

## **CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATION, AND RECOMMENDATION**

### **5.1. Introduction**

This chapter presents the conclusion of the study, limitations, and recommendations. The first section summarizes the core findings of the study. The second one discusses the implications and the last section presents the recommendations for further study.

### **5.2. Conclusion**

The present research entitled project-based learning practices in the context of academic writing in an Indonesian higher education context. This research investigates the implementation of PjBL in academic writing in Indonesia's higher education context. The main points analyzed in this research include 1) the implementation of PjBL in academic writing, 2) teaching-learning activities indicate the stages of PjBL, and 3) the way students learn academic writing through projects.

The first finding proves that the implementation of PjBL in the Academic Writing course produces two project outputs which in the findings are named as Project 1 and Project 2. The implementation of PjBL in the two projects has several differences including the purpose of the project, the number of activities, and the types of activities. Project 1 aims to help students master the theory of academic writing. Therefore, Project 1 is also called theoretical-orientation which has an output in the form of presentation slides containing academic writing materials. In the process of implementing PjBL in Project 1, seven activities were found including: delivering the learning contract, dividing students into several groups, preparing for the project making, starting the project, consulting the project, presenting the project, and evaluating the students' comprehension. In contrast, project 2 aims to help students implement academic writing theory into real written work. Therefore, Project 2 is also called practical-orientation which has an output in the form of research background writing. In the process of implementing PjBL in Project 2, five activities were found including: explaining project 2, working on the project, consulting the project, submitting the project, and scoring the project.

In addition, the first finding is also designed to identify the causes of differences in the types and amounts of activities in the two projects. The reason for the differences in type and amount of activity is that the lecturer modified the PjBL method he had adopted. The lecturer adjusts the type and number of PjBL activities according to the learning conditions and ultimate learning goals. Unfortunately, the modifications made by lecturers do not refer to the characteristics of PjBL as suggested by experts (Korkmaz and Kaptan cited in Du & Han, 2016) but are based on the lecturer's previous knowledge. The first findings underlined the different activities in the two projects. The differences appeared in the types and quantities of Project-Based Learning (PjBL) activities. The core findings are lecturer modification and lack of expert guidelines. The lecturer's modification was the primary cause of the variations. They adjusted PjBL activities based on specific learning conditions and goals. In addition, the lecturer's modifications were not grounded in established PjBL characteristics outlined by experts. Instead, they relied on the lecturer's personal experience.

The second finding proves that there are five stages of PjBL identified from this implementation. The five stages including preparation stage, information gathering stage, information processing stage, information display stage, and reflection stage (Stoller & Myers, 2019). However, there is an oddity in the implementation, namely the lack of involvement of lecturers in several stages of PjBL such as the lecturer did not involve in the information gathering stage and information processing stage in Project 1. This can happen because of two aspects, namely teacher cognition and teacher autonomy. The first aspect, namely teacher cognition which is influenced by initial knowledge, teaching experience, and educational history, has a major impact on the way teachers modify the PjBL stages. The second aspect, namely teacher autonomy, also has an impact on the implementation of PjBL.

The third finding, related to how students learn Academic Writing through PjBL, is presented in three points. The first point proves that students learn academic skills and non-academic skills during the PjBL implementation process. What is meant by academic skills here is academic writing material consisting of unity, coherence, cohesiveness, avoiding plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting,

summarizing, and developing a good paragraph. While what is meant by non-academic skills here includes supporting skills here are 21st century skills, such as critical thinking, creative thinking, communication, and collaboration. The second point proves that students learn Academic Writing through several activities including reading, making projects and displaying projects. The last point proves that students' academic writing results fluctuate over time. At this point, the researcher analyzed three types of student essays, namely the pre-test essay named as essay 1, the quiz essay named as essay 2, and the research background writing named as essay 3. The results of the analysis of essay 1 showed an average value of 30.8% while essay 2 showed an average value of 27.3% and essay 3 showed an average value of 34.4%.

Furthermore, the third finding is also designed to identify the causes of fluctuate students' writing result. The reason is the teacher's autonomy in choosing essay topics and the time to complete essays, especially in essay 2, which experienced a decrease in value. Students who are less familiar with the topics determined by the teacher are less able to develop their writing ideas. This is exacerbated by the limited time given by the teacher so that students have less time to search for and process information into writing. In essay 1 and essay 2, the time given by the teacher is more or less the same. However, in essay 1 the teacher gives students the freedom to choose their topics. So students tend to write on topics that they master and can complete their writing well in a relatively short time.

### **5.3. Limitation**

This research has several limitations including place of data collection and data collection methods. The first is the place where the data is collected. The data in this research were taken from two Academic Writing classes in the English Language Education study program, at a private university in the city of Kediri. Even though the researcher photographed two different classes, namely class A and class B, both classes were taught by the same lecturer. Thus, the implementation of PjBL reported in this research is less diverse.

Second, the data collection approach is less rigorous. The main data in this research were drawn from classroom observation. However, there were obstacles in collecting observation data because the data collection process was carried out

during the Covid-19 pandemic. There are several health protocols in place to prevent the spread of Covid-19, such as limiting the maximum number of participants in a class. The number of participants in class A has reached the maximum limit determined by the university, so researchers can only take direct observation data in class B.

This study suffers from the quality of being generalized. Thus, this study has no capacity to apply for other contexts. However, with an in depth investigation of a case study, this study should represent other similar contexts. The representation means addressing some of the criteria. Therefore, case studies should be conducted more to represent more precise findings and representative meanings.

In terms of data collection and analysis, some data could be recorded due to technical issues and the pandemic. The researcher should have been well prepared with the equipment necessary to anticipate the conditions of the pandemic. This pandemic limit flexible actions in collecting data. However, the researcher has made use of the available preparation for data collection by observation, interview, and documentation, and data analysis by transcribing, coding, and analyzing the relevant data.

This study is nor representative of the participants in terms of their capability in doing PjBL. There was no preliminary study to find out who has more knowledge and practices in implementing PjBL. this study only focused on a quite random approach by considering that the lecturers follow the recommended policy of teaching from the government that is using a participatory learning approach in which PjBL is one of those approaches.

#### **5.4. Implications**

The implications of this study address the theoretical and practical issues. Theoretically, first, this study tried to prove if PjBL is the right and convenient concept for teaching language. **This study indicates..**

**Second, this study contributes to the development of PjBL. Some modifications may be necessary to cater to the teaching objectives, students' need, and the nature of the learning content. This study indicates that ...**

Third, this study contributes to the development of PjBL for language teaching and learning. This study indicates ...

Practically, this study suggests that for practical reasons teachers have a crucial role. This study indicates ... (masukan teacher belief and cognition). Further recommendation is that sustainable teacher training should be conducted to keep the teachers well informed and updated with current practices of PjBL.

In addition, practically, policy formulation should consider research findings to see how methods and approaches of teaching work for certain content areas. Therefore, more case studies should be conducted to inform policy makers.

### 5.5. Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, several things are suggested. First, educators, especially language teachers, are highly recommended to adopt this project-based learning models in teaching and learning activities that cover preparation, information gathering, information processing, project display, and reflections (Fredricka L Stoller & Myers, 2019). This model has proven effective in increasing learning motivation, creativity, and students' understanding of the material being taught.

Second, for future researchers, it is suggested to conduct further studies on the limitations of modifications that can be made to the project-based learning model. This is important to ensure that the essence of this model is maintained, while allowing for innovations that are appropriate to different learning contexts. This study also provides insight into the references for modifying PjBL. The findings show that teachers have been modifying PjBL based on old knowledge that teachers already have and based on learning needs. In theory, modifications must refer to the existing characteristics of the PjBL (Korkmaz and Kaptan in Du & Han, 2016). The PjBL characteristics are student-centered, emphasizing students' autonomy, constructive investigations, goal-setting, cooperation, communication, and reflection within real-world contexts (Kokotsaki et al., 2016).

Finally, to support the successful implementation of the project-based learning, it is suggested that teachers actively participate in relevant and sustainable

training. This training will equip teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to design, implement, and evaluate effective learning projects. In accordance with the findings, the implementation of PjBL in the field is greatly influenced by teacher cognition and teacher autonomy. The first aspect, namely teacher cognition which is influenced by initial knowledge, teaching experience, and educational history, has a major impact on the way teachers modify the PjBL stages. The second aspect, namely teacher autonomy, also has an impact on the implementation of PjBL.