

ACQUISITION PLANNING FOR ENGLISH: A CASE IN MALAYSIAN
TERTIARY EDUCATION

Mohamad-Hassan Zakaria

A DISSERTATION

in

Education

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1997

Nancy H. Houburger
Supervisor of Dissertation

Susan Fuh
Graduate Group Chairperson

UMI Number: 9800946

UMI Microform 9800946

Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI

**300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

For my wife, Fara, whose hard work and perseverance inspired me to finish this dissertation, and who never failed in giving me all her attentions and support, and in putting aside her many obligations even while writing her own dissertation.

And for our children, Fadhil, Sarah, and Sakeena who always entertain and provide comfort, and show great appreciation towards their parents' challenging academic experience at the University of Pennsylvania.

And for my great teacher, Dr. Nancy Hornberger, whose warm friendship and invaluable advice made this writing a pleasant and rewarding endeavor.

ABSTRACT

ACQUISITION PLANNING FOR ENGLISH: A CASE IN MALAYSIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION

**MOHAMAD-HASSAN ZAKARIA
DR. NANCY HORNBERGER**

This qualitative case study examines issues concerning the goals for language planning for English as perceived by participants involved in English language teaching and English acquisition planning in Malaysia. It situates the problem of the decline in English proficiency in Malaysia within the scope of language planning, and specifically within the area of language planning goals.

Focusing on the English language program at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) in both its structural and pedagogical aspects, the study explores the relationships between Malaysian English language planning goals, the various curricular goals and objectives of the program, and the values and attitudes of participants at different policy levels, including ESL practitioners/teachers, administrators, and policy makers. The study's findings have implications for policy making, policy implementation and effective day-to-day operation for acquisition planning, in this case and other similar cases worldwide.

The results of the data collected suggest, first that there is ambiguity in goal-setting 1) at the national level

with regards to the contending roles between English and Malay in policy and in society, and 2) at the curriculum level with regards to distinguishing between a) problems with English and problems with communication, and b) a specific content syllabus and a general content syllabus. Second, the findings also suggest that there exists a goals-implementation gap which is due to a) lack of coordination and cooperation across levels -- national policy to university to RELP, and b) disempowerment of teachers.

It is, thus, postulated that in order to achieve a clear goal-setting, a) the role of English must continue to be as resource to the society and a tool for development, and that English must cease to be seen as a threat to the existing role for Malay, and b) environment and opportunity for English must be provided on campus and this necessitates structural changes in the institution. Also, in order to bridge the existing goals-implementation gap, there must be an emphasis on a) coordination across different disciplines, approaches, planning levels, and professionals, and b) the importance of teachers as leaders who can have direct roles in effecting change through the planning and implementation of a language program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Problem: the issues of proficiency and language policy	1
The roles of the Malay and English languages	6
The Study: A brief highlight.....	14

Chapter Two

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	21
Language planning goals	21
Coordination and cooperation in language planning.....	26
Language planning as problem solving	30
Non-linguistic ends of language planning.....	33
English for Specific Purposes (ESP) syllabus.....	36

Chapter Three

THE STUDY AND THE RESEARCHER-RESEARCHED RELATIONSHIP...	46
The researcher-researched relationship.....	46
Methods of data collection.....	56
Data Analysis.....	62
Notions of validity and reliability.....	67

Chapter Four

ENGLISH ACQUISITION PLANNING AT UTM	71
The problem: Declining English proficiency.....	71
Contending roles of Malay and English.....	79
In search of a solution	85
Views on proficiency.....	88
English-communication distinction.....	91
Specific versus general content syllabus.....	99
Creating environment and opportunity: A structural issue.....	105
Summary.....	114

Chapter Five

CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS AT UTM: ISSUES OF COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.....	116
Overview on levels of planning.....	117
Constraints in coordination and collaboration.....	120
Empowerment and disempowerment.....	129
Teachers as leaders for change.....	137
Summary.....	145

Chapter Six

DISCUSSION: LANGUAGE PLANNING GOALS AND ENGLISH ACQUISITION PLANNING.....	148
The importance of goals.....	148
<i>Status policy planning goals of nationalization, officialization, proscription.....</i>	<i>152</i>
<i>Status cultivation planning goals of intra-national and international communication, maintenance, spread, and revival.....</i>	<i>155</i>
<i>Acquisition cultivation planning goals of maintenance reacquisition, second language acquisition, shift.....</i>	<i>158</i>
<i>Acquisition policy planning goals with respect to education.....</i>	<i>160</i>
<i>Corpus policy planning goals of standardization/ auxiliary code standardization.....</i>	<i>163</i>
<i>Corpus cultivation planning goals of modernization, renovation, and stylistic simplification.....</i>	<i>164</i>
Goal-setting and implementation: the gaps and the need to bridge them.....	166
Top down versus bottom up planning.....	171
Cooperation from macro to micro, goal setting to implementation.....	175

Chapter Seven

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	179
English status viewed in broader contexts.....	180
Structural changes in acquisition planning	185
Multi-disciplinary and multilevel approach to curriculum planning.....	188
Consultational approach to syllabus design.....	191
Beyond syllabus: self-empowerment.....	196
Summary.....	203

REFERENCES	208
-------------------------	------------

ACRONYMS

CDC	- Curriculum Development Center
CFYS	- Center for First Year Studies
DML	- Department of Modern Languages
DVC(A)	- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
DVC(D)	- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Development)
DVC(S)	- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Affairs)
ELT	- English Language Teaching
ESL	- English as a Second Language
ESP	- English for Specific Purposes
FMHRD	- Faculty of Management and Human Resource Development
RELP	- Reorganized English Language Program
UTM	- Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
VC	- Vice-Chancellor

Chapter One

Introduction

This study examines issues concerning the goals for language planning for English as perceived by participants involved in English language teaching and English acquisition planning in Malaysia. Focusing on the English language program at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) in both its structural and pedagogical aspects, the study explores the relationships between Malaysian English language planning goals, the various curricular goals and objectives of the program, and the values and attitudes of participants at different policy levels, including ESL practitioners/teachers, administrators, and policy makers. By examining levels of planning involved and the relationship among them, the research offers deeper understanding of the goal formulation and implementation activities in language planning, and thus provides information on policy making, policy implementation and effective day-to-day operation for acquisition planning, in this case and, other similar cases worldwide.

The problem: the issues of proficiency and language policy

In Malaysia, there has been a significantly observed decline in levels of English proficiency (Asiah, 1995; Ching, 1995; Vatikiotis, 1991; Ozog, 1990; Chitravelu, 1985;

Asmah, 1979). This decline has been largely attributed to the government's choice of Malay (also known as Bahasa Melayu) as sole medium of instruction in the schools and the absence of the necessary status for English in education (Ozog, 1990; Gaudart, 1987). The 1967 Language Act, making the Malay language the national language, led to the successful implementation of the language as the official medium of instruction (the role that English had played during the British colonial rule). This act lowered the status of English to that of a compulsory subject to be taught in the schools, but also stated that "measures will be taken to ensure that English is taught as a strong second language" as stated in the Third Malaysia Plan (Malaysia, 1976, p. 397). Ozog (1990) further attributes the decline of English to the fact that the current constitution does not grant any official status to English even though English plays an undeniably important role in Malaysia. He notes that:

The demand for a better status for English in education tends to be ignored since policy makers are very comfortable with the status Malay enjoys and they are not willing to see it threatened. The resistance to revive English in school thus always persists (p. 312).

Zuengler (1985) relates a similar problem faced by Tanzanian educators. Since the use of Swahili as medium of instruction has become widespread "English has been relegated to a minor position with policy unclear as to its use" (p. 247).

The success in using Malay language, the national language, as the medium of instruction was the expected and desired outcome of the national language policy; yet it has also been viewed as contributing to the neglect of English as taught and learned in schools. Chitravelu (1985) acknowledges the decline in English proficiency among school leavers based on the low "overall achievement in terms of percentages who pass even the norm-referenced test" (p.25). Gaudart (1987, p. 533) attributes the emergence of monolingual Malay-speaking rural students to the shift in the medium of instruction. In similar tone, Rahimah, Marimutu, and Norjannah (1987) predict "that the use of ... English in the year 2000 will decline, making the younger generation monolingual..." (p. 19). Expressing similar concern, Asmah (1979) claims that there is a "definite downward movement in the level of proficiency in English among the current generation of Malaysians" (p.57).

English in the Malaysian context has always been regarded as a resource for its citizens, individually and collectively. Vatikiotis (1991) highlights concerns of the Prime Minister and Minister of Education on this same issue. Echoing their concerns, he states:

Declining standards of English in the population at large must be set against a socio-economic trend in Malaysia whereby fluency in English is fast becoming a premium for employment in urban areas...[and it] has become a potentially discriminative factor in employment (p. 28-30).

Faced with rapid development, an overwhelming economic growth and its increasingly active role in international affairs, Malaysia has always regarded English as an important language and a tool for development. English acquisition and mastery serves as an indicator that guarantees one's upward social mobility and economic betterment. Ching (1995) remarks:

After forsaking the English language and turning to Bahasa Malaysia as a nation-building tool, Kuala Lumpur is discovering the high price it had to pay in economic development. Once again, Malaysia is trying to reach outward through the use of English" (Ching, 1995, p.32).

Malaysian language policy, implemented to complement the economic policies and social planning, has been viewed as aiming at redressing the economic imbalance between different ethnic groups. Government, for example, has expressed concern that economic gaps between the ethnic groups will widen if Malays cannot communicate effectively in English (Mauzy, 1985, p. 155). High percentages of Malays or rural students, who are mostly not proficient in English, tend to settle for low-paying jobs. Coulmas (1992) claims that "language must be regarded as valuable not only in ideal, but also in material terms" (p. 21ff). To him, "the possession of a language implies a potential for unfolding individuals' range of action and hence their enrichment" (p. 55).

The basic objectives in teaching English obligatorily in the developing countries are developmental at both national and personal levels (see Pakir (1993) for Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei; Grabe and Kaplan (1986) for China; Zuengler (1985) for Tanzania; Pattanayak (1985) for India; Pride (1982) for Malaysia). In order to serve the needs of their citizens, such developing countries must have systematic and effective planned roles for English.

Ozog (1990, p. 313), commenting on the dilemma faced by the politicians and language planners, namely the role of English in Malaysian education and its relationship with the national language, resents those Malaysians who are not willing to admit the importance of English (that is, those who think that it would undermine the status of the national language.) Pakir (1993, p. 5) stresses that English has always been viewed as a "national asset,... an important means for personal advancement...[and] is seen as a cause and effect of economic development...." Since there are many important domains, such as business, which still utilize English only, opportunities to revitalize English by sharing the domains are wide open. Asmah (1979), however, maintains that:

If English is given equality with the national language in the system of education, the latter language will stand to lose in terms of its development.... [Consequently it] will undoubtedly shut off any opportunity for the [Malay] language to develop in terms of the enrichment of its morphemic and lexical inventories (p.56).

The roles of the Malay and English languages

As a multiracial nation, Malaysia's rich sociolinguistic situations offer insights into the roles of different languages and their domains, and the influences the society and language policy have on these domains. Malaysian population consists of various ethnic groups: Malays 53%, Chinese 35%, Indians 11%, and others 1%. The three main languages, Malay, Mandarin and Tamil, are widely spoken and used in the mass media but Malay predominates in governmental official use. The three languages serve as mediums of instructions with English as a compulsory subject for all and Malay as a compulsory subject for the other two types of schools. Gaudart (1987), in highlighting the current status of language in education in Malaysia, claimed that about 70% of the children are in the Malay medium schools, 26% in the Mandarin and 3% in the Tamil. Malay however, is the sole medium of instruction in secondary schools retaining English as a compulsory subject for all (Mandarin and Tamil may be provided if there are demands for them).

However, a pass in English language is not compulsory in the Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (the National Standardized High School Examination) even though suggestions to make it necessary have been made by educators and the public in general. This is because such a requirement is expected to produce a high failing percentage among school students

especially those who come from rural areas and also from low income families. The hesitation to make it a pass has also been viewed as in itself an acknowledgement of the education system's failure in providing equal treatment to all schools in English language teaching (see Gaudart (1987) and Chitravelu (1985) for the problems with shortage of teachers and infrastructure in Malaysian schools).

Tertiary level education utilizes Malay as the sole medium of instruction, but English is still used extensively in science, technical, and medical fields. At private colleges English is the medium of instruction. These colleges, increasing in number, normally have joint programs with universities in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and some other parts of the world. However, Malay is still required to be taught as a compulsory subject in these private colleges.

As a result of Malaysian language policy, Malay language naturally controls the domains the policy dictates. However, bilingual language use, such as code-switching, emerges at official and unofficial levels where the influence of English can be seen in these domains. Asmah (1994) highlights the policy's acknowledgement of the crucial role of English in Malaysia:

Although there have been moves by nationalistic movements to see to the full implementation of the national language in all aspects of the life of the Malaysians, English still remains as 'the other language' in officialdom and elsewhere... The

government...has allowed the continuity of English in Malaysia, even at the official level, in certain domains.... If Malay was chosen and is upheld for nationalism, then English is obviously retained for another purpose and that is nationism (p. 70).

At local universities for example, English is used on a regular basis by students across different races. Meetings among academicians at the university are normally conducted in both languages even though the policy states that only Malay should be used. Language attitudes or personal preference play an important role that contributes to such a language use. Chitravelu (1985) summarizes the roles of English in Malaysia:

English in Government: Malay is the official language in Government used for about 70% of the time. Among the lower rungs in the government service, Malay is used about 100% of the time except in those departments which have frequent dealings with foreigners or the private sectors. Foreign service officers and Trade and Industry ministry officers use quite a high percentage of English. If the work of a government officer is of a technical nature or if it requires research or references to law, English is used quite heavily. The government has training facilities for officers who are weak in English.

English in Business and Industry: English is the main lingua franca of this domain except in the traditional sectors and in those trades where there is a predomi-

nance of Chinese. Almost 100% of the documentation -- invoices, contracts, etc -- is in English.

English in The Professions: Professionals use English a very high percentage of the time because most professionals have had their training in English and most are not proficient in the National Language.

English in the Media: There is a very strong bias towards domestic programs and regional information sources but in practice, there is quite a lot of English in some of the media. There are more English programs than any other programs. English films on videos are still very popular in the urban centers. There are few, if any, English books in rural bookstores but large bookstores in town stock primarily English books. Computer data bases generally provide their information in English.

English in Day-To-Day Living: English and Malay are the lingua franca of the large towns but English is used in the family domain only among the English educated.

(Taken from: Chitravelu, 1985, pp. 34-72)

In short, even though Malay has made significant gains, English, following a natural process of language spread and maintenance, is still used extensively in some domains and academic fields. Malaysians have been known to maintain a certain language or shift to another irrespective of any

existing overt national language policy. But one can still question: To what extent can a particular language continue to be maintained when only a limited opportunity for learning it is provided by the schools?

There exists a widespread belief among people that the efforts to spread English need to be balanced with the efforts to spread Malay. Such a preferred "balanced maintenance" may be achieved through a compromise, and proper distribution of the functions and forms of both languages. However, the acquisition, maintenance, and spread of each language must all be taken into consideration in light of the various societal forces that naturally push toward either the spread or shift of any of the languages in some domains. Kloss (1969) stresses that languages "cannot leave each other alone; one always tries to drive out the other geographically or in a functional sense" (p. 556).

Noss (1995) warns:

Many countries in the world have tried to give the national language "equal" status [with English] -- for example Malaysia and Singapore. It is now fairly clear that this solution does not work. From the education system on up to all other sectors of the economy and the society, one of the two languages becomes dominant in the popular mind and becomes associated with success, the other with failure (Noss, p. 16).

Sharing similar concern, Asiah (1995) cautions: "we need to improve our command of the English language in this country to keep abreast of international development, but do we need to do so at the expense of the treasured and valuable

national aspirations and acquisitions?" (p. 64). There is a prevalent skepticism toward the potential of the Malay language to meet the discourse demands in certain domains, especially in trades:

English has a commercial value. I am afraid that Malay...will not proliferate if it is not protected. I do not know how we can protect it.... Is it possible that there will be a crisis in 10 years? How are we going to protect the Malay language without hampering the growth of English language? I think the answer is not found yet (DVCS, 4/6/95).

The language preferred by the majority of the trade community is not Malay (even though most of them can speak it); Malay suffers from a lack of economic profile, in the terms described by Coulmas (1992): "demand for a language as a commodity on the international market of foreign languages and the size of the industry it supports" (p. 89). Although linguistic relativism opposes unequal valuation of languages and contributes greatly to linguistics, other non-linguistic factors may jeopardize the "equal" position or status of a language. Justification for the continuing existence of Malay as language of use in the legal and medical professions, for example, perhaps can be explained on sociopsychological or cultural grounds (i.e. strong deep-rooted sentiments attached to it) rather than linguistic grounds (such as the perceived inadequacy of Malay to function in certain domains).

The tension between the contending roles for Malay and English as expressed by politicians, language planners, and

educators echoes two themes reverberating in the national dialogue about roles of languages in Malaysia: *Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa* (language is the soul of the nation) and *Wawasan 2020* (2020 Vision). The former refers to the crucial status and role of the Malay language as national identity and the agent of nation building and national integration, while the latter serves as a motto (coined by the Prime Minister several years ago) to promote the nation's direction and vision to be an industrialized country by the year 2020, a goal supposedly facilitated by a more effective use of English. The two have been serving as national campaigns, mottos, and political agendas, and they are rigorously and distinctly articulated on thousand of posters, stickers, TV and radio advertisements. The contending roles of the Malay and English languages implied by the two mottos are understandable because the spread of each of them has resulted either from the impacts of overt policies or the natural societal forces present in the society, or both. But the fact that the two languages contend may not necessarily be easily rationalized because people's sentiments towards each language are strong and deeply rooted in the history, culture, and politics of the nation.

The Prime Minister, among many other Ministers who have made similar public statements, in acknowledging the importance of the two languages to co-exist harmoniously,

denies that English is a threat to the national language (The Star, 2/23/92, p.1). "If we believe that besides preserving our nation [through the national language] we should develop the country [through an effective use of English], then a suitable approach has to be worked out" (The Prime Minister, quoted by Ching, 1995).

Working within the constraints of the national language policy that places Malay as the highest priority, educators are faced with great challenges in redefining the status and roles of English in education. Issues concerning the decline of the English language are traditionally viewed from a perspective that focuses on both the acquisition of English and the maintenance of it. However, the maintenance of English may be viewed as posing an extensive threat to the national language policy or the Malay language as compared to its acquisition or reacquisition, which in part implies an involvement of only one domain, i.e. education.

Due to the perceived contending roles of English and Malay, any planning advocating the maintenance of English in certain domains (such as, science and technology, business, commerce, and industry which were introduced by the colonial rule) tends to face some resistance from people. Although some feel that there are inadequacies of Malay to fully function in those domains, the government, with the help of its implementing agencies, started to gradually introduce

Malay language in those domains since the country's independence in 1957 (Asiah, 1995; Asmah, 1987; Asmah, 1979). However, these domains may not necessarily be dictated or determined by overt policies but by personal preference or societal forces (see Asiah, 1995, for a discussion of the non-controlling domains of language use in Malaysia). Thus, to some people, the continued maintenance of English seems to be the most viable option, but others deem such a goal to be detrimental to national language planning. They will argue that such a concession is an unnecessary compromise which undermines the capability of the Malay language to fully function as an academic language. Solving language problems often accompanies modernization and sociocultural, socioeconomic, and political integration, and sometimes it is achieved at the expense of traditions (Ferguson, 1968; Fishman, 1985).

The study: A brief highlight

The Universiti Teknologi Malaysia's Department of Modern languages (DML) serves as a fertile ground for investigation for this research. Since the implementation of the ESP syllabus for the English language program (Reorganized English Language Program or RELP) in the DML in 1990, its success and limitations have been seriously discussed and debated. Some staff have expressed worries

about the program's effectiveness while others firmly hold on to the ideals of the program. Several deans have questioned the long hours required by their students in the program. Some members of the university senate (including the deans) have demanded to see the results the program has brought about. Some blame others for not having clear concepts.

The pressures placed by one level of planning on another are gaining momentum due partly to the changing mission and vision of the university and partly to similar changes in the country in general. This has necessitated the participants to rethink, react, and take a serious look at the program. As my fieldwork began to take focus, there were three circumstances which encouraged my endeavors. First, another English program specifically for first year students was established by the Center for First Year Study, CFYS (but later was discontinued during the writing of this dissertation); second it was proposed that the DML be expanded into a language center; and lastly, there was a generally felt need for, as well as large-scale efforts toward, the improvement of RELP. The genuine interest of all participants in producing a quality program and its inevitable evolution offered me the needed circumstances for this study.

This is a qualitative case study which is both descriptive and interpretive. The research seeks to answer this broad question:

How are English acquisition planning goals perceived across different participants and levels of implementation in one ESP language program in Malaysia?

The description and narration in this study seek to provide specific and concrete details about the goals and objectives of one particular English language program and the values and attitudes of its participants, in order to explore relationships among different levels of planning. It is not a program evaluation. I recognize that some evaluative tendencies will always be present even in a description, but the goal of the study will not be to evaluate, but to describe.

Since I am familiar with the research site, its setting, and its community, a part of my goal in this qualitative case study is to explore beyond the surface of familiar actions and common perceptions displayed by the participants in order to "make the familiar strange and interesting again" (Erickson, 1990, p. 83). My role as an insider helps me achieve this because my easy access to and knowledge about the setting and its members allow me to look at the practice of the participants and their various social settings by "considering the relations between a setting and its wider social environment" (Erickson, 1986, p. 122).

Such holistic investigation into the acquisition planning of English in Malaysia is necessary due to the need to examine the interconnectedness among various levels of planning and implementation at the university and governmental levels, and also to interpret the various perceptions people have towards the teaching and learning of English language. In discussing the importance of creating meaningful interpretation, Erickson (1990) maintains that interpretive research "must include identification of the meaning-interpretation of the actors...[through] 'objective' analysis of 'subjective' meanings" (p. 100).

Interviews and conversations with selected lecturers, deans of various faculties, heads of department, administrators, officials from the Ministry of Education, and UTM students, sought to a) identify, describe, and analyze language planning goals as perceived by participants at various planning levels and b) investigate the relationships across the levels as they bear on the goals of acquisition planning for English. Besides the inputs from the informants and my interaction with them, documents which were available at the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, the Department of Modern Languages, the Ministry of Education, and other relevant departments were also examined and analyzed.

This study is by no means comprehensive, but efforts have been made to address the complexity of the issues discussed. Great attempts have also been made to

substantiate the data gathered and analyzed with theories of language, language planning, ESL pedagogy, and syllabus design. The findings gathered and insights gained were made possible through a research approach that was both eclectic and holistic. At the same time, the researcher's own experience in the program brought about the needed focus and delimitation of scope for this study. Without it, a study of such magnitude would be impossible to undertake given the methodology chosen, the scope covered, and the theoretical implications posited.

The research question posited yields several interrelated and multifaceted descriptive and interpretive questions. They generate broad themes necessary for the organization of this dissertation. In addressing the research questions, recurring patterns, responses, topics, and issues, gathered during the fieldwork, were classified and categorized into several headings that were later developed into broad themes. These became the justification for developing the chapters for this dissertation. Chapter 1 introduces the problem of the declining English proficiency in Malaysia, highlights the problem with language policy, and presents a brief background of the study. Chapter 2 provides the conceptual framework for the study discussed under sections of language planning and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Chapter 3 describes the study and the research design. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are

products of my attempts to weave my description and interpretation into the emergent themes by integrating data gathered in the fieldwork. Chapter 4 describes English acquisition planning at UTM and explores the nature of the problem and its solutions as perceived by the participants of the study and also their varying views on proficiency. Chapter 5 highlights the issues of coordination and collaboration and touches on the issues of empowerment and disempowerment of teachers and students. Chapter 6 attempts to converge LP perspectives with issues in ESL teaching, highlighting the LP goals and recapitulating the main themes along with their respective theoretical discussions. Chapter 7 concludes the discussion by presenting the possible implications and recommendations this study may offer.

There were a number of factors motivating and facilitating this research. First of all, there is my familiarity with the institution, its staff, and local context. I also felt driven by my own personal negative experiences earlier in life, i.e. in my English classes. To a great extent these experiences serve as invaluable assets to me in the exploration of this area. The English language taught at schools and at the UTM (when I was a student) failed to promote an ideal environment for language use within both the classroom and the campus. There were no meaningful opportunities to use the language. Instead of

cultivating my interest in the language, English classes heightened my anxiety, posing as an enemy for language learning. When I went to teach, first at a school and then later at three different universities, my students voiced similar experiences to mine, confirming the existence of problems with English language teaching especially at the tertiary level. The area of study selected is thus triggered by an accumulation of past observations, experiences, and shared sentiments with colleagues and students. These have provided me the needed energy to embark on this research.

beginning at the highest level of authority and ideally descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can support or resist putting the policy into effect (p. 160).

I hope that this study has highlighted the importance of defining language planning goals at various levels of planning and of bridging the gap between policy formulation and implementation in language teaching. Insights from the findings may assist ESL and non-ESL professionals in an institution to work together in collaborative leadership to come up with an English language syllabus that will provide the needed environments and opportunities to ensure learners' effective acquisition of English, and thereby a continuing role for English in Malaysia as a tool for development and a resource for society.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Halim, Othman, Abdullah M. Nor, Baharuddin Ishak, Mohamad Haji Alias. 1991. *Malaysian Universities: Facing the Challenges in the nineties*. Report presented at the Ministry of Education. Bangi, Malaysia: UKM.
- Asiah, Abu Samah. 1995. Language education policy planning in Malaysia: Concern for policy, reality, and rationality. In Abdullah Hassan (Ed.), *Language Planning in Southeast Asia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. pp. 52-65.
- Asmah, Haji Omar. 1987. Patterns of language communication in Malaysia. In Asmah Haji-Omar (Ed.), *National Language and Communication in Multilingual Societies*. Kuala Lumpur. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. pp. 13-26.
1979. *Language Planning for Unity and Efficiency*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Azizah, Abd Rahman. 1982. Inovasi Kurikulum: Beberapa Pertimbangan Penting. *Suara Pendidik*, 8(4):2-11.
- Bamgbose, A. 1991. *Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Benesch, S. 1993. ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4):705-717.
- Berwick, R. 1989. Needs assessment in language programming: From theory to practice. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 48-62.
- Borhek, J.T. & Curtis, R.F. 1975. *A Sociology of Belief*. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, D. 1991. TESOL at Twenty Five: What are the Issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2):245-260.
1987. (2nd Ed) *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Canale, M. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman. pp. 2-27.
- Ching, F. 1995. Malaysia returns to English. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, January 12:32.
- Chitravelu, N. 1985. The status and role of English: A research report prepared for the United States Information Agency.
- Cooper, R. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge.
- Coulmas, F. 1992. *Language and Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cummins, J. 1989. *Empowering Minority Students*. Sacramento: CAFE.
1980. The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J.E. Alatis (Ed) *Georgetown Round Table on Language and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Dalton, T. 1988. *The Challenge of Curriculum Innovation: A study of Ideology and Practice*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Denzin, N. 1988. *The Research Act*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Dexter, L.A. 1970. *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Eastman, C. 1983. *Language Planning: An Introduction*. San Francisco: Chandlers & Sharp Publishers.
- Erickson, F. 1986. Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Whittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Teaching*. New York: Macmillan. pp. 112-126.
- Erickson, F. & Linn, R. 1990. *Quantitative Methods Qualitative Methods*. NY: MacMillan Publishers.
- Ewer, J.R. & Boys, O. 1981. The ESL textbook situation. *The ESP Journal*. 1(2):87-105.
- Fagan, W.T. 1989. Empowered students: empowered teachers. *Reading Teachers*, 42(8), 572-8.

- Fatimah, Hamid Don. 1983. Beberapa pandangan mengenai dasar kurikulum. In Rahimah Hj. Ahmad et.al. (Eds.), *Tema Pendidikan dan Polisi Sosial*. Shah Alam; Persatuan Pendidikan Malaysia, (Working Papers presented at the 4th. National Convention on Education, 1984).
- Ferguson, C. 1968. Language Development. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. NY: John Wiley and Sons. pp. 27-35.
1959. Diglossia. *Word*, 15:325-40.
- Fishman, J. 1985. Macrosociolinguistics and the Sociology of Language in the Early Eighties. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11: 113-127.
1974. Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 79-102.
1973. *Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays* Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Fishman, J., Cooper, R., and Conrad A. 1977. *The spread of English: The sociology of English as an Additional Language*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Foster, K. 1990. Small steps on the way to teacher empowerment. *Educational Leadership*. 47(8), 38-40.
- Freeman, R. 1993. *Language Planning and Identity Planning for Social Change: Gaining the Ability and The Right to Participate*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.
- Freeman, Y. & Freeman D. 1992. *Whole Language for Second Language Learners*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Gardner, R.C. and Lambert, W.E. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Gaudart, H. 1987. A typology of bilingual education in Malaysia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 8(7): 529-552.
- Glazer, M. 1982. The threat of the stranger: vulnerability, reciprocity, and fieldwork. In J. Sieber (Ed.), *Ethics of Social Research: Fieldwork, Regulation, and Publication*. NY: Springer Verlag. pp. 49-70.

- Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. 1992. *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Glickman, C.D. 1989. Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last? *Educational Leadership*. 46(8), 4-9.
- Goertz, J.P. and LeCompte, M.D. 1984. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. Orlando, Fla: Academic Press.
- Goodman, K. 1986. *What's Whole in Whole Language*. Portsmouth. N.H: Heinemann.
- Gouldner, A.W. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. 1986. Science, technology, language, and information: Implications for language and language-in-education planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 59: 47-71.
- Guba, E. & Lincoln, S. 1981. *Effective Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A., & Stevens, P. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hammersley, M. 1992. Introduction: Reflexivity and naturalism. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *The ethnography of Schooling: Methodological Issues*. Driffield: Nafferton.
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. 1983. *Ethnography: Principles and Practice*. London: Tavistock.
- Harris, D. 1973. The future of ESOL: Continuity or generation gap. In R. Fox (Ed.), *Essays on Teaching ESL as a Second Dialect*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Haugen, E. 1985. The language of imperialism: unity or pluralism. In N. Wolfson and J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of Inequality*. New York: Mouton Publishers. pp. 3-17.
1983. The implementation of corpus planning: theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspective*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 269-29.

- Heath, S. B. 1985. Bilingual education and a national language policy. In J. Alatis and J. Staczek (Eds.) *Perspectives on Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Washington DC: Goergetown Univ. Press. pp 75-88.
- Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. 1995. *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hornberger, N. 1994. Literacy and language planning. *Language in Education: An International Journal*, 8(1&2):41-45.
1990. Bilingual education and English-Only: A language-planning framework. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March: 12-26.
- Houser, N. O. 1990. Teacher-researcher: The synthesis of roles for the empowerment. *Action in Teacher Education*. 12(2), 55-60.
- Howard, T. and Dedo, D. 1989 (November). Cultural criticism and and ESL composition. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National council of Teachers of English. Baltimore, MD. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No.ED 317062)
- Hutchinson, T and Waters, A. 1994. *English for Specific Purposes*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. 1971. *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Jacobs, G. 1988. *The English Curriculum: An Ethnographic Study*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publication.
- Johnson, R. (Ed.). 1989. *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. and Nelson, C. 1996. World Englishes. In S. McKay, & N. Hornberger. (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P. pp. 71-102.
- Karam, F.X. 1974. Towards a definition of language planning. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kennedy, C. (Ed.). 1984. *Language Planning and Language Education*. London: Allen and Unwin.

- Kirk, J. and Miller, M.L. 1986. *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research: Qualitative Research Methods Series*. Vol. 1. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Klein, F. (Ed.). 1991. *The Politics of Curriculum Decision-making: Issues in Centralizing the Curriculum*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Kloss, H. 1969. *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec. International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
1968. Notes concerning a language-nation typology. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, and J. das Gupta. (Eds), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Krashen, S. D. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Harlow: Longman.
- Lambert, R. 1994. Problems and processes in U.S foreign language planning. In *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March (532):47-58.
- Landau, J. M. 1993. The First Turkish Language Congress. In Fishman, J. (Ed.), *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The "First Congress" Phenomenon*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Larsen-Pusey, M., & Pusey, C. 1987. ESP in Colombian Public Universities. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6(1):45-52.
- Lim, K. B. 1976. A look at the teaching of reading in ESL. *RELJ Journal*, 7(1):8-12.
- Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mackay, R. & Bosquet, M. 1981. LSP curriculum and development: from policy to practice. In R. Mackay & J.D. Palmer (Eds.), *Language for Specific Purposes: Program Design and Evaluation*. Rowley: Newbury House. pp. 1-28.
- Mackey, N. 1967. *Language Teaching Analysis*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana U. Press.
- Malaysia. 1976. *Third Malaysia Plan 1976-1980*. Kuala Lumpur: The Government Press.

- Malaysia. 1982. Federal Constitution. Incorporating all amendments up to May 15, 1981. Kuala Lumpur: National Printing.
- Markee, N. 1993. The diffusion of innovation in language teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 13:229 -243.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. 1989. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mauzy, D. 1985. Language and language policy in Malaysia. In W. Beer & J. Jacob (Eds.), *Language Policy and National Unity*. Totowa: Rowman and Allanheld. pp. 151-77.
- Merriam, S. 1988. *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A.M. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morley, J. 1991. Perspectives on English for academic purposes. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1991: Linguistic and Language Pedagogy: The State of the Art*. Georgetown University Press: Washington D.C.
- Nahir, M. 1984. Language planning goals: A classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning*. 8(3):294-327.
- Neustupny, J. V. 1983. Toward a paradigm for language planning. *Language Planning Newsletter*, 9(4):1-4.
1974. Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 37-48.
- Nor Aini, A.Rahman, Leela, Koran, and Shanti, Chandran. 1994. "Using small group discussion in RELP Classes." *English Language Article*, UTM: Johor. 6: 32-42.
- Noss, R. 1995. The unique context of language planning in Southeast Asia. In Abdullah Hassan (Ed.), *Language Planning in Southeast Asia*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. pp. 1-51.

- Nunan, D. 1989. Hidden agendas: the role of the learner in programme implementation. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 176-206.
1988. *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ozog, C. 1990. The English language in Malaysia and its relationship with the national language. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters.
- Pakir, A. 1993. Issues in second language curriculum development: Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13:3-23.
- Pattanayak, D.P. 1985. India: A multilingual national state. In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of Inequality*. New York: Mouton Publishers. pp. 399-408.
- Patton, M. 1980. *Qualitative Evaluation and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Piatt, B. 1990. *Only English?: Law and Language Policy in the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- PPTS (Pusat Pengajian Tahun Satu): *Buku Panduan 94/95*. 1994. Skudai, Malaysia: UTM.
[School of Common First Year: A Handbook 94/95]
- Pratt, D. 1980. *Curriculum: Design and Development*. NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Pride, J. 1982. *Language for the Third World Universities*. New Delhi: Bahri.
- Rahimah, Haji-Ahmad, Marimutu, T. & Norjannah, Ismail. 1987. *Education and Polity*. Bangkok: Unesco Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.
- Razali, N. 1992. *Learning ESL in Malaysia: A Study of Reinforcing And Suppressing Factors in Two Communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Richterich, R. 1983. *Case Studies in Identifying Language Needs*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Ricento, T. & Hornberger, N. 1996. Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3):401-428.
- Rodgers, T. 1989. Syllabus design, curriculum development and polity determination. In R. Johnson (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 20-30
- Roe, P. 1993. Anatomy of ESP. *ESP Malaysia*. 1(1):1-16.
- Rubin, J. 1986. City Planning and Language Planning. In E. Annamalai, B. Jernudd, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Language Planning: Proceedings of an institute*. Honolulu: East-West Center. pp. 105-122.
1971. A view toward the future. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can Language be Planned*. Minoa: University of Hawaii Press. pp. 307-310).
- 1971b. Introduction: language planning as an element of modernization. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii. pp. xii-xxiv.
- Salter, B. & Tapper, T. 1989. *Education, Politics and the State*. London: Grant McIntyre.
- Schutz, N. W. & Derwing, B. L. 1981. The problem of need in English for specific purposes: some theoretical and practical considerations. In R. Mackay, & J. D. Palmer (Eds.), *Languages for Specific Purposes: Program Design and Evaluation*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers. pp. 30-42.
- Schiffman, H. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. New York: Routledge.
1992. "Resisting Arrest" in Status Planning: Structural and Covert Impediments to Status Change. *Language and Communication*, 12(1): 1-15.
- Shipment, M. 1972. Contrasting views of a curriculum project. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 4(2):25-31.
- Sickler, J.L. 1988. Teachers in charge: Empowering the professionals. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 69(5), 354-6.
- Singh, J., Mukherjee, H. 1993. Education and national integration in Malaysia -- stocktaking 30 years after

- independence. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 3, 2, 89-92.
- Spolsky, B. 1978. *Educational Linguistics: An Introduction*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- STAR. 1992. Saturday, July 11.
- Stern, H. 1989. Seeing the woods and the trees: Some thoughts on teaching language analysis. In R. Johnson, (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 207-221.
- Stevick, E. 1980. *A Way and Ways*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Stewart, W. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing multilingualism. In J. Fishman. (Ed) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. (pp. 531-45). The Hague: Mouton.
- Sutherland, J. 1995. Thoughts on the need to (re)claim, explain, define ESL/EFL/ESP. *TESL-EJ*, 1(4):F-1.
- Swart, E. 1990. So you want to be a professional? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(4), 315-18.
- Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.). 1995. *Power and Inequality in Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
1993. Language policy and power: Yugoslavia, the Philippines, and Southeast Asian refugees in the United States. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*. 103:73-95.
1991. *Planning Language Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. New York: Longman.
- UNESCO. 1991. *Malaysia: a Country Profile*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UTM RELP Committee. 1990. Research and Development of Teaching Materials for an English Language Programme for Institutions of Higher Learning with Special Emphasis on Science and Technology. pp. 8.
- UTM 92/93. 1993.
- UTM 91/92. 1992.
- Van Els, T. 1994. Planning foreign language teaching in a small country. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March(532):35-47.

- Van Maanen, J. 1983. *Qualitative Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Vatikiotis, M. 1991. A question of priorities. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, December:28-29.
- Walker, R. 1980. The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics theory, and procedures. In W. Dockerel and D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Rethinking Educational Research*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. pp. 40-55).
- Wardhaugh, R. 1986. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weinstein, B. (Ed.). 1990. *Language Policy and Political Development*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Weir, C. & Roberts, J. 1994. *Evaluation in ELT*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1972. The teaching of English as communication. *English Language Teaching*, 27(1):15-18.
- Wiley, T. 1996. Language Planning and Policy. In S. McKay, & N. Hornberger. (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P. pp. 103-148.
- Wolfson, N. 1989. *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Philadelphia: Newbury House Publishers.
- Wong, H., Sharifah, Z., & Bennett, S. 1976. Some problems in course planning: What to teach in UKM. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Teaching and Learning of English in Higher Institution in Malaysia*. Serdang, Malaysia: Agricultural University of Malaysia.
- Zuengler, J. 1985. Language of instruction in Kenya and Tanzania. In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of Inequality*. New York: Mouton Publishers. pp. 241-254.