INSET (In-Service Education and Training) and Professional Development of Teachers: A Comparison of British and Turkish Cases

Taner Altun

Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey

This study aimed to elaborate on the practices of INSET (in-service education and training) activities based on two different countries. The UK example has been taken as the practice of a developed and more advanced system, and the Turkish example of INSET is taken as the developing one. The study is based on analysis of literature search. The study starts with a brief articulation of teachers' needs in professional development and elaboration on possible contributions of INSET for developing teachers. Then, historical developments in INSET provision in the UK for last two decades will be considered. After that, because of the more gained attention of school-based in-service education in recent years, the school-based form of INSET, its possibilities and limitations are considered. The similar procedure follows in complementary sections in order to explain the current INSET practices in the Turkish educational system. The study concludes with some critical remarks on the issue being explored and some practical suggestions for effective INSET are made at final section.

Keywords: INSTE (in-service teacher education), teacher professional development, UK, Turkey

Introduction

Today, there are various trends that shape and change the world of education today. Those trends include changing age structures, knowledge intensive service economies, changing world of work and jobs, concept of learning society, rapid developments in ICT (information and communications technology), and social connections and values (OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), 2008). It is for this reason that policy-makers have increasingly focused on the need to develop system capacities for educational reform and change. Change attempts in education mostly aim to narrow the widening gap between the traditional capabilities of educational systems and emerging demands of the information age (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). In addition, human beings change in order to keep pace with a rapidly changing world. However, considering the continuum of change, educators appear to be less and less clear about what constitutes a legitimate reason for change (Uline, 2001). In many developed countries, teachers have found themselves under pressure from a drive to increase the quality of education and improve outcomes for pupils in order to create a more skilled and educated workforce (Osborn, 2006). According to James and McCormic (2009, p. 973), today's situation presents a challenge for teachers and schools who will need to focus on two

---

Taner Altun, Ed.D., assistant professor, Fatih Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Karadeniz Technical University.

things simultaneously: teaching the substance of subjects, and helping pupils to learn the ideas and practices associated with the process of learning itself. Hence, it can be said that profession of teaching require utilizing new trends and knowledge throughout the career which leads teachers to follow continuous professional development. In this way, teachers may be able to fulfill their professional roles in the changing contexts in which teachers work and learning takes place (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1996; Day, 1999; Sandholtz, 2002). Due to rapid changes in every phase of societies around the world, teachers' adaptations to these changes and long-term professional development have gained more attentions. As a result, it is argued that teacher professional development and continual deepening of knowledge and skills are major focus of systemic change and development in education (Ainscow, 1994; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001).

Today, in order to make knowledge economy successful, individuals and communities will constantly need to learn new things, apply their knowledge in new contexts, create new knowledge, where existing ways of doing and thinking are found wanting, and exercise wise judgment about what is important and what is not (James & McCormic, 2009, p. 973). James (1973, as cited in Altun, Yiğit, Özmen, & Alev, 2007) argued that link between knowledge and practice can be made by providing teachers with more in-service training opportunities.

However, most studies illustrated that despite of changing demands on teachers, in-service training models offered to teachers are centralized, deeply institutionalized in patterns of organization, management and resource allocation (Ovens, 2000; Altun et al., 2007). Furthermore, there are many factors that affect teacher professional development, for instance, teacher motivations and change processes in teachers (Guskey, 2002). In addition, teachers describe these one-shot workshops as boring and irrelevant, and they tend to forget 90% of what they have taught (Miller, 1998; as cited in Sandholtz, 2002, p. 815).

Aim of the Study

The study aimed to seek answers for the question: What constitutes of an effective INSET (in-service education and training) and what forms of teacher training should take place in schools in order to promote effective teacher development and consequently the best quality of education for learners?

On the basis of this question, the study aims to elaborate on the practices of INSET activities based on two different countries. The UK example has been taken as the practice of a developed and more advanced system, and the Turkish example of INSET is taken as the developing one.

The study is based on a literature review. The study starts with a brief articulation of teachers' needs in professional development and elaboration on possible contributions of INSET for developing teachers. Then, historical developments in INSET provision in the UK for last two decades will be considered. After that, it focuses on providing bodies of INSET and their responsibilities, as well as funding the INSET in the UK. Then, because of the more gained attention of school-based in-service education in recent years, the school-based form of INSET, its possibilities and limitations are considered. The similar procedure follows in complementary sections in order to explain the current INSET practices in the Turkish educational system. The study concludes with some critical remarks on the issue being explored and some practical suggestions for effective INSET are made at final section.

Continuing Professional Development and INSET: Possibilities and Limits

Today, CPD (continuing professional development) and INSET are terms which tend to be used

interchangeably. Both tend to be used to cover a wide range of activities designed to contribute to the learning of practicing teachers (Craft, 1996). Bolam (1993, as cited in Stoll & Fink, 1996, p. 155) described CPD as an on-going process which builds upon initial teacher education and training, begins with induction into teaching, includes in-service training, staff development and management development and concludes with preparation for retirement.

It is well known that, because the world that teachers are preparing young people to enter is changing so rapidly and because the teaching skills required are evolving likewise, no initial course of teacher education can be sufficient to prepare a teacher for a career of 30 or 40 years. Therefore, CPD is the process by which teachers (like other professionals) reflect upon their competences, maintain them up to date and develop their required skills and knowledge further in fast changing world (Website http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Teacher_training#Continuous_professional_development).

In this vein, it can be said that INSET is a continuing and practical activity for teachers to develop professional knowledge and skills throughout the education process. INSET can take different forms in attempting to achieve different objectives in order to bring change in education. Professional development activities through INSET are grouped under the following titles:

(1) Professional education, which is meant a widening and deepening of a teacher's theoretical perspectives by means of advanced study;

(2) Professional training, the development of knowledge and skills which are of direct applicability to daily work;

(3) Professional support, activities aimed at developing on-the-job experience and performance (Spence, 1996; as cited in Altun et al., 2007).

Above classification seems that INSET is only related to teacher development, however, it is obvious that the ultimate aim of the INSET activities in schools, today, is related to help teachers to learn and improve personal and professional skills for better learning opportunities of all pupils. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992, p. 2) asserted that a teaching force that is more skilled and flexible in its teaching strategies and more knowledgeable about its subject matter is a teaching force more able to improve the achievement of its pupils.

If professional development refers to changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior, teachers need to create their own knowledge and change their behavior in order to implement new developments and improve their practice (Kwakman, 1998). In other words, teachers need to be aware of their own learning processes when they carry out their practices in the school. The new model of teacher learning suggests that learning on the job may lead to improvement of practice (Kwakman, 1998; C. A. Johnston & J. Q. Johnston, 1998). C. A. Johnston and J. Q. Johnston (1998, p. 43) reported from their data that teachers' awareness of their learning processes can result in: (1) an increase in the using alternative teaching methods; (2) an increase in tolerance of students' varied learning behaviors; and (3) an increase in both teacher and student' willingness to work on teaching-learning strategies which facilitate student success.

Surely, INSET offers wide range of professional development opportunities for teachers. However, this raises some basic questions about teaching and learning. For instance, does INSET bring about change in the classroom and in school improvement? Does improved teacher skill impact on children's learning?

Burgess and Galloway (1993) argued that there is relatively little systematic evidence on the extent to which INSET affects classroom practice. The findings of a research study carried out by English (1995) suggested that change in the classroom is largely brought about by external factors, such as the national

curriculum and the examination boards. In his study, only 15% of teachers (out of 396 teachers) mentioned the in-service as a factor for change in the classroom. In terms of school improvement perspective, Hopkins (1989) noted that INSET is a necessary but insufficient condition for school improvement. Particularly, course-based one-shot in-service workshops were proven to be ineffective for both teacher development and school development as a whole. Similarly, Day (1999, p. 133) argued that whilst today's teachers have more opportunities for INSET, but they have: (1) less opportunity for extended learning; (2) less choice what they learn; and (3) less support for study unless they belong to a targeted group.

One of the reasons for this, as Day (1999) argued, is the politically driven initiatives. He pointed out:

> Since the late 1980s, purposes related directly to the implementation of mandated policies in the classroom and school management have dominated the INSET agenda. Much INSET has become driven by national, local, and even in some cases, school initiated managerial policy agendas. Teachers are seen as "delivery agents" acting in accordance with statutory demands of the employer. (p. 133)

The complexity of change is a critical factor in this argument. As Fullan (1999) argued that change is a highly complex and a process not an event. He went to comment that it is very difficult to change education—even in a single classroom—without changing the school organization with effective leadership and teacher cooperation. Thus, achieving change is much more a matter of implementation of new practices at the school level rather than simply adopting them (Hopkins, 1989, p. 84).

The second critical point is related to the evaluation of the INSET. As Burgess and Galloway (1993) explained, some changes in the classroom are easier to identify. For instance, if a primary teacher makes the computer more accessible for Internet searching for pupils, there will be recognizable effects in the classroom that can be identified and observed. However, it is difficult to observe the acquisition of higher thinking and questioning skills acquired by the teacher. In this vein, even when INSET has important implications for teaching process, it is hard to document change, which requires long-term investigations (Burgess & Galloway, 1993). On this issue, Baker and Sharpe (1992) provided practical and illuminating guidelines for effective evaluation of INSET, which includes step by step illustrations about developing and using an effective evaluation model.

The INSET Provision in the UK

In the UK, all teachers have a professional duty to review their teaching methods and work programs and participate in arrangements for their CPD (Holt, Boyd, Dickinson, Hayes, & Le Metais, 1997).

A Brief Historical Background

According to Henderson (1978), the beginnings of in-service training in the UK were synonymous with the beginning of any form of teacher training. The first training college was opened in 1841 by the National Society for Promoting the Education of the poor in the principles of established Church. Since then, there have been many developments and changes in the provision of INSET. The importance of INSET was recognized in the UK back in late 1960s. In 1967, Plowden and the Gittings Reports stressed the need for wider provision of in-service training in both primary and secondary fields (Henderson, 1978).

In the 1950-1970 periods, LEAs (local education authorities) has played a central role in INSET provision. According to Williams (1991), in this period, LEAs sought to establish new urban and rural services for expanding communities. LEAs recognized their responsibility to diagnose teachers' needs to appraise teaching

problems and maintain a flow of advice and assistance both through daily informal contacts with organizers, inspectors and advisors through organized courses (Henderson, 1978). Despite the LEAs has taken the major responsibility of providing of in-service education in the 1970s and 1980s, universities and education institutes (e.g., education colleges) also shared this responsibility and take their slice from the pie in order to provide scientific dimension to in-service education (Williams, 1991).

Williams (1991) explained that in 1970 again, letter 2/70 from the DES (Department of Education of Science) to area training organizations has made provision for grants to enable schools and institutes of education to run extend courses, planned by university in-service tutors in consultation with HMI (Her Majesty's Inspectorate), and offered free to teachers. Another emerged provision was distance learning or we could say that distance training. Therefore, the BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) made its entry into the INSET with an in-service education project for teachers which began in 1972. After that, in 1974, another development has been emerged which is establishing the Open University. Today, Open University provides great opportunity for teachers with the regular educational broadcasts from the television and the by computers and Internet Website connections in order to enrich the teachers professional development.

Throughout the 1980s, opportunities for teachers to participate in INSET have increased considerably as a result of a number of major educational innovations and changes in the funding arrangements. With the fast changes in the curriculum and introduction of the national curriculum, introduction of centrally funded initiatives, such as TVEI (technical and vocational education initiative) and TRIST (TVEI related in-service), the LEATGS (LEA (local education authorities) training grants scheme) and other changes associated with the 1988 Education Reform Act, have resulted in an increase in the availability of resources for in-service training (Brown & Earley, 1990, p. 4).

INSET Providing Bodies

In the UK, as Holt et al. (1997) explained, traditionally INSET is organized and conducted by many ways. It is possible to see some different bodies, mostly public but very few private, which train teachers in several ways. According to Holt et al. (1997, pp. 9-28), following bodies share the responsibility for the CPD of teachers: (1) Central government (DfE (Department for Education) and the TTA (Teacher Training Agency); (2) LEAs; (3) School governing bodies; (4) Head-teachers; and (5) The individual teachers concerned.

Morant (1981) noted that DfE actually is not an authority provider. The law on the LEAs has identified the roles of this body. Mainly, the courses organized by the DfE are run at the universities or at colleges. Despite of the limited resources, HMI (Her Majesty's Inspectorate) also provides staff by aiming to bring teachers or groups together to discuss their teaching and learning strategies, techniques, new approaches to modern education (Clegg, 1981). In 1994, TTA has been formed and it has shared the greater responsibility for teachers' professional development. Until the formation of the TTA, government's strategy to influence the competences of serving teachers was centrally planned, but largely workplace-centered and curriculum-led (Graham, 1996). Higgins and Leat (2001) argued that the increasing involvement of the TTA in CPD seems to strengthen the assessing teacher professionalism. Meanwhile, TTA reinforces the view that there is a growing realization of the need for continuity, which might provide progression from initial teacher education, through induction to continuing professional development.

Then, we can add LEA as main providers of INSET in the UK. There are more than 100 LEAs in England and Wales since 1974 and they are increasingly offering a contribution to INSET. By the White Paper on

Education in 1972, these programs have been scattered all over the UK and LEAs gained heightened awareness (Williams, 1991). The LEA's own INSET plans are now supported by a centrally directed grant system called the LEATGS (Evans, 1993).

Apart from these authorities and institutions which provide INSET in UK, Schools' Council, The National Union of Teachers, and NATE (National Association for Teaching English), The ASE (Association for Science Education) and Mathematical Association and Teachers' Union are the other institutions which time to time offer CPD courses for teachers.

In summary, in the UK, there are many institutions responsible for CPD as this can be provided within a school, at a LEAs teacher centre, at a HEI (higher education institution) or a further education institution or at an independent training or conference centre (Holt et al., 1997). In recent years, in the UK as elsewhere, there has been a move towards school-based, school initiated INSET (Evans, 1993; Day, 1999). Following sections will briefly elaborate on school-based INSET.

School-Based INSET

The introduction of the school-based INSET in England is related to redefinition of the INSET. Traditionally, INSET was seen as individual teachers attending courses, which are designed and provided by outside agencies (DES, 1978). However, this approach had some disadvantages, such as it seemed expensive and had little pay-off for whole school development (Keast, 1981). James's report in 1973 has introduced the idea of bringing INSET to teachers in schools, instead of taking teachers out from the school. The report states that in-service training should begin in the schools. It is here that learning and teaching take place, curricula and techniques are developed and needs and deficiencies revealed (as cited in Pike, 1993, p. 74).

Howey (1980, as cited in Evans, 1993, p. 16) described school-based INSET as an approach that includes those continuing education activities that focus on the interests, needs and problems directly related to the roles and responsibilities in a specific school. Therefore, school-based INSET focuses on the school, its needs, and its problems. It treats teachers as responsible actors in the process of the development of their own school (Evans, 1993). In terms of its advantages, Morant (1981) pointed out:

> Within the learning community of the schools, teachers and pupils' needs can be identified more easily, in-service experiences can be devised and related more closely to these needs, and resistance to implementation of teaching/learning outcomes of these experiences is likely to be less. (p. 41)

Meanwhile, research evidence points to the disadvantages of INSET courses provided by outside agencies. For instance, in Law and Glover's (1995, p. 17) study, teachers reported following disadvantages of LEA initiated INSET:

(1) Staff is limited, there is poor expertise, it has lack credibility and it makes pressure;

(2) Administration is so complex and there is poor organization;

(3) Course range is limited as well as the poor relevance;

(4) Facilities are poor and it is also reported that teachers found the quality poor again.

Some teachers also mentioned disadvantages of higher education INSET provision as:

(1) Staff: remoteness, unknown, lack credibility, lack reality and variability;

(2) Teachers found courses much theoretical, vague and course range is limited;

(3) Teachers mentioned that, in terms of access, there is a poor success and travel is costly.

Regarding these findings, Low and Glover (1995) commented that:

> Returns indicate that...HE (higher education) providers have yet to assure "clients" that they are not too far removed from the realities of the classroom. There was concern that they are not always credible, and do not seem to understand what goes on in schools—it is all a bit theoretical and we have to face the pupils. (p. 18)

Most of the schools today encourage their teaching staff to further their own professional development by attending these courses. In fact, there have been a number of reports of schools running their own programs of in-service education. According to Day (1999), school-based INSET appears to be more efficient way of addressing practical school matters of immediate relevance. Thus, this form of INSET brings responsibility for decision-making closer to the focus for implementation—the school and the classroom. As the teachers themselves agree on the subject and request a course which reflects their expressed needs and concerns (Keast, 1981), school-based INSET seems to avoid problems of match, relevance, knowledge transfer and utilization encountered in traditional off-site models of INSET (Day, 1999).

In brief, school-based INSET activities encourage valuable professional development opportunities in the school. As it is mentioned earlier, innovations in new technologies and curriculum make teaching complex and challenging more than ever. Therefore, such in-service programs are needed to train teachers to become competent and knowledgeable in furthering these innovations.

Limitations of School-Based INSET

Despite of the discussed advantages of school-based INSET, it is not problem-free. It has critiques and limitations. One of the criticisms about this model is that it can lead to insularity and it can inhibit possibilities for critical reflection (Day, 1999). In this vein, Morant (1981) stated:

> …especially if a school relies entirely on its own resources, may be equally severe as for externally based work. Members of staff drawing exclusively from their own resources may risk becoming over-insular in their attitudes and outlook, while individual teachers may be confirmed in existing prejudices. In any event, almost all the schools other than large comprehensives will be hindered by practical constraints in mounting, in-service activities that could meet all staff requirements. (p. 41)

In the mean time, Day (1999) argues that school-based INSET may be seen beneficial if they solely focus on teachers' responsibility for improving instruction. However, it gives little or no attention to organizational or social factors influencing teachers' instruction and the curriculum (Day, 1999, p. 139).

Money and time constitute other two major limitations on a school-focused program. In his book, Evans (1993) collated the 28 case studies, which provide reports of school-based INSET activities in 12 European countries. In this case, studies "restricted funding" and "time" was most mentioned limiting factors for school-based INSET activities. In addition, one of the reports (Soulsby & Swain, 2003, p. 17), which examines the award-bearing INSET scheme (administered by the TTA on behalf of the DfES) illustrates that the most commonly cited inhibitors for teachers to take up the both school-based and off-site INSET activities are workload, lack of time, lack of funding, lack of support from the head-teacher (as "gatekeeper" of the funds), the long-term nature of the commitment, lack of any clear financial or career incentive, the pressures of twilight sessions after a full day's work and the loss of time in travelling to and from them, the perceived demands of assignments and dissertations, a lack of supply cover and a reluctance to take time out of school.

The Turkish Case: Recent Context

As a developing country, during the last couple of decades, Turkey has made major efforts to establish an education system capable of providing young men and women with the broad range of knowledge and skills required meeting present-day job market needs. In last two decades, Ministry of National Education has greatly invested in education with aiming to raise the quality of education system and bring it to the standards of EU (European Union), which joining to the EU is one of the main ambitions of the country (MNE (Ministry of National Education), 2003). Despite of the all efforts made by the governments and the MNE, like many other countries, due to overcrowded classrooms, lack of appropriate as well as sufficient courseware and lack of resources and limited opportunities for the self-development of teachers, the quality of education has been on the agenda of discussions (Altun, 1996). It is argued that teachers have faced difficulties in catching up with the technological advances in their subject area and have been criticized for the inadequacy of teaching and learning methods used in schools (Altun, 1996; Altun, 2002). Since then, the government has sought assistance to introduce a number of projects aimed at improving the quality of education, including upgrading the curricula and instructional materials, revising student achievement tests, improving the teacher training system and increasing the research component in education (MNE, 1999). With the support of international organizations, i.e., World Bank, OECD, UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund), a number of projects have been developed, implemented in the Turkish educational system. The NEDP (National Education Development Project), so-called the largest project in Turkish education, sponsored by the World Bank and the Turkish Government is one of these major projects. The NEDP had three main targets:

(1) To improve the primary and secondary education in order to reach OECD levels;

(2) To reach standards which are identical to those in OECD countries so as to upgrade the quality and validity of teacher education;

(3) To ensure more effective and economic resource utilization in the areas of administration and management (Altan, 1998).

In order to implement the first and second aims, the necessity of training teachers both pre-service and in-service is gained paramount importance. As project required adopting new educational approaches and implementing these in the classrooms, existing teachers needed to upgrade their skills and pedagogical knowledge. In this vein, in recent years, INSET has gained crucial importance.

Provision of INSET in Turkey

Historically until 1995, INSET activities were centrally planned by the MNE (Ministry of National Education). In 1995, provincial administrations were given authorization and responsibility to organize such activities locally. Provincial directorates plan INSET activities in conformity with the local requirements and apply them accordingly. The duration of INSET programs varies from three to 90 days, according to the content of the program (MNE, 1999). The universities also contribute to INSET. However, this contribution is very limited and mainly off-site course nature. For instance, in order to obtain a further degree, teachers who graduated from two- and three-year HEIs are offered completion programs (equivalent to four years B.Ed (Bachelor of Education)) (MNE, 1999). Table 1 indicates recent statistics in INSET activities in Turkey.

As can be seen from Table 1, Turkey spends a lot of efforts to increase the quality of teacher competencies day by day to reach up to OECD standards. It is reported that economies in OECD countries are now often labeled "knowledge economies" and societies also referred to as "knowledge societies" (OECD, 2008), so that

reason knowledge to everyday life and to work gained greater importance. In order to help teachers to survive in knowledge creation society, Turkish Ministry of Education offers teachers INSET opportunities in wide range of areas. Table 2 summarizes the areas of INSET activities offered to teachers in 2009.

Table 1

Statistics of INSET Activities for Teachers Offered by Central Government and LEA in Turkey

Years	Central		Local		Total	
	No. of INSET	No. of participants	No. of INSET	No. of participants	No. of INSET	No. of participants
2000	445	23,583	6,126	288,426	6,571	312,009
2001	419	20,080	7,526	321,411	7,945	341,491
2002	313	22,072	11,772	495,643	12,085	517,715
2003	453	19,727	7,120	253,135	7,573	272,862
2004	526	34,154	11,422	587,402	11,948	621,556
2005	543	33,156	9,050	478,168	9,593	511,324
2006	634	44,006	13,460	472,533	14,094	516,539
2007	614	44,808	18,725	415,682	19,339	460,490
2008	751	41,783	24,416	481,412	25,167	523,195
2009	930	45,102	18,987	373,365	19,917	418,467
TOTAL	5,628	328,471	128,604	4,167,177	134,232	4, 495,648

Note. Source: MNE 2010 Statistics (Website http://hedb.meb.gov.tr/net/).

Table 2

Areas of INSET Covered in Turkey in 2009

Areas of INSET	No. of INSET activities	No. of participants
Computer based technology training	263	6,172
Training for teacher candidates	4	226
Professional field trainings	234	16,483
Professional technical trainings	114	1,995
Teaching techniques and project trainings	123	7,835
Curriculum development and induction	41	3,351
International social-cultural adaptation seminars	4	583
Foreign language courses	57	1,969
Management, legislation, institutional development	90	6,488
Total	930	45,102

Note. Source: MNE, 2010 Statistics (Website http://hedb.meb.gov.tr/net/).

Some Problematic Issues About INSET Provision in Turkey

It is important to note that there is limited research on the effectiveness of INSET activities in Turkey. Although after an INSET program, some evaluation studies were made, these are mainly based on quantitative statistics and are far from providing qualitative insights, i.e., teacher perspectives and impact on pedagogy. Few studies provided this sort of evidence (Özer, 2004; Uşun, 2004, as cited in Altun et al., 2007).

In addition, in their study, Altun et al. (2007) reported that teachers get bored easily when they attend INSET activities for just listening purposes. This means that teachers complain about theoretical based training sessions. Practical sessions for instance designed as workshops are highly limited. Other reported problem in Turkey is that inadequacy of instructors, who have no teaching experience in public schools, hence being inadequate in making clear links between bridge theory and practice (Yiğit & Altun, 2011). Furthermore,

Dilaver's (1994) study indicated that majority of primary teachers think that the length of INSET courses is not sufficient enough and also most of the teachers believe that the courses do not provide professional knowledge and skills in order to improve effectiveness of teaching in schools. Although there are some examples, most of INSET activities in Turkey held either in schools' conference rooms or outside the schools, classroom-based training activities are taken very limited space in whole INSET provision.

Reflections and Conclusions

It is clear that teachers' continuing professional development is a crucial element in ensuring the quality of what children experience through their education. As the teachers involved and gained knowledge, skills and experience, their increased confidence and expertise subsequently affects all children within their classrooms.

In study, it is aimed to provide an insight about the possibilities and the limits of the INSET for teachers' CPD, giving two different cases as examples of two different countries: UK and Turkey.

One of the main differences between these two cases is related to ownership of the INSET or sharing the responsibility of teachers' CPD. Although in two cases, the government (or ministry) seems to be very much in power of INSET provision, in the UK, certainly school-initiated INSET programs take a lot of space in the whole INSET provision. However, in Turkey, as a feature of whole education system, centralization in INSET provision is also highly clear and school-based INSET activities are so limited. As teachers appointed to schools by the ministry itself, the providing of continuing training for teachers on the job is also in the ministry's control. The ministry generally calls some selected teachers to mainly off-site training courses, and expect them to deliver what they learnt during these courses to other colleges when they return back to their schools. In the UK, this model is labeled as "teacher-as-technician model" associated with "delivery" model of teaching (Dadds, 2001). One of the criticisms about this model is that it is inappropriate and inadequate for developing well-educated teaching force. As this model is centrally controlled and is top-down nature, teachers are in a position that they are uncritical implementers of outside policies (Dadds, 2001). In the UK, particularly in 1970s, teachers had been expected to implement new initiatives and curriculum developments without fully understanding it or with no ownership of the innovation and they had little knowledge, experience, and/or resources to support their implementation in schools (Morley, 1994). According to Dadds (2001), for several years, teachers were regarded as "empty vessels" whose role is to receive and deliver centrally, packaged decisions, and the belief was that good practice would come from the outside agencies and argues that in these models teachers have very little to say about their understandings and crucial role of teachers and their experiences. He stated:

> …they have anything to say about the variety and complexity of processes which teachers undergo as continue to learn about their professional craft; as they continue to gain new knowledge and understanding; reconstruct their attitudes, beliefs, practices; struggle with the difficulties of the change process. (p. 50)

In the UK, during the 1980s, the importance of teachers' role in CPD as well as the awareness of the value of school-based curriculum development and school-centered INSET has gained its attention. This reinforced the need to put teacher development more explicitly into the context of the school, which clearly highlighted the weaknesses of the top-down model (Morley, 1994). TTA also elaborated its framework for CPD, which recognizes these facts and teachers' continuing needs as learners in a changing society.

In Turkey, however, these facts have yet to be realized. In other words, school-initiated INSET activities

yet to be implemented through the participation of the teachers themselves. As the whole system is centrally controlled and due to limited resources in schools (funding and trainers), it seems that there is a long way to promote a CPD model in schools, where everyone can develop personally and realize their full potential; participate with confidence in a collaborative management structure; give and receive advice and support, and finally, everyone can share collective responsibility for the development of the school (Altun et al., 2007).

One of the last critical points here worth to note is that balancing the identification of whole school needs and individual needs of teachers has crucial importance. As Wilson and Easen (1995) clearly pointed out that professional development in schools seems to be focused inaccurately and takes place outside of classrooms. They argue that in-classroom support should be provided for teachers as that offers considerable scope for professional learning about classroom practice. Similarly, Kwakman (2003) recommend that the work context needs much more attention and researchers and staff developers should collaborate with schools and teachers in jointly designing and creating interventions and investigating their effects.

References

Ainscow, M. (1994). Supporting international innovation in teacher education. In Bradley, Conner, & Southworth (Eds.), *Developing teachers developing schools: Making INSET effective for the school* (pp. 222-233). London: David Fulton Publishers.

Altan, M. Z. (1998). A call for change and pedagogy: A critical analysis of teacher education in Turkey. *European Journal of Education, 33*(4), 407-417.

Altun, E. H. (1996). Information technology in developing nations: A study of lecturers' attitudes and expertise with references to Turkish teacher education. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education, 5*(3), 185-207.

Altun, T. (2002). Factors influencing teachers' change in classroom practice due to introduction of information and communications technology (ICT) in Turkey (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nottingham).

Altun, T., Yiğit, N., Özmen, H., & Alev, N. (2007). A study on evaluation of effectiveness of an in-service training (INSET) course about the use of instructional technologies and material development (pp. 491-497). Proceedings of *7th International Educational Technology Conference (IETC2007)*. May3-6, Nicosia, Turkish Republic of North Cyprus.

Baker, G., & Sharpe, T. (1992). *Evaluating INSET.* Cambridge: Hobsons Publishing.

Brown, S., & Earley, P. (1990). *Enabling teachers to undertake in-service education and training: A report for the DES.* Berkshire: NFER (National Foundation for Educational Research) in England and Wales.

Burgess, R. G., & Galloway, S. (1993). Does in-service education have an effect on classroom practice? In Burgess, Connor, Galloway, Morrison, & Newton (Eds.), *Implementing in-service education and training* (pp. 168-175). London: The Falmer Press.

Clegg, A. (1981). The role of HM inspectorate in in-service training. In C. Donoghue (Ed.), *In-service: The teacher and the school* (pp. 162-175). London: Kogan Page in association with the Open University.

Craft, A. (1996). *Continuing professional development: A practical guide for teachers and schools.* London: Routledge.

Dadds, M. (2001). Continuing professional development: Nurturing the expert within. In Soler, Craft, & Burgess (Eds.), *Teacher development: Exploring our own practice* (pp. 50-57). London: Paul Chapman Publishing in association with The Open University.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning.* London: Falmer Press.

DES (Department of Education and Science). (1978). *Making INSET work: In-service education and eraining for teachers: A basis for discussion* .London: DES.

Dilaver, H. (1994). *Conditions of teacher training and replacement in Turkey.* Istanbul: MEB Press.

English, R. (1995). INSET: Initiating change or merely supporting it? *British Journal of In-service Education, 21*(3), 295-311.

Evans, K. (1993). *School-based in-service education: Case studies and guidelines for implementation.* Netherlands: Association for Teacher Education in Europe, Phaedon.

Fullan, M. G. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* London: The Falmer Press.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915-945.

Graham, J. (1996). The teacher training agency, continuing professional development policy and the definition of competences for serving teachers. *British Journal of In-service Education, 22*(2), 121-132.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3/4), 382-391.

Hallinger, P., & Kantamara, P. (2000). Educational change in Thailand: Opening a window onto leadership as a cultural process *School Leadership & Management, 20*(2), 189-205.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Understanding teacher development.* London: Cassell.

Henderson, E. S. (1978). *The evaluation of in-service teacher training.* London: Croom Helm.

Higgins, S., & Leat, D. (2001). Horses for courses or courses for horses: What is effective teacher development? In Soler, Craft, & Burgess (Eds.), *Teacher development: Exploring our own practice* (pp. 57-69). London: Paul Chapman Publishing in association with The Open University.

Holt, G., Boyd, S., Dickinson, B., Hayes, H., & Le Metais, J. (1997). *Education in England and Wales: A guide to the system.* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).

Hopkins, D. (1989). Identifying INSET needs: A school improvement perspective. In R. McBride, (Ed.), *The in-service training of teachers: Some issues and perspective* (pp. 84-99). London: The Falmer Press.

James, L. (1973). The James report's third cycle. In Watkins (Ed.), *In-service training: Structure and context* (pp. 12-19). London: Ward Lock Educational.

James, M., & McCormic, R. (2009). Teachers learning how to learn. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25,* 973-982.

Johnston, C. A., & Johnston, J. Q. (1998). Achieving staff development through understanding the learner. *British Journal of In-service Education, 24*(1), 31-47.

Keast, D. (1981). Supporting school-initiated INSET: School-based INSET in Devon. In C. Donoghue (Ed.), *In-service: The teacher and the school* (pp. 92-102). London: Kogan Page in Association with the Open University.

Kwakman, K. H. E. (1998). Professional learning on the job of Dutch secondary teachers: In search of relevant factors. *British Journal of In-service Education, 24*(1), 57-73.

Kwakman, K. (2003). Factors affecting teachers' participation in professional learning activities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19,* 149-170.

Law, S., & Glover, D. L. (1995). The professional development business: School evaluations of LEA and higher education INSET provision. *British Journal of In-service Education, 21*(2), 181-191.

MNE (Ministry of National Education). (1999). *2000 Yilinda Milli Egitim (National Education in Year 2000).* Ankara: MEB, Turkey.

MNE (Ministry of National Education). (2003) *National Education at the Beginning of 2002.* Retrieved from http://www. meb.gov.tr/indexeng.htm

MNE (Ministry of National Education). (2010). *Statistic.* Retrieved December 15, 2010, from http://hedb.meb.gov.tr/net/

Morant, R. W. (1981). *In-service education within the school.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Morley, G. (1994). Recent developments in in-service education and training for teachers: Where have we been and where we are going? In Bradley, Conner, & Southworth (Eds.), *Developing teachers developing schools: Making INSET effective for the school* (pp. 1-18). London: David Fulton Publishers.

OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2008). *Trends shaping education.* Retrieved January 8, 2011, from http://digm.meb.gov.tr/uaorgutler/OECD/6.Trends%20Shaping% 20Education.pdf

Osborn, M. (2006). Changing the context of teachers' work and professional development: A European perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45,* 242-253.

Ovens, P. (2000). *Reflective teacher development in primary science.* London: Falmer Press.

Pike, C. (1993). Appendix 2, Case E.P.1. Developing understanding and practice of evaluation. In Evans (Ed.), *School-based in-service education: Case studies and guidelines for implementation* (pp. 74-82). Netherlands: Association for Teacher Education in Europe, Phaedon.

Sandholtz, J. H. (2002). In-service training or professional development: Contrasting opportunities in a school/university partnership, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18,* 815-830.

Soulsby, D., & Swain, D. (2003). *A report on the award-bearing INSET scheme.* Retrieved from http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/ professionaldevelopment/opportunities/awardbearingandinset/

Stoll, L., & Fink. D. (1996). *Changing our schools: Linking school effectiveness and school improvement.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Uline, C. L. (2001). The imperative to change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(1), 13-28.

Wideen, M. F., Mayer-Smith, J. A., & Moon, B. J. (1996). Knowledge, teacher development and change. In Goodson, I. F., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.), *Teachers' professional lives* (pp. 187-205)*.* London; Falmer Press.

Williams, M. L. (1991). *In-service education and training.* London: Cassell.

Wilson, L., & Easen, P. (1995). Teacher needs and practice development: Implications for in-classroom support. *British Journal of In-Service Education, 21*(3), 273-285.

Yiğit, N., & Altun, T. (2011). Effectiveness of an in-service training course: Teaching methods and techniques. *Journal of National Education, 189,* 118-130. Retrieved from http://yayim.meb.gov.tr/dergiler/189/189.pdf