CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the methodology of the study based on the reviewed literature in Chapter 2. The discussion will begin with the elaboration of the design of this study, that is, case study with its characteristics underlying this study (Creswell, 2012; Malik & Hamied, 2014; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2003) and the participants and the site of the study. The discussion continues with the descriptions and procedures of data collections and data analyses that were conducted to achieve the purposes of the study, that is, to find out (1) whether a CGBA can help develop the tertiary EFL students' academic writing, critical thinking, and character in Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia and (2) in what ways a CGBA can help develop the aforementioned aspects.

3.2 Research Design

This study applied a case study to find out (1) whether a CGBA can help develop academic writing, critical thinking, and character of the first-year tertiary EFL students in Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia and (2) in what ways a CGBA can help develop the aforementioned aspects. A case study was chosen for three factors.

First, this study involved a single case, a small group of the research subject (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2005; Creswell, 2012; Farquhar, 2012; Gerring, 2007; Malik & Hamied, 2014; Marczyk, DeMatteo, & Festinger, 2005; Nock, Michel, & Photos, 2007; VanWynsberghe & Khan, 2008; Yin, 2003). The case was a group of tertiary EFL students of a private university in Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia. A single case is sufficient for this study because the case is special and represents a significant contribution to the knowledge and theory building (Rowley, 2002; Scholz & Tietje, 2002), in this case, to enrich the literature of the CGBA to teaching academic writing, developing CT, and building character that are still limited in the Indonesian context (Emilia, 2005,

Hardini, 2013). Furthermore, the results of this study are not meant for generalisation (Flyvbjerg, 2006; VanWynsberghe & Khan, 2008).

Second, the study used multiple sources of evidence (Swanborn, 2010; Yin, 2011). The multiple sources of evidence were collected from participant observation field notes, students' writings, students' responses to the questionnaire, and interview transcripts that will be discussed further in Section 3.4.

Third, the study used text analysis to analyse textual data (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2011; Travers, 2001). Thematic analysis was applied in the text analysis to analyse textual data collected from the participant observation field notes, students' responses to the questionnaire, and interview transcripts (a further discussion is in Section 3.5).

The students' writings were analysed using SFG (a further discussion is in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2) which is a powerful tool for text analysis (Banks, 2002). The results of the text analysis served as an explanation building (Yin, 2003) to find out how the CGBA can help develop the students' academic writing, CT, and character.

In relation to the reliability of this study, the case study protocol, namely the procedures of the data collections, including the case study database (see Section 3.4), and ethical consideration involved, and precaution taken (see Section 3.4.1) as suggested by Yin (2010, p. 84) will be described in the following sections.

3.3 Site and Participants of the Study

This study was conducted in the Department of English education under the Faculty of Language and Art Education of a private institute of teacher training and education that is located in Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia. In addition, the institution, before upgraded to institute in 2014, was a college since it was established in 1981. The institute prepares the tertiary students to be teachers and provides ten different programmes that can be chosen by the prospective students. The students are mainly from the regencies in West Kalimantan. In certain occasions, prospective students are also coming from Riau islands and Java.

English education department was chosen because of some reasons. First, the researcher is a lecturer in the English education department since it was first established in 2009. Being the lecturer in the department provides some benefits, such as naturalistic data and respondents are more accessible and better in producing 'emic' accounts. However, it also has a drawback that needs to be paid attention, that is, a researcher may lose the skill to produce neutral, 'etic' accounts. As a result, collaborators were involved in this study to overcome the issue (Trowler, 2011, p. 2). A further discussion is available in Section 3.4.1.

Second, a higher educational institution was chosen because academic writing is the focus of higher education in Indonesia (Bramantyo, 2013; The Directorate General of Higher Education, 2012) and the requirement to finish an undergraduate study is the students have to write their theses. The students who are not aware of academic writing, specifically, the genre of academic writing will find it difficult to write their thesis. The last reason is that higher education can serve as the place to promote critical thinking (Chaffee, 2012) and build good character (Colby, 2002).

This study was conducted in the second semester of academic year 2014/2015 that involved thirty-seven first-year tertiary EFL students from a regular class. The regular class enabled this study to conduct participant observations in a natural setting to gain understanding (Malik & Hamied, 2014, p. 202). A further discussion of the data collection is in Section 3.4.

The first-year tertiary EFL students were selected as the participants of this study because of some reasons. First, some studies showed that academic writing can be introduced to the first-year tertiary students (Downs & Wardle, 2007; Laura Jones, 2011). Second, the tertiary students should be active rather than passive as they have learning needs such as CT, communication skills, self-directed learning, and ability to work collaboratively; and by using these learning needs, they can gain life experiences to be useful people in the society (Carpino, Ugalde, & Gow, 2014, p. 65; Merriam, 2001, p. 5).

Third, the participants are prospective teachers that will teach the English language to the students in the context of secondary education especially teaching literacy skills that are still considered low (Mahmud, 2016). As a result, they need to master not only the genre of academic writing but also any other genres that are required to be taught to the students. The knowledge and skills of CT and character values related to academic writing will be useful for them to be applied in their teaching to develop their students' CT and character that are required by the national curriculum (Balitbang Puskur, 2010).

The participants in this study have two characteristics. First, the participants who were involved in this study had accomplished basic writing subject in the first semester as a requirement to take academic writing subject. The basic writing subject covers the sentence and paragraph writing development that includes descriptive, recount, and narrative forms (see Appendix 3 for the syllabus). The syllabus for the academic writing subject is available in Appendix 4.

Second, the participants were heterogeneous based on their age, sexes, and areas of origin. Having a natural setting and heterogeneous participants enabled this study to study things as they are without manipulating the environment where ordinary events and behaviours are studied in their everyday context (Norum, 2008). In particular, the ages of the participants were between 18-23 years old with twelve male participants and twenty-five female participants dominated the class where they came from various areas in West Kalimantan. The following table presents the areas of origin of the participants who were involved in this study (the complete data are available in Appendix 1.1).

Table 3.1 Participants' Area of Origin

Area of Origin	Number of Students
Pontianak	6
Kubu Raya	1
Mempawah	1
Singkawang	2
Sambas	8
Bengkayang	1
Landak	4
Sanggau	4
Sintang	2
Melawi	3
Ketapang	1
Kayong Utara	0
Kapuas Hulu	4
Total	37

Table 3.1 shows that the participants were from twelve regencies out of thirteen regencies in West Kalimantan. Unfortunately, this study did not address the students' ethnicities and languages. Nevertheless, in general, the students from the twelve areas or regencies have two major ethnics, namely Malay and Dayak (Arkanudin, 2012).

Malay and Dayak languages are commonly used by the people in their daily life to communicate with each other. Mother tongues are used when they communicate with the people from the same ethnic. In the campus, the students communicate with each other by using the Malay and Indonesian languages. The English and Indonesian languages are used mainly by the students and the lecturer during the teaching and learning activities in the classroom.

3.4 Data Collections

The data collections were conducted by using multiple instruments as required in a case study (Johansson, 2003; Runeson & Höst, 2009; Yin, 2013). The procedures of the data collections began with conducting participant observations,

documenting the students' writing, distributing open-ended questionnaires to the students, and interviewing the students at the end of the teaching program. The complete procedures are elaborated below.

3.4.1 Participant Observation

The first thing to do in the data collection was conducting participant observations. The participant observations are useful to study a small group of research subject (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) that enabled the researcher to obtain 'unique insight' of the case (Lacono, Brown, & Holtham, 2009). In this study, the researcher was the participant observer where the researcher took part in the activities (Kawulich, 2005; Whyte, 1979), in this case, as a lecturer.

Personally, before the year 2014, the researcher was accustomed to the process approach and had used several strategies based on the approach to the teaching of writing. In 2014, the researcher applied to UPI as a doctoral student. This changed the perspectives of the researcher. The researcher learned for the first time the fields of SFL, SFG, and SFL GBA which are the aspects underlying this study. With the guidance of the lecturers at UPI, the researcher confident enough to apply the aspects in this study. The researcher realised that this study is far from perfect and needed feedback for the betterment of the findings this study.

The participant observations focused on the teacher's and students' activities during the teaching and learning processes in the classroom (Allwright & Hanks, 2009) in relation to the application of CGBA to teaching academic writing, CT, and character as suggested in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.3.3 about the basic principles of the CGBA. The participant observations were conducted in nineteen meetings in one semester with each meeting lasted 150 minutes. The observations were recorded in the field notes (see Appendix 6).

In addition, some sessions were audiotaped. The audiotaped sessions were used to provide samples of the dialogue of the students with the lecturer in the form of excerpts (see Chapter 4). A limitation of audiotape is it has no visual clues that

could be used to enrich the data of participant observations (Garcez, Duarte, & Eisenberg, 2011).

The field notes are documentation of the observation (Altheide, 1996; Creswell, 2012; Newbury, 2001; Wolfinger, 2002). The documentation was conducted after each session of the observation ends. Information that is relevant to the study was documented in the field notes descriptively — descriptions of events, people, activities; and reflective-personal thoughts (Creswell, 2012, p. 217).

The presence of the researcher as an observer here could create considerable effects on the results of the observations such as biases that are resulted from the viewpoints of the observer. To reduce the biases, the researcher involved collaborators in checking the researcher's and the collaborator's viewpoints towards the results of the observations (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011; Millis, 1992).

The study involved two collaborators who were senior students from the sixth semester. The names of the collaborators are Ara and Saidi (in pseudonym). The involvement of the collaborators enabled this study to reduce biases from the viewpoints of the researcher and the collaborators (see the examples of the field notes filled by the researcher in Appendix 12.1 and the examples of the field notes filled by the collaborators in Appendix 12.2).

Having two collaborators also helped to make sure there is no absence of the collaborator at each meeting where the collaborators were asked to schedule their time and take turns to attend the meeting. However, a limitation of the participant observations was identified, that is, the collaborators were students who have limited knowledge or capacity in conducting an observation and were not familiar with the subject matter unlike faculty members who have better access to the subject matter (Millis, 1992).

To cope with the issue of limited capacity in conducting an observation, this study conducted three activities. First, a pre-observation meeting. The collaborators were introduced to the objectives and the form of the field notes and what to do during the observation (see appendix 6 for the sample of the form of the field notes with the brief guideline). The pre-observation meeting was conducted as a form of

training to provide the collaborators with the knowledge and skills needed to conduct the observation. Second, the collaborators conducted the observations and filled key information to the provided field notes during the observations. Third, post-observation, that is, clarifying the result of the observations conducted by the researcher and the collaborators (adopted from Sheal, 1989).

The post-observation meeting functioned to maintain the quality of the data where the researcher and the collaborators discussed the students' responses and activities during the teaching and learning activities followed by the researcher filled the field notes based on the researcher's observations and discussions with the collaborators.

In relation to the ethical conduct of the observations, the researcher and the collaborators were required to be friendly and respect the participants and the site of the study. Accordingly, at the end of the study, the researcher and the collaborators thanked the participants and informed them the use of the data and the availability of a summary of results when the study is completed (Creswell, 2012, pp. 216–217; McGinn, 2010).

The observation activities are briefly described in Table 3.2 following the teaching procedures of the CGBA as follows:

Table 3.2 Teaching Procedures of the Critical Genre-based Approach

Stages	Academic Writing	**CT Activities	**CB Activities
Introduction to the teaching program (Meeting 1)	An introduction to the purpose of the study followed by distributions of the diagnostic test and the open-ended questionnaire to assess the students' prior knowledge and skills of academic writing, CT, and character values.		
Introduction to CT and character (Meeting 2-3)	The students were introduced to CT skills and dispositions; and the expected character values in the academic writing practices including a brief introduction to the ethics of academic writing that are required in the academic writing practices.		
Introduction to SFL, SFL GBA, and SFG (Meeting 4-5)	The students were introduced to the basic concept of SFL, SFL GBA, and SFG. The introduction also covered how language can reflect CT skills and dispositions; and the ethics of academic writing.		
Teaching cycle I (Meeting 6-15)			
Building knowledge of the field (this stage or	The students worked collaboratively with their friends or peers and with the	The students did an inquiry with their friends and	The students learned to work with their friends or peers by building their

Stages	Academic Writing	**CT Activities	**CB Activities
activity occurred in every teaching stage of the CGBA — modelling, joint construction, and independent construction stages)	guidance of the lecturer in building their knowledge of a given topic before they worked independently in the independent construction stage with less guidance from the researcher as the lecturer (adapted from Feez, 2002)	independently to construct their ideas based on the topic given followed by reasoning to construct their arguments (adapted from Lipman, 2003, pp. 180-184).	sense of diligence, care and respect, and responsibility to reach a mutual goal, that is, building their knowledge of the topic given to them with the guidance of the lecturer before they were considered ready to construct their own knowledge on a certain topic. (adapted from Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Lumpkin, 2008)
Modelling	The lecturer introduced the schematic structure and linguistic features of the argumentative writing — an exposition genre.	The lecturer introduced how to organise the arguments into meaningful units, i.e. schema — argumentative writing by using proper language features (adapted from Lipman, 2003, pp. 180-184). To construct valid arguments, the intellectual standards were introduced. The intellectual standards are: clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth, logic, fairness (Elder & Paul, 2010).	The lecturer introduced the ethics of academic writing to the students through model texts and provided the style that should be used in their academic writing, that is, APA style to build their sense of honesty and responsibility and to strengthen their arguments in an ethical way. At the same time, in the learning and teaching activities, the students and their friends or peers internalised the character values that were built in the building knowledge of the field stage by observing the character values of his/her own, friends, the lecturer, and from the texts given to them. Then, the lecturer, their friends, and themselves reinforced what is right and what is wrong. (adapted from Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Lumpkin, 2008)
Joint construction	The lecturer asked the students to write a particular	The students learned to practise the	The students learned to construct their arguments

Stages	Academic Writing	**CT Activities	**CB Activities
	text based on the knowledge related to the topic and the genre that they had learned from the previous stage. Their peers provided feedback by using revision and editing forms to make their writings better followed by the lecturer's feedback (adapted from Emilia, 2012).	intellectual standards to provide clear, accurate, specific, and relevant information and evidence; and organise the arguments with the information and evidence in a logical manner by using proper language features (adapted from Lipman, 2003, pp. 180-184). The lecturer and peers provided feedback regarding the organisation of the arguments and the quality of the students' CT by using the intellectual standards that were introduced in the modelling stage.	by providing the required information and evidence in an ethical way by applying the ethics of academic writing where they recorded and cited the information and evidence in the form of citations. This application built the students' sense of honesty and responsibility. The lecturer and peers provided feedback to check whether they could perform or realise the character values through their academic writing and questionnaire (moral action) (adapted from Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Lumpkin, 2008)
Independent construction	The lecturer introduced a new topic. At this stage, the students were required to build their own knowledge of the topic followed by writing the text independently with less guidance from the lecturer (adapted from Emilia, 2012). The peers provided feedback by using revision and editing forms to make their writings better followed by the lecturer's feedback (adopted from Emilia, 2012).	The students learned to practise CT skills and dispositions or intellectual standards independently. The lecturer and peers provided feedback regarding the organisation of the arguments and the quality of the students' critical thinking through the application of the intellectual standards that were introduced in the modelling stage.	The students learned to practise the character values through the application of the ethics of academic writing in their writings independently with a less guidance from the lecturer. The lecturer and peer provided feedback to check whether they could perform character values or realise character values through their academic writing and questionnaire (moral action). (adapted from Lickona & Davidson, 2005; Lumpkin, 2008)
Teaching cycle II (Meeting 16-19)			
Building	The student built their	The students applied	The students recorded the

Stages	Academic Writing	**CT Activities	**CB Activities
knowledge of the field	knowledge on a new topic provided by the lecturer independently.	the intellectual standards to provide valid arguments.	relevant information and evidence required to build trustworthy of their academic writing
Independent construction	The students constructed their academic writing by following the schematic structure of an exposition text with its linguistic features independently.

To improve their academic writing, the students mainly received peer feedback. (adapted from Feez, 2002) | The students independently organise the arguments with the information and evidence in a logical manner.

To improve their quality of CT skills and dispositions — intellectual standards, the students mainly received peer feedback. | The students applied the ethics of academic writing independently where they cited the recorded relevant information and evidence to build trustworthy of their academic writing.

To improve their application of the ethics of academic writing, the students mainly received peer feedback. |

* The CB and CB activities described are adapted from the SFL GBA model (Feez, 2002, p. 66)

Table 3.2 shows that the first meeting was used as an introduction to the purpose of the study followed by a distribution of a diagnostic test and a background questionnaire to assess the students' prior knowledge and skills of academic writing, CT, and character values. In the second meeting and the third meeting, an introduction to CT, expected character values in the academic writing practices, and ethics of academic writing was conducted as this study adapts the mixed approach (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.3).

There are two reasons why this study adapts the mixed approach. First, general CT skills and dispositions can be transferred towards a subject, in this case, academic writing (Ennis, 1989). Two introductory sessions to CT and character were used in this study to introduce the students to the CT skills, dispositions, and also character values expected in this study that were then applied in the academic writing practices (a further discussion is in Chapter 4, Section 4.3.1).

Second, explicit teaching is more preferable (Facione, Giancarlo, & Facione, 1995; Marin & Halpern, 2011) as it has more positive impacts on improving critical thinking (Swartz & McGuinness, 2014). Explicit teaching has also been emphasised

in the SFL GBA (see Section 2.4.3.1). Explicit teaching means that the CT skills and dispositions are explicitly learned through the academic writing activities. Accordingly, apart from having the introductory sessions to CT and character, the students also learn to apply CT skills and dispositions in the academic writing activities.

The introductory sessions to CT and character values were followed by introductory sessions to the concept of SFL, SFL GBA, and SFG in the fourth and the fifth meeting. After that, two teaching cycles of the exposition genre as suggested by Knapp & Watkins (1994, 2005) were implemented as an introduction to argumentative writing at the tertiary level of education (see Chapter 4 for the complete description of the activities of the teaching program). Moreover, the activities described in the table are adapted from the SFL GBA model (Feez, 2002, p. 66).

3.4.2 Students' Writings

During the participant observations, students' writings were documented. The documentation was necessary to collect data that cannot be gained from the observations. In the interest of space, the students' independently-constructed texts in teaching cycle I were not selected to be analysed. To cope with the limitation, the researcher considered four aspects, namely authenticity, credibility, representativeness, and meaning in selecting the students' texts to be analysed.

Seven students' writings or written texts were collected that included three diagnostic texts and one jointly-constructed text that were constructed in the teaching cycle I; and three independently-constructed texts that were constructed in the teaching cycle II. The documents were considered to be authentic and credible works of the students (see Chapter 5 for the discussion of the analyses of the students' texts).

The students' texts were represented by three different levels of writing skills of the students based on the analysis of their diagnostic texts, that is, low, mid, and high. Mr. Hafis, a colleague of the researcher, was involved as a rater in

categorising the students' levels of writing skills. The description of each level is provided below (see Appendix 1.2 for the list of the participants along with their categories).

Table 3.3 The Description of the Level of the Students' Writing Skills

Category	Description
Low Achiever	Many attempts to communicate an idea. However, the attempts failed or very limited due to limited control of schematic structure and linguistic features of an exposition text followed by limited word choices, cohesive devices, sentence structures, and many grammatical mistakes.
Mid Achiever	The attempts to communicate an idea were limited and sometimes failed due to limited control of schematic structure and linguistic features of an exposition text followed by limited word choices, cohesive devices, sentence structures, and many grammatical mistakes.
High Achiever	The attempts to communicate an idea were limited and sometimes lost the focus due to limited control of schematic structure and linguistic features of an exposition text followed by limited word choices, cohesive devices, sentence structures, and many grammatical mistakes.

Table 3.3 shows that even though the students were categorised into low, mid, and high achievers, the description of each level has many common issues in academic writing where the analysis of the diagnostic texts will reveal that the students had limited control over the schematic structure and linguistic features of the exposition genre (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2).

Nevertheless, the students could develop their knowledge and skills of academic writing, CT, and character values related to academic writing through the application of the CGBA that allowed them to have better control of the schematic structure and linguistic features as will be revealed by the analysis of the jointly-constructed text (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3) and the analysis of the independently-constructed texts (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4)

Moreover, having three groups enabled this study to see the strength and weaknesses of the participants where teaching stages of SFL GBA with explicit teaching, group work activities, and a recursive process of academic writing that includes the lecturer and peer feedback were applied to make sure the participants

could reach the desired goal of this study, surely by paying attention to the three important aspects of this study, namely academic writing, CT, and character development. To address the meanings of the documents, this study applied SFG as a tool to interpret the documents (adapted from Raptis, 2010), which has been discussed earlier in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.

3.4.3 Students' Responses to the Questionnaire

After the participant observation, the students' responses to the questionnaire were collected. The questionnaire is a "data-gathering technique that collects, through written self-reports, either quantitative or qualitative information from an individual unit [e.g., a child, group, school, community] regarding the unit's knowledge, beliefs, opinions, or attitudes about or towards a phenomenon under investigation" (Chasteauneuf, 2010, p. 768).

This questionnaire applied open-ended items in which there is a set of questions to guide the students to provide their critical reflections. The questionnaire serves two different purposes as described in the following paragraphs.

First, a background or initial questionnaire was given to the students at the beginning of the study to find out the students' prior knowledge and perceptions of academic writing, CT, and character. There are ten items in the questionnaire that assess the students' knowledge and their performance in writing, the genres that they had learned, their perceptions of CT, CB, and their expectations from the teaching program (see Appendix 8.1 for the example of the background questionnaire).

Second, a self-reflective questionnaire was given to the students at the end of every teaching stage to provide reflections regarding the application of the CGBA. There are six items in the questionnaire that assess the students' learning experiences including their friends' or peers' learning experiences in the academic writing, CT and character value practices; and the lecturer's performance as the role model of good academic writing, CT, and character values (see Appendix 8.2 for the example of the questionnaire).

The weaknesses of the questionnaire as a data collection instrument is that the students' responses can be incomplete and to cover that, another instrument is required, that is, interview (Chasteauneuf, 2010). Here, the questionnaire serves as a preliminary data for the in-depth data collection using interview (Boyce & Neale, 2006; DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Harris & Brown, 2010; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Swanborn, 2010; D. W. Turner, 2010).

3.4.4 Interview

At the end of the teaching program, interview sessions were conducted. Interview is "a process of seeking knowledge and understanding through conversation" (Barlow, 2010, p. 495). The type of the interview that was used in this study is a semi-structured interview. The semi-structured interview used some predetermined questions that can evolve during the interview session (see Appendix 9). The goal of the interview is to obtain insights from the participants' experiences towards the application of the CGBA in developing the students' academic writing, CT, and character.

A limitation of interview is a hierarchical relationship of the researcher as the interviewer with the participants which could create a possibility to please the researcher (Boyce & Neale, 2006; DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Emilia, 2005). Accordingly, due to the benefits reached from the participant observations by looking at the collaborators' readiness in participating in this study, the researcher involved five senior students in conducting the interview to reduce the possibility to please the researcher. Two of the interviewers were already familiar with the study as they had involved as collaborators in the participant observations. The names of the interviewers are Ana, Nopi, Adit, Valen, and Ara (in pseudonym).

In order to make sure the interview could run effectively, this study introduced the interviewers to the basic concept of interview. First, the interview objectives, procedures, and ethical issues were introduced to the interviewers, including a written guideline was given to them to help them to conduct an interview (see appendix 9). Second, a try-out of the interview questions with one student from

the participants was conducted secretly to find any confusing or irrelevant items. After the try-out, from seventeen items in the interview questions, four items were modified and two questions were added to the list (see appendix 9).

Skill-building exercises on interviewing and interpersonal communication where a demonstration on how to do the interview was conducted at the same time during the try-out. Unfortunately, the interview practices were not conducted because of a limited time. However, before the real sessions of the interview were conducted, the researcher himself opened the interview sessions by giving one to two questions to the participants before the senior students as interviewers to give them time to see how a real interview is conducted (the procedures were adapted from Boyce & Neale, 2006, p. 6).

The interviews were conducted in individual and focus group settings to provide information that could be compared and contrasted (adapted from Barlow, 2010; Boyce & Neale, 2006; Fraenkel et al., 2011). The students were selected based on the results of the analysis of their diagnostic texts, the sexes of the students, the researcher's observations on their performance in writing, and the student attendance records.

Individual interview sessions were conducted with six participants, consisted of three male and three female students. The students were Desi, Heri, Aan, Saly, and Ani (their names are in pseudonym) who represented the mid achievers. Elias represented the high achievers. The main reason for mainly selecting mid achievers was the low achievers and high achievers who were earlier selected to be interviewees did not come to the class and there were no possibilities that they would come the following week. As a result, the researcher selected the students who attended the class by considering other aspects (the results of the analysis of their diagnostic texts, the sexes of the students, the researcher's observations on their performance in writing, and the student attendance records). Nevertheless, the low achiever voices were facilitated in the focus group interview session.. Even though the students were in the same category but their progress in the teaching program was different.

The limitation of the selection criteria was the individual interviews did not facilitate the low achiever voices and the numbers of the students in every category were not equal. Nevertheless, the low and high achiever voices were facilitated in the focus group interview session as indicated below.

Ten participants, consisted of five male and five female students, involved in a focus group session. They were Sarah — her texts were analysed and discussed in Chapter 5, Dila, and Liman (low achievers); Hillary, Susi, and Ardi (high achievers); and Aldi, Arfi, Agung, and Karin (mid achievers). This time, the focus group interview could facilitate the voices of the low and mid achievers even though the numbers of the students in every group were unequal as there were limited numbers of the students who were in low-achieving and high-achieving levels.

The limitation of the focus group interview was the students' responses might have been influenced by other students who had already provided their responses earlier (Milena, Dainora, & Alin, 2008). Nevertheless, the students offered additional comments once they heard the earlier responses (Fraenkel et al., 2011). A week after the interview sessions, two individual interview sessions were conducted with Aan and Ani to test the reliability of the students' verbalisation.

There were two things that the interviewers paid attention in conducting the interview. First, before the interview session, the interviewer informed the participants that their name and the records of the interviews remained classified and used only for this study. Second, during the interview, the interviewer showed respect to the participants, asked the same questions in different ways if needed, asked the participants to repeat their answer when necessary, varied who controlled the flows of communication, and avoided leading questions (Fraenkel et al., 2011, pp. 454–455). The interview sessions were recorded by using a digital sound recorder and then the records were transcribed verbatim as interview transcripts to be analysed qualitatively (Creswell, 2012).

3.4.5 Ethical Considerations involved and precaution taken

The main ethical consideration in a case study research is protecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants (Greenaway, 2011). The data collection should be ethical and it should respect individuals and sites (Creswell, 2012). As the research was conducted in the classroom setting, it was the researcher's responsibility to hold the students' educational interests paramount as it provides an important perspective when considering ethical issues for research in teaching and learning (MacLean & Poole, 2010).

Accordingly, the study had applied the ethical considerations as follows: (1) the identity of the participants and the site of the study are strictly confidential; (2) the researcher asked permission to the Head of English education department of the private institute in Pontianak to conduct a data collection on the site of the study; and (3) the researcher respected any objection before, during, and after the research from the participants regarding the procedures and/or data that were collected and described in the informed consent (adapted from Xiangli, 2008). The consent form is available in Appendix 2.

To avoid an unnecessary event, this study conducted two things as a form of precaution as follows: (1) had lines of communication between the researcher, the participants, and the institute's officers; and (2) the researcher communicated the data collection process to the Head of English Education Department of the private institute in Pontianak.

3.5 Data Analysis

Four data sets were analysed qualitatively, namely the observation field notes, students' responses to the open-ended questionnaires, interview transcripts and the students' written texts. The observation field notes, the students' responses to the open-ended questionnaires, and interview transcripts were analysed qualitatively using thematic analysis. Meanwhile, the students' written texts were analysed using SFG as suggested in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.

Thematic analysis was used to analyse qualitative data (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2008; Guest et al., 2011; Lacey & Luff, 2001; Lapadat, 2010; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Onwuegbuzie, Leech, & Collins, 2012) that is more typical of the use of an inductive approach to coding (Guest et al., 2011; Jebreen, 2012; Lapadat, 2010; J. Thomas & Harden, 2008) where themes emerge from textual data (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2008; Lancia, 2012). The goal of the thematic analysis using the inductive approach is "to allow research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant, or significant themes inherent in raw data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies" (Thomas, 2006, p. 238).

In general, the thematic analysis used was adapted from Creswell (2012, p. 237) followed by triangulation of each data set (Cox & Hassard, 2010). The triangulation is used to validate the accuracy of the findings and to deal with inconsistent and even contradictory data by attempting to make sense of what had been found that requires embedding the empirical data at hand with a holistic understanding of the specific situation and the general background knowledge about a certain phenomenon (Mathison, 1988, p. 17). The data analysis was applied throughout and after the fieldwork with its iterative and flexible process (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2008). The following paragraphs will describe the procedures of the thematic analysis of the four data sets.

First, the participant field notes were coded into several themes that are related to the application of the SFL GBA, CT, and CB principles such as explicit teaching, group work, peer feedback (see the samples of the field note analysis in Appendix 12). The results of the analysis will be reported in Chapter 4 in a narrative form. The audiotaped sessions of the teaching program were used to provide illustrations of the explicit teaching, group work, and peer feedback.

Second, the students' responses to the background questionnaire and the self-reflective questionnaire were coded into themes. The background questionnaire's themes are related to the students' prior perceptions of academic writing, CT, and character values such as the students' difficulties in writing (see

Appendix 13 for the analysis of the students' responses to the background questionnaire). The results of the analysis will be reported in Chapter 4 to support the findings from the field notes by describing the students' background knowledge and skills before the teaching program was conducted.

The self-reflective questionnaire' themes are related to the application of the SFL GBA, CT, and CB principles such as explicit teaching, group work, the students' difficulties in the CGBA teaching stages, and the lecturer's and the students' performance in relation to the application of CT and character values (see Appendix 14 for the analysis of the students' responses to the self-reflective questionnaire). The results of the analysis will be reported in Chapter 4 to support the findings from the field notes by describing the students' strength and weaknesses; and the lecturer's and the students' performance during the teaching program in relation to the academic writing, CT, and character value practices.

Furthermore, the results of the analyses of the background and the self-reflective questionnaires also support the findings in Chapter 5 by providing confirmations of what went well and what went wrong in the teaching program and their influences to the students' texts. The samples of the students' responses to the questionnaires that are related to the themes will be provided in Chapter 4.

Third, the interview transcripts were coded into themes that are related to the students' perceptions of the teaching program based on the aspects of the academic writing, CT, and character values and the students' suggestions for the betterment of the teaching program (see Appendix 17 for the analysis of the interview transcripts). The results of the analysis will be reported in Chapter 6 to support the results of the analyses of the field notes, the students' responses to the questionnaires, and the students' texts where the students provided their responses and perceptions of the teaching program.

Fourth, the students' written texts in the form of argumentative writing were analysed qualitatively to find out the students' development in academic writing, CT, and character. The analyses applied SFG. In order to conduct the text analyses successfully, the elaboration of SFG has been provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2.

Unfortunately, a limitation was identified in the results of the text analysis. Chapter 5 will show that the text analysis mainly covers lexicogrammatical aspects such as Theme and Transitivity systems (see Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2). Meanwhile, discourse semantic aspects such as ideational-experiential, appraisal, and reference systems (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) were not involved in the analysis. These aspects might enrich the results of the analysis.

Despite the limitation identified in the text analysis, the text analysis also covers CT as discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2 where CT can be reflected from three important points, that is, an issue to be developed or defended, arguments with supporting evidence, and a conclusion that may include the establishment of positions and recommendation (adapted from Ennis, 1993, p. 180) that can also be reflected in the schematic structure of the argumentative writing that realise an organisation of academic writing. The quality of the CT also covers seven dispositions or intellectual standards. They are clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth, logic, and fairness (Elder & Paul, 2010) where clarity, accuracy, precision, and logic are the characteristics of academic writing language (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2).

At the same time, the texts were analysed in relation to CB. The character values that were analysed in the argumentative writing are honesty, responsibility, fairness, and respect because the character values are interdependent as described in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.6. One character value, that is, religious, is not meant to be omitted, but actually based on the discussion in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.6, the character value is visible when the other character values are realised in the students' writings or written texts.

To ensure the quality of this case study, the draft of the dissertation was read by three participants of this study, namely Sarah, Elias, and Rick (in pseudonym) whose texts play important parts as findings that are elaborated in Chapter 5. This activity was conducted by e-mail where they read and provided their comments on the draft of the dissertation. The activity provided insightful and helpful comments that could contribute to the dissertation (Yin, 2003). The comments show that they

agreed with the contents, especially the contents that are related to their learning experiences and their written texts (see Appendix 11).

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the methodology of this study that was conducted in the field. The discussion covered the research design, the site and participants of the study, data collection, along with the ethical considerations and precaution taken, and data analysis. In the discussion, the methodology, including the limitations have been described thoroughly.

The procedures of the data collection followed by the presentations of the results of the analyses of the participant observation field notes and the students' responses to the open-ended questionnaires will be elaborated in Chapter 4. The results of the text analyses will be elaborated in Chapter 5 and the results of the analyses of the interview transcripts will be elaborated in Chapter 6 followed by conclusions, implications, and recommendations in Chapter 7.