
The Development of Daily Used English Instructional Supervision Model by Using Task Based Learning of Internship Students to Enhance Communicative Ability for Basic Education Students in Northern Area

Thaweesak Linkhome

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thailand E-mail: Thaweesak_l@rmutt.ac.th

Jariyaporn Tapin

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thailand E-mail: Jariyaporn_t@rmutt.ac.th

***Corresponding author: Rujira Jaroensawut^{*1}**

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Tawan – Ok, Chakrabongse Bhuvanarth Campus, Thailand, E-mail: Rujira_ja@rmutto.ac.th

***Corresponding author: Thanyapatra Soisuwan^{*2}**

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thailand, E-mail: Thanyapatra_s@rmutt.ac.th

Abstract: A dynamic learning environment in which internship students are guided to design and facilitate tasks encourages active communication (Kruse, 2007). The model created by the researcher (The NUNME model) aims to design and implement an instructional supervision system that utilizes task-based learning (TBL) techniques to improve the communicative abilities of internship students working with basic education students in the northern area. The research methodology involved 30 English learners. Comparative pre- and post-communication test scores were obtained after 16 weeks of the NUNME model. The results of the paired-sample t-test illustrated that the sample group significantly improved their communicative skills, including communicative response, approach, prediction, and inference, after monitoring the model. Exploring the participants' perceptions of the intervention, an attitude questionnaire and a semi-structured interview were used to collect data, which revealed positive perceptions of the model. In conclusion, the development of a task-based learning instructional supervision model holds promise for addressing communication challenges and enhancing communicative skills through interactive class participation.

Keywords: English language teaching (ELT), task-based learning (TBL), communicative ability, Northern

Introduction

The main focus of English language teaching (ELT), learning is a collective process. It is aligned with the natural principles of the student as well as with constructivist philosophy, which holds that knowledge is generated by the person through interaction with the environment. Dewey (1963) claimed that this is a cross-disciplinary idea for managing instruction that turns the pupil into an active practitioner. This is regarded as a shift in the student's learning role from "receiver" to "learner" and the instructor's role from "teacher" or "transmitter of knowledge" to "organizer of learning experience."

Task-based Approach: The three phases of Willis's (1996) concepts and frameworks are followed in this study: 1: Pre-task; Subject and task are introductions; 2: Task Cycle 2.1 Task: Under the guidance of the teacher, students may do tasks in pairs or groups. 2.2 Planning: Students engage in brainstorming and discussions to communicate their findings or decisions to the class while presenting the assignment performance. 2.3 Report: Students present in their own creative ways or trade written reports and contrast their outcomes. 3: Language Emphasis; 3.1 Analysis: Students scrutinize and debate certain elements of the recorded text or transcript; 3.2 Practice: The instructor places emphasis on using new words, phrases, and patterns occurring in the data, either during or after the analysis.

As a result of the implementation of different types of instructional supervision, there are various problems, including the lack of interrelationships between supervisors and students, which results in a variety of problems, such as a lack of knowledge about the students' work duties or a lack of confidence in counseling, which all affect learning, teachers' ethics, and students' learning. In accordance with Roadrangka and Srisukvatanan (2008), other studies have found that escort teachers

also have educational problems. However, it is not known how to provide this guidance. Escort teachers also have flaws in learning-management planning. Traditional approaches in the field of English teaching are the main problems today, as are the research gaps in methodology, techniques, perspectives, concepts, and theory frameworks. The problem (research) is that researchers have not yet led to research and development in new English teaching methods through the teaching of students, instructors, and teachers, as well as teaching institutions for primary schools. Therefore, the present study aims to examine the effective the communicative abilities.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The three main research questions in this study are as follows:

1. Is there efficiency in the assigned criteria 80/80 of the NUNME Model to Enhance Communicative Ability for Basic Education Students in the Northern Area?
2. Will the NUNME Model to Enhance Communicative Ability for Basic Education Students in the Northern Area?
3. How are students, supervisors, and student teachers' opinions toward the NUNME Model?

Literature Review

Instructional Supervision Eye et al. (1971), instructional supervision is the phase of school administration that focuses primarily on achieving the appropriate expectations of the educational system. Wiles (1967) referred to actions intended to enhance instruction across boards in educational institutions. The same is true for Alfon et al.'s (1975) definition of instructional supervision: behavior formally intended by an organization that directly impacts teacher behavior in such a way as to facilitate students learning and achieve the goals. In contrast, instructional supervisors and inspectors are more like observers of teachers (and schools) and do not directly enhance teachers' instructional effectiveness or improvement (Aderounmu and Ehiamentor, 1985). Based on these reasons, needs, and actual circumstances, a researcher is interested in developing a daily English instructional supervision model using task-based learning with internship students to enhance the communicative ability of basic education students in the Northern Area. Therefore, the teaching process in this model is a task-based learning strategy that emphasizes the performance of many tasks.

Communicative English

McPheat, S. (2010) claimed that two-way communication is essential. The person on the other side of these obstacles will make an effort to communicate with you as well. The success of the conversation would be left up to chance if you relied only on their capacity for effective communication to comprehend them effectively. To guarantee that you hear information clearly, you may also employ your own communication abilities. Syllabus, lecture material, and learning objectives are frequently seen by English teachers as the foundation of their lessons. Gill (2012) stated that the word "communication" is derived from the Latin word "communis," meaning speaking in a common tongue. Making something known and widely known conveys people's sentiments. Therefore, communication involves the sharing of thoughts, information, and emotions. Teachers can encourage students to create their own learning objectives and curricula as well as to communicate while learning a language. To motivate pupils, teachers can also form discussion groups and allow them to provide one another with advice as they study.

Task-based Learning

According to a review of its theories, guiding principles, and related studies, the task-based method is a subset of communicative language teaching (CLT). As a result, it adheres to the core principles of language learning and teaching as a CLT. However, the task-based and communicative language teaching approaches have certain distinctions. Interacting in the target language is prioritized because it is seen as a prerequisite for learning to communicate in a second language as well as to give language usage a genuine purpose and offer a context for language study. Thus, it is ensured that the language used in the classroom is related to the language used outside it using real materials. Students' own experiences are also crucial components. In this context, activities play a key role in TBL in language classrooms because they help students acquire L2s and activate learning processes. The four main TBL strategies taught in this Model are as follows:

First, the pre-task was to introduce the stage and elicit background knowledge from students.

Second, the pre-task was to model how to learn communicative English through TBL procedures.

Third, the task cycle is to practice various tasks with a "learning by doing process."

Fourth, the language focus or post-task is the wrap-up and evaluation steps.

Additionally, it emphasizes that factors other than instructional techniques or materials that affect learning include motivation, attitudes toward learning, student beliefs, language phobia, and preferred learning style. The term "task" refers to a process whereby the target language is learned through performing important activities. It has a work plan and places more emphasis on the results than on the process. The interaction and execution of a task in the real world requires learners to draw on prior knowledge. (Prabu, 1987; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1998; Ellis, 2003; Branden, 2006) Several academics have created a framework for the task-based language education method. For instance, Willis's framework consists of pre-task, task, and assessment phases.

Related Studies

There have been some recent studies that have related the Task-Based learning strategy instruction to enhance students communicating effectively. For instance, the research conducted by Rahman (2010) conducted research on teaching conversational skills using a task-based learning model. The objective is to study the feasibility of using a workload-based learning model to develop speaking and conversation skills. The sample group is first-year undergraduate students at the Indian School of Mines University (ISMU), India, who are enrolled in Study Conversational Skills. The results of the study revealed that approximately 70 percent of the learners received A-level results. It was concluded that the workload-based learning model has great potential for a second language. But it takes a long time to see results. In addition, the research results found that most students have a positive attitude towards work-based learning. Students are given the opportunity to express their opinions or feelings about situations in their daily lives.

In addition, the study conducted by Dorathy (2011) conducted research on second language learning by teaching a task-based model using techniques. Teaching role play was in hypothetical situations (second language acquisition through a task-based approach—role play in English language teaching) with the objective of studying the benefits of teaching in a task-based format. The research results found that teaching style emphasizes task-based and role-playing in hypothetical situations to create fun for the learners, provide an opportunity for the learners to practice using language in their daily lives without worrying about language principles, and develop their interpersonal skills, including self-confidence.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a research and development project conducted using a mixed-methods approach, integrating data collection through quantitative and qualitative methods with an embedded design and triangulation approach.

Participants

The population was composed of eight schools: Chiang Rai Municipality School Five Denha, Pukaeng (Intraratuppatham) School, Banpangkuek School, Kurekare School, Anubannanglae School, Bansantonkham School, Nongbuadang School, and Pongnamtok School. A total of 152 students study in schools located in Chiang Rai province in the first and second semesters of the academic year 2022 and are registered for the course of communicative English. The sample consisted of 30 secondary students at Pukaeng (Intraratupkpatham) School, who had enrolled in communicative English in the second semester of 2022, taught by an internship student. The sample was selected by simple random sampling for one classroom as a sampling unit with a one-group pretest-posttest design (Creswell and Clark, 2011).

Instrumentation

Communicative Materials

The instrument for assessing learners' ability in communicative English in daily life situations, and it was applied by the task-based learning strategy, which is composed of pre-task, task cycle, and language focus. Design the table of content specifications to be used for the development of the communicative lesson plan through a task-based approach integrating instructional supervision procedures to enhance communicative skills. The communicative English lesson plan, through a task-based approach integrated with instructional supervision, composed of 8 units. Each unit lasted for 6 hours. A needs analysis questionnaire on communicative English in daily life topics was used to

choose appropriate topics for preparing the lesson plan design from eight lessons used in the course were:

1. Daily Routines
2. School Subjects
3. Occupations
4. Sports and Hobbies
5. Special Occasions
6. Past Events
7. Future Planning and Vacation
8. Health and Fitness

The content validity and appropriateness of the language use were validated by five experts and then assessed using a five-point Likert scale with an analysis of the mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD). The criteria used to verify the content validity and interpretation of mean scores followed the same patterns as those used for the reading instructional model. The result of congruence verified by experts was (M = 4.50, SD. = 0.26), which is valid.

The Communicative Ability Measures

The communicative English test was designed and administered by the internship students in both the pre-test and post-test. It was designed with test specifications to cover all learning objectives. The appropriateness of the language used was validated by experts using a five-point Likert scale, with an analysis of the mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD). The criteria used to verify the content validity and interpretation of mean scores followed the same patterns as those used for the content analysis. The validation of the relevance of each test item (pre-test and post-test) to the objectives of experts was (M = 4.87, SD. = 0.34). Conduct the field trial with students similar to those who will take an assessment once it is administered operationally (for official score-reporting purposes) to evaluate the test. The item analysis was conducted through the computer program to investigate the discrimination and difficulty of the test items; the test items with difficulty scores between 0.20 and 0.80 and discrimination scores greater than 0.20 were selected. 40 items were selected with discrimination between 0.47 and 0.77 and difficulty of the test items between 0.20-0.73. The item discrimination and difficulty index analyses of the pre- and post-test were between 0.47 and 0.77, and the difficulty index was between 0.20-0.73. The reliability of the selected test items was analyzed using the KR-20 formula of Kuder and Richardson. The reliability of the test is 0.92.

Data Collection

The implementation was conducted with the participants in the classroom for the course of communicative English in semesters 1 and 2 of the academic year B.E. 2565. The experiment took 16 weeks, 3 hours each week, for a total of 54 hours. The internship student introduced the learning activities and roles of learners and instructors during the introductory session, with observation and instructional supervision procedures. A pre-test for reading comprehension was administered to participants. Learning activities were administered according to the NUNME Model consisted of four components, namely, principles, objectives, teaching and learning procedures, and evaluation and thereafter called the "NUMME Model". It is composed of five steps: "needs" (N), "understanding" (U), "notice" (N), "movement" (M), and "evaluation" (E), and the pre-test and post-test of each unit were also administered by the internship student to assess students' improvement, along with scores from the developed Rubric Score for assigned individual or group tasks. After the end of the course, an achievement test on communicative skills was administered, which was the same test used in the pre-test. A t-test was used to examine the difference between the pre-test and post-test. A questionnaire on satisfaction was administered to gather information from students, supervisors, and internship students regarding the degree to which they were satisfied with the instructional model. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to elicit students' opinions as a triangulation of assessment and to improve the model. The tryout results were presented to five experts to verify the model and validate the content's validity using a five-point Likert scale with analysis of the mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD). The criteria used to verify the content validity and the interpretation of mean scores follow the same patterns as those used for the content analysis form.

Scoring and Data Analysis

The data in this study will be analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively to identify the results from the NUNME Model and to investigate the efficiency of the Model with the criteria of 80/80 using the E1/E2 formula, including the analysis with a pair-sample t-test for the pre- and post-test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The effectiveness of NUNME Model based on the assigned criteria 80/80. The details of the implementation phase are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The effectiveness of the NUNME Model

Item	N	Total	M	SD	Efficiency (%)
Process (E1)	30	80	72	0.12	83.47
Product (E2)	30	40	38	0.91	85.55

Table 1 illustrates that the effectiveness of the process and product (83.47/85.55) improved and met the criteria of 80/80.

The students’ communicative performance by comparison between pretest and posttest after the NUNME Model

This section provides the results of the implementation of the NUNME Model. The Model was implemented with a sample group of 30 students. The implementation was conducted with the participants in the classroom for the course of Communicative English in the first and second semesters of academic year 2022 at the Pukaeng (Intraratuppham) School. The comparison of communicative abilities before and after the treatment of it, differentiated by the four abilities, is shown in the Table 2.

Table 2
The comparison of communicative abilities before and after the treatment of the NUNME Model differentiated by five abilities

	M	SD	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pre-Test	16.20	3.21	19.12	0.00*
Post-Test	30.33	1.69		

* $p < 0.01$

Table 3

Communicative Abilities	Treatment	Total (40)	M	SD	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
1. Communicative response with the questions	Pre-Test	16	6.40	1.71	12.79	0.00
	Post-Test	16	12.07	1.48		
2. Communicative approach with supporting details and find the information	Pre-Test	11	5.73	1.46	9.82	0.00
	Post-Test	11	9.03	0.72		
3. Predictive response from communicative response	Pre-Test	7	2.10	0.80	12.88	0.00
	Post-Test	7	5.23	1.07		
4. Inference approach by looking for key ideas	Pre-Test	6	1.97	0.81	12.00	0.00
	Post-Test	6	4.00	0.64		

As shown in Table 3, the overall descriptive statistics of the participants’ performance on the pretest and posttest are presented in it above. The mean scores of the pre- and post-tests were compared using a paired sample t-test. The mean pre-test scores were (M = 16.20, SD. = 3.21). The mean post-test scores was (M = 30.33, SD. = 1.69). Consequently, the results revealed that students acquired better English communicative abilities after the implementation of it, with a statistical significance of 0.01. This revealed that the mean post-test scores were significantly higher than the pretest scores. Certainly, the differences between pretest and posttest were statistically significant at the level of ($p < 0.01$). In comparison of each communicative ability according to the test specification, it was higher than that before treatment in it at (M = 30.33, SD.= 1.69).

The satisfaction levels with the NUNME MODEL

This section presents the questionnaire results on satisfaction and the interview questions. Both were collected from the sample group (students, supervisors, and internship students), who were treated using the NUNME Model. The findings from the questionnaire on satisfaction with it were interpreted using descriptive statistics (mean and S.D.) and illustrated in Table 4, shown as the following details:

Table 4
Findings of the satisfaction towards the NUNME Model

Item		M (n=30)	SD	Level
A: The students				
1	It is clear that the NUNME Model and tasks are appropriate.	4.83	0.56	High
2	Activities stimulate background knowledge related to the subject.	4.63	0.72	High
3	Contents are clear and easy to understand from TBL procedures	4.57	0.90	High
4	Contents are clear and interesting for all students, and can be used in communicative English in daily life.	4.55	0.92	High
5	It is an effective supplementary sheet, and exercises and activities can encourage me to communicate in English in daily life.	4.63	0.76	High
Overall		4.64	0.11	High
B: The supervisors				
1	The NUNME Model is expected to enhance the teaching field.	4.73	0.54	High
2	The goal of the NUNME Model is to effectively support instructional supervision.	4.74	0.52	High
3	The NUNME Model is a designated direction for instruction supervision.	4.75	0.74	High
4	The NUNME Model manual is effective for this purpose.	4.69	0.97	High
5	The NUNME Model's procedures support internship students.	4.52	0.84	High
Overall		4.66	0.14	High
C: The internship students				
1	The NUNME Model can effectively support internship students in a coaching manner.	4.55	0.73	High
2	The NUNME Model enhances internship students' definition of directional coaching.	4.72	0.49	High
3	The NUNME Model's evaluation processes are clear for the administration.	4.81	0.46	High
4	The NUNME Model can encourage internship students to adapt their ideas naturally.	4.67	0.75	High
5	The NUNME model is a clear stage in school coaching.	4.57	0.78	High
Overall		4.66	0.10	High

Table 4 gives the results of the questionnaire on students' satisfaction with it. The students, supervisors, and internship students were asked to express their degree of agreement on a 5-rating scale. The results were interpreted as the most highly satisfied (M) or highly satisfied (H). As illustrated in Table 3, the participants were most highly satisfied with its activities. The total mean score of the satisfaction for students, supervisors and internship students was at (M = 4.66, S.D. = 0.10). Definitely, the results from the data analysis indicated that the students, supervisors, and internship students had a positive attitude towards it, as shown in the table 5.

Table 5
Results of the interviews toward the NUNME Model

Students	Supervisors	Internship students
The NUNME Model is a good form of teaching English communication in everyday life. Free learning atmosphere and gave the opportunity for learners to answer questions from each other, there was a gradual teaching process. It is clear, with examples of how to practice in each step of the study that are detailed and easy. There are new interesting strategies, and the strategies are simple, easy to understand, and can be applied fluently.	It is a process where supervisors have a role in allowing students to practice the teacher's professional experience, which leads them to learn English as a form of supervision. This is a good process with systematic planning involving five steps. The internship students and supervisors had the same understanding of the teaching style through the supervision process of teaching English communication.	The NUNME model of teaching supervision was created for the educational system for internship students by researching teaching supervision to benefit students. It also affects the teaching skills of experienced professional teachers in teaching English and has a clear, systematic supervisory approach from supervisors.

In summary, considering the responses of the students, supervisors, and internship students taken from the semi-structured interview, it can be concluded that the students, supervisors, and internship students were satisfied and had a positive satisfaction with it. In addition, it was beneficial to all students, supervisors, and internship students in that they learned that supervision and coaching process communicative abilities, and were able to apply its procedures when they were required to act fluently. They can generally identify key concepts, the learning process through TBL, the supervision stage, and the coaching structure.

Discussion

The effectiveness of NUNME Model based on the assigned criteria 80/80.

It explains the discussions for further study of NUNME Model. The findings of the study will be presented against the four research questions of the study, and this is a discussion and reference to the related literature. The findings after the experiment revealed that the efficiency of it met the criterion of 80/80, based on Chaoyong Promwong (1989); therefore, it was considered an effective model. There are several reasons why the Model met these criteria. It was piloted with individuals (1:1:1), a small group (3:3:3), (10:10:10), and a field trial before implementation. The efficiencies of it (E1 and E2) were 80.00/82.50, 82.00/82.86, and 82.00/83.05, respectively. Later, the researcher collected data from the researcher's instruments to evaluate the efficiency of it in the implementation phase, and it was found that the efficiency of it (E1 and E2) was 83.47/85.55. It was then called the "NUNME Model," which included "needs" (N), "understanding" (U), "notice" (N), "movement" (M), and "evaluation" (E), and it was designed systematically based on the analysis and synthesis of the course syllabus, related theories, and related research.

The students' communicative performance by comparison between pretest and posttest after the NUNME Model

The findings of the study revealed that the post-test scores of the communicative abilities test were higher than the pre-test scores, and the retention scores were at nearly the same level as the post-test. Therefore, these differences were statistically significant at $p < (0.05)$. The students' communicative abilities were positively affected, and they were able to reproduce more ideas from conversation and questions. This evidence is consistent with the results of Chaiviriyawong (2017). The study proved that the students' reading comprehension ability scores obtained in the post-test were significantly higher than the pre-test at the .01 level of statistical significance. The communicative skills that students mostly used after applying the Daily Used English Instructional Supervision Model gathered from the self-report questionnaire were recognizing responses promptly and questions and answers as well. Students' satisfaction with the daily English instructional supervision model was at a good level. This was consistent with the findings of Sroysamut, J. (2020). The Development of an English Instructional Model by Using Activity-Based Learning to Improve Communicative English-Speaking Ability and Happiness in Learning by Using Local Context for Primary Students found that learners' satisfaction with the model implementation process was at a high level, and students

expressed positive views towards the instructional model and the instructional model implementation process. Verification of the development of the English instructional model using a task-based language teaching approach was at the highest congruence with the theories' rationality and probability.

The satisfaction levels with the NUNME MODEL

The findings obtained from the satisfaction questionnaire revealed that the experimental group had a positive level of satisfaction with the English instructional supervision model used daily. The satisfaction questionnaire revealed that learning activities had the highest satisfaction level, followed by content came in second. This was followed by internship students and methods of evaluating each unit, which were ranked third and fourth, respectively. The total average mean score of satisfaction was ($M = 4.64$, $SD. = 0.11$). In addition, evidence from the questionnaire and semi-structured interview revealed that students experienced enjoyment in performing the activities, and students were satisfied with the Daily Used English Instructional Supervision Model because it contained a variety of activities. Therefore, the satisfaction questionnaire confirmed that the task-based language teaching approach had a high level of satisfaction.

Conclusion and Implications

It can be concluded that the research on the NUNME Model had a positive effect on the communicative ability of students in Chiang Rai Province. The findings show that the model was evaluated by five experts and received a positive level of evaluation. The results after the implementation found that the efficiency of the model was consistent with the theories and met the E1/E2 standard. The efficiency of the model was 83.47/85.55.

In addition, the students' communicative ability scores obtained in the post-test were higher than the pre-test after applying the Model. These results from this study confirmed the findings of the post-test of Yuh Anchunda, H. (2020). An instructional model development based on authentic and communicative learning approaches to enhance vocational bachelor's degree students' English-speaking ability for project presentation in the northern region of Thailand *Journal of Education, Naresuan University*, 22(4), 1–15. The findings indicated that the developed instructional model was at the highest level of appropriateness ($M = 4.54$) and students' English-speaking ability for project presentations for both groups was significantly higher than before at the 0.01 level. Therefore, the findings of this study revealed that it had positive effects on students' daily use of the English instructional supervision model. Almost all the participants in the experimental group expressed that their confidence level grew when they communicated in English with each other. The communicative skills that students mostly used after applying the Model gathered from self-report questionnaires were recognizing responses promptly and questions and answers as well. Students' satisfaction with it was good. This was consistent with the findings of Sroysamut, J. (2020). The Development of an English Instructional Model Using Activity-Based Learning to Improve Communicative English-Speaking Ability and Happiness in Learning by Using Local Context for Primary Students that learners' satisfaction with a model implementation process was at a high level, and students expressed positive views towards the instructional model implementation process. The verification of it was at the highest congruence to the theories' rationality and probability.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

The limitations and suggestions were the sampling used only students in the secondary level. The current study was limited to provide recommendations for pedagogical implications for the model because the research findings indicated that after implementing it, students' communicative abilities improved only as the post-test score of students' communicative abilities was significantly higher than the pre-test. Consequently, the suggestion is that it could be employed with graduated students in educational majors. Similarly, the recommendation for further study is that the Model could be implemented with students of other levels for diploma students in vocational colleges.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Development Research Fund of Chiang Rai Rajabhat University and was approved by the Research Ethics Review Committee for Research Involving Human Research Subjects (COA No. 110/CRPPHO REC No. 105/2022).

References

1. Autrey, J. H. (1999). The effects of direct instruction and precision teaching on the achievement and persistence of adult learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (06), 1863A. (UMI No. 9932955)
2. Abedin, Zain Al. (2007). Task-based learning to project work. *Malaysian Online Journal*, 3(1): 55-56.
- Best, J.W, & Kahn, J. V. (1986). *Research on education*. 6th ed. N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
3. Burton, W. H., (2001). *Reading in child development*. New York: Bopp-Merrill.
4. Brown, H. (2000). *Teaching through principles and an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood cliffs: Prentice Hall.
5. Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communication Methodology in Language Teachers: The Role of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Bartz, W.H. (1994). *Testing Oral Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
7. Candlin, Christopher N. (1987) "Toward task-based language learning. In C. Candlin and D. Murphy (eds.) *Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall*.
8. Carroll. (1982). *Testing Communication Performance*. London: Pergamon Press.
9. Carroll. (2002). *Testing Communication Performance*. London: Pergamon Press.
10. Chatpaween Umpa. (2012). *A Synthesis of Research of Teaching English Reading for Secondary School Students: Silpakorn University*
11. Clark, J. L. D. (1972). *Foreign Language Testing: Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.
12. Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience. Later Works, 1935–1953. Vol. 10. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press*.
13. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. & Thomlinson, B. (1980). *Teaching secondary English: A guide to teaching English as a second language*. Hong Kong: Longman.
14. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glickman, Carl. D. and Stephen P. Gordon and Jovita M. Rose-Gordon. (2010).
15. *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. 8th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon
16. Harris, D. (1988) *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
17. Harris, D.P. (1990). *Testing English as a Second Language (EFL)* New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hasson, Gill, Brilliant. (2012) *Communication Skills*, (UK; Great Britain: Pearson Education, FT Press.
18. Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
19. Kruse, Kevin. (2008). *Introduction to Instructional Design and the ADDIE Model*. [Online]. Retrieved October 15, 2020. from http://www.transformativedesigns.com/id_systems.html.
20. Laowreandee, W. (2011). *Supervision* (9th ed). Nakhon Pathom: Silpakorn University. [in Thai]
- Little, Wood. (2008). *Communicative Language Teaching*. 18th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Lazaraton, Anne. (2001). *Teaching Oral Skill*. In Celce-Murcia, M. (ed.) *Teaching English as a Second Language or a Foreign Language*. (3rd ed., pp. 103- 115). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
22. Leni, W. & I Nengah, A. (2014). *Improving Speaking Skill Through Task-Based Learning* Littlewood,
22. Lap, Trinh Quoc, Trang, Ha Diem, Trang. (2017). *The Effects of Task-based Learning on EF Students' Learning Reading: A Case Study in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam*. *Studies on English Language Teaching*. 5(1):134.
23. Morrow, K. (1981). *Principle of communication methodology*. in *Communicative in Classroom*, 59-66. Edited by Johnson and Morrow. Essex: Longman Group.
- Mirshahvalad, Mahya Sadat, Azizmalayeri, Famararz, Akhondi, Masoumeh. (2015). *The effect of expository text structure training and graphic organizers on Iranian intermediate students' reading comprehension performance*. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*. 2 (9): 46-48.
24. Maslow. A.H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- MAYORD MASSUPHA *Teaching and Learning*. 2016. *Task-Based Learning: Source from* <https://massupha.wordpress.com/2016/03/12/%E0%B8%81%E0>
25. Nunan, D. (1989). "Designing Tasks for Communicative Classroom." London: Cambridge University Press.

26. Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
27. Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based learning teaching. Cambridge University, Cambridge, University.
28. O'Donnell, M. P. & Margo, W. (2004). *Becoming a reader: A developmental approach to reading instruction*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
29. Panahi, Ali. (2012). "Binding Task-Based Language Teaching and Task Based Language Testing: A Surveyin to EFL Teachers and Learners' Views of Task-Based Approach." *English Language Teaching*. 2, 5 (February): 148- 152.
30. Panich, V. (2013). *Teacher to student, building the flipped classroom*. 3th ed. Bangkok: Siam Commercial Foundation. (In Thai)
31. Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second-Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
32. Rawiwan Sitthisuwan.(2021). *The Development of English Reading Comprehension by using Reading newspaper for Mathayomsuksa 4: Chanburi Secondary Educational Service Area Office, Trat, Office of the Basic Education Commission Ministry of Education*
33. Robinson. (2000). "Teacher Job Satisfaction and Level of Clinical Supervision in Elementary Schools Dissertation Abstract, University of Southern Mississippi.
34. Rumelhart. (1981). *Schemata: Building blocks of cognition, comprehension, and teaching research reviews*. New York: International Reading Association.
35. Roadrangka, W. and Srisukvatanananan, P. (2008). Development of a field experience model for pre-service science teachers *Kasetsart Journal Social Sciences*.29 (1), 11-25. (Thailand)
36. Skehan, P. (1996). Framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*17(1):Supervision.2556. Source from, http://vecpromkiri.blogspot.com/2013/06/blog-post_6657.html?m=1
37. Sangnapa Jaiyen. (2019). *A Development of Reading Comprehension and QAR Questioning Ability Using Collaborative Strategic Reading For 1st Year Students in Lower Secondary Level: Chiang Mai Rajabhat University*.
38. Sathiraporn Ragsakambhira. (2017). *Development of English Reading Comprehension Skills Using QAR First-Year Students: Silpakorn University*.
39. Scott, R. (1981). *Speaking in Communication in the Classroom*. Longman Group UK Ltd.
40. Sinlarat, P. (2015). *Philosophy of Creative Education and Productivity*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Printing House.
41. Sahin, M.C. (2009). Instructional design principles for 21st century learning skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), pp.1464-1468. Source from: <file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/chaowanuch,+Journal+editor,+>
42. Sean Mcpheat, *Effective Communication Skills*, (UK: MTD Training & Ventus in 2010), p. 11.
43. Tang, Hersong, Chiou, Jer-Shiou, Jarsaillon, and Oliver. (2015). Efficacy of Task-based Learning in a Chinese EFL Classroom: A Case Study. *English Language Teaching*. 8(5): 168.
44. Teacher Profession Experience Training. (2015). *Internship 1 and Internship Handbook I*. Faculty of Education, Roi Et Rajabhat University.
45. Techniques and procedures. Willis, J. (1996). *Framework for task-based Learning*. Edinburgh: Longman
46. Thidarat Samanpant. Jan Thiyawong. (2018). *The Development of M.6 Students' English Reading Comprehension Using Collaborative Strategic Reading*
47. Willis, J. (2006). *Flexible Framework Task-based learning*. Oxford: Heinemann.
48. Willis, J. (1996). "A Framework for Task-Based Learning." Edinburgh: Longman Limited
49. W.F. (2001). *Communicative Language Teaching: Introduction*. Cambridge:
50. Yuh Anchunda, H. (2020). Development of an instructional model based on Authentic Learning and Communicative Learning Approaches to Enhance Vocational Bachelor's degree students' English-speaking ability for project presentation in the Northern Region of Thailand. *Journal of Education Naresuan University*, 22(4), 1–15