Development of the Training Packages for Professional Development of English Instructors from Prathom Suksa 1 to Mathayom Suksa 3 Based on the International Qualification Frameworks

การพัฒนาชุดฝึกอบรมสำหรับครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อพัฒนาวิชาชีพครูภาษาอังกฤษ ระดับชั้นประถมศึกษาปีที่ 1 – มัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 ตามกรอบคุณวุฒิระดับนานาชาติ

Paweenai Boonpok[*] Udomluk Koolsriroj and Sitthikorn Sumalee

ปวีณัย บุญปก[*] อุดมลักษม์ กูลศรีโรจน์ และ สิทธิกร สุมาลี

Curriculum and Instruction Program, Faculty of Education, Kasetsart University

สาขาวิชาหลักสูตรและการสอน คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์

[*]*Corresponding author, E-mail: paweenaib236@gmail.com, Tel. 099-2324451*

บทคัดย่อ

      การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) พัฒนาชุดฝึกอบรมสำหรับครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อพัฒนาวิชาชีพครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษตามกรอบคุณวุฒิระดับนานาชาติ 2) เพื่อประเมินผลการใช้ชุดฝึกอบรมสำหรับครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อพัฒนาวิชาชีพครูภาษาอังกฤษตามกรอบคุณวุฒิระดับนานาชาติ และ3) เพื่อสำรวจความพึงพอใจของครูผู้เข้ารับการอบรมต่อการฝึกอบรม ตัวอย่างในการวิจัยครั้งนี้ คือ ครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษตั้งแต่ระดับชั้นประถมศึกษาปีที่ 1 – มัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 จำนวน 42 คน ได้มาโดยการสมัครใจ เครื่องมือในการวิจัย คือ 1) ชุดฝึกอบรมสำหรับครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อพัฒนาวิชาชีพครูภาษาอังกฤษตามกรอบคุณวุฒิระดับนานาชาติ 2) แบบทดสอบก่อนและหลังการอบรม และ 3) แบบสำรวจความพึงพอใจของผู้เข้ารับการอบรม วิเคราะห์ข้อมูลโดยใช้การคำนวณคะแนนพัฒนาการสัมพัทธ์ ความถี่ ร้อยละ ค่าเฉลี่ย และส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน

      ผลการวิจัยสรุปได้ดังนี้ 1) จากการสังเคราะห์กรอบคุณวุฒิระดับนานาชาติทำให้ได้เนื้อหาในการสร้างชุดฝึกอบรม ซึ่งประกอบด้วยเนื้อหา 3 ส่วน ได้แก่ ด้านทักษะภาษาอังกฤษ ด้านการจัดการเรียนรู้ตามแนวการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสาร และด้านการพัฒนาตนเองในเชิงวิชาชีพ 2) ชุดฝึกอบรมที่พัฒนาขึ้นมามี 6 โมดูล ได้แก่ (1) การฟังและจับประเด็นหลักของเรื่องที่คุ้นชิน (2) การพูดและเล่าประสบการณ์ในบริบทที่คุ้นชิน (3) การอ่านและจับใจความเรื่องราวที่คุ้นชิน (4) การเขียนข้อความในเรื่องที่คุ้นชิน (5) การออกแบบแผนการจัดการเรียนรู้รายคาบและการจัดการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสาร และ (6) การวางแผนพัฒนาตนเองในเชิงวิชาชีพ 3) ภายหลังการอบรม ผู้เข้าอบรมส่วนใหญ่ มีพัฒนาการด้านทักษะภาษาอังกฤษอยู่ในระดับกลาง (จำนวน 14 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 33.33) ผู้เข้าอบรมส่วนใหญ่ มีพัฒนาการด้านการจัดการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษตามแนวการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารอยู่ในระดับสูง (จำนวน 16 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 38.09) และผู้เข้าอบรมส่วนใหญ่ มีพัฒนาการด้านการวางแผนพัฒนาตนเองในเชิงวิชาชีพในระดับต้น (จำนวน 21 คน คิดเป็นร้อยละ 50) 4) ผู้เข้ารับการอบรมมีความพึงพอใจต่อการฝึกอบรมโดยภาพรวมอยู่ใน

ระดับมากที่สุด โดยได้ค่าเฉลี่ย 4.51 ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน 0.54

คำสำคัญ: ชุดฝึกอบรมครูผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษ; การพัฒนาวิชาชีพครูภาษาอังกฤษ

Abstract

The objectives of this study were 1) to develop the professional development training packages for English instructors based on the international qualification frameworks, 2) to evaluate the usage of the developed training packages, and 3) to survey the satisfaction of the English instructors towards the training programs. The participants of the study included 42 English instructors who teach in Prathom Suksa 1 – Mathayom Suksa 3 from all parts of Thailand, obtained by volunteer sampling technique. The instruments included 1) the training packages for professional development of English instructors based on the international qualification frameworks, 2) two parallel forms of an achievement test for pre-testing and post-testing, and 3) a satisfaction questionnaire. The collected data were analyzed using the relative gain score, frequency count, percentage, mean and standard deviation.

The results revealed as follows: first, the developed training packages consisted of 3 parts: English Proficiency, English Teaching and Self-professional Development; second, there were 6 modules in the developed training packages: (1) listening and getting the main ideas in familiar contexts, (2) sustaining monologue and describing experiences in familiar contexts, (3) reading and getting the main ideas in familiar contexts, (4) writing in familiar contexts, (5) planning and teaching English for communication and (6) planning self-professional development; third, after the training packages implementation, the majority of the participants had a medium level improvement of the English proficiency part (14 participants, 33.33%), a high level improvement of the English teaching part (16 participants, 38.09%), and a beginning level improvement of the self-professional development part respectively (21 participants, 50%); and last, the English instructors' satisfaction towards the training program was at the highest level ($\bar{x}$ = 4.51, S.D. = 0.54).

Keywords: Training Packages for English Instructors; Professional Development for English Instructors; CEFR

Introduction

Nowadays, the English language plays many roles besides English as a mother tongue; English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as an International Language (EIL), World Englishes (Wes), English as an Asian Language and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Sirikhan, 2014). Because of the roles of English as mentioned, in Thailand, English has become the most important foreign language unavoidably. Although English subject is a compulsory subject for primary

and secondary levels in Thai education, it has been taught and used as a foreign language. Therefore, unsurprisingly, one of the biggest problems of Thai Education is the Thai learners' low ability in English.

The Ordinary National Education Test (O-NET) scores, from the academic year of 2015 to 2019, showed that the average scores in the English Subject of Thai students who were in Prathom Suksa 6, Mathayom Suksa 3, and Mathayom Suksa 6 were lower than 50 percent in all levels. (National Institute of Educational Testing Service, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019a, 2019b, 2019 c, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c) Moreover, in the world ranking of the EF English Proficiency Index (EF EPI), the proficiency of Thai learners and users of English from 2011 to 2016 had been in a very low group. However, in 2017 to 2018, the English proficiency of Thais were ranked in the low group while in 2019, the Thais' proficiency of English has been back to the very low group again. (EF English Profiiency Index [EF EPI], 2019)

The Ministry of Education (MOE) has realized that the majority of Thai students are not good at English. Thus, the MOE has announced the English teaching reform policy since 2014 aiming to solve the problem of Thai students' low ability in English. (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2014) According to this policy, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) has been implemented as the standard for all Thai students, included designing courses, developing teachers, and English teaching. Also, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been mentioned as an approach in English Language Teaching that must conform to the CEFR. (English Language Institute, 2015)

To run the English teaching reform policy, the English Language Institute, a branch of the Office of the Basic Education Commission (OBEC), has set goals of English proficiency for Thai students as follows: Prathom Suksa 6 should acquire an English proficiency of A1; Mathayom Suksa 3 should acquire an English proficiency of A2; and Mathayom Suksa 6 should acquire an English proficiency of B1 (English Language Institute, 2015). Since the English instructors should have higher English proficiency than their students have, the MOE, hence, has also set the goals of English proficiency for non-native English instructors who teach in General English Program (GEP) in Thailand as follows: primary English instructors should acquire an English proficiency of A2; junior high school English instructors of B1; and senior high school English instructors of B2. Besides the English proficiency, all English instructors need to be trained in at least one of the programs required, such as the Standard TEFL Certificate, Boot Camp Turbo, or the Teacher Development Interactive (TDI) (Office of the Basic Education Commission, 2019). However, at the primary level, there are many educational opportunity expansion schools where English instructors have also a responsibility to teach from Mathayom Suksa 1 to 3, therefore from the researcher's perspective, all primary English instructors should acquire an English proficiency of B1.

Previously, the English instructors in Thailand have never tested their English proficiency using the CEFR, so, in 2015, the MOE organized the English test based on the CEFR for the primary and secondary non-native English instructors. There were 42,712 volunteer English instructors, 29,930

primary instructors, and 11,812 secondary instructors, from schools under the Office of the Basic Education Commission who took the test. (Chongdarakul, 2015) The results showed that the majority of the volunteers were in A2 level (50.36%). When taking a deep look at the data, most of the primary English instructors were in A2 level (47.93%) and in A1 level (36.65%), respectively, meanwhile, most of the secondary English instructors also were in A2 level (56.53%) and in B1 level (28.15%), respectively (Chongdarakul, 2015), that is to say, a lot of English instructors were unqualified in their English abilities according to the MOE's goals.

Apart from the English instructors' proficiency, English teaching is one of the big issues that the English instructors have had for a long time. The studies found that there are many problems of English teaching in Thailand; lack of English skills, lack of experience in teaching (Ardpaksa, 2014), lack of motivation in English teaching (Kongchai, 2017), the problem of non-English major primary school instructors, and the difference of students' English proficiency (Chalarak, 2016; Tuamsuk et al, 2017).

Although there are many techniques that English instructors can choose to acquire their ability to reach the MOE's goals, such as studying for a post-graduate degree, observing classes, and doing classroom researches, one way to solve the problems, as mentioned above, in a short time is to train instructors both in English language skills and teaching techniques. In the past, there were studies about the development of training packages (Seanwisade, Klangprapan & Sriprachan, 2010; Thitawattana & Phattaraphakin, 2018; Watthanakuljaroen, 2019; Woottipong, 2016) the results showed that all developed training packages could enhance the English proficiency of the participants, that is, the training packages were good tools to improve the participants' abilities. However, our country lacks research concerning in-service teachers' English language skills improvement and English teaching based on the English teaching reform policy. Thus, this research aims to develop training packages for English instructors to bridge that gap.

Research objectives

The objectives of this study were

1) to develop the training packages for professional development of English instructors based on the international qualification frameworks

2) to evaluate the usage of the developed training packages and

3) to survey the satisfaction of the English instructors towards the training program.

Research Methodology

The research process comprises of 4 phases as follows:

Phase 1 was the synthesis of the training packages framework. The framework of this research had been synthesized from Thai and international frameworks that related to the CEFR and English Teaching as follows: (1) The CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001, 2018), (2) Cambridge English Teaching Framework (Cambridge Assessment English, 2018), (3) The Eaquals Framework for Language Teacher Training & Development (Eaquals Exellence in Language Eduation, 2016) and (4) Occupational Standards and Professional Qualifications for English Language Teachers in Thailand (Thailand Professional Qualification Institute, 2015). The content of the training packages consisted of 3 parts: 1) English Proficiency, 2) English Teaching and 3) Self-Professional Development.

Phase 2 was the development of the training packages for professional development of English instructors based on the international qualification frameworks. The content of initial training packages, composed of 4 modules: (1) listening and speaking skills, (2) reading and writing skills, (3) English lesson planning and teaching, and (4) self-professional development were approved and analyzed by 3 experts, comprised of an expert on English, an expert on Teacher Education, and an expert on Curriculum and Instruction. The research instrument of the second phase was a quality evaluation form for the training packages. Data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, and content analysis. The evaluation results were as follows: module 1 was a very good level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.56, S.D. = 0.32), module 2 was a very good level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.47, S.D. = 0.31), module 3 was a good level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.67, S.D. = 0.21), module 4 was a very good level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.60, S.D. = 0.30). After that, the experts' feedbacks were used to improve the training packages. The developed training packages composed of 6 modules. The components of the training packages in this research included the name of the training packages, objectives, content, activities, materials, and measurement and evaluation.

Phase 3 was the implementation of the training packages. The participants of the study consisted of 42 volunteer English instructors who teach from Prathom Suksa 1 to Mathayom Suksa 3 from all parts of Thailand. Some of them have never tested the CEFR test before, the rest have tested the CEFR test; some reached at B1 and some were at lower levels. Because of the COVID-19 situation, the training had been changed from onsite training to online training through Zoom program. The training was a 5-day training program on 14th, 16th, and 18th - 20th June, 2020. The research instruments of this phase were 1) two parallel forms of an achievement test for pre-testing and post-testing, 2) the training packages for professional development of English Instructors based on the international qualification frameworks, and 3) a satisfaction questionnaire.

Phase 4 was the evaluation of the training packages. This phase was a study of the training packages' implementation results. The pretest and posttest scores of the participants were analyzed to evaluate the usage of the developed training packages using the relative gain score (Kanjanawasee, 2013), frequency count, and percentage. The satisfaction survey results were analyzed using mean and standard deviation.

Research Results

1. Results of Training Packages Development

The developed training packages consisted of 3 parts which were divided into 6 modules. Part 1, English Proficiency composes of 4 modules: (1) listening and getting the main ideas in familiar contexts, (2) sustaining monologue and describing experiences in familiar contexts, (3) reading and getting the main ideas in familiar contexts, and (4) writing in familiar contexts. Part 2, English Teaching, there was only one module; (5) lesson planning and teaching English for communication. Part 3, Self-Professional Development, there was only one module; (6) self-professional development.

2. Results of evaluation of the developed training packages usage

2.1 The basic characteristics of the participants

The personal information of 42 volunteer English instructors was as follows:

Table 1 Basic characteristics of the participants

	Characteristics	Number	Percent
Gender	Female	35	83.33
	Male	7	16.67
	Total	**42**	**100.00**
Age	21 – 30 years old	18	42.86
	31 – 40 years old	12	28.57
	41 – 50 years old	9	21.43
	51 – or older	3	7.14
	Total	**42**	**100.00**
Education	BA	24	57.14
	MA	18	42.86
	Total	**42**	**100.00**
CEFR Level	Never take a test	30	71.43
	A1	1	2.38
	A2	4	9.52
	B1	7	16.67
	Total	**42**	**100.00**

Table 1 showed basic characteristics of the English instructors who completed their training. There were 42 English instructors who completed the training program, 35 of them (83.33%) were female. Most of the English instructors were between 21 -30 years old (18 participants, 42.86%). Only 3 of them (7.14%) were 51 or above. In term of education, most of English instructors were BA holders (24 participants, 57.14%), while 18 of them (42.86%) held a master degree. As to the CEFR level, most

of the English instructors had never taken the CEFR test (30 participants, 71.43%). Only 1 (2.38%) was at A1 level.

2.2 The results of training package implementation

To analyze the participants' improvement, the researcher used the relative gain score (Kanjanawasee, 2013) which had been divided the improvement into 4 levels: a very high level (76 – 100 scores), a high level (51 – 75 scores), a medium level (26 – 50 scores) and a beginning level (0 – 25 scores). In addition to the criteria, in this research, for those who got the gain scores less than 0, they were in the undeveloped level.

Part 1: English Proficiency

Analysis of the improvement of the learning achievement scores showed that the English proficiency; listening, speaking, reading and writing skills of the participants were as detailed in Table 2.

Table 2 Improvement of English proficiency part of the participants

Improvement level	Number of Participants	Percent
Very high	1	2.38
High	5	11.91
Medium	14	33.33
Beginning	12	28.57
Undeveloped	10	23.81
Total	42	100.00

Based on Table 2, the majority of English instructors had an English ability improvement at a medium level (14 participants, 33.33%). Only 1 had the improvement at a high level (2.38%), meanwhile, 10 of them were at undeveloped level (23.81%).

Part 2: English Teaching

Analysis of the improvement of the learning achievement scores in the English teaching part showed that the English instructors had an improvement as detailed in Table 3.

Table 3 Improvement of English teaching of the participants

Improvement level	Number of Participants	Percent
Very high	7	16.67
High	16	38.09
Medium	12	28.57
Beginning	7	16.67
Undeveloped	-	-
Total	**42**	**100.00**

According to the table 3, the majority of English instructors had an improvement at a high level (16 participants, 38.09%) in this part, and an inferior level was at a medium (12 participants, 28.57%). None of the undeveloped participant was in the English Teaching part.

Part 3: Self-professional Development

Analysis of the improvement of the learning achievement scores in the self-professional development part showed that the English instructors had an improvement as detailed in Table 4.

Table 4 Improvement of Self-professional Development part of the participants

Improvement level	Number of Participants	Percent
Very high	2	4.76
High	7	16.67
Medium	12	28.57
Beginning	21	50.00
Undeveloped	-	-
Total	**42**	**100.00**

Table 4 showed that the majority of the English instructors had an improvement at a beginning level (21 participants, 50.00%) in the last part, the Self-Professional Development. Only 2 of them had an improvement at the very high level (4.76%), while none of them was in the developed level.

3. Results of participants' satisfaction towards the training program

Besides the improvement that derived from the learning achievement scores, the participants' satisfaction questionnaire was another instrument used to evaluate the training program. The participants' satisfaction questionnaire was divided into 4 aspects: the satisfaction towards speakers, format and duration, knowledge and understanding, and knowledge implementation. Analysis of the participants' satisfaction showed as detailed in Table 5.

Table 5 Participants' satisfaction towards the training program

Satisfaction Aspects	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	Satisfaction level

1. Speakers	4.51	0.48	highest
2. Format and Duration	4.49	0.71	highest
3. Knowledge and Understanding	4.52	0.54	highest
4. Knowledge Implementation	4.54	0.50	highest
Average	**4.51**	**0.54**	**highest**

Regarding the participants' satisfaction questionnaire, the majority of the participants were satisfied at the highest level in all aspects: speakers, format and duration, knowledge and understanding, and knowledge and implementation. Therefore, overall, their satisfaction towards the training program was rated to be the highest level ($\bar{x}$ = 4.51, S.D.= 0.54).

Discussion

1. The Usage of The Developed Training Packages

1.1 English Proficiency Part

In regard to Table 2, most of the English instructors could improve their English 4 skills after the training at the medium level (14 participants, 33.33%), that is, to be trained by using the training packages for professional development of English instructors from Prathom Suksa 1 to Mathayom Suksa 3 based on the international qualification frameworks could help the participants to enhance their English proficiency, similar to the studies which revealed that the English language instructors improved their English skills and English teaching by using the developed training packages (Mejang, 2017, 2020; Yiemkuntitavorn, 2012, 2013, 2015) This is maybe because, during the training, (1) the speakers lectured and gave the examples clearly, (2) the participants did many exercises in each module, and (3) the contents in the developed training packages were in their familiar contexts.

1.2 English Teaching Part

The Module 5, Planning and teaching English for communication, was about lesson planning and English teaching using CLT. Due to the Covid-19 situation, the training program had been changed from onsite to online training which affected the activities in this module. For example, in the lesson planning which was a group activity, some of the group members needed to work at schools during the training, they could only listen to others during the activity. Besides lesson planning, micro-teaching was an activity related to the lesson planning activity. This activity was contained in the training packages, but it was inconvenient for the participants to do online micro-teaching as the reason mentioned above, hence the researcher cut it off from the training program. Then the evaluation of this module came from lesson planning scores only.

According to the improvement results of this part, it was found that all English instructors had an improvement. It was possible that they have been familiar with lesson plan writing since they were pre-service instructors, that is they had a lot of experiences in lesson plan writing. Moreover, they were

trained by the speaker in this training program, thus they could write the CLT lesson plan very well. However, the participants should study more on selecting instructional media and designing the assessment and evaluation tools because most of them got only 3 scores out of 5, similar to the research conducted by Mejang (2017) found that the top three problems in learning and teaching of the secondary school English instructors were having limited knowledge of teaching method, unappealing learning activities, and non-diversity assessments.

1.3 Self-professional Development Part

The Module 6, Self-professional development, was like the previous part; none of the English instructors was in the undeveloped level in the last part. In this part, the participants analyzed their strong and weak points so that they could do an individual development plan (ID plan). The result showed that their strong and weak points were divided into 3 groups; characteristics, profession, and English skills. According to the professional weak point, some of them mentioned that they need professional development because of lacking teaching techniques, lacking technology and innovation knowledge, non-diversity activities. A few of them mentioned that English skills were their strong points, however, they identified only one or two skills. Meanwhile, the majority of the participants identified that speaking, listening, and writing English were their weak points which they wanted to improve, that is to say, they were not confident in their English skills. This result was similar to the study conducted by Noom-ura (2013) which found that Thai teachers needed to improve their listening, speaking, and writing skills.

2. English Instructors' Satisfaction

According to Table 5, the overall satisfaction of English instructors towards the training program was at the highest level. This maybe because of some reasons as follows: (1) all participants could communicate with the speakers directly both during and after the training, also, could ask for more explanation and more examples when they did not understand, (2) since it was an online training, the participants could attend the training program from everywhere, (3) due to the training packages were developed based on the English teaching reform policy, the contents in each part of the training packages were what the participants needed to improve themselves, and (4) the participants could apply their knowledge derived from this training program to their classrooms.

Conclusion

According to the English teaching reform policy in 2014, one of the urgent issues to run the policy is to train non-native English instructors who teach in both primary and secondary levels to be

qualified English instructors. The purposes of this study were to develop, evaluate the usage of the training packages based on CEFR B1 level, which is the language goal of the MOE, and survey the satisfaction of the participants towards the training program. Findings showed that the developed training packages composed of English proficiency part, English teaching part, and self-professional development part. Based on the learning achievement results, in each part, the majority of English instructors had an improvement and they were satisfied with the training program.

Suggestions

  1. Suggestions for applying research results

  1.1 The training packages for professional development of English instructors based on the international qualification frameworks are suitable for onsite training because there are some group activities that the participants need to concentrate on them, such as speaking activities and micro-teaching. Therefore, to organize an online training using these training packages, the organizer should review more pieces of literature on designing an online training program so that the participants can get the most out of the training. Also, the organizer should follow up on how to the participants' English skills usage after training and how to the participants' CLT lesson planning usage in classes to get more information to improve the training packages.

  1.2 Due to the difference in the participants' English ability, the organizer who would like to use the training packages should assign some supplementary exercises to participants who need scaffolding. However, all participants should spend more time practicing language skills to improve their English.

  2. Suggestions for the next research

  The followings are some areas that could be investigated for further studies, according to this research study.

  1. It is recommended that other researchers should develop the training packages based on CEFR in other levels such as A1 and A2.

  2. It is recommended that other researchers should develop the training packages based on CEFR in other languages such as Chinese, Vietnamese and others.

References

Ardpaksa, S. (2014). The needs assessment to self development of teachers, ratchaburi private
   education schools (Master's thesis). Bangkok: Silpakorn University. Retrieved from
   http://www.sure.su.ac.th/xmlui/handle/123456789/10516

Cambridge Assessment English. (2018). *English teaching framework.* Retrieved
   fromhttps://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/172992-full-level-descriptors-cambridge-
   english-teaching-framework.pdf

Boonpok, P., Koolsriroj, U., & Sumalee, S. (2022). Development of Training Packages for Professional Development of English Instructors from Prathom Suksa 1 to Mathayom Suksa 3 Based on the International Qualification Frameworks. *Journal of Rangsit University: Teaching & Learning, 16*(2), 88-101.

Chalarak, N. (2016). State of English instruction of Thai teachers of Prathomsuksa 6, Lamphun Primary Educational Service Area 1. *FEU Academic Review, 10*(2), 130-141.

Chongdarakul, W. (2015). *Development of English Listening Skill Improvement Curriculum Compared to CEFR of English teachers under the Office of the Basic Education Commission.* Retrieved from http://tdc.thailis.or.th/tdc/browse.php?option=show&browse_type=title&titleid=428592

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment.* Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97

---------. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4

Eaquals Excellence in Language Education (2016). *The Eaquals framework for language teachertraining & development.* Retrieved from https://www.eaquals.org/resources/the-eaquals-framework-for-language-teacher-training-and-development/

EF English Proficiency Index (EF EPI). (2020). *The world's largest ranking of countries and regions by English skills.* Retrieved from https://www.ef.co.th/epi/regions/asia/thailand/

English Language Institute. (2015). *CEFR Manual for Primary level.* Retrieved from http://english.obec.go.th/ english/2013/index.php/th/2012-08-08-10-26-5/74-cefr

Kanjanawasee, S. (2013). *Classical Test Theory* (7th ed.). Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Publishing.

Kongchai, I. (2017). Study of current stage in English Learning of Network Uten Nontan group Thauten District Nakhonpanom Province. *Journal of Educational Administration Superstition, 8*(3). 206-214. Retrieved from http://www.edu.msu.ac.th/JAD/home/journal_file/412.pdf

Mejang, A. (2017). The development of a web-based training package on integrated-skills approach to English language teaching for secondary school English teachers. *Journal of Education Naresuan University, 19*(4), 276-292. Retrieved from https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/edujournal_nu/article/view/93821/85790

---------. (2020). The Development of a Web-Based Training Package on Reading Strategy Instruction for English Language Teachers at Secondary Education Level. STOU Education Journal, 13(1), 1-14. https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/edjour_stou/article/view/175338

National Institute of Educational Testing Service. (2016). *Annual report 2016.* Retrieved fromhttps://www.niets.or.th/uploads/content_pdf/pdf_1503649895.pdf

---------. (2017). *Annual report 2017.* Retrieved from https://www.niets.or.th/uploads/ content_pdf/pdf_1533870929.pdf

---------. (2018). *Annual report 2018.* Retrieved from https://www.niets.or.th/uploads/content_pdf/pdf_1571281594.pdf

Boonpok, P., Koolsriroj, U., & Sumalee, S. (2022). Development of Training Packages for Professional Development of English Instructors from Prathom Suksa 1 to Mathayom Suksa 3 Based on the International Qualification Frameworks. *Journal of Rangsit University: Teaching & Learning, 16*(2), 88-101.

---------. (2019a). *Summary of Prathom Suksa 6 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2018.* Retrieved from

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETP6_2561.pdf

---------. (2019b). *Summary of Matthayom Suksa 3 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2018*.

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETM3_2561.pdf

---------. (2019c). *Summary of Matthayom Suksa 6 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2018*.   Retrieved from

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETM6_2561.pdf

---------. (2020a). *Summary of Prathom Suksa 6 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2019*. Retrieved from

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETP6_2562.pdf

---------. (2020b). *Summary of Matthayom Suksa 3 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2019*. Retrieved from

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETM3_2562.pdf

---------. (2020c). *Summary of Matthayom Suksa 6 O-NET Test Results Academic year 2019*.   Retrieved from

http://www.newonetresult.niets.or.th/AnnouncementWeb/PDF/SummaryONETM6_2562.pdf

Noom-ura, S. (2013). English-teaching problems in Thailand and Thai teachers' professional development needs. *English Language Teaching, 6*(11), 139-147. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n11p139http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/31115

Office of the Basic Education Commission. (2014). *Guideline for notification of ministry of education, subject: English teaching*. Retrieved from http://english.obec.go.th/english/2013/ index.php/th/component/attachments/download/68

---------. (2019). *Handbook of English language teaching management for IP, EIP and GEP*. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uurOdcdWK4RXOunJZgcO7_iqsnVinUoN/view

Saenwisade, N., Klangprapan, M., & Sriprachan, S. (2010). Develop of English reading packages to enhance analytical thinking for Mathayom Suksa 1 Teachers. *Journal of Academic Curriculum and Instruction, 2*(3), 61-70. Retrieved from https://jci.snru.ac.th/ArticleViewFile?ArticleID=702&FileArticle=702-ArticleTextFile-20190927102314.pdf

Sirikhan, S. (2014). The Preparation of Thai English teachers' attitudes and empowering concepts concerning English as a Lingua Franca for ASEAN. *FEU Academic Review, 8*(1), 46-60. Retrieved from https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/FEU/article/view/26648

Taumsuk, K., et al. (2017). *Development of communicative English language teaching approachesfor basic education in Northeastern Region*. Khon Khen: Faculty of Humanities and Social

Sciences, Khon Kaen University. Retrieved from https://elibrary.trf.or.th/project_content.asp?PJID=RDG5740080

Thailand Professional Qualification Institute. (2015). *Occupational standards and professional qualifications for English language teachers in Thailand*. Retrieved from http://tpqi-net.tpqi.go.th/home/occ/qualifications/ILS-IED-3-235301-A

Thitawattana, N., & Phattaraphakin, K. (2018). *Developing an English for communication training program for the purpose of promoting Thai culture to foreign tourists under the context of tourist attractions in Bangkok.* Bangkok: Dhonburi Rajabhat University. Retrieved from http://cms.dru.ac.th/jspui/handle/123456789/1462

Watthanakuljaroen, T. (2019). The Development of and electronic training package via network for teachers on the topic of production of instructional modules using facebook as supplementary resources for primary students in schools under the office of the basic education commission. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University, 12*(6), 783-802. Retrieved from https://he02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/Veridian-E-Journal/article/download/196759/154150/

Woottipong, K. (2016). The effects of using and e-learning whole language course on primary school teachers' learning. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, 11*(2), 9-30.Retrieved from https://so02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/HUSOTSU/article/view/167646/120795

Yiemkuntitavorn, S. (2012). Development of a distance training package on the teaching of English language in order to gain the teaching ability for secondary school English teachers in Nonthaburi Province. *Journal of Rangsit University: Teaching & Learning, 6*(1), 83-95. Retrieved from https://jrtl.rsu.ac.th/volume/6/number/1/article/84

---------. (2013). Development of distance training package on the teaching principles of foundation English for secondary school English teachers in Bangkok and its vicinity. *Journal of Rangsit University: Teaching & Learning, 7*(1), 69-86. Retrieved from https://jrtl.rsu.ac.th/volume/7/number/1/article/97

---------. (2015). Development of distance training package on online English newspaper reading for secondary school English teachers in Nonthaburi Province. *Journal of Rangsit University: Teaching & Learning, 9*(1), 80-90. Retrieved from https://jrtl.rsu.ac.th/volume/9/number/1/article/134