makes INSET programmes of high quality. This in turn has encouraged the publication of hundreds of policy documents, articles, research papers, and studies over the past 15-20 years in attempts to reach such consensus. Consequently, the principles that characterize effective or high quality INSET are various, multiple, highly complex and even sometimes, contradictory. (Cohen & Hill 2000; Corcoran et al., 1998; Yoon et al.,2007; Gusky 2000, 2002, 2003; Remeirs 2003; Ingvarson et al., 2005).

Examining INSET literature, it turns quite clear that educators and researchers all over the world are still struggling to provide specific scientific based principles that would finally lead to high quality INSET programmes. According to Guskey (2003, p.4), "It is illogical to assume that there are certain specific lists that can guarantee success or effectiveness". Nevertheless, there is still a demanding need to identify certain criteria or principles to guide INSET efforts towards steady, stable progress and effectiveness.

In what follows, 15 contemporary principles of high quality INSET programmes are chosen by the researcher. Choosing these 15 principles, in particular, is not done randomly, rather, it comes through valid and detailed document analysis of 43 lists as will be further explained in the following chapter.

1. Enhancement of Teachers Content and Pedagogic Knowledge

Several lists on principles for high quality INSET whether issued through policy reports or empirical studies have reported the importance of focusing on deepening teacher’s content knowledge as well as pedagogic knowledge. Within EFL, or ELT field, deciding on the content of English training programmes has been a debatable issue. According to Richards and Farrell (2005, p. 9) this content should involve:
1. Subject matter knowledge involving knowledge of English grammar, phonology, second language acquisition, discourse analysis and testing;

2. Pedagogical expertise focusing on the process of teaching areas of subject knowledge, for example, how to teach grammar;

3. Understanding of learners, understanding of curriculum teaching materials, and career development.

Enhancing teachers’ pedagogical and content knowledge can be achieved through introducing teachers to most recent research creams and findings in their subject content and providing them with a repertoire of new techniques and skills proved to be of value in teaching their subject content.

2. Collaboration

Effective INSET programmes should be characterized with collaborative participation. This collaboration can be maintained either at school level– teachers working in the same school, same area, same grade, and same subject- or at policy level including all educators, stakeholders and institutions participating in planning, carrying out and evaluating training programmes. Carefully planned and monitored collaboration offers teachers several potential advantages as:

1. Giving them the chance to discuss barriers which occur during their training experience.

2. Helping in better identification of their needs as well as their students’ needs.

3. Opportunities for increased reflection.

3. Provision of sufficient:

   - Time

Successful INSET programmes should be continuous, sustained, intensive and of longer duration. Several researchers assume that teachers need time to practice the new introduced
knowledge and skills; they need time to observe, analyze, reflect, modify and evaluate.

According to Garet et al., (2001, p. 933 cited in Ingvarson et al., 2005, p. 17) “INSET is likely to be of higher quality if it is sustained over time”. However, how much time and how many contact hours are needed to guarantee deep changes and effectiveness is still a debatable issue among these researchers.

- **Resources**

Several lists on high quality INSET declare that plenty of resources are needed to guarantee effectiveness. These resources involve the availability of human resources such as trainers who should be highly qualified, competent and, skillful in varying training methods and many other attributes. Besides, successful INSET programmes provide a plenty of physical resources involving, for example, the training centre which should be well-equipped, with modern facilities as labs, libraries, technological devices, comfortable seating, proper heating, and cooling, the availability of transport to and from the training centre and many other facilities.

In short, deeper changes in teachers practices require considerable amounts of time and provision of sufficient resources, however, how many hours of training programmes are needed, when these changes can exactly occur and definite evidences of sufficient duration and sufficient resources impact on teachers practices and students achievement are still issues under investigation within INSET researches today.

4. **Coherence**

Coherent training programmes are those programme tied into a larger plan of training policies with activities built one upon another. They are not mere isolated activities in isolated training courses and sessions. In addition, coherence as a principle can be inspired through:

- Systematic investigation of teachers’ needs levels and expectations.
• Planning INSET content in the light of social philosophy, schools’ needs, English curriculum goals, and students’ achievement problems.

5. School-based or classroom-focused INSET

Job-embedded or classroom focused training programmes help teachers to cope with their classroom realities through authentic experience, realistic strategies and practical solutions.

Successful INSET programmes are relevant to what actually takes places inside the schools or even classrooms. Elmore (1997:4) states that, "Teachers are more likely to learn from direct observation of practice, trial and error in their own classroom than they are from abstract descriptions of teaching". Similarly, Floden, Goertz and O’Day (1995, p.245 citedin Yoon et. al., 2007, p.11-13) argues that "the greatest influences on teachers’ capability for improved instructional practice occurs at schools or within school-site level".

Nowadays, recent models of INSET programmes take into accounts the potentials offered through site-based training programmes, such focus has led to the rising of Professional Development Schools (PDS) a successful reported experience in USA and other countries.

6. Reflection and active learning opportunities

High quality INSET programmes are reflective, they engage teachers in an active cognitive process where they sort out the barriers they face in their day to day practice, test out their interpretations and reasonable judgments, take decisions, then modify their actions in the light of feedback obtained through such reflective process (Ng et al.,2004; Sarsar 2008; Kocoglu et al., 2008). Taking the importance of reflective and active learning opportunities into account, several INSET programmes start employing recent models including action research, study groups, teachers’ networks, teaching journals, portfolios, and peer observation. All these models present rich reflective and active learning opportunities for teachers to be engaged in.
7. Driven by best available researches and students data

Successful INSET programmes are guided by recent cream of the best available researches, they make use of "strategies, methods, proven effective by the standard of scientifically based research" U.S Department of Education (2002, p.2).

Furthermore, employing up-to-date innovations and researches calls for focusing on students’ achievements as key indicators of successful INSET programmes. Students’ data involve making use of students' performance analysis, achievement records, and problematic areas in learning a specific subject matter, preferred learning styles; ways of thinking, techniques used by students in learning a certain skill, and finally drop out percentages and attendance records.

8. Systematic feedback and evaluation

Systematic feedback and evaluation characterizes high quality INSET programmes, without systematic evaluation “there is only one –in- ten chances that the participants will even be able to engage sufficiently in the practice of the new learning”. Joyce and Showers, (1995, p. 15 cited in Remeirs, 2003, p.98). Evaluative procedures can involve traditional reaction evaluation forms gathered at the end of the training programmes, questionnaires, and interviews or more recently through teachers’ portfolios, observation, peer evaluation and analysis of students’ data outcomes. Gathering evaluative information through previous procedures provides rich sources of data that can lead to programme's modification, refinement and improvement.

9. Needs Assessment

Several researchers have recognized the importance of having needs assessments prior to INSET programmes. According to Weddle and Van Duzer (1997, p.2 citedin Idris et al., 2007, p.104), “Needs assessment is an essential ingredient in all successful training programmes"

Needs assessment can be approached in a variety of forms as:
1. Survey questionnaires.
2. Open-ended interviews.
3. Observation of teachers’ performance.

The final ultimate goal of any needs assessment is to identify objectives, content and techniques that can be useful in bringing about desired changes in the teaching performances. Thus, INSET programmes should cater for the real needs of the teachers. Educators, trainers or any other stakeholders should not be given the supreme authority to prescribe what teachers should do to enhance and improve their teaching practices.

10. Teacher Involvement

Successful INSET programmes are characterized with profound teacher involvement. This involvement can be maintained through needs assessment which gives teachers the opportunities to learn what they believe they need to learn. Teacher involvement also plays a vital role in the planning phase of the training programmes where teachers input should guide the programme goals, content, training methods, and evaluation techniques.

11. Driven by Systematic, Ongoing Follow up and Support

This principle refers to providing teachers with adequate remunerative incentives -financial incentives- as salary increase or moral incentives; reinforcement, encouragement and career promotions. In addition, this principle emphasizes supporting teachers inside their classrooms when implementing the new learned knowledge since teachers are sometimes reluctant, afraid or even frustrated when they try to use the new skills or techniques introduced in the INSET programme. Thus, through the provision of sufficient support and follow up inside their classrooms, teachers can be encouraged to overcome such obstacles. This support can take the form of friendly visits from their supervisors and colleagues or even support through school principals.
12. Variety of Forms

High quality INSET programmes employ a wide variety of INSET models, training techniques. Recently a plenty of various innovative models are proposed and much favored since they actively engage the teachers and provide them with opportunities for reflection and active learning. These models involve using action research, study groups, peer observation, coaching, mentoring, journal writing, and portfolios.

13. Clarity of stated goals

Goals or objectives in terms of INSET programmes answer the question "what does the INSET programme seek to attain or plan to achieve?" To Gusky (2002, p.15) any successful INSET programme should be guided with “a clear set of objectives, a clear vision of planned goals” and even "such planned objectives and clear goals form the principles by which content, materials are selected, process and procedures developed and assessments and evaluation prepared".

Furthermore, Guskey confirms that good quality goals should be:

1. Explicit

2. Stated and decided upon from the early beginning as in “beginning with the end in mind" or what is described by spark 1996. "Result-driven training programmes"

3. Worthwhile

4. Other researchers add the importance of stating training programmes goals in the light of teacher's needs, school needs and in accordance with the overall policy (Porter et al., 2000, Dicerbo & Duran 2006).

Clarity of INSET programmes goals is a key determiner of its success. Today it is no longer accepted to deliver highly rated, well attended programmes rather successful programmes are those with "clearly-articulated goals." (Wong et al., 2007)
14. Practicality

Theoretical focus of traditional one-shot inservice courses has always been cited as a main fault within traditional INSET. Teachers have always showed a strong bias against such theoretical focus stemming from highly theoretical university academic world which is entirely distant from classroom realities. Hence, practicality of training programmes entails providing teachers with realistic experience and realistic solutions for classroom dilemmas. It confirms moving away from knowledge transmission based approaches in teaching into innovative practice, composed of real situations inside real classrooms.

15. Technology Integration

While surveying INSET literature, technology integration seems to be a prevailing trend dominating several successful INSET programmes. These programmes focus on enriching teachers’ knowledge of ICT principles and improving their use of technology in teaching and learning. Furthermore, this technology integration involves utilizing online-learning, web-based activities, internet, email services, television, radio and satellite communications in teachers training programmes as the case of Japan and China.

Summary

The previous theoretical section gave a clear vision of several issues related to INSET as its main trends, importance, goals and phases. Special attention was given to evaluating INSET programmes in particular. Through such theoretical background, thorough, insightful and deep understandings of INSET are gained. Such understandings were of great help in guiding the following chapters. Next, is the section that covers previous studies of the research and commentary on these studies.
Section II

An Overview of Related Previous Studies

Introduction

1. Evaluative Studies Related to Teachers' Reactions
2. Evaluative Studies Related to Teachers' Change Process
3. Evaluative Studies Related to Students' Learning Outcomes

Commentary on the Previous Studies
Previous Studies

Introduction

Teacher inservice training programmes are of various aims and purposes. Ministries of education, policymakers, and stakeholders may resort to these programmes to change positively teachers' beliefs or practices, train teachers into new curriculum innovations, refresh and upgrade their knowledge, and finally to meet their needs and expectations. Following these training programmes within a vast rich literature; it turns quite clear that endless numbers of evaluative studies were attempted to judge these programmes quality and effectiveness. Despite, the fact that these evaluative studies ranged widely in their aims, agendas, tools and results, they seem to adopt one of the following evaluative trends:

1. Evaluating the INSET programme through teachers’ reaction, views and their degrees of satisfaction.
2. Evaluating the INSET programme in terms of its success in changing teachers’ practices, beliefs and attitudes.
3. Evaluating the INSET programme in terms of improvements in students learning outcomes

In accordance with these evaluative trends, the researcher cited 47 evaluative studies distributed thematically into three categories as follow:

1. The first category reviews 27 studies which evaluated the INSET programmes through teachers’ reactions and satisfaction.
2. The second category reviews 13 studies which appealed to teacher changes when evaluating the INSET programme.
3. The third category reviews 7 evaluative studies with positive improvements in students learning outcomes.
In addition, the studies purposes, participants, data collection tools, results and recommendations are thoroughly presented and discussed. Finally, it is worthy to note that all the reviewed studies are of ELT or EFL concern except for the nine Palestinian studies as will be illustrated later.

1. Evaluative Studies Related to Teachers Reactions

Judging the effectiveness of INSET programmes through teachers’ reactions seems to be the most common trend within the evaluation literature. These studies aimed to evaluate programmes effectiveness through participants teachers’ point of views, attitudes, degrees of satisfaction, and whether the programmes have met their real needs, expectations and perceptions or not. This investigation is mainly done through using descriptive analytic research designs employing questionnaires and interviews as main data collection tools.

An example of such studies is the one conducted by Kucksuleymonoglu (2006). The researcher aimed to describe and examine Turkish EFL teachers' views of the inservice training programmes organized by the Ministry of Education from, 2003-2005. A sample of 186 EFL teachers and five instructors was randomly chosen; data collection tools involved structured interviews along with 18-item questionnaire. Results of data analysis showed that the INSET programmes were carried out in a centralized fashion. Teachers were not satisfied since their needs were not taken into consideration. The number of these programmes was insufficient with unsatisfactory content as well. The researcher suggested increasing the number of these programmes, performing need analysis, addressing new ELT topics, and finally enhancing co-operative efforts between the ministry of education and universities.

Similar unsatisfactory responses were maintained through Alwan's study (2000) in the United Arab of Emirates. In this study, the researcher attempted to investigate the effectiveness of the current INSET programmes available to English language teachers in UAE through teachers and supervisors’ views. It also sought to examine the possibility of
introducing more self-directed innovative training models. Data were collected using a questionnaire administered through 158 participants, and interviews with 14 participants. The main significant findings showed unsatisfied teachers and unsystematic, unstructured programme with several drawbacks as, short duration, insufficient numbers of in-service training sessions and theoretical topics in a lecture-mode delivery. The researcher recommended employing more innovative models especially self directed models as teaching journals. These models can end up successfully through raising teachers’ awareness, providing incentives, enough time with reduced workloads.

In support of previous negative results, Al-Ansari (1995) investigated the current INSET provision for EFL teachers in Saudi Arabia. The study also aimed at identifying EFL teachers’ needs and designing a model for future INSET. To fulfill all these aims, the researcher used a sample of 102 EFL teachers, 25 EFL inspectors and 32 teacher trainers. The researcher employed a triangulation of data collection tools including three sets of questionnaires, follow up interviews, courses observation and document analysis. Analysis of the collected data indicated unsatisfactory responses. There was a gap between the current in service training provided for Saudi EFL teachers and their real needs.

Close to previous studies’ aims, Huang (1999) carried out a study to investigate to Taiwanese EFL teachers attitudes towards inservice training in general, their perceptions towards the current inservice training in Taiwan and the factors influencing these perceptions. Data were collected mainly through two open-ended interviews with 13 EFL teachers used as a chosen sample. The main obtained results showed that Taiwanese EFL teachers held positive attitudes towards INSET in general. They considered it as an important tool for enhancing their professional lives and improving their teaching practices. However, they showed their unsatisfaction of the current inservice training in Taiwan. The main negative or shortcomings involved; limited teachers involvement, several administrative or policy
constraints, and lack of practical and applicable content. The researcher suggested increasing the number of inservice training chances offered either through school-based, university partnership, or even overseas inservice training programmes.

Complying with the previous negative results, Cimer et al., (2010) carried out a study to evaluate the effectiveness of inservice programme conducted by the Turkish Ministry of National Education in advance of introducing the new curricula. This evaluation was mainly done through investigating teachers’ views and in the light of six criteria drawn from INSET literature. The study sample consisted of 20 primary and 18 secondary teachers. The data collected through semi-structured interviews showed negative and unsatisfied views. Several inadequacies were cited as, absence of needs assessment, general theoretical content, limited opportunities for reflection and practice, unqualified trainers, limited follow up, and absence of evaluation and feedback strategies. The researchers recommended utilizing more opportunities for reflection and collaboration with universities.

In an additional study, Gonzalez (2003) examined the professional needs of 44 EFL Colombian teachers. The study portrayed a comprehensive picture of the current in-service models available, tried to evaluate their usefulness and their potential for satisfying teachers’ needs, perceptions and attitudes. Data were collected through focused group interviews, a questionnaire and in-depth open-ended interviews. The analyzed results showed that teachers were unsatisfied with current INSET. The main faults within these programmes included limited numbers, and the theoretical content. The researcher recommended focusing on practical, real and everyday problems, besides, more opportunities for reflection and collaboration should be provided.

As the Palestinian context is concerned, most of studies focused on evaluating inservice training programmes in general. An example of these studies is the one carried out by Al Farra (1996) which aimed to evaluate inservice training programmes for Gaza Basic Stage
teachers in the light of the contemporary trends. The study sample consisted of 390 teachers who responded to a questionnaire of eight domains. The study results proved several shortcomings within these programmes as theoretical content, lack of teacher involvement in the planning process, lecturing styles domination and lack of facilities. To handle the cited shortcomings, the researcher recommended focusing on issues as practicality, technology integration and systematic evaluation.

In the same Palestinian context, Al-Ajez and Al–Banna (2003) conducted a study to evaluate the current inservice training programme available to lower elementary and upper elementary teachers in governmental schools. The study also aimed at suggesting a future inservice training programme in the light of the teachers’ professional needs. The study sample involved 275 teachers who responded to a questionnaire in two parts. Data analysis showed that teachers were not satisfied with the current programmes due to several inadequacies as lack of incentives and proper facilities. The researchers concluded with several practical recommendations as, establishing well-equipped training institutions, providing sufficient incentives, proper planning, and carrying out needs assessment prior to the intended training programmes.

A second study performed by the same researcher -Al-Ajez (2004) - aimed at investigating the in-service training workshops for secondary teachers in high schools in Gaza Governorates. It also aimed at identifying the main shortcoming of these workshops from teachers and supervisors’ point of views. The study followed a descriptive analytical approach with a questionnaire involving 455 teachers and 80 supervisors. Result analysis showed several shortcomings as; theoretical content, lack of teacher involvement and under-qualified trainers. The researcher recommended more teacher involvement, verifying training techniques, providing incentives, establishing specialized training centres and most
importantly conducting more detailed and specialized evaluative studies within each discipline taught.

Identical to Al-Ajez’s study, Jeber (2002) reported a study which aimed at evaluating in-service training programmes at the lower basic stage in Gaza Governorates from teachers and supervisors points’ of views and in the light of contemporary trends. The main instrument used was a questionnaire of 91 items divided into eight categories. The study sample consisted of 455 teachers, along with 80 supervisors. Results analysis showed that the number of inservice programmes is still insufficient, furthermore, the content, format of these programmes should be modified to suit teachers’ real needs and expectations.

The previous presented shortcomings within the current inservice training programmes available in the Palestinian context cited in Al-Ajez (2004) and Jeber (2002) were also validated in a fifth recent Palestinian study conducted by Abu-Atwan (2008). This study aimed at investigating the main barriers of INSET in Gaza Governorates and the main strategies that would help in overcoming these barriers. The study sample consisted of 484 teachers in the basic stage teaching grades seven to ten. The main tool used for collecting the data was a questionnaire with ten main categories. The study verified eight types of barriers, showing that the most cited include incentive 86.8%, and training needs 74.3%. The researchers suggested providing teachers with various incentives, establishing well-equipped training centres with modern facilities, decentralizing training programmes, and finally focusing on practicality rather than theoretical demonstrations.

In correspondence to Abu-Atwan’s (2008) study, Abu-Salem (2008) conducted a study to evaluate INSET programmes for physical education teachers in Gaza Strip. The study also aimed to identify the main barriers from teachers’ views. The sample involved 157 teachers who responded to 2 questionnaires. Result analysis showed negative teachers’ satisfactions. Besides, the main barriers identified included underqualified trainers, limited training
facilities, and insufficient timing. The researcher recommended more teacher involvement, technology integration and systematic evaluation.

In line with Abu Salem (2008) study, Al-Qreanawi (2009) conducted a recent study to evaluate the INSET programme for UNRWA Math teachers in the light of Total Quality Standards. The study sample consisted of 22 teachers who responded to a questionnaire of 63 items. Data analysis showed that the programme did not achieve the quality standards and did not satisfy the study sample. The researcher ended up with several practical recommendations.

Within the previously reported studies, an attempt is made to investigate teachers’ reactions, views, attitudes, perceptions, levels of satisfactions towards the current available inservice training programmes. The findings of these studies showed negative and unsatisfactory responses. Unlike these studies with negative outcomes, other studies which also examined teachers’ satisfactions, needs and perceptions have yielded positive results.

An example is, the study conducted by Turner (1999) in Costa Rica in Central America. The study aimed to investigate if a training programme designed to upgrade secondary 600 English language teachers’ skills and knowledges had met the trainees’ needs and expectations. A triangulation of data was used involving a test, and a questionnaire. The study sample consisted of nine instructors and 118 secondary English teachers. Results analysis reflected average to high satisfaction across the participants. The final outcomes were highly positive and appreciated and the programme has been found to be much-needed and a long-awaited refresher due to its practicality and being responsive to trainees’ needs.

Sharing a similar positive stance, Khanal (2006) conducted an evaluative study to investigate the perceptions of Nepalese EFL teachers after being involved in an INSET programme. Ten secondary English teachers responded to three instruments including unstructured interviews, semi structured observations and daily journal writings. Findings
showed positive participants satisfaction. All the participants highly rated the training program which helped them to learn new ideas. The researcher concluded that INSET is an important facet of teacher development. It "helps teachers to be professionally strong." (2006, p.127) Khanal further recommended increasing the number of inservice training programmes, and making use of more collaboration, teacher involvement, facilities provision, and finally systematic and regular follow up and feedback.

In support of Khanal’s (2006) study positive findings, Daloglu (2004) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of an inservice training programme on 45 Turkish English language teachers in private primary schools in Ankara. The programme was designed to improve teachers’ abilities in material adaptation. Data collected through using a questionnaire, and in-depth interviews showed that teachers regarded the programme as useful, successful, relevant, and positively affected their attitudes. The researcher confirmed that the programme succeeded because it was school- based, responsive to teachers’ specific identified needs and it entailed practical remedies for classroom problems.

Additionally, Atay (2008) conducted a study to evaluate a designed training programme for EFL teachers in Turkey. The training programme used action research to upgrade experienced teachers’ theoretical knowledge of pedagogical issues. To figure out teachers’ reactions and satisfaction, the researcher analyzed 18 participants’ journals and narratives. Study findings proved that although teachers reported difficulties in conducting their researches, still they viewed the programme as successful and positively impacted their attitudes. Taking these beneficial outcomes into consideration, the researcher called for research-based training programmes to give teachers the potential for enhancing their professional lives.

Under the same umbrella, Idris et al., (2007) carried out an evaluative study in Malaysia. The study aimed to investigate the extent to which a training programme satisfied teachers'
needs and expectations. The training programme was implemented by the Malaysian government in response to curriculum changes. To collect the required data, the researchers used a questionnaire in thirty three secondary schools with a sample of 72 teachers. The final results showed that the majority of the participants were satisfied with the programme. About 84.1% of the teacher reported that they still needed more training particularly in speaking skills. The researchers ended declaring that further studies are still needed to identify shortcomings of INSET programmes to get a better comprehensive feedback.

Likewise, Al-Shandaweali (1990) reported an evaluative study conducted to measure the effectiveness of a training programme designed to ease the introduction of a new text book "Welcome to English" in prep schools in Egypt. The data were provided by 100 prep stage inspectors and senior teachers of English through responding to a questionnaire of 48 items, and an observation checklist. Results analysis pointed out that the teachers found the programme very helpful and successful in aiding them to cope with the new introduced curriculum.

Close to the previous study positive results, Maiworm et al., (2010) carried out a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the Comenius Inservice Training Programme arranged by the European Union between January and June 2009. There were about 4,000 programme participants with a majority English language teachers. The programme provided three types of inservice training forms including, courses and seminars, conferences and less informal types including job shadowing and peer observation. Two questionnaires implemented prior to and after the programme were used to collect data. Data analysis showed that 93% of the participants were satisfied with the programme; they considered it to be very valuable leading to enhancement of their new skills and improving their language proficiency. Only 6% showed some reservations and a very limited number of the participants were dissatisfied.
A further relevant study was performed by Cetina (2007) to assess an INSET programme designed to provide immediate feasible and efficient training to a group of unspecialized ELT teachers. The study sample included 15 EFL male and female teachers of an average of 5 years teaching experience. Data were collected mainly through two questionnaires, and two structured interviews administered at the beginning and the end of the programme. Results analysis showed positive satisfaction and enthusiastic attitude towards the programme. The programmed succeeded mainly because it enriched participants' teaching and linguistic competences.

In a relevant direction, Pacek (2002) carried out a study to identify Japanese EFL teachers’ perceptions of their one year inservice overseas training programme in UK. To achieve such purpose, a questionnaire was used with a sample of 56 secondary who had previously participated in the programme. Analysis of the data showed that most participants rated the programme as very beneficial. However; they reported several constraints. Pacek concluded with the importance of further investigation of such constraints especially the cultural ones.

Focusing on assessing a second overseas training programme, Crooks (2005) reported an evaluative study of a four month overseas training programme in Canada. The programme aimed at helping Japanese EFL teachers to teach English more communicatively. The study examined the programme execution, planning and cultural dimensions. Various tools as document analysis, questionnaires, observation and oral interviews were employed. Results proved the success of the programme in meeting its assigned goals and teachers' expectations, again as in Pacek (2002) study; some cultural constraints were as cited.

Similarly, Kurrihara & Samimy (2007) evaluated four months overseas training programme in two USA universities. The programme aimed at deepening participants understanding of ELT methodology, developing their English proficiency skills and raising their awareness of USA culture. The study focused on examining eight Japanese EFL teachers’ reactions
towards the overseas training programme. In-depth interviews and a questionnaire were used to collect data. Study findings showed that the majority of the participants considered the programme so positive. It helped them in reshaping their teaching practices, and beliefs, and in gaining more confidence in teaching English communicatively. Despite such positive impact, teachers still reported several constraints as classroom large sizes, non-communicative exams, and cultural differences as shown previously within Pacek (2002) and Crooks (2005) studies.

In parallel, Rabbini et al., (2003) conducted a study to evaluate the JET programme- Japan Exchange and Teaching- an INSET programme established in Japan since 1987. This programme aimed to improve English language teaching, promote culture exchange through hiring about 6000 native English speakers to assist Japanese secondary EFL teachers in enhancing their communicative teaching. The study made use of a set of criteria based on related literature to evaluate the JET programme besides; a survey of 140 participants on the usefulness of the programme was used. Findings showed that about 69% found the programme useful and appreciated. The researcher concluded that the JET programme should attempt trying to provide a more realistic picture and more practical methodological input.

As the Palestinian context is concerned, two evaluative studies have reported positive participants reactions, the first study was conducted by Samours (2006) which aimed to investigate the strength and weakness of using schools as training units (STU), an experiment implemented in 66 governmental with 1550 teachers involved during four years time plan. The main data collection instrument was a questionnaire. The sample involved about 244 teachers in four secondary schools. The study results indicated that teachers were satisfied with this positive experiment. This success may due to giving teachers the chance to identify their own needs. The researcher admitted that more co-operation between policy makers,
school principals and teachers is needed to make such experiment more successful and efficient.

The second study was carried out by Sabri (1997) to assess the effectiveness of the first national in-service training programme conducted in 1991-1994 in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The total number of teachers participated in this programme was 700 teachers enrolled in six universities in the West Bank and Gaza City. However, the study sample included teachers who were trained only in Birzeit University in (1993). Data were collected through a questionnaire which required teachers to evaluate the three courses content from their point of views ordering them from the most important to the least important. Data analysis showed that the programme content as a whole was perceived to be positive and successful. The researcher concluded the study emphasizing issues as practicability, needs assessment, and teacher involvement.

To sum up, within the first category, 27 studies were reviewed. These studies were conducted in various countries including Palestine, Colombia, Taiwan, UAE, America, Nepal, Egypt, Mexico, Turkey, Japan, Saudi Arabia and Malaysia. This variety reflects the importance assigned to teachers in service training programmes all over the world. All the 27 reviewed studies counted on teachers' reactions when evaluating the programme effectiveness which is the most common trend in INSET literature today. These studies adopted descriptive analytic methods and employed questionnaires and interviews as main data collection tools. Among the 27 reviewed studies, 13 studies have yielded negative results due to several insufficiencies as theoretical orientation, lack of teacher involvement and lack of systematic ongoing follow up and support. Hence, within their recommendations, these studies highlighted important issues as practicality, school based, needs assessment and teacher involvement.
Furthermore, it is worthy to note that the Palestinian reviewed studies have tackled inservice training programmes in general as in Al-Ajez (2004); Al-Ajez and Al-Banna (2003); Al-Farra (1996); Sabri (1997); Jeber (2002); and Samour (2006); or in relation to Math teachers as in AL-Greanawi (2009) or Physical Education teachers as in Abu–Salem (2008). There are no studies -as far as the researcher knows- which are concerned with evaluating English teachers inservice training in particular, hence, this study seems vital and distinguished to fill in the missing parts in the whole scene of Palestinian INSET programmes.

2. Evaluative Studies Related to Teachers Change

A second category of recent studies have focused on examining the effectiveness of INSET programmes through teachers overall changes. Literature on teacher change has admitted that this phenomenon is extremely complicated with several influencing multidimensional factors (Fullan 1995; Guskey 2002; Kenndy, 1998; Hargreaves, 1992). Some of these factors are external involving the influence of teaching contexts, cultures, administration and policy issues. Other factors are internal relating to teachers themselves such as their needs, change eagerness, willingness, enthusiasm, confidence, past experience and own beliefs. In this way, some teachers can be seen as eager and so willing to adopt the new proposed changes, while others consider such changes as a source of threatening their stability and professional security.

Due to the difficulty and complexity of tracing all these interrelated factors, the trend of judging programme effectiveness in terms of teachers overall changes is a less common trend in INSET literature today. Thus only thirteen studies have been reviewed within this category. Again these evaluative studies are divided into two sets, studies with positive results and studies with negative results.

An example of these studies with negative results is the one conducted by Harumi (2005) in Japan. The study evaluated the impact of a five year training programme on changing
teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and practices. The designed programme aimed to improve English language teachers’ abilities of employing the communicative approach inside their classrooms. Data were collected through structured interviews with the 5 participants chosen as the study sample. Results indicated that limited changes have occurred concerning teachers’ practices, attitudes and beliefs. Such limited change may be attributed to several problematic aspects in the programme as, its coercive nature, lack of sufficient time and resources, lack of practical focus and continuous evaluation. The researcher clarified that INSET programmes can lead to long lasting changes if they are relevant to teachers needs, well-structured, with focused practical content, and most importantly, focusing on teachers’ inner values and beliefs.

A further recent study was carried out by Nicolaidis & Matheoudakis (2008) in Greece. This study aimed to assess the long term effectiveness of 60 hour training programme on 21 EFL Creek teachers a year after the programme completion. In other words, the study aimed at presenting a follow up investigation regarding long term changes induced through a training programme held at Aristotle University in Greece. The only instrument used was a questionnaire consisted of three sections. Results showed that participants benefited from topics focusing on language components as teaching vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. However, limited changes in their classroom practices were reported. These limited changes may due to several context based factors as lack of time and resources, large classes, the gap between theoretical content and classroom realities. The study ended with a suggested co-operative model to be employed when designing and carrying out training programmes.

Close to previous studies negative outcomes, Conco (2005) reported a study which aimed to determine the effectiveness of an inservice training programme in South Africa. The study main focus was to trace the real impact the programme had on teachers’ practices inside their classrooms. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with three teachers.
Results clarified that the programme was not completely adequate or satisfactory. It failed in changing teachers' practices. Reasons behind such failure-as pointed by the researcher-may be due to the insufficient time set for the programme, lack of follow up, and abstract theoretical content with limited practical applications.

Negative outcomes were also reported by Kubanyiova study in (2006). This longitudinal study aimed at exploring the impact of 20-hour in-service programme on changing eight EFL teachers teaching practices in Slovakia. Data were collected through pre-post tests, interviews, observation, field notes, and a questionnaire. Results showed a depressing picture where no changes occurred in teachers practices despite of teachers' enthusiasm, commitment and endorsement of the programme materials. Two reasons have led to such failure including lack of practicality and other individual, social, external factors as absence of reflective teaching culture, constant fear of language mistakes, and unsupportive system. The researcher ended suggesting that the door is still left open for other researchers to answer the unavoidable question “What is needed to promote change in the teaching practices of in-service non-native EFL teachers? (2006, p.11)

Investigating the previous verified constraints, Mohammed (2006) conducted a study to assess the extent to which a training programme has influenced and changed teacher practices and beliefs. The study evaluated a 12 week inservice training programme introduced to the sample of EFL 14 teachers from two secondary schools in Maldives. The main focus of this programme was to introduce teachers to more innovative inductive grammar teaching techniques. Data gathered mainly through observations, interviews and questionnaires showed that the programme may have increased teachers understanding of inductive approaches of grammar teaching at the level of awareness only; however, limited changes within teachers’ practices had occurred. The researcher, similarly, as in Kubanyiova (2006) suggested several constraint factors that may have impeded teachers changing practices as,
lack of openness to change, lack of supportive school culture, low motivation, and other contextual factors including large classes, and difficult working conditions. The researcher recommended teachers involvement in planning and carrying out inservice training programmes, using more innovative models of INSET as clinical supervision, mentoring, and finally the provision of sufficient worthwhile incentives.

In contrast, Lamie (2002) reported positive and evident changes within her study which aimed at evaluating a training programme carried out by the Japanese Ministry of Education in cooperation with Birmingham University. The programme aimed at helping Japanese EFL teachers to embrace the communicative language teaching premises. The study focused on determining the impact of the programme on four Japanese English language teachers in three main areas, their practices, their espoused methodology and their beliefs. Data were collected through three main tools involving three questionnaires, observation checklist and interviews. Study findings confirmed positive recorded changes at all levels. The four participants turned out to be “increasingly communicative” despite changes in practices were prior to changes in attitudes. Lamie recommended involving teachers in the process of planning if long term changes to be attained.

Lamie (2006), in a further more recent attempt, evaluated the impact of one month training programme on 13 EFL Chinese University teachers. This programme was carried out in a response to a curriculum reform which implied teaching 20% of the university courses in English; thus, the programme aimed at refreshing and updating lecturers English language skills. Lamie analyzed participants’ responses to a set of predetermined activities. This analysis showed that the programme was a successful initiative and a positive experience which changed a lot of teachers' practices and attitudes. At the same time, Lamie argued that change is a complex task of which teachers cannot hold the complete responsibility.
Continuous follow up, support and evaluative feedback are desperately needed to reach deeply rooted positive changes.

Sharing the same scenario of investigating the impact of inservice training programmes on teachers overall change process, Imijinda (2005) conducted a study which aimed at developing, implementing and evaluating a small-scale inservice training programme for primary Thai EFL teachers. The programme was designed to help EFL teachers in changing their practices from traditional forms into more communicative practices. The programme content made use of collaboration, peer coaching, and a systematic follow up inside classroom models. The study sample consisted of nine primary EFL teachers along with their classes and supervisors in three cities in Thailand. A triangulation of data was used over the span of eight months including interviews, observation checklist, and a questionnaire. Results clarified that the programme has led to observable positive changes in teacher classroom practices; furthermore, all teachers were rated higher by their supervisors on following the communicative language teaching principles. The researcher suggested that any INSET programme closely adapted to teachers specific needs, contexts, making use of collaboration, peer coaching, ongoing follow up is capable of bringing about long-lasting positive changes at all levels.

In correspondence with the previous studies positive results, Kirkgoz (2008) reported a study which aimed to evaluate inservice training programmes impact on teachers’ implementation of Communicative Oriented Curriculum -COC- in primary Turkish schools. The study sample consisted of 32 Turkish English teachers. Two ethnographic data collection tools were used involving interviews and observation. Data analysis showed that teachers have changed their teaching practices and employed COC principles positively. The researcher commented that such findings highlighted the need for more expanded inservice training programmes taking into account teachers own beliefs.
Following the same track of evaluating inservice training programmes focusing on teachers’ changes, Abed-Haleem (2008) attempted to investigate the effect of a designed training programme on improving teaching performances of a selected sample of 24 fourth year EFL student teachers at Helwan University in Egypt. The programme employed three innovative models involving study groups, action research and peer coaching. Data were collected through a triangulation of tools involving scoring rubrics, achievement tests, portfolios assessment, observation checklist, and a questionnaire. Data analysis showed that the programme with its three innovative models proved to have a positive large size effect on EFL teachers' practices. It was highly effective in improving their teaching performances, particularly, in classroom management and assessment domains.

A further recent study performed by Chinda (2009) to investigate the impact of a training programme in language assessment and testing on five Thai EFL teachers' attitudes, beliefs and classroom practices. The study was conducted into three phases, pilot study, main study, and follow up study. The programme was carried out in a series of nine inservice workshops with five non-native Thai EFL teachers. Individual in-depth and focused group interviews were used to collect data. The study findings showed that the programme had a positive impact on the participant teachers. Those teachers have become more aware of their rating styles, more confident when rating students performance and more critical to the assessment practices. In conclusion, the researcher stressed that effective INSET programmes should be ongoing, empirical based, and teachers centered.

Additionally, Kim (2009) aimed at tracing the effects of using a developmental training strategy on changing Korean EFL teachers’ practices. Data collection tools included a questionnaire and personal interviews with a sample of 610 elementary and secondary EFL teachers. Data analysis showed that INSET programmes following developmental strategies had positive effects on teacher practices compared to traditional inservice training
programmes. The researcher recommended planning INSET programmes that are featured with active engagement, sufficient support, continuous follow up and practicality.

The final study in this category is reported by Ji-Kim (2008) which aimed to examine different INSET strategies used by Korean EFL teachers in an INSET programme and how these strategies affect their practices and their students’ achievements. The study sample consisted of twenty four EFL teachers in three zones. A series of in-depth interviews were used to collect data. Results showed that Korean EFL teachers use strategies as demonstration lessons, workshops, collaborative teacher research and teachers’ networks. The study reported positive effects of employing these strategies on teachers' practices.

To conclude, this category reviewed 13 studies which evaluated the programme effectiveness through its success in changing teachers’ practices, attitudes and beliefs. 8 studies have reported changes while the remaining 5 studies reported limited or no changes at all. Several reasons hindered changes and led to these negative outcomes. Investigating these reasons critically, it seems that, the training programmes within these studies fell short of principles of effective INSET programmes as, teacher involvement, needs assessment, practicality, active learning opportunities, and the provision of sufficient support and resources. As a result, to maintain high quality INSET programmes, a complete utilization of these principles should be guaranteed.

3. Evaluative Studies with Experimental Design Related to Students’ Learning Outcomes

So far, the previous 40 studies focused on investigating inservice training programmes effectiveness either through teachers' reactions or through teachers' overall changes. A third recent category of programme evaluative studies made a further forward step. These studies focused on examining the training programme impact not only in terms of teachers’ changed practices but rather the impact of these changes on students' learning outcomes and their
levels of achievements. Thus, a recent dominant trend, today, attempts to measure the programme quality in terms of increased students' achievements, and learning gains. This last category reviews seven studies within this trend. Most of these evaluative studies adopted an experimental or quasi experimental design to compare pre- and the post levels of students’ achievements.

An example of these experimental studies is the one conducted in Egypt by Nasralla (2007). The main objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of 60 hour standard-based INSET programme on students' language achievements, language learning strategies and attitudes. The study adopted an empirical design; an experimental group of 63 participants was compared to a control one of 33 of English teacher along with their classes. Findings showed significant differences between students in the experimental group -whose teachers were involved in the training programme-and their counterparts in the control group. Improvements were cited in students listening skills, language learning strategies and their overall attitudes towards English language learning. These improvements occurred mainly as a result of teacher's positive involvement in the training programme. The researcher ended with discussing a set of the programmes related contextual factors that would increase the opportunity for teacher improvement, the transfer of training to classrooms and consequently positive impacts on students' achievements.

Adopting similar experimental methodology, Jager et al., (2002) reported beneficial outcomes in second evaluative study. The study aimed at identifying the effects of an INSET programme for primary teachers in Netherlands. The programmed trained teachers on using new instructional behaviour entitled "Cognitive Apprenticeship in Teaching Reading Comprehension". The study sample consisted of an experimental group of 78 teachers who were trained to use the new instructional method along with their classes, and a control group of 7 teachers who taught the same curriculum of reading comprehension texts but received no
training. Data were collected using an observation checklist, and a final course evaluation questionnaire. Students in the experimental and control groups were assessed using a group of standardized pre-post tests. Analysis of data showed that teachers in the experimental group successfully changed their teaching behaviours and used the new instructional behaviour in an effective way compared to teachers in the control group who received no training. These positive improvements were translated in improved students' gains in their reading skill. The researchers argued that when teachers are appropriately trained and coached, they can change their behaviours in accordance with the new practices.

Close to previous positive outcomes, Whitney et al., (2005) reported an evaluated study which investigated the effect IIMPac participation upon teachers’ classroom practices and their students' learning outcomes. IIMPac is an acronym for training programme of five elements; Inquiry, In-service Workshops, Models, Practice and Coaching. The programme aimed at developing teachers’ instructional practices in teaching English writing skill. The sample of the study consisted of 15 language teachers of grades 4-8 with 20/30 students each. 8 teachers along with their students participated in the experimental group, while the other 7 with their students were involved as the control group. The study employed a quasi experimental design; three forms of qualitative data were used to measure the differences in teachers' classroom practices in teaching writing. Other tools used involved interviews, classroom observation, and collection of classroom artifacts documentations. Students' outcomes were measured using pre-post writing test and an attitude survey. The study reported positive changes in teachers’ practices when teaching writing skill. Furthermore, these positive changes have resulted into noticeable improvements in students' performance and attitudes towards writing tasks. Thus, INSET programmes with specific context focus can be fruitful at teachers and students level.
Under the same umbrella, Podhajski et al., (2009) conducted a study to examine the effects of a training programme in scientifically based reading instruction on teachers’ knowledge and students’ reading outcomes. The programme was entitled “TIME” - Acronym for-Training in Instructional Methods of Efficacy-. The 35 hours programme focused on training first and second grade teachers on the teaching phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency. It also helped teachers to investigate how English language is constructed and to experience explicit and implicit strategies of teaching phonics, phonemes and reading assessment as well. The study was of experimental nature involving an experimental group of 4 teachers and their 33 students compared with a control group of 3 teachers and their 14 students. A pre-post test was used to investigate the programme impact on teachers’ knowledge concerning explicit reading instruction and the impact of this knowledge on students reading achievements. Test scores reported positive effects of the programme on both teacher knowledge and students’ growth in reading. The researchers concluded that effective programmes which enhance teachers’ knowledges in specific skills can have a positive effect on teachers and students learning outcomes practices (2009, p.414).

A fifth evaluative study which yielded a positive impact on teachers’ practices and students’ performance as a result of participating in a training programme is the one conducted by Biggs et al., (2008). The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of the training programme on teachers’ use of new instructional methodology entitled "Sheltered Instruction". The programme started with interviewing participating teachers and observing their classes twice in 2004. The data collected in this pre-stage were used in designing the 45 training hours with the focus on using sheltered instruction with ELLS. The study involved 23 teachers from the same elementary school with their students. Data collection was mainly done through structured interviews and focused classroom observation. Result analysis showed that this focused individualized programme resulted in positive
outcomes for teachers and for their students as well. Such successful results obtained through the study highlighted main key features of effective inservice training programmes as content focus, active learning, collaboration and coherence.

Confirming the previous positive results, Ye He et al., (2009) evaluated the impact of a training programme designed by US Department of Education on teachers’ and their ESL learners’ achievements. The programme was designed to address the language and achievement gap between ESL learners (learners living in USA and whose native language is not English) and non-ESL learners (native Americans) by providing a comprehensive inservice training programme to their teachers in two school Zone in South Carolina in USA. Two school Zones with 22 teachers and their 235 ESL learners were chosen as a sample. Data were collected through pre-post ESL knowledge Inventory and Feedback, with Likert scale items and open ended questionnaire distributed before and after the programme. In addition, an English language proficiency test was also used to measure learners overall improvements. Analysis of the gathered data showed that 86% of the participants ranked the programme so positive, 14% cited some negative aspects involved as too much information, lack of practical strategies. Concerning ESL learners’ outcomes, test results proved that students’ scores were higher in 2008 than in 2007. Commenting on such positive findings, the researcher emphasized that research-based, needs-oriented, collaboratively designed inservice training programmes can provide teachers with useful strategies and resources. In this way teachers can move beyond "Just good teaching" (2009:8)

The final study in this category was carried out by Buysse et al., (2009) to evaluate a training programme targeting ESL learners’ early language and literacy skills through updating their teachers' knowledge, skills and practices. The study adopted an experimental design with overall number of participants of 55 teachers along with their 193 students divided in 26 teachers with 92 students in the experimental group and 29 teachers with their
101 students in the control group. Observation checklist was used to measure changes in teachers' practices while three achievement tests were used to measure gains in students' language skills. Results indicated that teachers in the experimental group showed greater gains over the school year in the quality of their classroom practices with positive statistical significant differences in favour of the experimental group. Unlike the previous six studies, the study results reported limited students' improved learning outcomes. The researcher commented that improvements in students' achievements may need extra time to lead to more in-depth changes.

To end up, this last category reviewed 7 evaluative studies related to evaluating the programme effectiveness in relation to students' learning outcomes. It seems that tracing the impact of training programmes on students' learning gains is not an easy task. Thus, it is no wonder that only 7 studies have been reviewed within this category compared to 27 studies in the first category and 13 studies in the second category. Despite this difficulty, this trend is starting to become more valid toady since, with students' learning outcomes in focus, the programme quality can be judged more comprehensively and more objectively.

**Commentary on the Previous Studies:**

In the previous section entitled “Previous Studies”, 47 evaluative studies have been reviewed. These studies are grouped into three categories according to the trends followed in evaluating the programme impact either through teachers' reactions, teachers' changes or through improvements in students' learning outcomes. These studies ranged from 1990 to 2010. Six studies were conducted in a period between 1990 and 1999. The other 41 studies were conducted from 2000 to 2010 with 31 up-to-date studies from 2005 to 2010.

Reviewing 47 varied, recent, and rich studies shows clearly that INSET programme evaluation is a deeply rooted concern in the educational literature today. Evaluation has always been a part of every effort directed towards enhancing teacher's INSET. Such focus
on the importance of inservice training evaluation justifies choosing the topic of current study.

Furthermore, reviewing these studies confirm that teacher training is a national priority in many countries. It is placed at the heart of every single education reform initiative. The 47 studies show how training programmes have been counted upon to bring about curriculum innovations (Idris et al., 2007), El- Shandaweli (1990); Conco (2005); Kirkgoz (2008), to refresh, enhance and upgrade teachers skills and knowledge (Daloglu (2004); Chinda (2009), Cetina (2007); Lamie (2006); Imjinda (2005) Mohammed (2006), and to implement new innovative models and changes (Samour (2006); Atay (2008); Ji-Kim (2008); Alwan (2000), and abed-Haleem (2008).

Through a careful examination of the reviewed studies results, it seems that these studies have pointed out similar training programmes inadequacies and limitations as, theoretical orientation (Alwan (2000); Cimer et al., (2010); Conco (2005); Nicolaidis & Matheoudakis (2008); Al-Farra (1996); Al- Ajez & Al-Banna (2003), lack of teacher involvement and needs assessments (Al–Ansari (1995); Huang (1999), lack of facilities, short duration centralization, and absence of systematic ongoing feedback and evaluation (Kucksuleymonoglu (2006), Mohammed (2006); Gonzalez (2003); Jeber (2002); Abu- Salem (2008); Abu-Atwan (2008).

In an attempt to handle such deficiencies, most of the reviewed studies ended with similar recommendations as increasing chances of inservice training programmes (Kucksuleymonoglu (2006); Khanal (2006); Kirkogz (2008); Huang (1999); Al–Shandaweali (1990), technology integration and provision of sufficient time resources, facilities and incentives (Al- Ajez (2004); Al-Ajez & Al-Banna(2003); Abu- Salem(2008); Abu-Atwan (2008); Al- Farra (1996 ),focus on practicality (Gonzalez (2003); Al- Farra (1996); Sabri (1997); Daloglu (2004); Harumi (2005), employing more innovative INSET models (Alwan (2000); Atay (2008), focusing on teachers' needs and active involvement (N-Kim (2009);
utilizing collaboration, taking advantages of cooperative efforts as schools and universities partnerships (Nickoladies (2008); Cimer et al., (2010); Kucksuleymonoglu (2006); and finally the importance of continuous follow up and support (Lamie (2006); Imjinda (2005); Conco (2005); Mohammed (2006); Harumi(2005); Ji-Kim(2008); Ye-He et al., (2009); Abed-Haleem (2008).

In addition, the studies give a clear picture of the theoretical and practical issues related to INSET. They, for example, clarified the important role INSET plays in helping teachers coping with innovative changes. The positive results shown by Kirkgoz (2008); Idris et al., (2007) and El-Shandawily (1990) studies bring back to the memory the introduction of the new Palestinian English Curriculum within the last few years. This introduction was accompanied with almost no training. Only a few training courses were cited here and there in separate efforts far away from large scale coherent policy plans. Such exclusion of inservice training programmes role might have contributed to the difficulties, complaints, dissatisfaction and misunderstandings that accompanied the introduction of the new Palestinian curriculum.

Furthermore, the current study is similar to the 27 reviewed studies in the first category in two ways. Firstly, it is concerned with evaluating the inservice training programme through teachers' and supervisors reactions and views. Secondly, it adopts the descriptive analytic method with questionnaires and interviews as the main data collection tools. Also, this study is similar to Al-Farra (1996) and Jaber (2002) in their attempts of evaluating training programmes in the light of contemporary trends. In addition, this study is similar to Cimer et al., (2010) in evaluating the training programme in the light of a set of predetermined principles. Nevertheless, Cimer et al.’s study adopted only 6 principles derived from general literature review, this study adopts 15 principles established through elaborate, detailed and comprehensive survey of contemporary trends within INSET literature.
Finally, despite the wide range of the reported studies and varied literature, a conspicuous lack can be noticed within the Palestinian context. At the local level, and to the knowledge of the researcher, there is not any research study recorded up-to-date which is concerned with evaluating inservice training programmes for UNRWA English language teachers in particular. Acknowledging such scarcity, this study tends to be a distinguished one for two main reasons. Firstly, it aims to evaluate inservice training programmes provided for UNRWA English teachers in particular, secondly, this evaluation is conducted in the light of innovative principles collected and chosen through a careful study of contemporary trends within INSET literature.

Summary

Surfing literature in chapter two, the researcher has gained rich and deep insights on both theoretical and practical aspects needed for designing the present study. The theoretical framework laid the basis for what counted as successful INSET programmes. It helped the researcher in going beyond INSET misconceptions, and passing all traditional boundaries through presenting innovative models and trends. Furthermore, the previous studies section provided the complementary parts of the whole scene; it translated theory into practice by showing how INSET programmes evaluation can be approached through practical steps, particularly, in relation to study tools. Finally, special attention was paid to every reviewed study’s recommendations to make use of them in the following chapters.
Chapter III
Methodology

Introduction

3.1. Research Design

3.2. The Study Population

3.3 The Study Tools

3.3.1 Document Analysis
3.3.2 The questionnaire
3.3.3 The Focused Group Interview

3.4 The Study Statistical Methods

3.5 Procedures of the Study

3.6 Difficulties in Data Collection

Summary
Chapter III
Methodology

Introduction
This chapter illustrates the methodology employed within the study. It presents the research design, involving the population, the three instruments, data analysis and procedures. Finally, it ends up with the statistical analysis techniques and difficulties faced while carrying out the present study.

3.1 Research Design
The descriptive analytic method was adopted to carry out the study purposes. This method refers to "any research that describes a setting or events in numerical terms" (Brown & Rodgers, 2002, p.118). The researcher adopted this method due to its relevance to the study purposes. Brown and Rodgers (2002, p.117) point out that this method has always been used in second language researches for achieving several purposes especially for needs analysis, and evaluating the usefulness of teacher training programmes.

3.2 The Study Population
The study population includes two groups:

1. 20 female and 26 male teachers who were enrolled in the INSET programme within the last two years 2008, and 2009 in Gaza Governorates.

2. 8 English supervisors in Gaza Governorates involving (6) males and (2) females. The total number of English supervisors are 9, thus, one supervisor was excluded mainly because he had not participated in the INSET programme.

The distribution of the first group of participants (trainees) according to the demographic variables including gender, teaching experience and educational district is shown below in Tables (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3).
Table: (3.1)
Distribution According to Gender Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table (3.1) shows that male trainees constitute the majority of the study population as their percentage is 56.5% while the female teachers constitute 43.4% of the study population.

Table: (3.2)
Distribution According to Years of Teaching Experience Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher classified the trainees according to their years of experience. The first category includes those novice teachers of 1-5 years, the second category includes trainees of 5-10, and the third category involves experienced teachers of more than ten years. Table (3.2) above shows that trainees of 1-5 years of experience constitute the largest percentage 47.8%, followed by 5-10 years of experience 30.4% and the third is the least category. This can be justified since the INSET programme targets newly appointed teachers, more qualified teachers are nominated through their supervisors if they were in need for improvement.
Table (3.3)

Distribution According to Educational District Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational district</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Governorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Governorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Governorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3.3), above clarifies that 47.8% of the trainees are located within Gaza district while the other districts have equal percentages of 17.4%.

3.3 Instrumentation

The researcher used three tools: document analysis, a questionnaire and a focused group interview.

3.3.1 The 43 Document Analysis Lists

One of the study aims is to formulate a list of contemporary principles (criteria) which are used for evaluating the quality of INSET programmes. To achieve this aim, the researcher analyzed 43 lists introduced through four main categories as follows:

1. Ten Policy lists
2. Twelve Studies lists
3. Ten Researchers lists
4. Eleven Countries Survey list

Each of the previous categories is presented and detailed in a single table, thus, four tables with the most frequent principles in each category are shown in (Appendices, 1, 2, 3, 4). Next, the principles in the four tables are compared, analyzed and a final list of the most common principles are selected as illustrated in Appendix (5).

Before proceeding on presenting the four categories, it is essential to clarify that these principles represent broad guidelines for effective INSET programmes. They are sometimes
referred to either as trends, standards, criteria, or even characteristics of high quality INSET programmes.

1. Policy Lists:

This category refers to a set of principles chosen after surveying ten policy lists drawn from the publications of several organizations and agencies. These agencies and organizations are drawn from various countries and regional areas as England, USA, Canada, and Australia to reflect universality.

Table (3.4) below shows the ten policy lists arranged in a descending chronological order.

Table (3.4): Policy Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>England Plan School Zone</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Albetra Teacher Association</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Victoria Department of education</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Common Wealth of Virginia Department of Education</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>NSCD</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>NAPEAT</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>US Department of Education</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ALESCO</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Arab World</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix (1) shows the selected principles where every principle is assigned a number. For example, enhancement of specific content and pedagogical knowledge as the first principle is assigned number 11 in NSCD list while, in the OECD list it is assigned number 5. These numbers do not show any kind of superiority rather they refer to the number of the principles appearance in each list. It is commendable to note that appendix (1) includes only the
principles that are frequently as cited. Infrequent or irrelevant principles such as, accommodating diversity, promoting equity are ignored because they do not relate to the Palestinian context.

2. Studies List

This category refers to a set of principles developed through twelve INSET studies. These studies aimed to find a correlation between specific INSET programme qualities as collaboration, coherence; active learning and the effectiveness of these programmes. The first six studies are empirical; they involve, Supotivz and Turner (2000), Garet et al. (2001), Boyle et al., (2003), Desimone et al., (2002), Marek and Methen (1991), and Ingvarson et al., (2005). The other six studies are review studies of the available researches in INSET literature. They involve Yoon et al., (2007); DiCerbo & Duran (2006); Snow-Renner& Lauer (2005); Kennedy (1998); Cohen &Hill (1998); and Darling–Hammond et al., (2009). Appendix (2) shows these studies and the principles investigated in details.

It is vital to confirm that, despite, the large bulk of literature that can be found on high quality INSET programmes, limited number of INSET studies focused on investigating the relationship between a certain quality and programme effectiveness. In other words, most of principles found were merely a survey of researchers' opinions, and preferences with little scientific evidences as pointed out by Guskey (2003, p.4) “They lack verifying evidence". In a similar way, Desimone et al., (2002, p.82) confirm that "There is a little direct evidence on the extent to which these characteristics [principles] are related to better teaching and increased student achievement."
3. Researchers Lists

This category involves reviewing lists of principles suggested through ten researchers whose names are repeatedly associated with INSET studies. The ten researchers’ lists appear below in a descending chronological order:

1. Karagiorgi & Symeon (2008) in a recent article entitled as *Through the Eyes of the Teachers: Revisiting In-Service Training Practices in Cyprus*

2. Thomas Corcoran (2007) in an article entitled *Teaching Matters: How State and Local Policymakers Can Improve the Quality of Teachers and Teaching*

3. Smith & Gillespie (2007) in an article entitled *Research on INSET and Teacher Change: Implications for Adult Basic Education*


7. Speck & Knipe (2001) in a book entitled; *Why can't We Get It right? INSET in the Schools*


10. Abed- Haqq (1996) in an article entitled *Making Time for Teacher INSET*

These ten lists are chosen mainly for being:

- Repeatedly cited in several recent INSET literature, for example, Abed- Haqq's list has been referred to by (Guskey 2002; Stockton 2007; O’Brein 2004; Mohamed
2006; Garet et al., 2001; Fullan 1993, Desimone et. al, 2002; Yoon et al., 2007, Snow-Renner & Lauer 2005; Supovitz & Turner 2000; Ingvarson et al., 2005.)

- Various (researchers from different countries)
- Relevant
- Comprehensive
- Spreading over an expanded period of time from 1996 to 2008

Appendix (3) shows the researchers, the year and the principles in the ten reviewed researchers’ lists.

4. Countries Survey List

Countries survey list is the last category reviewed when establishing the needed principles for the purposes of the current study. This survey aims to identify the current INSET scene in eleven countries. This identification is done through investigating INSET distinctive features in every country. These features involve laws regulations, main models and formats, duration, main facilities, resources, training techniques, technology integration, main inadequacies and plans for improvement. The countries involved in the survey were chosen mainly for being:

- Of various geographical distributions.
- Of different economic, social and political status involving Arab countries, industrial, and developed countries.

Through careful analysis of the surveyed countries, several conclusions can be made as:

1. A vivid increased recognition of teacher in-service training role in successful educational reform initiatives can be noticed. Most of the surveyed countries, whether industrial or developed, Arab or non-Arab acknowledge the serious impact of inservice training on quality of teachers and teaching.
2. Most of the surveyed countries have identified the current inadequacies in their training programmes and in response they have initiated improvement plans regulating their teacher inservice training schemes.

3. Concerning Arab countries involving (Egypt, Kuwait, and UAE), the picture seems to be less optimistic. The main common drawbacks repeatedly cited include:
   - Practicality is not a main focus where theoretical aspects are still dominating most of in-service activities.
   - Lack of teachers input and no strategies for needs assessment are employed.
   - Lack of systematic feedback and evaluation.
   - Insufficient human and financial resources.
   - Lack of clear –cut strategy and clear –cut goals.
   - Lack of collaboration between pre-service institutes in colleges and universities and in-service training providers.
   - Traditional training techniques with lecturing and workshops.
   - Isolation between pre-service and inservice programmes (Al-Mutawa 1997; El-Khateeb 1987; Al-Farra 1996; Al-Muteeri 2007; Alwan 2000; Rashed 2002).

4. The improvement plans implemented in the surveyed countries suggest similar principles to those proposed in researchers lists, empirical studies and policy lists, for example, most improvement plans focused on principles as technology integration, school-based programmes, practicality, and provision of sufficient time and resources.

Appendix (4) shows the chosen countries with their distinctive trends and features of INSET.
To conclude, the first tool used by the researcher consisted of document analysis of 43 lists introduced through international organizations, researchers, empirical studies and several countries. This analysis ended with developing a list of 15 contemporary principles used for evaluating high quality INSET programmes. These 15 frequent principles are chosen in terms of their recentness, variety, standardization, and relevancy. The final results of the four categories analysis with the 15 chosen principles are shown in Appendix (5).

3.3.2 The Questionnaire

The second tool used by the researchers consisted of sixty-five-item questionnaire. This questionnaire aims at investigating trainees' reactions, views and attitudes towards the inservice training programme. The questionnaire construction process underwent the following steps:

1. Conducting a wide survey of the related literature, this survey included reviewing forty seven and several theoretical studies as shown previously in chapter two.

2. Making use of 43 lists document analysis which resulted in choosing 15 principles for evaluating high quality INSET programmes. These principles constitute the basis for formulating the questionnaire items.

3. Preparing the first draft of the questionnaire, which includes (45) items and two open-ended questions. (Appendix 6).

4. A second draft of the questionnaire was created and it consisted of 72 items and two open-ended questions. This questionnaire was reviewed by 20 experts of educational specialists at the Islamic University, Al-Aqsa University, Al-Azhar University, Qattan Centre for Educational Research and Development-Gaza, (Appendix7). Taking into consideration the referee panels’ suggestions, several items were modified, thus, creating a third draft of the study questionnaire, (Appendix 8).
5. The third draft was distributed among a pilot sample consisted of 28 English teachers in different UNRWA schools who had previously participated in training sessions. In the light of pilot sample statistical analysis, seven items were deleted for being statistically insignificant.

6. The final questionnaire consists of three main parts, the first is biographic and includes the three variables of the study including, gender, years of experience and the educational zone, the second part consists of 65 items distributed among six main domains, and finally the third part consists of two open-ended questions as appears in Appendix (9).

- Questionnaire Instructions

The instructions of the questionnaire were clearly written in English on a cover sheet. The instructions included the purpose of the questionnaire and guiding steps for the trainee teachers to choose the appropriate answer for every item. In addition, there was a section allocated to defining six of the terms used within the questionnaire to guide trainees within the process of responding to the questionnaire items.

- Validity of the Questionnaire

Validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to be measuring. Validity has a number of different aspects and assessment approaches. To examine the questionnaire validity, the following steps are used:

- Content Validity (Experts Judgment)

The second draft of the questionnaires was reviewed by 15 experts of educational specialists at the Islamic University, Al-Aqsa University, AL A-zhar University, El-Najah University, and EL- Qattan Centre for Educational Research and Development–Gaza as shown in (Appendices 12, 13). The referees’ comments were taken into consideration. Two items (number 4 in the first domain and number 18 in the second domain) were specified and
explained. The second draft of the questionnaire consisted of seventy two items distributed into six main domains along with two open-ended questions.

- **Statistical Validity**

To ensure the validity of the questionnaire, two statistical tests were applied. The first test was Criterion-related validity test (Spearman test) which measures the correlation coefficient between each item in one domain and the whole domain. The second test was structure validity test (Spearman test) that judges the validity of the questionnaire structure by testing the validity of each domain and the validity of the whole questionnaire. (Levine; Krebeil &Berenson, 2003, p. 262)

- **Criterion Related Validity**

Internal consistency of the questionnaire is measured by selecting a pilot study sample consisting of 28 UNRWA English language teachers in different UNRWA schools who had previously participated in training sessions conducted by EDC. After the statistical analysis of the correlation coefficients between each item in the six domains in the pilot study questionnaire, seven items were deleted from the questionnaire, namely, items 2, 4 in the first domain, 15, 20 in the second domain, 6 in the third domain, 4 in the fourth domain, and finally item 1 in the fifth domain where Spearman probability value (Sig.) is greater than 0.05, so being statistically insignificant. Thus, the final questionnaire consists of 65 items distributed among six domains along with two open-ended questions as appears in Table (3.5) next page
Table (3.5)
The Final Construction of the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questionnaires Domains</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Training Programme Goals</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Training Programme Content</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Training Methods and Techniques</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Training Programme Evaluation Tools</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>Training Programme Time and Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>The Programme Trainers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>six domains</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Construct Validity of the Questionnaire-

Construct validity is the second statistical test used to test the validity of the questionnaire structure by testing the validity of each domain and the validity of the whole questionnaire. This type of validity indicates the correlation of each item degree with the total average of the questionnaire (Levine et al., 2003, p.267). The researcher used Pearson correlation formula to calculate the correlation between the score on each domain of the questionnaire with the total score of the questionnaire and also Pearson correlation formula was used to calculate the correlation between the score on each item of the questionnaire with the total score of the questionnaire by using the statistical analytical programme (SPSS). The correlation coefficient of the questionnaire can be illustrated in the following tables.
Table (3.6) 
Correlation Coefficient of Each Item in Domain (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Spearman Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3.6) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the first domain and the total of the first domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items within this domain are consistent and valid.

Table (3.7) 
Correlation Coefficient of Each Item in Domain (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Correlation Value</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (3.7) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the second domain and the total of the domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items of this domain are consistent and valid.

Table (3.8)
Correlation Coefficient of Each Item in Domain (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Spearman Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3.8) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the third domain and the total of the domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items of this domain are consistent and valid.
Table (3.9)
Correlation Coefficient of each Item in Domain (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Spearman Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3.9) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the fourth domain and the total of the domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items of this domain are consistent and valid.

Table (3.10)
Correlation Coefficient of Each Item in Domain (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Spearman Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3.10) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the fifth domain and the total of the domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients
of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items of this domain are consistent and valid.

Table (3.11)
Correlation Coefficient of Each Item in Domain (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Spearman Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3.11) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each item of the sixth domain and the total of the domain. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of this domain are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the items of this domain are consistent and valid.

In addition, the researcher assessed the domains structure validity by calculating the correlation coefficients of each domain of the questionnaire and the whole of questionnaire as shown in Table (3.12) next page.
Table (3.12) above clarifies the correlation coefficient for each domain and the whole questionnaire. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of all the domains are significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, so it can be said that the domains are valid.

- **Reliability of the Questionnaire**

The reliability of an instrument is the degree of consistency in measuring the attributes supposed to be measured. The less variation an instrument produces in repeated measurements of an attribute, the higher its reliability. Reliability can be equated with the stability, consistency, or dependability of a measuring tool. (Brown and Rodgers, 2002, p.241) The researcher used Alpha Cronbach and split-half methods to measure the reliability of the questionnaire.

**Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha**

This method is used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire between each domain and the mean of the whole domains of the questionnaire. The normal range of Cronbach’s coefficient alpha value is between 0.0 and +1.0, and the higher values reflects a higher degree of internal consistency (Levine et al., 2003, p. 270). The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was calculated for each domain of the questionnaire as shown in Table (3.13) next page.
Table (3.13) Cronbach's Alpha Correlation Coefficient Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Training Programme Goals</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Training Programme Content</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Training Methods and Techniques</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Training Programme Evaluation Tools</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Training Programme Time and Resources</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The programme Trainers</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3.13) above shows the values of Cronbach's Alpha for each domain of the questionnaire and the entire questionnaire. For the domains, values of Cronbach's Alpha were in the range from 0.707 and 0.915. Cronbach's Alpha equals 0.950 for the entire questionnaire which indicates an excellent reliability. Thereby, it can be said that the questionnaire is valid, reliable, and ready for distribution.

**Split Half Reliability**

This statistical method refers to a form of internal reliability in which the consistency of item responses is determined by comparing scores of the odd items with scores of even items.(Levine et al., 2003, p.275).
Table (3.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Domains</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Corrected Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>P-Value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain(1)</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(2)</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(3)</td>
<td>0.7100</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(4)</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(5)</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(6)</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>0.899</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through Table (3.14) above, it can be said that the questionnaire correlation coefficient by using split half method is (0.899). This indicates that the questionnaire is reliable and hence can be applied to the study population.

3.3.3 The Focused-Group Interview

A. The Aim of the Interview

The focused–group interview is used to evaluate the programme through trainer's views, reactions and perceptions. The researcher used focused group interview, in particular, for the following reasons:

1. The group setting allows individuals to use the ideas of others as cues to elicit their own views;

2. As participants involved within this study (trainers) have different unique experience, this tool is beneficial for sharing these unique experience through the interactive discussions guaranteed when using focused group interview "a comment made by one person may jog another's memory about a particular experience shared" (Kreuger, 1994, p. 55; Lederman, 1990, p. 119; Morgan, 1996, p. 135);
3. Information can be obtained more quickly because only one interview must be scheduled for a group, rather than one for each person.

B. Description of the interview

The focused group interview consisted of seven semi-structured questions as shown in Appendix (10). The interview was conducted on Monday 18th of October 2010 and held at UNRWA Educational Development Centre (EDC) in Gaza. It lasted for fifty minutes. 8 supervisors participated in the interview. The interview was tape recorded, besides, a second written version of notes were made by an assistant teacher who attended the interview for such purpose. The taped interview was transcribed and a written version was created out of the taped interview. The two versions (the written and the taped) were compared and a third version was created out of the two. This final version, which appears in Appendix (11), was used for statistical analysis later.

- Validity of the Interview

To ensure the interview validity, it was reviewed by a jury of 20 specialists from the Islamic University, Al-Azhar University, Al-Aqsa University, El-Najah University and Al-Qattan Centre as shown in appendix (12). All of them agreed on the suitability of the questions in the interview.

- Reliability of the Interview

The researcher re-interviewed three supervisors a week after the first interview to measure the internal consistency. Then, she calculated the reliability through time by using Holisti Equation. Table (3.15) next page shows the reliability through time for the interview.
Table (3.15)
The Reliability through Time for the Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Agreed Codes</th>
<th>Disagreed Codes</th>
<th>The Total Codes</th>
<th>Agreed Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The First</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Third</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3.15) above shows that correlation between the first and the second interview equals 87.8% which reflects strong reliable data.

3.4 The Statistical Techniques Used within the Study

The researcher used applications from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS.15) to treat the data. The following statistical treatments were used:

1. Cronbach's Alpha and split half for reliability statistics
2. Spearman rank correlation for validity
3. Frequency and descriptive analysis

3.5 Procedures of the Study

1. Reviewing the literature related to INSET evaluation within contemporary trends, and formulating 15 principles for high quality INSET programmes.
2. Consulting a number of experts for verifying the tools (the questionnaire and the focused group interview questions).
3. Modifying the questionnaire and the focused group interview questions to the referees' comments.
4. Getting the permission from UNRWA administrators to maintain all theoretical and statistical data related to EDC and training programmes (Appendix 13)
5. Getting the permission from UNRWA administrator to distribute the questionnaire and carry out the interview. (Appendix 14).
6. Applying the questionnaire
7. Sending the trainers an interview invitation to attain their approval and to set a suitable timing. (Appendix 15)
8. Conducting the interview with English supervisors.
9. Analyzing the collected data in the form of frequencies and percentages and organizing it through tables.
10. Giving interpretations and comments.
11. Presenting recommendations and suggestions.
12. Designing a practical framework for future INSET programme.

3.6 Difficulties in Data Collection

Throughout the procedures and phases of the study, the researcher faced some difficulties which can be displayed as follows:

1. Collecting and analyzing the criteria used in evaluating inservice training programmes and reading the current contemporary trends within this field was a challenging task due to the lack of studies related to English language inservice training programmes.
2. Interviewing English supervisors (programme trainers) in one focused group was a difficult task due to their busy schedules.
3. The questionnaire distribution was challenging to the scattered sample from northern to southern governorates.
Summary

This chapter gave a full illustration of the three tools employed by the researcher. It outlined the 15 principles resulting from the first tool (document analysis). It presented the questionnaire and the focused group interview. Deciding on these tools was in accordance with the vast literature review conducted, especially in relation to the questionnaire and the interview usage. However, this study is distinguished in the sense that formulating the questionnaire items and the interview questions was performed in the light of the third tool results (document analysis). Hence, it can be said that, the study tools were inspired by 47 reviewed studies and 43 analyzed lists in a total of 90 theoretical and empirical studies; this triangulation, collecting data from different valid and reliable sources, has led to reliable findings to be discussed next chapter.
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Chapter IV
The Study Findings

Introduction

This study aimed at evaluating the current INSET programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in regards to contemporary trends. To achieve this aim, the study attempted to answer six questions through using three tools. This chapter introduces the results of the study tools as statistically treated. It illustrates the SPSS formula used in treating the data including, frequencies, percentages and statistical tests as Sign, Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis. Tables are used to present the treated data. Through such statistical treatment, an overall picture of the programme is provided, where aspects of weaknesses and strengths are identified and classified.

Examination of Research Questions

4.1 The First Question: What are the main aims and features of the current in-service training programme available for UNRWA English teachers?

To answer this descriptive question, the researcher utilized information taken from two main sources involving; the official website of UNRWA and an interview conducted with two officials at EDC on 21st of November 2010 as shown in Appendix (17). In what follows a full description of UNRWA Institute of Education and the Educational Development Centre is provided, along with a detailed explanation of INSET programmes planning in general and English INSET programmes in particular.

A. The Institute of Education

Since the foundation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA) in 1950, education has been its main preoccupation in Gaza Strip. The agency helped to preserve the right of education for hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees for more than six decades. A major role in this area has been assigned to the Institute of Education established by UNRWA in 1964. The Institute of Education was
established in December 1964 as a joint project by UNESCO and UNRWA. It aimed to train UNRWA uncertified teachers since as UNRWA reported; over 90% of teachers serving in UNRWA schools at that time were professionally untrained and uncertified (http://www.unesdoc.unesco.org/2004-2005).

This high percentage of uncertified teachers arose from the fact that the agency focused on finding teachers for newly established classes regardless of whether those opting for the job had or did not have the necessary qualifications. The Institute started training teachers in October 1964, since then it was the only institute responsible for INSET programmes. These programmes involve long term and short refresher courses for elementary, preparatory teachers as well as other key educational personnel as supervisors, and headteachers (Abu-Jado, 2008, p. 15).

The Institute of Education consists of two main units: (Interview with EDC officials)

1. Training Programme Unit; which is responsible for designing, implementing and evaluating training programmes

2. Training Materials Unit; which is concerned with providing the needed, printed training materials, the audio visual aids, as well as reviewing and evaluating these programmes to provide sufficient feedback.

B. Educational Development Centres (EDC)

According to (Abu-Jado, 2008, p. 15) two educational development centers were founded as a pilot project, one in Amman and the other in Gaza in 1973. The overall aim of these centres is to achieve qualitative improvements in the education system through innovation and better utilization of the available resources. These two pilot centres were later expanded to include one centre in each of UNRWA five fields of operation including, Lebanon, West bank, and Syria.
Gaza Educational Development Centre aims to: (Abu-Jado, 2008:1-8)

1. Provide inservice teacher training
2. Curriculum enrichment
3. Provide educational documentation and library services
4. Conduct action researches
5. Provide technical guidance to teachers and headteachers.

Planning and Designing Training Programmes goes in the following steps as: (Interview with EDC officials)

1. Target group identification including trainees’ teachers, supervisors, and principals.
2. Needs assessment using different techniques
3. Analyzing and prioritizing trainees’ needs.
4. Goals specification in the light of the identified needs
5. Content selection
6. Training materials selection
7. Training techniques selection
8. Deciding on training times, place and resources
9. Evaluation techniques selection
10. Evaluating the programme before implementation
11. Implementing and providing feedback

C. INSET Programmes Description

1. Number

The EDC in Gaza conducts 10 to 12 training programmes every year in all specializations. Appendix (18) shows the total number of training programmes implemented in the last four years; from 2005 to 2009. The number of the trainees involved ranges from 15 to 25 in each session.
2. Training Techniques

The main training technique employed by the EDC is known as the Integrated Multi-Media Approach. It combines both direct and indirect methods of instruction as short intensive courses, coupled with educational materials for self-study and a decentralized tutorial system. The uniqueness of this approach lies in its ability of integrating different techniques into one organic whole. Figure (3.2) below, shows the different components of the Integrated-Multi-Media Approach adopted by EDC.

![Diagram of Integrated Multi-Media Approach](image)

**Figure (4.1):** The Integrated-Multi-Media Approach adopted by EDC (cited in Abu-Jado 2008, p. 12)
3. Trainees Evaluation

The system of evaluation employed by EDC as reported in (Interview with EDC officials) involves the following:

1. A series of periodic tests
2. The participants’ active and effective participation in the weekly seminars, and summer courses
3. Supervisory guidance visits by field supervisors to the trainees in their classrooms.
4. The quality of action research studies required of the trainees.
5. Final exams prepared by experts in the Institute of Education

D. English Teacher INSET Programmes

The EDC conducts two inservice training programmes for elementary and preparatory English teachers every year. Conducting these programmes is done in similar ways as other in other specializations. This study is concerned with evaluating the INSET programme provided for UNRWA English teachers in the last two years, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009. Choosing these two years in particular arises from two main facts:

1. Within these two years, the UNRWA along with EDC have adopted similar policies concerning planning and implementing INSET programmes.
2. From 2009 and onwards; several changes have occurred concerning the EDC and INSET. Thus, including training programme conducted in 2009-2010 was not possible and not in accordance with the study purposes.

1. Inservice Training Aims

According to English supervisors, the general aims for training UNRWA English teachers are:

1. To raise English language teachers teaching and linguistic competencies
2. To provide English teachers with practical methods and techniques in order to be used in the classroom

3. To refresh teachers’ minds

4. To familiarize teachers with the problematic areas in teaching English and ways of solving these problems

5. To train teachers on classroom management and procedures to be followed in organizing work inside classrooms

6. To provide teachers with the techniques of presenting new language structure, vocabulary and grammatical points, reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are emphasized in the training

7. To acquaint teachers with the rules and regulations of UNRWA

8. To help teachers in finding ways of connecting theory to practice in light of the knowledge acquired

9. To raise teachers knowledge with current trends and issues in the field of education in general.

2. Programme Description

The INSET programme, as reported by English supervisors in the interview, consists of one year course to be followed by a summer course. Training is given in weekly spaced 3 hours seminars throughout the school year (24 seminars) followed by a six day summer course involving about 30 hours. Most of training sessions are conducted after schooldays from 11a.m to 1 p.m. Training sessions are held in training rooms belonging to the EDC or in particular UNRWA schools chosen by supervisors in each area.

3. Trainees

The trainees are English teachers working in UNRWA schools. They are commonly chosen from newly appointed teachers of 1-5 years experience. Other experienced teachers can also
be involved as well. The trainees are selected by English supervisors (trainers) according to their personal experience and judgment and field visits observation. Supervisors rarely conduct any type of formal need assessments as questionnaires or interviews. Trainees’ numbers range approximately from 20 to 25.

4. Training Content

Training materials are specified through the Institute of Education. Some of these materials as mentioned by English supervisors themselves are theoretical, old, and unsuitable for trainees hence, supervisors do their best to adapt and modify these materials to suit their trainees’ needs. Appendix (19) shows the training topics included in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 training programme.

4. Training Techniques

Most of the training techniques used are similar to those used within other training programmes in other specializations. However, the most common training techniques used as mentioned by the trainers, or the activity leaders -as termed by EDC- in the interview involve lecturing and demonstration lessons.

5. Trainees’ Evaluation

Evaluating trainees is done in the same way adopted in other training programmes run by the EDC -as explained before in page 113- including periodic tests, field visits, written examinations and research papers.

To sum up, the previous paragraphs provided a detailed description of the programme context, main aims, components and features in general. A special attention was given to English INSET in particular. These descriptions have been used to answer the first question in the study.
4.2 **The Answer of the Second Question**: What are the stated principles for evaluating inservice training programmes in the light of the available contemporary trends?

To answer this question, 43 lists distributed into four categories including 10 policy lists, 12 studies list, 10 researchers’ lists, and 11 countries survey lists were analyzed, as shown previously in chapter three and presented in appendices (1-2-3-4-5). The prolonged and detailed examination of the four categories has resulted in choosing 15 common principles as follows:

1. Enhancement of teachers specific content and pedagogic knowledge
2. Collaboration
3. Coherence
4. Provision of sufficient time and sufficient resources
5. School-based, and classroom focused
6. Provision of opportunities for reflection and active learning opportunities
7. Guidance by best available research and students data
8. Employment of systematic ongoing feedback and evaluation
9. Needs assessment
10. Teacher Involvement
11. Employment of systematic and ongoing follow up and support
12. Variety of forms
13. Clearly stated objectives
14. Practicality
15. Technology Integration

A full explanation and a complete illustration of the 15 principles’ practical employment in designing the questionnaire items have been provided in chapter two, in pages 48-55.
In addition, more practical illustrations of these principles will be provided in chapter five when these principles are used as guidelines in designing the final suggested framework.

4.3 The Answer of the Third Question

To what extent does the in-service training programme meet trainees’ needs from their own perspectives?

In an attempt to answer this question, the researcher calculated the total responses, the frequencies, the mean, the relative weight and ranking of each domain in the six-domain questionnaire as shown in table (4.1) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weight Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>(Sig) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Training programme Goals</td>
<td>2.9748</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Training Programme Content</td>
<td>3.1087</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Training Techniques and Methods</td>
<td>3.2283</td>
<td>64.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Training Programme Evaluation Tools</td>
<td>3.3261</td>
<td>66.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Training Time and Resources</td>
<td>2.1413</td>
<td>42.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Programme Trainers</td>
<td>3.6848</td>
<td>73.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0777</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.1) above shows that the total average of the six domains equals 3.0777 with a total weighted value of 61.54%. The sixth domain “Programme Trainers” has the first rank with a ratio weight of 73.70% while the fifth domain “Training Time and Resources” has the lowest rank with a weighted value that equals 42.83%.

The ranking of the six domains appears below in a descending order:

1. Programme Trainers (73.70%)
2. Training Programme Evaluation Tools (66.52%)
3. Training Techniques and Methods (64.57%)
4. Training Programme Content (62.17%)

5. Training programme Goals (59.50%)

6. Training Time and Resources (42.83%)

The following tables detail the statistical analysis involving the frequencies, percentages, averages, weighted value, ranking and p-value of each item within the six domains.

4.3.1 Domain (1) “Training Programme Goals”

Table (4.2) above shows trainees’ responses to the nine items in domain (1) “Training Programme Goals”. It is clear that responses to a small extent and a very small extent are the highest with 39.11 % while only 21.74 % of the trainees’ responses are in accordance with the domain items. These responses reflect trainees’ unsatisfactory attitudes towards items in domain 1. Such dissatisfaction highlights programmes main shortcomings as lacking practicality, and rare use of needs analysis as will be discussed later.
Table (4.3) below shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item in the first domain.

Table (4.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>The Ratio Weight %</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>p-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. determined in the light of a valid and a comprehensive needs analysis</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. clearly stated at the beginning of the printed training materials</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>66.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. applicable (can be applied in classroom realities)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>62.61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. focused on students' achievement problems inside the classrooms</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. focused on problematic areas in the English curriculum</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. planned collaboratively with the participation of trainees</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. derived in the light of the general goals of English language teaching</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>64.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. derived in the light of schools needs</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. derived in the light of a general coherent plan</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.9748</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.3) above shows that the mean of “Training Programme Goals” domain equals 2.9748, the weighted value that equals (59.50%), and P-value = 0.866 which is greater than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the first domain is statistically insignificant and the average degree of responses to this domain does not differ from the degree of neutrality.

In addition, Table (4.3) shows that:

1. The highest ranking item is number 2 (clearly stated at the beginning of the printed training materials) which has the first rank with a weighted value that equals 66.09%.
2. The second highest item was number 7 (derived in the light of the general goals of English language teaching) with a ratio weight of 64.35% followed by, item number 3
(applicable - can be applied in classroom realities) with a weighted value that equals 62.61%.

3. Item number six has the lowest rank (planned collaboratively with the participation of trainees) with a ratio weight (49.57 %.)

4. The other remaining items (1, 4, 5, 8, and 9) are shown below in a descending order.
   1. Determined in the light of a valid and a comprehensive needs analysis (59.57%)
   2. Derived in the light of a general coherent plan (57.83%)
   3. Derived in the light of schools needs (57.39%)
   4. Focused on students’ achievement problems inside the classrooms (56.96%)
   5. Focused on problematic areas in the English curriculum (54.35%).

4.3.2 Domain (2) “Training Programme Content”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.4) above shows that a total of 23.91% of trainees’ responses are in accordance with the domains’ stated items, while 32.61% of respondents are not. These percentages reflect trainees’ moderate satisfaction of the training content employed in the programme.
Table (4. 5) below shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item of the second domain “Training Programme Content”

Table (4.4)
Arithmetic average and the Probability of Value (Sig.) for each item in Domain (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>The Ratio Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>P-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain(2) &quot; Training Programme Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. is directly based on the programme goals</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>67.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. develops trainees’ English speaking skill</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>59.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. enhances trainees’ English writing skill</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. improves trainees' English reading skill</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. enriches trainees' English listening skill</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. deepens trainees' knowledge of how to teach speaking</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. adds to trainees' knowledge of how to teach writing</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>65.65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. enriches trainees' knowledge of how to teach reading</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. develops trainees' knowledge of how to teach listening</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. increases trainees' knowledge of how to teach vocabulary</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>68.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. deepens trainees' knowledge of how to teach pronunciation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. enhances trainees' knowledge of how to teach spelling</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. improves trainees' knowledge of how to teach grammar</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>66.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. is coherent ( built on previously learnt experience )</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. is logically sequenced from the easiest to the most difficult</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>63.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. involves topics related to employing technology in teaching and learning</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. focuses on specific problematic topics teachers mostly need</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>54.78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. provides trainees with practical topics related to classroom realities</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1187</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous Table (4.5) clarifies that the mean of “Training Programme Content” domain equals 3.1087, the weighted value that equals (62.17%), and P-value = 0.419 which is greater than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the second domain is statistically insignificant and the average degree of responses to this domain does not differ from the degree of neutrality. Table (4.5) also shows that:

- The highest item is number 10 (increases trainees’ knowledge of how to teach vocabulary) which has the first rank with a weighted value that equals (68.69%).
- The second and the third highest items are number 8 (enriches trainees’ knowledge of how to teach reading) with a ratio weight of (68.26%) and item number 9 (develops trainees’ knowledge of how to teach listening) with the same weighted value (68.26%).
- The lowest ranking items are number 17 (focuses on specific problematic topics teachers mostly need) with a weighted value that equals (54.78%), and item number 14 (is coherent (built on previously learnt experience) with a weighted value that equals (55.22%).
- Trainees ranked the rest of the domains’ items moderately including items number 2,3,4,5,6,7,11,12,13,15,16,18. They are arranged in a descending order as shown in the previous table.

4.3.3 Domain (3) Training Methods and Technique

Table (4.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Domain (3) Items (1-9)</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.6) above shows that a total of 36.95% of the trainees’ responses are in accordance with the stated items in the third domain while 26.08% of trainee’s responses are not.
Table (4.7) below shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item of the third domain “Training Methods and Techniques”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Ratio Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>p-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are directly related to programme goals</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are directly based on programme content</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>69.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>73.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are accompanied with practical illustrations and examples</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employ individually guided techniques such as portfolios and journal writing</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use the technique of action research</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>54.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employ innovative techniques such as online training</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide trainees with chances to reflect on their classroom practices</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide trainees with chances to work collaboratively with their colleagues using peer coaching or peer observation</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>60.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2283</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.7) above shows that the mean of “Training Methods and Techniques” domain equals 3.2283, the weighted value that equals (64.57%), and P-value =0.109 which is greater than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the third domain is statistically insignificant and the average degree of responses to this domain does not differ from the degree of neutrality 3. These percentages reflect trainees’ moderate satisfaction of the training methods and techniques employed in the programme.
Table (4. 7) also shows that:

- The highest items are number 3 (depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations) which had the first rank with a ratio weight of 73.48% , secondly, item number 2(are directly based on programme content) with a weighted value that equals 69.13% and thirdly, item number 1(are directly related to programme goals) with a ratio weight of 68.70%

- The lowest rank item is number 7(employ innovative techniques such as online training) with a weighted value that equals 44.78% and item number 5(Employ individually guided techniques such as portfolios and journal writing with a ratio value of 53.91%

- Items number 4, 6, 8, 9 are ranked by trainees as moderate with weighted value as shown table (4.7) arranged in a descending order.

4.3.4 Domain (4) “Training programme Evaluation Tools”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Domain (4) Items (1-10)</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>23.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.8) above shows that 39.13% of the trainees’ responses are in accordance with the stated items in the fourth domain while 26.08% are not. Such percentages reflect moderate trainees’ satisfaction.

Table (4. 9) next page shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item of the fourth domain “Training Programme Evaluation Tools”
Table (4.9)
Arithmetic average and the probability of value (Sig.) for each item in Domain (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Ratio Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>p-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain(4) &quot; Training Programme Evaluation Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. are relevant to the programme goals</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>66.52%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are based on the programme content</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>71.74%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>70.43%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. use field visits and observation</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>64.78%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. employ recent tools such as portfolios</td>
<td>2.587</td>
<td>51.74%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. examine the impact of training on students achievements through analysis of students data</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>54.78%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. involve follow up of teachers practices inside the classrooms after the training programme</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>61.74%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. are planned with the participation of school principals or ministry officials.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>55.65%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. are ongoing (starting from the beginning of the programme to the end)</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>64.35%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. are applied systematically (at the beginning, during and at the end of the programme)</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>66.52%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.326</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.52%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.009</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4. 9) above clarifies that the mean of “Training Programme Evaluation Tools” domain equals 3.3261, the weighted value equals (66.52%), and P-value =0.009 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the fourth domain is statistically significant and the average degree of responses to this domain differs from the degree of neutrality3. This means that trainees agree with items in the fourth domain.

Table (4.9) also shows that:

- The highest items are items number 2 (are based on the programme content) which has the first rank with a ratio weight of 71.74%, secondly, item number3 (are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques) with a weighted value that equals 70.43% and thirdly, items number 1(are relevant to the programme goals) and number
10 (are applied systematically (at the beginning, during and at the end of the programme) with a ratio weight of 66.52%.

- The lowest rank item is number 5 (employ recent tools such as portfolios) with a weighted value of 51.74%
- Items number 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 are ranked by trainees as moderate with weighted value arranged in a descending order as shown in the previous table.

4.3.5 Domain (5) Training Programme Time and Resources

Table (4.10) below shows that a total of 6.52% of trainees’ responses are in accordance with the stated items in the fifth domain “Training Programme Time and Resources”, while 76.09% of trainees responses are not. This high percentage shows that the programme resources and timing are the weakest aspects due to several factors as will be detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>32.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (4. 11) below shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item of the fifth domain “Training Programme Time and Resources”

Table (4. 11)
Arithmetic average and the Probability of Value (Sig.) for each item in Domain (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Ratio Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>P-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain(5) &quot; Training Programme Time and Resources &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Training rooms are well-equipped with various up-to-date technological devices ( LCD, Internet)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training rooms are provided with proper light, heating and air conditioning</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training centre is provided with well-equipped library with up-to-date references</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training centre is provided with other proper facilities as (cafeteria and a garden, training labs)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The transport to and from training centre is available and convenient</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>48.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The chosen time for training sessions is convenient for trainees schedules</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>46.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The programme duration is sufficient for achieving its goals</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>58.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The programme provides sufficient incentives such as career promotion</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The programme provides sufficient incentives such as salary increase</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.83%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4. 11) above shows that the mean of “Training Programme Time and Resources” domain equals 2.14, weighted value that equals (42.83%), and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the fifth domain is statistically significant and the average degree of responses to this domain differs significantly from the degree of neutrality3.
In addition, Table (4.11) shows that:

1. The highest item is number 7 (The programme duration is sufficient for achieving its goals) with a ratio weight of 58.70%.

2. The lowest items were items number 9, 8 and 6 as shown below in a descending order as follows:
   - The chosen time for training sessions is convenient for trainees’ schedules (46.52%)
   - The programme provides sufficient incentives such as career promotion (43.91%)
   - The programme provides sufficient incentives such as salary increase (34.35%)

4.3.6 Domain (6) “The Programme Trainers”

Table (4.12) below shows that a total of 52.18% of the trainees’ responses are in accordance with the stated items in the sixth domain while 6.52% are not. Such responses reflect trainees’ satisfaction and positive attitude towards programme trainers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a very small extent</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (4.13) below shows the mean, the ratio weight, sign value and ranking of each item of the sixth domain “The Programme Trainers”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Arithmetic average</th>
<th>Ratio Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>P-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. are competent and highly qualified</td>
<td>3.6087</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are interested in keeping gentle relationships with trainees</td>
<td>3.7609</td>
<td>75.22%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. are capable of using technological devices efficiently</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. are punctual</td>
<td>3.5652</td>
<td>71.30%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. vary their training techniques according to trainees needs and levels</td>
<td>3.3913</td>
<td>67.83%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. invest the training time properly</td>
<td>3.4348</td>
<td>68.70%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. provide trainees with chances for feedback and comment</td>
<td>3.7174</td>
<td>74.35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. engage trainees in collaborative and active learning</td>
<td>3.5217</td>
<td>70.43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. provide trainees with the needed follow up and support in their classrooms visits</td>
<td>3.6087</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. are preferred to be university professors or native speakers trainers</td>
<td>3.7609</td>
<td>75.22%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6848</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.70%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.13) above shows that the mean of “Programme Trainers” domain equals 3.6848, the weighted value equals (73.70%), and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. This means that the sixth domain is statistically significant and the average degree of responses to this domain differs from the degree of neutrality3. This means that trainees agree with items in the sixth domain.
In addition, Table (4.13) shows that:

- All the items within the sixth domain are ranked high with (to a large extent and a very large extent)
  1. The highest item are number 2(are interested in keeping gentle relationships with trainees) with a ratio weight of (75.22%)
  2. Also, with the same ranking, item number 10(are preferred to be university professors or native speakers trainers) with a ratio weight of (75.22%)

The rest of the items are ranked high including 1, 3,4,5,6,7,8,9, as shown in the previous table.

4.3.7 Analysis of the Two Open-Ended Questions

The questionnaire involved two open ended questions:

A. What changes need to be done to improve the current inservice training programme?

B. What are the topics or skills that you feel in need for further training to improve your competencies as an English teacher?

In order to answer these questions, the researcher used the descriptive statistics, frequencies and percentages as illustrated below:

A. Trainees’ Suggested Changes

In the first open ended question, trainees were asked to suggest essential changes to improve the current INSET programme. Out of the 46, only 33 questionnaires were returned with answers to the first open-ended question.
Table (4.19) below shows the frequencies and percentages of trainees suggested changes.

Table (4.14)
Trainees Suggested Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The Suggested Changes</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Percent%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Focus on practicality: practical training –students real problems– schools needs –Palestinian English curriculum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Suitable timing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Training centre facilities -well-equipped training rooms- labs-refreshment –transportation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Highly qualified trainers ( native speakers –university professors)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>Content modification- up-to-date topics – focus on specific skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Technology integration ( online training –how to use technology in teaching )</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>Teacher involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>Provision of sufficient incentives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>Follow up of trainees work inside classrooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.19) above shows that the need for practicality had the highest percentage (48.57%) followed by the need for suitable timing (37%) and the need for well-equipped training centre along with proper facilities, refreshment and transportation(34.2%).

B. Trainees Suggested Topics and Skills

In the second open ended question, trainees were asked to suggest specific skills or topics in which they need further training to improve themselves as English teachers. Out of the 46 questionnaires, only 33 were returned with answers to this question.
Table (4.20) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of trainees suggested topics and skills.

Table (4.15)
Trainees Suggested Topics and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The Suggested Topics</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Speaking skills</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Pronunciation and phonetics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>How to teach grammar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>How to teach reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>Using games and songs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>How to teach low achievers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>How to employ efficient A.V.M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.20) shows that trainees mostly preferred topics and skills include:

- Speaking skills (42.85%)
- Pronunciation and phonetics (37%)
- Listening skills (31.42%)
- Writing (28.57%)
- How to teach grammar (25.7%)

The previously presented paragraphs and tables were used to illustrate the statistical analysis of the questionnaire domains and items which attempted to answer the third question included in the study. Full interpretations and discussions of these statistical analyses will be introduced in the following chapter.
4.4 The Answer of the Fourth Question:

Are there statistically significant differences at \( \alpha \leq 0.05 \) between trainees’ levels of satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to the variables of?

A. Gender

B. Years of teaching experience,

C. Educational District

To answer this question, the researchers used two statistical tests; Mann-Whitney, and Kruskal-Wallis as will be detailed below.

(A) Gender Variable

The researcher used Mann-Whitney test to examine if “there is a statistically significant difference at \( \alpha \leq 0.05 \) between levels of trainees’ satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to the gender variable as shown in table (4.14) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Smaller than 3</th>
<th>Larger than 3</th>
<th>Equal 3</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
<th>test statistic (z)</th>
<th>Mann–Whitney</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>p-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain(1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>-1.562</td>
<td>187.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>62.17%</td>
<td>-0.510</td>
<td>234.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>64.57%</td>
<td>-0.878</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>66.52%</td>
<td>-0.920</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(5)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>42.83%</td>
<td>-1.919</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain(6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>73.70%</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>252.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the Domains</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>60.86%</td>
<td>-1.115</td>
<td>206.5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average is significant at the 0.05 level
Table (4.14) above clarifies that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of each domain due to the gender variable because the p-value is larger than 0.05. This can be justified since INSET is of crucial importance for every teacher whether male or female. It shows that all teachers regardless of their gender appreciate INSET role and they are convinced of INSET worth and importance in refreshing and enriching their teaching careers.

(B) Years of Teaching Experience Variable

“Is there a statistically significant difference at (α ≤ 0.05) between levels of trainees’ satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to years of teaching experience variable?

The researcher used Kruskal-Wallis Test to answer this question. Table (4.15) above shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of each domain due to the years of teaching experience because the p-value is larger than 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Kruskal–Wallis test statistic</th>
<th>P-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Training Programme Goals are</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Training Programme Content</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Training Methods and Techniques</td>
<td>3.585</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Training Programme valuation Tools</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Training Programme Time and Resources</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The Programme Trainers</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>All the Domains</td>
<td><strong>1.234</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (4.16) below shows in details the average and standard deviation for each category in relation with years of teaching experience variable.
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Table (4.18)
The average and St.d of each Domain in Relation to Years of Experience Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>St.d</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>St.d</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>St.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The programme Goals</td>
<td>3.2143</td>
<td>.57893</td>
<td>2.7955</td>
<td>1.1918</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
<td>.70907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Programme Content</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>75320</td>
<td>3.0455</td>
<td>.98693</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
<td>79757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Techniques</td>
<td>3.6071</td>
<td>.71195</td>
<td>3.0682</td>
<td>.79757</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
<td>.95598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Evaluation Tools</td>
<td>3.3929</td>
<td>.59415</td>
<td>3.2273</td>
<td>1.0203</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>.86442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Time and Resources</td>
<td>2.1492</td>
<td>.66299</td>
<td>2.0682</td>
<td>1.1579</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
<td>1.20646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme trainers</td>
<td>3.6071</td>
<td>.59415</td>
<td>3.7727</td>
<td>.78266</td>
<td>3.6848</td>
<td>.96609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2242</td>
<td>.43219</td>
<td>2.9538</td>
<td>.85783</td>
<td>2.9862</td>
<td>.72554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.16) above shows clearly that the average of the three categories = 3 which shows that there are no statistically significant differences in trainees responses due to the variable of years of teaching experience. Such result clarifies the importance of the INSET programme for all teachers involved regardless of their years of teaching experience.

(C)Educational District Variable

To find out if there is a statistically significant difference at (α ≤ 0.05) between levels of trainees’ satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to the educational district, the researcher used the Kruskal-Wallis Test as shown in Table (4.17) next page.
Table (4.19)

Kruskal-Wallis test of the Domains and their P-values for Educational Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Kruskal-Wallis Test statistic</th>
<th>P-value (Sig.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9.778</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>14.451</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>15.188</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>13.727</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10.241</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4.563</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Domains</td>
<td><strong>14.335</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (4.17) above shows that there are statistically significant differences between the means of each domain for the first five domains due to the Educational district because the p-value is smaller than 0.05 for each domain, while there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the sixth domain due to the Educational district because the p-value is larger than 0.05 for that domain.

Table (4.20)

The average and St.d of each Domain in Relation to Educational district Variable

| Domain | Educational Zone | Northern | | | Gaza | | | Middle | | | Average | | | Standard deviation | | | | | | | Southern | | | Average | | | Standard deviation |
|--------|------------------|----------|---|---|------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|------------------|---|---|--------|---|---|-----------------|---|
|        | Average | St.d   | Average | St.d | Average | St.d | Average | St.d | Average | St.d | Average | St.d |
| 1      | 2.18    | .59387 | 3.11    | 0.6159 | 2.25    | 1.28174 | 1.87    | 1.0264 |
| 2      | 1.12    | .44320 | 3.22    | 0.7515 | 2.75    | 1.03510 | 2.12    | .51755 |
| 3      | 1.37    | .51755 | 3.45    | 0.7385 | 2.68    | 1.06695 | 2.00    | .46291 |
| 4      | 2.56    | .56300 | 3.45    | 0.6709 | 1.81    | .92341  | 2.25    | .75593 |
| 5      | 1.93    | .56300 | 2.29    | 0.6665 | 2.75    | 1.88982 | 1.31    | .53033 |
| 6      | 1.75    | .70711 | 3.56    | 0.7447 | 3.18    | 65124   | 3.43    | .8634  |
| Total  | 2.17    | .30023 | 3.17    | .51175 | 2.46    | 1.00687 | 2.13    | .48035 |

Table (4.18) above shows the average and the standard deviation for each domain in relation the educational district variable. When comparing the averages and standard deviations of the
three zones, it is clear the average and the standard deviation of Gaza zone is the largest. This result shows clearly that there are statistically significant differences in trainees’ responses due to educational district variable in favour of Gaza district. It is also clear that these differences are in the first five domains, while there are no statistically significant differences in trainees’ responses in the sixth domain. These differences in favour of Gaza District can be justified since Gaza has the largest number of trainees when compared to northern, middle or southern districts which share the same number of trainees.

4.5 The Answer of the Fifth Question: To what extent are trainers satisfied with the current in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers?

To investigate trainers' views and reactions towards the current INSET programme, the researcher interviewed 8 English supervisors who work as trainers within this programme. The researcher asked the trainers 6 questions related to the programme components involving goals, content, training techniques, evaluation tools, training centre facilities, and trainees. The seventh question discusses the trainers’ suggestions to improve the current programme. The following tables show the frequencies and the percentages of each of the six questions, the seventh question is not illustrated in a table, since it requires the interviewees to give their suggestions on improving the INSET programme.

4.5.1- Question (1): “What are the main goals the INSET programme seeks to attain, how can you comment on these goals?

Trainers’ answers were collected, compared and coded. Table (4.19) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of the first question in the interview.
As it is clear from Table (4.19) the eight trainers agreed that, the INSET programme's main goals involve:

1. Improving trainees teaching competencies
2. Improving trainees linguistic competencies

Other important goals involve:

3. Providing teachers with practical skills and techniques to be used in the classroom (62.5%)
4. Refreshment (12.5%)
5. Updating teachers knowledge and skills (12.5%)
6. Focusing on problematic areas in English language teaching (12.5%)
7. Improving trainees classroom management skills (12.5%)
8. Introducing trainees to the rules and regulations of UNRWA (12.5%)

Describing these goals, the 8 interviewees agreed that:

1. These goals are decided on through experts of the Institute of Education
2. These goals are derived in the light of trainees needs
3. Trainees needs are decided on through trainers observation and experience
4. Deciding on these goals are not preceded with systematic valid needs assessment
5. These goals are specified and modified through collaborative work of the trainers
6. Focused on students achievement problems
7. Focused on problematic areas in English curriculum
8. Specific and applicable

4.5.2 Question (2): “What words can you use to describe the training content (training topics and materials)? Table (4.20) below, shows the frequencies and the percentages of trainers coded answers to the second question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Two</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.20) above shows that the eight trainees agreed that the training content is

1. Theoretical
2. Old
3. Some of the training assignments are written in Arabic
4. Focused on improving the four skills
5. Focused on improving how to teach the four skills
6. Modified by trainers as (substituting Arabic with English and including up-to-date topics related to using technology in teaching)

One of the interviewee confirmed that this content is

7. Illogically sequenced (12.5%).

Another interviewee declared that the content is
8. Traditional but good and needed (12.5%)

**4.5.3 Question (3):** “What are the main training techniques and methods used by you within the training sessions and what do you think of them?

Table (4.21) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of the third question in the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is clear from Table (4.21) the eight trainers agreed on the following answers:

1. Theoretical presentations and lecturing is the most common
2. Demonstration lessons to follow each session
3. Using collaborative techniques as peer coaching
4. No use of recent models as study groups or portfolios
5. No use of website or online training
6. Using of technology is limited to LCD and PowerPoint presentations
7. Technology use depends on the individual hard work of trainers themselves

One of the interviewee declared that all techniques are guaranteed to be relevant, flexible and applicable and another interviewee declared that training techniques usefulness and suitability cannot be judged through the trainers’ views.

8. Relevant, flexible and applicable 12.5%
9. Suitability and usefulness of these techniques cannot be judged from their views 12.5%
4.5.4 Question (4): “What do you think of the evaluation tools employed within the INSET programme? Table (4.22) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of trainers coded answers to the fourth question in the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Four</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freq</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As clearly shown in Table (4.22), the trainers agreed that

1. Evaluation techniques are various
2. Evaluation is ongoing and systematic
3. written exams
4. Observational field visits
5. Questionnaires
6. No use of recent models as portfolios
7. Focus on teachers' practices
8. Follows the impact on students' achievement

One of the interviewees declared that following the impact of training on teachers' practices and on students' achievements cannot be done since “trainees and students real progress can be noticeable after longer periods of time.”
4.5.5 Question (5): “What comments do you have on the training centre, training facilities, programme duration and timing? Table (4.23) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of the fifth question in the interview.

Table (4.25)
Frequencies and the percentages of Question (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.23) above shows that, the trainers agreed on the following:

1. No training centre
2. Poor and limited training facilities
3. Programme duration is sufficient
4. Training timing is not convenient
5. Lack of incentives

Only two of the interviewees agreed that the programme duration is insufficient for covering the programme included topics.

4.5.6 Question (6): “What comments do you have on the trainees’ involvement in the programme? Table (4.24) below shows the frequencies and the percentages of the sixth question in the interview.

Table (4.26)
Frequencies and the percentages of Question (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table (4.24) above clarifies, the eight trainers agreed that:

1. Experienced teachers are less motivated and less committed
2. Complaining
3. Individual differences

Six of the interviewee declared that some of the trainees are

4. Highly motivated

5. Enthusiastic and willing to learn and develop themselves

Only one of the interviewees declared that trainees are

6. Passive and resistant to change

4.5.7 The Seventh Question: What are necessary changes needed to improve the programme?

The trainers agreed on the following suggestions if the current training programme to be improved as:

- Highly qualified independent training centre with all needed facilities
- Duty-off training days
- Focus on practicality
- More teacher involvement
- Focus on Palestinian English curriculum
- Provision of sufficient incentives
- Provision of sufficient resources as stationary and refreshments
- Focus on enhancing teachers speaking and listening skills and how to teach these skills in particular
- More logically arranged, up-to-date training topics are needed
- Conducting valid needs assessment surveys
- Focus on improving teachers’ linguistic competencies
4.6 The Answer of the Sixth Question: What are the main features of the suggested inservice training programme in the light of the cited weaknesses?

A major concern of the current study is to suggest a framework of a future INSET programme for UNRWA English language teachers and to determine the programmes main features. This framework is suggested in a form of a manual or a guide that can be of potential value for English trainers and any training centre. This practical framework is inspired through the following:

- The theoretical framework
- Previous studies recommendations
- The 15 contemporary principles
- The answers of the two open ended questions (Tables 4.17-4.18), trainers’ suggestions (the seventh question in the interview)
- The current study findings and shortcomings

The future suggested INSET programme should be formulated following these steps:

1. Needs assessment
2. Goals Specification
3. Training content selection
4. Training Techniques and Methods Selection
5. Trainees’ selection
6. Trainers’ selection
7. Provision of sufficient facilities
8. Provision of sufficient incentives
9. Evaluation

A detailed and a practical illustration and thorough discussion of the suggested framework and the proposed nine steps will be provided in the next chapter.
Summary

This chapter provided a detailed description of the current INSET programme aims and features. It also presented the results obtained through implementing the three tools used within the study involving the document analysis, the questionnaire and the focused group interview. Regarding these results, it can be concluded that the evaluated programme is perceived with a moderate satisfaction. The programme timing, facilities and available resources proved to be the weakest aspect while programme trainers proved to be the strongest one. Generally it can be said that both trainees and trainers responses showed several weaknesses and shortcomings. Full discussion and interpretation of weaknesses and strengths aspects will be provided in the next chapter.
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Introduction

The core aim of this chapter is to discuss the study results thoroughly in the light of the previous studies. Next, the findings of the study are concluded. Finally, the researcher comes out with overall suggestions and recommendations based on the study findings, interpretations and analysis.

5.1 Discussion of the First Question Results

What are the main aims and features of the current in-service training programme available for UNRWA English teachers?

The answer of this question included a detailed description of the EDC and its strategy in planning and carrying out INSET programmes. Sufficient illustration of INSET programmes aims, number, training techniques, trainees’ evaluation, training content was provided. Through these descriptive illustrations, it becomes clear that the current strategy adopted by EDC in planning and carrying out INSET programmes has several shortcomings. One of the most serious shortcomings is the limited authority given to the EDC in designing, planning and implementing INSET programmes. In other words, planning INSET programmes is assigned completely to the experts of the Institute of Education in Jordan with insufficient input from EDC in Gaza Strip. Such decontextualization has left negative impacts on several aspects of the INSET programmes, particularly, in relation to the content of the training materials. Some of the training materials sent through the Institute of Education turned out to be theoretical, outdated, irrelevant and irresponsible to trainees’ needs as clarified by English supervisors who confirmed that they do their best in modifying and adapting these materials to suit their trainees.
Acknowledging such limitations, EDC is experiencing a series of current changes and adopting a new strategy in planning and implementing INSET programmes. According to EDC officials, the current changes will result in designing future INSET programmes which are completely relevant to trainees in Gaza Strip. These changes as reported in the interviews with the EDC officials on 21st of November 2010, and the English supervisors on 18th October involve:

1. Giving the EDC in Gaza the supreme authority in planning, implementing and carrying out INSET programmes. Thus, today as expressed by one of English supervisors “Gaza is independent now”.

2. This new authority gives the EDC free hands in planning, designing and implementing its own training programmes without any interference from the Institute of Education in Amman, thus, English trainers and other supervisors are free in designing and implementing their own training materials. They are also free in choosing training timing places and the participating trainees.

3. Various types of training programmes are conducted for UNRWA English teachers now involving:
   - Training programmes for newly appointed teachers or regular teachers with fixed term contracts
   - Training programmes for supporting teachers
   - Training programmes for teachers of over-aged classes

4. Different evaluation system involving two field visits and one final exam instead of three field visits, three exams and research paper

5. Cancelling Summer courses and focusing only on one-school year training

In brief, EDC in Gaza is living a new era and experiencing new challenges which will lead, hopefully, to effective future inservice training.
5.2 Discussion of the results of the Second Question

What are the stated principles for evaluating inservice training programmes in the light of the available contemporary trends?

To answer this question, a set of 15 contemporary principles was formulated through analysis of 43 lists as shown in the previous chapter. Despite the fact that these 15 contemporary principles constitute broad guidelines, they were used as the basic framework relied on in deriving the 65 items of the six-domain questionnaire.

The 15 contemporary principles presented within this list are similar to the principles proposed in several lists. Researchers employed these principles to evaluate the quality of INSET programmes as in Crimer et al., (2010), who used six of these principles as indicators of effective INSET, and Al-Farra's (1996) who used similar principles as an outline of the contemporary trends.

In brief, the formulated list of the 15 contemporary principles is an up-to-date list reflecting the current scene of INSET throughout the whole world. It is a comprehensive one that involves all the components of the INSET starting from goals, content, training methods, evaluation, timing and the available resources. In addition, this list guides the framework of the suggested future INSET by the end of this chapter; hence, the researcher believes that this list is valuable for programme planners, educators, and those who are concerned with evaluating INSET programmes in general.

5.3 Discussion of the Results of the Third Question

To what extent does the in-service training programme meet trainees' needs from their own perspectives?

To answer this question, a six-domain questionnaire along with 65 items was used. Through trainees’ responses to the questionnaire domains, it becomes clear that the investigated INSET programme as a whole is perceived with an average satisfaction of about 61.54% as
proved in the questionnaire results analysis. This overall estimation of the INSET programme was found lower than findings proved within other similar Palestinian studies as Al-Ajez and Al-Banna’s (2003) study where trainees’ satisfaction average was about 66% and Abu Salem’s (2008) study with a degree of satisfaction equals 72%. In contrast, this result is compatible with Al-Qreanawi’s (2009) study where the programme estimation average was about 61.8%. This moderate satisfaction is justifiable in the light of several cited shortcomings and insufficiencies which outweighed the strengths. In what follows, the researcher discusses the programme shortcomings as well as the strengths found in relation to the questionnaire results.

5.3.1 Programme Major Strengths

The questionnaire analysis showed that the programme strengths involve:

1. Programmes’ Trainers

Throughout trainees’ responses to questionnaire items, programme trainers scored the highest percentage and the first rank of the whole domains with a weighted value of 73.70%. In other words, programme trainers turned out to be the programme strongest component. These findings coincide with Al-Ajez’s and Al-Banna’s (2003) who showed that trainers are the strongest aspect of the investigated INSET programme. They contradict with Al-Qreanawi’s (2009) findings, in which the trainers ranked secondly after the programme goals, Abu Salems’ (2008) results where trainers ranked the fourth and Jebers’ (2002) where trainers ranked the third.

The highest percent assigned to programme trainers can be attributed to the humanistic and the gentle relationship that trainers always committed to as proved in item number 2 (are interested in keeping gentle relationships with trainees) which had the highest ranking with a ratio weight of (75.22%). Furthermore, the high ranking of programme trainers can be justified in terms of trainers’ relevancy to trainees, since trainers were previous teachers, thus
they are aware of the difficulties teachers face in reality. They share their common social and educational conditions, and this common understanding between trainers and trainees has led to better interactions and positive trusting relationships. Maintaining positive and trusting atmospheres between trainers and trainees has been cited as features of successful INSET programmes (El Khateeb, 1998; Al-Ajez 2004).

Finally, trainers are to be thanked and appreciated due to their efforts since they are doing their best in modifying the training content and keeping up with recent trends and up-to-date topics in ELT. They are so eager to improve the current training programme as they declared "we feel that we can be better and we need to be better"

In spite of the high appreciation showed to the trainers’ thankful efforts, trainees preferred engaging university professors and native speakers trainers in the training process as shown in item number 10 (are preferred to be university professors and native speakers trainers) in the sixth domain which had the same highest ranking of item 2 (are interested in keeping gentle relationships with trainees). The researcher believes that this desire for changing programme trainers can be justified in the following:

- Trainees’ aspiration for more improvement especially in relation to speaking skills and language proficiency
- There are only nine trainers working with teachers in all Gaza governorates, these trainers are with similar qualifications, and experience, hence, justifying trainees need for dealing with new personalities and new experience.

2. Specific Skills Improvement

A second programmes strength involves improving trainees’ specific skills as how to teach vocabulary, how to teach reading, and listening. This was reflected in the high ranking of items; number 10 (increases trainees’ knowledge of how to teach vocabulary 68.69%), item is number 8 (enriches trainees' knowledge of how to teach reading) with a ratio weight of
(68.26%) and item number 9 (develops trainees’ knowledge of how to teach listening) with a weighted value that equals (68.26%) in the second domain.

Such high ranking may due to the fact that trainers work hard to equip trainees with highly specified steps when teaching vocabulary, reading and listening. Trainees, in particular, novice teachers try hard to stick to such specified procedures which they are recommended to stick to by their supervisors. Similar results were achieved within Nicolaidis & Matheoudakis (2008) study where Greek EFL teachers ranked teaching vocabulary the highest of the whole topics included in the evaluated training programme.

3. Coherence
The programme is distinguished for the strong correlation between programme components. Trainees emphasized the connection between the programme goals, content, training techniques and evaluation tools as reflected in the questionnaire items such as:

- Item number 1 in the second domain (Training programme content is directly based on the programme goals) with a weighted value of (67.33%)

- Item number 2 in the third domain (Training methods and techniques are directly based on programme content) with a weighted value that equals 69.13% and thirdly, item number 1 (Training methods and techniques are directly related to programme goals) with a ratio weight of 68.70%

- Items number 2 in the fourth domain (Evaluation tools are based on the programme content) which has the first rank with a ratio weight of 71.74%, secondly, item number 3 (Evaluation tools are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques) with a weighted value that equals 70.43% and thirdly, item number 1 (Evaluation tools are relevant to the programme goals) with a ratio weight of 66.52%.

This strong correlation is maintained due to trainers’ hard work in modifying programmes goals, content sent to them through the Institute of Education in Jordan. They work together
as a team in carrying out these modifications. Furthermore, trainers who are the planners and the executors of the programme share common qualifications and experience. All of them were previous teachers who worked in UNRWA schools, thus they have a clear vision of the programme. This clarity is translated into a strong correlation between programmes components.

5.3.2 Programme Weaknesses

The questionnaire analysis results illustrate that the investigated INSET programme weakest components involve the following:

1. **Training Time and Resources: Domain(5)**

Training timing and resources had the lowest rank in the whole programme components with a ratio weight of (42.83%). This lowest ranking can be attributed to the following:

- There is no specialized training centre; most of training sessions are conducted in UNRWA schools with inconvenient seating and limited facilities as training labs, technological devices, and well-equipped library, refreshment facilities as garden, besides, transportation problems
- Inconvenient timings with training sessions conducted by the end of long and hard-working school days when trainees are tired and exhausted.
- Lack of incentives where trainees are not rewarded with any type of incentives which explains trainees feeling of INSET as a heavy burden.

These findings are compatible with those of Abu Salem (2008); Al-Qreanawi (2009); Al-Ajez and Al- Banna (2003); Al- Ajez (2004); Nicolaidis & Matheoudakis (2008); Mohammed (2006); Alwan (2002); Harumi (2005) who pointed out that, lack of proper resources and facilities as a common barrier of several evaluated INSET programmes. Part of these shortcomings can be justified in the following:

- Inadequate budget allocated to INSET programmes
• Lack of overall policies and comprehensive plans which can regulate INSET provision
• Most importantly, is the domination of INSET traditional trend as training sessions and courses, INSET is not seen as a continuous, broad and a systematic process.

The two lowest items within this domain are related to the provision of incentives as in item 8 “The programme provides sufficient moral incentives such as career promotion” (43.91%) and item 9 “The programme provides sufficient material incentives such as salary increase” (34.35%). These results are confirmed by Abu-Atwan (2008) study findings which showed that the lack of incentives was the most frequently cited barrier with the highest percentage (86%).

2. Training Programme Goals: Domain (1)

Through trainees overall responses to domains’ one items, it is proved that programme goals are the second weakest component of the programme after its timing and resources. This result is in contrast with AL-Qreanawis’ (2009) study with goals of the investigated programme ranked the highest of all domains.

Trainees ranked first domains items as moderate with a total average of 2.9748 and a ratio weight of (59.50%). The lowest item rank was of number 6 (Planned collaboratively with the participation of trainees). Thus; it can be deduced that trainees were not involved in the process of goals identification. This may have affected trainees’ responses to the whole domain items, if trainees had been given the chance to be involved through conducting valid needs assessments, better understanding and more satisfaction would have been reflected in trainees’ responses. Several negative aspects in relation to the programme goals are highlighted through trainee’s responses as:
1. Conducting valid needs assessment is not a common practice. Programme trainers made this clear when they confirmed that “trainees are not sincere in filling needs assessment questionnaires, so we depend only on our observation and experience”

- Specifying these goals without sufficient input from trainees, and schools.
- Limited correlation between these goals and the general goals of English language teaching in Palestine, curriculum, and students’ achievement problems.

The need for modifying INSET goals in making them more practical, applicable, relevant to trainees needs and expectations has been cited as a common recommendation in INSET studies as in Al Farra (1996); Jeber (2002); Abu-Atwan(2008); Abu Salem(2008); Al-Ajez and Al-Banna(2003).

3. Training Programme Content: Domain (2)

Training programme content ranked fourth with an average of 3.1087 and a ratio weight of (62.17%). All of the items in this domain were ranked with a moderate degree except for the four items relating to connecting goals and content, teaching reading, vocabulary and listening. Item number 10 “increases trainees’ knowledge of how to teach vocabulary” had the highest rank. Followed by items number 8, 9 “enriches trainees’ knowledge on how to teach reading” “develops trainees’ knowledge on how to teach listening”.

Through trainees’ responses, shortcomings within programme training content can be grouped as:

1. Inadequate focus on problematic topics teachers mostly need as how to deal with low achievers and over-aged students
2. Limited linguistic competencies improvement as developing trainees listening, speaking, writing and reading skills as compared with pedagogic competences
3. Incomplete improvement of trainees teaching skills related to grammar, writing and pronunciation teaching
4. Lack of practicality, in the sense that the content does not entail practical remedies for classroom realities

5. Partial focus on up to date innovative topics as using technology in teaching

These drawbacks especially lack of practicality, and theoretical focus can be justified in terms of the adopted traditional trend of INSET, and the limited provision of sufficient resources as has been stated before, it is relatively easy to collect a group of teachers in a classroom and lecture them on theoretical topics.

These shortcomings and insufficiencies were validated through previous studies results especially lack of practicality and theoretical focus as in Alwan (2000); Haung (1999), Gonzales (2003); Harumi (2005); Al-Ajez (2004); Crimer et al., (2010); Kucksuleymonoglu (2006); Jeber (2002); Abu Salem (2008).

4. Training Methods and Techniques: Domain (3)

Through trainees’ reaction to the third domain items, it is proved that most of the training methods and techniques employed in the programme fell into the traditional trend of INSET. In other words, item number 3 (depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations) had the first rank with a ratio weight of 73.48%, thus, highlighting the theoretical focus of the whole programme whether in the programme content as shown previously or in the training techniques used. Proving such theoretical focus of the current INSET programme is in accordance with findings of several studies as in Crimer et al., (2010); Alwan (2000); Harumi (2005); Abu-Atwan(2008); Jeber(2002); Al-Ajez(2004); Gonzalez(2003); Haung (1999); Al-Faraa (1996).

A second major highlighted insufficiency is the limited employment of innovative techniques as action research, teaching journals, and study groups as well as the lack of technology integration and online training employment.

The previously stated shortcomings can be explained in the light of:
- Traditional faulty perceptions of INSET as one shot training courses or sessions
- Limited facilities and resources
- Inconvenient training timings
- Lack of expertise in dealing with innovative training techniques

Generally, Training methods and techniques employed by trainers within the INSET programme ranked third with an average of 3.2283 and a ratio weight of (64.57%). Five items in this domain were ranked with a moderate degree with item number 7 “employ innovative techniques such as online training” as the lowest item.

5. Programme Evaluation Tools: Domain (4)

This component ranked second after “Programme Trainers” with an average of 3.3261 and a ratio weight of 66.52%. The lowest ranking item was of number 5 “employ recent tools”. The rest of the items ranked moderately except for items 1, 2, 3 which measured the correlation between the programme goals, content, training techniques and methods to the evaluation tools employed in the programme.

These findings correspond to those of Al- Farra (1996); Al- Ajez and Al-Banna(2003) who ascertained the traditionalism of evaluation techniques employed by the evaluated INSET programmes. On the other hand, these results contradict with Abu Salem (2008); and Al-Qreanawi (2009) studies who showed lower ranking of this domain. This may due to the fact that trainers (as clarified in the interview) do their best to vary their evaluation tools and provide the trainees with systematic follow up and feedback within their field visits. Furthermore, through trainees’ responses, it can be said that:

1. The INSET programme employs various evaluation tools as observation, field visits, and exams.
2. Programme evaluation is ongoing and is done systematically.
3. Lack of innovative evaluation tools as portfolios.
4. Inadequate follow up of the programme’s impact on both teachers practices and students achievement.

5. Limited involvement of other stakeholders in the evaluation process as school principals or ministry officials.

To conclude, the questionnaire analysis results demonstrated several weaknesses and shortages in the current programme. It has been confirmed that needs assessment is hardly carried out prior to the INSET programme and that teachers are not involved in the planning of INSET activities. Evaluation of the programme and follow-up of the participants is done in a limited way using traditional tools. In most cases the participants' performance is evaluated only through examination or field visits, and the programme itself is not evaluated. Programme resources, facilities and incentives are very poor and limited, the content, training materials and the goals are in need for deep changes and modifications. As such, the shortcomings and insufficiencies of the current programme validated through the questionnaire results are consistent with several previous studies findings. Examples of the shared inadequacies are listed below:

1. Lack of practicality or theoretical orientation in the programme content and within the training techniques applied Alwan (2000); Cimer et al., (2010); Conco (2005); Nicolaidis & Matheoudakis (2008); El-Farra (1996); El- Ajez & El-Banna (2003) Gonzales (2003); Harumi (2005); Haung (1999); Dalglu (2004).

2. Inadequate teachers’ involvement whether in the planning or evaluation of theses programme Al-Ajez (2004); Haung (1999); Alwan (2000); Kucksuleymonoglu (2006)

3. Limited use of needs assessment prior to the INSET programme and thus being irresponsible to trainees’ needs (Alwan (2000); Kucksuleymonoglu (2006); Al-Ansari (1999); Harumi (2005); Al-Ajez (2004).

5.4 Discussion of the Results of the Fourth Question

Are there statistically significant differences at (\( \alpha \leq 0.05 \)) level between the trainees’ levels of satisfaction regarding the inservice training programme due to gender, educational district, and years of teaching experience variables?

To answer this question, two statistical tests were used including; Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis. The statistical analysis of the two tests results proved that there are no statistical differences in trainees’ responses due to gender or teaching experience. These results correspond to those of Al-Ajez’s and al- Banna’s( 2003); Abu-Salem’s(2008); Al-Qreanaw’s (2009); and Jeber’s (2002) which showed no statically significant differences found due to gender or teaching experience. These negative results reflect the need of every teacher whether male or female, experienced or novice for INSET opportunities. Also these results confirmed that INSET or PD should be an integral part of teachers’ career. INSET is not a series of one-shot training workshops; rather, it is a continuous, sustained, and ongoing process which teachers should always engage in to refresh, broaden, recharge their batteries and gain up-to-date skills and techniques.

On the other hand, the study proved statistically significant differences due to the educational district in favour of trainees in Gaza City. These differences were found in relation to the first five domains while there were no statistically significant differences in trainees’ responses in relation to the sixth domain. The researcher believes; that these differences might have occurred because Gaza has the largest percentage of the participants.
than the other districts. This result contradicts with Al- Qreanawi’s (2009), who proved no statistically significant differences due to the same variable.

5.5 Discussion of the Fifth Question

To what extent are trainers satisfied with the current in-service training programme provided for UNRWA English teachers? Focused group interview with seven semi-structured questions was used to answer this question. Throughout trainers’ answers to the interview questions, programme major strengths and weaknesses can be identified as follows:

5.5.1 Programme Strengths

1. Training Programme Goals

Through trainers’ answers to the first question focusing on programme goals, it turns clear that, the current INSET programme seeks to accomplish two general goals which are:

- Enhancement of trainees’ teaching competencies;
- Developing trainees’ linguistic competencies.

The eight trainers argued that these two goals are equally and adequately focused on and maintained, furthermore, the eight trainers agreed that these goals are:

- Decided on through experts of the Institute of Education
- Responsive to trainees needs which are decided on through trainers observation and experience
- Not preceded with systematic valid needs assessment
- Specified and modified through collaborative work of the trainers
- Focused on students achievement problems
- Focused on problematic areas in English curriculum
- Specific and applicable

Holding such positive views of the programme assigned goals can be justified since trainers try hard to modify and translate the broad objectives, sent to them through the experts in the
Institute of Education in Jordan, into attainable, suitable and applicable goals relevant to trainees’ needs.

Other positive aspects proved by the trainers include:

- The programme was of sufficient duration
- Variety of evaluation tools
- Clarity and practicality of the assigned goals
- Strong correlation between the programme goals, content and training techniques and training evaluation tools

Such positive stance held by trainers can be attributed to trainers’ efforts in modifying the training content and focusing on trainees’ needs, trainers are the planners and the designers of the whole programme starting with its goals, and thus it is no wonder that they are holding such positive stance.

5.5.2 Programme Major Weaknesses

Throughout trainers’ responses to the seven interview questions, the main programme insufficiencies spotted include:

1. **Training timing and Resources**

Similar to trainees’ responses, trainers also responded negatively to this domain. The eight trainers reflected their dissatisfaction of the current available resources, they confirmed that there is no training centre with limited facilities “we don’t have a training centre” “I am dreaming of a day we can find a training centre especial for UNRWA teachers …let's say…equipped with all facilities, refreshment .so…and so… we are suffering a lot regarding this issue.”. Furthermore, they emphasized the unsuitability and the inconvenience of training times for both trainers and trainees as they wished for duty off training days, as expressed by one of the trainers, “we dream of a day that we find a day for training….teachers are off of their regular work and they come only for training …this will
give us more stimulation and it will give them more motivation to share.” In addition, they ascertained the lack of incentives which affected negatively trainees’ enthusiasm and motivation.

Limited resources and Lack of the available facilities devoted to INSET programmes has been found a common insufficiency in many evaluative studies as in Alwan(2000); Al-Ajez and Al- Banna (2003); Abu Salem (2008) and Al- Qreanawi (2009).

2. Training Programme Content

Through trainers’ answers, it turns clear that the eight trainers agreed on the following insufficiencies of training content as:

   A. Theoretical content
   B. Old with a lack of up to date training topics
   C. Illogically sequenced

In addition, trainers admitted that the training materials are in need for modification and they are doing their best in this regard, for example, they have substituted Arabic materials with English and have designed up- to- date training materials. Also, trainers agreed that the focus of most of the training materials is on how to teach as improving trainees teaching competencies is a main goal. In total, trainers confirmed the lack of practicality and the limited focus on up-to-date innovative topics as using technology in teaching. These insufficiencies are found common in several INSET studies as in Huang (1999); Gonzalez (2003); Conco (2005).

Other minor cited weaknesses involve:

- Unmotivated trainees especially experienced teachers
- Limited trainees’ involvement
- Lack of recent models of training
- Partial employment of valid needs assessment techniques
Traditional evaluation tools

These weaknesses can be justified through:

- Limited budget and absence of overall policy plans to guide INSET programmes
- Insufficient facilities and expertise
- Traditional faulty perceptions of INSET

5.6 Comparative Analysis of Trainers and Trainees’ Responses

A careful look at trainers’ answers within the interview and trainees responses to the questionnaire items; a number of similarities as well as contrasting views can be noted as follows:

5.6.1 Similarities

Both trainees and trainers agreed on the following views:

1. Programme resources, facilities are the weakest aspects; they both have shown their unsatisfied reaction towards the lack of well-equipped training centre, lack of proper facilities and lack of the sufficient incentives.

2. Unsuitability of training timing, both of trainees and trainers expressed their desire for off-duty training days.

3. Theoretical training models.

4. Shortage of innovative training techniques.

5. Lack of technology employment.

6. Domination of theoretical presentation and lecturing styles.

7. Lack of up-to-date training topics.

8. Lack of teacher involvement.


10. Variety of evaluation tools.

11. Shortage of recent evaluative tools.
5.6.2 Differences

In contrast to the previously outlined similarities, trainers and trainees held several contrasting views as follows:

1. Trainers have claimed that the goals are relevant to trainees needs despite the fact that trainees are not involved in the process of goals planning as shown in item number (6) in the first domain. Also, trainers admitted that they rarely conduct needs assessment depending mainly on their experience when determining such goals claiming that “teachers are not sincere in figuring out their real needs” (See interview Transcription Appendix(11).

2. Trainers claimed that the goals are applicable with a focus on problematic areas in the English curriculum and students’ achievement problems, despite the fact that trainees ranked these items the lowest and demanded for more practicality.

3. Trainers claimed that the training goals focus on enhancing trainee’s pedagogic and linguistic competences, despite the fact that trainees showed their dissatisfaction of linguistic component in training topics and demanded more focus on speaking skills and language proficiency.

5.7 Discussion of the Results of the Sixth Question

What are the main features of the suggested inservice training programme in the light of the cited weaknesses?

To answer this question and propose the framework of the suggested INSET programme, the researcher utilized several inspirations guided through the study main findings as stated before in chapter four. It was found that the suggested INSET programmes should be planned through nine steps as detailed below:
1. Needs assessment

Needs assessment can be defined as “an investigation into the nature of the performance barriers in order to establish the underlying causes and how these causes can be addressed by training” (Conco, 2005, p. 37). It is considered the first and the essential step before any further plan is developed upon which the content, the mode, the length of the programme is determined. It is always recommended that professional development planning should begin with a thorough and a well-designed needs assessment which is considered essential in planning well-targeted and highly efficient programmes. (Sultana, 2004, p. 9-12; El-Khateeb, 1987)

A major shortcoming of the current INSET programme is the lack of teachers input which affected negatively the whole components of the programme. Teachers input helps in deciding on the programme goals, content, training methods and evaluation techniques. In short, as in Maggiolis’ words (2003, p. 4 cited in Remeirs, 2003):

> programmes which involve participants in the planning, organization, management, delivery and evaluation of all actions in which they are expected to participate have more chances to success than those planned using top-down approach where administrators make decisions in lieu for teachers. (p. 123)

Hence, any suggested future INSET programme should be decided on through sufficient teachers input. A major strategy for teacher involvement is through conducting needs assessment through: (Conco, 2005, p. 61)

1. Studying performance records and on-job reports
2. Conducting individual interviews and questionnaires

To make such strategy more practical, the researcher presents a model for needs assessment survey which can be used by programme planners to determine the programme goals, content, techniques, evaluation tools and other contextual factors involving trainers, training centre, and
training facilities. The Suggested form of needs assessment designed by the researcher is shown in appendix (20)

2. Goals Specification

Goals specification is considered a vital step in the planning phase. It provides the data needed within further phases as content, training methods and techniques, trainees and trainers selection, (Bohi and Baumi, 2002, p.326-357). Programme goals should be determined accurately so the goals turn out to be so specific, clearly articulated, applicable, measurable and in relation to trainees’ needs; as Guskey clarifies "of all variables related to the effectiveness of training programmes, goal clarity perhaps is the most important" (2002,p.15-17)

These goals can be better determined through:

- Sufficient teachers input through elaborated , systematic and valid needs assessment as shown previously in appendix (20)
- Participation of stakeholders other than trainers as school principals, parents and students.
- English Palestinian curriculum main challenges.
- The problematic areas for students through scientific and logical examination of students’ available data as their exam results, common mistakes, and their success rates.
- Weaknesses and strengths of newly graduated teachers and pre-service limitations.
- Result analysis of UNRWA annual teachers’ competencies or proficiency exams.

Goals Features may involve:

1. Based on needs assessment.
2. Clearly specified and articulated.
3. Focused on problematic issues for teachers and students.
4. Focused on problematic areas in *English for Palestine*.

5. Practical.

**Examples of goals statements:**

The future suggested INSET programme aims to:

1. Familiarize trainees with the aims, structure, components, features, strengths and weaknesses of *English for Palestine* textbooks.

2. Provide trainees with practical strategies for classroom management.

3. Develop trainees speaking abilities (language proficiency).

4. Provide trainees with practical techniques for teaching pronunciation.

5. Provide trainees with practical techniques for teaching functional grammar.

6. Provide trainees with practical techniques for teaching speaking.

7. Provide trainees with practical techniques for teaching listening.

8. Provide trainees with up-to-date ELT training methods and techniques in relation to teaching (grammar, reading, writing, pronunciation, spelling, speaking, and listening).

9. Enhance trainees’ professional development skills as using technology and e-resources in English teaching.

**3. Training content selection**

The content of the training programme can be decided on in the light of; trainees’ needs and expectations as reflected in the needs assessment surveys and interviews and the specified goals. When choosing this content, it is important to consider the following:

- Involving up-to-date theories and innovative trends and embracing the recent findings of best INSET researches.

- Specific content focus where the programme should handle specific skills, topics or focus on certain particular problematic areas for both teachers and students. It is not sufficient to provide trainees with general recipes for success without focusing on
particular issues as proved within the findings of studies conducted by Biggs et al., (2009); Cetina (2009); Chinda (2009); Daloglu (2004); Jeger et al.,(2002); Buysess et al., (2009); Whitney et al., (2005) Podhajski (2009); and Ye He et al., (2009).

- Providing teachers with practical remedies for classroom realities. One suggested way of achieving this is to activate peer coaching and peer observation and providing trainees with video tapes of recorded real teaching contexts to comment, analyze and reflect on. The need for practicality was the most frequent suggestion within trainees’ responses. The suggested INSET programme should avoid theoretical topics, repeated pre-service courses and to focus mainly on practical topics with practical solutions for classroom dilemmas (Al- Ahmed, 2005: 213).

- Familiarizing trainees with the aims, structure, components, features, strengths and weaknesses of English for Palestine textbooks through specific training courses, since INSET plays an essential role in easing off challenges teachers might face as proved in Kirkgoz(2008); Shandaweali (1990); Conco (2005); Idris et al., (2007).

- Focusing on both linguistic competencies and teaching competencies, especially when trainees within this study demanded more focus on linguistic and language proficiency aspects. In Cullen’s (1994, p.154) point of view, most of EFL training programmes focus on two main components; Linguistic and Pedagogic components. In addition, Cullen (1994) highlights the importance of language proficiency as a main component and he called for incorporating a language improvement component in every INSET programme:

  An in-service teacher training course which fails to take into account improving the trainees overall command of the language is arguably failing to meet the needs or respond to the wishes of the teachers themselves. (p.154)

- The topics preferred by trainees as shown in the second open ended question include
  - Speaking skills
Pronunciation and phonetics
Listening skills
Writing
How to teach grammar
How to teach reading
How to teach low achievers
Using games and songs
How to employ efficient A.V.M

4. Training Techniques and Methods Selection

When selecting the training methods, Obeidat (2007, p. 176); Craft (2000, p.49) suggest adopted the following methods:

- Learning by doing from concrete experience, for example, from doing things in the classroom, or from doing things during the INSET activity itself.
- Learning through reflection.
- Innovation “to use innovative and recent models of training which proved to be valuable and fruitful as action research (Atay 2008), study groups and peer coaching in Abed-Halim (2008) , Namsoon Kim (2009); Alwan (2000).
- Making use of technology and online training.

5. Trainees’ selection

After conducting needs assessment and goals selection, it is important to select and determine the trainees who will be involved in the training programme, it is important to involve limited numbers of trainees almost 20-25 in each group; to give each trainee the best chance to make use of the training process (ELkhateeb, 1987, p. 75). It is also important to consider common trainees qualities and needs which help in overcoming the diversity barriers and finding suitable ways of creating mutual understanding.
6. Trainers’ selection

Rashed (2002, p. 207-209) summarizes the main desirable qualities trainers should possess to be successful as:

- Preferable to involve native speakers and university professors
- Punctual
- Good models to follow
- Self confident
- Highly qualified and Well prepared
- Accept critical notes
- Capable of keeping gentle relationship with trainees
- Capable of involving trainees in the process of training
- Capable of varying his training techniques and styles
- Capable of using computer and technology
- Capable of giving trainees sufficient opportunities for feedback and reflection

7. Provision of Sufficient Facilities

In the light of the study’s shortcomings, it was proved that poor facilities are the most frequent cited shortcomings, these facilities involve the shortage of a well-equipped training centre, well-equipped training rooms and labs, and resourced library, sufficient refreshments, and proper transportation. These facilities require developing a specialized training centre through:

- Providing sufficient budget
- Cooperating with the Ministry of Education and universities in establishing this centre to be used for training English teachers working in UNRWA, or governmental and possibly for some pre-service training.
8. Provision of sufficient incentives

Providing trainees with sufficient moral or material incentives is vital to the success of the INSET programme. The success of the suggested future INSET programme depends to a large extent on creating suitable degrees of eagerness and willingness to change, especially for experienced teachers who have developed their own fixed routines and their sets of teaching practices and behaviors which will be very difficult to change. Resistance to change is recognized as a main barrier to successful INSET programmes as shown in Nicolaidis and Matheoudakis (2008) study, Kubanyiovi (2006); Mohammed (2006). Overcoming this resistance requires provision of various incentives and most importantly promoting CPD culture and reinforcing the philosophy of teachers’ continuous learning “from cradle to grave”.

Incentives as shown in appendix can involve:

- Salary increase;
- Scholarships;
- Gaining university qualifications as M.A. or High Diploma in education;
- Career promotion for examples INSET participation can promote teachers scale from teacher C (newly appointed teachers) to B (teachers with moderate experience) to A (experienced teachers) to A+ (highly qualified teachers who can be promoted to be mentor teachers (resident supervisors at schools with reduced teaching loads who handle the supervision and mentoring of newly appointed teachers.

9. Evaluation

Evaluation plays a vital role in determining the strengths and weaknesses of any programme.

Any effective evaluation should be characterized with:

- Comprehensiveness: handling the various components of the whole programme
- Collaborative: involving several stake holders
Recent: using recent tools as portfolios and teachers journals

Triangulation of tools: using several tools in collecting and analyzing the data

Suggested evaluative plan developed by the researcher consists of the following four levels:

1. **Context of the INSET**

At this level, several components of the INSET programme are to be judged. These components include, the programme setting, duration and available resources and facilities. Data collection tools may involve questionnaires and interviews administered at the end of the programme. Questions at this level may include:

- To what extent are the training rooms well-seated with proper spaces, lightening and heating?
- To what extent is the training timing convenient?
- To what extent is the programme duration sufficient?

2. **Content of INSET**

This level is concerned with measuring the “what” of the INSET. It evaluates the knowledge, skills and values presented within the training materials. This evaluation can be done through questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis of the introduced training materials. Questions at this level may involve:

- To what extent is the training content practical?
- To what extent is the introduced knowledge comprehensive and up to-date?
- To what extent are the training materials relevant to teachers’ needs?
- To what extent are the training materials relevant to student’s problematic issues?
3. Process of INSET

At this level, evaluation can be done through questionnaires and interviews. It handles the suitability, usefulness, the relevancy and the recent employment of training techniques, format and models. Questions at this level may include:

- To what extent are training techniques up-to-date?
- To what extent are training techniques varied?
- To what extent are training techniques relevant to trainees’ levels and expectations?
- To what extent are training techniques practical?

4. Impact of INSET

The effectiveness of INSET programmes is measured in its impact on both teachers changed practices, attitudes, and skills and students increased achievements. This can be done through observation of teachers’ performance and document analysis of teachers’ records, and students’ exam results. Questions addressed at this level can include:

- To what extent does the INSET programme improve teachers’ practices?
- To what extent does the INSET programme enhance teachers’ skills?
- To what extent does the INSET programme increase teachers’ knowledge?
- To what extent does the INSET programme enhance students’ learning outcomes?

Figure 5.1 next page shows the main components of suggested evaluative plan developed by the researcher and the main data collection tools used at each level.
As illustrated in Figure 5.1, the suggested evaluative plan should focus on four main components of the training programme involving context, content, process and impact. The figure also illustrates the main elements that should be evaluated under each component along with the main evaluative tools for each, for example, to evaluate the content of the programme; the major focus will be on measuring knowledge, skills and values included in this content. This measurement can be done through using the suggested evaluative tools in the figure including document analysis, questionnaires and interviews.
To sum up, it can be said the suggested future training programme should make use of the previously cited 15 principles within the available contemporary trends. Figure (5.2) next page presents the different phases and all affecting variables of the future suggested training programme as suggested by the researcher in the light of the study findings.

As shown in Figure (5.2); the main phases of designing the suggested INSET programme should be done in the light of needs assessment results. Needs assessment paves the way for the following phases and leads to goals specification, content, training techniques, trainers, and trainees selection. The figure also highlights the role of evaluation which should accompany all phases. In addition, using the arrows in the figure illustrates the interactive relationships between all aspects involved within the process of designing the suggested INSET programme.
The Future Suggested INSET Programme

Needs Assessment

Goals Specification
Content selection
Training techniques selection
Trainees Selection
Trainers Selection
Provision of Sufficient Facilities
Provision of Sufficient Incentives

Evaluation
Context-Content- Process-Impact of INSET

Figure (5.2): the Suggested Model of the Future INSET Programme
5.8 Final Conclusions

Drawing upon the results of the two tools, it is clear that the weaknesses or shortcomings of the current programme are as follows:

2. Limited trainees’ involvement in the programme. Trainees were not given the chance to participate in the process of goals specification or content selection; their needs were not investigated through valid and systematic needs assessments.

3. Insufficient resources as well-equipped training centre. Most of training sessions are conducted in UNRWA schools in classrooms with very poor facilities as improper seating, rooms with improper heating, cooling, and lighting, transport difficulty, no training labs or well-equipped libraries and shortage of suitable refreshment.

4. Inadequate incentives whether moral or material ones where trainees complained a lot, this lack may have contributed to the trainees’ low motivation and enthusiasm.

5. Unsuitable training times where trainees and trainers as well, hoped for duty-off training days.

6. Lack of practicality whether in the goals, content and the training techniques, trainees ascertained that the programme goals were moderately applicable, with a moderate focus on problematic areas in the English curriculum or students’ achievement problems. They also ascertained that trainers mostly depended on lecturing and theoretical presentations thus practicality is a frequent demand as appears in trainees’ responses to the open ended questions.

7. Partial use of up-to-date and recent content, where there are still training materials which dates back to 1990 so they are old and in need for replacement or modification.

8. Limited technology integration where online training is not activated, technology employment is limited to using LCD and power point presentations.
9. Lack of focus on the linguistic competencies since most trainees ranked items related to pedagogical knowledge as “how to teach” higher than content knowledge- knowledge of the language itself items. Trainees also demanded native speakers trainers mainly to improve their language proficiency and to get benefits of these native speakers on linguistic aspects.

10. Insufficient inclusion of up-to-date INSET models as study groups, portfolios, journal writing depending mostly on traditional techniques in training especially lecturing despite trainers emphasis on demonstration lessons, thus trainees are still in need for more practical guidance.

11. Inadequate employment of recent evaluation tools as portfolios and teaching journals.

12. Limited collaboration entailed in the planning process between different stakeholders, for example, schools principals are not involved in programme planning, despite the fact that schools principals are real soldiers in the field, they are aware of trainees weakest performances thus their involvement can provide rich feedback.

13. Diversity problems where trainees come from different schools in different educational Zones, these schools are with different needs, even trainees themselves are of various abilities and levels; this highlights the importance of giving a chance for more school-based training.

Generally, it can be said that current reality of INSET in Gaza is not much better than the scene of most Arab countries as shown previously in the countries survey results and proved within studies of Alwan (2000); Al-Ansari (1999); El-Muteeri (2007); Shandaweali (1999) with several shortcomings and inadequacies in common including theoretical orientation, limited resources, lack of clear-cut strategy, clear-cut goals, and lack of collaboration between pre-service institutes in colleges and universities and in-service training providers.

Furthermore, the current English INSET programme share similar negative aspects and pitfalls with other programmes conducted in other specifications as Arabic, Math or even P.E.

5.9 Recommendations

**Recommendations for Policy-Makers in EDC**

In the light of the current INSET programme shortcomings, policy makers within EDC are recommended to consider the following:

1. Establishing a specialized training centre, this centre should have the following facilities:
   - Well-seated with enough space, proper lighting, heating and cooling training rooms
   - Well-equipped training labs with technological devices as video, audio recordings, LCD, and internet connections along with technicians who will train teachers on using these devices.
   - Well-equipped library with sufficient up-to-date references using e-resources
   - Sufficient refreshments including a cafeteria and a garden

2. Establishing teachers centers at least one in each zone which works under the supervision of the specialized training centre. These centres aim mainly to provide systematic follow up and support for teachers in their schools. Their main services should include:
   - Starting a teacher journal to provide support to teachers right on the spot with opportunities to grow professionally
   - Conducting annual competitions for teachers’ best practices where teachers can present their experience, research papers, reflections, diaries, the best of these participations can be rewarded and published under the supervision of EDC.
3. Establishing planning and evaluation review committees which will hold responsibility for planning and evaluating each running INSET programme before, while and after the programme execution to make use of the available feedback

4. Allocating sufficient technology integration through
   - Establishing teachers’ networks, a particular website to be concerned with keeping EFL teachers on track with recent developments within ELT.
   - Considering the possibility of starting a highly specialized TV channel or Radio channel devoted for teachers INSET

5. Restructuring INSET into legislative frameworks such as:
   - Specifying the number of required hours for INSET, teachers should participate in within time limits
   - Considering the possibility of engaging teachers especially novice in one year out of duty full-payment training
   - Providing trainees with sufficient incentives whether moral or material ones
   - Nominating mentor teachers in every school. Those mentors are chosen for being highly experienced with distinctive teaching abilities. Those mentors with release time and reduced working loads will play the role of resident supervisors and will be assigned the task of training novice teachers through peer observation, study groups, peer coaching.
   - EDC should consider initiating partnership training with universities and overseas and exchange training programmes with native speakers trainers participation
**Recommendations for English language Supervisors**

1. Specifying precise assignments and reports for every teachers especially novice ones to be accomplished and passed on through the website to be corrected and commented on through English supervisors.

2. Making use of recent models in teacher training as study groups, portfolios and journal writing.

3. Recognizing that traditions die hard and teachers change is a gradual painful process which needs extra time, effort and continuous follow up and support.

4. Convincing trainees at the beginning of the training process of that they are good and they are not trained mainly to fix their insufficiencies in a way that shakes their professional stability. Instead, English supervisors should defend and strengthen teachers’ self-confidence and careers stability since lack of supportive systems can lead to limited teachers’ changes as approved in Kubanyiova (2006); and Mohammed (2006).

5. Varying training techniques and styles and employing innovative models as action research, study groups, critical friends, and peer coaching.

**Recommendations for English language Teachers**

1. English language teachers should believe that no one is perfect and every one of them is in a constant need to up-date their skills, knowledge’s and techniques.

2. English teachers should acknowledge that no gains without pains, they have to work hard to develop their life long career especially with massive advancement in technology and plenty of websites which aid in promoting INSET. Some of these websites are collected in (Appendix 21) which can be of great value and help for every teacher.
Recommendations for Educationalists, and Academics at the Pre-Service Level

1. Activating school university- partnerships as an effective model of INSET
2. Increasing practicum hours
3. Reconsidering pre service courses to avoid repetitions and overlapping
4. Designing a course curriculum providing teachers with means and chances for continuous INSET
5. Reconsidering pre-service courses and traditional training methods in a way that delimit the gap between theory and practice.

Suggestions for Further Studies

The researcher believes that the current study is only one step on a very long road and the door is left widely open for further studies as the following:

1. Investigating EFL teachers’ perceptions and attitudes to INSET in general
2. Investigating the main barriers to INSET through trainees’ perceptions and ways of overcoming such barriers.
3. Designing specific inservice training programmes and evaluating their effectiveness
4. Comparative studies of inservice training programmes in modern countries as well as in Arab countries
5. Designing inservice programme focusing on enhancing trainees linguistic competencies or content competences and comparing the two programmes overall effects on developing English teachers efficiency
6. Investigating INSET programmes impact on students’ achievement
7. Investigating the relationship between teachers training and teachers change phenomenon
8. Investigating the impact of specific programme qualities on the programme effectiveness as timing, resources, and quality trainers.
9. Comparative studies of INSET policies in UNRWA and in Governmental schools
10. Evaluative studies of INSET effectiveness through the participation of other stakeholders as school principals, parents, and policy makers.

Summary

This chapter presented a full discussion of the study results followed by brief, solid conclusion. It also drew upon the findings of this research study and previous literature as well to generate some insightful implications In addition; a group of relevant recommendations for future research were included.
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Appendices
## Appendix (1) Policy Lists: Organizational Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Organizational lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>England Plan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District EPSD ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria VGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia VDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAPEAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education USDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELESOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OECD Report 2005:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of specific content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research –based</td>
<td>7 8 3 4 4 6 4 5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of sufficient time and resources</td>
<td>1 14 5 8 3 8 9 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based –job –embedded</td>
<td>7 2 2-b 11 4 6 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic and ongoing feedback evaluation</td>
<td>6 10 5 7 10-a 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherence</td>
<td>4 7 3 5 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on students data</td>
<td>3 1 9 6 4 10-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>2 4 4-a 9 5 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher involvement</td>
<td>13 9 3 8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly stated goals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and active learning opportunities</td>
<td>12 4-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>5 3 6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology integration</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up and support</td>
<td>6-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix (2) Studies List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>The Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Principles proved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supotivz &amp; Turner</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Provision of sufficient time – content focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Garet et. al</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Specific content focus – coherence- active learning – collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boyle et. al</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Provision of sufficient time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Desimone et. al</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Collective participation – content focus – coherence – active learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ingvarson et. al</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Content focus – active learning – school-based – reflection – systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up and support – provision of sufficient time – teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Merek &amp; Methen</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Specific content focus – collaboration – active learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Analytic study</td>
<td>Specific content focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yoon et. al</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Review study</td>
<td>Content focus – sustained – well-defined – research – based – intensive sustained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coherence – systematic evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coherence – systematic evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cohen &amp; Hill</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Analytic study</td>
<td>Content and pedagogical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Duran-DiCrebo</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Review study</td>
<td>Coherence- systematic evaluation – content and pedagogical knowledge – clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>articulated goals – active learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Snow-Renner &amp; Lauer</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Review study</td>
<td>Content and pedagogical knowledge – active learning – coherence – collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– specific content focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix (3) Researchers Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Researcher-S</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Principles Suggested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Abedal – Haqq</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ongoing –reflection-school-based and job-embedded – collaboration –is rooted in knowledge based -accessible and inclusive -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Speck&amp;Knipe</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Based on SS learning and SS data – needs identification – coherence – teacher involvement –job-embedded – reflection – content and pedagogic knowledge focus -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dennis Sparks</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Content and pedagogic knowledge focus – reflection- sustained – school-based and job-embedded – collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Smith &amp;Gillespie</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Of longer duration – job- embedded- content focus – reflection – variety – collaboration - focus on quality not format or type – practicality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Thomas Corcoran</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Content and pedagogic knowledge focus- school-based- active learning – collaboration – coherence – follow up and support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix (4) Countries Survey List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>The country</th>
<th>The Most Distinctive Features of the Professional Development Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Governmental priority – centralized through seven training institutes – recently provinces are authorized to plan their own PD programmes – increased co-operation between universities and ministry of education – sustained over 5-12 days – compulsory induction training lasting for 380 hours – focus on ICT training – suggestions for improvement includes :- collaboration and active learning – planned systematic training – needs assessment – school-based training – provision of sufficient time and support – systematic feedback and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Governmental priority – legislative laws – multi level training including - training institutes – university and colleges school-based training - In a five year cycle with 240 hours - training models involve peer observation – mentoring – collective research study groups - Well funded web-based training through internet and TV – radio and satellite communications Adequate time and support – feedback and assessment - incentives involving credits and promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Compulsory and governmental priority – five days a year – training institutes – teacher centres- new improvements involve :- school – university partnership – school-based collaborative and collective work - online training – teacher network – TV satellite - web site services – research based PD activities – provision of more feedback and systematic support and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Governmental priority – three main modes of PD including :- academic programmes through universities and colleges – school-based inservice training programmes in a decentralized modes – teacher unions providing individual models of professional development Well funded teachers unions – available incentives ( paid in-service study leave up to one year ) Improvements include trends towards collaboration – research based PD programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Governmental priority – centralized - training at various levels at national – ministerial – educational zone - school level — educational zone – school level - variety of formats including :- overseas training ( 80-120 days ) – remote video conferences net – ICT training – school university co-operation – specific qualified centres for training ( Mubark institute )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestions for improvement:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- teacher involvement – provision for feedback and systematic evaluation – sufficient time and support – practicality - collaborative and collective work – active learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Centralized – governmental training through a training institute established in 1998 – training programmes involving (refreshment – retraining – formative – subject specified - ) training techniques involving lecturing and workshops mainly – Suggestion for improvement include: - provision for feedback and systematic evaluation – collaboration – clear-cut planning – focus on practicality – ongoing sustained training – provision of adequate support and resources with professional staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Centralized - governmental priority with new training strategy applied in 1992-1993 - unsystematic training run on occasional basis - scheduled routine training programmes for specific reasons a main training institute is to be established in Sharaqa Suggestions for improvements include: - clear-cut educational strategy - practical focus - provision of sufficient time and resources follow up and systematic evaluation ongoing training - teacher involvement -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Governmental priority - Decentralized system since 1980s – compulsory participation in universities and colleges training programmes lasting from 7 days to 20 weeks - All teachers are obliged to participate in at least 5 days of PD a year – Co-operative partnership between universities and colleges and local schools Improvement plans advocate: - ongoing research-based collaboration - careful assessment of teacher needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Decentralized - governmental priority since 2007 – more than 35 training centres – main forms involve one shot workshops and courses – improvement plans involve: - strategies for needs identification - school-based programmes – practicality – systematic support – sustained PD programmes – collaborative communities – chances for active learning opportunities through mentoring and peer coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Highly centralized- voluntary – compulsory only for teachers promoted for administrative posts- main forms involve workshops and courses provided by Pedagogical Institute and school inspectors – improvement plans involve trends for restructuring inservice training into legislative frameworks – providing sufficient incentives (salary increase and career promotion) – decentralization – establishing agreed on criteria to regulate training scheme – using innovative models as (research groups – critical friends – mentoring – observation – teachers network – systematic ongoing evaluation - school-based activities – applying regular teachers needs assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix (5) The Final List of the 15 Contemporary Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Criteria selected</th>
<th>Policy Lists</th>
<th>Researchers lists</th>
<th>Empirical studies</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Enhancement of teacher specific pedagogic and content knowledge</td>
<td>::::\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Provision of sufficient: Time - Resources</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>School-based and classroom –focused</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reflective and active learning opportunities</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>::\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Driven by best available research and students data</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Systematic feedback and evaluation</td>
<td>::\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Teacher involvement</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Driven by Systematic and ongoing follow up and support</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Variety of forms</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>::\</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Clearly articulated goals</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Practicality</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Technology integration</td>
<td>:\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Principles for high Quality PD</td>
<td>Support from Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Teacher Involvement</td>
<td>ALT-AFT- NAPEAT-ELESCO-OECD - Ingvarson et al. – El- Khateeb &amp; El- Eila-Speck&amp; Knipe-Guskey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Driven by Systematic ongoing follow up and support</td>
<td>NAPEAT-Ingvarson et. al – Hawely &amp;Valli – Corcoran Guskey- Karagiorgi &amp;Symeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Technology Integration</td>
<td>VDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Training Programme Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>are declared to all participants from the early beginning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>are clearly stated and specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>are derived in the light of a general coherent plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>are derived in the light of trainees needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>are planned collaboratively (with the participation of trainers, trainees and other stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Programme Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>is based on the programme goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>enriches trainees’ knowledge of the four English skills (reading – writing – listening – speaking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>enriches trainees’ knowledge of the four English aspects (vocabulary – spelling – pronunciation – grammar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-</td>
<td>enhances trainees’ knowledge of how to teach the four language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-</td>
<td>enhances trainees’ knowledge of how to teach the four language aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-</td>
<td>enhances teachers’ English language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-</td>
<td>focuses on specific problematic topics teachers and students mostly need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-</td>
<td>provides trainees with practical topics related to classroom realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-</td>
<td>is coherent and logically sequenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-</td>
<td>is based on the best recent researches and innovative up to date teaching skills and methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-</td>
<td>involves topics related to technology and ICT (how to employ technology in teaching and learning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Methods and Techniques**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-</td>
<td>based on programme goals and content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-</td>
<td>are various</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-</td>
<td>depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-</td>
<td>involve using innovative techniques (peer coaching, observation, study groups, action research, portfolios, online training, school-university partnership)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>are accompanied with practical illustrations and examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to reflect on their classroom practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to work collaboratively with their colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-</td>
<td>are based on the programme goals and content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-</td>
<td>are various (questionnaires, observation, analysis of students learning outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-</td>
<td>are comprehensive involving all the programme components(trainers, trainees, goals, content, ----)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-</td>
<td>involve follow up of teachers practices inside the classrooms and the impact on students’ achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-</td>
<td>is planned with the participation of (trainers, trainees and all stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-</td>
<td>involves examining the programme impact on students’ learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-</td>
<td>is ongoing and systematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Training Programme Time and Resources

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong>-</td>
<td>Training environment is appropriate ( convenient seating , light , heating , air conditioning )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong>-</td>
<td>Training centre is well-equipped with various up- to- date technological devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong>-</td>
<td>Training centre is provided with proper facilities ( library , training labs, cafeteria , garden -----)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34</strong>-</td>
<td>The transport to and from training centre is available and convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong>-</td>
<td>The chosen time for training sessions is convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong>-</td>
<td>The programme duration is sufficient for achieving its goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37</strong>-</td>
<td>The programme provides sufficient incentives ( career promotion , salary increase )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38</strong>-</td>
<td>The trainers are competent and highly qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers are capable of using technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers are punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers vary their training techniques according to trainees needs and levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers invest the training time properly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers provide trainees with chances for feedback and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers engage trainees in collaborative and active learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45</strong>-</td>
<td>Trainers provide trainees with the needed follow up and support in their classrooms visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**In your opinion , what changes need to be done to improve the current inservice training programme**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What are the topics or skills that you feel in need for further training to improve your competencies as an English teacher ?

- -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
- -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
- -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thanks for your cooperation
Dear English Teachers,

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

This study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza. This evaluation is conducted in light of contemporary trends and a set of criteria developed by the researcher through surveying the related literature.

The following questionnaire is one of the study tools used to collect the needed data. It consists of five main domains with seventy two items. You are kindly requested to answer this questionnaire by responding to five likert scale ranging from, very large extent to a very small extent. As example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The training programme goals are clearly stated.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you please, read each item carefully, choose the responses you believe right. Your responses hopefully will provide valuable insights that will eventually lead to the programme improvement. All the provided information will be only used for research purposes and thus will remain confidential.

**Your participation is highly appreciated**

**Personal Information**

Gender:  Female [ ]  Male [ ]

Years of Experience:  1-5 Years [ ]  5-10 Years [ ]  More than 10 Years [ ]

Educational Zone:  Northern Governorates [ ]  Gaza [ ]

Middle Governorates [ ]  Southern Governorates [ ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N O</th>
<th>Training Programme Goals are</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>determined in the light of valid and a comprehensive needs analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>declared to the trainees from the early beginning of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>clearly stated at the beginning of the printed training materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>specific (focusing on acquiring trainees specific skills and competencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>applicable (can be applied in classroom realities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>focused on students’ achievement problems inside the classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>focused on problematic areas in the English curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>planned collaboratively with the participation of trainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>derived in the light of the general goals of English language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>derived in the light of schools needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>derived in the light of a general coherent plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Programme Content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Programme Goals are</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>is directly based on the programme goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>develops trainees' English speaking skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>enhances trainees' English writing skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>improves trainees' English reading skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>enriches trainees' English listening skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>deepens trainees' knowledge of how to teach speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>adds to trainees' knowledge of how to teach writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>enriches trainees' knowledge of how to teach reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>develops trainees' knowledge of how to teach listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>increases trainees' knowledge of how to teach vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>deepens trainees' knowledge of how to teach pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>enhances trainees' knowledge of how to teach spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>improves trainees' knowledge of how to teach grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>is coherent (built on previously learnt experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>is logically sequenced from the easiest to the most difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>is based on up-to-date and relevant theories, strategies and studies in the field of ELT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>involves topics related to employing technology in teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>focuses on specific problematic topics teachers mostly need (for example, how to deal with low achievers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>provides trainees with practical topics related to classroom realities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>involves repeated topics learnt previously at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training Methods and Techniques**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are directly related to programme goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are directly based on programme content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are accompanied with practical illustrations and examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>employ individually guided techniques such as portfolios and journal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>employ collaborative training techniques such as study groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>use the technique of action research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>employ innovative techniques such as online training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to reflect on their classroom practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to work collaboratively with their colleagues using peer coaching and peer observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Training Programme Evaluation Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are relevant to the programme goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are based on the programme content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are based mainly on written exams and quizzes to evaluate trainees advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>use field visits and observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>employ recent tools such as portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>examine the impact of training on students achievements through analysis of students data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>involve follow up of teachers practices inside the classrooms after the training programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>are planned with the participation of school principals or ministry officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>are ongoing (starting from the beginning of the programme to the end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>are applied systematically (at the beginning, during and at the end of the programme)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Training Programme Time and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training rooms are appropriate with convenient space and seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training rooms are well-equipped with various up-to-date technological devices (LCD, Internet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training rooms are provided with proper light, heating and air conditioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training centre is provided with well-equipped library with up-to-date references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training centre is provided with other proper facilities as (cafeteria and a garden, training labs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The transport to and from training centre is available and convenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The chosen time for training sessions is convenient for trainees schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The programme duration is sufficient for achieving its goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The programme provides sufficient incentives such as career promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The programme provides sufficient incentives such as salary increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion, what changes need to be done to improve the current inservice training programme?

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

What are the topics or skills that you feel in need for further training to improve your competencies as an English teacher?

- 

- 

- 

- 

Thanks for your gentle co-operation
Appendix (8) The Third Draft of the Questionnaire
Evaluating the Inservice Training Programme for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates in regards to the Contemporary Trends

Dear English Teachers،

This study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza. This evaluation is conducted in light of contemporary trends and a set of criteria developed by the researcher through surveying the related literature.

The following questionnaire is one of the study tools used to collect the needed data. It consists of five main domains with seventy two items. You are kindly requested to answer this questionnaire by responding to five likert scale ranging from very large extent to a very small extent. As example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The training programme goals are clearly stated.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you please, read each item carefully, choose the responses you believe right. Your responses hopefully will provide valuable insights that will eventually lead to the programme improvement. All the provided information will be only used for research purposes and thus will remain confidential.

Your participation is highly appreciated

Personal Information
Gender: Female ☐ Male ☐
Years of Experience: 1-5 Years ☐ 5-10 Years ☐ More than 10 Years ☐
Educational Zone: Northern Governorates ☐ Gaza ☐ Middle Governorates ☐ Southern Governorates ☐

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Training Programme Goals are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>determined in the light of valid and a comprehensive needs analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>declared to the trainees from the early beginning of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>clearly stated at the beginning of the printed training materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>specific (focusing on acquiring trainees specific skills and competencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>applicable (can be applied in classroom realities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>focused on students' achievement problems inside the classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>focused on problematic areas in the English curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>planned collaboratively with the participation of trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>derived in the light of the general goals of English language teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>derived in the light of schools needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>derived in the light of a general coherent plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Training Programme Content

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>is directly based on the programme goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>develops trainees’ English speaking skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>enhances trainees’ English writing skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>improves trainees’ English reading skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>enriches trainees’ English listening skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>deepens trainees’ knowledge of how to teach speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>adds to trainees’ knowledge of how to teach writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>enriches trainees’ knowledge of how to teach reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>develops trainees’ knowledge of how to teach listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>increases trainees’ knowledge of how to teach vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>deepens trainees’ knowledge of how to teach pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>enhances trainees’ knowledge of how to teach spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>improves trainees’ knowledge of how to teach grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>is coherent (built on previously learnt experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>is logically sequenced from the easiest to the most difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>is based on up-to-date and relevant theories, strategies, and studies in the field of ELT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>involves topics related to employing technology in teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>focuses on specific problematic topics teachers mostly need (for example, how to deal with low achievers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>provides trainees with practical topics related to classroom realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>involves repeated topics learnt previously at the university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Training Methods and Techniques

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are directly related to programme goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are directly based on programme content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are accompanied with practical illustrations and examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>employ individually guided techniques such as portfolios and journal writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>employ collaborative training techniques such as study groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>use the technique of action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>employ innovative techniques such as online training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to reflect on their classroom practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to work collaboratively with their colleagues using peer coaching and peer observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peer Observation
In its simplest meaning, observing involves "visiting a class of another teacher to observe different aspects of the teaching process"

### Peer Coaching
A confidential process through which two or more colleagues work together to reflect upon current practices; expand, refine and build new skills, share ideas, conduct action research, teach one another or problem solve within the work place.

### Action Research
A method of systematic inquiry undertaken and documented by classroom teachers for the purpose of improving their own practices"

### Study Groups
"A group of teachers who meet regularly over a specific period of time to learn about, discuss issues of importance concerning their teaching performance".

### Written Journals
"Written or recorded accounts of teaching experience"

### Portfolios
Portfolios can be defined as" a collection of items gathered over a certain period of times to illustrate different aspects of a person work, professional growth and abilities"

---

**Training Programme Evaluation Tools**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are relevant to the programme goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are based on the programme content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are based mainly on written exams and quizzes to evaluate trainees advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>use field visits and observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>employ recent tools such as portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>examine the impact of training on students achievements through analysis of students data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>involve follow up of teachers practices inside the classrooms after the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>are planned with the participation of school principals or ministry officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>are ongoing (starting from the beginning of the programme to the end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>are applied systematically (at the beginning, during and at the end of the programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Training Programme Time and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training rooms are appropriate with convenient space and seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training rooms are well-equipped with various up-to-date technological devices (LCD, Internet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training rooms are provided with proper light, heating and air conditioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training centre is provided with well-equipped library with up-to-date references</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training centre is provided with other proper facilities as (cafeteria and a garden, training labs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The transport to and from training centre is available and convenient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The chosen time for training sessions is convenient for trainees schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The programme duration is sufficient for achieving its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The programme provides sufficient incentives such as career promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The programme provides sufficient incentives such as salary increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## The Programme Trainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are competent and highly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are interested in keeping gentle relationships with trainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>are capable of using technological devices efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are punctual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>vary their training techniques according to trainees needs and levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>invest the training time properly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances for feedback and comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>engage trainees in collaborative and active learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>provide trainees with the needed follow up and support in their classrooms visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>are preferred to be university professors or native speakers trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, what changes need to be done to improve the current inservice training programme?

1.                                                                                       
2.                                                                                       
3.                                                                                       

What are the topics or skills that you feel in need for further training to improve your competencies as an English teacher?

-                                                                                         
-                                                                                         
-                                                                                         

Thanks for your gentle co-operation
Appendix (9) The Final Questionnaire
The Islamic University of Gaza
Faculty of Graduate studies
Curriculum & English Teaching Methods Department

Evaluating the Inservice Training Programme for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates in regards to the Contemporary Trends

Dear English Teachers,

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

This study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza. This evaluation is conducted in light of contemporary trends and a set of criteria developed by the researcher through surveying the related literature.

The following questionnaire is one of the study tools used to collect the needed data. It consists of five main domains with seventy two items along with two open ended questions at the end of the questionnaire. You are kindly requested to answer this questionnaire by responding to five likert scale ranging from, very large extent to a very small extent. As example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>The training programme goals are clearly stated.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you please, read each item carefully, choose the responses you believe right. Your responses hopefully will provide valuable insights that will eventually lead to the programme improvement. All the provided information will be only used for research purposes and thus will remain confidential.

Your participation is highly appreciated

Personal Information

Gender: Female □ Male □
Years of Experience: 1-5 Years □ 5-10 Years □ More than 10 Years □
Educational District: Northern Governorates □ Gaza □ Middle Governorates □ Southern Governorates □

Researcher
Shams El-Wuhaidi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Training Programme Goals are</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a very small extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>determined in the light of a valid and a comprehensive needs analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>clearly stated at the beginning of the printed training materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>applicable (can be applied in classroom realities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>focused on students' achievement problems inside the classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>focused on problematic areas in the English curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>planned collaboratively with the participation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Training Programme Content

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>is directly based on the programme goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>develops trainees’ English speaking skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>enhances trainees’ English writing skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>improves trainees’ English reading skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>enriches trainees’ English listening skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>deepens trainees’ knowledge of how to teach speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>adds to trainees' knowledge of how to teach writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>enriches trainees' knowledge of how to teach reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>develops trainees' knowledge of how to teach listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>increases trainees' knowledge of how to teach vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>deepens trainees' knowledge of how to teach pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>enhances trainees' knowledge of how to teach spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>improves trainees' knowledge of how to teach grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>is coherent (built on previously learnt experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>is logically sequenced from the easiest to the most difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>involves topics related to employing technology in teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>focuses on specific problematic topics teachers mostly need (for example, how to deal with low achievers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>provides trainees with practical topics related to classroom realities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Training Methods and Technique

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>are directly related to programme goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>are directly based on programme content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>depend on lecturing and theoretical presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>are accompanied with practical illustrations and examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>employ individually guided techniques such as portfolios and journal writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>use the technique of action research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>employ innovative techniques such as online training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to reflect on their classroom practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>provide trainees with chances to work collaboratively with their colleagues using peer coaching or peer observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Observation
In its simplest meaning, observing involves "visiting a class of another teacher to observe different aspects of the teaching process"

Peer Coaching
"A confidential process through which two or more colleagues work together to reflect upon current practices; expand, refine and build new skills, share ideas, conduct action research, teach one another or problem solve within the work place."

Action Research
"A method of systematic inquiry undertaken and documented by classroom teachers for the purpose of improving their own practices"

Study Groups
“A group of teachers, who meet regularly over a specific period of time to learn about, discuss issues of importance concerning their teaching performance”.

Written Journals
"Written or recorded accounts of teaching experiences"

Portfolios
Portfolios can be defined as" a collection of items gathered over a certain period of times to illustrate different aspects of a person work, professional growth and abilities"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Programme Evaluation Tools</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 are relevant to the programme goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 are based on the programme content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 are relevant to the programme training methods and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 use field visits and observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 employ recent tools such as portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 examine the impact of training on students achievements through analysis of students data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 involve follow up of teachers practices inside the classrooms after the training programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 are planned with the participation of school principals or ministry officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 are ongoing (starting from the beginning of the programme to the end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 are applied systematically (at the beginning, during and at the end of the programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your opinion, what changes need to be done to improve the current inservice training programme?
1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________

What are the topics or skills that you feel in need for further training to improve your competencies as an English teacher?
- ____________________________________________________________
- ____________________________________________________________
- ____________________________________________________________

Thanks for your gentle co-operation
Appendix (10) Interview Consultation

The Islamic University of Gaza
Faculty of Graduate studies
Curriculum & English Teaching Methods Department

Consultation Form of an Interview
Dear ………………....,

The researcher Shams El-Wuhaidi is carrying out an M.ED research entitled Evaluating Inservice Training Programme for UNRWA English Prep Teachers in Gaza Governorates

This study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza. This evaluation is conducted in light of contemporary trends and the surveyed literature review.

You are kindly invited to examine and referee the attached focus group interview with seven questions that are intended to evaluate the programme from trainers’ perspectives.

I would be very grateful if you provide comments on:-
1. the relevance of the questions to the purpose of the interview
2. the comprehensiveness of the questions to the needed data
3. the sufficiency of the number of the included questions
4. the correctness and the clarity of the questions linguistically

This will be a valuable chance to benefit from your valuable experience and insightful feedback hence, feel free to omit, change, and modify any included question.

Many thanks for your kind cooperation

Researcher
Shams El-wuhaidi

Referees’ name and Signature

Focused Group Interview Questions

1- What are the main objectives does the inservice training programme seek to attain and what comments would you say about these goals?
2 -How would you describe the content of the training programme?
3- What do you think of the training techniques and methods used in the programme?
4- How can you describe the evaluative procedures employed in the programme?
5- What comments do you have on
   ▪ The training center facilities
   ▪ The programme duration
6- What do you think of the trainees involved in the programme?
7- What changes are necessary to improve the programme?
   Is there anything else you would like to add?

Any comments are highly appreciated

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Thanks for your generous cooperation
Researcher
ShamsEl-wuhaidi

Referees' name and Signature

-------------------------------
Appendix (11) Focused Group Transcription

Introduction
Assalaam alyukum

Good evening, and welcome to such fruitful – inshalaah – focused group interview
I would like to start by thanking every one of you for attending such focus group interview, I really appreciate your participation, I know that you're so busy may Allah reward you for your efforts. Thank you again and it is really a great honor for me to be in a company of such talented and dedicated personnel.

My name is Shams El-Wahidi and I'm working on my thesis which is entitled as "Evaluating the Inservice Training Programme Provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Strip" ……More specifically, I'm interested in finding out the current reality of the inservice training in Gaza, and I am trying to find out trainees and trainers perceptions and views of theses programmes. All this evaluation is done in light of predetermined criteria and a set of selected standards dominating the contemporary trends in inservice training or what is known today as professional development.

This is my colleague Sereen Shehadaa who will be my assistant helping me in taking some notes. You are invited because you have participated in this programme and worked as trainers for several times. Thus you're familiar with this programme, and hopefully you will be able to provide the necessary data. You may have noticed the tape recorder so we are tape recording the interview because we don’t want to miss any of your worthy comments. Be sure that everything you will mention remain confidential, feel free to express your views frankly and openly ……………Before starting lets go quickly though some rules if you please can stick to while the interview

These rules appear here if you can help in reading them

- There are no right or wrong answers everything you tell is worthy and welcomed
- Feel free to share your point of views even if it differs from what others may have said
- Keep in mind that I am interested in positive and negative comments as well and sometimes negative comments are the most helpful
- One person speaks at a time
- You may converse with each other and respond to something that someone else says during the discussion

Thanks and let's start with the first question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Names Of participants</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Ms Sanaa Abu Daqqa</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Mr Nabil El-Hajj</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Mr Alaa Hareb</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>Mr Karam El-Shanti</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>Mr Kamal Hasaballah</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-</td>
<td>Mr Awni Abu Sweirh</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-</td>
<td>Mrs Suha Dawoud</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-</td>
<td>Mr Maher Shraf</td>
<td>English supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the English supervisors (Ismael El Faqawi) was excluded for not taking part in teachers training
Interviewer: What are the main goals the inservice programme seek to attain by the end? How can you comment on these goals?

Participant 1: I think that the ultimate goal of the training sessions that the UNRWA conduct is to improve English language teachers by raising their teaching competencies and under this goal, there are some sub goals such as raising the competency of teachers on the linguistic part side by side by the educational ones.

Interviewer: you mean teaching competences and language competencies.

Participant 1: yes, that's right.

Interviewer: who would like to add?

Participant 2: I think that training programmes that take place and training sessions provided by UNRWA… the ultimate goal of this sessions actually is .. to enhance teachers performance which will, actually, be reflected on students achievements

Participant 3: I completely agree with my colleagues… in these sessions of training programmes, we are just providing our teachers with practical methods and techniques in order to be used in the classroom, especially that universities really, ….don't give students enough practice and in these programmes, we mainly….

Interviewer: - you mean, you try to compensate pre-service insufficiencies.

Participants 3: Yes, yes, that's completely right.

Participant 4: I don't want to repeat my colleagues of course. I totally agree with them…but I want to emphasize something. I still remember the title of some training conducted at the UNRWA "refreshment courses" .So they are supposed to refresh teachers minds and competencies, their experience…once again of model techniques to be followed…procedures to be followed in classroom.

Participant 4: Ok, to acquaint our teachers the best skills and competencies necessary for effective teaching

Participant 5: I have nothing to add…

Participant 7: - The programme has many objectives professional objectives as improving teachers competencies in teaching ESL or as EFL ……Also to update teachers methods and techniques of teaching within the Palestinian educational context ………, and to develop teachers knowledge of teaching English as a second language

Also there are some academic objectives to attain as equipping teachers with knowledge and basic principles of language acquisition theory

Other objectives involve helping teachers of finding ways of
connecting theory to practice in light of the knowledge acquired
and to raise teachers knowledge with current trends and issues
in the field of education in general

Participant 8: The main objectives of the programme are as
follows, To acquaint teachers with practical and applicable
techniques in teaching English
To get teachers familiar with the problematic areas in teaching
English and ways of solving these problems
Train teachers on classroom management and procedures to be
followed in organizing work inside classrooms
To provide teachers with the techniques of presenting new
language structure, vocabulary and grammatical points,
Reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are emphasized
in the training
Also acquaint teachers with the rules and regulations of the
organization UNRWA

Interviewer: how do you decide on these goals?

Participant 3: I still remember... When I was assigned a
supervisor. They used in Jordan to send us questionnaires, we
used to publish or let's say.Distribute or give the questionnaire
to teachers to fill in, then we specify a sample of the
questionnaires to be sent again, to experts in Jordan. I think two
English experts are there...

Participant 6: No one...

Participants 3: They send back the goals based on the needs of
the five areas namely Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, West Bank and
Gaza Strip... Now they once again, they send the goals... we
can identify the participants usually are chosen from newly
appointed teachers perhaps teachers of 1-5 years experience.

Participant 6: ... as a group of supervisors, we assign the goals
as a team... all of us determine the goals according to our
experience.

Interviewer: ... so the goals are decided on only through your
participation

Participants 6: all of us ... as a team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript text</th>
<th>Open code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants 5: nowadays actually we have three types of training programmes for regular teachers for newly appointed teachers, support teachers and teachers of over-aged classes, each group has certain goals which are different from the others. So we put the needs, teachers needs, then we design…the whole programme.</td>
<td>we put the needs we design…the whole programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewers, so … you got the needs through your experience and your observation. You are not following for example..Conducting a pre-needs analysis.</td>
<td>Experience and observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants 5: sometimes, we have a strategy of the questionnaires.. Sometimes from our experience but mostly our observation and experience.</td>
<td>Sometimes we use questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 5: and all teachers</td>
<td>Mostly our observation experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants 3: and yes may be all teachers, it depends on the nature of the teacher, his ability or her ability ,competences so … and so…. This is for the programme conducted last year and in the previous years. Now my colleagues as Kamal said are talking about newly conducted programmes.</td>
<td>Experts in Jordan. I think two English experts are there…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer: Would you like to add something ?</td>
<td>send back the goals goals are specific, applicable , helping teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant : I think that these goals whether are sent by Jordan or by us , we try to make these goals specific , applicable and helping our teachers with the curriculum and their problems</td>
<td>teachers are not sincere in filling these questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 6: yes , that’s right</td>
<td>we interfere we ourselves as supervisor we choose them without filling the questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 2: yes, and I’d like to add something in regard, regarding the specification of teachers needs and performance. You see sometimes the teachers are not sincere in filling these questionnaire they don't write their the truth real needs so we interfere we ourselves as supervisors, we are everyday in the field, we know in advance their needs so we choose them without filling the questionnaires.</td>
<td>we interfere we ourselves as supervisor we choose them without filling the questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewer: so you appeal to your observation and experience</td>
<td>observation and experience records and files get them from the institute of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants 2: … Yes, yes and sometimes we refer to their records and files.. I want to add…</td>
<td>we depend on our observation and always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 6: From last year and on we started to have our own instructional material. In the past we used to get them from the institute of education, Nowadays things are quite difference…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant 5: you can say Gaza is independent now

Participants 3: I want to say that the questionnaires aren't the only way.. Of needs analysis…. That's why we depend on our observation and always

Interviewer: What words can you use to describe training content…training materials, topics…?

Participant 4: to some extent. Theoretical, sometimes not suitable to the participants and not logically arranged, but, lets be fair, some are good and perhaps so helpful for supervisors and for teachers…that's it.

Participants 6: … In the past we don't have some …for example classroom management we used to have …it in.. Arabic. Last year, we had one prepared by Mr Alaa

Participant 1: I think, in the old ones…we don't have the practices of teaching, so in the new ones we try just to prepare something related to the practices of teachers inside…on the spot. on track , we prepared teaching four skills..Grammar..vocabulary..we specified the needs of teachers to have something practical

Participant 5: in the past, assignment were of two types Arabic assignments unified for all majors for example teaching process, classroom management, etc.. and English assignment for English focuses on methodology and technical issues.

Nowadays, all the assignments are in English and are designed by our colleagues here, most of them are technical and professional rather than academic assignments.

Participant 7: nowadays , we make our best to make the content highly scientific and covering a wide range of topics that have to do with teachers needs and interests , however, in some particular cases , the content needs to be modified --- So as to take into account particularity of English for Palestine that we are teaching nowadays ……..Some topics have to be delayed or to be arranged in more logical ways so as the interrelatedness between issues discussed can be highlighted and made clearer.

Participant 8: I think the content is derived from the goals of the training programme and is built in a way that will achieve these goals , we try our best to modify the content and substitute old materials with topics that encourages full understanding and comprehension of the skills , we also try to provide trainees with every
contemporary techniques and methods used in ELT, it encourages teachers to be aware of ICT techniques

Interviewer: the training materials, do they reflect current theories or recent theories employed or discoursed in the field of ELT, you know, ELT every day, every minute we have something new...so...do you...

Participant 4: I still remember last year I conducted a session entitled Task based approach, and I think it is up to date approach so perhaps, from now to another time, we are trying to update the training materials, since we they are very old, perhaps from 1995,1997 and very few materials were perhaps produced in 2002 and 2005, that’s it....

Participant 1: .... and there was an assignment entitled "cognitive grammar" prepared by Mohammed El-Qasem in Jordan and it was really a very creative material.

Participant 5: and also we try to cope with modern tendencies like learners style, the theory of Multiple Intelligences, utilizing technology in teaching...all of them

Participant 3: but still... I would say, not everything traditional is bad...sometimes we need some traditional methods...this is very important point...the best method...is the method that works by teachers .... sometimes we need to make exchange between traditional method and new one

Interviewer: Let's go to the training techniques and methods used by you in training techniques and methods used by you in training sessions. What techniques do you rely on mostly?

Participant 8: The techniques used by us can be described as, relevant, applicable, practice more than theory
Flexibility and choice in using them
Encourage trainees to add their own personality and views

Participant 7: It is difficult to say whether the training techniques were acceptable to the trainees since the evaluation sheets filled by the end of each session did not cover adequately nor sufficiently this particular aspect of the training
Generally speaking training techniques are something

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Participant 4</th>
<th>Participant 1</th>
<th>Participant 5</th>
<th>Participant 3</th>
<th>Participant 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| the training materials, do they reflect current theories or recent theories employed or discoursed in the field of ELT, you know, ELT every day, every minute we have something new...so...do you... | I still remember last year I conducted a session entitled Task based approach, and I think it is up to date approach so perhaps, from now to another time, we are trying to update the training materials, since we they are very old, perhaps from 1995,1997 and very few materials were perhaps produced in 2002 and 2005, that’s it.... | .... and there was an assignment entitled "cognitive grammar" prepared by Mohammed El-Qasem in Jordan and it was really a very creative material. | and also we try to cope with modern tendencies like learners style, the theory of Multiple Intelligences, utilizing technology in teaching...all of them | but still... I would say, not everything traditional is bad...sometimes we need some traditional methods...this is very important point...the best method...is the method that works by teachers .... sometimes we need to make exchange between traditional method and new one | It is difficult to say whether the training techniques were acceptable to the trainees since the evaluation sheets filled by the end of each session did not cover adequately nor sufficiently this particular aspect of the training
Generally speaking training techniques are something...
that have to be dealt with the trainees themselves, there was no training guidelines provided before hands, all guiding was given as part of the training material that was not enough

Participant 4: Perhaps all my colleagues use the same techniques, we do our best to make theoretical issues, practical as much as we could, I still remember I conducted "Gallery work" with my teachers within my trainees, in a form of a workshop sometimes perhaps some demonstrations were conducted, done by trainees during the session...let's be Frank...sometimes depending on lecturing

Participants 5: Ok..., as you know, we have several techniques for training over thirty, but mostly, number 1 lecturing, demonstration, group work, but here, there is a very important point...each theoretical session is followed by practice...demonstration lessons or group work.

Participant 6: I'd like to stress all the time we have demonstration lessons after theoretical presentation, this is very good and beneficial for our teachers.

Interviewer: There are recent models used in inservice training for example study groups, peer coaching and portfolios...do you employ any kind...any of these models?

Participant 4: now the idea of demonstration lesson of course is a type of peer-coaching, now portfolios...I don't think we have at all...we don't have portfolios, but depending mostly on demonstration lessons perhaps demonstration to be conducted during the training session itself.

Participant 5: seminars, lecturing is the most common

Participant 6: ...of course...the traditional techniques commonly...

Interviewer: what about technology and online training...do you for example...email-assignment..., website services...?

Participant 1: all the sessions are printed or computerized showed by power point, and LCD presentation but using models or websites...no...

Participant 4: I have heard a lot from my colleagues, Sanna and of course, Alaa, that a lot of teachers now are interacting with them through perhaps hotmail...yahoo. Yesterday I conducted a session, I got a feedback from most teachers. Or participant that they were asking ok why not to have a chatting room...through yahoo messenger...Do you mind if you send your email...I said of course not...this is...I think
..you may say the allowed…the available mean to interact on line with teachers.
Of course …in schools it is impossible, you are a teacher and you know that very well…

Participant 1 : but…some of the sessions we conducted we have tasks through emailing..but not on the line in the systematic way.

Participant 4 : It depends individually on the hard work of supervisors.

Interviewer : What are the main evaluative tools used by you to make sure that trainees have got the ideas or going to apply them in their classrooms and what comments do you have on such tools?

Participant 8 : Variety of tools were used as written exams ,research paper, guiding and evaluation classrooms visits ……….. these tools can give clues of the progress in teachers performance , but the real progress of the trainees is that can be noticeable after enough time , the training impact can't be seen directly after finishing the training trainees still need more time to put what they gained in the training under practice

Participant 7 : Evaluation is done in different ways as classrooms visits Peer coaching , trainees lead demonstration lessons ,individual interviews , school principal reports students achievement and their written work

Participant 2 : I think we have special forms designed by the education in Amman and sent to the EDC here in Gaza..these are questionnaires distributed at the end of the programme and fill by the trainees themselves…

Participant 5 : we have two visits.. classroom visits…questionnaire… and two tests
Participant 2 : and in the addition we conduct three visits…for trainees… a primary visit then the second visit and a third evaluative visit.

Interviewer : Do you focus on following tracing the impact of training on students work not only on teachers
Participant 1 : Yes of course.
Interviewer : How?

Participant 4 : for sure.. yes..the supervisor visiting a teacher in his classroom conducting a lesson now the supervisors usually follows the students written work which the supervisor can observe the teachers in schools impossible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>written exams ,research paper, guiding and evaluation classrooms visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we try to follow the impact of training , but it needs more time to judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classrooms visits- Peer coaching , demonstration lessons individual interviews school principal reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS written work classroom visits…questionnaire… and two tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes of course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sure supervisors usually follows the students written work which the supervisor can observe the teachers performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance, the teacher techniques, perhaps the teachers procedures employed during the lesson itself...so perhaps the students written work and the student interaction in the class with the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1: ...let me conclude that the ultimate goal for us is the students so we are getting teachers to be more better to just improve their performance of their students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: would you briefly comment on training centre facilities, programme duration and timing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6: first of all we don't have a training centre... and the other facilities are very weak...I don't want to add more...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8: - Training facilities are in need to make training more effective, ............... involvement of trainees is acceptable and facilities should be taken into consideration to make their involvement easy............. time of training is not suitable to trainees, it should be given in their free time not after work or add more loads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7: - The training centre is not adequate not well –equipped, the trainees involved, some were chosen randomly, the training seems not to so satisfy their needs .......... one reason for that is that training nomination was not based on needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4: Shams.. I am dreaming of a day we can find a training centre especial for UNRWA teachers ...let's say...equipped with all facilities refreshment, so...and so... we are suffering a lot regarding this issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: ...now the programme duration I think it lasts for one year... What do you think..... is it enough for achieving the goals assigned...Would you like it longer...shorter, do you like it to conducted in summer holiday only or in school day timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5: quite sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1: totally sufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7: no, I think the programme duration is not enough for most of the included topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4: once again. Look, it was called refreshment courses. Since it was refreshment, it should be conducted all during the year...but it differs it should be for example more intensive ...but let's be fair, it was quite sufficient as my colleagues said.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>we dream of a day that we find a day for training teachers are off of their regular work and they come only for training this will give us more stimulation and it will give them more motivation to share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>the success of our training programme depends on the trainees themselves, their desire and commitments that's all…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>trainees, how can you describe them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>we still can find trainees who are lets say, highly motivated, they are willing to acquire more, and more, to exchange experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>newly-appointed teachers are more motivated, to attend but these are who have five or ten years are not they are…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>complaining all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>yes they complain, because of lack of incentives…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>sometime you can find those who don't try to develop themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>once again…individual differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>change is something difficult, people don't like to change, they believe that there is nothing better they can do you are shaking their professional security and stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>the problem is that when you nominate anyone of such group, he finds himself off cast among his colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>my final question now, what changes do you think are necessary to improve any future programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>we had a lot of changes my colleagues have mentioned now we give trainees more practice, we try to build our own training materials, according to our needs, teachers needs, we relate training with schools, the curriculum, teachers working on, because on the previous days programmes there wasn't a link between the training materials and what we are teaching here in the Palestinian curriculum we start to have our own different programme, according to different teachers needs and teachers groups we feel that we can be better and we need to be better I think that the reinforcement, the rewards would help in order to motivate our teachers, if you attend this inconvenient timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly motivated</td>
<td>willing to acquire more, and more, to exchange experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly-appointed</td>
<td>teachers are more motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining</td>
<td>complain, because of lack of incentives…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who don't try to develop themselves.</td>
<td>individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaking their professional security and stability.</td>
<td>Off- cast among his colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give trainees more practice</td>
<td>build our own training materials, according to our needs, teachers need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We relate training with schools, the curriculum, teachers working on, because on the previous days programmes, there wasn't a link between the training materials and what we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programme or this session, you will be rewarded, you’ll be given certain certification. For example, I think this will reinforce and motivate out teachers.

Participant 5: to enhance the training quality as my colleagues said first of all number 1: we shall have an independent training centre equipped with all facilities and number 2: to have training days off-duty.

Participant 6: one more comment, I have noticed that most some of our students suffer from listening and speaking skills and this reflects the weakness of our teachers in these skills. So more attention is needed on these two.

Participant 7: more practical training is needed training in the field inside real classrooms with natural real setting. Topics should be arranged logically and in relation to each other. Needs assessment survey still needed. The training should cover academic topics, grammar, speaking, to develop teachers language fluency and accuracy too. Site visits and ongoing monitoring is highly appreciated and finally --- English for Palestine textbooks activities and rubrics should be referred to in the training tasks and exercises.

Participant 8: Changes needed may involve………
Duration, Refreshments, Stationary
Up to date techniques and expired materials should be replaced by new ones.

Interviewer: would you like to add anything?
Participants, no, thank you.

Interviewer: thank you very much for your participation.

| are teaching here in the Palestinian curriculum rewards would help in order to motivate our teachers, independent training centre equipped with all facilities listening and speaking skills out of duty training |
| more practical training is needed training in the field inside real classrooms with natural real setting Needs assessment survey still needed Topics should be arranged logically and in relation to each other |
| The training should cover academic topics, grammar, speaking, to develop teachers language fluency and accuracy too English for Palestine textbooks activities and rubrics should be referred to in the training tasks and exercises. Duration Refreshments Stationary Up to date techniques and expired materials should be replaced by new ones |
Appendix (12) Questionnaire Consultation

The Islamic University of Gaza
Faculty of Graduate studies
Curriculum & English Teaching Methods Department
Consultation Form of a Questionnaire

Dear ………………,...

The researcher Shams El-Wuhaidi is carrying out an M.ED research entitled "Evaluating Inservice Training Programme for UNRWA English Prep Teachers in Gaza Governorates in the Light of contemporary Trends"

This study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme provided for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza. This evaluation is conducted in light of contemporary trends and the surveyed literature review. You are kindly invited to examine and referee the attached questionnaire which is designed by the researcher to assess the programme from trainees’ perspectives and reactions. It consists of six main domains.

I would be very grateful if you provide comments on,

▪ the relevance of the items to the specified domain
▪ the comprehensiveness of the five chosen domains
▪ the sufficiency of the number of the items included within each domain
▪ the correctness and the clarity of the included items linguistically

This will be a valuable chance to benefit from your valuable experience and insightful feedback hence, feel free to omit, change, modify any include items you may consider essential.

Any modifications, omission, additions will be taken into consideration when processing this questionnaire

Thanks for your kind cooperation

Researcher Referees' name and Signature
Shams El-wuhaidi -----------------------
Appendix (13) The List of Juries

1. The questionnaire    2. The interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Dr Awad Keshta</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dr Kamal Murtaja</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dr Akram Habib</td>
<td>PhD. in literature</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Dr Sana Abu Daga</td>
<td>PhD. in Education</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dr Khader Khader</td>
<td>PhD. Stylistics</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dr Sadeq Ferwana</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Dr. Mohammad Abu Mallouh</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Qattan Centre for Educational Research and Development</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dr Basil Skeik</td>
<td>PhD. in TESOL</td>
<td>Al-Azhar University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dr. Mohammad Abu Mallouh</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>Al-Azhar University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mrs Maha Barzaq</td>
<td>M.A. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Qattan Centre for Educational Research and Development</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Dr. Hassan Abu Jarad</td>
<td>PhD. in TESOL</td>
<td>Al-Azhar University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dr. Abdullah Kurraz</td>
<td>PhD. in TESOL</td>
<td>Al-Azhar University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Dr. Hatem Abu- Salem</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Methodology</td>
<td>Al-Aqsaa University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dr. Ataa Darweesh</td>
<td>PhD. in Methodology</td>
<td>Al Azhar University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dr. Issam El–Louh</td>
<td>PhD. in Methodology</td>
<td>Al-Aqsaa University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Dr. Sami El – Breem</td>
<td>PhD. in TEFL</td>
<td>The Islamic University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix (14) Permission (1)

Evaluating an In-Service Training Programme for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates
Appendix (15) Permission (2)

Dear English Supervisors, AEO's,

To help the student to conduct her research.

Best regards,

Fadel Alshelwa

6/10/2010

Evaluating an In - Service Training Programme for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates

D. Ziyad Ibrahim Mqdad
Appendix (16) Focused Group Interview Invitation Letter

Dear English Supervisors,

The researcher Shams El-Wuhaidi - an MA student at the Islamic University in Gaza - is carrying out a study entitled "Evaluating the In-Service Training Program for UNRWA English Teachers in Gaza Governorates in regards to Contemporary Trends"

The study aims to evaluate the current inservice training programme through trainees and trainers reactions, views and perceptions. This purpose will be attained through using two instruments, a questionnaire and a focused group interview.

This letter is sent to you to attain your first approval to participate in the interviews. I truly appreciate your participation despite your busy schedules, your valuable experience and insightful feedback will make a worthy and a profound study.

If you are willing to participate, you will be interviewed twice. Each interview will last approximately for one to one and half hour. The interviews procedures and protocols will be fully explained to you later on. The questions will be sent to you before the interview, and the time and place for the interview will be arranged at your convenience.

All the information obtained in the interviews will be used for research purposes only and all responses will be held completely confidential.

I will contact you, later, to discuss your willingness and availability for interviews participation.

Thanks so much for your generous co-operation

Yours

Researcher

Shams El-Wahaidi

Appendix (17) Interview Questions with EDC Officials

1. Who is in charge of the current INSET programmes?
2. What are the main aims that EDC in Gaza seek to attain?
3. How many training programmes are conducted every year and what are the major types?
4. Can you briefly outline the EDC adopted strategies in planning and carrying out INSET programmes in relation to?
   • Trainees numbers
   • Training techniques
   • Training timing and places
   • Trainees evaluation
5. Can you briefly outline the EDC adopted strategies in planning and carrying out English INSET programmes in relation to?
   • Trainees numbers
   • Training techniques
   • Training Content
   • Training timing and places
   • Trainees evaluation
6. What are the main changes that EDC is implementing to improve inservice training?
Appendix (18) The Total number of training programmes held between 2005-2009
1- Training Courses held between 2005-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Training Course</th>
<th>No. of Trainees</th>
<th>No. Of hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School Management HT(jj)</td>
<td>51 Assistants</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teaching Science SU(u)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social Studies RPSoc. (c)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>School Management HT(jj)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Education for Computer Teachers</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Guidance EP(LL)</td>
<td>50 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maths RPM(e)</td>
<td>38 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lower Stage Education LE/CT(n)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Religion IE(g)</td>
<td>21 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Art PAE/(f)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Vocational Training VTI (iif)</td>
<td>7 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Vocational Training VTI (iif)</td>
<td>21 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Courses in 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Training Course</th>
<th>No. of Trainees</th>
<th>No. Of hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School Management HT(jj)</td>
<td>51 Assistants</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teaching Science SU(u)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Social Studies RPSoc. (c)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>School Management HT(jj)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Education for Computer Teachers</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Directing &amp; Guidance EP(LL)</td>
<td>50 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maths RPM(e)</td>
<td>38 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lower Stage Education LE/CT(n)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Islamic Education IE(g)</td>
<td>21 Teachers</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Art PAE/(f)</td>
<td>25 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Vocational Training VTI (iif)</td>
<td>7 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Vocational Training VTI (iif)</td>
<td>21 Teachers</td>
<td>Two Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Training Courses in 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Tutor</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>2nd Week</th>
<th>Course Tutor</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>1st Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeyad Thabet</td>
<td>Educational Supervision</td>
<td>2008/7/31-7/26</td>
<td>Zeyad Thabet</td>
<td>Educational Supervision</td>
<td>2008/7/24-7/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathi Abu Ouda</td>
<td>School Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fathi Abu Ouda</td>
<td>School Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathi Nasser</td>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fathi Nasser</td>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamil Hamad</td>
<td>Educational Refreshment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamil Hamad</td>
<td>Educational Refreshment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emd Al- Rubi</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mueen Al- Farr</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najah Al- Hassanat</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanaa Afanna</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karima Muniefi</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saleh Mohsen</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim Weshah</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abed Al- Razeq</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Training Courses in 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Training</th>
<th>Field Tutor</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Fadel –Al Saloul</td>
<td>School Management HT (LL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Fathi Nasser</td>
<td>Vocational Training PHC(m) 2nd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Saleh Mohssen</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Consulttion GCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Zeyad Al- Khaldi</td>
<td>Arabic RPA (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Anwar Al- Faumi</td>
<td>Math RPM(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Awni Abu- Sweareh</td>
<td>English RPE (j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Khamis Al- Afeafi</td>
<td>Social Studies RPSoc.(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Nabil Al- Salhi</td>
<td>Lower Education LE/CT (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Mohammed Abu Shaweash</td>
<td>Science SU(w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Fayez Abu- Atheraa</td>
<td>Islamic Education IE (h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Issam Helis</td>
<td>Art P/AE(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSET Training Programme

### 3. General Description of the Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser. No.</th>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Training Year</th>
<th>No. of Seminars</th>
<th>No. of hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Orientation about Institute of Education and the course components and description</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Basic Communication Functions and Main Grammatical Points in the Syllabus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lesson Planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Guidelines for the Application of Role-play in Language Teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Developing Critical Thinking Skills in Reading Lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Developing linguistic competence Guidelines and exercises for Critical Reading of the Novel Cry the Beloved Country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Developing Comprehension Skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Developing the Productive Skills of Speaking and Writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Development Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Reading: Problematic Area in Teaching/Learning Reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Teaching Supplementary Reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Verbal interaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Language Learning Strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Conducting tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Basic Sentence Patterns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Problematic Areas in Learning English Pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer Course Topics - 2007-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>No. of Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Practical Teaching: Teaching speaking.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching Writing.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching Listening.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching reading.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speaking practice through Role Play.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-instruction in language learning.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reviewing Trainees’ Developmental Projects.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evaluation of the course.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Content of Training Course Programme - Training Year 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Training Topics</th>
<th>No. of Sess</th>
<th>Target Time</th>
<th>Activity Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientation session:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29/10/07</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Focal issues in the Elementary English curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/11/07</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lesson Planning: Guidelines for using the Teachers' Book in lesson planning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/11/07</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>English sentence patterns in intermediate course books.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/11/07</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Language Teaching in Upper Elem. Cycle: (4-6 grades). Goals, Aims and Objectives of the curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25/11/07</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Developmental project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/12/07</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EFL Learners' Errors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16/12/07</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Teaching handwriting and spelling for the 5th &amp; 6th grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30/12/07</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Developing student's language learning strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/1/08</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplementary Component: a. Discussion session.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13/1/08</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic Test No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/2/08</td>
<td>Sana +Suha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Verbal interaction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/2/08</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>b. Guidelines on Teaching the Novel: &quot;Cry, the Beloved Country&quot;.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17/2/08</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Developing the productive skills of speaking and writing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24/2/08</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Developing critical thinking in the Reading lessons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/3/08</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Developing Comprehension skills: The Listening Skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/3/08</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Morphology.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16/3/08</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Problematic Areas in Learning English Pronunciation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23/3/08</td>
<td>Suha Dawoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Exercises for developing selected aspects of the English teachers' language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30/3/08</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Constructing tests according to the table of specification.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/4/08</td>
<td>Abu Sweirh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teaching Supplementary Reading.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13/4/08</td>
<td>Sana Afana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodic Test No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/4/08</td>
<td>Sana +Suha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix (20) Suggested Needs Assessment Survey

Needs Assessment Survey

Dear English Teachers,

The following survey aims to provide sufficient data needed to design the future INSET programme. Through your accurate and objective responses to the survey items, the programme main goals, content, techniques, models and evaluation tools can be determined.

The questionnaire is divided into five parts. It starts with biographic section involving your gender, school, years of experience, and educational zone. The first part identifies the goals of the future INSET programme. The second part investigates your potential needs to improve your linguistic and teaching competencies. The third part is allocated for choosing the preferred models to be used in the INSET programme. The fourth part is concerned with preferred evaluation tools to be employed in the future programme. The fifth part is concerned with determining other contextual factors related to timing, facilities, place and the needed incentives. Please, read every item carefully and be sure that this survey will not be used for any type of evaluation.

Gender  Female  Male
School  Primary  Prep
Teaching experience  1-5  6-10  more than 10
Educational zone  Northern Governorates  Gaza  Middle Governorates

Southern Governorates

Part I: Participating in INSET programmes is essential to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Provide me with up-to-date ELT training methods and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Familiarize me with the aims, structure, features, components, strengths and weaknesses of English for Palestine textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enhance my skills in integrating technology and e-resources in English teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Develop my teaching of specific skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Exchange experience with new colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Enhance my self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Provide me with practical strategies for classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develop my linguistic competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Improve my teaching competencies in relation to specific skills and topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: Linguistic and Teaching Competencies:

In the following two parts rate how you feel you need to improve your linguistic and teaching competencies; circle the number which reflects your feelings:

1- No need
2- Low need
3- Moderate need
4- High need
5- Critical need
### Linguistic Competences
**I need to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Need</th>
<th>Low Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>High Need</th>
<th>Critical Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>improve my speaking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>enrich my vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>develop my listening abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>know more about the pronunciation, intonation and stress patterns of English language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>develop my ability to write in an authentic way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>develop my reading skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>know more about syntactical and semantic patterns of English sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>learn more about English and American culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching Competences
**I need to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Need</th>
<th>Low Need</th>
<th>Moderate Need</th>
<th>High Need</th>
<th>Critical Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>learn more about how to teach pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>know more about how to motivate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>know more about the use of technology in teaching English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>learn more about lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>learn more about how to work with different students levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>learn more about the use of the native language inside classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Learn more diagnosing students needs and deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Learn more about test construction, analysis, administration and scoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Learn more about evaluating the appropriateness of text and materials for EFL learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Learn more about English curriculum main strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Part III the Content of the INSET programme:**

Please read the following suggested topics and rate each of these topics according to your preferences:

1. Not Preferred
2. Little Preference
3. No opinion
4. Preferred
5. Most preferred
**Part IV: Training Models and Techniques:**
Please read the following suggested models and training techniques and rate each of these models according to your preferences:

1. Not Preferred
2. Little Preference
3. No opinion
4. Preferred
5. Most preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Suggested Topics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teaching vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching young learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching grammar functionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching writing communicatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teaching listening communicatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Using song and games in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Authentic Material choice and adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Storytelling and language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Technology use in classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feedback to errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lesson planning and preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Innovative techniques in teaching English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teaching different abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Suggested Models and Training Techniques</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expert lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Study groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Peer coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inquiry action researches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teaching journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School university partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Demonstration lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Electronic teachers network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Personal study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Job shadowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Overseas training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V: INSET programme Evaluation Tools:
Please read the following suggested evaluation tools and rate each of these tools according to your preferences:
1. Not Preferred
2. Little Preference
3. No opinion
4. Preferred
5. Most preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Suggested Evaluation Tools</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Written exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Short assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Action Researches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Field visits Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Principals reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Triangulation of tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part VI Contextual Features of the INSET Programme
Please read the following items related to several contextual feature of the future INSET programme including; timing and duration, programme trainers, training place and facilities, and the available incentives. Rate each of these items according to your preferences:
1. Not Preferred
2. Little Preference
3. No opinion
4. Preferred
5. Most preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Training Timing and Duration</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer participating in INSET training on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>After the school day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Before the school day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>During Summer holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Off-duty training days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The INSET programme should extend to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>One week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>More than one month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>One year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Programme Trainers are preferred to be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>UNRWA English Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Highly Qualified Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>University Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>School principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Native Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The INSET programme is preferred to take place at**

| 1. | Schools                             |
| 2. | Educational Development centres     |
| 3. | Teachers centres in every district  |
| 4. | Specialized training centres        |

**The training centres is preferred to be equipped with**

| 1. | Well-equipped library with e-resources |
| 2. | Sufficient refreshments as cafeteria and a garden |
| 3. | Training labs                         |
| 4. | Well-seated, air conditioned training rooms |
| 5. | Availability of transportation       |

**Programme incentives are preferred to involve**

| 1. | Salary increase                      |
| 2. | Career promotion                     |
| 3. | Teaching hours reduction             |
| 4. | Scholarships                         |

Thank you for your gentle cooperation
Appendix (21) Suggested Useful Websites for English Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBC World Service--Learning English <a href="http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/">http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/learningenglish/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.rong-chang.com/">http://www.rong-chang.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.iatefl.org/">http://www.iatefl.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.nclrc.org/">http://www.nclrc.org/</a> .htm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk">www.teachingenglish.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.aaal.org/">http://www.aaal.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.ncte.org/">http://www.ncte.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.educationworld.com/">http://www.educationworld.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cal.org">www.cal.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.mextesol.org">www.mextesol.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.international.ulca.edu/">www.international.ulca.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.etni.org">www.etni.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.teachernet.com">www.teachernet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.mes.english.com">www.mes.english.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.efl44.com">www.efl44.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.webenglishteacher.com">www.webenglishteacher.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.esl.lounge.com">www.esl.lounge.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.onestopenglish.com">www.onestopenglish.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.mrsalphabet.com">www.mrsalphabet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.esl-galaxy.com">www.esl-galaxy.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.starfall.com">http://www.starfall.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.lingual.net">www.lingual.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.ello.org">www.ello.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.world-english.org">www.world-english.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.wnglsh-at-home.com">www.wnglsh-at-home.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.agendaweb.org">www.agendaweb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.englishlearning.com">www.englishlearning.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.eslgold.com">www.eslgold.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://cambridgeenglishonline.com">http://cambridgeenglishonline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.abcteach.com">www.abcteach.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.eslpoint.com">www.eslpoint.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.canada-esl.com">www.canada-esl.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.teflgames.com">www.teflgames.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.developingteachers.com">www.developingteachers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.happyschool.org">www.happyschool.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.countryschool.com">www.countryschool.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.amepc.mq.ed.au">www.amepc.mq.ed.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.onlineenglish-grammer.com">www.onlineenglish-grammer.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.gsu.edu">www.gsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.ccc.comment.edu/grammar/">www.ccc.comment.edu/grammar/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.www.ucalgary.ca/uofc/edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.wnglsh-4u.edu">www.wnglsh-4u.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.foneticks.org">www.foneticks.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.uiowa.edu.phonetics">http://www.uiowa.edu.phonetics</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.soundsofenglish.org">www.soundsofenglish.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.writingproject.org/">http://www.writingproject.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://owl.english.purdue.edu/">http://owl.english.purdue.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.readingrocket.org">www.readingrocket.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.eslreading.org/">http://www.eslreading.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.www.uoregon.edu/pizza2/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.eslwonderland.com">www.eslwonderland.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.English.zone.com">www.English.zone.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.mark-english-school.com">www.mark-english-school.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.tolearnEnglish.com">www.tolearnEnglish.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.englishpage.com">www.englishpage.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.go4English.com">www.go4English.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.usingenglish.com">www.usingenglish.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.1-">www.1-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://atesl.org/language.com">http://atesl.org/language.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.songsforteaching.com">www.songsforteaching.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.123listening.com">www.123listening.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.eslnow.com">www.eslnow.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ملخص الدراسة

تقويم برامج تدريب معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية العاملي في وكالة الغوث في قطاع غزة أثناء الخدمة في ضوء الاتجاهات المعاصرة

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تقويم برامج تدريب معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية أثناء الخدمة في ضوء الاتجاهات المعاصرة حيث كان الهدف الأساسي هو التعرف على مواطن القوة والضعف في هذه البرامج ومعرفة مدى تلبيتها لاحتاجات المعلمين الحقيقيين من وجهة نظر كل من المتدربين والمدربين وفي ضوء الاتجاهات السائدة في مجال الاتجاهات أثناء الخدمة وكان ذلك من خلال الإجابة على الأسئلة التالية:

1. ما هي أهم الملامح الرئيسية التي تميز البرنامج الحالي؟
2. ما هي أهم المبادئ والمعايير السائدة في الاتجاهات المعاصرة لتقويم برامج تدريب المعلمين أثناء الخدمة؟
3. هل هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى α ≤ 0.05 بين مستوي رضا المتدربين عن برامج التدريب?
4. ما هي أهم المبادئ والمعايير السائدة في الاتجاهات المعاصرة لتقويم برامج تدريب المعلمين أثناء الخدمة؟
5. ما هي أهم الملامح الرئيسية للبرنامج المستقبلي المقترح لتدريب معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية أثناء الخدمة؟

ولتحقيق أهداف الرسالة أتى البحث بالمنهج الوصفي التحليلي واستعمال الاتجاهات المعمارية ثلاثية أدوات رئيسية: تحليل محتوى لـ 43 قائمة ضمن الاتجاهات المعاصرة للوصول إلى قائمة من 15 مبدأ تقويم برامج تدريب المعلمين أثناء الخدمة.

1. استبان مكون من 65 فقرة موزعة على ستة مجالات رئيسية بالإضافة إلى سؤالين مفتوحين.
2. مقابلة مركزية مكونة من سبعة أسئلة رئيسية للتعرف على وجهة نظر المدربين في البرنامج الحالي.

شمل مجتمع الدراسة كل من المعلمين المتلتحقيين بالبرامج التدريبية في العام {2007 \ 2008 \ 2009} كما شمل أيضاً 8 مشرف لغة إنجليزية من عملوا كمدربين في هذه البرامج.

وباستخدام برنامج الإحصائي SPSS تم التحليل مع البيانات وتحقيقه وبناء نظريات فرضية تعزى لمتغير الجنس أو سنوات الخبرة بين استجابات المتدربين.

تنتسب إلى النتائج التالية:

- حصل البرنامج ككل على درجة متوسطة بنسبة 61.54% من وجهة نظر المتدربين.
- من أهم نقاط القوة الترابط بين مكونات البرنامج الأساسية كالأهداف والمحتوى طرق التدريب والأساليب التدريبية.
- من أهم عوامل القوة الترابط بين مكونات البرنامج الأساسية كالأهداف والمحتوى طرق التدريب والأساليب التدريبية.
- وجود عدد من نقاط القوة والضعف بين وجهة نظر كل من المتدربين والمدربين في البرامج الحالية.
- عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تعزى لمتغير الجنس أو سنوات الخبرة بين استجابات المتدربين.
- وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية تعزى لمتغير المعلمين في منطقة فئة "التعليمية".

استنادًا إلى النتائج السابقة التي أظهرتها الدراسة أوصى البحث بدراسة الاهتمام برامج التدريب لذا من أهمية قصوى وذلك من خلال توفير الموارد البشرية والمادية وضرورة إنشاء مركز تدريبي مزود بكافة الأدوات المطلوبة وكذلك الاهتمام بنشر المفاهيم الحديثة لبرامج التدريب وتوسيع المعلمين بالموارد المختلفة لضمان مشاركتهم الفاعلة في هذه البرامج.

كما قامت الباحثة بوضع مقترح عملي لبرنامج تدريب مستقبلي للاستفادة به عند تصميم البرامج المستقبلية لتدريب المعلمين أثناء الخدمة.
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
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