3-2019

# A Systematic Evaluation Process: Soliciting Client Participation and Working in a Cross-Cultural Context

D'Jeane T. Peters
*Boise State University*

Lisa A. Giacumo
*Boise State University*

# A Systematic Evaluation Process: Soliciting Client Participation and Working in a Cross-Cultural Context

**D'Jeane T. Peters**
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho
djeanepeters@gmail.com

**Lisa A. Giacumo**
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho
Lisagiacumo@boisestate.edu

A systematic evaluation process helps performance improvement practitioners organize their work with clients to deliver valued results. Further, we implemented a strategic partnership approach to solicit client participation to conduct a feasible systemic training evaluation project. In this article, we share our experience and recommendations for performance improvement practitioners who work in cross-cultural evaluation project contexts.

## Introduction

Imagine a group of adults, from a diverse range of professions and life experiences, traveling to a new country. Immediately upon arrival, they have five days of training to learn a new professional skill set. After that five-day training, they will be required to practice those skills in their new workplace, which also has a whole new language, unfamiliar cultural norms, and, frequently, an entirely new peer group. This was the setting in which this evaluation team set out to make evidence-based recommendations to support these learners and a client-partner's program development goals for a scalable and replicable training in this unique situation.

Based on over a decade of our combined experience and interactions with learning and development specialists, we can share that five-day training workshops are a common standard practice for international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Further, from conversations at professional societies, we are also aware of our colleagues' experiences using this intensive training model to address for-profit performance improvement and training needs in other contexts such as oil, gas, and telecommunications, and construction. The clients we have worked with often see intensive training models, similar to the program we evaluated, to be efficient, cost-effective, and the approach that is logistically possible. In other words, while this format lacks spaced instruction interspersed with practice, in our experience, we have seen it implemented across a variety of workplace learning contexts and found it to contribute to desired performance outcomes.

When it comes to trainings that aim to develop learners' cross-cultural competencies, it is critical to make employees feel comfortable in their host country. The primary evidence-based methodologies used to do this are the "cognitive" or fact-oriented approach, the "affective" or information-acquiring approach, and the "experiential" or field-experience approach (Ko & Yang, 2011). In this article, we tell the story of how we built a partnership with an INGO to document the outcomes of a train-the-trainer program through a formal formative evaluation.

### Theory Applied in Practice

To ground our work in this project, we relied on performance improvement principles and evidence-based practice. The performance improvement principles included focusing on the outcomes, treating our client and stakeholders as partners, focusing on their need, taking a systematic and systemic approach, and designing a feasible evaluation project, from which the results would add value to the organization (ISPI 10 Standards, 2017). We used a systematic evaluation procedure to guide our work plan. The work plan was based on Chyung's (2019) 10-step evaluation process:

This is an author-produced, peer-reviewed version of this article. The final, definitive version of this document can be found online at *Performance Improvement*, published by Wiley on behalf of the International Society for Performance Improvement. Copyright restrictions may apply. doi: 10.1002/pfi.21845

1. Identify the program to be evaluated.
2. Identify stakeholders of the program and their needs.
3. Identify the purpose of evaluation based on how the evaluation findings will be used.
4. Develop or review a program logic model for the program.
5. Determine dimensions and importance weighting.
6. Determine data collection methods.
7. Develop data collection instruments.
8. Collect data.
9. Analyze data with rubrics.
10. Draw conclusions.

We used Kirkpatrick (1996) and Kellogg's (2006) evidence-based practice frameworks to help the client make strategic decisions. We solicited the client's participation to develop the following evaluation tools: a logic model, key evaluation questions, evaluative dimensions, a triangulated data collection approach, and data collection tools (Chyung et al., 2013; Urban, Christenson, & Benson, 2015).

In addition to general evaluation and performance improvement practices, we found both industry-specific content knowledge and knowledge of Thai cultural norms imperative to this evaluation project. While there are almost no previous research studies published in the area of developing individuals' capacity to teach English as a second language (ESL), a few context-specific evaluation studies do exist (de Dio Martinez Agudo, 2017). Specifically, we reviewed other evaluations of other Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) training (Aliakbari & Ghoreyshi, 2013; de Dios Martinez Agudo, 2017; Karimnia & Kay, 2015), workplace learning (Kennedy, 2006; Manuti, Pastore, Scardigno, Giancaspro, & Morciano, 2015), and the evolution of ESL educational technology teaching strategies (Nomass, 2013). We drew upon Karakas' (2012) descriptions of the main components of TEFL, which include linguistic competence, pedagogy, and general teaching practices, to guide our some of evaluation item design. We draw upon Ko and Yang's (2011) work to substantiate our recommendation for a combination of cognitive and affective approaches to guide the cross-cultural training aspect of new ESL teachers. Based on multiple researchers' recommendations we also included representatives from the culture (Asino, Giacumo, & Chen, 2017; Bhawuk, & Triandis, 1996; Young, 2009) in the evaluation project.

## Evaluation Case Study

### 1. The Background and Evaluand

The client was the Program Director for the Teaching Thailand Group (TTG, pseudonym), a non-profit organization that hosts a five-day abbreviated Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) course held biannually in Bangkok, Thailand. After the training, learners work for 6-12 months as ESL teachers throughout Thailand, at schools that have developed long-term relationships with TTG. These schools pay TTG a fee to recruit native English-speaking teachers for employment at their school, which is why TTG is highly invested in providing their partner schools with quality teachers who are able to adapt to the local and organizational culture.

The client partner determined a need to hire more trainers and scale up their program implementations. While our client's experienced trainers had built strong teaching skills over time, they had not developed useable curriculum packages to pass on to future trainers. Therefore, our client needed to formalize what was working well, document the current program results, and determine potential future improvements. Hence, a new pilot instructional package had been recently developed by one of the organization's trainers, who is also one of the authors of this article. The client needed to assess the pilot program train-the-trainer participant outcomes and evaluate the newly formalized training program. Therefore, the goal of the partnership was to conduct a formative evaluation. The client requested the evaluation with the purpose to guide future program revisions, development, and delivery at scale, with a strong consideration to the desired workplace performance and cross-cultural training needs of the participants.

## 2. The Program Stakeholders

Participants in the program hold American, Canadian, Australian, or South African nationalities, and are about 80% female and the average age is under 35 years old. The Thai government requires all teachers employed at credentialed schools to hold at least a bachelor's degree, although not necessarily in education. For many years, 30-40 participants attended a TEFL training at the start of their teaching contract, at several small regional locations in Thailand.

Recently, there has been an increase in the number of program participants. With this increase and the decision to consolidate multiple trainings into one location meant that program participation increased from 30-40 participants at regional training events to nearly 230 participants at a single location, as of October 2017. Therefore, the external contractors TTG usually hired could not deliver the training in the same format as they did when they had one seventh as many participants.

## 3. The Evaluation Request and Evaluation Purpose

We talked with the client about how we could collaborate and the benefits of using a systematic and systemic program evaluation process. We explained that as partners, we would work with them to develop an evaluation plan, work with the client to collect data from multiple sources, review and make meaning of the results together, and then deliver recommendations that would be evidence-based and data driven. The client agreed to take on a highly participatory partner role.

We then worked with the client to specify a formal evaluation purpose. The goal of the evaluation was to determine curriculum that should be included and emphasized, when scaling to a standardized teacher training approach and train-the-trainer program. We then discussed a systematic evaluation plan to measure and determine the worth the training in a series of logical steps.

## 4. Program Logic Model

To begin this evaluation project, we first developed a logic model with the client. The development of a logic model is an important step in the process of evaluation in a variety of sectors (Chyung, 2015; Savaya & Waysman, 2005; Urban et al., 2015). The W. K. Kellogg Foundation (2006) created a logic model to assist practitioners with evaluation projects that focus on program outcomes. The model consists of five key elements, the program resources or inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts (W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2006).

We defined these elements with the client by first engaging in a conversation regarding of the overall mission and goals of the organization. We then created a detailed model, and formally presented it model to the client to verify its accuracy. We found the client was easily able to see the value in the activity to describe each category, except for the program impacts. The client had trouble seeing the value of looking past the outcomes of the program, which may be in part an artifact of not needing to recruit program participants. Generally, partner organizations based outside of Thailand refer participants to TTG. While the logic model we employed spanned several pages and included listing many out-of-scope program elements, a condensed version of the model is shown in Table 1.

------------------------------------

Insert Table 1 About Here

------------------------------------

## 5. Key Evaluation Questions and Dimensions

After consulting with the client regarding the logic model, we collaborated to define the overarching goal of the evaluation and key evaluation questions. The goal of the evaluation was to determine curriculum that should be included and emphasized, when scaling to a standardized teacher training approach and train-the-trainer program. Next, we partnered with the client to develop key evaluation questions that aligned with the logic model. The two key questions were also associated with additional sub questions that related to the logic model, as shown in Table 2.

------------------------------------

Insert Table 2 About Here

------------------------------------

### *Establishing Evaluation Dimensions and Importance Weighing*

The goal of this evaluation project was to determine the merit of the programs processes and outcomes, to inform future revisions of the training and program. To define the scope of our evaluation process, while developing the logic model, we determined that the client desired evaluation data regarding both the process and the outcome of the training. The content of the course was determined to be a process evaluation because it focuses on the merits of the program; the client was requesting specific, evidence-based suggestions for improvement (Chyung, 2015). However, "training is only one of many contributors to the goals that we seek to achieve from training" (Brinkerhoff, 2006, p. 7), and therefore we also decided to ask questions regarding the actions of the trainees' actions after the left the training. These questions then fell into the evaluation category of outcomes, since we used them to evaluate the trainee's competence after they worked in their jobs (Chyung, 2015). The outcomes we sought information about were the specific teaching and cultural behaviors (questions 1b and 1c) that the trainees self-reported eight weeks post-training. We used these categories to focus the evaluation project dimensions.

The client was initially hesitant to look further than workshop participants' reactions. We involved the client in assigning importance weighting and used this input to get buy-in to the project and gather data that looked into the participants learning gains and behavior outcomes. The scale we used to ask the client for help with prioritizing our evaluation efforts and the dimension table are shown in Table 3 and 4.

------------------------------------

Insert Table 3 About Here

------------------------------------

------------------------------------

Insert Table 4 About Here

------------------------------------

## 6. Data Collection Methods

### *6.1 Participants*

A total of 17 teacher trainees from the U.S., the U.K., and Canada participated in this evaluation project of the pilot training curriculum. Six trainees had degrees in education, and 11 did not. All trainees had some experience as a classroom teacher. Two trainees had experience teaching in Asia. The average age of this predominantly Caucasian participant group was approximately 29 years old, with a range from 22 to 71 years of age. Three identified as male and 14 identified as female.

### *6.2 Triangulating Plan*

After working with the client to finalize the dimensions and importance ratings of the evaluation project, it was time to develop a data collection and triangulation plan. In alignment with established practices (Chyung, 2015; Urban et al., 2015), we utilized multiple data sources to investigate the key evaluation questions. We worked with the client to outline each data source, including the training participants, the trainers, and the Thai school managers. We planned to collect survey data from the participants immediately after the training as well as eight-weeks post-training. We planned to collect data from two other experienced trainers, who have been delivering a similar training within the organization for over ten years. Lastly, we planned a focus group with the Thai placement managers to investigate the training participant's performance on-site.

We used Kirkpatrick's (1996) first three levels of evaluation (i.e., reaction, learning, and behavior) to guide our work on designing the data collection instruments. We chose to integrate levels one and two (reaction and learning) in the learner survey questions because the client had a strong interest in defining what to keep and what to cut in the training. The client stakeholders ranked this dimension as "very important" because the client directly influences this portion of the participant experience. We implemented level three (behavior) evaluation items to measure the actions the learners take after they completed the training. According to Silberman, Biech, and Auerbach, (2015), when evaluating an active training program, reaching the fourth level outlined by Kirkpatrick (1996), the level that examines the "business results of training, may be the most difficult to do" (p. 353). Achieving a level four evaluation is rarely achieved for a variety of reasons (Bates, 2004; McNamara, Joyce, & O'Hara, 2010; Reio, Rocco, Smith, & Chang, 2017). In this particular case, the client was not invested in the fourth level of the evaluation. At the time of the project, the client had no baseline measures for results (e.g., cost, returns on investments, productivity) we were not able to inspire the client's interest in capturing them. Thus, we were not able to complete in the work required to capture in-depth data to analyze regarding of the fourth level of a Kirkpatrick's (1996) evaluation framework.

Prior to collecting any data, we first received approval from the Boise State University Institutional Review Board (IRB number: 217-SB18-058). By using data triangulation as described by Denzin (1978) and Hussein (2015), we were able to check the validity of the data we had collected and thus paint a robust picture for the client using multiple stakeholder perspectives. To do this, we chose to delineate the learner-reported reaction, learning, and behavior surveys as our primary data sources, and then selected at least two other sources to crosscheck the data against. If there were discrepancies between the data sources, we outlined these for the client and advised them to act accordance with the best interests of their organizational goals. See Table 5 for our data triangulation plan.

------------------------------------

Insert Table 5 About Here

------------------------------------

## **7-8. Instruments and Collect Data**

To measure the participant reactions to the training, we asked participants a series of questions about the workshops and training based on a Likert scale. To measure the learning outcomes, we asked the participants key questions specific to the learning objectives defined in the training. We measured these two elements of the training by a survey distributed immediately after the training concluded. 17 out of 17 participants (100%) responded to this survey, which is shared in Appendix A.

To measure participant behavior, we sent out an additional survey eight weeks after the training. This survey asked participants to rank, on a Likert scale, how often they used specific teaching tools and strategies that were include in the training. Finally, participants responded to open-ended questions about their overall viewpoint on the training, and what additional resources they would like to receive at their specific placements. 12 out of 17 participants (70%) responded to the second survey, which is shared in Appendix B.

To triangulate the data, a focus group consisting of 17 of the trainee's Thai managers was held on July 20, 2018, after the new trainees had been employed at their schools for three months. These managers all have a year or more experience managing a TTG-trained ESL teacher at their school. The questions that were asked were, 1) What do you think of the quality of TTG-trained teachers? and 2) What would you like to see improve? The client insisted on conducting this focus group because of the cultural need of pre-existing relationships for meaningful feedback. The results were recorded in Thai and the client partner translated a summary into English.

For additional triangulation, two of the three experienced teacher-trainers on staff completed a full, systematic critique of the pilot curriculum in interviews. These trainers have a more than ten years' experience doing teacher training for TTG, and over fifteen years of experience teaching in Thailand. The client insisted on conducting these interviews because one of the evaluators had previously been hired to conduct trainings and formalize the pilot curriculum.

## 9. Analysis of Data

For the quantitative analysis of Likert scale items, we used frequency counts because they provide more valuable information than standard means. For example, with a frequency table you can see the number of times participants selected an individual rating (i.e., strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree) or category (i.e., different types of teaching methods). Whereas providing a mean would not tell you how many people selected a strongly disagree rating or a specific category description.

For the qualitative analysis, we used a thematic analysis approach. In this approach, we worked to identify thematic labels, which describe both implicit and explicit ideas within the data (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2011). We then further grouped those thematic labels into categories and provided examples of the corresponding thematic direct quotations. This organizational approach provides transparency as well as a method to focus attention on the qualitative evidence in meaningful ways.

We then looked for patterns across the quantitative data and qualitative data in individual sources as well as across the planned triangulated data sets. We involved the client in reviewing the summarized data, to help make meaning and ensure we interpreted the findings correctly. We then used the patterns of findings and interpretations to answer the evaluation questions. In addition, the findings and interpretations served as the basis for the data driven recommendations we shared with the client. These recommendations are listed in Appendix C.

## 10. Data-Driven Recommendations

Our data collection process, triangulation approach, and analysis revealed findings for the client with reasonably strong evidence regarding the outcomes of the training and areas for improvement. We confidently informed the client that the learners had some awareness of appropriate teaching methods, classroom management strategies, and a strong awareness of appropriate behavior in a Thai classroom. Based on our findings, we recommended that the client keep several aspects of the training program and change other program components. For example, one important session to keep, which is also frequently included in other ESL teacher-trainings, requires the learners to participate in a 20-minute language lesson held entirely in an unfamiliar language. This module received a high feedback score from both participants and teacher-trainers. Other specific course elements we determined are important to maintain included providing practical advice and a high level of group interaction.

We observed other patterns that emerged, which led us to make several recommendations on what to change or add to the training design. We made two recommendations for the modification of the curriculum, which included requiring the learners to have a workable first-day lesson plan by the end of the training. We also recommended, based on feedback from the learners and experienced trainers, to provide additional information about the purpose and objectives or goals of the training. We recommended that the client add additional emphasis on the sessions that cover lesson planning and level assessment. We provided them with a high-level overview of how to modify the lesson planning and level assessment as well. Lastly, we also recommended that the training expand the session on classroom management, in order to allow additional scenario-based training to take place (Kim & Klassen, 2018).

To present the data to the client in a meaningful way, the evaluation team directed the client to a report section titled "data driven recommendations." By synthesizing the data and providing options for specific courses of action available to the client, the team was able to give guidance towards concrete actions based on the data, which also align with the structure recommended by Robertson and Wingate (2017). The recommendations and their data sources are in Appendix C.

This is an author-produced, peer-reviewed version of this article. The final, definitive version of this document can be found online at *Performance Improvement*, published by Wiley on behalf of the International Society for Performance Improvement. Copyright restrictions may apply. doi: 10.1002/pfi.21845

**Opportunities for Continued Performance Improvement Work with the Client**

This project represents a small portion of the possibilities for future development of this training. In order to establish stronger evidence of continued improvement to this training, additional data would need to be collected. This could mean utilizing a similar evaluation framework, but expanding to include all participants and trainers, as well as gather additional data within the school placements. While this work would require additional resources, the findings could help TTG drive towards improvements that would results in increased requests for future placements as well as manage future needs for change.

In short, TTG could expand their efforts to:

- conduct an evaluation with a larger sample of program participants, trainers, Thai school managers, Thai teachers' colleagues, and Thai students or their parents
- purposefully sample participants from across Thailand at a variety of schools
- conduct follow up interviews to further clarify the level to which learners are prepared to navigate the Thai school culture and any patterns of workplace challenges or barriers to performance that might be useful to target in the intensive training
- conduct direct observations of teaching performance in the classroom to confirm self-report data and better inform future program development decisions
- add a knowledge check prior to learners' participation in the workshops, as recommended in Silberman et al. (2015) to assess participants' learning gains, which would support decisions to reduce emphasis in select areas or better meet the needs of diverse groups of learners (e.g., those with degrees in education vs. those without) who may arrive with different levels of prior knowledge
- consider a shortened version of the training program for those with sufficient prior experience to reduce costs or allow resources to be diverted towards more pressing organizational or learner needs
- add an induction program for new teacher-trainers and facilitate an on-going teacher-trainer community of practice
- create a plan for an ongoing needs assessment and formative evaluation project, to inform continuous improvement cycles.

Silberman et al. (2015) does make suggestions for additional ways to evaluate a training at the business level. The suggestions that could be applicable in future, long-term projects for this particular client include using a control group to measure the impact of training changes, and business outcomes for teacher retention and how satisfied the school is with teacher placements. However, we acknowledge, "most training efforts have little capacity to directly affect four level criteria" (Bates, 2004, p.345). Therefore, one must carefully consider the extent to these four-level criteria impact the decisions the organization makes. Other models for evaluation, such as those detailed by Cheng and Hampson (2008), focus more exclusively on training transfer, which incorporates training outcomes, learner motivations, and other learner-centered situational variables.

**Practitioner Takeaways**

Based on this experience as evaluators operating in a cross-cultural context, we offer several valuable experiences to consider in future evaluation projects. These key takeaway points can help improve the practice of evaluations conducted in a cross-cultural setting.

1. Work with the client to develop a program logic model helps a practitioner understand the working of the organization and generates buy-in with the client.
2. Use a logic model used to guide key evaluation questions.

3. When developing evaluation dimensions, base them on the needs of the client and weigh them according to their business goals.

4. To develop a strong case for recommendations, triangulate the data through multiple sources.

5. Clients value recommendations including a high level of detail for actions they can take in the future. Provide them with answers to evaluation questions regarding process improvement.

6. A rigorous approach to qualitative analysis best serves project designs with focus groups and formal interviews. However, one may need to balance typical procedures with various cultural norms of diverse populations. When cultural norms suggest the client to be the best interviewer, one way to facilitate a more rigorous approach would be to ask the client to record the interview data verbatim and share the files with the evaluation team for analysis.

7. Include someone with an advanced and nuanced understanding of culturally appropriate actions and a participatory approach to evaluation design on your team. Representatives with extensive experience in the specific cross-culture norms should assist the evaluation team in developing the evaluation, protocol, and data collection strategies. This mirrors recommendations by several cross-cultural instructional design and research models (Asino, Giacumo, & Chen, 2017; Bhawuk, & Triandis, 1996; Edmundson, 2007; Gunawardena, Wilson, & Nolla, 2003; Young, 2009).

8. Conduct an evaluation of both cognitive and affective outcomes within a cross-cultural performance context (Ko & Yang, 2011).

## Conclusion

In short, the HPT evaluation practices we shared in this article can be used to partner with clients to produce valued recommendations. Care should be taken to balance the scope, constraints, and findings, of a project with future organizational research opportunities and transparent client interactions. Special attention must be paid in any HPT work across cultures by including representation in the project design, implementation, and analysis.

## References

Aliakbari, M., & Ghoreyshi, M. (2013). On The Evaluation of master of arts program in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) at Ilam University. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 2*(2s), 545.

Asino, T. I., Giacumo, L. A., & Chen, V. (2017). Culture as a design “next”: Theoretical frameworks to guide new design, development, and research of learning environments. *The Design Journal, 20*(sup1), S875-S885.

Bates, R. (2004). A Critical analysis of evaluation practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 27*(3), 341-347.

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Triandis, H. C. (1996). The Role of culture theory in the study of culture and intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd. ed.) (pp. 17–34). Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Brinkerhoff, R. O. (2006). *Telling training's story: Evaluation made simple, credible, and effective*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cheng, E. W., & Hampson, I. (2008). Transfer of training: A Review and new insights. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *10*(4), 327-341.

Chyung, S. Y. (2019). 10-step evaluation for training and performance improvement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chyung, S. Y., Wisniewski, A., Inderbitzen, B., & Campbell, D. (2013). An Improvement-and accountability-oriented program evaluation: An Evaluation of the adventure scouts program. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *26*(3), 87-115.

Chyung, S. Y. (2015). Foundational concepts for conducting program evaluations. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 27*(4), 77-96.

Edmundson, A. (2007). The Cultural adaptation process (CAP) model: Designing e-learning for another culture. In A. Edmundson (Ed.), *Globalized e-learning cultural challenges* (pp. 267-290). IGI Global: Hershey, PA.

de Dios Martinez Agudo, J. (2017). What EFL student teachers think about their professional preparation: Evaluation of an English language teacher education programme in Spain. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(8), 62-76.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to research methods.* New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2011). Applied thematic analysis. Sag: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Gunawardena, C. N., Wilson, P. L., & Nolla, A. C. (2003). Culture and online education. In M. G. Moore (Ed.) *Handbook of distance education* (3rd ed., pp. 753-775). Routledge: New York.

Hussein, A. (2015). The Use of triangulation in social sciences research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work*, *4*(1), 1-12.

ISPI 10 Standards. (2017). Retrieved October 2, 2018 from https://www.ispi.org/ISPI/Our_Society/About_ISPI/10_Standards/ISPI/About_ISPI/10_Standards.aspx?hkey=3cde04b8-2f30-49ec-babd-afcf4946933d

Karimnia, A., & Kay, E. (2015). An Evaluation of the undergraduate TEFL program in Iran: A Multi-case study. *International Journal of Instruction*, *8*(2), 83-98.

Karakas, A. (2012). Evaluation of the English language teacher education program in Turkey. *ELT Weekly, 4(*15), 1-16.

Kennedy, D. (2006). *Writing and using learning outcomes: a practical guide*. University College Cork: Cork, Ireland.

Kim, L. E., & Klassen, R. M. (2018). Teachers' cognitive processing of complex school-based scenarios: Differences across experience levels. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *73*, 215-226.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Great ideas revisited. *Training & Development*, *50*(1), 54-59.

Ko, H. C., & Yang, M. L., (2011). The Effects of cross-cultural training on expatriate assignments. *Intercultural communication studies. 20*(1), 158-174.

Manuti, A., Pastore, S., Scardigno, A. F., Giancaspro, M. L., & Morciano, D. (2015). Formal and informal learning in the workplace: a research review. *International Journal of Training and Development*, *19*(1), 1-17.

McNamara, G., Joyce, P., & O'Hara, J. (2010). Evaluation of adult education and training programs. In B. McGraw, E. Baker, & P. Peterson (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (*3*rd ed., pp. 548-554). Elsevier Ltd.: Oxford, UK.

Nomass, B. B. (2013). The Impact of using technology in teaching English as a second language. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *3*(1), 111.

Reio, T. G., Rocco, T. S., Smith, D. H., & Chang, E. (2017). A Critique of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, *29*(2), 35-53.

Robertson, K. N., & Wingate L. A. (2017). *Checklist for program evaluation report content.* Kalamazoo, MI: EvaluATE, The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University. Retrieved from http://www.evalu-ate.org/resources/checklist-evalrpts/

Savaya, R., and Waysman, M., (2005). The Logic model: A Tool for incorporating theory in development and evaluation of programs**.** *Administration in Social Work*, 29(2), 85-103.

Silberman, M., Biech, E. and Auerbach, C. (2015). Evaluating an Active Training Program. In M. Silberman, E. Biech & C. Auerbach (Eds.), *Active training* (pp. 343-358). John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, New Jersey. doi:10.1002/9781119154778.ch17

Urban, L., Christenson, M. and Benson, S. (2015), Learning the ropes of program evaluation: A Case study. Pe*rformance Improvement, 54*(1), 7–13.

W. K. Kellogg Foundation (2006). Logic model development guide. Retrieved from: http://www.wkkf.org/knowledge-center/resources/2006/02/WK-Kellogg-Foundation-Logic-Model-Development-Guide.aspx

Young, P. A. (2009). *Instructional design frameworks and intercultural models*. IGI Global: Hershey, PA.

This is an author-produced, peer-reviewed version of this article. The final, definitive version of this document can be found online at *Performance Improvement*, published by Wiley on behalf of the International Society for Performance Improvement. Copyright restrictions may apply. doi: 10.1002/pfi.21845

## Appendix A: Pre-Placement Survey

1) The following sessions helped prepare me for Teaching in Thailand (0 DID NOT ATTEND, 1 strongly disagree- 5 strongly agree)

| | Did not attend | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Thai culture in the classroom | | | | | | |
| Total Language Immersion | | | | | | |
| Lesson Planning | | | | | | |
| Classroom Management | | | | | | |
| Games and Activities | | | | | | |
| Teaching your grade level | | | | | | |

2) Overall, in TEFL Sessions…

| | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The objectives of the training were clearly defined | | | | | |
| Participation and interaction were encouraged | | | | | |
| The topics covered were relevant to me | | | | | |
| The content was organized and easy to follow | | | | | |
| The materials distributed were helpful | | | | | |
| The trainer was knowledgeable about the topics | | | | | |
| The trainer was well prepared | | | | | |
| The objectives were met | | | | | |
| The time allotted for the training was sufficient | | | | | |

3) What did you like most about the training? (open ended text)
4) What aspects of the training could be improved? (open ended text)
5) What topics do you wish had been covered? (open ended text)
6) What else would you like to share with us about this training? (open ended text)
7) Are you teaching in a primary or secondary level classroom? (choose one or both, branch to appropriate follow up question(s))
    a. Primary (if selected, only answer questions 8.1 and 8.3)
    b. Secondary (if selected, only answer questions 8.2 and 8.4)

c. Both primary and secondary (if selected, answer questions 8.1-8.4)

d. University or Trade school (if selected, only answer questions 8.2 and 8.4)

8) How would you help/manage a classroom where: **Correct Answers in Bold**

8.1) A young child is throwing a tantrum, how do you react? *(check as many as apply)*

- Ignore it
- **Ask your Thai co-teacher to address it**
- Stop teaching and address it in front of the whole class

8.2) A teenager is regularly falling asleep *(check as many as apply)*

- Ignore it
- **Ask your Thai co-teacher to address it**
- Stop teaching and address it in front of the whole class

8.3) A student is constantly interrupting other students, preventing them from answering *(check as many as apply)*

- **Ignore it**
- **Ask your Thai co-teacher to address it**
- Stop teaching and address it in front of the whole class

8.4) A group of students is chatting while you teach (*check as many as apply)*

- **Ignore it**
- **Ask your Thai co-teacher to address it**
- Stop teaching and address it in front of the whole class

9) From the list below, categorize each behavior as desirable/undesirable for a Thai classroom teacher. *(choose one)* **Answers in bold**

a) Pointing feet at things

a. Desirable

b. **undesirable**

b) Yelling

a. Desirable

**b. Undesirable**

c) Expressing when you are upset

a. Desirable

**b. Undesirable**

d) Use an upside-down wave to beckon others to join you (fingers pointing downward)

**a. Desirable**

b. Undesirable

e) Use your fingers pointed up to call someone to join you

a. Desirable

**b. Undesirable**

f) Be a serious teacher

a. Desirable

**b. Undesirable**

g) Be a fun (sanuk) teacher

**a. Desirable**

b. Undesirable

10) For each teaching strategy match vocabulary words that would be best taught with the select strategy (**acceptable answers checked)**

| | Cline | Real Objects | Act it out | Build a context/tell a story |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adverbs of frequency (ex. always/sometimes/never); | **x** | | | |
| Apple | | **x** | | |
| Run (verb) | | | **x** | |
| Dance (verb) | | | **x** | |
| Bored (adjective) | | | **x** | **x** |
| Temperatures (ex: warm/hot/cold) | **x** | | | |

1) Why is it important to drill students for pronunciation? (check all that apply)

**a. To allow students to practice pronunciation in a safe space**

**b. To encourage students in improving their pronunciation**

c. To fill time in the lesson

2) Why is it important to grade your language to be appropriate for the learners levels? (open ended)

(sample answer: In order to be understood by your learners)

3) How would you grade your language for your future Thai students? (answers in bold)

a. Speak at your usual pace

b. Use slang and colloquialisms

**c. Use simple language**

**d. Speak more slowly**

## Appendix B: Post Placement Survey

1) What is the name of the school you teach at? (open text)
2) What grades to do you teach? (check all that apply)
   - o K1-K3
   - o P1-P4
   - o P5 and/or P6
   - o M1-M3
   - o M4-M6
   - o University, college or technical school
3) Where is your school located? (city, province) (open text)
4) Were you surprised by any responsibilities in your job? If so, which ones? How did you handle it/them? (open text)
5) After you arrived at your placement, did you use the lesson planning template provided in the TEFL training? (select one)

    a. Yes. I always use the system provided to me
    b. No. I use my own system
    c. Sometimes I use the template

6) Do you use the following tools in your classroom? (chose one)

| | Always | Most of the time | About half the time | Sometimes | Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total physical response (giving instruction using body language and movement) | | | | | |
| Games learned in TEFL training | | | | | |
| Websites posted in the teacher Facebook group | | | | | |
| Drilling for pronunciation | | | | | |

1) What, if anything, was included in the TEFL Teacher-Training but you are not able to use on the job? (Open text)
2) If you're having challenges in your classroom, do you have Thai colleagues who you can go to for support?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. If no, why not?
3) If you're having challenges in your classroom, do you have English-speaking colleagues who you can go to for support?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. If no, why not?
4) Is developing professional relationships with your Thai colleagues something that you would like further instruction on? If so, please explain.
5) What additional professional development, if any, would you like to access? (Open Text)
6) What, if any (teaching related!) things did you wish you had known before your arrival to Thailand? (Open Text)
7) What, if any (teaching related!), other feedback you could provide to improve future our TEFL training, that you did not already address in your responses? (Open Text)
8) What advice (teaching related!), if any, could you provide to future TEFL teachers arriving in Thailand? (Open Text)

**Appendix C: Data-Driven Recommendations Presented to the Client**

| **Data-Driven Recommendation** | **Sources of data that support this action** |
|---|---|
| Keep specific training modules: practical advice, group work, and total language immersion | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions<br>• Interview with trainers<br>• Document Review |
| Emphasize: level assessment and lesson planning | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions<br>• Interview with trainers<br>• Focus group with Thai managers |
| Emphasize: classroom management | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions<br>• Interview with trainers<br>• Focus group with Thai managers |
| Add new curriculum: first-day lesson | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions<br>• Interview with trainers<br>• Focus group with Thai managers |
| Add new curriculum: placement-specific information | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions |
| Revise teaching strategy: communicating learning objectives | • Participant survey: responses to Likert scale items & open-ended questions |