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Abstract

Purpose of Study: The current study aimed at revealing the integration of information and communications technology (ICT) in EFL/ESL teachers' training and self-efficacy beliefs as perceived by trainers. A group of (64) trainers from different countries (Palestine, UK, USA, Iran, Lebanon, Yemen, Iraq) completed the two instruments of the study.

Methodology: The first instrument was a survey of the actuality of ICT integration in the training; it comprises (47) items distributed into nine domains, i.e. PowerPoint, Facebook, Wiki, YouTube, Blogs, Email, Google, Mobile, and PlatformE-course. The second instrument was a self-efficacy scale which consists of (14) items. The results of trainers' responses revealed that Emails, Mobile, and Google are often used with relative weights (%78.59, %68.13, and %68.02) respectively, whereas Wikis were never used i.e. relative weight (%)28.96. The differences in integrating ICTs between male and female trainers were statistically insignificant. Furthermore, there were no statistically significant differences due to the respondents' period of experience.

Results: The results also showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the respondents' integration of ICT due to country of origin. The trainers' self-efficacy wobbles between 66.88 and 58.13 with a total of 61.70, which is moderate. Based on the study findings, the researchers recommend arousing trainers and trainees' awareness regarding integrating more ICTs in their training courses and encouraging them to try the different ICTs which make it easier for trainees to grasp the training material.
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INTRODUCTION

Due to the fast pace of information and communications technology (ICT) in the recent few decades, the significance of technology became indispensable in the different walks of life. The significance can be seen in its outcomes in different fields. Rouse (n.d.) maintained that advances in ICT resulted in saving large amounts of money in businesses. In addition, it availed big data revolution to organizations, enabled transactions such as internet shopping, as well as telemedicine and social media. Moreover, ICT continues to revolutionize all parts of human experience as first computers and now robots do many of the tasks once handled by humans. Not only did it highly impact the users' way of thinking, their behaviors, their styles of living, their interests and preferences, viz. the student/trainee, the teacher/trainer, but also it influenced the daily life of the active members of the pedagogical process.

ICT is widely used in the last few years in education. Davis mentioned that "ICT has many roles in education and will continue to develop three dimensions through this century: ICT aspects of core skills, ICT as a theme of knowledge, and ICT as a means of enriching learning". Educators, scholars, trainers, teachers, and learners were among those influenced by the rapid advancement of technology since the turn of the twenty-first century just to cope with the actuality of gaining knowledge and fostering skills. For centuries, the above-mentioned people used to use the very traditional methods supported with instructional aids such as the blackboard, pictures, flashcards, worksheets and the like in the different contexts of teaching, learning or training some of which do not fit in the current era needed skills. Therefore, there should have been shift to the modern ways of spreading knowledge, i.e. ICT which people find easier, more interesting and convenient (Matandare, 2018; Araya-Guzmán et al., 2018, Baroughi & Zarei, 2013).

ICT DEFINED

The researchers reviewed the literature of ICT and found that ICT, which is extended from information technology (IT) has no fixed universal definition due to the fact that its concepts, methods, and applications are constantly evolving rapidly and technological inventions are appearing on an almost daily basis. However, they quoted the following definitions:

Rouse (n.d.) stated that ICT "refers to all the technology used to handle telecommunications, broadcast media, intelligent building management systems, audiovisual processing and transmission systems, and network-based control and monitoring functions." In addition, UNESCO (2002) defined ICT as "the combination of informatics technology with other technology modalities. ICT will be used, applied, and integrated into activities of teaching, learning, and management on the basis of conceptual understanding and methods of informatics." And Crawford (2013, p. 1) mentioned that ICT is "a powerful tool as it significantly extends people's abilities, and as a learning tool, it is particularly effective."

It is noticeable that the aforementioned definitions are matched in highlighting the common components needed for ICT. ICT includes concepts, methods, and applications are constantly evolving rapidly and technological inventions are appearing on an almost daily basis. More importantly, the definition above stresses the integration of telecommunications,
i.e. telephone lines and wireless and cellular phones and gadgets, computers, digital television, email, robots as well as necessary software and audio-visual systems, which enable users to access, store, transmit, and manipulate information in a digital form (Murray, 2015; Soleymani et al., 2014).

All in all, ICTs are various technologies such as: smartphones, internet (websites, emails, social networks) phone, computers, digital screens, that enable users to store, transmit and manipulate information in a digital form which can be used in isolation or integrated with one or more technology. They are used in different sectors of education such as: teaching, learning, and training to activate the process of education and enhance the needed competencies for the area of the current age. Some of the recent technologies are: PowerPoint, Facebook, E-course, websites, emails, Blogs, Google, Wiki, mobile learning.

Since ICT has produced many uses of adapting software and materials, it is concluded that all of ICTs share in many possibilities, facilities, and characteristics. The table below points out some recent ICTs and some facilities for each one. The ICTs in the table below are the only ones handled in the current study. Table (1) presents a brief definition of each ICT and some of its most common facilities and uses.

| ICT            | Facilities                                                                 |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PowerPoint     | a slide show for interactive summarized presentation which includes logical ideas. It has different tools such as insert text, image, video, link, diagram, conference, slides, note page, handout, outline, etc. The presenter can save the presentation and develop it for next uses. |
| Facebook       | an online second generation of social networking focused on specific communities, such as job-seekers and ethic communities. It enables people to up/download profiles, pictures, videos, make links, post public messages, add applications (Green & Quieley, 2010). |
| Wiki           | an online encyclopedia which includes: Wiktionary: a wiki-based dictionary, Wikiquote: an online source of quotations contributed by users, Wikibooks: a collection of free online books, Wikiversity: a wiki-based learning resource. There are many sites inside Wiki but these are the most related ones to teaching/learning (Gray, 2014). |
| YouTube        | video sharing websites are social networking sites that allow you to upload and store video clips and share them with others and, in some cases, download the. YouTube is far and away the most used of these sites and the first commercial one. Upload presentation, video, download |
| Blogs          | “gives you your own voice on the web. It is a place to collect and share things that you find interesting, whether it is your political commentary, a personal diary or links to websites that you want to remember. The most reason why people blog are; Journal: blog to record your life journey to be shared with friends and members. Expression of feeling Blog acted as your medium to voice out your opinion about everything that happens in your environment. Promoting their product: blogging can help you to market your product widely and effectively. The more people visiting your blog, the more sales you can make. Sharing information and knowledge: some people blogging for knowledge sharing a purpose. Maybe sharing recipes, discussing new books on self and so on. Work purpose: some university courses allowed their students to do and submit assignments and research through blog. Especially those in media and communication field. Pp. 2-3 AMC the School of Business (n.d.) |
| Email          | a message sent electronically over the Internet. To send an email message, you must have an email account. It has several parts: including the recipient's email address, the address of anyone who is receiving a copy of the message, the message subject, the body, and the name of any file attachments. The body of the email contains your message. A message is created in a form, which includes options for formatting text, attaching files, or adding additional recipients as courtesy, or blind courtesy copies. Basic email activities include writing, reading, replying to, and forwarding messages. P.14 June, D. et al (2016) |
| Google         | It includes google sites, google drive, google calendar, google YouTube, google Maps, create document, upload document, shares document, Spreadsheet, or Presentation, google site, google map, creates youtube video, creates a google calendar p.35 |
Mobile learning is more than just using a mobile device to access content and communicate with others—it is about the mobility of the learner. According to Mike Sharples, it is "the processes (both personal and public) of coming to know through exploration and conversation across multiple contexts amongst people and interactive technologies".

As the table above depicts, ICTs provide a wide range of possibilities and facilities for the technology users, particularly learners and trainees which all make the learning/training process more lively, interesting and promising. They can make the trainer and the trainee's tasks easier since the material can be downloaded, saved or recorded.

**PROCEDURES OF USING ICT IN TEACHING/TRAINING**

In recent years, there has been a growing tendency and concern towards employing modern technologies in education as well as in training even in developing countries. This might be as a result of the wide spreading of those technologies in the least expenses and as a motive for providing alternative solutions to the obstacles encountered in the conventional educational systems in order to reform them to meet the needs of the current age. ICTs would be able to provide education and knowledge in a wider reach, even with a limited amount of resources, unlike conventional systems of education (Reddi, 2011). To grantee the success of using ICT in teaching/training, a set of (10) procedures drawn by Collis and Moonen that could be divided into three main categories before starting the use, during use and after use as follows:

**Before Starting the Use**

This part shows the procedures required before implementing and using ICT. Those are fourfold:

- Selecting and using appropriate ICT tools and supporting students in the use of these tools.
- Thinking of new forms of student activity and determining how ICT can help support these.
- Learning how to set up and monitor ICT-related learning activities.
- Determining and communicating how learners will be evaluated in the new forms of ICT-related activities, particularly for group projects and peer evaluations.

**During the Use**

While using ICT, the user is required to:

- Monitor and intervene when there are problems with group work or using technology.
- Manage contact with students, web submissions, e-mail, discussions, and comments on each other's work.

**After the Use**

After implementing ICT, the trainer/teacher should:

- Develop new methods of grading student performance.
- Monitor the quality of what students find via the Web and share it with others.
- Keep records of student participation and process for monitoring and grading.
- Manage incoming and outgoing e-mail and contacts with individual students.

**Importance of ICT in Training**

ICT proved beneficial in the different contexts and environments amongst which is the training environment. First and most importantly, it enhanced the trainer's abilities, skills, and awareness by using ICT to match trainees' needs. Secondly, it creates an enjoyable training environment and supports social relations among trainees. Thirdly, it offers an unlimited number of educational and training resources. Fourthly, communication channels are increased between the trainer and the

**Mobile**

Mobile learning is more than just using a mobile device to access content and communicate with others—it is about the mobility of the learner. According to Mike Sharples, it is "the processes (both personal and public) of coming to know through exploration and conversation across multiple contexts amongst people and interactive technologies".

**Platform/ecourse**

At its simplest, an e-course is an educational course delivered via the internet. Although there are exceptions, ecourses are typically taught in modules or dedicated classes in which students learn specific skills or techniques as part of the broader course.

E-course is the E-Learning environment for Al-Quds Open University, it contains all QOU courses and provides the students with the digital content.
trainees from one side and between the trainees themselves through email, discussion groups, and chat rooms. Fifthly, ICT facilitates sharing resources, expertise, and advice. Sixthly, greater flexibility in the time and the place of carrying out the tasks is guaranteed through the use of ICT in training (Jacobsen and Kremer, 2000). Seventhly, it is worth mentioning, ICT gains both the trainer trainees in ICT literacy skills, confidence, and enthusiasm. Eighthly, Trainers find planning and designing the materials required for the training much easier. Ninthly, ICT tools foster an anytime, anywhere environment of increased learners/trainees cooperation and teamwork and lead to increased collaboration and teamwork among trainers who are seeking to integrate ICT in their training. Tenthly, to use ICT is that it can help to implement personalized learning (Freedman 2008) so that the ICT user can work independently. Solimon discusses the ways of using ICT in training EFL teachers by suggesting a number of electronic learning activities to enhance students’ independency and proficiency in learning. Some of those who are different in their structure are synchronously or asynchronously administered. Amongst the proposed e-learning activities are chat, forums, database, hotpot, wikis, worksheets, survey and the like. Learning activities that use different technologies makes teachers and student's tasks easier (Tambunan, 2019; Samadi et al, 2018).

Given, there are many factors amongst which are the affective factors that play an essential role in the learning/ training process. Those, no doubt, affect the learning/ training process either positively or negatively. Self- efficacy is one of the personality factors that affect learning/ training. Pedagogically speaking, there is controversy whether self-efficacy is cause for success in the learning/ training process or an effect on it.

Self-Efficacy

There were always serious and practical endeavors that sought to understand why people do what they do. A number of factors have been perceived to affect what people do and provide strong reasoning for doing something. Amongst the most important of those are the cognitive, psychological, affective, economic, cultural, social and personality ones. Personality factors are people's emotional side they bring in to the activity or the task they are performing (Kharma and Bakir, 2010). Those comprise anxiety, self-esteem, extroversion, risk-taking, empathy, inhibition, self-confidence and self-efficacy beliefs. Bandura provided a vivid definition of self-efficacy.

"Perceived self-efficacy is ...... people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through .... Cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes".

Self-efficacy is also defined as the belief in one's capability to achieve a goal or an outcome. According to Margoli and McCabe (2006), self-efficacy is perceived as helping students believe in themselves. Thus, it is the belief that a person bears in mind and the sense he has about enhancing his abilities to accomplish something successfully. In the present research, the researchers are concerned with the trainers' beliefs about their abilities to integrate and use ICT in their trainings despite, sometimes, the huge challenges they face due to a number of influencing factors such as economic factors, shortage of technological and communication devices, frequent cuts in the electric power and the like. People with strong sense of efficacy are sure they can carry out even difficult tasks. The research seeks also to investigate and identify the trainer's intrinsic interests and approval, on the one hand, and their fears, depression, and anxiety due to the challenges they encounter, on the other hand, in adoption of recent technological devices. Apparently, these belief-based behaviors will, by the end, affect the quality of training they provide.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Granston (2004) set up an action plan for integrating technology into Jamaica’s teacher training programs by describing the status of integrating technology into teachers’ training programs in Jamaica and by assessing teachers' perceptions towards using in teaching. Data were gathered through triangulation of interviews, questionnaires and focus group discussions. The study revealed that teachers did not perceive themselves as qualified enough to teach with technology. Upon that conceptual framework was proposed as an action plan to integrate technology into teaching.

Bell & Kozlowski examined the effect of providing trainees with some guidance and learners' control on learning and performance in a technology-based training environment. It also examined the instructional strategy and adaptive guidance. It was found that adaptive guidance had tangible effect on the trainees' study and practice, self-regulation, knowledge acquired, and performance technology-based training.

Georgina & Hosford examined the effect of faculty technology literacy and technology training on the integration of technology in their instruction. This required examining the way faculty technology literacy skills related to integrating technology into their pedagogy while controlling for training. Respondents surveyed in that study included faculty members from the 15 peer institution of the University of North Dakota. Results indicated significant correlation between technology literacy and pedagogical practice integration.

Nicollaidis & Mattheoudakis explored the long-term effectiveness of EFL teachers training courses in the Greek educational context via a questionnaire tackled the respondents' beliefs regarding the relevance of the acquired knowledge to their individual needs. Accordingly, a cooperative model was proposed for the promotion of change involving active cooperation between the components of the educational process.
Wen et al's (2010) utilized a competency-based training (CBT) model used by professionals of Educational Curricula design to integrate with the popular e-learning information technology to form an e-CBT model. It attempted to develop indicators of professional teaching competencies in university teachers, and a structure for training programs. The study recommended that universities can apply the e-CBT model to enhance teacher's in-service training and professional development.

Bell & Kozlowski attempted to explore the most important advances in technology-based training. The study examined the technology-based training applications available in the workplace. It also compared the costs and benefits of technology-based training to identify the factors that influence its effectiveness. The study concluded a few guidelines on how to use technology effectively to deliver training and to meet human development needs.

Oliver & Townsend (2013) reviewed the literature of integrating technology in teaching to figure out six types of training programs: pre-service training, long-term training, short-term workshops, coaching and mentoring, learning communities, and product assessment approach. The article outlined three major factors affecting integrating technology in teaching, i.e. technology leadership, contextual factors, and personal factors.

McClanahan (2014) discussed the reasons for the slow adoption of technology as a means of instruction in the adult ESL classes. The article figured out facts on the relationship between adult ESL learners and technology. Additionally, the article proposed theoretical support appealing for the integration of technology in adult ESL classes. Finally, the way technology can make ESL instructors work more organized and time-effective was presented.

**COMMENTARY**

The studies reviewed highlighted various angles of EFL/ESL teacher training courses. The proposed frameworks for training courses in general, tackled the use of technology in training, indicated the need of using technology in training and teaching and revealed the effect of EFL training courses on developing the teachers’ competences. The current study is distinguished by tackling the status of using technology in training in the international contexts to suggest a formula for adopting recent technology in EFL/ESL teacher programs.

**THE NEED OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTION**

The current era demands necessitate skills for using ICTs and implementing them in different life sectors. School students spend many hours daily working with various kinds of ICT for a variety of reasons such as entertainment, learning, communication and so on. Such a situation creates a creative experience for school students in using ICT which motivates the teachers, especially EFL/ESL teachers to think deeply in finding suitable ways for integrating such technologies in the learning and teaching FL/SL. In the same context, EFL/ESL teachers’ trainers stimulates to integrate ICT in the training process for different purposes such as: selecting training contexts in line with the ICT era, presenting samples for different situations EFL/ESL teachers can integrate ICT in, integrating ICT manageably and successfully, and opening horizons for EFL/ESL teachers to create other tasks based on ICT in their teaching.

Based on the previous mentioned reasons, the researchers find the necessity to highlight the different ways of integrating ICT in EFL/ESL teachers' training and trainers' self-efficacy. So, the main research question is: What is the actuality of ICT integration in EFL/ESL teachers' training and what are the trainers' self-efficacy beliefs regarding ICT integration?

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In light of the literature review and the study purpose, the following research questions were probed:

1. What is the actuality of trainers' integration of ICT in their training?
2. Are there statistically significant differences between the trainers’ integration of ICT due to the following variables: gender, region, the period of training experience?
3. How do trainers perceive their self-efficacy in regard to their integration of ICT in their current training?
4. Are there statistically significant differences in the trainers’ self-efficacy beliefs regarding their integration of ICT in training due to their gender, region, and period of training experience?

**RESEARCH PURPOSES**

This research aims at revealing the actuality of trainers' integration of ICT in training EFL/ESL teachers in different countries and different training courses develop TEFL/ TESL. In addition, it shows the self-efficacy in regard to their integration. In this investigation gender, region, and period of training experience variables were considered.

**RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE**

The current study is desperately needed for both teachers and trainers who teach/train through technology since it seeks to investigate the actuality of using modern technologies in training contexts by trainers having different experiences in training and belonging to different communities, cultures, regions, and bearing different thoughts and beliefs. No doubt, this survey gives a clear picture of the most frequently used technologies in training EFL/ESL teachers in different
countries and enables observers and people of interest to anticipate and foresee the future of training as well as the real impact of technology in the different walks of life. Trainer's adoption of a technological tool or another, no doubt, is geared towards the goals they set and seek to accomplish.

**METHODOLOGY**

The research design adopted in the current study is the descriptive-analytical approach. The researchers designed two instruments a survey to identify the frequently used ICT in training and a self-efficacy scale to investigate the trainers' self-efficacy beliefs regarding their integration of ICT in their training. The subjects for the present study were 64 trainers drawn from a large poll of international trainers from seven countries, namely Palestine, UK, USA, Iran, Yemen, Iraq, and Lebanon. Following is a distribution of the participants with regard to the variables: gender, training experience, training courses and country of origin.

**Table 2: Distribution of the Sample according to Gender**

| Gender  | No. | %  |
|---------|-----|----|
| Male    | 20  | 31.3 |
| Female  | 44  | 68.8 |
| **Total** | **64** | **100.00** |

Table 2: Deals with the distribution of the sample due to gender. The sample included only twenty males, i.e. 31.3% and the rest were females, i.e. 68.8%.

**Table 3: Distribution of the sample according to the training experience**

| Training experience | No. | %  |
|---------------------|-----|----|
| 1-5                 | 12  | 18.8 |
| 6-10                | 16  | 25.0 |
| more than 10        | 36  | 56.3 |
| **Total**           | **64** | **100.00** |

With reference to the table (3), the majority of the study subjects, namely 56.3% experienced training for more than ten years whereas only 18.8% training experienced for 1-5 years.

**Table 4: Distribution of the Sample according to Country of Origin**

| Country of origin | No. | %  |
|-------------------|-----|----|
| Palestine         | 8   | 12.5 |
| UK                | 26  | 40.6 |
| USA               | 12  | 18.8 |
| Iran              | 12  | 18.8 |
| Lebanon           | 2   | 3.1 |
| Yemen             | 2   | 3.1 |
| Iraq              | 2   | 3.1 |
| **Total**         | **64** | **100.00** |

According to the table (4), the majority of the study subjects, namely 40.6% belong to UK whereas the average i.e. 18.8% belong to both USA and Iran each. The same table also presents that subjects from Lebanon, Yemen, and Iraq were the minority.

**Instrumentations**

With respect to the first instrument, i.e. the survey, it was devised into nine ICTs; each of which addresses different uses (PowerPoint, Facebook, Wiki, YouTube, Blogs, Email, Google, Mobile, Platform:E-course). The Likert scale from 1-5
ranging from never to always was used to identify the frequency of using ICT.

The second instrument, the self-efficacy scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, was confined to 14 items to which the subjects should respond.

To validate the instruments, the correlation coefficient, Cronbach Alpha and Split Half methods were employed.

Table 5: Correlation coefficient of Material Reinforcement Effect Items

| Items | Pearson correlation | Items | Pearson correlation | Items | Pearson correlation |
|-------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|
| 1     | **0.659             | 2     | **0.714             | 3     | **0.817             |
| 4     | **0.730             | 5     | **0.602             | 6     | **0.729             |
| 7     | **0.846             | Blogs | total ** 0.689      | Mobile| 7 ** 0.855          |
| 8     | **0.782             | 1     | **0.842             | total | ** 0.713            |
|       | total ** 0.652      | 2     | **0.898             | 1     | **0.973             |
| 1     | **0.873             | 3     | **0.852             | 2     | **0.936             |
| 2     | **0.862             | 4     | **0.861             | Total | ** 0.985            |
| 3     | **0.879             | 1     | **0.766             | 4     | **0.969             |
| 4     | **0.887             | 2     | **0.769             | 5     | **0.548             |
| Total | ** 0.621            |       |                     | 6     | ** 0.941            |
|       |                     |       |                     | Total | ** 0.424            |
| 1     | **0.851             | 4     | **0.729             | 3     | **0.825             |
| 2     | **0.884             | 5     | **0.740             | 6     | **0.835             |
| 3     | **0.870             | 7     | ** 0.740            |       |                     |
| Total | ** 0.524            |       |                     |       |                     |
| 1     | **0.861             |       |                     |       |                     |
| 2     | **0.840             |       |                     |       |                     |
| 3     | **0.775             |       |                     |       |                     |
| total | ** 0.777            |       |                     |       |                     |

**"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 0.361

**"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463

The two instruments were validated using Pearson correlation, where the correlation of the first instrument was (0.463) which was significant at the level (0.01) and that for the second instrument i.e. the self-efficacy scale was (0.933) which was significant at the level (0.01).

The survey's validity was checked also through Cronbach Alpha and Split Half methods. Cronbach Alpha was (0.937) and the Spilt-half coefficient was (0.826).

Table 6: Correlation coefficient of Material reinforcement Effect Items

| Items | Pearson correlation | Items | Pearson correlation |
|-------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|
| 1     | **0.714             | 8     | **0.630             |
| 2     | **0.846             | 9     | **0.766             |
| 3     | **0.646             | 10    | **0.789             |
| 4     | **0.886             | 11    | **0.712             |
| 5     | **0.769             | 12    | **0.578             |
| 6     | **0.732             | 13    | **0.835             |
| 7     | **0.786             | 14    | **0.543             |

**"r" table value at (28) d f. at (0.05) sig. level equal to 0.361
As the table above shows, the correlation coefficient of the self-efficacy scale items is high. The correlation coefficient for all items was significant at both levels (0.05) and (0.01). This is an indicator that the scale is reliable to test what it was designed for.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

In this section, findings obtained from the analysis of the collected data regarding the actuality of trainers’ integration of ICT in their training are presented. The table below displays the various percentages of employing the recent ICTs.

**Table 7:** The results of Trainers’ Responses to Integrating ICTs

| No. | ICTs        | Sum | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Relative Weight | Rank |
|-----|-------------|-----|-------|----------------|-----------------|------|
| 1   | PowerPoint  | 1444| 22.563| 7.237          | 56.41           | 5    |
| 2   | Facebook    | 464 | 7.250 | 4.171          | 36.25           | 8    |
| 3   | Wiki        | 278 | 4.344 | 2.205          | 28.96           | 9    |
| 4   | YouTube     | 550 | 8.594 | 2.849          | 57.29           | 4    |
| 5   | Blogs       | 716 | 11.188| 5.981          | 37.29           | 7    |
| 6   | Emails      | 1006| 15.719| 3.439          | 78.59           | 1    |
| 7   | Google      | 1306| 20.406| 6.026          | 68.02           | 3    |
| 8   | Mobile      | 1526| 23.844| 6.864          | 68.13           | 2    |
| 9   | Platform/e course | 986 | 15.406| 8.023          | 51.35           | 6    |
|     | Total       | 8276| 129.313| 29.181          | 55.03           |      |

The findings in the table (7) show that ICTs were employed in different degrees in the training. The results reveal that Emails, Mobile, and Google are often used with relative weights (%78.59, %68.13, and %68.02) respectively, whereas Wikis were never used i.e. relative weight (%28.96). The responses show that the total integration of ICTs was %55.03 which indicates that trainers sometimes use ICTs in their training.

As a matter of fact, teacher training courses seek to meet certain temporary needs and requirements in the era of IT and call for implementing technology in training. This is an opportunity for EFL teachers to infuse the use of ICTs in teaching/learning English through real experiences.

The researchers assume the frequent use of certain technologies such as email, google, and mobile is more applicable than other technologies because email, google, and mobile is used by both trainers and trainees regularly to submit assignments, feedback, and announcements; whereas the other technologies such as wikis might be implemented in some sessions by the trainers only.

Georgina & Hosford (2009) found a significant correlation between technology literacy and pedagogical practice integration. This is in line with the results of the current study. It is obvious that the use of ICTs in training or teaching can be determined by many factors amongst which is the readiness of the trainer. In this respect, Oliver & Townsend (2013) outlined three major factors affecting integrating technology in teaching, i.e. technology leadership, contextual factors, and personal factors.

**ICTs and Gender, Region, Experience**

In this section, the results pertaining to different demographic variables, i.e. Gender, Region, and Experience are presented. Table (8) below is concerned with the differences in responses due to gender.

**Table 8:** Differences in the Subjects’ Responses Due to Gender

| ICTs        | Gender | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | T value | Sig. level |
|-------------|--------|----|-------|----------------|---------|------------|
| PowerPoint  | male   | 20 | 24.050| 6.557          | 1.111   | Not sig.   |
|             | female | 44 | 21.886| 7.500          |         |            |
| Facebook    | male   | 20 | 6.950 | 3.546          | 0.385   | Not sig.   |
|             | female | 44 | 7.386 | 4.458          |         |            |
| Wiki        | male   | 20 | 4.350 | 2.277          | 0.015   | Not sig.   |
|             | female | 44 | 4.341 | 2.199          |         |            |
| YouTube     | male   | 20 | 8.200 | 3.381          | 0.743   | Not sig.   |
|             | female | 44 | 8.773 | 2.596          |         |            |
| Blogs       | male   | 20 | 11.400| 6.484          | 0.190   | Not sig.   |

**“r ” table value at (28) d f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 0.463**
| Source of Variance | Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | f | Sig. level |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------------|
| **PowerPoint**    | Between Groups    | 58.641         | 2  | 29.321      | 0.552 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 3299.750       | 61 | 53.133      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 3299.750       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Facebook**      | Between Groups    | 24.200         | 2  | 12.100      | 0.689 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 1071.800       | 61 | 17.570      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 1096.000       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Wiki**          | Between Groups    | 15.064         | 2  | 7.532       | 1.577 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 291.374        | 61 | 4.777       |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 306.438        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **YouTube**       | Between Groups    | 2.980          | 2  | 1.490       | 0.179 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 508.458        | 61 | 8.335       |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 511.438        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Blogs**         | Between Groups    | 62.787         | 2  | 31.394      | 0.874 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2190.963       | 61 | 35.917      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2253.750       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Emails**        | Between Groups    | 40.359         | 2  | 20.180      | 1.747 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 704.578        | 61 | 11.550      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 744.938        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Google**        | Between Groups    | 97.584         | 2  | 48.792      | 1.359 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2189.854       | 61 | 35.899      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2287.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Mobile**        | Between Groups    | 129.664        | 2  | 64.832      | 1.393 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2838.774       | 61 | 46.537      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2968.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Platform/e-course** | Between Groups   | 354.097        | 2  | 177.048     | 2.918 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 3701.341       | 61 | 60.678      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 4055.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Total**         | Between Groups    | 1564.533       | 2  | 782.267     | 0.916 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 744.927        | 61 | 12.306      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2309.461       | 63 |             |     |            |

"t" table value at (62) d.f. at (0.05) sig. level equals 2.00
"t" table value at (62) d.f. at (0.01) sig. level equal to 2.66

It is obvious from the table above that the computed T is lower than the tabulated T, which shows that the differences in integrating ICTs between male and female trainers were statistically insignificant at both levels (0.05) and (0.01).

**Table 9**: One Way ANOVA Results Due to the Period of Training Experience

| Source of Variance | Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | f | Sig. level |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------------|
| **PowerPoint**    | Between Groups    | 58.641         | 2  | 29.321      | 0.552 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 3299.750       | 63 |             |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 3299.750       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Facebook**      | Between Groups    | 24.200         | 2  | 12.100      | 0.689 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 1071.800       | 61 | 17.570      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 1096.000       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Wiki**          | Between Groups    | 15.064         | 2  | 7.532       | 1.577 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 291.374        | 61 | 4.777       |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 306.438        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **YouTube**       | Between Groups    | 2.980          | 2  | 1.490       | 0.179 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 508.458        | 61 | 8.335       |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 511.438        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Blogs**         | Between Groups    | 62.787         | 2  | 31.394      | 0.874 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2190.963       | 61 | 35.917      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2253.750       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Emails**        | Between Groups    | 40.359         | 2  | 20.180      | 1.747 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 704.578        | 61 | 11.550      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 744.938        | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Google**        | Between Groups    | 97.584         | 2  | 48.792      | 1.359 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2189.854       | 61 | 35.899      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2287.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Mobile**        | Between Groups    | 129.664        | 2  | 64.832      | 1.393 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 2838.774       | 61 | 46.537      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 2968.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
| **Platform/e-course** | Between Groups   | 354.097        | 2  | 177.048     | 2.918 | Not sig. |
|                   | Within Groups     | 3701.341       | 61 | 60.678      |     |            |
|                   | Total             | 4055.438       | 63 |             |     |            |
Table (9) shows that the value of tabulated F and computed F for all the ICTs are not significant, which means that there are no statistically significant differences due to the respondents’ period of experience.

With respect to the variable of the country of origin, table (10) reveals the results concerned.

| Source of variance | Source of variance | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. level |
|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------------|
| PowerPoint         | Between Groups    | 330.875        | 6  | 55.146      | 1.059 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 2968.875       | 57 | 52.086      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 3299.750       | 63 |             |    |            |
| Facebook           | Between Groups    | 189.929        | 6  | 31.655      | 1.991 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 906.071        | 57 | 15.896      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 1096.000       | 63 |             |    |            |
| Wiki               | Between Groups    | 24.175         | 6  | 4.029       | 0.814 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 282.263        | 57 | 4.952       |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 306.438        | 63 |             |    |            |
| YouTube            | Between Groups    | 80.675         | 6  | 13.446      | 1.779 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 430.763        | 57 | 7.557       |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 511.438        | 63 |             |    |            |
| Blogs              | Between Groups    | 161.628        | 6  | 26.938      | 0.734 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 2092.122       | 57 | 36.704      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 2253.750       | 63 |             |    |            |
| Emails             | Between Groups    | 44.114         | 6  | 7.352       | 0.598 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 700.824        | 57 | 12.295      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 744.938        | 63 |             |    |            |
| Google             | Between Groups    | 423.511        | 6  | 70.585      | 2.159 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 1863.926       | 57 | 32.700      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 2287.438       | 63 |             |    |            |
| Mobile             | Between Groups    | 284.854        | 6  | 47.476      | 1.008 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 2683.583       | 57 | 47.080      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 2968.438       | 63 |             |    |            |
| platform/ e course | Between Groups    | 626.143        | 6  | 104.357     | 1.735 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 3429.295       | 57 | 60.163      |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 4055.438       | 63 |             |    |            |
| Total              | Between Groups    | 2061.676       | 6  | 343.613     | 0.380 | Not sig.  |
|                    | Within Groups     | 51584.074      | 57 | 904.984     |    |            |
|                    | Total             | 53645.750      | 63 |             |    |            |

“F” table value at (2, 61) d.f. at (0.05) sig. level equal 3.15
“F” table value at (2, 61) d.f. at (0.01) sig. level equal 4.98

With respect to the variable of the country of origin, table (10) reveals the results concerned.

Table 10: ANOVA Results of the Differences in Responses Due to Country of Origin
Similarly, Table (9) shows that the value of tabulated F and computed F for all the ICTs, which means that there are no statistically significant differences due to the respondents' country of origin.

The researchers think that no significant differences existed between the subjects due to gender, experience, and country of origin pertaining to different reasons. The study subjects train courses, i.e. PCEL, CELTA, and TESOL enjoying the following characteristics: the training courses are international, standardized, authentic and accredited. That is to say that the training materials are designed and organized in particular templates that do not allow for many modifications. This, in turn, led to absence of gender, experience or country significance. Despite some of those trainers do rarely train other freelance courses from their own design, this did not influence their philosophies of training which seem to be unique since the freelance trainers are few compared to the total number of trainers, and this did not show differences.

The results pertaining to the trainers' self-efficacy with relevance to their use of ICT in their training are presented in table (10) below.

| No. | Strategies                                                                 | Sum | Mean     | Std. Deviation | Relative Weight | Rank |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----------|----------------|----------------|------|
| 1   | I can use technology facilities well enough to help trainees use them in my training. | 212 | 3.313    | 1.367          | 66.25          | 2    |
| 2   | I have the skills necessary to use technology in my training.              | 206 | 3.219    | 1.419          | 64.38          | 4    |
| 3   | I believe I can successfully perform training courses with appropriate use of technology. | 190 | 2.969    | 1.391          | 59.38          | 11   |
| 4   | I can help participants when they have difficulty with using some technologies. | 208 | 3.250    | 1.469          | 65.00          | 3    |
| 5   | I can effectively monitor participants' use of technology for handling some tasks related to the training course. | 204 | 3.188    | 1.435          | 63.75          | 5    |
| 6   | I can motivate the participants to take part in technology-based tasks.   | 192 | 3.000    | 1.309          | 60.00          | 9    |
| 7   | I feel confident I can provide individual feedback to participants during technology use. | 194 | 3.031    | 1.297          | 60.63          | 6    |
| 8   | I regularly incorporate technology into my sessions.                      | 192 | 3.000    | 1.309          | 60.00          | 10   |
| 9   | I can select appropriate technologies for training based on specific standards. | 214 | 3.344    | 1.417          | 66.88          | 1    |
| 10  | I can assign and grade technology-based assignments.                      | 190 | 2.969    | 1.321          | 59.38          | 12   |
| 11  | I can keep training goals and technology uses in mind when selecting an ideal way to assess participants' performance. | 190 | 2.969    | 1.247          | 59.38          | 13   |
| 12  | I can use technology resources, i.e. (spreadsheets, electronic portfolios etc.) to collect and analyze data from participants' assignments. | 186 | 2.906    | 1.269          | 58.13          | 14   |
| 13  | I can respond to participants' needs during my use of technology.         | 192 | 3.000    | 1.309          | 60.00          | 8    |
| 14  | I can develop creative ways to cope with technological constraints and continue training. | 194 | 3.031    | 1.297          | 60.63          | 7    |
|     | Total                                                                      | 2764 | 43.188   | 13.786         | 61.70          |      |

The above table shows that the trainers' self-efficacy wobbles between (66.88) and (58.13) with a total of (61.70), which is moderate. Item (9) "I can select appropriate technologies for training based on specific standard." Got the highest rank amongst the other self-efficacy items, whereas item (12) "I can use technology resources, i.e. (spreadsheets, electronic portfolios etc.) to collect and analyze data from participants' assignments" ranked the lowest.

Bandura (1994) states that people with high self-efficacy are usually motivated to accomplish more challenging tasks compared to those with lower self-efficacy. With reference to the trainers' responses which indicate moderate self-efficacy,
it could be amplified that those trainers are aware regarding the basics of using ICT in training despite the fact that some technologies require the intervention of IT technicians. In this regard, the trainers may be aware of the benefit of employing ICT in their training and the facilities of each ICT, however, they still need to learn more about implementing ICTs more effectively in their training as well as to enhance their self-efficacy.

CONCLUSION

With respect to the study findings, it could be concluded that the implementation of ICTs in EFL/ESL training contexts is high with trainers’ approval of some ICTs, namely, email, google and mobile over others such as wikis. This could be attributed to the fact of the ease of dealing with them and their abundant availability in the trainers and the trainees’ hands. The trainers also showed that they are self-efficacious when they implement ICTs in their training as they are interesting and motivating as well as saving their time and effort. Thus, the use of ICT as a 21st century signpost is badly required in training and teaching contexts. Hence, trainers should be empowered with the willingness to use ICTs widely.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based in the results, the researchers present the following recommendations:
- Increase the use of integrating ICT in training EFL/ ESL teachers.
- Conduct sessions for exchanging successful experiences in using ICT in training ICTs.
- Making spilt site courses among trainers in different countries to find different and distinguished use of ICTs.
- Conducting study for revealing the range of trainers’ awareness and abilities in using and integrating ICT in teaching EFL/ ESL.
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