



Measuring the Effectiveness of an Online Teacher Training Program for In-Service Secondary School Teachers: Trainees’ Reactions and Learning

Mintra Puripunyavanich

mintra.p@chula.ac.th, Language Institute, Chulalongkorn University,
Thailand

APA Citation: Puripunyavanich, M. (2025). Measuring the effectiveness of an online teacher training program for in-service secondary school teachers: Trainees’ reactions and learning. <i>LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network</i> , 18(1), 816–857. https://doi.org/10.70730/YVSD7249	
Received 11/10/2024 Received in revised form 19/12/2024 Accepted 28/12/2024	ABSTRACT This study evaluates the effectiveness of a 48-hour online training program designed for in-service secondary school English teachers across Thailand. Using Kirkpatrick’s model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006), the research examines the participants’ reactions to the program (Level 1: Reaction) and changes in their attitudes, knowledge, and skills (Level 2: Learning). A mixed-methods approach was adopted, with 38 trainees completing an online questionnaire and 17 subsequently joining focus group interviews. Findings indicated that the program was well-received, achieving a high satisfaction score ($M = 4.87$) at the reaction level. At the learning level, the participants reported increased knowledge, particularly in ELT methods. Questionnaire and focus group interview data further revealed that the program positively impacted their attitudes toward online teacher training and motivation to engage in further learning. Additionally, the training enhanced both their teaching competencies and their English language skills. The study’s findings offer baseline data for further development of online professional development

	<p>programs tailored to in-service secondary school English teachers' needs.</p> <p>Keywords: training program evaluation, training program effectiveness, online teacher training program, Kirkpatrick model, in-service secondary school teachers</p>
--	--

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic shifted teaching and learning from traditional classrooms to online learning (Li & Lalani, 2020), creating a need for teachers to acquire new pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills (Poonpon, 2021). There is also an urgent need to improve the standard of Thai teachers' English language proficiency (Watson Todd & Darasawang, 2020). In 2018, the Ministry of Education (MOE) and British Council Thailand tested 40,000 English teachers, aiming for a B2 level on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). However, results showed that about 75% were at the A2 level (Mala, 2021). This outcome underscored the urgent need for training to improve English language teachers' English proficiency as well as their teaching skills.

Since the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020, teacher training programs have been conducted online, with educational institutions and publishers offering free webinars and workshops to support teachers' ongoing development of English language teaching skills. In March 2022, the language institute of the university in this study partnered with the U.S. Embassy's Regional English Language Office (RELO) to launch an online training program for Thai secondary school English teachers, marking the institute's first official online teacher training initiative for this group. This study evaluated the program's effectiveness using Kirkpatrick's four-level training model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). While such a model has been widely used to evaluate training programs both in organizational (e.g., Heydari et al., 2019; Homklin, 2014) and educational contexts (e.g., Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021; Asghar et al., 2022; Mahmoodi et al., 2019), there is little information on how it is used to systematically evaluate online training programs for English teachers, indicating a knowledge gap that this study aimed to fill.

Literature Review

Professional Development of English Language Teachers in Thailand

Research highlights the strong influence of teacher quality on student learning outcomes (Gaertner & Brunner, 2018), underlining the need for ongoing professional development to enhance teaching skills (Wang & Zhang, 2023). In response to this, Thailand has implemented education reforms whose focus is on enhancing teaching standards, emphasizing pedagogical skill improvement and holistic professional development to better equip teachers and leaders in curriculum and assessment implementation (OECD/UNESCO, 2016).

Poonpon (2021) identified two successful professional development projects related to English teaching in Thailand. The English Resources Information Center (ERIC) project, running from 1984 to 1992 with UK government support, focused on enhancing English instruction in secondary schools. Another significant initiative, the Regional English Training Centres or “Boot Camp,” was conducted by the British Council Thailand and the Ministry of Education between 2016 and 2018. The British Council’s (n.d.) report reveals that 90% of the participants reported increased confidence in teaching and English usage, 93% improved their subject knowledge, and 94% enhanced their lesson planning and management skills.

Continued teacher training proves more cost-effective for boosting student outcomes than class-size reduction or extending learning time (Angrist & Lavy, 2001). Effective training also requires a needs assessment to align programs with teachers’ specific needs. Thus, Poonpon (2021) conducted a needs analysis for professional development with 4,220 in-service English teachers in Thailand. The key training aspects of language knowledge and skills for secondary school teachers included speaking, listening, pronunciation, writing, cross-cultural communication, and reading skills. Main areas for pedagogical development needed by these teachers were creative materials development, teaching speaking, CEFR-based learning approaches, and game-based learning approaches (see Poonpon, 2021, pp. 13 & 15).

Online Teacher Professional Development (OTPD)

Powell and Bodur (2019) defined online teacher professional development (OTPD) as online courses, workshops, or modules for teacher professional development and identified six key features of OTPD design and implementation. First, relevancy ensures alignment with teachers’ professional learning needs through needs analyses (Farris, 2015). Second, usefulness refers to OTPD’s ability to address teachers’ needs to solve

problems about instruction, practice, or student learning (Powell & Bodur, 2019). Third, interaction and collaboration promote learning engagement, especially for reluctant participants in face-to-face settings (Powell & Bodur, 2019). Fourth, authentic tasks and activities can enhance the training's effectiveness by relating directly to teachers' real classroom practice (Huang, 2002; Vrasidas & Zembylas, 2004). Fifth, reflection helps teachers link new knowledge to their teaching (Huang, 2002). Sixth, the intersection of technology, content, pedagogy, and learners emphasizes OTPD's dynamic nature as stakeholders explore opportunities and challenges (Powell & Bodur, 2019). Such components should be taken into consideration when designing and implementing online training courses to make the courses more effective for trainees.

Purposes of Training Evaluation

Training evaluation refers to the process of gathering feedback to judge a program's impact and value (Hamblin, 1974). Topno (2012) emphasizes measuring outcomes to verify effectiveness. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) identify three purposes which support ongoing program refinement and accountability, namely justifying the training department's existence and funding, deciding if programs should be continued, and gathering data to improve future programs. In summary, training evaluation is conducted to measure the program's effectiveness.

Adoption of Kirkpatrick's Model for Training Program Evaluation

Kirkpatrick's model, consisting of four levels, is a widely used framework for evaluating training effectiveness in organizations (Praslova, 2010). Aimed at increasing the program quality (Topno, 2012), *Level 1: Reaction* gathers trainee feedback on various aspects, e.g., contents, materials, methodology, and trainer quality, through a post-training questionnaire (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). *Level 2: Learning* measures changes in trainees' knowledge, skills, or attitudes (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006) through tests on instructional content or self-reports on whether trainees' expectations were met (Ruiz & Snoeck, 2018). *Level 3: Behavior* examines any post-training behavioral changes through conducting surveys or interviews with the trainees, their supervisors and subordinates (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). *Level 4: Results* assesses broader organizational outcomes, e.g., efficiency and quality improvements (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). In educational contexts, outcomes may include alumni employment, graduate school admission, etc. (Praslova, 2010).

Although this model has been criticized due to its assumption of causal linkages, the incremental importance of 4-level information (Alliger & Janak, 1989; Bates, 2004), and a lack of consideration towards individual or contextual influences in training evaluation (Bates, 2004), it is “the most popular and widely known approach to the evaluation of training” (Passmore & Velez, 2012, p. 316). This is mainly because it provides a straightforward system for assessing training outcomes (Bates, 2004) and enhances training assessment thinking and practice (Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021).

It should be noted that this study evaluated the effectiveness of the training program, not of Kirkpatrick’s model. The evaluation focused on the first two levels, reaction and learning, as they are immediate and accessible metrics post-program and evaluating such levels is important in case no behavioral change occurs (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Studies examining teacher training programs often adopt Kirkpatrick’s four-level evaluation model. Mahmoodi et al. (2019) assessed a secondary school teacher training program in Iran, examining participants’ satisfaction, learning outcomes, behavioral changes, and long-term impact on teaching practices. Findings indicated generally positive reactions and learning outcomes. Using the same model, Alsalamah and Callinan (2021) evaluated 12 training programs for 250 female head teachers in Saudi Arabia, finding that participants demonstrated improved leadership skills and positive reactions to the programs. The study also emphasized aligning training with educational needs. Additionally, Asghar et al. (2022) assessed vocational teacher training in Pakistan, where participants showed satisfaction with the trainer, materials, and the blended learning approach. They also reported gains in knowledge, skills, and work-related attitudes. Therefore, it can be seen that Kirkpatrick’s model seems to work well for evaluating teacher training programs.

While the aforementioned studies have shown evidence of the utilization of Kirkpatrick’s model to assess teacher training programs in various countries, none illustrates an evaluation of teacher training in English language teaching in Thailand, using such a model. As a result, this area remains unexplored.

Research Questions

This research evaluated the online training program’s effectiveness based on the following research questions:

1. What are the trainees’ reactions to the online teacher training program?
2. What changes in trainees’ learning have resulted from attending the training program?

Notably, the online training program in this study was a formal professional development course that provided certificates of achievement and participation. Training effectiveness was determined based on trainees' successful application of the content in teaching methods, materials development, and English language teaching trends in their contexts. Trainees' reactions reflect their perceptions of the program, while their learning encompasses changes in knowledge, attitudes, and skills post-training.

Methodology

Research Design

This research employed a mixed-methods design in which quantitative and qualitative inquiry can support and inform each other (Dörnyei, 2007). An online questionnaire was utilized to obtain quantitative and qualitative data. Semi-structured focus groups were then conducted to triangulate the questionnaire data. These two research instruments are discussed in detail in the research instruments section.

Research Context: The Teacher Training Program

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) emphasized key factors for effective training programs, including determining needs, objectives, subject content, and the best schedule; selecting participants, appropriate instructors and facilities; preparing audiovisual aids; and coordinating and evaluating the program. They also suggested addressing participants' needs as it was vital for program success. Following Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick's (2006) suggestion, the training program in this study was developed based on the findings from Poonpon's (2021) needs analysis, which identified in-service secondary school teachers' needs. The program aimed to enhance secondary school teachers' knowledge and skills in ELT teaching methods, materials development, and new ELT trends. These areas determined subject content and formed three training modules (see Table 1), addressing the identified needs in language knowledge and skills and pedagogical development in Poonpon's (2021) study (see Appendix A).

This study examined a free 48-hour online teacher training program for 43 secondary school English teachers across Thailand, organized by a public university's language institute and funded by the U.S. Embassy's Regional English Language Office (RELO). Conducted via Zoom in March–April 2022, the training involved three experienced English language specialists from the U.S. State Department (Trainers 1–3) and two Thai

trainers from the language institute (Trainers 4–5) who were knowledgeable about the subject content. The five trainers lived in three different time zones; thus, the training time varied. Furthermore, the trainers utilized learning activities such as group discussions, projects, and presentations to encourage engagement, collaboration among trainees, and reflection on their own practice and application of the new knowledge. The program design and implementation demonstrate the integration of some core OTPD features such as relevancy, usefulness, interaction and collaboration, and reflection, as identified by Powell and Bodur (2019).

Table 1

Training Modules

Module	Date and Time	Trainer
Module 1: ELT Teaching Methods	March 28–April 7 (24 hours)	Trainer 1 Trainer 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching speaking • Teaching listening • Teaching writing • Teaching reading • Teaching vocabulary • Teaching cross-cultural communication 	9:00–12:00 hrs.	
Module 2: Materials Development	April 18–25 (18 hours)	Trainer 3
	13:00–16:00 hrs.	
Module 3: New Trends in ELT	April 27 (6 hours)	Trainer 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards-based learning approach • Game-based learning approach 	9:00–16:00 hrs.	Trainer 5

Participants and Sampling Method

Prior to conducting the study, the institutional review board at the researcher's university approved this study. The study involved voluntary participation through purposive sampling for both questionnaires and focus groups. Selection criteria were established to include participants who attended all three modules, completed at least 39 hours of training (80% attendance), and were willing to participate.

Thirty-eight participants completed the questionnaire, with backgrounds in teaching at junior high ($n = 7$), senior high ($n = 16$), or both levels ($n = 15$). Their English teaching experience varied, with 36.84% ($n = 14$) having 6–10 years, 28.95% ($n = 11$) having 11–15 years, and 13.16% ($n = 5$) having 2–5 years of teaching experience.

Additionally, three focus group interviews were conducted with 17 questionnaire respondents who volunteered to provide further information, were willing to sign the informed consent form, and taught at one of these levels—junior high school, senior high school, or both junior high and high school. Seventeen participants were divided into three groups—junior high (JH, $n = 3$), senior high (SH, $n = 7$), and both junior and senior high (JHASH, $n = 7$).

Research Instruments

To measure the effectiveness of the training program, an online questionnaire and focus group interviews were used to collect data after the training program was finished. Kirkpatrick's model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006), specifically Levels 1: Reaction and 2: Learning, was used as a framework for developing the research instruments because it offers a structured approach to assessing training. See research instruments in Appendix B.

Online Questionnaire: Teacher Training Program Evaluation

The questionnaire comprised 18 items (Likert scale, short-answer, and multiple-choice questions) across five sections to evaluate various aspects of the training program and trainees' learning. Sections 1–3 assessed training effectiveness based on Level 1 of Kirkpatrick's model: Reaction, focusing on overall trainees' impressions of the training program, content, trainers, materials, schedule, and facilities. Section 4 evaluated Level 2: Learning, examining the program's impact on trainees' knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Section 5 was optional, allowing respondents to share contact details for potential participation in focus group interviews.

A few items were adopted or adapted from Alsalamah and Callinan (2021; Sections 2–4), Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006; Section 2A), and the international teacher's teaching evaluation used at the researcher's university (Section 2B: Trainers) as they suited the present study's context (see Appendix B), while most items were developed by the researcher. Translated into Thai to ensure comprehensibility and overcome language barriers, the questionnaire was distributed via Google Forms to collect trainees' reactions to the training program and their learning changes. The questionnaire was distributed online in late May 2022 to all trainees who met the selection criteria previously mentioned. The questionnaire demonstrated high reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.963.

Semi-structured Focus Group Interviews

Three 90-minute Zoom focus group interviews in Thai were conducted to encourage participants to discuss and react to points about their reflections, feedback, and experiences from the training program. This group interaction enables an insightful discussion, helping the researcher obtain high-quality data (Dörnyei, 2007).

The focus groups were conducted in mid-June 2022 and recorded for subsequent transcription and translation. There were 20 interview questions divided into four sections following the questionnaire. Five questions came from the questionnaire (i.e., Section 1 questions 1–3 and Section 4 question 4). Most questions were created as open-ended questions to enable the researcher to obtain detail-rich responses. To ensure anonymity, gender-reflective pseudonyms were assigned to all focus group participants and used when reporting their responses in this paper.

Table 2 summarizes the Kirkpatrick model adoption and the instruments used to evaluate the training program in this study. Sections 1–3 of the questionnaire and focus group questions focused on evaluating Level 1, while Section 4 in both instruments assessed Level 2.

Table 2

Adoption of Kirkpatrick's Model of Training Program Evaluation

RQs	Kirkpatrick's model levels	Sections in the questionnaire and focus group questions
1. What are the trainees' reactions to the online teacher training program?	Level 1: Reaction (i.e., reaction to content, trainers, materials, schedule, and facilities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1: Overall impressions of the training program • Section 2: Three modules • Section 3: Management aspects of the training program
2. What changes in trainees' learning have resulted from attending the training program?	Level 2: Learning (i.e., knowledge, attitudes, and skills)	Section 4: Impact of the training program on trainees' learning

To ensure reliability and validity of the instruments, the questionnaire and focus group interview questions were validated by three experts in the fields of training program evaluation and learning assessment, using the Item Objective Congruence (IOC).

Data Analysis

All quantitative responses were analyzed with descriptive statistics calculated using SPSS Statistics 26. Qualitative data, including short answers and interview transcriptions, underwent content analysis in which the researcher made inferences about data by objectively identifying categories within the data (Gray, 2014). The researcher created main categories to structure the coding frame (Flick, 2014) before analyzing the data by following the topics (e.g., content, trainers, materials, facilities, knowledge, attitudes, skills) in the interview question sections. In the analysis process, the researcher analyzed the data by identifying the key features in the data. Similar responses were then grouped and counted to identify the frequency of each category.

To enhance the validity of the focus group content analysis, member checking was employed. Participants were requested to review the translated interview excerpts for accuracy and to see if they would like to add any comments (Creswell, 2013; Gray, 2014).

Results

Results are reported in two parts. Part 1: Trainees' Reactions to the Training Program (the Kirkpatrick's model Level 1: Reaction) answers RQ1 and Part 2: Trainees' Learning (Level 2: Learning) answers RQ2.

Part 1: Trainees' Reactions to the Training Program

This section includes three dimensions at the reaction level: trainers, training delivery, and facilities, following Alsalamah and Callinan's (2021) study. Training delivery involves the content, materials, duration, scheduling, and mode. Facilities include electronic devices, the Internet connection, and technical problems.

Results indicated a high level of participants' satisfaction in aspects evaluated at the reaction level. The training program received an overall rating mean of 4.87 ($SD = 0.34$) on a 5-point scale, indicating positive participant experiences. Qualitative feedback confirmed its effectiveness, with 78.95% ($n = 30$) stating they could apply the training content to their teaching, highlighting its relevance and transferability to their teaching contexts.

Trainers

Overall, Table 3 indicates that all five trainers received high average mean scores, indicating that they excelled in all aspects being evaluated. Trainer 2 achieved the highest average mean score of 4.95 ($SD = 0.15$), while Trainer 4 had the lowest at 4.44 ($SD = 0.71$), which was still high.

Table 3

Trainers

Item	Module 1				Module 2		Module 3			
	Trainer 1		Trainer 2		Trainer 3		Trainer 4		Trainer 5	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Knowledge about the subject	4.92	0.27	4.97	0.16	4.63	0.59	4.32	0.84	4.58	0.60
2. Ability to communicate the information	4.87	0.34	4.97	0.16	4.61	0.55	4.42	0.83	4.68	0.57
3. Preparation	4.87	0.41	4.95	0.23	4.71	0.57	4.58	0.76	4.76	0.49
4. Pace of teaching	4.82	0.39	4.89	0.31	4.61	0.68	4.37	0.88	4.50	0.76
5. Clarity of voice (clearness and accent being easy to understand)	4.89	0.39	4.97	0.16	4.79	0.47	4.63	0.67	4.84	0.37
6. Use of training materials	4.71	0.52	4.84	0.44	4.58	0.64	4.42	0.86	4.79	0.41
7. Variety of exercises and activities	4.89	0.31	4.95	0.23	4.61	0.64	4.16	0.86	4.39	0.68
8. Teaching valuable and relevant points	4.92	0.27	4.95	0.23	4.76	0.49	4.45	0.83	4.66	0.53
9. Encouraging trainees' participation and interaction	4.95	0.23	4.97	0.16	4.87	0.41	4.58	0.68	4.68	0.53
10. Checking trainees' understanding	4.92	0.27	4.97	0.16	4.84	0.37	4.47	0.83	4.58	0.68
11. General classroom atmosphere	4.95	0.23	4.97	0.16	4.82	0.46	4.47	0.86	4.63	0.59
Average	4.88	0.24	4.95	0.15	4.71	0.40	4.44	0.71	4.68	0.46

Focus groups provided positive feedback on the five trainers, with participants generally being satisfied with their teaching quality. This section highlights Trainers 2 and 4's performance who received the highest and lowest average mean scores respectively.

Participants in all three focus groups unanimously praised Trainer 2 for her clear explanations, making the content easily understandable.

Anyu (SH): She knows the content very well, so she is able to explain things clearly and make us understand. Also, she is highly organized.

This reflects Trainer 2's strong subject knowledge and effective communication, contributing to her high mean scores.

Wiwat (JHASH) added that Trainer 2's engaging teaching style motivated participants:

She's an ideal teacher who makes the content interesting which in turn motivates us to want to learn more.

However, suggestions for improvement were provided. Nithi (JHASH) recommended she laugh more to create a relaxed atmosphere, while Pipat (SH) suggested speaking more slowly, indicating a need for adaptability of her teaching pace.

Most participants agreed that Trainer 4 explained the content clearly. Wipha (JH) noted her good clarity of voice, reflected in her mean score of 4.63 ($SD = 0.67$). However, JH and JHASH participants suggested that she make the content more relevant to their contexts as they could not connect teaching and assessing pharmacy students, on which Trainer 4 mainly focused in her training session, to their contexts. Additionally, most SH participants recommended clearer instructions and time limits for breakout room activities.

Training Delivery

Content

Table 4 indicates that Module 1 had the highest average mean score ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 0.09$), reflecting high participant satisfaction. Notably, 100% agreed that its content on ELT teaching methods was relevant to their teaching contexts ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.00$). However, Module 3: New Trends in ELT received the lowest scores in four areas, averaging 4.49 $SD = 0.53$.

Table 4*Training Content*

Items	Module 1: ELT Teaching Methods		Module 2: Materials Development		Module 3: New Trends in ELT	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The module met the trainees' needs.	4.97	0.16	4.66	0.63	4.45	0.72
2. The module contained ideas that the trainees could apply to their work.	4.97	0.16	4.79	0.53	4.61	0.55
3. The content covered was relevant to the trainees' teaching context.	5.00	0.00	4.79	0.53	4.61	0.68
4. The content was well organized.	4.92	0.27	4.45	0.72	4.45	0.65
5. The content was easy to understand.	4.97	0.16	4.58	0.68	4.37	0.71
Average	4.97	0.09	4.65	0.52	4.49	0.53

Focus group results indicated that participants were generally satisfied with all three modules. They noted the content was “up to date and relevant” (Thanat, SH), “appropriate and can be applied with our students” (Lada, JH), and “interesting and can be applied to my teaching context” (Danai, JHASH), underscoring the training’s relevance and high mean scores for Item 3 as shown in Table 4.

The following excerpt suggests that studying the same content across teaching grades was not problematic and highlights a benefit of breakout room discussions in enriching participants’ understanding:

Sasa (SH): Although we teach different grades, studying the same content wasn’t a problem and we are still able to apply it to our contexts. Discussing and sharing ideas in breakout rooms helped us exchange perspectives and enriched our understanding, allowing each of us to adapt ideas to our own teaching contexts.

While feedback on the three training modules was generally positive, some limitations were identified, particularly with Module 3, which had the lowest mean scores, especially regarding the clarity of content. Focus group discussions highlighted two main issues. First, participants found Module 3’s

content on new trends in ELT significantly different from the first two modules, making it challenging to connect with their teaching contexts:

Pailin (JHASH): Module 3 is totally different from the other two modules which made it difficult for me to connect with the other two modules and my teaching context.

Second, the six-hour duration was deemed insufficient to cover two topics comprehensively.

Kanok (SH): I expected to learn more from the game-based learning approach session but its short duration made me unable to see how to apply the applications to my context.

Materials

Table 5 presents positive feedback on the training materials, with Module 1 receiving the highest scores for sufficiency, facilitating content understanding, and application to teaching contexts (average $M = 4.87$, $SD = 0.31$). However, Module 3 materials seemed to facilitate trainees' understanding of the content the least as they received the lowest mean score ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.81$).

Table 5

Training Materials

Items	Module 1: ELT Teaching Methods		Module 2: Materials Development		Module 3: New Trends in ELT	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. The materials were sufficient.	4.89	0.31	4.66	0.71	4.55	0.76
2. The materials helped the trainees understand the content better.	4.82	0.39	4.53	0.69	4.34	0.81
3. The materials can be applied to their teaching context.	4.89	0.31	4.63	0.67	4.47	0.65
Average	4.87	0.31	4.61	0.64	4.46	0.66

Focus group results aligned with the questionnaire findings. All JH participants deemed the materials appropriate, while all SH participants found them sufficient. Four JHASH participants appreciated the variety and applicability of the materials. Additionally, Pinya (JH) and Wiwat (JHASH)

noted that using Google Classroom for accessing training materials was practical and user-friendly.

Duration

Table 6 shows that the participants thought that the durations of the training session, program, and Modules 1–2 were generally appropriate. However, Module 3's training duration received the lowest mean score ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.12$), suggesting the least appropriate duration.

Table 6

Training Duration

	Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.	The three-hour training session per day was appropriate.	4.50	0.80
2.	The length of the training program (48 hours) was appropriate and adequate.	4.55	0.60
3.	The duration of 24 hours was appropriate for Module 1.	4.66	0.48
4.	The duration of 18 hours was appropriate for Module 2.	4.47	0.60
5.	The duration of 6 hours was appropriate for Module 3.	3.79	1.12
	Average	4.39	0.47

Some participants in the focus groups voiced the opinion that the 6-hour duration of Module 3 was too short and suggested more time be given.

Pailin (JHASH): More time should be given to Module 3 to allow us to practice using tools taught in the game-based approach learning session.

Scheduling

Participants expressed clear preferences regarding training scheduling. A significant majority, 81.58% ($n = 31$), preferred morning sessions, while 18.42% ($n = 7$) favored afternoons. Preferences for training days were evenly split between every other day (Monday, Wednesday, Friday) and weekends (Saturday and Sunday), each receiving 34.21% ($n = 13$), with 31.58% ($n = 12$) opting for weekdays (Monday to Friday). For timing during school breaks, 89.47% ($n = 34$) preferred the summer break in late March to April, while 10.53% ($n = 4$) chose the October break. Overall, the training program aligned well with participant preferences, as 88.24% of the participants ($n = 15$) across three focus groups felt that a three-hour daily session during summer break was appropriate for effective learning.

Modes

Questionnaire data revealed that 52.63% of the participants ($n = 20$) preferred online training for its convenience, saving time and costs. Meanwhile, 28.95% ($n = 11$) favored on-site training for better concentration and enjoyment from face-to-face interactions. Additionally, 13.15% ($n = 5$) were neutral, recognizing the benefits and drawbacks of both modes, while two responses were excluded for irrelevance.

Facilities

Electronic Devices

During the training, laptops were the main device used by 44.74% ($n = 17$) of the participants, while 34.21% ($n = 13$) used personal computers, 18.42% ($n = 7$) used tablets, and only 2.63% ($n = 1$) used mobile phones.

The Internet Connection

The Internet connection was reported as either *somewhat stable* by 57.89% of the participants ($n = 22$) or *usually stable* by 42.10% ($n = 16$), while no participants reported it as *rarely stable*.

Technical Problems

Data from the questionnaire revealed that 50.00% of the participants ($n = 19$) did not experience any technical problems. However, 26.32% ($n = 10$) reported a problem with the Internet connection, and 18.42% ($n = 7$) reported unfamiliarity with using Zoom and Google Classroom. Only 2.63% ($n = 1$) reported a non-technical problem which was having to attend the school's event on the training day.

Part 2: Trainees' Learning

Findings in this section revealed changes in the learning level, including trainees' knowledge, attitudes, and teaching and language skills developed from the training, which were all positive.

Knowledge Development

Table 7 illustrates that the participants felt the training effectively enhanced their knowledge in teaching methods, materials, ELT trends, and

new concepts, with teaching methods rated highest ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 0.31$) and an overall mean of 4.85 ($SD = 0.33$).

Table 7

Knowledge Development

	Item	M	SD
1.	The training helped develop your knowledge of ELT teaching methods.	4.89	0.31
2.	The training helped develop the trainee's knowledge of materials development.	4.87	0.34
3.	The training helped develop the trainee's knowledge of new trends in ELT.	4.84	0.44
4.	Through the training program, the trainee learned about new concepts, practices, and activities that they had not known before.	4.79	0.53
Average		4.85	0.33

Seven participants from three focus groups, namely Lada (JH), Pipat (SH), Danai, Raya, Palin, Lisa, and Suda (JHASH), reported gaining knowledge of teaching techniques.

Lada (JH): The training provided new teaching techniques that I can apply, and learning from American trainers highlighted how methods vary by context and student background. This training program broadened my horizons.

Wipa (JH) and Wiwat (JHASH) learned teaching management techniques.

Wiwat (JHASH): Teaching management techniques are useful for learners and make them interested in the English subject.

Nithi (JHASH) gained theoretical knowledge.

Module 1 trainers provided some theoretical backgrounds for some learning activities they gave as examples and showed us how such backgrounds would affect the learners.

Changes in Attitudes

Table 8 indicates that the program positively impacted participants' attitudes, encouraging knowledge exchange, boosting motivation to learn, shifting perspectives, and enhancing work performance, with an average mean score of 4.85 ($SD = 0.30$). The highest-rated benefit was the

opportunity to share knowledge and experiences with peers ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 0.27$), followed by increased motivation to learn ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 0.31$). Although work performance improvement received the lowest score ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 0.49$), it remained high, suggesting participants successfully applied new insights to their professional roles. Overall, the training fostered both personal and professional growth.

Table 8

Attitudes

	Item	M	SD
1.	The training program provided an opportunity for the trainee to exchange information, knowledge, and experiences with other trainees.	4.92	0.27
2.	The training program motivated and made the trainee interested in learning more.	4.89	0.31
3.	The training program has positively changed the trainee's attitude toward an online teacher training program.	4.82	0.46
4.	The training program has helped the trainee do their job better.	4.76	0.49
Average		4.85	0.30

Focus group discussions revealed participants' positive attitudes as they felt motivated to learn more and attend online training programs. Eight participants expressed increased interest in furthering their learning. For example, Pinya (JH) noted:

The program inspired me to reflect on and improve my teaching. Also, I've been doing more research on ELT to better support my students.

Similarly, Pipat (SH) felt encouraged to adapt new activities, saying:

This program made me want to learn more. I was encouraged to adapt new activities to my teaching.

Wiwat (JHASH) highlighted the value of continuous improvement, sharing:

The program changed my attitude, making me realize how important it is to keep improving myself. As teachers, we should always be seeking out training and learning opportunities to grow.

These insights underscored the positive motivational impact of the program.

Ten participants across three focus groups expressed increased motivation to join future online training programs like this one. Lada (JH) valued the opportunity to “connect with other teachers, share experiences, and pick up new ideas for teaching.” Danai (JHASH) highlighted the need to continually reskill and upskill, stating “skills can always change as time passes, so we would need to reskill and upskill them again.” Pipat (SH) expressed interest in joining future programs “if the topics match my interest, so I can build on my knowledge,” adding that connections with classmates often lead to “speaking opportunities where we can share our knowledge.” These reflections illuminated participants’ enthusiasm for ongoing professional growth.

Development of Teaching and Language Skills

The questionnaire’s responses indicated that 78.95% ($n = 30$) of the participants across the three groups felt the training enhanced their teaching skills. They also reported gaining valuable insights into materials development.

Equal proportions of the participants (10.53%, $n = 4$) from the SH and JHASH groups reported improvements in their language skills, particularly in speaking and listening, alongside enhancements in their teaching skills, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Trainees’ Skills Development

Level	Teaching skills % (n)	Language skills % (n)	Both teaching and language skills % (n)
JH (7 participants)	18.42% (7)	0.00% (0)	0.00% (0)
SH (16 participants)	31.58% (12)	5.26% (2)	5.26% (2)
JHASH (15 participants)	28.95% (11)	5.26% (2)	5.26% (2)
Total	78.95% (30)	10.53% (4)	10.53% (4)

Focus group findings highlighted various teaching skills participants developed through training. Lada (JH) noted an improvement in her writing instruction, applying learned techniques that increased her students’ interest in writing activities, demonstrating the training’s positive impact on her teaching context.

Pipat, Thanat, Anya, and Kanok (SH) noted they learned new teaching techniques from both trainers and classmates. Sasa and Napat (SH) improved their organizational skills.

Sasa: Before the training, I'd just say things without much structure. Now, I've become more mindful of my students' context and organize my thoughts better when teaching.

Napat: My organization skills, especially with lesson planning, have really improved... now I focus more on prepping with my students' needs in mind.

Their experiences highlight the training's effectiveness in developing teaching skills, as Lisa (JHASH) expressed:

After the training, I feel my teaching has really improved. I can make lessons more interesting and my students are more engaged and happier.

Wiwat (JHASH) recognized the importance of teaching cross-cultural communication:

I used to stick to the textbook without focusing on cultural differences but now I realize that cross-cultural communication is also important to teach.

Focus group data also revealed that participants' writing, listening, and speaking skills were enhanced:

Wipa (JH): Attending this training really improved my listening and speaking skills...now I speak English more with my students.

Pipat (SH): My speaking skill has been improved because we used English throughout the training.

Suda (JHASH): Fortunately, this training was in English. It gave me the chance to listen to trainers and classmates, which I really enjoyed.

Discussion and Implications

This study systematically evaluated an online training program's effectiveness by using Kirkpatrick's model to assess trainees' reactions and improvements in knowledge, attitudes, and skills. By assessing immediate

reactions and changes in knowledge, skills, and attitudes, training program developers can systematically address participants' needs. This structured framework facilitates evidence-based program refinement, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness of future training initiatives.

This study's findings add evidence to support designing the program based on a needs analysis as it leads to high satisfaction, with positive feedback across nearly all aspects being evaluated, and improvements in participants' knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Responsiveness to trainees' needs and their teaching contexts is mandatory to make training programs effective; thus, conducting a program based on teachers' needs is recommended (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). This research also noted that the training program implementation achieved results at the learning level of Kirkpatrick's model, as it was able to increase secondary school teachers' knowledge and skills in ELT teaching methods, materials development, and new ELT trends. Furthermore, integrating core tenets of online training professional development design and implementation identified by Powell and Bodur (2019) may have contributed to the program's effectiveness. Notably, the participants found the program useful and relevant to their needs. While completing learning activities, they were able to interact, collaborate, and reflect on applying new knowledge to their teaching contexts with each other. As online training transcends geographical boundaries, in-service secondary school teachers across Thailand were able to access and be engaged in a professional development program offered by a prestigious institution.

At the reaction level of Kirkpatrick's, participants were highly satisfied with the program, particularly regarding trainers, content, materials, and duration. Apparently, trainers' subject knowledge and communication skills were the two key elements that significantly enhanced trainees' comprehension, predominantly contributing to high trainer ratings. Such results evidently underscore the importance of involving knowledgeable and experienced trainers who are familiar with EFL contexts as their expertise could enhance participants' comprehension. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) indicated that a program's success relies heavily on selecting trainers who are knowledgeable about the subject taught, able to communicate, and skilled at encouraging participation. Research also shows that trainer satisfaction is linked to effective training outcomes (Sitzmann et al., 2008) and positively influences trainee reactions (Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021), highlighting the crucial role of trainer quality and efficiency in program success (Boyd et al., 2017). These statements support this study's findings and

highlight the importance of skilled trainers in delivering successful training. Notably, trainee satisfaction significantly depends on trainers' ability to convey content clearly and engage trainees effectively. Thus, investing in the recruitment and development of trainers with strong pedagogical and communication skills is vital for program success.

In addition, the relevance and applicability of the training content to teachers' teaching contexts largely contribute to the training program's effectiveness, aligning with previous studies (Mahmoodi et al., 2019; Sakulprasertsri et al., 2021). Training content is crucial in determining the program's effectiveness as it directly influences trainees' ability to acquire relevant knowledge and skills. Reeves and Pedulla (2011) indicated that online professional development with practical and readily usable content contributes to higher participant satisfaction. High satisfaction with the content underscores the value of needs analyses in designing context-specific training that meets teachers' needs, and the effectiveness of tailored content. Thus, program designers should employ findings from needs analyses to design context-specific training that fosters engagement and offers practical applications to support long-term learning outcomes.

This study also indicated that training materials must be sufficient in order to aid trainees' comprehension of the training content. Also, materials prove to be particularly useful when they are readily applicable to their teaching contexts. Based on such findings, providing sufficient materials that are applicable to the trainees' contexts should also be a main focus for the trainers. In online training, the practicality and accessibility of materials provided also play a crucial role in contributing to the program's effectiveness. Google Classroom may be highly practical as both trainees and trainers can easily access and use it during the online training program free of charge. The findings suggest that the training program designer should use a platform that both trainees and trainers are familiar with for uploading and accessing the training materials.

Additionally, although this study found that the session duration for most modules was generally appropriate, the 6-hour duration proved to be less effective for covering two topics. Results indicated that insufficient time and content might have limited participants' ability to fully grasp the material in the module. Although not pinpointing a precise session duration, Fernandes et al. (2023) suggested that sessions in training programs be long enough to provide time for trainees to explore and practice applying activities in their teaching. Thus, when developing a training program, the program designer should take content complexity and the amount of time for practice

activities into consideration to help them decide on the appropriate duration for each module.

A preference for 3-hour morning sessions, either on every other day or weekends during the late March–April summer break was also found. Teachers' preference for attending a program during the summer break could be because it is the period when teachers are not overwhelmed by their teaching and administrative workload. Additionally, Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) suggested that the training schedule must meet the participants' needs instead of the trainers' convenience. This study, however, argues that trainers' convenience should also be considered when conducting synchronous virtual training to accommodate trainers living in different time zones from the host country. Furthermore, no participants reported experiencing Zoom fatigue, i.e., feeling exhausted due to engagement in video meetings (Bennett et al., 2021) or eyestrain, which might be because the majority of the sessions did not last longer than three hours per day and each session incorporated a 15-minute break. During the online class time, including breaks for learners to drink water and step outside for a while is recommended to overcome sluggishness (McWhirter, 2020). Based on the findings, it is recommended that future online programs for secondary school teachers in Thailand be conducted in the summer break, scheduled at the time that suits both trainees and trainers. Also, a session should not last longer than three hours and should include built-in breaks to maintain engagement and prevent Zoom fatigue and eyestrain.

Findings also revealed that participants preferred online training due to its convenience and cost-effectiveness, likely because they lived in different provinces and traveling to the training venue in Bangkok would cost them time and money. This supports Sakulprasertsri et al.'s (2021) finding that participants valued webinars for saving travel time and expenses.

Although no participants reported device issues, some faced connectivity problems, while a few noted unfamiliarity with Zoom and Google Classroom despite having taught online during the pandemic. Such unfamiliarity could result from not having the experience with using them in their online teaching. These insights suggest that online training is favorable. Additionally, addressing connectivity issues and supporting platform familiarity will improve access to online training, ensuring more educators can participate effectively.

At the learning level of Kirkpatrick's model, participants gained knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes from the training, attributing these improvements to effective instruction, relevant content, and adequate

materials. Such results demonstrate that components in Level 1 of Kirkpatrick's model: Reaction, could affect Level 2: Learning. Participants reported better understanding of teaching methods, materials development, and ELT trends, along with increased motivation for continued learning and application. Such findings evidently indicate that learning has taken place as the participants' knowledge was increased; skills were improved; and attitudes were changed (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). Reeves and Pedulla (2013) emphasize that more teacher learning occurs when online professional development content is readily transferable to participants' contexts. These positive outcomes align with findings from other studies using Kirkpatrick's model, particularly in knowledge enhancement (e.g., Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021; Asghar et al., 2022; Mahmoodi et al., 2019). Essentially, it is crucial that effective instruction as well as relevant and transferable content and materials be integrated into the program if trainees' enhancement of knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes is to be expected.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This study has three primary limitations. First, the study only evaluated the program based on the first two levels of Kirkpatrick's model (reaction and learning), omitting behavior (Level 3) and organizational outcomes (Level 4), which require extended evaluation periods. Future studies should address these additional levels for a more comprehensive analysis of the training's impact. Second, data collection relied on subjective methods, including an online questionnaire and focus groups, potentially introducing bias. While these instruments are valid means of evaluation, future research could incorporate objective measures like knowledge assessments to strengthen the validity of the findings. Lastly, the study did not examine the specific challenges teachers faced in online training. Although not a focus of this study, exploring these obstacles in future research could inform improvements in online professional development, fostering more effective and sustained growth for educators.

Conclusion

This study evaluated an online training program's effectiveness for secondary school teachers by utilizing Kirkpatrick's model to systematically examine their reactions and learning changes. The findings highlighted the importance of incorporating the results from needs analyses in designing professional development programs to increase the program's effectiveness

in enhancing teachers' knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes, as confirmed by the findings of this study.

The findings at the reaction level further indicated that an effective online training program involves *trainers* who are knowledgeable about their subject content and good communicators; *content* that matches the trainees' needs and is relevant to their contexts; sufficient *materials*; a *duration* of three hours per session to prevent Zoom fatigue and maintain participants' engagement; and *electronic devices* connected to the internet with a *stable connection*. At the learning level, *effective instruction*, *relevant content*, and *adequate materials* contribute to an increase in knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes.

Thanks to the COVID-19 pandemic, we have realized that online training holds a bright future as a feasible option that makes professional development possible during unexpected circumstances such as a pandemic. This training mode can also help training program providers reach an even wider group of target trainees provided that they have access to the internet.

Insights from participants' feedback offer valuable information for consideration when developing online professional development programs to make them align more closely with the specific needs of in-service secondary school English teachers in Thailand.

Acknowledgements

This research, funded by Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (grant number 043), acknowledges the contributions of the research assistant, the three experts, and the research participants. The author thanks Assoc. Prof. Dr. Punchalee Wasanasomsithi for her advice and feedback, and Luke Petterson for his feedback and manuscript editing. The author also expresses her gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments which helped enhance the quality of the paper.

About the Author

Mintra Puripunyanich, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor at Chulalongkorn University Language Institute (CULI). She co-founded and is Immediate Past Chair of the Thailand Extensive Reading Association (TERA), and a committee member of Thailand TESOL. Her research interests are extensive reading, L2 reading, and materials development.

References

- Alliger, G., & Janak, E. Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 331–342.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb00661.x>
- Alsalamah, A., & Callinan, C. (2021). Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four-level model of training criteria to evaluate training programmes for head teachers. *Education Science*, 11(3), 116.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030116>
- Angrist, J. D., & Lavy, V. (2001). Does teacher training affect pupil learning? Evidence from matched comparisons in Jerusalem public schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(2), 343–370.
<https://doi.org/10.3386/w6781>
- Asghar, M. Z., Afzaal, M. N., Iqbal, J., Waqar, Y., & Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, P. (2022). Evaluation of in-service vocational teacher training program: A blend of face-to-face, online and offline learning approaches. *Sustainability*, 14, 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su142113906>
- Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: the Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 27, 341–347.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.04.011>
- Bennett, A. A., Campion, E. D., Keeler, K. R., & Keener, S. K. (2021). Videoconference fatigue? Exploring changes in fatigue after videoconference meetings during COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(3), 330–344. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000906>
- Boyd, M. R., Lewis, C. C., Scott, K., Krendl, A. & Lyon. A. R. (2017). The creation and validation of the Measure of Effective Attributes of Trainers (MEAT). *Implementation Science*, 12, 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0603-y>
- British Council. (n.d.). *The story of Boot Camp*.
https://www.britishcouncil.or.th/sites/default/files/the_story_of_bootcamp.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Researching methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Farris, S. (2015). Think “e” for engagement: Use technology tools to design personalized professional e-learning. *Journal of Staff Development*, 36(5), 54–58.

- Fernandes, S., Araújo, A.M., Miguel, I., Abelha, M. (2023). Teacher professional development in higher education: The impact of pedagogical training perceived by teachers. *Education Sciences*, 13(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13030309>
- Flick, U. (2014). *An introduction to qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Gaertner, H., & Brunner, M. (2018). Once good teaching, always good teaching? The differential ability of student perceptions of teaching quality. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 30(2), 159–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-018-9277-5>
- Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Hamblin, A.C. (1974). *Evaluation and control of training*. McGraw-Hill.
- Heydari, M. R., Taghva, F., Amini, M., & Delavari, S. (2019). Using Kirkpatrick’s model to measure the effect of a new teaching and learning methods workshop for health care staff. *BMC Research Notes*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-019-4421-y>
- Homklin, T. (2014). *Training effectiveness of skill certification system: The case of automotive industry in Thailand* [Doctoral dissertation, Hiroshima University]. Hiroshima University Repository. <https://ir.lib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/00035962>
- Huang, H. (2002). Toward constructivism for adult learners in online learning communities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(1), 27–37.
- Kirkpatrick, D. & Kirkpatrick, J. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Li, C., & Lalani, F. (2020, April 29). *The COVID-19 pandemic has changed education forever. This is how*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/coronavirus-education-global-covid19-online-digital-learning/>
- Mahmoodi, M., Raschtchi, M., & Abbasian, G-R. (2019). Evaluation of in-service teacher training program in Iran: Focus on the Kirkpatrick model. *Educational and Self Development*, 14(4), 20–38. <https://doi.org/10.26907/esd14.4.03>
- Mala, D. (2021, February 18). Bid to raise English skills of teachers: Instructors to get scored on new scale. *Bangkok Post*. <https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/2070087/bid-to-raise-english-skills-of-teachers>
- McWhirter, J. L. (2020). Are you zoomed out? Dealing with zoom fatigue in the virtual classroom. *Choral*, 61(2), 41–43. <https://acda-publications.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/CJ/September2020/McWhirterSep20.pdf>

-
- OECD/UNESCO (2016). *Education in Thailand: An OECD-UNESCO perspective*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264259119-en>
- Passmore, J., & Velez, M. (2012). SOAP-M: A training evaluation model for HR. *Industrial and Commercial Training Journal*, 44(6), 315–325.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851211254743>
- Poonpon, K. (2021). Professional development needs of in-service English language teachers in Thailand. *THAITESOL JOURNAL*, 34(2), 1–25. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/thaitesoljournal/article/view/253961>
- Powell C. G., & Bodur, Y. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of an online professional development experience: Implications for a design and implementation framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 19–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.09.004>
- Praslova, L. (2010). Adaptation of Kirkpatrick's four level model of training criteria to assessment of learning outcomes and program evaluation in Higher Education. *Education Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 22, 215–225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-010-9098-7>
- Reeves, T. D., & Pedulla, J. J. (2011). Predictors of teacher satisfaction with online professional development: Evidence from the USA's e-learning for educators initiative. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(4), 591–611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2011.553824>
- Reeves, T. D., & Pedulla, J. J. (2013). Bolstering the impact of online professional development for teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies*, 1, 50–66.
- Ruiz, J., & Snoeck, M. (2018). Adapting Kirkpatrick's evaluation model to technology enhanced learning. *Proceedings of the 21st ACM/IEEE International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems: Companion Proceedings (MODELS' 18)*. ACM, Copenhagen, Denmark, 135–142. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3270112.3270114>
- Sakulprasertsri, K., Tangkiengsirisin, S., Phoocharoensil, S., Kanokpermpoon, M., & Koowuttayakorn, S. (2021). Online English teacher training during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Thai contexts. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education*, 36(2), 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.21315/apjee2021.36.2.15>
- Sitzmann, T., Brown, K. G., Casper, W. J., Ely, K., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2008). A review and meta-analysis of the nomological network of trainee reactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 280–295.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.280>

- Topno, H. (2012). Evaluation of training and development: An analysis of various models. *Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), 16–22.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-0521622>
- Vrasidas, C., & Zembylas, M. (2004). Online professional development: Lessons from the field. *Education + Training*, 46(6/7), 326–334.
- Wang, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2023). Understanding teachers' online professional learning: A “community of inquiry” perspective on the role of Chinese middle school teachers' sense of self-efficacy, and online learning achievement. *Heliyon*, 9(6), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16932>
- Watson Todd, R., & Darasawang, P. (2020). English language teacher education in Thailand: A mix of global and local. In A. Tsui (Ed.), *English language teaching and teacher education in East Asia: Global challenges and local responses* (pp. 195-216). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108856218.011>

Appendix A

Table 10

Language Knowledge and Skills and Pedagogical Development Needs of 589 Secondary School Teachers (Poonpon, 2021, pp. 13 & 15)

Language Knowledge and Skills Needs			Pedagogical Development Needs		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Speaking skills	3.54	0.72	1. Creative material development	3.34	0.80
2. Listening skills	3.51	0.75	2. Teaching speaking	3.31	0.79
3. Pronunciation skills	3.41	0.85	3. CEFR-based learning approach	3.29	0.85
4. Writing skills	3.41	0.83	4. Game-based learning approach	3.28	0.86
5. Cross-cultural communication	3.38	0.84	5. Teaching listening	3.28	0.79
6. Reading skills	3.28	0.89	6. 21 st Century teaching management	3.26	0.83
			7. Teaching writing	3.26	0.82

Appendix B

Research Instruments

Online Questionnaire: CULI RELO Teacher Training Program Evaluation

Trainee's Profile ข้อมูลผู้เข้าอบรม

1. Gender เพศ
 - ☐ Female หญิง
 - ☐ Male ชาย
2. Age อายุ
 - ☐ below 25 years ต่ำกว่า 25 ปี
 - ☐ 25–29 years
 - ☐ 30–34 years
 - ☐ 35–39 years
 - ☐ 40–44 years
 - ☐ 45–49 years
 - ☐ 50–55 years
3. Years of teaching English จำนวนปีที่สอนภาษาอังกฤษ
 - ☐ less than 2 years ต่ำกว่า 2 ปี
 - ☐ 2–5 years
 - ☐ 6–10 years
 - ☐ 11–15 years
 - ☐ 16–20 years
 - ☐ 21–25 years
 - ☐ 26–30 years
 - ☐ 31–35 years
 - ☐ 36+ years มากกว่า 36 ปี
4. Highest qualification ระดับการศึกษาสูงสุด
 - ☐ Bachelor's degreeปริญญาตรี
 - ☐ Master's degreeปริญญาโท
 - ☐ Ph.D.ปริญญาเอก

5. Level of teaching ระดับชั้นที่สอน

- ☐ Junior high school ชั้นมัธยมศึกษาต้น
- ☐ High school ชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปลาย
- ☐ Both junior and high school levels ชั้นมัธยมศึกษาต้นและปลาย
- ☐ Others (please specify) อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

Section 1: Overall impressions of the training program**(5 questions, 1 items)****ส่วนที่ 1: ภาพรวมของโครงการอบรม****Remark: Questions 1–4 require short answers. หมายเหตุ: คำถามข้อ 1-4****ต้องการคำตอบสั้น ๆ**

1. Overall, do you think this online training program was effective? Please explain. (Remark: Effective means the fact that the trainees are able to apply their knowledge in teaching methods, materials development, and trends in English language teaching to their teaching context.) ในภาพรวมท่านคิดว่าโครงการอบรมออนไลน์นี้มีประสิทธิผลหรือไม่ โปรดอธิบาย (หมายเหตุ: ประสิทธิภาพหมายถึง การที่ผู้เข้าอบรมสามารถนำความรู้ด้านการสอน การพัฒนาวัสดุสื่อการสอน และแนวโน้มด้านการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษไปประยุกต์ใช้ได้จริงในบริบทการสอนของตนเอง)
2. What did you like the most about this training? Please explain why you liked it. ท่านชอบอะไรที่สุดเกี่ยวกับการอบรมครั้งนี้ โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมถึงชอบ
3. Could you please share one suggestion for the organizer to improve this training program? ท่านช่วยให้คำแนะนำ 1 ข้อ สำหรับผู้จัดอบรมเพื่อปรับปรุงโครงการอบรมนี้ได้ไหม
4. What topic would you like to study in the next training program? ท่านอยากเรียนหัวข้ออะไรในโครงการอบรมครั้งถัดไป
5. How would you rate the training program overall on a scale of 5? ท่านจะให้คะแนนโครงการอบรมในภาพรวมครั้งนี้กี่คะแนนจากคะแนนเต็ม 5 คะแนน
 - A. 5 Excellent (ยอดเยี่ยม)
 - B. 4 Very good (ดีมาก)
 - C. 3 Good (ดี)
 - D. 2 Fair (พอใช้)
 - E. 1 Poor (แย)

Section 2: Three modules (2 questions, 23 items)**ส่วนที่ 2: 3 โมดูล**

Section 2 consists of 1. training curriculum (content, assessment, and trainer's feedback on the assessment), 2. trainers, and 3. training materials in the three modules.

ส่วนที่ 2 ประกอบไปด้วย 1. หลักสูตรการอบรม (เนื้อหา การวัดประเมินผล และการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของ
วิทยากรต่อชิ้นงานสำหรับการประเมินผล) 2. วิทยากร และ 3. สื่อการอบรมในโมดูลทั้ง 3 โมดูล

Information about the three modules

1. Module 1: ELT Teaching Methods (March 28–April 7, 24 hours)
โมดูล 1: ELT Teaching Methods (วันที่ 28 มีนาคม – 7 เมษายน จำนวน 24 ชั่วโมง)
Assessment: 10-minute microteaching and 5-minute group discussion per person
2. Module 2: Materials Development (April 18–25, 18 hours)
โมดูล 2: Materials Development (วันที่ 18 – 25 เมษายน จำนวน 18 ชั่วโมง)
Assessment: 7-minute material presentation
3. Module 3: New Trends in ELT (April 27, 6 hours)
โมดูล 3: New Trends in ELT (วันที่ 27 เมษายน จำนวน 6 ชั่วโมง)
Assessment: A written reflection of 250-300 words to compare and contrast the standards-based and game-based learning approaches

- A. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
ท่านเห็นด้วยหรือไม่เห็นด้วยกับประโยคด้านล่างนี้มากน้อยแค่ไหน (12 items for 5-Likert scale)

	Strongly Agree เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง	Agree เห็นด้วย	Do Not Agree or Disagree เฉย ๆ	Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย	Strongly Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง
1. Overall impressions ภาพรวม					
1.1 The module met your needs.* โมดูลตรงกับความต้องการของท่าน					
1.2 The module contained ideas that you can apply to your work. โมดูลมีแนวคิดที่ท่านสามารถนำไปประยุกต์ใช้กับงานของท่านได้					

2. Content เนื้อหา					
2.1 The content covered was relevant to your teaching context. เนื้อหามีความเกี่ยวข้องกับบริบทการสอนของท่าน					
2.2 The content was well organized. มีการเรียบเรียงเนื้อหาที่ดี					
2.3 The content was easy to understand. เนื้อหาเข้าใจง่าย					
3. Assessment การประเมินผล					
3.1 The assessment was appropriate. การประเมินผลมีความเหมาะสม					
3.2 The assessment allowed you to reflect on your own practice. การประเมินผลทำให้ท่านได้สะท้อนคิดถึงสิ่งที่ท่านปฏิบัติจริง					
4. Trainer's feedback on the assessment taskการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของวิทยากรต่อชิ้นงานสำหรับการประเมินผล					
4.1 The trainer's feedback was clear. การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของวิทยากรมีความชัดเจน					
4.2 The trainer's feedback was useful. การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของวิทยากรมีประโยชน์					
5. Training materials สื่อสำหรับการอบรม					
5.1 The materials were sufficient.					

สื่อสำหรับการอบรมมีเพียงพอ					
5.2 The materials helped you understand the content better. สื่อสำหรับการอบรมช่วยให้คุณเข้าใจเนื้อหาการอบรมได้ดียิ่งขึ้น					
5.3 The materials can be applied to your teaching context. สื่อสำหรับการอบรมสามารถนำไปประยุกต์ในบริบทการสอนของท่านได้					

B. Could you please rate the trainers in the three modules?

กรุณาประเมินวิทยากรทั้ง 3 โมดูล ได้ไหม (11 items for 5-Likert scale)

	Excellent ยอดเยี่ยม	Very good ดีมาก	Good ดี	Fair ปานกลาง	Poor แย่
1. Knowledge about the subject* ความรู้เกี่ยวกับวิชาที่สอน					
2. Ability to communicate the information ความสามารถในการสื่อสารข้อมูล					
3. Preparation การเตรียมสอน					
4. Pace of teaching ความเร็วในการสอน					
5. Clarity of voice (clearness and accent being easy to understand) ความชัดเจนของน้ำเสียง (ความชัดเจนและสำเนียงฟังเข้าใจง่าย)					
6. Use of training materials การใช้สื่อการอบรม					
7. Variety of exercises and activities					

ความหลากหลายของแบบฝึกหัดและ กิจกรรม					
8. Teaching valuable and relevant points สอนประเด็นที่มีคุณค่าและเกี่ยวข้อง					
9. Encouraging trainees' participation and interaction สนับสนุนการมีส่วนร่วมและการมีปฏิสัมพันธ์ ของผู้เข้าอบรม					
10. Checking trainees' understanding ตรวจสอบความเข้าใจของผู้เข้าอบรม					
11. General classroom atmosphere บรรยากาศทั่วไปในชั้นเรียน					

Section 3: Management aspects of the training program (9 questions, 5 items)

ส่วนที่ 3: ประเด็นเกี่ยวกับการบริหารจัดการโครงการอบรม

This section explores 1. training schedule, 2. number of trainees, 3. facilities, 4. others.

ส่วนที่ 3 สํารวจ 1. ตารางการอบรม 2. จำนวนผู้เข้าอบรม 3. สิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก 4. อื่น ๆ

1. Training schedule ตารางการอบรม

1.1 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

ท่านเห็นด้วยหรือไม่เห็นด้วยกับประโยคด้านล่างนี้มากน้อยแค่ไหน (5 items for 5-Likert scale)

	Strongly Agree เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง	Agree เห็นด้วย	Do Not Agree or Disagree เฉย ๆ	Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย	Strongly Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง
A. Number of hours จำนวนชั่วโมง					
1. The three-hour training session per day was appropriate. การอบรมครั้งละ 3 ชั่วโมงต่อวันมี ความเหมาะสม					

2. The length of the training program (48 hours) was appropriate and adequate. ระยะเวลาการอบรม (48 ชั่วโมง) ของโครงการนี้มีความเหมาะสม และเพียงพอ					
B. Duration of each module ระยะเวลาการอบรมสำหรับแต่ละโมดูล					
1. The duration of 24 hours was appropriate for Module 1. ระยะเวลาการอบรมจำนวน 24 ชั่วโมงมีความเหมาะสมสำหรับ โมดูล 1					
2. The duration of 18 hours was appropriate for Module 2. ระยะเวลาการอบรมจำนวน 18 ชั่วโมงมีความเหมาะสมสำหรับ โมดูล 2					
3. The duration of 6 hours was appropriate for Module 3. ระยะเวลาการอบรมจำนวน 6 ชั่วโมงมีความเหมาะสมสำหรับ โมดูล 3					

Remark: Questions 1.2–2.1 are for future training programs.

1.2 Which training session do you prefer? ท่านต้องการอบรมช่วงเวลาไหน

- A. a morning session ช่วงเช้า
- B. an afternoon session ช่วงบ่าย

1.3 Which days do you prefer the session to be on? ท่านต้องการอบรมช่วงวันไหน

- A. every weekday (Monday–Friday) ทุกวันทำการ (จันทร์–ศุกร์)

- B. every other day (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.) วันเว้นวัน (จันทร์ พุธ และศุกร์)
- C. every weekend (Saturday–Sunday) วันสุดสัปดาห์ (เสาร์–อาทิตย์)

1.4 Which school break do you prefer the training program be organized in? ท่านต้องการให้การอบรมจัดขึ้นช่วงปิดภาคเรียนช่วงไหน

- A. a summer break in late March–April ช่วงปิดภาคเรียนฤดูร้อนปลายเดือน มีนาคม–เมษายน
- B. a break in October ช่วงปิดภาคเรียนเดือนตุลาคม

2. Number of trainees จำนวนผู้เข้าอบรม

2.1 How many participants should there be in the training program?

ควรมีจำนวนผู้เข้าอบรมกี่คนสำหรับโครงการอบรม

- A. No more than 30 ไม่เกิน 30 คน
- B. 31–40 คน
- C. 41–50 คน
- D. 51–60 คน
- E. Others (please specify) อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

3. Facilities (Internet, electronic devices, and technical problems) สิ่ง

อำนวยความสะดวก (อินเทอร์เน็ต อุปกรณ์อิเล็กทรอนิกส์ และปัญหาทางเทคนิค)

3.1 Your Internet connection was _____. การเชื่อมต่ออินเทอร์เน็ตของท่าน

- A. usually stable มักจะเสถียร
- B. somewhat stable ค่อนข้างจะเสถียร
- C. rarely stable แทบจะไม่เสถียร

3.2 Which electronic device did you mainly use for attending the sessions? อุปกรณ์อิเล็กทรอนิกส์: ท่านใช้อุปกรณ์ใดเป็นหลักในการเข้าอบรม

- A. laptop แล็ปท็อป
- B. personal computer คอมพิวเตอร์
- C. tablet (e.g., iPad) แท็บเล็ต (เช่น ไอแพด)
- D. mobile phone โทรศัพท์มือถือ

3.3 Technical problems: Did you experience any technical problems?

If so, what were they? [Short answer] ท่านประสบปัญหาทางเทคนิคหรือไม่ ถ้าใช่

ปัญหานั้นคืออะไร [คำตอบสั้น ๆ]

4. Others [Short answer] อื่น ๆ [คำตอบสั้น ๆ]

4.1 Do you prefer an online or on-site training program? Please explain. ท่านชอบโครงการอบรมแบบออนไลน์หรือในห้องเรียน โปรดอธิบาย

Section 4: Impact of the training program on trainees' learning (knowledge, attitudes, and skills) (2 questions, 8 items)

ส่วนที่ 4: ผลกระทบของโครงการอบรมต่อการเรียนรู้ของผู้เข้าอบรม (ความรู้ ทัศนคติ และทักษะ)

Section 4 explores trainees' perceptions of the training program's impact on their knowledge, attitudes, and skills.

ส่วนที่ 4 สำรวจมุมมองของผู้เข้าอบรมในด้านผลกระทบของโครงการอบรมต่อความรู้ ทัศนคติ และทักษะของผู้เข้าอบรม

***Remark:** Items 1–5 focus on knowledge, 6–7 on attitudes, and 8 in 1.1 and 1.2 on skills.

1.1 To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

ท่านเห็นด้วยหรือไม่เห็นด้วยกับประโยคด้านล่างนี้มากน้อยแค่ไหน (8 items for 5-Likert scale)

	Strongly Agree เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง	Agree เห็นด้วย	Do Not Agree or Disagree เฉย ๆ	Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย	Strongly Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง
1. The training helped develop your knowledge of ELT teaching methods. การอบรมช่วยพัฒนาความรู้ด้านวิธีการสอนภาษาอังกฤษของท่าน					
2. The training helped develop your knowledge of materials development. การอบรมช่วยพัฒนาความรู้ด้านการพัฒนาสื่อการสอนของท่าน					
3. The training helped develop your knowledge of new trends in ELT.					

การอบรมช่วยพัฒนาความรู้ด้านแนวโน้มใหม่ ๆ ในการสอนภาษาอังกฤษของท่าน					
4. Through the training program, you learned about new concepts, practices, and activities that you had not known before. ท่านเรียนรู้แนวคิด แนวทางปฏิบัติ และกิจกรรมใหม่ ๆ ที่ท่านไม่เคยรู้มาก่อนผ่านโครงการอบรม					
5. The training program provided an opportunity for you to exchange information, knowledge, and experiences with other trainees. โครงการอบรมเปิดโอกาสให้ท่านได้แลกเปลี่ยนข้อมูล ความรู้ และประสบการณ์กับผู้เข้าอบรมท่านอื่น					
6. The training program motivated and made you interested in learning more. โครงการอบรมกระตุ้นและทำให้ท่านสนใจที่จะเรียนรู้มากขึ้น					
7. The training program has positively changed your attitude toward an online teacher training program. โครงการอบรมได้เปลี่ยนทัศนคติของท่านที่มีต่อการอบรมครูทางออนไลน์ไปในเชิงบวก					
8. The training program has helped you do your job better. โครงการอบรมได้ช่วยให้ท่านทำงานได้ดีขึ้น					

- 1.2 What skills have you developed from participating in the training program? Please explain with an example. The skills could be language (e.g., speaking, listening, etc.) and/or pedagogical skills (e.g., teaching speaking, listening, etc.) ท่านได้พัฒนาทักษะอะไรจากการเข้าอบรม โปรดอธิบายพร้อมยกตัวอย่าง ทักษะอาจจะเป็นทักษะภาษา (เช่น การพูด การฟัง ฯลฯ) และ/หรือทักษะการสอน (เช่น สอนการพูด การฟัง ฯลฯ) [คำตอบสั้น ๆ]

Section 5: Trainee's contact information (Optional)

ส่วนที่ 5: ข้อมูลติดต่อผู้เข้าอบรม (ไม่บังคับ)

หากท่านยินดีที่จะให้ข้อมูลเพิ่มเติมผ่านการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่มเป็นภาษาไทยทาง Zoom ประมาณ 90 นาที ในช่วงเดือนมิถุนายน โดยมีค่าชดเชยการเสียเวลาให้คนละ 500 บาท กรุณากรอกข้อมูลติดต่อสำหรับนักวิจัยทาง Google Forms (ข้อมูลของท่านจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับ)

Interview questions

คำถามสัมภาษณ์

Remark: The blue questions came from the questionnaire.

หมายเหตุ คำถามสีฟ้ามาจากแบบสอบถาม

Section 1: Overall impressions of the training program (3 questions)

- Overall, do you think this online training program was effective? Please explain. (Remark: Effective means the fact that the trainees are able to apply their knowledge in teaching methods, materials development, and trends in English language teaching to their teaching context.) ในภาพรวมท่านคิดว่าโครงการอบรมออนไลน์นี้มีประสิทธิผลหรือไม่ โปรดอธิบาย (หมายเหตุ: ประสิทธิภาพหมายถึง การที่ผู้เข้าอบรมสามารถนำความรู้ด้านการสอน การพัฒนาวัสดุการสอน และแนวโน้มด้านการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษไปประยุกต์ใช้ได้จริงในบริบทการสอนของตนเอง)
- What did you like the most about this training? Please explain why you liked it. ท่านชอบอะไรที่สุดเกี่ยวกับการอบรมครั้งนี้ โปรดอธิบายว่าทำไมถึงชอบ
- Could you please share one suggestion for the organizer to improve this training program? ท่านช่วยให้คำแนะนำ 1 ข้อ สำหรับผู้จัดอบรมเพื่อปรับปรุงโครงการอบรมนี้ได้ไหม

Section 2: Three modules (8 questions)

- Training curriculum (content, assessment, and feedback on assessment) หลักสูตรอบรม
 - Content เนื้อหา
 - What do you think about the content of the three modules? ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับเนื้อหาของทั้ง 3 โมดูล

1.1.2 Were there any topics that you wished to learn but were not included in any modules? If so, what were they? มีหัวข้อไหนที่ท่านประสงค์ที่จะได้เรียนแต่ไม่ได้ถูกบรรจุในโมดูลไหนเลยหรือไม่ ถ้ามีหัวข้อเหล่านั้นคือหัวข้ออะไร

1.1.3 Would you like to study about these topics in the next training program? ท่านอยากเรียนหัวข้อเหล่านั้นในโครงการอบรมครั้งหน้าหรือไม่

1.2 Assessment การประเมินผล

1.2.1 What do you think about the assessment in each module? ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับการประเมินผลในแต่ละโมดูล

1.3 Trainer's feedback on the assessment task การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของวิทยากรต่อชิ้นงานสำหรับการประเมินผล

1.3.1 What do you think about the trainer's feedback on the assessment in each module? ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของวิทยากรต่อชิ้นงานสำหรับการประเมินผล

2. Trainers วิทยากร

The following questions will be asked for all five trainers in three modules. คำถามเหล่านี้จะถามเกี่ยวกับวิทยากรทั้ง 5 ท่านใน 3 โมดูล

2.1 What did you like the most about each trainer? Please explain. ท่านชอบอะไรที่สุดเกี่ยวกับวิทยากรแต่ละท่าน โปรดอธิบาย

2.2 What would you like them to improve on? ท่านอยากให้วิทยากรปรับปรุงอะไร

Module 1: ELT Teaching Methods = Trainer 1 and Trainer 2

Module 2: Materials Development = Trainer 2

Module 3: New Trends in ELT = Trainer 4 and Trainer 5

3. Training materials (PowerPoint slides, worksheets, handouts, suggested resources, etc.) สื่อสำหรับการอบรม

3.1 What do you think about the training materials? ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับสื่อสำหรับการอบรม

Section 3: Management aspects of the training program (4 questions)

1. Training schedule ตารางการอบรม

1.1 What do you think about the current schedule of this training program? (48 hours; 3 hours per session; every week day; in the morning, afternoon, and all day; during a school summer break) ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับตารางการอบรมของโครงการอบรมนี้

2. Number of trainees จำนวนผู้เข้าอบรม

- 2.1 What do you think about the current number of trainees per program? (43 participants per program) ท่านคิดอย่างไรกับจำนวนผู้เข้าอบรมจำนวน 43 คนต่อโครงการ
3. Facilities สิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก
3.1 Did you have any problems with the facilities including the Internet and electronic devices during the training? Please explain. ท่านมีปัญหอะไรเกี่ยวกับสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก คือ อินเทอร์เน็ตและอุปกรณ์อิเล็กทรอนิกส์ในระหว่างการอบรมหรือไม่ โปรดอธิบาย
4. Others อื่น ๆ
4.1 Do you prefer an online or on-site training program? Please explain. ท่านชอบโครงการอบรมแบบออนไลน์หรือในห้องเรียน โปรดอธิบาย

Section 4: Impact of the training program on trainees' learning (knowledge, attitudes, and skills) (5 questions)

1. What knowledge did you gain from this training program? ท่านได้รับความรู้อะไรจากโครงการอบรมนี้
2. What were new things that you learned in this training program? ท่านได้เรียนรู้อะไรใหม่ ๆ จากโครงการอบรมนี้บ้าง
3. Changes in your attitudes toward teacher training programs as a result of attending this training program
การเปลี่ยนแปลงทัศนคติของท่านที่มีต่อการโครงการอบรมครูอันเป็นผลมาจากการเข้าร่วมโครงการอบรมนี้
3.1 Did this training program make you interested in learning more? Please explain. โครงการอบรมนี้ทำให้ท่านอยากเรียนรู้มากขึ้นหรือไม่ โปรดอธิบาย
3.2 After joining this training program, do you feel more motivated to join a teacher training program like this in the future? Please explain. หลังจากที่ได้เข้าอบรมครั้งนี้ ท่านรู้สึกอยากเข้าอบรมในโครงการลักษณะนี้ในอนาคตมากขึ้นหรือไม่ โปรดอธิบาย
4. What skills have you developed from participating in the training program? Please explain. The skills could be language (e.g., speaking, listening, etc.) and/or pedagogical skills (e.g., teaching speaking, listening, etc.) ท่านได้พัฒนาทักษะอะไรจากการเข้าอบรม โปรดอธิบาย ทักษะอาจจะเป็นทักษะภาษา (เช่น การพูด การฟัง ฯลฯ) และ/หรือทักษะการสอน (เช่น สอนการพูด การฟัง ฯลฯ)