The Effects of Peer Interaction on English Reading Comprehension and Learning Motivations of EFL Students at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University, Thailand [*]

Prachak Rotarwut [**]

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of peer interaction on English reading comprehension, learning motivations, and self-perception of EFL students at Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University, Thailand. This research was carried out through an experimental design with experimental and control groups. In the second semester of the 2013 Academic Year, 50 second year students majoring in English (Teacher Education) formed the experimental and the control groups. They were all randomly chosen. Peer interaction techniques were applied to the experiment group for 8 weeks while the control group was educated through traditional methods in teaching reading English for comprehension. The data of the research were gathered by the Learning Achievement Test for English Reading Comprehension, the Questionnaire on Motivation for Learning English in General, the Questionnaire on Motivation for Reading Comprehension, and the Questionnaire on Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension. The results demonstrated that the researcher-mediated learning environment, i.e. the group engaged in peer interaction techniques, was successful in enhancing reading comprehension achievement. The students' motivation for learning English in general and for reading comprehension, and students' self-perception for reading comprehension were increased significantly.

Keyword: Peer Interaction, English reading comprehension, Learning motivation, Self-perception

---

Introduction

Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University is a local university which it serves the community in educational development. It offers various courses from bachelor to doctoral degrees. Faced with international competition and the introduction of the ASEAN Community in 2015, the Thai government has strongly urged all educational institutions to promote students' English ability and improve the quality of teaching English due to its international communication language and being the official language for ASEAN.

Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University has followed the government's policy by increasing the English courses from six to twelve credits in each learning program. Each program requires students to enroll in English courses of at least 12 credits: 6 credits from two compulsory general education courses and the other 6 credits from two core courses. The first two courses are as follows: Foundation English and English for Communication. The other two English courses are English for specific purposes related to its respective programs, e.g. English for Technology, English for Industrial Work, English for Science, etc.

The increase of English credits and hours of learning should expectedly lead to the enhancement of the students' English ability and achievement. However, as the results of their learning English in both courses in compulsory general education, it was found that most students had a low achievement in English and thus their grade band was mostly from a borderline pass to a pass with an acceptable satisfaction level (D, D+, C and C+). Only a few students could achieve the grade band of good and very good (B, B+ and A). In the third or fourth year of studying, all students need to sit in on the English Exit Exam organized by the Language Centre, Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University as required of each program, most of them had achieved a very low level of English ability of band four out of band twelve.

The students' average of overall English achievement and ability were at the low level except the students who were in the Education Program majoring in English. Most of them had a grade of band C and C+ and only some had B, B+ or A. However, their English ability tested by the Language Centre was also not in the higher levels. The students' English ability was mostly in band 4 and some was in band 5. Based on the four skills of English, reading skills are essential for students who study English as their major since they need to utilize it as a tool for gaining or improving their knowledge and other skills in learning English for their future careers and to further their studies.

One of the courses to improve reading skills, Reading English for Comprehension is provided for students who are studying English major, or related to other English majors, such as English for Education, English-Chinese, English for Business Communication, etc. Reading English for Comprehension is one of the

compulsory courses and it provides students with knowledge of reading for comprehension from articles, periodicals and academic research papers, and increase students ability in fluently reading for comprehension. This course will be the students' tool in decoding knowledge from various sources by reading from websites, e-books, e-Learning, etc. Unfortunately, in learning and teaching this particular course, lecturers mostly relied on passive teaching modes.

The lecturers often used questions and answers in teaching Reading English for Comprehension without involving students' group or pair activities. As a result, the students still showed low proficiency in reading for comprehension and thus had less motivation in searching or finding more information through reading from information technology available from various sources nowadays.

Lecture mode should not be the only method or technique in teaching reading English for comprehension since it is one of the direct modes supporting students' passive learning. Instead, to lead students to be successful in reading English for comprehension, active learning should be implemented in learning and teaching. Through active learning, students are provided with active learning activities which include a class discussion, a think-pair-share activity, a mind mapping activity, a team project activity, etc. The students not only receives immediate feedback from instructors, but their motivation is also increased, (Bonwell, 2000). As a result of active learning, students will be able to improve and increase their learning achievement (Rohrbeck et al., 2003).

Besides active learning, peer interaction should be implemented along with active learning. Peer interaction obviously can draw students' prior knowledge for sharing and building experience toward learning materials used in learning (Roscoe and Chi, 2007), get students' interaction and communication for creating a body of knowledge through reflecting and discussing (Fuchs et al, 1997), involve students' performance and feedback (McMaster, Fuchs and Fuchs, 2006), and get students' perception and understanding on the materials for promoting social interactions or real-life application (Brown and Conroy, 2001). Peer interaction can be organized through paired learning or small group learning (Topping, 2001).

The three research questions of this study are:

1. Does peer interaction enhance students' English reading for comprehension better than those who receive traditional lecture instruction?

2. Do the two instructional methods increase the motivation for learning in general and motivation in reading for comprehension?

3. Does peer interaction promote students' self-perception for reading comprehension?

Literature Review

1. Active Learning

Active learning refers to several models of instructions that focus the responsibility of learning on students through working collaboratively, discussing materials while role-playing, debating, engaging in case studies, taking part in cooperative learning, or producing short written exercises, etc. The students must read, write, discuss, or be engaged in solving problems. In particular, they must engage in such higher-order thinking as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bonwell and Eison 1991).

In active learning, students are mostly provided time and an activity to interact with their peers. The examples of active learning activities include a class discussion, a think-pair-share activity, a mind mapping activity, a team project activity, etc. Through these active learning activities, Bonwell and Eison (1991) states that students are involved in more than passive listening and engage in activities, and students' motivation is increased and can receive immediate feedback from their instructor. There is less emphasis placed on information and greater emphasis placed on developing student skills and thus greater emphasis is placed on the exploration of attitudes and values. As a result, students will be able to improve and increase their learning achievement (Rohrbeck et al., 2003).

Most activities that students participate in active learning are based on interaction. Krashen (1988) mentioned that interaction is an important factor in the acquisition process in addition to providing the student with comprehensible input of the target language. The interaction among the students that takes place in the classroom is a means through which language (input o f L2 data) can be learned (VanPatten, 1996).

2. Peer Interaction

Peer interaction including paired learning or small group learning is the acquisition of knowledge or skill through active helping and supporting among students who are equal in standing or status (Topping, 2001). Peer interaction obviously can draw students' prior knowledge for sharing and building experience toward learning materials used in learning (Roscoe & Chi, 2007), get students' interaction and communication for creating a body of knowledge through reflecting and discussing (Fuchs et al, 1997), involve students' performance and feedback (McMaster, Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006), and get students' perception and understanding on the materials for promoting social interactions or real-life application (Brown & Conroy, 2001).

To apply peer interaction in reading English for comprehension, students' prior knowledge and building experience can be drawn through pictures of a passage and asking questions on the passage title or

topic. Pair and small group learning will be used for promoting students' interaction and communication for a body of knowledge construction. The students' performance and feedback can be shown through mind mapping techniques as well as the students' real-life application from their perception and understanding. The peer interaction therefore can increase not only the students' motivation in learning actively but also can promote students' ability in English reading comprehension.

Method

This section presents information on the research design, treatments, and instruments used in the study.

1. Research Design

The experimental study was implemented in the English Reading Comprehension course, a three-credit course, over eight weeks of the first semester of the academic year 2019. Four reading passages had been used for this study.

This study was a quasi-experimental design that employed a pretest-posttest group for comparison. The sample comprised 50 second year students majoring in English from the Faculty of Education who enrolled in the English for Reading Comprehension course with the researcher as the lecturer. The 50 students were split into 2 groups. The first group comprised 25 students selected from number I - 25 and it was assigned as the experimental group (n = 25). The second group also comprised 25 students selected from number 26 -50 and it was assigned as the comparison group (n = 25). The experiment group was exposed to peer interaction instruction through active learning, whereas the comparison group received traditional lecture instruction. Both groups had the same learning materials, schedule, tests, and lecturer except for the difference of the instructional method.

In this study, four instruments: three questionnaires and one test, were used. Before the experiment, the pre-test was administrated. Both students from the experiment group and comparison group were measured by their level of English reading comprehension using the test on "Learning Achievement for Reading for Comprehension". They were measured by their motivation level using two questionnaires of motivation through firstly the questionnaire on "Motivation for Learning English in General" and secondly the questionnaire on "Motivation for Reading for Comprehension. Also, they were measured by their self-perception through the questionnaire on "Self-Perception for Reading for Comprehension". After the experiment, the post-test was organized for both groups to determine the variations of their level of

English reading comprehension, both motivations, and self-perception. The experimental design for this study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Experimental design for the study

Groups	Instructional Methods	Pretest	Treatments	Posttest
Experimental group	Peer interaction & Active Learning Instruction	O_1	X_1	O_3
Control group	Traditional lecture instruction	O_2	X_2	O_4

X_1 : The experimental group received "Peer Interaction& Active Learning instruction"

X_2 : The control group received "traditional lecture instruction"

O_1, O_2 : Pretest included the Learning Achievement for English Reading Comprehension, Motivation for

      Learning English in General, Motivation for Reading for Comprehension, and Self-Perception for Reading

      for Comprehension.

O_3, O_4 : Posttest included the same instruments used in the pretest.

2. Treatment

    2.1 Peer Interaction & Active Learning instruction

        The experimental group received Active Learning & Peer Interaction instruction. In the experimental group, students were arranged to work in pairs, in small groups of four throughout the study. In the first week of the experiment, the lecturer spent 10 minutes guiding students to practice Peer Interaction& Active Learning strategies and skills through explanation and coaching. The four reading passages selected by students were used with the various techniques of reading for comprehension: scanning, skimming, referring, etc.

        In each passage of reading for comprehension, students were able to understand and find the main idea, the subject matter, the supporting details, the clarifying devices, the vocabulary in context, and the conclusion. The mind mapping of each passage was created by each group of students before they were tested for the understanding of the passages. The students worked in pairs and later in groups of four through four stages of Active Learning: learning from experience, creating a body of knowledge, presenting knowledge, and applying knowledge.

        In the first stage, the students were asked to work in pairs to discuss the title and the picture of the passage while the lecturer walked around the class and wrapped up the concept being discussed by students. The students next continually worked in pairs and read the passage in order to understand the whole passage.

In the third stage, once the students understood the passage, they work in groups of four to create the mind mapping of the passage and showing it to the whole class for discussion. The lecturer helped students resolve misunderstandings, offered feedback, and facilitated discussions. In the last stage, the students were tested individually on the reading comprehension questions based on the reading passage.

2.2 Traditional Lecture Instruction

The control group received the traditional lecture instruction, or teacher-centered instruction. In traditional lecture classrooms, students were asked to read the passage, and the lecturer instructed the whole class by explaining the passage, focusing on English syntax and semantics. The students were asked to read the passage individually and translate from English into Thai language. The lecturer randomly asked students to compare their translation with their friend whether it was the same or not and shared his/her understanding. Finally, after finishing each passage, students were tested individually on the reading for comprehension question based on the reading passage.

3. Instruments

The four research instruments used in this study are as follows:

3.1 Learning Achievement Test for English Reading Comprehension

Learning achievement test for English reading comprehension assessed whether different instructional methods induced varied performance in English reading comprehension. The English reading comprehension test consisted of four passages and thirty-two items in total. Each passage assessed students' English reading comprehension that included understanding main ideas, organizing ideas, drawing conclusions, recognizing words in context, and making inferences. The test was based on the textbook "Reading in the Content Areas: Social Studies" published by the Mc Graw Hill companies (2005). The test was administrated as the pretest and posttest. The pretest and posttest scores were used to compare the learning achievement for English reading comprehension both in experimental group and control group.

3.2 The Questionnaire on Motivation for Learning English in General

The questionnaire on motivation for learning English in general was written and permitted for this study by the centre for English language communication---Temasek Foundation Thai Project Development of curriculum, methodologies and materials English language lecturers of Rajabhat universities, Thailand (2013). The questionnaire consists of thirty-six 5-point Likert-type items, ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree", where a higher score indicates greater motivation for learning English in general.

3.3 The Questionnaire on Motivation for Reading Comprehension

The questionnaire on motivation for reading comprehension was developed by the researcher consisting of 10 components of reading: external help/dictionary, prediction from structure and context, key words, skimming and scanning, rereading and analysis, peer/active learning, previewing, predicting, guessing from context, and paraphrasing. The questionnaire consists of twenty 5‑point Likert-type items, ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree", where a higher score indicates greater motivation in reading comprehension.

3.4 The Questionnaire on Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension

The questionnaire on self-perception for reading comprehension was adapted from a Reader Self Perception Scale written by Steven and others (2009). The questionnaire consists of four components: progress, observational comparison, social feedback, and physiological states with twenty 5‑Likert-type items, ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree", where a higher score indicates greater self-perception for reading comprehension.

4. Data Analyses

The data were analyzed using the software package SPSS. To understand the effects of Peer Interaction on English reading comprehension, learning motivations and self-perception of EFL students, pretest and posttest results were compared, and t-tests was conducted to determine whether the differences were significant.

Research Findings

The research findings related to the three research questions: the peer interaction enhances students' English reading for comprehension, the two instructional methods increase the motivation for learning in general and motivation for reading for comprehension, and the differences of self-perception for reading comprehension.

Table 2 The pre-test scores of Learning Achievement Test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Learning achievement on English reading comprehension	15.80	15.00	0.80

Table 2 presents the pre-test scores of learning achievement test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates that students' learning achievement on English reading comprehension in the experimental group was 0.80 of mean difference higher than the control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 3 The data analysis of the pre-test scores of Learning Achievement Test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Learning achievement on English reading comprehension	15.80	1.98	15.00	1.78	1.304

(df = 24, p = .205)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 3 presents the data analysis of pre-test scores of the learning achievement test on English reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates no significant differences between the two groups before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 4 The posttest scores of Learning Achievement Test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Learning achievement on English reading comprehension	27.68	22.44	5.24

Table 4 presents the posttest scores of the learning achievement test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates that students' learning achievement in the experimental group was 5.24 of mean difference higher than the control group after learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction

Table 5 The data analysis of the posttest scores of Learning Achievement Test on English Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Learning achievement on English reading comprehension	27.68	2.39	22.44	1.94	8.045[**]

(df = 24, p = .000)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 5 presents the data analysis of posttest scores of the learning achievement test on English reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates significant differences at .01 （t = 8.045, p=.000） between the two groups, and the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group.

Table 6 The pre-test scores of Motivation for Learning English in General between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Motivation for learning English in general	120.28	115.56	4.72

Table 6 presents the pre-test scores of motivation for the learning English in general between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates that students' motivation for learning English in general in the experimental group was 4.72 of mean difference higher than the control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 7 The data analysis of the pre-test scores of Motivation for Learning English in General between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Motivation for learning English in general	120.28	6.98	115.56	6.24	3.900[**]

(df = 24 , p = .001)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 7 presents the data analysis of pre-test scores of motivation for learning English in general between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates significant differences at .01 01 （t = 3.900, p=.001） between the two groups and the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group.

Table 8 The posttest scores of Motivation for Learning English in General between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Motivation for learning English in general	131.00	120.64	10.36

Table 8 presents the posttest scores of motivation for learning English in general between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates that students' motivation for learning English in general in the experimental group was 10.36 of mean difference higher than the control group after learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 9 The data analysis of the posttest scores of Motivation for Learning English in General between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
peer interaction	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Motivation for learning English in general	131.00	3.45	120.64	3.94	8.358**

(df = 24, p = .000)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 9 presents the data analysis of posttest scores of motivation for learning English in general between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates significant differences at .01 (t = 8.358, p=.000) between the two groups and the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group.

Table 10 The pre-test scores of Motivation for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through	Mean	Mean	Mean
peer interaction	Experimental group	Control group	Difference
Motivation for reading comprehension	61.36	62.40	1.04

Table 10 presents the pre-test scores of motivation for reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates that students' motivation for reading comprehension in the experimental group was 1.04 of mean difference higher than the control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 11 The data analysis of the pre-test scores of Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
peer interaction	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Motivation for reading comprehension	61.36	8.28	62.40	6.99	0.499**

(df = 24, p = .001)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 11 presents the data analysis of pre-test scores of reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates no significant differences between the two groups after learning English reading through peer interaction.

Table 12 The posttest scores of Motivation for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Motivation for reading comprehension	76.64	68.68	7.96

Table 12 presents the posttest scores of reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates that students' reading comprehension in the experimental group was 7.96 of mean difference higher than the control group after learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 13 The data analysis of the posttest scores of Motivation for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Motivation for reading comprehension	76.64	7.43	68.68	6.91	3.823**

(df = 24 , p = .000)   ** with statistically significant at .01

Table 13 presents the data analysis of posttest scores of reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates significant differences at .01 (t = 3.823, p=.001) between the two groups and the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group.

Table 14 The pre-test scores of Motivation for Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Self-Perception for reading comprehension	53.64	54.16	0.51

Table 14 presents the pre-test scores of self-perception for reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group. The result indicates that students' self-perception for reading comprehension in the experimental group was 0.51 of Mean Difference higher than the control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 15 The data analysis of the pre-test scores of Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Self-Perception for reading comprehension	53.64	15.83	54.16	12.78	.115**

(df = 24, p = .910)　　** with statistically significant at .01

Table 15 presents the data analysis of pre-test scores of self-perception for reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates no significant differences between the two groups after learning English reading through peer interaction.

Table 16 The posttest scores of Motivation for Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Mean Experimental group	Mean Control group	Mean Difference
Self-Perception for reading comprehension	76.16	63.72	12.44

Table 16 presents the posttest scores of self-perception for reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates that students' self-perception for reading comprehension in the experimental group was 12.44 of mean difference higher than the control group after learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction.

Table 17 The data analysis of the posttest scores of Self-Perception for Reading Comprehension between the experimental group and control group

Learning English reading through peer interaction	Experimental group		Control group		t-test
	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	
Self-Perception for reading comprehension	76.16	11.55	63.72	12.59	3.200**

(df = 24 , p = .004)　　** with statistically significant at .01

Table 17 presents the data analysis of posttest scores of self-perception for reading comprehension between the experimental group and control group before learning English reading comprehension through peer interaction. The result indicates significant differences at .01 (t = 3.200, p=.004) between the two groups and the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group.

Conclusions and Discussion

This study aims to investigate whether the peer interaction is able to enhance students' English reading comprehension achievement, increase students' motivation in general and motivation for reading comprehension, and promote students' self-perception for reading comprehension. The study findings are summarized and discussed as follows:

1. Conclusions

Students receiving the peer interaction method were able to enhance their English reading comprehension significantly than students learning through traditional lecture instruction. As a result of more learning through peer interaction, the students also could increase their motivation in general and motivation for reading comprehension higher than those who were taught through traditional lecture instruction. Compared with traditional lecture instruction, the peer interaction could reflect higher students' self-perception for reading comprehension.

2. Discussion

The study indicates that students who learned through peer interaction performed better in English reading comprehension. Peer interaction provided students with an opportunity to work with their peers by helping and supporting each other in learning, especially in English reading comprehension. This method of learning also could draw on students' prior knowledge through sharing, and encourage them to build experience while they were reading English for comprehension. Through interaction with their peers, students could communicate, discuss and comprehend the reading of passages. They would sometimes encounter with difficulty during their reading alone but working in corporation with peers, students discovered the solutions of difficulty in reading for comprehension. They thus could perform better on their English reading comprehension based on peer interaction.

The activities through peer interaction also activated students in a better performance of English reading comprehension. The active learning activities were as follows: think-pair-share, think-pair-share-square, group discussion, trading a problem, brain storming and mind mapping. Through these active learning activities, students were provided with help or learning assistance from their peers and be ready to make decision by themselves and

understand reading passages. In the process of doing mind mapping, students had to interact with their peers in order to help one another to come up with important key words of the passage that summarized its idea. This activity helped students to understand the passage and helped them to comprehend the passage clearly. Most students could then answer each question correctly through mind mapping activity.

Students who learned through the peer interaction could increase their motivation in general and motivation for reading comprehension more than those who were taught through traditional lecture instruction. The increase of motivation in general and motivation for reading comprehension caused by the process of learning that engaged student learning beginning from students' involvement in learning through selecting passages, participating in warm-up activities, working and discussing with peers before, during, and after the reading process, and participating in summarizing passages through the mind mapping technique. The students' engagement was relevant to learning because the process as mentioned was an active process that encouraged students to be motivated and enabled them to engage enthusiastically in the learning tasks (Mclnerney and Liem, 2008).

The students' self-perception for reading comprehension was also measured, and the results were higher after being taught through peer interaction. The students' self-perception was an important factor that affected their learning. The process of learning through peer interaction as mentioned promoted students' self-perception for reading comprehension and made students particularly self aware towards reading. With self-perception, students could see their progress, observe and compared themselves with classmates, received feedback, and felt good about themselves when engaging in reading comprehension. With these, Steven and others (2009) stated that students could have an opportunity to learn more about themselves as a reader and made self-perception of reading ability.

References

Bonwell, C. (2000). *Select Active Learning Articles (1995-1999): Active Learning Workshops*, Green Mountain Falls.

Bonwell, C. & Eison, J. (1991). Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom. *AEHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 1. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, W.H., & Conroy, M.A. (2001). Promoting peer-related social-communicative competence in preschool children with developmental delays. in H. Goldstein, L. Kaczmarek, & K. English (Eds.), *Promoting social communication in children and youth with developmental disabilities.* (pp. 173-210). Baltimore: Brookes.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Mathes, P., & Simmons, D. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to academic diversity. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 174-206.

Krashen, Stephen D. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall International.

McMaster, K. L., Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2006). Peer-assisted learning strategies: The promise and limitations of peer-mediated instruction. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 22, 5-25.

Mclnerney, D. M., & Liem, A. D. (2008). Motivation theory and engaged learning. In P.A. Towndrow, C. Koh, & H. S. Tan (Eds.), *Motivation and practice for the classroom* (pp. 11-36). Rotterdam /Taipei: Sense Publishers.

_____. (2008). *Reading in the Content Areas: Social Studies*. Mc Graw Hill.

Rohrbeck, A.C. and others (2003). Peer-Assisted Learning Interventions with Elementary School Students: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 245-257.

Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. H. (2007). Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-telling in peer tutors' explanations and questions. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 534-574.

Steven, A. M., William, A. H., & Barbara, A. M. (2009). Validation of a Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS2) for Use in Grades 7 and Above. *Paper presented the annual meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association*, Rocky Hill. CT October 21-23, 2009

_____. (2009). Temasek Foundation Thai Project Development of curriculum, methodologies and materials English language lecturers of Rajabhat universities. Thailand (2013).

Topping, K.J. (2001). *Peer Assisted Learning: A Practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge MA: Brookline Books.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction: Theory and research*. Norwood, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

****