

**The implementation of project-based learning in increasing speaking achievement and self-confidence**

Aswadi Jaya<sup>1</sup>

Hermansyah<sup>1</sup>

Evi Rosmiyati<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas PGRI Palembang

[aswadijaya@yahoo.com](mailto:aswadijaya@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** This study was to find out: 1) whether or not Project-based Learning (PBL) could make a significant difference in increasing both students' speaking achievement and self-confidence, and 2) the contribution of PBL towards both students' speaking achievement and self-confidence. Out of 72 students, 40-average levels of achievement students were randomly selected as sample. These students were equally divided into two groups. The first group was taught using PBL and the second was given no treatment. For collecting the data, both groups were given a speaking test and self-confidence questionnaire. Both data were analyzed by using *t*-test to see the differences of speaking achievements and their self-confidence. Regression analysis was done to understand the contribution of PBL to the variables in the questions. The results showed that 1) there was a significant difference both in speaking achievement and self-confidence of the experimental group after being taught using PBL, 2) there was also a significant difference between experimental and control groups both in speaking ability and self-confidence, and 3) the contribution of PBL to the students' speaking achievement was 99.7% and to self-confidence was 92.7%. In conclusion, PBL could be considered as an effective method in teaching speaking and in increasing students' self-confidence.

**Keyword:** Project-based learning, speaking, self-confidence

## **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, English becomes a global language which is used for international communication. There are two main reasons to determine a language as a global language; the language becomes the official language in many countries, and the language becomes a priority to be learned in the foreign language countries (Crystal, 2003). As we know that now English is used in "over 100 countries" (Crystal, 2003, p. 5) in the world as an official language or a priority learned language. That is the reason why Graves (2008) mentions that the purpose of learning English is to be global citizen in order to communicate and to improve one's economic prospects. English is used in many concerns for education, job, information, and entertainment. According to Nga (2008) English is the main language of books, newspapers, airports and air-traffic control, international business and academic conferences, science, technology, medicine, diplomacy, sports, international competitions, pop music, and advertising.

Over two-thirds of the world's scientists write in English. Three-quarters of the world's mail is written in English (Nga, 2018). Of all the information in the world's electronic retrieval systems, 80% is stored in English.

Understanding these facts, it is a must for learners to learn English in order to communicate with many people around the world. In learning to communicate in English, speaking takes place as the most important language in the world. Many students argue that fluency to communicate verbally with others often considers more important than the ability to read or write (Nazara, 2011). Burnkart (1998) argues that speaking is the most important language skills that need to be controlled, and the achievement in mastering English is based on the ability to speak English. In addition, the new parameter used to determine success in second/foreign language education program is to develop English speaking proficiency (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006). It is followed by the changed paradigm of English learners that a large percentage of the world's language learners study English on the goal of developing proficiency in English (Richards & Renandya, 2002).

In Indonesia, the changed paradigm in learning English is not followed by the change in students' proficiency in speaking English. Although it was found that the position of Indonesia in terms of the score of English proficiency has increased for the last three years based on Education First-English Proficiency Index (EF-EPI). In 2016, Indonesia was predicated in low proficiency level with the rank of 34th out of 44 countries. In 2012, it increased to 27th out of 44 countries still in the low proficiency level with the score of 53.31. In 2013, Indonesia was positioned in moderate proficiency level, in the rank of 25th out of 60 countries with the score of 53.44. In comparison with some countries in Asia, Indonesia is positioned under Singapore (Rank 12th) and Malaysia (Rank 11th) which included to high proficiency countries.

Gan's study (2012) which interviewed 20 students in the final 4-year of Bachelor of Education (BEd) in dealing with their experience during BEd programme in Hongkong mentions that in fact, some important points which influenced students' speaking proficiency are: 1) inadequate vocabulary, 2) grammar as stumbling block, imperfectly learned pronunciation, 4) inadequate opportunities to speak in the class, 5) lack of focus on language improvement in the curriculum, and 6) input-poor environment outside class. Those problems actually covers almost all areas of knowledge that language learners need to recognize in speaking (Bashir, Azeem & Dogar, 2011), namely: 1) mechanics which is meant to use right words in right order with the correct pronunciation (the problems number 1,2 and 3); 2) function of speaking as transaction or interaction, and 3) social and cultural rules and norms.

In Indonesian context, from the reports on teaching problems, Widiati and Cahyono (2006) mention that there are two core problems faced by students in oral English proficiency. Firstly, the students of English major have a great number of errors when speaking (Mukminatien, 1999). The errors cover 1) pronunciation, 2) grammatical accuracy, 3) vocabulary, 4) fluency, and 5) interactive communication called mechanics problems (Bashir et.al., 2011). Secondly, the problems are related to emotion, such as: students feel anxious (Padmadewi, 1998), keep silent which is caused by the lack of

self-confidence, the lack of prior knowledge about the topics, and poor of teacher-learner relationship (Tutyandari, 2005). On the other words, the students' problems in speaking can be classified into knowledge and emotion (e.g. self-confidence).

All students are absolutely eager to develop their speaking skills. It is mentioned in Nazara's study (2011), the result of the questionnaire administered to 40 students in the fifth and seventh semester of FKIP UKI is 100% of respondent agree that they are eager to develop speaking skills. But, again, they have not got enough time to practice their speaking even in the class. 90% respondents agree that the time provided for practicing speaking in speaking classes is too limited (p. 37). So, if a teacher gives much more time to the students to practice and to explore their Speaking, of course, the two main problems mentioned above can be solved. Nobody is diffident to speak in front of others, as happened in Awan, Azher, Anwar and Naz' study (2010) in which 55.3% of respondents state that speaking in front of others becomes the highest anxious to do. It can be seen that the students lacked of confidence. Although, it was only 20%, other responses also indicate that they have problems with confidence in speaking English (e.g. nervous, shy to speak English, etc). There are only two responses which indicate positive motivation, namely „not nervous, try hard to use English“.

The role of teachers is to foster the students to get their speaking ability. Teachers need to apply a strategy which can give students much more opportunity to explore their competence as well as to grow their confidence in speaking English. The strategy proposed in this study was PBL. PBL is an approach which can "engage students in activities that are interesting to them and important to the course" (Fleming, 2000, p. 1). It focuses on two points which can give solutions to the problems mentioned in speaking. Interesting activities support students to enjoy their learning process. Here, students are not stressed to join in the learning process, since, the activities are fascinating. It can motivate students and avoid their less-confident. Secondly, important course(s) means that even though a class is set by considering students' interest in the activities, but, the corridor that must be followed is the activities still keep on the track.

Poonpon (2009) argues that PBL brings to benefits cognitively, emotionally and psychometrically. Cognitively, most students showed improvement in all four language skills. Emotionally most learners are eager to participate in learning activities. They seemed to developed intrinsic motivation. The last, psychomotor aims to foster the development of curiosity and observation skills to the students. In other words, PBL can improve students' cognitive competence, emotion and psychomotor.

Considering facts and reasons explained above, we were interested in conducting research in the form of experimental study to the second semester students of one University in Palembang, Indonesia. Therefore, we addressed the study entitled "The implementation of Project-Based Learning (PBL) in increasing speaking achievement and self-confidence".

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The problems of study were formulated in the following questions: (1) was there any significant increase in speaking achievement of the second semester students of One University in Palembang, Indonesia using PBL? (2) was there any significant increase in self-confidence of the second semester students of One University in Palembang, Indonesia by using PBL? (3) How much was PBL contribution in increasing speaking achievement of the second semester students of One University in Palembang, Indonesia? And (4) How much was PBL contribution in increasing self-confidence of second semester students of One University in Palembang, Indonesia?

This study used the experimental method, we used quasi-experimental design, specifically, non-equivalent control group design. There were two groups, namely, experimental group in which it was given treatment by using PBL and control group in which it was given no treatment (McMillan, 1992:176). Both groups at the beginning section were administered by pretest, and they were administered by posttest at the last section of the study.

We used purposive sampling. Fraenkel, et. al, (2012) mentioned that in using purposive sampling, a researcher used their judgement to select the sample that they believed based on the prior information about the population they had. To select the sample of the research, we considered the following criteria: 1) the age of students was around 18-21 years old. 2) The score of semester test were grouped into three categories; the above average, average and below average. We chose the average group (56-70) as the sample that consists of 40 students. Those students were placed into two groups, experimental group and control group.

3) They were divided in the same number of each gender because there were more female than male. In analyzing the data, we used quantitative data analysis by using SPSS version 21.

There were two kinds of data that were analyzed. They were the data of students' speaking achievement and the data of students' self-confidence from questionnaire. At the beginning, we got the scores through oral test which was conducted as pretest and posttest. The scores were analyzed based on five criteria, namely: 1) Accent, 2) Grammar, 3) Vocabulary, 4) Fluency, and Grammar (Adam & Frith cited in Hughes, 2003, p. 131-133).

## **FINDINGS**

There were two important things to describe in this part. They are 1) students' speaking ability and 2) students' self-confidence. We gave the test twice in the form of pre and posttest. To test the students' speaking ability, we conducted an oral test by using 8 items. The students' responds were recorded and analyzed by two raters using five elements, namely: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. We also distributed the questionnaire consisted of eighteen statements with Likert scale (1-6) which asked the students to choose one of the choice which really drew their feelings in self-confidence. The questionnaire was presented in the form of score from 18 to 108; the students' classification of their speaking achievement and self-

confidence. As a results based on the level of achievement, as a whole the students' speaking achievement (N=40) was still categorized in average level with the mean score of 58.04. Using five level of achievements, the students' achievement was classified as follows: excellent was 0%, good was 25%, average was 35%, poor was 22.5%, and very poor was 17.5%.

As a comparison, as a whole the students' self-confidence (N=40) was also categorized in average level with the mean score of 70.53. Using three levels of categories, the students' self-confidence was classified as follows: high was 40%, average was 42.5%, and low was 17.5 %. Here is the table of the mean score of students' speaking ability and their self-confidence. In the statistical analysis, we tried to find out whether or not Project Based Learning could increase students speaking ability and their self-confidence. In this part, we focused on the influence of PBL towards students' self-confidence.

To determine which statistical formula were used in analyzing the data, we started by calculating the normality and the homogeneity of the data. As a result, it was found that the distribution of speaking scores and of self-confidence questionnaire were considered normal since  $p > 0.05$ . For the data of speaking by using Saphiro Wilk test, the scores of normality were 1) Sig.=.100 for pretest and Sig.=.095 for posttest of experimental group, 2) Sig.=.061 for pretest and Sig.=.170 for posttest of control group. Meanwhile, for the data of questionnaire by using Saphiro Wilk test, the scores of normality were 1) Sig.=.879 for pretest and Sig.=.0.78 for posttest of experimental group, 2) Sig.=.893 for pretest and Sig.=.286 for posttest of control group. The data of speaking score and self-confidence were considered homogenous since  $p > .05$ . The significance score were .693 for speaking and .081 for self-confidence. Based on the consideration above it can be concluded that to find out the significant differences of speaking and self-confidence among the students, we used *t* test of parametric statistics in SPSS version 20 program for the statistical analysis.

There were two main parts in this analysis. They are the analysis of 1) paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test, and 2) multiple regressions. Paired sample t-test analysis was used in order to find out whether or not there was significant different between pretest and posttest within the group. In the experimental group, it-tested whether or not PBL could increase students self-confidence. Meanwhile, in control group, it used to find out the significant difference between the pretest and the posttest although they did not apply PBL. Independent sample t-test was used to determine whether or not there was significant difference between experimental and control group. The second analysis tool, regression, is used to find out PBL's contribution to the increase of students' speaking ability and their self-confidence in which we also used the program of SPSS version 20 for windows.

In the results of *t-test*, we explained in detail the total and the aspects of students' speaking ability and self-confidence. As a result, it was found out that PBL increased students' speaking ability. It can be seen that the mean difference within the experimental group was 19.23,  $t\text{-value}=8.828$ ,  $p<.000$  (N=20) and control group was 4.53,  $t\text{-value}=1.260$ ,  $p=.223$ , it meant that  $p>.05$  which indicated that it was not

significantly increased. To see the effectiveness of PBL towards students' speaking ability, it was found that the mean difference posttest between experimental and control group was 11.48,  $t$ -value=2.307,  $p=0.027$  ( $p<.05$ ). It meant that PBL significantly increased students' speaking ability in experimental group rather than control group. The result of statistical analysis of students' self-confidence showed that PBL increased students' self-confidence. It can be seen that the mean difference within the experimental group was 21.95,  $t$ -value=7.964,  $p<.000$  ( $N=20$ ) and control group was 8.20,  $t$ -value=5.027,  $p<.000$ . To see the effectiveness of PBL towards students' self-confidence, it was found that the mean difference posttest between experimental and control group was 11.05,  $t$ -value=3.595,  $p=0.001$  ( $p<.05$ ). It indicated that PBL significantly increased students' self-confidence in experimental group rather than control group.

## **DISCUSSION**

Overall Project based learning significantly increased students' speaking ability and self-confidence. To get the detail results, we also provided the results of paired sample  $t$ -test and independent sample  $t$  test of the aspects of speaking and self-confidence. The aspects of speaking analyzed were accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Meanwhile, there were four aspects of self-confidence, namely: language use anxiety, causal attribution, perceived L2 competence and self-efficacy. For detail information about the statistical analysis of aspects of students' speaking ability and also self-confidence, it can be seen in the table 4.2.

Next, we also wanted to find out the contribution of PBL to students' speaking ability and their self-confidence. It was perceived by the presence of stepwise regression analysis. By using this statistical formula, we found out how much each aspect of speaking ability and self-confidence contributed to the increase of students' speaking achievement and their self-confidence.

We analyzed the aspects of speaking ability and of students' self-confidence. Based on the results of the stepwise regression analysis, the contribution of PBL toward speaking achievement as a whole was 99.7%. The results showed that aspect of fluency contributed 94.8% ( $R^2=0.948$ ,  $F=327.94$ ,  $p<.000$ ), followed by grammar for 2.7%, vocabulary 1.5% and comprehension 0.7%. The data displayed showed that the aspect of accent did not contribute to the students' speaking achievement and there was still an unidentified factor which influenced to the students' speaking achievement.

Furthermore, the results of stepwise regression analysis on the contribution of PBL toward students' self-confidence showed that as a whole was 92.7%. In detail, the aspect of language use anxiety alone influenced students' self-confidence for 79.1% ( $R^2=79.1$ ,  $F=68.009$ ,  $p<.000$ ), followed by causal attribution for 13.5%, perceived L2 competence for 0.1% and self-efficacy for 0.1%. The data showed that there was still any an unidentified factor which influenced the students' self-confidence for 7.3% and the aspect of perceived L2 competence and self-efficacy did not significantly contribute to the cultivation of students' self-confidence.

The data were gained and calculated statistically and the documentation as the

supporting data analyzed qualitatively, we attempted. Statistically, it was found that the students who were taught through PBL achieved better than those of the students of control group. At the beginning in the pretest, we postulated that between the two groups, experimental and control group, the students' score were similar. It showed that the students had the equal ability in Speaking ability and their self-confidence. After a treatment, the experimental group experienced the significance progress in speaking and the increase of their self-confidence better than the control group. It indicated that the treatment used, in this case PBL, was a good strategy which can be implemented in a teaching and learning process.

There are some reasons bringing the success of PBL on its implementation to the second semester students' speaking ability of One University in Palembang, Indonesia in the academic year of 2017/2018. First reason is that PBL has characteristic which can support the students to explore their ability without making them saturated. The design of learning activities was arranged by the students themselves. They planned, organized, worked, and evaluated their works by themselves. It caused the students were motivated in joining the class. This reason is supported by Fleming (2000, p. 1) that PBL can "engage students in activities that are interesting to them and important to the course."

Second, PBL is also in line with the nature of teaching speaking. In teaching speaking, there are five taxonomy emerges. They are 1) imitative, 2) intensive, 3) responsive, 4) interactive, 5) extensive (Brown, 2003, p. 140-141). In comparison, the design of tasks in PBL in the learning and teaching process to the students was arranged based on the easier to the more difficult ones. There were three programs namely: A parody-TV Show, Gallery Walks, and Exhibition. In the first program, the students did an imitative and intensive process through the performance. The second program, Gallery walks, in which the students still worked in the groups made stations which were visited by their friends. In the second program, the students experienced responsive and also interactive process.. For the last program, Exhibition, the students displayed and explained in detail the product they made in the previous two programs to the visitors who were not from their class. In the last process, they did extensive speaking.

PBL also increases students' self-confidence. PBL gives motivation to the students to explore their ability. It opens the space for the students to show their existence in the class. Everybody got the same opportunity to speak, to respond, to comment, etc. By getting the chance, the students got responsibility and were engaged to do best for their program. Eventually, they got their self-confidence.

Besides, PBL gave many advantages beyond the variables investigated in this study, for example: 1) students' readiness to accept suggestion from their friends, 2) self-evaluation, 3) solving their problems. The students were accustomed to accepting suggestion even criticism from their friends. At the end of each program, the audiences can deliver their ideas in the form of question, suggestion, criticism, and or review. They shared one and each other as a process of evaluation. Their readiness to be evaluated was also supported by their self-evaluation. They noted in their learner

diaries about their feelings, problems, and planning for the next week. They really understood about themselves related to their problems in speaking and their self-confidence. They also wrote their planning to solve their problems.

This study answered the challenging things underlined by some experts on students' readiness and time management (Ravitz, 2008; Fragoulis & Tsiplakides, 2009; Chayanuvurat, 2007 in Poonpon, 2009). It was proved that during the process the idea came from the students themselves. The teacher was only as facilitator and coordinator. The students decided and created some programs by having discussion in their groupworks. Time management factor was also solved by stretching the time schedule planned at the beginning. The students were informed about the time they had to finish their works. We thought that this condition happened because students understood how they should work with PBL.

However, there were some notes which became challenge in this study. From the data, it was known that there was one aspect of each variable, speaking ability and self-confidence, which did not significantly increase. They are 1) perceived L2 Competence and 2) comprehension. There were some possible reasons we argued for the problem occurred. First, we thought that the designs of the program implemented in the treatment actually tended to emphasize the students to memorize the material. From the three programs, the students had the material and memorized it before the performance. We assumed that because of less comprehension, the students still perceived that they had less competence in L2. To prove this assumption, we calculated to correlate between the two things. It was found that  $r=0.156$ . It means that there was no correlation between these two things. Second, The students focused on the grammar and vocabulary. It can be seen from the note the students wrote in their learner diary. In their self-evaluation, they wrote that vocabulary and grammar are the two problems of their speaking ability. It could be one of the reason which caused we were inattentive on their comprehension and something burdened them so that they always felt they were not competent in L2. Third, in evaluation section, the students focused on the performance rather than on the comprehension. In this case, it was a probably problem which make the students as well as we were inattentive toward students' comprehension. The last, the students were in second semester of their school. It indicated that they were in-growth students of their comprehension. It means that they need much more things to increase their comprehension and perceived L2 competence.

In conclusion, PBL contributed to the second semester students' speaking ability and their self-confidence of One University in Palembang, Indonesia in the academic year of 2017/2018. It was seen from the results of the study in the form of statistical analysis and descriptive analysis collected from test and documentation during the research process. Furthermore, PBL not only increased students' self-confidence and speaking ability, but also in fact it absolutely worked more than that. It can increase students' readiness in accepting criticism, self-evaluation, and problem solving, since in the process of teaching and learning, PBL gives the students time to evaluate their works in evaluation section. In this case, the students try to listen other comment,

suggestion, and criticism in order to make their works better. We believe that by implementing this method and by considering some notes to others' investigation, researchers can dig deeper related to the students' potential in learning, and get many benefits from PBL.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the findings and interpretations, we intend to conclude this study. PBL increased the students' speaking ability. There were some aspects improved, namely: accent, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. There was only one aspect which did not increase when it was compared between the two groups. It was comprehension. It indicated that the treatment designed had been able to support the increase of technique for speaking, but it needs much more efforts to support the students' comprehension.

PBL also increased the students' self-confidence for some aspects. They were language use anxiety, causal attribution, and self-efficacy. It showed that the intervention given to the students in this study gave them space to explore and to exist on their lesson. It helped them feel safe and relax when they were studying in the class. However, the students still felt that they had less competence in L2. Although there was no correlation between students' comprehension and their perception towards L2 competence, but we believed that their so-called feeling was caused by their comprehension which made them uneasy to neutralize and to save their feelings and to convince them that they were good at English.

Finally, each aspect, for both speaking achievement and self-confidence contributed to their improvement. On speaking achievement, the aspects which had strong contribution were fluency, vocabulary, and grammar and comprehension. It is interesting to know that comprehension contributed to students' speaking achievement, since it did not increase when the mean was compared between students' posttest of control and experimental group. The contribution of comprehension was only 0.7% which indicated it gave contribution but could not increase students' speaking comprehension. Second, the aspect of accent did not influence very well. We assumed that in the teaching and learning process, we were inattentive to the accent. Besides, on self-confidence, the aspects that influenced well were language use anxiety, causal attribution, perceived L2 competence and self-efficacy. Perceived L2 competence and self-efficacy did not significantly contribute to the students' self-confidence. It indicated that the students have had the opportunities to explore themselves and the learning designed support the students to decrease their anxiety when they were speaking in the class. However, again, it needs much more time to convince the students and to change their paradigm related to their perception towards L2 competence. Based on the conclusion above, we would like to propose some suggestions. First, the students are suggested to use PBL in order to increase their speaking ability and self-confidence. The students can create some programs/projects which they are interested in. By doing interesting things, it helps them to learn in a saved feeling which automatically motivates them. A student must be

believed as an individual who can grow well emotionally and cognitively by getting time and space to explore their potential. PBL is one suitable way can cover them.

As practitioner, teachers are really suggested to apply PBL in teaching English especially speaking. It is because from the results of the study there are many advantages in implementing PBL. It is an important information that PBL is good for productive skills and students' motivation. However, considering some notes in interpretation, in implementing PBL, a teacher should cover all aspects of speaking, made detail of the program in order not to leave one or two aspects of speaking since they are one complete package and unified. A teacher should also suit the program with the material and students character. The projects must be designed from the easier to the more difficult one.

The last, for others researcher, there are still many opportunities to do research on the topic of PBL. They cover design, planning, control and evaluation. The success of PBL implementation is really supported by the design. The students need the design which they enjoy and are motivated to do as well as are representative for the goal of learning. The second one is planning in which the students really understand how to do with project works. The better planning we have the better result of the projects they will get. In the control section, a researcher needs to have standard and some guidance which keep the students on the right track. The third one is evaluation, we addressed right feedback.

We let the students to have correction from other students; however, we also evaluated the students' works to cover all aspects planned. Another challenging thing is how to make the students understand the projects without forgetting the lesson. It is really expected that when the students are doing the projects, they work on how they can create projects well and on what they can learn from the projects related to the particular material. Out of PBL context, one of interesting things happened in this study was found that the students have less comprehension in speaking and perceived that they had less competence in L2. At glance, these two things are interrelated. However, when it was correlated, there was no correlation between them. By the limitation of this study, we argued that it is needed to do correlational research between these two things for future researches. Another possible research can be investigated later on related to the benefits of PBL, namely self-evaluation, students' readiness in criticism, and solving problem. These three things could be researched through experimental study to know the implementation of PBL in improving them or qualitative one to get students' response toward their readiness, self-evaluation, and problem solving after the application of PBL.

## REFERENCES

- Awan, R., Azher, M., Anwar, M. N., & Naz, A. (2010). An investigation of foreign language classroom anxiety and its relationship with students' achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 7(11), 33-40.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2011). Factor effecting students' English speaking skill. *British Journal of Arts and Social Science*, 2(1), 34-50.

- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H.D. (2003). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. San Francisco: Longman
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents
- Burnkart, G. S. (1998). *Spoken language: What it is and how to teach it*. Washington, DC: CAL.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Education First-English Proficiency Index (EF-EPI). (2016). *EF English proficiency index trends*. Technical Report. Retrieved from <http://www.ef.com/epi>.
- Fleming, D. S. (2000) *A teacher's guide to project-based learning*. Charleston, WV: AEL.
- Graves, K. (2008). The language curriculum: A social contextual perspective. *Language Teacher*, 41(2), 147-181. doi: 10.1017/S0261444807004867.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McMillan, J.H. (1992). *Educational research: Fundamentals for customers*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Mukminatien, N. (1999). The problem of developing speaking skills: Limitations of second language acquisition in an EFL classroom. *English Language Education*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Nazara, S. (2011). Students' perception on EFL speaking skill development. *Journal of English Teaching*, 1(1), 28-43.
- Nga, N. T. (2008). English a global language and its implication for students. *VNU Journal of Science*, 24, 260-266.
- Poonpon, K. (2011). Enhancing English skills through project based learning. *The English Teacher*, 40, 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2011/1-10-Kornwipa%202011>.
- Ravitz, J. (2008, March). *Project based learning as a catalyst in reforming high schools*. In the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The teaching of EFL speaking in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *Bahasa dan Seni*, 34(2), 269-292.