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ABSTRACT

English is considered an important language in Malaysia and taught beginning at the preschool level. However, the Malaysian examination system does not require students to pass English for them to move up in grades or to enter public tertiary institutions. This has led to student apathy towards English as they could easily enter and graduate from public universities without needing to be proficient in English. Limited proficiency in English has been cited as one of the main reasons for the rising number of unemployed public university graduates – a great many of whom are bumiputeras.

The main objective of the study was to explore whether the ESL learners’ knowledge of English loan words in Malay could be a useful resource in their acquisition of English vocabulary. The focus is primarily on academic vocabulary from the Academic Word List (AWL) and ESL learners in Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia.

The study, implemented in two phases, employed the mixed methods methodology combining a lexical analysis of a specifically designed corpus (500,000 running words), language assessment, and survey research methods (questionnaire and semi-structured interview). Phase 1 covered the linguistic dimension of the research with a preliminary analysis of the Academic Word List and the construction of the corpus taken from semi-academic articles from a Malay print media. Phase 2, on the other hand, covered the cognitive-affective dimension of the research which involved a language attitude questionnaire, two vocabulary tasks, and a focus group interview. The test instruments were earlier piloted with 34 students and in the main study there were 101 participants (70 bumiputeras, 31 non-bumiputeras).

The preliminary analysis revealed that English loan words in Malay comprised 40% of the most frequent word in the AWL. Results from the vocabulary tasks show that learners are familiar with the core meaning of the English word based on their knowledge of the word’s loan form in Malay. This indicates that if teachers were to successfully use the loan words as a teaching aid, care should be taken to instruct learners in the meaning(s) and usage(s) of the English and its loan in Malay. The study also showed that students have a positive attitude towards English and the loan words in general.
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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

1.0  Overview

This study is concerned with English language learning, particularly academic vocabulary acquisition, at the university level in Malaysia. By the time they enter university, many of the students have studied English at Malay-medium schools for 11 years. However, their proficiency is still not adequate for tertiary study or for employment in the private sector after graduation. Consequently, teachers of English at university level need to find effective strategies to develop the English language competence of these undergraduates.

One result of the long history of English in Malaysia is the occurrence of many English loan words in Malay as a result of both planned and spontaneous borrowing. Every day, Malaysians meet old and new loan words in the mass media either in print or non-print media. Examples of these loan words are universiti (‘university’), sistem (‘system’), kritikan (‘criticism’), komprehensif (‘comprehensive’), dinamik (‘dynamic’), and strategi (‘strategy’). The loan words can be said to be free vocabulary resources to the Malaysian learner of English. The question then is whether it is possible to exploit the students’ knowledge of loan words in Malay to enhance their knowledge of English vocabulary. The suggestion to utilise the English loan words does not imply it is a magic formula which will conveniently add thousands of English words in the learners’ vocabulary bank. Rather, we treat the loan words as a means to reduce the learning burden (Nation, 2001: 23) of the original English words.

Malaysia is far from being the only non-English speaking country which has a challenging task with its English language learners. However, it does have a unique sociolinguistic background which ties in with the present decline in English proficiency of students at public universities. The majority of students in the English proficiency classrooms are bumiputera (lit. ‘sons of the soil’) students – Malay or indigenous bumiputera from Sabah and Sarawak. Given the history of English and Malay in the country, specifically with the bumiputeras, we also need to consider the attitudinal dimension to English language learning. This chapter, therefore, introduces the sociolinguistic background to English the language, as well as English language learning, in Malaysia.

The English language has been part of Malaysia for a long time, going back to the beginning of British colonial rule in the 18th century. The present attitudes towards English can be said to vary from conservative (e.g. referring to it as bahasa penjajah, lit. ‘language of the
coloniser’) to general acceptance (e.g. English is part of the Malaysian history) and to a liberal/modern/Western outlook (e.g. calling for the return of English-medium schools). The conservative view stems from history or, for some, the memory, of the role English played in the colonial education system as the language of the elite which served to separate the urban and rural populations into the haves and the have-nots. Inevitably, the abolition of English-medium education became one of the key matters for debate during the campaign for independence from British rule in the 1950s. Malay nationalists considered English-medium education as part of a British agenda to maintain control of the country after Independence. Replacing English with Malay as the medium of instruction as well as the national language in Malaya was, therefore, vital. In 1967, through the National Language Act, Malay became the sole official language in Malaysia a decade after Independence. Thus, from 1970 onwards, the phasing out of English as a medium of instruction from the Malaysian education system was carried out fervently, while at the same time Malay was zealously promoted not only in education but in all spheres of public life.

The ties between the national language and patriotism have since, more or less, directed the national language education policies in Malaysia. As a result, the status of English in public education in Malaysia has, over the years, been affected by the social and political developments in the country. Even now, fifty-three years after Independence, despite its importance to Malaysia as the language of international communication, trade, and technology, English is still viewed with distrust in some quarters. At the primary and secondary school levels, English is a subject to be taught and learned but it is not compulsory to obtain a pass mark in the examinations. Students, therefore, are able to enter public tertiary institutions without being required to have a pass or distinction in English. There are also variations amongst the public tertiary institutions with regard to expected English language proficiency upon graduation. This has led to student apathy towards English as they could easily enter and graduate from public universities without needing to be proficient in English.

This has created a problem because the number of unemployed graduates from public universities continues to rise every year. Feedback from the private sector shows that limited proficiency in English plays a part. This has forced the government to make changes in the national language policy to give more emphasis to English in education. In 2003 the medium of instruction for Mathematics and Science subjects in schools was switched from Malay to English. The new policy, however, upset Malay nationalists who opposed it right from when
it was first announced. The groups held their strongest protest in 2009 with street demonstrations in the capital city. In July 2009, the six-year policy was finally dropped and the government admitted that rural students, especially Malays, had suffered from lower grades in Mathematics and Science since the policy was introduced (New York Times, 9 July 2009). The policy reversal received mixed responses which can be gauged from the different headlines in the papers then: ‘Divided over decision’ (The Star, 12 July 2009), ‘Parents unhappy over decision to revert’ (The Star, 9 July 2009), ‘Is there a need to revert?’ (The Star, 12 July 2009’), and ‘Why PPSMI reversal makes sense’ (New Straits Times, 19 July 2009). Observers of English Language Teaching (ELT) in the Malaysian context are not incorrect in saying that the policy reversal is yet another example of the fact that English cannot seem to move away from its stereotyped portrayal as a threat to Malay.

In an effort to understand the challenging task teachers of English face in English language teaching in Malaysia, we need to review the background story of the language in Malaysia. It almost seems as if the present student generation inherited a system of English language learning which, over the decades, went from being an important subject matter to one that is important, but is not necessary to pass.

1.1 The language situation and Malay/ bumiputera nationalism

Malaysia is a multiethnic, multilingual, and multireligious country with a population of about 28 million\(^1\) and its national language is Malay. The country is a federation of three entities: Peninsular Malaysia with its 11 states, and the Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak. Other major languages are various Chinese and Indian dialects, English, Orang Asli languages, and about 96 indigenous languages spoken in the Borneo states of Sabah and Sarawak (Lewis, 2009). There are three main ethnic groups in Malaysia: *bumiputera* (Malay and non-Malay), Chinese, and Indian\(^2\). The term *bumiputera* is Sanskrit in origin i.e. *bumi* (‘soil’ or ‘earth’) and *putera* (‘prince’). It refers to the people indigenous to Malaya, Sabah, and Sarawak as opposed to the Chinese and Indians (non-*bumiputeras*) who migrated from their respective home countries\(^3\). The term gained prominence following the introduction of the National Economic Policy (NEP) in 1971 which had a focus on restructuring the society in terms of economic wealth. The NEP has also been called the *bumiputera* policy (Shamsul A.B, 1986; Rappa and Wee, 2006: 26) because of its affirmative action provisions for the *bumiputera* community. It can be argued that the NEP – through its offshoots of the National Language
Policy and National Education Policy – started the decline in the role, status, and most importantly the proficiency of English in Malaysia of today. Rappa and Wee explains,

...the privileging of the Malay language means that the widespread use of English for official purposes is problematic; it is seen as a threat to the Malay language and thus to the bumiputera policy. The use of English in official domains in Malaysian society, unlike that in Singapore, is therefore extremely sensitive and contested (2006: 5)

In order to better understand the situation, it is important for us to review the background of the situation leading up to the NEP and the language policy applied in Malaysia today.

Malay is the national and official language of government and education while English is the second most important language in the country (Asmah Haji Omar, 1993: 46). During the colonial period, the British rulers introduced secular education through the Malay vernacular schools and missionaries arrived to teach in mission schools which used English as the medium of instruction. English-medium schools became the main avenue to a higher socioeconomic status. Students who went to vernacular schools were not able to advance to secondary education as their qualification was deemed unsuitable. Students from English-medium schools, though, could go to secondary level and at the end of their secondary education were able to sit for an external examination which could then allow them to go for university education at the University of Malaya in Singapore or universities in Great Britain (Asmah Haji Omar, 1996: 514).

Graduating from an English-medium school accorded one an elite standing in urban society and those who could afford such schooling for their children were mostly the Malay aristocrats, along with rich Chinese traders and Eurasians. By the late 1940s, English had become the lingua franca of the English-educated Malayans and the society in postcolonial Malaya was divided into the English-speaking versus the non-English speaking, which meant in effect, the elite versus the non-elite. The division in the Malaysian social strata resulted in the English language becoming a symbol of high status and of intelligence, whereas the Malay language was relegated to being a language for the commoners (Ismail Hussein, 1992: 51). As a result of the differences in the status of the two languages, Malay-medium education came to be looked upon as the poor man’s education (Heah, 1989: 70). English as the medium of instruction in English schools continued to flourish as the lingua franca of the educated while Bazaar Malay became the inter-ethnic language for the less-educated members of the society.
The non-elite Malays developed what was almost a profound cultural and religious antipathy towards the English language (Wicks, 1980: 172). Doubts and wariness about British policies grew within the Malay community, who more and more felt that they were deliberately being excluded from the economic progress that was happening in *Tanah Melayu* (Land of the Malays),

The Malays erected a religious-cultural barrier of suspicion, mistrust and resentment against both the explicit and implicit dimensions of change in British colonial policy. This barrier often reached xenophobic proportions, preventing many young Malays from taking advantage of Western schools in the new urban centres,..”(ibid: 172-173).

More modern Malay academics do admit that the suspicion and mistrust was a backward mentality. Asmah Haji Omar described the religious-cultural barrier in the language attitude of the Malays towards the English then as the actions of the “non-enlightened” ones because, although many Malay parents could afford the fees of the English-medium schools, going to English schools was considered equivalent to learning the language of the colonialists (1992: 122). The heightened suspicion towards English was strong before Independence in 1957 and also in the years immediately following it. This period was also when the movement pushing for Malay to become the national language was at its peak (p.122).

As a result, at the time of Independence, Malaya had a divided education system which separated the *bumiputera* Malays and the non-*bumiputera* Chinese and Indian communities. The schools were located based on ethnic group locations i.e. in the *kampungs*, or rural villages (Malay-medium alongside religious education in Arabic), in towns (English-medium and Chinese-medium), and in the plantations (Tamil-medium). Education was available in the different languages and each type of school followed its own curriculum, which served different purposes from the curricula in the other schools.

The description thus far is a necessary background for understanding the rationale behind the prioritization of Malay and a rejection of any official role for English after Independence. The different education systems and their effect on the socio-economic standing of the people contributed to the rise of Malay nationalism eager to end the elite vs. non-elite division. The early nationalist movements were language and literary associations (Asmah Haji Omar, 2007: 344) which explains the strong focus of the nationalists on the English vs. Malay issue. From the perspective of the nationalists, it was important to remove the cause of elitism i.e. English and English-medium education.
1.2 The development of Malay as the national language

1.2.1 The transitional language policy 1957-1970

Malay was set to become a tool for national unity following the landmark recommendations of two top-level education committees. In late 1955, a special committee under the then Minister of Education, Tun Abdul Razak, was set up as part of the preparation for nation-building in an effort to pull the different education streams into one. The results of the committee’s work, well known in Malaysia as the 1956 Razak Report, for the first time laid down the goals, direction and basic thrust of a national education policy (Asiah Abu Samah, 1994: 53). It legitimized the status and role of Malay as the national language as well as the key element of national unity and integration. It was the Razak Report that stressed the need to realign all schools to a unified Malaysian outlook by the introduction of common content syllabuses and the use of Malay as the main medium of instruction (p.54). Its recommendations were confirmed by another education committee, in the 1960 Rahman Talib Report.

Despite its pursuit of a united Malaysian identity via the national language and common-content curricula, the national education policy that was adopted in the period immediately after Independence did not ignore the needs and aspirations of other ethnic groups. The Chinese and Indian communities were allowed to retain schools where their languages were used as media of instruction, although Malay was made a required subject in these vernacular schools. In the former English schools, English was also retained as the medium of instruction.

The Malaysian Constitution specified a ten-year transition period for the replacement of English with Malay, not only in education but in other public domains. By the late 1960s, several Chinese groups were agitating for a more liberal language policy, which would permit the use of Mandarin in some public affairs. The government at the time, under Tunku Abdul Rahman and other political leaders who belonged to the English-educated elite, were sympathetic to this view and were willing to allow the official use of English under certain circumstances and the use of non-Malay languages for non-official purposes. This, however, was met with total rejection by young Malay nationalists, who pushed hard for full implementation of the policy of adopting Malay as the sole official language in Malaysia. The 1969 general election saw politicians “exploiting racial issues that heightened communal
tensions” at pre-election campaigns (Ooi, 2009: 197). The 10th May election saw the mainly non-bumiputera Opposition parties denying the mainly bumiputera Alliance Party a two-thirds parliamentary majority. Consequently, the social and political tensions culminated in an unprecedented race riot between the Chinese and the Malays in 13 May 1969. As a result of the race riot, the government introduced the New Economic Policy to restructure the society and do away with the unequal divisions of economic wealth along racial lines. The policy, however, has subsequently accentuated the bumiputera/non-bumiputera distinction within Malaysian society.

1.2.2 The full implementation of the national language policy

In the aftermath of the riots, the principal policy response by the Malaysian Government, led by the, then, new Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak, was the announcement of the New Economic Policy (NEP). The NEP had two objectives, namely “poverty eradication regardless of race” and “restructuring society to eliminate the identification of race with economic function”, but in practice was seen as “pro-bumiputera, or more specifically, pro-Malay” and the “policies principally oriented to rural Malay peasants” (Jomo K.S, 2004: iii). With the implementation of the NEP, the changes that were recommended for the Malaysian education system in the Razak Report effectively took place. Hence, within the NEP, the Education Bill 1970 was passed which meant that from that year, primary school students in the government or government-assisted schools were given their education via the medium of the national language. The change in medium of instruction from English to Malay eventually went into effect legally at all levels of the education system for the whole of Malaysia6. The phasing out of English as a medium of instruction in favour of Malay occurred in stages and took a total of 12 years. By 1982, all school subjects – except for English and other languages – were taught in Malay. With the policy change, English was relegated to being second to the Malay language. English ceased to be the medium of instruction but remained a school subject.

What followed were the aggressive promotion, expansion, and development of Malay. Malay needed a massive upgrade if it was to be used as an administrative and management tool of the government as well as the medium of instruction for education. The most obvious shortcoming of Malay was the lack of secondary and tertiary level textbooks with standardized terminology in the various academic subjects and professional fields (Asmah Haji Omar, 1992: 189). In 1956, a language planning agency, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka
(DBP) had been formed for the purpose of planning, developing, and publishing in the national language. One of its earlier tasks was to spearhead and consolidate planning and research in enriching the Malay vocabulary for science and technology through the coining of technical terms. The bulk of these terms are loan words from English (Heah, 1989: 269).

As a government agency, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka has played a patriotic role in the development of the Malay language. Noss (1967: 320) noted that the Dewan has campaigned relentlessly for the propagation and sole use of the national language with a militancy that it was difficult to believe, stemmed from purely educational or linguistic motives. The Malay language nationalists were (and still are) unyielding in their position that Malay should replace English in all aspects of life in Malaya. Asmah Haji Omar (2000: 241) termed the process of the Malay replacing English as “mendaulatkan” (‘elevating’) the Malay language. The term daulat in Malay is a sacred word, used only to mean the crowning of a Sultan or the King. In essence, Asmah explains that the Malay language has daulat and it reigns supreme over all languages in Malaysia. The use of the term daulat perhaps clarifies the feelings of great honour the Malays bestow upon the national language. Elevating Malay as the sole national language in Malaysia is considered a sacred duty and opposition to this goal is completely unacceptable to the nationalists.

1.2.3 Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and the expansion of Malay terminology

In its bid to become a language suitable for intellectual pursuits, Malay has undergone massive lexical expansion. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka initiated a vigorous programme in terminology-building. By 1994, over 500,000 terms covering 300 sub-fields of knowledge had been coined by the more than 27 terminology committees (Nik Safiah Karim, 1994: 135) under the patronage of DBP. However, the expansion and modernization of Malay in the fifteen years immediately after Independence was done without any standardized guidelines. This caused many new technical and scientific words coined by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka to be rejected by the users – the scientists and professionals. The terminology committees found that “the biggest obstacle is that a large number of terms which had been simply coined, borrowed, translated are still not being actually used” (Abdullah Hassan, 1975: 35). Asmah Haji Omar added that “Each subcommittee worked on its own, independent of others. Linguists only attended their subcommittee on linguistics terms and were not consulted with by the other committees.” (1979: 101). In contrast to the conservative attitude of DBP, the inter-university committees on technical terms had more standardized rules and were
concerned with the acceptability of the technical terms by the language users (Asmah Haji Omar, 1975: 122). As a result, the universities (Universiti Malaya, Universiti Sains Malaysia, and Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia) worked on their own terminological expansion project apart from Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

The separate working situation and separate set of terminologies were brought to a halt with the publication of *Pedoman Umum Pembentukan Istilah Bahasa Melayu* (‘General Guide for the Formation of Malay Terms’) in 1975. The guidebook was the result of a joint venture effort with Indonesia. Lexical expansion of scientific and technological terminology was done in collaboration with Indonesia “in an effort to standardize the national language of Malaysia and Indonesia which are in fact two varieties of one and the same language” (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 61).

1.3 The changing status of English

1.3.1 The decline in English standards

It can be argued that the decline in English language learning in Malaysia is one of the outcomes of prioritising the national language. It seems inevitable especially because of the emotional and nationalistic sentiment attached to the propagation and expansion of Malay. Yet, despite being replaced as the medium of instruction in Malaysian public education, English remains the second most important language in the nation, recognized as the language needed to keep Malaysians abreast of scientific and technological developments in the world, and is the language of meaningful participation in international trade and commerce (Third Malaysia Plan 1976: 397). However, for all that acknowledgement given to English, there was (and still is) a preoccupation that the single-national-language policy is equal to peace and well-being. The idea projected then was that English was not supposed to be at par with Malay or surpass it, and a bilingual co-existence is not viable.

This Malaysian model rejects the pluralistic approach in a national system of education.

... In a truly bilingual system of education, equality of the languages concerned cannot be attained. One language is certainly going to be more equal than the other (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 55).

After the implementation of the NEP in 1970, English became only a subject to be learned (but not to pass) in schools; in fact in the rural areas where there was almost no exposure to
the language outside the classroom, English was virtually a foreign language (Gill, 2005: 244). As it was just a classroom subject taught within a limited number of hours, it was not possible to teach English for equal proficiency in all skills. This has proved to be another aspect of the decline in English proficiency among Malaysian learners. The students have not been able to become proficient in any single language skill, even after eleven years of attending English language classes throughout their school career (Asmah Haji Omar, 1993: 47). Compared to the English-medium schools where the language skills were taught and reinforced in other subjects, the Malay-medium schools could not offer that environment for the teaching of English (p.48).

News of the drop in the proficiency in English started to appear in the local and Singaporean newspapers. Headlines appeared such as “English language results shocks” (The Straits Times, 7 Mar 1991); “Drop in English skills in Malaysia: some blame it on narrow nationalism” (The Straits Times, 19 Apr 1991); “A call for English competency” (The Straits Times, 6 Nov 2000); “Performance of PMR candidates in English declines further” (Bernama, 20 Dec 2000); “Arresting decline in English standard” (The New Sunday Times, 29 June 2003); and “English not spoken well or widely” (The Sunday Mail, 19 Sept 2004).

Opposition to Malay as the sole medium of instruction in education in Malaysia was not accepted by the government, despite claims that the effects would be falling academic standards. Decline in English proficiency was explained as resulting from a “natural cause” (Asmah Haji Omar, 1992: 12) and the concept of standards was seen as relative because Malaysia was a newly independent country that was establishing its own identity within the framework of a national ideology:

[A]cademic standards should be considered within the borders of the country concerned. In the early stages of nation building the issue that is most crucial in the sense that it can abort the rising nation is the unity of the people for self-identification and a sense of belonging, and not so much academic standards. …but that if need be and if all other means fail, then academic standards can be sacrificed [my emphasis], to be taken up again later on when the nation is politically well on its feet (Asmah Haji Omar, 1993: 24-25)

Asmah, however, admitted that there was in fact a definite downward movement in the level of proficiency in the English language among the present generation of Malaysians. However, as with the ‘natural cause’ explanation, she described the phenomenon as a natural
development and one that was inevitable in light of the implementation of the national language policy. In a stronger tone of argument in favour of the policy, she posited that,

One cannot have one’s cake and eat it too; as such, the Malaysians have to sacrifice the standard of English proficiency that they had so long prided themselves in. It would be quite in order for them to transfer this particular type of pride to the mastery of their own national language (1993: 48-49)

To this day, the debate about the relationship between English and Malay appears to have been cast around this position. The English language hence continues to be a subject taught without a definite requirement or need of competence on the part of the students. A new class of students emerged, those who could pass examinations and continue to tertiary level without actually being able to use the English language productively for any communicative purpose (Pandian, 2003: 272-273).

1.4 English in tertiary education in Malaysia

1.4.1 Medium of instruction in Malaysian universities

Even after decades of Independence, the linguistic complexities of the national language policy are most clearly manifested in higher education (Gill, 2004: 136). At the oldest university, Universiti Malaya, the conversion from English medium to Malay started in 1965 with a bilingual policy of Malay for the Arts subjects and English for the Science and Technology subjects. The bilingual system was gradually changed to a completely monolingual, Malay-medium one by 1983. At the same time, several other universities (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia, and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia) were already Malay-medium institutions from when they first started.

Nonetheless, there are several linguistic challenges with regard to the Malay language as the medium of instruction in public universities. Despite the commendable work done by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in translating academic books into Malay, the translators could not keep up with the pace of publications in science and technology, which are mostly in English (Gill, 2005: 252). In addition, undergraduates educated in the Malay medium had difficulties understanding academic texts in English (p.143). The decline of English proficiency became a cause for concern in the diplomatic, business, and academic circles, and this is succinctly voiced by Asmah Haji Omar:
There has been a feeling among Malaysians, including the top leaders, that there has been a drop in the attainment level of proficiency in English among Malaysians. This impression has proven to be a fact supported by performance in schools, colleges and universities. It has now become an uphill task for students in the universities to refer to texts written in English, let alone discourse on their academic subjects in the language. In the public sector, there has been a general decry of the fact that the government officials of today are no longer efficient in handling tasks in English compared to their predecessors (Asmah, 1992: 11-12).

The situation, termed by Asmah Haji Omar (1992: 67) as a “linguistic deficit”, caused the Malaysian Government to worry that it would hinder Malaysia’s progress towards achieving developed nation status (Far Eastern Economic Review, 1991: 28). The language policy which had long been nationalistic was now set to be reviewed to have a more pragmatic outlook.

In 1993, the Mahathir government announced plans to teach science, engineering, and medical courses in English. This decision, however, was totally rejected by the Congress of Malay Intellectuals, who submitted a memorandum to the Prime Minister. Interestingly, the Malaysian Cabinet’s decision also did not have the support of the majority of the public universities. Thus, the change in language policy did not go through, despite the insistence of the Prime Minister himself that the change would in no way pose a threat to the Malay language.

### 1.4.2 English proficiency and public/private university graduates

Despite the negative reaction to English from some segments of the Malaysian society, there has been growing support for a stronger role for English in Malaysian higher education. One reason is the widely publicised phenomenon of unemployed graduates. In a September 2005 survey by the Malaysian Economic Planning Unit (EPU) nearly 60,000 Malaysian graduates were found to be unemployed, and many of them could not get jobs, not only because of their lack of experience but also because of poor English and communication skills. The study also noted that the typical unemployed graduate was from the majority Malay ethnic group, from a lower income background, and female (Daily Express, 5 Nov 2005).

The civil service, with its emphasis on the national language, has been the largest employer of public university graduates. However, the government could not go on employing all bumiputera graduates and hence a surplus of graduates has occurred. In the 1990s, the private sector became the main employment choice for graduates, but here, the most important
linguistic proficiency was (and still is) in English (Gill, 2005: 255). At the same time, in its aspiration to become a regional hub of education, Malaysia had liberalized its educational policies, making it easier to set up private higher institutions in the country. In addition, through a reform of the Education Act 1961, private universities and colleges were permitted to use English as the medium of instruction. In essence, higher education in Malaysia was split into two, in which the public universities use Malay and the private universities use English.

The issue of unemployed graduates, the majority of whom are *bumiputeras* from the public universities, highlights another debate about the quality of public versus private university graduates. Up to the 1990s, there was a noticeable dualism in the system of higher education in Malaysia. Some scholars suggested that the emergence of private tertiary institutions could be attributed to the affirmative action policy inherent in the NEP (Singh and Mukherjee, 1993; Brown, 2007; Jomo, 2004), which applied strict racial quotas in the admission of students to the public universities (Lee, 1996: 109). The system strongly favours *bumiputera* (mainly Malay) students in allocating the limited places available in public higher education institutions; consequently, many non-*bumiputeras* are left without access to higher education within the country.

This situation quickly gave rise to a ‘demand for more’ in terms of unmet demands by the public university system and a ‘demand for different’ with respect to the prevailing preference for the use of English as a medium of instruction in higher education (Lee, 1996: 109). It led to the development of pre-university courses in private education institutions to help prepare non-*bumiputera* students to pursue their tertiary studies overseas. Over time, twinning programmes with overseas universities were established allowing for degree studies to be done partly in Malaysia. The overall result sees the *bumiputeras* as the majority of students in public universities while most students in private universities are non-*bumiputeras*. Malaysians have come to strongly associate Malay with public tertiary institutions and English with the private institutions. On top of the duality in the tertiary sector, Malay nationalists accuse the government of being lenient with the private universities, because they are allowed to use English as their medium of instruction (Zainal Abidin, 1996).

It is becoming apparent to the government that public university graduates – the overwhelming majority of whom are Malays – are losing out to the private university
graduates for linguistic reasons. Compared with their counterparts in private universities, graduates of public institutions are disadvantaged when seeking employment in the private sector because of their weaker English competence (Gill, 2004: 148). In a hard-hitting statement in 2002, in response to the information that 44,000 public university graduates were unemployed, the Director of the Malaysian National Economic Action Council had this to say:

This is basically a Malay problem as 94% of those registered with the government are [Malays] (Chinese constitute 3.7% and Indians 1.6%). It has to do with the courses taken, and…also their poor performances in, and command of, the English language. (New Straits Times, 14 March 2002)

In the present education system, students who have failed in English in the Form 5 *Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia* (SPM) examination can still apply into public universities using their Malaysian University English Test (MUET) results.

### 1.4.3 The Malaysian University English Test (MUET)

The Malaysian University English Test (MUET) was introduced in 2002 mainly to encourage students intending to enter tertiary institutions to equip themselves with English proficiency suitable for higher education studies. Zuraidah (2004: 151) cites the MUET Handbook 1999, which states the two functions of the test as being,

1. to fill in the gap with respect to the teaching and learning of English as an important second language and
2. to consolidate and further enhance the English language ability of sixth form and other pre-university students. …

Administered by the Malaysian Examinations Council, the MUET is developed to help universities in Malaysia evaluate the level of English language proficiency of the students they want to admit as undergraduates.

However, the universities at best give lip service to the need to improve English standards as even students who have obtained Band 1 (extremely limited user⁹) in MUET can send in a university application, as can be seen from the admission prerequisites of public universities. For example, on its admissions website, Universiti Sains Malaysia states that an applicant must have *sat* MUET but the university does not indicate the band that it requires an applicant to have (USM Admissions Channel). Some public universities do require a higher band of MUET for admissions and also require at least a credit for English in their SPM (Form Five exam) results. Universiti Malaya, for instance, requires matriculation certificate
holders to have at least Band 4 for MUET and a credit for their SPM English to enter its Bachelor of Law program. Without going into further details of the admission requirements, the fact remains that public universities accept students who are, to borrow the MUET definition of Band 1, ‘extremely limited users’ of English if they fulfill the other admission prerequisites.

An argument can be made that it is unfair to reject students’ applications based on their weak English proficiency when they could turn out to be future scientists and economists, given the right training and encouragement. It may also be postulated that the students’ poor performance in English is mainly due to their not getting enough access to English compared to the rich and privileged students who can afford English tuition and books. Sharom (1980) maintains that “[i]n Malaysia, an admissions policy which is based solely on academic merit will result in the exclusion of many Malays from universities, and this will have adverse effects on the efforts to promote national unity” (p. 727). While true enough that it is not fair to penalise the students, Sharom’s argument is typical of ones that justify the pro-bumiputera strategy stemming from the NEP, which assumes that all non-bumiputeras are economically well-off.

It is suspected that the number of bumiputeras accepted into universities would be greatly affected should a good MUET result be considered as a requirement for admission. The fact that it is not explains the very large number of bumiputera Malay students who take English proficiency classes in their undergraduate studies. In Universiti Malaysia Sabah alone, each new intake sees roughly 1200 undergraduates (the majority being bumiputeras) who are required to take these classes.

While trying its best to maintain a pragmatic perspective by providing means such as MUET to help enhance English language learning and increasing the entrance requirements into public universities, the government faces a possible strong political and emotional reaction from the Malay nationalists, who remain committed to the spirit of the national language policy and the NEP. The complexity of the roles English and Malay play in education in Malaysia still persists because of the awkward position of the two languages within the national ideology. As explained by Gill (2002:102), in Malaysia there will always be a dynamic tension between Malay and English - one pulling in the direction of establishing itself as the language of the nation and the language of identity, while the other one pulls in the opposite direction towards being the language for instrumental purposes, as Malaysia undoubtedly needs English for trade and international communications.
1.4.4 English teaching in Malaysian public universities

1.4.4.1 English as a medium?

There have been recent indications that the Malaysian Government wants to change the medium of instruction in public universities from Malay to English. However, in contrast to the detailed programmes prepared for primary and secondary schools to cope with the switch to English for science and mathematics teaching (the recently abolished ETeMS), the universities were caught off guard when the first announcement to this effect appeared as a one-sentence statement in the local newspaper (Gill, 2006: 88):

All public universities will also have to switch to English as the medium of instruction in science and technology subjects in 2005 when the first batch of STPM students taught in English enter university. (*Sunday Star*, 21 July 2005)

That switch, however, did not happen and up to now, there is no clearly drafted document on how public universities are to implement the language switch. This means that the universities have all come up with their own benchmarks for the percentage of English medium instruction across the faculties.

In response to this perplexing situation, a two-year research study was undertaken by Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia involving 37 upper management personnel from the nine public universities and 630 lecturers from the universities’ science, technology, and engineering faculties. The majority of the academics were generally supportive of the switch from Malay to English (63%). However, the upper management staff were quoted as saying they were not clear on the policy, they had not been given definite answers with regard to implementation procedures, and one even attributed the lack of a clear directive to political considerations, because of the effect the switch would have on the national language (Gill, 2006: 86). The universities are in different stages of readiness for implementing the proposed switch, and it is still unknown whether the newest public university in Malaysia, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, will have English as the medium of instruction for its science and technological subjects.
1.4.4.2 The teaching of English at Universiti Malaysia Sabah

Regardless of when the switch in the medium of instruction will be implemented, public universities in Malaysia have the responsibility to equip limited English proficient students with English language skills. Universiti Malaysia Sabah (the location of the present study) is not excluded from that challenging task. There is a general perception that public university graduates are not as good as graduates from private and/or overseas universities. Lecturers at language centres are often reminded that private sector companies are dissatisfied with the English proficiency of public university graduates. Despite the fact there has been no actual study of how UMS graduates have fared in job interviews, the reminder should be taken seriously.

The English Unit at the Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, has undergone at least three syllabus changes at the request of the Vice Chancellor due to informal reports that UMS graduates were not able to perform in the job market. In the earlier years of the university’s existence, there were perceptions that the English language programmes were unnecessary and a distraction for the undergraduates. The credit hours for English were therefore reduced from six to four hours per week, but its examination grades were still included in the students Cumulative Grade Point Average (CGPA). A few years later, the four hours per week were further reduced to three hours, this time excluding the examination grades from the students’ CGPA. Interestingly, the reduction of credit hours then reflected the outdated perspective that English was unimportant for university students. Due to worsening attendance records throughout the faculties as well as a general “could-not-be-bothered” attitude towards English language learning, the students’ grades inevitably suffered. After intense debate at a faculty retreat, the English Unit managed to restore the credit hours to four with a compulsory pass in the final examination. That system was implemented in 2007 and the Unit has recently adopted a newer arrangement beginning with the 2008/2009 session.

The description for the new system is given below:

- first year students who obtained Bands 3 (modest user), 4 (competent user), 5 (good user), and 6 (very good user) in MUET are to take only one English language paper in their first semester. They can choose either English for Academic Reading and Writing, English for Research Purposes, or Grammar in Context. Upon completing this first semester, the students then continue with three semesters of foreign language.
first year students who obtained Bands 1 (extremely limited user) and 2 (limited user) are required to take up Communicative English Grammar in their first semester. They then take English for Oral Communication, English for Reading and Writing, and English for Occupational Purposes in the subsequent semesters.

The university has not developed discipline-specific English syllabuses for each faculty mainly due to the lack of personnel. Hence, students from various faculties take similar courses.

There is a clear need to improve the students' acquisition of English at the tertiary level. This is because it is not compulsory to have a pass in English in order to enrol at public universities in Malaysia (except for Universiti Institut Teknologi Mara and International Islamic University). Be it four or five semesters, time is limited for the less proficient students to master the academic English required at university level. UMS needs to look at ways to improve their English proficiency to a level suitable to their status as undergraduates. One way is the acquisition of vocabulary through using English loan words as a facilitative tool. By increasing their academic vocabulary, it is hoped that the students become more word-conscious and in time build their academic vocabulary for use in their university studies.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study was to explore whether the Malaysian learners of English as a Second Language knowledge of English loan words in Malay could be a useful resource in their acquisition of English vocabulary. Since the majority of bumiputera undergraduates enrolled in public universities with an English language grade that is either borderline failure or two steps away from the failed grade, the ability to recognise English loan words and be able to associate them with the original English words within academic texts may help the weaker learners.

This study set out to investigate the extent which learners were aware of the presence of the English loan words in Malay, and specifically academic loan words. Learners' awareness is crucial prior to being able to transfer that awareness into vocabulary knowledge. A glance at the SPM and MUET results for English for many bumiputera undergraduates taking English proficiency classes in UMS reveals that the great majority of them are weak and limited users of English (Bands 1 – 2). Lack of English proficiency may be attributable to various causes,
such as lack of access to reading materials in English, attitudes towards English, or lack of exposure to the language other than in English classes in their previous secondary schools.

By inculcating the knowledge that they can utilise English loan words to their advantage, it is hoped that the strategy will help them in expanding their knowledge of academic vocabulary in English as the basis for a more adequate level of proficiency in the language generally and for use in their university studies in particular.
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.0 Overview

The objective of this study is to explore whether the English loan words in Malay can be utilised as a resource to help English language learners learn academic English vocabulary. However, given the background on the role and status of English in Malaysia, we also need to investigate whether the learners will be open to the idea. This requires us to investigate the students’ attitudes towards English and the English loan words. The study focuses on the acquisition of academic vocabulary especially by bumiputera (Nagata, 1974) students. Bumiputeras make up the majority of students in Malaysian public universities. They also make up the majority of students required to take English proficiency courses. Incidentally, the majority of unemployed public university graduates are also bumiputeras. Hence, the following discussion covers both the attitudinal as well as the linguistic dimension. It begins with a description of how language is used as a tool for national identity in Malaysia. It then goes on to elaborate on the rationale behind the language policy that has established Malay as the national language and its exclusive use in government and the education system. The discussion also touches on language attitudes towards English in Malaysia. In addition, the chapter highlights the development of Malay as a modern language which borrowed – and continues to borrow - from English to expand its vocabulary. From there, it goes on to describe of the theoretical ideas motivating the linguistic dimension of this study i.e. the use of cross-linguistic similarity in vocabulary learning as well as the use of the L1 (in this context, Malay) in the learning of English. It also discusses related research on the use of learners’ first language (L1) in the teaching and learning of English in Malaysia. Finally, we look at available research on loan words in Malay and discuss what this present study can contribute to the students’ academic English vocabulary acquisition.

The next section sketches the contemporary language debate related to the status of English in Malaysia. It will be followed with a review of the background of the nation’s language policy. A critical look at the language situation will enable us to situate this study in the middle of the language debate, its participants, and those affected by the debate (the English language learners).
2.1 Language as a tool for national identity: past and present application in Malaysia

Pennycook states that “the effects of language policy in the past have a powerful continuity with the present in terms of the ways in which they construct particular views of language” (2000: 50). It could be argued that the continuity remains in the policies governing, and affecting, English language teaching and learning in Malaysia. Policies which were pro-English language were often established – and later possibly reversed - to favour the status of Malay instead of more pedagogical concerns. We find an example of this powerful continuity in the recent Cabinet decision to discontinue the policy of teaching Mathematics and Science in English (ETeMS) (New Straits Times, 9 July 2009) following unyielding negative criticisms from Malay language nationalists. The ETeMS reversal is also an example in which economic demands, and their influence over language policy, are at odds with the political goals in Malaysia. This is because Malaysia is striving to maintain an international economic presence but at the same time the Malay conservatives – who wield significant political power – are pushing for exclusive use of Malay as a type of patriotic duty of all Malaysians\(^1\) (see Tan, 2005). In his analysis of newspaper articles which were published after the initial announcement of the ETeMS policy, Tan found that, in general, the policy received positive reactions from Malaysians who favoured the return of English-medium education (p.55). The main reason for supporting the ETeMS policy was that “with English, Malaysia will be more competitive, presumably in attracting investment and building a more efficient workforce” (p.57). Those in favour, however, made no reference to the relevance of English to the Malaysian national identity, despite Malay academics acknowledging its status as the “second most important language” (Asmah Haji Omar, 1996: 530; 2000a: 242), and the role it plays in achieving nationism in Malaysia (Asmah, 1992: 66). Referring to Malaysian literature and plays in English\(^2\), Tan stressed that “the claim that English is or could be a language that is culturally-grounded in the Malaysian context, if it is made at all, is very muted” (2005: 59). Tan concluded that the medium of instruction debate,

reinforces the assumed division of labour between the languages: Malay is for national identity and English is for progress and for wider communication. The assumption is also that only a single language can serve the function of national identity and national integration (2005: 60).

Tan’s study reveals that Malay continues to be regarded as the only language which can achieve national integration and unity. This shows the continuous application, since the country’s Independence, of the idea that Malay is and should be the only language to
symbolise the national identity. The continued practice however contrasts with the “realisation that there are disparate groups in Malaysia and that it might not be appropriate to address the needs of the more urbanised, fully English-literate and middle-class sections of Malaysian society” (ibid). It is interesting that the phrases ‘might not be appropriate’ and ‘had never previously been explicitly stated in formal circles’ (Asmah Haji Omar 2007: 354) both bring to mind the image that English is the Cinderella – doing good work but required to stay hidden - and Malay is the pampered stepsister.

Efforts by the gatekeepers, or the nationalists, which could be said to be holding back the growth, or even popularity, of the previous colonial language understandably will create tension. This is certainly not an uncommon phenomenon in post-colonial countries as seen in Sri Lanka (Canagarajah, 2005a), Bangladesh (McGinley, 1983), and the Philippines (Gonzalez, 1980; 1998; Tupas, 2007). Edwards (1994) rightly observed that there is “a continuing tension between the practical necessity for English and the demands for more expedition in the promotion of Malay in all sectors” (p.187). This tension and conflict between the former colonial language and the local language has been articulated in collections of studies on language planning in post-colonial countries (Fishman et al., 1996; Street, 2001; Canagarajah, 2005b; Lin and Martin, 2005) as well as in studies on language and nation-building (Wright, 2000; Lee and Suryadinata, 2007; Orman, 2008). Certainly the link between nationalism and language as seen in the bahasa jiwa bangsa (‘language is the soul of the nation’) philosophy of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka is not exclusive to Malays. In fact, the Malay nationalist groups found inspiration from neighbouring Indonesia which selected bazaar Malay as their language of unity (Asmah Haji Omar, 2007: 345). Asmah states,

> Although the Malays before this were never fanatical about their language, the Indonesian Sumpah Pemuda gave them an idea of the role that language could play in forging them as a strongly coherent group as well as in giving an identity to a new Malaya, where all the races could be united through a single language (ibid).

It could be argued that the adjective ‘fanatical’ is apt in the Malaysian case. The nationalists’ demands for the pemartabatan (lit. 'bestowing a higher prestige’) of Malay involved the complete phasing out of English as the medium of instruction in schools – this whole process took a total of 12 years (1970 – 1982) and continues today via Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka among others. The preoccupation with language continues into the Malay self-identity. It is one of the three factors which, to this day, encapsulate the identity of a Malay person in
Malaysia: “ethnicity (Malay descent), religion (Islam), and language (the Malay language)” (ibid: 340). In an attempt to play down the preoccupation, Asmah stressed that “Malay as a category now is an open group which admits anyone from any other group (Chinese, India, European, etc.) as long as he or she displays all three critical identity factors” (ibid: 345). At this point of the discussion, it can be posited that the setting up of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka as well as the displacement of English from the national education system are local examples of such preoccupation. It is therefore understandable when tension related to language issues arises in Malaysia.

An example of this tension is visible in the debate carried out in the media following the discontinuation of the ETeMS policy. To this day, some parents – particularly those in urban areas - do not agree with this action. The parents’ disagreement is consistent with David and Govindasamy (2005) who found that there is support for English to play a stronger role in the students’ education particularly among non-bumiputera (p.124). Interestingly, the demand for English-medium education – at least in the urban schools – does not conform to the typical bumiputeran non-bumiputera dichotomy as mentioned by the study. Urbane and educated Malay parents have begun to voice out their disagreement with the policy reversal. In an online newspaper article, the Parent Action Group for Education (PAGE) voiced its concern that the policy reversal “will totally eliminate scientific English and replace it with ‘scientific’ Malay words the majority of which are actually nothing more than ‘Malay’-fied English terms such as oksida, fotosintensis, silender etc.” (Noor Azimah, 21 Mar 2010). The group also criticised Malay nationalists for labelling English as a colonialist language and accused them of being “bigoted ‘patriots’” (ibid.).

Political parties from both sides (opposition and government) have used the language issue extensively in pre-election campaigns and one can be misled into thinking that the issue is about some segment of Malaysian society not accepting the status of Malay as the national language. However, if one were to study the issue more closely, one can see that the main cause of disagreement lies more with the (imposed) lack of language-in- education choices for the people. Lee Hock Guan (2007) highlights an important point:

In a sense, Tunku Abdul Rahman, the first Prime Minister, accurately observed that the language controversies have never been over Malay language as the sole national language, as everyone accepts this, but rather about Malay as the sole official language and main medium of instruction (p.118) [italics my own].
In the process of entrenching Malay as befitting its status and role as *sole* national language, *sole* official language, and *main* medium of instruction which inevitably sidelined English, it is understandable if Malays are not too keen to look at the effect of their efforts on *bumiputera* students. In his article titled ‘Language planning in Malaysia: the first hundred years’, Abdullah Hassan (2005: 10), himself a staunch nationalist, admits that,

Ironically, the implementation of the National Language policy has produced some adverse repercussions. Rural children have tended to be monolingual, because their English (the second language taught) for various reasons never attained a respectable level of proficiency. This handicap is augmented when they are discriminated against in employment, and they suffer serious setbacks in furthering their education beyond the secondary level.

Perhaps it is from this realisation that some nationalists (see Abdullah Hassan, 2009) strongly reiterate that they are not against Malaysians, particularly *bumiputera*, learning English. They are against the logic of the ETeMS policy which was intended to improve the students’ English proficiency through the Science and Maths subjects (p.3). Abdullah and his colleagues are perhaps an exception as there are also more conservative nationalists who view giving English a role in the nation’s language and education policies as a form of imperialism (Zainal Abidin Abdul Wahid, 2002; Ahmad Hassan, 2009). Continuous claims by conservative nationalists of imperialism, while understandable, can be contested because Malaysia is a sovereign country and has constitutionalised its unilingual language policy (see Esman, 1992) effectively eliminating the possibility for a second or other official language. In addition, the nationalists’ negative reaction towards English is inconsistent with the initial objective of achieving a national identity through the unilingual policy which is termed as the “bargain” between the *bumiputera* and the non-*bumiputera* (Asmah Haji Omar, 2007: 347). The *jus soli* principle, outlined by the United Malay National Organisation (UMNO), offered the non-*bumiputera* citizenship by birth provided that non-*bumiputera*

accept Malay as the national language and recognize the special rights and privileges of the Malays as the natives of the Land. The offer and its acceptance in turn facilitated the writing of the National Language Act, Article 152, in the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya (ibid: 347-348).

The nationalists’ continuous negative view of English could perhaps be explained in Esman’s (1992: 385) observation that following the unilingual policy “English...has been shorn of official status, in part because Chinese, unable to achieve any official recognition for their
own language, were perceived to be falling back on English to avoid using Malay”. However, this perception of non-*bumiputeras* using more English and not enough Malay has also been debunked. As seen in the quotation above, Abdullah Hassan commented on the irony of the national language policy, admitting that “The Chinese and Indians did eventually become bilingual and indeed trilingual (cf. Fenn-Wu, 1952), mastering the National Language, their respective mother tongues, and English – and understood the advantages well” (Abdullah Hassan, 2005: 7). In addition, negative attitudes towards English, prominently highlighted during protests against the ETeMS policy, also seem to be attributable only to conservative Malays, as studies have found that Malaysian students generally have positive attitudes towards English and towards learning it (Ratnawati, 2004; Mardziah and Wong, 2006; Rahman, 2008). University students interviewed by The Star expressed their disagreement with the shelving of the ETeMS policy (The Star, 12 July 2009). In support of the policy, one *bumiputera* student said that “one of her peers had to extend her engineering course in order to take up English classes and others had failed their courses as they couldn’t answer their papers in English”. The pragmatic attitude of the students is quite clearly the opposite of that of the conservatives and nationalists. As Asmah puts it “It is not just an impression but a foregone conclusion that Malaysian students are in general positive towards learning English” (1992: 134).

The positive and practical attitudes towards English amongst Malaysian youths of today suggest that they do not find using English as running counter to their being Malaysian. In recent years, online media in Malaysia have seen an increase in youth-oriented websites in English or bilingual (in English and Malay), which feature local events aimed at the youths mainly in the urban capital, Kuala Lumpur. Two significant features of these sites are that they are English or bilingual (English-Malay) and they have a team of multiracial contributors, which can be seen from the ‘About Us’ sections. One can also hear many code-switching occurrences in the videos/interviews on these websites. A closer look at these sites reveals that the dominant language for the write-ups is English, while the Malaysian variety of English is used for the more informal conversations, music videos, or interviews. The latter include both Standard Malaysian English as well as the Colloquial Malaysian English sub-varieties (Rajadurai, 2004: 54-55). The use of English, as opposed to Malay, on these sites is interesting given that the contents are of local interest. It could be argued that the more educated and urban Malaysian youths are not caught up in the previous generation’s concept of language loyalty. The use of English as well as the code-switching on these sites is
consistent with the observation that the language choice for out-of-group interactions amongst urban Malaysian youths is English for Chinese and Indians (David, 2007; Lim Chin Chye, 2008; David, 2008). Interestingly though, the language choice on these English/bilingual youth-oriented websites does not support David (2007: 7) and Lim Chin Chye (2008: 163), who found that Malay was the in- as well as out-of-group language choice for Malays. Content on these non-mainstream websites suggest that English may also be the out-of-group language choice amongst urban Malays.

The recent development described in the preceding paragraphs indicates that the viewpoint of single-language identification with the national identity may not be relevant or applicable in modern-day Malaysia. It also suggests that the unfriendly attitude towards English in Malaysia could be limited to conservative Malays and nationalists who most often are the older generation. Younger Malaysians have a more pragmatic and practical attitude towards English. More importantly younger Malaysians also use English (or at least the Malaysian variety) in inter-ethnic communication. The perception that English is not a suitable language for national integration, national identity, and national unity is becoming increasingly vague and irrelevant. This is a positive sign for the younger generations, particularly the bumiputeras, because the business of equipping bumiputeras with sound English proficiency can be carried out without unnecessary distractions.

The description thus far serves to impress upon us the nature of the relationship between English and Malay in Malaysia. It is possible that what conflict there may be is not only about the national identity but involves the status of the two languages.

2.2 The (changing) role and status of English in Malaysia

The discussion thus far has tried to show that an old mindset (conservative and nationalist) often dominates the discourse related to the role of English in Malaysia. Modernity (including globalisation) and economic concerns, however, pose challenges to that mindset and resulted in English gaining a stronger role, for example, the ETeMS policy and the Private Higher Educational Institutions Act 1996. After only six years of implementation, however, the ETeMS policy (2003-2009) was forced to a stop.

Foreign researchers have noted that Malaysia has an “off-again-on-again affair with the English language” (Ridge, 2004: 409). It can be argued that it is precisely this off-on situation
– often related to the socio-political events in the country – that significantly slows down the successful implementation of English language learning in Malaysia, especially in the rural areas and in public education institutions. Yet, this study does not suggest that the growth of English is stunted for all Malaysians as studies have shown that the divide is, in general, an urban-rural one (David, 2000; Ratnawati and Ismail, 2003; Ratnawati, 2004). The changing priorities, however, point to a lack of strong commitment to the mastery of English even in the face of industry reports which highlight the fact that the majority of Malaysian undergraduates from public universities struggle with English proficiency. It is posited that this is not for lack of a policy basis on the role of English in Malaysia (Baldauf, 1993/1994: 84), but rather the will (or the clarity) to implement those policies. It is useful to recall here the importance of who the language managers are (Baldauf, 1982; Spolsky, 2009). Based on the present language situation in Malaysia, with the ETeMS policy as a case in point, it would seem that the role and status these language managers or planners have set for English are not necessarily acceptable to many Malaysians, especially those in favour of a stronger role for English in the education system.

2.3 Impact of the national language policy on English

This section reviews the impact of the national language on English teaching and learning in Malaysia. The relegation of English, following the National Language Policy, did not mean students were not encouraged to learn it. In fact, “Teaching English as a compulsory language in the schools in the remote areas is an illustration par excellence of this ideology of not denying anyone the chance to acquire a language which is a means to progress” (Asmah, 1996: 531). The requirement of English as a compulsory school subject, however, is not the same as a compulsory pass in examinations. The former means that students who did not pass the subject could still move up the school grades and onto university if they were inclined to.

Gill (2004) provides an outline of the changes in the role and status of English as well as its effects on the higher education sector. After Independence, the change to the medium of instruction in all levels of public learning institutions was gradual: from English-monolingual (English) to bilingual English-Malay and eventually monolingual-Malay. The government also instituted the ethnic quota in public universities to ensure “a sufficient number belonging to certain ethnic groups were provided with opportunities to take critical degrees” (p.140). At the same time, there was a rapid growth of private higher learning institutions which provide tertiary access to non-bumiputera students following limited space in the public universities –
as a result of the ethnic quota - and the high cost of overseas education (Lee, 1997a: 200; 1997b: 35-36). Unlike the public universities, the 1996 Private Higher Education Act allows the private tertiary institutions to use English as their medium of instruction\textsuperscript{16} (Lee, 1997b: 36). By now it should be clear that there has been a dual university system – which persists to the present time - with each having a different ethnic majority in its student population and a different medium of instruction: public (bumiputera; Malay-medium) and private (non-bumiputera; English-medium). In addition, the ever-increasing gap between the urban and rural students in terms of English proficiency (Ratnawati, 2004) is such that some ELT professionals have conceded that Malaysia has two types: an English as a Second Language (ESL) setting for the urban students, and an EFL setting for the rural students (David, 2000; Ratnawati and Ismail, 2003).

There are segments of Malaysian society who use English, comfortably, as a second or even first language. One could say that an affluent and urbane lifestyle may have no need for Malay at all. It is likely that these Malaysians do not view English as a foreign language; in fact “...placing the label EFL (English as a Foreign Language) in Malaysia is construed to be downgrading the Malaysians’ ability to speak and write English. Most Malaysians still think they speak good English” (Asmah, 2000b: 18). Nevertheless, such an ESL setting is not extended to the majority of Malaysians who live in rural areas where interaction in English is only available in the English classroom. The majority of those who obtained Bands 1 and 2 for their MUET or a 9 (‘Failed’ grade) in their SPM English exam could not be the ‘most Malaysians’ referred to in Asmah’s justification. So, do the terms ‘ESL’ or ‘EFL’ matter in any way for the low proficiency learners? We have no evidence to say it does or does not, as to date, there has been no study in the Malaysian ELT scene which tested an EFL methodology.

Thus far, it can be said that the effect of the national language policy, with its strong emphasis on Malay, has had a negative impact on the motivation of Malaysians – particularly the rural students - to acquire a good proficiency in English. Ironically, “the success in having a national language resulted in the Malays – the race it was designed to help – being disadvantaged” (Lowe & Khattab, 2003: 219). Furthermore, non-bumiputeras “may learn the national language as the lingua franca but not use it much with non-Malays and even with English-educated Malays” (David and Wendy Yee, 2009: 308).
2.4 Early form of lexical borrowing in Malay

Malay is shaped and influenced by other languages from cultural groups which once reached the Malay shores. The influence of Arabic on Malay in Malaysia has been documented most notably by Beg (1983). In his book, Beg maintains that the Arabic loan words “form the kernel of Malay language; they are the pride of literate Malay’s speech. Arabic loan words represent Malay culture, religion, law, customs, ceremonies and the like” (p. 81). The Arabic loan words (and often actual Arabic words too) have a strong unifying function in the Malay Muslim community. The sense of religiousness and togetherness in Islam via the Arabic loan words and/or the Arabic words themselves is utilized in Malay speeches to evoke a sense of a collective Muslim ummah (Arabic for Muslim community). A glance at a speech by a former president of the United Malay National Organization (UMNO)17 shows many Arabic loan words such as Ilahi, amal, jemaah, insaf, makruf and nahi mungkar. In short, the Arabic words (loan words or not) play a role in the consciousness of the Muslim Malay in Malaysia.

Compared to the development of Malay in Indonesia, which favours Sanskrit, Malay language development in Malaysia shows a leaning towards Arabic words. Asmah Haji Omar (1992: 162) states that,

Although the Indonesians, inclusive of the Javanese, were also Islamised, Arabicism in bahasa Indonesia has not seemed to stand out as it is in bahasa Malaysia and the bahasa Melayu of Brunei. … The Indonesian predilection for Sanskrit over Arabic linguistic elements has persisted over the ages. This phenomenon is productive even to this day. It is seen in the coining of new terms for new concepts or for acquiring new affixes in the effort to enrich the language, and this reflects a natural inclination among the Indonesians to look to the Sanskrit source rather than to Arabic.

Asmah’s point echoes the one made earlier by Alisjahbana (1976: 81) that Arabic and English have a stronger influence on the development of modern terminology in Malaysia compared to Indonesia. He gave the example of ‘administration’ which in Malaysian Malay is pentadbiran (derived from Arabic) whereas in Indonesian it is tatausaaha (derived from Sanskrit). This is not actually surprising as prior to the British education policy, the Malays already enjoyed a close relationship with Arabic from the thriving Islamic religious education and literary knowledge within the Malay Archipelago.

The historical contact with Islam and Arabic which persists to this day amongst Malay Muslims gave an advantage to Arabic loan words over ones from Western languages. The
purist attitude among Malay nationalists towards Western loan words specifically in the years 1956-1966 has been described as “paradoxical to the development that had been undergone by Malay since the coming of the Hindus and the Arabs to the Malay Archipelago” (Asmah Haji Omar, 1975: 104). Although the Sanskrit and Arabic languages similarly brought innovations to Malay in terms of new phonemes and phonological structures, language purists view such loan elements and structures as “usually Malay due to their long time membership in the Malay linguistic inventory, such that their existence as loans never surfaced. On the other hand, any innovation that came from English or any other European language was considered an outright violation of the purity of the Malay language” (ibid: 104).

Asmah terms the Malays’ attitudes as differential and proceeds to explain the reason:

This differential attitude towards the Sanskrit and Arabic as against English and other European languages is explicable in terms of the depth of influence that the Hindu and the Arabic civilizations had on the Malay civilization as a whole, compared to the superficial influence exercised by the Europeans. The Hindu and the Arabic influences are manifested in both material and spiritual culture such that these influences had transformed by way of assimilation from just mere alien elements into ones which were deemed local and indigenous in nature. The European influence never succeeded in going farther than the material culture and, later on, the sciences which it brought with it to the Malay world. It had never exerted much influence in the Malay life (ibid: 104).

Asmah’s explanation reveals the sociocultural forces that play a part in language planning and policy in Malaysia. The British education policy of establishing vernacular schools for the different races in Malaya (Hirshman, 1972) is popularly held by Malay nationalists to have been a deliberate policy to divide and conquer the population. This perspective increased feelings of distrust for the British and alongside that their culture – which included the Christian missionaries and the use of English in English-medium schools. The discourse of the Malay nationalists with regard to the British colonial powers is often one that talks about “repossessing political and economic dominance from the British and the immigrant population” (Shamsul A.B, 1997: 245) and this obviously already shows the Malay nationalists’ anger at the colonial power.

Malay had its first contact with the English language when the British acquired Penang Island in 1786 (Augustin, 1982: 249). Ever since then, English has continued to have an impact not only on the development of Malay but also on the social lives of Malaysians in terms of their language choice and language attitudes. The borrowing of English words does not show any
signs of slowing down despite the developed status of Malay. The borrowing can be attributed to the status of English in Malaysia – it is still the second most important language in the country (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 55). In addition, the constant contact that Malay has with English gives a bigger chance for the latter to assume a stronger role in the lexicon of the former, especially since English is the international language of business, academia, and technology. On top of that, the unofficial second language status of English makes it the natural choice to turn to when Malay needs words to express new concepts in the language. It can be said that the continuous contact and relationship that the two languages have with each other encourages the borrowing of words from English (source language) to Malay (recipient language).

The relationship between Malay and English has resulted in various studies on language contact phenomena in Malaysia. These include studies of linguistic borrowing and loan words (Heah, 1989; Mior Hamzah et al., 1992; Aishah Mahdi, 1992; Khairiah, 1994; Puteri Roslina, 1994; Nik Safiah Karim, 1996; Hartley & Kim, 2000; Shamimah, 2006; Sew, 2007), code-switching (Ozog, 1996; David, 2003c; Hajar Abd Rahim & Harshita Aini Haroon, 2003; Martin, 2005), the emergence of the Malaysian variety of English (Platt, 1977; Platt & Weber, 1980; Lowenberg, 1986, 1991; Newbrook, 1997; Rajadurai, 2004; Tan, 2005), and the acquisition of English as a second language (Kaur, 1995; David, 2000; Ambigapathy, 2002). Aside from the language teaching perspective, there is also research on the role(s) of English in Malaysia and in Malaysian language policies (Asiah Abu Samah, 1994; Asmah Haji Omar, 1979, 2001; Gill, 2005; Abdullah, 2005).

2.5 Language contact and linguistic borrowing

Linguistic borrowing arises out of contact-induced changes to a language. The simplest kind of influence that one language may exert on another is the borrowing of a word (Sapir, 1921: 193). In another classic definition of borrowing, the process is termed as the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another (Haugen, 1950: 212). Winford (2003: 2) says that most, if not all, languages have been influenced at one time or another by contact with others. The results of these contacts...
relationship between the languages in contact, specifically the degree of typological similarity between them. … Relevant social factors include the length and intensity of contact between the groups of speakers for the languages concerned, their respective sizes, the power or prestige relationships and patterns of interaction between them, as well as the patterns of interaction between the languages.

In his classic definition of borrowing, Haugen (1950) proposes that borrowing is a process and terms such as loan word, hybrid, loan translation or semantic loan are not related to the borrowing process but are tags that are applied to the results of borrowing (p. 213). In his definition of these tags, Haugen differentiates between importation and substitution as the comparison between the model (source language) and the reproduction (the loan word). If the loan is similar to the model such that native speakers would accept it as their own, borrowing speakers may be said to have imported the model into their language. However, if the reproduction of the model is inadequate, they may be said to have only substituted a similar pattern from their own language. Hence, according to Haugen’s definitions, loan words involve morphemic importation without substitution; loan blends involve morphemic substitution as well as importation (includes hybrids); and loan shifts involve morphemic substitution without importation (includes loan translation and semantic loans) (ibid: 230-231).

Heah (1989: 25), however, states that such criteria work only for oral borrowing but not for loan words that enter into a language via the written mode, or transliteration. In the case of the English loan words in Malay, there is only morphemic transfer and the phonemic form is not imported. She suggests that “the orthographic adjustments made during transliteration would determine the phonemic form that the loans take in the borrowing language. Hence in sub-classifying such “loanwords” an orthographic criterion would have to be used” (ibid: 26). In general, the English loan words in Malay can be classified according to their morphemic importation based on Haugen (1950: 214) i.e. no morphemic importation/pure loan words (e.g. program, medium, multi-, editorial); partial morphemic importation (e.g. revolusi, kritikal, kolektif, presiden, skrip, sosial, ekonomi); and complete morphemic importation (e.g. resit, mesin, stesen, lesen, inci, wayar). A fuller account of the process of importation of English words into Malay will be given later.

The most common type of borrowing involves primarily lexical borrowing of content morphemes such as nouns and verbs (Winford, 2003: 12). Weinreich (1953) notes that “the ways in which one vocabulary can interfere with another are various” and, in the case of non-
compound lexical elements, they are: the outright transfer of the phonemic sequence from one language to another and the extension of the use of an indigenous word of the influenced language in conformity with a foreign model (p.47-48). Before we move on, it is worth pointing out that the word *interfere* in the quoted statement is not necessarily meant in a negative way. Weinreich and many scholars of language contact use the term “borrowing interference” in the broadest sense as a cover term for all kinds of contact-induced language changes (Winford, 2003: 12; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988: 20). To avoid confusion related to the concept of *interference*, the term is avoided in this study and, following Winford (2003), the terms ‘contact-induced changes’ and ‘cross-linguistic influence’ are used as general labels to denote all kinds of influence by one language over another (p. 12). This is in line with Thomason and Kaufman’s definition of the term borrowing: *the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers’ native language*, and not to interference in general (1988: 21).

According to Weinreich, examples of loan words resulting from outright transfer are available from practically every language described. In his own differentiation of *borrowing* and *interference*, he states that,

...two or more languages will be said to be in contact if they are used alternately by the same persons. The practice of alternately using two languages will be called bilingualism, and the persons involved, bilingual. Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact, will be referred to as interference phenomena (p.1)...

In speech, it [interference] occurs anew in the utterances of the bilingual speaker as a result of his personal knowledge of the other tongue. In language, we find interference phenomena, which having frequently occurred in the speech of bilinguals, have become habitualized and established. Their use is no longer dependent on bilingualism. ... For the individual speaker today, it is an inherited loanword which he may or may not recognize as such (p.11).

Though focusing on the bilingualism phenomenon, Weinreich’s statement also applies to the study of all contact languages and it turns out that, when borrowing occurs, it is not specific to bilingual situations. A relevant point made by Weinreich is that words which were originally borrowed can successfully become incorporated into the recipient language and they may or may not even be recognized as loan words by the present speakers of that language. This can be demonstrated by the Malay words that originated from Sanskrit, for example, *manusia* (‘human beings’), *menteri* (‘minister’), *perdana menteri* (‘prime
Winford (2003: 30) writes that perhaps a majority of lexical borrowing results from only marginal contact with other languages through travel, exploration, or conquests. This type of casual-contact lexical borrowing may also be caused by exposure to the donor language via the mass media, foreign language instruction, and lexical borrowing from the language of the colonizers to those of the colonized is even more common. Winford gave the example of English influence on the Japanese lexicon as a result of growing exposure to it via the radio, cinema, newspapers, and other forms of mass media, which spread popular American culture, especially among the Japanese youth. The presence of English loan words in contemporary Japanese is so strong that Japanese today cannot adequately be spoken without the use of English loan words or English-based vocabulary items (Stanlaw, 2004: 2). Other settings where lexical borrowings can occur are where there is unequal bilingualism as a result of sociohistorical forces such as immigration, invasion or military conquest, or the realignment of national boundaries (Winford, 2003: 33). Examples of this setting are the Basques in southern France (persistence of ethnic minority enclaves) and the Hispanics in the United States (urban segregation). The final setting given by Winford is lexical borrowing in equal bilingual settings where power and prestige differences between the languages involved play an important role in the promotion of borrowing from the High to the Low language (e.g. Flemish-French languages in Brussels and French-Alsatian contact in Strasbourg (ibid: 37).

The presence of the English loan words in Malay can be said to have begun under the first setting, which is casual contact via exposure to the donor language during colonisation. Large-scale borrowing from English into Malay did not happen during the colonial period but, given the status of English in Malaya at that time, it is understandable that after Independence, the terminology committees looked to English as the main source language for
borrowing. Similarly, Indonesia looked to Dutch as one of its source languages during the development period for the national language, Indonesian (Alisjahbana, 1976: 70).

What constitutes borrowing and what were the reasons for the recipient language to borrow features from the source language? Weinreich offers several reasons (1953:56-61): (a) to supply words in the recipient language to designate names for new things or concepts; (b) to resolve a clash of homonyms in the recipient language; and (c) to fulfil the constant need of synonyms in the recipient language whose words sometimes lose their expressive force. For bilinguals of the recipient language, additional reasons for borrowing are d) to compensate for the semantic fields in the recipient language which are insufficiently differentiated, (e) to acquire the prestige associated with the word in the source language, and (f) to make word choices through mere oversight due to the bilingual’s knowledge of both languages. The reasons for Malay borrowing of English words can be said to utilize all of Weinreich’s reasons except for the reason that borrowing resolves the clash of homonyms.

English loan words in Malay are the result of the contact between English and Malay which produced mainly lexical borrowing. Lexical borrowing is significant in the enrichment of the Malay lexicon in the “pure, natural and social sciences and various fields of study, e.g. biology, chemistry, mathematics, economics, anthropology, sociology and so on” (Asmah, 1993: 43). Contemporary Malay also enjoys an increasing number of English loan words through the print media which bring new information and new concepts daily. Weinreich observes that “lexical borrowing, … can often be explained by investigating the points on which a given vocabulary is inadequate in the cultural environment in which the contact occurs” (1953: 3). The ensuing discussion centres on a description of Malay corpus development and the background to loan words in Malay.

2.6 Malay corpus planning and development

2.6.1 Definition

Corpus planning in Malaysia is a process that involved modernizing the existing language to make it more efficient for use. Dismissing the idea that Malay is “immature” and “less developed” as suggested by sociolinguists writing about language corpus planning in developing nations, Asmah asserts that the Malays and other “so called ‘less developed’ societies which involve themselves with language corpus planning do not always start from
scratch” (ibid: 59-60). The societies were already “in the possession of sets of corpuses in terms of writing systems and lexicons which are adequate for use in their own society” (ibid).

What corpus development for Malay essentially means then is the modernization of the language in terms of “standardization of the system, elaboration of the code, and the propagation of the policy” (ibid). Asmah’s definition is therefore similar to what Baldauf (1990: 4) terms as codification: “Codification of a language focuses on the standardization procedures needed to develop and formalize a linguistic and usually literate set of language norms.” According to Baldauf, codification of a language “has become so extensive that language agencies have been created to do the necessary corpus planning work.” (ibid.). In Malaysia, the language agency referred to is Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, and indeed codification of Malay has certainly been extensive and in depth. Under Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka - which we can effectively term the language manager for Malay - the graphization, grammatization, and lexication (Haugen, 1983: 271-272) of Malay have been done through its Jawatankuasa Tetap Bahasa Malaysia (Permanent Committee for Malay), aided by smaller committees for the various academic disciplines (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 100).

2.6.2 The period of sociolinguistic purism (1956 – 1966)

The following discussion elaborates on the corpus development of Malay with regard to vocabulary expansion in the period since Independence. As with other modern languages, the lexicon of Malay has had to increase, particularly for use in science, technology, economics, and other fields. Haugen (1983: 273) terms this process as elaboration, which is

in many ways simply the continued implementation of a norm to meet the functions of a modern world. … A modern language of high culture needs a terminology for all the intellectual and humanistic disciplines, including the cultural underworld that runs from low to popular.

According to Haugen, elaboration involves “terminological modernization” and “stylistic development” (ibid: 275). For the purpose of this study, we will concentrate on the former. Baldauf (1990) further explains that terminological modernization requires that “in culturally, technologically, and economically changing conditions, thousands of new terms must be generated each year in a language if that language is to be fully expressive in every domain” (p.6). Terminological modernization is reported in studies of numerous languages around the world, for instance, Dutch loan words in Indonesian (De Vries, 1988), English loan words in
These examples make it clear that borrowing from English is a very common source of terminological modernization.

In the Malaysian context, the language planning agency Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP) has had the primary responsibility for the lexical expansion of Malay and has developed formal procedures for this purpose. Under the DBP, Malay vocabulary expansion has undergone two periods of ‘attitudinal projections’: the period of sociolinguistic purism (1956-1966) and the period of compromise (1967-present) (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 62-63). The purists’ committee regarded innovations from English as well as Indonesian words borrowed from Javanese and Sanskrit as unsuitable for the Malay lexicon. Asmah attributed this to several factors: the fact that the Javanese and Sanskrit words were deemed as not ‘Malay’, the strained relationship between Malaysia and Indonesia which led to the break-up of diplomatic relations between 1963 and 1966, and the fact that Indonesian was considered to project “unlimited liberalism in the acceptance of innovations particularly from Dutch and English” (Asmah, 1979: 62).

The purists’ strategy was to: (a) coin terminology which had Malay characteristics because those with foreign ones were considered to pollute the Malay language (Puteri Roslina, 2001: 37) e.g. perahu or sampan (‘boat’) and kereta api (‘train’); (b) resort to loan-translating or loan-shift when the ‘(a)’ approach failed, e.g. selari (‘parallel’), pepasir (‘granules’), and rangkaian (‘network’) (Asmah Haji Omar, 1975: 125); and (c) in the event that methods ‘(a)’ and ‘(b)’ failed, adapt the foreign term in such a way that the “Malayized counterparts when written according to the spelling system are then reflections (though not necessarily perfect ones) of the English proto-types” (Asmah Haji Omar, 1979: 63). This method of coining resulted in words like jeologi (‘geology’), prizam (‘prism’), oksijan (‘oxygen’), ketelog (‘catalogue’), sekil (‘scale’), maikerofilam (‘microfilm’), haiderojan (‘hydrogen’), and saikologi (‘psychology’) (Asmah Haji Omar, 1975: 113).

However, only Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka seemed to find this purist stand useful. The words and terminology coined by the purist committee in DBP did not have many supporters. Instead, even the Ministry of Education formed its own committee:
The negative reaction was stronger than the positive one. Such was the case that although the terms were supposed to be sanctioned by the government’s highest language authority... only a small percentage of these terms ever entered the technical language currency. Various bodies being unsatisfied with the technical terms issued by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka began creating and issuing their own terms for their purposes. Such bodies were the universities and other institutions of higher learning, the Ministry of Education itself, the publishers and individuals involved in the teaching of the various subjects or in the producing of textbooks for the various subjects. (ibid: 105)

As a result, the corpus planning during this period produced competing technical terms which confused users. This duality was resolved following the period of compromise. However, remnants of such duality – including their confusing usage – can still be seen today e.g. the loan words *ejen* and *agen* (‘agent’). To further complicate matters, the latest edition of Kamus Dewan (2007) provides a different entry for each word and with different definitions.

### 2.6.3 The period of compromise 1967 – present

As a result of resumed diplomatic relations with Indonesia, joint venture cooperation on language issues was established between the two countries. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka became more accepting of English concepts and technical terms which did not exist in Malay. Asmah states that DBP compromised in two ways,

One was the version of the phonetics of English. As such, those English words taken into Malaysian [Malay] when spelt according to the Malaysian spelling system could look poles apart from their original English counterparts. ..[second] was to adopt the English words in such a way that their Malayized counterparts when written according to the spelling system are then reflections (though not necessarily perfect ones) of the English proto-types. Here emphasis is given to the visual representation of the word rather than to its phonetic value (ibid: 63)

This compromise allowed for the introduction of English words that suited Malay far better than those adopted according to the purist approach. For instance, the examples of method (c) are now *geologi*, *geografi*, *prisma*, *oksigen*, *hidrogen*, *katalog*, and *psikologi*.

The basic methods for lexical expansion in Malay, as practised by DBP, are by (a) creating new words using existing Malay vocabulary and (b) *peminjaman atau penyerapan kata* (lit. ‘word borrowing or absorption’) (Hassan Ahmad, Klik DBP, 19 July 2007). These processes use Malay as well as foreign words which are later adapted to suit the orthographical, phonological and morphological systems of Malay. In order to explicate this process clearly
we will refer to the latest edition of the official guidebook used by the DBP terminology committees i.e. the *Panduan Pembentukan Istilah Umum Bahasa Melayu* (Guide to the Formation of Malay Terms, 2004).

The following sections review the two main processes of lexical borrowing in Malay: *planned* and *spontaneous*. As the names suggest, the former is borrowings which are planned by the language authority (Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka), while the latter is a creative and unplanned process which has largely happened outside the control of the language authority.

### 2.6.4 Procedures for developing *istilah* (technical terms): planned word borrowing

*Istilah*, a key term in the guidebook, is defined as follows,

*Istilah*, or ‘technical term’, refers to a word or phrase which accurately expresses a concept within a specific field of knowledge. Each technical term, or *istilah*, has a precise meaning within the context of that knowledge field, and therefore can be given an accurate definition (ibid: 2). [my translation]

Thus, *istilah* signifies a term used in a specific scientific or technical context. It is to be distinguished from *kata pinjaman*, or ‘loan word’, which is a more general concept of a word borrowed from another language, whether it is a technical term or a word for everyday use. Interestingly, DBP does not use the phrase *kata pinjaman saintifik* (‘scientific loan words’) to refer to scientific words borrowed from English. In this study, *loan word* refers to any borrowed word, irrespective of whether it is an *istilah*, for example, *elektron* (‘electron’), *sodium klorida* (‘sodium chloride’), *bajet* (‘budget’), *professor* (‘professor’), *tender* (‘tender’), *metod* (‘method’), and *leksikal* (‘lexical’), or a general one used by the public and disseminated by the mass media such as *polisi* (‘policy’), *dekad* (‘decade’), *dominasi* (‘domination’), *global* (‘global’), *fleksibel* (‘flexible’), *minoriti* (‘minoriti’), *konsumer* (‘consumer’), and *hab* (‘hub’). This is to avoid the confusion that can be associated with words that were originally created as *istilah* but gained currency and relevance in everyday usage. Thus, *loan word* or *kata pinjaman* will be the general term overall and *istilah* will be used to refer to words and phrases that are introduced in the Malay lexicon through the formal processes of lexical expansion adopted by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

As there is no English version of the 2004 edition of the guidebook, what follows are my own translations of relevant sections quoted from the guide. The guidebook (ibid: 3) explicitly
states conditions for the formation of istilahs when selecting words or phrases already existing in Malay, which are,

(a) the word/phrase chosen as the istilah is able to express the foreign concept and is stable in terms of its meaning within the knowledge field;

(b) the word/phrase chosen is the briefest amongst the possible choices;

(c) the word/phrase chosen has a positive connotation i.e. it is not obscene nor must it have negative implications for religions, ethnic group norms, and international relations;

(d) the word/phrase chosen has a pleasant sound to it (euphony); and

(e) the word/phrase chosen is formed based on accepted methods.

The conditions stated above are to ensure that the technical terms which were coined, adapted, or borrowed are accepted by language users and that there is no repeat of the unsatisfactory process for producing technical terms in the first fifteen years of terminology work done by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

In the formation of terms to refer to a foreign concept, the guidebook is clear that priority must be given to words or phrases in Malay before resorting to other sources. The order of priority is as follows:

(1) Malay including Indonesian as well as Malay dialects and classic Malay which has absorbed words from Arabic, Sanskrit, Persian, and etc.;

(2) other languages within the Malay family such as Iban, Kadazandusun, Javanese, and etc.;

(3) English, Arabic, and others.

(ibid., my translation)

It states that sources (1) and (2) can provide technical terms related to community living, farming, agriculture, animals and plants, and other fields. Meanwhile, English is the source for istilahs for various branches of science and technology and Arabic is for religious concepts as well as philosophy (ibid: 5-6). This priority for local or regional sources as shown in (1) and (2) has been described as a form of ethnographic purism which is also a form of linguistic nationalism (Thomas, 1991: 77). This is not surprising given the fact that Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka was established at the height of Malay nationalism.
In borrowing words from foreign sources, Asmah Haji Omar (1975: 126) also cautions that due consideration should be given to the five linguistic aspects of a word i.e. etymological, phonological/orthographic, grammatical, lexical, and semantic. For example, previously the DBP gave priority to the phonological representation of borrowed words, which meant that some words like sekil (‘scale’) and sepiar (‘sphere’) produced what Asmah termed as “visual repulsion” (ibid.: 113). In contrast to DBP, scholars at the University of Malaya adopted a different approach, which meant that in the adapting of technical terms from the international scientific vocabulary, priority should be given to the visual representation of such terms rather than their phonetic renderings. This rule was made to ensure that the scientific terms in Bahasa Malaysia would not be too far apart from their counterparts in the international vocabulary, when they appear in their orthographic representation. (ibid: 112)

Taking these factors into consideration, the words sekil and sepiar were then changed to skala and sfera.

2.6.5 Guidelines for utilising foreign language sources

The DBP guidebook states that there are four methods of utilising foreign sources (borrowing) to make new Malay words: penterjemahan (‘translation’), penyerapan (‘absorption’), penyesuaian imbuhan istilah asing (‘affixation’), and gabungan penterjemahan dan penyerapan (‘a blend of translation and absorption’). Chiew (1999: 612) observes that these procedures can be generalized into two common methods, which are “adopting the words “wholesale” - including their meaning and spelling - from English into Malay e.g. novel (‘novel’), virus (‘virus’), mineral (‘mineral’) … and giving the closest resemblance to the orthographic spelling of the English words in Malay e.g. misteri (‘mystery’), teori (‘theory’), and teknik (‘technique’).”

The guidebook also provides 72 English prefixes and 51 English suffixes that can be translated or absorbed into Malay (2004: 10-35). Modifications of the English affixes are utilized to create new words through the process of translation and absorption. This is done by:

(1) absorbing the affix in full alongside the foreign term it is attached to;
(2) taking the affix from its foreign term and attaching it to a Malay word;
(3) giving the affix an equivalent modification in Malay but still in an affix form;

(4) translating the affix part of the foreign term into Malay (ibid: 9).

Examples for condition (1) are the prefix *ana*- in *anafora* (‘anaphora’) and *anagram* (‘anagram’) and the suffix ‘-*al in *radikal* (‘radical’) and *nasional* (‘national’). Examples for condition (2) are the prefixes *anti*- in *antibeku* (‘antifreeze’) and *bio*- in *biokawalan* (‘biocontrol’). Examples for condition (3) are the prefix *dwi*- in *dwibahasa* (‘bilingual’) and the suffix –*arki in *anarki* (‘anarchy’). Finally, the examples for condition (4) are the prefixes *anti*- in *lawan arah jam* (‘anti-clockwise’) and ‘*pre*‘ in *bayar dahulu* (‘prepaid’).

In the case of translation of foreign terms, this must be done according to the following conditions (ibid: 7-8),

1. The Malay translation accurately defines the original term, for example, *pasar raya* (‘supermarket’).
2. The translation does not have to follow the form of the original i.e a word may be translated into a phrase and vice versa e.g. *pencakar langit* (‘skyscraper’).
3. The translated word/phrase must follow the part of speech of the original term.
4. The translated word/phrase must retain the key semantic features of the original term.
5. Where it is not necessary, based on rules in Malay, there is no need to include certain semantic features as well as the plural/singular aspect into the translated word/phrase.
6. A translation equivalent should be found in Malay even though the word at first seems unproductive or is no longer used and to use it in analogy with current words.
7. If the foreign term forms an acronym, the translated version in Malay (if possible) should produce a similar acronym as well.

Absorption of foreign technical terms means taking the whole foreign term with modifications in orthography and pronunciation, or without these modifications. This method is used when,

1. the foreign term is easily transferable;
(2) the foreign term aids the reading of foreign texts by Malaysians because it has the feature of text transparency;

(3) the foreign term is less cumbersome than its Malay translation;

(4) the foreign term makes it easier for experts to use rather than its translation which may have too many synonyms;

(5) the foreign term is more suitable and accurate because it does not have any negative connotations (ibid.: 8-9)

An important factor in this method is that the absorption of the foreign term gives priority to its visual form, i.e. its spelling, to suit Malay orthographic norms. Examples of foreign terms absorbed with spelling modifications are kamera (‘camera’), sistem (‘system’), sains (‘science’), filum (‘phylum’), and arkeologi (‘archeology’). Foreign terms absorbed without spelling modifications are, for example, radar, sonar, neonatal, nasal, and golf.

Finally, the guidebook states that the method of blending translation and absorption will produce words such as morfem terikat (‘bound morpheme’), koloid lempung (‘clay colloid’), and subbahagian (‘subdivision’) (ibid: 35).

The previous discussion has elaborated on planned borrowing and the rules that guide the terminology committees of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Up to now the committees have produced almost a million istilahs and 219 registers and glossaries such as Istilah Ekonomi (‘Economy technical terms’), Istilah Biologi (‘Biology technical terms’), Istilah Sains Politik (‘Political Science technical terms’), Glosari Insurans (‘Insurance glossary’), and Glosari AIDS (‘AIDS glossary’) (Azizul Ismail, 2006). In the next section we take a look at the spontaneous or unplanned word borrowing.

### Spontaneous word borrowing

An elaborated description of what spontaneous word borrowing is found in Heah (1989). According to Heah, lexical innovations outside the normal procedures of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka are “sporadic and spontaneous” compared to the planned word borrowing activities (p. 271). However, in the space of more than two decades since Heah’s work was published, contemporary spontaneous word borrowing is anything but sporadic. New words - borrowed and coined - are frequently found in the local Malay newspapers, which incidentally are the main source for the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Malay Corpus Database. This is not to
dismiss Heah’s work, as it remains by far, the most in-depth study on the influence of English loan words on Malay. Heah presented several interesting findings in her study, which compares planned and spontaneous lexical innovations. The findings are significant for the present study in that they confirm the history of the loan words in Malay, their types and sources, and their various functional purposes.

Heah found that the planned sector (the language agency) preferred substitutions, while the spontaneous sector (the print media) had a stronger preference for direct importation (pure loan words) (ibid: 275). This is because “lexical innovation in the spontaneous sector is influenced more by consideration of speed, expediency, fashion, and impact on audience” (p.273). These factors understandably contribute to spontaneous word borrowing due to the nature of newspapers as a business which must deliver information to the readers (audience/customers) as soon as possible.

Heah attributed the spontaneous sector’s preference for pure loan words to sociocultural factors, such as the ever increasing influx of information entering the country through English. In addition, she found that the planned sector had a preference for borrowing nouns from English, understandably so since the objective of Malay vocabulary development is to provide “designations for innovations, techniques, discoveries of one kind or another, concepts, processes – all of which, to an overwhelming degree, need to be designated by nouns.” (p. 287). In contrast, the spontaneous sector had a more varied preference. Aside from nouns, spontaneous borrowing involves adjectives, verbs, adverbs, and so on, to use as the means to express or to create “images, …attitudes, behaviour, qualities associated with a much admired and sought after western way of life” (p.289). In short, Heah’s study shows that,

whereas the frequency of use of lexical processes tends to reflect prevailing social trends in the spontaneous area, in the planned area the balance between the principal means of word formation can be deliberately altered. … The existence of competing lexical forms and variant forms of loans has to be accounted for, and in the case of Bahasa Malaysia, it was shown to be attributed to the different emphases and priorities of planning agencies, and innovators in the spontaneous area (p. 308)

The above quote provides evidence that word borrowing in Malay is subject to sociocultural and socio-political factors. The two sectors have different priorities and they do not utilize the same methods or processes in introducing new words. Here it can be argued that Malaysian learners of English stand to gain from the direct importation (pure loan word) method of the
spontaneous sector as these loan words do not differ much from their original form. A similar situation of more spontaneous word borrowing compared to the planned types was seen in Indonesian by Sneddon (2003: 150), who states that “in particular, the press has played an enormous part in the entry of a great number of English terms and expressions into the language…, much to the chagrin of the language planners”.

2.7 Research on loan words in Malay

Aside from Heah (1989), who took a more sociolinguistic perspective, there have been other works on English loan words in Malay. These are dissertations or theses on the pedagogical implications of the loan words in the teaching of English (Khairiah, 1994), the pedagogical value of English loanwords for bilingual Malay-English speakers (Normawati, 1996), the functions of the loan words and motivations for their use (Shamimah, 2006), students’ awareness of English loanwords in Malay (Mahaesvary, 1994), the use of English loan words in Malay short stories (Wong, 1993), a semantic study on direct importation of English words (pure loanwords) in Malay (Aishah, 1992), and problematic issues with English affixes as loan words in Malay (Chiew, 1997). Other works include a general description of English loan words in Malay (Abdullah, 1975), the etymology of modern Malay scientific terminology (Mior Hamzah et.al, 1992), the influence of English on Malay in the area of legal terminology (Puteri Roslina, 1994; Powell, 2004), English loan words in Malay in the field of mathematics (Hartley and Wong, 2000), library terms (Che Putih Ismail, 1996), and sports terms (Mohd Azemi, 1997). Aside from Khairiah and Shamimah, the other studies were descriptive in nature, documenting the effects of the language contact between Malay and English over the years. However, research on the pedagogical functions of the loan words, particularly in English vocabulary acquisition, remains lacking.

Masters theses by Khairiah Othman (1994) and Shamimah (2006) are very relevant to the present study. Khairiah discussed the pedagogical implications of English loan words in Malay for the teaching of English to Malaysian students. Khairiah noted that the participants in her study gained considerable success in learning English using the loan words (personal communication, 11 November 2009). Shamimah, on the other hand, did not focus on the pedagogical aspect but rather on the functions of English loan words in Malay as well as the motivations for borrowing them. Shamimah found that her participants – university undergraduates and Malay newspaper journalists – had a positive attitude towards the English loan words and generally preferred the loan words over their Malay equivalents. Her study
found that the loan words in Malay reflect the changes in lifestyle, and cultural influence in contemporary Malaysian society. In addition, motivations and preference for the loan words were due to semantic and extralinguistic factors (pragmatic, social, psychological, developmental) particularly for the journalists who have to produce written work under a strict deadline. Shamimah’s findings are consistent with Heah’s description of the spontaneous word borrowing process in that the loan words in this category satisfy users’ need for convenience and fashion. A similar preference for English loan words in the media and their borrowing motivations was also found in German newspapers by Gentsch (2004).

Compared to Malaysian learners of English, Malaysian learners of Arabic have already benefited for some time now from Arabic loan words in Malay. Students are taught the MUKADDAM concept (Abd. Razak Abu Chik, 2004) as one of the strategies to learn Arabic vocabulary. MUKADDAM stands for Metodologi Ubahsuai Kalimah Arab Dalam Dialek Alam Melayu (lit. ‘Methodology of modifying Arabic words in dialects within the Malay world’) and utilises the Arabic loan words in Malay in the teaching of Arabic vocabulary. The method has proven to be very popular with Arabic learners as well as Arabic language teachers in Malaysia. According to Abd. Razak, there are 1700 Arabic loan words in Malay and students who are familiar with these have an advantage in answering their Arabic essay examination, which requires a minimum of 150 Arabic words.

This discussion now turns to a doctoral study by Normawati (1996), who investigated the pedagogical value of English loanwords for bilingual Malay-English speakers. The goal of her study was “to discover whether knowledge of English, specifically vocabulary knowledge of English, has any influence on a reader’s ability to interpret texts written in Malay.” (p. 11). She argues that the presence of many English loan words in Malay technical texts poses reading difficulties for Malay native speakers due to the unfamiliar pronunciation and meanings of the loan words. She asserts that “these words often act as hurdles to full comprehension for an average reader who is unable to assign meanings to them, and as a result is not able to interpret the text successfully” (p. 6-7). Hence, the argument is that a bilingual reader should be able to utilize his/her knowledge of English to understand the Malay version of a text.

Normawati was particularly interested in the extent of the relationship between English and Malay in Malay technical texts. Her participants were 128 undergraduates of the Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering faculty at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia and all were
Malay native-speakers. These students were taking English proficiency classes and, according to Normawati, ranged from low to advanced levels of proficiency. The participants were given various tests: a yes/no vocabulary test for Malay and English, comprehension tests using a Malay technical text, and a loan word recognition test based on the same Malay technical text. A random sample of the students also took part in a retrospective interview.

Her study concluded that vocabulary knowledge of English and Malay “are strongly linked to one another, and that overall, subjects who knew the meaning of a word in English were shown to also know the meaning of an English loanword in Malay equivalent” (p. 79). She argues that bilingual students can draw from their knowledge in one language (English) and transfer that knowledge to another language (Malay) i.e. the students’ knowledge of English aided them in reading Malay technical texts. She also found that an awareness of transferred vocabulary (i.e. loan words) was “significantly related to reading performance of the Malay text.” (p.84). However, the hypothesis that vocabulary knowledge in English is a strong predictor [my italics] of success in reading Malay technical text (p.79) was not confirmed. Normawati attributed this to several factors,

(a) The vocabulary knowledge was English and the reading material was Malay, two different languages. She quotes Alderson (1984) who explains that “effects of transfer can become irrelevant or even negated” if the two languages are vastly different (p.85).

(b) It was caused by semantic narrowing i.e. the meaning of a loan word was more limited compared to its polysemous meaning in English.

(c) The non-significant relationship was most apparent in the low English proficiency level group of participants. Normawati suggests that proficiency was critical in accounting for the more bilingual participants’ test performance, which showed there was an influence on their reading comprehension compared to the less proficient participants (p. 85-88).

Normawati’s study provides evidence that bilingually proficient Malay-English speakers can better utilise their knowledge of English to interpret technical text in Malay. Considering that she did not specify the number of participants at different levels of English proficiency, it is difficult to assess whether the low proficiency participants caused the data to show a non-significant relationship between vocabulary knowledge of English and success in reading Malay technical texts. Alderson (1984: 23) states that research on equating reading ability and language ability should “focus upon individuals, and be specifically designed to allow a
detailed examination of the nature of their abilities, strategies, knowledges, attitudes, and motivations, and any other variables that appear to be relevant.” It would have been interesting to know the tests results of the low proficiency students when compared with those of the average to advanced proficiency groups.

In addition, Normawati presented interview results only with bilingual students who were found to read more in English than in Malay, and not surprisingly these participants confirmed that they used their knowledge of English to help them interpret the Malay technical texts. It would have been interesting to know the opinions of the low proficiency participants with regard to using English loan words. There was also no information pertaining to the participants’ socioeconomic background and their history of access to English, both at school and at home. Nevertheless, it is most interesting that this study explored the idea that knowledge of English could be used to better comprehend Malay technical texts.

To date, except for Khariah (1994), there has been no in-depth study of either the general or academic English loan words in Malay and the effect of these words on the Malaysian ESL learners’ acquisition of academic English vocabulary. General refers to the English loan words that are present in what Heah (1989) categorized as the spontaneous sector: the Malay newspapers and other media outlets that are not solely under the jurisdiction of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. As Heah has shown, the spontaneous sector has the potential to produce English loan words that are more similar to their original forms due to factors such as speed and expediency.

2.8 English loan words and English vocabulary learning

Vocabulary knowledge is an important aspect of second language learning. Pikulski and Templeton state that “Perhaps the greatest tools we can give students for succeeding, not only in their education but more generally in life, is [sic] a large, rich vocabulary and the skills for using those words” (2004: 1). Vocabulary is essential to reading and an inability to read is often attributed to a lack of vocabulary knowledge (Alderson, 1984). This knowledge is so critical that English language learners whose vocabulary develops slowly run the risk of being diagnosed as learning disabled (August et al., 2005). The importance of having sufficient vocabulary, especially for a university student, will be apparent in the way the student is able to express his/her views on any given assignment topic in English. In addition,
increased knowledge of vocabulary will greatly aid the students’ comprehension of academic texts in English.

How many English words then must a student in a public university in Malaysia know? The average educated native speaker of English is estimated to know 17,000 word families with an average acquisition of two to three words a day (Goulden, Nation, and Read, 1990: 356). This means that about 1,000 word families are acquired each year throughout childhood (Nation, 2001: 9). Admittedly that amount of vocabulary is unrealistic as a goal for second language learners to attain. In the Malaysian education system, English classes are held five times a week with 40 minutes per class session (Awang Sariyan and Kamal Shukri, 2002: 832). These classes do not involve learning purely vocabulary or wordlists as there are other skills to master within the Ministry of Education’s communicative approach in its curriculum. With such limited time and a large syllabus to cover, teachers have to be selective in the vocabulary they teach to students.

Selection of which words to teach should be determined by “the needs of the learners and the usefulness of the vocabulary item” (Nation and Meara, 2002: 37). If we take a look at the Forms 4 and 5 English Syllabus of the Ministry of Education Malaysia, there is a 309-word list which the syllabus states is “selected for teaching” and “is drawn from a sample of the more common or high frequency words used in daily life.” (2003: 3). The syllabus, however, does not provide any reference or rationale to the source of the words other than the following:

This suggested word list comprises general words in alphabetical order. These are base words and teachers are encouraged to use them when teaching the learning outcomes. ...

The word list for upper secondary is given so that teachers are aware of the range of words to be covered. The number of base words used for teaching in both form 4 and 5 should not exceed 1600 words for Form 4 and 1800 words for Form 5. However, teachers can add other words to ensure that the topic at hand is dealt with meaningfully (Form 5 English Syllabus, Ministry of Education, 2003: 32)

It would give more information to teachers if they knew the rationale for teaching students the list of words which include autumn, carriage, canal, cottage, earthquakes, forth, lone, and sow (ibid: 33-34). In addition, the syllabus cautions that the “word list is only the minimum for the year. Teachers are encouraged to widen this list according to the level, ability, and maturity of their students” (ibid: 3). It is noted here that there is no mention of
whether the words are chosen for their high frequency in English texts or for any other linguistic-related criteria.

High frequency words are defined as words that “cover a very large proportion of the running words in spoken and written texts and occur in all kinds of uses of the language” (Nation, 2001: 13). The General Service List (West, 1953) contains 2,000 high frequency English word families and learning them is “so important that anything that teachers and learners can do to make sure they are learned is worth doing” (Nation, 2001: 16). This is because,

The first 1,000 words cover about 77% and the second 1,000 about 5% of the running words in academic texts. …The words are a small enough group to enable most of them to get attention over the span of a long-term English programme. … The time spent on them is well justified by their frequency, coverage and range.

2.8.1 Academic vocabulary and the Academic Word List (AWL)

Aside from just basic vocabulary to enable students to converse in English, academic English is necessary if the students are to engage in academic discourse at university. Examples of these words include ‘concept’, ‘interpret’, ‘distinctive’, ‘institutional’ and ‘justification’ (see Coxhead, 1998, 2006; Schmitt and Schmitt, 2005 for a complete list and further reading). Academic vocabulary is a vital component of academic literacy practice in higher education - essayist literacy - as the students’ participation and success in university, as well as post-university, is affected by their success in this writing practice (Lillis, 2001: 20). Stahl and Nagy (2006: 108) describe ‘academic vocabulary’ as words which students may be less familiar with, as they are less frequent than high-frequency words but still important because they occur within a variety of academic contexts. If second language learners are intending to do university study, then it is necessary to extend their vocabulary knowledge beyond the high-frequency words to include specialised academic vocabulary, such as that represented by the Academic Word List (AWL) (Coxhead, 1998; 2011).

The AWL contains 570 word families that can account for around 10% of the total words in academic texts. This means that, compared to other word lists, the AWL has a higher coverage of academic words across the fields of arts, commerce, law, and science. The development of the AWL was based on the principles of corpus linguistics and vocabulary teaching and learning i.e. teach the most relevant vocabulary, teach the most useful vocabulary, and teach the most frequent vocabulary first (Coxhead, 2002). With its corpus of
3.5 million words of written academic discourse, the AWL is an example of corpus-based research applied to the teaching and learning of vocabulary. Coxhead states that “if learners are not able to recognize or use this language, this can act as a kind of barrier or ‘lexical bar’ to higher learning” (2006:3). She points out that academic vocabulary is different from technical vocabulary in that the latter is “useful for learners with specific goals in language use, such as reading academic texts in a particular discipline, writing technical reports or participating in subject-specific conferences” (Coxhead and Nation, 2001: 260).

The strength of the AWL, compared to other word lists, is its 570 word families which

... not in the most frequent 2,000 words of English but which occur reasonably frequently over a very wide range of academic texts; … That means that the words are useful for learners studying humanities, law, science or commerce. (Nation, 2001: 17)

The AWL coverage of other corpora has also been reported in a number of studies. Cobb and Horst (2002) noted that the AWL list, added to the 1000 and 2000 English word frequency lists, “…gives reliable coverage of about 90% of the running words in an academic or quality newspaper text” (http://www.lextutor.ca/cv/awl_F.htm). Chen and Ge (2007: 502) reported AWL coverage of 10.07% was found in medical research articles. Specifically, they found that 51.2% of the 570 word families in the AWL were frequently used in the medical research articles. Another study, Vongpumivitch et al. (2009) found that the AWL has a coverage of 11.17% in their 1.5 million word Applied Linguistics Research Articles Corpus. This is even higher than the 9.3% coverage in the Arts texts investigated in Coxhead (2000). More recently, Li and Qian (2010) reported an AWL coverage of 10.46% in their Hong Kong Financial Services Corpus which has about 6.3 million running words. We note that in all of these corpora, the AWL coverage is around or more than 10% which supports the claim that the AWL “covers approximately 10% of any academic text” (Coxhead, 2000; Coxhead and Byrd, 2007: 132).

Despite the merits of the AWL, it also has its critics who question the validity and usefulness of the AWL. Hyland and Tse (2007) queried whether there is an academic vocabulary and posit that

... a perspective that seeks to identify and teach such a vocabulary fails to engage with current conceptions of literacy and EAP, ignores important differences in the collocational and semantic behavior of words, and does not correspond with the ways language is actually used
Hyland and Tse argued that the AWL is a word list based on an opportunistic corpus and an unequal number of texts in each study field (ibid: 239). Consequently, they maintained that the AWL, and other such lists, encourages students to view the list as representing the vocabulary of academic discourse and “...so be valuable to all students irrespective of their study fields” (ibid: 238). In short, they are of the view that the AWL is “…an undifferentiated, unitary mass” (ibid: 247). As an alternative, Hyland and Tse proposed that if such lists were to be completely useful they should be more specific i.e. developed based on the vocabulary and discourse features that the students will likely encounter in their particular study fields (see ‘specificity’ in Hyland, 2002a). In a recent article, while noting that “...future research needs to be based on more balanced corpora that represent a wider range of subjects within a university. More work is also needed to establish whether words really are very different across different subject areas.” (Coxhead, 2011: 357). She gave the example of whether ‘theory’ in biology is really not at all related to ‘theory’ in psychology.

In another specific corpus of agriculture research articles, the AgroCorpus, Martinez et al. (2009) found that the AWL coverage was only 9.6%. Their results led them to concur with Hyland and Tse (2007), who argued that “… highly specific corpora may be served differently by the AWL”. The AgroCorpus had a total of 826,416 words. Based on their findings, Martinez et al. suggested that it is necessary to directly use the students’ target texts when developing frequency word lists (2009: 193). In addition, Martinez et al. stated that, instead of being based on frequency, it would have been more useful to develop word lists based on the semantic and pragmatic criteria (ibid.). This was because they found that some of the words in the AWL also had other more technical meanings or usage in the field of agriculture e.g. site, stress, and culture (ibid: 191).

Hancioglu et al. (2008) argue that the existence of the AWL on its own may not be sustainable, given the unclear distinction between “general and so-called academic lexis” (p.475). The authors conclude that combining the AWL and GSL as a general comprehensive word list would be more useful to teachers and learners of both general and academic English.
Eldridge (2008) is of the view that the AWL may possibly be a list of relatively high-frequency word families which happen to have been extracted from an academic corpus (p.111). He further question the idea of using the “far from problem-free General Service List” (ibid.) as a foundation for the AWL. For example, Eldridge noted that the word ‘job’ is found in the AWL but not more academic words such as ‘dissertation’ and ‘examine’. Compared to Hyland and Tse, however, Eldridge takes a more moderate approach towards the AWL by saying that for now, taking into consideration ESL teaching in “an imperfect world” and similarly its “hard-pressed instructors”,

...Coxhead’s flawed AWL may yet continue for a while longer to be of more practical service than the specialized approach suggested by Hyland and Tse (ibid.).

Therefore, while agreeing with Hyland and Tse (2007) that many relevant fields were not well represented in the AWL, this study adopts Eldridge’s (2008) point of view. The AWL is a useful and practical reference particularly for ESL learners in public higher institutions such as Universiti Malaysia Sabah, which does not have the capability of streaming students into English for Specific Purposes classes. At the most, ESL courses at Universiti Malaysia Sabah can be described as courses for general academic purposes. This is mainly due to the lack of full-time ESL teaching staff and a huge number of students requiring compulsory English proficiency classes. As a result, students from diverse programs such as agriculture, medicine, geography, and contemporary arts are grouped into hybrid classes in which the instructors “...may struggle to provide meaningful levels of specialization” (Eldridge, 2008: 111). An ESP teaching context would be ideal for Universiti Malaysia Sabah but it is not feasible for logistical factors beyond the control of the teaching staff. Specifically-tailored ESL courses for their respective programs of study would be a welcome situation for the students. Having said that, what “similarities and generalities that will facilitate instruction in an imperfect world” (ibid.), such as the AWL, are a more functional and feasible alternative.

Having a good grasp of academic vocabulary in English is essential for university undergraduates in Malaysia as the majority of the reference works are in English. To cope with the task of reading these references in English, learners of English as a foreign language need a productive knowledge of at least 3000 high-frequency English words (Nation, 1990: 24). In a study which measured the vocabulary size of Indonesian undergraduates, the researchers found that the students did not reach the minimum vocabulary knowledge of 4000 – 5000 words required to read academic texts (Nurweni and Read, 1999: 172). Thus far,
however, there has not been any in-depth study on the vocabulary size of undergraduates in Malaysian public universities.

Also, despite the good intentions of translating international academic texts into Malay, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka cannot cope with the increasing numbers of books to be translated. As Gill states,

From the setting up of the Translation Section of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in 1956 up to 1995, a total of 39 years, it has translated and published 374 books. Of this, 191 were books in the pure science, applied science and social science fields. (Gill, 2005: 252)

As the majority of the students’ reference texts are in English, it is worthwhile to expose students to the vocabulary on the AWL. In addition, although the ETeMS policy has been abolished, the Malaysian Ministry of Education still offers English for Science and Technology (EST) as an elective for students in Forms 4 and 5. With regard to vocabulary learning, the EST syllabus states,

Students need to be familiar with words commonly used in science and technology literature as well as the register of these texts. To guide teachers, a word list is found in the Syllabus Specifications. The words in the list comprise ‘semi-technical’ language, which is typical of scientific language. These items, however, are not exclusive to any one branch of science. Some examples are consist of, range, dependent on and pulleys. However, teachers may also need to teach other words when dealing with the themes and topics. Teachers are also encouraged to adapt and change the list according to the level and ability of their learners (EST Syllabus, 2001: 6)

The aim of the syllabus is “to provide students with the language basis to access and understand materials on science and technology and to express ideas and concepts in English” (ibid: 3). The EST word list provides the basis for an interesting comparison with the AWL. However, at present I am not aware of any work that has been done on such a comparison.

2.8.2 Utilising the L1 to learn academic vocabulary in English

This study proposes the use of loan words (which are essentially L1 Malay words despite being borrowed) as a means for students to acquire English vocabulary, and in particular the academic vocabulary on the AWL. Modern Malay has the tendency to borrow mainly academic vocabulary from English. Hence, the goal is essentially to exploit the learners’ first
language (L1), i.e. Malay, to develop their competence in their L2 (English). The literature shows that the L1 may play a role in several areas of language learning such as word recognition due to orthographic similarity (Chikamatsu, 1996), transfer effects (Ringbom, 1990, 1992), use of cognates (Oskarsson, 1975; Kharma and Hajjaj, 1989; Moss, 1992; Granger, 1993), first language translation (Elliot and Adepoju, 1997), and a motivation aid in adult ESL classes (Collins, 2001). A consistent theme in all of the studies mentioned is that there is evidence that when the L1 was used alongside the learning of the L2 by low level learners, better results were obtained.

Constant use of the L2 by learners is certainly the most effective method to acquire the foreign language. Nonetheless, “...research shows that the first language has a small but important role to play in communicating meaning and content” and that the role is an important one across the four strands of language learning (Nation, 2003: 1). Learning is further assisted if the L1 and the L2 word have similarities in orthography (form) and phonology (sound). Nation (2001) points out that

[m]aking the form-meaning connection is easier if roughly the same form in the first language relates to the roughly the same meaning. That is, the learning burden of making the form-meaning connection is light if the word being learned is a cognate or a loan word shared by the first language and the second language. For some languages, the presence of loan words makes learning much easier (p. 48).

Nation and Gu (2007: 116) also mention several arguments in support of the use of L1 in the L2 classroom:

…there is plenty of research evidence to show that using the first language is an effective way compared to other ways like using second language definition or using pictures. … there is also research evidence that, in the early stages of language learning, the first language and the second language share a common lexical store in the brain(de Groot and Poot, 1997). …the best definitions are short, simple and clear. The more complicated a definition, the more likely it is to be misinterpreted. First language translations meet this criteria well. …all ways of conveying the meanings of words to learners are necessarily indirect. …Translation into the first language is simply one of a range of options which are available to convey meaning.

In support of the use of the learner’s L1 in the L2 classroom, Cook maintains that the L1 “can be a useful element in creating authentic L1 users rather than something to be shunned at all costs” (2001b: 402).
With regards to the acquisition of English L2 vocabulary using the L1 as a learning platform, research in the United States has been very encouraging particularly with Spanish L1 speakers. In a study which is described as an instructional intervention, researchers found that a challenging curriculum and sustained vocabulary learning instruction which, among others, teaches Spanish-speaking English language learners to be attentive to the links between their L1 and the L2 outperformed the control group, which did not receive the intervention (Carlo et al., 2005). Another study by Calderon et al. (2005), showed that, even if cognates were not the main focus of intervention, L2 vocabulary was developed through discussion surrounding the word concerned using different methods and (if available) the L2’s cognate status, depth of meaning, and utilisation in the L1 was brought up. Bravo et al. (2007) analysed a corpus of science vocabulary in the United States national standards and noted that the corpus had a large number of cognates, which merited the use of an explicit cognate instruction strategy in the teaching of science vocabulary to Spanish-speaking students (p.153). Despite this seemingly available tool for vocabulary acquisition, cognate recognition is neither automatic nor spontaneous even for Spanish-speaking English language learners (Hancin-Bhatt and Nagy, 1994). Thus, drawing the learners’ attention to the relation or similarities between the L2 and L1 words is important as it can facilitate learning, particularly for weak learners.

However, not all ESL teachers will accept the important role of the learners’ L1 in the acquisition of the L2 vocabulary. Malaysian ESL classrooms whether in urban or rural schools, are not exempted from the practice of avoiding the L1. ESL teachers have their own personal experience either of having a senior teacher reprimand them for using the L1 or being criticised for not giving their students genuine examples of the L2 (see Cook, 2001a: section 6.3 for more arguments given for not using the L1). Cook further states that avoiding the use of the L1 is “taken for granted by almost all teaching and is implicit in most books for teachers. The reasons are rarely stated” (2001a: 153).

In contrast to English language learning and the L1, it seems that teachers teaching foreign or ethnic languages\textsuperscript{18}, for example Japanese and Spanish, do not get similar criticism. When these classes are in session, one can hear the instructors use English or Malay with their students who are considered proficient in English. It would seem, therefore, begrudging the English language learners useful access to their L1 in the L2 class is quite unfair.

An argument could be made that the foreign language learners need to learn Japanese or Spanish with the help of English or Malay because (unlike English) Japanese and Spanish are
not second languages in Malaysia. However, if we recall the discussion earlier regarding the
definition of ‘second language’ in Malaysia, for English this designation is not pedagogical
but socio-cultural i.e. it is a second language to those who already speak the language. In a
statement which should encourage ELT practitioners in Malaysia to consider the issue of
teaching methodology, Asmah Haji Omar says,

The label ‘second most important language’ has now been truncated to ‘second
language’, an act which confuses applied linguists because English had never been
treated as a second language in the school curriculum, that is, in being a medium of
teaching some of the school subjects, and has instead just been taught as a subject on
par with other subjects such as history, geography, etc. Applied linguists would be
more likely to refer to English in Malaysia as a foreign language, similar to its status in
Indonesia and Thailand. However, such a way of referring to English did not sit well
with Malaysians, who may feel offended to be identified as inhabitants of an EFL

It is arguable whether Malaysians would in fact be offended by being identified as from an
EFL country. In practice, it would be more useful if, the English language learners in
Malaysia were provided with an enjoyable English language learning atmosphere like their
counterparts have in foreign language classes.

The suggestion here is, clearly, not to teach English in the L1 but for English language
teachers to be open to teaching that uses the L1 systematically (Cook, 2001a: 155-158).
Specifically for this study, a case is made for teachers to “actively create links between the
first and the second language” and by this link we mean the reduced learning burden (Nation,
2001: 23) discussed earlier in the Introduction. Links between the first and second languages
would result, in particular, from cross-linguistic similarities i.e. the use of loan words.

Thus far, based on the literature reviewed, this study set out to explore the possibility that
focusing on loan words (an aspect of the learners’ L1) would be helpful with learners at a low
level of proficiency. The use of loan words as a strategy is targeted at helping the less
proficient learners especially at the beginning levels. As the learners move on to more
advanced levels, they will require various other strategies and should reduce their reliance on
their L1.

Research related to the positive use of Malay (L1) in the learning of English (L2) in Malaysia
is uncommon. Nevertheless, one interesting study found that Malay does play a role in
assisting Malay speakers in their English language lessons. Goh and Fatimah (2006)
investigated the extent of L1 (Malay) use in comprehending L2 (English) texts and found that “the learners relied heavily on the L1 when confronted with unknown vocabulary or the idea conveyed in the text”. Four Malay learners with low-level English proficiency in the study utilized 199 strategies (32.2%) involving L1 use out of a total of 618 strategies (text-based and reader-based). Of the 199 strategies, translation into Malay was used 63 times. Goh and Fatimah state several reasons for use of L1 in the collaborative reading activity: (a) “to figure out the words that apparently hampered their understanding”; (b) “to check their comprehension of the sentence”; (c) “to facilitate reading by removing affective barriers that exist when students try to understand the L2 texts”; and (d) “to gain more confidence in tackling L2 texts”. While agreeing that teachers should encourage the use of L2 in ESL classrooms, Goh and Fatimah suggest that use of L1 should not be hindered when the students are required to think aloud in a group. They add that “ESL students, particularly those of lower proficiency, usually lack the vocabulary and ability to express or verbalise their thoughts confidently, clearly and accurately”. The use of L1 in their study was more in actual conversations amongst the learners in Malay. The learners had to resort to their L1 to finish the task because they were struggling to understand the text they were reading.

In the long run, however, students learning English have to learn not to rely so much on using their L1 to complete L2 tasks. Teachers have to introduce other strategies to help students expand their English vocabulary. Goh and Fatimah’s study provides evidence that the use of the L1 amongst low level learners bolsters their confidence and helps them to finish the task. Similarly, learners’ L1 has been found to promote effective collaborative learning among Spanish-speaking learners where, because of their L1 knowledge, they were able to play a bigger role in completing language tasks for a mixed-language group (Snow and Kim, 2007: 130).

2.8.3 Cross-linguistic similarity and a lighter learning burden

Part of effective vocabulary teaching involves working out what needs to be taught about a word i.e. knowing the word’s “learning burden” (Nation, 2001: 23). The learning burden differs from word to word according to the ways in which the word relates to first language knowledge and already existing knowledge of the second language or other known languages (Nation, 2005). Daulton (2004) argues that strategies for general vocabulary learning should achieve greater success with borrowed words, due to their lighter learning burden. Malay is
not a language which is related to English, i.e. they are not cognate, but many English loan words in Malay bear a close resemblance to the original English words.

“Cognates in two languages can be defined as historically related, formally similar words, whose meanings may be identical, similar, partly different or, occasionally even wholly different” (Ringbom, 2007: 73). Examples of cognate languages are German and English, Spanish and Italian, or Spanish and English. de Groot and Poot (1997: 217) define cognates as “translation-equivalent words similar in form – orthography and/or phonology”. They add that “meaning, frequency of use/familiarity, and whether or not the two words in a translation pair share a “cognate” relation” play an important role in translation (ibid).

Concrete words, … frequently-used words, and words with a cognate translation in the target language are easier to translate (faster, with fewer omissions and errors) than abstract words, uncommon words, and noncognates, respectively. These effects occur both in “translation production” and “translation recognition”.

Ringbom states that “even totally unrelated languages with little or no structural cross-linguistic similarity may exhibit surprising similarities, especially in lexis. This is above all manifested in the existence of loanwords, even high-frequency words” (2007: 77). Despite not being cognates in the traditional sense, the English loan words in Malay can result in positive transfer (cf. Ringbom, 1990, 1992, 2007), in that the Malaysian learner can use prior knowledge in L1 (knowledge of the loan words) to facilitate the learning task.

The existence of cross-linguistic similarities in the form of loan words should be seen as a potentially positive tool to help lower level learners of English. Doubts about using the loan words to learn academic English vocabulary may arise in that learners may overuse or overgeneralize the loan words in Malay and misinterpret words that are false cognates or false friends. Granger (1993: 45-46) defines “good cognates” as “words that are similar or identical in form and meaning in two or more languages” and “deceptive cognates” as “words which have the same spelling in the two languages but different meanings”. In Malay, examples of good cognates are kriteria (‘criteria’), konsep (‘concept’), konteks (‘context’), organisasi (‘organization’), and teori (‘theory’). There are not that many deceptive cognates in Malay, but it is possible learners might make comprehension errors due to knowing only one or two meanings of the loan word compared to the range of meanings associated with the original English word. An example is the loan word fungsi and its English word ‘function’,
where the loan word is limited to the meanings ‘work’ and ‘purpose’ but does not include ‘ceremony’ and ‘result’ (Cambridge Online Dictionary).

In order to minimise misunderstanding of the term ‘cognate’, this study will use the term ‘cross-linguistic similarity’ to refer to the similarity of the loan words in Malay to their English counterparts. Cross-linguistic influence has also been termed as the learner’s equivalence hypothesis (Swan, 1997: 166). Swan states that the hypothesis means “regard everything as the same unless you have good reason not to” (ibid), but he cautions that not all language learners “draw the ‘good reason’ line in the same place” (ibid). Research by Naiman et.al (1996) shows that good language learners “refer back to their native language(s) judiciously (translate into L1) and make effective cross-lingual comparisons at different stages of language learning” (p.31). Ringbom notes:

> Perceiving and making use of cross-linguistic similarities to existing linguistic knowledge is important in the learner’s striving to facilitate the learning task. L1 and other languages known to the learner clearly provide an essential aid, not a troublesome obstacle for learning a new language (2007: 2)

In this sense, it is hypothesised that English loan words contribute to making it easier for Malaysian learners (at the lower level of proficiency) to quickly identify and understand the academic English vocabulary.

Research on *gairaigo* (English loan words in Japanese) has shown that the use of high-frequency loan words is advantageous to Japanese learners of English. Daulton (2004) contends that high-frequency English vocabulary is of great use to learners in an L2 situation, as it provides good coverage of unsimplified texts. In an earlier study, Daulton (2003a) created a nearly exhaustive list of correspondences between high-frequency English words and common loan words in Japanese. In this study, out of the 3000 most frequent word families in English, as many as 45.5% were found to have correspondences with common Japanese loan words. Referring to studies by Carton (1971) and Haastrup (1991) on types of cues involved in successful inferencing – intralingual, contextual, and interlingual cues – Daulton (2004b) states that low level ESL learners can connect with the third type of cue: interlingual. Interlingual cues draw upon “…learner’s previous, usually native, language knowledge, particularly the phonological and orthographical correspondences that arise through borrowing.” (p.74). The “previous, usually native language knowledge” refers to the learner’s L1. Similarly, Daulton (1998) shows that recall and recognition of English words
which have equivalents in Japanese is “considerably better than for those without”. He found that “734 of the headword groups in the General Service List correlated to at least one loanword, at a rate of 38%”. This means that there is a strong case for Japanese learners of English to use knowledge of loanwords in their L1 to learn English vocabulary. Up to now, Daulton (2008) is the most in-depth yet of studies into the potential of utilising gairaigo in Japanese EFL. Daulton’s research found that Japanese speakers “have access to countless potential cognates, which include high-frequency and academic words. English loanwords in Japanese are a built-in lexicon of English words learners have yet to encounter” (ibid: 4). Despite the fact that the languages involved are not cognate in the way that Spanish and English are, the research on gairaigo and its role in the acquisition of English vocabulary provides a motivation to research whether loan words in Malay have similar positive returns.

The idea of a word having a lighter learning burden for the learner proves helpful when there are similarities between native language and target language vocabulary as this can reduce the time needed to develop good reading comprehension. In the context of the English loan words in Malay, the orthographic similarity of many of them to their original English versions is a possible tool that teachers should not ignore but rather exploit for the benefit of Malaysian learners of English with low level proficiency. It is the exploration of this possibility that motivates this study in an effort to help Malaysian learners to gain more from their ESL lessons.

2.9 Research Questions

Thus, the study was designed to investigate these research questions:

1. Which academic words occur as loan words in Malay, and to what extent do the loan words have the potential to facilitate the learning of the original English words?

2. To what extent do the students have the ability to recognise and comprehend the English loan words in Malay?

3. To what extent to the students have the ability to recognise and comprehend the corresponding words in English?

4. What attitudes do the students have towards English, English loan words, and Malay, and how might these attitudes play a role in their learning of academic English vocabulary?
CHAPTER 3  METHODOLOGY

3.0  Overview

This chapter gives an overview of the research design, data collection procedures, and the method of data analysis and data interpretation. The study combined lexical analysis of a specifically designed corpus, language assessment, and survey research methods (questionnaire and semi-structured interview). The combination means that this study employed the mixed methods methodology which is defined as “a type of research design in which QUAL and QUAN approaches are used in types of questions, research methods, data collection and analysis procedures, and/or inferences” (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003: 711). In Dörnyei (2007: 163), the methodology is defined as a “study which involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study with some attempts to integrate the two approaches at one or more stages of the research process”. The mixed methods methodology fits in well with the overall goal of this study i.e. to explore whether Malaysian English language learners can benefit from utilising the English loan words in Malay.

The design of the research was based on the four research questions presented at the end of Chapter 2. The design comprised two phases which complemented each other. The first phase had a more linguistic dimension whilst the second had a more cognitive-affective focus. More importantly, the latter complemented the former by applying the findings of the linguistic dimension. The first phase was divided into three sections: (a) preliminary analysis: identifying English loan words that came from words in the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000); (b) compiling a Malay corpus to produce a word frequency list for the loan words; and (c) conducting a lexical analysis of the English loan words. The second phase investigated the learners’ knowledge of the loan words and their attitudes towards English and English loan words. It comprised two vocabulary tasks (Gap Filling and Translation), a language attitude questionnaire, and a focus group interview. Phase 1 of the research involved background preparation and is summarised in the Table 3.1.
Table 3.1: The research process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1 (Linguistic)</th>
<th>STEP 1: Preliminary analysis of the Academic Word List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEP 2: Corpus Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEP 3: Construction of Test Instruments and Pilot Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEP 4: Lexical and Grammatical Analysis of Selected English Loan Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2 (Cognitive-affective)</td>
<td>STEP 5: Revision of Test Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEP 6: Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEP 7: Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Phase 1

Phase 1 covers the linguistic dimension of the research. This means that much of the work, particularly in relation to the analysis of the loan words and their English equivalents, was carried out at this stage. The linguistic analysis included reference to dictionary sources. A major process at this stage was constructing the Utusan corpus which was later used as a main reference in the linguistic analysis. The following sections describe the sources and procedures involved in Phase 1.

3.1.1 Reference sources

The primary reference sources in this phase were the Academic Word List, dictionaries, and the Utusan corpus. The descriptions of these sources will be followed by the description on the selection and analysis of the loan words.

3.1.1.1 The Academic Word List

Malay has hundreds of thousands of English loan words (both technical and general loan words) but the focus of this research was on academic vocabulary. This followed from the overall goal of the study, which was to explore whether the English loan words in Malay had the potential to help the students expand their English vocabulary for study purposes. Given the timeframe of this study, it was not practical to analyse and compare all the English loan
words in Malay with the original English words, especially all of the technical terminology. Hence, the Academic Word List was selected as a base of comparison for its features (content, design, and quantity) which were practical and compatible with the objectives of this study.

The Academic Word List (AWL) (Coxhead, 2000) is the most established reference for academic words in English. The list was compiled from a corpus of 3.5 million words taken from written academic texts ranging across 28 academic disciplines from the Arts, Commerce, Law, and Science Faculties of a New Zealand university. The criteria for selection were specialised occurrence, range, and frequency. For a word family to make it on the list, it could not be in the General Service List of high-frequency vocabulary (West, 1953), it had to occur at least 100 times in the corpus overall as well as in all four subject areas, and finally it had to occur in at least 15 of the 28 academic disciplines (Coxhead, 2000: 221). The result is a list of 570 word families “that account for approximately 10.0% of the total words (tokens) in academic texts but only 1.4% of the total words in a fiction collection of the same size” (Ibid.: 213). The AWL is divided into 10 sublists which are ordered according to decreasing word family frequency (Ibid: 228), which means that words in Sublist 1 have the highest occurrence in the corpus, followed by Sublist 2 and so on. The most frequent form of each word family is also highlighted within the sublists.

3.1.1.2 Dictionaries

The linguistic aspect of this study required the use of various reference sources to determine the meaning and usage of the loan words in Malay, as compared to their English equivalents. Three Malay dictionaries functioned as sources of official definition and usage of the loan words. They were necessary references for the lexical analysis, when comparing the definitions and usages to those in the Oxford English Dictionary. The dictionary, representing the language community, “sets the convention on the formal correctness of sentences and on their meaning. Those conventions are both implicit and dynamic; ...” (Teubert, 2007: 113). These standard definitions and usages for the loan words by the Malay dictionaries, however, were not the primary basis for the analysis.
3.1.1.2.1 Kamus Dewan

Kamus Dewan was first published in 1970 by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka and is now in its fourth edition (2007). Phillips (1996) describes the Kamus Dewan published in 1990 as ‘The most complete dictionary at the teacher’s disposal including both modern and traditional Malay’ (p.105). Other lexicographers, however, have criticised it as a dictionary which draws heavily on an Indonesian dictionary by Poerwadarminta and ‘incorporates Poerwadarminta’s entries almost wholesale with some alterations of examples, expanded citation of affixed forms, and listing of some additional forms used only in Malaysia’ (Wolff, 1991: 2563). Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP) itself describes Kamus Dewan as the most authentic dictionary and the main reference for speakers of Malay in Malaysia, Brunei, Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand (ibid: xv). Its intended users are those who speak Malay as their first or second language. The fourth and current edition (2007) contains a large amount of new vocabulary in technological and professional fields, for example e-mel (‘email’), menge-melkan (‘to email’) akses (‘access’) mengakses (‘to access’) and siber19 (‘cyber’). Each new edition features new words, ranging from slang expressions to neologisms, which are accepted as part of the Malay language by DBP and often termed as istilah (‘terminology’). The 2007 edition included 5,843 new words as part of the Malay lexicon, such as homisid (‘homocide’), ori (slang, referring to ‘original’), privasi (‘privacy’), and partisipasi (‘participation’).

There were, however, some drawbacks in using Kamus Dewan as a reference for the lexical analysis. First, there were definitions and usages of the loan words that were excluded, as mentioned earlier. Second, the print version of the dictionary did not contain information on the word class of the entry. Interestingly, Choy-Kim Chuah (2005) included the first drawback, but not the second one, in his article which described what digitalisation could do to refine Kamus Dewan. Realising this deficiency, DBP has recently started to provide the word class information in the online version of Kamus Dewan but it has not yet extended to all entries. Despite these difficulties, the analysis in the present study referred to Kamus Dewan, as it represents the accepted standard (see ‘standard language ideology’ in Milroy and Milroy, 1999) for Malay definitions over other monolingual Malay dictionaries in Malaysia. It is also the dictionary featured most in research and theses on/or related to Malay linguistics.
3.1.1.2.2 Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan (KIMD or Dewan English-Malay Dictionary)

Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan (KIMD) is the only bilingual English-Malay dictionary published by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. It has undergone three editions since it was first published in 1991. The first edition (1991) has over 38,000 headwords which include standard everyday words, with a selection of informal, literary, and technical terms. Its intended users are “people who speak English as their first or second language, people who, the compilers assume, are not only educated but know the basics of Malay as well” (Nor Azizah and Prentice, 1991: x). The dictionary was also designed “first and foremost ...as a practical and reliable tool for translation and secondly as a tool to help the reader express himself in Malay” (ibid: xi). Its use, mostly as a professional tool, is evident from the description on its jacket i.e. “an invaluable guide for translators, writers, administrators...” Unlike the Kamus Istilah (terminological dictionary), the KIMD provides more than 50,000 example sentences which are intended to “show typical usage in terms of collocation and syntactic behaviour and to make them as insightful as possible” (ibid: xiii). Despite the availability of other English-Malay dictionaries such as the Oxford Compact Advanced Learner’s English-Malay Dictionary (Hornby and Asmah Haji Omar, 2007) or the Longman Kamus Dwibahasa (‘Longman Bilingual Dictionary’) (Oo Yu Hock and Tan Seok Cheng, 2008), the decision to use KIMD was because it represented the standard Malay endorsed by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka as the national language planning agency. The use of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka’s own English-Malay dictionary gave more depth to the lexical analysis.

3.1.1.2.3 Kamus Istilah Dewan (Dewan Terminology Dictionary or Istilah Malaysia)

By 2006, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka had published 219 daftar istilah (‘terminology glossaries’) and 31 kamus istilah (‘terminology dictionaries’) which altogether amount to about a million technical terms (Berita Harian, 2006). Amongst the glossaries are Istilah Ekonomi (‘Economics Terminology’), Istilah Undang-Undang (‘Legal Terminology’), and Glosari AIDS (‘AIDS Glossary’) whilst examples of the terminology dictionaries are Kamus Kejuruteraan Awam (‘Dictionary for Civil Engineering’), Kamus Botani (‘Dictionary for Botany’), and Kamus Fizik (‘Dictionary for Physics’). The Terminology Dictionary is, therefore, a compilation of these glossaries and technical dictionaries covering over a hundred fields of study. The publication of the dictionary reflects the fact that translation of
English publications into Malay, especially academic works, remains one of the key items on DBP’s agenda in its efforts to modernise Malay. Specific terminology committees, made up of experts from each subject field, were (and are) appointed by DBP. The difference between this dictionary and the two described earlier is in the specialized nature of its vocabulary. Users refer to this dictionary for terms such as ‘martial law’, ‘custodial organisation’, ‘computing scale’, or ‘soil nodule’. It also differs from the other dictionaries in that it does not necessarily provide examples of sentences in which the terms are used but examples of the concepts themselves. An elaborated description is given for some of the terminology but this does not occur for all entries. The dictionary provides the English term, the Malay term for it, its field of study, and an elaborated description if available as shown in Table 3.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Termology</th>
<th>Target Termology</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>bahasa-bahasa</td>
<td>Linguistik ('linguistics')</td>
<td>Tiada ('none')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austronesia</td>
<td>Austronesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendant</td>
<td>bahasa turunan</td>
<td>Linguistik ('linguistics')</td>
<td>Bahasa yang berasal dari bahasa induk. Contohnya, bahasa Perancis berindukkan bahasa Latin. ('A language which originated from a parent language. For instance, French originated from Latin').</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terminology dictionary is available on the DBP website, as are the previous two. The online interface also provides the Indonesian and Brunei versions of the Malay term, because DBP is a member of the Malaysia-Brunei-Indonesia terminology coordination committee (MABBIM). Similarly to the KIMD, Kamus Istilah was used as an additional means of cross-checking the meaning and usage of the loan words.

3.1.1.2.4 The Oxford Dictionary of English (ODE)

One of the disadvantages of the Academic Word List is that it does not include any listing or analysis of the meanings of the word families as a whole or their members. It is essentially a list of word forms. Therefore, the Oxford Dictionary of English (2005) was used as the main reference for definitions and usage of the original English words. The decision to use the ODE was because of the 800-million-word Oxford English corpus that informed the dictionary. The dictionary is also accessible online via the University of Auckland library.
database (Oxford Reference Online). The digital version helped make the look-up process, including notation and record-keeping, faster and more systematic. In addition, more definitions and usages of a particular entry were available from the collection of English dictionaries and thesauruses on Oxford Reference Online. It should be noted that, as of 2010, Oxford University Press has set up a specific website for the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (OALD) which includes word lists from the AWL. The site has audio pronunciation, word class, examples, idioms, and usage notes for each of the most common words from the AWL. Thus, the website is very useful material which Malaysian English language learners could utilise alongside the English loan words in Malay.

3.1.1.3 Corpora

The dynamic nature of the loan words in terms of definitions and usage meant that they needed to be complemented by a different kind of source. As Yallop (2004) pointed out, the meaning of a word is “not necessarily fully contained or exhaustively captured” by a dictionary definition (p. 25). Thus, a corpus was compiled of articles published in a Malay-language newspaper, Utusan Malaysia. In fact, the lexical analysis found that, compared to the major Malay dictionary Kamus Dewan, the corpus was more reflective of the meanings of the loan words as used in contemporary media. There were usages in the corpus which were not covered in Kamus Dewan, and on the other hand some meanings given in Kamus Dewan were not found in the corpus. In short, the corpus provided the study with the spontaneous, unofficial or excluded usages of the loan words and subsequently represented a more genuine reflection of the loan word usage in the Malay media. This was consistent with the argument that corpus linguistics “is best suited to deal with this dynamic aspect of meaning” (ibid). Interestingly, the latest version of Kamus Dewan itself drew on the 85-million word Dewan Bahasa Corpus, a manual corpus (data collected on cards), and other dictionaries to update the meanings for old and new entries in the dictionary (Noresah Baharom, 2007: xvi). The following section describes the dictionaries used in the lexical analysis for this study.

The print media constitute a key source of information about the contemporary usage of English loan words in Malay. Unlike the planned sector, i.e., the language planning agencies and their planned lexical innovations published in the dictionaries, the print media represent the spontaneous sector, whose lexical innovations are “influenced more by speed, expediency, fashion, and impact on audience” (Heah, 1989: 273). Thus, it is the most
practical source for a Malay corpus, especially when we want to observe the loan words expressing new ideas, notions, or concepts. In short, the print media are a key resource for textual analysis (Mautner, 2008: 38) of loan words in a wider context. The analysis would have been incomplete if we had only compared definitions of word entries in the dictionaries. A corpus constructed from the print media enabled a check on the standard definitions, highlighting any overinterpretation or underinterpretation (O’Halloran and Coffin, 2004). Once the decision was made to focus on the Malay print media, three possible corpora were identified, and the results of a preliminary investigation showed that one corpus was clearly more suitable than the other two for the purpose of this study.

3.1.1.3.1 The Malay Concordance Project

The Malay Concordance Project was established at the Australian National University by a team of researchers focusing on classical Malay texts. It is a growing corpus, now amounting to 140 texts, including over 120,000 verses, and a total of over 5.7 million words. Despite having a speedy search facility and a website that is well laid out, this corpus was not relevant to the study because it is confined to traditional and classical Malay texts. The Malay Concordance Project can be accessed online at http://mcp.anu.edu.au/

3.1.1.3.2 The Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP) Database

As of 25 November 2008, the open-access corpus of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP) had a collection of over 130 million words. The corpus incorporates written material taken from newspapers, academic and general books, magazines, literary works (novels, drama, and poetry), school textbooks, lexicographic item cards, letters, brochures, and advertisements. Thus, it includes not only classical and literary texts but also a range of everyday written documents in Malay. Newspapers are the largest contributors to the database with more than 80 million words. The predominance of newspaper texts results from the fact that newspapers are produced in digital form on a daily basis and thus can be readily added to the database. Overall, the DBP corpus provides broad coverage of contemporary Malay usage, and users can obtain concordances and more detailed word analyses.

Despite its merit, there were practical disadvantages to using this corpus. First, there was no information on the sources obtained by concordancing i.e. date, type of publication, and author. The database search engine was also extremely slow in carrying out the instructions
given to it. A sample search for the word *ekonomi* (‘economy’) using the word analysis feature took more than 10 minutes at 6Mbps broadband speed (sometimes more). In addition, the interface of the database was not very user-friendly. Only 10 concordance results were displayed at a time and this added to extra use of time. In short, despite having a large Malay corpus, the database lacked ease of use and relevant information for the analysis.

3.1.1.3.3 The Utusan Malaysia Online Archives

Another source of Malay texts is the online archives of the Malay newspaper, Utusan Malaysia. Utusan frequently publishes articles on serious subjects such as the economy, technology, the environment, language and society written by academics, lay people, and journalists. Some of the article titles include *Merealisasikan penubuhan tabung kanak-kanak* (‘Making the establishment of the children’s trust a reality’), *IPT turut berperanan menjayakan MEB* (‘Higher learning institutions also play a role to make the MEB successful’), and *Asia Barat sebagai zon bebas nuklear?* (‘West Asia as a nuclear-free zone?’). Based on the content and writing style of these articles, it can be said that they are semi-academic texts and are similar to the kind of informative material that undergraduate students read in journals, except for their brevity and lack of citations.

There were several advantages to using the online Utusan archives compared to the previous two resources. Foremost was the fact that Utusan is a newspaper carrying not only contemporary news but also op-ed pieces and feature articles. Another big advantage was its very efficient search facility. For example, in less than 5 seconds, a search for the word *ekonomi* produced 200 documents (the maximum number for a search), complete with the headline of the article, date published, and the complete article itself. The documents for *ekonomi* were all articles published in 2010, indicating that the loan word was very popular and current. In contrast, the loan word *interpretasi* (‘interpretation’) resulted in only 27 documents, which included articles from the years 2009-2010, indicating the loan word was not so popularly used in the print media. Because the actual articles are returned from a search, users have the option of selecting particular articles and ignoring others which are not relevant. For example, in the context of this study, the short stories and general news items on topics such as sports, cooking, and entertainment were ignored. In addition, the articles could be saved in HTML, .txt, or Word formats for further corpus building. Another advantage was that, when the whole article was reproduced on the screen; we could then use the ‘Find’ and ‘Highlight All’ functions of the Web browser to find and highlight the loan word(s). Thus, it
was possible to view all occurrences of a loan word in an article – although this was done by counting manually. The only disadvantage of this resource was that there were no concordancing and word analysis functions, such as the ones found on the DBP database. However, this is understandable because the newspaper archives were not designed primarily for academic research but more as a general record of past editorial material.

In summary, after considering the factors of time, ease of use, and the available features, the Utusan Malaysia corpus was selected as the main source of Malay language texts for this study. Next, we describe the preliminary analysis of the Academic Word List before we go on to describe the process of corpus design.

3.1.2 Preliminary analysis of the Academic Word List

The main objective of the preliminary analysis was to identify the number of English loan words in Malay that came from words in the AWL. As it turned out, 216 English loan words (40% of 570) corresponded to the most frequent member of a word family in the AWL. This is considerably higher than the number of AWL word families that were the origin of common Japanese loan words (153 words or 27% of word families) (Daulton, 2005).

One complication was that the AWL consists of word families, which usually include a head word plus a number of inflected and derived forms of the head word. For example, the ‘indicate’ word family is made up of the head word ‘indicate’, the inflected forms ‘indicates’, ‘indicated’, and ‘indicating’, and the derived words ‘indicator(s)’, ‘indicative’, and ‘indication(s)’. Malay is not an inflected language and so there are no equivalents in Malay for the inflected members of the AWL word families. On the other hand, often it is a derived member of a word family that has been borrowed into Malay rather than the head word, particularly if the derived form is a noun. Therefore, in identifying the AWL words that were loan words in Malay, the preliminary analysis focused on the most frequent member of the family (if that was different from the head word).

3.1.2.1 Loan words from the Academic Word List

The focus on the most frequent members of word families in the AWL was influenced by practical considerations. It avoided the complication of analysing all the inflected and derived forms of the English words in Malay. For example, the most frequent word of the ‘analyse’ family is ‘analysis’, which gives us the loan word analisis. Some of the family members are
‘analyst’ (loan word, *penganalisis*), ‘analysed’ (loan word, *dianalisis*), and ‘analysing’ (loan word, *menganalisis*), which all share the stem form *analisis*. On the other hand, ‘analytical’ is most commonly represented as the different stem form *analitis* in Malay, although the terminology dictionary Kamus Istilah Dewan shows that ‘analytical’ can also be translated in other ways: ‘analytical review’ is translated as *semakan semula analitis*, ‘analytical approach’ is translated as *pendekatan analitik*, ‘analytical data’ is translated as *data analisis*, and ‘analytical solution’ is translated as *penyelesaian beranalisis*. If this was purely a linguistic study of the loan words, it would be important to study all of the complex ways in which members of English word families have or have not been borrowed into Malay.

However, the focus of this study was on exploring the potential of the loan words as helpful vocabulary learning tools for Malaysian English language learners. From this point of view, it was important to encourage learners to make basic meaning connections in the first instance between the English words and their loan word forms in Malay. By focusing on the most frequent word, learners would be able to be introduced to the idea of making this connection without worrying about more advanced matters such as affixes and semantic properties – these could be taught to them as they went further in their vocabulary study.

Four sources, the dictionaries (Kamus Dewan, Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan, and Kamus Istilah) and the archives of the Malay newspaper Utusan Malaysia, were used to conduct the preliminary analysis. The dictionaries represented the formal use of Malay (planned), whilst the newspaper represented the more informal or unplanned usage of Malay (spontaneous). The preliminary analysis found three relationships between the English words and loan words in Malay:

1) the English word occurred in Malay, with some modification in form to fit Malay phonology and orthography, and the loan word was the one that was normally used in Malay to express the same meaning as the English word;

2) the English word occurred in Malay and, at the same time, there was also a Malay equivalent; and

3) the English word did not occur in Malay. The AWL word in fact had to be translated with a Malay word.
The preliminary analysis showed that there were 215 words in Category 1, which is 37.7% of the words in the AWL’s most frequent words. Of these, 167 were nouns, 47 were adjectives, and only 1 was a verb. A sample of the results is shown in Table 3.3:

Table 3.3: Sample of results from the preliminary analysis of the AWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Word in AWL</th>
<th>Malay loan word/ equivalent</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'analysis'</td>
<td>analisis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'approach'</td>
<td>pendekatan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'area'</td>
<td>kawasan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'concept'</td>
<td>konsep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'assessment'</td>
<td>asesmen / penilaian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it turned out, the four Malay language sources often gave different evidence as to whether the English word had been borrowed into Malay. For example, the bilingual KIMD dictionary gives two Malay words, *kemampuan* or *keupayaan*, as the equivalents of ‘capacity’ i.e. Category 3 (has neither loan word nor Malay equivalent). Meanwhile, the terminology dictionary defines ‘capacity’ as *kapasiti*, which is Category 1 (loan word exists). In addition, *kapasiti* also has an entry in the monolingual Kamus Dewan. As for results from the Utusan archives, the loan word *kapasiti* appeared in 200 articles. In the month of May 2007 alone, there were 24 articles using the word. This indicates that there was inconsistency in the Malay dictionaries in the translation of the meaning for an English word. It could be argued that this disagreement was attributable partly to the different publication dates of the DBP dictionaries, but in general it showed that multiple sources were needed to determine whether an English word had become an established loan word in Malay and, if so how it was used. In short, the results of the preliminary analysis showed there was a basis to use the AWL in the study. This was the main objective of the analysis i.e. to ascertain the number of loan words within the AWL. Another step was to investigate whether English loan words were actually popular in the Malay print media. In particular, which of these 216 loan words were found in the (semi-)academic articles in the Malay newspapers? For this purpose, it was necessary to design a corpus specifically for this study.

3.1.2.2 Lexical analysis and the need for a corpus

A corpus was needed to carry out a lexical analysis to find not only whether the English word had been borrowed into Malay but also whether the loan word was equivalent in terms of
meaning and usage. Viewed from this perspective, the AWL has one limitation: it does not provide a lexical analysis of the words on the list. It presents only word forms and not word meanings. This poses two problems: 1) it does not show which meanings of the words are found in academic texts, and 2) it does not distinguish homographs.

Homography means that the same written form has two or more unrelated meanings, and thus represents more than one word family. An example is “it is an abstract concept” and “we have tried to abstract the relevant information”. Wang and Nation (2004) investigated this phenomenon in the Academic Word List and found that approximately 10% (60) of the word families were actually homographs, which should not have been classified as belonging to the same family (ibid: 305). They discovered examples of formal differentiation of meanings which were not included in the word families of the AWL. In addition, they provide a list of homographs found in the AWL which was a useful starting point for the lexical analysis of the AWL words included in this study.

The objective of the lexical analysis of the English loan words was to verify whether the meanings of the loan words are similar to those of their equivalents in the AWL. This is important in establishing Malay-English equivalence and avoiding possible confusion for Malaysian learners when applying their knowledge of English loan words in Malay to their English counterparts. For instance, the word ‘analysis’ in Sublist 1 is a loan word in Malay, analisis. The examples in Table 3.4 show a sample result of the lexical analysis using only Kamus Dewan with several of the homographs found by Wang and Nation (2004):
Table 3.4: Sample results of the lexical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWL homographs</th>
<th>Loan words and meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Wang and Nation, 2004: 311)</td>
<td>(based on Kamus Dewan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'contract':</td>
<td>kontrak:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a written agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to decrease in size</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to catch a disease</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'function':</td>
<td>fungsi:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a purpose</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a formal event</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'issue':</td>
<td>isu:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an important topic</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the action of flowing/producing (children)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'major':</td>
<td>major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a rank in the army</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'policy':</td>
<td>polisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a course or principle of action</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an insurance contract</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us look at Table 3.4. The Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘policy’ as ‘a course or principle of action’ and ‘an insurance contract’. The definitions are similar to the ones for polisi given in Kamus Dewan, hence both the symbol ‘✓’. This means that the loan word polisi and its corresponding English word ‘policy’ should be understood by learners with little semantic difficulty. On the other hand, the word ‘contract’ is also a loan word in Malay, kontrak. However, of the three meanings listed in Wang & Nation (2004: 311) for ‘contract’, only one meaning applies to the loan word kontrak, which is ‘a written agreement’ and noted by ‘✓’. The two other meanings, ‘to decrease in size’ and ‘to catch a disease’, are expressed as totally different Malay words which are not loan words at all, hence the symbol ‘x’. This simple classification demonstrated that a one-to-one relationship between the meanings expressed by academic words in English and the corresponding loan words in Malay does not necessarily exist. Consequently, this means that a careful lexical analysis needed to be undertaken to identify those loan words that are likely to be more helpful and less confusing for Malay-speaking students in transferring their knowledge of loan words into their study of English vocabulary.
In addition, the question was whether the loan words from the preliminary analysis have currency in the Malay (semi-)academic articles. Currency means more people would be exposed to the loan words and thus Malay native speakers would be more familiar with them. Hence, the lexical analysis went beyond just analysing homographs and the Utusan corpus was designed to provide evidence of spontaneous usage, as opposed to the dictionaries, which informed the study about planned usage or definitions (Heah, 1989). Words often have particular meanings or uses in academic texts which are related to but somewhat different from the way they are used for everyday purposes. In short, the Malay dictionaries and the Utusan corpus were used to distinguish the usage of the English loan words in academically-oriented articles in a Malay newspaper. The following sections provide a description of the corpus design and these are followed by a description of the lexical analysis of the loan words.

3.1.3 Designing and Building the Utusan Corpus

A corpus of 500,000 running words was compiled for the purposes of this study. In designing a corpus, “The composition should be determined by the purpose of the research. A corpus must represent the type of language that is being investigated” (Chung, 2003: 225). The semi-academic articles in Utusan Malaysia were considered suitable primarily because of their content (informative) and easy accessibility. The design of the corpus was based on two of the three criteria used for the written texts for the British National Corpus (BNC, 2005): domain and time. In addition to these, several guidelines were used to construct the corpus.

3.1.3.1 Domain

The first criterion indicates the type of writing that is contained within the article. The BNC divides its domain of written texts into informative and imaginative writings, but it does not explicitly differentiate between academic and non-academic texts. Following Hyland’s (2002b: 529) description of academic writing, informative, or semi-academic, writing in this corpus refers to newspaper articles on serious social, economic, technical and scientific topics in which the writers negotiated the status of their claims with their readers and presented their work in ways that readers were likely to find credible, persuasive, argumentative, and engaging. The materials selected included feature articles, special reports, political and non-political speeches, interviews with professionals and public figures in the public as well as private sectors, and opinion essays from professionals. The corpus included materials which
were originally spoken and later published in Utusan Malaysia (eg, speeches and interviews). These materials were included because they had been edited for the purpose of publication. An important feature of these articles was that they contained many academic words of the kind that are found on the Academic Word List (AWL). This is partly the reason for referring the corpus as a collection of (semi-)academic articles in Malay.

In contrast, non-academic articles included those reporting general news about events such as road accidents, criminal trials, petrol price increases, football matches, or opening parties for new businesses. Articles which had the primary purpose of promoting tourist attractions (shops, places, food, etc.), health supplements, and music albums or movies were not included. Another category that was excluded was imaginative writing (literary and creative works) such as drama scripts, short stories, poems and others of this genre.

3.1.3.2 Time

The second criterion refers to the date of publication of the article. Following the BNC corpus, which is synchronic, this corpus included only articles published in the year 2000 and later.

3.1.3.3 Specific search terms

Newer feature articles were easily accessed without using the archives by clicking on the link for Rencana (‘feature articles’) on the newspaper website itself. However, clicking on the links retrieved at most only eight feature articles per publication day. Hence, specific search terms were used on the search engine of the archives to retrieve semi-academic articles. For example, opinion pieces from professionals and corporate figures often ended with Penulis ialah (‘The writer is’). By typing Penulis ialah on the search engine, up to 200 search results (articles) would be displayed. Other specific search terms used were Rencana (‘feature article’), Teks ucapan (‘speech text’), Dr. (‘Dr.’), Pensyarah (‘Lecturer’), Prof.Madya (‘Associate Prof’), and Universiti (‘university’). In addition, the search terms also included names of Utusan’s journalists known to be writing feature articles. Once the specific search terms produced results, each of the articles was read and the indicators below were used as guidelines to check whether an article could be considered as material for the corpus.
3.1.3.4 Topic or subject of article

First, the articles were classified according to the type of content they contained. Once a text was identified as informative writing, it was necessary to classify it for further divisions within the corpus. Kennedy states that “for a corpus to be ‘representative’ there must be a clearly analysed and defined population to take the sample from” (1998: 52). Sinclair (1996) examined in detail the problems of text classification and stated that corpus design made use of external (sociocultural, non-linguistic) and internal (text-linguistic) factors to determine the classification of the text. He suggested that, rather than depending on just the topic of the text (with materials from newspapers and magazines), both factors needed to be considered when classifying texts and he proposed a subject typology that consists of 35 categories. However, Sharoff (2006a: 85) believed that the typology was too fine-grained and proposed instead eight general categories:

a) natural science /natsci (maths, biology, physics, chemistry, geo, …)
b) applied science/appsci (medicine, computing, ecology, engineering, military, transport, …)
c) social science/socsci (law, history, philosophy, sociology, language, education, …)
d) politics
e) business
f) life (a general topic that is used for fiction, conversation, etc.)
g) arts (visual arts, literature, architecture, performing arts)
h) leisure (sports, travel, entertainment, fashion, …) (ibid: 86)

Sharoff has employed this classification of texts for large corpora of Chinese, English, Romanian, German, Russian, and Ukrainian compiled from Internet sources (2006b). Al-Sulaiti and Atwell (2006) have also utilised Sharoff’s classification in their Corpus of Contemporary Arabic. For the purpose of the corpus in this study, Sharoff’s categories were used as the representative base of this corpus insofar as they reflected academic and informative writing. This means that a feature article that discussed the issue of money spent by the government to better the performance of Malaysian athletes in international sporting events was included in the corpus. However, a lengthy interview with an artist over his/her win at the Malaysian Music Industry Awards was not included.
3.1.3.5 Utusan Malaysia in-house classification

In-house classification by Utusan Malaysia was another indicator as to whether an article was suitable for inclusion in the corpus. The headings used by the newspaper are divided into News and Lifestyle, as seen on Table 3.5:

Table 3.5: Utusan Malaysia in-house classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main headlines</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament</td>
<td>TV schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>Police and Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to the Editor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this classification, materials for the corpus could be retrieved from the Feature articles, Forum/Letter to the Editor, Education, Science and Technology, Health, and Literature sections. Sinclair (1996: EAGLES online document) referred to this method as ‘reflexive’, a version of the external criteria for text classification and “evidence [that] comes from statements within the text”23.

3.1.3.6 Title of the article

Another reflexive indicator used to determine whether the text was semi-academic was the title of the article. For example, titles such as *Kim Hock optimis beregu senior* (‘Kim Hock optimist for senior doubles’) were not included in the corpus as opposed to the feature article *Cabaran urus alam sekitar guna ICT* (‘Challenges in managing the environment using ICT’).
3.1.3 Summary

The final count of corpus material showed that it included 988 semi-academic articles with a total of 889,037 running words and 32,704 total word types. However, for the purpose of the lexical analysis, this study used a working corpus of 547,838 running words (559 articles). This size was considered reasonable for a corpus with a specialized purpose. Kennedy (1998: 43-45) states that the majority of specialised corpora for linguistic investigations contain between 100,000 and two million words of running texts. The selection of the 559 articles was random as all of the articles retrieved from the online Utusan archives had already been through the selection process described in sections 3.1.2.1 to 3.1.2.6. Even after reduction, balance was still ensured by keeping the total number of texts for each genre within a reasonable range. The resulting Utusan corpus, classified according to genre and author based on Sharoff (2006a), is shown on Table 3.6:
Table 3.6: The Utusan corpus by author and genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Journalists</th>
<th>Columnists</th>
<th>PuPr sector</th>
<th>Pub. interviews</th>
<th>Pub. speeches</th>
<th>Total Texts</th>
<th>Running Words</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App Sci</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>132,236</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus &amp; Econ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>126,016</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152,114</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc Sci</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>137,472</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>547,838</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
PuPr = articles written by professionals in the public or private sector (e.g. medical doctors, engineers, architects, etc.)
Pub.interviews = texts of interviews published in the newspaper
Pub.speeches = texts of speeches published in the newspaper
Selection and Analysis of the Words

A lexical analysis was carried out prior to the selection of words (loan words and their English equivalents) as items to be featured in the vocabulary test instruments. There were several objectives in carrying out the analysis using the Utusan corpus and the dictionaries. The first was to see if the loan word in the corpus matched up with the word class of its English original. For example, the analysis of the loan word "ekonomi" revealed that the same Malay word was used for ‘economy’, ‘economic’, and ‘economics’. The second objective was to find out if there were meanings of the loan word that were not defined in the Oxford Dictionary of English (ODE) as meanings of the original English word, and vice versa. Thus, the lexical analysis would reveal whether the meaning of the loan word had been narrowed or expanded. Divergence from the meaning(s) and usage in English might pose a learning problem and increase the learning burden of the English equivalent of the loan word, i.e it is a potentially problematic loan word.

Divergence here refers to an extension of the meaning in English, or a split from the meaning in English. In the case of English loan words in Japanese, Daulton describes divergent words as deceptive cognates or unreliably false cognates (2007: 89). Conversely, a similarity between the loan word and its English original lightens the learning burden of the word. In explaining the learning burden, Nation (2001: 24) states,

So, if a word uses sounds that are in the first language, follows regular spelling patterns, is a loan word in the first language with roughly the same meaning, fits into roughly similar grammatical patterns as in the first language and has similar collocations and constraints, then the learning burden will be very light and the word will not be difficult to learn.

Thus, English words that are (almost) similar in spelling, pronunciation and meaning to the loan words in Malay would technically be the easiest to introduce to learners.

Therefore, the lexical analysis followed the criteria below for determining whether a loan word is potentially or not potentially problematic are as such:
Therefore, the lexical analysis followed the criteria below for determining whether a loan word is potentially or not potentially problematic:

1) the loan word is potentially non-problematic if it is almost similar in spelling, pronunciation, and meaning to the English word;

2) the loan word is potentially problematic if it has these features:
   
a) The same word form in Malay for what are different parts of speech in English e.g. *ekonomi* is the noun ‘economy’ as well as the adjective ‘economic/al’.

   b) Narrowing of meaning in Malay compared to in English e.g. *isu* (‘issue’) means only ‘an important topic or problem for debate or discussion’ and does not have the other meanings of the English word.

   c) Broadening of meaning in Malay compared to in English, and the broadened meaning has currency in Malay e.g., *akademik* is used in Malay to mean ‘education’ and not as ‘a person who is a member of a learning institution’.

   d) Mismatch of actual use of loan word in the corpus and its definition in Kamus Dewan (4th ed) e.g., *senario* (‘scenario’) meaning ‘current events’. The usage is not yet documented in Kamus Dewan (4th ed).

Note that the labelling of potentially problematic and potentially non-problematic words in the lexical analysis reported in Chapter 4 is also based on the criteria above.

The following sections introduce the concordancing software (AntConc) used in the analysis as well as the processes involved in the analysis.

3.1.4.1 AntConc

The concordance software used in the lexical analysis was AntConc 3.2.1w for Windows. It is a free concordancer developed by Dr. Laurence Anthony at Waseda University in Japan and has been used in recent corpus-related research (Craig, 2008; Pecorari, 2008). The main functions of AntConc in this study were to generate word frequency lists and to display collocation patterns for the selected loan words. AntConc also easily arranged in alphabetical order or by frequency the concordance results of a particular loan word or clusters of words centred on the loan word. This feature was very helpful when checking for the difference or similarity in meaning.
and usage of the loan word and the original English word (see Anthony, 2005a and 2005b for other features of AntConc).

3.1.4.2 Selection of words for the lexical analysis

The analysis was not carried out for all 216 English loan words found from the preliminary analysis of the AWL. To make the study more manageable, the analysis was restricted to loan words that actually occurred in the Utusan corpus and those that were to be included in the test instruments in Phase 2 of the study.

There were 91 loan words in total from the pilot test materials. However, only 62 of the words corresponded to the most frequent word in a word family in the AWL. In addition, the word frequency list featured on AntConc showed that all but two of the 62 loan words were found in the corpus. The 60 words are shown in Table 3.5, with the additional words logik (‘logic’) and logikal (‘logical’). These last two were included in the study as examples of the difficulty which loan words could present to learners. Even though ‘logic’ is the most frequent member of the AWL word family, both loan words logik and logikal are sometimes used to mean ‘logic’ in Malay; hence, logik was included in the lexical analysis and ‘logical’ was used in the Translation task.

In order to further limit the scope of the analysis within the timeframe available, only the 30 loan words used in the vocabulary tasks are presented in Chapter 4. These loan words and their corresponding English words are highlighted in bold in Table 3.7.
Table 3.7: Word frequency list of the 62 loan words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>freq.</th>
<th>loan word</th>
<th>('English')</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>freq.</th>
<th>loan word</th>
<th>('English')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>ekonomi</td>
<td>('economy')</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>('element')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>isu</td>
<td>('issue')</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>('Focus')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>('sector')</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>('technique')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>proses</td>
<td>('process')</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>integrasi</td>
<td>('integration')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>('factor')</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>('relevant')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>media</td>
<td>('media')</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>prosedur</td>
<td>('procedure')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>aspek</td>
<td>('aspek')</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>kompleks</td>
<td>('complex')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>('academic')</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>tradisional</td>
<td>('traditional')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>individu</td>
<td>('individual')</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>impak</td>
<td>('impact')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>strategi</td>
<td>('strategy')</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>analisis</td>
<td>('analysis')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>konsep</td>
<td>('concept')</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>implicasi</td>
<td>('implication')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td>('communication')</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>kategori</td>
<td>('category')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>konteks</td>
<td>('context')</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>komen</td>
<td>('comment')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>positif</td>
<td>('positive')</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>konsisten</td>
<td>('consistent')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>kontrak</td>
<td>('contract')</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>formula</td>
<td>('formula')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>('data')</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>signifikan</td>
<td>('significant')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>negatif</td>
<td>('negative')</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>minoriti</td>
<td>('minority')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>('status')</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>skop</td>
<td>('scope')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>fizikal</td>
<td>(physical')</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>respons</td>
<td>('response')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>komponen</td>
<td>('component')</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>('fundamental')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>('function')</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>topik</td>
<td>('topic')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>profesional</td>
<td>('professional')</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>definisi</td>
<td>('definition')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>alternatif</td>
<td>('alternative')</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>interaksi</td>
<td>('interaction')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>polisi</td>
<td>('policy')</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>konvensyen</td>
<td>('convention')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>komuniti</td>
<td>('community')</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>spesifik</td>
<td>('specific')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>senario</td>
<td>('scenario')</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>logik</td>
<td>('logic')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>('potential')</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>orientasi</td>
<td>('orientation')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>struktur</td>
<td>('structure')</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>interpretasi</td>
<td>('interpretation')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>reaksi</td>
<td>('reaction')</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>koordinasi</td>
<td>('coordination')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>infrastruktur</td>
<td>(infrastructure')</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>paragraf</td>
<td>('paragraph')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>objektif</td>
<td>('objective')</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>logikal</td>
<td>('logical')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** freq. = frequency

### 3.1.4.3 Procedures for the lexical analysis

The analysis was based on the concordance lines of each selected loan word. However, a system was required so that the analysis would not take too much time when analysing a huge amount of corpus data. Hunston (2002: 52) states that looking at 100 concordance lines for general patterns and 30 lines for detailed patterns might
not be enough, especially if the word under investigation was a frequent one, because the number of lines will not show all the patterns and meanings involved. Using what she terms ‘hypothesis testing’, Hunston has adapted Sinclair’s (1999) procedure and selects 20 random concordance lines for the word being investigated as a basis to test a set of hypotheses about the patterns of that word. Once those hypotheses are confirmed by checking the phrases in which the said word occurs, another 50 - 100 lines are checked with a different set of hypotheses. In doing so, Hunston finds that the “…corpus-user does not need to examine every one of thousands of lines to obtain a reasonably accurate picture of how a word behaves.” (ibid: 55). This method was adopted in investigating the concordance results from the Utusan corpus.

Thus, our analysis investigated the loan word not in isolation but in collocation with other words within the concordance lines. The collocations helped make identification of similarities or differences in dictionary meaning(s) and usage faster and more systematic due to the context that was provided by the collocations. The procedures for the lexical analysis are described in the following sections.

3.1.4.3.1 Step 1

AntConc was earlier used to generate a word frequency list which showed the 60 loan words that qualified for the analysis. The loan words were ranked in order of frequency. The usage and meanings of each loan word could then be determined by looking at the concordance lines. For a particular loan word, the keyword in context (KWIC) was set as sorted one to the right of the node word. AntConc then displayed the output as such:

Figure 1: Concordance lines for sektor with one word to the right highlighted

Figure 1 shows the loan word (or node) sektor (‘sector’) in blue, and the collocate (one word to the right of the loan word) in red.
3.1.4.3.2 Step 2

The concordance lines could then be scrutinized for similarities and/or differences in meaning and usage between the loan word in Malay and its English original. To do this, definitions for each loan word were taken from the Oxford Dictionary of English (ODE) and Kamus Dewan (KD) and compared to the usage of the word in the corpus to verify which core and/or peripheral definition(s) of the English word had been borrowed into Malay. However, in cases such as concordance line 2 above, which has a full stop between the loan word and the collocate, the word to the left of the loan word was taken as the collocate; hence, *merentas sektor* (‘across sector’) was the collocation in this case. The analysis noted any similarities and/or any divergence bearing in mind the similarities would make the loan word potentially non-problematic for learners and vice versa. The online Utusan archives were referred to particularly if a meaning or usage in the ODE was not found either in the Utusan corpus or KD.

One difficulty in doing the analysis, as previously noted, was that Kamus Dewan does not consistently provide information about word class for all the entries in the dictionary. This made it often necessary to send email queries to Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka for help in determining the word class of a loan word. The online version Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka’s Tesaurus (‘Thesaurus’) was recently uploaded online and does include the word class information but not for all of the words in the dictionary. Note that the print and online versions of Kamus Dewan do not have such information at all. Nonetheless, it was also possible to infer the word class from the examples, where they were provided in the dictionary.

The results of the lexical analysis are described in further details in Chapter 4. We next turn to a description of Phase 2 of the research in the following sections.
3.2 Phase 2

Phase 2 covered the cognitive-affective dimension of the research. It served several purposes: (a) to investigate the students’ ability to recognise the loan words and the corresponding English words; (b) to explore the students’ preference for using either the loan word or a Malay equivalent in Malay sentences; (c) to investigate whether students understood what the loan words mean when they are used in Malay sentences; and (4) to explore the students’ attitudes towards the two languages and towards English loan words in Malay in particular. For these purposes, three tests and a questionnaire were developed and tried out in a pilot study. Based on the results of the pilot, the instruments were thoroughly revised for the main study which followed.

3.2.1 Pilot Study

The pilot study was designed to try out the vocabulary tasks and the questionnaire in order to evaluate their suitability as instruments to address the research questions for this study. It was also to identify particular items that needed to be revised, or even deleted if they did not work effectively, in preparation for the main study.

3.2.1.1 Instruments in the Pilot Test

3.2.1.1.1 Recognition task

The purpose of the first task was to test whether students were able to recognize the English loan words that occur in a Malay-language text. Two articles were chosen for this task. The first article appeared in a magazine with a focus on the Malaysian economy (*Dewan Ekonomi*). Only the first two pages were taken and then adapted to fit on one page of an A4-sized sheet. The second article was a set of notes on academic writing delivered at a workshop for aspiring young writers. This was also adapted to fit a single A4 page. It was expected that the students would more easily identify the English loan words in the article with the economic focus because of the prominence of words borrowed from English in the fields of economics, science and technology. By contrast, loan words are less expected to occur in a non-economic or
non-scientific text. Hence, the second article would be able to show if it was more difficult for students to identify loan words in a text with less technical content.

The instructions for the task asked students to underline any loan word (or kata pinjaman) that they could identify in the text. The term kata pinjaman is the translation of ‘loan word’ given in the Kamus Istilah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (‘terminology dictionary’). The phrase kata pinjaman Bahasa Inggeris (‘English loan word’) was used at this stage of the data-gathering because the recognition task was intended to investigate what students perceived as loan words. Examples of English loan words students were expected to underline in this task are:

Namun kesan negatif seperti inflasi, masalah sosial, kos hidup yang semakin meningkat tidak mampu dielakkan seratus peratus.

(‘However, negative effects such as inflation, social problems and steadily rising living costs are impossible to avoid one hundred percent.’)

The responses to this task were analyzed in two ways. First, the students’ performance was scored on the basis of the number of English loan words they correctly identified, as a measure of each student’s ability to recognise the loan words. Where a particular loan word was repeated in the text, it was only counted once. An exception was when the word occurred both with and without a Malay affix, as in the following examples:

Prof. Pazim bersetuju bahawa ada kesan positif dan negatifnya…

(‘Prof. Pazim agreed that it has positive effects and negative…’) [nya refers to ‘it’]

Namun kesan negatif seperti inflasi, masalah sosial, kos hidup…

(‘However, negative effects such as inflation, social problem, living cost…’)

In the first sentence, the loan word negatif has the suffix –nya attached to it but it has no affixation in the second sentence. These instances of negatif were considered as two separate words for the purpose of the count.

Secondly, each English loan word was scored in terms of how often it was correctly identified by the students. This was a measure of how recognisable each loan word was for the students collectively. In addition, a record was kept of loan words underlined by the students which were borrowed from languages other than English,
such as Arabic or Indonesian, to indicate how aware students were of loan words in Malay in general.

Using both Kamus Dewan and Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan as references, the English loan words were identified and listed together with their frequency of occurrence in the texts. The list of loan words was then cross-checked with the results of the preliminary analysis of the AWL. The results are shown in Table 3.8:

**Table 3.8**: Loan words in the pilot texts and their equivalents in the AWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text content type</th>
<th>total loan words in text</th>
<th>loan word with equivalents in AWL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic writing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loan words in the economics article included aktiviti (‘activity’), drastik (‘drastic’) and inflasi (‘inflation’). The loan words in the article on academic writing included kolokial (‘colloquial’), slanga (‘slang’) and formal (‘formal’). Since the loan words in both texts were not pre-selected, there was some overlap with the loan words featured as items in the two other vocabulary tasks, but this recognition task was not designed to focus on exactly the same words.

### 3.2.1.1.2 Word Selection task

The purpose of the second task was to explore whether the students, when given a choice, would prefer to use an English loan word or a Malay equivalent of that word in a particular sentence context. Many English loan words have existing Malay equivalents that express a similar meaning, for example bajet / belanjawan (‘budget’), komuniti / masyarakat (‘community’), objektif / tujuan (‘objective’), bisnes / perniagaan (‘business’), and program / rancangan (‘programme’). Supporters of Malay consider the use of the loan words instead of the existing Malay words as disrespectful to Malay. Other speakers of Malay view the situation as a matter of choice that is up to the individual language user, and some may have no opinion at all.
Therefore, it was interesting to design a task that would explore these attitudes through the students’ choice of words in a set of Malay sentences.

In order to develop the task, it was necessary to obtain sentences in Malay that contained an English loan word. The loan words for this task were selected from the results of the preliminary analysis of the AWL. The words were checked to ensure that they had a Malay equivalent that was likely to be familiar to the students. The selected loan word was entered into the online Utusan Malaysia archives search engine to find articles in which the loan word occurred. The search found up to 200 past articles, which indicated the popularity of the loan word. An article was selected and the browser’s search function was then used to locate the target loan word. A sentence containing the target word was then selected if it was relatively short and could be understood by itself without needing to refer to the whole paragraph that surrounded it. Where necessary, the sentence was edited to ensure it was not too lengthy while still maintaining comprehensibility.

Thirty sentences were retrieved from the Utusan archive and used as a resource for a draft set of multiple-choice items. Each sentence formed the stem of a multiple-choice item, with the English loan word deleted and replaced by a blank. There were four response options to choose from. The options consisted of the English loan word, the Malay equivalent of the loan word, and two more Malay words which were semantically related but did not fit in the sentence. The latter two words served as distractors.

The following example shows how each item was developed. The sample item was based on the sentence:

\[
\text{Proses pemindahan organ dan tisu membabitkan pembedahan yang benar-benar bersih.}
\]
\[('The organ and tissue transplant process involves surgery which is thoroughly sanitary.')\]

The loan word \textit{proses} (‘process’) was deleted and replaced by a blank. The word \textit{proses} was one of the four response options. The Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan (English-Malay dictionary) was referred to for the second option i.e the Malay
equivalent for ‘process’, which was *kaedah*. Then the Kamus Dewan was consulted to source the other two options, which were Malay words that were semantically related to the loan word but did not fit into the sentence given. The two words chosen in this case were *aturcara* (‘program’) and *tindakan* (‘action’). Thus, the multiple-choice item looked like this:

_______ pemindahan organ dan tisu membutuhkan pembedahan yang benar-benar bersih.

A) *aturcara*  B) *kaedah*  C) *proses*  D) *tindakan*

The preparation of the draft items for this task showed that it was difficult to decide which words to put into the ‘semantically related but does not fit in the sentence’ category. However, the final decision on the words was made after a consultation with Malay language lecturers at Universiti Malaysia Sabah.

The main focus of the analysis was to look at patterns of preference between the loan words and their Malay equivalents. There was no marking involved since the task was intended only to investigate the students’ word preference. The SPSS (version 16) software was used to record the students’ responses for this task.

### 3.2.1.1.3 Word Definition task

The purpose of the third task was to investigate the students’ understanding of the meaning of an English loan word when it is used in a Malay sentence. Twenty English loan words were selected from the preliminary analysis of the AWL. As with the word selection task, a large set of texts including the target word was retrieved from Utusan Malaysia. Sentences containing the English loan word(s) were then selected as the sources for test items. The criterion for selection was that the sentence was relatively short and could be understood by itself without needing the whole paragraph that surrounded it. The sentence was also edited if it was too lengthy.

In this task the loan word was left intact in the sentence and underlined. The students were required to read the sentence and supply a synonym or a short definition in
Malay for the underlined word. An example is shown with the loan word *prosedur* ('procedure'):

**Sentence:**  
*Kes saman itu akan mengambil masa kerana ia harus mengikuti prosedur yang sudah ditetapkan mahkamah.*  
('The summons case will take a long time because it has to follow the procedures that have been set by the court.‘)

**Acceptable response:** *langkah-langkah* (synonym); or  
*aturan yang lazim untuk membuat sesuatu urusan* (short definition)

In the scoring, each acceptable synonym or short definition was given 1 point whilst unacceptable ones received no credit. The SPSS (version 16) software was used to process the students’ responses.

### 3.2.1.4 Language Attitude Questionnaire

In addition to the three vocabulary tasks, a questionnaire was designed to elicit the students’ attitudes towards the English and Malay languages in general and the phenomenon of loan words in Malay in particular. The questionnaire was selected as the survey method to investigate the participants’ attitudes. Questionnaires have been popular research instruments in the social sciences because “they are relatively easy to construct, extremely versatile and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processible” (Dornyei, 2007: 101-101). Their frequency of use in applied linguistics research “is surpassed only by that of language proficiency tests” (ibid: 102). Survey research in the form of questionnaires is often used to gather and describe data on peoples’ attitudes and beliefs (Brown, 2002: 142). Questionnaires have featured in language attitude studies such as those by Cooper and Fishman (1977); Loveday (1996); Asmah Haji Omar (1992); Su-Hie Ting (2003); and Hassall et al. (2008). The questionnaire for this study was adapted from one used by Loveday (1996), which had the objective of exploring “the relationship between social factors and the intelligibility of, preference for, and attitudes towards, Japanese contact with English” (p. 162). Based on this similar objective, it was felt
that Loveday’s questionnaire suited the type of responses to be elicited from the participants.

For the questionnaire in this study, each item was made up of an attitudinal statement followed by a six-point Likert response scale: strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, agree, and strongly agree. A scale with an even number of response options and no neutral response in the middle was intended to force the participants to express some degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement. The piloted questionnaire had 10 open-ended items, which asked for information on the student’s language background, and 50 Likert-scale statements. The large number of items was considered as an item bank during the pilot stage, so that problematic items could be excluded when preparing the revised version.

Sources of statements for the items were newspaper articles on language issues, letters to editors, articles on issues affecting Malay and English in Malaysia from Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka publications, paper presentations at conferences on the Malay language and blogs related to Malay. The statements in the questionnaire were grouped under the following categories, with more items in the category on attitudes towards use of loan words:

1) beliefs about English and motivations to learn the language
e.g. Being able to speak more than one language will make me a more marketable graduate.

2) the status of English as compared to Malay in Malaysia
e.g. Official letters should be allowed to be written in English.

3) the use of English as a medium of instruction in Malaysia
e.g. Learning Mathematics and Science in English is a positive step in the Malaysian education system.

4) loyalty to the national language; attitudes to code-switching
e.g. Mixing English with Malay in one’s speech is a disrespectful act towards the national language.

5) attitudes towards the use of loan words
e.g. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka should create more original Malay words instead of borrowing.
The questionnaire was bilingual (Malay/English) to cater for students whose English proficiency was poor. Originally drafted in English, Malay translations of the items were finalised after consulting with a Malay language lecturer at Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS).

3.2.1.2 Participants and Procedures

The participants for the pilot test were 34 Malaysian English language learners at Universiti Malaysia Sabah. The students were second-year undergraduates who comprised 24 *bhumiputera* and 10 non-*bhumiputera* students. In relation to their MUET grades, there were 1 extremely limited user (Band 1), 18 limited users (Band 2), and 15 modest users (Band 3). In complying with the ethical procedures, the participants were asked to sign the consent form which had earlier been presented to them in the presence of their class tutors.

The participants were asked to complete the language attitude questionnaire first, followed by the vocabulary tasks. All of the tasks were administered in a classroom with the assistance of the class tutor. The participants were given 30 minutes to complete each of the tasks. They were also informed that the tasks were individual work and discussions with their friends were not allowed.

3.2.1.3 Analysis and Results

The results of the three vocabulary tasks were recorded in such a way as to provide data on the students’ ability to recognise and understand the meaning of the target loan words. The frequency of recognition for each of the loan words was also recorded. In the case of the word selection task, there were separate tallies for the loan word response and the Malay-equivalent response to each item. This was done to get a measure of the students’ preferences for loan words as compared to the corresponding Malay expressions.

Descriptive statistical analyses were carried out SPSS version 16. The reliability of each instrument was estimated using an appropriate statistic and item analysis was used to find out whether each of the items performed effectively. Correlational
procedures were used to explore the relationships between the various measures. The relationship between the students’ language attitudes and their performance on the vocabulary tasks was of particular interest. Statistical procedures were carried out on data from the questionnaire to investigate relationships between the variables.

Responses from the participants showed that there was a high level of recognition of the loan words. In the Recognition task, the participants were able to identify more than 75% of the loan words on average in both texts. The results provided information as to which loan words were the easiest and most difficult to identify. As for the Word Selection task, the results showed that an overwhelming majority of participants were able to choose the loan word option. This could be due to the quite visible difference in the forms of the loan word and the other Malay equivalents e.g. *objektif* (‘objective’) as opposed to *matlamat* (‘objective’ / ‘purpose’) and *cita-cita* (‘ambition’). Similarly, in the Word Definition task, the results indicated that the majority of participants provided the correct synonyms for most of the loan words within the context of Malay sentences. That students were able to define the loan words in terms of their Malay equivalents points to their knowledge that the loan words had synonyms in Malay vocabulary. However, the results of the Word Definition task did not give evidence whether the students understood that the loan words are borrowed English words and that they have their original English forms. Hence, for the main study it was decided to shift the focus to finding out how the students could apply their knowledge of loan words to an understanding of the equivalent English words in the context of English sentences. Finally, the results of the questionnaire showed that the majority of the participants were interested in learning English mainly for the purpose of getting jobs upon graduation. There was also no apparent negative reaction towards the use of loan words in Malay. However, there was an inclination to support the national language, particularly in questionnaire items which were deliberately worded to be negative. This was expected as the majority of the participants were *bumiputera* students. In terms of length, the participants said that the questionnaire had too many items.
Overall, the results of the pilot provided very useful information in terms of changes required for the revised test instruments in the main study. We shall go into these details in the following sections.

3.2.2 Main Study

3.2.2.1 Revised Test Instruments

Several changes were made to the test instruments for the main study based on the results of the pilot tests. First, the Word Recognition task was dropped because the pilot study indicated that students found it quite easy to identify loan words in a text. In addition, the amount of time the data gathering would take needed to be reduced. Secondly, the Word Selection task, which had a multiple-choice format at the pilot stage, was turned into a Gap-Filling format without the multiple-choice options. The pilot task had established that the majority of students opted for the loan word response for almost all of the items. Eliminating the multiple-choice options required the participants to come up with a word of their own – either the loan word or its Malay equivalent. This was considered to be a more authentic method of eliciting the preferred word from the participants. Thirdly, the Word Definition task used English instead of Malay sentences. Students were required to translate the underlined English word in each sentence with a Malay synonym. Hence, the test was renamed the Translation task. The change was because the Word Definition task was not achieving the objective of investigating students’ understanding of the loan word i.e. whether, when reading texts in English, they could make any connection between the meaning of the English word and its loan word equivalent in Malay.

Finally, a semi-structured interview was added to the data collection procedure. This was an added measure which was used to provide follow-up data for the other tasks. For practical reasons, only a limited number of students could participate as the interviews were conducted during lessons. Hence, with the agreement of teachers to release several of their students during class time, 15 students were selected to be interviewed in a total of eight interview sessions.
An important aspect of the revision was that the design of the tasks for the main study was informed by the lexical analysis of the loan words derived from the AWL in Phase 1. The relatively tight schedule for the data-gathering at Universiti Malaysia Sabah meant that the pilot study had to be carried out before the lexical analysis had been completed. The revised test instruments benefited from the lexical analysis of the loan words from the previous tasks. The significance of the analysis was in providing evidence as to whether the loan word was potentially problematic or non-problematic, which was made an important focus of the vocabulary tasks. The Malay sentences in the revised tasks were also taken from the carefully constructed Utusan corpus.

3.2.2 Selection of loan words

Some loan words in the pilot vocabulary tasks occurred more than once, especially as the loan words in the recognition task were not pre-selected. However, the list of loan words included in the three revised vocabulary tasks was edited to ensure no overlap of words from one task to another in the main study.

As explained in 3.1.4.2 above, of the 91 loan words used in the pilot study tasks, only 62 had English equivalents in the AWL that were the most frequent member of their word family. A word frequency list was generated for the 62 loan words using AntConc and the Utusan corpus. The word frequency list showed that only 60 of the words occurred in the corpus. A lexical analysis was therefore carried out on these 60 loan words (see Chapter 4). Both the word frequency list and the result of the lexical analysis were the basis for the selection of loan words featured in the revised test instruments. It was important to base the selection on these two sources for two reasons: (1) the word frequency list was ranked according to how often the loan words appeared in the Utusan corpus; and (2) the lexical analysis compared the meaning and usage of the loan words on the frequency list with that of the original English words. The latter resulted in a list of potentially non-problematic loan words (27 items) and potentially problematic loan words (35 items).

As shown in Chapter 4, in general, Malay borrows only the basic meaning and usage of the English words. It is possible, for instance, that students may know the loan
word *faktor* (‘factor’) as a Malay noun and recognise ‘factor’ in an English sentence. However, they might not understand ‘factor’ if it was used as a verb in the English sentence. This makes the loan word *faktor* a potentially problematic loan word. In contrast, the lexical analysis found that the loan word *kompleks* (‘complex’ or ‘difficult’) is potentially non-problematic. One may ask if *kompleks membeli-belah* (‘shopping complex’) might be potentially problematic. However, the words following *kompleks* i.e. *membeli-belah* (‘shopping’) easily directs one to the meaning of a ‘a shopping complex’ or ‘a building where one can do some shopping’. In addition, the usage of *kompleks* in academic texts would be more towards its meaning of ‘difficult’ instead of ‘a building’. This means that students might understand the loan word *kompleks* in Malay sentences, as well as recognise and understand ‘complex’ in an English sentence. Potentially non-problematic loan words could then be used as vocabulary tools to help Malaysian ESL learners learn the academic vocabulary. As for potentially problematic loan words, teachers could still use them as vocabulary tools but they need to give more direct instruction and examples on the different meanings and usages.

### 3.2.2.3 Gap-Filling Task

The purpose of the Gap-Filling task was to explore whether, when given a choice, the students would use an English loan word or a Malay equivalent of that word in a particular sentence context. The twenty English loan words in this task were taken from the list of loan words which were included in the lexical analysis in Phase 1 of this study. The idea of the task was that preference for a loan word indicated that the student was familiar with the word and he/she understood its meaning and usage.

Another purpose of the task was to check students’ comprehension of the loan word meaning and usage in Malay sentences. Based on the lexical analysis, the loan words had been classified as potentially problematic or non-problematic. Potentially problematic words, with a difference in meaning and usage from the original English word, were presented in a Malay sentence context, to see whether the students would face much difficulty with this task.
There were three criteria for inclusion of a loan word in this task. The first was that the word had been included in the lexical analysis in Phase 1 to determine its similarities and differences in meaning in relation to the English original word. Secondly, the loan word had to have a direct Malay equivalent: one word or at most two words that could fit in the gap without the need for a lengthy phrase or a modification of the sentence. Some of the loan words did not have a Malay equivalent or synonym, for example, ekonomi (‘economy’), teori (‘theory’), dokumen (‘document’), and kontrak (‘contract’). The third criterion was that the loan word had to be relatively frequent in Malay, as indicated by the fact that it occurred at least 50 times in the Utusan corpus, so that it was reasonably likely that the students would be familiar with the word. A familiar loan word would provide a realistic choice of whether to use it or its Malay equivalent. Other than these criteria, the sentences had to be relatively short and able to be understood without needing a larger context.

An example of the items is shown below:

Sentence: Mengikut buku tersebut, __________ ‘buli’ ialah percakapan atau perlakuan fizikal yang tidak dapat diterima.

Answer: definisi (‘definition’)

(‘According to the book, the definition for ‘bully’ is words or physical acts that are unacceptable’.)

Possible words that fit the gap are definisi (‘definition’) and its Malay equivalent, takrif (‘definition’). Another Malay word that could fit in the sentence semantically is erti (‘meaning’). It is precisely to present this choice of word that participants were tested only on loan words that had Malay synonyms and equivalents. The student’s response was also marked for comprehension i.e. did the response (Malay equivalent or loan word) fit the gap correctly?

3.2.2.4 Translation task

The purpose of the Translation task was to test whether the potentially problematic loan words were indeed problematic to learners. The task comprised 20 individual English sentences, with each having an English word that had both a loan word form and a Malay equivalent. Sentences were taken from one of the English learners’
dictionaries (Oxford Advanced Learners’ Dictionary; Cambridge Advanced Learners’ Dictionary; Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English; or Collins Essential English Dictionary) and modified where necessary. Students were explicitly told to provide the Malay equivalents – and not the loan word - of these English words. Eleven of the twenty sentences contained the original English versions of loan words that were considered to be problematic for Malaysian English language learners. This is because, for these particular eleven, the original English words had meanings or usages which were not covered by Kamus Dewan or the Utusan corpus. In this task, students were required to translate the English word (highlighted) into Malay but without using any loan word in the translation. This was to prevent the participants from taking the easy option of simply writing the equivalent loan word and also to obtain some evidence of how they understood the meaning of the original English word.

3.2.2.5 Language Attitude Questionnaire

There was no major revision done to the questionnaire except for its length. The initial questionnaire in the pilot test had 10 open-ended items, which asked for information on the student’s language background, and 50 Likert-scale statements. In the revised questionnaire, the 10 open-ended items were retained but the Likert-scale statements were reduced to 20 items following the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for them (0.709) indicating acceptable internal reliability (Dornyei, 2003: 112). The 20 items covered the themes of: attitudes towards the use of loan words; beliefs about English and motivations to learn the language; the status of English as compared to Malay in Malaysia; the use of English as a medium of instruction in Malaysia; and loyalty to the national language / attitudes to code-switching.

3.2.2.6 Interview (Focus Group)

The interview questions were semi-structured and based on reviewing the participants’ responses to the three earlier tasks. There were 10 questions on the interview schedule intended to find out the students’ opinions and values with respect to their responses. Questions on opinions and values are geared towards “understanding the cognitive and interpretive processes” (Patton, 2002: 350) the
students used in providing their answers to the tasks. Interview types in most applied linguistic research fall under the semi-structured type (Dornyei, 2007: 136) in which the “format is open-ended and the interviewee is encouraged to elaborate on the issues raised in an exploratory manner” (ibid.). This means that there were no ready-made response categories which would limit the participants’ reply and they were free to give more details in their responses. The 10 questions were:

a) Why did you choose this word as your answer? (Gap-filling task)
b) What was difficult about this item? (if no response was given at all) (Gap-filling task)
c) Is this word familiar to you? (Translation task)
d) Have you ever seen this word? (If yes, what do you think it means?) (Translation task)
e) Do you know any other synonym for this word? (Translation task)
f) Which task was easy for you to answer? Why? (Overall tasks)
g) What aspect of the sentence made it difficult to translate? (if participant says he/she understands the sentence but one or two words made the task difficult) (Translation task)
h) Are you satisfied with your English proficiency skills? (Overall tasks)
i) Do you think that the Malay media rely too much on loan words? Why or Why not? (Language attitude questionnaire)
j) Do you think that knowing the Malay version of the English word can be a tool to help you learn the original English word and its meaning? (Overall tasks)

3.2.3 Participants for the Study

The participants were 101 ESL learners at a public university in Malaysia. It was a typical case sampling (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2009) “which involves selecting those cases that are the most typical, normal, or representative of the group of cases under consideration” (p.176). In this case, the participants were Malaysian undergraduate students at Universiti Malaysia Sabah (UMS) who were taking English proficiency courses in their first year of study. This means that their English results in the SPM examination at the end of secondary school were not good enough for them to be exempted from English proficiency courses at the tertiary level. This in turn indicates that their English proficiency, including their knowledge of English vocabulary, was relatively low, despite having studied English since their first year in primary school.
Although English proficiency classes at UMS were held at various times of day (morning, afternoon and evening), it was decided that the participants would be students who had their ESL classes in the morning sessions. The reason was that the data-gathering involved the completion of a questionnaire and a series of vocabulary tests. It was important that the students were relatively fresh, rather than tired and possibly bored at the end of the day. There was no difference between the morning-session and afternoon/evening-session students except that the latter classes were taught by part-time tutors engaged by the University. These were ESL teachers from around the city and as such they were not fulltime staff of the University. Liaising with fulltime lecturers based in the University was considered to be more practical.

A basic summary of the participants is given in Table 3.9. Their Malaysian University English Test (MUET) bands indicate the level of proficiency they had upon entering university (one student did not provide his MUET result):

**Table 3.9:** Research participants and MUET Band categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Bumi-putera</th>
<th>Non-Bumiputera</th>
<th>Native Malay Speaker</th>
<th>Non-Native Malay Speaker</th>
<th>Modest user</th>
<th>Limited user</th>
<th>Very limited user</th>
<th>No data provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>data collection</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.4 Procedure

Data from the main study was collected several months after the pilot test and after completing all necessary revision on the test instruments. Similar to the pilot test, the main study was conducted at the Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning at Universiti Malaysia Sabah. Data was collected in the month of January 2009 based on the availability of classes as advised by the Coordinator of the English Language Unit. Overall, a total of six classes participated with the cooperation of four ESL lecturers. The tasks were administered by the researcher and assisted by the lecturers of the classes involved. The task sequence was in the order of the (1) language attitude questionnaire, (2) gap-filling task, and (3) the translation task. Students were given 30 minutes to complete each task and they were to finish
the tasks on the same day. Breaks of about 15 minutes were given in between the tasks. A general briefing session was held earlier in the week with everyone involved. The students were told that although the main language of the research was English, they were free to ask questions in Malay and to provide their responses in Malay – in particular if they were selected for the interview. No problems arose during the completion of the tasks and students seemed eager to help the researcher.

The interview was the last to be carried out. It functioned as a complement to the three earlier tasks: language Gap-Filling task, Translation task, and the attitude questionnaire. Fifteen participants were selected for the interview. The interview sessions were conducted in the researcher’s office at Universiti Malaysia Sabah. There were eight sessions altogether and each session took about thirty minutes. The interview was carried out a few days after the participants had finished the other three tasks. The arrangement of the interviews depended on the number of students released from class by their tutor. Two participants had a one-to-one interview, ten participants had paired interviews and three participants were interviewed as a group. This was done several days after checking the students’ responses to the tasks and attitude questionnaire. In terms of their performance on the vocabulary tasks, the students were selected based on three response patterns: mostly correct; mostly incorrect; and in between. Similarly, students were selected based on their responses to the attitude questionnaire: mostly positive towards English/loan words; mostly negative towards English/loan words; and in between. The interview was conducted in the language preferred by the students and was held in the researcher’s office located at the Centre.

3.2.5 Data analysis

3.2.5.1 Analysis of the Language Attitude Questionnaire

There were two types of analyses for data from the questionnaire. The first type was a general analysis for the purpose of getting an overall result. Data was then interpreted based on the descriptive statistics for the participants’ responses to all the items in the questionnaire, including the means, standard deviations, and individual response frequencies. In the general analysis, the items from the questionnaire were grouped under these topics:
1) Effects of English loan words on Malay
2) Personal perspectives on borrowing
3) English use in universities
4) English in business and employment
5) English in the media
6) English use among Malaysians

The second analysis was more thorough as it investigated data from the three subscales: ‘English loan words in Malay’, ‘English and Malaysian education’, and ‘English and society in Malaysia’. The variables of ethnicity and degree programs were then statistically analysed and interpreted based on the results of the One Way ANOVA and Independent Samples T-tests.

### 3.2.5.2 Analysis of the Gap-Filling Task

Data from the Gap-Filling task was analysed in two aspects: preference and comprehension. The analysis for preference was categorised into these six types and later entered into SPSS version 16:

a) **exact loan word correct**: response which matched the original word deleted from the sentence.
b) **other loan word correct**: an alternative loan word that could fit the gap semantically and grammatically.
c) **loan word incorrect**: incorrect English loan word response.
d) **malay correct**: Malay word that fitted the gap.
e) **malay incorrect**: incorrect Malay response.
f) **no response**: no response was given for the gap.

The categories that provided a measure of word preference were:

i) acceptable English loan word that fitted the gap (categories ‘a’ and ‘b’)
ii) acceptable Malay word that fitted the gap (category ‘d’).

Incorrect responses were excluded because the measurement was only interested in word preference which fit the gap. Data was then analysed with statistical tests on the SPSS to see whether there were significant correlations with specific variables.
3.2.5.3 Analysis of the Translation task

Data from the Translation task was analysed in terms of frequency distribution of the participants’ responses, classified in two ways: simple and elaborate. The simpler classification summarises the participants’ responses into three categories: correct, incorrect, and no response. In contrast, the more elaborate classification identifies the following types of responses which were given by participants in the task:

a) MC: correct Malay equivalent;  
b) MI: incorrect Malay equivalent;  
c) OLWC: correct response in the form of another English loan word;  
d) OLWI: incorrect response in the form of another English loan word;  
e) ELWC: correct response and the exact transliterated form of the English word in Malay;  
f) ELWI: incorrect response and the exact transliterated form of the English word in Malay

Analysis was carried out to investigate the differences between the usages of eleven potentially problematic items as English loan words in Malay. The eleven items came from the top range of the AWL word frequency list. In addition, further analysis was also carried out on the ten words which were also used in the Gap-Filling task.

3.2.5.4 Analysis of the Interview

Data from the interview was in audio form as it was recorded using a digital voice recorder (Olympus VN-2100PC). Data was saved in both mp3 as well as the default Olympus wav. file formats. Saving in two different formats was to allow for a more flexible usage of the files i.e. so they can be played in most software audio players. Data was then transcribed using Transcriber (v1.5.1), a free, open-source transcribing software. Themes or categories of reasons for the students’ responses for particular test items were summarised based on the interview transcription. The transcribed interview data was saved in a Word 2007 document. This was useful particularly when using the Ctrl-F function on the keyboard to search for a particular word or expression (e.g. susah (‘difficult’), (‘confused’), senang (‘easy’)) used by the interviewees. As the interview segment was intended as an added measure to provide follow-up data for the other tasks, the transcribed data was referred to at each
point of data analysis on the other tasks. For example, the researcher would do a search on the Word document for the word *isu* (‘issue’) and extract the relevant information given by the interviewee to be interpreted alongside the data from the other tasks.

### 3.3 Conclusion

This chapter has given a description of the research design of the study, specifically the pilot test and the revised test instruments. Details of the data analysis are also given briefly so as to limit the length of this chapter. The more elaborated details of data analysis procedures were placed in Chapters 5 and 6.
CHAPTER 4 LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LOAN WORDS

4.0 Overview

This chapter presents in greater detail the linguistic analysis of selected academic English loan words used in the vocabulary tasks (Gap-Filling and Translation) during data collection. The results of that linguistic analysis are presented in terms of their potential for being problematic or non-problematic loan words for learners. The distinction between the two is that a non-problematic loan word is expected to help learners easily make the connection between that loan word and the original English word i.e. it reduces the learning burden. In contrast, learners may not make the connection as easily with a potentially problematic loan word, hence requiring more teacher input for that particular loan word. The criteria for being potentially non-problematic or potentially problematic (Chapter 3, p. 83) were applied in this lexical analysis.

Each of the 30 loan words is discussed in order of their frequency in the Utusan corpus, as shown in Table 3.7 in Chapter 3. The definitions are referred to by the reference (or sense) numbers that they are given in the Oxford Dictionary of English (ODE) e.g. sense 1. It is also important at this point to distinguish what is meant by “meaning” and “usage” as these two words will occur very frequently in this analysis. Hence, “meaning” refers to the basic, core definition of the word in a given dictionary, whereas “usage” refers to the way that the core meaning is expressed, in a more specific way(s), in particular contexts (see Carter, 2002: Chapter 2; Schmitt, 2000: Chapters 3 and 4) by the speech community. In the context of the Oxford Dictionary of English (ODE) and Kamus Dewan (KD), the core meaning refers to the senses which the dictionaries have delineated for the lexeme – typically ordered from central to peripheral meanings, and from concrete to abstract and figurative meanings (Jackson & Ze Amvela, 2000: 178). Meanwhile, usage refers to the observed or available evidence of the word in action (for the loan words in this study, in the Utusan Corpus).
4.1 Semantic analysis of the individual loan words

4.1.1 isu (‘issue’)

The 800 concordance lines for the loan word isu showed that the word was always used as a noun in Malay and that its meaning and use were similar to only sense 1 in the ODE (‘an important topic or problem for debate or discussion; personal problems or difficulties’). These meanings and usages are also found in KD. Some examples from the corpus were isu FTA (‘FTA issue’), isu gas ammonia (‘ammonia gas issue’), isu geopolitik (‘geopolitical issue’), isu global (‘global issue’), isu hak asasi kemanusiaan (‘human rights issue’), isu panas (‘hot issue’), and isu harga ayam (‘the price of chicken issue’). These and the rest of the concordance lines contained isu functioning as a noun and meaning “an important topic or problem for debate or discussion”.

The six other senses in the ODE (‘the action of supplying or distributing an item for use, sale, or official purposes; each of a regular series of publications; a result or outcome of something; children of one’s own; the action of flowing or coming out’) were not found in KD and there was no usage of these senses found in the corpus. This means that the loan word isu is potentially problematic for learners because there is a narrowing of the meaning of isu in Malay. In addition, the usage of ‘issue’ as a verb in English is not available in Malay and there were no examples of such use within the corpus or the archives.

4.1.2 sektor (‘sector’)

Sense 1 for ‘sector’ in the ODE defines it as ‘an area or portion that is distinct from others’. However, the sub-definition of sense 1 ‘a distinct part or branch of a nation’s economy or society or of a sphere of activity such as education’ might be more relevant to the Malay usage. The other senses include ‘the plane figure enclosed by two radii of a circle or ellipse and the arc between them’, and as used in mathematics ‘a mathematical instrument consisting of two arms hinged at one end and marked with
sines, tangents, etc. for making diagrams’. Only senses 1 and 2 are found in KD. Except for tidak bersifat sektor atau partisan (‘is not sectoral or partisan’) in which the adjective ‘sectoral’ is used, all of the concordance lines in the corpus showed sektor used as a noun and similar in meaning with sense 1 in the ODE. Corpus examples for sektor (‘sector’) include sektor komunikasi berkembang pesat (‘the communication sector develops fast’), semua sektor perlu bekerjasama (‘all sectors have to cooperate’), dalam sektor awam mahu pun swasta (‘in the public sector or the private’). The analysis thus found that despite the slightly dissimilar range of senses for sektor in Malay to that in English, it is expected to be potentially non-problematic for learners. This is because the core meaning of sektor in Malay adheres to sense 1 and its sub-definition in English.

4.1.3 faktor (‘factor’)

The definitions provided by KD for faktor refer to sense 1 (‘a circumstance, fact, or influence that contributes to a result’), sense 2 (‘a number or quantity that when multiplied with another produces a given number or expression’, and sense 5 (‘a company that buys a manufacturer's invoices at a discount and takes responsibility for collecting the payments due on them’) for the noun ‘factor’. KD also has similar definitions for sense 1 (‘another term for ‘factorize’) and sense 2 (‘a company selling its invoices to a factor’) for the verb ‘factor’ in the ODE. Examples from the corpus include faktor sikap (‘attitude factor’), faktor sosial (‘social factor’), faktor status sosioekonomi (‘socioeconomic status factor’), faktor suasana ceria (‘feel good factor’), pelbagai faktor (‘various factors’), and sebagai faktor terpenting (‘as an important factor’). The analysis found that faktor in the 339 concordance lines referred only to sense 1 of the noun ‘factor’ in the ODE. This suggests that the loan word faktor has a narrower meaning and usage than ‘factor’ in English, consequently making it a potentially problematic loan word.

4.1.4. aspek (‘aspect’)

The definition for aspek in KD refers to only sense 1 in the ODE (‘a particular part or feature of something; a particular way in which something may be considered’) and it is also a noun in its usage in Malay. All 198 concordance lines showed aspek used as
a noun similar to sense 1 in the ODE. Some examples from the corpus were *dalam beberapa aspek* (‘in some aspects’), *mengambil kira segala aspek* (‘taking into consideration all aspects’), *aspek-aspek ketenteraan* (‘military aspects’), *aspek negatif* (‘negative aspect’), *aspek paling penting* (‘most important aspect’), and *pelbagai aspek kehidusan* (‘various life aspects’). Although KD does not define *aspek* with the other senses for ‘aspect’ in the ODE i.e. sense 2 (‘the positioning of a building or other structure in a particular direction’) and sense 3 (‘a category or form which expresses the way in which time is denoted by a verb’), the analysis found that *aspek* is potentially non-problematic for learners based on the similarity of the core meaning as well as usage of *aspek* to ‘aspect’.

4.1.5 *akademik* (‘academic’)

The definitions in KD refer to sense 1 (‘relating to education and scholarship’) of the adjective ‘academic’ in the ODE. Examples from the corpus show that *akademik* is potentially non-problematic if the loan word *akademik* is used in this sense. There were 187 concordance lines for *akademik* which had this meaning and usage. Examples include *kelayakan akademik* (‘academic qualification’), *kakitangan akademik* (‘academic staff’), *tokoh akademik* (‘academic figure’), *reputasi akademik* (‘academic reputation’), *jurnal akademik* (‘academic journal’), and *tahun akademik* (‘academic year’).

However, there are two issues with *akademik* as a noun in Malay, which make it potentially problematic. Firstly, *akademik* does function as a noun in Malay, but the meaning is broadened to mean ‘education’. Examples from the corpus for the broadened meaning were *ibu bapa menganggap jika gagal akademik, masa depan anak-anak mereka akan gelap* (‘parent assume that if their children failed in their academic/education, their children’s future will be bleak’), and *sistem nilai murni akademik perlu dipelihara* (‘the value system of academic/education should be preserved’). This indicates that *akademik* is a potentially problematic loan word for learners. Secondly, in the ODE, ‘academic’ as a noun refers to a teacher or scholar in a university or institute of higher education. In Malay, this particular meaning, i.e. the scholar, does not translate directly as *akademik*. The loan word *akademik* requires the
quantifier para (‘indicating a large number’) or the word ahli (‘member’) to precede it. Examples from the corpus include di kalangan para akademik (‘amongst the academics’), ahli akademik perlu mengkaji perkara ini (‘academics should research this matter’), kebajikan ahli akademik perlu dijaga (‘the welfare of academics must be taken care of’), and mengapa ahli-ahli akademik sains sosial kita sukar mendapatkan tempat dalam jurnal komunikasi Barat (‘why our social science academics cannot get a place in Western communication journal’). Both these ways of using akademik as a noun might be confusing for less proficient students.

4.1.6 individu (‘individual’)

The first entry for individu in KD refers to the noun sense in the ODE (‘a single human being as distinct from a group’). KD’s definition shows that individu refers to the noun orang perseorangan (‘a single person’) whilst in the ODE ‘individual’ is also an adjective (‘single; separate; of or for a particular person; designed for use by one person; characteristic of a particular person or thing; having a striking or unusual character; original’). Corpus examples of individu as a noun were: menunggu-nunggu kehadiran individu (‘waiting for the individual’s arrival’), ia berbeza mengikut individu (‘it differs according to individuals’), implikasinya kepada negara, bangsa, dan individu (‘its implication to country, race, and the individual’) and individu itu akan menjadi ketagih (‘the individual will become addicted’).

What makes individu a potentially problematic loan word is that the different senses of the English adjective ‘individual’ have different affixes in Malay. For example, the English adjective ‘individual’ meaning ‘having a striking or unusual character; original’ is keindividuan. However, the affixes ke-an in Malay are used to create a noun, which means keindividuan is actually ‘individuality’, a noun in English. In addition, the adjective individual has an entry in KD but it is also defined as individu (‘individual’), which is rather confusing as this indirectly equates the loan word individual with individu i.e. both are nouns. In contrast, Kamus Inggeris Dewan Bahasa (KIMD) defines ‘individual’ as an adjective which means ‘related to a single person’. The examples given by KIMD are hak-hak individu (‘individual rights’), milik individu (‘individual possessions’), ciri tersendiri (‘individual traits’), jabatan
masing-masing (‘individual departments’) and perhatian khusus (‘individual attention’). Note that the last two examples – masing-masing and khusus – clearly go beyond the KIMD definitions but KIMD treats the contexts of masing-masing (lit. ‘respectively’) and khusus (lit. ‘specific’ or ‘special’) as similar to ‘related to a single person’.

Interestingly, query responses from Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka stated that the adjective ‘individual’ becomes secara individu (‘individually’, an adverb). This intended clarification did not help to clear the confusion, as the words secara or dengan (lit. ‘in the manner of’) are normally used to translate the English adverb prefix –ly into Malay e.g. secara visual (‘visually’), secara kasual (‘casually’), dengan fasih (‘fluently’), dengan lancar (‘smoothly’) (Sulaiman Masri et al., 2006: 29). It is possible that the problematic individu as a loan word for the noun and adjective ‘individual’ resulted in confusion amongst writers. A search on the Utusan archives for the loan word individ resulted in some articles that have used it as an adjective instead of secara individu. These include kebebasan individual (‘individual freedom’), tanggungjawab individual (‘individual responsibility’), and pengalaman spiritual dan individual (‘spiritual and individual experience’). Further evidence of the confusing usage was also found in the Utusan corpus, which had 6 concordance lines for secara individu. Four of the usages referred to the English adverb ‘individually’ and only two referred to the adjective ‘individual’.

Based on KD’s description, which stresses the use of individu as orang perseorangan (‘single person’), the loan word individu in Malay has become almost synonymous with orang or seseorang (‘a single person’). As a result, individu can now be used to replace the word orang (‘person’), as in individu berkenaan akan mendapat penyakit Parkinson (‘the individual/person concerned will get Parkinson’s disease’), setiap individu di Malaysia (‘each individual/person in Malaysia’), sama ada individu menyalahgunakan dadah atau tidak (‘whether the individual/person abuses drugs or not’), and emosi dan sentiment setiap individu (‘emotion and sentiment of each individual/person’). In addition, KD also does not provide examples for usages of individual apart from defining it as individu. More information pertaining to ‘individual’ is instead found in KIMD, which incidentally defines the adjective
‘individual’ as *individu*. The confusing and vague definition of *individual* in Malay limits *individu* mostly to its use as a noun. The adjective ‘individual’ is used as a stylistic choice of the writer, or the Malay synonyms of ‘individual’ such as *tersendiri*, *khusus*, and *masing-masing* are used instead. In short, the loan word *individu* is narrower in meaning and usage compared to the English ‘individual’. Learners may not be exposed to, and not know how to use, ‘individual’ as an adjective. Less proficient learners might misinterpret ‘individual style’ as *gaya seseorang* instead of *gaya tersendiri*, and ‘individual responsibility’ as *tanggungjawab orang* instead of *tanggungjawab masing-masing*.

**4.1.7 strategi (‘strategy’)**

The analysis indicates that *strateji* would not pose any learning problems for learners as *strateji* has similar meaning and usage to the English word ‘strategy’. The ODE’s definition of ‘strategy’ as ‘the art of planning and directing overall military operations and movements in a war or battle’, and often contrasted with ‘tactics’, is found in KD, as is the ODE’s definition of ‘strategy’ as ‘a plan of action designed to achieve a long-term or overall aim’. The corpus evidence shows that all 180 concordance lines have *strateji* used as a noun. Examples include *kejayaan strateji ini* (‘the success of this strategy’), *dengan adanya empat strateji ini* (‘with these four strategies’), *strateji mereka sendiri* (‘their own strategy’), *strateji pemasaran yang tepat* (‘accurate marketing strategy’), *strateji alternatif* (‘alternative strategy’) and *segala strateji pembangunan* (‘all development strategies’). However, a possible confusion may arise over the use of the plural ‘strategies’ as students might think that the noun *strateji* must be derived from the plural form in English, even with the Malay quantifiers such as *banyak* (‘many’), *empat* (‘four’), and *segala* (‘all’), and may incorrectly understand ‘many strategies’ as *banyak strateji-strateji*. The opposite of this is that learners may incorrectly use the phrase ‘many strategy’ based on their understanding of *banyak strateji*, which is correct for Malay. Note that the plural form is a problem which does not only apply to ‘strategy’ but to all loan words that are countable in English such as ‘factors’, ‘issues’, and ‘aspects’.
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4.1.8 **komunikasi (‘communication’)**

There is only one definition for the noun *komunikasi* in KD and it matches sense 1 in the ODE for ‘communication’ (‘the imparting or exchanging of information by speaking, writing, or using some other medium’). Examples from the corpus which matched sense 1 in the ODE were *masalah komunikasi* (‘communication problem’), *komunikasi dua hala perlu ada* (‘two-way communication must be there’), and *Fakulti Komunikasi dan Bahasa Moden* (‘Faculty of Communication and Modern Languages’). The corpus has 154 concordance lines which contained *komunikasi*, and the word was used in this way in the majority of cases.

The corpus also has some concordance lines in which *komunikasi* is used in sense 2 (‘means of sending or receiving information, such as telephone lines or computers – ‘communications’’) and sense 3 (‘means of travelling or of transporting goods – ‘communications’’) in the ODE. These included *Kementerian Tenaga, Air dan Komunikasi* (‘Ministry of Energy, Water and Communications’) and *dua buah satelit komunikasi* (‘two communications satellites’). Note that there was no differentiation between ‘communication’ and ‘communications’ with the loan word *komunikasi* in the previous examples. This appears to be a more narrowed usage in Malay because there is only 1 form i.e. *komunikasi* for both ‘communication’ and ‘communications’.

Based on this analysis, *komunikasi* is a potentially problematic loan word for learners, not so much in terms of meaning as in form. Learners might use ‘communication’ when they should use ‘communications’, or the other way around.

4.1.9. **data (‘data’)**

The definition given by KD for the loan word *data* is similar to the meaning and word class for ‘data’ in the ODE (‘facts and statistics collected together for reference and analysis’). The ODE states that in modern non-scientific use ‘data’ is treated as a mass noun, despite the more traditional use of it, especially in specialized scientific fields, as the plural noun of ‘datum’. However, KD does not have an entry for ‘datum’.
The use of *data* in English is also similar in Malay except for the reduplicated version of *data* to indicate plurality i.e. *data-data*. The use of *data-data* is not unusual in Malay. The *Utusan* Archives search result for *data-data* shows that there are 200 articles, including the latest ones, which use *data-data* as a plural noun. The *Utusan* corpus showed there were 92 concordance lines for *data* and only 11 containing *data-data*. The examples for the former were *melindungi komputer dan data mereka* (‘to protect their computer and data’), *data penyelidikan dari Barat* (‘research data from the West’), *data juga menunjukkan* (‘data also shows’), *500 data profil penjenayah* (‘500 data of criminal profile’), *data peribadi* (‘personal data’), *banyak data dan fakta* (‘many data and facts’), and *merekodkan data dan maklumat peserta* (‘to record data and information of participant’). Examples of *data-data* include *namun data-data semasa* (‘however, latest data’), *perolehan data-data terkini* (‘acquisition of latest data’), *data-data berkenaan itu dibekalkan oleh* (‘the relevant data were supplied by’), *data-data jualan juga disimpan* (‘sales data are also kept’), and *data-data yang direkod* (‘recorded data’).

In short, the evidence from the corpus showed that *data* in Malay is used mainly as the mass noun which is also defined in the ODE. Based on the availability of both forms i.e. *data* as well as *data-data* on the *Utusan* corpus, and on the actual *Utusan* Malaysia archives, this linguistic analysis cannot establish whether *data-data* is a grammatical error. It is possible that both variants are acceptable in Malay because of the reduplication rule in Malay grammar which makes a noun plural e.g. *buku-buku* for ‘books’. Nevertheless, the analysis found that that *data* is potentially non-problematic for learners from a semantic point of view.

### 4.1.10 status (‘status’)

The definition in KD for *status* as meaning *taraf atau kedudukan* matches sense 1 for ‘status’ (‘relative social or professional position or standing’) and sense 2 (‘the situation at a particular time during a process’) in the ODE. Based on evidence from the corpus, there appears to be no difference in meaning or usage for *status* in Malay. Examples from the corpus for sense 1 include *imej dan status Amerika Syarikat* (‘image and status of the United States’), *status halal produk-produk* (‘halal status of
products’), perubahan status ekonomi (‘change in economic status’), status sebagai negara sedang membangun (‘status as a developing country’), faktor status sosioekonomi (‘the factor of socioeconomic status’), status wanita di Malaysia (‘status of women in Malaysia’), and status mereka sebagai bumiputera (‘their status as bumiputera’). Examples for sense 2 from the corpus were mengenai status perkahwinan selepas pembedahan (‘regarding the status of the marriage after the surgery’), mengenai status orang Cina di Malaysia (‘regarding the status of the Chinese in Malaysia’), and status kunjungan Zainul (‘the status of Zainul’s visit’). In short, the analysis found that status is potentially non-problematic loan word as it has similar meanings and usage to the English ‘status’.

4.1.11 fungsi (‘function’)

The KD’s definition for fungsi matches only with sense 1 in the ODE for the noun ‘function’ (‘an activity that is natural to or the purpose of a person or thing; practical use or purpose in design’). Examples from the corpus included fungsi utama Bernas ialah (‘the main function of Bernas is’), salah satu fungsi media (‘one of the functions of media’), jika fungsi sistem badan terganggu (‘if the function of the body system is disrupted’), and gagal menjalankan fungsi dan peranannya (‘failed to play its function and role’).

ODE also defines ‘function’ as a verb, for example, ‘her liver is functioning normally’ or ‘the museum tends to function as an educational and study centre’. The verb is also found for fungsi in KD but the loan word is affixed with the prefix ber-, making it berfungsi (‘functioning’). In English, ‘functioning’ collocates with ‘as’ and this is similar in Malay, in which berfungsi requires the adverbs sebagai or dengan, as in berfungsi sebagai hakim (‘functioning as a judge’) or berfungsi dengan baik (‘functioning well’). This process is similar to other loan words which need affixes to function as verbs in Malay. It can be argued that ‘function’ as a verb in English also has affixes such as ‘-ed’ and ‘-ing’ and thus berfungsi may not be problematic. However, in Malay grammar, berfungsi is described as a kata terbitan (‘derivative word’) that is fronted by the verb prefix ber-, hence it is not clearly described as a kata kerja (‘verb’). Unless the learner is familiar with which inflectional affix in
Malay grammar is equivalent, or almost similar, to the corresponding affix in English, the low-level ESL learner may not make such a connection easily. Thus, the analysis found that fungsi has a narrower meaning and usage in Malay compared to ‘function’ and this makes fungsi a potentially problematic loan word.

4.1.12 komuniti (‘community’)

The definitions for komuniti in KD match the definitions in the ODE for ‘community’ as a noun in sense 1 (‘a group of people living together in one place, especially one practising common ownership’; ‘a particular area or place considered together with its inhabitants’), and sense 2 (‘a group of people having a religion, race, profession, or other particular characteristics in common - usually with a modifier’). The other senses outside of these two in the ODE are not found in KD, meaning the usage of komuniti is much narrower in Malay.

Corpus examples of sense 1 were mewujudkan komuniti ASEAN (‘to produce an ASEAN community’), pusat komuniti ICT (‘community ICT centre’), and kolej komuniti (‘community college’) and for sense 2, komuniti karyawan filem (‘film artists community’), komuniti intelektual berkualiti (‘quality intellectual community’), komuniti perniagaan global (‘global business community’), komuniti akademik (‘academic community’), and komuniti peniaga negara ahli (‘business community of member countries’). There were no examples in the corpus for the other senses of ‘community’ in the ODE i.e. ‘a body of nations or states unified by common interests’, and ‘[as modifier] denoting a worker or resource designed to serve the people of a particular area’. Similarly, there are no examples from the corpus for the usage of ‘community’ used as a mass noun, as in English (the ODE gives ‘the sense of community that organized religion can provide’ as an example).

It should be mentioned, though, that the use of komuniti in the ecological sense (‘a group of interdependent plants or animals growing or living together in natural conditions or occupying a specified habitat’) as defined in the ODE is not found in KD but in Kamus Istilah. In fact, examples from Kamus Istilah show komuniti as a pure science term as well as a term in the social sciences eg. komuniti tani (‘peasant community’), komuniti fosil (‘fossil community’), komuniti bandaran (‘urbanised
community’), and komuniti mikrob (‘microbial community’). Despite the narrower usage in Malay, examples from the corpus showed that the main senses of ‘community’ are covered by komuniti which leads us to conclude that the loan word is potentially non-problematic to learners, particularly when the text content is not scientific.

4.1.13 senario (‘scenario’)

Both of the definitions for the noun senario in KD match the ODE’s definitions for the noun ‘scenario’ (‘a written outline of a film, novel, or stage work giving details of the plot and individual scenes; a postulated sequence or development of events’). One definition from the ODE, however, is not found in KD, i.e. ‘scenario’ as a setting, in particular for a work of art or literature. In addition, although not found in KD, senario is commonly used in Malay to mean situasi (‘situation’), another loan word in Malay, or its equivalent keadaan (‘situation’). Hence, despite the matching definitions, there were only 10 concordance lines out of 60 which used senario to mean a postulated sequence or development of events. The rest of the concordance showed senario used as situasi (‘situation’). Corpus examples of senario which matched the ODE’s definitions were senario masa depan yang terserlah pada buku-buku seperti (‘scenario of the future which shines from books such as’), membayang senario sebuah kapal tangki dirampas (‘imagining a scenario in which an oil tanker was seized’), senario yang dibayangkan Thaksin (‘the scenario imagined by Thaksin’), and harapan wujudnya senario paling gembira (‘the hope for the existence of a most happy scenario’).

The majority of examples from the corpus showed senario used as situasi (‘situation’). The examples included keadaan dan senario di Iraq sekarang (‘the situation and scenario in Iraq now’), trend dan senario semasa (‘current trend and scenario’), and senario terbaru ini (‘this latest scenario’). The loan word senario in these examples basically means keadaan or situasi. Hence, instead of a “postulated sequence or development or event”, the use of senario in Malay is expanded to mean ‘the present setting’ or ‘the present situation’. This explains the term senario semasa (‘current scenario’) which because of the word semasa (‘current’) does not match the
‘postulated’ part in the ODE’s definition. In a search for the phrase ‘current scenario’ in two corpora, only 1 instance was found in the BYU-BNC corpus and only 4 instances in the Corpus of Contemporary American English.

Examples from the corpus with situasi (‘situation’) include situasi ini menimbulkan implikasi besar kepada rakyat (‘this situation will cause a big implication to the people’) and dalam situasi ekonomi dunia yang tidak menentu (‘in the situation of an uncertain world economy’). The corpus also has examples for keadaan such as Hari ini keadaan itu telah berubah (‘Today that situation has changed’) and Keadaaan menjadi lebih tragis apabila kanak-kanak yang telah didera (‘The situation becomes even more tragic when the abused children’). If we were to use the loan word senario instead of the words situasi and keadaan in these examples, the meaning of the sentences would not change. The usage of senario as situasi or keadaan may have to do with the fact that KD lists senario as a synonym for hal (‘matter’) and kejadian (‘event’), among others. The Malay words hal and kejadian are in turn listed as synonyms of situasi and keadaan. In short, senario is potentially a problematic loan word because its main usage and meaning in Malay is different from that of the English word ‘scenario’.

4.1.14 potensi (‘potential’)

The ODE defines ‘potential’ as both an adjective (‘having or showing the capacity to develop into something in the future’) and a mass noun (‘latent qualities or abilities that may be developed and lead to future success or usefulness; and the possibility of something happening or of someone doing something in the future’). The definition in KD for potensi matches the noun description in the ODE whilst berpotensi (lit. ‘has/have potential’) matches the adjective in the ODE but in Malay it is instead described as a kata terbitan (‘derivative word’). This is a similar problem as found with berfungsi earlier in 4.1.11. The difference between the noun potensi and the kata terbitan berpotensi is clear in Malay because of the prefix ber- for berpotensi. In English, however, the noun ‘potential’ and ‘potential’ the adjective share the same form and this may confuse learners.
As this study does not include Malay-affixed loan words, all of the 59 concordance lines in the corpus were examples of the noun *potensi*. These include *potensi berlakunya tanah runtuh* (‘the potential for landslide’), *potensi generasi muda* (‘potential of the young generation’), and *membincangkan potensi bisnis* (‘to discuss business potential’). Nonetheless, a search for *berpotensi* in the corpus found 31 concordance lines for the adjective *berpotensi* (‘potential’), *such as sekumpulan sel yang berpotensi menjadi lebih daripada 200 jenis sel* (‘a group of cells with the ability to become potential 200 cells or more’), *Bukankah pendidikan Bahasa Arab ini suatu industri berpotensi besar?* (‘Isn’t Arabic language education a potential big business?’), and *ASEAN amat berpotensi untuk menjadi salah satu destinasi yang menguntungkan* (‘ASEAN is one of potential profitable destinations’). In short, the analysis found that *potensi* is a potentially problematic loan word. Teachers should highlight the difference in meaning and usage so that learners could connect *potensi* to the noun ‘potential’ and differentiate *berpotensi* – a derivative word with a verbal prefix – from the adjective ‘potential’ or for that matter the noun ‘potential’.

4.1.15 **objektif** (‘objective’)

The definition for *objektif* in KD matches the ODE’s definition for the adjective ‘objective’ (‘of a person or their judgement not influenced by personal feelings or opinions in considering and representing facts; and not dependent on the mind for existence; actual’), as well as the noun ‘objective’ (‘a thing aimed at or sought; a goal’). However, there were only 3 examples from the corpus for *objektif* used with the adjective definition above. These included *tidak ada kriteria yang objektif di dalam tindakan tersebut* (‘there is no objective criterion in that action’), *pembaca yang objektif* (‘an objective reader’) and *berdasarkan penelitian yang objektif* (‘based on an objective observation’). There were also 2 concordance lines in which *objektif* was used with the modifier *secara* (‘in the manner of’) to become an adverbial phrase (‘objectively’). These examples were *beri penilaian secara objektif* (‘give assessment objectively’) and *dapat berfikir secara objektif* (‘can think objectively’). This means that the majority of the concordance lines showed *objektif* used as a noun (‘a thing aimed at or sought; a goal’). These included *objektif pembangunan negara* (‘objective of the country’s development’), *mempunyai objektif yang sama* (‘have a similar
objectives’), mencapai objektif sebenar (‘achieve the real objective’), and mengambil kira tiga objektif (‘taking into consideration three objectives’). Based on the corpus, we can say that the main usage of objektif in Malay has the meaning of the noun ‘objective’ (‘a thing aimed at or a goal’).

Interestingly, there is a definition in KD for objektif which is not found in the ODE. KD defines objektif as a type of examination with questions that present the examinee with several choices and the marks given do not depend on the marker. The ODE does not have this definition but ‘objective test’ is found in the more specialised Oxford Dictionary of Education (Wallace, 2009), which defines it as ‘a means of assessment in which there is no margin for subjectivity, interpretation, or speculation on the part of the assessor or examiner’. This definition matches the one given in KD, except that KD treats objektif as a single noun, whilst in the Dictionary of Education’s entry of ‘objective test’ it is part of a noun phrase. There were no examples of objektif in this sense in the corpus. However, some examples were retrieved from the online Utusan website for education (www.tutor.com.my), such as ujian objektif (‘objective test’), kertas jawapan objektif (‘objective answer sheet’), and soalan objektif (‘objective question’). National school examinations in Malaysia consist of two papers, which are called Kertas 1 (‘Paper 1’) and Kertas 2 (‘Paper 2’). Kertas 1 in the Lower Secondary Assessment contains 60 soalan objektif (lit. ‘60 objective questions’) in multiple-choice format whilst Kertas 2 contains questions which require jawapan subjektif (lit. ‘subjective answer’) in essay format (Sulaiman Masri, 2007: 75). Students and teachers in Malaysia often refer to Kertas 1 as kertas objektif (‘objective paper’) and Kertas 2 as kertas subjektif (‘subjective paper’). Based on the usage of objektif in the Malaysian examination system, it could be said that Malaysian students are also familiar with the adjective sense of objektif in the context of examinations.

In short, based on the corpus and the dictionary definitions, the analysis found that objektif is a potentially problematic loan word. Teachers should highlight the different contexts of use so that learners would be more exposed to the ways in which ‘objective’ is used in English.
4.1.16 *elemen* (‘element’)

The definitions for *elemen* in KD are limited to only some definitions of ‘element’ in the ODE. KD defines *elemen* firstly as *anasir* (‘the four elements of earth, water, air, and fire’), which matches the ODE’s sense 3 for ‘elements’ (‘any of the four substances as the fundamental constituents of the world in ancient and medieval philosophy’). Interestingly, another definition for *anasir* matches the ODE’s definition for ‘element’ (‘usu. with modifier; often ‘elements’, a group of people of a particular kind within a larger group’). The second definition for *elemen* in KD matches the ODE’s sense 1 for ‘elements’ (‘an essential or characteristic part of something abstract’). Finally, the third definition for *elemen* in KD matches sense 2 of ‘element’ in the ODE, which has to do with a chemical substance.

Let us take a closer look at sense 1 in the ODE (‘an essential or characteristic part of something abstract’) and its match in KD’s *sesuatu yang menjadi bahagian dalam sesuatu keseluruhan unsur* (‘something that becomes a part in an overall substance’). We can say that this is not an exact match because there is no reference to ‘essential’ or ‘characteristic’ in the KD’s definition. However, examples from the corpus showed that the ODE definition still applies in that there is a sense of something that is essential being discussed e.g. *salah satu elemen budaya masyarakat Jepun* (‘one of the cultural elements of the Japanese society’), *kesemua elemen di atas boleh dianggap sebagai kunci kepada kejayaan China* (‘all of the elements above can be assumed to be the key to China’s success’), *elemen kestabilan akan terganggu* (‘the element of stability will be disrupted’) and *kerajaan-kerajaan ASEAN mempunyai elemen baru yang kritikal* (‘ASEAN governments have a new critical element’).

We turn now to the main definition of KD for *elemen*, which is *anasir* and the latter’s matching definition in the ODE. Notice that the ODE’s definition states ‘usually with modifier’). This description is not available or provided in KD in its definition of *elemen* as *anasir*. This might encourage Malaysian English language learners to equate *elemen* with *anasir* and less with the general meaning of ‘element’. *Anasir* in Malay often has a negative connotation, referring to an unwanted person or group; hence *anasir* is specifically ‘dissident elements’. KD uses the example *masyarakat*
bandar telah dipengaruhi oleh anasir Barat (‘urban society has been influenced by Western elements’) and berwaspada terhadap tindak-tanduk anasir jahat (‘be wary of the actions of bad elements’). Examples from the corpus with this definition were provokasi dari berbagai elemen (‘provocation from various elements’), mengusir sebarang elemen dalam perisikan tentera yang difikirkan beliau mendatangkan ancaman (‘to drive out any elements within military intelligence that he feels will bring harm’), and terdapat elemen-elemen yang bersimpati dengan pengganas (‘there are elements who sympathise with terrorists’). The negative connotations in the examples above were signalled by the use of the words provokasi (‘provocation’), mengusir (‘to drive out’), and bersimpati dengan pengganas (‘sympathising with terrorists’). Interestingly, in spite of this negative connotation of anasir, it is not referred at all in the KD definition.

Therefore, the analysis found that elemen is a potentially problematic loan word. Firstly, as has been mentioned earlier, learners might equate it directly with anasir and not with the general meaning of ‘element’ in English. Secondly, learners might be confused with the use of ‘elements’ in the plural e.g. ‘positive elements’ and ‘there was no barrier to the elements’. The Malay translation for ‘positive elements’ is elemen-elemen positif but there is no direct translation for ‘elements’ in the sense 4 as defined in the ODE as strong winds, heavy rain, or other kinds of bad weather. Needless to say, there was no example of such usage in the corpus. In short, the use of elemen in Malay is narrower and limited to only certain contexts. This is understandable given that the ODE has a total of 7 senses for ‘element’ whilst KD lists only 3 senses.

4.1.17 fokus (‘focus’)

The definitions for the noun fokus in KD, which are tumpuan perhatian (‘centre or point of attention’) or tumpuan perbincangan (‘centre or point of discussion’) match only one definition for the noun ‘focus’ in the ODE i.e. sense 1 (‘the centre of interest or activity’). Corpus examples of this use were menjadi fokus agensi berita asing (‘become the focus of foreign news agency’), fokus kepada keselamatan negara tidak
boleh dipermainkan (‘focus on the country’s security is not to be joked with’), and fokus sekarang bukan kepada biodiversiti (‘the focus now is not on biodiversity’).

There are several issues which make fokus a potentially problematic loan word. The first issue has to do with redundancy. Some writers used the loan word fokus as if it was not a synonym of its Malay equivalent ‘tumpuan’ (‘focus’). For example, the sentence kita menumpukan fokus kepada sektor pendidikan translated into English is ‘we are focusing our focus on the education sector’. Here the loan word is redundant because its meaning is already expressed by the verb menumpukan. The KD definition for menumpukan is memberikan segenap perhatian, minat, dan lain-lain kepada (‘giving full attention, interest, etc to’). Even the definition for the loan word konsentrasi (‘concentration’) is tumpuan perhatian (lit. ‘focusing of attention’). Sentences such as kita menumpukan fokus kepada sektor pendidikan have been criticised by Malay language enthusiasts for using loan words when a Malay word would suffice. It would not be so confusing if there was another noun that was not simply a synonym of tumpuan (‘focus’), such as perhatian (‘attention’) or fikiran (‘mind’) as in kita menumpukan perhatian kepada sektor pendidikan (‘we are focusing our attention on the education sector’).

The second issue related to fokus is its use as a verb. Malay does not have inflections for tense and number; hence, the equivalent of the singular verb ‘focuses’, the plural ‘focus’, and the past tense ‘focused’ is still fokus. This is an issue because the KIMD translates the verb ‘focus’ as memfokuskan, whereas KD presents the verb as berfokus (‘focused’), memfokuskan (‘focusing on’) and pemfokusan (‘the focusing of’). However, the corpus contains examples in which fokus was used as a verb without these affixes e.g. jika kita fokus pada satu bidang pada satu masa (‘if we focus on one thing at a time’), kita fokus satu-satu isu dulu (‘we focus on each issue first’), tidak boleh fokus untuk melakukan kerja (‘cannot focus to do work’), and ahli-ahli juga fokus untuk turun ke akar-umbi (‘members are focused to return to the grassroots’). There were also 2 examples of berfokus (‘focused’) and 10 of memfokuskan (‘focusing on’) in the corpus. Thus, there is some inconsistency here that might cause problems for learners. Speakers and writers who use fokus as a verb without affixes may be influenced by their knowledge of English. This use of fokus in
Malay is another example of spontaneous borrowing which may or may not gain currency with speakers of Malay.

The third issue is the use of *fokus* as an adjective in Malay, despite the fact that there is no entry for such use in KD. This is perhaps understandable because the ODE also does not have an entry for ‘focused’ as an adjective. However, it is listed in the Oxford Paperback Thesaurus as one of the synonyms for ‘undivided’, alongside ‘absorbed’ and ‘committed’. Examples from the corpus include *selagi ASEAN tidak memutuskan dan kekal tidak fokus mengenai bentuk integrasi* (‘as long as ASEAN does not decide and stays unfocused on the form of integration’), *konsep kepada pengkomputeran teragih ini lebih fokus kepada pemerosesan data* (‘this concept of divided computing is more focused on data processing’), and *mereka lebih fokus iaitu mahu mengejar kejayaan dalam pendidikan* (‘they are more focused which is wanting to pursue success in education’). The analysis therefore found the adjective usage as a broadened usage of the loan word *fokus* in Malay.

4.1.18 *teknik* (‘technique’)

The definitions for *teknik* in KD match only one definition from the ODE for ‘technique’ (‘a way of carrying out a particular task, especially the execution or performance of an artistic work or scientific procedure’). Let us take a look at the KD definitions. Sense 1 for *teknik* is *pengetahuan yang berkaitan dengan pembuatan barang-barang hasil industri seperti jentera, kenderaan, bangunan, dan lain-lain* (‘knowledge related to the making of industrial products such as machinery, transportation, building, and others’) and sense 2 is *kaedah mencipta sesuatu hasil seni dalam muzik, karang-mengarang, dan lain-lain* (‘method to create works of art in music, prose, etc.’). Compared to the ODE’s definition, which is more general, the two senses in KD for *teknik* seem to limit the meaning of ‘technique’ to knowledge of industrial products and the arts despite the use of *dan lain-lain* (‘and others’ or ‘etc.’). Fortunately however, examples from the corpus for *teknik* matched the definition in the ODE more: *Ia diperoleh dengan menggunakan teknik biopsi* (‘It was achieved by using the biopsy technique’), *Apabila kod genetik diubahsuai terutamanya melalui teknik mutasi* (‘When the genetic code is modified especially through the mutation
technique’), *semua teknik pemasaran boleh digunakan* (‘all marketing techniques can be used’), *teknik terkini dalam menentang rasuah* (‘the latest technique to combat bribery’), *teknik penyisatan juga perlu ditingkatkan* (‘investigation technique must also be improved’), *teknik melindungi jantung semasa surgeri* (‘technique to protect the heart during surgery’) and *teknik pemerosesan produk makanan* (‘technique of food product processing’). In addition, all but 5 of the 44 concordance lines from the corpus used *teknik* in a similar way to its English equivalent. In the other 5 concordance lines, *teknik* was used as a noun in Malay when it could be an adjective from the English point of view. However, we can consider the use of *teknik* in the 5 concordance lines as isolated cases because the majority of the corpus evidence showed *teknik* as the equivalent of the noun ‘technique’. This signals that *teknik* is potentially a non-problematic loan word.

Now let us take a look at the adjective ‘technical’, which is a loan word entry in KD as *teknikal*. KD defines *teknikal* as related to the implementation of a particular word, etc; related to a specific field of knowledge. The examples given by KD are *masalah teknikal* (‘technical problem’), *perkataan teknikal* (‘technical word’), and *istilah teknikal* (‘technical terminology’). Amongst the corpus examples showing the adjective usage were *kepakaran teknikal perlu dieksploitasikan semaksimum mungkin* (‘technical expertise should be exploited to the maximum’), *mata pelajaran teknikal* (‘technical subjects’), *pendidikan yang berbentuk teknikal* (‘education which is technical in nature’), *pendekatan yang lebih teknikal harus difikirkan* (‘a more technical approach should be thought of’), *universiti teknikal* (‘technical university’), and *institusi teknikal dan vokasional* (‘technical and vocational institute’). Interestingly, ‘technical’ is not translated as *teknikal* in KIMD. There was, however, an entry for ‘technical college’, which is translated as *maktab/kolej teknik*. In addition, the corpus had examples where the noun *teknik* was used instead of the adjective *teknikal* in *Maktab Teknik* (lit. ‘Technic College’) and *Sekolah Menengah Teknik* (lit. ‘Technic Secondary School’) instead of *Maktab Teknikal* (‘Technical College’) and *Sekolah Menengah Teknikal* (‘Technical Secondary School’). Further searching online showed the usage of the noun *teknik* in technical schools’ names such as *Sekolah Menengah Teknik Kuala Kangsar* in Perak, *Sekolah Menengah Teknik Likas* in Sabah, and *Sekolah Menengah Teknik Shah Alam* in Selangor. It appears that
schools and institutes use the noun *teknik* as an adjective, or to put it in another way, the English adjective ‘technical’ becomes the noun *teknik* in Malay. Interestingly, the adjective *teknikal* is used in *Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka* (‘Technical University Malaysia Melaka’), a university which specialises in engineering and technical subjects. An argument could be made that the use of *teknik* in the names of educational institutions is an innovation or a specialised use, as in ‘polytechnic’, which in Malay is *politeknik*. Nonetheless, highlighting the differences is the objective of this linguistic analysis which ultimately aims to benefit the English language teacher and his/her learner.

The KIMD definition of ‘technical college’ is consistent with the names of the schools and institutes which use *teknik* instead of *teknikal*. However, in the Oxford English-Malay Dictionary (OEMD), ‘technical’ is translated as *teknikal* and ‘technical school’ is translated as *sekolah teknikal*. The usage of *teknik* and *teknikal* is more confusing based on the Kamus Istilah’s translations of specialized terms containing ‘technical’. For example, ‘technical change’ is *perubahan teknik* (lit. ‘change of technique’) instead of *perubahan teknikal*, and ‘technical faults’ is *kesilapan teknikal* (lit. ‘errors which are technical’). Similarly, ‘technical problem’ is *masalah teknik* (lit. ‘problem technique’), ‘technical report’ is *laporan teknik* (lit. ‘report technique’), but ‘technical training’ is *latihan teknikal* (lit. ‘training which is technical’). The corpus showed 2 concordance lines with *masalah teknikal* (‘technical problem’). In fact, all 53 concordance lines for *teknikal* showed it used as an adjective by the writers, similar to its usage in English. The translation of the adjective ‘technical’ into *teknik* in Kamus Istilah proved to be not popular with writers. The Utusan archives produced no results for *masalah teknik* but there are 112 articles which used *masalah teknikal* (‘technical problem’). Furthermore, *laporan teknik* produced no results from the archives but *laporan teknikal* (‘technical reports’) produced 49 articles. These results suggest that the planned loan words have little currency in actual use and newspaper writers have a strong preference for *teknikal* as the adjective form.

Thus far, the analysis found that there is an inconsistency in the use of *teknik* and *teknikal* as a noun and an adjective in Malay. This could certainly create problems for Malaysian learners in understanding the corresponding words in English.
4.1.19 relevan (‘relevant’)

The definition for the adjective relevan in KD matches the definition in the ODE for ‘relevant’ (‘closely connected or appropriate to the matter in hand’). All 47 concordance lines from the corpus showed relevan to mean ‘relevant’. Examples from the corpus include isu itu sudah tidak relevan lagi (‘that issue is no longer relevant’), supaya lebih relevan dengan keperluan semasa sumber manusia (‘so more relevant with the current needs of human resource’), dari sudut itu kontrak sosial tetap relevan (‘from that angle the social contract continues to be relevant’) and teori-teori ekonomi yang mungkin masih relevan (‘economic theories which maybe are still relevant’). A further search for the loan word relevan in the online Utusan archives returned 200 articles which used relevan in the same manner as the adjective ‘relevant’. Based on the corpus and archives evidence, the analysis found that relevan is a potentially non-problematic loan word for learners because of its similar usage and meaning to its corresponding English word.

4.1.20 kompleks (‘complex’)

The definition of kompleks in KD matches only one sense of the adjective ‘complex’ in the ODE, which defines the word as consisting of many different and connected parts; and as not easy to analyse or understand, complicated, and intricate. Examples for this use from the corpus were sebenarnya teknologi satelit sangat kompleks (‘actually satellite technology is very complex’), ayat-ayat yang lebih kompleks (‘sentences which are more complex’), parasit Plasmodium juga mempunyai rangkaian DNA yang lebih kompleks (‘the Plasmodium parasite also have a more complex DNA network’), isu politik Myanmar yang cukup kompleks (‘the political issue of Myanmar which is highly complex’) and kerja-kerja pengurusan air akan menjadi bertambah kompleks (‘works on water management will become more complex’).

In addition, the definition for the noun kompleks in KD also matches sense 1 for the noun ‘complex’ in the ODE (‘a group of similar buildings or facilities on the same site’). KD also has a definition which matches sense 2 for ‘complex’ in the ODE (‘a
related group of repressed or partly repressed emotionally significant ideas which cause psychic conflict leading to abnormal mental states or behaviour; in psychoanalysis field’). Examples from the corpus for sense 1 in the ODE were terbitan kompleks percetakan Al-Malik Fahd di Arab Saudi (‘publication of the printing complex of Al-Malik Fahd in Saudi Arabia’), institut tersebut mempunyai kompleks bangunan baru (‘the institute has a new building complex’), lot letak kereta kompleks beli-belah (‘parking lots of the shopping complex’) and menyelenggarakan kompleks sukan negeri (‘maintaining the state’s sports complex’). Kamus Istilah does list the translations for terms such as kompleks Oedipus (‘Oedipus complex’), kompleks rendah diri (‘inferiority complex’), and kompleks rasa bersalah (‘guilt complex’) and categorised these to be under the field of Psychology. However, there was no example of such usage within the corpus in this study. Therefore, based on the examples from the corpus and the matching dictionary definitions, the analysis found kompleks to be potentially non-problematic for learners.

4.1.21 signifikan (‘significant’)

The ODE’s definitions for the adjective ‘significant’ are sense 1 (‘sufficiently great or important to be worthy of attention, or noteworthy’), sense 2 (‘having a particular meaning, or indicative of something’), and sense 3 (‘relating to or having significance statistically’). The KD’s definitions for the adjective signifikan are bermakna (‘meaningful’) and penting (‘important’), which are essentially synonyms and the Malay equivalents of signifikan. The synonym bermakna can be said to match sense 2 of the ODE for ‘significant’ while penting matches with the ODE’s sense 1. There is no entry in KD for the definition related to statistics. Kamus Istilah, however, lists signifikan (statistik) (‘significant’ in statistics), tahap signifikan (‘significance level’), and tahap signifikan (p) (‘level of significance’ (p)) under the category of Education.

Examples from the corpus were bagaimanapun, tiada kemajuan yang signifikan (‘however, there was no significant progress’), Malaysia juga telah melalui proses transformasi yang sangat signifikan (‘Malaysia has also undergone a transformation process which was very significant’), and sistem ini melibatkan kos pentadbiran yang signifikan (‘this system involves administration costs which are significant’). All of
the examples above would retain their original meaning even if the loan word *signifikan* was replaced with either *bermakna* or *penting*. The analysis found that within the context of using *signifikan* as adjective, learners should be able to make the connection between the loan word and its English equivalent. The corpus showed that 22 out of the 24 concordance lines for *signifikan* were instances of it used as an adjective.

However, a possible problem might arise for learners when the loan word *signifikan* is also the Malay translation for the noun ‘significance’. Malay does not have *kesignifikanan* as a noun. KIMD’s definition for ‘significance’ is *kepentingan* with the circumfix *ke-* attached to the adjective *penting* (‘important’). This means that *kepentingan* is also the Malay equivalent for ‘importance’. There were 2 examples from the corpus in which *signifikan* was used as a noun: *Signifikan dari krisis subprima di AS ialah perubahan dasar monetari* (lit. ‘The significance from the United States’ subprime crisis is the change in monetary policy’) and *Signifikan hubungan ekonomi Malaysia – Jepun menjadi sinergi yang dapat mempercepatkan* (‘The significance of the Malaysia-Japan economic relationship becomes the synergy which accelerates’). Even in Malay the two examples above are difficult to understand but they become clearer in meaning when *signifikan* is replaced with *kepentingan* (‘importance’). It would not be grammatically correct in Malay to have the adjective *penting* at the beginning of those sentences but *kepentingan* is grammatically correct.

A search of the Utusan Archives resulted in several more examples of *signifikan* used as a noun. These included *usaha untuk menyempitkan signifikan peruntukan Perkara 3(1) Perlembagaan* (‘efforts to belittle the significance of the provision of Article 3(1) of the Federal Constitution’), *Apakah signifikan remaja dalam mengawal tabiat berbelanja?* (‘What is the significance of teenagers in controlling spending habits?’) and *Apakah signifikan di sebalik Persidangan Antarabangsa Ketiga Dunia Islam dan Barat ini diadakan?* (‘What is the significance behind the Third International Conference on Islam and the West being held?’). Again, these examples would still be understood if *signifikan* was replaced by *kepentingan*. As this usage of *signifikan* as a noun is not found in KD, KIMD, and OEMD, we could say that it is an example of a
loan word usage from the spontaneous sector. It also suggests that the usage of *signifikan* is broader in Malay compared to its English equivalent, which remains an adjective. This recent use of *signifikan* as a noun may confuse learners when they encounter the noun ‘significance’ and the adjective ‘significant’ and, hence, it is a potentially problematic loan word.

4.1.22 *minoriti* (‘minority’)

The definition for *minoriti* in KD matches only a part of sense 1 in the ODE definition for the noun ‘minority’ (‘a small group of people within a community of country, differing from the main population in race, religion, language, or political persuasion’). The other senses for ‘minority’ in the ODE are not found in KD. These are sense 1 (‘the smaller number or part, especially a number or part representing less than half of the whole’) and sense 2 (‘the state or period of being under the age of full legal responsibility’). KD also does not have the ODE definition which shows ‘minority’ as an attributive noun functioning as an adjective or a modifier, for example ‘minority rights’. In contrast, Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan (KIMD) does list ‘minority’ as an adjective which matches the ODE definition. In short, based on KD’s entries and limited definition for *minoriti*, it has a more narrowed usage and meaning in Malay than its English equivalent ‘minority’. Malay speakers wishing to know the word class of *minoriti* in Malay have to depend on KIMD, and not KD, for its word class and usage.

The lack of information on the usage of *minoriti* as an adjective in KD may confuse students. Nouns used as adjectives (attributive nouns) are found in phrases such as ‘the minority party’, ‘the minority status’, ‘the minority members’, and ‘the minority voters’. In the Malay translation of these examples, however, *minoriti* remains as a noun: *parti minoriti*, *status minoriti*, *ahli minoriti*, and *pengundi minoriti*. We can see this in the example given by KIMD in which it translates ‘minority government’ as *kerajaan minoriti* and identifies it as a noun. It could be confusing for the ESL learners if they were required to locate the adjective in a reading text which has ‘minority’ in an attributive function. Furthermore, this function itself is more common in Malay than the one in which *minoriti* is not an attributive noun. Examples from the
In general, the analysis found that the loan word minoriti is potentially problematic for learners. The definition and word class for minoriti in KD match the ODE’s for ‘minority’ but learners may be confused with the word class issue involving adjectives in English and nouns in Malay. Teachers should highlight the grammatical functions related to ‘minority’ as an attributive noun in English and the different syntax structures of this function in English and Malay.

4.1.23 skop (‘scope’)

The definition for the noun skop in KD matches only one out of the four definitions for the noun ‘scope’ in the ODE. The matching ODE definition is sense 1 (‘the extent of the area or subject matter that something deals with or to which it is relevant’). The other definitions in the ODE which are not in KD are sense 2 (‘the opportunity or possibility to do or deal with something’), sense 3 (‘the length of cable extended when a ship rides at anchor’), and sense 4 (‘the number of terms or arguments affected by an operator such as a quantifier or conjunction’). Also, unlike the ODE, KD does not have an entry for skop as a verb. The ODE defines ‘scope’ as a verb meaning to look at carefully, or to scan. All 18 concordance lines from the corpus showed skop used in a similar way to sense 1 in the ODE.

Examples from the corpus for this meaning were skop pendidikan diperluaskan sehingga tiada sebab kepada masyarakat miskin tegar untuk tidak menyekolahkan
In short, the loan word skop in Malay has a more limited usage compared to ‘scope’ in English. This suggests that skop is a potentially problematic loan word for learners, although it should be noted that senses 3 and 4 in the ODE are somewhat specialised meanings of the English word.

4.1.24 respons (‘response’)

The definitions for the noun respons in KD are sambutan (‘response’), reaksi (‘reaction’), and jawapan (‘answer’). The definitions for the noun ‘response’ in the ODE are sense 1 (‘a verbal or written answer; an answer to a question in a test, a questionnaire, etc.’), and sense 2 (‘a reaction to something; an excitation of a nerve impulse caused by a change or event; a physical reaction to a specific stimulus or situation’). In comparing the definitions between the KD and the ODE, we could say that the definitions for respons match senses 1 and 2 of ‘response’ in the ODE. Examples from the corpus included polis berupaya beri respons dalam masa empat minit untuk setiap laporan (‘the police were able to give a response within four minutes for each report’), ia mendapat respons daripada Perdana Menteri Britain (‘it received a response from the British Prime Minister’), and trend perhatian pihak media ini telah mengundang respons positif (‘the trend of media observation has invited positive response’). All, except for one, of the 17 concordance lines in the corpus showed usage of respons in either sense 1 or sense 2 of the ODE definition.

The loan word respons was used as a verb in that one concordance line: Saya tidak mempunyai pengetahuan yang cukup bagaimana orang lain respons terhadap cabaran-cabaran yang diajukan oleh masyarakat mereka, (‘I don’t have enough knowledge of how others respond to challenges given by their society’). KD does not have an entry for respon or respons as a verb. The sentence was from the text of a speech and it is possible that the speaker was using the English word ‘respond’ but it
was written as *respons*. Another possibility is the speaker personally translated the verb ‘respond’ as the loan word *respon* (‘respond’). The corpus showed 2 concordance lines which contained *respon* but in these cases it was used as a noun.

A further search of the Utusan archives resulted in several examples of *respon* as a verb. These were *Ramai pemilik tanah respon terhadap notis itu* (‘Many land owners responded to the notice’) and *Tan Sri Kasitah Gadam pada mulanya tidak respon kepada permintaan* (‘Tan Sri Kasitah Gadam earlier did not respond to the request’), *mampu respon terhadap permintaan klien* (‘able to respond to the needs of the client’), *tidak akan respon kepada khabar angin* (‘will not respond to rumours’), and *bagaimana Datuk Seri respon kepada soal ini?* (‘How does Datuk Seri respond to this matter?’). A check on KD shows that there is no entry for *respon* (‘respond’) as a verb. This suggests that *respon* could be an example of a loan word created by the spontaneous sector. The analysis found that the usage of the loan word *respons* in the articles was inconsistent in terms of word class and spelling and is potentially problematic for learners.

4.1.25 *fundamental* (‘fundamental’)

The definition of *fundamental* as an adjective in KD matches the adjective ‘fundamental’ in the ODE. There are several senses to this definition in the ODE: sense 1 (‘as a necessary base or core; of central importance’), sense 2 (‘affecting or relating to the crucial point about an issue’), and sense 3 (‘so basic as to be hard to alter, resolve or overcome’). In addition, the ODE defines ‘fundamental’ as a noun with sense 1 (‘a central rule or principle on which something is based - usually ‘fundamentals’’) and sense 2 (‘a fundamental note, tone, or frequency – Music’). This additional definition is not found in KD. The corpus showed only 5 out of 15 concordance lines for *fundamental* in which it was used as an adjective. These included *Asas ini amat penting dan fundamental dalam strategi membangun modal insan yang integratif* (‘These basics are fundamental in the strategy to develop an integrative human capital’), *Ini sangat fundamental* (‘This is very crucial’), and *tiga perubahan fundamental yang telah membentuk pandangan hidup ‘supraetnik’ bangsa*
Melayu (‘three basic changes which have formed the supraethnic Malay race view towards life’).

The other concordance lines showed fundamental used as in the English noun ‘fundamentals’. These included kerajaan membina fundamental yang kukuh untuk memastikan negara berada di landasan yang betul untuk maju (‘the government built strong fundamentals to ensure the country is on the right track to succeed’), Apakah fundamental itu? (‘What are those fundamentals?’) and mewujudkan pasaran subprima yang longgar dan di luar fundamental (‘establishing a loose subprime market and outside of the fundamentals’). Seeing that ‘fundamentals’ is a technical word in this sense, we can refer to Kamus Istilah, where ‘fundamentals’ is defined as asas, which does not match the usage of fundamental in the corpus. Examples from Kamus Istilah are asas aritmetik (‘fundamentals of arithmetic’), asas pengurusan (‘fundamentals of management’), asas muzik (‘fundamentals of music’) and asas perakaunan (‘fundamentals of accounting’). This means that in the following example from the corpus fundamental is redundant: usaha memperkukuh asas dan fundamental ekonomi negara (‘efforts to strengthen the fundamentals and the fundamentals of the country’s economy’). Taking both the definitions of KD and Kamus Istilah, we find that ‘fundamental’ and ‘fundamentals’ are both asas in Malay. Based on these examples, we could say that the usage in Malay for fundamental is narrower than its English equivalent.

4.1.26 definisi (‘definition’)

The noun ‘definition’ in the ODE is defined by sense 1 (‘a statement of the exact meaning of a word, especially in a dictionary; an exact statement or description of the nature, scope, or meaning of something; and the action or process of defining something’) and sense 2 (‘the degree of distinction of distinctness in outline of an object, image or sound’). In KD definisi also has a noun meaning: kenyataan yang ringkas dan padat bagi menjelaskan konsep atau makna sesuatu kata, frasa, dan lain-lain (‘a brief but exact statement to explain the concept or the meaning of a word, phrase, and others’).
In comparing *definisi* and ‘definition’ in the two dictionaries, it appears that the meaning and usage of *definisi* in Malay is limited to sense 1 in the ODE. The corpus provided these examples: *Satu definisi tentang keganasan sehingga sekarang ini masih tidak dipersetujui oleh semua* (‘A definition for terrorism up until now has not been agreed by everyone’), *akta ini secara keseluruhan tidak memberi definisi bahasa kebangsaan* (‘this Act as a whole does not provide a definition to the national language’), and *Tetapi kita perlu mencari definisi yang lebih mendalam* (‘But we have to find a more in-depth definition’). Despite matching only one sense in the ODE, the linguistic analysis found *definisi* to be a potentially non-problematic loan word for learners. Nonetheless, teachers should expose learners to the usage of ‘definition’ within the context of sense 2.

4.1.27 *konvensyen* (‘convention’)

The definitions for *konvensyen* in KD match two of ODE’s definitions for ‘convention’. These are sense 2 (‘an agreement between states covering particular matters, especially one less formal than a treaty’) and sense 3 (‘a large meeting or conference, especially of members of a political party or a particular profession or group; an assembly of the delegates of a political party to select candidates for office; a body set up by agreement to deal with a particular issue; a meeting of Parliament without summons from the sovereign’). The ODE’s sense 1 for ‘convention’ (‘a way in which something is usually done; behavior that is considered acceptable or polite to most members of a society’) is not found in KD. The corpus examples also did not show any usage of *konvensyen* as defined by sense 1 in the ODE. Based on KD’s definitions, we could say that Malay has a narrower usage of *konvensyen* compared to the English ‘convention’.

There were only 10 concordance lines for *konvensyen* in the corpus, none of which referred to sense 1 in the ODE for ‘convention’. These included *Konvensyen Bandaraya Berkembar Melaka baru-baru ini berjaya menarik perhatian umum* (‘The recent Melaka Twin Cities Convention successfully attracted general interest’) and *perlembagaan dan juga Konvensyen Geneva yang dipatuhi oleh semua negara* (‘constitution and also the Geneva Convention which is adhered to by all countries’).
The loan word *konvensyen* also collocated mainly with names of places such as *Pusat Konvensyen Kuala Lumpur* (‘Kuala Lumpur Convention Centre’) and *Pusat Pameran dan Konvensyen Martrade, Kuala Lumpur* (‘Martrade Exhibition and Convention Centre, Kuala Lumpur’). Based on the analysis above, we can say that *konvensyen* in Malay has a narrower usage both in meaning and usage compared to ‘convention’ in English and is a potentially problematic loan word.

4.1.28 *spesifik* (‘specific’)

The ODE defines ‘specific’ as both an adjective and a noun. The adjective ‘specific’ is defined in several senses: sense 1 (‘clearly defined or identified; precise and clear in making statements or issuing instructions; belonging or relating uniquely to a particular subject’), sense 2 (‘relating to species or a species’), sense 3 (‘of a duty or tax levied at a fixed rate per physical unit of the thing taxed, regardless of its price’), and sense 4 (‘of or denoting a number equal to the ration of the value of some property of a given substance to the value of the same property of some other substances used as a reference’). As a noun, the ODE defines ‘specific’ as sense 1 (‘a medicine or remedy effective in treating a particular disease or part of the body – dated usage’) and sense 2 (‘usually ‘specifics’ to mean ‘a precise detail’’). Meanwhile, KD defines *spesifik* as an adjective meaning *khas* (‘special’), *khusus* (‘specific’), and *tertentu* (‘certain someone or something). Corpus examples included pengguna yang lebih spesifik (‘users who are more specific’), angka yang spesifik (lit. ‘an amount that is specific’), and teknik yang lebih spesifik (‘technique which is more specific’). Based on the corpus examples, we could say that the definition for *spesifik* matches only a part of sense 1 of the adjective ‘specific’ in the ODE: belonging or relating uniquely to a particular subject. Out of the 8 concordance lines, 5 showed *spesifik* used in this sense. The other 3 were actually translations of ‘specifically’ e.g. *dengan spesifik* (‘specifically’), *tanpa spesifik menyebut* (‘without specifically mentioning’), and *secara spesifik* (‘specifically’). The words *dengan* (‘with’), *tanpa* (‘without’), and *secara* (‘in a manner of’) acted as modifiers to the words *spesifik* in these examples.
KD does not have any other entry for spesifik, which means that it is a loan word whose usage is narrower than its English original. For instance, 'specific' meaning 'clearly defined', 'precise', 'clear', or 'exact' is not elaborated in KD. On the other hand, the OEMD defines 'specific' as terperinci, tepat, and jitu ('detailed, precise/exact, accurate'). These definitions for 'specific' however are not similar to the Malay definitions given in Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan, which are what KD also uses: khusus, khas, and tertentu. The difference between the KD and Kamus Oxford English-Malay's definition lies in the use of 'specific' as an adjective that means 'a description that is exact and clear' (Collins Cobuild Advanced Learners' English Dictionary). For example, in the sentence 'This report offered the most specific and accurate description of the problem', it would be more correct to translate 'specific' with the OEMD definitions of spesifik i.e. terperinci ('detailed'), tepat ('accurate/exact'), and jitu ('accurate') that with khas ('special'), khusus ('specific'), and tertentu ('certain someone or something) from KD.

Learners need to be careful with spesifik especially because its Malay equivalent matches only part of the definitions provided by the ODE. A narrow usage and function of the loan word compared to its English original might make learners confused when they encounter ‘specific’ in its other definitions and usages. In addition, teachers should also highlight the differences between the adverb ‘specifically’ in English and its realisation in Malay. Despite the limited definition in KD, further searches of the Utusan archives revealed that there were many instances of spesifik meaning ‘detailed’, ‘precise/exact’, and ‘accurate’. This suggests that speakers of Malay use the loan word with a broader meaning than the KD definition suggests. Nevertheless, based on the findings of the analysis, spesifik is considered to be a potentially problematic loan word for learners.

4.1.29 koordinasi (‘coordination’)

The ODE defines ‘coordination’ as a noun with several senses. These are sense 1 (‘the organization of the different elements of a complex body or activity so as to enable them to work together effectively - mass noun’), sense 2 (‘cooperative effort resulting in an effective relationship’), sense 3 (‘the ability to use different parts of the body
together smoothly and efficiently’), and sense 4 (‘the linking of atoms by coordinate bonds – Chemistry’). KD defines koordinasi as saling hubungan yang dapat melicinkan perjalanan sesuatu (‘relationship between each other which makes things run smoothly), jalinan pertalian - tindakan, gerakan, dan sebagainya - antara bahagian-bahagian dan lain-lain (‘a joint relation with each other in action, movement and others’), and penyelarasan (‘coordination’). Since penyelarasan is shorter and more to the point than the other lengthy definitions for ‘coordination’, it is not surprising that another Malay-related dictionary, the OEMD, defines ‘coordination’ as perbuatan menyelaraskan (‘the act of coordinating’). Malaysian university students are familiar with Koordinator Kursus or Penyelaras Kursus (‘Course Coordinators’) and Koordinator Program or Penyelaras Program (‘Program Coordinator’). Based on the definitions, we can say that koordinasi, or its Malay equivalent penyelarasan, matches with all of the senses in the ODE’s definitions for ‘coordination’ except for the more technical sense 4.

However, there were only 3 concordance lines for koordinasi from the corpus. These were lemahnya koordinasi antara agensi kerajaan dan orang awam (‘weak coordination between government agencies and the public’), koordinasi yang baik antara agensi kerajaan difikirkan amat penting (‘a good coordination between government agencies is considered to be important’), and kurangnya koordinasi memartabatkan bahasa kebangsaan (‘lack of coordination to uplift national language’). The usage of koordinasi in these examples referred to sense 1 for ‘coordination’ in the ODE. Thus, the corpus contained very little usage of koordinasi. Even its Malay synonym, penyelarasan, has only 8 concordance lines from the corpus. However, a search of the Utusan archives showed 59 articles which used koordinasi with the same meaning as sense 1. In contrast, there were 200 articles which contained usage of the Malay equivalent penyelarasan. Based on the analysis of the definitions and corpora evidence, this study found koordinasi to be potentially problematic for learners mainly because it is not a familiar loan word.
4.1.30 logik (‘logic’) and logikal (‘logical’)

The ODE defines ‘logical’ as an adjective which means of or according to the rules of logic or formal argument; and characterized by or capable or clear, sound reasoning. Interestingly, there is no entry for logikal in KD. There was only one concordance line from the corpus for logikal: pemikiran Melayu mula bersifat rasional dan menurut Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, bersifat logikal dan saintifik (‘Malay though started to be rational and, according to Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, logical and scientific’). The sentence shows that logikal was used as an adjective describing the subject pemikiran Melayu (‘Malay thought’). Also, a search of Utusan archives for logikal resulted in 13 articles with examples such as universiti telah menjadi pilihan yang logikal (‘the university has become a logical choice’), Disember 2006 atau Januari 2007 akan merupakan tarikh akhir yang logikal (‘December 2006 or January 2007 will be the logical deadline), and kerajaan percaya bahawa pembangunan kapasiti adalah satu cara logikal (‘the Government believes that capacity development is a logical step). The loan word logikal functioned as an adjective in all of these examples. The lack of articles containing logikal in the corpus and in the Utusan archives could mean that this loan word is not popular among writers.

The loan word logik (‘logic’), however, has an entry in KD and it is defined in several senses. Logik in sense 1 is sains yg berkaitan dgn prinsip yg membolehkan pemikiran dan penaakulan dibuat secara teratur dan bersistem (‘a science that is related to the principle which allows for thinking and rationalization in an organized and systematic manner’); ilmu tentang cara berfikir, atau kaedah berfikir (‘skill or method of thinking’), ilmu mantik (‘logic’); and sense 2 dapat diterima oleh akal, masuk di akal, munasabah (‘can be accepted by the mind, what seems reasonable, correct reasoning’). If we look at sense 2 for logik, we could say that its definition matches the definition for ‘logical’. Based on these matching definitions, we could say that the English words ‘logic’ (noun) and ‘logical’ (adjective) are both realised as logik in Malay. Consequently, the Malay translation for ‘illogical’ is tidak or tak logik, and ‘logically’ is secara logik. The translation of ‘logical’ as logik is consistent and also found in the OEMD which translates ‘a logical argument’ as hujah logik, ‘the logical outcome’ as hasil munasabah, and ‘a logical mind’ as fikiran logik. Further search on
the Utusan archives for the Malay logik included *mana yang lebih baik dan logik antara agama Islam dan agama lain* (‘which is better and logical between Islam and other religions’), *Kenaikan saham TNB adalah logik* (‘The increase in TNB’s stocks is logical’), and *Jika majikan mengutamakan keperluan bahasa Inggeris mungkin lebih logik kerana bahasa Inggeris merupakan lingua franca* (‘If the employer gives a priority to English it is more logical because English is a lingua franca’). Similarly, a search for ‘logical’ in Kamus Istilah resulted in 75 *istilah* (technical terms) translated from their English originals which contain the adjective ‘logical’. For example, *analisis logik* (‘logical analysis’), *kalkulus logik* (‘logical calculus’), and *litar logik* (‘logical circuit’). Finally, a search for ‘logic’ in Kamus Istilah resulted in 152 *istilah* containing the noun ‘logic’. They include *logik analisis* (‘analytic logic’), *logik gunaan* (‘applied logic’), *logik epistemologi* (‘epistemological logic’), and *logik kabur* (‘fuzzy logic’).

Thus far, the analysis found the concerns related to *logik/logikal - logik* (‘logic/logical - logic’) are similar to those related to *teknik/teknikal – teknik* (‘technique/technical – technique’) in section 4.1.18 earlier. We recall that the analysis found the adjective ‘technical’ when translated into Malay becomes the noun *teknik* (‘technique’).

In short, *logik* is a potentially problematic loan word for learners. In addition, learners also need to be careful with *logikal* (‘logical’) and the English noun ‘logic’ because of the possible confusion that learners might face when attempting to connect these words to their usages in Malay.

### 4.2 Classification of the loan words

To summarize, the objective of the linguistic analysis was to investigate the learning burden of each loan word. For the learner to make the connection between the loan word and its English equivalent, that loan word needs to be as close as possible in meaning and usage to its English equivalent. In other words, loan words which are potentially non-problematic would be easier to use with learners. This does not suggest, though, that the potentially problematic loan words have no merit. It only means that teachers need to highlight for learners the differences between the loan words and their English equivalents. Next, we describe the conditions in which a loan
word is potentially problematic for learners. Table 4.1 shows the classification of the loan words according to whether they are potentially or non-potentially problematic.

**Table 4.1 Classification of the loan words based on the linguistic analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan words</th>
<th>Potentially problematic</th>
<th>potentially non-problematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narrowed meaning</td>
<td>broadened meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>relevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>respons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu</td>
<td>teknik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>logik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konvensyen</td>
<td>objektif</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isu</td>
<td>signifikan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spesifik</td>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the linguistic analysis, a loan word is potentially problematic if it fits into any of the criteria outlined below. Note that these are similar to the criteria earlier mentioned in Chapter 3, p.83 on what is potentially problematic.

### 4.2.1 Loan words have narrower meaning and usage in Malay

The loan words which have a narrower definition and usage in Malay do not hold the advantage of lessening the learning burden of their English counterparts. In fact, the learning burden for these words may be considerably heavier than for the non-problematic loan words. Loan words such as *isu* (‘issue’), *faktor* (‘factor’), *individu* (‘individual’), *elemen* (‘element’), and *potensi* (‘potential’) are used in a limited sense in Malay. This means that only the core meanings and a single word class are borrowed into Malay. Malay speakers familiar with these loan words may not be familiar with the other meanings and word classes which the English equivalents have. For example, learners may be very familiar with *isu* as a noun and be able to connect it to the noun ‘issue’ but not the verb because the latter function does not exist in Malay.
4.2.2 Loan words have broadened meaning and usage in Malay

Another condition in which a loan word may potentially be problematic is when its meanings and usages are broadened in Malay. This refers to loan words such as *akademik* (‘academic’), *fokus* (‘fokus’), *senario* (‘scenario’), *teknik* (‘technique’), and *logik* (‘logic’). These are loan words which have gained other meanings and word classes in the Malay context. Learners may bring these broadened meanings into their interpretation of English texts. This would not be to their advantage in learning English.

4.2.3 Loan words have conflicting description and usage in Malay-related publications

In addition, the analysis found that loan words which have conflicting descriptions and usage in Malay-related publications (e.g. dictionaries and newspapers) may confuse learners. This refers to loan words such as *relevan* (‘relevant’), *fundamental* (‘fundamentals’), and *respons* (‘response’). Of particular concern is the use of loan words in the same sentence as their Malay equivalents or synonyms. It suggests that the loan words have a different meaning than their equivalents or synonyms. This does not encourage speakers of Malay to become familiar with the loan words and identify them with their Malay equivalents. In fact, it encourages learners to view the loan words as English words in Malay.

4.3 Summary

This chapter has presented a description of the linguistic analysis of the loan words and the results of that analysis. In order to limit the scope of the analysis, only the loan words which were tested in the vocabulary tasks in Phase 2 of the study have been presented here. The Utusan corpus was designed specifically to represent semi-academic articles published in the Malay print media. Subsequently, the corpus and the dictionaries were used as the main tools in the linguistic analysis of the loan words. The analysis found that the loan words could be classified into two categories: (a) potentially non-problematic i.e. less learning burden for learners, and (b) potentially problematic i.e. more learning burden for learners.
Based on the linguistic analysis, 23 potentially problematic loan words and 6 potentially non-problematic loan words were selected to test the validity of the analysis. For this purpose, two elicitation tasks were developed and the results are presented in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 5  STUDENTS’ ATTITUDES TO THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND ENGLISH LOAN WORDS

5.0  Overview

This chapter reports on the results of the survey of attitudes among the 101 student participants at Universiti Malaysia Sabah to English loan words in Malay and to the roles of English and Malay in Malaysian education and society. The main instrument was the 20-item questionnaire, with other data provided by follow-up interviews with focus groups.

The chapter begins with a detailed analysis of the questionnaire results for the whole group of 101 participants, with the items grouped under particular topics. The topics are:

1) Effects of English loan words on Malay (Q1, Q5, Q15, Q16, Q18, Q19);
2) Personal perspectives on borrowing (Q6, Q11, Q17);
3) English use in universities (Q2, Q9, Q13);
4) English in business and employment (Q3, Q10, Q12, Q20);
5) English in the media (Q7, Q14); and
6) English use among Malaysians (Q4, Q8).

The topics will be analysed separately in the initial presentation of the results for the whole group. In the ensuing sections, the attitudes of the students will be analysed according to their ethnicity and their degree program. In order to simplify these analyses, the items will be grouped a little differently into three subscales: ‘English loan words in Malay’, ‘English and Malaysian education’, and ‘English and society in Malaysia’. Extracts from the focus group interviews about items in the questionnaire will be included where necessary in the analysis by ethnic group and degree program. The final section of the chapter will summarise the main findings of the language attitude survey.

The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the whole questionnaire (20 items) is 0.709, indicating acceptable internal reliability (Dornyei, 2003: 112). The subscales,
however, had somewhat lower alpha coefficients: English and the Malaysian education system (0.612), English and society (0.555), and English loan words in Malay (0.726).

5.1 Overall analysis: responses and patterns from all participants

Table 5.1 presents the descriptive statistics for the participants’ responses to all the items in the questionnaire, including the means, standard deviations, and individual response frequencies. Each item is marked with the symbol ‘+’ or ‘-’, indicating whether the statement is favourable or unfavourable towards English and/or English loan words. Items with the ‘+’ symbol were scored from 6 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). In contrast, items marked with the symbol ‘-’ were reverse-scored i.e. 1 indicating ‘Strongly Agree’ and 6 indicating ‘Strongly Disagree’. Thus, the higher the mean score is, the more favourable the attitude towards English.

We will now look at the questionnaire items in groups according to the six topics listed above. Table 5.2 presents the items related to the first topic, Effects of English loan words on Malay. The items are ranked in order of the mean response, from those that express the most favourable attitude to English down to those that express that are least favourable.

Table 5.2: Effects of English loan words on Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>+ M is lucky it can easily adapt E into its vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>+ ELWs help to enrich the M vocabulary.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1+</td>
<td>- Borrowing words from E is an acceptable way for M to stay up to date.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5+</td>
<td>- M needs to borrow words from E to become modern.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15-</td>
<td>- The more borrowing from E increases, the lower the value of M.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16-</td>
<td>- M needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from E.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the mean values were clustered around the middle of the scale, indicating that the students as a whole did not have strongly positive or negative attitudes
towards borrowing. On the other hand, the relatively large standard deviations for a number of the items show that the students varied quite a lot in their responses.
Table 5.1: Overall descriptive statistics for all the questionnaire items (n=101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Sl A</th>
<th>Sl D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SDis</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1+ Borrowing words from E is an acceptable way for M to stay up to date.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2- Private univs in Msia should use M as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3+ E is important for govt servants' promotion in the public sector.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- Msians who use E more than M are show offs.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5+ M needs to borrow words from E to become modern.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6+ ELW add an air of sophistication to my writing.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7+ The media plays a big role in introducing ELW to the public.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8- A M speaker is arrogant if she/he uses E to speak with another M speaker.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9+ Lectures &amp; tutorials in Sci &amp; Tech faculties should be in E.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10+ It's natural that private sector requires fluency in E as promotion criteria.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11+ Using ELW in my writing means M still lacks a formal academic style.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12- Foreign business offices in Msia should use M.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13+ Public univs should use E as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14- Msia should decrease TV shows which are in E.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15- The more borrowing from E increases, the lower the value of M.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16- M needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from E.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17+ Journal articles written in M are easier to understand if they contain many ELWs</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18+ M is lucky it can easily adapt E into its vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19+ ELWs help to enrich the M vocabulary.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20+ Msian public univs graduates should have good E proficiency skills.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD= Standard Deviation, SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, Sl A=Slightly Agree, Sl D=Slightly Disagree, D=Disagree, SDis=Strongly Disagree, NR= No Response.

Note: Strongly Agree = 6, Strongly Disagree = 1. (Reversed items: Strongly Agree = 1, Strongly Disagree = 6)
The item that had the highest mean response was Q18, which refers to the ease with which English loan words can be incorporated into Malay. It should be noted that this mean is at just the “Slightly agree” point on the response scale and so it does not represent a highly favourable attitude. The other items which indicate a modestly positive attitude are Q19 and Q1, which both refer to role of English loan words in modernizing and enriching the vocabulary of Malay. These three items show that the students overall were willing to accept that loan words from English could make an acceptable contribution to the development of the Malay language.

Q5, Q15 and Q16 are items which reflect slightly less favourable attitudes to English, in the sense that they involve criticisms of Malay. Q5, which suggests that loan words are needed for Malay to become modern, is somewhat similar to Q1 and Q19, but this item was phrased in a way that was less acceptable to the students. Q19 obtained a lower mean, which denotes that the statement did not receive much support from the participants. Data from item Q19 are consistent with those from items Q5, Q15 and Q16, which showed an unfavourable attitude towards the presence of English loan words in Malay. The results exhibited the similar pattern of a cautious response to the statement on the part of the participants.

In short, data from items in Table 5.2 provide evidence that the majority of participants paid attention to the words in the items which hinted at the relationship of power and status between English and Malay. This was first signalled by the clear show of agreement with item Q16 (Malay needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from English). A pattern of measured and careful responses, nonetheless, followed for the other items. This type of response was expected particularly because the items in this set were designed to provoke an emotional response from the participants. However, it was only item Q16 that elicited this kind of response, indicating that the participants took a pragmatic attitude towards the effects of English loan words on Malay. Next we look at the items on Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3** Personal perspectives on borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17+</td>
<td>Journal articles written in M are easier to understand if they contain many ELWs.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6+</td>
<td>ELW add an air of sophistication to my writing.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11+</td>
<td>Using ELW in my writing means M still lacks a formal academic style.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three items in Table 5.3 are clustered right around the centre point of the response scale. These items relate to the students’ own experience with the loan words in their reading and writing. In all three cases, at least 50 of the students chose the neutral responses in the middle of the scale, Slightly Agree or Slightly Agree. Perhaps the students had not really thought about how the presence of loan words might affect their reading and writing activities and so they were not sure whether to agree or disagree with each of these statements. It is interesting to note that the critical comment in Q11 about Malay lacking a formal style did not produce noticeably more disagreeing responses than the other two items did. We turn next to Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4: English use in universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2-</td>
<td>Private univs in Msia should use M as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9+</td>
<td>Lectures &amp; tutorials in Sci &amp; Tech faculties should be in E.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13+</td>
<td>Public univs should use E as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses for items in the group ‘English use in universities’ show a marked difference from responses to items in the two groups analysed earlier. All three items received quite strong responses, particularly items Q9 and Q13. The following paragraphs further explain these responses.

The mean for item Q2 shows the majority of the participants (n=43) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. It had the largest standard deviation (1.55) and the lowest mean (3.13) for this cluster of items. Item Q2, a statement negative towards English, was designed to stir strong reactions amongst the participants, given that it asked public university students whether private university students should also use Malay as their medium of instruction. Further investigation later on in this chapter will reveal which variable caused the large standard deviation for item Q2. The fact that the majority of the participants showed at least some agreement with item Q2 suggests that they were aware of the debate on the quality of public vs. private university graduates, which often favours the latter in terms of employability. At present English is the medium of instruction for private universities in Malaysia and is very likely to stay that way. We will look at item Q2 in more detail in the presentation of data results based on the variables ethnicity and degree program.
Item Q9, with a mean of 4.63, revealed the strongest indication that the participants in the study had favourable attitudes towards English, particularly in regards to their own university studies. The results also reflect the make-up of the group of participants for this study, which contained more students in the Science degree program (n=45) compared to those in Humanities (n=34) and Business (n=22).

The final item in this group had responses which make for interesting interpretation. Results for item Q13 were consistent with item Q9, which also elicited a favourable attitude towards English. The majority of participants supported the idea of English becoming the medium of instruction in public universities. The results for item Q13 contrasted with those of item Q2, in which the participants favoured Malay to be the medium of instruction for private universities. The results of item Q13, again, suggest that students in public universities are aware, at least where English is concerned, that they lag behind their counterparts in the private universities. It is possible that the participants could have viewed item Q2 as a “we vs. they” situation in light of the present language policy for tertiary institutions in Malaysia which allows English as the medium of instruction only for private colleges and universities. To sum up, results for items Q9 and Q13, but not item Q2, showed surprisingly good support for the use of English in universities. Next, we look at Table 5.5.

Table 5.5: English in business and employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3+</td>
<td>E is important for govt servants' promotion in the public sector.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10+</td>
<td>It’s natural that private sector requires fluency in E as promotion criteria.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12-</td>
<td>Foreign business offices in Msia should use M.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20+</td>
<td>Msian public univ graduates should have good E proficiency skills.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 5.5 followed the positive pattern seen in Table 5.4. The majority of participants responded with clear support for items Q3, Q10 and Q12. The only item with less support was item Q12, which incidentally was a statement negative towards English. The following paragraphs further explain these responses.

The high mean (4.69) for item Q3 and the large numbers of participants at the ‘Strongly Agree’ – ‘Agree’ end of the scale show a very positive attitude towards the statement. This
indicates that participants largely agreed that good English proficiency was an asset to their future career.

Similarly, the majority of participants (n=74) agreed with the statement in item Q10. These results indicate that public university students are aware that the public and private sectors have different sets of language requirements and demands of a university graduate. The fact that the participants recognized the importance English plays in job promotions within the private sector, and even in the public sector, suggests their pragmatic attitude as regards the realities of workplaces.

In contrast to items Q3 and Q10, item Q12 is a statement negative towards English and was intended to gauge how far would the participants go with loyalty to the national language. The majority of the participants (n=45) appeared to be non-committal about it and the variation in responses was shown by a large standard deviation of 1.46. We will look at item Q12 in more detail in the presentation of data results based on the variables ethnicity and degree program. At present, the results for item Q12 were similar to the earlier pattern of careful responses, quite likely due to the reference to the relative status for English and Malay in the statement.

Item Q20 obtained similar results to items Q3 and Q10, which showed positive attitudes towards English. The responses to these items revealed evidence of a pragmatic outlook the participants had towards English in relation to their profile as university students and the role English would play in their future careers.

To sum up, a positive attitude could be seen for items in this group which were clear of any reference to power and status between English and Malay. A cautious response was apparent only in item Q12, which promoted Malay over English as the language of business and trade. We turn now to Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: English in the media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7+</td>
<td>The media plays a big role in introducing ELW to the public.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14-</td>
<td>Msia should decrease TV shows which are in E.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high mean for item Q7 indicated that participants largely agreed with the statement. The results indicate that participants were aware that they were most likely to encounter English
loan words in the media. The results are consistent with the fact that the principal source for the Malay Corpus of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka was newspaper articles rather than books (Rusli et al, 2004: 9).

Item Q14 is a statement of opinion which was unfavourable towards English and was designed to gauge loyalty to Malay. Interestingly it did not receive much support overall. Only a small number of participants (n=7) agreed with the statement while a large majority (n=72) disagreed. The results suggest a pragmatic attitude on the part of the participants. The result for item Q14 is understandable, given that radio and television programs in Malaysia are streamed by language. This means that listeners and viewers have a choice of which channel or program to access according to their language preferences. The present language arrangement within print and non-print media in Malaysia presents no threat to the national language, which helps to explain this pragmatic outlook. Hence, unlike items Q1, Q5, Q6 and Q11 in which the statements present situations where Malay and English could be seen as in competition with each other, the absence of such a situation encouraged the participants to give a more straightforward response.

To sum up, results from items in this group further confirmed the earlier pattern of giving cautious responses for items which highlighted the relationship of power and status between English and Malay. It is clear that items without such reference received more unreserved responses from the participants, particularly if the statement suggested no threat to Malay as the primary language of Malaysia. Next, the final data set from the overall analysis is seen on Table 5.7.

**Table 5.7: English use among Malaysians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Msians who use E more are show offs.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>A M speaker is arrogant if she/he uses E to speak to another M speaker.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items on Table 5.7 had to do with aspects of English use among Malaysians. Both items were worded to be negative statements towards English and both clearly received only limited support from the participants.
The high mean for item Q4 showed that the majority (n=53) of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Most of the rest (n=40) chose the neutral middle points of the scale. It should be noted that this item used the term “Malaysians”, referring to national identity. On the other hand, item Q8 used the term “Malay speaker”, which could be interpreted to mean ethnic Malays, but also covers other Malaysians who are proficient in the language. In fact, item Q8 had the same mean as Q4 and a similar pattern of responses overall. This again is evidence of the pragmatic attitude of the participants. They took a liberal view about the personal language choices of individual speakers in multilingual Malaysian society, as distinct from the formal requirements of the national language policy, which gives precedence to Malay. This applies not only to private conversations but also more public occasions. For example, at formal and high level meetings at public universities the opening speech will be in Malay and, as the meeting progresses, the discussions will almost always be carried out in Malay and English. The results were also consistent with the positive attitude towards use of English in universities, business and employment. Next, we take a look at the re-analysis of the subscales by ethnicity and degree programs.

5.2 Re-analysis of the subscales by ethnicity and degree program

The responses to the questionnaire from the whole sample of students revealed some interesting patterns, but it was also necessary to investigate whether there were differences in attitudes among the participants according to their ethnicity and their degree program. For this purpose, the sample was divided by ethnicity into bumiputera (n=70) and non-bumiputera (n=31) groups; and by degree program into students who were enrolled in Humanities (n=34), Science (n=45) and Business (n=22).

In addition, in order to simplify the re-analysis and reveal broader patterns of response, the six subscales used in the previous section were collapsed into three: Loan words and borrowing, English use in universities, and English and society. We will look at each of the new subscales in turn and test whether there were the expected differences by ethnicity and degree program. The presentation of the results also includes some selected extracts from the interviews with participants, to help gain a better understanding of the questionnaire responses.
5.2.1 Loan words and borrowing

5.2.1.1 Results by ethnicity

As shown in Table 5.8, the first subscale combined Tables 5.2 and 5.3. It also included Q7, which was previously part of the ‘English in the media’ subscale. Thus all of the questionnaire items related to loan words and borrowings were brought together in one scale. The table shows the mean responses for each item by bumiputera and non-bumiputera students separately.

Table 5.8: English loan words subscale by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Bumi</th>
<th>non-Bumi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English loan words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1+ Borrowing words from E is an acceptable way for M to stay up to date.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5+ M needs to borrow words from E to become modern.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6+ ELW add an air of sophistication to my writing.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7+ The media plays a big role in introducing ELW to the public.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11+ Using ELW in my writing means M still lacks a formal academic style.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15- The more borrowing from E increases, the lower the value of M.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16- M needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from E.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17+ Journal articles written in M are easier to understand if they contain many ELWs.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18+ M is lucky it can easily adapt E into its vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19+ ELWs help to enrich the M vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 36.83 | 12.83 | 34.14 | 12.06 |

An Independent-Sample T-tests revealed that the mean response for the bumiputera students (36.84) was higher than that for the non-bumiputera students (33.39), and that the difference was statistically significant ($t = 2.226$, df = 99, $p = 0.02$). The effect size was found to be small ($r=0.22$). This showed that overall the bumiputera students had more favourable attitudes towards English loan words and borrowing than the other students did.
When we look at the individual questionnaire items, we can see the mean scores for the bumiputera students were higher in each case, except for Q11 and Q16. For Q11, the means for the two groups were in the middle of the response scale, with the bumiputera students slightly disagreeing overall and the non-bumiputera students slightly agreeing. It is understandable that as native speakers of Malay the bumiputera students did not want to criticize their language for lacking a formal style. It should be noted, though, that the standard deviation for this item was relatively high, which shows that they had a range of opinions on this issue among themselves. Q16 was about controlling the number of loan words borrowed from English. Both groups definitely agreed with this statement, so that, with the reverse scoring, the means for the two groups were low. In fact they were the lowest means for the whole questionnaire. It was to be expected that the bumiputera group felt more strongly about this matter than the non-bumiputera group did.

The items which produced the biggest differences between the means of the two groups of students were Q7, Q18 and Q5. Q7 was about the role of the media in promoting English loan words and it was the item that produced the highest mean score for the bumiputera group. Their mean was almost a whole step higher on the response scale than the mean for the non-bumiputera. This is understandable in the sense that bumiputera students would typically read better in Malay and would be more inclined to buy Malay newspapers, as well as accessing other Malay media such as television and radio. As a result, compared to non-bumiputera participants, they would be more exposed to the English loan words from the Malay media and thus in a better position to express an opinion about it.

In response to Q18, it appears that the bumiputera students responded in a pragmatic way to this item, just as they did to Q19, giving a positive attitude to the use of English loan words in Malay, in contrast to Q16. On the other hand, in Q5 they disagreed with the idea that Malay needed to borrow the loan words in order to be a modern language. Interestingly the non-bumiputera participants had lower mean scores than the bumiputera group for both Q18 and Q5.

In order to understand why non-bumiputera students would have negative attitudes towards English loan words, we can turn to data from the focus group interviews. In the interviews, the three non-bumiputera students expressed frustration or irritation because English loan words caused them some difficulties with their studies. This could be seen from the comment by Participant 47 (P47), a Humanities major:
P47: Because sometimes if they change to the Malay word, like ...difficult to understand, ... if English means easy to understand. Because sometimes the terms, we know in the English, so we cannot ...able to understand in Malay. ...for example, like the scientific term as I know like ‘dehydration’. Because I remember last semester, because actually we study in English, so suddenly he gave in the Malay one, so...I think the journal, so if like that, we can’t remember in English, so if we asked in the Malay means suddenly cannot.

R: So, is penyahhidratan (‘dehydration’) difficult?

P47: Emmm...not difficult but like.. if ‘dehydration’ means we know, because since like Form 6 we studied in English. Suddenly they asked in Malay means we also take time to think.

As pointed out by P47, the loan words were not the problem per se but, because she was already familiar with the English term ‘dehydration’, it took her longer to figure out what penyahhidratan meant.

Participant 77 (P77), who was a Science major, gave the same reason of familiarity with English terms as a reason they did not accept English loan words in Malay:

R: If you’re familiar with ‘website’, would you understand laman web (‘website’)?

P77: Yes.

R: Laman sawang (literally ‘place web’)

P77: No.

R: Why not?

P77: For me more difficult to understand.

The official translation for ‘website’ is laman web (Kamus Dewan, 4th ed., 2007) but Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka also recognises laman sawang and laman sesawang. On the other hand, the Istilah Komputer Sains (Computer Science Terminology) lists ‘website’ as tapak web (literally ‘site web’). The various types of translation understandably confuse particularly participants who were already very familiar with the term ‘website’ or the original English word.
This problem of multiple terms in Malay for the English word was discussed in Chapter 2 as one of the problems which resulted from the process of Malay vocabulary expansion. Participant 79 (P79), who was a Science major, further explained this:

*P79: Because our studies maybe...In Geology they mostly using English, suddenly if refer to Malay we don’t know some of the terms in Malay. And English, if they are using loan word or English words, that’s better to understand...easier to understand.*

All three non-*bumiputera* participants highlighted English terms in their fields of study which they found difficult in Malay. They were in fact talking about the technical loan words and not the general loan words which are in the everyday Malay vocabulary. Note that the questionnaire did not differentiate between the two types of loan word, so the non-*bumiputera* participants were simply responding based on their experience with the technical loan words. They found the technical loan words were more of a hindrance instead of help. This can be seen in the interview extracts with P47 (who referred to the general loan words as ‘normal words’) and P79:

*R: How about loan words like sektor (‘sector’), elemen (‘element’), kolaborasi (‘collaboration’), signifikan (‘significant’)? Are these helpful?*

*P47: I think the normal word okay, and it would help, but the scientific terms would be confusing. Because last time he gave, he teach in Malay and the assignment also in Malay, so suddenly he...like the ‘catenation’ but in Malay he give like mengkatanetkan I think. So I confused, my friend also thinking where he founded this kind of word.*

*R: But if it’s more familiar like the English word?*

*P79: Can understand. But if it’s totally in Malay like laman sawang (literally ‘place web’), I can’t understand.*

*R: So loan words which are closer in form to their English original are easier to understand and basically help?*

*P79: Yes.*
It would seem that, to the non-bumiputera participants, it was better to use the more familiar English word if the technical loan word was only going to take more of their time before they could understand or use it.

Interestingly, one bumiputera participant who was a Science major, (P78) agreed with the non-bumiputera participants as regards technical loan words:

*R: As a Science major, would you agree that scientific terms that are loan words in Malay are difficult and confusing compared to non-scientific terms?*

*P78: Sometimes like ‘dehydration’ and penyahhidratan (‘dehydration’), they do make us feel like confused.*

*R: So would you say the loan words which didn’t look similar to its original aren’t helpful?*

*P78: Yes, those that change a lot don’t help; in fact they made us more confused.*

P78 agreed that as a Science major the technical loan words in Malay were not helpful because they do not resemble English much. This is an accurate description of the technical loan word form in Malay. One of the most distinctive features that differentiate a general loan word and a technical loan word in Malay is the tendency for the latter to be quite removed from the English source form.

The bumiputera interview participants had a variety of other reasons for not accepting the English loan words. One of these reasons was the nationalist sentiment, as can be seen in the interview extract with Participants 4 (P4), 39 (P39) and 80 (P80), all Humanities majors:

*P4: Because if we too depend to the loan words then we will forget our Malay words.*

*R: So, it’s not about...so it’s really about like national, nationalism or spirit of loving Malay as our national language?*

*P4: Yes.*

*P39: Because, first, it is detrimental to the real Malay. And then...because these loan words aren’t suitable...no, not suitable is not it. Not accurate.*
P80: I rather that Malay...let it have its own word so we don’t need to...We can also enrich our language. No need to borrow.

R: You don’t really agree...do you feel the loan word will make people more confused? To you it’s not really about confusing, right?

P80: If we...Malay...there’s no need to borrow, right. Use our own words. At least Malay is preserved.

R: Your reason is more to preservation of Malay?

P80: Yes.

One bumiputera participant, however, believed that the English loan words were helpful as long as one already has some knowledge of the English word. According to Participant 51 (P51), who was a Business major:

P51: Because sometimes in Malay it is difficult to capture the exact meaning of the word. But if it’s an English loan word then the meaning is immediately accurate.

P51 however cautioned that the English loan words would be helpful only if the person already had an idea of what the original English word meant:

P51: If we already know the meaning then it’s easier because the meaning is exact. But in certain parts, if we don’t know then it’s even worse. ... For example, kolaborasi (‘collaboration’), if we have to explain in Malay, we have to use lengthy sentences, but if we said kolaborasi, if we wrote kolaborasi, if people already understand that word, then it’s easier to capture the meaning.

P51 basically said that the benefit of the English loan word was its brevity over the lengthy Malay equivalent. He stressed however that the user had to already understand, or at least be familiar with, the word for the English loan word to be of use. The subject of ‘familiarity’ is consistent with what was said earlier by the non-bumiputera participants in their interviews.

Thus, both groups had reservations about the use of English loan words in Malay and the value of knowing these words for their studies. The results of the focus interviews are helpful
in explaining why the non-bumiputera students expressed less positive attitudes overall towards the loan words than bumiputera students did.

5.2.1.2 Results by degree program

Table 5.9 shows the mean responses for each item in the ‘English loan words’ subscale according to the participants’ degree program: Humanities, Science and Business.

Table 5.9: English loan words subscale by degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Hum Mean</th>
<th>Hum SD</th>
<th>Science Mean</th>
<th>Science SD</th>
<th>Business Mean</th>
<th>Business SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1+ Borrowing words from E is an acceptable way for M to stay up to date.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5+ M needs to borrow words from E to become modern.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6+ ELW add an air of sophistication to my writing.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7+ The media plays a big role in introducing ELW to the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11+ Using ELW in my writing means M still lacks a formal academic style.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15- The more borrowing from E increases, the lower the value of M.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16- M needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from E.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17+ Journal articles written in M are easier to understand if they contain many ELWs.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18+ M is lucky it can easily adapt E into its vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19+ ELWs help to enrich the M vocabulary.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA confirmed that the mean responses for the three groups for this subscale were quite similar: Humanities, 36.68, Science, 35.44, and Business, 35.09, and that the differences were not significant ($F = .393$, df 2, 98, $p = .676$). This showed that overall attitudes to English loan words did not vary on the basis of the students’ field of study.

Given the problems that interview participants had with technical loan words, as discussed above, it might be expected that Science students would respond differently to some of the
questionnaire items about borrowing, as compared to the Humanities and Business students. However, there was no clear pattern of difference in the way that participants in the three degree programs responded to individual items on this subscale.

Further analyses (not reported in detail here) showed that within each of the three programs, there were no significant differences between bumiputera and non-bumiputera students on the subscale.

5.2.2 English use in universities

5.2.2.1 Results by ethnicity

As shown in Table 5.10, the second subscale was the same as in the original analysis, except that Q20, about the need for public university graduates to have good proficiency in English, was added. This item was previously included in the ‘English in business and employment’ subscale. The table shows the mean responses for each item by bumiputera and non-bumiputera students separately.

Table 5.10: English loan words subscale by degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Bumi</th>
<th>non-Bumi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2- Private univs in Msia should use M as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9+ Lectures &amp; tutorials in Sci &amp; Tech faculties should be in E.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13+ Public univs should use E as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20+ Msian public univs graduates should have good E proficiency skills.</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Independent-Samples T-test showed that the mean response for the non-bumiputera students (19.97) was higher than that for the non-bumiputera students (16.30), and that the difference was highly statistically significant ($t = -5.723$, df = 99, $p = 0.000$). The effect size was found to be large (r=0.50). This showed that overall the non-bumiputera students had more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian universities.

Looking at the individual items, we can see that both groups agreed that graduates of public universities needed to be proficient in English (Q20). In some ways, this could be seen as a
statement of fact, given the problems of graduate unemployment that Malaysia has had when graduates have not been able to find jobs in the private sector because of their lack of English skills. However, with regard to the other three questionnaire items, the attitudes of the bumiputera students were clearly different from those of the non-bumiputera group.

The obvious difference between the two groups was in response to Q2, about the use of Malay at private universities in Malaysia. As explained previously, the private universities are allowed to use English as their sole medium of instruction and the non-bumiputera students expressed their support for this policy by disagreeing with the statement in Q2. On the other hand, the bumiputera students tended to agree with the statement. In this way, they can be seen as supporting the aim of the National Language Policy to implement Malay as the medium of instruction at all levels of education in Malaysia.

On the other hand, both groups agreed with the other two items on this subscale, Q9 and Q13, that English had a role as a medium of instruction in public universities, especially in Science and Technology courses. Nevertheless, the results showed that the non-bumiputera respondents supported this point of view more strongly than the bumiputera students did.

A full discussion of the public versus private university issue is beyond the scope of this study, but it is important to note that the student body in the public universities is predominantly bumiputera, whereas private universities mostly serve the educational needs of non-bumiputera students. The students’ responses may seem contradictory in some ways. For example, while the respondents felt that public university students should have English as a medium of instruction; the majority were keen to see private universities use Malay instead. However, it is clear from the responses to the items in this subscale that ethnicity has quite a strong influence on the students’ attitudes.

5.2.2.2 Results by degree program

Table 5.11 shows the mean responses for each item according to the participants’ degree program: Humanities, Science and Business.
Table 5.11: English and education subscale by degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2- Private univs in Msia should use M as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>2.85 1.33</td>
<td>3.13 1.70</td>
<td>3.55 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9+ Lectures &amp; tutorials in Sci &amp; Tech faculties should be in E.</td>
<td>4.29 1.32</td>
<td>4.78 1.11</td>
<td>4.86 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13+ Public univs should use E as medium of instruction.</td>
<td>4.21 1.15</td>
<td>4.53 1.29</td>
<td>4.00 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20+ Msian public univs graduates should have good E proficiency skills.</td>
<td>5.44 0.66</td>
<td>5.40 0.92</td>
<td>5.14 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.79 4.45</td>
<td>17.84 5.01</td>
<td>17.55 5.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the first subscale, the mean responses for the three groups were quite similar: Humanities, 16.79, Science, 17.84, and Business, 17.55. A one-way ANOVA confirmed that the differences were not significant (F = .935, df 2, 98, p = .396). This showed that overall attitudes to the use of English in universities did not vary on the basis of the students’ field of study.

Analyses of differences between bumiputera and non-bumiputera students within each program on this subscale produced non-significant results for the Humanities and Business Programs. However, in the case of the Science Program, there was a significant difference (t = 5.848, df 43, p = 0.00). The mean for the bumiputera students was 16.07, whereas for the non-bumiputera group it was 20.76. Thus, non-bumiputera students in Science had more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian universities than their bumiputera counterparts.

5.2.3 English and society

5.2.3.1 Results by ethnicity

As shown in Table 5.12, the third collapsed subscale combined all the remaining questionnaire items which were previously included in the ‘English in business and employment’, ‘English in the media’ and ‘English use among Malaysians’ subscales. The table shows the mean responses for each item by bumiputera and non-bumiputera students separately.
Table 5.12: English and society subscale by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Categories</th>
<th>Bumi</th>
<th></th>
<th>non-Bumi</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3+ E is important for govt servants' promotion in the public sector.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- Msians who use E more than M are show offs.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8- A M speaker is arrogant if she/he uses E to speak with another M speaker.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10+ It's natural that private sector requires fluency in E as promotion criteria.</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12- Foreign business offices in Msia should use M.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14- Msia should decrease TV shows which are in E.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean response for the non-bumiputera students (28.66) was higher than that for the bumiputera students (25.65). The independent samples t-test showed that the difference was highly significant \((t = -3.433, \text{df} = 99, p = 0.00)\). The effect size was found to be medium \((r=0.33)\). This showed that overall the non-bumiputera students had more positive attitudes towards the use of English in various social contexts in Malaysia.

Looking at the individual items, the most obvious difference in means between the two groups was for Q12. Non-bumiputera participants had a higher mean (4.61), which indicated disagreement with the idea that foreign companies in Malaysia should use Malay as the language to conduct their business in. The smaller mean (2.90) for bumiputera participants, on the other hand, suggested that the idea was favoured and very much acceptable.

Apart from Q12, both groups responded positively with regard to the role of English in Malaysian society, but the individual mean scores of all the items were higher for the non-bumiputera students. In Q14, the non-bumiputera group were noticeably more opposed to reducing the number of television shows in English. The non-bumiputera students also disagreed more with the statement in Q4 that Malaysians who used more English than Malay were showing off. However, both groups disagreed to a similar degree with Q8, that it was arrogant to speak to another Malay speaker in English.
In contrast to Q12, both the bumiputera and the non-bumiputera students accepted that English was important for promotion in both the public and private sectors of employment (Q3 and Q10). These two items could be interpreted as statements of fact to some extent, although in Q10 the phrase “It’s natural” was added to make it more of an attitudinal statement.

### 5.2.3.2 Results by degree program

Table 5.13 shows the mean responses for each item according to the participants’ degree program: Humanities, Science and Business.

**Table 5.13: English and society subscale by degree program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3+ E is important for govt servants' promotion in the public sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4- Msians who use E more than M are show offs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8- A M speaker is arrogant if she/he uses E to speak with another M speaker.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10+ It's natural that private sector requires fluency in E as promotion criteria.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12- Foreign business offices in Msia should use M.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14- Msia should decrease TV shows which are in E.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again, as with the other two subscales, the mean responses for the three groups were similar: Humanities, 25.92, Science, 27.19, and Business, 26.33. A one-way ANOVA confirmed that the differences were not significant (F = .838, df, 2, 98, p = .436). This showed that students in the different degree programs had basically the same attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian society.

The analyses of differences between bumiputera and non-bumiputera students within each program on this subscale produced similar results as for the English use in universities’ subscale. The difference was not significant for the Humanities and Business Programs, but it was significant for the Science Program (t = 2.920, df 43, p = 0.006). The mean for the non-bumiputera group was 29.12, compared to the bumiputera mean of 25.86. Thus, non-
*bumiputera* students in Science had more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian society than their *bumiputera* counterparts.

Overall, it is clear that ethnicity had more effect on the students’ responses to the questionnaire than their degree program did. The degree programs had variable proportions of non-*bumiputera* students, from 24% (8/34) in Humanities and 27% in Business (6/22) to 38% (17/45) in Science. Thus, to some extent the Humanities students reflected the views of the *bumiputera* group, whereas the attitudes of non-*bumiputera* students were better represented in the Science Program.

### 5.3 Summary

The main findings of the language attitude questionnaire can be summed up as below:

#### 5.3.1 English loan words in relation to ethnicity and degree programs

Overall, despite some reservations on both sides, it can be said that the *bumiputera* students had more favourable attitudes towards English loan words and borrowing. Although, the non-*bumiputera* students seemed to not favour the English loan words, upon further questions during the focus group interviews, it was found that they were instead referring to the technical loan words. In short, although both groups had reservations about the use of English loan words in Malay and the value of knowing these words for their studies, they do so for different reasons. *Bumiputera* students were more concerned with the impact of the loan words on Malay vocabulary, whilst NB students were more concerned with the effect of being unfamiliar with the technical loan words will have on their studies. In relation to their degree programs, there was no clear pattern of difference in the way that participants in the three degree programs responded to individual items on this subscale.

#### 5.3.2 English and education in relation to ethnicity and degree programs

Overall, the non-*bumiputera* students had more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian universities. The obvious different attitudes between *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* students towards language use in higher education in Malaysia can be seen in their support, or non-support, for the use of Malay in private tertiary institutions. It was clear that non-*bumiputera* students favour English as the language of choice in private higher
education. It was interesting, though, that bumiputera students agreed to the use of English as the language of instruction in science and technology-related courses.

Also, the overall attitudes to the use of English in universities did not vary on the basis of the students’ field of study. However, upon further analysis in terms of ethnicity within the three fields of study, it was revealed that non-bumiputera students in the Science program had more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian universities than their bumiputera counterparts.

5.3.3 English and society in relation to ethnicity and degree programs

It can be said that the non-bumiputera students had more positive attitudes towards the use of English in various social contexts in Malaysia. It was also found that the overall attitudes to the use of English and society did not vary on the basis of the students’ fields of study. However, similar to the finding in the English and education subscale, when analysed in terms of ethnicity within the three fields of study, it was found that non-bumiputera students in Science again showed more favourable attitudes towards the use of English in Malaysian society.
CHAPTER 6  RESULTS OF THE GAP-FILLING AND TRANSLATION TASKS

6.0  Overview

This chapter presents the results of the two vocabulary tasks which were given to the participants after they had completed the language attitude questionnaire. The participants did the Gap-Filling task first and then the Translation task and so the tasks will be analysed in that order.

6.1  Gap-Filling Task

In the Gap-Filling task, the participants were presented with twenty Malay sentences which were taken from the Utusan corpus. Each sentence had one gap which represented an English loan word that had been deleted. The loan word could be replaced with a Malay word and the sentence would still mean the same. Thus, the first purpose of the task was to find out whether the participants would choose the loan word or the Malay word in each case, as an indication of their preference for one type of word or the other. The second purpose was to check whether, if English loan words were used to fill the gap, the participants understood the meaning expressed by the loan word and had supplied an appropriate word.

6.1.1  Marking for Preference

All of the participants’ responses were entered into SPSS version 16 and classified into six categories:

a)  exact loan word correct: response which matched the original word deleted from the sentence.
b)  other loan word correct: an alternative loan word that could fit the gap semantically and grammatically.
c)  loan word incorrect: incorrect English loan word response.
d)  malay correct: Malay word that fitted the gap.
e)  malay incorrect: incorrect Malay response.
f)  no response: no response was given for the gap.

The responses were categorised as such so that it would be easier to identify them in a standard manner later. There were 2,020 possible responses if all 20 gaps were filled in by the 101 participants.
The categories that provided a measure of word preference were:

i) acceptable English loan word that fitted the gap (categories ‘a’ and ‘b’)
ii) acceptable Malay word that fitted the gap (category ‘d’).

Incorrect responses were excluded because the measurement was only interested in word preference which fit the gap. The results are shown in Table 6.1 for all participants. Table 6.1 shows that the loan words *isu, akademik, strategi, data,* and *potensi* were strongly preferred by the participants. This suggests they were more familiar with these words that the Malay equivalents. On the other hand, in the case of items represented by *individu, relevan, aspek, elemen,* and *komuniti,* the Malay equivalents were supplied much more often than the loan words. The high number of responses in Malay for these items shows that participants had a clear preference for the indigenous word rather than the loan word. Thirdly, responses were even for the items *sektor, faktor, fungsi* and *teknik.* This indicates that participants were familiar with both the English loan word and its Malay equivalent. Although, it could still be argued that there seems a definite preference for the loan word version for *teknik* because of the number of loan word responses it obtained. Finally, there were sentences that had a low number of responses of either kind. These involved the items *komunikasi, senario, status* and *objektif.* The low responses suggest difficulty on the part of participants in coming up with responses for the gaps. The difficulty might be due to unfamiliarity with the items or failure to comprehend the sentence.
### 6.1.1.1 Comparison of the Gap-Filling results and the Corpus word frequency list

6.1: Responses to the Gap-Filling task for all participants (N=101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>ELW pref</th>
<th>Malay pref</th>
<th>ELW high pref</th>
<th>M high pref</th>
<th>even pref</th>
<th>low responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isu</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>isu (55)</td>
<td>individu (82)</td>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>komunikasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>akademik (54)</td>
<td>relevan (82)</td>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>senario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>strategi (59)</td>
<td>aspek (80)</td>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>objektif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>data (59)</td>
<td>elemen (72)</td>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>potensi (54)</td>
<td>komuniti (71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>kompleks (62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>fokus (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ELW pref= English loan word preference; M = Malay word preference; even preference= even responses; low responses = neither ELW nor M preference.

Table 6.1 showed a clear preference for English loan words in certain items, as well as items which obtained an even number of responses. These findings can be related to word frequency data from the Utusan corpus.
Next, Table 6.2 shows the frequency of the loan words in the corpus, as compared to the student preferences in the Gap-Filling task:

**Table 6.2: Word frequency list for Gap-Filling items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>pref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>737</td>
<td><em>isu</em> ('issue')</td>
<td>ELW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>497</td>
<td><em>sektor</em> ('sector')</td>
<td>even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>297</td>
<td><em>faktor</em> ('factor')</td>
<td>even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
<td><em>aspek</em> ('aspect')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>186</td>
<td><em>akademik</em> ('academic')</td>
<td>ELW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>176</td>
<td><em>individu</em> ('individual')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td><em>strategi</em> ('strategy')</td>
<td>ELW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td><em>komunikasi</em> ('communication')</td>
<td>low response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td><em>data</em> ('data')</td>
<td>ELW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td><em>status</em> ('status')</td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td><em>fungsi</em> ('function')</td>
<td>even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td><em>potensi</em> ('potential')</td>
<td>ELW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>eleven</em> ('element')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>komuniti</em> ('community')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>objektif</em> ('objective')</td>
<td>low response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>relevan</em> ('relevant')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>senario</em> ('scenario')</td>
<td>low response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td><em>fokus</em> ('focus')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td><em>teknik</em> ('technique')</td>
<td>even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td><em>kompleks</em> ('complex')</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ELW = English loan word; M = Malay word; 
even = even responses; low response = neither in ELW nor M.

The figures in Table 6.2 show some relationship between preference for the loan word in the Gap-Filling task and the frequency of the loan word in the corpus among the words that occurred at least 100 times. The pattern is even clearer for less frequent words i.e. for items 11–20, the loan word is preferred in only one case (‘data’). Thus, the preference for the loan words *isu* (‘issue’), *akademik* (‘academic’), and *strategi* (‘strategy’) in the Gap-Filling task could be explained by participants’ familiarity with the words in Malay. This is similar for items where the preference was even, such as *sektor* (‘sector’) and *faktor* (‘factor’). Items in which the preference did not correspond so strongly to the word frequency are *data* (‘data’) and *potensi* (‘potential’), which had fewer than 100 occurrences in the corpus and yet there was clear preference for the loan word in the Gap-Filling task. The results also showed an
even number of loan word and Malay responses for *status* (‘status’), *fungsi* (‘function’), and *teknik* (‘technique’), even though these words did not occur very frequently in the corpus.

There is a similar but perhaps clearer pattern of results for the Gap-Filling items in which the participants showed a preference for Malay words. The loan words *elemen* (‘element’), *komuniti* (‘community’), *relevan* (‘relevant’), *fokus* (‘focus’), and *kompleks* (‘complex’) appear at the lower end of the word frequency list, with less than 48 occurrences in the corpus. The same applies to the items *senario* (‘scenario’) and *objektif* (‘objective’) for which there was no clear preference either for the loan word or the Malay equivalent. However, there were mismatches between the word frequency list and the data from the Gap-Filling task for the items *aspek* (‘aspect’), *individu* (‘individual’), and *komunikasi* (‘communication’). These loan words had a high occurrence in the corpus, whereas in the Gap-Filling task there was a very strong preference for the Malay equivalents of *aspek* and *individu*, while the items for *komunikasi* and *status* did not receive many responses of either kind.
6.1.1.2 Comparison of the Gap-Filling and semantic analysis results

The 20 items in the Gap-Filling task can also be related to the linguistic analysis presented in Chapter 4. The results can be seen on Table 6.3:

Table 6.3: Comparison of the Gap-Filling and the semantic analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>pref</th>
<th>semantic analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isu</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>pnp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: pp = potentially problematic; pnp = potentially non-problematic

Table 6.3 shows response preferences in the Gap-Filling task compared with the possible difficulty level of the target loan words, based on the linguistic analysis which was carried out earlier on the basis of the Utusan corpus. The correspondences are not very clear-cut, but it is noticeable that, except for status (‘status’), the items which had low responses i.e. komunikasi (‘communication’), senario (‘scenario’), and objektif (‘objective’) fall into the category of potentially problematic words. The Utusan corpus showed that objektif and senario were less frequent loan words.

Note that the Utusan frequency list does not necessarily represent the likelihood of comprehension of the meaning and usage of the loan word by the Malay native speaker. The
list only shows the frequencies of the English loan words occurring in texts which were written and edited by newspaper reporters who are assumed to be highly fluent in Malay. On the other hand, the linguistic analysis took into consideration the usage of the loan words in Malay in comparison to the uses of the original English words. An English loan word was deemed to be potentially problematic if it varied greatly from the original meaning(s) and use(s) in English, and vice versa for potentially non-problematic loan words. The Gap-Filling results found that the highest frequency of response for the item *komunikasi* was ‘Malay incorrect’ (n=75). Although the frequency list shows *status* as being quite frequent, it also had more ‘Malay incorrect’ responses (n=55) in the Gap-Filling task. This indicates that, compared to the word frequency list, the linguistic analysis had more potential for identifying difficult words and offered a better explanation for the difficulty.

Thus far, the analysis has found that of the many potentially problematic loan words, only *objektif, komunikasi* and *scenario* turned out to be problematic in the Gap-Filling task. Table 6.3 shows the Gap-Filling results for the six potentially non-problematic loan words. In three of the items, there was in fact a strong preference for the loan words (*aspek, strategi, and data*), in two cases (*komuniti* and *kompleks*) the Malay equivalent was preferred and for *status* there was low response.
6.1.1.3 Preference results for subgroups

Table 6.4: Response preferences for the Gap-Filling task by ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bumi (N=70) ELW pref</th>
<th>Malay pref</th>
<th>Non-Bumi (N=31) ELW pref</th>
<th>Malay pref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isu</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ELW pref = English loan word preference; M = Malay word preference; even preference = even responses; low response = neither in ELW nor M preference.

Bumi:
- isu (41)
- sektor
- akademik (40)
- strategi (40)
- data (38)
- potensi (38)

Non-Bumi:
- isu (14)
- sektor
- akademik (14)
- strategi (19)
- data (21)
- potensi (16)
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Table 6.4 shows that there was no difference between the word preference of *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* participants for loan words or Malay equivalents. Both groups had similar items in the ‘even’ category except for the item *sektor*, where non-*bumiputera* participants preferred the Malay word. Interestingly, both groups also had similar items in the ‘low response’ category. This indicates that the items *komunikasi, senario, objektif* and *status* were difficult for both *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* participants.
### Table 6.5: Response preferences for the Gap-Filling task by program of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>ELW</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** ELW = English loan word preference; M = Malay preference

```
Table 6.5 shows the preference results by program of study. Similarities of word preference in all four categories can be seen for the Humanities and Science programs. However, the results for the Business program showed more differences than similarities. Compared to their peers in Humanities and Science, participants from the Business program had only two items where they supplied loan words (data and strategi). In addition, the Business program students had more items in the ‘low response’ category, in addition to komunikasi, status, objektif, and senario. The word frequency list from the discipline-specific corpus suggests that the Business participants were not familiar with using the items within the ‘low response’ category in their daily studies. These discipline-specific corpora are collections of articles in the corpus whose items are related to the business, arts/humanities, and science fields respectively. For example, an article titled Euro dan Dollar Amerika Syarikat kuasai dunia (‘Euro and US Dollar conquer world’) would be included in the business-discipline corpora.

The discipline-specific corpus frequency list in Table 6.6 is also consistent with the items that were found in the Business program’s ‘low response’ category i.e. the words occurred with low frequency in the corpus. There is, however, an exception with the item isu, which Table 6 shows as having a high frequency within the Business texts of the corpus.
### Table 6.6: Program-specific word frequency list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isu ('issue')</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik ('academic')</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor ('sector')</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek ('aspect')</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor ('factor')</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu ('individual')</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi ('strategy')</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi ('communication')</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status ('status')</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan ('relevant')</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen ('element')</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti ('community')</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario ('scenario')</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funksi ('function')</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data ('data')</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus ('focus')</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif ('objective')</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi ('potential')</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks ('complex')</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik ('technique')</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7: Overall results of the analysis of the Gap-Filling task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Word List Frequency</th>
<th>Semantic Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>isu</em> ('issue')</td>
<td>loan word</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>737 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sektor</em> ('sector')</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>497 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>faktor</em> ('factor')</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>297 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aspek</em> ('aspect')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>189 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>akademik</em> ('academic')</td>
<td>loan word</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>186 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>individu</em> ('individual')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>176 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>strategi</em> ('strategy')</td>
<td>loan word</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>148 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komunikasi</em> ('communication')</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>unsuitable</td>
<td>123 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>data</em> ('data')</td>
<td>loan word</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>96 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>status</em> ('status')</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>error</td>
<td>83 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fungsi</em> ('function')</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>73 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komuniti</em> ('community')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>56 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>senario</em> ('scenario')</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>highest no response</td>
<td>48 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potensi</em> ('potential')</td>
<td>loan word</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>48 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>objektif</em> ('objective')</td>
<td>low response</td>
<td>unsuitable</td>
<td>47 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>elemen</em> ('element')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>47 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fokus</em> ('focus')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>45 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>teknik</em> ('technique')</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>43 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>relewan</em> ('relevant')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>39 pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kompleks</em> ('complex')</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>38 pnp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 brings together the various measures based on the Gap-Filling task: preference, comprehension, word frequency, and the linguistic analysis. The preference data has shown some consistent findings. For several items the participants showed a clear preference for loan words that were also high on the word frequency list of the corpus. Similarly, several items where there was a clear preference for the Malay equivalent were also found to be on the lower end of the frequency list. However, contrary to earlier predictions based on the linguistic analysis, only three items thought to be potentially problematic loan words were found to be actually difficult items for the participants i.e. *komunikasi* ('communication'), *senario* ('scenario'), and *objektif* ('objective'). This is not necessarily a negative finding as a longer list of potentially difficult loan words, based on the linguistic analysis, will help teachers to cover more ground and they can narrow down the field of problematic loan words on their own later on with their students. Table 6.7 will continue to be used in the subsequent sections which describe the results based on the comprehension measurement.
6.1.2 Scoring for Comprehension

The initial categories (a – f) in Section 6.1.1 were used as the basis for measuring word comprehension. Unlike the measurement for preference, the comprehension measurement scale was only concerned with whether the participant filled the gap correctly, irrespective of whether the response was an English loan word or Malay word. Hence, the comprehension scale was as follows:

i) fully correct: an acceptable English loan word or Malay word which fits the gap semantically and grammatically. (categories ‘a’, ‘b’ and ‘d’)

ii) partially correct: a loan word or Malay word which is semantically correct but not grammatical and hence did not suit the gap. (not in the earlier category).

iii) incorrect: a loan word or Malay word which is semantically and grammatically incorrect. (categories ‘c’ and ‘e’).

6.1.2.1 Results for all participants

The results for the Gap-Filling task based on the comprehension scale are shown in Table 6.8:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>fully correct</th>
<th>partially correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>No Resp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isu ('issue')</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor ('sector')</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor ('factor')</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspek ('aspect')</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akademik ('academic')</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu ('individual')</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategi ('strategy')</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komunikasi ('communication')</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data ('data')</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status ('status')</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi ('function')</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komuniti ('community')</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senario ('scenario')</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi ('potential')</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objektif ('objective')</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen ('element')</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fokus ('focus')</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik ('technique')</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan ('relevant')</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kompleks ('complex')</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full table: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fully correct</th>
<th>partially correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>No Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>faktor (98)</td>
<td>komunikasi (42)</td>
<td>status (59)</td>
<td>senario (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sektor (92)</td>
<td>objektif (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi (85)</td>
<td>individu (83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi (82)</td>
<td>elemen (82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan (71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6.8 shows that, overall, the participants gave fully correct responses for most of the items in the Gap-Filling task. Even the item which received the least number of fully correct responses – *data* (‘data’) - had more than half of the participants filling the gap correctly. The items that had the highest number of fully correct responses were *faktor* (‘factor’), *aspek* (‘aspect’) and *sektor* (‘sector’). The high number of correct responses for the 16 items indicates that participants understood what meaning needed to be expressed by the word they chose for each gap. The items which are in bold under the ‘fully correct’ category were also items for which a loan word was preferred or where there was an even number of responses (in English loan word and Malay equivalent) in the preference measurement.

The participants demonstrated a high level of comprehension for three of the items (*sektor, faktor and fungsi*) which had also received an even number of English loan words and Malay responses in the preference measurement scale (see Table 6.7). This shows that the participants were very familiar with the loan word and Malay word equivalents of ‘sector’, ‘factor’ and ‘function’ as they were used in the Gap-Filling task. As for the items in the ‘fully correct’ category which are not in bold, the participants had minimal comprehension problems as these were items where suitable Malay responses were preferred.

Table 6.8 also shows the group of items which were found to be difficult for the participants based on their responses. The difficult items are classified into the ‘partially correct’, ‘incorrect’ and ‘no response’ categories. As might be expected, the difficult items on Table 6.8 (*komunikasi, objektif, status and senario*) are the same words which fall under the ‘low response’ category of the preference scale in Table 6.1, where there was no clear preference for either loan words or Malay words. That the participants found these four items difficult could be explained by the results of the frequency list and the linguistic analysis on Table 6.7. The frequency list shows that *status* (‘status’), *senario* (‘scenario’) and *objektif* (‘objective’) are not very frequent in the corpus. In addition, the linguistic analysis showed *komunikasi, senario* and *objektif* as potentially problematic items for learners.
6.1.2.1.1 ‘Partially correct’ and ‘Incorrect’ categories

Let us look at Q8. *komunikasi* (‘communication’):

> Kajian mendapati bahasa Melayu sudah berkurun-kurun menjadi bahasa ______ serantau.

(‘Research has found that Malay has been used for many centuries as the language for regional communication’.)

The ‘partially correct’ responses for the item *komunikasi* were mainly unsuitable word choices for the gap. Examples of the ‘partially correct’ responses were *gunaan* (‘applied’), *pengantar* (‘medium’), *ibunda* (‘mother’), and *kebangsaan* (‘national’). It appears that the participants arrived at these unsuitable responses based on the word immediately preceding the gap i.e. *bahasa* (‘language’). The phrases *bahasa gunaan* (‘applied language’), *bahasa pengantar* (‘medium of instruction’), *bahasa ibunda* (‘mother tongue’) and *bahasa kebangsaan* (‘national language’) were all correct phrases on their own. However, these responses were incorrect because of the word *serantau* (‘regional’) in the sentence.

‘Incorrect’ responses clearly show that the participant did not know which part of speech to use in the gap hence making it more difficult to fill the gap correctly. Examples of ‘incorrect’ responses for the item *status* were *sebagai* (‘as’), a preposition, *sebuah* (‘a’), an article, and the nouns *kejayaan* (‘success’), *wawasan* (‘vision’) and *sasaran* (‘aim’). The sentence in the Gap-Filling task was:

> Jika kita ingin mencapai ______ negara maju menjelang 2020, kita perlu membuat penambahbaikan kepada system pendidikan tinggi negara.

(‘If we want to attain the status of developed country by 2020, we need to upgrade the system of higher education in the country’.)

Based on the participants’ incorrect responses, it was possible that the participants were influenced by the word immediately following the gap i.e. *negara* (‘country’). This was in contrast to the sentence for *komunikasi* (‘communication’) in which the participants seemed to be influenced by the word immediately preceding it. On their own, the phrases *sebagai negara* (‘as a country’), *sebuah negara* (‘a country’), *kejayaan negara* (‘success of the nation’), *wawasan negara* (‘vision of the country’) and *sasaran negara* (‘aim of the country’) were semantically and grammatically correct. However, in this
sentence, the participants’ responses were incorrect as they made the sentence ungrammatical. For example with \textit{sebagai} in the gap, the sentence would mean: ‘If we want to attain \underline{as} developed country by 2020, we need to upgrade the system of the higher education in the country.’ Thus, these incorrect responses focused on the immediate context of the gap rather than the meaning of the whole sentence.

Similarly, the item \textit{objektif} received partially correct responses such as \textit{keberkesanan} (‘effectiveness’), \textit{pengurusan} (‘management’) and \textit{kesan} (‘effects’). These responses were all nouns and they fitted grammatically in the gap based on the phrase preceding it i.e. \textit{sejauh mana} (‘how far’). The loan word which was deleted from the gap was \textit{objektif} (‘objective’) and the sentence would also be correct with the Malay equivalents of \textit{objektif} : \textit{matlamat} or \textit{tujuan}. Nonetheless, the meaning of the sentence was somewhat odd when filled with the partially correct responses. For example, with \textit{keberkesanan} (‘effectiveness’) the sentence would mean as such:

Q15. \textit{Satu penilaian perlu dilakukan untuk menilai sejauh mana keberkesanan program Alam Sekitar Merentas Kurikulum telah melahirkan pelajar yang menghargai alam sekitar.} (‘A thorough assessment should be carried out to assess how far the Environment across the Curriculum programs’ effectiveness has produced students who appreciate the environment.’)

The use of \textit{keberkesanan} (‘effectiveness’) would have been correct had the sentence in Q15 been as such:

\textit{Satu penilaian menyeluruh perlu dilakukan untuk menilai keberkesanan program Alam Sekitar Merentas Kurikulum.} (‘A thorough assessment should be carried out to assess the effectiveness of the Environment across the Curriculum program.’)

Incorrect responses for \textit{objektif} were, for example, \textit{dengan} (‘with’), \textit{bagi} (‘for’), and \textit{tahap} (‘level’). These responses rendered the sentence ungrammatical and hence difficult to understand.

\textbf{6.1.2.1.2 ‘No Response’ category}

Table 6.8 shows that the item \textit{senario} had the most non-responses (n=22) from participants for this task. The equivalent Malay word which would correctly fit the gap would be \textit{suasana} (‘scenario’). Despite the number of non-responses, most of the
participants (n=59) completed the gap correctly and there were relatively few incorrect responses. It appears that for a certain number of students, the sentence did not provide sufficient contextual clues for them to supply a correct response. Perhaps one reason for the difficulty was that the first word in the sentence was deleted.

Q13. scenario (‘scenario’):

Senario pembangunan teknologi genetik yang memberangangkan turut berlaku di Thailand, China, Jepun malah Indonesia.

(‘Encouraging scenarios of genetic technology development are also seen in Thailand, China, Japan and even Indonesia’.)

As these examples show, the nature of the Gap-Filling task had some influence on the students’ responses. On the one hand, it was necessary to present each target word in a natural sentence context, but on the other hand certain words in the sentence could mislead the students into giving an incorrect response which did not take account of the meaning of the whole sentence.

6.1.2.2 Analysis of comprehension results by subgroup

Statistical analyses were carried out to investigate whether student variables could have influenced the results. In order to perform the analyses, data from the Gap-Filling task were recoded into four new variables: total error response (toterror), total partially incorrect (totpartial), total correct response (totcorr), and total no response (totnoresp).

The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was then used to analyse whether there were statistically significant differences on these four variables according to ethnicity, program of study, and reading language.

6.1.2.2.1 Ethnicity

Are there statistically significant differences between the two ethnic groups (bumiputera and non-bumiputera) on the variables totcorr, totpartial, toterror, and totnoresp?
Table 6.9: Student performance on the Gap-Filling task by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>variables</th>
<th>ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totcorr</td>
<td>bumi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonbumi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totpartial</td>
<td>bumi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonbumi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toterror</td>
<td>bumi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonbumi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totnoresp</td>
<td>bumi</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonbumi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>totcorr</th>
<th>totpartial</th>
<th>toterror</th>
<th>totnoresp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td><strong>0.004</strong></td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Kruskal Wallis Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Grouping Variable: ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6.9 the Ranks provide the Mean Ranks for the four dependent variables. The Mean Ranks show that bumiputera participants had higher total partially incorrect and total correct responses. Non-bumiputera participants, on the other hand, had higher total incorrect and total non-responses. This indicates that non-bumiputera participants had more difficulty with the Gap-Filling task.

The chi-square statistics show that the differences for the two ethnic groups were significant for two of the four dependent variables: total error response ($p = .004$) and total correct response ($p = .002$). There is no significant difference for either total partially incorrect or total non-responses.

### 6.1.2.2.2 Program of study

Are there statistically significant differences between the three programs of study (Humanities, Science and Business) on the variables totcorr, totpartial, toterror, and totnoresp?
Table 6.10: Student performance on the Gap-Filling task by program of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>variables</th>
<th>program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totcorr</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totpartial</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toterror</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>totnoresp</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>(\text{totcorr})</th>
<th>(\text{totpartial})</th>
<th>(\text{toterror})</th>
<th>(\text{totnoresp})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>3.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: program

Table 6.10 shows that Humanities students ranked highest on total correct responses and lowest on total errors. This indicates that they performed best on the task. On the other hand, Science students had the lowest Mean Rank on correct responses and highest on errors. The Science students also had a higher rank for non-responses. Students in the Business program were ranked in between the other students on these three variables. For partially incorrect responses, the three programs had similar mean ranks.

The chi-square statistics show that for total correct responses, the difference in ranks was highly significant, and the difference in total errors almost achieved significance at the .05 level. There was no significant difference for either total partially incorrect or total non-responses. These results appear to be consistent with the results on Table 6.9 as the majority of the participants in the Humanities program were bumiputera, whereas the biggest group of non-bumiputera participants was in the Science program.
6.1.2.2.3 Reading Language

Are there statistically significant differences among the participants according to their reading language (Malay, English and Mandarin) on the variables totcorr, totpartial, toterror, and totnoresp?

Table 6.11: Student performance on the Gap-Filling task by reading language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>rdglang</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>totcorr</td>
<td>malay</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>english</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mandarin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totpartial</td>
<td>malay</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>english</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mandarin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toterror</td>
<td>malay</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>english</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mandarin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totnoresp</td>
<td>malay</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>english</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mandarin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>totcorr</th>
<th>totpartial</th>
<th>toterror</th>
<th>totnoresp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.349</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>6.369</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: rdglang

As expected, Table 6.11 shows that participants with Malay as their reading language had the highest rank for total correct responses (56.99) and the lowest for total errors. Students who read in Mandarin had a much lower rank for correct responses and a higher one for errors, whereas those with English as their reading language had the poorest performance on these two variables. The Mean Ranks for the three groups on the partially incorrect response and non-response variables were more comparable.

The chi-square results were similar to the previous analyses for ethnicity and program of study. The difference in ranks was significant only for the total correct response ($p =$
0.009) and total error response ($p = .041$). There was no significant difference for either total partially incorrect or total non-responses.

### 6.1.2.3 Summary of comprehension results

The results presented for the comprehension scale have produced several consistent patterns. The first is the words which produced responses in the partially incorrect responses for the participants, were similar to the words grouped under the ‘low response’ category on the preference scale (see Table 6.7). These items were *komunikasi, status, objektif* and *senario*. A common thread in the ‘low response’, ‘partially correct’ and ‘incorrect’ categories is that the items appeared to be difficult or problematic for the participants. The findings from the comprehension scale with regard to *status, objektif* and *senario* support the results from the linguistic analysis earlier, which had found these items to be potentially problematic. In addition, the four items were also on the lower end of the corpus word frequency list.

The second observable pattern in the results of the comprehension scale is that, generally speaking, only the total correct response and total error variables produced statistically significant differences according to ethnicity, program of study, and reading language. The other two variables did not differentiate the students so clearly.

The third pattern is that the basic distinction among the students on all three independent variables was whether they were *bumiputera* or non-*bumiputera*. Clearly, the *bumiputera* students had an advantage in completing the Gap-Filling task because they were almost all native speakers of Malay. They tended to perform best on all four of the dependent variables.

### 6.1.3 Overall summary for results from the Gap-Filling task

The results from the preference and comprehension scales have achieved the objectives of the Gap-Filling task. Both measures showed that certain loan words were more familiar to the participants, at least partly because they had seen or heard the words through the print or non-print media. The words which the participants were more familiar with were also on the higher end of the corpus word frequency list. In contrast, items which were difficult for all of the participants were found to be at the lower end of the frequency list. Interestingly, items which were difficult for students in a particular
program of study were also found to be at the lower end of the frequency list for their specific corpus.

In addition, the results from the Gap-Filling task highlight the value of the linguistic analysis, which offered an alternative explanation for why certain words were difficult for the participants even though the words were high on the corpus word frequency list. The linguistic analysis was needed to help determine the learning burden of potentially problematic English loan words for learners.

6.2 Translation Task

The purpose of the Translation task was to test whether the loan words suspected to be problematic for learners were in fact problematic. Each of the twenty English sentences in the task contained the English equivalent of a loan word in Malay. Eleven of these English words, however, had meanings or usages which were not covered by the Kamus Dewan definition of the loan word or the usage of the loan word in the corpus. The participants were required to translate the original English word into Malay without using a loan word in their translations. This was to prevent participants from simply transliterating the words into Malay, for example, ‘evaluation’ into evaluasi; ‘institution’ into institusi; and ‘document’ into dokumen. If the participant had been allowed to use loan words as answers, it would not have been clear whether they really understood the meaning of the English word.

The Translation task also included words which had earlier been included in the Gap-Filling task as the English loan word equivalents (n=10). Seven of these overlapping items are categorised as potentially problematic based on the results of the linguistic analysis. The purpose for including these items within the Translation task in their original English form was to test whether they were indeed problematic, as the linguistic analysis had found.

We begin by describing the overall responses of the participants and move on to the analysis of these results. Particular attention will be given to the results involving the items which overlapped with the Gap-Filling task.
6.2.1 Frequency distribution: simpler and more elaborate classification

Table 6.12 shows the frequency distribution for the participants’ responses, classified in two ways. The simpler classification summarises the responses into three categories: correct, incorrect, and no response. In contrast, the more elaborate classification identifies the following types of responses which were given by participants in the task:

a) MC: correct Malay equivalent;

b) MI: incorrect Malay equivalent;

c) OLWC: correct response in the form of another English loan word;

d) OLWI: incorrect response in the form of another English loan word;

e) ELWC: correct response and the exact transliterated form of the English word in Malay;

f) ELWI: incorrect response and the exact transliterated form of the English word in Malay
Table 6.12: Frequency distribution of the Translation Task responses: simpler and more elaborate classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>OLWC</th>
<th>OLWI</th>
<th>ELWC</th>
<th>ELWI</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convention</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data *</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status *</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect *</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **MC** = Malay correct; **MI** = Malay incorrect; **OLWC** = other loan word correct; **OLWI** = other loan word incorrect; **ELWC** = exact loan word correct; **ELWI** = exact loan word incorrect; **NR** = No Response.

**Item bold & starred** = problematic and also in Gap-Filling task. **Item not bold & starred** = non-problematic and also in Gap-Filling.
As can be seen on Table 6.12, despite the instruction not to do so, some participants provided the exact loan word translation (ELWC and ELWI) as their response to certain items. This was particularly so for item 15 ‘function’, which received 42 responses of fungsi (‘function’). The same type of response was also provided for other items such as those for ‘issue’, ‘logical’ and ‘definitions’. The high number of responses in these categories made it necessary to include them within the elaborate classification. However, these exact loan word responses were divided into two: correct and incorrect. Exact loan word responses did not necessarily equate to a correct response, as in the case of ‘function’ and fungsi (‘function’). The words marked with the asterisk (*) and in bold were also the focus of items in the Gap-Filling task.

6.2.2 Simpler classification: potentially problematic loan words

Eleven of the items (in bold) in Table 6.12 were deliberately selected for the Translation task because of their potential to be problematic words based on the linguistic analysis. These were: ‘issue’, ‘factor’, ‘individual’, ‘elements’, ‘response’, ‘fundamental’, ‘convention’, ‘coordination’, ‘relevance’, ‘function’, and ‘potential’. They are ‘potentially problematic’ because the linguistic analysis showed that the loan words were used in any of these situations: (a) a more narrowed usage in Malay compared to the usage(s) of the English word in English; (b) a broader usage in Malay compared to the usage(s) of the English word in English; and (c) having different grammatical features in Malay compared to English. Problems might occur if, due to situations (a), (b), or (c), learners over-generalised the meaning of the English word and ended up misunderstanding the sentence. The differences between the usages of these potentially problematic items as English loan words in Malay and in the Translation task are shown in Table 6.13.
### Table 6.13: Differences in usage of the target words in the Translation task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>usage in Malay</th>
<th>usage in English sentence in Translation task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'issue' *</td>
<td>isu : (noun) matter being discussed. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(noun) An issue of something such as a magazine or newspaper is the version of it that is published, for example, in a particular month or on a particular day; edition, publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 'factor' *</td>
<td>faktor : (noun), one/many things that affect an event, decision, or situation. (narrower usage &amp; different part of speech)</td>
<td>(phrasal verb) To include something when you are doing a calculation, or when you are trying to understand something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 'individual' *</td>
<td>individu : (noun) a person. (narrower usage &amp; different part of speech)</td>
<td>(adjective) Relating to one person or thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 'elements' *</td>
<td>elemen : (noun) one of a number of factors that make a whole. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(noun) The most simple things that one has to learn first about a subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 'response'</td>
<td>respons : (noun) reply, answer, reaction. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(noun) Something that is done as a reaction to something that has happened or been said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 'fundamental'</td>
<td>fundamental : (adjective) basic. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(adjective) Very necessary and important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 'convention'</td>
<td>konvensyen : (noun) conference of members of a profession, political party, etc. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(noun) Behaviour and attitude that most people in a society consider to be normal or right; custom; norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 'coordination'</td>
<td>koordinasi : (noun) relationship between each other which makes things run smoothly. (different part of speech is more common in Malay i.e koordinator ('coordinator')).</td>
<td>(noun) The organization of people or things so that they work together well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 'relevance' *</td>
<td>relevan : (adjective) connected with what is being discussed, what is happening, what is being done, etc. (different part of speech)</td>
<td>(noun) Importance or significance in a situation or to someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 'function' *</td>
<td>funksi : (noun) purpose or role of a person or thing. (narrower usage)</td>
<td>(noun) A quantity or quality whose value changes according to another quantity or quality that is related to it (Technical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 'potential' *</td>
<td>potensi : (noun) qualities that exist and can be further developed. (different part of speech)</td>
<td>(adjective) Likely to develop into a particular type of person or thing in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = The loan word equivalents of this word was the focus of the Gap-Filling task.
Malay usage of the loan words in items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10 is narrower, while those for items 9 and 10 are more commonly used as different parts of speech in Malay. The loan words in items 2 and 3, on the other hand, have both of these differences in Malay. We can better understand the significance of the differences by attending to the ten items which were present in both vocabulary tasks.

6.2.2.1 Items present in the Gap-Filling task

Half of the words in the Translation task were also in the Gap-Filling task, in the form of the equivalent loan words in Malay: *isu* (‘issue’), *faktor* (‘factor’), *individu* (‘individual’), *elemen* (‘elements’), *relevan* (‘relevance’), *fungsi* (‘function’), *potensi* (‘potential’), *data* (‘data’), *status* (‘status’) and *aspek* (‘aspect’). All of these loan words were potentially problematic except for *data*, *status* and *aspek*. This means that there are seven potentially problematic items that were included in both the Translation and the Gap-Filling tasks: *isu* (‘issue’), *faktor* (‘factor’), *individu* (‘individual’), *elemen* (‘elements’), *relevan* (‘relevance’), *fungsi* (‘function’) and *potensi* (‘potential’). However, the usage of the words in the Translation task was different from that in the Gap-Filling task.

Table 6.14 shows the overlapping items in the two vocabulary tasks. All of the seven potentially problematic items were found to be high on the ‘fully correct response’, category in the Gap-Filling task, if measured by comprehension. However, in terms of preference, the loan word was not preferred in most cases. Only *isu* (‘issue’) and *potensi* (‘potential’) were in the ‘English loan word preference’ category. The data also showed that *individu* (‘individual’), *relevan* (‘relevance’) and *element* (‘elements’) received more Malay equivalent responses by preference. *Faktor* (‘factor’) and *fungsi* (‘function’), on the other hand, received balanced responses of English loan words and their Malay equivalents.

The results in Table 6.14 indicate that, in terms of comprehension, the participants did not have any problem understanding the seven items in the Gap-Filling task. This was because the words were presented as they were typically used in Malay (see Table 6.13). In addition, the preference scale results indicate the participants’ familiarity with the typical usages of the loan words in Malay, specifically for the items *individu* (‘individual’), *relevan* (‘relevance’) and *elemen* (‘elements’). In contrast, the Translation
task results for the seven items confirmed that participants were not familiar with other usages of the English words. Note that, for this task, participants had to translate the underlined original English word (which has an English loan word equivalent) into Malay. The sentences deliberately used the English words in usages different from how the English loan word equivalents are typically used in Malay. Higher numbers were recorded for incorrect responses by participants. The English words ‘issue’ and ‘elements’ did not elicit a single correct response, while the words which received the most non-response were ‘function’, ‘relevance’ and ‘potential’. However, as English loan words, these three words received a high number of fully correct responses in the Gap-Filling comprehension scale. These results are significant in that they further support the findings of the linguistic analysis for these seven loan words.

Table 6.14: Potentially problematic items both in the Gap-Filling and in the Translation tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gap-Filling results</th>
<th>Translation results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension scale</td>
<td>Translation scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference scale</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully correct</td>
<td>English loan word Malay equivalent</td>
<td>'factor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faktor (n=98)</td>
<td>isu individu faktor</td>
<td>'function'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fungsi (n=85)</td>
<td>potensi relevan fungsi</td>
<td>'individual'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individu (n=83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'potential'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potensi (n=82)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'elements'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elemen (n=82)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'relevance'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevan (n=71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'issue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isu (n=64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2.2 Comparison between the results for the Translation and the Gap-Filling tasks for the overlapping items

Table 6.15 shows the Translation task items ordered according to number of ‘Correct’, ‘Incorrect’, and ‘No Responses’ responses. All of the potentially problematic items in the study (in bold), and specifically the items which overlapped with the Gap-Filling task, feature at the top end of the ‘Incorrect’ category. The top three items on the ‘No Response’ category were also items from the group of potentially problematic loan words. These items with the asterisk received a high number of correct responses in the comprehension category in the Gap-Filling task, but the Translation task presented the original English words in usages other than how they would typically be used in Malay and, as a result, these items received the lowest correct responses.

Table 6.15: Types of response to the Translation task, ordered by frequency: simple classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definition</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>function *</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>function *</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>significance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convention</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>significance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 6.2.3 The Translation task results based on the more elaborate categories

Table 6.16: Types of response to the Translation task, ordered by frequency: more elaborate classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>OLWC</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>OLWI</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>ELWC</th>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>ELWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definition</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data *</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>aspect *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aspect *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>data *</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status *</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>status *</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect *</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>significance</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>data *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>function *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convention</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>significance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>function *</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>status *</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>convention</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **MC** = Malay correct; **MI** = Malay incorrect; **OLWC** = other loan word correct; **OLWI** = other loan word incorrect; **ELWC** = exact loan word correct; **ELWI** = exact loan word incorrect
6.2.3.1 ‘Malay correct’ and ‘Malay incorrect’ categories

Table 6.16 shows a more detailed classification of the types of responses which were given by the participants. The seven items (bold and starred) which were high in the correct response category of the Gap-Filling task also feature higher on the list of the ‘Malay incorrect response’ category (MI). Three of the seven items (‘function’, ‘potential’ and ‘issue’) that overlapped with the Gap-Filling task also had high numbers of responses which were actual English loan words, albeit incorrect (ELWI) i.e. fungsi, potensi and isu; they did not fit the sentence in the Translation task. The results in the ‘Malay correct’ category (MC) show that the items in bold, and specifically those with the asterisk, were items that received the least number of correct responses. This further supports the linguistic analysis, which found these items to be potentially problematic words for learners.

The ‘Malay incorrect’ category is for translations which were incorrect and did not fit the context. This was because the participants merely gave other Malay equivalents which matched the usage of the loan word in Malay but not the use of the English word in the task. The translations for the item ‘individual’ (Q3, for example, included orang (‘person’), seseorang (‘someone’, ‘somebody’), and persendirian (‘private’, ‘personal’) which all relate to orang (‘individual’). The linguistic analysis of the word ‘individual’ found that both loan words individu and individual are interchangeable to mean orang (‘person’) in Malay. Hence, participants were only translating based on their knowledge of the loan word usage in Malay. The same translation process occurred with the item ‘elements’ (Q4), whose translations included bahagian (‘part’, ‘component’), ciri ciri (‘components’, ‘parts’), unsur (‘element’, ‘component part’), perkara (‘matter’), and kandungan (‘contents’). These Malay equivalents all point to the most common usage of the loan word elemen (‘element’) in Malay, that of ‘something which is part of a whole’. These results agree with the findings in the linguistic analysis for the potentially problematic words.

6.2.3.2 ‘Other loan word correct’ and ‘Other loan word incorrect’ categories

The ‘other loan word correct’ category (OLWC) understandably had a very small share of the total responses. This was presumably because the vast majority of the participants had low English proficiency. The high number of responses in Malay shows that participants were more inclined to respond in the language they were more familiar and confident with. Nonetheless, a small number of participants provided a correct translation using other loan
words for several items on the task. One participant, P5, translated the item ‘factor’ (Q2) as *menganalisa* (‘analysing’), which was correct in the Malay sense as the nearest equivalent to the verb ‘factor’. Another participant, P40, translated the item ‘individual’ (Q3) into *personal* (‘individual’), which was also correct. For the item ‘response’ (Q8), only four participants provided a correct translation using another loan word, which was *reaksi* (‘response’). The item ‘convention’ (Q10) also had only four participants who used other loan words to translate it. These included *konvensi* (‘convention’), *norma* (‘norm’) and *normal* (‘normal’).

Results in the ‘Other loan word incorrect’ category (OLWI) again show participants’ responses based on their understanding of the loan words in Malay. Responses for ‘issue’ (Q1) included *agenda* (‘agenda’) and *topik* (‘topic’), both of which did not fit the context. These responses are synonyms of the loan word *isu* (‘issue’) in its narrower usage in Malay. Similarly, the item ‘elements’ also had responses which were narrower in meaning compared to how the word was used in the sentence i.e. as the basic things that one has to learn first about a subject (see Table 6.13). Responses for ‘elements’ included *aspek* (‘aspect’), *komponen* (‘component’), and *objek* (‘object’). ‘Individual’ (Q3) is another item which received responses according to the Malay usage *individu* (‘person’). Responses within this category for the item ‘factor’ (Q2) included *fokus* (‘focus’), *impak* (‘impact’) and *mengaplikasikan* (‘applying something onto’). Unlike the other responses within the OLWI category, these Malay responses were not the typical usage as described in Table 6.13. These variations can be attributed to the participants’ attempts to translate the item ‘factor’ based on the context in which it was used in the sentence, instead of focusing on the English loan word *faktor*. Three of the participants were in the Science program, whilst one was in the Business program. The atypical responses, although incorrect, indicated that these four participants judged that the usage of ‘factor’ in the sentence was not similar to that of the loan word *faktor*.

The item ‘function’ (Q15) also received similar attempts i.e. responses that did not rely on the typical understanding of the loan word *fungsi* (‘function’). The same two participants who translated ‘factor’ as *fokus* (‘focus’) for item Q2 had worked out that *fungsi* did not fit as a translation for ‘function’ as used in the sentence. Another participant also responded with *faktor*. All three participants were in the Science program and, according to their grades and MUET scores, were a little more proficient in English than most of the other students. This apparently allowed them to better understand the sentence.
The final two items which also overlapped with the items in the Gap-Filling task are ‘relevance’ (Q14) and ‘potential’ (Q16). Both items received one incorrect response in the form of a loan word. One participant attempted to translate ‘relevance’ as informasi (‘information’) which did not fit the context of the sentence. Another participant translated ‘potential’ into kualiti (‘quality’), which was also incorrect. These two Business program participants apparently inferred that ‘relevance’ and ‘potential’ in the sentences did not equate to the Malay words relevan and potensi. Despite their educated guesses, however, their responses were not correct.

6.2.3.3 ‘Exact loan word correct’ and ‘Exact loan word incorrect’ categories

Responses in these two categories were not expected, given that the participants were specifically instructed not to give this type of responses i.e. ‘definition’ translated as definisi, ‘minority’ as minoriti, ‘significance’ as signifikan and so on. However, it turned out that these responses were useful in that they were evidence that a number of participants over-generalised and hence assumed the English word’s usage was similar to that of the loan word in Malay. The items which received these responses were not potentially problematic, based on the linguistic analysis. The exceptions were for items ‘aspect’ (Q20), ‘status’ (Q18) and ‘response’ (Q8) which were translated correctly but as loan words. The item ‘response’ had one translation of respon. This does not match the spelling for the English loan word in Kamus Dewan, which is respons. Nevertheless, the translation was considered acceptable despite the spelling error. The reason why respon was accepted as correct was that it fitted the context of the sentence in the task. The Malay equivalent for ‘response’ in the sentence would be sambutan or another English loan word, reaksi (‘reaction’). The latter option, though, could have been a clearer option had the sentence used ‘reaction’ instead of ‘response’. This lack of one-to-one exact equivalents for English words in Malay is often considered the reason why English loan words are on the increase in Malay vocabulary. The translation of English words, for example ‘response’, requires care and involves more time for the learners or users to come up with the most suitable Malay word. Loan words provide a faster solution and users do not have to spend time considering several options in Malay, which sometimes also include other English loan words, for example, jawapan (‘reply’), maklum balas (‘reply’, ‘feedback’), reaksi (‘reaction’), tindak balas (‘reaction’), and gerak...
balas (‘response’). One participant from the focus group interview, P51, explained the advantage of brevity that English has over Malay in this way:

P51: Like I’ve said, for example *kolaborasi* (‘collaboration’), if we explained this word in Malay, we have to use lengthy sentences. But if we said *kolaborasi*, or if we wrote *kolaborasi*, everyone...if everyone already understands that word, then it’s easy to get the meaning.

Table 6.16 shows that all seven of the overlapping items feature at the top end of the ‘exact loan word incorrect’ category. ‘Function’ received the highest number of the responses with the loan word *fungsi* (‘function’). These were *fungsi* (n=35) and *berfungsi* (‘function as’) (n=4).

In short, we can say that data from these two categories of responses support the findings of the linguistic analysis with regard to the potentially problematic items.

6.2.3.4 ‘No Response’ category and corpus frequency word list for items in the task

Table 6.17 shows the distribution of nil responses for the Translation task, ordered from highest to lowest frequency. The table also shows the frequency in the corpus of the loan word equivalents for the task. The top three items which did not receive any responses (‘function’, ‘relevance’, and ‘potential’) are potentially problematic items which were included in the Gap-Filling task. The other two items, ‘fundamental’ and ‘convention’, are also potentially problematic words but were not in the Gap-Filling task.
Table 6.17: The ‘No Response’ (NR) category and the corpus word frequency list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TT item</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>English loan word</th>
<th>Corpus Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>function *</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>isu * ('issue')</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance *</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>faktor * ('factor')</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential *</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>aspek ('aspect')</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>individu * ('individual')</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convention</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>data ('data')</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect *</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>status ('status')</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scope</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>fungsi * ('function')</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>potensi * ('potential')</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>elemen * ('elements')</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>relevan * ('relevance')</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status *</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>signifikkan ('significance')</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements *</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>minoriti ('minority')</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>skop ('scope')</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>fundamental ('fundamental')</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor *</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>respons * ('response')</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data *</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>definisi ('definition')</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issue *</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>spesifik ('specific')</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>koordinasi ('coordination')</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>konvesyen ('convention')</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>logikal ('logical')</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A possible reason that these three items were the most difficult can be found in the corpus word frequency list. The loan word equivalents of the items have low frequency (less than 100 occurrences) within the corpus, although they all occurred at least 10 times. For example, the item ‘function’ received about similar number of responses in the ‘Malay incorrect’ (n=31) and ‘exact loan word incorrect’ (n=39) categories. Similarly, the highest number of responses for the items ‘relevance’ (n=68) and ‘potential’ (n=50) were in the ‘Malay incorrect’ category. These results show that the participants recognised the loan words and their Malay equivalents as having the same meaning or usages. This brings us to another possible reason for the high number of non-responses – uncertainty on the part of the participants.

Not providing a response does not necessarily mean the participant had no idea about the answer. Data from the focus group interviews showed that several participants did not provide a response because they “could not get the Malay word” for the English items. Nonetheless, this explanation did not mean the participant was actively looking for the translation of the English items as they were used in the sentence. The participant instead was
trying to find a synonym for the loan word *relevan* – which has essentially become a Malay word. An example of this situation is seen in this interview excerpt:

R: But why couldn’t you translate it? Is it because, again, you don’t know the Malay word for it? *(referring to an earlier item ‘convention’ which P4 also said she understood the sentence but could not find the Malay word for.)*
P4: Yes.
R: What's the Malay word for ‘relevance’? What's the loan word?
P4: Errr...*relevan*.
R: So, it’s *relevan*, is it?
P4: Yes.

Another example is with the item ‘elements’, as seen in this interview excerpt:

R: ... Okay, what about ‘elements’?
P3: ‘Elements’?
R: Why wasn’t it answered? Why was it difficult to answer?
P3: Because in Malay I can only understand it was *elemen*.
R: You understood it as *elemen*?
P3: Yes.

Both excerpts indicate that the participants first translated the English words ‘relevance’ and ‘elements’ into their loan word equivalents *relevan* and *elemen* and, instead of working on translating the English words, the participants were centred on finding Malay synonyms for the loan words. In essence, the participants were actually having trouble with the Malay vocabulary *relevan* and *elemen*. In other words, they could not think of any Malay word that had the same meaning as the loan word. Thus far, the results from the Translation task match up with the findings of the linguistic analysis, particularly with the potentially problematic loan words.

The items on the Translation task are shown on Table 6.17 with the corpus frequencies in descending order. As was described earlier in this chapter, the Translation task deliberately used the English equivalents of the potentially problematic loan words (in bold) in usages which were not familiar or available in Malay. Based on the linguistic analysis, it was posited that the participants would encounter difficulties in translating these words. In addition, the corpus frequency list indicates that these loan words occur frequently in their Malay usages and they feature on the top half of the list. Data from the Gap-Filling task earlier in the chapter also supports this finding.
However, the top three items in the ‘No Response’ category are seen in the middle of the word frequency word list. This could indicate that these three items are not as commonly used as the other potentially problematic loan words, which might make them more unfamiliar – either as English words or as loan words – to the participants.

6.2.4 Summary of the Translation task

The task set out to support the findings of the linguistic analysis. The hypothesis was that potentially problematic loan words would confuse learners because of the differences in how the English loan words are used in Malay as compared to how the original English words are used in English. Results from the Translation task, in particular for the seven loan words which were also tested in the Gap-Filling task, are consistent with the findings of the linguistic analysis. The difference in usage between the loan word in Malay and the original English word (Table 6.13) resulted in more incorrect responses for the potentially problematic loan words. The results of the linguistic analysis were tested in this task in order to provide evidence that learners need to be aware – and should be taught to be aware – of such potentially problematic words if they are going to benefit from using the loan words as tools in their learning of English vocabulary. Learners who are more word-conscious would have a better understanding of the relationship between English loan words in Malay and their English source.

6.3 Conclusion

The vocabulary tasks – Gap-Filling and Translation – were designed to elicit particular responses based on the results of the linguistic analysis and the corpus word frequency list. The Gap-Filling task was also an experiment to investigate learners’ preferences for either an English loan word or a Malay word upon filling in a gap in a Malay sentence. Earlier results from the linguistic analysis show that there are potential pitfalls in using the English loan words as tools in the learning of academic English vocabulary. The most obvious problematic scenario is when learners over-generalise and hence relate the usage of the loan word in Malay to the actual English word. This chapter shows that data from both tasks support the findings of the linguistic analysis.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION

7.0 Overview

It is undeniable that English language teachers at Malaysian public universities face a challenging task. They have to find innovative ways to make significant improvements in the students’ English proficiency if the students are to meet the language demands of their university studies. One key aspect in improving the students’ proficiency is by expanding their vocabulary knowledge – especially knowledge of academic vocabulary as represented by the Academic Word List. Many of these words are already potentially known to the students as English loan words in Malay. The aim of this study is to provide a basis for encouraging learners to apply their latent knowledge of the loan words and to be conscious of the loan words as pre-existing lexical resources for learning academic vocabulary.

This study found that 216 of the headwords in the Academic Word List (40%) exist as loan words in Malay. It also found that not only could Malaysian ESL learners identify English loan words in Malay easily but that some of the loan words were considered as native Malay words, particularly to bumiputera learners. However, even though many of the loan words might be effective for vocabulary learning in linguistic terms, it might be counterproductive to highlight their use particularly if the students did not view English positively, or if their use provoked a negative attitude among bumiputera students. Results from the language attitude questionnaire showed that this concern was largely unfounded. There was some unease among the students over the fact that Malay borrowed so many words from English, but that concern did not affect the learners’ pragmatic acceptance of English as a language which would be useful to them especially after graduation. In fact, the majority of learners in this study were agreeable to English being the medium of instruction in public universities.

This study has endeavoured to investigate whether English loan words in Malay have potential as academic vocabulary learning tools for use by Malaysian undergraduates. The subject of English loan words is particularly interesting in light of their large numbers in Malay vocabulary due to planned and spontaneous borrowing. As has been described in Chapter 2, lexical borrowing has been carried out aggressively by the national language agency, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (DBP), as part of the country’s language planning efforts. After a decade of sociolinguistic purism (1956 – 1966) it was only from 1967 onwards that the DBP became more accepting of words borrowed from English. The purist
attitude still exists with regards to accepting loan words in Malay. However, there are also an increasing number of occurrences of English loan words in the Malay print media. English loan words in Malay can no longer be described as just *istiklah*, or terminology borrowed merely for technical description in the field of science and technology\(^26\) where Malay words do not exist. This chapter will discuss the findings from the previous three chapters in an effort to arrive at a conclusion about the viability of the English loan words as resources for learning academic English vocabulary. It is useful at this juncture to review the overall argument and the goals of this study as reflected in the research questions, which were:

1. Which academic words occur as loan words in Malay, and to what extent do the loan words have the potential to facilitate the learning of the original English words?

2. To what extent do the students have the ability to recognise and comprehend the English loan words in Malay?

3. To what extent do the students have the ability to recognise and comprehend the corresponding words in English?

4. What attitudes do the students have towards English, English loan words, and Malay, and how might these attitudes play a role in their learning of academic English vocabulary?

The chapter will also briefly recapitulate the motivation for undertaking the study of English loan words, which thus far have received only limited attention from researchers and language teachers in Malaysia. It will explain the steps taken in the research and review the results of the preliminary analysis of the AWL, the linguistic analysis of the selected English loan words, and the vocabulary test instruments given to the participants of the study. In addition, the attitudinal dimension of utilising the English loan words will be considered in light of the history of English – Malay language contact from a socio-political and socio-cultural perspectives, particularly for Malay *bumiputera* students. Also included in this chapter is a discussion of other similar studies which have attempted to use loan words (cognates in certain cases) in the teaching of English vocabulary. Finally, this chapter will discuss the prospects for a vocabulary teaching programme as well as presenting some guidelines for developing such a programme.

### 7.1 English loan words in the Malay print media

The Malay print media, represented in this study by the Utusan newspaper, is an environment in which we find an abundance of English loan words, especially of the importation variety.
We have learnt from the discussion in Chapter 2 that loan words of this variety have four main characteristics: (1) they occur most often in the media (newspapers); (2) their borrowing into Malay is influenced by “considerations of speed, expediency, fashion, and impact on audience” (Heah, 1989: 273); (3) because of characteristic number (2), their borrowed form in Malay often very much resembles the original English words; and (4) they occur outside the control of the language planning agency. Resemblance to their English sources is part of the usefulness of the loan words in this study, as they are expected to have a lighter learning burden for students. This study found that the print media was able to provide more than sufficient material to build a sample corpus of semi-academic articles in Malay. The corpus was limited to 559 articles (547,838 running words), as its purpose was primarily to obtain concordance data on the usage of the loan words in the articles. The fact that Malay newspapers are the largest contributors to the DBP Malay Corpus Database signifies the important role that Malay newspapers play in the dissemination of new language items. As opposed to retrieving English loan words from Malay dictionaries, the semi-academic newspaper articles were considered to be more authentic sources in which we can see whether there are changes to the original meanings and/or grammatical class of the loan words.

Lexical borrowing from English in Malay has been described as having begun out of the need for prestige but later turned to one of need-filling (Abdullah, 1975: 35). The latter includes the need for technical and scientific terms as well as for words describing novel and current concepts or items in everyday life which originate from the West. Modernization of the state as well as other social and cultural changes all require new words and novel concepts to be expressed in Malay. This study found that the Malay print media is an excellent source of English loan words, including some which are not officially recorded in Kamus Dewan yet. In addition, some semantic usages of the loan words in the newspaper articles were not covered by the definitions provided by Kamus Dewan. This highlights the issue of semantic narrowing or broadening of the loan words concerned, which affects the density of the direct teaching the teacher needs to do when using the loan words to teach the academic English vocabulary.
7.2 Analyses of the English loan words

This section focuses on Research Question 1: Which academic words occur as loan words in Malay, and to what extent do the loan words have the potential to facilitate the learning of the original English words?

7.2.1 Preliminary analysis of the Academic Word List (AWL)

The first step was identifying the number of AWL words borrowed into Malay. The 570 word families of the AWL were used as a starting point because it is this type of vocabulary that university students meet in their academic texts. The AWL was a more suitable choice when working with English loan words in Malay because more academic words than high-frequency English words have been borrowed into Malay. This is in contrast to the situation in Japanese, in which there are more gairaigo from the British National Corpus (BNC 3000), a high-frequency English word list (45.3%), than from the AWL (27%) \(^\text{(Daulton, 2005: 11).}\)

The initial basis for identifying the loan words was orthographic. However, the English words from the AWL were also cross-checked for their Malay translations with Kamus Inggeris-Malay Dewan (Dewan English-Malay Dictionary) and Oxford Advanced Learner’s English Malay Dictionary. The preliminary analysis revealed 216 (38%) of the 570 head words had been borrowed into Malay.

The morphemic shapes of these loan words still retain evidence of their English original sources in spite of some modification to fit the Malay phonology and orthography. These loan words may also be defined as a form of importation, as opposed to substitution, on the basis that the reproduced loan resembled the model (Haugen, 1950: 212). e.g. analisis and ‘analysis’. Haugen’s distinction between importation and substitution is significant in this study because the loan words which are the focus of this study are of the importation type. This resemblance is crucial as it is the link which students need to be aware of and should be taught to be aware of.

Of the 216 loan words, 78% (168) were nouns while about 22% were adjectives and only one was a verb. We can therefore establish that the borrowing hierarchy of the importation-type English loan words based on the AWL was: Nouns – Adjectives – Verbs. A similar hierarchy of Noun – Adjective – Verb – Affixes was found in an earlier study of English loan words in Malay.
selected Malay newspaper articles (Shamimah, 2006: 58). Noun loan words were also found to have the highest occurrence followed by Adjectives and Verbs in an analysis of loan words in bank brochures in Malay (Norhazlina, 2009: 103). Note, however, that these numbers represent loan words of the importation category and that this study does not include loan words of the substitution category even if they are such loan words for the AWL.

Findings from the preliminary analysis are also consistent with Heah’s analysis of English influence in the Malay lexicon. Heah found that the English loan words in her study were predominantly nouns followed by adjectives and the verbs (1989: 287). However, the initial analysis in this study, as well as those by Heah (1989), Shamimah (2006), and Norhazlina (2009) support only one part of Winford’s (2003:12) argument, which states that content morphemes such nouns and verbs are the most common type of lexical borrowing. The only loan word verb found in the preliminary analysis was (Malay prefix)-ilustrasi-(Malay suffix) for the verb ‘illustrated’. It is quite difficult for Malay to borrow verbs from English because Malay verbs have more complex structures than nouns as a result of the many affixes which the verb employs such as mengilustrasikan or only mengilustrasi (Abdullah, 2006: 96).

This means that English verbs with base words that are of the importation type are likely to be borrowed and still retain the base word alongside the Malay affixes. The examples are memaksimumkan for the verb ‘maximize’ and menstabilkan for the verb ‘stabilizing’. Having said that, journalists and writers are generally practical and, thus far, there have been no cases of literally-translated loan words such as mensimbolkan or penyimbolan for ‘symbolising’ even if the loan word simbol exists for ‘symbol’.

7.2.2 Linguistic analysis of the Academic Word List (AWL)

A linguistic (lexical, grammatical, and semantic) analysis of the English loan words was carried out to determine whether there were loan words which could cause confusion and learning problems since they did not match their English source words in meanings, word form, or usage. The linguistic analysis was considered to be a necessary part of the study as it would provide the basis for guidelines in utilising the loan words with learners. Malaysian ESL learners might know ekonomi but might misunderstand the meaning if they encountered ‘economy’, ‘economic’, or ‘economics’ in an English sentence.
A total of 559 semi-academic articles were retrieved from the Utusan Malaysia database to form the corpus used for the linguistic analysis of 62 English loan words, selected on the basis that: a) they occurred in the Utusan corpus, b) they were included in the pilot test instruments, and c) they were to be included in the test instruments in Phase 2 of the study. A loan word frequency list was generated from the corpus using the concordance software Antconc (Anthony, 2007). The concordance results were then analysed using Kamus Dewan (3rd edition) and the Oxford Dictionary of English for similarities or differences.

The linguistic analysis led to predictions of ways in which the linking of particular loan words to their English equivalents could be problematic or not. A problematic loan word was one whose meaning(s) had been narrowed, or expanded, or was used as a different part of speech from its English source. On the other hand, a non-problematic loan word retained the core meaning of the English source as well as its part of speech and usage. The analysis found 37 loan words to be potentially problematic and 26 which are potentially non-problematic.

An important characteristic of the non-problematic loan words was that they shared the definitional or denotational meaning of the English source (Daulton, 2008: 88) and hence were predicted to facilitate positive transfer and provide a lighter learning burden for the English word (Nation: 2001: 23-24). Examples of the potentially non-problematic loan words were strategi (‘strategy’), aspek (‘aspect’), definisi (‘definition’), and data (‘data’).

7.2.2.2 Potentially problematic loan words

Comparison of the meanings and usage of the English loan words based on the corpus revealed several issues of concern:

a) The same word form in Malay for what are different parts of speech in English.
   An example of this problem is the loan word ekonomi, which is from both the noun ‘economy’ and the adjective ‘economic/al’. The same problem occurs for the loan word logik, which is the loan word for both the English noun ‘logic’ and the adjective ‘logical’.

b) Narrowing of meaning in Malay compared to in English.
   An example is the loan word isu (‘issue’), where the noun form has been borrowed into Malay but not the verb. Further examples are the loan words faktor (‘factor’), and
fungsi (‘function’). The usage of the loan word faktor in Malay is limited to the noun which means a ‘circumstance’, ‘fact’, or ‘influence’ which contributes to a result or outcome. Other usages, such as the phrasal verb ‘factor in’, are not borrowed into Malay. Similarly, the usage of the loan word fungsi in Malay is limited to the noun which means ‘the natural purpose of something’. Other meanings of ‘function’ like ‘ceremony’ and ‘result’ are not borrowed into Malay.

c) Broadening of meaning in Malay compared to in English (the broadened meaning has currency in articles written in Malay).
An example is the loan word akademik, which is used as a noun in Malay to mean ‘education’ and not as ‘a person who is a member of a learning institution’. The corpus shows sistem nilai murni akademik perlu dipelihara (‘the value system of academic/education should be preserved’). In this example, the sentence did not mean ‘the value system of the person who is a member of a learning institution should be preserved’.

d) Mismatch of actual use of the loan word in the corpus and its definition in Kamus Dewan.
An example is the loan word senario (‘scenario’), which Kamus Dewan defines following the definitions in the Oxford Dictionary of English. However, the corpus in this study shows that senario is also used to refer to ‘current events’ and not just ‘postulated or imagined development of events’. Data from the corpus show the use of senario to mean ‘situation’. This could also be described as a widening of meaning but compared to Problem (c), in which the broadened meaning is already noted in Kamus Dewan, the use of senario in the corpus appears to be a good example of a spontaneous loan word as the new usage is yet to be documented in Kamus Dewan.

The significance of these identified problems is that students who are familiar with these loan words may impose the loan word meaning, or word form, or usage in Malay onto the English source. Similar findings, albeit not focused on the pedagogical aspect, were reported by Heah (1989), who also listed semantic widening and semantic restriction as being amongst the ways that English loan words are modified in Malay (ibid: 149-150).

On the other hand, the problems related to the loan words found in this study differ from those highlighted by Heah (ibid: 135-142). This is understandable given the different
purposes of the two studies and the time period when each study was carried out. Heah found the inconsistency between the phonological and orthographical adaptation of the English loan words into Malay to be more problematic. Amongst the problems related to spelling were variant spellings for the same word such as (talipon/‘telefon’), (pilem/‘filem’) and alternative word endings for loan words (aksi/‘aksyen’), (matematika/‘matematik’). English loan words also cause conflict when, in the bid to maintain a visual resemblance to English, new letters for equally new phonemes were introduced to the Malay spelling system. Examples include the letter $g$ representing the phoneme /dʒ/ as in the English agenda, as opposed to the Malay agar /g/ (‘so that’). During the time of Heah’s research Malay was still undergoing various developments, but the phonology and spelling of new loan words has become more standardised now.

The Malay dictionary Kamus Dewan was carefully consulted in the course of analysing the meanings, word parts, and usage of the English loan words and their English sources. KD prides itself as the foremost authority on Malay, but it is interesting - and frustrating - that KD does not include labels for parts of speech for each of its entries. In addition, the dictionary does not label English as one of the sources for its loan words. An argument, therefore, can be made that the lack of information in the Malay dictionary may cause more problems in using the English loan words as students will not have a point of reference for the part(s) of speech and usage(s) in Malay. The missing information is useful for students and teachers to discern the extent to which the borrowed English words are functional or can function in Malay. Without this information, users of Malay are left to improvise on their own.

The linguistic analysis in this study also revealed the inconsistency between Kamus Dewan, the terminology guidebook by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, and actual usage found in the Malay semi-academic articles for borrowed English adjectives, especially those that have the suffixes ‘-ic’ and ‘-ical’. It is worthwhile at this point to discuss this inconsistency as it has a direct effect on the use of loan words in learning the corresponding English word. In addition, English adjectives tend to be borrowed more by those writing in the spontaneous sector (Heah, 1989: 287). This study argues that the conflict between the prescribed usage and the reality contributes to making the English loan words potentially problematic. An example from the corpus of this study is logik. Logik in Kamus Dewan (4th edition) is the loan word for both the English noun ‘logic’ and the adjective ‘logical’. However, the Guide for the
Formation of Malay Terminology (1992: 32) advises that ‘-ical’ suffix be translated into –is or –ik, which would make ‘logical’ logis (Indonesian variant) or logik, as it currently appears in Kamus Dewan.

Nevertheless, confusion may arise when learners encounter other borrowed adjectives such as idealistik (‘idealistic’), praktikal (‘practical’), and nasional (‘national’), whose suffixes in the original source words are included in their loan word form – unlike logik (‘logical’).

This study argues that the problem might lie in the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka’s exclusive treatment of English words that enter the Malay lexicon as istilah or terminology. Guidelines and manuals on translation of English words steer the prescribed technical usage of these loan words in Malay, while loan words that gained currency in non-technical contexts are described as istilah dalam konteks umum (‘terminology in general context’). Hence, terminological guidelines are devised based on information pertaining specifically to the use of loan words in technical texts and show insufficient consideration for occurrences of the loan words in non-technical usage. Asmah, for example, states that there are few borrowings of English adjectives into Malay technical texts (Asmah, 2005: 17) and this is also the conclusion reached in Heah (1989: 287).

The loan words logik and individu, hence, are both nouns as well as adjectives in Malay and, from the perspective of this study that makes ‘logic’, ‘logical’, and ‘individual’ potentially problematic loan words. Having the original English adjective translated as a noun is inconsistent with the guideline of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, which states that the translation must ensure the istilah (‘terminology’) remain similar to the original part of speech (Guide for the Formation of Malay Terminology, 2004: 7). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that 62 out of 101 participants in this study did not manage to translate the English word ‘individual’ into Malay in the Translation task. The word ‘logical’, on the other hand, received a high number of correct translations. However, based on the responses given, it was understood because of the context it was in. The participants mainly used the synonym of ‘reasonable’ instead of the Malay equivalents of logikal, which are munasabah or masuk akal.

The complications discussed above show that the exclusive treatment of loan words as terminology and technical is a limitation, in that it does not allow the terminology guideline and manuals to explain the behaviour of the loan words in non-technical and non-scientific
contexts. It is true that English adjectives are seldom borrowed in the planned sector, but there is evidence that they figure quite predominantly in the spontaneous sector (Heah, 1989: 287). The limitation gives the impression that the loan word logikal is unlikely to appear in other types of Malay text. It is odd to categorise loan words which are used by the general public as istilah umum (‘general terminology’), as in this sentence in the newspaper:

*Mereka menyediakan saya dengan jawapan yang begitu ringkas dan amat logikal.*

(‘They provided me with answers which are very brief and very logical.’) (Utusan Malaysia, 15 Jan 2009)

The writer’s usage of logikal instead of logik as the adjective in the example above clearly violates the prescribed terminology guideline. Hence, the linguistic analysis shows that it is not possible to generalise about the form that an English adjective will take in Malay, despite several established guidelines by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Data from the analysis provide further evidence to show that Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka needs to be more systematic with its translation guidelines related to English words with affixes – in this case, those which are attached to English adjectives. This conclusion is consistent with other research in Malay which states that the problem of translating English affixes e.g. the ‘–ic’ and ‘–ical’ suffixes has yet to be solved (Abdullah Hassan, 1992: 326; Chiew, 1999). Abdullah in fact argues that these particular suffixes are ‘the tip of the iceberg’ and reveal various other problems in Malay related to istilahs with English affixes. Chiew found that there are various adaptations into Malay for the ‘–ic’ and ‘–ical’ suffixes which cause confusion. The reason, according to Chiew, is the discrepancies in the guidelines and terminology manuals published by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (1999: 608). By contrast, we can see an example of non-confusion in Japanese which has a positive vs. negative arrangement in its treatment of English adjective loan words. English nouns which enter the Japanese lexicon are converted into adjectives by attaching –na to it e.g. romanchikku na (‘romantic’) and into adverbs by attaching –ni e.g. romanchikku ni (‘romantically’) resulting in an unnecessary morphological change to the loan base (Daulton, 2008: 20).

The role of the media in the creation and the dissemination of loan words in Malay should not be taken for granted. Newspaper editors and writers cannot afford the time to be fastidious over word choice. Even if the articles are semi-academic in nature, writing for the newspaper gives writers more licence to be creative as it is influenced by speed, expediency, fashion and impact on audience (Heah, 1989: 273). Writers, hence, often rely on their personal choice of
words and attitudes towards English loan words in their writing. Shamimah (2006: 139) found in her interview with Malay newspaper writers that an open attitude toward loan words was one of several factors in the writers’ preference for using these words. Another factor mentioned by the writers was that the loan words were easier to use and understand.

That using loan words is most often determined by the preferences of writers points to a different aspect of reliability in relation to the currency of loan words in the media. This is best illustrated by reference to the word *logikal* (‘logical’). The decision to include *logikal* in the vocabulary tasks was partly based on the fact that 57 articles containing the word were found in the initial search of the online archives. However, one year later, the same search produced zero results. This raises the issue of the constancy of the word *logikal* in the corpus and whether it should be included in this study. The varying results underline the fluid status of English loan words in Malay, especially in commercially-owned text archives whose contents are subject to the owners’ editorial decisions. The variation is also considered as evidence of the ‘fluctuating trace of change’ (Hunston, 2002: 32) in the nature of language use within the newspaper articles. For example, *superfisial* (‘superficial’) and *ekstensif* (‘extensive’) (Heah, 1989: 348) are no longer loan words in today’s Malay. This is in line with the observation that changes occur more quickly in the newspapers compared to other discourse (Hunston, 2002: 31). Hence, it is quite likely that *logikal* will eventually cease being a loan word, as even now its use is based on writers’ preferences and its form violates the prescribed guidelines. Nonetheless, variation in search results for a loan word in the newspaper online archives – from 57 to zero - provides evidence of fluctuation in the currency of loan words.

Despite the variations for *logikal*, it is safe to say that many English loan words will continue to appear in the semi-academic articles in the Malay media. A glance at any article in a Malay newspaper – regardless of its content – will show that it will at least have a few English loan words. The current situation is already in contrast to that less than two decades ago when borrowing outside the jurisdiction of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka was “sporadic and spontaneous” (Heah, 1989: 271). This study suggests that the print media (here also referring to writers in the general public) should be included as active members of the Malay vocabulary expansion project. A more active participation might pave the way for a smoother understanding of words – loan words in particular – as well as reducing the inconsistency.
between what is prescribed and what is actually used by the public. A similar call was raised by Heah (1989: 301), who states that the

..refusal of planners to take into consideration the attitudes and preferences of the public, and especially, the media, has been the main factor for the glaring discrepancies between planning and usage, and the reason why so many of the terms it has produced has [sic] not gained currency.

ESL teachers should be aware of these discrepancies should they use the loan words in semi-academic articles in the Malay media as readily-available tools for English vocabulary learning. They should highlight inconsistencies such as those discussed above and guide the ESL learners to arrive at the correct usage(s).

We move on to discuss the two important semantic changes with respect to English loan words: semantic narrowing (Malay borrows mainly the core meaning of the English word) and semantic extension (Malay expands the meaning of the English word). Semantic changes of words are not uncommon and words need not be loan words for change to occur semantically. However, highlighting these semantic changes is necessary from the perspective of this study so that ESL teachers may have an idea of the learning burden of the original English words. The linguistic analysis found 16 out of the 37 potentially problematic loan words showed semantic narrowing while six revealed semantic broadening.

One of the criticisms of using loan words in learning English vocabulary is an over-emphasis on form (Granger, 1993: 50). The problematic loan words in this study are manifestations of that valid concern. If the original word is introduced to learners as having a very similar form to the loan word, it will result in learners applying an incorrect strategy. The loan word *isu* (‘issue’), for instance, has 764 occurrences in the corpus with just one consistent meaning i.e. as ‘topic’ or ‘matter’. Another example is the loan word *konvensyen* (‘convention’) used in all ten occurrences in the corpus to mean a ‘large meeting’ or ‘conference’. These two are among several English words which were deliberately selected as having different meanings from the Malay loan words. The participants’ performance in the Translation task will be discussed in detail in a later section but suffice to say that the majority of the participants, as predicted, did not give a correct translation for the English words ‘issue’ and ‘convention’. A majority of participants also, as predicted in the linguistic analysis, treated the loan word *akademik* (‘academic’) as having the broader meaning of ‘education’ instead of understanding its function in English as an adjective. The linguistic analysis of the semi-
academic newspaper articles offered evidence that – where usage of English loan words in Malay is concerned – it is highly likely that learners’ understanding of the target vocabulary will be limited to the semantic sense of the loan word in Malay. Similar problems with using loan words have also been characterised as ‘pitfalls of cognates’ (Shepherd, 1996), ‘misuse of loan words’ (Simon-Maeda, 1995), and ‘deceptive cognates’ (Granger, 1993).

7.3 Extent of familiarity and vocabulary tests

The categorisation of the loan words into potentially problematic and non-problematic loan words required further investigation. The basic question was to what extent were the words already familiar to the students, and were they problematic or non-problematic in the way that had been predicted? This section will discuss the findings from the pilot study carried out involving loan word recognition tests as well as the vocabulary tasks of Gap-Filling and Translation.

7.3.1 Pilot tests: loan word recognition and vocabulary tasks (Gap-Filling and Synonym definition)

Two semi-academic articles were chosen for the simple purpose of investigating whether ESL learners recognise English loan words in Malay. The hypothesis was that learners would be able to identify the loan words based on their familiarity with contemporary Malay vocabulary. The results were as predicted in that there was a high level of recognition of the loan words. In both texts, the learners were able to identify more than 75% of the loan words on average. This is partly orthographic as loan words from English have a standard appearance as a result of the borrowing guidelines from Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

The initial recognition tests indicated that speakers of Malay have the potential to benefit from the formal appearance of the English loan words. In this aspect, Malaysian ESL learners particularly those with Malay as a first language, have the same advantage as Japanese ESL learners with the katakana filters which aid identification of gairaigo (loan words in Japanese) based on their phonological alteration (Daulton, 2008: 92). The only difference between Malay and Japanese is that Malay does not have a different phonetic script for loan words. Japanese, on the other hand, reserves the katakana script for gairaigo and uses kokugo for original Japanese vocabulary (Gottlieb, 2005: 15). Unlike in Malay, however, the process of truncation may complicate recognition of the English loan words in Japanese, as they lose important morphological elements (Daulton, 2008: 92). Truncation is not a common process
for English loan words in Malay and it is not likely to hinder recognition. As mentioned earlier, English loan words are borrowed into Malay with as little change as possible so as to maintain the resemblance to the English word (Asmah, 1979: 63). However, in line with the concerns expressed by Granger (1993) on deceptive cognates and an over-emphasis on form, we must be careful to not teach students to rely on the formal resemblance per se. They must also be taught to appreciate the semantic differences of the loan words in Malay and the source words in English.

The similarity of the loan word form also resulted in successful results for the first version of the Gap-Filling task, which had multiple-choice options for the participants to choose from to fill the gap. These included the English loan word, the Malay equivalent of the loan word, and two more Malay words which were semantically related but did not fit in the sentence. The results of the pilot Gap-Filling showed a preference for the loan word option over Malay equivalents. Examples of loan words with over 90% preference were *isu* (‘issue’), *konsep* (‘concept’), *faktor* (‘factor’), *fungsi* (‘function’), and *konteks* (‘context’). Apparently it was easy to detect the pattern in the options provided due to the standard appearance of English loan words in Malay.

The results from the Gap-Filling pilot are similar to those of Brown’s (1995) study with Japanese learners, which also used a gap-filling task. Brown’s participants chose borrowed words 49.6% of the time despite there being four other options. Brown terms this as the ‘borrowed word recognition phenomenon’ and concludes that the loan words in Japanese are a ‘latent English vocabulary base’ because the participants were comfortable to select the loan words over the non-loan words. The pilot for Gap-Filling task did not have an interview component; hence, there was no data to support whether the participants felt comfortable with the loan words or they merely detected the pattern and conformed to a social desirability bias (Dornyei, 2003:12). The results for the pilot of the Gap-Filling task were expected to show preference for the loan words. Hence, the options were taken out of the Gap-Filling task in order to eliminate the bias or the phenomenon described by Brown (1995).

The other vocabulary task in the pilot study was the word definition task. The overall results revealed that the majority of the participants in the pilot managed to give correct Malay equivalents for many of the loan words. *Impak* (‘impact’), *respons* (‘response’), and *strategi* (‘strategy’), for example, received over 90% correct synonyms. However, some participants had difficulty providing correct equivalents or synonyms for loan words such as *koordinasi*.
(‘coordination’), 
alternatif (‘alternative’), and minoriti (‘minority’). The results of the word definition task showed that students might not have problems understanding the use of the loan words especially when the sentence was already in Malay. As there was, at that stage, ample evidence that English loan words in Malay were easily identifiable and understood, we wanted to know whether students would be able to understand the original English words in English sentences. Hence the word definition task, having served its purpose, was replaced with the Translation task in the main study.

The loan word recognition tests were limited in that they did not include a comprehension aspect as well as an indication of preference. It was necessary to find out whether recognition of loan words also entailed comprehension of their meanings and subsequently the meanings of the original source word.

7.3.2 Gap-Filling task: preference and comprehension

The objective of the Gap-Filling task in the main study was to provide further evidence for the findings of the linguistic analysis in terms of whether the loan words were actually problematic or not as had been predicted. The preferences in the Gap-Filling task highlight several issues which will be elaborated below.

7.3.2.1 Participants preferred Malay equivalents more

In contrast to the pilot participants, the participants in the main study showed a strong preference for the Malay equivalents rather than loan words in the Gap-Filling task. The results for preference are unlike those of Daulton (2003c) and Brown (1995), who found that Japanese ESL learners showed a preference for loan words in their writing. The loan words were already familiar to them as there are already gairaigo versions of these English words in Japanese. The different results are understandable for two reasons. The first is the type of task which was given to the participants. Daulton’s participants were required to write a take-home descriptive essay in English and were allowed to consult a Japanese/English dictionary. In comparison, the participants in this study had a time-constrained Gap-Filling task and were not provided with answer options. In addition, they were also not allowed to refer to the dictionary. The purpose of the task was to capture the choice of words by the participants as neutrally as possible. The task required them to make a decision between the loan word and a Malay equivalent on the spot, with only the sentences as their prompts. The second reason is
the level of English proficiency of the participants. The participants in Daulton’s study were economics majors enrolled in an advanced English class. In contrast, the participants for this study were from three different programs of study (Arts, Science, and Business) and ranged from very limited to modest users of English. It would have been interesting to employ Daulton’s essay method with Malaysian participants who had been exempted from taking English at the university i.e. the more proficient users of English, as it would be quite beneficial to learn to what extent original English source words were included in their English production. This was not a suitable task to give to the less proficient participants in the present study.

The strong preference for Malay equivalents found in this study also contrasts with the findings in Shamimah (2006). She found that her participants – 68 readers and 20 newspaper writers – preferred English loan words over the Malay equivalents, for linguistic (e.g. semantic) as well as extralinguistic reasons (e.g. pragmatic, social, psychological, and modern development)\(^3\) (ibid: 105-131). Interestingly, one of the preferred loan words in Shamimah’s study was also preferred in this study – *isu* (‘issue’). The reasons given by Shamimah’s readers for preferring *isu* were: more suitable and effective in conveying message, easier to use and understand, and easier to use because it is shorter in word length (ibid: 136). The writers preferred *isu* because it was more popularly used as well as being a more modern word than the Malay equivalent provided i.e. *persoalan* (ibid: 149). In contrast, two loan words whose Malay equivalents received higher preference in this study were more strongly preferred in Shamimah (2006). These are *elemen* (‘elements’) and *fokus* (‘focus’) which are both also potentially problematic loan words based on the linguistic analysis.

The strong preference for loan words in Shamimah’s study is understandable because hers centred on the preference of the audience (readers) as well as the news provider (writers); and did not focus on the pedagogical element involved in utilising loan words with English language learners, which is vital in this study. The strong preference for the loan words *isu* (‘issue’), *akademik* (‘academic’), and *potensi* (‘potential’) in this present study provides evidence that learning the original words via these loan words may be problematic. As a result of the formal similarity between the loan word and the target word, learners may experience negative crosslinguistic influence from their present understanding of the loan words in Malay when attempting to comprehend or use the original English words.
The strong preference for Malay equivalents in the Gap-Filling task points to two things. The first is that, when faced with a word selection task, average Malaysian ESL learners will resort to words with which they are most familiar and feel safe - their ‘lexical teddy bears’ (Hasselgren, 1994:237). This means that their word choice was generally not based on the status of the word – native Malay or loan word. This is quite reasonable because ESL learners ultimately will want to fill the gap with the “correct” answer. This is illustrated in the response given by one participant in the interview session. When asked to give a reason for her choice (a loan word which was correct) she replied “I am only answering the question”.

It could be posited, therefore, that the ESL learners do have a latent knowledge of loan words. The question is does recognition of the loan word means comprehension of the original English word? We will discuss this question in a later section on comprehension.

7.3.2.2 Preference of loan word does not necessarily mean knowledge of the English source word

The data analysis found that preference for a loan word was more because the participants were familiar with word’s usage and meaning in Malay. This was evident in the strong preference as loan words for the potentially problematic English words ‘issue’, ‘academic’, ‘potential’, ‘sector’, ‘factor’, ‘function’, and ‘technique’. In short, the more popularly used the loan word is in Malay, the more its Malay meaning is attached to it. Hence, teachers should pay more attention to ensuring learners understand and know of similarities or differences between that loan word and its original English word.

7.3.2.3 Loan word preference is related to ethnicity

The study also found that loan word preference was related to the participants’ ethnicity. Bumiputra participants tended to prefer loan word responses more than their counterparts. However, the strength of the relationship between ethnicity and loan word preference was found to be fairly weak. Instead, results from the data analysis showed that Malay equivalent responses were preferred by non-bumiputra participants.

Caution, however, should be exercised in interpreting the bumiputra participants’ preference for English loan words. It is likely that they responded with loan words out of familiarity i.e. they were not consciously making a decision to supply a loan word. This means that they may not have even been aware of the word’s English origin. In fact, the bumiputra participants in the interview session had a matter-of-fact attitude towards their choices and
shrugged their shoulders when asked why, for example, they used *isu* (‘issue’) instead of the Malay equivalent *perkara*. As explained in the previous section, the participants may have chosen the words they felt were most correct based on their understanding of the linguistic environment surrounding the gap.

It could be argued, therefore, that the state is successful in its language management\(^{34}\) (Spolsky, 2008: 2) in the sense that the notion of borrowing from English is quite invisible except for interested parties. Quite possibly, the younger generation of Malaysians will not think twice about whether a word could be a loan word. One *bumiputera* participant in the interview even claimed that she had never heard of the Malay equivalent for *status* (‘status’), which is *taraf*. This might not be an unreasonable response given that the participants were all young adults aged 20 – 21 who experience English loan words as indigenous Malay words.

We now turn to discuss several other points of interest in relation to the Gap-Filling results according to word preference. The first is that, although the difference was not statistically significant, non-*bumiputera* participants had a higher mean score for the total number of Malay equivalent responses. This means that they responded with as many, if not more, Malay equivalents compared to the *bumiputera* participants. However, non-*bumiputera* participants also had more non-responses to the overall task, which could mean the task was more difficult for this group. It is possible that more loan word responses came from the *bumiputera* participants because of their native fluency in contemporary Malay - influenced by current use of the language in the Malay newspapers, which tends to not conform to prescribed language rules and regulations.

The non-*bumiputera* participants, on the other hand, may have had more Malay equivalent responses as a result of their exposure to and training in using the Malay dictionary. For example, the Malay syllabus\(^{35}\) of Dong Jiao Zong Chinese schools states that lack of Malay vocabulary is a problem for its students, especially in speaking and writing. Therefore, the schools give special attention to students learning Malay vocabulary. Students are taught effective use of the dictionary and teachers must instil in them the habit of looking up unknown words. Each student must also keep a personal dictionary in which she/he writes down the new word learnt for that day\(^{36}\). Keeping a word dictionary is typical of the vocabulary learning strategies employed by non-native speakers (the non-*bumiputera* participants). This observation is in line with Zamri and Mohamed’s (2005; 2006) finding
that, compared to Malay students, non-Malay students use more language learning strategies to learn Malay.

The second interesting finding is that data from all three programs of study showed similar non-preference for certain words, neither the loan word nor its Malay equivalent. These words were *komunikasi* (‘communication’), *status* (‘status’), *objektif* (‘objective’), and *senario* (‘scenario’). Note that responses were identified as preferred if they were acceptable loan words or Malay equivalents which fitted the gap. Responses for these items were found to be neither loan words nor Malay equivalents, which suggested the participants either found the sentences difficult or were unfamiliar with the words. The data is consistent with the word frequency analysis in the Humanities, Science, and Business corpora which found that all four items had low frequencies ranging from eight for *senario* in the Science corpus to sixty-four for *komunikasi* in the Humanities corpus. The low frequency in the corpora consequently helps to explain the findings of the semantic analyses for three of the four words (*komunikasi*, *objektif*, and *senario*) i.e. they are potentially problematic words. However, while the linguistic analysis found *status* to be potentially unproblematic, the results from the Gap-Filling task showed otherwise. The Malay equivalent for ‘status’ i.e. *taraf* was not given as a response very often. Interestingly, *status* has only slightly more occurrences (89) in the whole corpus compared to its Malay equivalent *taraf* (80). The linguistic analysis showed that the participants should not have had any difficulty with *status* or *taraf*. Perhaps the participants were confused by the sentence context of the item, rather than not familiar with the loan word *status*.

### 7.3.2.4 Comprehension of loan words are based on their established meanings in Malay: impact on loan words with broadened meanings

Results from the Gap-Filling task showed that the participants who gave fully correct loan word responses did so based on their understanding of the loan words as they are used in Malay. This means that the Gap-Filling task achieved its objective of confirming that the core meanings of the English loan words have become established in Malay and these meanings were what the participants retrieved as their responses. The findings are supported by data from the Utusan corpus word frequency list, which shows that the fully correct loan words responses have high occurrences in the corpus.
The use of the English loan word in its established Malay usage, however, does not necessarily mean it will be easily understood by students. This means that loan words with broadened or narrowed meanings in Malay are potentially problematic. Explicit instruction will be required when the students learn the original English words. The potentially problematic word *senario* (‘scenario’), for instance, received the highest number of non-responses despite the fact that slightly more than half of the total number of participants answered it correctly (preference = neither loan word nor Malay equivalent). Yet, only a quarter of the participants responded correctly in Malay, and another smaller number of participants responded correctly with a loan word. The rest of the responses given were incorrect and these belonged to various word classes, suggesting the difficulty participants had with the sentence. This tells us that there is a problem with the use of this loan word even in Malay. It is possible that the construction of the sentence – in which the blank was the first of the sentence – that caused the participants unable to respond correctly. This is also consistent with data from the corpus word frequency list which shows that *senario* occurs only forty-eight times in the whole corpus.

In the corpus, *senario* is more popularly used as a synonym for the word ‘situation’ or ‘state of affairs’ but this broader usage of the loan word is not included in Kamus Dewan. Also, the definition for ‘scenario’ in the Oxford English Dictionary has no reference to ‘situation’ or ‘state of affairs’\(^{37}\). A Google search for the phrase *senario semasa* (‘current scenario/situation/state of affairs’ in the Malay usage) on the Utusan Malaysia website came back with 97 results\(^{38}\). In addition, *senario* is not even on the list of synonyms listed for *keadaan* (Ainon Mohd and Abdullah Hassan, 2006: 105). In comparison, there are only six occurrences of the phrase ‘current scenario’ in the 400-million word Corpus of Contemporary American English and only one result from the 100-million word British National Corpus. In effect, the loan word *senario* has undergone a process of semantic extension involving a ‘widening in the semantic scope of a word or phrase to cover more concepts’ (Hartmann and James, 1998: 54). It can be postulated here that the Gap-Filling results for *senario* provide the evidence that learners may misunderstand, be incorrect or be put off (non-responses) because they do not have enough information pertaining to a loan word which has a broadened meaning.

Loan words with semantic extension in Japanese may not be as problematic because they are relatively rare (Daulton, 2008: 22). Instead, semantic narrowing of *gairaigo* in Japanese
appears to be the main cause of comprehension problems (Simon-Maeda: 1995; Shepherd, 1996). Similarly, the linguistic analysis for this study found semantic narrowing and syntactic features to be the two main causes for loan words to be potentially problematic. On the other hand, semantic broadening or semantic extension affected only six of the thirty-seven potentially problematic loan words. Even so, semantic extension should not be viewed as less important, as three (akademik, individu, and komunikasi) of the six words were also amongst the most frequent in the corpus. Therefore, in contrast to the Japanese case, semantic extension may be a more challenging issue for Malaysian learners using the English loan words as vocabulary learning tools.

Thus far, we have tried to show the complex relationship between users’ comprehension of the loan words, the established and popular meanings of the words in Malay, and a lack of documentation of the differences and/or similarities between the prescribed meanings and everyday usage of a loan word. The elaborated explanation is to emphasise, to both the learner and the teacher, the ‘problematic’ aspect in the term ‘potentially problematic loan word’.

7.3.2.5 The correct use of a potentially problematic loan word is related to the popular usage of its Malay equivalent

Results from the Gap-Filling task show that the participants’ correct usage of a problematic English loan word could be related to whether the Malay equivalent is also popularly used. This applies to isu (‘isu’), sektor (‘sector’), faktor (‘factor’), akademik (‘academic’), fungsi (‘function’), and teknik (‘technique’). There are two components to this claim: a) these loan words are problematic, and b) their Malay equivalents are not popularly used. The participants mostly did not supply these specific loan words to fill the gaps even though they fitted the context. Let us look at the first component: a) these loan words are problematic because of semantic narrowing and a change in part of speech. A native speaker of Malay who is not fluent in English and not intending to use the loan word as a vocabulary tool may not face any such problem. This brings us to the second component i.e. the Malay equivalents for these loan words are not popularly used. More usage of these loan words over their Malay equivalents means the average reader of the Malay print media receives more exposure to the loan words and becomes more familiar with them. Evidence can be seen in the more than 100 occurrences each in the corpus for isu, sektor, faktor, and akademik. Furthermore, Shamimah (2006: 144-150) found that writers preferred the loan words isu
Compared to the classification of words in this study as potentially problematic and potentially non-problematic, Shamimah classified the loan words in her study into loan words which have and do not have Malay equivalents. Shamimah found that despite *isu* (‘issue’) having a Malay equivalent, the loan word form was more popularly used and preferred by her participants because it had a “wider and more in-depth meaning” (ibid: 120) compared to its equivalent *persoalan* (‘matter’). Interestingly, the potentially problematic loan words *sektor*, *faktor*, *akademik*, *fungsi*, and *teknik* were classified as having no Malay equivalents (ibid: pp.186-192); hence writers preferred these loan words and used them often. Shamimah based her analysis on lexical gaps in Malay, the significance of the loan words in Malay, and their capacity to accurately describe and express the writers’ intentions. The phrase ‘without Malay equivalent’ may not find favour with Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, though. Kamus Dewan does provide Malay equivalents for these loan words but the linguistic analysis in Chapter 4 has demonstrated that the Malay equivalents for problematic loan words are limited in their descriptive and expressive scope. In addition, for some loan words, the Malay equivalent may be a phrase or as lengthy as a whole sentence\(^{39}\). Therefore, it is quite understandable that the writers in Shamimah’s study preferred to use the loan words when a simple word could express the meaning accurately, compared to the two or more words of the Malay equivalent, which were imprecise or inadequate. One of the participants interviewed in this study explained that it was easier to understand a single English loan word compared to a Malay equivalent which is a phrase or a sentence. The participant gave the example of the loan word *kolaborasi* (‘collaborate’) and stated that, once one knew the meaning of *kolaborasi* in Malay, one could also understand the English word because it was accurate and needed no more explanation. The preference for loan words in this context can be understood in light of the “designative inadequacy of a vocabulary in naming new things” and to use “ready-made designations is more economical than describing things afresh” (Weinreich, 1953: 57). In addition, the preference for a loan word is also reasonable particularly when the loan word has a more narrowed definition in Kamus Dewan. The word *kolaborasi* (‘collaborate’), for example, is defined as *subahat (kerjasama) dengan musuh atau orang jahat, subahat dalam perbuatan jenayah dan sebagainya* (lit. ‘conspire (cooperate) with the enemy or bad persons, conspire in crime and others’). At the time of writing, the meaning of ‘cooperation’ or ‘joint venture’ is not listed for the entry *kolaborasi* in Kamus Dewan.
It can be argued that, at least to the language purists, what Shamimah suggests, i.e. that there are loan words which do not have Malay equivalents\textsuperscript{40}, is problematic or troubling for Malay language development. It is beyond the scope of this study to delve into that argument. We are, nevertheless, interested in the fact that despite the different methodology as well as purposes for the two studies, the same loan words were found to be problematic albeit to different groups of users. It is highly possible that, as English becomes a more important other language in Malaysia, the number of loan words which can be considered not to have Malay equivalents will increase, although resistance to such a development may come from Malay language purists and related agencies.

7.3.2.6 Bumiputera ESL learners are more likely to benefit from the English loan words

Results from the statistical analyses found an interesting pattern in relation to the participants’ ethnicity. Evidence of this pattern can be seen in the consistent statistically significant differences found on various measures between bumiputera and non-bumiputera participants. The significance of this pattern is clearer when we consider that non-bumiputera participants almost always produced more incorrect or nil responses. This was a pattern even when the differences were not statistically significant. The results support the general premise of this study, which is that bumiputera ESL learners could potentially benefit more from using English loan words to acquire academic English vocabulary because of their familiarity with the words. The statistical evidence suggests that non-bumiputera participants, not being as fluent in Malay as their bumiputera peers, might benefit less from using the loan words as a vocabulary learning tool because they were not so familiar with the words.

We might now query whether the difference relates to ethnicity (bumiputera or non-bumiputera) as such or fluency in Malay. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, language use and the effects of language use in Malaysia are not clear cut issues. This means that fluency in Malay, and even more so English, is not a matter of whether or not students put enough effort into learning the language to be fluent in it. There are other sociocultural issues involved which will bring us to the root of everything in Malaysia i.e. ethnicity.

It is difficult to disentangle fluency in Malay as a factor from a participant’s ethnicity. In Japan, ESL teachers may assume that their students are primarily if not exclusively users of Japanese. Even fourth and fifth generation Japanese-born Koreans and Chinese, whose
parents enrolled them in ethnic school education, are Japanese L1 speakers (Yasuko Kanno, 2008: 18) and some may have no knowledge of their heritage language (Gottlieb, 2005: 26). Contrast this with Malaysia, where Chinese and Indian parents who send their children to Chinese-medium or Tamil-medium schools, are active users of their heritage language at home. It is also not uncommon to find the national language as the second language (L2) of third, fourth or fifth generation of Indians and Chinese in Malaysia. This is not to say, of course, that there are no non-bumiputeras who are fluent in Malay.

The results from the statistical analyses also reveal that the non-bumiputeras’ reading language impacts their use of contemporary Malay. One limitation of this study was it did not have enough information pertaining to the primary and secondary education of non-bumiputera participants. This information would have helped to estimate the participants’ fluency in Malay. Nonetheless, the existing information (home, reading, writing, and speaking languages) tells us that the bumiputera participants did not read non-Malay newspapers very much, and vice versa. Similar findings can be seen in a study of readership behaviour of 674 Universiti Sains Malaysia undergraduates and 974 Form Four secondary school students (Pandian, 2000). Some of its findings were that, compared to Chinese and Indian undergraduates, Malay undergraduates: had a greater exposure to Malay reading materials; read a wider variety of materials in Malay; and spent more time reading in Malay. Interestingly, compared to the non-bumiputeras, Pandian also found that the bumiputera undergraduates in the study were significantly more active in acquiring reading materials in English as well as spending more time reading in English (p.9). As for the secondary students, it was found that non-bumiputeras read a variety of materials in English especially newspapers whilst Malay students tended to read more magazines in English (reading for pleasure) (p.13-14). The reading habits of the non-bumiputera undergraduates and school students reported in Pandian (2000) help to explain the tendency of non-bumiputeras in this study not to be familiar with English loan words and therefore not use them in their responses.

We return to the gist of this section which is that bumiputera ESL learners are more likely to benefit from formal study of the English loan words. That data from the interviews show the bumiputera participants might not be conscious of choosing loan word responses only supports the intention of this thesis i.e. to help the bumiputera ESL learners who still continue to lag behind their non-bumiputera classmates in learning and acquiring English as
a second language. The advantage that bumiputera ESL learners have in having Malay as their first language (L1) should be tapped, used, and guided for their benefit.

Thus far we have discussed the issues arising from the results of the Gap-Filling task in terms of word preference and comprehension. We shall now discuss the findings from the Translation task in the following sections.

7.3.3 Translation task

The purpose of the Translation task was to test whether the loan words predicted to be problematic to learners were indeed problematic. The function of the task was to investigate the third research question of this study i.e. to what extent do the students have the ability to recognise and comprehend the corresponding words in English? The hypothesis was that the students would generalise their understanding of the loan words and assume the meanings would be similar for the original English words. These would be loan words in Malay which were classified as potentially problematic based on the findings of the linguistic analysis (narrowed or broadened meanings and conflict of grammatical class in English and Malay usage). For example, the word ‘issue’ in this task meant ‘edition’ or ‘product’ instead of ‘matter’ or ‘topic’, which is what the loan word isu means in Malay. The results of this task have demonstrated that comprehension of the English loan word in Malay does not necessarily translate to comprehension of the original English word and how it is used in English. We shall discuss the results of the Translation task in relation to the results of the Gap-Filling task. The discussion is mostly based on the items (loan words) which were tested in both tasks.

7.3.3.1 Semantic changes to the original English word affect learners’ comprehension

The results of the Translation task show that the semantic changes in the loan words affected learners’ comprehension of the original English words. The majority of participants found it difficult to translate an English word that had a usage or meaning that was not available in its loan word form in Malay. The loan word isu (‘issue’), for example, is a high-frequency word in the Utusan corpus and is a potentially problematic loan word based on the linguistic analysis. The results from the Gap-Filling task showed that not only was isu preferred over its Malay equivalent (perkara or persoalan), but more than half of the total participants used isu correctly. Another study of English loan words in Malay also found isu to be preferred by
writers and that it actually did not have an exact Malay equivalent (Shamimah, 2006). However, in the Translation task, the majority of participants translated the English word into a Malay equivalent with a usage limited to the Malay definition of the loan word.

In the Translation task, where the word ‘issue’ was used to mean ‘edition’ (loan word = edisi) or ‘publication’, none of the participants managed to respond correctly. In fact, all of the Malay equivalent responses as well as other loan word responses were incorrect. Similarly, the other six potentially problematic items which overlapped in both the Translation and the Gap-Filling tasks – faktor (‘factor’), individu (‘individual’), elemen (‘elements’), relevan (‘relevance’), fungsi (‘function’) and potensi (‘potential’) – were all translated based on their loan word usage in Malay.

Here again Hasselgren’s (1994: 237) ‘lexical teddy bears’ are relevant, i.e. words or phrases which either closely resembled their L1 or the students had learnt much earlier and were familiar with. We can, therefore, state that the items which the linguistic analysis had predicted to be problematic for learners were indeed difficult precisely because of the narrower meaning and usage in Malay. In addition, we can also say that recognition of the English loan word in Malay does not equate to comprehension of the original English word in the L2 context.

**7.3.3.2 Some loan words are potentially native Malay words to some ESL learners**

One of the predictions for the Translation task was that the participants would not have any difficulty translating the original English words whose loan words were predicted to be non-problematic. For example, status and aspek are non-problematic loan words based on the similar meaning and usage to the original English words ‘status’ and ‘aspect’. ESL teachers who are native Malay speakers might think that the results for ‘status’ and ‘aspect’ would resemble those of ‘minority’, ‘definition’, and ‘data’ as these are all loan words with minimal orthographic variation from English. ‘Minority’, ‘definition’, and ‘data’ are the top three most correctly translated words in the task. However, results for ‘status’ and ‘aspect’ were contrary to expectation. Only 62 participants translated ‘status’ correctly and 45 participants in the case of ‘aspect’. This raises an interesting point in relation to how we interpreted the results of the linguistic analysis initially. Note that the criterion for determining a loan word as potentially problematic or non-problematic was in relation to whether the learner could relate the loan word to the meaning(s) or usage(s) of the original English word.
Based on the results for ‘status’ and ‘aspect’, it is possible that some loan words are regarded as native Malay words by some ESL learners and they may not be aware that they are loan words with Malay equivalents. In the interview, some participants said they found it difficult to find the Malay equivalent for ‘status’ because they were not familiar with any other Malay word with that meaning. Unless the difference is pointed out to them or they have an avid interest in Malay vocabulary and its etymology, it stands to reason that younger Malaysians may not be aware of the Malay equivalent for a loan word in Malay\(^43\). This indicates that many of the older loans are “so thoroughly indigenized that speakers are unaware of their origins (unless they learn about it in formal education)” (Goddard, 2005: 55). Furthermore, the fact that the print media prefer loan words more for their popularity and accuracy in expressing concepts or ideas (Shamimah, 2006) only gives more exposure to loan words among the Malaysian public.

Interview responses related to the Translation task also revealed that some English loan words in Malay were making inroads in replacing their Malay equivalents and becoming more salient in contemporary Malay. This is not a new phenomenon and there are already English loan words which have replaced Malay words in popularity despite action to discourage their use. For instance, the Utusan corpus shows that the loan word *isu* (‘issue’) has a higher occurrence (n=800) than its Malay equivalents *perkara* (n=491) and *persoalan* (n=156). These figures suggest the use of the loan word *isu* is at least fifty percent higher than its Malay equivalents in a corpus with academic-related materials. The phenomenon of loan words replacing native language equivalents is indeed common in other languages. The various uses of *gairaigo* have made them indispensable to modern Japanese society (Daulton, 2008: 38) as they provide “shades of meaning and stylistic values” (Shibatani, 1990: p. 144). In Korean, too, the native equivalents for the loan words *kapetŭ* (‘carpet’), *hotel* (‘hotel’), and *taipŭraitŏ* (‘typewriter’) are used mainly by older speakers “in reference to old-fashioned objects or ideas, or in very formal – and usually written – contexts”(Tyson, 1993: 33). This development, replacement of native equivalents, may provoke different reactions from users of Malay. Certainly those who view the loan words positively would consider them as enriching the Malay vocabulary in the role of synonyms of the Malay equivalent. Weinreich states that “there is in many languages a constant NEED FOR SYNONYMS [upper case in the original source],...”(1953: 58). Some, however, see them as *peminjaman yang membazir*
(lit. ‘borrowing which is wasteful’) and explicitly discourage their use, as in the foreword of one publication (Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1988: vii-viii):“Dengan terbitnya buku ini, diharapkan masyarakat pengguna bahasa Malaysia akan lebih mengutamakan penggunaan kata-kata yang sudah sedia ada dalam bahasa Malaysia bagi konsep yang dibawa oleh perkataan bahasa Inggeris yang tidak digalakkan penggunaannya dalam bahasa Malaysia.

(lit. ‘With the publication of this book, it is hoped that the community of Malay users will prioritise the use of words already existing in Malay for concepts which are brought by English words whose usage is not encouraged in Malay.’)

7.3.3.3 Summary

We have learnt several things from the above discussion of the results from the Gap-Filling and Translation tasks. We learnt that each complemented the other. We found that the participants could identify English loan words easily based on their orthographic similarity with the original English words. This similarity in form was already an advantage which Japanese ESL learners do not have and which Malaysian ESL teachers should try to exploit (see Koda (1997) for connections between L1 orthographic system and L2 processing procedures). In addition, we found that based on the Gap-Filling task, loan words were not typically the first words which the participants recalled except for several high-frequency ones. Further, the participants’ understanding of the loan words in Malay (narrower meaning and usage) affected their production of the original English words. Evidence from the Translation task also showed that Malay native speakers are likely to benefit from the use of loan words. This follows the theory of using the learner’s L1 to help in his/her acquisition of the L2. The role of the L1 may be small but nevertheless it is important as Brown and Williams (1985), Nation (1990: pp.33-49), Ringbom (2007a, 2007b), Uchida (2007), Daulton (2007, 2008), and Nation and Macalister (2010: pp.47-48) pointed out. Unlike Japanese ESL learners, who would be native speakers of Japanese, the term ‘Malaysian ESL learners’ does not necessarily mean that the learners have Malay as their first language. Hence not all Malaysian ESL learners may find the loan words helpful to their ESL learning. Finally, we learnt that some loan words are in effect native Malay words to some learners (particularly those who speak Malay as their L1). Provided the meaning and usage are the same as for the original English words, this should be another advantage to native Malay speakers learning the English vocabulary. For instance, a method used in the teaching of Arabic has so far proven to be effective and popular in Arabic language teaching in Malaysia. The method
utilises Arabic loan words in Malay to help students learn Arabic vocabulary. The method known as MUKADDAM highlights the 1700 Arabic loan words available in Kamus Dewan.\(^4\)

This study is based on the idea that lexical similarities will help to lessen the learning burden of the word and give the learners more time to concentrate on more difficult vocabulary. In other words, ESL teachers can draw learners’ “attention to systematic patterns and analogies within the second language, and by pointing out connections between the second language and the first” (Nation, 2001: 24). Previous knowledge is constantly at work and invoked to facilitate the learner’s processing of his/her L2. This argument is in line with Ringbom’s emphasis on the importance of focusing on similarities rather than differences in the learning of an L2 (1987: 33-44). Provided that the learners are guided in their acquisition of English vocabulary, retention of the words will be aided even more because storing the “new items in memory will operate largely on the basis of cross-linguistic and intralinguistic similarities: how naturally relations can be established to items already known” (Ringbom, 2007: 16).

Nonetheless, this study is not based on any illusion that utilising the loan words as a facilitative tool is a magic formula for the learners’ academic vocabulary acquisition. The onus is on the ESL teachers who should also be aware that reliance on the loan words should lessen as the learner advances in his/her learning. The evidence gathered thus far points to the possibility that limited proficiency Malaysian ESL learners can be guided to exploit the latent knowledge they possess, but may be unaware of, in order to improve their mastery of English.

From the results that the vocabulary tasks provide, we can speculate that with direct instruction and informed teaching the learners can be guided to “formulate realistic hypotheses about the nature and limits of crosslinguistic correspondences,” (Swan, 1997: 179). However, even though (many of) the loan words might be effective for vocabulary learning in linguistic terms, what about the attitudinal dimension? This question brings us to the discussion of the language attitude questionnaire.

As emphasised in Chapter 2, there is no escaping the link between English the language, English language learning, and English language teaching, on the one hand, and the Malaysian socio-cultural and socio-political environment on the other. We should keep this
background in mind as we consider the results of the language attitude questionnaire in the following sections.

7.4 The language attitude questionnaire: the attitudinal dimension to ESL learning in Malaysia and the feasibility of utilising the loan words

Over the course of this discussion, we keep returning to attitudes towards the loan words or their social reception (Loveday, 1996: 157-188) in Malaysia. Attitude towards English is an important aspect in this study as the teaching and learning of English in Malaysia is inevitably affected by how English is perceived by the local population. We begin this section by highlighting the differences and similarities between Malaysia and Japan. We use Japan as a point of comparison for two reasons: (a) it has a rich literature on gairaigo in English language teaching there (among others Daulton, 1998; 2003b; 2003c; 2004a; 2004b; 2005; 2006; 2008; Brown, 1996; Shepherd, 1996; Rebuck, 2002; Uchida, 2001; Uchida, 2003) as well as English and gairaigo in Japanese society (among others Loveday, 1996; Stanlaw, 2004; Gottlieb, 2005; 2008) and (b) rather than comparing this study to, for example, Spanish ESL learners and English cognates in Spanish, it makes more sense to compare the use of English loan words in another Asian language which is also not genetically related to English. The following section this provides a general discussion on loan words in Malay vs. gairaigo in Japanese is considered suitable in this chapter to provide a basis for attitude comparison.

As the discussion unfolds, keep in mind that the socio-cultural, sociolinguistic, and sociopolitical contexts in Malaysia are not similar to Japan. Ethnicity plays an important role in almost every situation in Malaysia. Political scientists describe the use of “racialised language” which exists without critical examination (Mandal, 2004: 57) such as “ketuanan Melayu (Malay supremacy) and pendatang (newcomer)” and the highlighting of one’s ethnic group even in for example an insurance company advertisement “‘Top Agency Managers’, ‘Top Unit Managers’, ‘Top Agents’ followed by ‘Top Malay Agents’” (ibid.). This study does not imply that Japan does not have race relations issues, as research shows that in fact they do exist (Hiroshi Ikeda, 2001; Gottlieb, 2005). However, the pivotal point of difference is the attitude towards and the acquisition of the national language – Malay – by the different ethnic (and linguistic groups) in Malaysia. These two aspects form the basis of the person’s attitude (negative or pragmatic) towards English in Malaysia. We shall return to this point later on. Next, the main themes which arise out of the analysis of the language attitude
questionnaire will be reviewed. We end the discussion by drawing some conclusions about whether, or to what extent, student attitudes might play a role in the proposed vocabulary teaching programme based around the English loan words in Malay.

7.4.1 English loan words in Malay vs. *gairaigo*

The nature of the difference between loan words in Japanese (*gairaigo*) and Malay could be attributed to socio-cultural and socio-political factors. The Malaysian public does not have the same level of exposure to loan words as do the Japanese. Japanese agencies such as the Japanese National Language Institute (*Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo* or *KKK*, a counterpart of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka) and the Japanese Broadcasting Corporation (*Nippon Hōsō Kyōkai* or NHK) periodically carry out language surveys and publish their findings on the proportions of loan and native words in Japanese, as well as information related to comprehension and usage of the loan words (Shibatani, 1990: 142-153). More significantly, the *KKK* has, since its establishment in 1948 as an affiliate of the Education Ministry, published a volume of guidelines on the teaching of loan words (Kowner and Rosenhouse, 2001: 529). Also, unlike the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, *KKK* does not focus its activities on lexical modernisation of Japanese and is minimally involved in the planning and moderation of lexical borrowing into Japanese (Grootaers, 1983: 343). Finally, information pertaining to the number of loan words in Japanese is also easily accessed through the loan word dictionaries which date back to 1912. At that time, 1500 loan words were recorded, as compared to an estimated 30,500 in the 1990 *Gairaigo-jiten* (Tomoda, 1999: 234).

Negative views towards *gairaigo* do exist but these are in the minority as most Japanese opt to tolerate and use *gairaigo* (Tomoda, 2005). The positive attitude towards *gairaigo* persists until today because it “denotes prestige, ...modernity, open-mindedness, internationalism and the Western lifestyle” (Kowner and Daliot-Bul, 2008: 257). Such positive and open-minded attitudes have allowed *gairaigo* to further develop in Japanese. Unlike the loan words in Malay, *gairaigo* usage is clearly visible in Japanese life encompassing “…virtually all domains and registers, and by virtually all speakers” (Morrow, 1987: 51). The widespread use of English loan words in Japanese now extends to a category of words termed as either nativised items (Loveday, 1990: 175), pseudo loan words (Stanlaw, 1987: 93) or *wasei eigo* (Miller, 1998) which are basically compound *gairaigo* used to create a new Japanese word or concept**.
It is possible that Japanese ESL learners were more comfortable with using loan words as the presence of loan words in Japan is more widespread. Use of *gairaigo* in Japanese is more evolved compared to the English loan words in Malay. What we mean here is that there are two types of *gairaigo* in Japanese, the ones which still remain similar in meaning to the original English words and the ones which have diverged quite far from the original meanings in English. The latter is best explained as such,

the English used in Japan is not really borrowed, as is commonly thought, but instead is motivated or ‘inspired’ by certain English speakers or English linguistic forms; it is a created-in-Japan variety for use by Japanese in Japan (Stanlaw, 2004: 2)

It can be argued, then, that the English loan words in Malay are certainly not at the level where *gairaigo* is in Japanese. This results in a lack of awareness, on the part of the Malaysian public, of the word borrowing process or the extent of word borrowing for that matter. Take for example the various terms that Dewan Bahasa uses with regard to loan words e.g. *istilah* (‘terminology’), *istilah umum* (‘general terminology’), *kata serapan* (lit. ‘word absorbed’), *kata pinjaman* (‘loan word’), and *ungkapan umum yang baru* (‘new general expression’). The many alternative expressions to ‘English loan words’ in Malay can almost be said to imply a denial of the existence, contribution, and function of the loan words in Malay. In one sense, the term of choice to replace “loan word” is irrelevant as borrowed words are not given back after all (Stanlaw, 2004: 35). However, in the context of Malaysia, the issue with the English loan words can be traced to the complex relationship between Malay and English which continue to shape and reshape the attitude towards English in Malaysia. The issue lies in the identity of the language manager of the loan words i.e. DBP, which intentionally or unintentionally, provides the perspective towards matters related to Malay language. However, results from the attitude questionnaire showed that the younger generation do not view loan words in a negative light and that it is likely that only the older generation (which DBP represents) do so.

7.4.2 The ethnicity factor in attitudes towards English in Malaysian society

The ethnicity factor stands out most visibly in the results of the questionnaire. This was to be expected, to a certain extent, given that ethnicity encompasses almost all aspects of life in Malaysia and most definitely on language-related issues. The results from the questionnaire highlight the different attitudes that *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* participants had towards English and loan words in Malay. Actually, their attitudes to English are similar (i.e. positive)
until the comparison with Malay comes up and only then can we see a difference. *Bumiputera* participants were found to view English with a more pragmatic outlook *insofar* as English would be useful to their future careers. Similar positive findings with *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* ESL learners were found in a language attitudes study by Ratnawati and Ismail (2003), which included a questionnaire, class observation, and an in-depth interview. The pragmatic viewpoint of *bumiputera* students is indeed a welcome finding particularly for ESL teachers who are *bumiputera* themselves, if only because it gives more motivation and reason to continue to help the students.

Ratnawati and Ismail’s questionnaire did not include items which investigated the students’ sense of loyalty towards the national language. However it had an item which expressed the view often “associated with the Malays” (ibid.: 89) which is ‘the more we learn English, the more we will think like the English or Americans’. Interestingly, the researchers found that more non-*bumiputera* learners agreed to the item compared to Malay learners. Amongst the reasons provided in their interview were ‘those who use English tended to like English-related items such as English songs’ and ‘tended to not think like “us”’ (ibid.). In contrast, this study did not find a similar attitude among the participants and the majority did not agree with the statement that Malaysians using English were show-offs or arrogant. We would attribute the difference in attitudes to the age of the participants in the two studies. The participants in Ratnawati and Ismail (2003) were “mostly 13-year olds” (p.85) whilst the participants for this study were young adults. It is possible maturity is a factor in the responses given by the different age groups.

What then is the ‘*insofar*’ factor above if both *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* students are positive towards English in general and in their education in particular? The questionnaire items which hinted at changes to the current language policy of institutionalising English to be on a par with Malay made *bumiputera* participants cautious and some were protective of Malay. The cautious attitude can be seen in the attitudes towards the proposal of making English the medium of instruction in public universities. The cautious attitude, however, did not signify a complete rejection of English. Only a small number of *bumiputera* participants disagreed whilst the number of those who were non-committal was the same with those who agreed with the option. *Bumiputera* participants were also divided over the suggestion that English should become the medium for science and technology faculties. Interestingly, the questionnaire results reflect Malay *bumiputeras’* reactions towards the recent reversal of the
English in the teaching of Maths and Science (ETeMS) policy. Some Malay parents regret the policy reversal whilst some are very happy that their children can now learn Maths and Science in Malay. In contrast, non-bumiputera participants were very much in agreement with English playing a stronger role in their tertiary education. Note that the non-bumiputera participants were also considered weak in English, which was why they were required to take English proficiency classes. In addition, similar to their bumiputera counterparts, all except one of the non-bumiputera participants spoke their respective mother tongues (e.g. Mandarin, Tamil, and Hakka) as their L1 and not English at home, which means Malay was their L2. Interestingly, this finding differs from another language attitude study with 167 Universiti Malaya students (Asmah, 1992). Asmah found that the majority of students (including the majority of the bumiputera students) did not find English to be the rival of the national language. However, Asmah questioned the results and wondered whether the students had similar understanding of the item (here translated into English):

11. I regard English as  
   (i) a rival of the national language (30%)  
   (ii) not a rival of the national language (70%)

Asmah noted that there were two possible interpretations of the item based on their ethnicity: i) the Malays might have interpreted it to mean “a competition between the two languages” in terms of importance in the country; and ii) the non-Malays or non-bumiputera might have interpreted ‘competition’ as “one being as much or less utilised than the other in their academic context” (ibid.: 130). Her conclusion was that the item was “not a plausible one” and needed to be rephrased if it were to be used again. What can we infer from the results of item 11 in Asmah (1992) and her conclusion from it? We can say that there is an existing mindset as to how one should view the national language and English in Malaysia i.e. through the lens of one’s ethnicity. Item 11 actually seemed to be a clear-cut question and the positive attitude shown by the Universiti Malaya students is heartening and its validity should not be questioned. The suggestion that there could be two interpretations based on the students’ ethnicity seemed to suggest the question was intended to elicit responses based on whether they were bumiputera or non-bumiputera. Again here we see traces of ethnicity as the platform for one’s opinions and in this case on language use.

The results of the language attitude questionnaire in this study shed some light on the different attitudes towards English within an ESL student population in a public university setting. The results also realistically reflect a conflict between English and Malay in Malaysia.
(issues of power and status) and in particular the effect of that relationship on Malay bumiputeras’ achievement in English proficiency.

7.4.3 The ethnicity factor in attitudes towards English in Malaysian education

The results of the language attitude questionnaire highlight the typical profile of the public university graduate, which includes being bumiputera and not proficient in English. This profile tallies with findings from recent studies on the employability of Malaysian graduates (Lim, 2008; Singh & Singh, 2008). Lim’s study investigated graduates from Universiti Utara Malaysia, a public university, and found that “Malay graduates are more likely to experience less favourable labor market outcomes compared to non-Malays” (p.330). Unlike previous research, Lim found that English proficiency was not a significant determinant of labour market outcome for his study population. However, Lim suggests caution in interpreting this finding because of his relatively small sample size (349 participants) and that the fact that sample population was very homogenous in their English language skills. The study found that type of degree and ethnicity were the more significant determinants of a graduate’s employability.

The present study also found that the majority of the participants – most of whom were bumiputeras – showed support for English as the medium of instruction in public universities. Most interestingly, the majority also supported Malay as the medium of instruction for the private universities. The indication that bumiputera students were aware of the employability issue and of the stereotyped images of the public vs. private university graduates is a positive sign that the public university student want to improve their profile. Lim (2008) found that Malay graduates experienced higher levels of unemployment and lower levels of full-time employment compared to non-Malay graduates (p.328). He suggests that “reducing graduate unemployment in Malaysia requires an understanding in particular of the issues faced by graduates from a Malay background.” (p.336). Lim’s final analysis suggests that the experience of public tertiary education is different for bumiputera and non-bumiputera students. Lim did not elaborate on the nature of that experience but it is possible that successful university experience includes the ability to speak and write in English especially in courses which require such skills.

Finally, the results of this study show that a more positive attitude towards English was shown by the non-bumiputeras. This is consistent with the findings of Nik Rashid (1981:
and Abdullah (2005:7), who found that bumiputera students were essentially monolinguals compared to non-bumiputera students. The proposal to use Malay as the medium in private universities was not favoured by non-bumiputera participants. Delving further into the reasons for such responses is beyond the scope of this study. It is possible that the reason is that the non-bumiputeras were not fluent in the national language and they were concerned for their grades should they not be able to study in a language they were not academically comfortable in. This could be said to be similar to the argument from the Dong Jiao Zong in not agreeing with the English in the Teaching of Mathematics and Science program (ETeMS) policy discussed earlier. Some researchers remarked, though, that the persistent demand for vernacular schools in the Malaysian education system is “because they believe these schools are superior academically to the national schools with Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction” (Azirah Hashim, 2003: 101). Azirah’s view portrays the general perception of Malays towards non-bumiputeras in terms of the latter’s relationship with Malay. That perception speaks of the expectations bumiputeras have about non-bumiputeras’ ability in or loyalty to the national language,

The behavioral expectation for “Chinese” to prefer speaking in a language other than the national language, Bahasa Malaysia, lowers their standing in the general society. (Daniels, 2005:45)

The views of Azirah (2003) and Daniels (2005), however, could not be substantiated based on data from this study as there were no items in the questionnaire which investigated the students’ opinions on the issue of the national language and the bumiputera vs. non-bumiputera dichotomy.

Non-bumiputera participants were found to be more accepting of a larger role for English in the education system. In addition, non-bumiputera students were still ahead of bumiputera students in terms of previous English achievement, despite the fact that both groups were in an English proficiency class. Based on the data, we can say that even if the non-bumiputera participants were not fluent in the national language, it is not the result of disrespect for the language but more because of concern for the effects on their academic performance. This is basically the mirror argument of the one used by Malay L1 users to oppose the ETeMS policy. The Malay nationalists stress that Malay students are already weak in English and to require them to learn important school subjects such as Maths and Science in English is detrimental to their academic achievements (Abdullah Hassan, 2009). The attitudes towards
English in Malaysian education can be said to be positive for the non-bumiputeras as well as the bumiputeras. However, care must be taken to ensure that the academic achievement of the bumiputeras is not jeopardised in the process.

7.4.4 The attitude towards loan words

In discussing the results of the language questionnaire with regard to the loan words, we note that, although the questionnaire items referred explicitly to English loan words, they ultimately touched on the status of the Malay language and Malay ethnicity as well. The main findings in relation to participants’ attitudes towards the loan words are as follows:

- there was overall a positive and generally accepting attitude towards the English loan words;
- there were overall measured and non-committal results for the loan words subscale, which contained items designed to provoke the participants’ reaction. The items included an assumption of loyalty to or level of fluency in Malay. This point is discussed further at the end of this section.

The above were the results from all of the participants – bumiputeras and non-bumiputeras. The findings are consistent with research which found that young people in various countries have positive attitudes towards loan words (Loveday, 1996; Hogan, 2003; Lee, 2006; Hassall, 2008). However, what of the ethnicity factor as discussed above? In order to find that answer, the data was analysed in terms of ethnicity and we found several interesting findings:

- The results of the questionnaire and the focus group interview showed that, for the non-bumiputera participants, hesitancy in support of the loan words was specifically related to technical loan words or istilah (‘terminology’). The majority of the non-bumiputera participants obtained better grades for English at the SPM level compared to the bumiputera participants. Thus, their concern was whether the loan words would delay their understanding of the material or advance it. This is a valid response and it is consistent with the distinction made earlier on in Chapter 2 that the loan words in Malay could be divided into istilah (‘terminology’) and kata pinjam umum (‘general loan words’). This study focuses more on the facilitative nature of the latter. The students’ concern over the technical nature of the istilahs or terminology is well-founded and quite possibly may not be limited to non-bumiputera students. In his
analysis of Chemistry and Biology textbooks of secondary schools (Form Four level), Razak (1989) found that the difficulty in reading science-related materials written in Malay was attributable to five reasons:

When reading science textbooks written in Malay, Malaysian students will encounter different categories of words: (a) scientific vocabulary borrowed from foreign languages (mainly English) and transcribed into Malay, (b) scientific vocabulary created from Malay words, (c) ordinary Malay words used in specific science contexts, (d) functional Malay words, and (e) synonyms for words already taught (p.118).

We argue that Category (a) is understandably difficult because these words are, by nature, technical i.e. terms which are specific to people in its field. The difficulty in Category (a) is akin to the first year TESL major at the university meeting words such as fossilization, interlanguage, motherese, bound morpheme, or suprasegmental for the first time. In contrast, words in Categories (b) to (e) are difficult because they are, either created from ordinary Malay words or from words that students have never heard or read before” (p.124). “rare words, that is those words that are seldom used in daily communication, words that are part of local Malay dialects, or words that are borrowed from other related languages such as the Javenese language” (p.126). “used in a scientific context the common words are assigned specific meanings” (p.127). “the transcribed words when added with the [Malay] affixes can be difficult to understand” (p.133).

We note that Razak’s explanation of the words in these latter categories seems to reflect the Dewan Bahasa’s guide for terminology formation (2004) which prioritises Malay elements over English. On the English loan words themselves, Razak stated that they are not difficult because the original meaning or the concept does not change (p.140).

The concern of the non-bumiputera students is, therefore, practical and understandable as many istilahs were, and continue to be, created through the various terminology expansion procedures or coining (see Asmah Haji Omar, 1975: pp.102-141 for the history of terminology expansion). The majority of the istilahs are not easily memorised even for native Malay speakers, let alone for the non-bumiputeras whose L1 is not Malay. Non-bumiputeras might end up learning Malay instead of English if words in Razak’s categories of (b) to (e) are used instead of the general ones. This is because the guidelines for terminology creation in Malay give high priority to Malay vocabulary sources, wherever possible, before turning to
lexical sources in other languages such as English (Panduan Umum Pembentukan Istilah Bahasa Malaysia, 2004: 6). Compared to the natural process of word borrowing, the members of the terminology committee are likely to be the first people to have seen the terminology before it is disseminated through Dewan Bahasa’s publications. In contrast, if a foreign (say, English) word becomes popularly used by the Malay print or non-print media; it may ultimately be borrowed in as close a form as possible to its original English word. These are the loan words which are of the importation variety, which continue to resemble the original English word. So, where does ethnicity fit into all this? We may find the answer in the second part of this quote from Asmah (ibid: 121),

The short-cut way towards a standardized terminology for Bahasa Malaysia is to accept the foreign terms, whatever they are, and have their phonological appearances adapted to Bahasa Malaysia. This implies that Bahasa Malaysia is not capable of expressing by way of its own linguistic elements any technical concept there be. While this implication is false, it also sensitizes the linguistic pride of the Bahasa Malaysia speech community as well as that of the nation. ...To look into the Malay dialects and genetically related indigenous languages may prove to be a time-consuming and futile effort. For such terms [in the fields of sciences and technology], it would be worthwhile just adapting the foreign terms. [italics my own]

In the quote above, we learn of the ‘linguistic pride’ which perhaps may be the driving force of any language planning agency (see Thomas, 1991; Fishman, 2006 for self-pride and dignity of one’s language). It is quite a well-known fact that Malay is not the L1 of all Malaysians. The effort by Dewan Bahasa to publish hundreds of thousands of istilahs is certainly commendable but it is perhaps not quite helpful to other Malaysians who do not speak Malay as fluently. One Turkish linguist, Faliş Rifkî Atay, remarked that “neologisms were dead butterflies pinned into collections” (quoted in Lewis, 1999: 75) if they did not find favour from users. This study, therefore, argues that to generalise istilahs as loan words is misleading because although the meanings did come from English, the words in Categories (b) to (e) in Razak (1989) are quite literally Malay words used to explain or express a foreign concept. In addition, istilahs should not be considered in the same terms as the general loan words or kata pinjam umum because the technical nature of the istilahs does not appear to encourage a positive perception of borrowing from English. For instance, note the disapproval in the complaints given by Malay language enthusiasts who question the need for loan words when Malay words are readily available for usage e.g. persatuan, badan, or
pertubuhan for the loan word organisasi (‘organisation’) (Nik Safiah Karim, 2006). Further, Member of Parliament Dr. Wan Hashim, in his speech at the House of Representatives, censured the DBP’s Terminology Committee for experiencing kemandulan minda (‘barren mind’) and for not being committed to elevate the Malay language. He singled out Kamus Dewan which he said contains too many istilahs borrowed from English. He queried the need to use bajet (‘budget’) when belanjawan (‘budget’) has been in use for more than 40 years in Malay (Utusan Malaysia, 2 Dec 2007). In their defence, DBP stated that the inclusion of borrowed words from English was done only after a thorough and systematic process which involved Malay language experts (ibid).

- Similar to the results in the other subscales, bumiputera participants showed generally positive attitudes towards the loan words only to the extent where they felt their ethnic status as bumiputeras was not involved. The one item in this subscale which clearly indicated a negative reaction to loan words was ‘Malay needs to control the number of loan words it borrows from English’. Items such as ‘borrowing words from English is an acceptable way for Malay to stay up to date’, ‘Malay is lucky it can easily adapt English into its vocabulary’, and ‘English loan words help to enrich the Malay vocabulary’ received positive responses. The positive attitude reflected by the students is indicative of the balancing act they continuously perform in relation to what is expected of them (as bumiputeras) and their own personal opinions.

- The non-committal responses from the bumiputera participants to the items in the loan words subscale indicate a sense of neutrality instead of prejudice towards English. Their responses to this subscale can be interpreted in tandem with their positive responses to the use of English in Malaysian education (even as the medium of instruction in public universities). We then see a pattern which shows the bumiputera participants as avoiding stirring the hornet’s nest. This is a promising finding, particularly when viewed from the perspective of students who have to negotiate their dual identities as ethnic bumiputeras as well as public university students. Each identity comes with demands which the students have to meet. At the end of each focus group interview, the students were asked if they were satisfied with their level of proficiency in English. The non-bumiputera students participated in the interview quite easily and answered that they needed to work harder to master the language better. They appeared to be comfortable and confident speaking in English.
In contrast, interview sessions with the bumiputera students took longer because it was more difficult for them to understand the questions and respond in English. However, confident students took advantage of the bilingual nature of the interview and felt more able to express themselves. They were also more eager to speak in both Malay and English even if they were not fluent in English.

7.4.5 Summary

In conclusion, data from the language attitude questionnaire does point to a positive reception for the English loan words. As younger and more educated persons, the participants also fit the profile of people who accept loan words more readily. We find that where the loan words are not acceptable is actually more in relation to the topic of English vs Malay. The loan words are technically Malay, despite their origin, as are the many Arabic loan words in Malay. Some English loan words are even potentially native to Malaysians. The success of utilising Arabic loan words in Malay in the teaching of Arabic in Malaysia shows that the loan words, per se, can have a valuable facilitating effect on vocabulary learning. We accept the sensitive nature of the language choices Malaysians make every day. Nevertheless, data in this study finds no support for the idea that there is strong prejudice to deny the benefits of mastering English. As such, there is a good basis for the use of English loan words in Malay as one way for ESL teachers to help the bumiputera learners achieve their goals.

7.5 Overall Summary

This chapter has been a discussion of the key results of the test instruments utilised in this study. It has shown, based on the pilot test, that English loan words in Malay were easily identifiable based on their orthographic nature i.e. close resemblance to the English source words. This would already provide Malaysian English language learners with an advantage when processing academic English vocabulary, provided their attention is pointed towards this similarity. This is because Malaysian learners may not be aware of such advantage being available to them. Learners must be taught to utilise this available resource to their benefit. Results from the Gap-Filling task showed that the loan words were not typically the first words which the participants recalled except for several high-frequency ones. Also, the participants’ understanding of the loan words in Malay (narrower meaning and usage) affected their production of the original English words in gap-filling tasks. However, results from the Translation tasks showed that Malay native speakers are likely to benefit from the
use of loan words as learners can use knowledge of their L1 to help them decode the L2 vocabulary.

This chapter also discussed the attitudinal dimension to using the loan words, particularly from the *bumiputera* perspective. It was found that the younger generation do not hold similar views as the older generation – many of whom may still feel patriotic towards Malay as the impetus for the country’s independence – in terms of language status. The questionnaire, however, did reveal that the participants were aware of the language status issue. Nonetheless, the participants’ main concern was, ideally, mastery of both English as well Malay which would help them in their careers upon graduation. This finding was supported by data from the interview which saw that the participants have no specific reason for choosing a loan word as their responses in the Vocabulary tasks. Neither do they have extreme views towards using English loan words or, for that matter, English. In short, the ready advantage available in the form of the loan words, coupled with the learners’ positive attitude towards English and the loan words should be exploited for the benefits of the learners themselves.
CHAPTER 8    CONCLUSION

8.0  Overview

The main arguments presented in this study address the potential for utilising English loan words in the teaching of academic vocabulary to Malaysian ESL learners. More significantly, the near resemblance of the loan words to the original English words means that the loan words are resources within the learners’ first language which could be activated to help in their learning of the academic English vocabulary. A further look at the English loan words show that they can be differentiated into two types: general loan words, and technical loan words (istilahs). Examples of these general loan words are analisis (‘analysis’), konteks (‘context’), spesifik (‘specific’), proses (‘process’), definisi (‘definition’), and isu (‘issue’). Examples of technical loan words are elektron (‘electron’), kuarza (‘quartz’), oligopoly (‘oligopoly’), reifikasi (‘reification’), deflokulasi (‘deflocculation’), fonemik (‘phonemic’), and supraorbit (‘supraorbital’). We can see that both types of loan words still retain a resemblance to the original English words. However, while the general loan words can be used in academic writing and for general everyday purposes, the technical terms are restricted to specific fields of study.

Malaysians encounter these general loan words – new and old - every day by way of the Malay print media, especially the newspapers. Some loan words appear only for a short period of time, for example during certain phenomena or events, but many remain popular and eventually become established in the Malay vocabulary. There have been various research studies on loan words in Malay; however, the bulk of this research has been centred on the description of the loan words and their influence on Malay. Few studies have been carried out on the role(s) that English loan words can play in the learning of English by Malaysian ESL learners.

This is quite different from the situation for Japanese learners of English. Not only is there an extensive use of gairaigo in Japanese but there is also active research on the use (or misuse) of gairaigo in the teaching and learning of English in Japan. The use of gairaigo in Japanese is so widespread that a new type of vocabulary has evolved which is inspired by English. These are called English-derived vocabulary items, or wasei eigo, and are used mainly amongst native Japanese speakers, meaning native English speakers will have a difficult time understanding what they actually mean. There have been many studies describing gairaigo
and its impact on Japanese and the Japanese society. More importantly, though, *gairaigo* has created many opportunities for research – from differing viewpoints - on the use of loan words by Japanese learners of English. On one hand, proponents of the use of English loan words argue that the strategy is helpful because the words reduce the learning burden of the L2 words. Critics, on the other hand, point out that the loan words are causes of learners’ production errors, especially in relation to the ‘false friends’ notion. As a result, there are different types of publications and teaching materials available, for students and teachers, depending on which side of the debate one stands on.

In contrast, except for Khairiah (1994), there has been no in-depth study of English loan words and their effect on the Malaysian ESL learners’ acquisition of academic English vocabulary. We might wonder if there is a negative view towards the loan words in modern and multilingual yet post-colonial Malaysia. However, current research on Malaysian ESL learners’ attitudes towards English, from primary school to university, presents a positive picture and reflects a generation who acknowledge the role that English plays in their academic as well as career success.

In this study, *bumiputera* and non-*bumiputera* students were found to display some uncertainty towards English and the loan words. The reasons for the uncertainty, though, were not the same for each group. *Bumiputera* students appeared to be caught between their personal opinions and what is expected of them with regard to the issue of the relative status of English and Malay. Non-*bumiputera* students, on the other hand, were more concerned with the impact of the technical loan words on their studies. Thus, the case for the use of loan words with Malaysian learners of English may not be as clear cut as using *gairaigo* with Japanese learners of English. The situation is made more complex in Malaysia because of the socio-cultural and socio-political background which needs to be taken into consideration. There is, however, one advantage which Malaysian learners of English have over their peers in Japan. Compared to *gairaigo*, which is written in *katakana*, English loan words in Malay are written in the same Roman alphabet as the original English words. It is possible that loan word recognition for Malaysian ESL learners is not a major problem unlike for Japanese learners of English whose key challenge is cognate recognition (Daulton, 2008: 101).

Another finding was that not all of the Malaysian ESL learners have a fluent grasp on Malay – including *bumiputera* participants. An earlier hypothesis of the study was that Malaysians are somewhat fluent or at least have a good grasp on Malay vocabulary and translating the
potentially non-problematic English words would be easier. The issue of fluency in Malay is quite related to the present study in that utilising the loan words presumes the learner is familiar with Malay, hence, the hypothesis that the strategy would be most beneficial to bumiputera ESL learners with Malay as their L1. Even so, it does not mean that using loan words would be ineffective if the learner does not have a good grasp of Malay vocabulary. On the contrary, the lesson should prove to be more interesting as the learners are exposed to new information about his/her L1 and to the idea that, to a certain extent, the L1 in the forms of loan words has a facilitative function in his/her learning of the L2.

This study, therefore, was an attempt to provide the groundwork in connecting the English loan words and the Malaysian ESL learners as a potentially successful partnership. We view the connection as practical and useful because the main ingredients are already available for exploitation. In addition, this is the first study, to my knowledge, which realistically addressed the potential usefulness of exploiting the loan words for academic vocabulary acquisition, and the relationship between the loan words and attitudinal dimension of learning English as a second language in Malaysia.

8.1 Contribution of the Study

This study offers information and data as evidence to support the argument that the English loan words in Malay are viable tools for learning English vocabulary particularly for low level learners. The research extends the current literature on English loan words in Malay in several ways:

(1) It undertakes the identification of English loan words in a systematic manner. In doing so, we were able to know the number of English loan words in Malay from the list of most frequent occurring academic word families. The 216 loan words identified are single-item loan words and do not include those which occur with Malay affixes. The reason for this was that the study wanted to find as close as possible similarity in form to the original English word as the target users are low level ESL learners. This means that the number is likely to increase – especially verb forms - if Malay-affixed English loan words were included e.g. mengklasifikasi (‘classify’), mentransformasikan (‘transforming’), or penstrukturkan (‘structuring’). This finding is consistent with research which shows that verbs are least often borrowed into another language.
(2) It investigates the extent of students’ ability to recognise and comprehend the English loan words in a Malay sentence.

(3) It analyses the extent of students’ ability to recognise and comprehend the original English words in an English sentence.

(4) It explores the role of attitudes of contemporary ESL learners in Malaysia i.e. the attitudes of the two ethnicities (bumiputra and non-bumiputra) that define Malaysians from three inter-related perspectives: English in the society, English in Malaysian education, and English loan words in Malay.

This chapter presents a summary of the main findings in relation to the research objectives. We will also discuss the pedagogical implications of the study with regard to (a) the prospects for a vocabulary teaching programme; and (b) the guidelines for developing such a programme. In addition, we will point to the limitations of the study as well as provide recommendations for future lines of inquiry based on the findings of this study.

8.2 Main findings of the research: linguistic and cognitive-affective dimensions

As far as recognising English loan words in Malay texts or sentences is concerned, this study found that the ESL students were able to do so quite easily. We would argue that this applies to English loan words of the importation variety i.e. loan words which have minimal deviation in form from the original English words. It appears that, apart from the loan words which are firmly established and can be said to be indigenised, it is fairly easy to identify contemporary English loan words in Malay text. Some loan words from the AWL words which can be said to be indigenised in Malay are status (‘status’) and isu (‘issue’). However, it was also necessary to find out whether the loan words were socially accepted and to what extent. In addition, we wanted to know which type of loan words would be helpful for the Malaysian ESL learners. The answers to these questions could be classified into two dimensions i.e. linguistic and the cognitive-affective.

8.2.1 Linguistic findings

8.2.1.1 Main findings from the preliminary analysis, corpus design, and lexical analysis

Based on preliminary analysis of the AWL, about 40% of the words in the AWL are loan words in Malay. This percentage translates to at least 216 potential items for the ESL
academic vocabulary lesson, excluding Malay-affixed English loan words. We also found that single-item English loan words are mainly nouns, followed by adjectives, and the odd verb. More complex morphological structure may not be useful for learners at this stage.

As for finding material for the corpus on English loan words, we found that there was no shortage of it in the Malay print media. This is consistent with research which states that loan words are more easily found in the spontaneous sector (Heah, 1989). A corpus was therefore specifically designed for this study. It consists of 547,838 running words from a total of 559 semi-academic articles in Malay. The corpus featured articles from four fields: Social Science, Business and Economics, Politics, and Applied Science. Care was taken to balance the representativeness of the corpus. A lexical analysis was then carried out on this corpus with the aid of a concordancing software.

Most notably, the analysis found that the loan words could be classified into two categories: (a) potentially non-problematic (less learning burden for learners), and (b) potentially problematic (more learning burden for learners). We also found that we can generate a word frequency list of these loan words using the concordance software and the corpus. This word list was useful as it provides practical information to help in the selection of words to be featured in the vocabulary test instruments.

In the semantic analysis of the loan words and the original English words, we found that loan words can either be potentially problematic or non-problematic. A loan word is potentially non-problematic when it is almost identical to the original English word in form and meaning. This similarity reduces the learning burden on the learner’s part so he/she can have more time to spend on learning other more difficult words. Potentially problematic loan words are words which are different from the original English equivalent in one or more of these aspects: semantic (narrowing or broadening); grammatical (conflict in part of speech and number); and lexicographic (inconsistent definitions and/or usages in Malay dictionaries). The semantic analysis found that the majority of potentially problematic loan words had more narrowed meanings in Malay. Also, the semantic analysis found that, for single-item loan words, the noun of a word family was more likely to be borrowed than the verb.
8.2.2 Cognitive-affective findings

8.2.2.1 Summary of findings from the Gap-Filling task

This study found that, in the context of a gap-filling task, the participants chose Malay equivalents rather than the loan words. However, it is possible that the preference for Malay might have been an unconscious choice led more by the desire to fill the gap with the correct word than by a rejection of the loan words. The majority of English loan words in Malay function as synonyms of their Malay equivalents. Often the choice to use the loan word or its Malay equivalent/synonyms depends on the context of usage and audience. For example, loan words are less likely to occur in an informal speech at a village community centre than in a formal speech at a conference. In some cases, for instance loan words such as aspek (‘aspect’), individu (‘individual’), and elemen (‘element’) it turned out that the students know only the Malay equivalent and not the loan word. This brings us to question whether the students’ vocabulary size in Malay has a bearing in his or her knowledge of loan words – which are often listed as synonyms alongside other Malay definitions in Malay-Malay or even English-Malay dictionaries. It is clear though that the English loan words which are academic in nature – based on the Academic Word List – were not necessarily the first choice for the ESL learners in this study.

In addition, the study found that low frequency loan words tended to be unfamiliar with the participants. This explained why responses for low frequency loan words were not correct whether they be a loan word or as a Malay equivalent. The participants appeared to find the potentially problematic loan words difficult and even more so if they were low frequency words. On the other hand, the reason why participants found the non-problematic loan word difficult might not be because of the loan word per se, but more as a result of transliteration from English to Malay. The Malay sentence became ungrammatical when an English syntax construction, which is not present in Malay, was borrowed and used within the sentence. Despite there being only one example of such event, we could say this explains why students were not able to figure out the non-problematic loan word. It was because the whole sentence was ungrammatical in Malay. It was difficult to gauge possible responses in Malay especially when the gap included a part of the transliterated phrase. It is possible that writers who are fluent in English translated the English syntax into Malay but did not do so well.
Word borrowing from English to Malay could be said to fill the need for a more modern and sophisticated vocabulary. Hence, we predict that there will be more academic English loan words entering the Malay vocabulary in the future, especially in the spontaneous sector. This will only benefit the Malaysian ESL learners - providing they are also well-versed in Malay vocabulary. This finding is related to the ethnicity of the participant in that bumiputera low level ESL learners will possibly benefit more from the English loan words. Results from Phase 2 of the research suggest that non-bumiputera participants were not as fluent in Malay as their bumiputera peers to benefit from using the loan words as a vocabulary learning tool.

In addition, almost all of the loan words given as responses in this task were correct usages. This suggests that, to the participants, the loan words were familiar Malay words and that loan word collocation e.g. *analisis data* (*‘data analysis’*) could be the trigger for participants to prefer the loan word. It is safe to say therefore that, in the context of learning using the loan words, it would be more practical to use *analisis data* (*‘data analysis’*) compared to *analisis maklumat* (*‘data analysis’*). This finding highlights the point that the spontaneous sector should provide the materials for a contemporary Malay corpus if it was to be useful to learners; this is because loan words from this sector retain their resemblance to the English words more compared to loan words from the planned sector.

Another finding was that bumiputera participants tended to supply more loan word responses than non-bumiputera participants did. This finding was supported by the significant correlation between loan word preference and ethnicity. Interestingly, the participants with bumiputera ethnicity with low MUET bands tended to prefer loan word responses. This suggests that English loan words are indeed latent vocabulary within native speakers of Malay. This provides more reason for ESL teachers to explore the role of loan words especially with low level ESL learners. The other side of this coin is that non-bumiputera participants tended to respond with Malay equivalent words. As was discussed in the previous chapter, this particular finding may not reflect language loyalty (to Malay). Rather it shows that non-bumiputera students were indeed familiar with Malay vocabulary most probably as a result of their language learning strategies while in secondary school. Malaysian students intending to further their studies at public universities must have a minimum pass in Malay. It is a compulsory subject to pass and vernacular schools take extra measures to ensure non-Malay speakers (non-bumiputera students) could get good grades for the Malay examination subject.
The results also showed that loan words which have had their meanings broadened or narrowed in Malay were potentially problematic and require explicit or direct learning instructions. Evidence for this argument could be seen in the participants’ responses to the loan word usage within a Malay context and the use of its English word in an English context. This was because, for potentially problematic loan words, the majority of participants provided incorrect responses for the English meanings or usages they were not familiar with.

8.2.2.2 Summary of findings from the Translation task

We can already predict the results for the Translation task based on the results of the Gap-Filling task. For example, one of the main findings of the Translation task is that semantic changes to the loan words affect learners’ comprehension of the original English words. Presentation of the original English words with meaning(s) or usage(s) unfamiliar to the Malaysian ESL learners, or unfamiliar in Malay for that matter, led to incorrect translations. This provides the evidence that the participants in this study did recognise the English word but only to the extent of their understanding of its meaning in Malay. Also, we can conclude that recognition of the English loan word in Malay does not equate to comprehension of the original English word in the L2 context.

As a result, in terms of usage within Malay, English loan words in Malay can be classified into two groups: a) loan words used much more than their Malay equivalents to the extent of overshadowing the latter; and b) loan words which are used interchangeably with their Malay equivalents to the extent that both are known as synonyms. Based on the results, we can say that loan words in both categories are useful but that loan words in group (a) may be easier to use in class because learners would be more familiar with them.

8.2.2.3 Summary of findings from the Language Attitude Questionnaire

It is clear by now that ethnicity plays a role in the language attitudes of Malaysians. We would say, though, that the current literature on attitudes towards English in Malaysia often depicts the older generation’s perspective and not enough of the younger and more modern generation’s. This is because results from the questionnaire showed that, in general, bumiputera and non-bumiputera participants both had positive attitudes towards English.
Another finding was that there was a difference between group language choice and personal language choice particularly in relation to the national language policy. Bumiputera participants viewed English with a more pragmatic outlook insofar as it would be useful to their future careers. Results from the questionnaire highlighted that the participants were conscious of the multilingual situation which Malaysians face as regards to language choice. Results from items which required participants to reveal their personal language choice showed that the majority of bumiputera participants were not personally prejudiced towards English. This was consistent with the positive attitude shown towards use of English in universities, business, and employment. The positive attitude towards English suggests that bumiputera participants realised the negative stereotyped image that public university students in Malaysia are tagged with in relation to English language skills. A further example of the bumiputera participants’ positive attitudes was their readiness to accept English as the medium of instruction for public universities. This response was expected from the non-bumiputera participants but it was quite surprising coming from bumiputera participants. This further supports the argument that bumiputeras in Malaysia (in fact we can say this for all younger generation in Malaysia) often need to balance their language choices depending on context.

The majority of bumiputera students in the study supported the idea that Malay should become the medium of instruction in private universities. We could view this support as resulting from loyalty to the national language. However, the majority of bumiputera students also supported the idea of English as the medium of instruction in public universities. So, the interpretation here is that the bumiputera students were keenly aware of their shortcomings in comparison to students in private universities, especially in relation to English and consequently their employability upon graduation.

As for the participants’ attitudes towards the loan words, we found that the majority of the participants were more non-committal. Items in this theme referred to the relationship of power and status between Malay and English in Malaysia. The reference was deliberate because the items were designed specifically to provoke a strong response from participants. We wanted the participants to reveal their real attitudes (negative or positive) towards the loan words and English in general. However, despite the deliberate provocation, the majority of the participants seemed to prefer staying in the middle. We found out why this was so in the next section on summary of the interview segment of the study.
8.2.2.4 Summary of findings from the Interview

The interview results complemented the findings of other data sources. For one thing, the researcher was able to observe during the interview which language – Malay or English – the participants preferred to speak. These observations supported the expectation that non-bumiputera students were more proficient in English compared to their bumiputera friends – despite the fact that both groups were taking the ESL course. The interview transcript showed that non-bumiputera participants were more comfortable talking in English, whereas the only bumiputera students who were comfortable talking in English were those who were in the Science and TESL programmes.

In addition, the interview also enabled the researcher to listen to the different examples provided by the students when elaborating on their choice of responses to the tasks and the questionnaire. These examples enabled the researcher to arrive at the observation that although both the bumiputera and the non-bumiputera rather stayed non-committal in their responses to the loan words subscale, they did not have similar reasons for doing so. Non-committal responses - neither for loan words nor against them - might not be based on loyalty sentiments per se. Only two or three participants in the interview clearly mentioned that Malay should use its own vocabulary and not borrow from English. The majority of those interviewed thought that the loan words, particularly with collocations, were easily retrieved as answers for the vocabulary tasks; they did not think of the Malay equivalents because the loan words “automatically” came to mind; and one participant reported that he did not even know what a kata pinjam (‘loan word’) is. Some of the participants in the interview, on the other hand, did not like loan words which hamper their understanding of the text they are reading. The interview showed that these loan words were in effect technical loan words, often not resembling the original English words. With such responses, it was likely that the non-committal responses were the result of participants not able to make up their mind on how they should view the loan words in relation to Malay because, whether the participants realised it or not, there are two types of loan words with the non-technical loan words being the more helpful ones.
8.3 Pedagogical Implications

Drawing on the findings of this study, we can offer a discussion of the prospects for an academic vocabulary teaching program built around the English loan words and based on the guidelines of vocabulary teaching (Nation, 2001: 385). In addition, given the results which showed that participants could easily identify the loan words, it is possible to build upon this linguistic resource and highlight it as one of the vocabulary learning strategies and subsequently develop the students’ metalanguage awareness (Hancin-Bhatt and Nagy, 1994; Carlo et al, 2004; Carlo et al., 2005; Bravo et al., 2006; Daulton, 2008; Carlo, 2009).

8.3.1 Using the AWL and the Utusan corpus word frequency list

The concordance software, Antconc, from the Utusan corpus generated a word frequency list for the 216 loan words from the AWL. Teachers could either teach words based on the AWL sublists and their available loan word equivalent from the word frequency list or vice versa. The advantage of using the latter is that students are possibly more familiar with the loan words at the top end of the word frequency list. The word frequency list from the corpus and their English equivalents in the AWL could be used in a lesson introducing the idea of English loan words. The lesson would be a chance for teachers to gauge whether his/her students know what an English loan word is and how they determine if a word is a loan word.

The results in the pilot study show that students found it was easy to identify the loan words but that does not mean they necessarily know what to do with that information. Nevertheless, it suggests that they are already open to the idea of borrowed elements in Malay vocabulary, specifically for more sophisticated words, which should make the introduction to the strategy easier. Introduction to the loan words – especially in relation to the AWL – would be a good point to compare the differences between a general loan word and a technical loan word. We recall that some of the participants, non-bumiputera students especially, expressed the view that loan words were difficult to understand. We have discussed earlier that this is a well-founded concern as technical terms borrowed from English are somewhat more difficult to recognise and understand especially when they do not resemble the English equivalents. For instance, in Kamus Istilah DBP, ‘universalistic hedonism’ is translated as faham nikmat sejagat (lit. ‘school of universal hedonism’) but the term ‘hedonism’ itself is translated as hedonism. As the loan words are from the Academic Word List, they are not in themselves
technical but more of the general loan word types (e.g. faktor, strategi, and isu) which are often used in the print media.

8.3.2 Using results from the linguistic analysis and the vocabulary tasks

The following sections will refer to the instruments and analyses used in the study. However, note that these are meant only as examples. The study does not intend to suggest that the instruments and analyses are comprehensive. Indeed, they represent only a partial analysis of the Academic Word List, or the prospective vocabulary for an ESL course.

8.3.2.1 Semantic aspects: narrowing and broadening of meaning

The semantic analysis found that some loan words were potentially problematic while others were potentially non-problematic. The results from the student tasks basically affirmed the findings from the analysis except for a few words from the potentially non-problematic group such as status (‘status’) and aspek (‘aspect’) which turned out to be difficult for the students. Teachers may start with the list of potentially non-problematic loan words and compare them to their English equivalents. Low-level learners, especially, would benefit from learning the easier words first as there is a clear one-to-one connection between the loan word and its English equivalent e.g. strategi – strategy, komuniti – community, and definisi – definition.

Teachers, however, must take care not to encourage generalisation of the one-to-one comparison. Once the morphological correspondences are understood, teachers can introduce the list of potentially problematic loan words and their English equivalents. Teachers can focus on the semantic aspects of the loan word and its English equivalent. The items from the Gap-Filling and Translation tasks, for example, can provide material for this lesson. Both tasks had several similar potentially problematic loan words. The loan words in the Gap-Filling task were used in their Malay usages. In contrast, their English equivalent in the Translation task had usages which are not available in (or not borrowed into) Malay. For example, isu in the Gap-Filling task meant ‘matter’ but in the Translation task the word ‘issue’ meant ‘edition of publication’. The results of the Translation task show that the majority of participants gave similar incorrect translation for ‘factor’, ‘individual’, ‘elements’, ‘potential’, and ‘function’. The vocabulary lesson could focus on the contrast between the core meaning and other peripheral meanings of these potentially problematic loan words. This focus will be able to highlight the semantic aspects found in analysis, that of, narrowing and broadening of meanings.
8.3.2.2 Grammatical aspect: differences in word class and number

Results from the semantic analysis show there were several differences in word class and number between the loan words and their English equivalent. Evidence was further found in the results of the Translation task when the participants provided a translation for the noun ‘factor’ instead of the required verb. This is because the verb function is not the core part of speech borrowed into Malay for ‘factor’. Similar results with the differences were found for ‘significance’, ‘response’, and ‘individual’. The loan word respon (‘response’), for example, have been found to be used as a verb in Malay with exactly the same spelling. This is potentially confusing for learners because the verb form is ‘respond’ and the noun form is ‘response’.

There are two possible vocabulary teaching strategies which could use the findings above. The first is careful selection of non-problematic loan words, and the second is consciousness-raising about the differences. A lesson plan could make use of the loan words as the tool of focus aimed at “promoting general word analysis strategies” (Bravo, 2007: 153) where students will be taught to be conscious of loan words within their reading texts and apply the word analysis skills to reach an understanding of the English words.

8.3.2.3 Lexicographic aspect: inconsistent definitions and/or usages in Malay dictionaries

Results from the semantic analysis also show there were inconsistencies between the definitions for the loan words in the Malay and in the English dictionaries. Inconsistencies were also found between the definitions in the Malay dictionaries and usage in the Malay newspapers. For example, the loan word drastik in Kamus Dewan means keterlaluan or terlalu keras (‘overboard and extreme’; ‘overly harsh’) but in the Oxford Dictionary of English that definition is only part of the definitions for ‘drastic’. The meaning of ‘far-reaching effects’ is not included in Kamus Dewan, yet this meaning was one of the definitions for the loan word drastik in the Malay newspaper articles. The inconsistencies are considered to be problematic in terms of the challenges for teachers and vocabulary course designers in finding suitable and/or authoritative information about the status and meaning(s) of loan words in Malay. The situation, obviously, is somewhat fluid with words of the importation variety.
Another example of the inconsistency is the loan word *response* (‘response’) which Kamus Dewan defines as ‘an answer or a reply in words or action’. However, the loan word *respon* which has no entry in Kamus Dewan is also used in the newspaper articles to mean ‘an answer or a reply in words or action’. The results in the Translation task show that the majority of participants had difficulty with the English word ‘response’. Another loan word which the participants had difficulty with was *individual* (‘individual’). The semantic analysis found that both the loan words *individu* and *individual* are defined in Kamus Dewan as ‘a single person’. The Kamus Inggeris-Melayu Dewan, on the other hand, defines ‘individual’ as an adjective and means the ‘characteristics of a single person; distinctive’ but still includes the loan word *individu* in its definition which in Kamus Dewan is a noun. A vocabulary lesson plan designed to take into account these inconsistencies will help learners to gain a deeper understanding of not only the English word but also its relationship to the loan word.

In the semantic analysis, this study revealed that even the most recent edition of Kamus Dewan (2007) has not updated several older loan word entries – despite its claims to have done so. Nonetheless, Kamus Dewan might not be alone in this inadequacy as “dictionaries do not always reflect this [semantic extension] either in their sense-discrimination techniques or in their ability to document lexical innovations” (Hartmann and James, 1998: 123).

Therefore, dictionary publishers have the responsibility for continuously updating their content, particularly, when the dictionary claims to be the most authentic source of reference for the language (Kamus Dewan, 2007: xv). The relevance of the update is more relevant for the ESL teachers than the students as teachers need to have a contemporary and up-to-date language reference for use in the linguistic analysis of the loan words.

The analysis also highlights the importance for Malay of having a more user-friendly and dynamic interface for the contemporary Malay corpus much like the ones available for English language users (e.g. Corpus of Contemporary American English and British National Corpus). The current online *Pangkalan Data Korpus* DBP (‘DBP Corpus Data Port’) produced by Dewan Bahasa is a commendable effort. However, compared to the Corpus of Contemporary American English, the 135-million Malay Corpus gives too much emphasis to classical Malay. The corpus includes more than 2.8 million words from traditional Malay texts. The interface and architecture of the corpus also lack several features which greatly facilitate the use of other corpora such as the Corpus of Contemporary American English or the British National Corpus. Such a corpus can assist native and non-native Malay speakers...
to get more current information on specific words and their mainstream usage especially when definitions provided by dictionaries are not quite up-to-date. Most importantly, ESL teachers intending to use English loan words as a vocabulary learning tool could benefit from this corpus as it provides a contemporary and realistic source of information for the meanings of those loan words.

8.3.3 Principles and procedures of utilising the loan words as an academic vocabulary teaching tool

Although having no language family relationship, the English loan words in Malay may be compared with the cognates between English and Spanish, or English and German, in terms of being linguistic resources for use in ESL classes focusing on vocabulary acquisition. Several principles and procedures are suggested here in order for the loan words to be useful in the ESL classroom:

(1) Teachers should make it sufficiently clear that English loan words exist. This includes: introducing students to the concept of what a loan word is and where might they encounter them; what types are available (general and technical); which types are useful for English language learners; what are the features of the useful loan words that are helpful (e.g. close resemblance to the English words).

(2) Teachers should include word-consciousness activities in the vocabulary acquisition lesson. This includes systematically pointing out sound-meaning correspondences between the English word and its loan word in Malay (e.g. *isu* and ‘issue’). We have seen from this study that some of the participants had no idea whether the Malay word is an English loan word. We could say because they already do not read enough English texts to have such knowledge but that is exactly why the teacher should help learners be more loan word-aware. This is especially important because English loan words in general already do not receive much publicity in Malaysia and it is possible learners grow up thinking that the loan word *status* (‘status’) is an original Malay word. This situation is unlike in Japan, where *gairaigo* (English loan words) dictionaries are common publications and the Japanese public are aware of the many loan words in their national language. In addition, the word-consciousness activities may also include morphological analysis of the English word and its loan word in Malay. Earlier in Section 2.9.2 of the Literature Review we have also discussed the
matter of word recognition due to orthographic similarity (Chikamatsu, 1996; Nation, 2001). English nouns with the suffix ‘–tion’, for example, are commonly borrowed into Malay with the suffix ‘–si’ as in ‘organisation’ and *organisasi*. This is not to suggest for learners to rely on systematic patterns, as they would be anomalies, but only to as far as the systematic patterns are helpful for learners to guess intelligently the meaning of an English word.

(3) An important part of this strategy is to expose learners to the knowledge that a loan word may not necessarily fit the function of the English word even if its form resembles the latter. In other words, the teacher should highlight the fact that often, only the core meaning and usage of the English word gets transferred along with the borrowed form into Malay. For example, the loan word *isu* in Malay functions only as a noun but not both noun and verb as what it could in English for ‘issue’. Teachers could carry out activities which incorporate problematic and non-problematic loan words (such as found in this study) in order to train learners to differentiate between the two.

(4) Once the English language learners are quite familiar with the activities in (1) - (3) above, teachers should increase and encourage vocabulary acquisition activities which built on the students’ knowledge of the loan words. For example, the teacher could bring in a Malay newspaper article which discusses interesting current world events and ask learners to identify any English loan words. Using what they know of loan words so far, the teacher could ask them to write the English words of those loan words. The teacher could then discuss with learners the points of similarities in terms of forms and functions of the loan words and the English words. Another related activity could be where the teacher brings in the English version of the article (if any) and ask learners if they recognised any of the vocabulary used. Based on the learners’ responses, the class can then use the results of their previous discussion on the forms and functions of the English loan words in the Malay article.

(5) Obviously, these activities would require the teacher him/herself to treat the students’ L1 as a linguistic resource in the ESL classroom – a crutch, if one will (Banta, 1981: 136; Nation and Gu, 2007: 116) – particularly for the MUET Band 1 (very limited user) and Band 2 (limited user). Having this positive opinion of the loan words help the teacher to further help his/her students to capitalise on their L1 knowledge when
learning the L2 vocabulary. Having said that, this study believes that the strategy of utilising the English loan words should function as a scaffold which helps the weak learners, particularly, to increase the number of English vocabulary learned. Having at least some stored English vocabulary and a strategy could help them either to guess intelligently at the meaning of a sentence or text. This hopefully will increase their level of motivation to tackle reading activities in English. It is extremely frustrating to be staring at a foreign text and not being able to understand any of it. Compared to their friends who obtained MUET Bands 3 to 6 to which English is a second language and maybe even a first language, a ‘foreign’ language is possibly what English is to learners with MUET Bands 1 and 2.

(6) In the context of reducing the learning burden of words, teachers should always point out any available similarities between the English vocabulary and the loan word in Malay (if any). We recall Hancin-Bhatt and Nagy's study (1994) which found that cognate recognition – despite its seemingly availability for vocabulary acquisition – is neither automatic nor spontaneous even for Spanish-speaking English language learners. Hence, English language learners at the MUET Bands 1 and 2 levels need some guidance or training to see the point of connection to the new word. The loan word could help to be the bridge that eases the learning of that new word. Teachers are giving the learners a vocabulary learning strategy when they teach learners to find useful parallel patterns (Nation, 1990: 37) between the target vocabulary and the loan word.

With regard to limited English proficient students such as students with MUET Bands 1 (very limited user) and 2 (limited user), it would be helpful if English language teachers did not overlook the role of the L1 in the English language classroom. We have discussed in the Literature Review the utilisation of the L1 in order to learn the academic vocabulary in English such as transfer effects (Ringbom, 1990, 1992), use of cognates (Oskarsson, 1975; Kharma and Hajjaj, 1989; Moss, 1992; Granger, 1993), first language translation (Elliot and Adepoju, 1997), and a motivation aid in adult ESL classes (Collins, 2001). In the context of students in Malaysian public universities that L1 is Malay. It is undeniable that the use of the L2 in the Malaysian ELT classroom be maximised. However, “research shows that the first language has a small but important role to play in communicating meaning and content” (Nation, 2003: 1). Either from personal or professional teaching beliefs, English language
teachers in Malaysia are not exempt from avoiding the use of L1 in their classroom. Yet, “…none of the three arguments from L1 learning, compartmentalization of languages, and the provision of L2 use strongly support the view that the L1 should be avoided” (Cook, 2001: 410). Using the loan words require ELT teachers to have an open-minded attitude while discussing the usage and differences or similarities of the loan word in Malay sentences and its English word in English sentences. If instructors of foreign languages such as Japanese, Spanish, and French could use English to teach the foreign language at the beginner’s level to students even with MUET Bands 4 (competent user), 5 (good user), and 6 (very good user) then surely using Malay to help the Bands 1 and 2 in the ESL classrooms in Malaysian public universities could only help these limited English proficiency learners. In addition, the ESL classes which specifically have adult ESL learners would benefit as well. Compared to the 18-20 year old undergraduates, adult ESL learners have left school for a far longer duration. What they remember of English vocabulary very much depends on their usage of the language since then to present time. The use of the L1 in their ESL class could encourage and motivate them to not be shy and afraid of the language learning process (Goh and Fatimah, 2006).

8.3.4 An academic vocabulary teaching programme using the loan words from AWL

Since its introduction to the ELT field, the Academic Word List has been successful in its reach to vocabulary teachers. There are already a number of ESL vocabulary textbooks which utilise the AWL within a vocabulary teaching context e.g. Focus on Vocabulary: Mastering the Academic Word List (Schmitt and Schmitt, 2005) and Student Tools: Essential Academic Vocabulary – Mastering the Complete Academic Word List (Huntley, 2006). There are also vocabulary workbook series such as the College Vocabulary – English for Academic Success and Inside Reading: the Academic Word List in Context (both a four-level series of student workbooks by different authors). The authors acknowledge there is a “natural relationship between academic reading and word learning” (Zwier, 2009: vi). However, these books were “designed to prepare students of English for academic success in U.S. college degree programs” (Byrd et al., 2006: back cover). More recently, the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary’s (OALD) website (http://www.oxfordadvancedlearnersdictionary.com/wordlists) has included the AWL as one of four wordlists on its site. It describes the AWL as a list of words that students are likely to meet if they were studying at an English-speaking university. Similarly, the University of Plymouth has a dedicated page on its website developed
specifically for students to learn the AWL (Lowes, 2008). Note how the vocabulary workbooks and websites describe the function of the AWL: the AWL is useful for college vocabulary in English-speaking universities. To my knowledge, there is yet a textbook or workbook which uses the AWL in English proficiency courses at public universities in Malaysia.

Having gone through the AWL in the course of this study, and despite criticism on the corpus being unevenly distributed and does not serve students in the sciences well (Hyland and Tse, 2007: 240), this study contends it is a worthwhile wordlist for undergraduates taking ESL proficiency classes in public universities in Malaysia. In fact, Hyland and Tse’s criticism may turn out to be a positive situation for the Malaysian ESL students. This is because the vast majority of those taking ESL proficiency classes at public universities are non-science majors.

Thus, given enough time for a proper syllabus design and with a team of interested colleagues, the plan is to develop a four-series textbook similar to the College Vocabulary – English for Academic Success for Malaysian ESL learners at Universiti Malaysia Sabah. The four-series is compatible with the present structure of ESL courses at UMS where students take the required proficiency courses for four semesters. The goal is to expose students to these academic words beginning from Sublist 1 (having the most frequent word families) to Sublist 10 spread over four semesters. ESL students at UMS take Communicative English Grammar in their first semester followed by Oral Communication in English in the second, English for Reading and Writing in the third, and in their fourth semester Academic English for Reading and Writing. The planned College Vocabulary textbook series for UMS students may be used in conjunction with the other courses’ textbooks. Note that to date there has not been any such vocabulary textbook per se used in the present ESL structure at UMS. Students learn vocabulary (not academic vocabulary from the AWL) mainly from the vocabulary sections of the courses’ textbooks. How would the academic words be presented?:

Learning new words is more effective when words are studied in meaningful contexts. Each chapter in the Vocabulary series contextualizes a set of approximately 25-30 AWL words in a “carrier topic” of interest to students. The carrier topics are intended to make the study more interesting as well as to provide realistic contexts for the words being studied. Learning a new word means learning its meaning, pronunciation, spelling, uses, and related members of the word’s family. (Bryd et al., 2006: iv)
As described by Bryd et al. above, it will follow the existing formula for the original College Vocabulary: English for Academic Success series. However, the difference between that series and the one intended for UMS students is the inclusion of Malay glosses for the academic words. The glosses may be in the form of loan words or translation from Malay.

One of the clearest and simplest ways of providing a meaning for a word is to give a first language translation. This has several advantages: (1) the translation is usually short and clear, (2) it is usually in the form of a synonym rather than a definition (definitions are more difficult to understand because of their complex grammatical structure), (3) the new word is related to something the learners already know well, and (4) the meaning is presented in totally familiar language. (Nation, in Berns, 2010: 204)

Note that the L1 – in our context, Malay – has a role in lessening the learning burden (Nation, 2001, 2010) of words for students. Teachers could use the glosses to encourage the students to be attentive to the links between the English word and its loan word in Malay such as was done in the instructional intervention study by Carlo et al. (2005).

For the loan words, it will include the core meaning, pronunciation, spelling, and most importantly examples of usage(s) taken from the Utusan corpus compiled for this study. It is also possible to include more recent examples from the Utusan online archive search engine. In addition, the textbook will highlight cases where the gloss (particularly for the loan words) has a different meaning as well as usage in Malay. Following a study by Calderon et al. (2005) in which the L2 vocabulary is developed through discussion surrounding the target word using different resources such as available cognate status, depth of meaning, and utilising learners’ L1, this study similarly believes that highlighting the similarities and difference between the English words and the loan words enables students to be aware that some loan words may have other meaning and usage in Malay despite having similar form to the English word.

Another planned development as an outcome of this study is to set up a website similar to the one by the University of Plymouth. However, rather than a stand-alone website as developed by Lowes (2008) it could be set up as the College Vocabulary textbook companion website with further examples of the AWL in English and in their glosses, exercises, links to the usages of the academic words in the vast corpora such as www.corpus.byu.org created by Prof. Mark Davies which is available free online, corpus from this study, as well as links to the Utusan archives. The links will hopefully enable students to experiment (initially with
teacher's guidance) on their own the process of finding the words in academic or semi-academic materials outside of the ESL classroom.

Overall, the proposed plans above utilise the loan words, as well as maximise any benefit to be reaped from using Malay judiciously in the L2 classroom, so as to facilitate learning the academic vocabulary from the AWL. Also, it is about encouraging students to link their existing linguistic knowledge to available cross-linguistic similarities (Ringbom, 2007b: 2) they perceived from the target words. Nevertheless, the low-level ESL learners at Malaysian public universities should not be left alone to work with this learning tool or develop the skill of using it. ESL teachers must play a role to train their students so that they will become good language learners who “refer back to their native language(s) judiciously (translate into L1) and make effective cross-lingual comparisons at different stages of learning” (Naiman et al., 1996-31).

8.3.5 Summary

The strategy of using the loan words as a facilitative vocabulary learning tool is only one of the many strategies an ESL teacher can employ. It is not assumed that the loan words will solve all the problems Malaysian ESL learners faced in learning English. What we do propose, based on the results of this study, is that Malaysian ESL learners, especially bumiputera learners, use the available material (the loan words) and exploit them for their benefit. Teachers and learners, should not, however, expect the strategy to have or require a simple execution. We should also take heed of this caution from practitioners of a strategy which uses cognates with learners of L1 Romance-based languages,

Becoming facile with cognates and/or in the morphology of Romance-derived words does not necessarily result from a single lesson or even a series of lessons, especially for students who have spent several years in reading instruction where the phonology of Anglo-Saxon words of English has been the focus (Hiebert, 2009).

The implication there is that teachers, particularly, should have a more positive outlook towards the role that loan words, or the students’ L1, may play in the ESL classroom. It also indicates that the strategy requires consistent application in order for it to bear fruit on the students’ learning of the English vocabulary. This study proposes several point strategy, outlined in 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 above, for incorporating loan words into ESL courses.
8.4 Limitations of the Study

A limitation of this study is that it was carried out only at one university and in just a selection of classes there, hence the lack of a larger number of participants. The study could not afford to have more participants given the extra logistical arrangement which it would bring to this study which had a limited completion time and personnel. It would be very interesting to find if the results would remain to be similar had it been able to include, for example, five hundred or more participants. In addition, this study did not have participants from public universities in West Malaysia. Hence, a more in-depth distinction between the data from bumiputra Malays in West Malaysia and indigenous bumiputeras in Sabah and Sarawak was not possible for further exploration.

The study also had a limitation in that it did not have enough information pertaining to the non-bumiputera participants’ fluency in Malay. This information would have given additional information especially in relation to their reading habit, because students who had attended the vernacular schools in their first six years of schooling would have learnt Malay as a second language. In addition, compared to those who went to Chinese vernacular schools, non-bumiputera who attended national public schools would have received more exposure to Malay from bumiputera students in the same school.

8.5 Future Research

We suggest future research related to loan words also collects input of the participants’ examination grades in Malay so it can be further determined whether participants are fluent enough in Malay to provide equivalents to the loan words.

Another research project could be carried out on the usage of loan words and their currency as synonyms in Malay vocabulary. Researchers may want to investigate whether English loan words feature strongly in a test of providing synonyms to native Malay words. The loan words which appear prominent in the results could then be compared to the list of high-frequency loan words found in this study or to their original English words in the Academic Word List.

Yet another future research would be to identify more English loan words from the Academic Word List in terms of the headwords and subsequently the full list of words in the Academic Word List. This work could include Malay-affixed loan words which are likely to increase
the current number of loan words in this study (216 or 40%). Needless to say, identifying is just the preliminary stage. The more important aspect is the semantic analysis of the additional loan words. Results from the semantic analysis would be the material for the rich instruction and direct teaching. In that context, a larger research project may want to have a fuller analysis on English loan words in Malay and not limit it to the AWL. Each new addition to the loan words list will result in a different word frequency list. Teachers need to consider several things in light of each change and the quality of the change: (a) level of ESL learners, and (b) the timing of introduction of loan word type (single-item vs. Malay-affixed), and (c) the high-frequency word. For (a) to (c), we refer to the proficiency levels of the learners in that teachers may delay introducing the Malay-affixed loan words to low level learners. However, he/she may use them early with an intermediate level ESL learner. If the teacher uses the word frequency list and both types of loan words are on it, the teacher then needs to ensure that his material for the direct/rich instruction is adequate for the level of students he has in class.

Another interesting aspect would be to investigate ESL teachers’ attitudes towards the use of students’ first language in the ESL classroom. This can be an extension to the cognitive-affective dimension in this study which focused on students. It would be interesting to see if there are different attitudes to using the students’ first language in terms of ethnicity, the training the teachers had had (local vs. overseas universities), and qualification (first degree vs. postgraduate level).

Other possibilities for future investigation on this topic would be a learner corpus of Malaysian English to see if loan words were used more frequently or less frequently than they were used by native speakers of English. That is, are loan words preferred or over-used because of their low-level burden? It would also be possible to do a discourse completion type study which could provide data which might show preferences for or against the use of English words which are loan words in Malay. Another possibility would be to do a study using the Utusan corpus in order to systematically examine the relative frequency of loan words and their Malay equivalents in the corpus.\(^{55}\)

Finally, future research could include testing a vocabulary module or course which utilises the loan words with students at the public university. This can be modelled after the cognate curriculum developed as part of a larger joint research project between the Center for Applied
Linguistics (CAL) and its partners. CAL and its research partners developed a Cognate Awareness Test (August et. al, 2001) designed to assess “...whether native Spanish-speaking children have access to the meaning of words in English that have cognates across Spanish and English.” Researchers could look at transfer of vocabulary knowledge from Malay to English and on intervention strategies which will help students make “…explicit connections between their knowledge of their first language and their understanding of their second.” (ibid).

8.6 Conclusion

At present and to our knowledge, there is no set method, module, or course design which uses the English loan words in the Malaysian ESL classroom. Several ideas have been discussed in this section and, ultimately, it depends on the teacher’s efforts to make the strategy a success. Ringbom (2007: Chap.11) highlights several serious efforts in Europe with Romance languages in the EuroCom project and EuroComGerm with Germanic languages which make “practical use of the facilitative learning potential that exists between speakers of related languages”. Teaching strategies using English loan words in Japanese are outlined in Daulton (2007: Epilogue) which includes paying special attention to loan words in formal instruction; including more loan words in beginners’ textbooks because they are easier to comprehend; using bilingual flash cards focusing on high-frequency English words and their loan words in Japanese; and adapting reading materials built around high-frequency English words which have been borrowed into Japanese.

An important point teachers should always keep in mind is that the English loan words do reduce the burden on the part of the learner’s learning process. That does not imply the teacher’s responsibility in teaching is reduced. In fact, section 8.2.3 above, show that the teacher has more to do. Hence, some important guidelines are that teachers draw attention to the similarity of the L2 word to the loan word or to systematic patterns. The utmost care must be ensured in not ending up training the students to generalise instead (e.g. using the Malay suffix -si for the English ‘-tion’ as in ‘transformation’/transformasi). Teachers must also highlight the semantic differences between the L2 word and the loan word in terms of meaning and usage: narrowing, broadening, conflicts in parts of speech, conflict within Malay (inconsistent usage between Malay dictionary and contemporary use in the media). Almost always the English loan words in Malay import only the core words and not the peripheral meanings. In addition, the majority of the English loan words borrowed are nouns,
followed by adjectives, and quite rarely the verbs. Explicit teaching of these variations will be helpful to students, especially with them being more sensitive towards similarities, in dealing with vocabulary such as ‘economic’ from ‘economy’ whose loan words ekonomik and ekonomi fall under the category of problematic loan words. To give another example, the loan word evolusi the noun in Malay (‘evolution’) is available in Malay and basically means what ‘evolution’ the noun means in English. Failure to properly highlight semantic and grammatical limitations of loan words may lead the student to find a loan word counterpart for ‘evolve’, which there is none. Also, it would also be useful to perhaps start the course or programme with the potentially non-problematic loan words before moving on to the potentially problematic ones. Teachers may also want to be up to date with the corpus (preferably to have a contemporary one) as it is possible that what is potentially problematic may change to be non-problematic in the future, for example, Dewan Bahasa updates its definitions, etc.

Some teachers – or students and parents even – may be sceptical with what this study proposed. The results, however, show the loan words are potentially helpful in the students’ learning of English vocabulary. With proper planning and execution, teachers can use the loan words to help limited English proficient students, especially those who failed their MUET, and the MUET Bands 1 and 2 learners increase their acquisition of academic vocabulary.
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END NOTES


2 Compared to the Peninsular, interethnic marriages are more common in Sabah and Sarawak, hence the demarcation by ethnicity and religion is not as pronounced. The difference between a bumiputera from Sabah and Sarawak to a bumiputera from the Peninsula is his/her religion – a bumiputera Malay is constitutionally defined as Malay and Muslim. That definition does not apply to bumiputeras in Sabah and Sarawak. The current population estimates by ethnic group in Malaysia lists bumiputeras as the majority (17.7 million), followed by the Chinese (6.4 million), Indians (1.9 million), others (344,000), and non-Malaysian citizens (2 million). Source: Statistical Bulletin, Malaysia (Jan 2010) http://www.statistics.gov.my/portal/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=570&Itemid=14&lang=en

3 Literature on the definition and explication of the term vary depending on who is doing the definition. Positive views towards bumiputera and the implications of the terms tend to come from Malay authors, while critical views of it tend to come from non-bumiputera authors as well as non-Malaysians (see Nagata, 1974; Lee, 1992; Samsul A.B, 1996 for an in-depth discussion on the term).

4 The Chinese students though were able to proceed to Chinese secondary schools but not to tertiary level as there was none at that time.

5 The less well to do Malays, Chinese, and Indians communicated with each other using Malay in the pidgin form as the majority of the non-Malays had no incentive to acquire more than the rudimentary command of the language (Heah, 1989: 70).

6 Section 21(2) of the 1961 Education Act allowed vernacular Chinese and Tamil schools to use their preferred languages until 1983 when all these schools were fully converted to be national schools (1961 Education Act). However, this was strongly protested by the Dong Jiao Zong, the body that safeguards Chinese education in Malaysia (which comprised the United Chinese Schools Committees’ Association and the United Chinese School Teachers’ Association) and the 1996 Education Act repealed Section 21(2). Hence, Section 16 of the 1996 Act provides for three categories of educational institutions in the National Education System, namely fully government-funded, government-aided, and private. This means that the 1996 Act recognizes the existence of independent Chinese school system, whose existence was ignored in the 1961 Act. (Segawa, 2007: 30).


8 The memorandum stated these resolutions: 1. to reject any move to introduce English as a medium of instruction for science and technological subjects; 2. to encourage the use of foreign languages, including English, which help in the acquisition and mastery of knowledge; and 3. to emphasize the fact that Malay has been the medium of instruction for about 20 years and has not faced any problems that necessitate a change in the language policy, especially regarding the use of Malay as the language for imparting knowledge and instruction (in Gill, 2004: 145).

9 MUET does not indicate a student fail the test but merely indicates the level of English proficiency they are at: Band 1 = Extremely limited user, Band 2 = Limited user, Band 3 = Modest user, Band 4 = Competent user, Band 5 = Good user, and Band 6 = Very good user. The 2006 MUET results which was sat by 89,805 students nationwide, 13,138 students obtained Band 2 and16,152 obtained Band 1 (The New Straits Times, 17 July 2007).

10 The NEP has since ostensibly been replaced by the National Development Policy associated with the Second Outline Perspective Plan for 1991–2000, and then by the National Vision Policy linked to the Third Outline Perspective Plan for 2001–2010. Although the new policies have put far greater emphasis on
achieving rapid growth, industrialization and structural change, there is the widespread perception that public policy is still dominated by the NEP’s interethnic economic policies, especially wealth redistribution or “restructuring” targets (Jomo, 2004: iii).

11 The government has since replaced ETeMS with the Memartabakan Bahasa Malaysia, Memperkuatkan Bahasa Inggeris or MBMMBI (“Upholding Bahasa Malaysia, Strengthening English”) beginning July 2009. Information of the new policy is available on the Ministry of Education’s website (www.moe.gov.my). The section contains mainly local newspaper articles on the new policy and information pertaining to its implementation. Recently though, urged by parents and advocates of ETeMS, Prime Minister Najib Tun Razak has announced that the government is considering a dual-medium of instruction for the Mathematics and Science subjects (Tan Ee Loo, The Star, 5 Apr 2011).

12 In an article discussing Malaysian authors writing in English, Raihanah M.M observed that “the establishment of the National Language Policy and the National Culture Policy in the 1970s, which are both based in the Malay race, heightened the ‘us vs. them’ tension faced by the people in the country” which in the literary scene translates to the ‘us vs. them’ between “literatures written in the national language and those written in English, Chinese, Tamil and other vernaculars. The former is given the National Literature status, whilst the latter carry sectional or vernacular status” (2009: 47). See Quayum and Wicks (2001) for a critical look at Malaysian literature in English and Zawiah Yahya’s (2004) ‘The other side of exile: Malaysian writers who stayed behind’ on the contribution of Malaysian writers in English who continued to write in English amidst the challenges of doing so. The pro-nationalist definition of ‘national literature’ as being only literature written in Malay is most explicitly stated in Ismail Hussein (1971).

13 Interestingly, Indonesian linguists do not view their version of Malay as the bazaar variety. Alisjahbana (1965) specifically stated that the standard language in Indonesia “went under the name of Melayu tinggi, High Malay, in contrast to Low or Bazaar Malay” (p.521) and instead contended that the Malay variety in Malaya “is not as well defined as High Malay in Indonesia, due the less extensive education in Malay in the Peninsula” (ibid).

14 However, the Ministry of Education was quick to issue directive warning school principals “to ensure that Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA) meetings do not discuss matters that oppose its policies” (Malaysian Insider, 23 Mar 2010). Incidentally, the ‘Malay-fied’ words are English loan words: oksida (‘oxide’), fotosintesis (‘photosynthesis’), and silinder (‘cylinder’).

15 Examples of these websites are PopTeeVee (http://popteevee.popfolio.net/), KLue (http://klue.com.my/), LifeinKL (http://klue.com.my/), and the slightly more serious Unscientific Malaysia (http://unmalaysia.wordpress.com/). In addition, one can also find Malay professionals blogging in English commenting on sociopolitical situations in Malaysia. Examples include Art Harun (http://arthurun.blogspot.com/), Marina Mahathir (http://rantingsbymm.blogspot.com/), Haris Ibrahim (http://harismibrahim.wordpress.com/), and Azmi Sharom (http://azmisharom.blogspot.com/).

16 The 1996 Private Higher Education Act paved the way for foreign universities to set up branch campuses in Malaysia.


18 The Centre for Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning at Universiti Malaysia Sabah offers foreign language (Japanese, Spanish, and Russian) as well as ethnic language courses (Mandarin, Kadazandusun, and Tamil) for students who are exempted from taking English proficiency classes.
Nevertheless, now and again, DBP is criticised for having too many loan words in its Kamus Dewan. The heaviest criticism came last December when a Member of Parliament accused DBP of being mentally impotent. He states that DBP and its terminology committees are taking the easy way out by importing many loan words into Malay when Malay words are easily available for similar meanings. In Malay, the terms ‘mandul minda’ is very insulting as the word ‘mandul’ means a woman who is barren. One of the words the MP used as his example was bajet for the Malay word belanjawan. The Star. (2007). DBP mentally impotent, says backbencher. 27 Nov 2007.


Creating the BNC. http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/corpus/creating.xml

Sinclair (1996). The url for this specific citation: http://www.ilc.cnr.it/EAGLES96/texttyp/node10.html#SECTION00040000000000000000

http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/antconc_index.html.


Some quarters, particularly language purists, may avoid using the word pinjam (‘borrow’) or pinjaman (‘borrowing’) perhaps to minimize the influence or the impact of English on the Malay lexicon. It is quite difficult to determine whether a loan word is an istilah still if it has already gained acceptance and became an established Malay word. The latest version of Kamus Dewan (4th ed.) referred to these loan words as istilah umum (‘general terminology’) e.g. Internet (‘Internet’) and akauntabiliti (‘accountability’). Aside from istilah (‘terminology’) which is an Arabic loan word in Malay, other terms for a loan word is kata serapan (lit. ‘word absorbed’). Interestingly, Kamus Dewan defines kata pinjaman (‘loan word’) as perkataan yang diambil dari bahasa asing (lit. ‘words taken from a foreign language’). Note that the word is taken and not borrowed.

Daulton states that 27% is a conservative count as it ignores compound word forms and “deals only with free-standing loanwords” (pp. 11-12).

An example is the AWL words ‘marginal’ which Kamus Dewan defines as kecil, tidak penting (lit. ‘small’, ‘not important’) or ‘prime’ which is defined as utama or perdana (‘main’, ‘prime’). Loan words of this type (substitution) are not included in this study.

There are four types of affixes in Malay: prefixes, suffixes, infixes, and circumfixes i.e. based on their position of occurrence in relation to the base. The affixes can also be grouped into verbal affixes and nominal affixes. Verbal affixes are the most complex of the two groups (Syed Zainal Ariff, 2005: 6).

A query to Utusan Malaysia regarding this matter has yet to receive a response.

A total of 16 reasons were listed which include modern development, English loan word sounds better, loan word has appropriate collocation, euphemisms and length of word.

In her study of Norwegian learners of English, Hasselgren found that the learners’ lexical choices based on cognate use and transliteration “comprises a quarter to a third of all wrong words” (1994: 250).

The participants were given various prompts to encourage them to elaborate on their choices of word. This was considered necessary particularly when participants responded with ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I just
thought of it’ statements. Nonetheless, after analyzing the interview transcripts, it appears that the
participants did try their best to elaborate and when they responded with ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I just thought of
it’ they actually meant they did not know why they chose the particular word. One participant became quite
irritated with the continuous prompts for more elaboration and she raised her voice slightly when she
answered ‘I am only answering the question’.

34 Spolsky (2008: 2) defines language management activities as “...attempts by any individual or institution
with or claiming authority to modify the language practices and language beliefs of other members of the
community.” A more recent definition of language management is “…the explicit and observable effort by
someone or some group that has or claim authority over the participants in the domain to modify their
practices or beliefs (Spolsky, 2009: 4). Of the two, I believe that the first definition is more suitable in the
Malaysian context as the term ‘explicit’ is subjective to the experience or interest of each language user – at
least in reference to the English loan words.

35 http://www.djz.edu.my/kecheng/malay/drafukuatan.htm

36 This explains why the Malay conversations of some of my non-bumiputera students (especially those
from West Malaysia) were always very formal and in complete sentences as if they were taken out from
Malay language textbooks.

37 Interestingly, the online MSN Encarta thesaurus shows the synonyms for ‘scenario’ as including
‘consequence’, and ‘picture’.

38 The clearest example for the use of senario (‘scenario’) as equated to keadaan (‘situation’) can be seen
on the response by a teacher on the blog of former Prime Minister of Malaysia, - Mahathir Mohamad -. An
excerpt of the response is given here: Sebagai pendidik dan ibubapa saya SANGAT SANGAT kecewa dan
sedih kerajaan dan pembangkang sekali lagi mempolisitkan pendidikan di negara ini. Saya ingin bertanya
tepat kepada Kerajaan sampai bila keadaan / senario ini akan berterusan? (‘As an educator and parent I am
VERY VERY disappointed and sad that the government and the opposition are again politicising education
in this country. I would like to ask the Government til when this situation / scenario will go on?’).

39 These equivalents, on their own, are not completely without use because in the absence of a direct
translation, one can have a near-equivalent or a gloss. The definitions or translations, however, could be
supplemented with usage notes or a style guide (Atkins and Rundell, 2008: 505) to help users be more
informed on the usage context(s) or limitations (if any) of that definition or translation. Ainon Abdullah and
Abdullah Hassan (2000:83) cites the dynamic equivalence translation theory (Nida, 1964) and stress that
there is no exact translation between two languages. The authors gave the example of the Malay equivalent
istana which is not the exact equivalent for ‘castle’ because of the different mental images that both
structures bring to readers who have seen a Malay istana and an English castle (p.83). Kamus Dewan does
not contain such supplementary material. In addition, as had been mentioned in an earlier chapter, Kamus
Dewan also does not provide information regarding the parts of speech for an entry.

40 A total of 181 English loan words in Malay are found to have no Malay equivalent based on the
classification employed by Shamimah (2006: 44-85; 172, 175-180). Examples include professional
(‘professional’), sinonim (‘synonym’), tema (‘theme’), teori (‘theory’), toleransi (‘tolerance’), simbolik
(‘symbolic’), negatif (‘negative’), and emosional (‘emotional’).

41 Examples of prominent non-bumiputera fluent and active in promoting Malay language and literature are
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lim Swee Tin of Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra
Malaysia and Uthaya Sankar SB, President of Kumpulan Sasterawan Kayvan (‘Kayvan Literary Group’).
Kumpulan Sasterawan Kayvan comprise Malaysians of Indian ethnic group who writes short stories, novels, and poems in Malay.

42 We would like to point out however that this may not be a general feature for Malay undergraduates in all public universities in Malaysia. Whilst the findings from the language attitude questionnaire in this study support that bumiputera undergraduates actually have positive attitudes towards English, we do not have data to support that the undergraduates in this study were significantly active in acquiring reading materials in English and spending more time reading in English. It is worthwhile to point out that public universities in Malaysia are ranked and entrance to the top two public universities – Universiti Malaya and Universiti Sains Malaysia – is competitive even amongst bumiputera applicants. This study has also pointed out in a much earlier chapter that there is no consistent benchmark for English proficiency qualifications applied to bumiputera university applicants in the public universities. It is possible that Universiti Sains Malaysia accepts only the crème de la crème of bumiputera applicants which may in turn explains the active effort of acquiring English reading materials and spending more time to read in English.

43 For the same reason, many Malaysians would not be aware of the fact that everyday words such as saya (‘I’) - a modern version of the Classic Malay hamba (‘servant’) - is itself a modified version of the Sanskrit loan word sahaya (‘servant’). Examples of other everyday Malay words which are Sanskrit loan words are kerana (‘because’), budaya (‘culture’), beza (‘difference’) and bila (‘when’) (de Casparis, 1997). See also Goddard (2005: 55-57) for more examples of old and indigenized loan words in Malay and Beg (1983) for Arabic loan words.

44 The book presents sixty English loan words and their Malay equivalents. Examples include kegiatan for aktiviti (‘activity’), rencana for artikel (‘article’), penghibur for artis (‘artist’), kugiran for band (‘band’), and dialog for perbualan, percakapan (‘dialogue’) and perbincangan (‘discussion with the intention of resolving something’).

45 The innovator for this concept, Dr. Abu Raza Abu Chik, was awarded the national level Anugerah Maulidur Rasul (the highest level of Muslim appreciation for service rendered to the nation and Islam in Malaysia) in 2006 for his effort in innovating the teaching and learning of Arabic in Malaysia.

46 Examples include peepadoraiba (‘paper driver’) which means a person who has a licence but does not actually drive (Rebuck, 2002: 63) and bebii sutoppu (‘baby stop’) which means an abortion (Miller, 1998: 135). These Japanized English words are often unintelligible to native speakers of English which has resulted in the term ‘Japlish’ or ‘Engrish’ (Daulton, 2008: 19).

47 Stanlaw, in fact, suggests an alternative term: ‘English-inspired vocabulary items’ (2004: 35) for the Japanese English loan words. His suggestion is acceptable for the Japanese context as the creativity and ingenuity displayed in the English-inspired vocabulary in Japanese is certainly far beyond the borrowing that occurs in the context of Malay. Hitchings (2008: 19) stresses that the terms ‘borrowing’ and ‘loan words’ are misnomers as the donor language does not have to give up the borrowed word even.


49 Note that this study does not intend to project the image that all non-bumiputera cannot speak the national language. On the contrary, as a result of policies implemented after the 1967 National Language Act which include the change of medium of instruction from English to Malay, the percentage of Chinese able to speak in Malay doubled from 37% in 1970 to 70% in 1980 and the percentage for Indians able to speak in Malay also went up from 50% in 1970 to 86% in 1980 (Azirah Hashim, 2003: 96).

50 The Preface of Kamus Dewan (2007:xv) states that the latest edition has included older entries which have undergone semantic changes – either broadening or narrowing. However, it has not done so for the loan word kolaborasi (‘collaboration’) which Kamus Dewan defines as subahat (kerjasama) dengan musuh
atau orang jahat, subahat dalam perbuatan jenayah dan sebagainya (lit. 'abetting (cooperate) with the enemy or bad person, abetting in crime and others'). This despite the more than 300 articles on Utusan Malaysia which use kolaborasi to mean a cooperation but not as defined by Kamus Dewan. However, other than to thank for bringing the matter to its attention, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka did not provide further information as to why the definition for kolaborasi is limited to the one provided (Personal communication, 3 Sept 2009). Inaccurate or imprecise Malay equivalents were also found for several English loan words in the Dewan Bahasa’s Malay-English Bilingual Dictionary (Shamimah, 2006: 111).

51 The free BYU-BNC: British National Corpus (http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/) is not the latest edition of the BNC and is limited to a certain period (1980s-1993). The latest edition is the BNC XML (2007) which still has 100 million words but the corpus is POS-tagged more extensively (http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/XMLedition/URG/BNCdes.html#BNCpurp). Unlike the 400 million Corpus of Contemporary American English, the BNC XML requires product licensing and requires an additional software.

52 Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka admits the corpus is not yet a corpus but more of “an archive or port” (my translation) made up of various collections of texts (Rusli, 2005: 10). Its interface allows users to select sub-corpus related to their use or research. Rusli explains that two reasons contributed to the present interface: (1) “opportunistie” in nature – the collection needed to be compiled in the shortest time possible and so any digital text of any genre which DBP has warrant inclusion; and (2) there is no clear description yet on the concept and criteria for a balanced and representative corpus of Malay (pp.7-10). The writer is currently Head of the Language Department at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

53 This proposal had recently won a bronze medal for the Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning at the 2011 Universiti Malaysia Sabah Inventors competition.

54 Beginning with the session 2012/2013, the course English for Academic Reading and Writing will only be offered to students with MUET Bands 3 and above. Student taking ESL classes will instead be offered English for Occupational Purposes.

55 The researcher would like to thank Prof. Paul Nation for suggesting these further research possibilities in his external examiner report.
Appendix A: Gap-Filling Task

Arahan: Isikan tempat kosong dalam setiap ayat di bawah dengan perkataan yang sesuai.

Instruction: Fill in the blank of each sentence below with the appropriate word.

Contoh: Pihak universiti akan meneliti pelbagai pandangan sebelum membuat keputusan.
(‘The university will go over various views before making a decision’.)

1. _______ kenaikan harga minyak di pasaran global juga dilihat sebagai salah satu mekanisme penjajahan alaf baru.
(‘The _______ of rising oil prices in the global market can also be seen as one of the mechanism of colonialization in the new millenium.’)

2. Sekiranya anda tidak berminat bekerja sebagai usahawan, anda boleh mencuba kerjaya dalam _______ swasta.
(‘If you are not interested to work as an entrepreneur, you can try a career in the private _______’.)

3. Antara _______ yang mengakibatkan serangan penyakit asma adalah pencemaran udara, asap rokok, dan kurang senaman.
(‘Amongst the _______ that lead to an asthma attack is air pollution, cigarette smoke, and lack of exercise’.)

4. Dewasa ini dapat kita lihat bahawa penyertaan kaum wanita dalam pelbagai _______ ICT amat memberangsangkan.
(‘Nowadays we can see that the involvement of women in various _______ of ICT is very encouraging’.)

5. Guru-guru, disamping memberi tumpuan kepada kecemerlangan _______, harus juga mengenalpasti kecenderungan dan minat pelajar mereka.
(‘Teachers, aside from focusing on academic excellence, should also identify the inclinations and interests of their students’.)

6. Hanya 15 peratus sahaja di kalangan _______ yang berusia lebih daripada 65 tahun selalu mengamalkan senaman.
(‘Only 15 percent among _______ more than 65 years old do exercises’.)

7. Radio Televisyen Malaysia (RTM) wajar ada satu badan khusus untuk merancang _______ bagi menarik penonton.
(‘Radio Television Malaysia radio (RTM) should have a specific body to plan _______ to attract audience.’)
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   (‘Research has found that Malay has been used for many centuries as the language for regional _________.)

9. Penyimpanan dan analisis _______ yang dihasilkan daripada bidang bioteknologi moden memerlukan kepakaran biologi perkomputeran dalam menafsirkannya.  
   (‘Storage and analysis of _______ resulting from the modern biotechnology field requires expertise in computing biology to interpret the findings’.)

10. Jika kita ingin mencapai _______ negara maju menjelang 2020, kita perlu membuat penambahbaikan kepada sistem pendidikan tinggi negara.  
    (‘If we want to attain the _______ of developed country by 2020, we need to upgrade the system of higher education in the country’.)

    (‘Since it was established in 1956, the main _______ of Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka is to realize the development and expansion of Malay’.)

    (‘Cooperation among the business _______ of South Korea and North Korea will be encouraged to advance joint development projects along the border’.)

13. _______ pembangunan teknologi genetik yang memberangsangkan turut berlaku di Thailand, China, Jepun malah Indonesia.  
    (‘Encouraging _______ of genetic technology development are also seen in Thailand, China, Japan and even Indonesia’.)

    (‘China, India and Vietnam are indeed powerful countries that have the _______ to go far ahead of others’.)

15. Satu penilaian menyeluruh perlu dilakukan untuk menilai sejauh mana _______ program Alam Sekitar Merentas Kurikulum telah melahirkan pelajar yang menghargai alam sekitar.  
    (‘A thorough assessment should be carried out to assess how far has the Environment Across the Curriculum programs achieved its _______ in producing students who appreciate the environment’.)

16. Perkembangan kanak-kanak dan remaja akan dikelirukan dengan wujudnya _______ negatif dalam Internet.  
    (‘The development of children and teenagers will be confused with the existence of negative _______ on the Internet’.)
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17. Wabak selesema burung yang berlaku di Indonesia kerap menjadi ______ agensi berita asing.
   (‘The bird flu epidemic in Indonesia often becomes the ______ of foreign news agencies’.)

18. Akademi Antirasuah Malaysia berperanan melengkapkan pegawai-pegawaiannya dengan kemahiran moden dan ______ terkini dalam menentang rasuah.
   (‘The role of the Malaysia Anti-Corruption Academy is to equip its officers with modern skills and the latest ______ in fighting corruption’.)

19. Kurikulum universiti perlu sentiasa dikaji untuk memastikan kursus yang ditawarkan kepada pelajar adalah ______ dalam suasana industri semasa.
   (penting / berkaitan / sesuai / sejajar)
   (‘The university’s curriculum should always be examined to ensure that courses offered to students are relevant to the industries’.)

20. Pada dasarnya, lebih ______ faktor yang dibincangkan maka lebih lamalah masa yang kita perlukan dalam rundingan bersama Amerika Syarikat mengenai Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas.
   (‘In principle, the more ______ the factor being discussed, the longer time we will need in the Free Trade Zone negotiations with the United States’.)
Appendix B: Translation Task

Arahan: Berikan terjemahan perkataan bergaris berikut mengikut konteks ayat yang diberikan. Anda TIDAK BOLEH menggunakan terjemahan dalam bentuk kata pinjam bahasa Inggeris.

Instruction: Translate the underlined words below based on the context of their sentences. You are NOT allowed to use English loan words in your translations.

Contoh: The world of the Internet is getting larger, more complex, and overwhelmed with information.

complex = rumit, NOT kompleks

1. The special issue of the journal has been written to discuss in-depth those problems that young people face.

issue =

2. The researchers will factor the participants’ medical history and overall health into their decision before continuing further with the experiment.

factor =

3. It is quite difficult for a teacher to give individual attention to students in a large class.

individual =

4. What I like about their program is the business and management elements which have been built into the course.

elements =

5. The findings of this study also highlight the significance of connections to family during the adolescent years.

significance =

6. Students who own laptops are very much in the minority in rural schools.

minority =
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7. The bank’s management has increased **scope** to develop new financial products for the public.

scope =

8. The proposal for a blood donation event was met with an enthusiastic **response**.

response =

9. A solution to the water crisis on Earth is so **fundamental** to our personal health and the health of our planet.

fundamental =

10. In many countries, it is the **convention** to wear black at funerals as a sign of respect.

convention =

11. This report offered the most **specific** and accurate description of the problems experienced by farmers in this area.

specific =

12. There's absolutely no **coordination** between the different groups - nobody knows what anyone else is doing.

coordination =

13. The marketing team agrees that the area is a **logical** site for a new supermarket because of the housing development nearby.

logical =

14. The *FedEx-JA International Trade Challenge* aims to teach and expose students to the **relevance** of international trade in the increasingly borderless world we live in.

relevance =
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15. The low temperatures here are a function of the terrain as much as of the climate.
function =

16. Many potential customers are waiting for a fall in prices of cars before buying.
potential =

17. The data for the research was collected by various researchers.
data =

18. Women are asking to be given equal status with men in terms of salary.
status =

19. There are many definitions of the word 'feminism'.
definition =

20. Dealing with people is the most important aspect of my work.
aspect =
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandakan dengan ✓ pada petak yang sesuai dengan pendapat anda pada setiap pernyataan di bawah. (Read each statement below and tick ✓ in the box which is the closest to your opinion.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Meminjam perkataan dari B.Inggeris untuk membolehkan BM mejadi bahasa yang mutakhir adalah suatu langkah yang boleh diterima.</strong> (Borrowing words from English is an acceptable way for Malay to stay up-to-date.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>BM patut digunakan sebagai bahasa perantaraan di IPT swasta.</strong> (Private universities in Malaysia should use Malay as their medium of instruction.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>BI adalah penting untuk penjawat awam mendapatkan peluang kenaikan pangkat di sektor awam.</strong> (English is important for government servants to secure promotion in the public sector.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Rakyat Malaysia yang menggunakan BI lebih daripada BM adalah berlagak dan menunjuk-nunjuk.</strong> (Malaysians who use English more than Malay are just showing off.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>BM perlu meminjam perkataan dari BI untuk membolehkannya menjadi bahasa yang moden.</strong> (Malay needs to borrow words from English in order to become a modern language.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Kata pinjam BI menjadikan penulisan saya lebih canggih.</strong> (English loan words add an air of sophistication to my writing.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Media memainkan peranan besar dalam memperkenalkan kata pinjam BI kepada masyarakat awam di Malaysia.</strong> (The media plays a big role in introducing English loan words to the Malaysian public.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Sangat tidak /Tidak /Sedikit /Agree</th>
<th>Disagree /Tidak /Sedikit /Bersetuju</th>
<th>Slightly disagree/ /Sedikit /Bersetuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree / Sangat bersetuju</td>
<td>Slightly agree /Bersetuju</td>
<td>Slightly disagree/ /Sedikit /Bersetuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. **Penutur BM yang menggunakan BI untuk bertutur dengan seorang penutur BM yang lain adalah sombong.**
   (A Malay speaker is being arrogant if he/she uses English to talk to another Malay speaker.)

9. **Kuliah dan tutorial di fakulti-fakulti sains dan teknologi patut diadakan dalam BI.**
   (Lectures and tutorials in the science and technology faculties should be in English.)

10. **Kefasihan dalam BI sebagai salah satu kriteria kenaikan pangkat di sektor swasta adalah perkara biasa.**
    (It is natural that the private sector requires fluency in English as a criterion for promotion.)

11. **Menggunakan kata pinjam dalam penulisan saya menunjukkan bahawa BM masih kekurangan gaya bahasa akademik yang formal.**
    (Using English loan words in my writing means Malay still lacks a formal academic style.)

12. **Negara-negara asing yang mempunyai pejabat dagang di Malaysia patut menggunakan BM dalam urus niaga mereka.**
    (Foreign countries having business offices in Malaysia should conduct their business in Malay.)

13. **BI patut dijadikan sebagai bahasa perantaraan di IPT awam.**
    (Public universities should use English as their medium of instruction.)

14. **Malaysia patut mengurangkan jumlah rancangan televisyen yang menggunakan BI.**
    (Malaysia should decrease TV shows which are in English.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandakan dengan ✓ pada petak yang sesuai dengan pendapat anda pada setiap pernyataan di bawah.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Read each statement below and tick ✓ in the box which is the closest to your opinion.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **15.** *Semakin berleluasa peminjaman perkataan BI, maka semakin rendahlah nilai BM.*
| *(The more borrowing from English increases, the lower the value of Malay becomes.)* |
| **16.** *BM perlu mengawal jumlah perkataan yang dipinjam dari BI.*
| *(Malay needs to control the number of words it borrows from English.)* |
| **17.** *Lebih mudah untuk memahami artikel jurnal yang ditulis dalam BM sekiranya ia mengandungi banyak kata pinjam BI.*
| *(Journal articles written in Malay are easier to understand if they contain many English loan words.)* |
| **18.** *BM bertuah kerana perkataan BI yang dipinjam masuk mudah untuk disesuaikan dengan perbendaharaan kata BM.*
| *(Malay is lucky that it can easily adapt English words into its vocabulary.)* |
| **19.** *Kata pinjam BI membantu memperkayakan lagi perbendaharaan kata BM.*
| *(English loan words help to enrich the Malay vocabulary.)* |
| **20.** *Graduan IPT awam patut mempunyai kemahiran berbahasa Inggeris dengan baik.*
| *(Malaysian public university graduates should have good English proficiency skills.)* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree/Sangat tidak bersetuju</th>
<th>Disagree/Tidak bersetuju</th>
<th>Slightly disagree/Sedikit tidak bersetuju</th>
<th>Slightly agree/Sedikit bersetuju</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Sangat bersetuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Maklumat Peserta: Sila isikan bahagian berikut
(Participant’s Information: Please fill in the space below)

1. *Nama/Name:* ______________________

2. *Program Ijazah/Degree Program:* _______________________________

3. *Bangsa/Ethnicity:* ________________________

4. *Asal/Hometown (sila bulatkan/please circle one):* Sabah / Sarawak / Semenanjung Malaysia

5. *Bahasa pertuturan anda di rumah/ Language you speak at home:* ______________

6. *Bahasa pembacaan anda yang lebih baik/Language in which you read better:* ______________

7. *Bahasa penulisan anda yang lebih baik/Language in which you write better:* ______________

8. *Bahasa pertuturan anda yang lebih baik/Language in which you speak better:* ______________

9. *Gred SPM English dan MUET/SPM English and MUET grades:* SPM ________; MUET ________

10. *Gred kursus Bahasa Inggeris semester lalu/Last semester’s English course grade:* ________