

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT WORK BY ENCOURAGING STUDENTS TO CREATE A SIMILAR GO POP-UP BOOK AS STUDENTS' PROJECT TO TEACH WRITING OF A REPORT TEXT TO THE ELEVENTH GRADERS OF SMAN 1 KERTOSONO

Nazilatun Isrofani

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Surabaya State University

11020084025.nazilatun@gmail.com

Dra. Theresia Kumalarini, M.Pd

English Education, Languages and Arts Faculty, Surabaya State University

Abstrak

Adanya penggantian kurikulum membuat guru-guru di Indonesia diminta untuk menggunakan berbagai model pembelajaran dari pemerintah. Salah satu modelnya yaitu pembelajaran proyek, atau dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris dikenal dengan *project work*. Project work sudah dikenal sebagai model yang tepat untuk pengajaran menulis. Karena baik project-work dan menulis sama-sama menekankan pada proses. Selain itu, dengan kesulitan yang dihadapi siswa Indonesia dalam menulis, model ini bisa dijadikan solusi. Tugas yang menarik dalam Project work bisa memotivasi siswa dan membantu dalam menulis. Salah satu tugasnya yaitu dengan membuat buku GO Pop-up. Buku ini mirip dengan buku pop-up yang dijual dipasaran, tapi dilengkapi dengan *graphic organizer*. Sayangnya, setelah dua tahun pelaksanaan kurikulum ada guru yang masih bingung dalam menerapkan model-model ini. Mereka membutuhkan prosedur yang jelas dalam menerapkannya.

Oleh karena itu, peneliti melakukan penelitian ini untuk mendeskripsikan penerapan project work yang sudah dilakukan guru dengan mendorong siswa kelas sebelas membuat buku GO pop-up untuk pengajaran menulis teks report. Selain itu, peneliti juga akan mendeskripsikan kualitas tulisan siswa yang dihasilkan dalam penerapan model pembelajaran project work ini.

Penelitian ini termasuk penelitian kualitatif dasar. Guru dan siswa kelas bahasa dari SMA N 1 Kertosono merupakan subyek penelitian ini. Data didapat dari pengamatan yang ditulis dalam catatan lapangan, dan dari hasil tulisan siswa. Setelah melakukan empat kali pengamatan dalam penerapan Project work, peneliti kemudian menganalisis data yang didapat.

Dari hasil penelitian ini, peneliti dapat mengambil kesimpulan antara lain. Pertama, Project work bisa digunakan dalam pengajaran menulis teks report. Walaupun ada langkah yang tidak berurutan dan ada hal yang dilupakan oleh guru yaitu memberi rubric penilaian menulis. Langkah yang tidak berurutan tidak berpengaruh pada siswa dalam mengerjakan proyek tersebut, akan tetapi kesalahan guru karena tidak memberi rubric sangat berpengaruh pada hasil tulisan siswa. Kedua, dari langkah-langkah Project work, siswa dapat belajar tentang proses menulis, sehingga diharapkan, dapat melatih siswa untuk bisa menjadi penulis mandiri. Terakhir, project work dapat meningkatkan kreatifitas, kemampuan berfikir kritis, pemecahan masalah, dan kemampuan kerja sama siswa.

Kata Kunci : menulis, *Project work*, *buku GO Pop up*

Abstract

Due to the reformation of the curriculum, Indonesian teachers are demanded to use various models suggested by the government. One of the models is Project-based Learning, which in English teaching and Learning known as Project work. Project work has been known as a right model to teach writing. As both writing and project work, emphasize on the process, this model could be a solution to the difficulty of Indonesian students in writing. The interesting tasks demanded by Project work could motivate and help students to write. One of the tasks is creating a similar *GO Pop-up book*. This book is like a commercial pop-up book, but completed by a graphic organizer. Unfortunately, until the second year of the application of the 2013 curriculum, some teachers are still confused in implementing the model. They need practical procedures in applying them.

Therefore, the researcher conducted this study to describe the implementation of project work by encouraging students to create a similar GO-pop up book as students' project to teach writing of a report text to the eleventh graders. Moreover, the researcher would also describe the students' writing quality during the implementation of project work.

This study belonged to basic interpretative study. The teacher and the students from language program of SMA N 1 Kertosono were as the subject. The data were gained from the result of observations documented in field notes, and from the students' compositions. After conducting four observations toward the teaching learning process used Project work, the researcher, then, analyzed the data.

From the result of the study, the researcher could draw several conclusions, which are as follows. First, Project work could be well implemented to teach writing of a report text, even though there were disorganized steps and there was one thing being missed by the teacher to give a writing rubric. The chaotic steps applied did not affect the students, as they were still able to follow the activities. Meanwhile, the missing of the writing rubric made the quality of the students' compositions did not change to be better although there was proofreading activity. Second, by the steps applied, the students could learn the process of writing, which hopefully, could train them to be independent writers. At last, Project work could increase students' creativity, critical thinking, problem solving and collaboration skills.

Keywords: *writing, project work, GO Pop-up book*

INTRODUCTION

In this 21st century, education field is demanded to be able to create creative and innovative generations who have adequate critical thinking and problem solving ability. Fulfilling this demand, the Indonesian government altered the KTSP curriculum to be the 2013 curriculum. Due to the reformation of the curriculum, there are several changes in the education systems. One of the changes is the approach used. The 2013 curriculum employs scientific approach that includes observing, questioning, exploring, associating, communicating, and creating in the teaching learning process. Moreover, based on the *Peraturan Pemerintah No 59 Th 2014 lampiran 3*, the teacher could use other learning models such as discovery learning, project-based learning, or problem based learning.

In English language teaching, Project-based Learning is known as project work. It is argued by Harmer (2004) that project-work is a model of teaching which demanded students to create a project. He also adds that project is a product created in extended period of time, and may be a product of a research. As project work demands the creation of a product, this model could be used as an alternative model to teach writing. Harmer (2004:104) claims that projects are excellent way to combine genre study with work on the writing process.

However, for English as a second language to Indonesian students, writing is considered as a difficult skill. As Harmer (2007) states that, some students do not know what to write and do not have any ideas to say. Yet, Harmer adds that this condition can be overcome by creating interesting and enjoyable tasks to do. When

students get something interesting, they will be motivated and get the idea easily.

Project work has been widely used in English language teaching and learning for a long time (Harmer, 2004:103). Harmer also gives an example of the application of project work in one of the school in the city of Bath, UK. In this school, students created a 'wheelchair-user guide' after some activities including public building and spaces visit, interview, and doing a research about the need of wheelchair-bound citizens. Instead of the extended time needed to create the project, the created project was very beneficial for the students and the Bath citizen as well.

However, most Indonesian teachers claim that they got many difficulties in applying new learning revolution (Darsih, 2014). In addition, based on the previous observation done by the researcher when the researcher had a teaching practice in SMAN 1 Sidayu, the teachers said they still got confused about the implementation of the approach and the model suggested by the government. Although they knew the difference of what the models suggested, they need more practical procedures in applying each model. Nevertheless, for the extended time needed to apply project work they did not want to take a risk by implementing the model, which they did not master yet.

For those reasons, the researcher would describe the implementation of Project work to teach writing. The project that will be created by the students is similar with a commercial pop-up book, but it is added by a graphic organizer. It is called *GO Pop-up book*. A graphic organizer is a tool for teaching learning process that helps students to visualize their thought in to a graphic (Katherine, 2010). While a pop-up book is a three

dimension moveable book, which will transform to a different form when it is opened. By creating this product, the students will be given sequences guidance to write a report text by using the graphic organizers. Moreover, this will also encourage students to write by composing their ideas in the form of interesting pop-up book, and involve them into a meaningful project at the same time.

Therefore, the researcher conducted this study to answer:

- 1) how did the teacher implement project work by encouraging students to create a similar Go-Pop up book?
- 2) how were the students writing quality in the process of doing the project and in the final project?

METHODOLOGY

This study belonged to basic interpretative study, since the researcher described and interpreted the teacher's experience in implementing Project work. It is under the qualitative research. According to Cohen et al (2007:461), the aims of qualitative research are to describe, to summarize, to prove, to examine the application and to operate the same problem in different contexts.

Through this study, the researcher would try to describe, explain, and report how the teacher implemented Project work by encouraging students to create a similar *GO Pop-up* book as their project. Moreover, the researcher would also describe students' writing composition created during the implementation of project work.

The subjects of this study were the teacher and the students of SMA N 1 Kertosono. Particularly, the students were the eleventh graders from language program. This subject was chosen as they provided the research object that the researcher wanted to observe. Ary et al (2010:429) state, it is important to choose the subject who the researcher believes that they can provide relevant information about the topic. The researcher knew that the teacher was implementing project work due to her experience. When the researcher was studying in this school, the teacher asked the students to create a project. Therefore, it was believed that from the experience that the teacher had, the sufficient data would be gathered.

The researcher only used one instrument this study, i.e. field notes. According to Ary et al, (2010: 435) field note is a brief note made during the observation, which may contain the main information of the study. The researcher wrote down everything happened during observation on the field notes. In this case, the researcher

utilized the field notes suggested by R. C. Bogdan and S. K. Biklen (1998) in Ary et al (2010). This field notes contained the explanation of explanation about the setting, the people and their personal interaction, and accounts of events (who, when, and what was done) and observer's comment.

In collecting the data, four observations were conducted, and students' compositions were collected. In the process of observing the implementation of Project work by encouraging students to create a similar *GO Pop-up* book, the researcher was as a non-participant observer who wrote all the things happened during the observation. The term non-participant observer was defined by Kothari (2004) as the researcher who only observe without any attempt to involve and experience through participation. Additionally, the researcher collected the students' writing in the form of a report text. The students' compositions then would be used to analyze the writing quality of the students, which would be interpreted as the students' ability in writing a report text.

After gaining the data, the researcher firstly divided the data gathered from field notes to answer the first research question related to the implementation of Project work, and the data gained from students' compositions to answer the second research question about students' writing quality. Secondly, the researcher familiarized the data by reread it. Next, the researcher gave code to the compositions gained. The researcher coded it based on the mastery level of the students. After that, the researcher interpreted the data and represented it descriptively. From the description, after being crosschecked with the theory, the researcher finally drew conclusion of this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Implementation of Project Work

After conducting four observations on the 20th, 21st, 27th, and 28th of February 2015, it was found that teacher implemented project work in four meetings on which, each meeting produced a similar GO pop-up book in stages. The further explanation of the steps followed by the teacher and the description of the students' compositions were explained as follows

On the first meeting, the teacher started the pre writing activity by telling the objective of the learning to the students that they would create a project, but she did not show what project it was. The teacher called the project as a secret project. Apparently, this was the teacher strategy to stimuli students' curiosity. Despite some students asked what project it was, she just told that before she would show the project later after they prepared the main materials for the project. Therefore, the

students did not have a clear view of what they would create and what activities they would undergo.

This activity was different with what Harmer suggested. Harmer (2004) suggested that the first step of implementing project work is *briefing and choice*. The teacher should give a clear command and explanation of they are going to do and what project they will create. In this research, the teacher did not give detailed explanation of the project.

On the next activity, the teacher emphasized more on guiding the students to write a report text, which would be the students' material for the project. The teacher guided the students from brainstorming, making outline to elaborating the outline to be a completed report text. These activities showed that the teacher was following the theory that writing is a process (Harmer, 2007). In guiding the students to write a report text, the teacher used a media called a graphic organizer. The teacher, firstly, introduced what a graphic organizer was and how they could arrange their ideas using a graphic organizer.

This was suited with what Egan (1999) states that the most important thing in using a graphic organizer is that the teacher should model how to use it before expecting students' to use that independently. Moreover, in the process of explaining about graphic organizers the teacher also explained briefly about a report text, including the language features and the generic structure of a report text about animal. This process belongs to the second process of Project work, i.e. idea and language generation (Harmer, 2004). By this process, the students could decide what appropriate language they will use for their project.

The teacher, then, continued to whilst writing activity by having negotiation with the students about what topic they chose. It was in line with what Harmer suggested. The process of choosing topic for the project still belongs to the first step (Harmer, 2004). Additionally, Thomas and Mergendoller (2000) argue that in PJBL to start students on productive tracks, use negotiation as needed. As writing was an independent work for the students, choosing a topic was very prominent initial activity. That is why, the teacher decided to get the students involved in the process of choosing topic. As a result, students were very enthusiastic in arguing their preferred topic. However, the activities done by the teacher was not in sequence of the step suggested by Harmer (2004). The teacher did the second step first and went back to the first step. Fortunately, the disorganized step done by the teacher did not affect the students. The students were still able to follow the activities.

The students, then, made their own graphic organizers and elaborated it became a report text. During the writing process, the students were allowed to use

internet to search more information to complete their report text. Thomas and Mergendoller (2000) claimed that the use of internet could train students' critical thinking as they chose the best information fit to their project. This activity could be considered as the third step of Project work that is *data gathering* (Harmer, 2004). This meeting ended by the submission of the students' compositions to the teacher.

On the second meeting, the teacher started by getting the students gathered in their groups, and then she showed the example of project called *GO Pop-up* book. She also explained what the students needed to do in completing the project. To succeed in conducting Project work, a meaningful project should be accompanied by a clear instruction. At this process, the teacher finally gave the clear explanation of what project that the students should create. Therefore, the teacher began the second meeting by applying the first steps of Project work suggested by Harmer (2004).

Then, still work in-group, the students discussed the theme of the project, the job description of each member of the group, and the timeline in doing the project. This belonged to the fourth step of project work, i.e. *planning* (Harmer: 2004).

The teacher went on the activity; it was the time for the students to start to create the project. Harmer (2004) called this step by drafting and editing. In this activity, the students started to share what they got from the previous activity. As the previous activity asked each of the students to create their own report text, the students then share their writing to the group. The students' compositions could be called as the draft of the project. The teacher then, asked them to proofread the other students' compositions from their group, because the needed writing and graphic organizer was only one presented in the project. If there were some mistakes in their draft, the students were asked to give correction. It is in line with what Harmer (2004) argue that this step allows both the students to self-evaluate the project and the teacher to check the progress of the project as well. Therefore, proofreading the draft of their writing was the right activity to choose.

Furthermore, there were many advantages got from this activity. First, the students could learn every process of writing. The students could learn that before they start to write they should organize their ideas. It could be in the form of outlines or graphic organizers. Furthermore, they also exposed to find appropriate information in elaborating their writing. After that, when they finished writing, their composition still needed to be checked by other people. They still needed reread and feedback either from their peer or the teacher (Harmer, 2004). Second, it can enhance their skills for the teacher enforcing the use

of English in their communication (Stripling et al, 2009). Grant and Tamim (2013:82) state students acquired a variety of skills in Project-based Learning. They are exposed to do many skills that way. They are reading, writing, finding information, composing, and editing. Furthermore, in the process of proofreading, they were exposed to think critically. After they proofread the students' compositions, they should have a discussion to choose one of the best writing. This activity also involved problem-solving skills, as the students should decide one of the five compositions. Hence, Project work contained multipurpose in one time activity.

However, the researcher thought that the teacher missed one thing in this process. The teacher asked the students to proofread other students' compositions but she did not give a guide for the students. Giving students a guide was very crucial since the students had different ability. If the students did not know what to assess in the writing, how could they give correction. The teacher should have given a simple rubric for the students. The rubric would be a guide for students of what to assess and what the criteria of the composition was like.

At the third meeting, the teacher still continued the step of drafting and editing. If the previous meeting done for editing the graphic organizers and the compositions, the third meeting focused on creating the popping pictures and gathering all the elements of a similar GO Pop-up book. The teacher created this project by her own. She thought that every elements of *GO Pop-up* book had beneficial and it would be perfect when they were combined. A graphic organizer as a guide for the students to write, completed by the students writing would not be interesting when it was composed plainly in a piece of paper. Then, she combined those elements with the book, which could pop up when it was opened. The addition picture and the background of the animal reported made the project more lively. Therefore, by creating the projects it was expected that the students were able to write well while the other students had a clear image and visualization of the animal being described.

In this activity, the students constructed a similar *GO Pop-up* book authentically. The students could create on based on their creativity, there was no limitation as long as the project consisted of the graphic organizer, writing, and popping up picture. As Grant and Tamim (2013) argue that the students will get a lot more creativity, because they can put their own personal touches on it. Additionally, Grant and Branch (2005) argue that the task in under the project-based learning model, should set in the content differentiation, so do the project work. It means that the students were given the opportunity to create the project freely. It was showed in

the result of students' *GO Pop-up* books; students had various themes in decorating the pop-up books.

In the process of creating *GO Pop-up* book, the teacher just facilitated the learning. Solomon (2003), states that the teacher's roles are to guide and advice, rather than to direct and manage work. Nevertheless, the teacher also assessed the students in this activity. When the students were busy working with their groups, the teacher monitored the teamwork of each group, and the participation of each member of the group. Assessing project-based learning did not simply score the product, but also appreciate the process. This was in line with Thomas and Mergendoller (2000:30) statement, that the activity under the Project-based learning model, uses variety of assessment methods including both individual and group grades. It was also done from the previous stage when the teacher asked the students to choose one writing for the project, yet she also told that each students' compositions also being assessed by the teacher.

The time was almost over. Unfortunately, there were still two groups that did not finish the project yet. The teacher deplored the condition. The teacher had spared enough time for them, but they still needed more. The teacher, then, allowed them to continue the project in home. From this condition, the students also could learn about time and task management. They were provided time so that they should have managed that well. As Grant and Tamim (2013) state that time management, project management, and discipline were skills that the students acquire in Project-based learning.

The last meeting was scheduled for the last phase of Project work, i.e. final version (Harmer, 2004). The teacher asked them to present their projects. Some groups looked very proud of showing their project, while two other groups were not confident. The unconfident groups were having problem with their project, then, the teacher calmed them down and motivated them. As Solomon (2003) stated before that teacher's guidance and advices were needed in Project-based Learning. Moreover, this process also belongs to the one of the steps suggested by Harmer, i.e. consultation and tutorial. Consultation and tutorial done in every process of implementing project work, includes preparing, creating and presenting. Here, the teacher should be able to give advices and helps. The teacher must be ready to the role as a tutor, advisor, and facilitator (Harmer, 2004).

After all groups had their presentations, the teacher set the class looked like in exhibition, so the students could presents their projects and the other students could clearly see their product. Han and Bhattacharya (2001: 4) suggest that the teacher should find ways for students to compare their compositions with others. Therefore,

making an exhibition was a good idea to foster students' attention. Moreover, each group was also given a 'love' paper to assess their friends' compositions. Harmer (2004) states that the essential aims of this activity is to give students reward of their work. In this activity, the students got feedback and advice both from the teacher and their friends. This was included in the process of consultation and tutorial (Harmer, 2004)

The above result showed that the teacher had completely implemented project work. Even though at the first and the second meeting she did not following the steps suggested by Harmer (2004) by not giving clear explanation of the project, and changing the second step to be the first step, yet the students were still able to follow the steps without any confusion.

Students Writing Quality during the Implementation of Project Work

Once the researcher collected the compositions, the students' compositions were analyzed by using ESL Composition Profile suggested by Jacobs et al (1983). There are five elements to be analyzed; they are content, vocabulary, language use, organization, and mechanic.

The result of the students' compositions, which produced at the first meeting were quite good. Most all of the students' writing were relevant to the topic, even though not all the students gave detailed description of each. Their writing was also understandable. It reflected that students had good knowledge of what subject they were describing. Jacobs et al (1983) indicates that successful communication has occurred in this level.

Second, the students' vocabularies had adequate range of word that usually used in report text. They used technical terms, and were able to understand the meaning of each. It was indicated from the next sentence they elaborated to give more information to the readers. However, some of them had occasional errors of word choice such as the word *mustache* instead of *whisker*. Jacobs et al (1983) adds this still belongs to good to average level in which occasional errors may happen, but it does not obscure meaning.

Third, in writing a report text the most of the students had used appropriate language features. They wrote in present tense, used action verb and adverbial phrase. Yet, just few students used appropriate transition signal to support the flow of their writing. Some students also still forgot to put articles in their writing.

Fourth, it showed the students' organization of the compositions. Unfortunately, there were some students, who were weak in their organization. Few of them did not write complete generic structure of a report text, while some others put the structure inappropriately. They still found difficulty differentiating the general classification and description. Therefore, sometimes they

put detailed description in the first paragraph. Meanwhile, the relation between one sentence to another was logical. Jacobs et al (1983), states that students in this level are somewhat choppy, but as long as the main ideas stand out it is tolerated.

At last, it described students' writing from mechanics element. Overall, most of the students did not make any errors in the use of punctuation. Additionally, about two of the students sometimes did misspelling. Yet, most of all wrote each word correctly. Besides, some of them also knew the use of capital letters and applied it well.

Unfortunately, although the teacher had given their chance to give correction to their compositions not all the group did that. Just one out of five groups corrected the writing to be better, one group did mistake in the final composition that made their first writing better, and other group did not change the compositions. It showed that, the essential step of the project work was being missed by the teacher, i.e. giving the students writing rubric. After all, doing a mistake in writing was normal for the students who were still learning, the most important was that all the students had learned how to write and each process of writing. Additionally, the teacher and the researcher also appreciated that the students had given their maximum effort to create the project. This led the project to be various and beyond the teacher's expectation. The students were very creative in decorating the project.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings and discussion, it could be concluded that Project work could be well implemented to teach writing of a report text. Even though there were disorganized steps implemented on the first and the second meeting and there was one thing being missed by the teacher in giving the writing rubric for students to do peer-correction. The chaotic steps did not affect the students, as they were still able to follow the activities. Meanwhile, the missing of the writing rubric made the quality of the students' compositions did not change to be better although there was proofreading activity. By the steps applied, the students could learn the process of writing, which hope fully, could train them to be independent writers.

Moreover, the students also showed good performances in every steps of Project work. They succeeded in creating a graphic organizer, a composition, and the final project. They had created the project beyond the teacher's expectation.

Hence, the researcher could conclude that Project work done by encouraging students to create a similar *GO Pop-up* book could be implemented to help students

to write a report text, increase students' creativity, critical thinking, problem solving and collaboration skills.

SUGGESTIONS

The suggestions addressed to the other teacher and the future researchers are as follows:

- a) The teacher: As concluded in this study that there was chaotic step in implementing Project work and one thing being missed by not giving a writing rubric. It is better for the teacher to be more careful in every step of Project work. Many steps to follow may cause missing important things. Moreover, it is also recommended that developing any other project that will be beneficial for the students. Project work will only work when the projects created is meaningful to the students. Therefore, there is no limitation of what to produce as long as it is related to the students' content knowledge and appropriate to the students' level.
- b) The future researchers: The researcher can conduct a research concerning the implementation of Project work in other skills such as speaking, reading, or listening. Moreover, other types of texts can also be explored to check whether or not Project work could be applied to help students learn about the texts.

REFERENCES

- Ary, Donald, Lucy Leshner Jacobs, Schris Sorensen, and Asghar Razavieh. (2010). Introduction to Research in Education. 8th Ed. Canada: Wadsworth
- Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion and Keith Morrison. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. 7th Ed. New York: Routledge
- Darsih, Endang. Indonesian EFL Teachers' Perception on the Implementation of 2013 English Curriculum. *English Review*. Vol. 2/ No 2. 2014 (ONLINE) <http://englishreview.web.id/index.php/ERJEE/article/view/42> Accessed on 6 May 2015)
- Egan, Margareth. (1999). *Reflections on Effective Use of Graphic Organizers*. Standpoint and voices journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy. Vol 42/No.8. pp. 641-645
- Grant, Michael M., Suha R. Tamim. (2013). Definitions and Uses: Case Study of Teachers Implementing Project-based Learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, Vol 7/ No 2. Fall 2013, (Online), (<http://dx.doi.org/107771/1541-5051.1323> Accessed on 13 th December 2014)
- Grant, M. M., & Branch, R. M. (2005). Project-based learning in a middle school: Tracing abilities through the projects of learning. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, Vol 38/ No 1, pp 65-98.
- Han, S., and Bhattacharya, K. (2001). *Constructionism, Learning by Design, and Project-based learning*. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging perspectives on learning, teaching, and technology*. (Online). (<http://epltt.coe.uga.edu/> Accessed on 17th January 2015)
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Malaysia: Pearson Education limited
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *The Practice of English language Teaching (4th edition)*. Cambridge: Pearson Longman
- Jacobs, Holly L., V.Faye Hartfiel, Deanna R. Wormuth, and Jane B. Hughey. (1983). *Teaching ESL Composition; Principles and Techniques*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers
- Katherine, Mc. Knight. (2010). *The Teacher Big Book of Graphic Organizer*. USA. Jossey Bass an imprint of WILEY.
- Knapp, Peter and Megan Watkins. (2005). *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. 2nd Ed. New Delhi: New Age International
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 59 Tahun 2014 Tentang Kurikulum SMA
- Solomon, Gwen. (2003). *Project-based Learning: A primer*. (Online), (http://www.techlearning.com/db_area/archives/TL/2003/01/Project.php Accessed on 20th December 2014)
- Stripling, Barbara. Norah Lovett, and Fran Corvasce Macko. (2009). *Project-Based Learning: Inspiring Middle School Students to engage in deep and active learning*. New York. New York department of Education
- Thomas, John W, and John R. Mergendoller. (2000). *Managing Project-based Learning: Principles from the field*. (Online). (<http://www.bie.org/files/research/managePBL.pdf> Accessed on 20th December 2014)
- Thomas, John W. 2000. *A Review of Research on Project-Based Learning*. (Online). (http://www.bie.org/index.php/site/RE/pbl_research/29 Accessed on 20th December 2014)