

Examination of In-Service Trainings in Terms of Functionality and Meeting the Needs and Expectations of Physical Education Teachers

Mehmet Asma

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Tel: 90-535-610-2222 E-mail: mehmet.asma@cbu.edu.tr

Diyar Kaya Saylam (Corresponding author)

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Tel: 90-544-864-8586 E-mail: diyar.kayasaylam@cbu.edu.tr

Deniz Şenavcı

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Tel: 90-553-051-3103 E-mail: denizsenavci@gmail.com

Hüseyin Çamlıyer

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Tel: 90-505-852-4398 E-mail: hsyncam@gmail.com

Hatice Çamlıyer

Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences

Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Tel: 90-505-852-4398 E-mail: hatccam@gmail.com

Received: April 19, 2022 Accepted: June 19, 2022 Published: June 30, 2022

doi:10.5296/jei.v8i1.19771

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v8i1.19771>

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the “World Congress of Sport Sciences Researches” held in Manisa/Turkey on November 23-26, 2017.

Abstract

Teacher’s in-service training is considered a lifelong learning activity to gain the knowledge, skills, and competencies they will need throughout their careers and to enable them to perform their profession more effectively. The surveys reveal the existence of various problems in these in-service training activities. This study aims to examine the problems encountered in the in-service training conducted for physical education (PE) teachers and the level of meeting their needs and expectations. The research was carried out under a mixed method. 302 teachers (private n = 131; public n = 171) who work in Manisa and Izmir provinces constitute the sample group of the research. Quantitative data were obtained by using the “In-Service Training Evaluation Scale” developed by Uçar (2005). Qualitative interview forms developed by the researchers were used to obtain qualitative data. Data obtained from interviews with five private and five public school PE teachers were recorded and analyzed by the descriptive analysis method. While there was a significant difference in favor of male teachers in the “necessity of training” sub-dimension, no difference was found between the average scores obtained from the teachers according to the gender variable. According to the data obtained from the qualitative interviews, the public school teachers interviewed agree on the inadequacy of the training. Based on the data obtained, it is possible to say that in-service training activities offered to private school teachers are carried out more effectively. When the results obtained from quantitative and qualitative data are compared, it is understood that the training in public schools is far from meeting teacher needs and expectations. The ineffectiveness of training and the inadequacy of educators are among the main problems that arise in terms of public schools.

Keywords: Physical education, Public schools, Private schools, In-service training, Teacher needs, Teacher expectations

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

As a result of developments in educational sciences and the impact of international student achievement measurement programs such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) and TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study), efforts towards the domination of a student-centered approach have accelerated in recent years in almost all developed and developing countries. Constructivism, which is the theoretical basis of student-centered education is the dominant pedagogical theory in contemporary

educational circles (Krahenbuhl, 2016). Although constructivism was a concept that was mentioned throughout the 20th century, it became more current at the end of this century. The reason for this is that research on the brain, especially in the 1990s, showed an important leap forward (Arslan, 2007). According to Açıkgöz (2003), the concept of constructivism has actually started to be used simultaneously with the concept of “active learning”, which has been mentioned frequently in education in recent years. The theoretical foundations of active learning are based on constructivism and its version in the field of learning, cognitive approach (cognitivism).

Piaget (1977) one of the pioneers of constructivism asserts that learning occurs by an active construction of meaning rather than passive reciepience. In this context, Dewey’s (1958) metaphor of the teacher trying to pour information into the “empty heads” of students is remarkable. According to Dewey, education is not a matter of ‘telling’ and being told, but an active and constructive process (As cited in: Pérez-Ibáñez, 2018). Constructivism advocates that students create their own knowledge rather than internalizing the ability to memorize knowledge and ideas given by teachers. In order to implement this approach effectively, teachers have critical roles and responsibilities. Within a constructivist framework the task of the teacher is to provide learners with opportunities and incentives to build up knowledge rather than be a dispenser of knowledge (Patton, Parker, & Pratt, 2013).

In today’s information society, expectations are increasing not only for students but also for teachers. As teachers are central to improving the quality of education, their creative thinking and teaching practices are becoming a sensitive subject of education in the 21st century (Ritchhart, 2004). Teachers are expected to meet the emerging new educational technologies and innovative approaches to teaching with an innovative attitude and behavior (Thurlings, Evers, & Vermeulen, 2015). In this sense initiating change in an education context may benefit from considering the impact of external factors, teacher beliefs, the role of professional development, and the specific needs of teachers as individual learners (Evans, 2010). The greatest task for the development of children, who are the future of societies, belongs to teachers. Teachers, who are the most important implementers of the curriculum, are the main catalysts for the successful implementation of the curriculum. It is indispensable for the success of education that teachers have knowledge about both the program and the elements of the program. In addition, it is extremely important that teachers have the attitudes and values required by the execution principles of the program (Yeşilyaprak, 2002). While curricula theoretically reveal the conceptual and philosophical differences of the change that is desired to be realized with education, teachers help us to see the extent of this change in practice (Fullan, & Miles, 1992). But research indicates that teachers have limited success in redesigning curriculum materials to become more constructivist in their approach (Roehrig, Kruse, & Kern, 2007). In addition, according to Duit and Treagust (2003) most of the teachers are not familiar with the theories about the teaching and learning process and their perspectives on learning are more transmissive than constructivist.

The constructivist approach reveals the necessity of making some important changes in the teaching behaviors of teachers in order to meet the changing needs of students. Adaptation of teachers to these changing circumstances can only be possible with well-planned in-service

training activities. In-service trainings are very useful for teachers when carried out in an effective and planned way (Sum, Wallhead, Ha, & Sit, 2018). The main questions to be asked here are how effectively this changing process is carried out and whether in-service training activities meet the professional needs and expectations of teachers.

It is unquestionably accepted by educational circles that teacher's professional knowledge should be constantly updated (Ball, & Cohen 1999; Wilson, & Berne, 1999). Teachers professional development is considered part of their lifelong learning and mirrors the process through which they acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes and competency throughout their career, individually or collectively, to improve their effectiveness and promote student learning (George, & Lubben, 2002; Hagood, 2007; Hoyle, & John, 1995; Wang, & Ha, 2009). The necessary criterion for effective in-service training is that teachers follow scientific and pedagogical developments and are a strengthening and feedback tool that enables them to successfully respond to the challenges of society (Pedagogical Institute, 2009). Also, there is a positive and strong relationship between student achievement and teacher quality (Papanaoum, 2010). Furthermore, ever-changing world and the changing learning needs of students make this trainings compulsory. According to Easton (2008: 756), "It is clearer today than ever that educators need to learn, and that's why 'professional learning' has replaced 'professional development'. Developing is not enough. Educators must be knowledgeable and wise. They must know enough in order to change. They must change in order to get different results. They must become learners". There are a number of research findings supporting this view of Easton in the literature. For example Cohen and Hill (1998) based on their research findings suggest that student performance increases when teachers have greater learning opportunities. According to Bolam (1982), who supports this view, the development of teachers professional skills and attitudes is as important as their professional knowledge. For this reason, making in-service trainings for teachers more attractive and ensuring that they leave these activities with maximum benefit is important in terms of increasing the willingness of teachers to participate in these activities. In this sense, all educational institutions should implement regulations that will encourage their teachers to participate in these trainings so that they are aware of the innovations in the field of education. Also, in order to obtain the expected benefit from these trainings, the trainings should be planned and organized according to the needs of the teachers, taking into account the individual development and professional qualifications. Research reveals the existence of various problems in the implementation of in-service training activities, which are considered crucial to the professional and personal development of teachers (Armour & Duncombe, 2004; De Marco, 1999; Postholm, 2008; Siedentop, 1982; Stremmel, 2007).

The results of the researches in Turkey in the related literature carried out with the teachers involved in the in-service trainings organized by the Ministry of National Education reveal the existence of a number of problems in the implementation of these trainings. Among these problems, there are topics such as, trainings are not planned according to teacher needs (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Baştürk, 2012; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Kala, Sungur Alhan, & Kirman Bilgin, 2019; Günbayı & Taşdoğan, 2012; Güneş, 2006; Karasolak, Tanrıseven, & Konokman, 2013; Limon, 2014; Nartgün, 2006; Özavcı & Çelikten, 2017; Parmaksız &

Kısakürek, 2013; Uçar, 2017, 2005, Uçar & İpek, 2006; Uştu, Taş, & Sever, 2016; Ulus, 2009; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), inadequacy of discipline-specific trainings (Gökkyer, 2012; Sıcak & Parmaksız, 2016; Tekin & Ayas, 2005) duration and timing of trainings (Avcı, 2018; Günbayı & Taşdöğen, 2012; Güneş, 2006; Ergin, Akseki, & Deniz, 2012; Nartgün, 2006; Özen, 2006; Sıcak & Parmaksız, 2016; Uçar, 2017; Yıldız, Sarıtepeci, & Seferoğlu, 2013), physical conditions of educational places (Ayvaz Tuncel, & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Karasolak et al., 2013; Özkan, 2010; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), insufficiency of educational materials (Büyükcan, 2008; Nartgün, 2006; Uçar & İpek, 2006), instructors' does not have the necessary competence on the subjects (Avcı, 2018; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Günbayı & Taşdöğen, 2012; Nartgün, 2006; Özen, 2006; Uçar, 2005-2017; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015;), theoretically realization of trainings rather than practice (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Ayvacı, Bakırcı, & Yıldız, 2014; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Karasolak et al., 2013; Özavcı & Çelikten, 2017; Özen, 2006; Sıcak & Parmaksız, 2016; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), disregarding of pre-knowledge of teachers (Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), inadequacy of methods and techniques used during trainings (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Karasolak et al., 2013; Parmaksız & Kısakürek 2013; Uçar, 2017; Uçar & İpek, 2006), not inclusion of real problems of teachers in trainings (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Erdem & Şimşek, 2013; Gültekin & Çubukçu, 2008; Günbayı & Taşdöğen, 2012; Güneş, 2006; Karasolak et al., 2013; Limon, 2014; Nartgün, 2006; Parmaksız & Kısakürek 2013; Uçar, 2005-2017; Uştu, Taş, & Sever, 2016; Ulus, 2009; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), negative attitudes towards of teachers to the trainings due to negativities in planning, implementation and evaluation stages of trainings (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Kala, Sungur Alhan, & Kirman Bilgin, 2019; Karasolak et al., 2013; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006; Uştu, Taş, & Sever, 2016; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), subjectivity of participation criterias (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Güneş, 2006; Ulus, 2009), no effective measuring and evaluation at the end of the trainings (Bümen, Ateş, Çakar, Ural, & Acar, 2012; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Gönen & Kocakaya, 2006; Parmaksız & Kısakürek 2013; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006), the lack of a collaborative and motivating learning environment for teachers (Gökmen, 2009; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015).

In-service training activities of teachers are generally carried out in the form of theoretical courses and seminars (Ayvacı, Bakırcı, & Yıldız, 2014). This raises the question of how effective these trainings are in practice-based disciplines such as physical education (PE). In addition, the results of the research show that the number of field-specific training practices is insufficient. According to Aksakal (2018), only 78 out of 10798 in-service training courses conducted by the Ministry of National Education (MNE) between 2001 and 2017 years were for PE teachers. In these circumstances, in-service training activities should be examined in the context of level of meeting the needs and expectations of PE teachers. Moreover, the number of research that address the in-service training of PE and sports teachers and reveal their opinions about the trainings they participated in is quite limited (Aksakal, 2018; Avşar, 2006-2011; Ercan, 2013; Karaküçük, 1989; Sabah & Çekin, 2016; Yıldız, 2006). In addition, there is no study in the literature that investigated this issue in the context of private schools and examines them in comparison with public schools. For this purpose in this study, how private schools with a certain brand value in their region keep their teachers up-to-date and

how they conduct their in-service trainings are examined as comparative with public schools. It is thought that examining teacher education experiences of these institutions, which take importance their student's holistic developments will make a significant contribution to understand and solution of the problem. In this context, the following questions will be sought within the scope of this research's quantitative part:

- Is there a difference in the views of teachers about in-service trainings in terms of gender variable?
- Is there a difference in the views of teachers about in-service trainings in terms of school type variable?
- Is there a difference in the views of teachers about in-service trainings in terms of school level variable?
- Is there a difference in the views of teachers about in-service trainings in terms of teacher's professional experience?

In the qualitative part of the research, it will be examined comparatively whether there is a difference between the answers given to the following questions by the teachers working in the public and private schools:

- What are the general views of teachers on in-service trainings?
- What are the reasons for participation of teachers in in-service trainings?
- How teachers physically evaluate in-service training environments?
- To what extent does in-service trainings meet the needs and expectations of teachers?
- What are the views of teachers about participant selection and measurement evaluation process in the trainings?
- What are the opinions of teachers about the instructors who carry out the trainings?
- What are the views of teachers on their institutions' in-service training policies?
- What are the topics that teachers think the best and the most problematic in the realization of trainings?
- What are the opinions of teachers on how to increase productivity in the in-service trainings?

2. Method

The research was carried out with mixed method. Mixed methods are studies where quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously and whether the data support each other based on the findings (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2011). Rossman and Wilson (1994) identify three reasons for combining quantitative and qualitative research. First, combinations are used to enable confirmation or corroboration of

each other through triangulation. Second, combinations are used to enable or to develop analysis in order to provide richer data. Third, combinations are used to initiate new modes of thinking by attending to paradoxes that emerge from the two data sources. The purpose of the mixed method is not to confirm or support an idea in many cases, but to expand the person's understanding of the event or situation (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2004). In this study, a mixed model was preferred by researchers in order to reveal the problem of in-service training in PE with all its dimensions.

Convenience sampling technique was used determining the quantitative sample group. Convenience sampling is a type of nonprobability or nonrandom sampling where members of the target population that meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate are included for the purpose of the study (Dörnyei, 2007). In this study data have been obtained with this method since there is no chance to reach all teachers in Izmir and Manisa regions and the participation in the research is based on voluntarism. The selection of qualitative participants was made with purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is defined by Rubin and Babbie (2011:357) as the selection of a sample based on the researcher's knowledge of the population, its elements, and the nature of the research aims. In purposive sampling each participant is selected for a purpose usually because of the unique position they hold (Engel & Schutt, 2010:96). For this purpose five private and five public school PE teacher which are thought to the best represent of their universe, have been selected by the research group for qualitative interviews. The most important selection criteria for determining the participants is to participate voluntarily in the in-service training courses organized by their institutions and to have a certain experience in their profession.

“The “In-Service Training Evaluation Scale” developed by Uçar (2005) used to obtain quantitative data of this research consists of 26 items and four sub-dimensions, namely the “necessity of in-service trainings” (8 items), “willingness to participate to the trainings” (3 items), “the effectiveness of the trainings” (12 items), “problems in the trainings” (3 items). Participants' opinions on the items on the Five-point Likert-type questionnaire were scored between 1 and 5. These are “I strongly disagree 1”, “I disagree 2”, “I agree a little 3”, “I agree 4” and “I strongly agree 5”. The total reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the original form of the scale is 91. For this research, it is 0.69. Independent samples T-test and One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test techniques were used in data analysis because of the normal distribution of the data. In obtaining qualitative data, qualitative interview form consisting of nine questions and developed by researchers was used. First the interview form developed by taking the opinion of two experts in the field of measurement and evaluation was applied to four teachers who were not involved in the research. Afterwards, the interview forms were finalized considering the pre-interview. The data obtained from the interviews with five private and five public schools PE teachers determined in accordance with the purpose of the study were recorded and analyzed by descriptive analysis method. The data obtained from the interviews were coded separately by two researchers and one expert who was not involved in the research. For the reliability of the study, the reliability formula proposed by Miles and Huberman [Reliability = Consensus Union/(Consensus + Disagree ×

100] was used. At the end of the calculations, 94% of the analysis results were found to be consistent. In addition, the participants were directly quoted by using the “direct quotation method”, which is another reliability method that increases the reliability of the research. Permission was obtained from the relevant institutions for the research. A voluntary consent form was obtained from the participants stating that they were informed about the research and they participated in the research voluntarily. In addition, the participants were informed that the results of the research will be used without the name of the person or institution. For this reason, the opinions of the teachers in the qualitative section are presented by using the codes as in the examples of “Private School Teacher 1 (PRT1)” “(Public School Teacher 3 (PUBT3)”.

3. Results

The descriptive statistics of the participants of the quantitative part of the research are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive data about the teacher group to which qualitative surveys were applied

	Gender		School Type		School Level		Professional experience of teachers			
	Female	Male	Public	Private	Middle school	High school	1-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15+ years
N	108	194	171	131	122	180	69	118	77	38
%	35.8	64.2	56.6	43.4	40.4	59.6	22.8	39.1	25.5	12.6

The descriptive statistics of the participants of the qualitative part of the research are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive data about the teacher group in which qualitative data is obtained

	Gender		School Type		School Level		Professional experience of teachers		
	Female	Male	Public	Private	Middle school	High school	11-14 years	15-19 years	20+ years
N	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	1
%	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	40	10

3.1 Qualitative Results

Table 3 contains the t test results of the data analysis of the participant opinions according to

the gender variable.

Table 3. Analysis of teachers data in terms of gender variable

Sub-dimensions	Group	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	df	p
Necessity of trainings	Female	122	1.84	.3872	2.142	300	.033*
	Male	180	1.95	.4394			
Willingness to participate	Female	122	2.06	.5496	.237	300	.813
	Male	180	2.08	.5676			
Effectiveness of trainings	Female	122	2.97	.6434	.559	300	.576
	Male	180	3.01	.6318			
Problems in training practices	Female	122	2.38	.9736	.955	300	.340
	Male	180	2.49	.9981			
Scale mean score	Female	122	2.51	.32527	1.841	300	.067
	Male	180	2.58	.3182			

In the sub-dimension of “necessity of in-service trainings”, a significant difference was found between groups ($t(300) = 2.142$; $p = 0.033$). According to the t test results, it was understood that male participants ($M = 1.95$, $SD = .44$) considered the in-service trainings more necessary when compared to women participants ($M = 1.84$, $SD = .39$). Table 4 shows the results of the t test which includes the analysis of the participants’ opinions of in-service training according to the school type variable.

Table 4. Analysis of teacher data in terms of school type variable

Sub-dimensions	Group	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	df	p
Necessity of trainings	Public	171	1.90	.3970	.172	300	.864
	Private	131	1.91	.4584			
Willingness to participate	Public	171	2.07	.5538	.311	300	.756
	Private	131	2.09	.5707			
Effectiveness of trainings	Public	171	2.72	.45068	.9486	300	.000*
	Private	131	3.36	.66088			
Problems in training practices	Public	171	2.78	.88278	7.082	300	.000*
	Private	131	2.03	.96043			
Scale mean score	Public	171	2.47	.27231	6.121	300	.000*

In the analysis of participant opinions on in-service trainings according to the school type, significant difference were obtained in the effectiveness of trainings ($t(300) = 9486$; $p = 0.000$), problems in training practices ($t(300) = 7.082$; $p = 0.000$) and scale mean score ($t(300) = 6.121$; $p = 0.000$). Private school teachers ($M = 3.36$, $SD = .66$) find their in-service trainings more effective when compared to public school teachers ($M = 2.72$, $SD = .45$). In terms of the problems encountered in the trainings, it is observed that the scores of the public school teachers ($M = 2.78$, $SD = .88$) are significantly higher than the private school teachers ($M = 2.03$, $SD = .96$). In terms of scale mean scores, it is understood from Table 4 that the scores of private school teachers ($M = 2.68$, $SD = .34$) are significantly higher than those of public school teachers ($M = 2.47$, $SD = .27$).

The analysis results of the teacher opinions according to the school level variable are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Analysis of teacher data in terms of school level variable

Sub-dimensions	Group	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	df	p
Necessity of trainings	Middle S.	122	1.88	.45231	.751	300	.454
	High S.	180	1.92	.40446			
Willingness to participate	Middle S.	122	2.12	.57666	1.154	300	.250
	High S.	180	2.04	.54857			
Effectiveness of trainings	Middle S.	122	2.91	.60838	1.755	300	.080
	High S.	180	3.05	.64933			
Problems in training practices	Middle S.	122	2.59	.98986	2.040	300	.042*
	High Sc.	180	2.36	.98027			
Scale mean score	Middle S.	122	2.54	.32754	.918	300	.360
	High Sc.	180	2.58	.31842			

In the comparison of the opinions of the participants about the trainings according to the school level, a significant difference was found between the groups in the problems in training practices sub-dimension ($t(300) = 1.755$; $p = 0.042$). Secondary school teachers ($M = 2.59$, $SD = .99$) think that there are more problems in the trainings compared to high school teachers ($M = 2.36$, $SD = .98$). There was no difference between the groups in the other sub-dimensions and scale mean scores. Also, according to the ANOVA test results which includes the analysis of the data in terms of teacher's professional experience, no significant difference was found between the groups.

3.2 Quantitative Results

General opinions of public and private school teachers on in-service trainings are given in Table 6.

Table 6. General views of teachers on in-service trainings

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Essential	5	Essential	5
Not performed effectively	5	Effective	5
Not well planned	5	Planned	5
Without a goal	5	Participation is mandatory	5
Not enough as quantitative	4	Performing regularly	4
Perceived as formality by teachers	4	Carried out in collaboration with colleagues	4
The teachers are reluctant to participate	4	Each training has a specific goal	3
Educational contents is irrelevant	2	Sometimes I think it's overrated	1
Poor communication between teachers	2		
Total	36	Total	32

When the opinions of teachers in Table 6 are examined, it is possible to say that the views of public and private school teachers do not overlap except for the necessity of the trainings. All public school teachers interviewed agreed that the trainings were ineffective, not well planned and without a goal. In addition, the majority of public school teachers think that the number of trainings is insufficient and it perceived by teachers as formalities. The situation is quite different for private school teachers. All the teachers interviewed emphasized that the trainings were conducted in an effective and planned way. Also, most private school teachers underlined that these trainings are carried out regularly, compulsorily and in cooperation with their colleagues. To give an example of these differences of opinion between both groups:

PUB1: It is not possible to talk about a full in-service training. These are perceived by teachers as mandatory or formality meetings.

PRT1: Since teacher supervision is well done in our school, this increases our motivation in training. I feel that it is very beneficial for us to carry out the trainings practically and to be together with our PE coterie.

The opinions of the teachers on the reasons for participation in in-service trainings are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Reasons for participation of teachers in in-service trainings

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Compulsory	5	Compulsory	5
To improve myself	4	To be informed about innovations	5
For offering education and holiday together	3	To stay up to date in the professional sense	5
To learn new teaching methods	2	To learn new teaching methods	2
To follow changes in sports branches	2		
To be aware of innovations in the field	1		
Total	17	Total	17

It is understood from the interviews that both public and private school teachers have participated in the trainings because they are compulsory. Other prominent topics in terms of public school teachers are willing to develop themselves. On the other hand, three public school teachers stressed that the fact that some in-service trainings were carried out in holiday areas and places with historical value or natural beauty encouraged them to participate in these trainings. All the private school teachers interviewed stated that they participated in the trainings in order to be aware of innovations and to stay up to date in the professional sense. The following statements can be shown as an example of the purpose of participating in in-service training activities of teachers working in both types of schools:

PUB3: The information we get from the university is insufficient after 5 years, 10 years later. Methods and approaches have changed a lot. The standards in the world have been set quite high. It is imperative that we raise the standards and improve ourselves.

PRT3: Participation in such trainings is mandatory in our school. In this way, we can stay up to date in our field. These trainings also enable us to raise the standards of our school.

The opinions of the teachers regarding the evaluation of the in-service training environments in terms of physical environment are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Teachers views on in-service training environments

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
The training environment is not suitable	5	The appropriate environment is selected according to the content.	5
The number of participants not suitable	5	The number of participants is appropriate	5
Only oral presentations with powerpoint support	4	Equipment to be used in practices is already set	5
Not suitable for educational practices	1		
Training hours are not appropriate	1		
Total	16	Total	15

All public school teacher participants think that educational environments are not appropriate for trainings. It is understood from the interviews with private school teachers, that the appropriate settings are arranged according to the training content. All interviewed public school teachers are of the opinion that the number of participants is higher than they should be. The four public school teachers interviewed considered that the trainings only took place in the form of verbal presentations with PowerPoint supported and this was not appropriate. Only one public school participant stated that she/he attended an applied training once but there was no suitable environment for carrying out the training practices. All private school participants are of the opinion that the trainings are suitable in terms of the number of participants and the materials to be used in the trainings are prepared in advance. Below are the views of one selected teacher from each group about educational environments.

PUB3: In a few trainings, the group was good, other than that the groups were crowded. As a standard, presentations are made via PowerPoint.

PST1: Some trainings are carried out practically in gym, while others are held in meeting rooms with small groups. In general, I think the educational environments are appropriate.

The opinions of the teachers about the fulfillment of their needs and expectations from the in-service training are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Teacher opinions on in service trainings in term of meeting their needs and expectations

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
It does not meet the teacher needs and expectations	5	It's meet the teacher needs and expectations	5
Teacher opinions are not considered	5	Needs are usually determined by the institution	5
Not field-specific	4	Teacher opinions are considered	5
Education topics are mostly irrelevant	3	We apply what we learned in our trainings in our lessons	4
Includes mostly changes in training programs	2		
Total	19	Total	19

When the opinions of teachers regarding in-service trainings in Table 9 are examined, significant differences are observed between the public and private school teachers. According to public school teachers, their needs and expectations are not met in these trainings. All public school participants stated that their opinions on the trainings were not taken into consideration. In addition, most teachers are of the opinion that education is not specific to their field and that the subjects of it are irrelevant. The private school teachers interviewed stated that the trainings meet the needs and expectations but the needs were mostly determined by their institutions. It was confirmed by all private school teachers interviewed that teachers' opinions were taken into consideration during the planning phase of the trainings. Besides, four private school teachers stated that they had to apply in their courses what they learned in these trainings. The below opinions of public and private school teachers regarding the level of meeting the interests and needs of teachers in in-service training will contribute to a clearer understanding of the difference in understanding between schools.

PUB3: I have never come across an applied training where we practice. The environment is already boring. I know nobody even asked a question just to make it over quickly. No interaction, no questions. I go to sleep mode when I sit in that chair.

PRT5: There is no education without practice. Whatever we need to do in class, we wear our tracksuits and practice it in the gym with our colleagues. We argue, we learn a lot from each other. In the trainings, it is already clear who is inadequate in what subject, who is equipped on which subjects, and everything is clear. Anyway, if you're in private school and you don't improve, you'll lose your job.

The opinions of the teachers about participant selection and measurement evaluation practices in the in-service trainings are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Teacher views on the selection of participants and the measurement and assessment in these trainings

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Participant selection is not objective except for compulsory trainings	5	All teachers have to participate	5
Ministry of Education or school administrators decide who will participate in field specific trainings	5	Measurement and evaluation is done effectively	5
No effective measurement assessment	5		
Total	15	Total	10

The public school teachers interviewed think that the selection of participants was not objective except for the compulsory trainings. In the field-specific trainings, Ministry of Education or school administrators decide who will participate. In addition, all the interviewed teachers think that no effective measurement and evaluation was made at the end of these trainings. All private school teachers interviewed agreed that they had to participate in these trainings and that an effective assessment was made at the end of the trainings. PRT2 summarized the situation of the interviewed private school teachers in the clearest way:

PRT2: I think there is no need for assessment and evaluation in our trainings. If we are given an education and we are asked to do what is necessary in our lessons, we must do it. Sometimes there are subjects in education that we do not fully understand, we discuss and evaluate among ourselves. The thing is, we must learn.

It is understood from PUB1's statements that the situation is very different in the trainings attended by the public school teachers interviewed.

PUB1: Unfortunately, as in most of the trainings, assessment and evaluation is done as a formality.

The opinions of the teachers about the staff conducting in-service trainings are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Teacher views on in-service training instructors

Public-school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Instructors are not experts in their field	5	There is a team of experts in training	5
No field specific training instructors	4	University field experts are assigned to consultancy and training	4
Appointed as a trainer for participating in a similar training	3	We provide training in the subjects we are competent	1
Total	12	Total	10

When the opinions of teachers about the education instructors are examined, it is seen that the public school teachers interviewed do not find these instructors sufficient. Four of the participants think that there was no field specific instructors for the trainings after the abolition of the formator and coordinator teacher practice. Three public school teachers emphasized that the personnel who will give trainings are selected from the people who take these in service training courses before. The two public school teachers stated that they did not come across with a training instructor who is expert in PE, except for compulsory and informative trainings. Private school teachers interviewed stated that there were specialized training staff in their institutions and received support from universities' field specialists. A private school teacher also emphasized that they were assigned as trainer in these trainings in the subjects she/he experts in. For example:

PRT2: We are in constant contact with universities. We are sent to some congresses, trainings and seminars with all our fees covered. We generally work with experts in the field. The private sector does not like to waste time. They do not take our time for an education that we will not benefit from.

PUB2's opinion on his/her experiences in these trainings is quite interesting. He/she stated that those who are not subject experts but who are responsible for presenting the content to the teacher group conduct these trainings with these words:

PUB2: Interesting but many of them say they are not competent at what they are about to present at the beginning of the training. All my concentration, which was already low, ends in that moment.

Teacher views on the in-service training policies of their institutions are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Teacher views on the in-service training policies of their institutions

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Not effective	5	Effective	5
Do not have a holistic perspective	3	The most important issue of my institution	5
Not give the necessary importance	2	It is seen as the secret of success	4
Good in theory but poor in practice	2	Specialization is given importance	3
Waste of money and time	1	An important budget is allocated for trainings	3
There is a credibility problem for teachers	1	Open to innovation	1
		Continuity	1
Total	14	Total	22

When the opinions of teachers about their institutions' in-service training policies in Table 12 are examined, it is observed that public and private school teacher's opinions are sharply differentiated. While all public school teachers interviewed find the in-service training policies of their institutions ineffective, all private school teachers find it effective. Three of the public-school teachers think that their institutions do not have a holistic perspective in the in-service training issue. According to all the private school teachers interviewed, in-service training is one of the most important priority of their institutions. Furthermore, the four teachers interviewed argue that the secret of their success in education stems from the importance given to teacher education. It is emphasized by three different private school teachers that their institutions allocate an important budget for teacher education. This situation is perceived by teachers as an indication of the importance that their institutions give to teacher education. It is understood that there is a clear difference of opinion between the groups regarding the education policies of their institutions. For example:

PRT4: I have been working in this school for a long time. Many senior executives I know have changed. They (Institution owners) just never touched the education department. Because this group keeps the school dynamic. They maintain university connections. In addition to being experts in their fields, they have gained a lot of experience over the years.

PUB3: It should be made disciplinary-specific, it is too general and ineffective.

The best and most problematic issues highlighted by the interviewed teachers regarding the in-service training in their institutions lists the Table 13.

Table 13. Topics that teachers think the best and the most problematic in the realization of in-service trainings

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
Need analysis is not performed well	4	Being systematic and planned	4
Instructors are not competent	4	Teachers keep up to date	3
Theoretically realization of trainings	4	Expert support	2
Field-specific training is not adequate	4	Teachers own course intensities reduce the efficiency of training	5
Instructors not equipped enough	3	Tiredness caused by extracurricular tasks	2
Do not have a holistic perspective	3	Sometimes trainings is overrated	1
Real problems are being ignored	2		
Total	24	Total	17

The data in Table 13 indicate that public school teachers are more focused on problematic issues but private school teacher more focused on the subjects that they think works well. The most problematic topics the in in-service training for public school teachers are the lack of effective analysis of the needs, instructors are not competent, theoretically realization of trainings and lack of field-specific trainings. Private school participants, on the other hand, state that their weekly course intensities other than in-service training reduce their efficiency in trainings. In addition, two private school participants emphasized that the other duties they undertake in addition to their lessons in schools make them force and reduce the effectiveness of in-service training. No public-school participant mentioned an issue that was effectively conducted in their trainings. On the other side the majority of the private school participants have defined their trainings systematic and planned. It is understood that the public-school teachers interviewed are not generally satisfied with the trainings and the policies implemented. For example:

PUB5: There used to be OBESID (Bureau of In-School Physical Education, Sports and Scouting), coordinators (teachers responsible for coordination between teachers from the same discipline), and formative teachers (expert teachers selected from their disciplines). We would have commissions on public holidays. There were things we criticized back then, but now we are in a much worse situation. Nobody knows each other, we go to the meeting, always foreign faces. We used to gather and mingle. Now it's all over.

The opinions of the teachers on how to increase productivity in the in-service trainings are in Table 14.

Table 14. Teachers' views on how to increase productivity in the in-service trainings

Public school teachers	f	Private school teachers	f
More effective need analysis	5	Reducing the weekly course hour of teachers	5
More emphasis on the training of instructors	5	Financial incentives for participation in trainings	4
Emphasis on applied trainings	4	Increasing university cooperation	3
Ensuring target integrity in trainings	3	Assigning more tasks to successful teachers in trainings	2
Getting more effective support from universities	3	Considering the views of teachers more effectively in determining the subjects of trainings	1
Expanding the number of in-service training instructors	3		
Increasing the quantity and quality of field-specific trainings	3		
Effective supervision of trainings	3		
Applying arrangements that encourage teachers to participate in trainings	3		
Authorization as trainer in these trainings to the exemplary teachers who do their job well	2		
Setting the number of participants to allow for effective training	2		
To give extra points to teachers who participate in in-service trainings when they apply for a higher position or institution changes	1		
Total	37	Total	15

When the opinions of the teachers in Table 14 are examined, it is understood that all the public-school teachers interviewed are in agreement to make need analysis more effectively and to give importance to the training of instructors. Ensuring target integrity in trainings, getting more effective support from universities, extending the training instructors, increasing the quantity and quality of field-specific trainings, effective supervision of trainings and applying arrangements that encourage teachers to participate in trainings are the other headlines highlighted by public school teachers. On the other hand, private school teachers agree that the most important factor that reduces the quality of in-service trainings is the

excess of their weekly course hours. Besides, most private school teachers think that participation in trainings should be supported financially in order to encourage by their institutions. Some of the teacher's views on this subject are as follows:

PUB5: The success of trademark schools should be examined. There are many private schools, some of which has been successful for years and has become a brand value in education. These should be investigated, I think the secret of success is in the in-service training and support as much as the selection of teachers.

PRT3: Weekly lesson hours of teachers should be reduced, and effective cooperation should be established with universities on in-service training.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Results are discussed in three sections: discussion of quantitative findings of the study, qualitative findings and comparison of whether quantitative and qualitative findings support each other. In addition, the results obtained from the first two sections were compared with the literature findings.

The results of the analysis of the data in terms of gender variable showed that only there is a difference in favour of men in sub-dimension of "necessity of trainings". There was no difference in the gender variable of the participants in the other sub-dimensions and the scale mean score. In the related literature, it was observed that the results of the analysis conducted in terms of gender varied. In some studies, there is a difference in favor of men in support of the findings of this study (Baştürk, 2012; Doğan, 2009; Güneş, 2006). Some of the results of the study showed that women are more positive than men in the in-service training phenomenon (Karakaya & Çoruk, 2017; Sabah & Çekin, 2016). In addition, there are many research findings in the related literature in this issue show that teacher views are not affected by gender variable (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Avcı, 2018; Büyükcan, 2008; Özkan, 2010; Uçar, 2005; Karasolak et al., 2013). The results of the research conducted by Aksakal (2018) with the PE teachers did not reveal any differences in terms of gender variable in all analyzes including the attitudes, expectations and evaluation of training programs scores of the teachers. According to Ercan's (2013) research results conducted with PE teachers, compared to men, women think that participation in the in-service training will be more beneficial for them. When all the research results are evaluated together in terms of gender variable, it is difficult to interpret that why women in this research sample consider in-service trainings less necessary than men. Among the reasons why women think that these trainings are less necessary than men, it is thought that women's maternity responsibilities in addition to their work life may be effective.

In the analysis of the opinions of the participants on in-service trainings according to the type of school, a significant difference was found in favor of private school teachers in terms of the effectiveness of the trainings, the problems in the training practices and the scale mean scores. Based on the findings, it is possible to say that private school teachers think that in-service training practices carried out in their institutions are performed more effectively than public school teachers in this research sample. Public school teachers think that there are

more problematic issues in the in-service training offered to them than their colleagues in private schools. Although the mean score was moderate in both groups, it was important to emphasize that the scores of private school teachers were significantly higher than those of public-school teachers. A comparative study of public and private schools was not found in the relevant literature. However, it is possible to interpret the results obtained from this research sample as giving more importance to teacher in-service training in private schools.

In the comparison of the views of the participants about the trainings according to the school level, it was found that the high school teachers found the trainings more problematic than the secondary school teachers. There is no difference between the other sub-dimensions and the scale mean scores. In the related literature, there is no study comparing in-service trainings in terms of school level. More research results are needed to make a clearer inference on this difference.

When the qualitative and quantitative findings of the research are examined comparatively, it is striking that they are generally consistent with each other. Based on the findings, it can be said that there are important differences between the private schools and public schools where the interviewed teachers work in terms of in-service training perspective and practice. The existence of such a difference in this research sample should be considered normal. Because the private school teachers selected for the research work in schools that have an important brand value and educational background in their regions. Such a choice was consciously made by the research group to better understand how these successful educational institutions conduct their in-service training processes and how they differ from public schools. It should not be understood from this that all private schools give importance to the in-service training of their teachers as these schools do. In fact, the private school teachers interviewed within the scope of the research stated that the secret of the success of the schools they work in and their difference from other private schools is due to the importance given to teacher selection and training. In the light of the data obtained from this sample group within the scope of the research, it is possible to interpret that the investment to be made in teacher education, regardless of the school type, will reflect positively on the quality of the education provided.

The data obtained from the research sample reveals that there are important problems especially in the in-service training activities carried out in public schools. These findings are in line with the general literature findings (Aksakal, 2018; Avşar, 2006-2011; Ercan, 2013; Karaküçük, 1989; Sabah & Çekin, 2016; Yıldız, 2006; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015). The results of the research on in-service training activities of public schools in the relevant literature support the view that the interests and needs of teachers are ignored in the planning of these trainings (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Baştürk, 2012; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Kala, Sungur Alhan, & Kirman Bilgin, 2019; Günbayı & Taşdoğan, 2012; Güneş, 2006; Karasolak et al., 2013; Limon, 2014; Nartgün, 2006; Özavcı & Çelikten, 2017; Parmaksız & Kısakürek, 2013; Uçar, 2005-2017; Uçar & İpek, 2006; Uştu, Taş, & Sever, 2016; Ulus, 2009; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015). The findings obtained from this research sample also overlap with the literature findings. The main purpose of in-service training is to provide teachers with the support they need to perform their duties more effectively. Keeping teachers up to date in their fields, analyzing the problems they encounter while practicing their profession and developing

solutions for these problems should be the focus of these trainings. According to Yılmaz and Esen (2015), the probability of being successful is very low for the trainings that are not based on the needs of the teachers. In addition, the preliminary knowledge of the teachers about the planned trainings should be determined and the trainings should be structured on this. Wang and Ha (2009) emphasize the importance of establishing collaborative professional learning communities that work continuously in effectively identifying teacher needs and producing effective solutions. The presence of these groups will minimize the problems in the planning and execution of the trainings. Dumlu's (2021) action research design study, in which he examined in detail in-service practices carried out in a private school via professional learning communities revealed that very beneficial results were achieved for the professional and personal development of teachers when these groups were used effectively.

It is understood from the research findings that participation in most in-service trainings is compulsory for both groups. In addition, the teachers who participated in these trainings stated the reasons for their participation as updating their knowledge and learning new teaching methods and approaches. However, it was stated by the public school teachers who were interviewed that this need was not adequately met in the trainings. According to Sum, Wallhead and Ha (2018), in-service training activities should be planned as continuous programs aiming to keep the professional qualifications of teachers up to date rather than obligatory. In other words, in-service training activities should be included in the teaching job description to support their continuous improvement. In the light of the relevant literature findings (Ayvaz Tuncel & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Karasolak et al., 2013; Özkan, 2010; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015) and especially the data obtained from the qualitative part of this research, it is understood that in-service training activities in the public schools included in this research sample are carried out in inappropriate environments and ways. The private school teachers interviewed stated that these trainings were carried out with smaller groups and mostly on a practical basis. The physical environment and the way of teacher in-service trainings is delivered give important messages about the quality of training and expectations from these trainings. If it is aimed to carry out an effective training activity in in-service trainings and to increase the general education quality of schools by this means, it is considered essential that these trainings are carried out in more suitable environments and with different practices. Rather than a central education planning and execution approach, it is thought that it would be very beneficial to carry out these trainings based on regional needs and with support from the education faculties of the universities located in the education regions. In addition, it is thought that a practice-oriented education approach will contribute significantly to achieving the planned goals in trainings for practice-oriented courses such as Physical Education and Sports. When these findings are evaluated together with the qualitative findings regarding the level of meeting the interests and needs of the teachers, they present a unity. It is understood that the interests and needs of teachers are better met in the trainings in private education institutions where physical facilities and applied education are organized relatively more effectively. The findings of various studies in the relevant literature (Ayvaz Tuncel, & Çobanoğlu, 2018; Büyükcın, 2008; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Karasolak et al., 2013; Nartgün, 2006;

Özkan, 2010; Uçar, 2005; Uçar, & İpek, 2006; Yılmaz, & Esen, 2015) also point out that authorities should focus on more effective solutions in terms of the ways of trainings are implemented, such as educational environments. In this context, it is thought that better results can be obtained if the trainings are carried out with smaller groups and in practice-based.

It is seen that the existence of problems in the relevant literature such as inadequacy of discipline-specific trainings (Gökyer, 2012; Sıcak, & Parmaksız, 2016; Tekin, & Ayas, 2005) duration and timing of trainings (Avcı, 2018; Günbayı, & Taşdoğan, 2012; Güneş, 2006; Ergin, Akseki, & Deniz, 2012; Günbayı, & Taşdoğan, 2012; Nartgün, 2006; Özen, 2006; Sıcak, & Parmaksız, 2016; Uçar, 2017; Yıldız, Sarıtepeci, & Seferoğlu, 2013), instructors' does not have the necessary competence on the subjects (Avcı, 2018; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Günbayı & Taşdoğan, 2012; Nartgün, 2006; Özen, 2006; Uçar, 2005-2017; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), negative attitudes towards in-service training of teachers due to negativities in planning, implementation and evaluation stages of trainings (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Kala, Sungur Alhan, & Kirman Bilgin, 2019; Karasolak et al., 2013; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006; Uştı, Taş, & Sever, 2016; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015), subjectivity of participation criterias (Aslan & Gül, 2015; Güneş, 2006; Ulus, 2009), no effective and measurable assessment at the end of the trainings (Bümen, Ateş, Çakar, Ural, & Acar, 2012; Durak, Sarıtepeci, & Çakır, 2016; Gönen & Kocakaya, 2006; Parmaksız & Kısakürek, 2013; Uçar, 2005; Uçar & İpek, 2006), the lack of a collaborative and motivating working environment for teachers (Gökmen, 2009; Yılmaz & Esen, 2015) was accepted by the public school teachers involved in the qualitative part of this study. Each of these problems constitutes an important obstacle in achieving the desired goals from in-service trainings. It is thought that in-service training activities, which are discipline-specific, at the appropriate time and place, under the supervision of competent personnel, supported by effective measurement and evaluation, are more likely to reach the targets. Based on the qualitative data obtained from the private school teachers interviewed within the scope of the research, it is understood that these schools have a more systematic structure and that the teachers do not experience such problems. It is thought that the time and money spent by these institutions on in-service trainings are highly rewarded, and all the efforts made contribute to the increase in quality and the preference of schools. From a holistic point of view, it is thought that PE and sports lessons can also be encouraging for quality perception and school preference. As a matter of fact, the findings of Hagood's (2007) study examining the relationship between in-service training for physical education teachers and physical activity and fitness levels of 4th and 5th grade students showed that students' physical activity and fitness levels increased significantly as a result of these trainings.

According to the results of the research conducted by Türkay, Toprak, and Tösten (2021), in which they analyzed the research on parents of students in Turkey with the meta-synthesis method, the main reason for Turkish parents to prefer private schools is the success of the education staff. In the context of students, the situation does not seem very different. As a matter of fact, according to the results of Abide's (2021) research that examines students' perceptions of the concept of qualified school, which he conducted with students at different

education levels, the most important factor that makes a school qualified for the participants is the qualified teachers in the education staff of the school. In addition, in the relevant literature, there are various research results showing that teachers make the greatest contribution to the success of schools that reach a certain level of success despite the limitations in other conditions (Glewwe & Jacoby, 1994; Betts & Morell, 1999).

Soylu (2018) argues that families, especially those belonging to the upper class, whose economic capital is much higher than other segments of society in Turkey, prefer to send their children to private schools. Swartz (as cited in: Aslan, 2020), on the other hand, argues that the underlying element of this tendency is the idea of increasing the cultural capital accumulation inherited from families together with the cultural capital to be gained from school. This decisive role of cultural capital in education systems causes inequalities in education to deepen without being aware of it (Bourdieu, 1986; as cited in: Yağan, & Özgenel, 2021). Atmaca (2019) is of the opinion that today schools are instruments that re-establish the boundaries between individuals from different socio-economic levels. In addition, Atmaca argues that students who are disadvantaged in terms of socio-economic and cultural capital and who do not have the conditions to bring academic success are always on the disadvantaged side of the border. This means that social inequality is reproduced through school.

According to the Education Reform Initiative (2018) data, the rate of private schools in Turkey was 2.7% until the 2007-2008 academic year, while this rate was 8.3% in the 2017-2018 academic year. Yolcu (2021) underlines that the two important reasons for this situation are the financial support given to families who want to send their children to private schools as of the 2014-2015 academic year, and the process of state support for the transformation of after-school support institutions into the private schools.

Another topic that needs to be addressed in this context is the situation of schools that are named as qualified by the Ministry of National Education (MNE). Kuzu, Kuzu, and Gelbal (2019) are of the opinion that the obligation for students who are not placed in such a qualified school in the high school entrance exam (HSEE) to enroll in the nearest school based on their address may trigger these class segregations. Kalsen and Öztekin (2021), drawing attention to another dimension of the issue, claim that schools with high academic success but not classified as qualified schools by the MNE are in settlements where families with high socio-economic level live densely. Kalsen and Öztekin think that this is another important factor that can deepen the differentiation of students according to their socio-economic characteristics.

In the light of all these data and in order to eliminate the social inequality concerns mentioned, it is thought that it is very important for teachers working in public schools to undergo continuous and high-quality in-service training. As a result of an effective analysis of teacher needs, it is thought that it would be beneficial to conduct these trainings through field-specific, practice-based, continuous or long-term collaborative professional learning communities and under the supervision of expert educators. One of the prerequisites for creating qualified human resources, which is of vital importance for all societies today, is the

continuous and effective in-service training of teachers who will create these generations. As this research data supports, in-service training should be seen as one of the most important problems to be overcome by the Turkish national education system and necessary steps should be taken immediately in this direction.

References

Abide, Ö. F. (2021). Farklı eğitim kademelerindeki öğrencilerin nitelikli okul, nitelikli ders ve nitelikli öğretmen özelliklerine yönelik algılarının karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, 7(26), 463-482. <https://doi.org/10.29228/kesit.49433>

Açıkgöz, K. Ü. (2003). *Aktif Öğrenme*. Eğitim Dünyası Yayınları, İzmir.

Aksakal, N. (2018). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerine yönelik hizmetiçi eğitim içeriğinin değerlendirilmesi ve kurs program önerisi* (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek lisans tezi, Eskisehir Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir).

Armour, K. M., & Duncompe, R. (2004). Teachers' continuing professional development in primary physical education: Lesson from present and past to inform the future. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 9, 3-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000208098>

Arslan, M. (2007). Constructivist Approaches in Education. *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 40(1), 41-61

Aslan, N., & Gül, T. (2009). Küreselleşmenin sosyal boyutunun hizmet içi eğitime yansımalarına yönelik sınıf öğretmenlerinin görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36, 20-31.

Atmaca, T. (2019). Sınıfsal Habitus ve Amor Fati'nin kesişim noktası: Meslek lisesi öğrencilerinin gözünden dezavantajlı eğitim hayatlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(3), 899-920. <https://doi.org/10.14689/issn.2148-624.1.7c.3s.1m>

Avcı, E. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyaçlarının belirlenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul).

Avşar, P. (2006). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin kendilerine yönelik hizmetiçi eğitim programlarını değerlendirmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara).

Ayvacı, H. S., Bakırcı, H., & Yıldız, M. (2014). Fen Bilimleri öğretmenlerinin hizmetiçi eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri ve beklentileri. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 357-383.

Ayvaz Tuncel, Z., & Çobanoğlu, F. (2018). In-service teacher training: Problems of the teachers as learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 159-174. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11411a>

Ball, D., & Cohen, D. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In G. Sykes & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3-32). San

Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Baştürk, R. (2012). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitime yönelik algı ve beklentilerinin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, 96-107.

Betts, J. R., & Morell, D. (1999). The determinants of undergraduate grade point average: The relative importance of family background, high school resources and peer group effects. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 34(2), 268-293. <https://doi.org/10.2307/146346>

Bolam, R. (1982). *School focussed in-service training*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood.

Bümen, N. T., Ateş, A., Çakar, E., Ural, G., & Acar, V. (2012). Türkiye bağlamında öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişimi: Sorunlar ve öneriler. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 194, 31-49.

Büyükcın, Y. (2008). *İlköğretim okullarındaki hizmet içi eğitim seminerlerinin öğretmenlere yararlılığı* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Ankara).

Büyükoztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The Mathematics reform in California. *Instructional policy and classroom performance* (CPRE Research Report Series, RR-39). <https://doi.org/10.1037/e382712004-001>

Çoruk, A., & Çiçek, H. K. (2017). İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Okul Yaşam Kalitesi Algıları ile İş Doyumu Algıları Arasındaki İlişki. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31, 750-761. <https://doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.1838>

De Marco, G. M. P. (1999). Physical education teachers of the year. What they are, what they think, say and do. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education*, 10(2), 11-13.

Dewey, J. (1958). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Doğan, O. (2009). *Hizmetiçi eğitime katılımın eğitim öğretim sürecine etkisi ile ilgili yönetici ve öğretmen görüşleri* (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul).

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Duit, R., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Conceptual change: A powerful framework for improving science teaching and learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(6), 671-688. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690305016>

Dumlu, N. N. (2021). *Özel okulda mesleki öğrenme toplulukları: Bir eylem araştırması* (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Aydın).

- Durak, H., Saritepeci, M., & Çakır, H. (2016). An in-service training of teachers on the model proposal: Web-based in-service professional development model. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*, 4(8), 222-248. <https://doi.org/10.18009/jcer.10737>
- Easton, L. B. (2008). From professional development to professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(10), 755-759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170808901014>
- Eğitim Reformu Girişimi. (2018). *Eğitim reformu girişimi raporu 2017-2018*. İstanbul: Sabancı Üniversitesi.
- Engel, R. J., & Schutt, R. K. (2010). *Fundamentals of social work research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ercan, O. (2013). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyacının belirlenmesi (Denizli İli Örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Muğla).
- Ergin, İ., Akseki, B., & Deniz, E. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan sınıf öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitim ihtiyaçları. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(42), 55-66.
- Evans, R. (2010). Change is what it means. *Seven secrets of the savvy school leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118269428>
- Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(10), 744-752.
- George, J. M., & Lubben, F. (2002). Facilitating teachers' professional growth through their involvement in creating context-based materials in science. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 22(6), 659-672. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(01\)00033-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(01)00033-5)
- Glewwe, P., & Jacoby, H. (1994). Student achievement and schooling choice in low income countries: Evidence from Ghana. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 29(3), 843-864. <https://doi.org/10.2307/146255>
- Gökkyer, N. (2012). Öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitim sürecinde karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve öncelikli ihtiyaç duydukları konular. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 16(2), 233-267.
- Gönen, S., & Kocakaya, S. (2006). Fizik öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitimler üzerine görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), 37-44.
- Günbayı, İ., & Taşdöğen, B. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin hizmet içi eğitim programları üzerine görüşleri: Bir durum çalışması. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(3), 87-117.
- Güneş, M. (2006). *İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Hizmet İçi Eğitim Programlarına Katılmayı İsteme ve İstememe Nedenleri (Mamak İlçesi Örneği)* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara).

Hagood, S. (2007). *The effect of a physical education professional development intervention on physical activity and fitness on 4th and 5th grade students* (Unpublished PhD. Thesis, Department of Sports Management, Recreation Management, and Physical Education, The Florida State University, USA).

Hoyle, E., & John, P. (1995). *Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice*. London: Cassell.

Kala, N., Sungur Alhan, S., & Kirman Bilgin, A. (2019) Akademisyen ve öğretmen perspektifinden Türkiye'deki hizmet sürecindeki öğretmen eğitiminin incelenmesi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 1277-1307. <https://doi.org/10.23891/efdyyu.2019.161>

Kalsen, C., & Yiğit-Öztekin, H. (2021). Liselere geçiş sisteminin öğrencileri özel okullara yönlendirip yönlendirmediğine ilişkin öğretmen ve veli görüşleri. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(2), 838-852. <https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.735552>

Karakaya Çiçek, H., & Çoruk, A. (2017). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin okul yaşam kalitesi algıları ile iş doyumunu algıları arasındaki ilişki. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31, 750-761. <https://doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.1838>

Karaküçük, S. (1989). *Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Eğitimi* (No. 146). Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Yayın.

Karadolak, K., Tanrıseven, I., & Konokman, G. Y. (2013). Öğretmenlerin hizmetiçi eğitim etkinliklerine ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(3), 997-1010.

Krahenbuhl, K. S. (2016). Student-centered education and constructivism: Challenges, concerns, and clarity for teachers. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 89(3), 97-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2016.1191311>

Limon, İ. (2014). *Yüz yüze ve uzaktan hizmet içi eğitim faaliyetlerine yönelik öğretmen algıları (Sakarya İli Örneği)* (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Ana Bilim Dalı).

Nartgün, Ş. S. (2006). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin hizmetiçi eğitim programlarının etkileri üzerine düşünceleri (Bolu ili örneği). *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(1), 157-178.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2004). Enhancing the interpretation of “significant” findings: The role of mixed methods research. *The Qualitative Report*, 9(4), 770-792.

Özavcı, E., & Çelikten, M. (2017). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre uzaktan hizmet içi eğitim uygulamalarında karşılaşılan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(2), 39-76.

Özen, R. (2006). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitim programlarının etkilerine ilişkin görüşleri (Düzce ili örneği). *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 141-160.

- Papanaoum, Z. (2010). For a better school. *The role of educators' training* (pp. 54-61).
- Patton, K., Parker, M., & Pratt, E. (2013). Meaningful learning in professional development: Teaching without telling. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 32, 441-459. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.32.4.441>
- Pedagogical Institute. (2009). *Proposal for educators' training*. Retrieved from http://www.pi-schools.gr/paideia_dialogos/prot_epimorf.pdf
- Pérez-Ibáñez, I. (2018). Dewey's thought on education and social change. *Journal of Thought*, 52(3-4), 19-31.
- Philips, D. C. (1995). The good, the bad and the ugly. The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher*, 24(7), 5-12. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X024007005>
- Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Postholm, M. B. (2012). Teachers' professional development: A theoretical review. *Educational Research*, 54(4), 405-429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2012.734725>
- Ritchhart, R. (2004). Creative teaching in the shadow of the standards. *Independent School*, 63(2), 32-41.
- Roehrig, G. H., Kruse, R. A., & Kern, A. (2007). Teacher and school characteristics and their influence on curriculum implementation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(7), 883-907. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20180>
- Rossman, G. B., & Wilson, B. L. (1994). Numbers and words revisited: Being "shamelessly eclectic". *Quality and Quantity*, 28(3), 315-327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01098947>
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2011). *Research methods for social work* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.
- Sabah, S., & Çekin, R. (2016). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin hizmet içi eğitim etkinliklerine katılımlarını etkileyen etmenler. *Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(2), 87-95. <https://doi.org/10.17155/spd.49494>
- Sıcak, A., & Parmaksız, R. Ş. (2016). İlköğretim kurumlarındaki mesleki çalışmaların etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 17-33. <https://doi.org/10.17679/iuefd.17144668>
- Siedentop, D. (1982). *Movement and sport education: current reflections and future images*. Paper presented at the Commonwealth and International Conference on Sport, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Brisbane, Australia.
- Soylu, A. (2018). *Özel okullarda okul içi süreçlerin ayrıcalıklı kimliğin kurulumunda ve yeniden üretimindeki rolü* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara).
- Stremmel, A. J. (2007). The value of teacher research: Nurturing professional and personal growth through inquiry. *Voices of Practitioners*, 2(3), 1-9

Sum, K. W. R., Wallhead, T., Ha, S. C. A., & Sit, H. P. C. (2018). Effects of physical education continuing professional development on teachers' physical literacy and self-efficacy and students' learning outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 88, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2018.01.001>

Tekin, S., & Ayas, A. (2005). Kimya öğretmenlerine yönelik bir hizmet içi eğitim kursunun yansımaları: Akçaabat örneği. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 165, 107-122.

Thurlings, M., Evers, A., & Vermeulen, M. (2015). Toward a Model of Explaining Teachers' Innovative Behavior: A Literature Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(3), 430-471. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314557949>

Türkay, A., Toprak, M., & Tösten, R. (2021). Türkiye'de veliler üzerine yapılan araştırmalar: Lisansüstü tezlerin bir meta sentez çalışması. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 27, 275-303.

Uçar, R. (2005). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin meb hizmet içi eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri (Van ili örneği)* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Van).

Uçar, R. (2017). Researching in-service training practices of Ministry of National Education according to the views of inspectors, managers and teachers. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(4), 4725-4741. <https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v14i4.5018>

Uçar, R., & İpek, C. (2006) İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yönetici ve öğretmenlerin meb hizmet içi eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1), 34-53.

Ulus, O. (2009). *Hizmet içi eğitim faaliyetlerinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi (Konya İli Uygulaması)* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara).

Uştu, H., Taş, A. M., & Sever, B. (2016). Öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişime yönelik algılarına ilişkin nitel bir araştırma. *Elektronik Mesleki Gelişim ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 1, 15-23.

Wang, C. L. J., & Ha, A. S. (2009). The teacher development in physical education: A review of the literature. *Asian Social Sciences*, 12(4), 2-17. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v4n12p3>

Wilson, S., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 173-209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1167270>

Yağan, E., & Özgenel, M. (2021). Okullarda yabancı dil ağırlıklı sınıflar aracılığıyla kültürel sermaye artırımı ve eğitimsel eşitsizlik üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 54, 277-299. <https://doi.org/10.15285/maruaebd.929651>

Yıldız, H., Sarıtepeci, M., & Seferoğlu, S. S. (2013). FATİH projesi kapsamında düzenlenen hizmet-içi eğitim etkinliklerinin öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişimine katkılarının ISTE

öğretmen standartları açısından incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 375-392.

Yılmaz, H. Y., & Esen, D. G. (2015). An investigation on in-service trainings of the Ministry of National Education (MONE). *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.019>

Yolcu, H. (2021). Eğitimde özelleştirme: Strateji, yöntem ve teknikler. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 54(2), 645-675.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).