Growing Together
A Model of Critical Research Design

Wakhid Nashruddin[1, 2]

[1]*Charles Darwin Unversity, Australia*
[2]*IAIN Syekh Nurjati, Cirebon, Indonesia*
wakhid.nashruddin@cdu.edu.au, wakhid.nashruddin@syekhnurjati.ac.id

Keywords: Engagement, academics, research design.

Abstract: This paper illustrates a research design that models direct engagement of academics teaching in English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) departments in implementing national policies, in this case, the integrating of National Standards of Higher Education (NSHE) into undergraduate courses. The key difference in the design between the present study and conventional research design is in that it did not begin with a question about its form, quantitative and qualitative. Furthermore, in Education, research design is largely limited to surveys and a testing of simple hypotheses. Unlike these traditional approaches, the present study engaged ELTE academics directly in the process of collaborative reflection on the meaning of the new higher education policies from the perspective of their own contexts. Key issue in designing the study was to conceptualise a perspective that will help inform this process of engagement, academics' reflections and further learning. Complex analyses were conducted to reach this point. Again, this was a very different process than simply listing "previous research". The presentation will briefly illustrate the background thinking behind the study design, the design and the impacts that the chosen design has helped to achieve.

1 INTRODUCTION

Critical research design might not be a popular design in educational research. The term critical itself is based on critical theory (Gelo, 2012, p.123) and aims at raising question "what should be?" (Tracy, 2013, p.48). The focus of this kind of research aims at transformation or improvement of practice (Tracy, 2013, p.48).

The research design in this paper is a design used in a PhD project entitled in *"Developing undergraduate research and inquiry in English language teacher education programs in Indonesia: A case study for empowerment and sustainability."* The research and the data collections of the research have been completed. In this research project, a quite new issue that has not been well addressed in the context of English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) in Indonesia was raised. In this study, the participants were asked to challenge their beliefs in integrating IQF into their teaching practice.

2 ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL FRAMING

The present study draws on the principles of a dialogic model of inquiry explicated by Lian (2006, 2012) in relation to research. Lian herself draws on Calhoun's model (1995) theorised for the purpose of critical social sciences and Latour (2003, 2004, 2010) in the philosophy of science. As illustrated by Lian (2012, p. 2), from the perspective of ontology, a dialogic inquiry resists the temptation to "seek [...] the umpire's chair" (Calhoun, 1995, p. 11) and the idea that researchers "move simply from false propositions to true ones" (Calhoun, 1995, p. 7), "claim[ing] – like Sherlock Holmes – to be working with "nothing but the facts" (Calhoun, 1995, p. 5). Instead, it is conscious of its own historicity and draws a distinction between the interpretations which guide researchers' questions and those of his or her informants (who have different stakes than the researcher). The inquiry serves as a tool for the researcher to identify the possibilities as well as the limits of his or her perspectives. A dialogic inquiry therefore neither represents voices nor gives voice; it

explores the relevance of its own voice: "You and your informants have different concerns—when they intersect it's a miracle, and miracles, in case you don't know, are rare" (Latour, 2003, p. 71).

In terms of epistemology, this self-reflective (critical) process originates in the perception of conflict (Lian, 2012, p. 2) which dialogic researchers purposefully seek out in order to "connect widely different phenomena" and build increasingly informed perspectives on the issues of interest (Latour, 2004). This process results in the construction of the points "from which positions, or possibilities, become more perceptible" (Hobson, as cited in Lian, 2012, pp. 2-3). Lian (2012, p. 3) explains, this process is oriented toward "discovering our limits rather than affirming our possibilities" (Calhoun, 1995, p. 13), i.e. an objective which gives the inquiry its critical process.

The dialogic approach provides this study with a conceptual framework specifying its purpose and the methodology. In accordance with the dialogic model, in terms of purpose (i.e. what is possible), the study will engage academics teaching in English language teacher education programs in Indonesia in a capacity-building context. Academic staff teaching in these programs will be involved in constructing, implementing and evaluating conceptual frameworks and strategies for supporting the culture and practices of research pedagogy in their undergraduate programs. In terms of methodology (self-reflection), the study will engage the participants in collaborative and learning opportunities, with the participants looking for ways to question what they know and how, without requiring from anyone to adopt a specific worldview or theory. The study will evaluate the impact of this learning process in relation to (a) feedback provided by the participants, and (b) the concepts that underpin current thinking and research in the area of research pedagogy in English language teacher education programs.

3 STUDY DESIGN AND INSTRUMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION

The study aims to engage academics teaching in English teacher education programs across Indonesia. In order to make the study manageable but also reflective of the diversity of higher education intuitions in Indonesia, the study identifies a sample of institutions from the public and private sectors, with both secular and religious missions (three private

universities and one Islamic university took part in the study). The institutions that were invited to take part in the study are already part of the network of the researcher's home university; others will be contacted by the researcher.

In different terms, this critical research may be called an action research project. While most traditional action research uses researchers' solution(s) for identified problems in those research, or a group of people (Tomal, 2010, p. 129) that discussed the problem to offer solutions, this current study facilitates the research participants in the study took a large control over their action plans, with as minimum interference as possible to make sure the actions are developed by the participants themselves. Such condition is expected to make the participants more creative and innovative in grappling with the issue of integration of research and inquiry in their context where they use their own networking, IT, and supports they already have.

Questionnaires, workshop, and interview are used to collect the data. Questionnaires are conducted before, during, and after the implementation of the integration of research and inquiry in English Language Teacher Education programs.

3.1 Questionnaire 1: Initial Questionnaire

The questions in the questionnaires address international developments and, specifically, issues raised in regard to research culture in undergraduate programs in the Boyer Report (Boyer Commission, 1998), USA; Bradley Report (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, and Scales, 2008), Australia; and in the various documents informing the development of universities in the ASEAN member countries (e.g. ASEAN Secretariat, 2009). The preliminary literature review conducted thus far to examine these developments in the USA and Australia showed a number of areas where progress is slow, with studies like Barrie et al. (2014) reporting that supporting research and inquiry in undergraduate programs is not without its problems. Thus, questions reflecting on the relationship between the graduate outcomes show to be important and will be explored.

To frame the questionnaire, "three levels of the architecture of a job" (HBS, 2010) were used. Firstly, exploration on "what is the job to be done" was used to capture the impact of the implementation of IQF (Indonesian Government, 2013) and Decree 44 (MRTHE, 2015). Secondly, this identification of the jobs to be done provided reflections on "what are the experiences" in relation to what academic staff doing

research in IQF and Decree 44 implementation. Finally, the reflections was expected to lead to thinking of "what and how we must integrate" IQF and graduate competencies in the curriculum supporting undergraduate research. The topics of the questionnaire are based on the Boyer report's recommendation (The Boyer Commission, 1998).

Research question 1: What challenges does the integration of graduate skills into degree curricula present to academics teaching in English language teacher education programs in Indonesian research universities?

An anonymous questionnaire is developed and sent to departments teaching English language teacher education programs in universities from the public and private sectors, with both secular and religious missions across Indonesia. The objective of the questionnaire is to (a) gather evidence about the broader context that impacts on the design and workings of the English language teacher education programs in Indonesia, including the knowledge of the international context and its impact on national (and university) policies and strategic planning; and (b) to make space for academics to critically approach current developments, practices and beliefs. The data from initial questionnaire informs Stage 2 of the study, reflection workshops.

The following list is initial questionnaire questions:

1) Please identify your academic level!
   - Level E (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.E)
   - Level D (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.D)
   - Level C (Lektor Kepala)
   - Level B (Lektor)
   - Level A (Asisten Ahli)

2) Briefly describe yourself in terms of teaching, research interests and any information you wish to share? What research have you produced relating to your teaching?

3) In as many words as you wish, please describe your experiences with Graduate Competencies! In your response, you may wish to consider the following guiding points:
   - Briefly describe your views of the Graduate Competencies.
   - Are you using Graduate Competencies in your teaching?
   - In your opinion, what impact do Graduate Competencies have on the planning of the English degree program and the units that you teach?
   - Are your students aware of Graduate Competencies? If so, how do you

perceive the Graduate Competencies impact on their learning?
   - In your research, do you make references to Graduate Competencies? Briefly describe how.
   - What problems do you find with Graduate Competencies? Explain your views.
   - Have you been supported by your university or Department in working with Graduate Competencies? How have these supports been made available?

3.2 A Three-Day Workshop

Research question 2: In what ways can a theoretical approach to graduate skills contribute to the building of a 21st century model of English teacher education programs relevant to the Indonesian context?

In order to generate opportunities for critical reflection, the researcher organised a three-day workshop. The workshop invited volunteering participants representing the universities participating in this study and working as lecturers in English language teacher education programs. The workshop was conducted from 20 to 24 December 2016 with seventeen participants attended the workshop.

The general goal of the workshop was to invite the participants to (a) approach graduate outcomes theoretically, rather than heuristically as this has been the case in Indonesia (Susilo, 2015) and in Australia (Lian, 2012); (b) identify what academic staff views as "best practice" models for integrating the IQF; (c) inquire about the support that lecturers design for their students; and (d) identify how the concern with research and inquiry skills support impacts on their research and teaching.

3.3 Questionnaire 2: Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

To evaluate the workshop program, participants were asked to reflect on the program they have joined. This reflection functions to see whether or not the learning has taken place. In evaluating a workshop, the main concern is the relevance of the workshop (curriculum, materials) with the jobs to be done by the participants Jolles (2005, p. 261, p. 270).

The questions in the workshop evaluation questionnaire were developed by looking at the relevant aspects of the participants learning experience, including their opinions about the workshop materials and their free comments about the workshop. The questions for the questionnaire are:

- Was the workshop a worthwhile experience?
- In what ways do you think the workshop relevant or irrelevant to you?
- What would you like to suggest the workshop could have done better?
- Please comment on the activities and materials in the first day of the workshop about "questionnaire findings: mapping your voice"
- Please comment on the activities and materials in the second day of the workshop about "literature review"
- Please comment on the activities and materials in the third day of the workshop about "planning strategies"
- Any other comments?

3.4 Questionnaire 3: Challenges of the Integration of Research and Inquiry in English Language Education Teacher Programs in Indonesia

During the workshop, the participants were asked to design their strategic planning of the integration of R and I to be applied after they return to their respective universities. It was unfortunate that they could not make it because they still had no clear direction on what units they were going to teach in the next coming semester. However, they did this strategic planning design after the workshop. The strategic planning in this study is the participants' unit syllabus.

A questionnaire was used to reframe their thinking and refresh their ideas about the integration of R and I. The questions were developed based on the important elements of syllabuses. The questions raised in the questionnaire are:

- How do you identify your unit outcomes (has to be 6 outcomes)?
- How do you integrate unit outcomes into the unit description?
- How do you link the structure and the key ideas of the syllabus with the unit outcomes?
- What is the general logic that informs your choice of unit materials in your unit?
- How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
- How do you develop assessment tasks?
- How is your assessment addressing the key outcomes?
- Other challenges (Please identify if any).

3.5 Questionnaire 4: Evaluation on the Integration of Research and Inquiry in English Language Education Teacher Programs in Indonesia

To review what the participants have done so far, in the end of the project, by the end of July 2017, a questionnaire on evaluation on the integration of research and inquiry in English language education teacher programs in Indonesia were sent to the participants.

Research question 3: What are the optimal conditions required to support research and inquiry in undergraduate English language teacher education degree structures?

The participants of the study were requested to provide feedback on their experiences in implementing new teaching support, which was agreed upon during the workshop, in their teaching programs. To obtain the data, a questionnaire was sent out with questions which will (a) include the criteria identified during the workshop as appropriate for evaluating the impact of this support; and (b) identify questions for future research; and (c) request feedback for evaluating the relevance of these new findings in the light of the findings of the initial questionnaire. The aim of this stage is to generate reflection upon the relationship between what seems feasible and the status quo reflected in the findings of the initial questionnaire.

Research question 4: In what ways did the "community-building" approach of the study assist (or prevent) the academic staff in identifying and implementing best practice models for working with graduate skills to support research and inquiry in undergraduate programs?

Together with the questionnaire relating to Question 3, the researcher also explored the participants' feelings about the relevance of their participation in the study as individuals and as members of their university community. The questions will inquire about the research capacity (as per graduate capabilities identified in the IQF and Decree 44) that the study generated in the research participants and their colleagues.

1) Please, identify your academic level!
   - Level E (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.E)
   - Level D (Guru Besar/Gol.IV.D)
   - Level C (Lektor Kepala)
   - Level B (Lektor)
   - Level A (Asisten Ahli)

2) How do you identify your unit outcomes (has to be 6 outcomes)?
3) How do you integrate unit outcomes into the unit description?
4) How do you link the structure and the key ideas of the syllabus with the unit outcomes?
5) What is the general logic that informs your choice of unit materials in your unit? Identify the number and specify if they all were from your university.
6) How do you integrate research and inquiry (higher order skills in the IQF and graduate competencies) into your teaching plan?
7) How do you develop assessment tasks?
8) How is your assessment addressing the key outcomes?
9) Other challenges (Please identify if any).

3.6 Interview

The interview questions were developed from the result of discussion. The interview questions come from the workshop participants. The purpose of this is to provide them space for thinking and allow them to develop as a part of their learning and collaboration. During the workshop, the participants were asked to suggest what aspects should be included in the evaluation of the study. After they provide some aspects, these aspects were discussed with three active participants of the study.

The participants were asked to brainstorm and lists the issues that need addressing in the further data collection. After that, the researcher help them to make the questions, and the questions were revised by them. From the discussion, the questions emerged are as follow:

1) How do the staff respond to the integration of research and inquiry in ELTE programs?
2) How do the students respond to the integration of research and inquiry in ELTE programs?
3) How did you work with the syllabus? Do you see the relevance of syllabi and the application of the syllabi plans?
4) Do you see the importance of synchronizing learning materials across units in the curriculum? Please explain.
5) Would you describe challenges in the integration of research and inquiry in ELTE programs' units?
6) Would you describe the inquiry processes happened in the field (classes)?

7) What kinds of support or resources do you need to support the integration of research and inquiry in ELTE programs' units?
8) How do you design the assessment? How do you relate it with the course description?
9) Is there anything else you would like to say regarding this project?

4 DATA ANALYSIS

In this step, the findings are not displayed as they are based on questions given, rather, the findings are displayed by categorisation according to two frameworks: a) questionnaires were analysed using HBS' framework in "integrating around the job to be done" (2010) and b) interviews were analysed using Lian and Pertiwi's framework about "theorizing for innovation in English Language Teacher Education" (2017). The two frameworks are considered to be the most relevant following the nature of data collection purposes.

5 MAKING CONCLUSION

The conclusions were drawn from the understanding of all data interpretation in relation to framework developed which are based on IQF and graduate competencies. Question 5 of this study was addressed in this section.

Research question 5: What strategies can be applied to change the culture and practices of research pedagogy in undergraduate programs and to contribute to the building of a 21st century model of English teacher education programs relevant to the Indonesian context?

In order to respond to this question, the study summarises its findings by evaluating their significance in relation to the vision for research universities described in Indonesian and ASEAN policy documents.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper has illustrated a research procedure where the participants are the center of the problem solving process, giving them opportunity to grapple with important issues by considering their own contexts. While most research in education tend to position researchers as experts (identifying problems, doing literature review, and judge what kinds of treatments

will work), this current research design allow research participants to learn, reflect their learnings in relation to their own experience and learn from the whole process of research and they become knowledgeable in coping with issues in front of themselves. After all, they may have their own research agenda as a follow up after their reflection after taking part in handling issues in this current research.

By involving the participants in the research, the researcher give them opportunities to learn, think critically, develop their capacity, and build their networks. As such, using critical research design, rather than putting participants and people involved in the study as "objects" of research, they have a chance to be "subject" of the research, where they have their right to take actions and have an equal chance to grow together.

REFERENCES

ASEAN Secretariat. 2009. *ASEAN socio-cultural community blueprint*, ASEAN Secretariat. Jakarta. Retrieved May 3, 2016 from: http://www.asean.org/?static_post=asean-socio-cultural-community-blueprint-2025.

Barrie, S., Hughes, C., Crisp, G., 2014. *Assessing and assuring Australian graduate learning outcomes: principles and practices within and across disciplines*. Final Report OLT Australia.

Boyer Commission., 1998. *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities,* The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. Stony Brook, US.

Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., Scales, B., 2008. *Review of Australian higher education: Final report,* Commonwealth of Australia. Canberra.

Calhoun, C., 1995. *Critical social theory*, Blackwell. Oxford.

Gelo, O.C.G., 2012. On research methods and their philosophical assumptions: Raising the consciousness of researchers, again. *Psychotherapie and Sozialwissenschaft (2),* (109-128).

HBS (Harvard Business School), 2010. Integrating around the job to be done. Retrieved May 2, 2016 from: http://www.public.navy.mil/fltfor/nwdc/CRIC%20Articles/Integrating_Around_the_Job_to_Be_Done[1].pdf

Indonesian Government., 2013. *Indonesian Qualifications Framework*. Jakarta

Jolles, R.L., 2005. *How to run seminars and workshops: Presentation skills for consultants, trainers, and teachers,* John Wiley and Sons, Inc. Hoboken, New Jersey, 3rd edition.

Latour, B., 2003. A Dialog on Actor Network Theory with a (Somewhat) Socratic Professor. In C. Avgerou, C. Ciborra, F. F. Land (Eds.), *The social study of information and communication study* (pp. 62-76), Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Latour, B., 2004. How to talk about the body: The normative dimension of science studies, *Body and Society, 10*(2-2), 205-229.

Latour, B., 2010. An Attempt at a "Compositionist Manifesto", *New Literary History, 41*, 471-490.

Lian, A.B., 2006. *A dialogic model of inquiry in second language teaching: Toward the concept of a critical approach to pedagogic research.* (PhD), The University of Queensland. Queensland.

Lian, A.B., 2012. A dialogic framework for embedding graduate attributes in discipline-based degree curricula, *Rangsit Journal of Arts and Sciences, 2*(1), 1-14.

Lian, A., Pertiwi, W.H.S., 2017. Theorising for Innovation: Implications for English Language Teacher Education, *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies, 17(3),* 1-17. http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2017-1703-01.

MRTHE (The Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education), 2015. *The Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Decree No.44 Year 2015 on National Higher Education Standards.*

Susilo, M-P., 2015. Curriculum of EFL teacher education and Indonesian Qualification Framework: A blip of the future direction, *Dinamika Ilmu,* 15(1), 11-24.

Tomal, D.R., 2010. *Action Research for Educators,* Plymouth, UK. Rowman and Littlefield Education, 2nd edition.

Tracy, S.J., 2013. *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact,* Wiley-Blackwell. West Sussex.