

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter presents the study's conclusion and recommendation based on the data reported in the preceding chapter Chapter IV discusses the findings and discussion in further detail. This chapter is divided into four sections: conclusions, implications, limitations, and recommendations. The first section, the conclusion, summarizes the entire result of this study concerning the research topics. The implication describes the incriminations and the suggestions related to the findings. The limitation explains the restraint of the study, and the recommendation section summarizes the request for additional specialist research on the connected topic.

5.1 Conclusion

This study aimed to answer two research questions; 1) How does teacher scaffolding contribute to the process of Joint Construction? 2) What kinds of cognitive engagement are involved in the process of Joint Construction?. The result of the answer to the all research questions can be presented below.

Regarding research question number 1 as indicated in Chapter 4, the results showed that the usage of teacher scaffolding in Joint Construction was well described by teacher. It referred to the frequency of teacher scaffolding to control the role of the teacher through the process of Joint Construction and teacher-students interaction dealing with promoting cognitive engagement. Based on data observation, it reveals that teacher scaffolding was effective to support Joint Construction stages. It happens when the teacher limits her ability to ask simple questions about the students' written work. The dominant category of teacher scaffolding from the 1st–8th meeting was increased prospectiveness. This component accounted for 23% of the percentage. The teacher desired at this point to concentrate on students' opportunities to answer questions during constructing text together. The teacher always gave students simple questions to link students' prior knowledge to catch students' attention on the writing activity. Additionally, the teacher distributed different teacher scaffolding categories

in every stage of Joint Construction, and the categories of teacher scaffolding helped the teacher to achieve learning goals in every stage.

Regarding research question number 2 as shown in the Chapter 4, the results pointed out that Joint Construction was able to improve students' cognitive engagement through teacher scaffolding. Throughout the learning process, 587 teacher-student interactions were observed. Based on the data provided, it was proved that teacher scaffolding in all levels of Joint Construction provided much more space for students' cognitive engagement. Promoting students' cognitive engagement is also visible and felt in all meetings that demonstrated various cognitive engagement categories. The majority of students' cognitive engagement categories are collaboration and deep understanding, indicating that they made an attempt to actively participate in writing class in order to gain prior knowledge of the text type covered during the learning process. It was discovered that the dominating categories of students' cognitive involvement that appeared may captivate students in writing activities and make them enjoy generating text together. At this stage, using Joint Construction to educate students how to write a decent text was an effective method. As implied by the title, this research assessed the use of Joint Construction to improve students' cognitive engagement.

In addition, the result of the interview reflected teacher's statement that she enjoyed teaching through Joint Construction. The data of the interview showed that the process of Joint Construction was a good way to support students to produce a text. The teacher could help students to construct a text together as their practice, so that, students were able to produce a good text. Following the result of the interview, the results for an observation revealed that the use of Joint Construction improved students' cognitive engagement in a writing activity. The teacher declared that she can be closer with her students through Joint Construction. It was in line with the observation data that Joint Construction enhanced teacher-students interaction. Therefore, the teacher had a chance to build communication with her students by giving simple questions to create collaboration between teacher and students to get a deep understanding since the teacher could touch them closer. Additionally, Joint

Construction did not only improve students' cognitive engagement but also improved students' skills in writing.

In conclusion, using the Joint Construction strategy in teaching writing in conjunction with students' writing performance may increase students' cognitive engagement and result in positive improvements. However, choosing and using appropriate materials may get different results of cognitive engagement, and the way how teachers deliver material may also get different results in all stages of Joint Construction. Therefore, the use of Joint Construction is dependent on the teacher's power to control classroom activity and how the teacher delivers materials to students.

5.2 Implication

According to Fedricks et al. (2004), student cognitive engagement refers to how students participate in class by attending, asking and answering questions, having excellent learning motivation, and using cognitive and metacognitive approaches in thinking and learning. It is in line with the result of the second research question that there were fifteen categories of cognitive engagement that appeared during the learning process. However, there were only two of the highest dominant categories appeared – collaboration and deep understanding, and then the two highest percentages followed up the other categories. From this finding, the teacher is expected to achieve all cognitive engagement categories in every process of Joint Construction since incorporating students in learning (e.g. group discussion and group work) can make them active to find flexibility in problem solving during classroom activity (Fedricks et al., 2004). When students are coped with it, the students' cognitive engagement occurs.

Furthermore, the second research question was more precise in terms of what cognitive engagement categories that used by students at each stage of Joint Construction — bridging, text negotiation, and review. From one stage to the next, the teacher intended the entire quantity of students' cognitive engagement percentage to be balanced. As a result of the 8 meetings observation, it was discovered that as the

overall amount of cognitive engagement categories decreased, so did the interaction between teacher and students. It resulted in monotonous learning activities for both teachers and students. Based on the interview section with the teacher, it was also found that several reasons for cognitive engagement categories appearing were not optimal in every stage of Joint Construction. It happened because the teacher put much attention on text negotiation which was the main stage of Joint Construction. The teacher did not even aware of the review stage. Thus, in teaching and learning activities, the teacher is expected to put balanced attention to the amount of interaction in every stage of Joint Construction and maintenance students' cognitive engagement to make the process of Joint Construction more effective.

5.3 Limitation of the Study

The first limitation of this study is catching up with the teacher during research due to different locations. The teacher was in Padalarang, while the researcher was in Bandar Lampung. To address this limitation, the researcher and teacher agreed to communicate via *Whatsapp* and *Zoom Meeting* if there was an issue while collecting data. The second limitation was that the data were collected only in 6 weeks (February 10th-March 18th). Besides, the total meetings in this study were only eight, which meant the findings were quite limited in representing the whole problems that would occur. This study was also conducted online, beginning with the interventional program, followed by the observation and interview sections. It made the researcher's exploration of the challenges less than desirable.

5.4 Recommendations

As previously stated, there are various recommendations for a more extensive and substantial study in this field. To begin, this study focused on one teacher, who was chosen as one of the major subjects of the study based on a set of criteria. The researcher was introduced to the teacher of the interventional program. As she was a participant and had prior teaching experience, the teacher was a reasonable option for the research subject, allowing for more valid data to be acquired.

Second, because this study is focused on students' ability to write a written text, future researchers may focus on other components of education, such as the teaching method and teacher-student interaction during a learning activity. It makes sense that several experts discovered research indicating that Joint Construction has a good teaching strategy for students' English writing ability.

Third, future researchers are suggested to use other engagements such as; behavioral and emotional or set of criteria cognitive engagement categories to ascertain the students' improvement in both engagement and writing ability via Joint Construction. This makes sense, as several of the current categories were not lack of discovered during the learning process. This may result in less accurate data. Therefore, further research relating to Joint Construction is highly suggested to fill the gap in this research.