AN EXPLORATION OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL CONTEXT OF THE EXPERIENCED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN THE SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ADDIS ABABA

A Thesis Submitted to
The School of Graduate Studies
Addis Ababa University

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Teaching English
As a Foreign language

By

Jeylan Wolyie

May, 2000

AN EXPLORATION OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL NATURE OF THE EXPERIENCED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN THE SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF ADDIS ABABA

BY: JEYLAN WOLYIE

APPROVAL OF BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Dekonnen Disasa
ADVISOR

SIGNATURE

Tota Nofrish
EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

Awol Endris
EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter V

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to acknowledge with gratitude the persons who helped me most in the writing of this thesis.

First I am greatly indebted to Dr. Mekonnen Disasa, my thesis advisor, for his indefatigable encouragement, guidance, constructive and critical comments, and valuable suggestions. By encouraging me to reflect on the explanations made, views held and procedures followed, he helped me a lot in improving and extending the clarity of my discussions. Indeed, the thesis would not have been in its present form if it were not for his unreserved dedication in reading each of the chapters thoroughly and meticulously.

Second, my thanks also go to Dr. Awol Endris for his constructive comments on my research instruments. Third, I am also very much obliged to express my thanks to Ato Getachew Birru for his patience in writing and rewriting the manuscript.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DF= Degrees of Freedom

GST= Government School Teachers

NGST= Non-government School Teachers

APPENDIX: LIST OF APPENDICES PAGE

ABSTRACT

The idea of teacher development has gained considerable attention in teacher education. The fact that it has been only marginally treated in the M.A TEFL research at Addis Ababa University provided the impetus to study it. The purpose of the present study was to explore the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. The study was carried out, specifically, to investigate the actual teacher development practices, the teachers' views of the various developmental activities, factors hindering teacher development efforts and anticipation of future developmental pursuits.

To conduct the study, a descriptive research approach was employed. The data used in the study were generated through questionnaires and interview. Thirty-six English teachers and six principals in the selected six government and non-government senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa were involved in the study.

Various statistical techniques and procedures of data analysis were used. To analyze the descriptive data, frequency distributions, percentages and average scores were used. T-test and Chi-square (X^2) analyses were made to detect the difference between the two groups of teachers with regard to their developmental experiences and views. To analyze written responses and reflections in the interview part of the study, content analysis and guided analysis procedures were applied.

Generally, the study revealed that in both government and non-government schools under study, teaching English is an isolated practice. Conditions within which collaborative learning can be optimized have not been sufficiently provided in both groups of schools. On the other hand, the results suggested that the teachers would like to improve themselves through learning in their profession and appreciate the various developmental activities in schools and administrative roles that may facilitate conditions within which individual and collective learning can be optimized. The implications of the findings for the schools and the teachers were presented and discussed Recommendations for further study were also made.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the research problem, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, importance of the study, scope of the study, limitations of the study, and definitions of some important terms and concepts used in the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Traditionally, teachers are considered simple deliverers of the ready-made national curriculum to students who would receive knowledge in the form of a package. A teacher's prominent role, thus, is the transmission of knowledge and the students' parallel role is receiving the knowledge transmitted to them in a mechanical way. According to current views, however, teachers are at the centre of educational enterprise (McNiff, 1993; Beyer, 1987; Wallace, 1996).

As several writers critically observed, the implementation of new syllabuses, the appropriate use of new materials and methodologies depend to a large extent on teachers (Stern, 1992; Kumaravadivelu, 1993; Freeman and Richards, 1996). Beyer (1987) maintained that a teacher is "a linchpin of educational improvements" (P.26).

Every progress in the teaching of language makes a great demand on the language teacher and by implication on language teacher education. According to England (1998), this is particularly true for the English language teaching profession "that has moved in new directions over the past 30 years." One way in which the English language teaching profession advanced is the change of student and teacher role in the classroom. England observes that, "Changing roles means that teachers need more opportunities for continuing their education on the job. Meeting learner needs in the classroom means meeting teacher needs to be prepared for the classroom"(P.19).

The dominant issue in the teaching and learning of a second/foreign language currently is the principle of learner-centredness or the idea of making language teaching more responsive to learners (Tudor, 1993, 1996). This principle might not be realized unless teachers are changed to effectively work according to the principle. Savingnon (1991) notes that "in our effort to improve language teaching, we have overlooked the language teachers"(P.272). But teachers should not be overlooked for they are "Central to the delivery as well as the quality of education" (Lockhead and Verpoor, 1991, in Alemayehu, 1998:371).

Teaching is a complex and exceptionally demanding profession. To handle it successfully, teachers have to learn their profession continually. It is not difficult to imagine, for example, the complex decision making processes involved in every moment of the life of a teacher in the classroom in order for him/her to maintain learner motivation and direct learning goals. As Bridges (1998) and Hailom (1998) wrote, teacher training can lay a foundation for teachers' later career-long development. Nonetheless, teachers may not acquire all the knowledge and skills to achieve control over their practice at once. Since teaching, probably more than any other profession, is a learning profession (Freeman and Richards, 1996), it requires teachers to make constant, life-long improvements.

Head and Taylor (1997) state that: "Your understanding of yourself and of teaching are shaped not only by the teacher training you have received"(P.19). What teachers do in their profession and how they do what they do may matter in the long-run. Some empirical studies have shown that pre-service teacher education programmes are not usually capable of adequately exposing the student teachers to all forms of knowledge; pedagogical skills and complicated decision making processes which the actual teaching-learning processes involve (Akyel, 1997; Westerman, 1991; Johnson, 1994). To cope with and be able to live in the complexities and demands characteristic of real teaching in schools, teachers must pursue

life-long learning and enquiry. The very nature of teaching and responsibility entrusted to them necessitate teachers to develop continually.

Many valuable works stressed that teachers can achieve an effective handling of their teaching and a meaningful learning by their students mainly when they realize that change is important and thus want to learn continually (Barksdalle-Ladd, 1994; McNiff, 1993; Widdowson, 1984; Head and Taylor, 1997). In all of these and other works, the unifying theme is that teachers have to develop personally, professionally and socially to effect meaningful learning by their students (Bell and Gilbert, 1996).

The concept of teacher development has been a dominant theme in teacher education, particularly since 1980's. As can be seen from the review of the related literature (See Chapter II), throughout this period, writers have conceptualized teacher development in various ways. A large number of factors affecting the reality of teacher development, sources of teacher development and the relationship between teaching experience and teacher development have been considerably highlighted. The various facets of teacher development show the important place it has in teacher education.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite its importance and shift of emphasis towards it in teacher education programmes, the topic of teacher development seems to have received little treatment in the English language teaching and learning circle. At Addis Ababa University, the only TEFL M.A. thesis on teacher development issue is Tsigue's (1997) "The Implications of Self help-explorative Supervision for the Professional Development of Teachers in an EFL Setting." Tsigue (1997) based his study on the conception of the self-help-explorative supervision advocated by Fanselow (1990).

Fanselow (1990) proposed the self-help-explorative supervision to enhance teachers' conscious self-appraisal. His model of supervision is important in two ways. First, it reacts directly to the traditional forms of supervision, which Stoller (1996:2) describes as "unannounced, supervisor-centred, authoritarian, directive and judgmental". Second, it correlates fairly well with the current idea in teacher education that teachers are responsible for their own development (McNiff, 1993; Clark, 1992; Wajnryb, 1992; Head and Taylor, 1997). Tsigue (1997) attempted to examine the implications of this model of supervision for the professional development of the English language teachers in Ethiopia. He conducted the study on a sample of five Medhanealem Senior Secondary School English language teachers. The cross-case analysis, which the study involved, shed light on the complex processes and procedures inherent in self-help explorative supervision. The researcher finally reported the teachers' impression that they would like to expose themselves to such experience and learn more about their classroom activities.

But the above study seems to be narrowly based from two perspectives. First, in schools teachers are supervised not only for their own personal and professional enrichment as the self-help explorative model of supervision tends to strongly suggest. They are also supervised or evaluated for quality control assurance (Barnard, 1998; Hopkins, 1989; McCormick and James, 1989). The school administrators and other concerned groups are meant to assure themselves and the potential clients they serve that teachers have performed their activities satisfactorily. But one form of supervision alone may not be able to emphasize both teacher accountability and development simultaneously. That may be why Ubben and Hughes (1997) propose situational supervision.

Tsigue's (1997) study seems to be narrowly based again in that teacher supervision and its implication for teacher improvements are only limited aspects of teacher development. One cannot capture a comprehensive meaning of teacher development merely by looking at it

from the point of view of supervision. In order to build a better understanding of the meaning of teacher development, one has to look at it within a wider ecological system of schools making or breaking it (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992). These writers hold the idea that: "Understanding and attending to the ecology of teacher development should therefore be an important priority for teachers, administrators and researchers alike"(P.13).

Among the ecological variables central to teacher development, the existence or absence of "supportive professional community among the teaching staff and strong principal leadership" (Hannaway and Talbert, 1993:165) are usually mentioned. In addition to these, the nature of teacher evaluation in the schools (Murdoch,1998; Stoller, 1996; Rea-Dickins, 1994) and the working condition of teachers (availability of time and other resources) affect the realization of teacher development efforts (Nunan, 1998). Even the personality of individual teachers is among a host of variables that can heavily influence the practicability of teacher development programmes.

The gist of the above view is that teacher development in all its forms is constrained by a multiple of factors in schools for which it is thought, planned and practised. Tsigue's (1997) study has not examined the English language teachers' developmental nature within the wider school system. The present study, therefore, seeks to fill the gap.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

In general terms, the study wants to explore the developmental nature of experienced English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. One central feature of the study is that it aims to investigate the teachers' developmental nature within the wider social and educational system of the schools.

In relation to the research issue and the general objectives of the research, attempts will be made to obtain answers to the following basic research questions: (1) To what extent

1.5 Scope of the Study

Teachers develop in various ways. Factors that facilitate or hinder teacher development are also large and multifaceted. In this study, the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers and their attitude towards development, and factors affecting it are delimited to the issues within the schools. Secondly, only the English language teachers who have taught for five years and above are involved in the study. Third, the non-government schools included in the study are only those senior secondary schools, which employ teachers of their own while using the same syllabus as the government schools.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

One obvious limitation of the present study is that not all aspects of teacher development, factors affecting it and ways of fostering it have been fully captured. The second limitation relates to the sample size used for the study. The study is a small-scale study involving only 36 teachers and 6 principals in six government and non-government senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. The generalization drawn may not, therefore, include the target population at large. As a result, the study does not claim completeness and should be interpreted within its limitations.

1.7 Definition of the Importanat Terms

And

Concepts used in the Study

Koul (1989) observed that it is plausible for a researcher to clarify the meanings of terms and concepts used in the study so that people might not have difficulty in comprehending them. With this in view, the meanings of the following terms and concepts are given in this section.

Collaboration – in a school situation collaboration "is an interactive process that enables individuals to work together cooperatively utilizing each person's unique skill and talents to generate solutions to mutually defined problems" (Greene et al, 1998-99:10).

Experienced teachers – Boud et al. (1993) noted that there is no theoretically grounded meaning of the notion of experience. If there is no clear meaning of experience, there cannot be clear meaning of the phrase 'experienced teachers'. In this study, it is operationally defined and thus refers to those teachers who have taught in schools for a relatively longer period of time, developed classroom routines and had exposure to various factors around their own development as teachers.

Teacher education – this refers to "formally organized attempts to provide more knowledge and skills to prospective or experienced teachers and occur either in teacher education institutions or in school contexts" (Tatto, 1997:405).

Teacher isolation – Barkkens et al. (1999) Capture the meaning of teacher isolation in a considerably elaborate manner in the following way:

> The extent to which teachers are restricted from or restricted themselves from interaction with other individuals or groups in the school. Isolation is a situation in which a teacher is minimally influenced by and exerts minimal influence on the staff members. In other words, it is a situation in which there is minimal interaction between a teacher and other staff members (p. 168). As a result of isolation (individualism), teachers fail to share from and extend their repertoire of knowledge and skills (Wallace, 1998; McGilp,1997).

CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature

There is a large body of literature on teacher education in general and teacher development in particular. In this chapter, the conceptual and research literature pertinent to the present study are reviewed and some of their implications for the English language teachers are drawn. The chapter is particularly devoted to the discussion of the conceptual construct of teacher development, conditions for teacher development at the level of schools, factors affecting teacher development, and teaching experience and teacher development. Each of these topics will be separately considered.

2.1 The Conceptual Construct of Teacher Development

Teacher development has gained an important place in teacher education. Thus, it has undergone various conceptualizations. This is evident in how it has variously been defined and understood. The following two sub-sections examine the various ways in which writers have conceptualized teacher development and highlight their implications for the English language teachers.

2.1.1 Defining Teacher Development

Lange(1990:230) briefly defines teacher development as "the process of continual, intellectual and attitudinal growth of teachers." Inherent in this definition is that teachers have to up-grade their intellectual and attitudinal base towards what they do and how they do experientially and continually. Teacher development was also elaborately defined by Underhill (1992). For him, it is "the overt and covert quest by teachers to be continually in the process of actualizing their own capacities, of becoming the unique and best teacher it is

in them to be"(P.71). This definition entials that every teacher has a potential to become a best teacher possible. Teachers have to strive, therefore, for the actualization of their potential.

Teacher development can be conceptualized as the human side of school change. As described by Underhill: "Teacher development is a continuous process of transforming human potential into human performance, a process that is never finished" (Cited in Head and Taylor, 1997: Vii). This definition has a strong implication for the English language teachers. The making of an effective English teacher does not end with a teacher preparation programme. To be effective, the English language teachers have to learn about their profession continually.

Pennington (1995) defined teacher development as "a meta-stable system of context-interactive change involving a continual cycle of innovative behavior and adjustment to circumstances" (P.706). In her view, teacher development is cyclic or recursive, not a linear process. It is also an interactive and innovative process characterizing the efforts teachers make to be able to act effectively in various conditions.

One of the major forces behind the current rise of interest in the English language teachers' development is the change which language teaching theories and practices have undergone. With this, the classroom roles of teachers have shifted considerably. Language teaching and learning to-day is not as it used to be in the past. Thus, teachers have to develop continually to work satisfactorily in the changing and challenging situations of language teaching.

Richards (1990) observes that development-orientedness may give rise to self-enquiry and critical thinking that would enable teachers "to move from the level where they may be guided largely by impulse, intuition, or routine, to a level where their actions are guided by

reflection and critical thinking" (Cited in Farrell, 1998:10-11). Teacher development in the above explanation is the development of critical awareness of one-self and one's actions.

From the definitions cited so far, it is possible to draw a conclusion that teacher development is continual, reflective, experiential and cyclical. It is also a dialectical and recursive process involving the construction and reconstruction of one's experience in a continous way (Freeman, 1996: Ur, 1992).

It is difficult, however, to indicate where teacher development begins and ends. Fullan (1991) thinks that teacher development constitutes "what teachers bring to the profession and what happens to them throughout their careers" (P.289). In another place in the same work, he defines teacher development as "the sum total of formal and informal learning experiences through out one's career from pre-service teacher education to retirement" (ibid:326). One, however, needs to be cautious in the understanding of teacher development as a process of learning from experience. It is not a mere construction of one form of experience on the other; it is rather a conscious and critical reflection on experience.

Teacher development generally signifies the process of achieving the best and most informed way of teaching. This has to be the goal which any English teacher who wants to see improvement in the way he/she teaches and in the learning processes and out comes of his/her learners should aspire continually. It is expected that teacher development is something without which teachers can not exist as long as they are in the profession. There is no reason, for example, why an English language teacher does not incorporate new understandings in his/her classroom management routine, or look at group-work related problems from other perspectives if doing this can make the kind of difference he/she likes to see. This by itself is one crucial aspect of teacher development.

2.1.2 Different Approaches to Understanding the Nature of Teacher Development

Within the realm of conceptualization, writers have variously understood the nature of teacher development. In the review of literature, one discovers that there are considerable variations in how teachers can achieve development. In the present section, five ways in which teacher development have been understood are discussed.

Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) view that one approach to understanding teacher development is looking at it as ***knowledge and skills development***. Underpinning this approach is the fact that teachers should master the subject matter they teach and the pedagogical skills necessary to enable them to teach properly. As Bell (1992) argues, "if teaching is to be taken as a profession, we should make the assumption that .....a body of knowledge exists on which practices are based" (Quoted in Carrivicki and O'Donoghure, 1997:36). Burke (1997), on the other hand, thought that for teachers to enter and stay in the teaching profession, they need to master the procedural skills (Discussed in Hailom, 1998:404).

It is possible, as a result, to see teacher development as knowledge and skill development. This is mainly because teachers need to regularly renew the knowledge of the subject matter they teach, the pedagogical skills and how to combine the two in a way that makes learning meaningful (Westerman, 1991). The knowledge and skills base of, for example, an English teacher should develop constantly. For instance, the English language teacher has to develop continually his or her knowledge of the applied linguistics, theory of language teaching and learning, and managing learning in the complex language classroom.

As Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) noted, teacher development as knowledge and skills development has some advantages. One advantage is that knowledge and skills "are practical in that they focus on methods that are understandable to and usable by teachers in the

classroom"(P.3). These writers observe that the groups that understand teacher development as knowledge and skills development hold the view that "if knowledge and skills are focussed, it becomes easier for administrators and by implication for supervisors to have a clearly focussed, easily organized and packaged, and relatively self contained" supervisory plan (Ibid).

Teaching, however, is a highly demanding profession involving many complex processes and activities. It is implausible, therefore, to reduce teacher development down to the mere development of the discrete knowledge of one's subject matter and pedagogical skills since teaching involves many things beyond readily available knowledge and pedagogical procedures. There are a complex set of personal, social and environmental factors that affect even the proper application of one's knowledge and skills as a teacher.

The second approach to understanding teacher development is seen as ***self-understanding.*** Teacher development as self-understanding stresses that as a first step towards their development, teachers have to develop self-awareness, and awareness of what they do and how they do what they do. Many writers (among them, McNiff, 1993; Swan, 1993; Burton, 1997) put forward the view that teacher development is basically a transformation of teachers' perspectives that arise out of their awareness about themselves and their practice.

Teacher development as self-understanding advocates teacher autonomy and places the responsibility of development on the teachers themselves. McNiff (1993), for example, contends that "teachers have the key to their own process of self-improvement by acknowledging that they are travelers and still have far to go" (P.10). Supporting her idea, Clark (1992) also stated that teachers are afterall "designers of their own professional development and, as a result, the responsibility of designing teachers' development should be placed in the hands of professional teachers" (P.77). Implied in the above explanations is that

since teachers are responsible for their own development, they must be aware of this and strive for their personal, professional renewals (Burton, 1997).

Freeman and Richards (1996) also believe that in the second language teaching contexts, teachers can improve on their practice when they build their awareness. They write:

> Individual teachers follow particular routes in the development of their pedagogical knowledge and skills, depending on their individual views of language teaching, learning, and their changing understanding of themselves, their learners, their subject matter and the nature of second language instructional task (P.6).

Bailey et al. (1996) also argued that "the first step towards changing our teaching practice is awareness." According to them, awareness "may encompass what we currently do, the factors that have shaped us and our options for change" (P.26). As Tudor (1996:238) wrote, teachers' classroom action is guided by their own "personal agenda and set of beliefs about language teaching as by the method or approach which they are, in theory, following". Teacher development as self-understanding logically constitutes teachers' awareness of the belief system underlying their action.

But, a simple understanding of the belief system shaping and guiding a classroom teaching behaviour may not, bring valuable effect on the growth of a teacher's classroom performance. As Head and Taylor (1997) pointed out, a teacher has to reflect critically on the principles and beliefs guiding his/her action and modify them.

One obvious drawback of this approach to understanding teacher development is that it does not take into consideration the wider social and environmental factors that affect the development of teachers' self-understanding. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) suggested that though it seems attractive, this humanistic approach to teacher development is usually slow, time consuming and costly. Its outcome is also largely unpredictable.

It is time consuming because teachers may need longer time to come up with their changed perspectives. It is costly in that allowing every individual teacher time and other necessary resources for development may be beyond the capacity of a school. It is also unpredictable, since according to the self-understanding approach, development is teacher-centred and every teacher develops in his/her own ways. The institutions may, therefore, encounter problem in predicting who is developing and how that is actually being achieved (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).

The other problem of the self-understanding approach is that it undermines the bureaucratic situations of controlling the work of teachers in the schools. Teachers are usually evaluated in terms of the standards set in the institutions where in they serve. It is deceptively simple, therefore, to think of teachers' autonomous learning about their profession. In actual situation, there are a wide range of institutional factors which constrain the extent to which teachers pursue their developmental practice autonomously.

Teacher development has also been understood as "***ecological change***" (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992). According to this approach, teacher development is understood within the wider social and organizational contexts making or breaking it (P.13). Teacher development, therefore, goes beyond the personality of the individual teachers to the complex social and environmental conditions which determine the nature of staff development entirely. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992:13) convincingly stated that: "The seeds of development will not grow if they are cast on stony ground. Critical reflection will not take place if there is neither time nor encouragement for it." It has no use, forexample, to think of the continual development of the English language teachers in the schools where teacher isolation is supported, collaborative learning is undermined and teachers are tightly occupied.

Generally speaking, teacher development as ecological change assumes that for teacher development to occur, the social and organizational situations of the schools must be

conducive. The success and failure of teacher development should be understood within the wider contexts that facilitate or obstruct it (Blase and Blase, 1994; Ainscow, 1994).

The fourth approach to understanding teacher development has been recently proposed by Bell and Gilbert (1996). These writers conceptualize teacher development as ***social-personal-professional*** development. They argue that ".....teacher development can be seen as a form of human development, involving social as well as the professional development of the individual teachers" (.13). They also give separate explanations to what each part of teacher development (social, personal and professional) constitutes and means for a teacher.

The social development component of teacher development constitutes the renegotiations and reconstruction of the meaning of being a teacher, for example, of English, with other teachers. Inherent in this aspect of teacher development is the idea of seeking a way through which one can work with other teachers collaboratively. Other writers also support the principle of constructing knowledge socially (Freeman, 1996; Head and Taylor, 1997; McCormick and James, 1989; Williams and Burden, 1997).

In Bell and Gilbert's (1996) model of teacher development, the personal development aspect signifies teachers' cognitive involvement personally in constructing for themselves the meaning of learning collaboratively, and managing the feelings and emotions which the process of development involves. Head and Taylor (1997) also suggested that any change process involves emotion. The implication for an English teacher is to manage the feelings and emotions inherent in the process of change.

Since teaching is basically a learning profession, teachers are usually expected to transform their knowledge and skills base. They have to revise also the theoretical assumptions underlying their daily activities (Tudor, 1996; Williams and Burden, 1997; Head and Taylor, 1997). In Bell and Gilbert's (1996) theoretical model of teacher development, the professional development component thus emphasizes the transformation of the above

perspectives. In this respect, an English language teacher is expected to regularly transform or improve his/her knowledge of the English language, theoretical and methodological principles underlying its instruction, and the learning processes which it requires.

Bell and Gilbert's (1996) work is interesting for one thing. It has made a clear distinction between teacher development and professional development. In the literature on teacher education, professional development and teacher development are usually used interchangeably. It has become distinct in their work that the professional renewal is only one aspect of teacher development. The social-personal-professional model of teacher development gives equal value for personal (autonomous), social (collaborative) and professional development of teachers. A teacher may not be effective without all of them. As a result, they should be considered as interdependent and integral components operating towards the fuller growth of teachers.

The fifth and the final approach to understanding teacher development is viewing it as a ***set of on-going cyclic stages***. Teacher development as a set of ongoing cyclic stages has been proposed recently by Elliott et al.(1998). The writers have developed a theoretical model for sustainable professional development out of their long field research in Australia. Their theoretical model is important in that it understands teacher development within the institutional contexts in which it is situated. It has generally five cyclic stages that are systematically linked. Each stage in the cycle has various activities and processes to be considered by the teachers and their institutions.

The first stage is the stage of ***stimulation.*** At this stage, teachers are to be stimulated to reflect on their classroom practice and critically think of the processes through which they make the necessary changes or modifications to bring a more improved learning. Other writers also support the idea of thinking and reflecting on action (Bartlett, 1990; Wallace, 1996; Farrell, 1998; Stanley, 1998; Williams and Burden, 1997). When teachers are

stimulated to reflect on and plan to "question taken-for-granted knowledge that is implicit in their actions" (Ainscow, 1994:39), they might well be able to make conscious and informed modifications on their activities. For the English language teachers this may imply that they have to question and reflect on their subject-matter knowledge, methodological procedures and theoretical assumptions up on which their day-to-day activities are based.

The second stage in Elliott et al's model is the stage of ***modification*** which requires teachers "to go beyond just thinking about existing practice to thinking about ways by which this process can be made more appropriate to the setting and its requirements to act on this" (Op.cit.: 120). Head and Taylor (1997) and Ainscow (1994) conceptualize these aspects of transformation as 'change in perspective'.

Schon (1984) states that modification of classroom actions involves the 'naming' and 'framing' of the existing problems. He writes: "Through complementary acts of naming and framing, the practitioner selects things for attention and organizes them, guided by an appreciation of the situation that gives it coherence and sets a direction for action" (Cited in Ainscow, 1994:36).

Head and Taylor (1997) and Wallace (1991) also encourage this process of combining on the-spot-decision and modification of classroom actions since it helps as well as provides for self-directed learning.

The third stage in the above developmental model is the stage of ***amplification.*** This stage "involves moving outwards from a personal recognition of what can or should occur to involve others in the activity. In this way, change becomes more institutionalized and more likely to be adopted" (OP.Cit:121). The above view reinforces the principle of collaborative learning and practising teacher development as an institutional process (Blasé and Blasé, 1994, Ainscow, 1994; Clift et al, 1990; Bailey, 1996; Knezevic and Scholl, 1996). In short, teacher development would become a reality "with in the culture of collaboration that encourages and

supports problem solving" (Ainscow, 1994:25). One important implication of this view for the English language teachers should be noted here. Developmental efforts are more likely to produce achievements notably when the teachers strive to share experience and cooperate to solve their own problems together. A fascinating and helpful information about teaching language and solving problems related to language teaching and learning may be considerably obtained when teachers learn from one another than when they strive in isolation.

The fourth stage of teacher development according to Elliott et al.(1996) is the stage of ***reconstruction***. This stage claims that teachers should not only feel of change, but also practise and live in the process of change. Teachers should "incorporate changes into coherent framework of professional practice that contains beliefs different from those previously held" (Op.Cit.) According to Elliott et al. (1998), the stage of reconstruction is the turning point at which teachers practically obtain "a reconstruction of the ways in which they think about a professional practice and engage in professional practice" (Op.Cit.) Here, professional thinking and action are concurrently held or teaching is described as thinking and acting simultaneously. Freeman (1996) designated this aspect of constructing new understandings about one's profession, by the double term "renaming/reconstructing experience"(P.222).

It is important to emphasize, however, that the stage of reconstruction does not necessarily involve complete overturn of the previous experience. Developing new understanding may not mean that a teacher learns entirely new things. New understandings are to be built on and interpreted interms of the pre-existing experience. For an English language teacher, adopting learner-centredness approach or encouraging the communicative use of English in the classroom does not necessarily mean that he/she is doing a completely new thing. This is because even when the teacher did not have conscious awareness of the trends, he or she might have been practising them. A reconstruction of experience may provide largely the opportunity to reflect on the previous experience.

Kennedy (1992) beautifully states the above view in the following way. "Teachers, like other learners, interpret new content through their existing understandings and modify and reinterpret new ideas on the basis of what they already know or believe" (Quoted in Freeman, 1996: 237).

The fifth and the final stage in the developmental cycle in Elliott et al.'s (1998) theoretical model is the stage of ***transformation.*** At this point, change becomes a formal practice for individual teachers. Change becomes also an institutional process and schools become a community of professional learning. In this respect, the development of English language teachers is likely to occur when it involves all or most of the English language teachers in a school as team and when it gets institutional support. As Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) argued teacher development does not occur in a vacuum. Conditions should be met that allow as well as sustain it.

The theoretical model of teacher development proposed by Elliott et.al.(1998) has two advantages. First, it strengthens the view that teacher development is continual and cyclical. Second, it re-emphasizes the argument that teacher development should be understood within the wider social and organizational constraints of the schools. Regarding this, the writers stressed that for teachers to pass through each of the phases successfully, all conditions must be met. They presuppose, for instance, the willingness of individual teachers, and the structuring of institutional contexts in a way that encourages or stimulates teachers to work out theory from practice and to construct experience socially. They emphasized, on the other hand, that without prior meeting of suitable personal, social and institutional situations that allow the practice of developmental activities, both individual and collective developmental inspirations and efforts may not become practical.

In the discussion so far, different approaches to understanding teacher development have been observed. The implication of each of the approaches for the English language

teachers have also been highlighted. The wide range of approaches illuminate the important place which teacher development has recently achieved in teacher education. While each of the approach falls short of completely conceptualizing the meaning of teacher development, it contains elements that virtually constitute it. As Underhill (1992) convincingly stated. "The idea of teacher development takes many forms, has different meanings in different contexts, operates from a variety of implicit and explicit beliefs and value bases, and is manifested in different forms of action" (P.71). It follows, therefore, that teacher development should not be reduced to one or the other of its divergent meanings.

2.2 Conditions for Teacher Development at the Level of Schools

Williams and Burden (1997)hold the belief that in order to see improvement in their practice teachers have to approach their profession critically. They write:

> As part of the process of education, teachers themselves should maintain a continuous process of personal reflection, within which they become aware of the personal and cultural values and beliefs that underpin their own and other people's actions. Only by raising their awareness in this way can teachers come to understand fully their own implicit educational theories and the ways in which such theories influence their professional practice. It should help them to understand also why and how their teaching may or may not lead to worthwhile learning (P.7)

In this section, two ways through which teachers can practise reflective activities suggested above are discussed. Broadly classified, these are classroom-based and school-based teacher developments.

2.2.1 Classroom-based Teacher Development

Ramani (1987) maintains that a language classroom is not only a place to test theory but also a place to derive theory from practice. Similarly, Wright (1990) holds that: "A primary goal of all teacher development programs is to link theory and practice"(P.82).

Cochran-Smith (1991) also beliefs that teacher development is: "An internal renewal process wherein teachers find ways to derive meaning and satisfaction from the work of teaching rather than an external training process wherein education experts find ways to improve or fix teachers (P.114)."

These writers indirectly point out that a classroom is one source of teacher development. As Freeman (1996) also thinks, teachers should be able to "remake the meanings associated with every day actions-in short, to reconstruct their practice"(P.238).

Thiessen (1992) defined classroom-teacher development as an "orientation which situates the professional growth of teachers within the daily realities of classroom life" (P.85). Out of the broadly proposed and implemented approaches to teacher development at the classroom level, action research is one (Nunan, 1990; Wallace, 1996, 1998; Bartlett, 1990; Tudor, 1996).

Wallace (1998) defines action research as "the systematic collection and analysis of data relating to the improvement of some aspect of professional practice" (P.1). Other writers have also indicated that action research is problem focused, enquiry-based, reflective and has, as its goal, a function of guiding a teacher to make professional decision in a structured manner (Elliott, 1991; Zuber-skerritt, 1992; Hopkins, 1989). It is a form of teacher research though which teachers may "generate new understandings from their unique perspectives inside classrooms by transforming cases in to knowledge" (Cochran-Smith, 1991:113).

Action research as a structured reflection on one's classroom practice (Wallace, 1996) is primarily a consciously planned and systematic enquiry. As a result, several activities that are systematically conjoined are involved. It is possible, therefore, to see the phases through which action research runs, taking some issues of concern for English language teachers as examples.

The initial stage in action research is the ***identification of classroom problem*** (Elliott, 1991, Zuber-Skirrett, 1992; Ashcroft and Palacio, 1996). One of the recurring problems in the

English language classroom, for example, is learning problem which encompasses, among other things, learners' lack of learning confidence or fear of taking risk, and regular recourse to the use of the first language while the teaching goal is to increase their proficiency of English.

An English teacher for whom problems like these have become the focus of enquiry may raise the following questions. "Students do not seem to have courage to speak infront of the class. What should be done to get them speak? Or students seem to regularly use their first language when they are made to work in groups. What should be done to minimize their recourse to their native language? Some of the students are not participating in the assigned group work. What caused this?" These questions provide a foundation for the teacher to seek more explanation regarding the essence of the problem.

The second stage is the ***reconnaissance stage***. Here, the teacher gives a clearly formulated description and explanation to the identified problem. Elliott (1991) notes that the teacher " needs to describe as fully as possible the nature of the situation" that needs to be changed or modified (P.72).

If, in the English language classroom, the students' poor participation in a group learning situation is the identified problem, the teacher may wish to know things like: which students are not participating well? What do they do or are supposed to do in a participatory situation? What do they do or are doing when they do not participate? These and many other questions and their subsequent answers are expected to offer the teacher direction towards seeking solution.

Giving a simple description to the identified problem alone is not sufficient, however. One has to go further to probe in to the source of the problem. Elliott (1991:73) states that by looking deep in to the problem "one moves from a description of the facts to a critical analysis of the context in which they arise." This stage, therefore, is the point at which teachers make and test hypotheses about the internal nature of the observed problem.

The third stage is the ***construction of the general plan.*** The assumption is that since the preceding stages involved clear description and explanation of the nature of the problem, the general idea formulated is by now likely to have changed or been clarified. One implication for the identified problem in the English language classroom can be elaborated here. The teacher who first hypothesized, for example, that the lack of active participation in a group learning situation had resulted from the students' pre-occupation with their private matters might have by now specified that the problem had rather stemmed from lack of interest in the assigned task(s).

According to Elliott (1991) another activity or process which the construction of general plan involves is the formulation of "statements of the factors one is going to change or modify in order to improve the situation and the actions one will undertake in this direction" (op.cit. 75). This concept can also be made explicit using the previous examples of the nature of problems in the English classroom.

After the teacher has made the assumption that lack of interest in performing the assigned group work resulted from lacking interest in the nature of the task(s), he/she can make statements showing the course of action to be taken. The teacher may decide to give the students different task(s) to perform or set a kind of task that may be interesting to all the group members. These are simply possible examples of a course of action a problem-posing teacher can set in his/her attempt to bring about change or improvements, and encourage curiosity in the learning process. Every classroom and the problems that teachers face are rigorously unique. As a result, teachers take predominantly various ways to solve problems unique to their classrooms. Even similar problems may be treated in different ways by different teachers.

Elliott(1991) stresses that a construction of the general plan should contain, as well, "a statement of negotiation one has had or will have to conduct with others before undertaking the proposed course of action" (op.cit). A teacher may need to look for important materials,

ideas and experiences from a group of other teachers and school administration. The idea of making negotiation re-emphasizes the general concern in teacher education programmes that any effort to improve the nature of professional practice seeks support system. Even in the independent teacher development programme like action research in a classroom, making negotiation or soliciting support system is usually presupposed. Positive intervention in developmental efforts are supportive and empowering (Blase and Base, 1994).

The fourth stage, according to Elliott (1991), is the stage of ***devising a more advance action step***. Here, one is usually required to decide "which of the courses of action outlined in the general plan one is going to implement next, and how both the process of implementation and its effects are going to be monitored" (op.cit:76). For example, based on the identified problem, that is, the lack of interest in the groupwork participation, the teacher has made statements of general plan that he/she has to change the type of task(s) or set tasks that are to the best interest of all the group members. These are courses of action devised to solve the identified problem. The teacher has to decide now on which of the devised courses of action should be implemented, and how the processes of implementations are to be monitored in terms of the desired solution.

The fifth stage is the stage at which the teacher examines the outcome of the processes and activities of the entire action research. At this stage, if the undertaken action has fallen short of illuminating or solving the identified problem, the teacher may, therefore, need to go back to the spiral (recursive) process of action research. It is important to stress here that during the second cycle, the teacher does not simply follow the previous paths. Prior to starting the second cycle of the research activities, the teacher may need to more critically evaluate his /her general statements, the research procedures followed, the courses of action undertaken and the entire processes passed through during the first cycle. Answers to these questions may provide him/her with some highlights of how the second cycle should be started. This shows

that action research is not as such a mechanical process that leads teachers progressively to a definitive answer to their problems; it encourages posing rather more complicated problems and devising more systematic ways to investigate them.

It is important to note that one should not assume, however, that action research is only to solve immediate classroom problems. Teachers can also use it to test theory, to implement new methodology and to see their own interpretation of new concepts (Nunan, 1990 ; Wallace, 1998; Cohen and Manion, 1994). In all of the cases, however, it enhances the personal and professional development of teachers.

The major advantage inherent in action research is that both the teacher and his students equally benefit from it. By solving the identified problem, for example, a teacher improves the quality of his/her teaching as well as miximizes the learning opportunity of his/her students at the same time. This is actually the inherent feature of a classroom-based approach to teacher development. As Thiessen (1992) contended, in a classroom-based teacher development situation, "teachers and students alike are learners whose mutual development depends on the interaction of their experience"(P.87).

Since its conception in the 1940's, action research has been valued for the distinctive feature of its concern to "promote improvement in practice and improvement in understanding ***simultaneously***" (McCormick and James, 1989:338, emphasis original). But it is naïve to assume that its implementation is easy. There can be institutional, social and attitudinal factors that would affect its implementation. Teachers may lack interest and enthusiasm to make enquiry into their classroom, the working condition (the availability of time and other important resources) may facilitate or hamper it, and the nature of workplace relationship between teachers on the one hand and between teachers and students on the other hand can also exert a great impact. Thinking of these and a host of other variables that can constrain action

research may produce more likely effective ways to minimize their impact and maximize conditions that would provide for development.

2.2.2 School-based Teacher Development

This is the second broader classification of the conditions for teacher development in schools. It is also known as school-focused in-service work (Day, 1987). McCormick and James (1989), and Tatto (1997) believe that schools are input for the on-going development of teachers.

Hopkins et al. (1994) hold that a school-based teacher development programme has as its aim the following: "The emphasis is on meeting the identified needs of the school as a whole, with the major goal of improving the quality of what occurs in classrooms. Thus, the concern is with the development of the work of the staff as a team, as well as their individual thinking and practice" (P.113).

At the school level, collaboration between teachers has long been suggested as a mechanism to work and improve together. There are several ways through which collaborative work may help individual as well as collective improvements of teachers. This section is entirely devoted to the discussion of how teachers can learn about their profession collaboratively, the theoretical underpinnings on which this is founded and its implication for the professional learning of the English language teachers.

McCormick and James (1989) argued that "the most important characteristic of a school's internal organization is a collaborative professional relationship"(P.31). Several other valuable works on teacher education have also stressed the significant role of collaborative work between teachers. In all of them, the undergirding theme is that as they work together, teachers can construct and reconstruct their experience (Underhill, 1992; Edge, 1992; Williams, 1989, McNiff, 1993; Knezevic and Scholl, 1996).

It is important also to stress that the idea of working collaboratively to enhance common developmental goals is not something new to education. Kruse and Louis (1997) have pointed out that the principle of working cohesively together emerged in the 1950's when "the human relations movement" flourished, advocating the idea that "the interdependent relations among members of a workunit could either reinforce or undermine the productivity goals of the organization" (PP.261-2).

Kruse and Louis (1997) cite Senge (1991) who has noted that according to the modern organizational theory teams are essential in determining the developmental nature of the organization in which they work. Senge (1991) expresses the view that "teams, not individuals, are the fundamental learning unit in modern organizations. Unless teams can learn, the organizations can not learn" (Cited in Kruse and Louise, 1997:262).

The implication is that the extent to which members of an organization work and solve problems together, or set organizational goals together determines the organization's long-term success. The principle of collaborative learning is more emphatically advocated in the teaching and learning situations where teachers deal with rich and diverse variables affecting their daily activities.

The point is that teaching effectiveness cannot be achieved by the teachers' individual efforts alone (Wallace, 1998; McGilp, 1997). Although, as Blase and Blase (1994:33) argue, "individual teachers are capable of an exciting, new, transformative vision of teaching", they may achieve substantial improvement on their activity only when they work collaboratively. Teachers should not only show career-oriented commitment in their classroom, they have to exercise also team-oriented commitment in order to improve the overall condition of what they do.

One of the theories which underpins the principle of sharing experience and learning together is the ***normative-re-educative perspective*** (Rainer and Guyton, 1994; McCormick and James,

1989). According to Rainer and Guyton (1994), the normative re-educative perspective claims that "change is a function of interaction among members of an organization to increase problem solving abilities of a system and release and encourage growth in members" (P.140).

This principle strengthens the foregoing discussion in this chapter that teacher development should encompass social relationship between the school teachers (Bell and Gilbert, 1996). Change becomes more institutionalized and more likely to be adopted by individuals only when colleagues are involved (Elliott et al. 1998) and the kind of relationship existing between teachers in the school is one of the ecological factors affecting the progress of teacher development (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992).

As observed by McCormick and James (1989), the normative re-educative principle underlying the idea of collaboration addresses that "change only occurs when individuals are encouraged to change their normative orientations in attitudes, beliefs, values, knowledge, skills, roles and relationships. In order for this to happen, it is necessary to activate forces with in the system to alter the system"(P.29). McCormick and James (1989) indirectly emphasize that a system can be altered or modified when members constituting it want to alter it and do that together. The argument made so far suggests several implications for the English language teachers. Teaching English is a complicated and demanding profession. It may be more complicated and laborious in foreign language contexts like ours where teaching is done under hard circumstances such as large student size, insufficient or poor materials, heavy teaching loads and poor learning conditions in the classroom. The teachers have to share their knowledge and experience in order to maximize the learners' opportunity of learning and progressing.

The other psychological theory that underlies the principle of collaboration between teachers is ***social constructivism*** which holds that knowledge is constructed socially (Williams and Burden, 1997). This theory emphasizes, among other things, "a view of learning as arising from interactions with others"(P.43). The traditional view that teaching is an isolated practice is

severely challenged by the constructivist approach. Instead, teachers are encouraged to share their knowledge and experience to improve the quality of their practice in a co-ordinated manner.

The other theoretically elaborate principle that encourages the idea of collaborative and collective learning in schools is Tatto's (1997) ***transformative teacher education.*** This principle maintains that "knowledge is socially constructed and is achieved through social interdependence, that is, through the coordinated effort of two or more persons"(P.407). She stated, "Teachers learning togater to improve their knowledge as well as to support each other in a continuous attempt to implement a different kind of teaching and guide a new kind of learning is an aim of and vehicle to transformative teacher education"(op.cit: 408).

Tatto (1997) further stated that the transformative principle of teacher education incorporates, in various degrees, elements of constructivist, cognitive and developmental theory. Teachers are expected to develop, for example, new cognitive orientations, participate in their own process of change, learn continually and seek deeper knowledge or understanding of the teaching learning processes.

Freeman (1996:222) suggests that when they work together, teachers might "renegotiate the meaning of their actions and thus construct different, more critical, ways of understanding what they are doing in their classrooms." Freeman's idea lies at the core of the constructivist perspective of teaching. Von Glasersfeld (1995) asserted, "Constructivism can not tell teachers new things to do, but it may suggest why certain attitudes and procedures are counter-productive, and it may point out opportunities for teachers to use their own spontaneous imagination" (Cited in Williams and Burden, 1997:51). It is not fair, for example, to impose on an English language teacher to adopt task-based approach to language teaching; instead, the teacher should be given opportunity to think critically of the desirability and validity of what is meant by task-based approach to language teaching or learning. The role of groups may be to

raise the teacher's consciousness and stimulate his/her interest to apply the principle and extend it.

The culture of working together not only promotes the sense of personal fulfillment but also increases teachers' interest in and commitment to their schools. Kruse and Louise (1997) have captured this view in an illuminating way. "Teachers' sense of affiliation with the school, and their sense of mutual support and individual responsibility for their effectiveness of instruction is increased by collaborative work with peers"(P.265).

It is possible now to conclude that for actual improvement in teaching to be realized, teachers have to discuss professional issues together, re-appraise and rethink of their knowledge and skills base, and the theoretical assumptions underlying their actions collaboratively. There are various ways through which these can occur.

One way is conducting collaborative action research. A distinctive feature of collaborative action research is that it "[extends] beyond a search for solutions to immediate problems toward the creation of professional learning culture in schools that emphasizes enquiry and reflection as the norm" (Clift et al.1990:5 4). As Schleppegrell (1997:69) similarly observed, "when groups of teachers are engaged in action research project, their enquiry also has potential to inform broader educational reform, including curriculum improvement". This on the other hand re-emphasizes teachers' great responsibility that they "not only apply other people's ideas by transforming knowledge in to cases ... but also generate new understandings from their unique perspectives inside classrooms by transforming cases in to knowledge" (Cochran-Smith, 1991: 113).

Team teaching is another source of learning how to teach collaboratively. Handy and Aitkin (1986) express their belief that team teaching enables teachers "to reach beyond themselves, to be part of something that none of them would have attained on their own and to discover ways of working with others for mutual benefit" (Quoted in Ainscow, 1994:38). Ainscow (1994) also

maintained that team teaching would provide teachers with the opportunity of reviewing "aspects of their practice and experimenting with the alternative ways of working" (P.43).

It seems that provided that the school contexts in general and the work relationships between teachers in particular are suitable to and functional towards fostering it, team teaching is potentially an invaluable source of professional learning. It is difficult to imagine, however, the idea of team teaching in a school culture that encourages isolation and provides minimal support for group learning (Blase and Balse, 1994).

The second form of collaborative learning in schools is peer evaluation. Peer evaluation in its developmental sense is designed to help teachers to evaluate one another for better improvement. This form of evaluation stands in direct contrast to the traditional form of evaluation whose central feature is passing judgements on the quality of the teaching performance of teachers (Hopkins, 1989; Williams, 1989). In peer evaluation, evaluation of teachers' accountability and teacher development are systematically integrated. Its central aim is advocating teacher self-evaluation as a dominant goal in the evaluation programme (Duke, 1995; McCormick and James, 1989; Stoller, 1996; Rea-Dickins, 1994; Iwanicki and Rindone, 1995).

The aim of peer evaluation is not simply to point out the fact that the evaluated teacher's instructional procedures have pitfalls. At its base is the principle of reflecting on the performance and commenting alternative ways, and raising the teacher's consciousness about the observed problem and progresses (Wallace, 1991; Wajnryb,. 1992). It is more transformational, however, if the observed teacher is involved to reflect on his/her activity and what guided him/her to teach the way he/she teaches.

Iwanicki and Rindone (1995) are among those who advocate the principle of integrating teacher evaluation and teacher development. They believe: "It is critical for teacher evaluation to be implemented in a more integrated manner, namely in combination with school

improvement and staff development" (P.81). They reported, as a good example, the Connecticut State Department of Education and its experience with the professional education programme in the U.S.A, that proposes development-oriented teacher evaluation system.

It is clear in their work that the essence of the teacher evaluation system launched by the above programme has drawn its principle from the idea that "teacher evaluation becomes a means for professional growth and development as well as for improving student learning on a continuous basis" (ibid). Like other educational programmes, the meaning of evaluation, the target it is set for and the ways in which it is conducted are subject to the soscio-cultural framework of the school in which it is designed. When fertile conditions that allow the growth of progressive evaluation is in place, both professional accountability and teacher development can be maintained side by side.

It should be stressed here that teacher accountability and teacher development are in a dialectical relationship. If, for example, an English language teacher's accountability in the classroom is maximizing conditions under which optimal learning is possible, the aim of English language teacher development by implication is to increase this accountability. Peer evaluation is potentially one way through which teachers can be more informed about their own accountability and development as teachers.

One form of performance evaluation geared towards teacher development is ***clinical supervision***. A distinctive feature of this model of supervision is that it presupposes interactive and interdependent learning about teaching practice in a problem posing mechanism (Gebhard, 1991; Wallace, 1991; Murdoch, 1998; Stoller, 1996). Stoller cites Acheson and Gall (1992) to have stated that as its goal, clinical supervision has "the professional development of teachers, with an emphasis on improving teachers' classroom performance"(1996:3).

Initially developed as a component of pre-service teacher education programme, clinical supervision later became a popular means of facilitating teacher development programmes

(Hopkins, 1989; Hopkins et al 1994; Wallace, 1991; Gaies and Bowers, 1990; Ainscow, 1994). Stoller (1996) argues that through clinical supervision, teachers can support one another to learn more about their teaching.

Clinical supervision is a cyclical process consisting of three systematically connected phases: the planning conference, classroom observation and feedback conference. At the planning stage, the involved parties set the stage for effective and meaningful supervision. Here, the focus of the actual classroom observation becomes clear to both the observer(s) and the observed. During the actual classroom observation, the observer(s) collect the necessary data on the basis of the agreement reached during the planning conference. At the third stage, the feedback conference, the involved groups analyse the data and reflect on their features. At this stage, "Strengths and weaknesses are examined and proposals are made to improve subsequent classroom performance" (Gaies and Bowers, 1990:168).

It is important to consider, however, that the process of examining the quality of teaching and setting direction for subsequent improvement should involve the observed teacher. The teacher's role should not be minimized to the role of acting and seeking comments regarding the quality of his/her acting system. In agreement, all of the involved parties must be able to generate hypothesis from what is actually happening in the classroom.

2.3 Minimizing Factors Affecting Teacher Development in School Settings

Within schools, there are several factors affecting the success with which teacher development occurs. For example, lack of time and other valuable resources may prevent teachers from making objective enquiry into their class room problems. If teachers do not have spare time other than one allocated to accomplish class room teaching, they may not be able to successfully work to wards their development.

In the same manner, collaborative activities are also hindered by teacher isolation and lack of support system (McGilp, 1997; Wallace, 1998; Ainscow, 1994; Bakkens et al 1999; Memon, 1997). If relation ship which exists between teachers is loose, it is possible to conclude that teachers exercise poor interdependent and interactive learning.

School principals can do a lot of things regarding the factors impeding teacher development activities. The literature shows that they can encourage teacher development by enhancing the idea of collaborative work between teachers, creating trust and respect among teachers and using the evaluation system in the school for teacher development and school improvement purposes (Beck, 1994; McCormick and James, 1989; Ainscow, 1994).

In their recent work, Blase and Blase (1999) have reported the finding their study that the measure characteristics of change oriented schools are "a positive and strong relationship between effective instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and teacher commitment professional involvement and innovativeness"(p.353).

The roles of an effective instructional leader are well elaborated by Sheppard's (1996) Synthesis of existing studies. Effective instructional leaders have to exercise roles of "framing school goals, communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, supporting professional development sensations and providing incentives for learning" (Blasé and Blasé, 1999:353).

School principals may assume many more other responsibilities. What is of key importance, however, is that among their activities, initiating and sustaining the development of teachers working in their schools should be given priority. This is because, without teachers' active learning of their profession, educational improvement in its strictest sense hardly ever occurs.

2.4 Teaching Experience and Teacher Development

This study deals with the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers. At this point, it seems plausible to briefly discuss the notion of teaching experience, how it is related to teacher development and differs from it.

Potentially, teaching experience can lead to teacher development, notably if teachers can make sense of their experience. But one may make a mistake of explaining a teaching experience merely in terms of the time lapse covered with little or no reference to the improvement made. Without the latter, the former is hardly defensible. In the view of Criticos (1993:16), for any experience to be meaningful, it has to "be arrested, examined, analysed, considered and negated to shift it to knowledge."

To effectively exploit experience, Boud et al. (1993:9) argue, there needs to be "active engagement with it." Supporting the same view, Johnson (1994) states that, "Experience alone is not enough. It is the thought and subsequent action associated with the experience which determine its value in the learning process" (P.207). At the base of the above series of ideas is that teachers have to think critically of what they have achieved through out their teaching experience and how they have achieved, for example, teaching effectiveness in their classrooms. They have to think back on their experience, recall patterns of professional activities and learn from them critically.

As Russel (1991) stressed, one can develop a practical knowledge from experience solely when one has " perspective that recognizes the possibility and the importance of being attentive to experience and the opportunity to learn from it". (In Johnson, 1994:207). Learning from experience is a transformational process. It is not a haphazard, spontaneous accumulation of discrete and uncoordinated pieces of knowledge. It is rather a conscious (deliberate) process of transforming one's perspectives (Swan, 1993).

Boud and Walker (1993) suggest that learning from experience involves the activities of "singling out an aspect of the experience and relating it to a previous experience and learning (association), integrating the new experience with previous learning (integration), testing its validity (validation) and making it our own (appropriation)" (P.73). Like any process of growth, learning from experience is expected to occur in a cyclic or recursive manner. An appropriated experience itself may thus need further modification and reconstruction.

The issue of experience is, however, a controvertial issue in the teaching profession. While in some situations experience can contribute towards development, it may not necessarily bring about improvement on how a teacher goes about his/her classroom activities. In this respect, Wajnryb (1992) noted that it is difficult to "assume because teachers are experienced, they necessarily remember or understand well the process of becoming a teacher." She goes on to underline the difficulty of assuming "that experienced teachers are necessarily consciously aware of many of the processes that co-occur in the classroom or that they have opportunities to articulate their thoughts on these" (P.25). In brief, teaching experience may not necessarily lead to teacher development.

For teaching experience to be meaningful and productive, it should be regulated, re-appraised or re-evaluated, and modified. If experience is not regularly questioned and modified, teaching becomes simply boring and routine. Teaching experience can become the source of teacher development, when teachers can make sense of their experiences, how they have changed in practising their profession, the problems they have encountered, and the mechanisms they have devised to solve the identified problems. These are aspects of experiential learning which Kolb (1984) defines as " the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience"(Quoted in Head and Taylor, 1997:24).

Head and Taylor (1997) list four things by which experiential learning is characterized.

1. Learning is conceived as a process, not as a series of outcomes.
2. This process is continuous, and grounded in the learner's own experience.
3. It involves bringing out the learner's existing beliefs and theories, testing them against new experiences and insights, and reintegrating the new, more refined ideas that evolve through the process of examination and reflection.
4. It is a process of ongoing adaptation to an environment which is constantly changing (ibid).

The concept of experiential learning has a strong implication for the Eniglishlanguage teachers. In order to improve their daily activities, the teachers have to be reflective. As Bailey et al. (1998) state, "a regular reflection on their classroom experiences allows teachers to identify areas in their teaching that they feel need attention and thus spurs their continuing professional development" (PP.536-7).

To sum, this chapter has generally examined the complex issue of teacher development. Specifically, it has highlighted the conceptual construct of teacher development, conditions for teacher development at the level of schools, factors hindering development and the implications of these for the English language teachers. Teaching experience and teacher development have also been related. It has been emphasized subsequently that the relationship between teaching experience and teacher development is far complicated and less linear than it is usually assumed.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

The current study is exploratory in nature. Thus, a descriptive research approach was used. In this chapter, the techniques and procedures followed in the collection and analysis of the data are discussed.

2.4 Data Gathering Instruments And Procedures

To generate the data needed for the purpose of the study self-designed questionnaires and interview were used. Two sets of questionnaires were prepared. One set of questionnaires was for the English language teachers while the second one was for the principals in the selected schools.

The questionnaire for the teachers consisted of 19 close-ended and 3 open-ended questions. The close-ended questions called on the respondents to address the following issues: their background information, teacher development practice, views of the value of the various developmental activities in schools, ideas toward factors affecting teacher development, leadership roles and future readiness to practise available developmental activities. The open-ended questions on the other hand focused on the respondents' perception of how to achieve teacher development and what schools need to do. The questionnaire for the principals contained 11 close-ended and 3 open-ended questions intended to address related issues.

Before launching the main study, a pilot-study was conducted on the instruments. The purpose of the preliminary study was to check the clarity and suitability of the questions in terms of the language used and their relevance in helping to obtain the required information. Based on the obtained feed-back concerning the comprehensibility and content validity of the

questions from the pre-test and subsequent other comments, some of the items and instructions which were found to be vague were modified to clarify their meanings. Finally, the revised instruments were used to collect the data in the study.

3.2, Samples and Sampling Techniques

The target population for the study was the experienced English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. In the study, the principals of the selected schools were also involved to obtain more reliable information about the developmental nature of the English language teachers in their schools.

It was difficult to find a readily available list of the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. As shown in the 1991/1998 Annual Statistical Booklet of City Administration Educational Bureau, teachers in the senior secondary schools have not been classified according to the subjects they teach. No other source was also available that could show the number of the target population.

To draw the sample of teachers, the cluster sampling technique was employed according to which the senior secondary schools were first broadly classified under government and non-government categories. In the study, 4(19%) of the government and 2(16.66%) of the non-government schools were involved. Of the selected schools, Nazereth and Saint Joseph Senior Secondary Schools represented the non-government schools. From the government school categories, Black Lion, Kefetegna 20, Abiyot Kerse and Nifas Silk Senior Secondary Schools were involved. All of the representative schools were selected on the basis of convenience.

Two types of sampling techniques were concurrently used to draw the teachers who participated in the study. Typical case sampling was used since the study involved typically the experienced teachers who have taught for five years and above. Using the quota

sampling technique, six teachers were selected from each of the sample schools. From the two groups of schools, a total sample size of 36teachers and 6 principals were finally drawn. Using an equal chance method, 24 teachers were selected from the government schools and the rest 12 were from the non-government schools. The number of the teachers representing each group of the schools is, therefore, proportional to the percentage of the total size which each sub-group forms.

To fix a five-year-teaching experience as a minimum year of experience, the schemata theory was employed (Jaques, 1986). As discussed by Allison and Allison (1993:304), Jaques (1986) suggested a four-step conceptual hierarchy of cognitive function. The fourth and the highest level of cognitive hierarchy in the Jaquestian theory is the transformational (transformative) level comprising the time span that virtually ranges from two to five years. The Jaquestian theory claims that if a person has longer exposure to something or some condition, he/she comes to know more about the thing or the condition. Allison and Allison (1993) also assert:

> Prolonged exposure to a given knowledge or action domain can be expected to provide opportunities for individuals to acquire relevant information about the phenomena, processes, and problems characteristic of that domain which will allow the construction or elaboration of domain relevant to schemata (P.305).

In the light of the above discussion, it is expected that a five-year-teaching experience is long enough for teachers to build up the opportunity of observing, undergoing and sensing the various aspects of their profession. The selected English language teachers were, therefore, thought to have had a relatively considerable exposure to teacher development realities characteristic of their schools to provide adequate information required for the study.

3.3. Method of Data Analysis.

The analysis of the obtained data involved manually organizing and classifying the responses of the subject of the study. Depending on the kinds of responses obtained and the nature of the basic research questions, different statistical techniques were employed. To analyse the characteristics of the respondents (their work experience and academic qualifications), frequency distributions and percentages were used. To examine the difference between the ratings of the two groups of teachers, tests of statistical significance were employed.

For the data of parametric nature such as the teachers' developmental experience, views of the usefulness of the various developmental activities and future developmental readiness, each of the five points on the Likert type rating scale was assigned value ranging horizontally from maximum to minimum. The average of each grouped scale value was calculated and the aggregate average computed vertically. T-tests set at $\leq$ o.o5 level of significance were then calculated to detect the existence of a statistically significant difference between the two study groups.

The Chi-square (x^2) tests were also employed to determine the level of significance in the observed frequency counts and percentiles of the study groups with respect to their ratings of the identified non-parametric variables, particularly the factors affecting their development and the overall evaluation of their development in the schools. The level of significance was also set at $P \leq 0.05$ for the X^2 analysis.

To analyse the data obtained from the written responses in the questionnaires, content analysis procedure was used (Burns, 1996). This virtually involved categorizing and summarizing the data according to common themes. In the analysis of the interview data, the guided analysis approach was employed (Freeman, 1996). This, on the other hand, required modification of the interview questions by interacting with and in the light of the actual data.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Analysis and Results

The data collected through questionnaires and interviews are analysed and discussed in this chapter. Based on the obtained data, discussions and interpretations are concurrently made to verify and validate the basic research questions. The chapter contains: (1) analysis of the close-ended items in the questionnaires; (2) analysis and interpretation of the open-ended (written) comments in the questionnaires; (3) discussion and interpretation of the interview data; and (4) general discussion of results and implications.

4.1 Analysis of Close-ended Items

In the questionnaires

This sub-section deals with the background information of the respondents, teacher development practices, views of the usefulness of the various ways to teacher development, factors hindering teacher development activities in schools, perceptions of the importance of the various leadership activities in supporting teacher development efforts and the tendency of future developmental readiness of teachers and schools. The null hypothesis of the form Ho: $\mu_1-\mu_2 = 0$ is tested under all treatments other than the background information.

Background Information on

the Respondents

The background information consists of the work experiences and academic qualifications of the respondents. These are demonstrated in the following two tables.

Table 1: Distribution of the Teachers According to Their Teaching Experiences

Teaching experience in years	Respondents				TOTAL	
	GST (N=24)		NGST(N=12)			
	f	%	f	%	f	%
5-8	8	33.33	3	25.00	11	30.55
9-12	2	8.33	2	16.66	4	11.11
13-16	1	4.16	2	16.66	3	8.33
17-20	4	16.66	3	25.00	7	14.44
Over twenty	9	37.50	2	16.16	11	30.55
Total	24	100	12	100	36	100

The above table shows that 61.1% of the two groups of teachers have a teaching experience of 5-8 (30.55%) and over twenty years (30.55%). It may be noted that the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa are composed of teachers with many years of teaching experience and a few years of teaching experience as well. The background information of the principals involved in the study (See Appendix C) showed that their work experience ranges from a minimum of 12 years to 30 years.

Table 2: Distribution of the Teachers According to Their Teaching Qualifications

Qualification	GST		NGST		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
12+2(Diploma)	4	16.66	-	-	4	11.11
B.A(B.SC)	20	83.33	11	91.66	31	86.11
M.A(M.SC)	-	-	1	8.33	1	2.77
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	24	100	12	100	36	100

The data presented in Table 2 reveal the teaching qualifications of the two groups of English language teachers. As can be seen from the table, all of the teachers are graduates from higher institutions, and the majority of them (86.11%) are B.A (B.SC) holders. The data provide further insight that the senior secondary schools under study have English language teachers with adequate professional qualification to teach the language.

One of the basic questions addressed in the study is the extent to which the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa practise the various classroom and school-based developmental activities (See Appendix 4, Item 3a-c). The teachers' responses concerning this are shown in the following table. The table compares the average scores of the two groups to see if a statistically significant difference exists between them with respect to the frequency of practising the identified developmental activities.

Table 3: T-test Analysis of the Teachers' Practice of Developmental Activities

No.	Item	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)			
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean Difference	t-Value
3	a) I have invited colleagues into my classroom to observe and comment on the lesson I teach.	2.41	0.65	2.58	.0.51	0.17	0.78
	b) I have supported colleagues having teaching related problems.	3.45	0.833	3.25	1.215	-0.2	-0.58
	c) I have tried to systematically study problems in my own classroom.	4	0.834	3.66	1.30	-0.34	-0.95

The first two items in the above table aimed at examining the teachers' practice of peer evaluation and professional discussion. The third one intended to look into the extent to which the teachers study problems in their own classrooms. As can be seen from the table, some differences exist between the average scores of the two groups of teachers across all of the treatments. But the t-value for each of the treatments clearly indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the groups. This is because, all of the obtained t-values are considerably below the critical value of 2.04 for 34 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance for this study. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no a statistically

significant difference between the government and non-government school English language teachers in their teacher development practice is retained.

The results in the above table can be employed to answer the basic research question addressing the extent to which the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa practise the identified developmental activities (See Section 1.3 in Chapter I). As can be observed form the table, the score of the government school teachers concerning the practice of peer-evaluation is below average (2.41) and counts to 48.2% of the highest score on the scale. The score of the non-government school teachers for the same treatment is only a little above average (2.58) and thus constitutes 51.6% of the highest score on the scale.

But the average score of professional discussion (See Appendix A, Item 3b) is relatively better for both groups. The percentage score for this is 69 and 65 for government school teachers and non-government school teachers. The average value of the systematic study of classroom problems (See Appendix A, Item 3c) is much better for both groups of teachers. Its percentage score is 80 and 72.2 for the government school teachers and the non-government school teachers respectively.

The principals' responses were used to strengthen the above results. Out of the six principals in the selected schools, both of the non-government school principals and two of the government school principals indicated that the English language teachers in their schools work together only sometimes. On the other hand, the principals generally seem to favour the individual classroom efforts of the teachers. Four of them showed their perception that the English language teachers in their schools make individual efforts to improve their classroom practice. Again, out of the four principals who rated the highest frequency for the teachers' individual developmental efforts, two are the non-government school principals (See Appendix B, Item 3a-b).

Conclusion would be drawn that there is reliable evidence showing the fact that the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools under study do teaching more frequently in isolation than in group. Particularly, they do not usually use peer-evaluation as a way to learning about their profession.

The respondents were also requested to indicate their perceptions of the usefulness of the various ways to teacher development at the level of schools (Item 4a-c). The following table depicts the obtained results.

Table 4: T-test Analysis of the Average scores of the Teachers' Views Concerning the Usefulness of the Various Ways to Teacher Development

No.	Item	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Mean Difference	t-value
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
4	a) discussion among and collaborative work with colleagues in the school	4.83	0.318	4.83	0.441	0	-
	b) the systematic study of perceived problems in the classroom	4.66	0.636	4.83	0.57	0.17	0.77
	c) evaluation of one's teaching aspect by other teachers and school administrators	4.45	0.65	4.75	0.62	0.3	1.32

On the whole, the teachers rated the identified developmental activities as helpful towards their improvement as teachers. The results of the t-test analysis generally reveal that there is no significant difference between the two groups in their ratings of the usefulness of the identified classroom-based and school-based developmental activities. This is because the observed t-value for each treatment in the above table does not reach or exceed the critical value of 2.04 for 34 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance for this study.

The results in Table 4 can be used to answer the second basic research question (See Section 1.3 in Chapter I). As can be deduced from the average scores of the teachers across the treatments, the English language teachers in both groups of study highly appreciate the value of collaborative work, systematic study of classroom problems and getting their teaching activities evaluated by other teachers and school administrators.

The other major purpose of the current study was to find out the teachers' views concerning some of the factors generally believed to affect teacher development activities (See Appendix A, Item 5). The results of the analyses of the teachers' responses, regarding these appear in Tables 5 to 8. Each table shows frequency distribution, percentage, chi-square value, and degrees of freedom and corresponding level of significance.

Table 5: Comparison of the Teachers' Degree of Agreement Concerning the Effect of Administrative Factors on Their Developmental Activities.

No	Item	Response	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Total	
		category	f	%	f	%	f	%
5	a)The school administration provides minimal support for the English language teachers to work towards their development	Strongly agree	6	25.00	2	16.66	8	22.22
		Agree	11	45.83	5	41.66	16	44.44
		Doubtful	4	16.66	1	8.33	5	13.88
		Disagree	3	12.50	1	8.33	4	11.42
		Strongly disagree	-	-	3	25.00	3	8.33
	Total		24	100	12	100	36	100

Note: $X^2 = 4.80$; df = 4, $P \leq 0.05$

As can be seen from the table, the majority of the teachers in the study groups accounting to 66.66% showed their agreement that the administration provides them minimal support to work towards their development. The chi-square test was also used to detect the difference between the responses of the groups. The result of the X^2 analysis indicates that there is no evidence confirming the existence of significant difference between the study groups. This is because the calculated X^2 value of 4.80 is much below the critical value of

9.488 for four degrees of freedom set at 0.05 level of significance used in this study. The null hypothesis claiming that there exists no significant difference between the two groups of teachers with respect to their ratings about the effect of administrative factor on their development is not rejected. On the basis of the combined frequency and percentage values revealed in the above table, it would be concluded that a majority of teachers in both groups of schools felt that the school administration does not provide them with adequate support to increase their development as teachers.

Attempts were also made to relate the principals' responses to Item 4b (See Appendix B, Item 4b) to the teachers' overall feelings. The information obtained from the principals tended to contradict the teachers' reaction. Out of the six principals, only one agreed that the English language teachers do not have adequate departmental and school support system. Four of the principals, one from the non-government school and the rest three from the government schools, denied the statement while the remaining one principal from the non-government schools neither agreed nor disapreed. It is, therefore, difficult to reach a definitive conclusion regarding this point. But those teachers from both groups of schools who participated in the interview session pointed out that administrative support system such as providing teachers with necessary time and other facilities, and encouraging interdependent learning and sharing of experience rarely exists. The teachers' written comments also hinted at the problem (see the analysis of the written and interview data in sections 4.2 and 4.3 in this chapter).

One of the fairly well recognized factors affecting the continual development of teachers is the nature of evaluation conducted on their performance in the classroom (Murdoch, 1998; Barnard, 1998; Rea-Dickins, 1994; Hopkins, 1989). This can be broadly categorized according to whether the performance evaluation system is judgmental and

prescriptive or developmental and descriptive. The item in Table 6 below shows the teachers' perception of the effect of performance evaluation on their development.

Table 6: Comparison of the Teachers' Degree of Agreement Concerning the Effect of Performance Evaluation on Their Development

No		Response Category	GST (N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Total	
			F	%	F	%	F	%
5	b) The performance evaluation made in the school does not help the English language teachers improve their activities.	Strongly agree	10	41.66	3	25.00	13	36.11
		Agree	4	16.66	4	33.33	8	22.22
		Doubtful	4	16.66	1	8.33	5	13.88
		Disagree	3	12.50	0	0	3	8.33
		Strongly disagree	3	12.50	4	33.33	7	19.44
	Total		24	100	12	100	36	100

Note: $X^2 = 4.308$; $df = 4$; $P \leq 0.05$

Table 6 shows that more than half of the total number of the respondents (58.33%) agreed that the performance evaluation conducted on them does not contribute towards their development. The Chi-square (X^2) test was also computed to see the difference in the degree of agreement between the two study groups. The calculated X^2 value of 4.308 does not equal or exceed the critical X^2 value of 9.488 for four degrees of freedom set at 0.05 level of significance in this study. Hence, there is no evidence confirming the existence of a statistically significant difference between the groups with respect to their reaction to the effect of the nature of performance evaluation in their respective schools. There is a tendency in both cases that the teachers largely felt that the performance evaluation has contributed little to the constant improvement of their activities.

The school principals in the selected sample schools were also requested to indicate their views towards the evaluation conducted on the classroom performance of the English language teachers (See Appendix B, Item 4c). The principals' responses directly contradicted the teachers' overall reactions. All of them disagreed to the statement that the performance

evaluation conducted on the English language teachers does not involve them. But in the interview session, the teachers revealed how the performance evaluation failed to meet their developmental needs and rather obstructed them (See Section 4.3 for the analysis of the interview data in this chapter).

The teachers were also asked to indicate the extent to which they agree to the existence of teachers' lack of willingness to work collaboratively. The following table shows the analysis of the teachers' responses to the item regarding this issue.

Table 7: Comparison of the Teachers' Degree of Agreement Concerning the Effect of Lack of Teachers' Willingness to Work Collaboratively

No.	Item	Response Categories	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Total	
			f	%	f	%	f	%
5	c) The English language teachers lack willingness to work collaboratively.	Strongly agree	5	20.83	4	33.33	9	25
		agree	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Doubtful	7	29.16	3	25.00	10	27.77
		Disagree	9	37.5	3	25.00	12	33.33
		Strongly disagree	3	12.5	2	16.66	5	13.88
	Total		24	100	12	100	36	100

Note: $X^2=1.02$; df =4 ; $P \leq 0.05$

The results in the above table show that a considerable number of the respondents (47.21%) did not agree to the statement. Twenty seven percent of them, however, neither agreed nor disagreed. But a closer look at the distribution of the teachers' responses indicates that some of the teachers in both study groups felt the existence of the problem of teachers lacking willingness to work collaboratively. For example, the teachers who strongly agreed that the teachers lack willingness to work collaboratively constitute 25% of the entire sample teachers.

The Chi-square (X^2) test was also calculated to detect the existence of a statistically significant difference between the views of the two groups of teachers regarding the above item. The obtained X^2 value of 1.02 is considerably below the critical value of 9.488 for four degrees of freedom set at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there exists no statistically significant difference between the study groups with respect to their ratings of the effect of lack of teacher willingness on their development is maintained. Based on the frequency distributions and percentage values, it would be concluded that lack of teacher willingness to work together is not a major problem for both government and non-government school teachers. But the interview data indicated the existence of the problem, particularly in the government schools (See Section 4.3 for the analysis of the interview data in this chapter).

Asked if the English language teachers in their respective schools are not interested to work together, all of the principals rather showed that the teachers do not lack interest to work and improve together. Two striking points should be noted here. In item 3a in the questionnaire (See Appendix B), the majority of the principals indicated that the English language teachers in their schools work together only sometimes. In item 4a, (See Appendix B), all of the principals revealed that the teachers do not lack interest to learn from one another. One explanation that may be made here is that the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools under study do not as such lack willingness to learn collaboratively. Probably, the social and organizational contexts in which they carry out the teaching learning processes constrain the possibility of group learning. The teachers' written responses and reflections in the interview session lend a strong support to the current explanation.

The teachers were also asked to show the extent to which they agree the teaching load in their schools has blocked the possibility of discussing professional issues. The details of the teachers' responses concerning this problem is presented in the following table.

Table 8: Comparison of the Teachers' Degree of Agreement Concerning the Effect of Teaching Load on Discussing Professional Issues.

No	Item	Response Category	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Total	
			f	%	f	%	f	%
5	d) The teaching load of the teachers does not allow them to discuss professional issues.	Strongly agree	16	66.66	4	33.33	20	55.55
		Agree	7	29.16	4	33.33	11	30.55
		Doubtful	0	0	1	8.33	1	2.77
		Disagree	0	0	1	8.33	1	2.77
		Strongly disagree	1	4.16	2	16.66	3	8.33
	Total		24	100	12	100	36	100

Note : $X^2 = 5.864$; df =4; $p \leq 0.05$

Table 8 shows that the majority of the government school teachers, 95.82%, and 66.66% of the non-government school teachers showed their agreement that the teaching load does not allow them to discuss professional issues. The combined percentage also shows that generally 86.1% (55'55% and 30.55%) of the two groups of teachers indicated their agreement that teaching load heavily exerts on their chance to discuss professional issues. A closer examination of the results in Table 8 reveals that the problem of teaching load is more serious in the government schools than in the non-government schools.

The chi-square (X^2) test was computed to detect the significance of this difference. The observed X^2 value is 5.864. This value is largely below the critical value of 9.488 for four degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the ratings of the two study groups with respect to the effect of teaching load on their discussion of professional issues is retained. It can be concluded, therefore, that the problem of teaching load is a common problem for both government and non-government school English language teachers. The teachers' written

responses and interview data strongly supported the existence and seriousness of the teaching load in both groups of schools.

The principals were also asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that teaching load is one of the factors affecting the developmental nature of the English language teachers (See Appendix B, Item 4d). The principals' views concerning the problem showed variation across the agreement-disagreement coninuum. Two of the government school principals agreed that teaching load is a major factor minimizing the possibility of discussing professional issues. Both of the non-government school principals and one of the government school principals denied the seriousness of the problem while the remaining one government school principal remained doubtful. Nevertheless, the principals' responses indicate that the problem of teaching load is more serious in the government schools than in the non-government schools.

The results obtained from the teachers' responses to item 5a-d (See Appendix A) can be used to answer the third basic research question which addresses the teachers' reaction to the various school-based problems that affect their development (See Section 1.3 in Chapter I). The results of each item generally indicated that in both groups of schools the administration provides minimal support, the performance evaluation made in the schools is not geard to teacher development, teachers do not as such lack willingness to work together and finally teaching load heavily exerts on their chance of discussing professional issues.

The teachers' views of the importance of some leadership roles (See Appendix A, Items 6-8) in enhancing developmental activities in their schools are summarized in the following table.

Table 9: T-test Analysis of the Teachers' Views of the Importance of Some Leadership Roles

No.	Item	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Mean difference	t-value
6	Providing teachers with necessary resources to study their class room problems methodically	4.54	0.779	4.91	0.288	0.37	1.608
7	Encouraging trust and respect among teachers	4.91	0.408	4.91	0.288	0	-
8	Initiating and valuing teachers' individual efforts	4.79	0.588	4.91	0.288	0.12	0.66

Table 9 reveals that both groups of teachers on the whole feel that the items describing the roles of the school principals and department heads are considerably important. The minimum average score of the teachers' ratings is 4.54 which was calculated for the government school teachers' ratings of the importance of providing teachers with necessary resources to study their classroom problems methodically. When converted to percentage average score, even this is a remarkably high average score of 90.8% of the highest score on the rating scale.

As can be seen in the table, there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of teachers with respect to their ratings of the identified domains of leadership roles in enhancing their development. The absence of statistically significant difference is largely attributed to the meager differences of the averages. In the case of item 7 in the table, the difference between the average scores of the two groups of teachers is a true difference of zero. As a result, the observed t-values are also considerably below the critical t-value of 2.04 for 34 degrees of freedom set at 0.05 level of significance for this study. Hence, the null hypothesis of the kind that there exists no statistically significant difference between the two groups of study with regard to their rating of the value of the identified administrative roles in fostering their development is maintained.

The basic research question concerning the above issue can be answered that both groups of teachers equally appreciate the significance of the administrative roles in promoting their development as teachers (see Section 1.3 in Chapter I).

In the following table, the teachers' prospect to pursue developmental activities are summarized (see Appendix A, Item 9a-c).

Table 10. T-test Analysis of the Teachers' Future Developmental Readiness

No	Item	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Mean difference	t-value
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
9	a) I would study class room problems methodically.	3.95	1.082	3.91	1.240	-0.04	-0.1
	b) I would take initiative in teacher development activities in my department.	3.87	0.899	4.16	1.029	0.29	0.878
	c) I would become cooperative in sharing and solving my colleagues' problems relating to teaching.	4.37	0.646	4.83	0.389	0.46	*2.3

As can be seen from Table 10, the teachers' overall responses to the "likelihood" scale show their readiness to study classroom problems methodically, take initiative in teacher development activities in their department and become cooperative in sharing and solving their colleagues' problems relating to teaching. The first vertical column in the table shows that the least average score is 3.87 which was calculated for the government school teachers' ratings of the likelihood of taking initiative in teacher development activities in their department. When converted to percentage average score, even this accounts for 77.45 of the highest score on the rating scale.

The t-test analysis indicated that the teachers' ratings of their readiness with regard to item C showed a statistically significant difference. The table reveals that there is a large difference between the average scores of the two groups of teachers. This, therefore,

contributed most to the generation of the t-value of 2.3, which exceeds the critical value of 2.04 for 34 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, while it remains true for the first two items in the table, the null hypothesis claiming that there does not exist a statistically significant difference between the two groups of teachers concerning their ratings of pursuing developmental activities is rejected for Item C. Conclusion would be drawn that the non-government school teachers showed that they are readier to become cooperative in sharing and solving their colleagues' problems relating to teaching than the government school teachers.

The principals were also required to indicate the future readiness of their schools to enhance the developmental nature of the English language teachers. Both of the non-government school principals and two of the government school principals revealed that their schools would provide the necessary conditions within which the English language teachers' development can be optimised. Only the remaining two government school principals indicated that they are uncertain of their schools' future readiness to facilitate conditions for the teachers' improvement in their teaching (See Appendix B, Item a-b).

All of the principals, however, indicated that in the future, the performance evaluation system conducted on the English language teachers would involve them and work towards their continual development. The obtained results regarding the English language teachers' future developmental readiness can be employed to answer the basic research question which addresses the likelihood of future developmental effort of the teachers. On the whole, both government and non-government school teachers showed the likelihood of their encouraging and participating in the identified domains of classroom-based and school-based developmental activities. The principals also pointed out the overall readiness of their schools to facilitate conditions that allow the occurrence of development and developmental efforts.

The critical question, however, is as to how the teachers would turn their mental disposition of development into the practical developmental endeavour. In order to better interpret the meaning and significance of the above results concerning the teachers' and principals' anticipation of their developmental future, it is necessary to consider and probe into other available information from the teachers themselves. The teachers' responses to the written questions and their reflection in the interview session are important to validate or qualify the significance of the obtained results with regard to the future developmental readiness. This will be discussed in the final sub-topic of the chapter wherein all discussions of results are pulled together and their implications are highlighted.

The following table summarizes the teachers' overall evaluation of their developmental nature (See Appendix A, Item 19).

Table 11: Comparison of the Teachers' Overall Evaluation of the Condition of their Development

No	Item	Response Category	GST(N=24)		NGST(N=12)		Total	
			f	%	f	%	f	%
10	Generally speaking, how do you evaluate the situation of the English language teachers' development in your school?	Excellent	1	4.16	2	16.66	3	8.33
		Very good	4	16.66	4	33.33	8	22.22
		Good	13	54.16	3	25.00	16	44.44
		Fair	2	8.33	2	16.66	4	11.11
		Poor	4	16.66	1	8.33	5	13.88
	Total		24	100	24	100	36	100

Note : $X^2 = 4.92$; df = 4; $p \leq 0.05$

The data in the above table show that in both study groups, the ratings of the overall evaluation of the situation of their development ranges from "poor" to "excellent". However, a large number of the government school teachers (54.16%) indicated that the situation of their development in their respective schools is generally good. A considerable proportion of the

non-government school teachers (33.33%), on the otherhand, showed that the nature of their development is very good. The sum of teachers who rated excellent, very good and good is 18 and 9 for the government school and non-government school teachers respectively. Therefore, they constitute 75% of the entire sample population in each group. It is possible to conclude that a large number of the sample teachers judged the nature of their development to be generally good.

The chi-square (X^2) test was also computed to see if there exists a statistically significant difference between the two study groups in their overall evaluation of the nature of their development in their schools. As shown in the table, the observed chi-square value of 4.92 is considerably below the critical value of 9.488 for four degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. It is, therefore, impossible to reject the null hypothesis holding that the two groups of teachers do not show significant difference in rating the nature of their development in the schools.

The principals' overall evaluation of the developmental nature of the teachers similarly showed positive attitude. All of them indicated that the developmental activities of the English language teachers in their schools is generally appreciable (See Appendix B, Item 6). Generally, both teachers and principals gave high valuation on the nature of the teachers' development.

Inorder to be more critically or sensitively aware of the validity or truth value of the respondents' judgement of the developmental nature, one may need to cross-examine it with the available other data. For example, the teachers indicated that conditions are not there which strengthen their developmental activities. Both teachers and principals, for instance, showed that the English language teachers do not frequently work and learn together, and the teaching load of the teachers do not allow them time to discuss the teaching learning processes. Interaction with the written and interview data obtained from the teachers also

highlighted the prevalence of these problems. If conditions and contexts within which teacher development can be optimized do not as such exist or are inconsistent, teacher development may not exist or is of little desirability and worth.

The discussion made so far has been devoted to the qualitative analysis of the close-ended items in the questionnaire. In the present study, attempts were also made to elicit information from the respondents through open-ended questions. In the following two sections, the tearhers' written comments and reflections in the interview session are discussed.

4.2. Analysis of the Teachers' Responses to the Open-ended Questions in the Questionnaire

The aim of the written section in the questionnaire was to elicit from the teachers views on three major points. The first was what they think the English language teachers in their schools can do to increase their development as teachers. The second question, related to the first one, was what the teachers would think their schools can do to promote their development. The third item in the written section of the questionnaire was to obtain the teachers' general comments with regard to the English language teachers' development and related issues (See Appendix A, Items 11-13). The questions intended generally to solicit two inextricably linked views: views about teachers development and how to achieve it. But the item designed to solicit further comments was discarded for two reasons. The first reason was that only a very few of the teachers gave further comments. Second, of the obtained comments only some were found to be relevant to what was desired.

To analyse the data obtained from the written responses, the content analysis procedure was used and this involved the classification and summarization of the data according to common themes.

The data suggested the teachers' view that as a way to their development, the English language teachers need also to promote their understandings and applications of the recent English teaching methodologies. This, according to the respondents, involves keeping in touch with modern trends of language teaching and adopting new methodological procedures necessary to facilitate learning. The respondents suggested not only what development means for them. They also indicated how to achieve it. A closer analysis of the obtained information showed that the teachers can up-grade their knowledge and pedagogical skills in two ways. One is through their own personal efforts and the other is through attending workshops and seminars regularly, and by obtaining on the-job-training opportunities.

The remaining comments provided by the teachers with regard to what the English language teachers can do to promote their development within schools suggested their social view of development. Both groups of teachers emphasized that at the level of schools, teachers can work collaboratively to improve their teaching. As a way to promote collaborative learning, they forwarded the idea of forming English language clubs and having professional meetings. They also appreciated the value of peer-observation, discussing on the observational data and sharing experience. This may mean that the teachers recognize that knowledge is constructed socially and sharing a wide range of experience works well towards expanding and fulfilling it.

4.2.2 Analysis of the Teachers' Views of What their Schools Can Do to Help them Work Towards Their Development

In relation to the above views, attempts were also made to get the teachers' views of what the schools might need to do to promote their development. A search in to the data

generally revealed that the teachers have rich and diverse views of leadership roles necessary to support or provide for their development.

In the cross-analysis of the respondents' views, the following major themes generally emerged. They pointed out that schools can support their constant improvement by organizing seminars and workshops so that they would develop new understandings of language teaching and learning. The data also generated the idea that as much as possible the teachers should be given the opportunity of attending summer courses. The overall suggestion shows that the teachers seek intellectual opportunities outside their schools and the administrations' parallel role is to facilitate conditions for them to look for their professional renewal elsewhere.

It was also suggested that within the school compounds, the school administration can encourage teachers to discuss ideas, observe one another and exchange experience. Another striking responsibility which most of the teachers placed on the school administration is that in order for the teachers to have sufficient time for classroom preparation and professional meetings, the school should reduce the heavy teaching load which tightly occupies them. They also emphasized the view that as much as possible the schools must provide them with up-to-date materials and research findings that would inform them better about their profession. On top of these, the teachers stressed that the school administration and the English language teachers should create mutual understanding. This may, fairly well, correlate with the belief that a caring administration is one in which teachers and principals work together towards the improvement of the entire school (Blase and Blase, 1994; Beck, 1994).

As workable means to realizing mutual understanding between them and the school administration, the teachers suggested several administrative activities. On the whole, however, the feelings are that the school should have a clear understanding of the teaching learning problems which the English teachers face on day-to day basis, encourage initiative in

the department, evaluate the teachers fairly and constructively, and help them with the enforcement of obedience on the students.

At this point, it is important to re-emphasize two major themes emerged out of the teachers' overall responses. One generally recognized idea is that underlying teachers' classroom behaviours are various assumptions and principles which they personally hold about teaching and learning, learners and themselves (Prabhu, 1987; Tudor, 1996; Head and Taylor, 1997; Burns, 1997; Williams and Burden, 1997). But the results in this study revealed that teachers also have various belief systems underlying their idea of teacher development and how to achieve it.

The other relevant point is that the English language teachers in the Senior Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa want to up-grade themselves and seek intellectual opportunities both inside and outside their schools. They stressed that for the English language teachers' development to occur, the human and organizational contexts that optimize development should be provided. The data highlighted that the teachers' expectation of administrative role towards their development ranges from providing individual teachers with necessary time and material resources to study their classroom problems and encouraging collaborative work between teachers in the schools to facilitating conditions for them to participate on the available ELT workshops, seminars and summer courses.

In relation to the teachers' perception, the school principals also emphasized that the teachers have to read vastly, exchange ideas and observe one another. The principals pointed out again that the teachers should use teaching aids in the classroom. They also stated that the evaluation should involve the English language teachers, the school should make the teachers exchange ideas concerning methodology through evaluation, and work together particularly on the new curriculum.

4.3 Discussion and Interpretation of the Interview Data

In the interview portion of the current study, totally four teachers from one government school and one non-government school participated. In this section, only the teachers' reflections that are pertinent to the study and the guiding questions have been directly quoted. The interviews generally focused on five points: (1) the teachers' awareness of their development of teaching effectiveness since they entered the profession; (2) the frequency of the teachers' classroom-based developmental activities; (3) the extent to which the teachers work together; (4) performance evaluation and administrative support system; and (5) the overall evaluation of the teachers' developmental nature. The individual teachers are coded using English letters A to D.

Regarding the first point, the teachers pointed out that they are aware of the constant improvement in their teaching effectiveness. A comparative analysis of the interview data across the respondents revealed that generally three things played major roles in shaping their improvement. The first one is their own personal effort. This, among other things, included reading that yielded improvement in their English language proficiency. The second source to which the teachers attributed their development as teachers is exposure to different seminars and workshops on the English language teaching methodologies and theories.

The third key source of their effectiveness is their own experience. Because they have taught for many years and in different schools, the teachers felt that they could accumulate a considerable knowledge of the English language and the procedural skills to teach it. The teachers' views emphasize two major complementary conclusions. The first is that teachers can think of and articulate on how their experience helped their effectiveness (Munby and Russell, 1994). The second is the idea that "the knowledge base of effective language teachers

includes not only linguistic and pedagogical theory but also the wealth of their individual experience" (Knezevic and Scholl, 1996:79).

The teachers were also asked to reflect on how frequently they attempt to study problems in their classroom deliberately, seek ways of overcoming the identified problems and thereby adjust the teaching learning situations. All of them indicated that on daily basis they face various problems and want to solve them. But situations constrain them from designing a deliberate and planned action to study the essence of their classroom problems.

Teachers A and B who were interviewed in Saint Joseph Senior Secondary School described the standard of their classroom enquiry in the following ways.

Teacher A

> I try to study these problems. I don't know whether I have taken time to study in a certain scheduled way. But there are few students who can be categorized like this and I usually tend to know more about these students and try to help them. Other than that, I cannot say that I have taken time to study my problem systematically (Interview).

Teacher B

> Since I am a teacher, I should solve the problem when I face the problem; but to tell you the truth, I did not go through the problem systematically (Interview).

Both teachers implicitly stated that learning from problems around teaching is part of the job of teaching; but learning from problems as a systematic and conscious planning is not part of their actual activity.

Teachers C and D in Abiyot Kerse Senior Secondary School similarly stated that though they regularly face teaching and learning problems in their classrooms, they have not as such taken time and considered their problems. For them heavy teaching load, lack of

initiative, large classes and student disciplines are some of the major factors blocking a systematic study of their classroom problems. While student population is not as such a serious problem, for teachers A and B time factor was considered to be a powerful constraint to practise developmental activities in their classrooms.

As regards the nature of collaborative work in their respective schools, both groups of teachers stated that the English language teachers carry out their jobs usually in isolation. Teacher A, for instance, revealed that: "Teachers here work independently or individually. We discuss usually but we don't try to solve problems formally in a group" (Interview). Teacher C also explicated similar view.

> I can say there is one thing. When I face a problem or a difficulty, when I find a difficult point to teach, or to understand, I ask an English teacher who I feel is nearer to me or close to me. I observe also others do like this. But this is not very often (Interview).

Collaborative learning suggests, basically, active involvement with others in a variety of experiences or the role of significant others in constructing knowledge and experience (Bailey, 1996; Knezevic and Scholl, 1996; Wajnryb, 1992). But the above teachers' views implied that collaborative learning in their schools is only intermittent and used to solve only immediate problems.

According to teacher C, three factors contributed to the lack of collaborative and interactive learning. The first one is the teachers' self-image. He pointed out that every teacher feels to be adequate for himself/herself and likes to do his/her activity independently. According to him, "A teacher feels complete by himself and he does not need the others' help". The second problem is time. Since all teachers are heavily occupied, extra time is hardly available for them to undertake developmental activities together. The third factor is

lack of support from the school administration, mainly in initiating individuals and facilitating time and material conditions.

Teacher D stated that on top of the problems of teaching load and administrative factors, the English language teachers in his school lack willingness to work together. As he pointed out, there are only a few number of the English language teachers in his school who have acquaintance with new trends of teaching underlying the text-books currently being used; those who have long worked in the old methods and approaches are not volunteer to share idea with those with a relatively better information and awareness. The study highlights, therefore, that change constrains are not only social and organizational contexts but also individual teachers' various personalities.

It is difficult, however, to entertain lack of teacher willingness as a justification for limited interaction among the teachers, particularly in the light of the inherent other problems that exert a direct bearing on their overall work. The question is whether lack of willingness is of great strength to affect collaborative work in a situation where teachers teach under severe time constraint and receive scant administrative support. As Williams and Burden (1997) have emphasized, "the interactive process within systems is both dynamic and multi-faceted. Thus, when something goes wrong within the system, it should not be seen as the fault of any individual, but a lack of balance in the system."(P.190). Lack of collaborative learning in this view is not, therefore, the direct result of individual teachers but the inconvenience of the entire social and organizational contexts within which they carry out teaching.

The interview portion also revealed teachers' perception of the nature of evaluation conducted on their classroom performance. Teachers A and B pointed out that in their school, teachers in general and the English language teachers in particular are not evaluated frequently. This shows that teachers' evaluation as a source of teacher development is not

emphasized in their school. Teachers C and D, however, indicated that in their school the school principal and department head sometimes evaluate their performance; but they expressed their dissatisfaction with the nature of the evaluation practised.

Teacher C, for instance, complained in the following way:

> I think the programme is good or the framework is good, but when you come to the practical reality, well, you are evaluated personally, not according to what you do in the school or in the class. And I feel that a person who is close to the office, whether he is active in his work, it does not matter, so long as he is close to the office (Interview).

Teacher C's reaction implies that non-academic factors intervene in and block the realization of proper evaluation that would check objectively the extent to which the teachers are assuming their responsibilities and provide them future direction for on-going development of their teaching quality.

Teacher C revealed further that the school administrators do not involve the English language teachers in the process of evaluation, for example, by announcing to them in advance the purpose of evaluation, allowing them the opportunity of designing the planning stage and pointing out the outcome of evaluation. He said:"Well, we don't take part in the evaluation process. They observe us when we teach, otherwise, we never participate, and what ever grade they give us, we simply accept". Regarding the practice of peer-evaluation among the teachers, he stated that even when the school principal sometimes attempts to encourage peer-evaluation, the English teachers do not generally welcome the programme. This is because the teachers perceive any form of evaluation as an obstacle to the development of their own career-ladder. This might have occurred, on the other hand, that the teachers do not have a clear idea of peer evaluation and how it differs from other general administrative evaluations.

Teacher D's reflection extended the pervasive nature of evaluation on the development of teachers. As he stated, a conflict of interest pervades the evaluation system in his school. In his school, the school supervisors judge the English language teachers' classroom performance along arbitrarily set and rigid parameters without considering the specific

situations in which the English language teaching-learning processes are carried out. Since teaching in general and teaching language in particular is less fixed and more multifaceted, it is difficult, in fact, to pass judgements on teachers' classroom performance using fixed frame of reference. Murdoch (1998) observed that such a rigid system of evaluation is "all too often viewed by teachers as having more to do with enforcing accepted practice and exercising the authority of supervisors rather than encouraging teachers at different career stages to develop professionally as reflective practitioners"(P.3).

Teacher D held the belief that since the school supervisors who usually observe the English language teachers' classroom performance and the language learning processes in the classroom have little or no awareness of the current trends of language teaching, reliable and objective evaluation would not be conducted. An extended meaning of this suggestion is that to achieve better self-transcendence and overall improvement of language teaching, the teachers themselves and those having a better idea of language teaching take part in the evaluation process.

The teachers' idea of the overall situation of their development highlights and extends the previous perception that except individual trials, teachers rarely work together and engender concern for collaborative improvement. It is possible to draw a conclusion that teacher development as an organizational (institutional) process and as a conscious participation in developmental activities is poorly practised in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. The English language teachers' development is largely fettered or constrained by conditions in which they work: their teaching load, poor or inconsistent inter-dependent learning, lack of administrative support and the inter-twined effect of all of these variables.

4.4 General Discussion of Results and Implications

At this point, findings from all the complementary research data are pulled together to answer the basic research questions which guided the collection and analysis of the data. Implications for future directions and practice are also highlighted.

With regard to the teachers' frequency of practising the various developmental activities, the results of comparative analysis in the questionnaire suggested that the English language teachers more often than not practise their own individual activities. The principals' ideas and the teachers' reflection in the interview part of the study explained this situation further. The findings have various implications for the English language teachers and school administrators.

Teaching is basically a learning profession and teachers learn more about their profession when they work together than when they strive in isolation (Wallace, 1998; McGilp, 1997, Ainscow, 1994; Johnson, 1994). To promote the collaborative development of the English language teachers, the schools may need to encourage teachers to learn from one another and facilitate conditions under which this becomes possible. Collaborative learning in its highly complicated and demanding feature may not ever occur in our senior secondary schools given the contexts in which the English language teachers do their activity; but the teachers can help one another with the limited resources they have and whatever understandings they have gained through their experience.

On the whole, the two groups of teachers appreciated the value of discussion among and collaborative work with colleagues in the school, systematic study of perceived problems in the classroom and performance evaluation. The teachers may, therefore, need to seek opportunities of working together, studying problems in their own classroom and using evaluation to get more insight of their teaching and how to improve it. The parallel

implication for the schools may be that the social and organizational situations should be structured in such a way that collaborative learning, independent study of classroom problems and constant self-evaluation would be enhanced.

The data also revealed that lack of administrative support, fair and constructive evaluation, teacher willingness and teaching load have affected the developmental nature of the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. The results of the questionnaires, and interview data revealed the seriousness of the problems at different degrees. The fact that the problems are common to both government school teachers and non-government school teachers was found out through the Chi-square (X^2) analysis which showed no significance difference between the two groups across all of the treatments. Moreover, the teachers revealed the existence of the problems in writing and oral reflections.

The findings have valuable implications for schools. Inorder to see a constant improvement of the English language teachers, the schools should remove the variables which block the teachers' progress. Particularly, the system of evaluating the English language teachers' classroom performance needs consideration. As McCormick and James (1989), for example, noted, " there is little point in an evaluation revealing educational provision to be unsatisfactory (by anybody's standard), if the question of how the situation may be remedied has not been considered" (P.28).

The average scores of the teachers' views of providing them with necessary resources to study problems in their own classroom, encouraging trust and respect among them, and initiating and valuing their individual efforts revealed their desire to see them practised by their respective school administrators. The t-test analyses computed to detect a statistically significant difference between the views of the study groups showed that there is no evidence confirming the existence of difference. Both groups of teachers stressed the importance of

these administrative roles in their written comments. The major implication for the school administrations is that as much as possible they have to be able to work to the expectation.

In this study, the teachers generally showed their future readiness to study classroom problems methodically, take initiative in teacher development activities in their department and become cooperative in sharing and solving their colleagues' problems relating to teaching. The analyses of t-test were made on the average differences between the two groups, with regard to the three domains of developmental readiness. The statistical analyses, however, demonstrated significance only in the teachers' future readiness to become cooperative in sharing and solving their colleagues' problems relating to teaching. In this respect, the non-government school teachers were found to be readier than the government school teachers.

Regarding the overall evaluation of the developmental nature of the English language teachers, two self-contradicting points emerged. In the questionnaires, both teachers and principals generally judged the developmental nature to be good. In other parts of the same instrument, the respondents, on the other hand, indicated that conditions within which meaningful development can be optimized are not significantly available. In a more apparent way, the groups of teachers who participated in the interview session revealed how the inconvenient school contexts, among them, loose work relationship, poor administrative support, pre-occupation with many teaching periods and lack of fair and constructive system of performance evaluation fettered their development. The respondents' inconsistency may be in part due to their own direct biases and partly due to misinterpretation of the essence of the item.

One important aspect of this study, however, is that it pointed out that the English language teachers in the senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa have various and multifaceted idea of teacher development and sources of teacher development. Secondly, the results emphasize that by approaching teachers and eliciting from them the social contexts and

organizational structures in which they work, it may be possible to gain meaningful understandings of the nature of their development and what they want should occur inorder to help them develop continually (Clark, 1995).

However, the results of the study should be interpreted within its various limitations. The study is mainly a descriptive research design and thus depended for its data on the presumed honesty of the respondents. Multiple other factors might affect or intervene in the reliability of the obtained data from the respondents. As McDiarmid (1992:85) explicitly stated, "Asking teachers directly about their views triggers socially acceptable responses".

But the study re-emphasizes the major rationale with which it started that teacher development should be understood within the wider social, environmental and organizational contexts in which it is carried out (Hargreaves and Fullan, 1992). It also supports Kilgone et.al.'s (1992) conclusion that "the professional development of teachers involves an interaction between a specific context and the people involved" (P. 35).

The study also lends support to Corrigan's (1994) argument that: "The educational system will not improve merely as a result of changes in programmes of the teacher education at colleges and universities.....Unless we make the conditions for professional practice a reality in the public schools, teaching will not become a profession (P.71)".

Though it is believed that, for example, a pre-service teacher training programme can lay a strong foundation for teachers' future development and reflective practice (Pennington, 1990; Bridges, 1998; Hailom, 1998; Almarza, 1996; Fullan, 1991), it would not guarantee their continued development. According to Corrigan (1994), it is not whether teachers are prepared with magnificent knowledge and skills that matters, but how they are going to apply their knowledge and skills. In the light of this view, the developmental nature of the English language teachers may not be improved unless the social and organizational contexts within which they work are also improved.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter is devoted to summarizing the whole study, drawing conclusions and making recommendations.

5.1 Summary

Teacher development as a life-long learning in the teaching profession is a popular theme in current teacher education literature. While this is true, the question of the English language teachers' development has not been adequately raised, particularly at TEFL M.A level in Addis Ababa University. This general problem provided the impetus to the designing of the study.

The purpose of the study was, therefore, to explore the developmental nature of experienced English language teachers in the Senior Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. The study was designed specifically to obtain answers to the following research questions: (1) To what extent have the experienced English language teachers of Addis Ababa Senior Secondary Schools been exposed to the various classroom and school-based sources of teacher development? ; (2) How do the teachers value the usefulness of these sources of development?; (3) To what extent have the various school-based factors hindered the developmental activities of the teachers?; (4) How do the teachers think of the helpfulness of some of the ways through which their schools might support their development?; (5) What does the future developmental readiness of the teachers look like?; and (6) Is there significant difference between the government school and the non-government school teachers with respect to their experience and views regarding the above questions?

The target population for the study was the experienced English language teachers in government and non-government senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa from which 36

teachers were finally drawn. In order to collect the data necessary to obtain answers to the above basic research questions, two questionnaires were designed. One questionnaire was for the English language teachers while the second was for the principals in the selected schools. The latter was to supplement the information obtained from the teachers. To probe deeply into the problem, an interview was also conducted with a few numbers of volunteer English language teachers from both types of schools.

The instruments were piloted prior to using them in the final study. The revised versions of the instruments were ultimately employed to collect the data used for this study. The obtained data were analysed using different methods. All of the close-ended items in the teachers' questionnaire were analysed. Comparisons were made between the two study groups using frequency distributions, percentages and tests of significance.

For the data of parametric nature such as the teachers' experience of developmental practice, their views of the value of the various sources of development, understanding leadership roles and future developmental readiness, t-test analyses were done to see the existence of significant statistical difference. For data of non-parametric nature such as the teachers' reactions to the factors affecting teacher development in their schools and overall evaluation of their own developmental nature, Chi-square (X^2) test analyses were made to detect significant difference between the two study groups. The information obtained from the six principals was used to strengthen the teachers' reactions across all the related topics.

The data obtained from the open-ended questions in both questionnaires were analysed using content analysis procedure, which involved categorization and summarization of the emerged themes. The interview data were analysed using guided analysis procedure which virtually required the process of modifying the questions in the light of the actually obtained data. The general discussion of the results was finally made which involved the process of pulling the overall results together and providing implications.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the general study and summary made here, the following conclusions and generalizations are drawn.

The results obtained at different stages of the study showed that the experienced English language teachers in both groups of schools practise teaching all too often in isolation than in groups. It is possible, therefore, to conclude that teaching English is largely an isolated activity in both groups of schools. No reliable evidence appeared that shows the existence of statistically significant difference between the study groups with respect to learning about their profession and its inherent problems together. In both cases, interactive learning and collaborative construction of knowledge is generally inadequate. This occurs mainly because conditions within which interactive learning can be facilitated have not been sufficiently provided in both types of schools.

On the other hand, reliable evidence appeared which indicated that both groups of teachers considerably appreciate the value of both school-based and classroom-based developmental activities. Similarly, the teachers valued the various administrative roles contributing to teachers' development as identified in this study. The results, therefore, suggested that if the institutional contexts are structured in ways that provide impetus to continual development, the experienced English language teachers may be able to benefit from them.

In this study, it was also suggested that in both groups of schools, the developmental nature of the teachers under study has been affected, at different levels, because of lack of administrative support system, inappropriate performance evaluation system, lack of teachers' willingness to work together and the heavy teaching load. It is not only the independent effect of these variables which mattered, but also the inter-twined and aggregate effect of all of them as institutional problems which affected the teachers' developmental nature.

The study, in general terms, highlighted two pressing and persistent problems of the English language teachers' development. The first is that deficient situations exist which hinder continuity between pre-service and in-service teacher education. During pre-service teacher training programmes, the English language teachers are encouraged to learn from one another reflectively. But the actual teaching and the situations in which they work would not promote their preparation. The second problem is that of striking appropriate balance between the teacher education pressure in the above context and the actual professional studies on the job. These issues may need to be the concern of further studies.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the general study and the conclusions drawn above, the following recommendations are made.

In order to improve their profession, the English language teachers in the Senior Secondary School of Addis Ababa should strive to develop thoughtful and reflective teaching practice through both individual and collective activities. Particularly, by coalescing their expertise, the teachers may not only help one another but also may come to realize, employ and extend their own potentials.

The study revealed that the teachers appreciate the value of both school-based and classroom-based developmental activities as well as the administrative roles that would facilitate conditions within which teacher development can be optimized. In order for this to occur, the schools need to adjust the social and organizational contexts in such a way that individual teachers will be more concerned about their continued individual and collective learning. The schools may need, for example, to foster positive atmosphere for peer-evaluation and professional discussion among the teachers. It may also be the responsibility of the schools to facilitate material and other conditions required for up-grading teachers' activities.

The results in this study also implied that the English departments in the schools under study do not as such organize the teachers to work towards their development. In contrast to this situation, academic departments are largely viewed as the most accessible social community where teachers can learn about their profession together.

Protherough and Atkinson (1991), for example, claimed: "Good practice is shared through example, discussions, working together and sharing of resources, and at its best the department can be its in-service team" (Cited in Tsigue, 1997:81). Other writers also portary academic departments as social worlds enclosing teachers within them together. As Huberman (1990) observed, departments are places "where people have concrete things to tell one another and concrete instructional help to provide one another" (Quoted in Siskin, 1994:90). Siskin on her part views that, "it is as community, a social group creating the atmosphere in which they work, that departments matter most to the teachers within them." She claims further that, "for teachers the department is most often and most simply the people with whom they work closely, the social group in which they are members"(Siskin, 1994:96).

In the above views, conditions, therefore, need to be met and the English language departments should be self-access centre for the English language teachers to share ideas, design peer-evaluation and call policies and innovations in to questions, and increase their instructional decision making capacities.

Teacher development is likely to be effective when teachers take time and study about their own work, share knowledge and skills from a wide range of their experience and understanding. The study pointed out, however, that since they teach many periods, the teachers do not have spare time to make thoughtful and reflective learning both individually and collectively. The schools thus need to reduce the teaching load which heavily occupies and blocks the teachers from practising or participating in developmental activities. To effect this, more English language teachers may also need to be employed since it is difficult to

reduce the number of periods allocated to the existing number of teachers unless more teachers who share the burden are available.

The evaluation of the English language teachers' classroom performance should be designed in such a way that it would not only point out the deficiency of their performance but would also suggest directions for their future improvement. Since the ways in which teachers teach language are less fixed and more diversified, their evaluation should not be reduced merely to checklist compliance. Moreover, the teachers may need to be involved in the designing of the process of evaluation. As McCormick and James (1989) wrote, particularly an "evaluation which is initiated and conducted by teachers in response to their own needs and interests has a greater capacity to promote professional development" (P.43). The teachers may also need to be allowed to know the outcome of the evaluation conducted on their performance even when the prime purpose of the evaluation is to monitor their accountability.

As has been mentioned earlier, the current study is a small scale study given the number of the participants involved and the teacher development issues considered. In order to study the problem broadly and increase its research data-base, further research embodying more teachers and considering other broader perspectives should be conducted.

Bibliography

Ainscow, M. (1994). Special Needs in the Classroom: A Teacher Education Guide. London: Jessica Kingsely Publishers.

Akyel, A. (1997). "Experienced and Student EFL Teachers' Instructional Thoughts". The Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 53, No. 4, June, 1997, PP. 677-695.

Alemayehu Debebe. (1998). "Teacher Education Trends in Some Countries: Implications for the Ethiopian Context." In Amare Asgedom and others (eds.), Quality Education in Ethiopia: Visions for the 21st Century (PP. 369-74). Addis Ababa: IER.

Allison, D.J. and P.A. Allison. (1993). "Both Ends of Telescope: Experience and Expertise in Principal Problem–solving." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 29, No. 3, August, 1993, PP. 302-322.

Almarza, G.G. (1996). "Student Foreign Language Teacher's Knowledge Growth". In D.Freeman and J.C. Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP. 50-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annual Booklet of City Administration Educational Bureau (1991/1998).

Ashcroft, K. and D.Palacio. (1996). Researching into Assessment and Evaluation in Colleges and Universities. London: Kagan Page.

Bailey, F. (1996). "The Role of Collaborative Dialogue in Teacher Education". In D.Freeman and J.C. Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP. 260-280). Cambridge: CUP.

Bailey, K.M and Others (1996). "The Language Learner's Autobiography: Examining the 'Apprenticeship of Observation'". In D.Freeman and J.C.Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP.11-29). Cambridge: CUP.

Bailey, K.M., A.Curtis and D.Nunan. (1998). "Understandable Insights: The Collaborative Use of Three Professional Development Practices." TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 32, No. 3, Autumn, 1998, PP. 546-556.

Bakkenes, I, C.de Brabander and S.Imants. (1999). "Teacher Isolation and communication Networks: Analysis in Primary Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 2, April, 1999, PP.166-202.

Barksdale – Ladd, M.A. (1994). "Teacher Empowerment and Literary Instruction in Three Professional Development Schools". Journal of Teacher Education, March – April, 1994, Vol. 45. No. 2, PP.104-111.

Barnard, R. (1998). "Classroom Observation: Some Ethical Implications". Modern English Teachers, Vol. 7, No. 4, October, 1998, PP. 49-55.

Bartlett, L. (1990). "Teacher Development through Reflective Teaching." In J.C. Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP. 202-214). Cambridge: CUP.

Beck, L.G. (1994). Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bell, B. and J.Gilbert. (1996). Teacher Development: A Model from Science Education. Thousands Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

Beyer, L. (1987). "What Knowledge is of most worth in Teacher Education?". In J.Smyth (ed.), Educating Teachers: Changing the Nature of Pedagogical Knowledge (PP. 19-34). London: The Falmer Press.

Blase, J. and J.R. Blase. (1994). Empowering Teachers: What Successful Principals Do. Thousands oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

_____ (1999). "Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Development: Teachers' Perspectives". Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 35, No. 3, August, 1999, PP. 349-378.

Boud, D., R.Cohen, and D.Walker. (1993). "Understanding Learning from Experience." In D.Boud, R.Cohen and D.Walker (eds.), Using Experiecnce for Learning (PP.2-17). Buchingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Boud, D. and D. Walker. (1993). "Barriers to Reflection on Experience." In D.Boud, R.Cohen and D.Walker. (eds.), Using Experience for Learning (PP.73-86). Buchingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Bridges, D. (1998). "Quality of Teacher Education and Training in Ethiopia." In Amare Asgedom and Others. (eds.), Quality of Education in Ethiopia: Vision for the 21st Century (PP. 361-367). Addis Ababa: IER.

Burns, A. (1996). "Starting all over again: From Teaching Adults to Teaching Beginners." In D.Freeman and J.C. Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP. 154-177). Cambridge: CUP.

Burton, J.(1997). "Sustaining Language Teachers as Researches of their own Practice". The Canadian Modern Language review, Vol.54, No,1, October 1977.pp.84-109.

Carrivicki, S. and T.A. O'Donoghue. (1997). "Principals' Perception of their Role in Enabling Teachers to Inform their Practice with Educational Research". Research Education,. Vol. 57, May, 1997, PP.36-44.

Clark, C. (1992). "Teachers as Designers in Self-directed Professional Development". In A. Hargreaves and M.G.Fullan.(eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (PP.75-84). London: Villers House.

_____ (1995). Thoughtful Teaching. London: Cassell.

Clift, R; M.L Veal, M.Johnson and P.Holland. (1990). "Restructureing Teacher Education Through Collaborative Action Research." Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, Vol. 41. No.2, PP.52-62.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). "Reinventing Student Teaching". Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, Vol. 42, No. 2, PP. 104-118.

Cohen, L. and L.Manion. (1994). "Action Research". In D.Johnson (ed.), Research Methods in Educational management (PP. 166-131). London: Longman.

Corrigan, D.C.(1994). "Creating the Conditions for Professional Practice: Education's Unfinished Agenda". Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 45, No. 1, January-February, 1994, PP.71-75.

Criticos, C. (1993). "Experiential Learning and Social Transformation for a Post-apartheid Learning Future". In D.Boud, R.Cohen and D.Walker. (eds.) Using Experience for Learning (PP. 157-168). Buchingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Day, C. (1987). "Professional Learning Through Collaborative Inservice Activity." In J.Smyth (ed.), Educatiing Teachers: Changing the Nature of Pedagogical Knowledge (PP.207-222). London: The Falmer Press.

Duke, D.L. (1995). "The Move to Reform Teacher Education." In D.L.Duke (ed.), Teacher Evaluation Policy: From Accountablility to Professional Development (PP.1-11). New York: State University of New York Press.

Edge, J. (1992). "Cooperative Development" In English Language Teaching Journal, Vol. 46. No. 1, PP. 62-70.

Elliott, J. (1991). Action Research for Educational Change. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Elliott, R.G. K.B. Lucas, D.E. Stewart and C.M.Burke. (1998). "Authenticating a Model for Sustainable Professional Development in an International Context".Journal of International Educational Development, Vol. 18. No. 2, PP. 119-131.

England, L. (1998). "Promoting Effective Professional Development in English Language Teaching (ELT)". English Teaching Forum, April-June 1998, PP. 18-23.

Fanselow, J.F. (1990). "Let's see: Contrasting Conversations about Teaching". In J.C.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP. 182-197). Cambridge: CUP.

Farrell, T. (1998). "Reflective Teaching: The Principles and Practices." English Teaching Forum, October –December, Vol. 36, No. 4. PP. 10-17.

Freeman, D. (1996). "Renaming Experience/reconstructing Practice: Developing New Understandings of Teaching". In D.Freeman and J.C. Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP. 221-241). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (1996). "The 'Unstudied Problem': Research on Teacher Learning in Language Teaching". In D.Freeman and J.C.Richards(eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching" (PP.351-378). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ and J.C.Richards. (1996). "Prologue: A Look at Uncritical Stories". In D.Freeman and J.C.Richards (eds.), Teacher learning in Language Teaching (PP. 1-6). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (eds.) (1996). Teacher Learning in language Teaching. Cambridge: CUP.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gaies, S. and R. Bowers. (1990). "Clinical Supervision of Language Teaching: The Supervisor as Trainer and Educator". In J.C.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP.167-181). Cambridge: CUP.

Gebhard, J.G. (1990). "Models of Supervision: choices". In J.C.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP. 156-66). Cambridge: CUP.

Greene, M; G.Lounsberry and M.L. Isaacs. (1998-99). "Interdisciplinary Partnership: The University Role as Change Agent". National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1998-99, PP. 8-26.

Hailom Benteyerga. (1998). "Explorations Towards and Alternative Model in Teacher Education: The Classroom Focus". In Amare Asgedom and Others (eds.), Quality Education in Ethiopia: Visions for the 21st Century (PP. 401-411). Addis Ababa: IER.

Hannaway, J. and J.E.Talbert. (1993). "Bringing Context in to Effective School Research: Urban – Sub-Urban Differences". Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 29, No. 2, May 1993, PP. 164-86.

Hargreaves, A. and M.G. Fullan (eds.). (1992). Understanding Teacher Development. London: Villers House.

Head, K. and P.Taylor. (1997). Readings in Teacher Development. London: Heinemann.

Hopkins, D. (1989). Evaluation for School Development. Buchingham: Open University Press.

Hopkins, D.,M. Ainscow and M.West. (1994). School Improvement in an Era of Change. London. Cassell.

Iwanicki, E.F. and D.A.Rindone. (1995). "Integrating Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation and Student Learning: The Evaluation of Teacher Evaluation Policy in Connecticut". In D.L.Duke (ed.), Teacher Evaluation Policy: From Accountability to Professional Development (PP. 65-98). New York: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, S. (1994). "Experience is the Best Teacher; Or Is It?": An Analysis of the Role of Experience in Learning to Teach". Journal of Teacher Education, May-June, 1994, Vol. 45, No. 3, PP. 199-208.

Kilgone, K., D.Ross, and J.Zbikowski. (1992). "Understanding the Teaching Perspectives of First-year Teachers". Journal of Teacher Education, January-February, 1992, Vol. 41, No. 1, PP. 28-38.

Knezevic, A. and M.Scholl. (1996). "Learning to teach together: Teaching to learn together". In D.Freeman and J.C.Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP.79-96). Cambridge: CUP.

Koul, L. (1989). Methodology of Educational Research (2nd edn.). New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

Kruse, S.D and K.S.Louis. (1997). "Teacher Teaming in Middle Schools: Dilemmas for a Schoolwide Community." Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 3, August, 1997, PP. 261-289.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). "Maximizing Learning Potential in the Communicative Classroom". ELT Journal, Vol. 47. No. 1, January, 1993, PP. 12-21.

Lange, D.E. (1990). "A Blue-Print for Teacher Development". In J.C.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP. 245-265). Cambridge: CUP.

McCormick, R. and M.James. (1989). Curriculum Evaluation in Schools (2nd edn.). London: Routledge.

McDiarmid, G.W. (1992). "What to do About Differences?: A Study of Multicultural Education for Teacher Trainees in Los Angeles Unified School District". Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 43, No. 2, PP. 83-93, March – April, 1992.

McGilp, E.J. (1997). "Curriculum, Culture and Students' Learning". Curriculum and Teaching, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1997, PP. 83-90.

McNiff, J. (1993). Teaching as Learning: An Action Research Approach. London: Routledge.

Memon, M.(1997). "Curriculum Change in Pakistan: An Alternative Model of Change". Curriculum and Teaching, Vol. 12 No. 1, 1997, PP. 55-64.

Munby, H. and T. Russell. (1994). "The Authority of Experience in Learning to Teach: Messages from a Physics Methods Course". Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, 1994, Vol. 45, No. 2, PP.. 86-94.

Murdoch, G. (1998). "A Progressive Teacher Evaluation System". English Teaching Forum, Vol. 36, No. 3, July-Sept. 1998, PP 2-7.

Nunan, D. (1990). "Action Research in the Language Classroom". In J.C.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP. 62081). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (1998). "Teacher Resources and Teacher Education Series (Review)". TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 32, No. 3, Autumn, 1998, PP. 601-605.

Pennington, M.C. (1990). "A Professional Delopment Focus for the Language Teaching Practicum". In J.C. Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (PP.132-151). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (1995). "The Teacher Change Cycle". TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 29, No. 4, PP. 705-731.

Prabhu, N.S.(1987). Second Language Pedagogy. Oxeford: OUP.

Rainer, J.D. and E.Guyton. (1994). "Developing a Constructivist Teacher Education Program: The Policy Making Stage". Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, 1994, Vol. 45, No. 2, PP. 140-146.

Ramani, E. (1987). "Theorizing from the Classroom". ELT Journal ,Vol. 41, No. 1, PP. 1-7.

Rea-Dickins, P. (1994). "Evaluation and English Language Teaching." Language Teaching, Vol. 27, No. 2, PP. 71-91.

Savingnon, S.J. (1991). "Communicative Language Teaching: State of the Art ". TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 2, PP. 261-77.

Schleppegrell, M. (1997). "Teacher Research through Dialogic Inquiry".The Canadian Modern Language Review", Vol. 54, No. 1, October, 1997, PP. 68-83.

Siskin, L.S. (1994). Realms of Knowledge: Academic Departments in Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C: The Falmer Press.

Stanley, C. (1998). " A Framework for Teacher Reflectivity". TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 32, No. 3, Autumn, 1998, PP. 584-591.

Stern, H.H. (1992). Issues and Options in Language Teaching. Oxford: OUP.

Stoller, F.L.(1996)."Teacher Supervision: Moving towards an Interactive Approach". English Teaching Forum, April, 1996, PP. 2-9.

Swan, J. (1993). "Metaphor in Action: The Observation Schedule in Reflective Approach to Teacher Education". ELT Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3, PP. 242-49.

Tatto, M.T. (1997). "Reconstructing Teachers Education for Disadvantaged Communities". International Journal of Educational Development, Vol. 17, No. 4, PP. 405-15, 1997.

Thiessen. D. (1992). "Classroom-based Teacher Development". In Hargreaves and Fullan (eds.), Understanding Teacher Development (PP. 85-109). London: Villers House.

Tsigue Addise. (1997). "The Implications of Self-help Explorative Supervision for the Professional Development of Teachers in an EFL Setting". Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University.

Tudor, I. (1993). "Teacher Roles in the Learner-centred classrooms". ELT Journal, Vol. 47, No. 1, 1993, PP. 22-31.

_____ (1996). Learner-centredness as Language Education. Cambridge:CUP.

Ubben, G.C. and L.W. Hughes. (1997). The Principals: Creative Leadership for Effective Schools. (3rd edn.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Underhill, A. (1992). "The Role of Groups in Developing Teacher Self-awareness". ELT Journal, Vol. 46, No. 1, PP. 62-75.

Ur, P. (1992). "Teacher Learning". ELT Journal, Vol. 46, No. 1, PP. 56-61.

Wajnryb, R. (1992). Classroom Observation Tasks. Cambridge:CUP.

Wallace, M.J. (1991). Training Foreign Language Teachers: a reflective approach. Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (1996). "Structured Reflection: the Role of the Professional Project in Training ESL Teachers". In D. Freeman and J.C. Richards (eds.), Teacher Learning in Language Teaching (PP. 281-294). Cambridge: CUP.

_____ (1998). Action Research for Language Teachers. Cambridge: CUP.

Westerman, D.A.(1991). "Expert and Novice Teachers' Decision Making". Journal of Teacher Education" , September-October, Vol. 42, No. 4, PP.292-305.

Widdowson, H.G. (1984). "The Incentive Value of Theory in Teacher Education". ELT Journal, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1984, PP. 86-90.

Williams, M. (1989). "A Developmental View of Classroom Observation". ELT Journal, Vol. 43, No. 2, April, 1989, PP.85-91.

Williams, M. and R.Burden. (1997). Pschology for Language Teachers. Cambridge: CUP.

Wright, T. (1990). "Understanding Classroom Role Relationship". In J.C. Richards and D.Nunan (eds.), Second language Teacher Education (PP. 82-97). Cambridge: CUP.

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1992). Action Research in Higher Education. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

APPENDIX A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

Questionnaire to be Filled by Senior Secondary School English Language Teachers

As a part of my graduate study, I am presently conducting a research on the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers in the Senior Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. The purpose of the attached questionnaire is, therefore, to gather the necessary information concerning this. The questionnaire, specifically, seeks information regarding what the English language teachers do towards their development, how they think of the various ways to their development and the factors hindering (minimizing) their development.

Your responses to the questions is highly important in providing the researcher with the information required to complete the study. Please, answer all the questions honestly.

I appreciate if you cooperate by filling in and returning the questionnaire prior to March 30, 2000. Your responses are confidential to the researcher.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
Jeylan Wolyie

General Instruction for filling in this Questionnaire.
Please, tick (/) the item which most closely identifies your attitude and respond by writing where required.

PART ONE: Background Information

Please, tick (/) the item which most directly applies to you.

1. In total, how many years of experience do you have in teaching English?
   5-8____ 13-16_____ Over twenty years_____
   9-12___ 17-20_____

2. What is your teaching qualification?
   12+2 (Diploma) _____ M.A(M.SC)_____
   B.A(B.SC)_____ Other (please specify)_____

PART TWO: On Your Experience of Teacher Development Practice.
Please, tick(/) the item which most closely applies to you.

3. During my experience of teaching English so far,
   a) I have invited colleagues in to my classroom to observe and comment on the lesson I teach.
   Very often _____ Often_____ Sometimes____ Rarely_____ Never_____
   b) I have supported colleagues having teaching related problems.
   Very Often_____ Often_____ Sometimes_____ Rarely_____ Never____

PART THREE: On Thinking about the Usefulness of the Various Ways to Teacher Development.

The following statements are about some of the ways through which teachers can improve their teaching in their schools. For each of them, please tick (/) the item according to the degree of its usefulness in helping the English language teachers' development in your school.

4. Among the ways to teacher development,
   a) discussion among and collaborative work with colleagues in the school is
   Very useful_____ Useful_____ Moderately useful_____ Less useful_____
   Not useful at all_____
   b) the systematic study of perceived problems in the classroom is.
   Very useful_____ Useful_____ Moderately useful_____ Less useful____
   Not useful at all_____
   c) Evaluation of one's teaching aspect by other teachers and school administrators is.
   Very useful____ Useful_____ Moderately useful_____ Less useful_____
   Not useful at all_____

PART FOUR: On Factors Hindering Teacher Development Activities in Your School

The following statements are about some of the factors generally believed to affect teacher development efforts at schools negatively. For each of them, please tick (/) the item which corresponds to your degree of agreement.

5. In our school,
   a) the administration provides minimal support for the English language teachers to work towards their development.
   Strongly agree_____ Agree____ Doubtful____ Disagree____ Strongly disagree_____

   b) the performance evaluation made in the school does not help the teachers to improve their activities.
   Strongly agree____ Agree____ Doubtful_____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree_____
   c) the teachers lack willingness to work collaboratively.
   Strongly agree____ Agree_____ Doubtful_____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree _____
   d) the teaching load of the teachers does not allow them to discuss professional issues,
   Strongly agree____ Agree_____ Doubtful_____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree_____

PART FIVE: On Your Views towards the Various Leadership Activities in Supporting Your Teaching Improvements.

The following items indicate some of the administrative roles thought to help the development of teachers within schools. For each of them, please tick (/) the response that shows your agreement of its importance in helping the English language teachers' development in your school.

Among the administrative activites,

6) providing teachers with necessary resources to study in to their classroom problems methodically is
   Very important _____Important_____No opinion_____ Less important_____
   Not important at all_____
7) encouraging trust and respect among teacher is
   Very important _____ Important_____No opinion_____ Less important_____
   Not important at all_____
8) initiating and valuing teachers' individual efforts
   Very important___Important_____No opinion_____ Less important ____
   Not important at all_____

PART SIX: On Your Future Developmental Readiness in the School

9) In the future, I think,
   a) I would study classroom problems methodically.
   Most likely____Likely_____Undecided____ Less likely_____ Unlikely_____

b) I would take initiative in teacher development activities in my department.
Most likely ____ Likely_____ Undecided_____ Less likely____ Unlikely___

c) I would become cooperative in sharing and solving my colleagues' problems relating to teaching.
Most likely_____ Likely____ Undecided____ Less likely_____ Unlikely_____

PART SEVEN: General Overview

10) Generally speaking, how do you evaluate the developmental nature of the English language teachers in your school?
Excellent____ Very good____ Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____

11) List, according to their importance, four things you <u>think</u> the English language teachers in your school can do to increase their development.
a) _____
_____
b) _____
_____
c) _____
_____
_____
_____
_____

12) In relation to the above question, list three ways through which you think your school can help the teachers to work towards their development.
a) _____
_____
b) _____
_____
c) _____
_____
d) _____
_____

13) What other comments do you have? _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you again for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

ADDIS ABABA UNIVESITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
AND LITERATURE

Questionnaire to be Filled by Senior Secondary School Principals

As a part of my graduate study, I am presently conducting a research on the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers in the Senior Secondary Schools of Addis Ababa. The purpose of the attached questionnaire, therefore, is to gather the necessary information concerning this. The questionnaire, specifically, seeks to collect your views on what the English language teachers do to develop their professional enrichment, factors that hinder their development and your schools' future readiness to help (promote) the developmental activities of the teachers.

I am particularly desirous of obtaining your responses in that as an administrative figure, the information you provide regarding the topic understudy is substantially important. You are, therefore, kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire. Please, answer all the questions honestly.

I appreciate if you complete the instrument prior to March 30, 2000. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
Jeylan Wolyie

GENERAL INSTRUCTION: Pleas, tick (/) the item which most closely identifies your attitude and respond by writing where required.

PART ONE: Background Information

1. How long have you been serving?
   a) In your present post _____ b) As a teacher _____
   c) Total _____
2. What is your academic qualification?
   12+2(Diploma) _____ B.A (B.SC)_____
   M.A(M.SC) _____ Other (please specify) _____

PART TWO: Information Concerning the Developmental Nature of English Language Teachers

3. In my school,
   a) the majority of the English language teachers work together to improve their teaching.
   Most frequently _____ Frequently _____ Sometimes_____ Rarely_____ Never_____
   b) the English language teachers make individual attempts to improve their classroom practice.
   Most frequently _____ Frequently _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely_____ Never_____

PART THREE: On Factors that Affect Developmental Activities of the English Language Teachers.

The following factors are generally believed to be some of the major factors affecting teacher development efforts. For each of them, please tick (/) the extent to which you agree or disagree.

4. In my school,
   a) the English language teachers are not interested to work together.
   Strongly agree_____ Agree_____ Undecided _____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree _____
   b) the English language teachers do not have adequate departmental and school support system to work towards improving their teaching.
   Strongly agree_____ agree_____ undecided _____ disagree_____ strongly disagree_____
   c) the performance evaluation conducted on them does not involve the English language teachers.
   Strongly agree_____ Agree_____ Undecided _____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree____
   d) the teaching load of the English language teachers does not allow them to make efforts towards improving their teaching.
   Strongly agree_____ Agree_____ Undecided_____ Disagree_____ Strongly disagree_____

PART FOUR: On the Future Readiness of the Schools to Promote the English Language Teachers' Improvement in Their Teaching Quality.

Please, tick (/) the item which most closely identifies your view.

5. In the future,
   a) my school would facilitate conditions for the English language teachers' improvement in their teaching.
      Most likely_____ Likely _____ Not Sure _____ Less likely_____ Unlikely____
   b) the performance evaluation conducted on the English language teachers would involve them and work towards their improvement in teaching.
      Most likely_____ Likely _____ Not Sure_____ Less likely _____ Unlikely____

PART FIVE: General Overview

Please, indicate your general idea on the following items.

6. My overall evaluation of the developmental activities of the English language teachers in my school is
   Excellent_____ Very good_____ Good_____ Fair_____ Poor_____
7. List three important things you think the English language teachers can do to improve their teaching.
   a) _____
   b) _____
   c) _____
8. List four things you <u>think</u> the teacher evaluation system in your school should look like to improve the English language teachers' teaching effectiveness and their students' learning outcome.
   a) _____
   b) _____
   c) _____
   d) _____
9. What other comments do you like to give about the developmental nature of the English language teachers in your school? _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

Thank you again for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C

Teacher Development Interview Questions

The following questions were prepared to gather your views concerning the developmental nature of the experienced English language teachers in your school. You are, therefore, requested to respond to each of them elaborately.

1. How long have you been teaching English?

2. How much do you think have you developed your teaching effectiveness since you entered the profession? If you realize an increased effectiveness in your professional practice, what do you think or know have contributed to your improvement?

3. How frequently do you study your classroom problems and make critical investigation?

4. To what extent do the English language teachers in your school work together? How do you evaluate, for example, the practices of peer evaluation, professional discussion and team-teaching? What are the factors that usually hinder or minimize the collaborative work between and among teachers?

5. What is your attitude towards the performance evaluation in your school? What are the major problems with the evaluation of teachers' classroom performance? How do you think could these problems detrimentally affect the English language teachers' development?

6. How do you generally evaluate your school administration's effort to encourage teacher development activities? Does it, for example, encourage peer-observation among the English language teachers and enhance their efforts to improve individually?

7. How do you generally evaluate your own, your colleagues' and your school's teacher development effort?

Thank you for your cooperation!

DECLARATION

The thesis is my original work , has not been presented for degree in any other university and all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: - Jeylan WOLYIE

Signature: Jey

Place: A.A.U

Date of submission 19 May, 2000

This thesis has been submitted for examination under my approval as a research advisor.

Name: Mekonnen Disasa

Signature: M.

Date June 20, 2000