

THE USE OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE THE READING
COMPREHENSION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS



Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
at Srinakharinwirot University

August 2017

THE USE OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE THE READING
COMPREHENSION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS



Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
at Srinakharinwirot University

August 2017

Copyright 2017 by Srinakharinwirot University

THE USE OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING TO IMPROVE THE READING
COMPREHENSION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS



AN ABSTRACT
BY
PRUKSAPAN JANTHORN

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language
at Srinakharinwirot University

August 2017

Pruksapan Janthorn. (2017). *The Use of Cooperative Learning to Improve The Reading Comprehension of High School Students*. Thesis, M.A. (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). Bangkok: Graduate School, Srinakharinwirot University.
Thesis Advisor: Assistant Professor Dr. Usapron Sucaromana.

The purposes of this study are (1) to investigate the effects of using STAD activities as a cooperative learning method to enhance the English reading comprehension skills of the students and (2) to examine opinions of students toward using STAD activities in cooperative learning activities. The samples in this study included thirty eight EFL students in Mattayomsuksa five at Srinakharinwirot University Prasarnmit Demonstration School (Secondary) in the 2015 academic year. Descriptive statistics, mean score and standard deviation, are employed to investigate the effective of using cooperative learning to improve the reading comprehension among high school students and content analysis is used to analyze data from the interview sections.

The results revealed that using STAD activities in cooperative learning played an important role in improving high school students' reading comprehension. The students preferred to use STAD activities in classroom and wanted to apply cooperative learning in with other subjects.

การใช้การจัดการเรียนรู้แบบร่วมมือเพื่อพัฒนาทักษะการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย



เสนอต่อบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัยศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ เพื่อเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษา
ตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต สาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ
สิงหาคม 2560

พฤษภาพันธุ์ จันทร. (2560). การใช้การจัดการเรียนรู้แบบร่วมมือเพื่อพัฒนาทักษะการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาตอนปลาย. ปรินญาณิพนธ์ ศศ.ม.

(การสอนภาษาอังกฤษ ในฐานะ ภาษาต่างประเทศ). กรุงเทพฯ: บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย มหาวิทยาลัย ศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ.

อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาปรินญาณิพนธ์: ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. อาสาห์ภรณ์ สุขารมณ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ(1)ศึกษาผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาตอนปลายโดยใช้การจัดการเรียนรู้แบบร่วมมือและ (2) เพื่อหาความพึงพอใจ ของนักเรียนที่มีต่อการจัดการเรียนรู้แบบร่วมมือ โดยใช้เทคนิค STAD โดยกลุ่มตัวอย่างที่ใช้ใน งานวิจัยครั้งนี้ได้แก่ นักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 5/2 โรงเรียนสาธิตมหาวิทยาลัย ศรีนครินทรวิโรฒ ประสานมิตร ฝั่งมัธยม ปีการศึกษา 2558 จำนวน 38 คน ได้มาด้วยการเลือกแบบเจาะจง การวิจัยครั้งนี้ใช้สถิติแบบบรรยาย ค่ากลางของข้อมูล และ ค่าเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐานในการหาผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของนักเรียน โดยเครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัย ได้แก่ แผนการจัดการเรียนรู้ แบบทดสอบผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่าน ก่อนเรียน - หลังเรียน และ การสัมภาษณ์

ผลการวิจัยปรากฏว่า ผลสัมฤทธิ์ทางการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจของนักเรียนหลังจากที่ได้เรียนด้วยวิธีแบบกลุ่มร่วมมือ โดยใช้เทคนิค STAD สูงกว่าก่อนเรียน นอกจากนี้นักเรียนยังมีเจตคติที่ดีต่อการจัดการเรียนรู้แบบร่วมมือ โดยใช้เทคนิค STAD และอยากให้นำการเรียนแบบร่วมมือไปใช้กับวิชาอื่น ๆ อีกด้วย

The thesis titled
“The Use of Cooperative Learning to Improve Reading Comprehension of High
School Students”

by
Pruksapan Janthorn

has been approved by the Graduate School as partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Master of Arts degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language of
Srinakharinwirot University.

.....Dean of Graduate School
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Chatchai Ekpanyaskul, M.D.)
.....

Thesis Committee

Oral Defense Committee

..... Advisor

..... Chair

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Usaporn Sucaromana)

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Anchalee Jansem)

..... Committee

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Usaporn Sucaromana)

..... Committee

(Dr. Kornsiri Boonyaparakob)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Usaporn Sucaromana for the continuous supports of my master degree thesis. She always welcome whenever I ran into a trouble, had questions about my research and writing, or gave up on doing my thesis.

I would also like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Asst. Prof. Dr. Anchalee Jansem and Dr. Korn Siri Boonyaparakob for their insightful comments and encouragement which helped me to widen my research from various perspectives.

Besides my advisor and my thesis committee, I would like to thank all the experts: Dr. Sunporn Eiammongkhonsakul, Asst. Kamolphet Puttasantitham, and Mrs, Panprapai Mukjang who helped validated my research instruments. Without their comments and suggestions, my research and instrument could not have been successfully conducted.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my parents, my brother, and my husband for all supports and encouragements throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis.

Pruksapan Janthorn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study.....	1
Objectives of the Study.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	4
Scope of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Reading Comprehension.....	6
Factors Affecting Reading Comprehension.....	8
The Concept of Cooperative Learning.....	11
Related Study on Cooperative Learning.....	13
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	16
Research Methodology.....	16
Context of the Study.....	16
Population and Sample Selection.....	17
Research Instruments.....	17
Procedures of the Study.....	20
Data Collection.....	21
Data Analysis.....	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
4 FINDINGS	23
The Effect of Using STAD Activities in Cooperative Learning.....	23
Students' Opinion Toward Learning by STAD Activities in Cooperative Learning.....	25
The Enhancement in Student's Reading Comprehension.....	25
Students' Preference for Using Cooperative Learning in Classroom.....	27
5 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION	29
Summary.....	29
Discussion.....	31
Limitations of the Study.....	33
Pedagogical Implications.....	33
Recommendations for Further Studies.....	34
REFERENCES	35
APPENDICES	42
VITAE	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 The Table of Lesson Plans.....	18
2 Results of The Improvement of Students' Reading Comprehension Between The Group of Students' Achievement Level.....	24
3 Results of An Independent Sample <i>t</i> Test on The Improvement of Students' Reading Comprehension Between Pre- and Post-Test.....	24



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter of thesis begins with background of the study including why reading is important for learners who wants to achieve their goals in studying or career. Moreover, this chapter also includes research questions, research objective, significance of the study, scope of the study, variable, and definition of term.

Background of the study

Reading is a basic life skill especially for a student's success in school and throughout their life. It is one of the most challenging areas in the education system. Many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners have struggle with reading especially in reading comprehension (Zhang & Koda, 2012). For example, learners with poor reading skill would give up in reading and perform poorly in other subjects. This might lead to their future problems such as failing the test or not getting a good job. Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985 stated that lacking of good skill in reading may have an effect on job success and personal fulfillment. In contrast, learners who have good reading skill can use their ability in reading to expand the vocabulary. Seeing how words are used in different context helps them to have a better understanding of what is read.

As a country that uses English as a Foreign Language, many students in Thailand have also encountered the difficulty with their reading comprehension. National Institute of Educational Testing Service (NIETS) summarized fifteen – year – old Thai students' reading literacy score in 2012 and reported that according to Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), the reading literacy score of Thai students are 441 which lower than Organization for Economic Co-operation and

Development (OECD) average score at 496. Among the eleven Southeast Asian countries participating in the study, Thailand is one of the three countries that have the lowest score below the OECD average. This has confirmed that reading in Thailand may be at a critical level. From the above information particularly, the result from PISA (OECD, 2012) makes it clear that Thailand needs to improve the instruction in reading.

In recent years, the government address the problem so that the ministry of Education in Thailand has shifted policy of teaching style from the traditional teacher - centered classroom to focus on student-centered teaching methods. According to Zou (2011), traditional teacher – centered is the method that teachers dominate the whole class and regarded as the unique authority. In contrast, student – centered teaching method allows student to be more active and responsible for his or her own learning. Teacher will be placed as a facilitator of learning rather than for the class as a whole.

In order to foster active learning in classroom where students are involved and can solve problems, answer questions, formulate questions of their own, discuss, explain, debate, or brainstorm during class, many strategies have been developed to promote active learning. Some strategies encourage student to work collaboratively with peers or small group. Cooperative learning is an active method having the idea that “Students learn more by doing something actively than by simply watching and listening” (Felder & Brent, 2001). Moreover, Languador (2014), added that giving the opportunity to take part in team exercise to the students enhances their capacity to become leader and be responsible in performing the task. Since, students need good reading skill for acquiring knowledge throughout their life, employing cooperative learning on English reading comprehension classroom provides students the

opportunity to learn and have interaction that could help them improve their language skill amongst their friends (Earl, 2009; Gillies & Boyle, 2010). Rather than sit quietly when they struggle, student can ask questions and work out challenges with their classmates in cooperative atmosphere.

Cooperative learning is beneficial for EFL learners in many ways. For example, cooperative learning can help build up interaction between learners. According to Earl (2009), “Student interactions lead to opportunities for improving communication skills, language skills and more importantly to collective problem-solving.” Besides, Gillies and Boyle (2010) supported the idea of learning through interaction that “ Student learn to interrogate issues, share ideas, clarify differences, and construct new understanding”. The other benefit from cooperative learning that helps students learn in classroom is a power of small group work. In cooperative learning, students are assigned to work in a small heterogeneous group (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). As describe by Krashen (2005), “A small group work improve the language classroom with comprehensible and developmentally appropriate”. Therefore, cooperative learning approach may provide students the better opportunity to achieve the goal and learn the subject in classroom.

To sum up, the researcher is going to conduct the research that examine whether or not cooperative learning is effective to improve high school students’ reading comprehension.

Objectives of the study

This study aims to do the following.

1. Investigate the effects of using STAD activities in cooperative learning method to enhance students’ English reading comprehension.

2. Examine the students' opinions toward using STAD activities in cooperative learning activity.

Research questions

1. Does STAD activities in cooperative learning help students improve their reading comprehension score?

2. What are the students' opinions about learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning?

Significance of the study

This study will be conducted to examine the use of cooperative learning to improve EFL students' reading comprehension. The result of the study shows that Mattayomsuksa 5 students can develop their reading comprehension ability after using STAD activities in cooperative learning method. According to the study, it would be beneficial for both student and teacher.

For teachers who want to change style of teaching and want to encourage students to have interaction in classroom might consider this method as a choice to teach their students in order to change traditional classroom into more active as in cooperative teaching environment.

For students, they will find out that reading will not be boring and difficult as always because they can learn with friends through various activities instead of learning alone and feeling nervous when they cannot answer the questions. Finally, they would change their attitude in reading.

Scope of the study

Population and participants in the study

Population

The population in the study was 750 mattayomsuksa 5 students who are required to study Basic Reading and Writing course level 2 from Srinakharinwirot University Prasarnmit Demonstration School (Secondary).

Participants

The participants of this study were 38 mattayomsuksa 5 students in class 5/2, academic year of 2015. They were chosen by purposive sampling. This class consisted of heterogeneous students. They reflect a mixture of achievement levels, gender and language ability. The achievement level and language ability are measured by their past English final test score.

Variable

There are two variables in this study.

The independent variable is STAD activities in cooperative learning.

The dependent variables are students' reading comprehension score and students' opinion.

Definitions of terms

1. Cooperative learning refers Team – Achievement Division (STAD) adopted from Slavin (1995). Five keys element of STAT are presentation, teams, quizzes, individual improvement scores, and team recognition.

2. Reading comprehension in this present study is the way that students are able to understand the written text. In this study, the students will be able to answer the questions that focus on main idea, paragraph details, and inference from the reading passage.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section of the study provides the description of reading comprehension, cooperative learning and student teams – achievement division (STAD). The literature details were described as follow:

Reading comprehension

Understanding the text is comprehension. Namely, comprehension is the ability to understand and interpret of what is read. To be able to accurately understand written material, learners need to decode what they read, make connection between what they read and what they already know and think deeply about that they have read. Many researchers agree that reader would develop their reading skill when they can interact with the text. If the reader is able to engage in an active interaction with the text, then he/she will be able to comprehend the text better (Hoover & Tunmer, 1993). Moreover, Durkin (as cited in National Reading Panel, 2000) confirmed that reading comprehension is “Intentional thinking during which meaning is constructed through interactions between text and reader”. Therefore, in order to foster students to have deep understanding of the text, they must have the ability to interact, engage, and make meaning of the information available. This shows that comprehension is important in reading and could be claimed that it is “The essence of reading” (Durkin, 1993). When learner develops as a reader, they will be able to “Understand, interpret, and critique what they read” (Duke and Pearson, 2001). National Reading Panel (2000), also examined the important of understanding that “A reader reads a text to understand what is read and to put this understanding to use. A reader can read a text to learn, to find out information, or to be entertained” (p. 232). Teele (2004) pointed out that, “Good readers are actively involved with the text, and they are aware of the

process they use to understand what they read”. In addition, “Students’ reading comprehension can be enhanced by developing reader’s prior knowledge” (Pressley, 2001). To help students develop their reading ability, teacher can support them by teaching through strategies in reading.

Base on the cognitive view, there are five majors of comprehension instructions that students can use when they read text (Heilman, Blair, & Rupley, 1994). First, determining importance is the strategy that readers realize what they have read and consider what is and is not important (Graves, Juel, & Graves, 2004). Heilman and his colleagues claim that, it is the majority of reading comprehension. Moreover, Dole, Duffy, Roehler, and Pearson (1991), added that “The ability to separate the important from the unimportant leads to effective comprehension”. Second, generating question is the way that student have a chance to build up their own question before or while reading (Heilman et.al, 1994). This strategy also encourages students to focus on the reading. According to Pressley (2001), “Good reader are aware of why they are reading a text, gain an overview of the text before reading, and make predictions about the upcoming text”. The third strategy is drawing inference. Making inference means filling in the gap left by the author, relating background knowledge to the text, and making sense of what they read (Qanwal & Karim, 2014; Heilman et.al, 1994). Additionally, writer sometimes state something indirectly; therefore, it becomes the responsible for the reader to infer the information (Mislevy & Rahman, 2009). Next, summarizing information “Requires students to first determine what is important and then condense it and put it in their words” (Graves et.al, 2004). It is a short, coherent, and cohesive description of the essential ideas of a text. Moreover, the instruction and practice in summarizing not only improves students’ ability to summarize text, but also be their overall

comprehension of text content (Duke, Pearson, Strachan, & Billman 2011). The last strategy is monitoring comprehension. According to Pressley (2001), “Good readers know when they need to exert more effort to make sense of text and they are also aware of the occasions when they are confused, when the text does not make sense”. In monitoring comprehension, readers keep track of what they wish to gain from the text both with their understanding and lack of understanding of the text they are reading (Graves et.al, 2004). In conclusion, to help students comprehend the text, teacher can encourage them to determine importance, generate question, draw inference, summarize information, and monitor comprehension.

Factors affecting reading comprehension

Some learners find that reading is challenging, especially when the material is unfamiliar, technical, or complex (McNamara D. S., 2012). There are various factors that impact student’s abilities to comprehend.

First is motivation. Research confirms that student motivation is a key factor in successful reading. It is helpful to consider motivation in order to effectively improve reading comprehension. Cambria and Guthrie (2010), mentioned three powerful motivations that drive student’s reading. Those motivations are interest, confidence, and dedication. The motivation of interest is when student enjoy reading, be excited about an author, or be delighted by new information. Another motivation is confidence. When students have confidence, they believe that they have the capacity to read and it could lead them to achieve the task. The last motivation is dedication. This motivation will drive students to read when they consider it is important to them. Furthermore, Cambria and Guthrie (2010), also stated that “For some students these motivations appear in the positive form driving students toward reading. For other students, the motivations are negative and push student away from books”. Another

research from Yang (2016), supported motivation as a key to succeed in reading that some readers are more interested in succeeding as students and seem to put more effort into their work. They have the character traits such as motivation and engagement in reading. The quality of learning resulted from the strength of motivation (Quifang, 2001). Moreover, (Alirio and Arteaga, 2006) also claims that “motivation is a dynamic and an interactive process composed of beliefs, wants, reasons, and goals mediated by socio-cultural and historical conditions to learn a second or a foreign language” (p. 154).

The second factor is prior knowledge. Some readers have more schema, or background knowledge about topics. Readers who familiar with topic are able to make connections with the text better than readers whose prior knowledge of target topic is limited or nonexistent. For example, Reader familiar with cultural information which they had background knowledge will successfully answer the question while reader who unfamiliar with the topic will face the difficulty in comprehending and gain less opportunity to acquire new information from reading. Therefore, reader’s level of knowledge about the topic determines how much reader will comprehend (Allington and Cunningham, 2010). According to schema theory, schema helps integrate an individual’s existing knowledge with new learning. It explains how learners learn, modify, and use information they acquire their experience (Heilman, Blair, & Rupley, 1994). Research conducted by Roberson (2011) shows that student’s enjoyment and their comprehension improved. They spend less time reading and recalling information with the story that they had prior knowledge. On the other hand, without prior knowledge students take more time to figure out, get frustrated and bored while reading. Similar results were reported by Al- Jahwari and Al- Humaidi (2015), who found that EFL teachers agreed that good

prior knowledge about the text's topic has great influence on student's recall and comprehension. They also agreed that teacher's role in fostering text comprehension with the use of students' prior knowledge help students with low level of reading improved their comprehension skill.

The last factor that affects reading comprehension is word recognition. Word recognition is the ability of a reader to recognize written words correctly. The more you remember the word, the more you capture the key point on the literacy materials (Cutting and Scarborough, 2006). If learners can apply word recognition in reading, it would help them to understand reading passage easily. Then learners can read more comprehendingly. A study by Knoepke, Richter, Isberner, Naumann, and Neeb (2014) support the idea that both types of word recognition skill, phonological recoding skill and orthographical decoding skill are important to improve reading comprehension skill.

From the theory above, it could be concluded that reading comprehension will not success with a single process. Using an appropriate strategy and considering factors in reading will have an impact on how students can comprehend the text. Reader factors including student's motivation and engagement during reading, student's prior knowledge, a process that link what students know to what they are reading, and word recognition are all factors related to each other in encouraging learner's reading comprehension ability.

In conclusion, how to make student understand what they have read is difficult especially for EFL students. Therefore, applying technique that can arouse students to read in classroom will help them have more interaction with the reading text. One of the methods that allows students to interact and have action in reading is cooperative learning method.

The concept of cooperative learning

According to Vygotsky (1978), learning occurs within a social context. People learn when relating to each other. In addition, Wittrock (1991) explains why people learn best together on his generative learning theory. According to his theory, “When students are learning together, they are encouraged to focus their attention on learning and to think. Cooperative learning is the method that involves social interaction between learners. The common concept of cooperative learning instruction is that students learn in small learning team with mixed abilities, gender, or cultural background. All students have an equal opportunity to learn and complete the task together in order to achieve their own and each other learning (Slavin, 1995; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 2013; Johnson & Johnson, 2014). According to Johnson and Johnson (2002), “Cooperative Learning is a successful teaching strategy in which small team, each with students of different levels of ability, use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject”. However, Krashen (1998), assert that it need to be comprehensible in cooperative learning in order to foster language acquisition. “Students working in cooperative group need to make themselves understood so they naturally adjust input to make it comprehensible” (Krashen, 1998).

According to Johnson, and Stanne (2000), there are ten modern methods of cooperative learning created by several researchers such as Complex Instruction (CI), Constructive Controversy (CC), Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), Cooperative Structures (CS), Group Investigation (GI), Jigsaw, Learning Together (LT), Student Team Achievement Divisions (STAD), Team – Game – Tournament (TGT), and Team Assisted Individualization (TAI).

Recently, Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (2013), have suggested four types of cooperative learning that are necessary to meet the challenges of Learning in 21 century. Those types of cooperative learning are formal cooperative learning, informal cooperative learning, cooperative base groups, and constructive controversy. First, formal cooperative learning consists of students working together for one class or several weeks in order to achieve the group goal and complete the specific tasks and assignment. Teacher should specific the objective for the lesson, make a decision of how to form the group, teach the academic concept and strategies, monitor the function of the learning group, and evaluate the student group performance. Second, informative cooperative learning consists of students who work together to achieve the same learning goal in temporary. Students engage within group for a short time from a few minutes to one class period. Students work together in three – to – five minute focused discussion before and after a lecture and another three – to –five minute turn – to - your – partner discussion interspersed throughout the lecture. Third, cooperative base groups are the permanent long – term heterogeneous cooperative learning group. Students learn and give one another with support, encouragement, and assistance to help each member to complete the assignment through the academic program. Finally, constructive controversy is the cooperative learning group that focuses the disagreement and argument among the members. It begins with randomly assign students to heterogeneous group. Then the group is divided into two. One half takes pro position and the other takes con. Each side will receive the information, which is necessary to support their side. Student learn, research, and prepare their assigned position. The important issue for each group is they need to write report and pass a test.

To be successful in setting up and having students complete group tasks within a cooperative learning framework, a number of essential elements or requirements must be met. The exact number and name of these requirements vary from one author to another. However, most of researchers agree that, in one way or another, the elements listed below are essential. According to, Johnson and Johnson (1994), five elements including, positive interdependence, individual accountability, face – to –face promotive interaction, appropriate use of collaborative skill, and group processing are widely accepted. Moreover, Slavin (1995) suggest three concepts in Student Team Learning Method, which are “team rewards, individual accountability, and equal opportunities for success”. In addition, Slavin (2014), have suggested the following five key practices that make cooperative learning powerful. Those key practices are form interdependent teams, set group goal, ensure individual accountability, teach communication and problem – solving skills, and integrate cooperative learning with other structures. However, it may be difficult to expect having all elements done effectively while implementing cooperative in classroom. Teacher needs to ensure that these requirements are met for each cooperative learning strategy (Stahl, 1994).

Related study on cooperative learning

Over the past three decades, many studies have been constructed through cooperative learning method in all subject areas (Johnson et.al, 2000). Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) is the simplest method of all cooperative learning for the teacher who is new at using cooperative learning (Slavin, 1995). Moreover, Ghaith and Yahi (1998), claim that among cooperative learning methods, STAD is simple and effective in improving student achievement in various subjects. STAD has five main elements, which include “Class presentation, teams, quizzes, individual

improvement scores, and team recognitions” (Slavin, 1995). In STAD, students are assigned to four or five members in a team that are mixed in performance level, gender, and ethnicity. The procedures of teaching in STAD begin with teacher presents a lesson to all the students. After that, students work within their teammates. If they need to get team reward, they must make sure that all team members have mastered the lesson. After finish learning the material together, all the students take individual quizzes. This time students are not allowed to helped one another. Students’ quiz scores are compared to their own past averages, and points are awarded on the basis of the degree to which students meet or exceed their own earlier performance. This means they have “Equal opportunities for success” (Slavin, 1995). These points are then summed to form team scores, and teams that meet certain criteria may earn certificates or other rewards.

Alharbi (2008) conducted a study on the effect of using cooperative learning on EFL reading comprehension performance and attitudes of students toward cooperative learning and students’ motivation toward reading at a girl school. A study was quasi – experimental design. The participants were sixty female students from three school. There were two group in the study both control and experiment group. Each group was consisted of thirty students. The result reveal that there was significant difference between the experimental group and control group in terms of reading comprehension performance and students’ attitudes toward cooperative learning. However, the study showed no significant difference between the group in terms of student’s motivation toward reading.

Another study from Khan and Ahmad (2014) investigated cooperative learning compared with traditional learning for reading skills of eighth grade students. The participants were divided into two groups. An experimental group was employed

by using a treatment plan consisted of cooperative learning (STAD). The control group was taught through traditional learning. The study revealed a significant difference between two groups with more favorable reading skill of students and better reading comprehension in experimental groups than in the control groups.

Moreover, Jalilifar (2010) compared the impact of using two cooperative learning techniques: STAD and Group Investigation (GI) in reading comprehension. He employed both techniques with pre-intermediate female students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in college. The result revealed that STAD was more effective in terms of improving reading comprehension than GI. Jalilifar (2010) also confirmed the idea that “Team rewards, as one of the central concepts of STAD, may have a strong impact on learners’ performance in reading comprehension”.

All of the above related studies shares the common situations in the way that they were conducted with EFL students. The study from Jalilifar (2010) and Khan and Ahmad (2014) showed that STAD was the effective learning method in cooperative learning that can be used to improve students’ reading comprehension although, the participants are not in the same country. STAD of cooperative learning has proved that it has been influential in bringing the positive effects in multiple grades (Alijanian, 2012). Therefore, researcher considers adopting STAD method in cooperative learning to improve students’ reading comprehension with Thai students.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study was to explore how STAD activities in cooperative learning effects high schools' English reading comprehension and examine students' opinions after they learnt through STAD activities. This chapter begins with an overview of the research methodology following by context of the study. The population, samples selection, research instruments, and procedures of the study are also explained in this chapter. Finally, the chapter ends up with the explanation of data collection and analysis.

Research methodology

This research was an experimental research with a single group pretest posttest design aiming to develop high school students' reading comprehension toward the use of STAD activity in cooperative learning. The quantitative data consisted of the students' pretest and posttest scores from the reading comprehension test. The qualitative data addressed the interview questions and the teacher journal. The data collection and analysis used both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. The study also determined students' opinion toward the use of STAD activities in cooperative learning. The study took seven weeks including the orientation and the pretest – posttest section. The independent variable was cooperative learning. There were two dependent variables: 1) the scores of students' reading comprehension, and 2) the students' opinions towards improving reading comprehension with the use of cooperative learning.

Context of the study

This study was conducted with Mattayomsuksa 5 students at Srinakarinwirot University Prasarnmit Demonstration School (Secondary). All

students were learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). They were required to study Basic English Reading and Writing course level 2. Some of the students were children who required special assistance as they had learning difficulties.

Populations and samples selection

The population of this study was 750 high school students in academic year of 2015. The sample for this study was 38 mathayomsuksa 5 students in class 5/2. They were selected by purposive sampling. The reason this class was selected as a sample of this study was that the class consisted of heterogeneous students. They reflected a range of academic achievement levels, gender as well as language ability. The achievement level and language ability were measured by their previous English final test score. Namely, there were nine high achievement students out of thirty-eight whose the final score was more than seventy of out eighty. The number of medium achievement students who achieved the final score of more than fifty was fifteen and there were fourteen low achievement students whose the final score was lower than fifty. Moreover, this class also had one student who was listed as a special needs student.

Research instruments

Two parts of instrument were used to obtain data for this study. The lesson plans and English reading comprehension pretest and posttest were employed to obtain quantitative data while the interview questions and teacher journal were used to obtain qualitative data. Three experts validated all instruments in order to check the validity and appropriateness.

The Lesson Plan

There were seven lesson plans containing three main topics, which were looking for paragraph details, making inference, and determining the main idea. In

each lesson plan, the researcher designed the activity based on five key elements of STAD method. All lesson plans were submitted to three experts of English teaching and learning to check the correctness of the content. The level of the reading passages for the lesson plan was based on a textbook for grade eleven students.

Table 1

The schedule of seven lesson plans

Schedule of seven lesson plans

Week	Content	Activity
1	Looking for detail (1)	Numbered head together
2	Looking for detail (2)	Classifying details
3	Making inference (1)	Two stay – two stray
4	Making inference (2)	Two stay – two stray
5	Determining the main idea (1)	Pair them up
6	Determining the main idea (2)	The missing main idea
7	Reading comprehension	Roundtable

- Looking for detail
- Making inference
- Determine the main idea

English Reading Comprehension Pretest Posttest

The reading comprehension test consists of two tests, which were the English reading comprehension pretest and English reading comprehension posttest. The purpose of the pre reading test was to assess students' ability in reading comprehension before learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning while the post reading test administered to evaluate students' reading comprehension after learning by using the STAD activities in cooperative learning. All the tests asked students the same questions by assigning them to read a paragraph with different topics. The questions aimed to evaluate the students' comprehension on paragraph details, inference, and main idea. The length of each paragraph was between 180 to 220 words and the time set for taking the test was 45 minutes.

Interview questions

After the students learnt reading through cooperative activities for seven weeks, the researcher interviewed all students in each team to obtain their opinions and points of view after learning through cooperative activities. As a result, the interview questions helped encouraged all students with high, medium and low ability to express their opinions. The interview allowed the research to gain more detail about cooperative learning after the experiment. The interview questions were submitted to three experts of teaching and learning English to check the appropriateness of the questions. In this study, there were six questions to obtain students' opinion and view point.

- 1) Do you like the activity that we learnt in the class? Why or why not?
- 2) How does cooperative learning differ from traditional learning?

3) Do you think your reading comprehension has improved after learning through cooperative learning activities?

4) How can STAD activity in cooperative learning help you to improve your reading comprehension?

5) What kind of activity do you prefer between cooperative learning and traditional learning?

6) Do you think the teacher should use cooperative learning activities with other classrooms?

Teacher journal

The researcher used a teacher journal to record student scores in each team after taking an individual test. The researcher compared each student's score to their previous record to observe their achievement. Moreover, the teacher journal was used to take notes of any problems occurring in classroom and students' reactions while learning through cooperative activities.

Procedure of the study

The research arranged this study into three stages. The first stage was the preparation of instruments used for this study including lesson plan, English reading comprehension pretest and posttest as well as interviewed questions. The second stage was the process of data collection. The final stage was about data analysis and conclusion.

The preparation of instruments

There are three stages for preparation of an instrument in this study.

Firstly, the researcher studied concept and five key elements of cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). Next, the researcher designed lesson plans considering those key elements and asked three experts to check the appropriateness and correctness. After the experts gave their feedbacks, the researcher revised the lesson plans and prepared to use with the sample.

Secondly, the researcher wrote fifty questions of English comprehension test. Then the researcher asked three experts to check the validity by using Item – Objective Congruence (IOC). After the experts gave comments and rating score, the researcher revised all tests and piloted the test with the pilot classroom in order to check the difficulty, discrimination, and reliability of the test. Finally, the researcher selected thirty questions out of fifty and used as a pretest with the sample.

Finally, the researcher wrote the interview questions and asked three experts to check language and appropriateness. After revising the interview questions, they were translated directly into Thai language in order to use with the sample after the experiment.

Data collection

The procedures for the experiment and data collections were employed as follows: Firstly, the researcher reviewed the curriculum, course objective, and course description. Secondly, the researcher constructed instruments used for the study including the lesson plan based on five key elements of STAD, the English pre - reading, the English post - reading test, as well as the interview questions about the students' opinion after studying through STAD program in cooperative approach. The researcher consulted with three experts to check the validity and appropriateness of the instruments. The three experts consisted of one native speaker and two Thai

teachers. The researcher piloted two lesson plans and an English pre reading test with another class in order to check reliability, discrimination, and difficulty. After piloting the test, the researcher revised the test again before using with the sample.

On the experimental process, the pretest was employed to the sample. Firstly, the researcher recorded the students' pretest scores. Secondly, the students were taught reading through STAD activities in cooperative approach for seven weeks or ten and a half hours. Thirdly, on the last week of the experiment, the posttest was administered to the students. Then the researcher interviewed the students in order to obtain their opinions toward the use of cooperative learning. Finally, The data was obtained and analyzed to answer the research questions.

Data analysis.

The data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The procedures for analyzing the data were as follows.

For quantitative data, the pretest and posttest scores were analyzed the descriptive statistic including mean and standard deviation with the SPSS programme. Then the mean scores and standard deviation were calculated to determine whether the mean score of the pretest and posttest are significantly different by t-test dependent for comparing the students' reading ability before and after learning through the STAD programme in the cooperative approach.

The qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis. Firstly, the data from the interview part was coded and grouped into categories. Then the data was analyzed to assess the students' opinion toward the use of the STAD activities in the cooperative learning.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the result of using cooperative learning method to improve high school students' reading comprehension. There are two parts in this chapter to answer the research question. The first part shows the effect of using STAD activities in cooperative learning with high school students. The second part focuses on student's opinion toward learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning.

The effect of using STAD activities in cooperative learning

This research question dealt with the effect of using STAD activities in cooperative learning with high school students.

Research question 1: Does STAD activities in cooperative learning help students improve their reading comprehension score?

This research question aimed to investigate the effect of using STAD activities in cooperative learning whether it could help enhance students' reading comprehension or not. The research instrument used to answer this research question was the English reading comprehension pretest and posttest and to answer the research question, t-test dependent sample was run to compare the mean score (M) and the standard deviation (S.D) between pretest and posttest in high school students' reading comprehension as well as to determine whether there was statistically significant difference. Table 2 showed the result of students' score between after and before using cooperative activities based on students' achievement level. Moreover, Table 3 showed the total result of students' scores after using cooperative learning method compared with students' score before learning with cooperative learning activities.

Table 2

Results of the improvement of students' reading comprehension between the group of students' achievement level

<i>Achievement Level</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>		<i>SD</i>	
		<i>Pretest</i>	<i>Posttest</i>	<i>Pretest</i>	<i>Posttest</i>
High Achievement	9	22.00	26.00	2.12	2.12
Medium Achievement	15	18.20	21.93	0.94	2.71
Low Achievement	14	15.64	18.71	1.64	2.94

Table 2 showed the mean and the standard deviation between pretest and posttest of students' achievement level. In high-achievement level, the mean for pretest was 22.00 and the posttest was 26.00. The standard deviation for pretest was 2.12 and posttest was 2.12. In medium-achievement level, the improvement mean was pretest was 18.20 and posttest was 21.93. The standard deviation in pretest was 0.94 and posttest was 2.71. For low-achievement level, the mean for pretest was 15.64 and posttest was 18.71. The standard deviation for pretest was 1.64 and posttest was 2.94.

Table 3

Results of an independent sample *t* test on the improvement of students' reading comprehension between Pre- and Post-test

<i>Test</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Post	38	21.61	3.73	9.443	37	.00
Pre	38	18.16	2.87			

According to the above results, the mean for the posttest was 21.61 and the pretest was 18.16. The standard deviation for posttest was 3.73 and for the pretest was

2.87. The dependent sample t test revealed that there were significant differences at the .05 significance level in the pretest and the posttest score. Results indicated that students' reading comprehension increased after receiving the treatment.

Furthermore, the information gathered from the teacher journal showed that every student passed all test in all seven lessons after they had learnt through STAD activity in cooperative learning for seven times. The test measured students' reading comprehension in looking for detail, making inference, and determining the main idea. The mean for the first test was 6.78. The mean for the second test was 7.44. The mean for the third test was 6.94. The mean for the fourth test was 7.31. The mean for the fifth test was 6.97. The mean for the sixth test was 7.89 and the mean for the seventh test was 7.71. This finding confirmed that using STAD activity in cooperative learning was able to enhance students' reading comprehension skill.

Student's opinion toward learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning.

This research question tended to elicit students' opinions about STAD activities in cooperative learning.

Research question 2: What are the students' opinions about learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning?

To analyze students' opinions, the interview responses were transcribed and categorized into two main points, the enhancement in student's reading comprehension and student's preference for using cooperative learning in classroom.

The enhancement in student's reading comprehension

The students were mixed ability within each group. There were students who had high, medium, and low achievement level of English. The results were divided into two parts from high achievement students. The other part is medium-and low-achievement students.

High-achievement students

The high achievement students expressed their opinion of the development of their reading comprehension after learning through cooperative learning as follows.

Some students in high achievement level reflected that cooperative learning slightly help them improve their reading comprehension. For example, two students said, “We thought our reading skill was quite good. We could understand the reading passage and completed the exercises by ourselves. Therefore, there was no difference whether learning through cooperative activities or not”. Another high achievement student added, “I thought using the activity for reading was fun but I thought my reading comprehension skills were still the same. I could pass the test as usual.”

Nevertheless, other high-achievement students had positive feelings about using cooperative leaning activities in classroom. For example, some students claimed, “Learning through cooperative learning helped us develop our reading skills. The activities allowed us to think more systematically. We thought cooperative learning gave us a chance to share our ideas with our friends and we could use those ideas before making the decision to choose the right answer in the exercise.”

Medium-and low-achievement students

In contrast, all students who were medium and low achievement had positive feelings after learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning. They thought cooperative learning helped them improve their reading comprehension skills. They gave some interesting feedbacks as follows.

Some students claimed “After learning through cooperative learning, they thought they could better comprehend the reading passage and their reading skills improved as they were able to find the correct answers by themselves.” One student confirmed, “Cooperative learning reduced my pressure and stress while reading. Before

learning through cooperative activities, I thought reading was very boring and difficult. I had no opportunity to ask my friends when I struggled but after learning through cooperative activities, I found that my friends encouraged me to read more. Members in my team also helped me with the more challenging vocabularies. Finally, it was fun when our group got full marks.”

In conclusion, from the interview of high, medium and low achievement students, it could be inferred that most of the students agreed that cooperative learning helps them to improve their reading comprehension as the activities allowed them to work collaboratively. This interaction reduced their stress when they got struggle while they were reading. Even the high achievement students agreed that working collectively was beneficial to everyone.

Students’ preference for using cooperative leaning activities in classroom

According to the interviews, the students reflected two points after learning through cooperative learning. Firstly, the students felt that cooperative learning motivated them to learn. One student said, “I preferred learning through cooperative learning to traditional learning because I thought, it was fun and had more interesting activities that helped not to make reading class boring.” Another student added, “Teacher should apply cooperative learning to other classes because I thought this would make students want to study more and could reduce their stress.” Secondly, cooperative learning encouraged students to have self-confidence. Some students claimed “Using cooperative learning in classroom was a great idea because we thought cooperative learning gave us a chance to ask and share opinions with other students.” One student commented “I thought discussing among my teammate made me learn more than usual. I could answer the question and I felt proud of myself. I thought using this kind of activity from cooperative learning should always be used in our reading classroom and it would

be fun if I could study like this with other subjects.” Few students supported that “We trusted our teammates. The discussion within our group ensured that our answers would be correct. We had more confidence when teacher called our name to answer the questions.”

Nonetheless, not all students preferred cooperative learning. Because they were not comfortable with cooperative learning in which students must learn with other students who were not their close friends in classroom. According to an interview, a few students were not particularly happy when teacher randomly set the group for them. Two students said, “We didn’t like being with other students because we didn’t know our members personally. We did not feel happy when we were not in the same group with our close friends. Therefore, We preferred studying alone.” Another student added, “It would be better if the teacher allowed me to choose my own members.”

Concluding from the interview, most of high school students enjoyed learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning and preferred to use cooperative learning in their reading classroom in order to improve their reading comprehension skills. Moreover, students also suggested using cooperative learning methods in other classes would benefit them academically. However, learning through cooperative learning was not fit for a few students who had high level of anxiety to work with the unacquaintance classmates.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of the study and the research work undertaken, findings of the study, discussion of research findings, limitation of the study, pedagogical implications, and recommendations for future research study.

Summary

This study aimed to investigate the effects of using STAD activities in cooperative learning to enhance students' English reading comprehension and to observe students' opinions after applying them in reading class.

The participants involved in this study were 38 students from class 5/2 of mattayomsuksa 5 at Srinakharinwirot Prasarnmit Demonstration School (Secondary) for the academic year 2015. All the participants were Thai – speaking students. They were chosen by purposive sampling as they have a mixed ability in English.

The study obtained quantitative data from pretest and posttest English reading comprehension test in order to examine the effectiveness of using STAD activities to enhance students' reading comprehension. Moreover, the qualitative data gained from an interview section where students from every team were asked to express their opinions after students learnt through STAD activities.

Thus to achieve the required objectives of this research, the study was divided into three stages. Firstly, the research instruments were designed carefully as to enhance and improve students learning experience through cooperative learning activities. It became necessary to reach understanding about nature of cooperative learning before designing the instruments. After they were designed, three experts were asked to check the validity and the appropriateness of the instruments. Then the data collection procedures were carried out to examine the use of STAD activities in cooperative learning whether they

could affect students' reading comprehension or not. Finally, the data were analyzed by using quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Namely, the quantitative data was analyzed for descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation; while the qualitative data were transcribed and group into categories.

The findings showed that STAD activities in cooperative learning helped enhance high school students' score in English reading comprehension. The result also revealed that there was a significant difference at the .05 significance level in pretest to posttest score. Additionally, the individual students' scores that were recorded in the teacher journal showed that most students continuously improved their reading comprehension in searching for details, determining the main idea, and making inference.

After transcribing from the interview section, it was decided to split this into two main points; the development in reading comprehension and the students' preference for using cooperative learning in the classroom.

The first point was the development in reading comprehension scores, all of the students who are medium and low achievement in reading comprehension thought STAD activities really helped them improve their overall reading abilities. On the other hand, some high achievement students thought STAD activities barely helped them improve because they believed that they already had strong reading comprehension abilities so STAD activities had little effect on their reading comprehension score.

The second point was about the students' preference for using STAD activities in the classroom. Most of the students agreed that applying cooperative learning in the classroom made the classroom environment had more fun and more interesting than traditional classroom whereas few students preferred using traditional learning to cooperative learning, as they were not comfortable and familiar to work in cooperative environment.

Discussion

STAD activities in cooperative learning helped students read the text while working collaboratively. As a result, cooperative learning was the answer for finding out how to help students of mixed achievement level succeed in reading comprehension with small groups (Meloth & Deering, 1992). After conducting and analyzing data, the study showed that STAD activities in cooperative learning was a useful teaching method that helped improve the reading comprehension skill in high school students. This section can be categorized into two aspects based on the research questions.

The effects of using STAD activities in cooperative learning on students reading comprehension

This present study investigated the effect of using STAD activities in cooperative learning on high school students' reading comprehension. The findings revealed that after adopting STAD activities in the reading classroom, students' abilities in reading comprehension by answering specific questions determined to find the following; answering details questions, determine the main idea and making inference was improved. The finding is consistent with earlier studies conducted by (Johnson & Johnson, 2001; Alharbi, 2008; Khan & Ahmad, 2014). Namely, the result of those studies proved that cooperative learning was effective in enhancing student's reading comprehension. Moreover, data gathered from the teacher journal supported the effectiveness of using STAD activities in cooperative learning that students' ability in reading comprehension was consistently improved while they were learning through cooperative activities. In addition, many studies confirmed the findings that STAD activities in cooperative learning are considered as an effective technique and a good alternative for teaching reading comprehension to EFL high school students and those who work in cooperative groups with others are more motivated and successful (Yusuf,

Natsir, & Hanum, 2015; Ghaith, 2003; Wenzel, 2000). In conclusion, what made this study significant was the effectiveness of STAD activities in cooperative learning among high school students.

Student's opinion toward learning through STAD activities in cooperative learning on reading comprehension

The study revealed two main aspects gathered from the interview questions.

The enhancement on students' reading comprehension

The result of this study indicated that the participants generally have a positive view of implementing cooperative activities for reading comprehension. They mentioned that learning through cooperative learning activities helped improve their scores in reading comprehension. Students felt a sense of achievement when reading test scores improved. Most students agreed that encouragement from their teammate, the opportunity to work collaboratively, and the individual accountabilities reduced their stress and pressure when doing reading comprehension. The study from Farzaneh and Nejadansari (2014), confirmed that by working in group, students feel that they can rely on others for help and it motivate them to have confidence when solving problems as well as creates a positive learning experience. Therefore, applying cooperative learning activities in the classroom is an important process when teaching reading comprehension that motivates students to learn and help improve their overall reading comprehension skills.

Students' need for using cooperative leaning in classroom

This study investigated the students' opinions after learning through STAD activities. From the interview section, the results revealed that students in this study mostly agreed that using cooperative learning in the classroom through STAD activities are beneficial. This indicated that most students realized the benefits of using STAD activities for reading class. Students felt that cooperative learning activities were

necessary and they preferred to apply cooperative learning activities to other subjects. Overall, most students agreed that it was a useful technique which helps them to learn reading comprehension more efficiently.

However, a few students from high achievement level preferred to study through the traditional method as they felt that learning collaboratively or individually had little effect on their test scores. Therefore, they did not consider cooperative learning as a tool to help them improve their reading comprehension.

In conclusion, the overall result of the study showed that students needed the facilitative activities and the assistance from team to help students improve reading comprehension skills more than learning individually.

Limitations of the study

The limitation of using cooperative learning in this study was students' learning style. As students felt unfamiliar with cooperative environment, the researcher found that it did take time to explain and ensure that students understood the rules and their roles in cooperative learning. Mismatched personalities within a group could cause unsatisfying result. For example, students with high achievement simply took over the majority of the task for the sake of speed and ease rather than helping struggling students learn.

Pedagogical Implications

It was believed that the research results reported here have significance to teachers, school leaders, teacher training institutions, policy makers, researchers and other stakeholders in the development of teachers. The findings of the study presented above have implications for the following people.

Firstly, based on the findings of the study, the following implications were made for the instructors and teachers. Teaching reading comprehension should not take for granted. Teachers should be trained to design reading comprehension lesson plan that

followed a cooperative learning process. Teacher needed to be given proper training to perform these roles well. They should be taught in the following process such as how to understand a context, how to choose appropriate activities for reading class and how to apply cooperative learning in the classroom.

Secondly, the school director together with the head of the English department should play an important role in encouraging teachers at their school to implement different activities for the students. Teachers should try to apply active learning activities such as cooperative learning to their class rather than teach through the traditional style in which students were the passive learners. The director should support teachers by providing them with opportunities to be trained in cooperative learning methods by organizing seminars or workshops to improve the standard of teaching and learning English at the school.

Recommendations for Further Studies

The results of the study reveal that cooperative learning has increased students' abilities for English reading comprehension. Therefore, adopting cooperative learning could be implemented with other groups at any levels for other skills such as writing, speaking, or listening. It would be worth investigating how effective cooperative learning is on other skills so that instructors can use findings for improving and developing their teaching process.

As this research is mainly based on STAD model in cooperative learning, future research should focus on comparisons between different models of cooperative learning in order to determine if other cooperative learning models are equally effective to enhance students learning as STAD.



REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alharbi, L. A. (2008). The effectiveness of using cooperative learning method on ESL reading comprehension performance, students' attitudes toward CL, and students' motivation toward reading of secondary stage in Saudi public girls' schools. *Proquest*, West Virginia University.
- Allington, R. L., & Cunningham, P. M. (2010). Prior knowledge plays a large role in reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language Journal*.
- Al-Jahwari, Y., & Al-Humaidi, S. (2015). Prior Knowledge in EFL Reading Comprehension: Omani Teachers' Perspectives & Classroom Strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(1), 169-181.
- Alijanian, E. (2012). The Effect of Student Teams Achievement Division Technique on English Achievement of Iranian EFL Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(9), 1971-1975.
- Alirio, J., & Arteaga, B. (2006). A Framework to Understanding Motivation in The TESOL Field. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, (7), 147-160.
- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. AG (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. *Eric*, 7-20. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED253865>.
- Cambria, J., & Guthrie, J. T. (2010). Motivating and engaging students in reading. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 46(1), 16.

- Cutting, L. E., & Scarborough, H. S. (2006). Prediction of reading comprehension: Relative contributions of word recognition, language proficiency, and other cognitive skills can depend on how comprehension is measured. *Scientific studies of reading, 10*(3), 277-299.
- Dole, J. A., Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 61*, 239 - 264.
- Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D. (2001). Reading comprehension: Strategies that work, 421 - 423. Retrieved from https://www.hand2mind.com/pdf/miriam/grades_1_2.pdf.
- Duke, N., Pearson, D., Strachan, S., & Billman, A. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. *What research has to say about reading instruction, 51-93*.
- Durkin, D. (1993). *Teaching them to read*. (6th ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Earl, G. L. (2009). Using cooperative learning for a drug information assignment. *American journal of pharmaceutical education, 73*(7).
- Farzaneh, N. & Nejadansari, D. (2004). Students' Attitude toward Using Cooperative Learning for Teaching Reading Comprehension. *Academy Publisher, 4*(2), 287-292. Retrieved from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol04/02/09pdf>.
- Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2001). Effective strategies for cooperative learning. *Journal of Cooperation & Collaboration in College Teaching, 10*(2), 69-75.
- Ghaith G. M. & Yaghi H. M.(1998). Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Acquisition of Second Language Rules and Mechanics. *System, 26* (2), 223-234.

- Ghaith, G. M. (2003). Relationship between reading attitudes, achievement, and learners perceptions of their Jigsaw II cooperative learning experience. *Reading Psychology, 24*(2).
- Gillies, R. M., & Boyle, M. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(4), 933-940.
- Graves, M. F., Juel, C., Graves, B. B. (2004). Teaching reading in the 21 st century. *Pearson*. United States of America.
- Heilman, A. W., Blair, T. R., & Rupley, W. H. (1994). *Principles and practices of teaching reading*. Macmillan College Publishing company, New York.
- Hoover, W. A., & Tunmer, W. E. (1993). The Components of Reading. *Reading acquisition processes, 4*(1).
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning techniques on college students' reading comprehension. *System, 38*(1), 96-108.
- Johnson, D. W. (1994). Cooperative learning in the classroom. *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2002). Learning together and alone: Overview and meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 22*(1), 95-105.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2014). Cooperative Learning in 21st Century. *anales de psicología, 30*(3), 841-851.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (2013). *Cooperation in the classroom* (9th ed.). Edina. MN: International book company.

- Khan, S. A., & Ahmad, R. N. (2014). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Cooperative.
- Knoepke, J., Richter, T., Isberner, M. B., Naumann, J., & Neeb, Y. (2014). Phonological recoding, orthographic decoding, and comprehension skills during reading acquisition. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 17(3), 447-471.
- Krashen, S. (1998). Comprehensible output. *System*, 26(2), 175-182.
- Krashen, S. (2005). Free voluntary reading: New research, applications, and controversies. *Anthology Series-Seameo Regional Language Centre*, 46(1).
- Laguador, J. M. (2014). Cooperative Learning Approach In An Outcomes-Based Environment. *International Journal of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities*, 2(2), 46-55.
- McNamara, D. S. (Ed.). (2012). Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies. *Psychology Press*.
- Meloth, M.S. and Deering. (1992). Effect of two cooperative conditions on peer – group discussion, reading comprehension, and metacognition. *Contemporary Education Psychology*. 17(2), p.175-193.
- Mislevy, R., & Rahman, T. (2009). Design pattern for assessing cause and effect reasoning in reading comprehension.
- National Reading Panel (US), National Institute of Child Health, & Human Development (US). (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups*. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.

- Pressley, M. (2001). Comprehension instruction: What makes sense now, what might make sense soon. *Reading online*, 5(2), 1-14.
- Qanwal, S., & Karim, S. (2014). Identifying Correlation between Reading Strategies Instruction and L2 Text Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(5), 1019-1032.
- Qiufang, W. (2001). Developmental Patterns in Motivation, Beliefs and Strategies of English Learners in China. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 2, 105-110.
- Roberson, D. K. (2011). Examining the role of prior knowledge in reading comprehension and vocabulary development of Korean heritage language learners. Texas A&M University-Kingsville.
- Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative Learning Theory, Research and Practice*, 2nd Edition. Allyn and Bacon, Massachusetts, MA.
- Slavin, R. E. (2014). Making Cooperative Learning Powerful. *Educational Leadership*, 72(2), 22-26.
- Stahl, R. J. (1994). *The Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*. ERIC Digest.
- Teele, S. (2004). *Overcoming barricades to reading: A multiple intelligences approach*. Corwin Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenzel, T. J. (2000). AC Educator: Cooperative student activities as learning devices.
- Wittrock, M. C. (1991). Generative teaching of comprehension. *The Elementary School Journal*, p. 169 - 184.

- Yang, X. (2016). Study on factors affecting learning strategies in reading comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(3), 586-590.
- Yusuf, Y. Q., Natsir, Y., & Hanum, L. (2015). A Teacher's Experience in Teaching with Student Teams-Achievement Division (STAD) Technique. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(2), 99-112.
- Zhang, D., & Koda, K. (2012). Contribution of morphological awareness and lexical inferencing ability to L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension among advanced EFL learners: Testing direct and indirect effects. *Reading and Writing*, 25(5), 1195-1216.
- Zuo, W. (2011). The effects of cooperative learning on improving college students' reading comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(8), 986-989.



APPENDICES

Appendix1

Lesson Plan of using STAD activities in cooperative learning to improve high school students' reading comprehension

Lesson Plan 1 Looking for details

Background:

Institution: Srinakarinwirot University Demonstration School (Secondary)

Course/Level: Reading and writing course 2, 90 minutes, Mattayomsuksa 5

Students: 38 students of Mattayomsuksa 5, age 17-18, Thai-speaking

Overall course goals: Students learn how to find details in the given passage.

Text/materials: Reading passage, worksheet, flash card

Lesson aim(s): Students are able to find details in the paragraph correctly.

Note: Students must sit in the group with mixed abilities arranged by the teacher.

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
Lead in (5 minutes)	To review students about what reading comprehension is.	-	T-S	Teacher checks students background knowledge of reading by asking students with the following questions:		

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				1. What is comprehension? 2. How can you answer questions after reading? 3. Do you need to know all words in the text to make you understand?		
Present (20 minutes)	Students will be able to read the paragraph focusing on details and complete questions after reading.	worksheet	T-S	1. Students sit with their group. 2. Teacher tells students to look at the example paragraph about litters. Some words in the given paragraph will be replaced by an image●. Each image represents one word, which is missing from the paragraph.	Student can answer questions after reading correctly.	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>Example paragraph:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Litters</p> <p>○○○sad ○see litter ○○○○○○ ○○public place. ○○○big problem ○○○be stopped.</p> <p>3. Teacher tells students to help one another read and answer the question after reading.</p> <p>4. Class discusses the answer together.</p>		

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				5. Teacher makes a conclusion that when we are looking for details in the paragraph we do not need to understand all words in the text.		
Practice (45 minutes)	Students are able to comprehend the given passage through cooperative activity.	worksheet	S-S	<p>1. Teacher tells student that they are going to do the other reading comprehension practice focusing on looking for paragraph details.</p> <p>2. Teacher informs students that this time they must help their teammate do the activity called “Number head together”.</p>	Students help their teammate read and complete the task correctly.	Make sure that every member in the group helps each other read and is able to answer the question correctly. Because student’s answer will affect their group score.

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>3. Teacher explains the rules of the “Number head together” as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each student gets a number 1, 2, 3, and 4. - Teacher asks a question and students put their head together to develop the answer and explanation for their answer. - When teacher calls number 1, 2, 3, or 4, students with that number in each groups gives there group’s answer and explanation. 		

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>4. Teacher lets students help each other read the text and continue doing “Number head together” activity.</p> <p>5. Teacher randomly calls students to answer questions after reading.</p> <p>6. The group, which has the highest score, gets a reward from the teacher.</p>		
Production (20 minutes)	Students are able to do the test individually.	Test paper	-	Teacher tells students to take the test focusing on answering details question.	Students pass the reading test.	

Lesson Plan 2 Making inference

Background:

Institution: Srinakarinwirot University Demonstration School (Secondary)

Course/Level: Reading and writing course 2, 90 minutes, Mattayomsuksa 5

Students: 38 students of Mattayomsuksa 5, age 17-18, Thai-speaking

Overall course goals: Students are able to make an inference base on the specific evidence from the passage given.

Text/materials: Reading passage, worksheet

Lesson aim(s): 1. Students are able to infer the text. 2. Students help their teammates do the inferring activity.

Note: Students must sit in the group with mixed abilities arranged by the teacher.

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
Lead in (5 minutes)	To review student about making inference from the reading passage.	Picture	T-S	1. Teacher shows a picture to students. 2. Tell students to guess what are the children doing?	Students are able to guess the answer.	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-stp detail	Evaluation	Other notes
Present (20 minutes)	To make the students learn the concept of making inference from reading passage.	Video clip about how to make an inference.	T-S	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tell students that we are going to learn making inference. 2. Teacher presents the video about how to make inference to class. 3. After watching the video, teacher makes the conclusion with the class again. 	Student can summarize how to make an inference after watching the video.	
Practice (40minutes)	Students are able to identify the inferences from the given clue.	Inference game card and worksheet	S-S	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher tells students to remain the same group. 2. Teacher separates set of game cards to every group. 	Students are able to make in inference from the clue correctly.	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>3. Describe the game rules as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Face down the inference cards in a stack. Provide each student answers card.2) Take turns select a card from the stack and read it.3) Look for phrase on your answer card that answer the question.4) Continue activity until all matches are made.		

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				4. Students share their answers. Group discusses the answers and corrects some mistakes made by team members.		
Production (20 minutes)	Students can do the test individually.	Test paper	-	Teacher tells students to take the test.	Students pass the reading test.	

Lesson Plan 3 Finding Main Idea

Background:

Institution: Srinakarinwirot University Demonstration School (Secondary)

Course/Level: Reading and writing course 2, 90 minutes, Mattayomsuksa 5

Students: 38 students of Mattayomsuksa 5, age 17-18, Thai-speaking

Overall course goals: Students learn how to identify the main idea of the paragraph.

Text/materials: Reading passage, worksheet, flash card

Lesson aim(s): 1. Students are able to identify main idea in the paragraph. 2. Students help their teammates learn and master the topic 3. Students help each other to do the identifying main idea activity.

Note: Students must sit in the group with mixed abilities arranged by the teacher.

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
Lead in (10 minutes)	The activity aims to review students about concept of main idea.	-	T-S	1. Teacher writes 3 sentences on the board. 2. Teacher asks students that which sentence could be the main idea.	Students can choose the correct sentence as a main idea.	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>Example:</p> <p>1) People used to use their fingers to calculate numbers.</p> <p>2) The ancient Romans counted on the fingers of just one hand because they needed to keep their hand free to grab their sword.</p> <p>3) The best explanation for why the Mayans counted in sets of twenty is that they didn't wear shoes!</p>		

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
Presentation (20 minutes)	Students are able to identify which main idea is too broad, too narrow, and too misinterpret information.	Worksheet	T-S	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher lets students read the passage about “The number system of ancient people” 2. After that, teacher gives students three sentences. 3. Teacher asks student which sentences is the proper main idea of this passage. 4. Teacher explains that there is one main idea form the passage the others called supporting details. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students are able to distinguish main idea from supporting detail correctly. 2. Students are able to answer the questions in main idea exercise correctly. 	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				5. Teacher and students discuss why the other sentences is not correct. 6. Teacher distributes handout of the concept of main idea consisting of topic too broad, too narrow, and misinterpret to students.		
Practice (40 minutes)	Students are able to identify main idea form the supporting details.	Worksheet and flashcard	S-S	1. Teacher provides each group five set of supporting details. Each set will be cut into piece of sentence.	Students can complete the task correctly.	

Activities/Timing	Objective	Materials/ Equipment	Interaction	Step-by-step detail	Evaluation	Other notes
				<p>2. Students find the correct main idea from each set of sentence and give the reason for each choice that which one is too vague, too narrow, and misinterpret.</p> <p>3. Class discusses answer together.</p>		
Production (20 minutes)	Students can do the test individually.	Test paper	-	Teacher tells students to take the test.	Students pass the reading test.	Students can do the test individually.

Appendix 2

Pre - Post Reading Test

This reading test consisting of three paragraphs evaluates student's reading comprehension ability. Each paragraph has 180 – 205 words with ten questions. The questions are emphasis on answering the paragraph details questions, making inference, and determining the main idea.

Direction: Choose the best answer.

Passage 1: Right Brain or Left Brain?

What do Leonardo da Vinci, Paul McCartney, Napoleon, and John McEnroe have **in common**? They are all left-handed. Today about 15 percent of the population is left-handed. But why are left-handed? The answer is in the way the brain works.

The brain has two halves-the right half and the left half. The right half controls the left side of the body, and the left controls the right side of the body. So right-handed people have a strong left brain, and left-handed people have a strong right brain.

The two halves of the brain are about the same size. But each side controls different things. The left side controls language, math, and logic. When you memorize the spelling of words, or when you put things in order, you use your left side. The right side of the brain controls your love of art, color, music, **It** is also good at recognizing faces.

This does not mean that all artists are left-handed and all accountants are right-handed. There are many exceptions. Some right-handers have a strong right brain, and some left-handers have a strong left brain.

1. People are right – handed or left – handed because of _____.
 - a. the population
 - b. the way the brain works
 - c. Paul McCartney and Napoleon
 - d. their fortune
2. The brain has _____.
 - a. two halves
 - b. two left halves
 - c. two order
 - d. two brain

3. Each side of the brain _____.
- likes language and math
 - controls the same thing
 - controls different things
 - controls two functions
4. What does the right side of the brain control?
- It controls left side of the body.
 - It controls right side of the body.
 - It controls both side of the body together with the left side.
 - It controls language and logic
5. What is the function of the left-brain?
- Anna reorder the sentences into passive voice.
 - Adam pains his wall.
 - the couple love watching opera.
 - Jenny tried to remember her new classmate.
6. Which statement is not mentioned in the text?
- Not all the artists are left-handed.
 - Left - handed people have a strong right brain.
 - All accountants are right-handed.
 - Some right - hander have a strong right brain.
7. Why does the author mention Leonardo da Vinci, Paul McCartney, Napoleon, and John McEnroe in the text?
- They are the famous person in the past.
 - To give the example of people who use left-handed.
 - All of them can control both brain side.
 - The are left-handed people but have strong left brain.
8. What does pronoun **it** in line 10 refer to?
- The brain
 - music
 - The right brain
 - The left brain

9. What is the main idea of the third paragraph?
- a. Two halves of the brain have the same size.
 - b. Two halves of the brain controls different things.
 - c. Left brain controls language and logic.
 - d. Brain has power in recognizing faces.
10. It can be inferred from the passage that the brain _____.
- a. is sometimes very difficult to understand
 - b. is likely to work in different function
 - c. is work well with the same things
 - d. has many exceptions

Passage 2 Ears and Your Character

The size and shape of your ears show your character more than any other part of the face. Other parts of the face change shape as we get older, but ears do not change their shape. **They** only change in size.

Reading people's character from their ears is a very old science. In ancient times people thought that a person with big ears had a good and generous character. They thought that a person with pale, small ears was dangerous. They also thought that the shape of the ear showed if a person was musical or not. Today, too, many people believe that the size and shape of the ear helps you know if a person is musical.

Ears are all different, and each characteristic has a meaning. Next time you look at a person, see if his or her ears are large, medium-sized, or small. Look at the lobes. Are they attached to the face? Ears that are always red mean that person may have temper, or he/she may just have high blood pressure. Ears that are always cold and pale mean that a person has a nervous character. And a big ear means a person in musical.

11. The size and shape of your ears show your character _____.
- a. more than other part of your face
 - b. as we get older
 - c. because they change shape
 - d. when it changes its size

12. Reading people's character from their ears is _____.
- only for music
 - an old idea
 - very popular
 - very new
13. Each characteristic of the ear _____.
- has no meaning
 - has a meaning
 - has a meaning in music
 - can predict your future
14. In ancient time people thought that a person with big ears _____.
- was very kind
 - loved music
 - was very dangerous
 - had a nervous character
15. It can be inferred from the passage that the ears
- tells the nature of person
 - tells the mood of the person
 - tells the blood pressure of the person
 - tells the skin color of the person
16. According to the passage, what statement is not mentioned?
- Ears that are red mean a person may have a temper.
 - Lobes attached to the face mean a person has high blood pressure.
 - Cold and pale ears may mean a person has a nervous character.
 - Today people believe the size and shape of the ear show if a person is musical or not.
17. What does pronoun **they** in line 3 refer to?
- the shape
 - the face
 - the ears
 - the character

18. What is the main idea of the whole paragraph?
- People have different ears shape.
 - Size and shape of ears can tell people characters.
 - Reading characters from ears is an old science.
 - Color of ears can tell people's health conditions.
19. According to the passage, who should we avoid having contact?
- Adam has red ears.
 - Bob has very big ears.
 - Jim has pale and thin ears.
 - Andy has the ears that attach to the face.
20. What can infer from the text?
- Today people do not believe ears can identify people's the characters.
 - Telling people's characters is a science.
 - Ears are different and each characteristic has a meaning.
 - If people grow up the ears will change the size.

Passage 3 Potatoes

Can you imagine life without French fries? Potatoes are very popular today. But in the past this was not true. Potatoes grew in South America five thousand years ago. But they only became popular in other places two hundred years ago.

In the 16th century, the Spanish took the potatoes from South America to Europe. But the people in Europe did not like this strange vegetable. Some people thought that if you ate the potato your skin would look like the skin of a potato. Other people could not believe that you ate the underground part of the plant. So they ate the leaves instead. **This** made them sick because there is poison in the leaves.

In the 1800s people started to eat potatoes. In Ireland, potatoes became the main food. Then, in 1845, a disease killed all the potatoes in Ireland. Two million people died of hunger.

Today, each country has its potato **dish**. Germans eat potatoes salad, and the United States has the baked potato. And, of course, the French invented French fries. Now French fries are popular all over the world. The English eat them with salt and vinegar, the French eat them with salt and pepper, and the Americans with ketchup.

21. What can be inferred from the first paragraph?
- Potatoes are very popular in the past.
 - Potatoes were grown in South America and very popular there.
 - Potatoes became the main food in South America.
 - Potatoes are very popular nowadays.
22. According to paragraph 2, in the 16th century_____.
- people in Europe had bad skin
 - people in Europe liked the potato
 - people in Europe invented French fries
 - people in Europe did not like the potato
23. According to the passage, what made people in Ireland die of hunger?
- Disease
 - Potato
 - The shortage of potato.
 - Poison in potato's leave
24. Why did European people prefer to eat potato's leave?
- They believed that if they ate potato their skin would look like the skin of a potato.
 - They did not eat the underground part of a plant.
 - They though that the leave can kill the disease.
 - They though that potato is a strange vegetable.
25. According to the passage, people started to eat potatoes_____.
- in 1800s
 - in the 16th century
 - five thousand years ago
 - in 1845
26. Which statement below is mentioned in the paragraph?
- Germans invented French fries and eat them with ketchup.
 - The Spanish was the first race that ate potatoes.
 - Nowadays, each country has its own potato dish.
 - The French fries are popular only in Europe.

27. What does “This” in paragraph 2 refer to?
- a. poison in the leave
 - b. eating potato’s leave
 - c. potato
 - d. people
28. According to the passage, which sentence is correct?
- a. There is poison in the skin of the potato.
 - b. Americans eat French fries with ketchup.
 - c. A disease killed the people in Ireland in 1845.
 - d. Potatoes grew in Europe five thousand years ago.
29. What is the main idea of the second paragraph?
- a. Potatoes become the main food in Europe.
 - b. The way the people in Europe think of potatoes.
 - c. Planting potatoes cause people die from hunger.
 - c. How to grow potatoes in Europe?
30. Why does the author show examples of how people eat French fries in many countries?
- a. To confirm that French fries are popular all over the world.
 - b. To suggest various dish of French fries.
 - c. To demonstrate the way of eating French fries.
 - d. To show the culture of each country.



VITAE

Name: Miss Pruksapan Janthorn

Date of Birth: May 5, 1989

Place of Birth: Nan, Thailand

Address: 201 M.1, Stan District, Pua Nan 10500

Workplace: Department of English

Srinakharinwirot University Prasarnmit Demonstration School
(Secondary)

Educational Background

2012 Bachelor of Education (English)

Srinakharinwirot University

2017 Master of Arts (Teaching English as a Foreign Language)

Srinakharinwirot University