

Comparing the Role of Project-Based Teaching Method vs. Place-Based Teaching Method on Motivation of Iranian EFL Learners

Zahra Rezaei Bandari ^{a*} and Iraj Khoshnevis ^b

^a MA Student, Faculty of English, University of Ardabil, Iran.

^b Assistant Professor, Faculty of English, University of Ardabil, Iran.

Article History: Received: 5 April 2021; Accepted: 14 May 2021; Published online: 22 June 2021

Abstract: There are Methods and approaches which can help learners to be motivated. Students should have inspiring learning experiences already in the schools. To meet the elevated requirements of education and motivation, several different learning methods have been developed. Project-based learning (PBL) is one of these methods. On the other hand in our global society children are increasingly disconnected from their local history and cultural traditions. So there is a great need for a revival in connection to our heritage which place based learning facilitate it. This study is going to investigate effect of project based education and place based education on motivation of Iranian EFL learners. The main objective of the current research is to compare the benefits of these approaches and survey their role on Iranian EFL learners' motivation. Participants of the study were 60 learners in upper-intermediate level who gave a PET as the homogenization test. Next, 40 participants were selected with respect to their proficiency level. Then, the researcher divided them into two experimental groups; experimental 1. (E1: project based instruction) and experimental 2 (E2: place based instruction); each group included 20 participants. The first instrument was the PET (Preliminary English Test) that was used to determine the proficiency level of the participants in this study. The data was collected from pretest, posttest and the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) test. The data obtained through the pretest and posttest were be analyzed using SPSS software, those Iranian upper-intermediate EFL learners who have been taught by project based instruction outperformed those learners who have been taught by place based instruction.

Keywords: Project-based learning, Place based learning, Motivation

1. Introduction

Motivation was defined by Oxford and Shearin (1994) as determination of the extent of active and personal involvement in L2 learning. They also indicated that motivation affects learners' use of L2 learning strategies, how to interact with native speaker, general proficiency, and the perseverance of L2 skills after instruction and so on and so forth. Motivating students in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom is often a complex and difficult task that involves a multiplicity of psycho-sociological and linguistic factors (Dornyei, 2010), but most English teachers will attest to the important role motivation plays in the teaching/learning process. While motivation has been defined in many ways (Liuoliene & Metiuniene, 2006), in this paper it is simply used by the authors to refer to effective strategies that could help the learners develop their English language skills.

As mentioned above there are Methods and approaches which can help learners to be motivated. The author in this paper will work on Project based learning method and place based method. The component of interest and value consists of a) variety and novelty of tasks, b) authenticity of problem, c) complexity of problem, d) ending of the project, e) freedom to choose on how to perform the project and f) opportunities of collaborative work. Tasks that have clear closure are authentic and complex enough, and tasks that enable freedom to choose how to work, have higher probability to raise and sustain student motivation for a long time. In addition, students may feel "ownership" towards the project when they have the chance to raise the questions to solve the project on their own. Motivation was one of the primary themes of place based education identified by researchers and teachers alike. When students are motivated and excited to learn, their desire to engage in and remember the material rises substantially. Unfortunately, motivation is something that teachers cannot directly give students. Instead, they must provide the circumstances under which students will feel motivated to learn. Place-based education does just that. When students believe that their actions can actually make a difference in their community, they are more willing to participate actively as students and citizens. Sobel and Smith (2010) write, "These [place-based] experiences show them that their ideas have merit and that they possess the capacity to voice their concerns. Creating opportunities that allow children to become change agents in their own communities is likely to inspire a taste for such involvement."

One of the basic elements in motivation that are ignored by nearly everyone is that the learner needs to be engaged. People say such things as "lessons need to be interesting", "the lessons need to be relevant" or "it's so boring". All these statements point at the problem but do not get to the core problem. For learning, the learner, need to be actively engaged, from their own feelings. I am not talking here about the desire to learn English, French, Chinese or some other language, but I am talking about the moment by moment engagement, which is something different from the desire or need to learn a language. So let's give a few examples of what I mean: think about people (maybe even you!) who play video games. Are they engaged? In fact, it is nearly impossible to tear them away from a game! Why? Because it is challenging them at the level they are at, making it possible for them to

move forward all the time. So they get “stucked in” wanting to play more and more. It’s the fun, the feedback, the interesting activity which have players persist at playing until they master the level they are at so they can get to the next level. You might even say I am really motivated to keep going when I play these games!

From the example I hope you can see that with certain kinds of learning we willingly engage ourselves moment by moment. Of course, the end result is important but in each moment that is not what is in the players’ minds. If the activity is engaging enough, we will do whatever it takes to master what we are doing. So the study is going to investigate effect of project based education and place based education on motivation of Iranian EFL learners. The main objective of the current research is to compare the benefits of these approaches and survey their role on Iranian EFL learners’ motivation. Therefore, these methods will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Second language professionals, after explaining what we do for a living, are inevitably asked “What’s the fastest/best/most foolproof method for learning a language?” Some of us like to answer: language by partner, meaning, go to the country and fall in love with someone who speaks only the language you want to learn and not yours. In academic terms, what are recommended is that people make the most of something that is crucial for language learning – motivation. Motivation is one of the biggest drives of learning a second language and it is a fundamental part of what a teacher faces every day. Most people find that learning another language after childhood is hard. Although not everyone who is motivated to learn manages to succeed, most people who do achieve a high level of success also turn out to be very strongly motivated.

Researchers who study the relationship between language learning and motivation explain that some learners are “intrinsically” motivated. These learners might want to learn a language to a higher level so that they can understand their grandparents who live in another country and are getting older. Or they might want to teach their children a second language because they want them to have the cognitive and social advantages of being bilingual.

It seems that at least three things are important for language learning success. These are your working memory, which can be thought of as how you hold a phone number in your head before you write it down, your associative memory, or how well you connect new and known information, and how strong your methods are for learning, which can be seen as the ability to figure out patterns in information. If you have these aptitude skills, along with high levels of various types of motivation, you’re most likely to succeed, especially if you have access to instruction that has been tailored to match your abilities and interests. The present study gains significance from different perspectives but the main significance of the current study is investigating the issue that which of these methods is more effective in order of motivation, Project based education or place based.

1.2. Review of Literature

Project-based learning (PBL) is a model that organizes learning around projects. According to the definitions found in PBL handbooks for teachers, projects are complex tasks, based on challenging questions or problems, that involve students in design, problem-solving, decision making, or investigative activities; give students the opportunity to work relatively autonomously over extended periods of time; and culminate in realistic products or presentations (Jones, Rasmussen, & Moffitt, 1997; Thomas, Mergendoller, & Michaelson, 1999). Other defining features found in the literature include authentic content, authentic assessment, teacher facilitation but not direction, explicit educational goals, (Moursund, 1999), cooperative learning, reflection, and incorporation of adult skills (Diehl, Grobe, Lopez, & Cabral, 1999). To these features, particular models of PBL add a number of unique features.

Definitions of “project-based instruction” include features relating to the use of an authentic (“driving”) question, a community of inquiry, and the use of cognitive (technology-based) tools (Krajcik, Blumenfeld, Marx, & Soloway, 1994; Marx, Blumenfeld, Krajcik, Blunk, Crawford, Kelly, & Meyer, 1994); and “Expeditionary Learning” adds features of comprehensive school improvement, community service, and multidisciplinary themes (Bound, 1999).

In the other hand Place-based education is an increasingly popular educational reform that focuses on expanding classrooms beyond the walls of a school and into the surrounding community such that “the school is open and inviting in the community and the community welcomes student learning occurring in many dimensions” (Powers, 2004, p. 18). David Sobel, a founder of place based education, defines it as “the process of using the local community and environment as a starting point to teach concepts in language arts, mathematics, social studies, science, and other subjects across the curriculum” (2005, p. 7). Gregory Smith (2002) explains that place-based education’s goal is to “ground learning in local phenomenon and students’ lived experience” (p. 586) instead of focusing on material that students have no connection to. When students are taught about their community, they learn to take care of the world by understanding where they live and taking action in their own backyards and communities. Place-based education encourages educators to consider place in the way that their curriculum is delivered, such that students can “pursue the kind of social action that improves the social and ecological life of places, near and far, now and in the future” (Gruenewald, 2003, p. 7-8). Place-based education is a combination of environmental education, sustainability education, project-based learning, community-based learning, experiential learning, and service

learning (Clark, 2008). Commitment to community results in a sense of self-competence and stewardship and the skills and experiences students have through place-based education often have a life-long effect.

Smith (2002) points out that because place-based education is focused on a particular place, it does not look the same when implemented in various locations, however he lists five themes that are consistently found in place-based education. The first is cultural studies, in which he suggests that once students learn about the local, teachers can then direct them to the regional, national, or international. The second theme is nature studies, which is the incorporation of the natural world into curriculum. Smith says “teachers who incorporate the study of the natural world into their curriculum reap the rich benefits of simply getting students outside the classroom and taking advantage of their curiosity” (p. 589).

Motivation refers to “the reasons underlying behavior” (Guay et al. 2010, p. 712). PBroussard and Garrison (2004) broadly define motivation as “the attribute that moves us to do or not to do something” (p. 106). Intrinsic motivation is motivation that is animated by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure. As Deci et al. (1999) observe, “Intrinsic motivation energizes and sustains activities through the spontaneous satisfactions inherent in effective volitional action. It is manifest in behaviors such as play, exploration, and challenge seeking that people often do for external rewards” (p. 658). Researchers often contrast intrinsic motivation with extrinsic motivation, which is motivation governed by reinforcement contingencies. Traditionally, educators consider intrinsic motivation to be more desirable and to result in better learning outcomes than extrinsic motivation (Deci et al. 1999).

Motivation involves a constellation of beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions that are all closely related. As a result, various approaches to motivation can focus on cognitive behaviors (such as monitoring and strategy use), non-cognitive aspects (such as perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes), or both. For example, Gottfried (1990) defines academic motivation as “enjoyment of school learning characterized by a mastery orientation; curiosity; persistence; task-endogeny; and the learning of challenging, difficult, and novel tasks” (p. 525). On the other hand, Turner (1995) considers motivation to be synonymous with cognitive engagement, which he defines as “voluntary uses of high-level self-regulated learning strategies, such as paying attention, connection, planning, and monitoring” (p. 413).

Now looking at some studies with detail can help to get insight about aim of the research. Keymak (2020) conducted a survey to assess the project - based learning (PBL) activities’ effects on student motivation. Two ninth-grade classes were randomly selected for experimental and control groups. Pre-test and post-test data were collected for measure of mathematics motivation of students. Data was analyzed using t-test. The results indicated a significant impact of peer instruction on achievement and an improvement in mathematics motivation.

Myeong-Hee (2018) investigated the Effects of Project-based Learning on Students’ Motivation and Self-efficacy. In this particular study, 79 students were distributed among 13 teams and each team shared a common goal. Each team was given a project, and every student in each team was assigned a task that would help the team achieve the preset goal. The project in this study was a video production that required students to work together in collaborative ways. The results of this study support the idea that project-based learning has a positive influence in students’ motivation and is able to enhance their cooperation skills as well. Furthermore, student responses in the survey taken after the project shows that the students’ perceptions toward project-based learning are very positive. Further research is suggested to find the effects of project-based learning on students’ motivation and self-efficacy in different levels, grades, or age groups.

Georgiou and Kyza (2018) conducted a survey to investigate the relations between student motivation, immersion and learning outcomes in location-based learning. Data were collected from a cohort of 135 10th graders, who used an AR app for environmental science learning; data were analyzed using multiple statistical analyses (pretest-posttest comparisons, correlations, regression analyses, cluster analysis). The results demonstrated that immersion was positively predicted by domain-specific motivation and cognitive motivation. In turn, conceptual learning gains were positively related to the level of immersion that students achieved.

1.3. Hypotheses of the study:

Based on what said before, the null hypotheses will be stated:

H1: project based education has no significant influences on improving motivation of EFL learners.

H2: place based education has no significant influences on improving motivation of EFL learners.

H3: There is no significant difference between place based education and project based education in improving motivation of EFL learners.

2. Methodology

The participants of this study were EFL learners from Kish Way institute in Karaj, with the range of 20 to 25 years old. There were 60 learners in upper-intermediate level who took a PET as the homogenization test. Next, 40 participants were selected with respect to their proficiency level. Then, the researcher divided them into two experimental groups, each group included 20 participants. There were two reasons for choosing the participants from upper-intermediate level: based on the belief that after about two years of studying English, they had acquired enough proficiency to attend this experiment. The participants had similar learning background, and they overall had similar point of view. They spoke Persian as their native language and none of them had ever lived or visited a foreign country.

2.1. Instruments:

In order to answer the research questions of this study, some instruments were used. The first instrument was the PET (Preliminary English Test) that was used to determine the proficiency level of the participants in this study. The second instrument that was used in this study was a book which named Interchange the fourth edition. The book is a four-level series for learners of English from the upper-intermediate level. The book Four Corners and Steps to Understanding are other instruments. Four Corner is an integrated four-skill English course for adults and young adults. Steps to Understanding is the book contains 30 carefully graded stories to provide training in reading and listening comprehension. The Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) is a self-report instrument designed to assess college students' motivational orientations and their use of different learning strategies for a college course, which was used as another instrument of the study.

Before starting the treatment process, the researcher visited the experimental groups for 20 minutes and explained the study to them what they were supposed to do in the study, and what they would learn. Then MSLQ was held to assess of the learners' motivation, and the scores of this questionnaire was considered as the pretest. The test was held at the end of the course to assess the motivation of the students after implication of the two mentioned method.

The study is in line with experimental studies with participants serving as two treatment groups. For answering the research questions, the data obtained through the pretest and posttest were analyzed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics of the study include means of the participant's scores, standard deviation and also variance of scores in the groups. After ensuring the normality of data by One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, the T-test was used. The reason for choosing T-test is that there is two groups and the obtained scores came from two groups. As it mentioned before all of this data analysis was conducted through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 23) software program. In addition, a post-hoc pairwise comparison was conducted to determine where the differences occurred between the groups.

3. Findings

3.1. Data Analysis:

To ensure the homogeneity of the two groups, the PET was administered among 60 EFL learners. Descriptive statistics for this homogeneity test is represented in Table 1.

Table 1. descriptive statistics of PET

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
VAR00001	60	30.00	64.00	94.00	4554.00	75.9000	.70177	5.43591
Valid N (listwise)	60							

Those students (N = 40) whose scores fell within the range of one standard deviation above and below the mean (score between 73 and 84) were chosen as homogeneous participants for this study (Table 2).

Table 2. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality for PET

		VAR00001
N		60
Normal Parametersa,b	Mean	75.9000
	Std. Deviation	5.43591
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.125
	Positive	.125

	Negative	-.084
Test Statistic		.125
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.957c

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test revealed that Sig. (p value) for PET Proficiency Test was .957, which is more than .05 ($p > \alpha$), based on which we may consider the scores are normally distributed.

Using t-test provided delicate and accurate results to compare the mean scores across two groups. By analyzing variances through t-test, it provided a statistical test of whether or not the means of all groups were equal by using SPSS software to answer the research question. Scales of MLSQ are shown in the following Table.

Table 3. Scale and subscales of MLSQ

scale	subscale
Intrinsic Goal Orientation	1, 2, 3, 4
Extrinsic Goal Orientation	5, 6, 7, 8
Task Value	9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14

The likert scale of the MLSQ also shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Likert spectrum of MLSQ

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all true	not true	Almost Not true	neutral	true	Almost true	Completely true

Table 5. Independent Samples Test of intrinsic goal orientation for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
a1	Equal variances assumed	.000	1.000	.000	38	1.000	.000	.238	-.483	.483
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	38.000	1.000	.000	.238	-.483	.483
a16	Equal variances assumed	.744	.394	.175	38	.862	.050	.285	-.528	.628
	Equal variances not assumed			.175	37.015	.862	.050	.285	-.528	.628
a22	Equal variances assumed	.412	.525	.846	38	.403	.250	.295	-.348	.848
	Equal variances not assumed			.846	37.236	.403	.250	.295	-.348	.848
a24	Equal variances assumed	1.696	.201	-.128	38	.899	-.050	.390	-.839	.739
	Equal variances not assumed			-.128	36.465	.899	-.050	.390	-.840	.740

Here the Leven test was used for equality of variances. As you can see the value of significances is 1/0, 0/394, 0/525, 0/201 and they are more than 0.05 ($P\text{-value} > 0.05$), so we concluded that the variances are equal: $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. Because the variances are equal thus we read first line of the Table 5. Here our significance (2-tailed) are 1, 0/862, 0/403, 0/899 and they are greater than 0.05. Whenever these value are smaller than 0.05 statistical average of the

classes are different but here the values are more than 0.05 so the average aren't different. And there is no significance difference between scores of intrinsic goal orientation in class E1 and E2.

Table 6. Independent Samples Test of extrinsic goal orientation for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
a7	Equal variances assumed	.064	.801	-.919	38	.364	-.250	.272	-.801	.301
	Equal variances not assumed			-.919	37.759	.364	-.250	.272	-.801	.301
a11	Equal variances assumed	.010	.919	1.748	38	.089	.500	.286	-.079	1.079
	Equal variances not assumed			1.748	37.843	.089	.500	.286	-.079	1.079
a13	Equal variances assumed	.761	.388	-.849	38	.401	-.300	.354	-1.016	.416
	Equal variances not assumed			-.849	37.903	.401	-.300	.354	-1.016	.416
a30	Equal variances assumed	.354	.555	-.936	38	.355	-.150	.160	-.474	.174
	Equal variances not assumed			-.936	37.991	.355	-.150	.160	-.474	.174

Here we used Leven test for equality of variances. As you can see the value of significances are 0/801, 0/919, 0/388, 0/555 and they are more than 0.05 (P-value > 0.05), so we concluded that the variances are equal: $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. Because the variances are equal thus we read first line of the Table 6. Here our significance (2-tailed) are 0/364, 0/089, 0/401, 0/355 and they are greater than 0.05. Whenever these value are smaller than 0.05 statistical average of the classes are different but here the values are more than 0.05 so the average aren't different. And there is no significance different between scores of extrinsic goal orientation in class E1 and E2. Because of the Chapter 4 Volume Restrictions, the following will be dedicated just to the t-test of the scales.

Table 7. Independent Samples Test of Task value for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
a4	Equal variances assumed	.460	.502	.143	38	.887	.050	.351	-.660	.760
	Equal variances not assumed			.143	37.312	.887	.050	.351	-.660	.760

a10	Equal variances assumed	.096	.759	-.204	38	.839	-.050	.245	-.545	.445
	Equal variances not assumed			-.204	37.801	.839	-.050	.245	-.545	.445
a17	Equal variances assumed	.792	.379	-.623	38	.537	-.100	.161	-.425	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			-.623	37.984	.537	-.100	.161	-.425	.225
a23	Equal variances assumed	.035	.853	.214	38	.832	.050	.234	-.423	.523
	Equal variances not assumed			.214	37.989	.832	.050	.234	-.423	.523
a26	Equal variances assumed	1.748	.194	-.383	38	.704	-.100	.261	-.629	.429
	Equal variances not assumed			-.383	37.115	.704	-.100	.261	-.629	.429
a27	Equal variances assumed	1.980	.168	.386	38	.702	.100	.259	-.424	.624
	Equal variances not assumed			.386	37.257	.702	.100	.259	-.425	.625

Here we used Leven test for equality of variances. As you can see the values of significances are more than 0.05 (P-value > 0.05), so we concluded that the variances are equal: $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$. Because the variances are equal thus we read first line of the Table 7. Here our significance (2-tailed) are greater than 0.05. Whenever these value are smaller than 0.05 statistical average of the classes are different but here the values are more than 0.05 so the average aren't different. And there is no significance different between scores of task value in class E1 and E2. It should be noted in both classes tension to the task value are rare.

Table 8. Independent Samples Test of Intrinsic Goal Orientation (posttest) for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
a1	Equal variances assumed	7.490	.009	4.548	38	.000	1.700	.374	.943	2.457
	Equal variances not assumed			4.548	24.243	.000	1.700	.374	.929	2.471
a16	Equal variances assumed	9.022	.005	5.447	38	.000	2.200	.404	1.382	3.018
	Equal variances not assumed			5.447	24.660	.000	2.200	.404	1.368	3.032
a22	Equal variances assumed	21.141	.000	5.356	38	.000	2.400	.448	1.493	3.307
	Equal variances not assumed			5.356	21.400	.000	2.400	.448	1.469	3.331
a24	Equal variances assumed	2.615	.014	5.077	38	.000	1.750	.345	1.052	2.448
	Equal variances not assumed			5.077	32.155	.000	1.750	.345	1.048	2.452

As it can be seen in Table 8 the value of significances are 0/009, 0/005, 0, 0/014 and they are less than 0.05 (P-value > 0.05), so we concluded that the variances aren't equal: $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$. Because the variances aren't equal thus we can conclude there is significant difference in intrinsic goal orientation of two groups.

Table 9. Group Statistics in Intrinsic Goal Orientation scale

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
a1	1.00	20	6.35	.587	.131
	2.00	20	4.65	1.565	.350
a16	1.00	20	6.30	.657	.147
	2.00	20	4.10	1.683	.376
a22	1.00	20	6.65	.489	.109
	2.00	20	4.25	1.943	.435
a24	1.00	20	6.05	.826	.185
	2.00	20	4.30	1.302	.291

As it shown in Table 9 the mean values of group 1 (E1) are significantly more than group 2 (E2). So the E1 had better feeling about Intrinsic Goal Orientation than group 2 (E2). It means that after the course project based instruction had better motivational performance based on intrinsic goal orientation mood of participants.

Table 10. Independent Samples Test of Extrinsic Goal Orientation (posttest) for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
a7	Equal variances assumed	29.428	.012	5.435	38	.000	2.950	.543	1.851	4.049
	Equal variances not assumed			5.435	28.210	.000	2.950	.543	1.839	4.061
a11	Equal variances assumed	3.730	.061	3.296	38	.002	1.300	.394	.502	2.098
	Equal variances not assumed			3.296	31.838	.002	1.300	.394	.497	2.103
a13	Equal variances assumed	17.723	.019	3.069	38	.004	1.800	.586	.613	2.987
	Equal variances not assumed			3.069	27.493	.005	1.800	.586	.598	3.002
a30	Equal variances assumed	15.725	.024	3.644	38	.001	1.700	.467	.756	2.644
	Equal variances not assumed			3.644	21.410	.001	1.700	.467	.731	2.669

As it can be seen in Table 10 the value of significances are 0/012, 0/061, 0/19, 0/024 and they are less than 0.05 (P-value > 0.05), so we concluded that the variances aren't equal: $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$.

Because the variances aren't equal thus we can conclude there is significant difference in extrinsic goal orientation of two groups.

Table 11. Group Statistics in extrinsic Goal Orientation scale

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
a7	1.00	20	6.50	1.100	.246
	2.00	20	3.55	2.164	.484
a11	1.00	20	6.15	.933	.209
	2.00	20	4.85	1.496	.335
a13	1.00	20	6.05	1.146	.256
	2.00	20	4.25	2.359	.528
a30	1.00	20	6.45	.510	.114
	2.00	20	4.75	2.023	.452

As it shown in Table 11 the mean values of group 1 (E1) are significantly more than group 2 (E2). So the E1 had better feeling about extrinsic Goal Orientation than group 2 (E2). It means that after the course project based instruction had better motivational performance based on extrinsic goal orientation mood of participants. Because of the Chapter 4 Volume restrictions, the following will be dedicated just to the t-test of the scales.

Table 12. Independent Samples Test of Task value (posttest) for Class E1 and E2

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
a4	Equal variances assumed	7.734	.008	6.146	38	.000	2.350	.382	1.576	3.124
	Equal variances not assumed			6.146	28.510	.000	2.350	.382	1.567	3.133
a10	Equal variances assumed	7.148	.011	3.859	38	.000	2.200	.570	1.046	3.354
	Equal variances not assumed			3.859	36.434	.000	2.200	.570	1.044	3.356
a17	Equal variances assumed	30.512	.000	5.493	38	.000	2.900	.528	1.831	3.969
	Equal variances not assumed			5.493	23.325	.000	2.900	.528	1.809	3.991
a23	Equal variances assumed	11.181	.002	3.327	38	.002	1.600	.481	.626	2.574
	Equal variances not assumed			3.327	27.588	.002	1.600	.481	.614	2.586
a26	Equal variances assumed	9.951	.003	7.048	38	.000	2.550	.362	1.818	3.282
	Equal variances not assumed			7.048	27.199	.000	2.550	.362	1.808	3.292
a27	Equal variances assumed	8.141	.007	.252	38	.802	.100	.397	-.904	.704
	Equal variances not assumed			-.252	27.095	.803	-.100	.397	-.915	.715

As it can be seen in Table 12 the value of significances less than 0.05 ($P\text{-value} > 0.05$), so we conclude that the variances aren't equal: $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$. Because the variances aren't equal thus we can conclude there is significant difference in task value scale of two groups. The mean values of group 1 (E1) are significantly more than group 2 (E2). So the E1 had better feeling about task value than group 2 (E2). It means that after the course project based instruction had better motivational performance based on task value mood of participants.

4. Conclusion

So after the analysis of the posttest (MSLQ) it can be concluded that:

Project based instruction has significant impact on improving motivation of EFL learners.

Place based instruction doesn't have significant impact on motivation of EFL learners.

There is a significant difference between projects based education and place based education on improving motivation of EFL learners.

The current study aimed at investigating effect of project based education and place based education on motivation of Iranian EFL learners. To achieve this purpose, Students were tested to identify their level and to select the intended participants for the two classes. The participants in two groups received project based instruction and place based instruction by the book *New Interchange* (Richards, 2012). The result of the study revealed that project based instruction was effective on improving the students' motivation. Moreover, by comparing students' mean score pre- and posttest, it was found that level of students' motivation improved with project based method; however, this improvement did reach to the significant level. In terms of motivation scale namely Intrinsic Goal Orientation, Extrinsic Goal Orientation, Task Value, Control of Learning Beliefs, Self-Efficacy for Learning & Performance and Test Anxiety, the results revealed significant improvement at the end of the experiment, indicating that teaching through project based instruction can have a positive effect on students' motivation.

5. Recommendations

Based on MSLQ to improve the motivation the following works can be effective:

- Skim the table of contents of the class textbook or take a look at the course syllabus and make a list of the three topics that most interest you and of the three topics that least interest you. Pay particular attention to these topics. What is it about the three most interesting topics that makes you like them so much? What is it about the other three topics that makes them uninteresting? Can you find any of the characteristics of the three most interesting topics in the three least interesting topics? If you identify what it is about the three most interesting topics that makes you like them so much, you may be able to apply what you found to the three least interesting ones, and perhaps you'll find that those uninteresting topics aren't so uninteresting after all!
- Evaluate your current approach to a course assignment from different points of view. For example, describe the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of your own approach from your own perspective. Then imagine how a classmate might evaluate your approach. By analyzing the way you are tackling an assignment, you may be able to figure out what you're doing right and what you're doing wrong and can change your approach. A better understanding of the way you learn, what works and what doesn't work, may help increase your confidence in doing well in this course.
- Developing better study skills usually results in less anxiety. Prepare well for class and try to complete assignments on time. Try not to wait until the last minute to get things done or to get ready for an exam. Doing this should help build your confidence at test time and hopefully reduce test anxiety. When taking a test, concentrate on one item at a time, and if you're stumped on a question, move on and go back to the question later. Remind yourself that you've prepared well and if you can't answer some questions, it's ok, you'll still be able to answer the others.

References

1. Bound, E. L. O. (1999). *A design for comprehensive school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound.
2. Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary-school-aged children. *Family and consumer sciences research journal*, 33(2), 106-120.
3. Clark, D. (2008). *Learning to make choices for the future: Connecting public lands, schools, and communities through place-based learning and civic engagement*. Center for Placebased Learning and Community Engagement.
4. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(6), 627.
5. Diehl, W., Grobe, T., Lopez, H., & Cabral, C. (1999). *Project-based learning: A strategy for teaching and learning*.
6. Dörnyei, Z. (2010). Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. *Introducing applied linguistics: Concepts and skills*, 3(5), 74-83.

7. Garon-Carrier, G., Boivin, M., Guay, F., Kovas, Y., Dionne, G., Lemelin, J. P., ... & Tremblay, R. E. (2016). Intrinsic motivation and achievement in mathematics in elementary school: A longitudinal investigation of their association. *Child development*, 87(1), 165-175.
8. Georgiou, Y., & Kyza, E. A. (2018). Relations between student motivation, immersion and learning outcomes in location-based augmented reality settings. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89, 173-181.
9. Gottfried, A. E. (1990). Academic intrinsic motivation in young elementary school children. *Journal of Educational psychology*, 82(3), 525.
10. Gregory, G., & Kaufeldt, M. (2015). The motivated brain: Improving student attention, engagement, and perseverance. ASCD.
11. Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American educational research journal*, 40(3), 619-654.
12. Headden, S., & McKay, S. (2015). Motivation Matters: How New Research Can Help Teachers Boost Student Engagement. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
13. Jones, B. F., Rasmussen, C. M., & Moffitt, M. C. (1997). Real-life problem solving: A collaborative approach to interdisciplinary learning. American Psychological Association.
14. Krajcik, J. S., Blumenfeld, P. C., Marx, R. W., & Soloway, E. (1994). A collaborative model for helping middle grade science teachers learn project-based instruction. *The elementary school journal*, 94(5), 483-497.
15. Liulienė, A., & Metiūnienė, R. (2011). Second language learning motivation. *Coactivity: Philology, Educology/Santalka: Filologija, Edukologija*, 14(2), 93-98.
16. Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J. S., Blunk, M., Crawford, B., Kelly, B., & Meyer, K. M. (1994). Enacting project-based science: Experiences of four middle grade teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 94(5), 517-538.
17. Moursund, D. G. (1999). Project-based learning using information technology. Eugene, OR: International society for technology in education.
18. Nurbavliyev, O., Kaymak, S., Almas, A., & Abedi, M. O. (2020, June). The Effect of Project-Based Learning on Students' achievement in Mathematics. In *Proceedings of International Young Scholars Workshop (Vol. 9)*.
19. Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The modern language journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
20. Powers, A. L. (2004). An evaluation of four place-based education programs. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 35(4), 17-32.
21. Shin, M. H. (2018). Effects of Project-based Learning on Students' Motivation and Self-efficacy. *English Teaching*, 73(1).
22. Smith, G. A. (2002). Place-based education: Learning to be where we are. *Phi delta kappan*, 83(8), 584-594.
23. Smith, G., & Sobel, D. (2010). Bring it on home. *Educational Leadership*, 68(1), 38-43.
24. Thomas, J. W., Mergendoller, J. R., & Michaelson, A. (1999). Project based learning for middle school teachers. *Middle School Journal*, 36(2), 28-31.
25. Turner, J. C. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 410-441.