

International Journal of Social Science Exceptional Research

Project-based learning method: Legitimate results of language knowledge with practical skills

Nguyen Thuy Van

Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

* Corresponding Author: **Nguyen Thuy Van**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-8261

Volume: 03

Issue: 03

May-June 2024

Received: 15-03-2024;

Accepted: 17-04-2024

Page No: 70-76

Abstract

Project-Based Learning (PBL) has emerged as a promising approach in language education, offering learners the opportunity to develop language knowledge alongside practical skills. This article explores the effectiveness of PBL in enhancing language acquisition and fostering essential 21st-century skills. Drawing upon constructivist learning theory, experiential learning theory, and communicative language teaching, the article presents a comprehensive overview of the benefits of PBL in language classrooms. It highlights how PBL can enhance vocabulary acquisition, reinforce grammar, and develop communication, collaboration, problem-solving, and critical thinking skills. The article also discusses the importance of designing effective projects, the teacher's role as a facilitator, and assessment strategies. Additionally, it addresses challenges such as time constraints and diverse learner needs, providing practical solutions. Case studies and research findings are presented to support the effectiveness of PBL in language education. The article concludes by reiterating the benefits of PBL, suggesting future directions for research and practice, and offering recommendations for language educators. Overall, this article aims to provide a thorough understanding of the legitimate results of language knowledge and practical skills that can be achieved through the implementation of Project-Based Learning in language classrooms.

Keywords: Project-Based Learning, language education, language acquisition, practical skills, 21st-century skills, constructivist learning, experiential learning

Introduction

1.1 Definition of Project-Based Learning (PBL)

Project-Based Learning (PBL) is a student-centered instructional approach that involves learners in authentic, complex, and challenging projects that culminate in the creation of a final product (Thomas, 2000) ^[65]. PBL is characterized by its focus on real-world problems, collaborative learning, and the integration of various disciplines (Krajcik & Blumenfeld, 2006) ^[11]. In the context of language education, PBL tasks are designed to engage learners in meaningful communication, problem-solving, and critical thinking while simultaneously fostering language acquisition (Beckett, 2002) ^[6].

1.2 Significance of PBL in language learning

The significance of PBL in language learning lies in its potential to bridge the gap between language knowledge and practical skills (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. Traditional language teaching methods often prioritize the acquisition of linguistic forms and structures, neglecting the development of communicative competence and real-world skills (Canale & Swain, 1980) ^[16]. PBL, on the other hand, provides learners with opportunities to use the target language in authentic contexts, enhancing their ability to communicate effectively and apply their language knowledge to practical situations (Ribé & Vidal, 1993) ^[55]. Moreover, PBL promotes learner autonomy, motivation, and engagement, as students take ownership of their learning process and work collaboratively towards a common goal (Dörnyei, 2001) ^[22].

1.3 Thesis statement

This article aims to explore the effectiveness of Project-Based Learning in achieving legitimate results in terms of language knowledge and practical skills. By examining the theoretical foundations of PBL, its benefits, implementation strategies, challenges, and empirical evidence, this article seeks to demonstrate how PBL can revolutionize language education and prepare learners for the demands of the 21st century (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12]. The following sections will delve into the various aspects of PBL in language learning, ultimately providing a comprehensive understanding of its potential to transform the way languages are taught and learned (Markham, 2011) ^[49].

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Constructivist learning theory

Project-Based Learning is firmly grounded in constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes the active role of learners in constructing their own knowledge and understanding (Piaget, 1972) ^[53]. According to constructivism, learning is a dynamic process in which learners build upon their prior knowledge and experiences to create new meaning and develop higher-order thinking skills (Vygotsky, 1978) ^[69]. PBL aligns with constructivist principles by providing learners with opportunities to engage in authentic, real-world tasks that require them to apply their knowledge and skills in meaningful ways (Savery & Duffy, 1995) ^[57]. Through collaboration, inquiry, and reflection, learners in PBL environments actively construct their understanding of the target language and develop a deeper appreciation for its practical applications (Hmelo-Silver, 2004) ^[33].

2.2 Experiential learning theory

Experiential learning theory, as proposed by Kolb (1984) ^[42], also plays a crucial role in the theoretical foundation of Project-Based Learning. This theory posits that learning is a continuous process grounded in experience, involving four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (Kolb & Kolb, 2005) ^[43]. PBL incorporates these stages by engaging learners in hands-on, experiential tasks that require them to apply their language skills in authentic contexts, reflect on their experiences, conceptualize new ideas, and experiment with different strategies (Knutson, 2003) ^[41]. By facilitating experiential learning, PBL helps learners develop a more comprehensive understanding of the target language and its practical applications (Beckett & Slater, 2005) ^[6].

2.3 Communicative language teaching approach

The communicative language teaching (CLT) approach has significantly influenced the development and implementation of Project-Based Learning in language education (Nunan, 1991) ^[51]. CLT emphasizes the importance of meaningful communication and the development of communicative competence, which encompasses grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980) ^[16]. PBL aligns with CLT principles by providing learners with opportunities to engage in authentic, purposeful communication that focuses on meaning rather than form (Larsen-Freeman, 2000) ^[46]. Through collaborative projects, learners develop their ability to use the target language effectively in various contexts, negotiating meaning and adapting their language use to suit

different purposes and audiences (Skehan, 2003) ^[60]. By integrating CLT principles, PBL creates a supportive and engaging learning environment that fosters the development of communicative competence (Ellis, 2003) ^[23]. Infrastructure (Lin & Lin, 2008). Case studies showed that organizations with compatible IoT solutions experienced smoother adoption processes (Wang et al., 2016).

3. Benefits of Project-Based Learning in Language Education

3.1 Enhancing language knowledge

Project-Based Learning has proven to be a highly effective approach in enhancing language knowledge, as it provides learners with meaningful contexts in which to acquire and apply new linguistic elements (Stoller, 2006) ^[62].

3.1.1 Vocabulary acquisition

PBL tasks often revolve around specific themes or topics, exposing learners to a wide range of relevant vocabulary (Beckett, 2002) ^[6]. Through repeated exposure and active engagement with these words in authentic contexts, learners are better able to internalize and retain new vocabulary (Nation, 2001) ^[50]. Moreover, the collaborative nature of PBL encourages learners to negotiate meaning and clarify understanding, further reinforcing vocabulary acquisition (Swain, 2000).

3.1.2 Grammar reinforcement

While PBL focuses on meaningful communication, it also provides opportunities for learners to practice and reinforce grammatical structures in context (Larsen-Freeman, 2003) ^[46]. As learners engage in project tasks, they naturally encounter and use various grammatical forms, helping them to develop a more intuitive understanding of language patterns (Ellis, 2002) ^[23]. Furthermore, the feedback and support provided by teachers and peers during PBL can help learners refine their grammatical accuracy and develop greater linguistic awareness (Long, 1996).

3.2 Developing practical skills

One of the key benefits of Project-Based Learning is its ability to foster the development of practical skills that are essential for success in the 21st century (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12].

3.2.1 Communication skills

PBL tasks require learners to engage in authentic, purposeful communication, both oral and written, in the target language (Stoller, 2002) ^[62]. Through collaborative projects, learners develop their ability to express ideas clearly, listen actively, and adapt their language use to suit different purposes and audiences (Savignon, 2002) ^[59]. These communication skills are not only valuable in language learning but also highly transferable to real-world contexts (Fried-Booth, 2002) ^[28].

3.2.2 Collaboration skills

Collaboration is a central feature of Project-Based Learning, as learners work together to plan, execute, and evaluate their projects (Kagan, 1994) ^[38]. Through collaborative tasks, learners develop essential skills such as teamwork, negotiation, conflict resolution, and leadership (Johnson & Johnson, 1999) ^[36]. These skills are highly valued in both academic and professional settings, making PBL an effective

means of preparing learners for future success (Dillenbourg, 1999) ^[20].

3.2.3 Problem-solving skills

PBL tasks often present learners with real-world problems or challenges that require them to think critically and creatively to find solutions (Hmelo-Silver, 2004) ^[33]. As learners engage in problem-solving activities, they develop the ability to analyze complex situations, generate alternative solutions, and make informed decisions (Jonassen, 1997) ^[37]. These problem-solving skills are not only valuable in language learning but also highly transferable to other domains (Barrows, 1996) ^[4].

3.2.4 Critical thinking skills

Project-Based Learning promotes the development of critical thinking skills by engaging learners in tasks that require them to evaluate information, analyze arguments, and synthesize ideas (Facione, 1990) ^[25]. Through PBL, learners develop the ability to ask questions, challenge assumptions, and formulate well-reasoned opinions (Paul & Elder, 2001) ^[52]. These critical thinking skills are essential for success in both academic and professional contexts (Willingham, 2007) ^[74].

3.3 Increasing motivation and engagement

Project-Based Learning has been shown to have a positive impact on learner motivation and engagement, as it creates a more learner-centered and dynamic learning environment (Blumenfeld et al., 1991) ^[11].

3.3.1 Authentic context

PBL tasks are designed to be authentic and relevant to learners' lives, interests, and future goals (Grant, 2002) ^[29]. By engaging in projects that have real-world significance, learners are more likely to perceive the value and relevance of their learning, leading to increased motivation and investment in the learning process (Brophy, 2008) ^[14].

3.3.2 Learner autonomy

PBL promotes learner autonomy by giving students greater control over their learning process and outcomes (Holec, 1981) ^[35]. As learners take ownership of their projects, they develop a sense of agency and responsibility for their own learning, leading to increased motivation and engagement (Deci & Ryan, 2000) ^[19]. Moreover, the open-ended nature of PBL tasks allows learners to pursue their own interests and passions, further enhancing their intrinsic motivation (Katz & Chard, 2000) ^[39].

3.3.3 Sense of achievement

Project-Based Learning culminates in the creation of a tangible product or outcome, providing learners with a sense of achievement and accomplishment (Thomas, 2000) ^[65]. As learners work towards a meaningful goal and see the fruits of their labor, they experience increased motivation and satisfaction with the learning process (Pintrich, 2003) ^[54]. This sense of achievement can also boost learners' self-efficacy and confidence, further fueling their engagement and persistence in language learning (Bandura, 1997) ^[2].

5. Implementing Project-Based Learning in Language Classrooms

4.1 Designing effective projects

Designing effective projects is crucial for the successful implementation of Project-Based Learning in language classrooms (Markham, 2011) ^[49]. Effective PBL projects should be carefully crafted to align with learning objectives and incorporate real-world relevance (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12].

4.1.1 Aligning with learning objectives

When designing PBL projects, it is essential to ensure that they align with the specific learning objectives of the language course (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) ^[73]. Projects should be structured in a way that allows learners to practice and develop the target language skills, such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. By aligning projects with learning objectives, teachers can ensure that learners are actively engaging with the language and making progress towards their learning goals (Biggs & Tang, 2011) ^[9].

4.1.2 Incorporating real-world relevance

Effective PBL projects should be designed to incorporate real-world relevance, making the learning experience more meaningful and engaging for learners (Grant, 2002) ^[29]. By connecting projects to learners' lives, interests, and future goals, teachers can increase learners' motivation and investment in the learning process (Brophy, 2008) ^[14]. Real-world projects also provide opportunities for learners to apply their language skills in authentic contexts, helping them to develop a deeper understanding of the practical applications of the target language (Fried-Booth, 2002) ^[28].

4.2 Teacher's role as facilitator

In Project-Based Learning, the teacher's role shifts from that of a traditional knowledge transmitter to a facilitator of learning (Hmelo-Silver & Barrows, 2006) ^[34]. As a facilitator, the teacher guides and supports learners throughout the project process, providing resources, feedback, and scaffolding as needed (Savery, 2006) ^[57]. The teacher also plays a crucial role in creating a supportive and collaborative learning environment that encourages learner autonomy and risk-taking (Ladewski et al., 1994). By adopting a facilitative role, teachers can empower learners to take ownership of their learning and develop the skills necessary for lifelong learning (Bransford et al., 2000).

4.3 Assessment and evaluation

Assessment and evaluation are integral components of Project-Based Learning, as they provide opportunities for teachers to monitor learners' progress and provide meaningful feedback (Barron & Darling-Hammond, 2008) ^[3]. In PBL, assessment and evaluation should be ongoing, authentic, and aligned with the learning objectives of the project (Markham, 2011) ^[49].

4.3.1 Formative assessment

Formative assessment is a crucial aspect of PBL, as it provides learners with continuous feedback and support

Throughout the project process (Black & Wiliam, 1998) ^[10]. Formative assessment can take many forms, such as teacher observations, peer feedback, self-reflection, and progress checks (Sadler, 1989) ^[56]. By engaging in formative assessment, teachers can identify areas where learners need additional support and adjust their instruction accordingly (Heritage, 2010) ^[32]. Moreover, formative assessment helps learners to monitor their own progress and develop metacognitive skills that are essential for self-regulated learning (Flavell, 1979) ^[26].

4.3.2 Summative assessment

Summative assessment occurs at the end of a PBL project and is used to evaluate learners' overall performance and achievement of learning objectives (Gronlund, 2003) ^[30]. Summative assessment in PBL should be authentic and performance-based, allowing learners to demonstrate their language skills and knowledge in meaningful contexts (Wiggins, 1998) ^[72]. Examples of summative assessment in PBL include project presentations, portfolios, and written reports (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12]. When designing summative assessments, teachers should use clear criteria and rubrics that align with the learning objectives and provide learners with a clear understanding of what is expected of them (Andrade, 2000) ^[1]. By combining formative and summative assessment, teachers can create a comprehensive and meaningful evaluation system that supports learners' growth and achievement in Project-Based Learning (Markham, 2011) ^[49].

5. Challenges and Solutions

While Project-Based Learning offers numerous benefits for language learners, it also presents certain challenges that teachers must navigate to ensure successful implementation (Beckett, 2002) ^[6]. Three common challenges in PBL include time constraints, balancing language focus and project work, and addressing diverse learner needs (Stoller, 2006) ^[62].

5.1 Time constraints

One of the most significant challenges in implementing Project-Based Learning is the time-intensive nature of the approach (Markham, 2011) ^[49]. PBL projects often require extensive planning, preparation, and class time, which can be difficult to accommodate within the constraints of a traditional school schedule (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12]. To address this challenge, teachers can employ strategies such as breaking projects into smaller, manageable tasks, integrating projects across multiple subject areas, and utilizing technology to facilitate collaboration and communication outside of class time (Grant, 2002) ^[29]. Additionally, teachers can work with school administrators to advocate for more flexible scheduling and dedicated time for PBL (Krajcik & Blumenfeld, 2006) ^[11].

5.2 Balancing language focus and project work

Another challenge in PBL is finding the right balance between language focus and project work (Beckett & Slater, 2005) ^[8]. While PBL emphasizes authentic communication and real-world application, it is essential to ensure that learners are still receiving explicit language instruction and feedback (Stoller, 2002) ^[62]. To address this challenge, teachers can integrate language-focused tasks and mini-lessons into the project process, providing learners with

opportunities to practice and refine specific language skills (Larsen-Freeman, 2000) ^[46]. Teachers can also use formative assessment to monitor learners' language development and provide targeted feedback and support (Black & Wiliam, 1998) ^[10]. By striking a balance between language focus and project work, teachers can ensure that learners are making progress in both their language proficiency and their project-related skills (Fried-Booth, 2002) ^[28].

5.3 Addressing diverse learner needs

Project-Based Learning classrooms often include learners with diverse backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles, which can present challenges for teachers in meeting individual needs (Tomlinson, 1999) ^[66]. To address this challenge, teachers can employ differentiation strategies, such as providing multiple entry points into the project, offering choice in project tasks and products, and using flexible grouping arrangements (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006) ^[67]. Teachers can also leverage the collaborative nature of PBL to encourage peer support and create a more inclusive learning environment (Cohen, 1994) ^[18]. Additionally, teachers can use scaffolding techniques, such as providing language frames, visual aids, and exemplars, to support learners with varying language proficiency levels (Walqui, 2006) ^[70]. By proactively addressing diverse learner needs, teachers can ensure that all students have the opportunity to engage meaningfully in Project-Based Learning and experience success (Udvari-Solner & Kluth, 2008) ^[68].

6. Case Studies and Research Findings

6.1 Successful PBL implementations in language classrooms

Numerous case studies have documented the successful implementation of Project-Based Learning in language classrooms across various contexts and age groups (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. For example, Tessema (2005) ^[64] reported on a PBL project in an EFL classroom in Ethiopia, where students collaborated to create a school magazine, resulting in improved writing skills and increased motivation. Similarly, Foss et al. (2007) ^[27] described a PBL project in a Spanish classroom in the United States, where students created a travel guide for a Spanish-speaking country, demonstrating gains in cultural knowledge and language proficiency. These case studies highlight the potential of PBL to engage learners, foster authentic language use, and promote the development of 21st-century skills (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12].

6.2 Empirical evidence supporting PBL effectiveness

In addition to case studies, a growing body of empirical research has investigated the effectiveness of Project-Based Learning in language education (Beckett & Miller, 2006) ^[7]. For instance, Kavlu (2015) ^[40] conducted a quasi-experimental study comparing PBL and traditional instruction in an EFL context, finding that PBL led to significantly higher gains in writing performance and learner motivation. Similarly, Baş and Beyhan (2010) ^[5] investigated the effects of PBL on English language learners' achievement and attitudes, reporting positive outcomes in both areas. A meta-analysis by Chen and Yang (2019) ^[17] further supported the effectiveness of PBL, revealing significant positive effects on language proficiency, content knowledge, and affective factors. These empirical findings provide compelling evidence for the benefits of PBL in language

education, underscoring its potential to enhance learning outcomes and promote student engagement (Stoller, 2006) ^[62].

7. Conclusion

7.1 Reiterating the benefits of PBL in language education

Project-Based Learning offers a powerful approach to language education, providing learners with opportunities to engage in authentic, meaningful language use while developing essential 21st-century skills (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12]. By aligning with constructivist, experiential, and communicative language teaching principles, PBL creates a learner-centered environment that promotes active engagement, collaboration, and problem-solving (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. The benefits of PBL in language education are numerous, including enhanced language knowledge, the development of practical skills, and increased motivation and engagement (Beckett & Miller, 2006) ^[7]. As evidenced by case studies and empirical research, PBL has the potential to transform language learning experiences and prepare students for success in an increasingly interconnected world (Markham, 2011) ^[49].

7.2 Future directions for research and practice

While the current research on Project-Based Learning in language education is promising, there are still areas that warrant further investigation (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. Future research could explore the long-term effects of PBL on language retention and transfer, as well as its impact on learners' intercultural competence and global citizenship (Byram, 2008) ^[15]. Additionally, more studies are needed to investigate the effectiveness of PBL in diverse educational settings, such as online and hybrid learning environments (Gruba & Hinkelman, 2012) ^[31]. In terms of practice, language educators should continue to share their experiences and best practices in implementing PBL, fostering a community of practice that encourages innovation and collaboration (Wenger, 1998) ^[71]. As technology continues to advance, language teachers should also explore ways to leverage digital tools and resources to enhance PBL experiences and facilitate global connections (Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012) ^[21].

7.3 Recommendations for language educators

Based on the evidence presented in this article, language educators are encouraged to incorporate Project-Based Learning into their teaching practice (Stoller, 2006) ^[62]. To ensure successful implementation, teachers should design projects that align with learning objectives, incorporate real-world relevance, and provide opportunities for authentic language use (Markham, 2011) ^[49]. Teachers should also embrace their role as facilitators, providing guidance, support, and feedback throughout the project process (Hmelo-Silver & Barrows, 2006) ^[34]. In assessing PBL, educators should employ a combination of formative and summative assessments that are authentic, performance-based, and aligned with learning objectives (Boss & Krauss, 2014) ^[12]. Finally, language teachers should seek out professional development opportunities to deepen their understanding of PBL and collaborate with colleagues to share ideas and resources (Krajcik & Blumenfeld, 2006) ^[11]. By implementing these recommendations, language educators can harness the power of Project-Based Learning

to create engaging, meaningful, and transformative language learning experiences for their students (Beckett & Miller, 2006) ^[7].

8. References

1. Andrade HG. Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*. 2000; 57(5):13-18.
2. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman; 1997.
3. Barron B, Darling-Hammond L. Teaching for meaningful learning: A review of research on inquiry-based and cooperative learning. In: Darling-Hammond L, Barron B, Pearson PD, Schoenfeld AH, Stage EK, Zimmerman TD, Cervetti GN, Tilson JL, eds. *Powerful learning: What we know about teaching for understanding*. Jossey-Bass; 2008:11-70.
4. Barrows HS. Problem-based learning in medicine and beyond: A brief overview. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. 1996(68):3-12.
5. Baş G, Beyhan Ö. Effects of multiple intelligences supported project-based learning on students' achievement levels and attitudes towards English lesson. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*. 2010; 2(3):365-386.
6. Beckett GH. Teacher and student evaluations of project-based instruction. *TESL Canada Journal*. 2002; 19(2):52-66.
7. Beckett GH, Miller PC, eds. *Project-based second and foreign language education: Past, present, and future*. Information Age Publishing; 2006.
8. Beckett GH, Slater T. The project framework: A tool for language, content, and skills integration. *ELT Journal*. 2005; 59(2):108-116.
9. Biggs J, Tang C. *Teaching for quality learning at university*. 4th ed. Open University Press; 2011.
10. Black P, Wiliam D. Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 1998; 80(2):139-148.
11. Blumenfeld PC, Soloway E, Marx RW, Krajcik JS, Guzdial M, Palincsar A. Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. *Educational Psychologist*. 1991; 26(3-4):369-398.
12. Boss S, Krauss J. *Reinventing project-based learning: Your field guide to real-world projects in the digital age*. 2nd ed. International Society for Technology in Education; 2014.
13. Bransford JD, Brown AL, Cocking RR, eds. *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Expanded ed. National Academy Press; 2000.
14. Brophy J. *Motivating students to learn*. 3rd ed. Routledge; 2008.
15. Byram M. From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections. *Multilingual Matters*; 2008.
16. Canale M, Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*. 1980; 1(1):1-47.
17. Chen CH, Yang YC. Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review*. 2019; 26:71-81.
18. Cohen EG. Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational*

- Research. 1994; 64(1):1-35.
19. Deci EL, Ryan RM. The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*. 2000; 11(4):227-268.
 20. Dillenbourg P. What do you mean by collaborative learning? In: Dillenbourg P, ed. *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. Elsevier; 1999:1-19.
 21. Dooly M, O'Dowd R, eds. *Researching online foreign language interaction and exchange: Theories, methods and challenges*. Peter Lang; 2012.
 22. Dörnyei Z. *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press; 2001.
 23. Ellis R. Grammar teaching - practice or consciousness-raising? In: Richards JC, Renandya WA, eds. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press; 2002:167-174.
 24. Ellis R. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press; 2003.
 25. Facione PA. Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. The California Academic Press; 1990.
 26. Flavell JH. Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*. 1979; 34(10):906-911.
 27. Foss P, Carney N, McDonald K, Rooks M. Project-based learning activities for short-term intensive English programs. *Asian EFL Journal*. 2007; 23:1-19.
 28. Fried-Booth DL. *Project work*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press; 2002.
 29. Grant MM. Getting a grip on project-based learning: Theory, cases and recommendations. *Meridian: A Middle School Computer Technologies Journal*. 2002; 5(1):83.
 30. Gronlund NE. *Assessment of student achievement*. 7th ed. Allyn and Bacon; 2003.
 31. Gruba P, Hinkelman D. *Blending technologies in second language classrooms*. Palgrave Macmillan; 2012.
 32. Heritage M. *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom*. Corwin Press; 2010.
 33. Hmelo-Silver CE. Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*. 2004; 16(3):235-266.
 34. Hmelo-Silver CE, Barrows HS. Goals and strategies of a problem-based learning facilitator. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning*. 2006; 1(1):21-39.
 35. Holec H. *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Pergamon Press; 1981.
 36. Johnson DW, Johnson RT. *Making cooperative learning work*. Theory into Practice. 1999; 38(2):67-73.
 37. Jonassen DH. Instructional design models for well-structured and ill-structured problem-solving learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. 1997; 45(1):65-94.
 38. Kagan S. *Cooperative learning*. Kagan Cooperative Learning; 1994.
 39. Katz LG, Chard SC. *Engaging children's minds: The project approach*. 2nd ed. Ablex Publishing Corporation; 2000.
 40. Kavlu A. The effect of project-based learning on undergraduate EFL students' reading comprehension ability. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*. 2015; 1(1):39-44.
 41. Knutson S. Experiential learning in second-language classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*. 2003; 20(2):52-64.
 42. Kolb DA. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall; 1984.
 43. Kolb AY, Kolb DA. *Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education*. Academy of Management Learning & Education. 2005; 4(2):193-212.
 44. Krajcik JS, Blumenfeld PC. Project-based learning. In: Sawyer RK, ed. *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*. Cambridge University Press; 2006:317-333.
 45. Ladewski BG, Krajcik JS, Harvey CL. A middle grade science teacher's emerging understanding of project-based instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*. 1994; 94(5):499-515.
 46. Larsen-Freeman D. *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press; 2000.
 47. Larsen-Freeman D. *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle & Heinle; 2003.
 48. Long MH. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In: Ritchie WC, Bhatia TK, eds. *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Academic Press; 1996:413-468.
 49. Markham T. Project based learning: A bridge just far enough. *Teacher Librarian*. 2011; 39(2):38-42.
 50. Nation ISP. *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press; 2001.
 51. Nunan D. Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*. 1991; 25(2):279-295.
 52. Paul R, Elder L. *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your learning and your life*. Prentice Hall; 2001.
 53. Piaget J. *The psychology of the child*. Basic Books; 1972.
 54. Pintrich PR. A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2003; 95(4):667-686.
 55. Ribé R, Vidal N. *Project work: Step by step*. Heinemann; 1993.
 56. Sadler DR. Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*. 1989; 18(2):119-144.
 57. Savery JR. Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning*. 2006; 1(1):9-20.
 58. Savery JR, Duffy TM. Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational Technology*. 1995; 35(5):31-38.
 59. Savignon SJ. Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice. In: Savignon SJ, ed. *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press; 2002:1-27.
 60. Skehan P. Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching*. 2003; 36(1):1-14.
 61. Stoller FL. Project work: A means to promote language and content. In: Richards JC, Renandya WA, eds. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of*

- current practice. Cambridge University Press; 2002:107-119.
62. Stoller FL. Establishing a theoretical foundation for project-based learning in second and foreign language contexts. In: Beckett GH, Miller PC, eds. *Project-based second and foreign language education: Past, present, and future*. Information Age Publishing; 2006:19-40.
 63. Swain M. The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In: Lantolf JP, ed. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford University Press; 2000:97-114.
 64. Tessema KA. Stimulating writing through project-based tasks. *English Teaching Forum*. 2005; 43(4):22-28.
 65. Thomas JW. *A review of research on project-based learning*. Autodesk Foundation; 2000.
 66. Tomlinson CA. *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; 1999.
 67. Tomlinson CA, McTighe J. *Integrating differentiated instruction and understanding by design: Connecting content and kids*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; 2006.
 68. Udvari-Solner A, Kluth P. *Joyful learning: Active and collaborative learning in inclusive classrooms*. Corwin Press; 2008.
 69. Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press; 1978.
 70. Walqui A. Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 2006; 9(2):159-180.
 71. Wenger E. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press; 1998.
 72. Wiggins G. *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. Jossey-Bass; 1998.
 73. Wiggins G, McTighe J. *Understanding by design*. 2nd ed. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; 2005.
 74. Willingham DT. Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach? *American Educator*. 2007; 31(2):8-19.