

THE USE OF PROJECT BASED LEARNING IN TEACHING ENGLISH AT SECOND GRADE OF SMP NEGERI 1 BARRU

Widia Astuti¹, Andi Tenri Ampa², Ratu Yulianti Natsir³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><i>Article history:</i> Received: 29-10-2021 Revised: 13-11-2021 Accepted: 2-11-2021 Published: 16-12-2021</p> <p><i>Keywords:</i> Project Based Learning Vocabulary and Fluency Teaching English</p>	<p>The objectives of this research were to know the differences between students vocabulary achievement into class taught by using Project Based Learning and those who are taught using Direct Method in teaching English, to know the differences between students fluency achievement into class taught by using Project Based Learning and those who are taught using Direct Method in teaching English, and to know the differences significant between students' vocabulary and fluency achievement who are taught by using Project Based Learning and Direct Method in teaching English at second grade of SMPN 1 Barru. The design of this research was Quasi Experimental Research that used one group as control class and another group as experiment class. The results of data analysis showed that the mean score of students' vocabulary in experimental class was higher than students' vocabulary in control class (78>66.6), and the mean score of students' fluency in experimental was higher than students' fluency in control class (84.1>69.9). After analyzing the data, the t-test value vocabulary and fluency in teaching English were higher than the t-table, the t-test value of vocabulary was 2.274 and the t-test value of fluency was 2.636, while the value of t-table was 2.024. It means that there was a significant difference of students' vocabulary and fluency in teaching English between before and after using project based learning method.</p> <p><i>This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.</i></p> 
<p>How to cite: Widia Astuti, Andi Tenri Ampa, & Ratu Yulianti Natsir. (2021). The Use of Project Based Learning in Teaching English at Second Grade of SMP Negeri 1 Barru. English Language Teaching Methodology, Vol 1(3), December 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.22219/jpbi.vxiy.xxyy</p>	
<p><i>Corresponding Author:</i> Widia Astuti English Education Department Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar 259 Sultan Alauddin Road, Makassar City, Rappocini 90221, Indonesia. Email: widiaastuti@bg.unismuhmakassar.ac.id</p>	

INTRODUCTION

As an educator, teacher always demand to create an atmosphere of teaching that will positively impact the achievement of learning outcomes optimally. Teachers must be able to teach properly, effectively and efficiently to help increase learning and improve student achievement in learning process.

Based on the information from the English teacher of the second grade students SMP Negeri 1 Barru, the students' ability in learning English was still low, it was prove by the students' achievement in learning English. It was only about 60 while standart score of curriculum was 70 and the target score is minimally like the standart of curriculum must be achieved. Most of the students in SMP Negeri 1 Barru also assumed that English is difficult to learn. The students seem uninterested in learning English. The students are bore when the teacher gives them explanation about the subject of teaching. It is happen because they are lack of vocabulary and they had no idea about the content of the subject.

There are some ways that can be used to teaching English. In this case, the researcher tries to find effective way to be used in teaching English for the students. The method will be use is Project Based Learning. Project based learning (PBL) is a student centered pedagogy that involves a dynamic classroom approach in which it is believed that students acquire a deeper knowledge through active exploration of real-world challenges and problems. Students learn about a subject by working for an extended period of time to investigate and respond to a complex question, challenge, or problem. It is a style of active learning and inquiry based learning. The researcher expects with the use of Project Based Learning in teaching English.

There is some previous researcher that found the advantages of Project Based Learning. Damar Widiseta (2016). In her research, improving students' Reading Comprehension through Project Based Learning (PBL) for grade XI students at SMAN 1 Teladan Yogyakarta, The aim of this research is to improve English reading comprehension through Project Based Learning in SMA N 1 Teladan Yogyakarta Grade XI in the academic year of 2016/2017. It concerns on how the use of Project Based Learning can improve the students reading comprehensions. This study is classified into action research study. In conclusion, the use of PBL can improve the students' reading comprehension in Class XI MIPA 3.

On the other hand, Kelly Walsh (2010). In her research, Motivating Students to read through project based learning. This study examined how Project Based Learning (PBL) motivated students to read content area texts. Data was collected though observations, student questionnaires, recordings of student presentations, and student created artifacts. The data shows that students were motivated to read content area texts because they were allowed to work collaboratively and given choices through PBL. Teachers who implement PBL into their classrooms will see an increase engagement in their students while fostering the development of essential skills in their students.

Based on the previous findings above, the researcher concluded that in teaching English by the use of project-based learning method can improve achievement of the students in teaching and learning process.

In this research, the researcher limited the research to the use of project based learning method in teaching English that focuses of speaking achievement of students, consist of vocabulary and fluency. Vocabulary is central to the learning and teaching of a second language as it affords learners access to all forms of oral and written communication that

includes literature, music, and content knowledge. Word knowledge is power as words serve as building blocks to learning. According to Zubaidah (2016), Vocabulary is essential component of all use of language. Vocabulary acquisition is one of the prime important in learning English. When the learners acquaint new vocabulary, they must know the meaning of words; they must also know how to arrange individual words within the sentence. On other hand, According to Cemink's (2012), fluency can be defined as the ability to speak fluently and accurately. Fluency in speaking is the aim of many language learners. Signs of fluency include a reasonably fast speed of speaking and only a small number of pauses and "ums" or "ers".

There some method in teaching English, for this research the researcher used project-based learning method. According to Patton (2012: 19), in project based learning students are the ones designing and planning what need to do to carry it out. From those statement, it can be inferred that project based learning is a method in which the students are learning through a project that is decided by themselves with the help from teachers, so that they can be actively engaged in the learning process.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher concludes that Project-Based Learning is an innovative and systematic teaching method that promotes student engagement through deep investigations of complex questions. That it was learning by doing. PBL focuses on imparting specific knowledge and skills while inspiring students to question actively, think critically, and draw connections between their studies in the real world.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used quasi experimental design, in this research the researcher wants to know the effect of treatment. According to Willey (2005:124) experiment research used two groups, one group is class control and another group is class experiment. In experiment class the researcher used treatment, and in control class, there was no treatment. This research was conduct to find out the effect of project based learning in teaching English of students at second year of SMP Negeri 1 Barru.

In this research, the population was all of the second grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Barru academic years 2019/2020 which was consisted of 9 classes. The numbers of population were 168 students. The sample of this research are VIII 1 and VIII 2 of SMP Negeri 1 Barru where each class consist of 20 students. Total the sample were 40 students. The samples were chosen by using purposive sampling. The researcher selected class VIII 1 as experimental class and VIII 3 as control class because the students of the class have familiar or their intelegancy.

In this research, the researcher only used one main instrument which to collect data. It was speaking test through the report test. The function of this instrument was to measure the students' vocabulary and fluency in teaching with the use of Project Based Learning. In the pre-test and post-test, the researcher order the students to choose one topic from some topic and then presented to the class.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results description collected through the test. In the discussion part, the researcher presents an interpretation of findings. In this chapter, the researcher analyzed the data obtained from the students with only one group of pre-test and post-test. The data consisted of the result of the pre-test and post-test of experiment and control class. The pre-test was used compare the absorption of the students, and the post-test was used to test an alternative hypothesis. The result of data analysis found that the use of Project Based Learning method can improve the students' speaking ability in report text at the second class of SMP Negeri 1 Barru.

The Students' Mean Score of Vocabulary and Fluency in Pre-test and Post-test

To find out the answer of the research question in the previous chapter, the researcher used a speaking test. A pretest used to be administrated before giving a treatment and posttest was administrated after giving a treatment which planned to find out whether there was a significant different of speaking ability of the students before and after giving a treatment were given to the students.

After count the output score of students, the mean score of each the pretest and posttest should be explaine to the table below:

Table 1. The students' mean score pre-test and post-test in vocabulary and fluency

Index	Group	Mean score		Improvement
		Pretest	Posttest	Percentage
Vocabulary	Experiment	56.6	78.2	38.16%
	Control	55.8	66.6	19.35%
Fluency	Experiment	53.3	84.1	57.78%
	Control	52.4	69.9	33.39%

The table above shows that the mean score of student's vocabularies in experimental class with control class have a difference before using a treatment. After giving the treatment, the result of the post-test in experimental and control class indicate a higher difference score of mean score. It means that there was upgrading after giving the treatment for the class experimental. The students' mean score in pre-test of class experimental was 56.6, while in control class the mean score was 55.8. The mean score of each group was higher difference after the treatment had been given. The students' mean score in post-test of class experimental after the treatment was 78.2, while the students' mean score in post-test of control class was 66.6. It means that, the mean score of experimental class was higher than control class ($78.2 > 66.6$).

The mean score of students' fluencies in experiment and control class have diffrence before conducting the treatment. After conducting the treatment, the mean score in post-test of experimental and control class showed a higher difference score of mean score. It means

that there was improvement after giving a treatment for experimental class. The mean score of students' pre-test of experimental class was 53.3, while in control class the mean score was 52.4. the mean score of each group have difference after the method was giving. The students' mean score in post-test of the experimental class after the treatment was 84.1, while the mean score of the students' post-test in control class was 69.9. It means that, the mean score of experimental class was higher than control class ($84.1 > 69.9$).

The Classification of Students Pre-test and Post-test

Table 2. The rate percentage score of the student's experiment and control class of pretest and posttest in term vocabulary

	Classifications	Score	Pre-test				Post-test			
			Experiment		Control		Experiment		Control	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	6	-	-	-	-	5	25%	1	5%
2	Very good	5	2	10%	2	10%	5	25%	4	20%
3	Good	4	6	30%	7	35%	9	45%	11	55%
4	Average	3	10	50%	8	40%	1	5%	3	15%
5	Poor	2	2	10%	2	10%	-	-	-	-
6	Very poor	1	-	-	1	5%	-	-	1	5%
Total			20	100%	20	100%	20	100%	20	100%

On the table above shows that pre-test of students in control class almost the same with students in experimental class. The percentage of the students of experimental class, there was 0 students who classified to "Excellent" but those who classified as "very good" was 2 (10%) students, "good" was 6 (30%) students, "average" 10 (50%) students, and "poor" 2 (10%) students. While, in the control group, those who classified as "very good" was 2 (10%) students, "good" was 7 (35%) students, "average" 8 (40%) students, and "poor" 2 (10%) students.

While the score in post-test, student in control class was lower than students in experimental class. In experimental class, there was classified as "Excellent" was 5 (25%) students, "very good" was 5 (25%) students, "good" 9 (45%) students, "average" 1 (5%) students. While, in the control group, those who classified as "excellent" was 1 (5%) students, "very good" was 4 (20%) students, "average" 11 (55%) students, "average" 3 (15%) students.

Table 3. The rate percentage score of the students in experimental and control class of pre-test and post-test in term fluency

No	Classifications	Score	Pre-test				Post-test			
			Experiment		Control		Experiment		Control	
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	6	-	-	-	-	6	30%	4	20%

2	Very good	5	-	-	-	9	45%	3	15%	
3	Good	4	7	35%	7	35%	5	25%	8	40%
4	Average	3	10	50%	10	50%	-	4	20%	
5	Poor	2	3	15%	2	10%	-	-	-	-
6	Very poor	1	-	-	1	5%	-	-	1	5%
	Total		20	100%	20	100%	20	100%	20	100%

On the table above shows that pre-test of students in control class almost the same with students in experimental class. The percentage of the students of experimental class, those who classified as “good” was 7 (35%) students, “average” was 10 (50%) students, and “poor” 3 (15%) students. While, in the control group, those who classified as “good” was 7 (35%) students, “average” was 10 (50%) students, “poor” 3 (15%) students, and “very poor” 1 (5%) students.

While the score in post-test, student in control class was lower than students in experimental class. In experimental class, there was classified as “Excellent” was 6 (30%) students, “very good” was 9 (45%) students, and “good” 5 (25%) students. While, in the control group, those who classified as “excellent” was 4 (20%) students, “very good” was 3 (15%) students, “average” 8 (40%) students, “average” 4 (20%) students.

The Significant of Vocabulary and Fluency

The researcher had used t-test analysis on the level of significant (D) 0.05 with the degree of freedom (df) = n-k = 38, and then the value of t-table was 38 (2.024). The t-test statistical analysis for independent sample was applied the following table showed the result of t-test calculation.

Table 4. T-test value of the students speaking ability in report text

Indicator	T-test	T-table	Comparison	Classification
Vocabulary	2.274	2.024	t-test > t-table	Significant
Fluency	2.636	2.024	t-test > t-table	Significant

Table 4 above shows that t-test value of vocabulary was greater than t-table value (2.274 > 2.024) and also t-test value of fluency was greater than t-table value (2.636 > 2.024). It means that, there was significance difference between the students without giving the treatment in teaching speaking English. It showed the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

From the analysis above, the researcher has concluded that there was significant difference between the pre-test and post-test of the students' speaking ability after giving treatment for developing their ability in speaking report text through project-based learning method.

Based on the result of the data analysis, it was proven that students' improvement in vocabulary and fluency by using project based learning method got better. It could be seen by the collation in pretest and posttest of the experimental class that could be seen on the (appendix E), there was an improvement on the students' score where the pre-test score in the term of vocabulary was 56.6 and the post-test was 78.2 and then the pre-test in term fluency was 53.3 and the post-test was 84.1.

Moreover, the findings from the calculation of the study and hypothesis testing above showed that the speaking score in term vocabulary and fluency of the students in experimental class had a significant difference after the use of project based learning method was done in compared to the control class achievement who did not receive the project based learning method as on the experimental class, but receive the usual treatment as the teacher uses in the class. The statement above was strengthened by the findings on the independent t-test computation.

The result means that null hypothesis was rejected and there was significant difference between post-test of the experiment and control class. In other words, the students' in control class after the treatment on the use of project based learning method which had been given.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of data analysis and the discussion of the result in the previous chapter, the researcher concludes that, the students' vocabulary in speaking English at the Second grade of SMP Negeri 1 Barru is improve after applying Project Based Learning Method. It is shown by the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test. The mean score of post-test in vocabulary is higher than pre-test. The students' fluency in speaking English at the Second grade of SMP Negeri 1 Barru was improved after applying Project Based Learning Method. It is shown by the significant difference between the pre-test and post-test. The mean score of post-test in fluency was higher than pre-test.

REFERENCE

- Abdul, Bte Nurdevi, 2011. *The Teaching of English to the Students of English Department at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in 2010-2011 Academic Year*. Makassar: Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
- Arikuto, Suharsimin. (2006). (Edisi Revisi VI) *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Bell, S. 2010. *Project Based Learning for the 21st Century: Skills for the Future*. *The Clearing Home: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*. Volume 83, 39-43.
- Dalle, M.B. 2010. *Fundamental of Research Methodology*. Makassar.
- Fragoulis, L. 2009. *Project-Based Learning in Teaching of English as A Foreign Language in Greek Primary Schools: From Theory to practice*. (A Journal) *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 2 September 2009.
- Gay, L. R, Georfey, E. Peter, A. 2006. *Eight: Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Pearson
- Gay, L. R. 2011. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application Tenth Edition*. Ohio : Pearson
- Goodman Brandon. 2010. *Project-Based Learning*. *Educational Psychology*.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *How to Teach English*. England: Longman.
- Istikori 2015. *The Use of Project Based Learning in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension: A Quasi Experimental Study at MTsN 2 Mataram in Academic year 2015/ 2016*. Journal (pdf. 1-15).

- Patton, A. 2012. *Work That Matters: The Teacher's Guide to Project-Based Learning*. The Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Penyusun, Tim. 2014. *Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi*. Makassar. Pusat Kurikulum. 2006. Model Penilaian Kelas. http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/FIP/JUR._PEND._LUAR_BIASA/195202151983011-M._UMAR_DJANI_MARTASUTA/B_UPI/8_Model_Model_Kurikulum/Model_Penilaian_Kelas/05_PLB/Penilaian_Pendidikan_Khusus-Januari.pdf. Downloaded at 04 October 2017)
- Poonpon, K. 2011. Enhancing English Skill through Project Based Learning. *The English Teacher* Vol. XL: 1-10 Journal. (pp. 1-10).
- Rahmawati. 2012. *Improving the Students' reading Comprehension through Context Clues Strategy*. Thesis: Unismuh Makassar.
- Rizki, Okta. 2012. *The Application of Project Based Learning in Improving the Students of Twelfth Graders Achievement on Speaking and Writing Skills of Public Vocational High School 3 Kayuagung*. [Online]. Downloaded on June 20, 2018 from <http://www.google.co.id/search/29-87-1-PB.pdf>.
- Shorten G & Carr C. 2009. *Middle / High School Instructional Support Materials for Writing: Introductions and Conclusions*. Shelton School District. (https://www.sheltonschoools.org/CAL/Shared%20Documents/Writing/SecondaryModules/Intros_ConclModule/IC_DocFolder/Conclscoringguide.doc. Downloaded at 16 June 2018)
- Solomon, G. 2003. Project-based learning: A primer. *Technology & Learning*, 23, 20-27.
- Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan RAD*. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Sukmadinata, Syaodih Nana. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Taniredja, Tukiran, and Mustsfidah, Hidayati. 2011. *Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Thomas. 2000. "Project Based Learning": in *What Teacher Need to Know About* (33) Australia: Peter Westwood. Acer Press, 2008.
- Ulwan, Nashihun M. 2014. *Cara Membaca atau Melihat Tabel T*. Taken by: <http://www.portal-statistik.com/2014/05/cara-membaca-atau-meilhat-tabel-t.html?m=1>. Acces on September 5th 2017.
- Zen, Ilham. 2013. *Uji t Dua Sample*. Taken by: freelearningji.wordpress.com/2013. Acces on April 10th 2017.