

Evaluating PjBL Instruction with Linguistic Landscape in English Course using CIPP Model

I G. A. P. N. S. Paragae¹

¹Institut Agama Hindu Negeri Mpu Kuturan, Singaraja, Indonesia
paragae.novita@gmail.com

Abstract

The lack of resources on the utilization of linguistic landscape (LL) in PjBL leaves educators with problems in its implementation. This evaluative study filled the gap by investigating the implementation of PjBL with LL by making use of CIPP (context, input, process, and product) model with a qualitative approach. Questionnaires and interviews were used to collect the data from 2 lecturers and 44 university students from Tourism Department joining an English course. The study revealed that (1) the learning goals covered four language skills and 21st-century learning skills; (2) the lesson plan, lecturers' capability, students' characteristics and ability as well as the facilities were considered sufficient; (3) although students responded positively on the instruction, some problems were faced by lecturers and students, and (4) the instruction resulted in improved students' language skills and 21st-century skills. The study also produced feedback for more effective and better implementation.

Keywords : CIPP model; linguistic landscape; PjBL; EFL course

Submitted: May 23, 2025

Revised: December 11, 2025

Accepted: December 16, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65576/indofes.v2i2.15>

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

©2025 The Author(s). Published by Asosiasi Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Pascasarjana Indonesia



1. Introduction

Linguistic landscape which is defined as the language, words, and pictures that are exhibited in public places in the environment (Shohamy & Gorter, 2009), might become the answer to overcome the problems of the lack of language exposure in foreign language learning. It has been acknowledged that it is difficult to provide enough exposure to the target language, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings (Nation, 2003). However, since English has been considered an international language, it has also been used in the LL in foreign countries, including Indonesia such as in shop signs, banners, posters, road markings, TV subtitles, product packaging, pamphlets, graffiti, and advertisements. This opportunity should be taken to make the LL material the source of students' English learning.

Taking the sources existing in students' surrounding environment or the students' real life, which is known as authentic material, is considered to be able to increase students' learning (Beresova, 2015; Rees Lewis et al., 2019). Linguistic landscape is considered to be a potential authentic material since it exposes the students to English in their daily environment (Aladjem & Jou, 2016; Barni et al., 2014; Hayik, 2020; Shang & Xie, 2020). Authentic learning materials play a crucial role in language learning as they provide learners with meaningful language input which exists in the real world (Alqahtani, 2014).

In addition to its authenticity which may enhance students' language skills, LL also represents cultures and other aspects which can also enhance other competencies which are also important in language learning. Previous research has proven that LL may (1) promote

incidental language learning (Chesnut et al., 2013; Gorter & Cenoz, 2008; Lee & Choi, 2020; Qi et al., 2020; Sayer, 2020a) as the result of reading LL texts, (2) improve pragmatic competence (Gorter & Cenoz, 2008; Rowland, 2013), sociocultural competence (Kim & Chesnut, 2020; Lozano et al., 2020; Sayer, 2020a) as the result of text analysis in different social functions (Li et al., 2020; Sayer, 2020a; Szabo & Dufva, 2020; Wiśniewska, 2019); (3) improve the acquisition of literacy skill (Gorter & Cenoz, 2008; Rowland, 2013) in multimodal analysis, and (4) increase students' awareness and appreciation to the language and environment (Gorter & Cenoz, 2008; Kim & Chesnut, 2020; Richardson, 2020) as well as social and political issues (Hernández-Martín & Skrandies, 2020).

In language instructions, LL can be utilized by using Project Based Learning (PjBL) framework. PjBL is a student-centered learning model where the students learn by creating an authentic project which is relevant to their lives. Some research inserting the use of LL in PjBL instruction (Kim & Chesnut, 2020; Lee & Choi, 2020; Lozano et al., 2020; Rowland, 2013) found that integrating the linguistic landscape into PjBL enriches students' learning experiences by deepening their understanding of languages, cultures, and communities.

Although there were only a limited number of research utilizing LL, previous studies on linguistic landscape and project activities were mostly conducted at the university level (Barrs, 2018; Dumanig & David, 2019; Qi et al., 2020). The students at the university level are considered to be suitable to have a project on LL due to their capability in using their critical thinking in analyzing the LL and their creativity in producing LL (Murtonen, 2020). However, since the implementation of instruction with LL has not much been studied, teachers or lecturers are still looking for its effective implementation.

A preliminary interview with English lecturers who implemented the use of LL in PjBL found that several problems were faced related to the instruction. Thus, it is crucial to evaluate the instruction holistically to assess the instruction in a program evaluation by collecting information in a scientific way and judging the program based on the information gathered (Scheerend & Thomas, 2003; Stufflebeam, 2000) and utilizing a model of evaluation (Manan et al., 2020). CIPP evaluation model is a conservative model which is chosen since it focuses on enhancing the effectiveness of program practice (Akpur et al., 2016). CIPP model consists of the evaluation of content, input, process, and product evaluation.

In this study, the instruction implementing PjBL with LL in Tourism Department was evaluated by using CIPP evaluation model. The evaluation was presented based on the four dimensions of CIPP. This study also suggested some feedback that can be used to conduct better and more effective instruction. The information from this study could be used as a guide and served as a basis to produce policy and plan better instruction.

2. Method

The study was conducted in a qualitative approach and presented descriptively, as explained by Cohen et al. (2018). The CIPP model was utilized as a tool to evaluate the instructions which consisted of four evaluation components: context, input, process, and product. The study was conducted in a Tourism Study Program of a university located in North Bali, Indonesia. The study involved the head of the study program, two English lecturers implementing PjBL instruction with LL and 44 students joining the English course. The students belonged to two classes in the first year of their study and joined 6 meetings of the English course implementing PjBL with LL.

Questionnaires, interviews, and documentation were used to collect the data. Table 1 presents the data collection based on the evaluation components.

Table 1. The data collection of the study

Evaluation Components	Aspects	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection
Context	Learning goals	HSP, lecturer	Interviews
Input	Lesson plan	HSP, lecturer	Interviews
	Lecturers	HSP, lecturer	Interviews
	Students	HSP, lecturer	Interviews
	Facilities	HSP, lecturer	Interviews, documentation
Process	Learning process	HSP, lecturer, students	Interviews, questionnaires,
Product	Learning outcomes	HSP, lecturer, students	Interviews, questionnaires, documentation

HSP = Head of the study program

The data analysis for the interview was conducted qualitatively, which covers data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles & A. Huberman, 1994), while for the questionnaire, the data were analyzed by looking at the average score. Moreover, triangulation was implemented to ensure the data validity. The types of triangulation used in this study were source triangulation and method triangulation. Source triangulation was carried out by involving some parties (head of the study program, lectures, and students) as the subjects of the study, while method triangulation was carried out by using more than one method of data collection (interview, questionnaire and documentation).

3. Findings and Discussion

The evaluation was conducted on the context, input, process, and product. The context was evaluated by looking at the instructional goals. Based on the result of the interview with the head of the study program and the lecturers, PjBL and LL were used as a part of English course instruction. The English course belongs to a general course which is given to all students in all study programs in the university. The course is dedicated to students in the second semester and is presented in two credits.

In general, the purpose or goal of the English course was to develop students' competence in communicating both orally and in writing in English in various contexts. To fulfill this purpose, the students were expected to develop their four English language skills, covering speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In addition, the head of the study program added the importance of relating it to the future job of the students.

"... the course should be adjusted to the students' study program. ... In the future, they will work in the tourism field. So, what they need is communication competence. Grammar is not very important as long as they can communicate. That is the goal"

The excerpt of the interview revealed that the students' need was expected to put their communication skills into priority. The students need to develop skills in communication both in oral communication involving speaking and listening, and written communication involving reading and writing. According to Bachman (1990), communicative competence covers organizational competence, or the use of language, and sociocultural competence which relates the language and culture. Students need to be able to develop all aspects of communicative competence to fulfill their needs as tourism students. It is very crucial to do some adjustments of the curriculum based on the students' needs (Aslan & Uygun, 2019; Mohd-Asraf et al., 2019; Tuna & Başdal, 2021) since it will determine the goal of learning and students' success.

The result of the interview found that all courses in the study program, including the English course should develop students' 21st-century skills or known as 4C (critical thinking, collaboration, communication, creativity), based on the needs of this era. Below is the excerpt from the interview with the head of the study program.

“... we do not know what the students might face in the future; what problems they will face to win the job market. Thus, we do agree with the experts that 4C skills can prepare students to face the uncertainty of the future.”

The head of the study program highlighted the importance of 4C skills or known as 21st-century learning skills, to prepare the students to face the challenge, especially in the labor market. Thus, the focus on developing students' 4C skills needs to be stressed in addition to the development of students' language skills. The 4C skills have also been emphasized by many experts because the skills enable the students to be good communicators, thinkers, and agents of change (Lai & Viering, 2012; Pardede, 2020; van Laar et al., 2020). Therefore, experts proposed the insertion of these skills in education (Haug, 2021; Valtonen, 2021).

To conclude the evaluation of the context, the main goal of the English course is to make the students capable of communicating in English by implementing the four language skills. Therefore, communication competence should be emphasized on meaning, rather than on grammatical structure. In addition, the mastery of 21st-century skills or 4C skills was also expected to be developed during the lesson.

For the input evaluation, the instruction is seen from the strategies planned, the capability of teachers and students, and the facilities needed which was collected through interviews and documentation.

The choice of the teaching method, that is, PjBL and the use of LL was decided by lecturers to fulfill the needs in achieving the goals of the instruction. PjBL is considered very suitable to develop 21st-century skills (Fallas Gabuardi, 2021; Husin, 2016). It is said to be able to allow students to develop the learning process in a meaningful way. The components of 4C, which are critical thinking, collaboration, communication, and creativity, could be developed through group interaction which involved inquiry, discussion, and the creation of the project (Husin, 2016; Ngereja et al., 2020). Thus, in the English course, besides addressing English competence as both a target language and a tool for communication during the accomplishment of the project (Al-Busaidi et al., 2021; Greenier, 2020), PjBL also provides an opportunity for the development of other skills and competence (Fallas Gabuardi, 2021; Prilestari, 2019), such as 21st-century skills.

In addition to PjBL, the use of LL was based on the reason of making the students aware of the learning opportunities they have outside of the class, as authentic material. Thus, the students will make use of their time learning the LL while they are outside the classroom. It was also to relate the classroom to the real world to make the students more motivated to learn (Mugimu & Sekiziyivu, 2016). Previous studies using LL in language learning found that it is suitable for students at the tertiary level (Barrs, 2020; Chesnut et al., 2013; Dumanig & David, 2019; Kweldju, 2021). The studies using LL has proved that it can improve students' language skills (Chesnut, 2013; Dumanig & David, 2019; Li et al., 2020) writing skill (Hayik, 2020) critical thinking ability (Lee & Choi, 2020; Lozano et al., 2020; Shang & Xie, 2020; Wangdi & Savski, 2022) and creativity (Lee & Choi, 2020), communication (Wangdi & Savski, 2022), and collaboration in group (Sayer, 2020b). It can also increase students' motivation (Aladjem & Jou, 2016; Kweldju, 2018).

The lecturers specified the planning of the steps in implementing PjBL and LL in the lesson plans. Based on the lesson plan, there will be two projects that will be conducted in 6 meetings. The first project was schoolscape project with the theme healthy environment, where

the students produce LL to be used and displayed in the campus area. The second project was making online travel advertisements with the theme of Balinese tourism. Below are the steps in conducting the instruction.

Table 2. Action Planning in Implementing the PjBL and LL

Meeting	Steps
Meeting 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of LL brought by lecturers - Group work: analyzing the LL - Discussion <p><i>Task: find out LL to be presented the following week</i></p>
Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of the LL found - Planning for the next creation of LL <p><i>Task: create LL</i></p>
Meeting 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation of LL created - Discussion

Viewed from the action planning, the planned activities have met the steps of PjBL proposed by Krajcik and Blumenfeld (2006). The steps suggested are (1) posing questions to guide the activities, (2) exploring questions in authentic and situated inquiry, (3) collaborating in answering the questions, (4) getting support for the inquiry, and (5) producing tangible outcomes. All the steps could be seen in the steps planned by the lecturers. First, the students drive questions in the process of the preparation of the group work. Second, the students explore the questions by doing analysis, inquiry, and discussion of the LL presented by the lecturers. Those processes were also carried out in the process of finding LL in their surroundings. Third, collaboration in answering the question happens when the students discuss the LL in groups. Fourth, the students may get support from the lecturer during the discussion. Fifth, the production of tangible outcomes is carried out in the form of the production of LL.

Based on the readiness and capability of the lecturers in conducting the instruction based on PjBL with LL, they were seen to be capable of conducting the instruction. Both of the lecturers were majoring in English education, graduated from bachelor's and master's programs in English Education, and shared an interest in instruction with LL. The readiness and capability of the lecturers are very important to consider because the quality of the teachers determines the quality of the instruction (Dagarin-Fojkar, 2022; Husein, 2015). More specifically, the pedagogical competence of the teachers influences the students' success in achieving the purpose of the instruction (Channa, 2022).

Another factor that is also important in the input of the instruction is the students. The instruction should be planned and adjusted based on students' needs. The students involved in this study are university students who belong to adult learners with various levels of English competence. They were perceived to be suitable to join the instruction with PjBL and LL. In adult learning, collaborative knowledge-building and scientific thinking are crucial (Bok, 2021; Murtonen, 2020). In the instruction, collaborative knowledge building is carried out through inquiry and discussion on the LL, while scientific thinking is trained through the process of inquiry and discussion.

Related to the facilities, the instructions need (1) English LL that can be analyzed, (2) a classroom for discussion, (3) equipment to create LL, (4) a laptop or mobile phone and an application to create online LL, and (5) an LCD for presentation. All the facilities were perceived to be available to facilitate the instruction with PjBL and LL. It is an important factor

affecting the effectiveness of instruction since it may influence students' motivation in learning (Alfiansyah, 2019).

From the result of the input evaluation, it was obvious that the planning has been decided to meet the important principles of PjBL. Moreover, the lecturers, students, and facilities provided were considered suitable to support the implementation of the instruction planned in the English course.

For the process, the evaluation assessed the implementation of the planned instruction. Based on the lecturer's view, the problems faced were as follows.

a. The students' lack of capability in technology

It was found that some students have low ability in technology. They were confused about what application or how to create LL, especially in the second project. This problem was unknown to the lecturers until the students presented their project in the third meeting. In this case, the lecturers' role in providing supervision to the students is crucial, like what was stated by Mustapha et al (2020).

b. The non-equal role and participation of students in the project

In the process of instruction, the lecturers also observed the students' activeness in the instruction. However, the teachers could not observe the process of the creation of LL since it was not conducted in the classroom. Some of the students reported that the role taken by each student were not equal. Some students were not participating in the creation of LL. This is also related to the problem of students' low ability in technology. When the students were asked to create the LL at home, the students tend to burden it on the student(s) with the highest capability in technology. This situation does not meet the purpose of the study that each student working in the group should get an equal chance to learn and to do the project.

c. Students' confusion in doing discussion

The lecturers observed that the students looked confused in the group and had ideas on what to do, especially in the first project. Even though the lecturers claimed that clear instruction had been given at the beginning of the project, the students also claimed that they still had confusion. Based on the observation, some students did not pay attention to the lecturers when the lecturers explained the instruction. It may be caused by the absence of questions that could lead the students in the analysis. Like Krajcik and Bumenfeld (2006), the existence of questions in guiding students' activity may lead the students in analyzing important points.

Data about the process of learning was also collected from the students. The result of the questionnaire is presented in Table 3

Table 3. Students' Response to the PjBL instruction with LL

Statements	Score	Interpretation
Clear instruction is provided so I have no confusion in doing the project.	3.93	Agree
The project given is useful for me.	4.06	Absolutely agree
The time provided to do the project is sufficient.	3.68	Agree
The instruction increases my motivation in the learning process.	4.43	Absolutely agree

I can practice all the language skills (speaking, reading, writing and listening through the project.	4.70	Absolutely agree
I can practice my critical thinking, collaboration, communication and creativity through the project.	4.79	Absolutely agree
It is easy for me to find LL to analyze.	3.13	Agree
I know what is expected by the teachers to get a high score.	3.45	Agree

Based on the result of the questionnaire, the students agree with the statement that the teachers have provided clear instruction, the time provided is sufficient, the LL to be analyzed is easy to get, and there was a clear assessment instrument to get a high score. Moreover, the students absolutely agree that the project provided by the lecturer is useful, the instruction increases motivation and gives opportunities to practice four language skills and four 21st-century skills.

The findings which need to be highlighted from the result of the questionnaire was the score for the easiness in finding LL to analyze. Even though the students agree that it is easy, the point is close to the “not sure” option (3.13). Based on the interview with the students, some of them find difficulties in finding examples of LL in their environment.

In conclusion for process evaluation, the instruction has been implemented based on the plan. However, in its implementation, there were several problems which are put forward by teachers, namely (1) students’ lack of capability in technology, (2) The non-equal role and participation of students in the project, and (3) students’ confusion in doing the discussion. Even though teachers reported some problems, it was not felt by the students. The students only report one problem in the implementation of the instruction, which is the difficulty in accessing LL to analyze. For the rest of the aspects, the instruction received positive feedback from the students.

For the product, the evaluation can be seen from the lecturers' and students’ views on their achievements and lecturers’ records on students’ performance. Based on the interview, the lecturers reported satisfactory results on students’ improvement in the four language skills and 21st-century skills.

The data about students’ views on their improvement was collected by using questionnaires and interviews which is presented in table 4.

Table 4. Students’ views about on their improvement

Statements	Score	Interpretation
My improvement in speaking is satisfactory.	4.75	Absolutely agree
My improvement in listening is satisfactory.	3.52	Agree
My improvement in reading is satisfactory.	3.81	Agree
My improvement in writing is satisfactory.	4.16	Absolutely agree
My improvement in critical thinking is satisfactory.	4.79	Absolutely agree
My improvement in collaborating is satisfactory.	4.81	Absolutely agree
My improvement in communicating is satisfactory.	4.59	Absolutely agree
My improvement in creativity is satisfactory.	4.77	Absolutely agree

From the table, it is obvious that the students were positive that the instruction with PjBL with LL improved their four language skills and four 21st-century learning skills. The language skills which were improved well were the speaking and writing ability. The students perceived that the highest improvement in language skills was in their speaking ability. It is because during the instruction, students were given a chance to speak as much as possible and are not allowed to speak in Bahasa Indonesia. In addition, support from lecturers and friends was provided when the students find difficulties in expressing themselves. The message of the communication was highlighted, not the structure. So, the students were willing and more motivated to speak (Kwangsawad, 2017; Uzoma & Ibrahim, 2018).

Another important point from the result of the questionnaire is the improvement of 4C skills. all four skills almost equally improved with collaborating (4.81) as the highest, followed by critical thinking (4.79), creativity (4.77), and communication (4.59). This finding proves previous research that PjBL is suitable to improve various skills in addition to the academic competencies that the students need to achieve (Fallas Gabuardi, 2021; Husin, 2016).

In conclusion, from the evaluation of the product dimension, the student's four language skills and 21st-century skills have been improved. Both lecturers and the students were satisfied with the improvement. The language skill which was viewed to improve the most is the speaking ability. It was based on the needs which were discussed in the context dimension of evaluation. Students' communication does not emphasize the structure, but the message in the communication, as what is needed by the students in the working field.

Based on the evaluation of context, input, process, and product, several feedbacks could be used or implemented in the instruction for better results. First, from the input dimension, there are problems with the lack of ability that the students have in technology. Thus, they find difficulties in creating the LL. In this case, lecturers' support and supervision are needed. The lecturers need to introduce some of the applications that the students may use in making online LL. More importantly, lecturers' supervision in each process of the activities is also needed. Not only in the form of guidance when they need help, but also in the form of motivation to work well in a group to finish the project as best as they can (Krauss & Boss, 2013; Tasci, 2015).

Second, from the result of the evaluation of the process, it was found that the role of the students in the creation of LL was unequal. Some students did a lot more than the other students in the group. To solve this problem, the same solution as the first problem can be used. Lecturers need to see the contribution of each individual in the completion of a project.

Third, related to the limited LL that can be accessed, lecturers can ask the students to broaden the example of LL that can be used as a model or can be discussed. The LL containing no English can also be used as an example where the students can learn how LL is used to deliver messages. In addition, the students could be supported in finding an example of LL on the internet. The Internet provides a lot of access to LL since it is for a wider audience (Mustapha et al., 2020). Thus, students will have more LL to explore as their example, which may result in a better product of the LL they will produce.

4. Conclusion and suggestion

From the study, it was found that the PjBL instruction with LL in the English course conducted in tourism study program reflected an effective way is effective to facilitate the students in achieving the learning goals based on the curriculum, which covers four language skills and the demands of 21st-century learning. It can be seen by the ability of the product evaluation, in this case, the teachers' and students' views on the students' improvement in language and 21st-century skills in meeting the goals based on the context evaluation. However, the study also found that the instruction conducted in PjBL with LL still has problems in the input and process dimensions. From the input dimension, students have a low ability in technology that can hinder the creation of LL. From the process dimension, the problems faced were the unequal role of students in doing the project and the difficulties in accessing LL to be analyzed. Therefore, from the study, it is suggested to the lecturers to give support to students in joining the instruction. It is also suggested to the lecturers to use the generalization or broadening of the LL that can be used for example, and analysis.

References

- Akpur, U., Alci, & Hakan. (2016). Evaluation of the curriculum of English preparatory classes at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(7), 466–473.
- Al-Busaidi, S., Yusuf, T., & Reinders, H. (2021). A model for implementing problem-based language learning: Experiences from a seven-year journey. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(1), 1–21.
- Aladjem, R., & Jou, B. (2016). The Linguistic Landscape as a Learning Space for Contextual Language Learning. *Journal of Learning Spaces*, 5(2), 66–70.
- Alfiansyah, H. R. (2019). the Role of Parental Involvement Towards the Students' Learning Motivation. *Lentera Pendidikan : Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah Dan Keguruan*, 22(2), 276.
- Alqahtani, E. T. (2014). *Effectiveness of Using YouTube on Enhancing EFL Students' Listening Comprehension Skills*. Al-Imam Muhammad Ibin Saud Islamic University.
- Aslan, M., & Uygun, N. (2019). Evaluation of preschool curriculum by stufflebeam's context, input, process and product (CIPP) evaluation model. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 44(200), 229–251.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Barni, M., Kolyva, K., Machetti, S., & Palova, R. (2014). Linguistic landscape theory in language learning. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on the Future of Education*, 333–336.
- Barrs, K. (2018). English in the Japanese Linguistic Landscape: An Awareness-Raising Activity Examining Place, Form, and Reason. *Studies in the Humanities and Sciences*.
- Barrs, K. (2020). Learning from the linguistic landscape: A PjBL approach to investigating English in Japan. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 17, 7–15.
- Beresova, J. (2015). Authentic materials – Enhancing language acquisition and cultural awareness. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 195–204.
- Bok, G. I. (2021). Adult learners' challenges in distance learning: A case study in universiti sains Malaysia. *Issues in Educational Research*, 31(1), 19–36.
- Channa, W. M. (2022). Effect of Pedagogical Competences of English Language Teachers on Their Students' Academic Achievement: A Qualitative Study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(11), 2274–2281. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1211.06>
- Chern, C., & Dooley, K. (2014). Learning English by walking down the street. *ELT Journal*, 68(April), 113–123.

- Chesnut, M. (2013). The language lessons around us: Undergraduate English pedagogy and linguistic landscape research. *English Teaching*, 12(2), 102–120.
- Chesnut, M., Lee, V., & Schulte, J. (2013). The language lessons around us: Undergraduate English pedagogy and linguistic landscape research. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 12(2), 102–120.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge.
- Dagarin-Fojkar, M. (2022). Teacher Competences for Teaching English as a Foreign Language in the First Educational Cycle of Primary Education. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 423–433.
- Dumanig, F. P., & David, M. K. (2019). Linguistic Landscape as a Pedagogical Tool in Teaching and Learning English in Oman. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 1, 1–13.
- Fallas Gabuardi, V. M. (2021). PjBL: boosting 21st century skills. *Estudios*, 43, 340–419.
- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2008). Knowledge about language and linguistic landscape. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*.
- Greenier, V. T. (2020). The 10Cs of PjBL TESOL curriculum. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1473405>
- Hakan, K., & Seval, F. (2011). CIPP evaluation model scale: Development, reliability and validity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 592–599.
- Haug, B. S. (2021). Taking 21st century skills from vision to classroom: What teachers highlight as supportive professional development in the light of new demands from educational reforms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103286>
- Hayik, R. (2020). Using linguistic landscapes as stimuli for relevant EFL writing. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in Public Space* (pp. 205–221). Springer.
- Hernández-Martín, L., & Skrandies, P. (2020). Taking the foreign out of language teaching: Opening up the classroom to the multilingual city. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in Public Space* (pp. 293–325). Springer.
- Husein, R. (2015). Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 2(4), 311–321. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jph/article/view/4473>
- Husin, W. N. F. W. (2016). Fostering students' 21st century skills through project oriented problem based learning (Popbl) in integrated stem education program. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching*, 17(1).
- Kim, S., & Chesnut, M. (2020). Teaching with virtual linguistic landscapes: developing translanguaging and transcultural competence. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in Public Space* (pp. 69–92). Springer.
- Krajcik, J. S., & Bumenfeld. (2006). PjBL. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of The Learning Sciences* (pp. 317–334). Cambridge University Press.
- Krauss, J., & Boss, S. (2013). *Thinking Through Project Based Learning: Guiding Deeper Inquiry*. Corwin.
- Kwangasawad, T. (2017). In-service EFL teacher development for technology integration in communicative language teaching. *Asian Journal of Education and e*
- Kweldju, S. (2018). Using Googlemaps for linguistic landscape activities in self-access center: improving English department students' competencies. *The 4th ACM in Cooperation International Conference in HCI and UX*, 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3205946.3205959>

- Kweldju, S. (2021). Incorporating linguistic landscape into English word-formation task in an English morphology course. *Teflin Journal*, 32(1), 29–49.
- Lai, E. R., & Viering, M. (2012). Assessing 21st century skills: integrating research findings. *Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April*, 66.
- Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2020). A geolocative linguistic landscape project in Korean as Foreign Language education. *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55761-4_9
- Li, Fu, X., He, Q., & Lu, J. (2020). The Influence of Linguistic Landscape on English Learning: A Case Study of Shenzhen City. *English Literature and Language Review*.
- Lozano, M. E., Jiménez-Caicedo, J. P., & Abraham, L. (2020). Linguistic landscape projects in language teaching: Opportunities for critical language learning beyond the classroom. In D. Malinowski, H. H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp. 17–42). Springer.
- Manan, A., Fadhilah, M. A., Kamarullah, & Habiburrahim. (2020). Evaluating paper-based toefl preparation program using the context, input, process, and product (Cipp) model. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 457–471. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16467>
- Miles, M. B., & A. Huberman, M. (1994). *Matthew B. Miles, Michael Huberman - Qualitative Data Analysis_ An expanded Sourcebook 2nd Edition (1994).pdf* (p. 338).
- Mohd-Asraf, R., Hossain, M. T., & Eng, T. K. (2019). Fifty years of communicative language teaching. *The Asian ESP*.
- Mugimu, C. B., & Sekiziyivu, S. (2016). Authentic instructional materials and the communicative language teaching approach of German as foreign language in Uganda. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and ...* <http://www.ijlter.net/index.php/ijlter/article/download/934/940>
- Murtonen. (2020). Adult Learners and Theories of Learning. In *Development of Adult Thinking: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Cognitive Development and Adult Learning* (pp. 97–122).
- Mustapha, R., Sadrina, Nashir, I. M., Azman, M. N. A., & Hasnan, K. A. (2020). Assessing the implementation of the PjBL (PjBL) in the department of mechanical engineering at a Malaysian polytechnic. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 12(1 Special Issue), 100–118.
- Ngereja, B., Hussein, B., & Andersen, B. (2020). Does PjBL (PBL) promote student learning? a performance evaluation. *Education Sciences*, 10(11), 1–15.
- Pardede, P. (2020). Integrating the 4Cs into EFL integrated skills learning. *Journal of English Teaching*, 6(March), 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v6i1.190>
- Potvin, A. S., Boardman, A. G., & Stamatis, K. (2021). Consequential change: Teachers scale PjBL in English language arts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 107, 103469.
- Prilestari, B. dwi. (2019). *Pengembangan Model Pembelajaran Project Based Learning (PjBL) dalam meningkatkan kreatifitas mata pelajaran Prakarya*.
- Qi, W., Zhang, H., & Sorokina, N. (2020). Linguistic landscape for Korean learning: A survey of perception, attitude, and practice of korean beginners at a Korean university. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(6), 956–961. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1106.12>
- Rees Lewis, D. G., Gerber, E. M., Carlson, S. E., & Easterday, M. W. (2019). Opportunities for educational innovations in authentic PjBL: understanding instructor perceived challenges to design for adoption. In *Educational Technology Research and Development* (Vol. 67, Issue 4). Springer US.
- Richardson, D. F. (2020). Floating Traffic Signs and the Ambiguity of Silence in the Linguistic

- Landscape. *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape*.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55761-4_8
- Rowland, L. (2013). The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(4), 494–505.
- Ruhanen, L., Axelsen, M., & Bowles, L. (2020). Engaging students through authentic learning: Connecting with international tourism partners. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 29, 100291.
- Santiyadnya, N. (2021). The effectiveness of CIPP model's implementation in secondary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1810(1), 0–5.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1810/1/012071>
- Sayer, P. (2020a). Ethnographic language learning projects through the linguistic landscape. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in Public Space* (pp. 327–347). Springer.
- Sayer, P. (2020b). Ethnographic language learning projects through the linguistic landscape. *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55761-4_14
- Scheerend, J. G. C., & Thomas, S. M. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systematic approach*. Swets and Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Shang, G. (2021). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of Eastern China: City residents' perceptions and attitudes. *Globe: A Journal of Language, Culture and ...*
- Shang, G., & Xie, F. (2020). Is “poor” English in linguistic landscape useful for EFL teaching and learning? Perspectives of EFL teachers in China. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*.
- Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2009). *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery*. Routledge.
- Simpson, J. (2011). Integrating PjBL in an English language tourism classroom in a Thai university. (PhD Thesis). In *Australian Catholic University* (Issue May). Australian Catholic University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). The CIPP Model for Evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation* (pp. 279–317). Springer.
- Szabo, T., & Dufva, H. (2020). University exchange students' practices of learning Finnish: A language ecological approach to affordances in linguistic landscapes. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil (Eds.), *Language Teaching in Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in Public Space* (pp. 93–117). Springer.
- Tasci, B. (2015). Project based learning from elementary school to college, tool : architecture. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 770–775.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.130>
- Tuna, H., & Başdal, M. (2021). Curriculum evaluation of tourism undergraduate programs in Turkey: A CIPP model-based framework. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 29(May), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2021.100324>
- Uzoma, N., & Ibrahim, M. (2018). Effects of Communicative Language Teaching Approach on students' performance in Narrative Essay and Informal Letter Writing among senior secondary *Journal of Research and Innovation in ...*
- Valtonen, T. (2021). How pre-service teachers perceive their 21st-century skills and dispositions: A longitudinal perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 116.
- van Laar, E., van Deursen, A. J. A. M., van Dijk, J. A. G. M., & de Haan, J. (2020). Determinants of 21st-Century Skills and 21st-Century Digital Skills for Workers: A Systematic Literature Review. *SAGE Open*, 10(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900176>
- Wang, X., & de Velde, H. Van. (2015). Constructing Identities through Multilingualism and Multiscriptualism The Linguistic Landscape in Dutch and Belgian Chinatowns 多元语

言文字中的认同建构——以 *Journal of Chinese Overseas*.

Wangdi, J., & Savski, K. (2022). Linguistic landscape, critical language awareness and critical thinking: promoting learner agency in discourses about language. *Language Awareness*, 1–22.

Wiśniewska, D. (2019). Emotions, linguistic landscape and language learning. *Neofilolog*.

Zaafour, A., & Salaberri-ramiro, M. S. (2022). Incorporating Cooperative Project-Based Learning in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language: Teachers' Perspectives. *Education Sciences*, 12(6).