



LEARNERS' AGENCY IN FOCUS: INTRODUCING THE 21ST CENTURY ACADEMIC WRITING PEDAGOGY IN INDONESIA

Lala Bumela*

English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

*Corresponding author: Kuningan, West Java, Indonesia. E-mail address: lalabumela@syekhnurjati.ac.id

article info

Article history:

Received: 16 December 2021

Received in revised form:

28 December 2021

Accepted: 28 December 2021

Available online: 31 December 2021

Keywords:

Transformative learning

Agency

Multisensorial pedagogy

Rhythm

Intonation

Emotion

Movement

abstract

The notion of transformative learning has been echoed by the Indonesian government in the National Standard of Education (2020, 2015). A shift from the teacher-centric into the student-centric pedagogy is a prerequisite to trigger the learning transformation. However, in the field of English language teaching (ELT) in particular, there remains a firm reliance on the dogma of modern linguistics that positions linguistic description and grammatical mastery as the key for meaning-making mechanism. Consequently, such monolithic ELT pedagogy expects a steady compliance from the students in relation to learning, and thus learners' creative agency was removed. This paper is a reflection on how the learning of academic writing unit was approached differently by using a multisensorial-multicognitive pedagogy as informed by neuroscience, thus breaking away from linguistics as the sole informing theory for learning language. This new academic writing pedagogy embraces language learning as a complex system, thus incorporating other biopsychological components in learning such as rhythm, intonation, movement, emotion, and aesthetics. This paper highlights how these components were used creatively in the three innovative learning tools – Verbotonal Approach, Reading for Emotions, and Aesthetics – to support agentive learning practice in academic writing course. This new pedagogy was developed in a doctoral research project in an Australian university and was proven effective to help students transform their learning practices.

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing in undergraduate English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) departments in Indonesia, just like any other undergraduate departments, gained a new wave of interest due to the newly-prompted higher education standard introduced by Indonesian government in 2005 (MONEC, 2005; Nashruddin, 2020; Pertiwi, 2020). Undergraduate students are now taught academic literacy in English to meet the new requirements. They are trained to develop into both proficient users of English and into competent researchers and communicators of their own pedagogic practice in schools. They are required to read, analyse and write academic texts in English in order to grow as capable members of the English teacher community in Asia and around the world. Academic writing is a difficult skill to manage by students of all higher education sectors in Indonesia, even when writing in Indonesian language (Jubhari, 2003).

Studies show that undergraduate students in ELTE departments lag behind in their capacity to present complex arguments using formal, objective, complex and abstract writing in English (Emilia, 2010; Aunurrahman, Hamied & Emilia, 2017). Jubhari (p. 126) suggests that poor academic writing of Indonesian students may be largely due to the pedagogy of academic courses in Indonesia, which, in her view, fail to teach the development of a critical

disposition to academic texts and academic ideas in general. Another scholar such as Alwasilah (2001, p. 24) also noted that writing tends to be neglected in English language teaching (ELT) curriculum in Indonesia. Alwasilah stated:

Writing is not only less practised, but –if anything– is also taught unprofessionally. ... Writing is the most exalted language skill, yet it has been the most neglected one in our education. Our high school and college students are subjected to unprofessional teachers and professors. Most of the teachers and professors lack writing skills, informed understanding of the nature of writing and teaching strategies (2001, p. 25-26).

Other scholars such as Kaplan & Baldauf (2003, p. 13) also noticed that in Indonesian context and many other countries in the Pacific Basin region, English teachers are said to have “rudimentary proficiency” or have exceptionally inadequate experience in writing themselves (p. 13). Such relatively poor performance of English, according to Kaplan & Bardauf (2003, p. 98), are generally caused by lack of resources; the need for better texts and materials; overcrowded classrooms; an inadequate methodological teacher-training; and the need for teachers or have better English skills; and the centralized mechanism that restricts the teachers to work communicatively in a range of settings and contexts. In other words, Indonesian higher education is now in a challenging moment to create a new academic culture where reading and writing are given more spaces in the curriculum.

The adoption of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA), a literacy pedagogy rooted in the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) developed by Halliday (1985) and his followers known as Sydney School, was viewed as a solution for modernizing the literacy pedagogy in Indonesia (Alwasilah, 2012, p. 19). However, Alwasilah (2012) realized that the genre-based approach in Indonesia had not been successful due to lack of socialization among teachers after it had been adopted within the period of eight years (from 2004-2012). Furthermore, another Indonesian scholar such as Sukyadi (2015) also highlighted the failure of the genre-based approach in Indonesian English education setting. Sukyadi mentioned that the 2004 competence-based curriculum was seen by many as “too linguistic, too difficult, and unrealistic for Indonesian children learning English as a foreign language” (p. 128). Furthermore, Sukyadi underlined the challenges faced by ELT teachers with different level of English proficiency when dealing with new SFL terms such as ideational, interpersonal, textual functions, genre, field, tenor, mode, ect. Sukyadi further asserted that genre-based approach was still preserved in the 2006 curriculum and 2013 curriculum and nothing much has changed ever since (p. 129). Unfortunately, in Indonesia context, genre-based approach is simply understood as “language instruction in which texts selected to teach are chosen and sequenced based on text types such as narrative, descriptive, recount, reports, procedures, etc.” (p. 131).

When the 2004 curriculum was changed into the 2006 curriculum and eventually up until the introduction of the 2013 curriculum, nothing much has happened (Sukyadi, 2015, p. 132). According to Sukyadi (2015, p. 132), in real practice, English teachers generally focused on certain number of texts to finish, and not on how to assist students in creating texts in an integrated and coherent fashion. More specifically, English teachers believed that the genre-based approach should be delivered in a linear fashion following the order of Building Knowledge of the Field, Modelling of Texts, Joint Construction of Text, and Independent Construction of Text, whereas in fact they could be arranged at any stage relevant to the students’ current writing skills, and most teachers in fact used their time to focus more on the generic structure, vocabulary, and grammar, and did not devote more time to build reading comprehension skills and constructing texts which are fundamental to genre-based approach (p. 132). The implementation of genre-based approach was becoming more challenging as

the 2013 curriculum only allocated two (2) teaching hours per week for English subject in every school (previously English was taught four hours per week) (Sukyadi, 2015, p. 130).

Language Learning as complex System: A Way Forward

A similar concern on genre-based approach in Indonesia was also delivered by A.-B Lian & Yunus (2017). According to these two scholars, the SFL genre-based approach model adopted by ELTE departments in Indonesia simply focus students' attention on what they see that matters in the texts (textual features) and essentially disregards the sources of values of the students. Furthermore, the teaching sequences of genre-based approach – the pre-reading, while reading, and post-reading – were mainly concentrated on the activation of students' background knowledge and relate it to the textual patterns and meanings to be found in the text; responding to comprehension questions and analysing linguistic choices in order to collaboratively build the meaning of the text; and transferred the learned skills on to new activities. In such sequence of learning, one that matters most is missing, namely, the connection between students' understanding of their own literacy needs and the arbitrarily constructed activities. In similar vein, Freedman (1998) asserts that the compliance on the linguistic paradigm may remove the sense of agency of the students in foreign language classrooms.

Freedman highlights the general practice of any foreign language classrooms that tends to put emphasis on the compliance over the linguistic system or description. The text types (genre) along with their lexicogrammatical features are in essence a kind of recipes for the students to follow. A model of a text with its sample of grammatical analysis may be easily followed by the students, but there seems to be limited space for fostering the sense of creativity and agency on the part of the students. In similar vein, Freedman (1994, p. 169) also highlights two major aspect of this linguistic-based paradigm. Firstly, she asserts that “language have not yet been described adequately even by the most sophisticated linguists”, clearly suggesting that the grammar of human language is too complex to describe. Secondly, the linguistic rules are too complex and too numerous to be explicitly taught in the context of writing or language instruction. More importantly, Miller (1984, p. 163) contends that ‘genres change, evolve, and decay, opposing the idea that the genres only constructed on the fixed and similar bases over time. Additionally, Freedman (1987, p. 53) insists that linguistic forms are not the only constituent of a genre and that the teaching of these forms will result in the appropriate text. For Freedman (1987), a genre (the game of the text, not text types) is organised by its ceremonial place, and this is aligned with “the full range of semiotic systems available as strategies for enablement conditions of that genre” (p. 53). In other words, a second language learner will operate functionally when he/she has capacities to utilise more than one semiotic system, therefore, there is a need to shift from a pedagogic grammar into the notion of language learning as a complex system. Grammar is only one component of language learning, and we need to recognise more components in the learning process.

As science has moved forward since the beginning of the 21st century (or since early 200), we can no longer rely on the so-called traditional science with the focus of one single variable in order to understand a single phenomenon. This should apply to English language learning pedagogy that has been reliant solely on pedagogic grammar and descriptive linguistic where language learning is understood simply as a grammar or linguistic formula mastery without incorporating other more fundamental components in language learning. There is now a shift from a monolithic research view into multidimensional research approaches that investigate the interrelationships of multiple variables that operate in complex systems (Gallagher & Appenzeller, 1999). Research in the 21st century has increasingly recognised that human beings are complex biological systems who live in complex social and cultural systems

(Berninger & Richards, 2002, p. 8). Consequently, (ELT) teachers across the globe are currently facing the same challenge: how to integrate many different instructional variables to assist students learn within complex classroom systems.

Berninger & Richards (2008) emphasise that any instruction must not be reduced into a single, unitary method that teachers “do” to students. In other words basically cannot program the learners’ minds. However, they can provide the so-called instructional hints where multiple components are delivered in ways that “package” the hints to assist students create functional systems for learning and performing in the classroom (p. 8). Consequently, the learners will use those hints in various ways depending on their background knowledge. Furthermore, it is important to note that the human brain works in ensemble (a set of structures), not as a singular structure in making learning happen (Berninger & Richards, 2002, p. 8). Such a view is relevant with the notion of functional systems of a brain at work by Luria (1973): multiple brain structures may be involved in one function and that the same brain structures can participate in more than one functional system. Therefore, using a monolithic pedagogical approach, namely using one single component i.e., grammar (or any linguistic description), is no longer compatible with the spirit of the 21st century that stresses multidimensionality. A new ELT pedagogy that embraces multidimensionality is

A View on the New Academic Writing Pedagogy: Learning as an Ensemble

The new pedagogy of academic writing reported in this paper is characterised by four key words: rhythm, intonation, movement, emotion, and aesthetics. These five components of learning are incorporated into the resources for learning academic writing. The first three components of learning – rhythm, intonation, and movement – are incorporated into the learning tool called “Verbotonal Approach” as informed by research by Guberina (1975), A.-P Lian (2017), and A.-P Lian & Cai (2021) . The fourth component – emotion – is incorporated into the learning tool called “Reading for Emotion” as informed by A.-B Lian (2017), and the last component of learning – aesthetics – is incorporated into the learning tool called “aesthetics” as informed by the neurological principles of aesthetics as informed by Ramachandran and Hirstein (1999).

The incorporation of these three learning tools in the academic writing unit was aimed to establish learning as an ensemble where learning is seen as a multisensorial experience as perceived by the learner as individuals, and not dictated by grammarian or even linguists. More importantly, such learning experience provides learners with opportunities to process different types of information as processed by different parts of the body using three-in-one learning tools (Verbotonal Approach-Reading for Emotions-Aesthetics). Such a view has never been addressed in the traditional ELT pedagogy where the epicentrum of learning is teacher-centric with grammar and linguistic formula as the only reference point.

In a nutshell, the new academic writing introduced in this paper operates as integrated complex system where the learners addressed a broader coverage of language learning components. The focus of students is learning by feeling or experiencing the patterns rather than memorising and replicating the grammatical or linguistic formula. First and foremost, this new pedagogy is mainly characterised by the incorporating the prosodic components of the typical academic English language. Rhythm and intonation) were integrated with movement to help students re-organise their speech perception capacities. The new pedagogy of academic writing described here are re-integrating speech and written language for a biological reason: written language is the representation of spoken language. Berninger & Richards (2008. p. 112) highlighted the critical role of the sound codes of human speech that serves as the re-coder of visual stimuli into language that later stored as orthographic word form representation. Therefore, listening practices with the focus on rhythm and intonation

were included in the learning of academic writing. Therefore, this new pedagogy basically opposes the traditional ELT pedagogy that spoken and written language .

The inclusion of listening practices with the focus on rhythm and intonation is compatible with the Implicit Prosody Hypothesis (Fodor, 2002). Fodor (2002) maintained that even during silent reading, readers produce representations of sentence intonation, phrasing, stress, and rhythm, and that these representations affect his/her interpretation of the text. Furthermore, Chafe (1988) once stated:

I am not alone in believing that writers when they write, and readers when they read, experience auditory imagery of specific intonations, accents, pauses, rhythms, and voice qualities, even if the writing itself may show these features poorly, if at all. This “covert prosody” of written language is evidently something that is quite apparent to a reflective writer or reader’ (p. 397).

The inclusion of rhythm and intonation into the academic writing pedagogy was previously informed by Verbotonal research (Guberina, 1972; A.-P Lian, 1980, Asp, 2006). The Verbotonal Approach was initially developed to help children and adults with hearing impairments, but later used for the purposes of foreign language teaching. Essentially, the Verbotonal approach introduced the use of filtered intonation as the basis for improving the reorganisation of speech pattern by tapping into the neuroplasticity of the brain and the overall neural networks (Guberina, 1972). This approach basically encourages language learning as a multisensorial experience by activating both auditory and vestibular sensory systems in the body (Guberina, 1972; Asp, 2006). As explained by Lian et al (2020, p. 4608), to this end, the approach utilizes low-pass filtering of auditory stimuli. The technique involves modifying recorded audio using an audio filter that only allows frequencies under 320 Hz (or some other appropriate frequency) to be preserved. According to Lian et al (p. 4608), “this filtered stimulus preserves the fundamental frequency (F0) of the sentences being studied, together with their stress, rhythm, loudness and intonation features, while the higher frequencies that help to define words are removed”.

The research in China by Yang (2017) shows that the Verbotonal Approach helps the simultaneous mobilisation of learners’ visual, auditory, vibrotactile, vestibular, proprioceptive senses in the learning process, thus facilitating the restructuration of neural activity of the learners, and therefore triggering the plastic changes in the brain.

Furthermore, the recent studies by Yang, Wannaruk, and Lian, A.-P. (2017), He & Sangarun (2015) and He, Sangarun & Lian (2015) provide evidence on how the Verbotonal approach has helped the experimental group to make significant improvements in their overall English learning skills. From the final examination on listening, reading, spelling, and translation in English conducted (for 403 third graders) by the government of Gucheng town in China, it was found that the experimental group (a mean score of 93.75) had outperformed the control group (a mean score of 77.45). These research also found that there was no individual regress in the experimental group, but there was some students in the control group who had regressed Yang, Wannaruk, & Lian, A.-P., 2017)

The new academic writing pedagogy reported here is also characterised by the analysis of emotional structure of the text. The Reading for Emotion model was developed by A.-B Lian (2017, 2021) to foster critical engagement of the students by examining the emotional structure of texts as the driving force for grammatical choices, and not the other way around. This approach emphasises that a change of emotion takes place from one stage of text to another stages of text (A.-B Lian, 2017). The dynamics of text is captured using the canonical structure of text that consists of six (6) stages: focus, disturbance (problem), dialogue, development, resolution, and moral. Reading for Emotion model essentially encourages

learners (as a reader and as a writer) to view this structure as text in motion, not as recipe to be replicated as normally believed by linguists with sociocultural approach such as Luke (2000) and systemic functional linguists such as Halliday (1985; 1994) and his followers such as Martin (2000), Rose (2000), Emilia (2005), etc.

The learning process in the new academic writing pedagogy here is also characterised by the use of aesthetics. This learning tool was developed by A.-B Lian (2017) to assist students with some technological means to examine their own intonational pattern of their sentences they have produced in their papers. This learning tool was adapted from the neurological principles of aesthetics theorised in the field of neuroscience by Ramachandran & Hirstein (1999). By adopting aesthetic principles, each student was encouraged to analyse the complexity of sentence structure, logical organisation and paragraphs, balance as well as rhythm. Essentially, a good text is always written by following the aesthetic principles that consists of elements such as peak shift, grouping, isolation, contrast, symmetry and balance, perceptual problem solving and metaphor. This learning tool helps students to uncover the aesthetic qualities of texts from the intonation curves of the texts spoken by the students as readers and writers. This is relevant with the principle of intonation and rhythm as a temporal dimension to human speech and behaviour ((Schwartz & Kotz, 2015; Eagleman, 2011).

In sum, the learning ensemble in the academic writing pedagogy described here is characterized by the nature of multisensorial learning as supported by innovative technological learning tools. The three-in-one learning tools (Verbotonal approach, Reading for Emotions, and Aesthetics) were used to help students in building the patterns of academic English by feeling capacities through rhythm, intonation, movement, emotion, and aesthetics. Such an approach to learning clearly emphasizes that learning academic writing is feasible even without a reliance on grammar or restrictive descriptive formula. The following section illustrates how the study was conducted..

METHOD

The study reported here is part of a Ph.D. research project recently completed in an Australian university. The entire data, however, was collected in an English Language Teacher Education (ELTE) department in Indonesia. The experiment was conducted in Academic Writing course for the third semester students. In a nutshell, this study was designed as mixed-methods approach with the experiment designed as a quasi-experiment. The quasi-experiment in this study was chosen at it was characterised with a pre-test, a treatment, and a post-test for the selected experimental group, and a pre-test, no treatment, and a post-test for the select control group (Cresswell, 2014, p. 310). In a quasi-experiment the researcher has less control over the population size or nature, which then impacts on the truth-value of the study results. When there is no need or reason to create artificial random groups, the researcher must utilise the existing groups (intact groups) to be included in the experiment (Cresswell, 2014, p. 309). The use of experimental and control groups using different methods of instruction with a student population which was more or less similar ensured the control of experimental setting and presence of the proper comparisons (Shaughnessy, Zechmeister, & Zechmeister, 2006).

In this PhD research project, three independent raters who are experts in academic writing were involved in the double-blind assessment of both the pre-test and post-test essays. The three raters utilized their preferred rubric in assessing the pre-test and post-test papers. This article, however, would only present a partial statistical finding on the perceptions of participants after taking the learning ensemble in the academic writing course. The comprehensive statistical findings are already in play for other publications..

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section describes the general perceptions of the participants in the experimental group in using the three learning tools as recorded in the weekly journals (saved in the learning management system). The following table illustrates the perceived level of difficulty of using the three learning tools – Verbotonal exercises, Reading for Emotions, and Aesthetics – on a weekly basis from week 1 to week 15.

Table 1. Perceived level of difficulty in using the learning components

WEEK	EASY	DIFFICULT
1	45	9
2	43	11
3	48	6
4	58	8
5	57	7
6	46	8
7	37	17
8	50	4
9	41	13
10	48	6
11	49	5
12	51	3
13	52	2
14	39	15
15	39	15

The table above shows the use of the three learning by the participants in the experimental group were generally easy to use. A selection of comments regarding the uses of the three learning tools is found in the following table.

Table 2. Reflective comments on the use of learning tools

Reflective Questions	Samples of Reflective Comments
How did you go this week?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So interesting! This is my first time to learn about rhythm • When my lecturer announced about the Moodle exercises, I gave up! I was so lazy to this stuff because I did not know how to use it. However, when I tried to do my work I think it was

	<p>not too difficult! I did all the sentences seriously. Sometimes the Moodle did not record my voice, but I tried again and again that I finally finished the exercises! I do not know why but I think the Moodle helped me improve my English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bit busy but having fun doing all the works! • I think I have a lot of problems this week such as bad connection in my village.
What did you think of this week's learning resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really helped me in improving my speaking, listening, writing, and pronunciation and other English skills too. • I feel that I learned more with Moodle with the Verbotonal exercises • I found many benefits in using the Moodle • Interesting and a bit difficult. Because in writing an essay i get many troubles in chunk, rhythms, aesthetic and emotion. I still make a long sentences. And many my sentences are not use emotion. • The learning resource this week is about the recursivity and intensity and I had to ask myself: did you start writing with good idea? I also used academic phrase bank, tried to be more consistent in writing every paragraph
How long did you spend exploring the lesson outside the classroom? Where? When? And with whom?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 1-2 hours at home in the evening with my friend. • Between 2-3 hours depending on the task difficulty. In the bedroom or in the university library. After class. Sometimes with a friend and by myself. • About one or two hours in my boarding house when I have free time in the night an in the morning.
Did you have any problems or difficulties? If so, what are they?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recordings cannot be detected by my laptop, so I have to find some other ways to complete these exercises • I have a bad Internet connection and limited Internet quota • The Internet connection makes me nuts! It makes me to retry the lesson, but I enjoy it. • My difficulties are in determining the chunk, and recording on the Speech analyzer application. Even though every week we are trained with moodle, I still find it difficult when I have to create chunk, peak shift, and emotion. Because if in Moodle we can follow the professor's intonation.

In general, the participants of the experimental group perceived that the uses of the three learning tools as relatively easy. Furthermore, they generally showed positive comments regarding the uses of the three learning tools. These findings suggest that the new pedagogy was not as complicated as many people have may expected even though it embraces the notion of language learning as complex systems.

Perceptions of the overall learning process

This section reports the findings on the perceptions on the overall learning process in the academic writing course completed by both the control and experimental groups. Likert

scale was used to measure the perception of the participants on the learning process (Strongly Agree = 1; Agree = 2; Neutral = 3; Disagree = 4; Strongly Disagree = 5). The 11 questions include in this part were: (1) *The course was organized in a way that helped me learn better*; (2) *The course provided me with opportunities to understand how to create academic texts*; (3) *The course helped me learn to think critically*; (4) *The course helped me learn to read critically*; (5) *The course helped me learn to write creatively*; (6) *The course (or section) improved my problem-solving skills*; (7) *The course helped me in differentiating academic and non-academic texts*; (8) *The course helped me in furthering my command of linguistic structures of English*; (9) *I enjoyed using innovative learning methods to support my learning progress*; (10) *The course helped me reflect on my learning progress*; (11) *The course developed my understanding of the value of academic writing in my capacity as a language user as well as a future language teacher*. The following table displays the descriptive statistics of the participants' perceptions of the learning process.

Table 4.3. Descriptive statistics for perceptions of the learning process

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9		Q10		Q11	
	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP	CTRL	EXP
Valid	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	1.907	1.574	1.648	1.352	1.833	1.519	1.759	1.648	1.907	1.648	2.093	2.167	1.833	1.611	1.944	1.722	2.111	1.463	2.130	1.722	1.852	1.556
Median	2.000	1.000	2.000	1.000	2.000	1.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	1.500	2.000	2.000	2.000	1.500	2.000	2.000	2.000	1.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000
Std. Deviation	0.708	0.690	0.555	0.520	0.771	0.574	0.751	0.705	0.652	0.731	0.708	0.863	0.720	0.685	0.685	0.529	0.718	0.605	0.702	0.596	0.656	0.572
Minimum	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Maximum	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	4.000	3.000	4.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	4.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	4.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000

The descriptive statistics above shows that all mean scores of the experimental group are smaller than the mean scores of the control group except for question 6. At first sights, this finding suggests that, in general, the experimental group appears to have more positive learning experiences than the control group. The following table displays between-group comparisons of participants' perceptions of the learning process.

Table 4.4. Between-group comparison on the perception of the learning process

	Test	Statistic	df	p	Effect Size
Q1	Student	2.479	106	0.015	0.477
	Mann-Whitney	1832.500		0.013	0.257
Q2	Student	2.864	106	0.005	0.551
	Mann-Whitney	1864.500		0.004	0.279
Q3	Student	2.406	106	0.018	0.463
	Mann-Whitney	1771.000		0.034	0.215
Q4	Student	0.793	106	0.430	0.153
	Mann-Whitney	1569.500		0.456	0.076
Q5	Student	1.945	106	0.054	0.374

	Test	Statistic	df	p	Effect Size
	Mann-Whitney	1770.500		0.037	0.214
Q6	Student	-0.488	106	0.627	-0.094
	Mann-Whitney	1391.500		0.665	-0.046
Q7	Student	1.643	106	0.103	0.316
	Mann-Whitney	1704.000		0.100	0.169
Q8	Student	1.888	106	0.062	0.363
	Mann-Whitney	1702.500		0.087	0.168
Q9	Student	5.071	106	< .001	0.976
	Mann-Whitney	2152.500		< .001	0.476
Q10	Student	3.252	106	0.002	0.626
	Mann-Whitney	1910.500		0.002	0.310
Q11	Student	2.502	106	0.014	0.481
	Mann-Whitney	1802.000		0.018	0.236

Table 4.22 above shows that the p values for Q1, Q2, Q3, Q5, Q9, Q10, and Q11 are smaller than 0.05. Q1 asked if the course was organised in a way that helped the participants to learn better. Q2 asked if the course provided them with opportunities to understand how to create academic texts. Q3 asked if the course helped them learn to think critically. Q5 asked if the course helped participants learn to write creatively. Q9 asked if they enjoyed the course's innovative learning methods to support their learning progress. Q10 asked if the course developed their understanding on the value of academic writing in their capacity as a language user as well as a future language teacher. Q11 asked if the course developed their understanding of the value of academic writing in their capacity as a language teacher as well as a future language teacher.

This finding clearly suggests that the participants in the experimental group had a more positive agreement with these seven questions compared to the control group. The comparison of the mean scores for these seven questions can be traced back in the previous table where the mean scores of the experimental group participants for these seven questions were all smaller than the mean scores of the control group. In the remaining questions (Q4, Q6, Q7, Q8), however, the p values are bigger than 0.05, suggesting that there was no significant difference in satisfaction between the experimental and control groups. More specifically, Q4 asked if the course helped the participants to learn to read critically. Q6 asked the course improved their problem-solving skills. Q7 asked if the course helped them in differentiating academic and non-academic texts. Q8 asked if the course helped them in furthering their command of linguistic structures of English.

The findings above suggest that the experimental group participants, in general, had developed more positive perceptions about the entire learning process using the three innovative learning tools. This clearly indicates that breaking away from pedagogic grammar and linguistic-oriented pedagogy is now feasible. However, a firm theoretical triangulation is needed in order to provide a solid ground on how the complex language learning system works. While the major statistical findings are not revealed here, it is well noted that the experimental group, which was previously left behind in the pretest than the control group,

had actually outperformed the control group in the posttest by a very large margin. The statistical findings presented in this article suggest that the positive learning attitude demonstrated by the experimental group, to a large extent, are well represented in the learning outcomes achieved by the experimental group (in upcoming publication). The new academic writing pedagogy was proven to be useful for the learners in the context of academic writing course.

CONCLUSION

This paper reports how the control and experimental group participants perceived their overall learning experiences in academic writing course. The treatment given to the experimental group was a new writing pedagogy that breaks away from pedagogic grammar. The new pedagogy embraces the notion of language learning as a complex systems by integrating the prosodic components (rhythm and intonation), movement, emotion, and aesthetics. The details of oh how this new pedagogy was arranged can be seen in Bumela (2020). The statistical findings in this paper show that the experimental group participants, in general, had developed a positive learning attitude, that eventually guaranteed their learning progress.

REFERENCES

- Aunurrahman, A., Hamied, F., & Emilia, E. (2017). Exploring the tertiary EFL students' academic writing competencies. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 72-79. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6860>
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, F. A., & Emilia, E. (2016). Facilitating character building through an academic writing practice. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3), 146–160.
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2013). Policy on foreign language education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 7(1), 1-19.
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2012). *Pokoknya Rekayasa Literasi*. Bandung: PT Kiblat Utama.
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2002, 02 May). Critical thinking crucial to global success, *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from lgtv.thejakartapost.com/index.php/read/news/89229.
- Baines, L. (2008). *A teacher's guide to multisensory learning: Improving literacy by engaging the senses*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Basthomi, Y. (2016). Mentoring penulisan karya ilmiah. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 21, 115-125.
- Basthomi, Y. (2009). Examining spaces in doctoral prospectuses. *TEFLIN Journal*, 20 (2), 140-158.
- Bumela, L. (2020). Designing 21st century language learning scenario in Indonesia: A Perspective from computer-assisted language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Arabic Studies*, 2(1). DOI : 10.24235/ijas.v2i1.6106
- Damasio, A. & Immordino-Yang, H. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective and social neuroscience to education, *International Mind, Brain, and Education Society*, 1(1), 3-10. doi:10.1111/j.1751-228X.2007.00004.x.
- Davis, B., Sumara, D., and Luce-Kapler, R. (2008). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times*. London: Routledge.
- Eagleman, D. (2011). *Incognito: The secret lives of the brain*. New York: Pantheon.

- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2010, October). Universal intellectual standards. Retrieved December 6, 2014, from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/universal-intellectual-standards/527>
- Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2015). Systemic functional linguistic genre pedagogy (SFL GP) in a tertiary EFL writing context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(2), 155-182. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-182>
- Freadman, A. (1994). Models of genre for language teaching. The 1994 Sonia Marks Memorial Lecture. [Sydney:] University of Sydney.
- Freadman, A. (2004). When the king and queen of England came to town: Popular entertainment, everyday life, and the teaching of “culture”. Inaugural lecture in the University of Melbourne. Retrieved June 10, 2011 from: <http://languages.unimelb.edu.au/about/staff/profiles/freadmanlecture.html>.
- Guberina, P. (1972). Restricted bands of frequencies in auditory rehabilitation of deaf. Zagreb: Institute of Phonetics, Faculty of Arts, University of Zagreb.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Education.
- He, B., & Sangarun, P. (2015). Implementing autonomy: a model for improving pronunciation in Chinese EFL university students. *Rangsit Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 5(1), pp. 1–12.
- He, B., Sangarun, P. & Lian, A.-P. (2015). Improving the English pronunciation of Chinese EFL university students through the integration of CALL and verbotonalism. In J. Colpaert, A. Aerts, M. Oberhofer, & M. Gutiérrez-Colón Plana (Eds.). *Seventeenth International CALL Research Conference: Task Design and CALL* (pp. 276–285). University of Antwerp. Retrieved from http://www.fundacio.urv.cat/congressos/public/usr_docs/call_2015_conference_proceedings.pdf.
- Henry, A. and Roseberry, R.L. (1998). An evaluation of a genre-based approach to the Teaching of EAP/ESP Writing. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)*, 32(1). DOI: 10.2307/3587913.
- Indonesian Government. (2014). *The Minister of Education and Culture Decree No. 49 Year 2014 on National Higher Education Standards* Jakarta: The Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Indonesian Government. (2012). *Publikasi Karya Ilmiah*. Jakarta: The Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Jubhari, R.S. (2003). *Cultural influences on the rhetorical structure of undergraduate thesis introductions in Bahasa Indonesia and English*. PhD Thesis. Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Klein, P. D. (1999). Reopening inquiry into cognitive processes in writing to learn. *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(3), 203-270.
- Lian, A.-P. (2000). Keynote address: From first principles: Constructing language learning and teaching environments. In M.-S. Lin (Ed.), *Selected papers from the ninth international symposium on English teaching* (pp. 49–62). Taipei: Crane Publishing. Retrieved 3 July 2017 from http://www.andrewlian.com/andrewlian/prowww/first_principles/index.html.

- Lian, A. B. (2006). A dialogic model of inquiry in second language teaching: Toward the concept of a critical approach to pedagogic research (Doctoral thesis), The University of Queensland, Australia.
- Lian, A.B., Bordnarchuk, A., Lian, A. P. & Napiza, C. (2016). Academic writing as aesthetics applied: Creative Use of Technology to Support Multisensory Learning. In: Lian, A., Kell, P., Black, P. & Koo Yew Lie, *Challenges in Global Learning*, CPS, London.
- Lian, A.B. (2017). Reading for emotion with ICT tools. In Chen, W. et al. (Eds.) (2017). *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Computers in Education*. (Internationally refereed proceedings) New Zealand: Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education.
- Lian, A.-P., & Sussex, R. D. (2018). (in press). Toward a critical epistemology for learning languages and cultures in 21st century Asia. In Andy Curtis and Roland Sussex (Eds), *Intercultural communication in Asia: Education, language and values*. Proceedings of the Third Macao International Forum, 15-19 December 2014, Macao Polytechnic Institute, Macao. Berlin and London: Springer Verlag.
- Lian, A.-P. (1980). Intonation patterns of French (teacher's book). Melbourne, Auckland: River Seine Publications Pty Ltd.
- Luke, A. (2000). Critical literacy in Australia. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, pp. 1-19. Retrieved May 22, 2017 from: <http://paddle.usp.ac.fj/collect/paddle/index/assoc/pride024.dir/doc.pdf>.
- Martin, J. (2007). Construing knowledge: a functional linguistic perspective. In Frances Christie and J.R. Martin (Eds.), *Language, Knowledge and Pedagogy: Functional Linguistic and Sociological Perspectives*, (pp. 34-64). London: Continuum.
- Ramachandran, V. & Hirstein, W. (1999). The science of art: A neurological theory of aesthetic experience. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6(6-7), 15-51.
- Ramachandran, V. S. (1996). The Evolutionary Biology of Self-Deception, Laughter, Dreaming and Depression: Some Clues from Anosognosia. *Medical Hypotheses*, 47, 347-362
- Schwartz, M. & Kotz, S. (2015). The timing of regular sequences: Production, perception, and covariation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 27, 1697-1707.
- Yang, Y. (2017). *Improving the English speaking and phonological working memory skills of Chinese primary EFL learners: A verbotonal-based approach*. PhD Thesis. Suranaree University of Technology.
- Yang, Y., Wannaruk, A. & Lian, A.-P. (2017). (Forthcoming) Improving the English-speaking skills of Chinese primary E