

This file has been cleaned of potential threats.

If you confirm that the file is coming from a trusted source, you can send the following SHA-256 hash value to your admin for the original file.

7c819b08d04133cdf8fc8823a5c507d11b7998b5faf7bf749124818c476cd43c

To view the reconstructed contents, please **SCROLL DOWN** to next page.

The Development of Thai Language Learning Achievement through Active Learning Approaches on "Parts of Speech" for Grade 3 Students

Winita Naeprakhon¹ and Nattakan Dangthongkhum²

^{1,2}Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Bangkok 10300, Thailand

E-Mail: ¹vinita.ne@ssru.ac.th, ²nattakan.da@ssru.ac.th

Abstract

This classroom-based experimental study aimed (1) to develop an active learning instructional approach for teaching Thai language to Grade 3 primary school students, and (2) to examine the effects of active learning instruction on students' learning achievement in the topic of types of words in the Thai language. The participants consisted of 31 Grade 3 students selected through purposive sampling. Research instruments included lesson plans, achievement tests, and observation forms. Quantitative data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, and dependent-samples t-test. The results revealed that students' post-test scores were significantly higher than their pre-test scores at the .05 level. The efficiency of the instructional model met the 80/80 criterion, indicating effective learning outcomes.

Keywords *Learning Achievement; Active Learning; Thai Language; Primary Education*

Introduction

Active learning emphasizes learner participation through thinking, interaction, and practice. In Thai language classrooms, traditional teacher-centered instruction often results in low engagement and learning achievement. This study applies active learning strategies to improve learning outcomes.

This experimental research report was conducted as part of a classroom research project in Thai language instruction. The study was developed with the aim of improving and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Effective learning management that enables learners to acquire knowledge, essential competencies, Piaget, J. (1970) and desirable characteristics of good citizens at both national and global levels requires instructional approaches that emphasize key skills for 21st-century learners. Therefore, active learning strategies were applied to promote essential skills that align with the goals of contemporary Thai education. Active Learning is an instructional approach that emphasizes learner participation and interaction through a variety of practical activities, such as analysis, synthesis, brainstorming, discussion, and case studies. Jinowat, N. (2025) The activities implemented are designed to foster critical thinking, analytical thinking.

Based on classroom teaching experiences, the researcher found that students' learning problems were primarily caused by a lack of responsibility and interest in learning, resulting in low academic achievement and boredom in Thai language classes. To address these issues, Active Learning strategies were implemented, emphasizing hands-on learning activities that actively engage students in the learning process.

Literature Review

Active learning is firmly grounded in constructivist learning theory, which posits that knowledge is actively constructed by learners through interaction, experience, and reflection rather than passively received from instructors. From this perspective, learning occurs most effectively when learners engage cognitively, socially, and emotionally with learning tasks that require analysis, problem-solving, and meaning-making (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978). Active learning environments therefore emphasize learner participation, collaboration, inquiry, and hands-on practice as core mechanisms for deep learning. In educational practice, active learning has been shown to promote higher-order thinking skills, including analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creative problem-solving. These skills are particularly important in language education, where learners must not only acquire linguistic knowledge but also apply it meaningfully in communicative contexts. Bonwell and Eison (1991) argue that active learning shifts the focus of instruction from content transmission to cognitive engagement, enabling learners to process information more deeply and retain it more effectively. Similarly, Prince (2004) reports that instructional strategies such as cooperative learning, problem-based learning, and inquiry-based activities consistently lead to improved student understanding and engagement across disciplines. Studies have demonstrated that language learners who participate in active learning activities show higher levels of engagement, improved learning attitudes, and better performance compared to those taught through traditional lecture-based instruction (Freeman et al., 2014; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 2014). Active learning strategies such as brainstorming, group discussion, role-playing, and game-based learning encourage learners to use language actively, thereby strengthening comprehension, vocabulary development, and grammatical awareness. At the primary education level, active learning is particularly beneficial because young learners tend to learn more effectively through concrete experiences and social interaction. Research indicates that when primary students are actively involved in learning tasks, they develop greater responsibility for their own learning and demonstrate increased persistence and motivation (Hattie, 2009).

Methodology

The study employed a one-group pretest–posttest design. Participants were 31 Grade 3 students. Instruction was conducted over two months using active learning lesson plans. This study employed a one-group pretest–posttest experimental design, which is widely used in classroom-based educational research to examine the effects of instructional interventions on students' learning outcomes. This design allows researchers to measure changes in learners' performance by comparing pre-intervention and post-intervention results within the same group, thereby providing practical evidence of instructional effectiveness in authentic learning environments (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2019). Although the design does not include a control group, it is considered appropriate for classroom action research where ethical and contextual constraints limit random assignment.

Participants The participants consisted of 31 Grade 3 primary school students enrolled in a demonstration school affiliated with Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University in Thailand. The sample was selected through purposive sampling, as the participants formed an intact classroom receiving regular Thai language instruction. All students were studying the topic of **types of** words in the Thai language as part of the prescribed curriculum. This sampling approach is commonly adopted in educational research to ensure ecological validity and relevance to real classroom contexts (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018).

Research Instruments Multiple research instruments were employed to collect quantitative and qualitative data

1. **Active Learning Lesson Plans**, developed to support student-centered instruction and promote active engagement in Thai language learning.
2. **Achievement Tests**, consisting of teacher-developed pretests and posttests, used to assess students' learning achievement before and after the intervention. The tests were reviewed for content validity to ensure alignment with learning objectives (Fraenkel et al., 2019).
3. **Score Recording Forms**, used to systematically collect and organize students' test scores.
4. **Behavioral Observation and Desirable Characteristics Assessment Forms**, used to document students' engagement, participation, and learning behaviors during instructional activities.

Types of Achievement Tests

Paivote Khachent (2014) classified achievement tests into two types: teacher-made tests and standardized tests. Both types assess content learned through instruction and measure six categories of learning behaviors: knowledge, remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating.

1. **Teacher-made tests** Teacher-made tests are developed by teachers for use in assessing students in the classroom. They are divided into two types:

Objective tests

Objective tests include true–false items, matching items, completion or short-answer items, and multiple-choice items.

Essay tests Essay tests include restricted-response items and extended-response (free-response) items.

Standardized tests

Standardized tests are developed by experts with expertise in subject matter and test construction. These tests undergo quality analysis and include clear instructions for test administration, scoring, and interpretation. Standardized tests possess objectivity, validity, and reliability. Examples of standardized tests include the California Achievement Test, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, the Stanford Achievement Test, and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

Results

The analysis of students' learning achievement revealed a clear improvement following the implementation of active learning instruction. The mean score on the **pretest** was **4.32**, indicating a relatively low level of prior knowledge regarding types of words in the Thai language. After the instructional intervention, the **posttest mean score increased to 7.86**, demonstrating a substantial gain in students' learning achievement.

The mean score difference between the pretest and posttest was **3.54 points**, reflecting a learning progress rate of **81.94%**. Statistical analysis using a **dependent-samples t-test** indicated that the improvement in posttest scores was **statistically significant at the .05 level** ($t = 14.91$). These results confirm that students' learning achievement after active learning instruction was significantly higher than before the intervention.

In addition to test score improvement, the efficiency of the active learning instructional materials was evaluated using the **80/80 efficiency criterion (E1/E2)**. The results showed that the instructional efficiency reached **86.14/83.42**, exceeding the established standard. This indicates that the instructional process effectively supported students' learning during the intervention (E1), and that learning outcomes achieved after instruction met the expected performance level (E2).

Classroom observations further revealed positive changes in students' learning behaviors. Students demonstrated increased participation in learning activities, greater responsibility for task completion, and more positive attitudes toward Thai language learning. These behavioral changes support the quantitative findings and suggest that active learning instruction positively influenced both cognitive and affective aspects of learning.

Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that active learning instruction effectively enhances learning achievement in Thai language education at the primary level. The statistically significant improvement in students' posttest scores supports previous research indicating that learner-centered instructional approaches promote deeper understanding and improved academic performance compared to traditional teacher-centered methods (Bonwell & Eison, 1991; Freeman et al., 2014).

One key factor contributing to the observed learning gains is the emphasis on student participation and hands-on practice. Active learning activities encouraged students to engage directly with language content, apply their understanding of types of words through practice, and construct knowledge through interaction with peers. This aligns with constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes that meaningful learning occurs when learners actively construct knowledge rather than passively receive information (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978).

The high instructional efficiency values ($E1/E2 > 80/80$) further demonstrate that the active learning lesson plans were pedagogically effective. The results suggest that students were able to successfully engage in learning activities during the instructional process and achieve the intended learning outcomes. This finding is consistent with prior studies reporting that active learning strategies improve both learning processes and outcomes in language education (Prince, 2004; Johnson et al., 2014).

In addition to academic achievement, improvements in students' learning behaviors and attitudes were observed. Increased engagement, cooperation, and responsibility indicate that

active learning instruction supports not only cognitive development but also positive affective outcomes. At the primary level, these affective factors are particularly important, as positive learning experiences can foster long-term motivation and sustained interest in language learning (Hattie, 2009).

Overall, the findings suggest that active learning provides a supportive and effective instructional framework for Thai language teaching, particularly for foundational topics such as types of words. By creating a learning environment that emphasizes participation, collaboration, and meaningful practice, teachers can enhance both learning achievement and learner engagement.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that active learning instruction significantly improves learning achievement among Grade 3 students in Thai language education, specifically in the topic of types of words in the Thai language. The results showed a statistically significant increase in posttest scores, a high learning progress rate, and instructional efficiency exceeding the 80/80 criterion. Beyond academic outcomes, active learning instruction also promoted positive learning attitudes, increased engagement, and improved classroom participation. These findings highlight the value of active learning as an instructional approach that addresses both cognitive and affective dimensions of learning at the primary education level. Based on the findings, active learning instruction is recommended for use in primary Thai language classrooms. Future research may extend this approach to other language topics, compare active learning with alternative instructional methods, or investigate its long-term impact on students' language development and learning motivation.

References

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(23), 8410–8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Jinowat, N., K., Boonyakitanton, P., Tiranant, P., & W., Wiboolyasarin (2025a). AI-driven chatbots in second language education: A systematic review. *Ampersand, 14*, 100224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100224>
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 25*(3–4), 85–118.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. Orion Press.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*.
Harvard University Press.