Norms of Language Choice and Use in Relation to Listening and Speaking: The Realities of the Practice in the Malaysian Banking Sector

Chan Swee Heng* and Ain Nadzimah Abdullah

*Department of English Language, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

Sociolinguists have pointed to the current linguistic development of the present era as being marked by a complex interplay of sociolinguistic concerns, among which are contradictions between global networks, local identities, (Barber, 1995; Castells, 2000), and also in norms in language choice and use. Economic and social globalization has created a strong demand for an international lingua franca, thus furthering English's presence as a global language (Crystal, 1997). However, local languages remain influential and exert a presence in a multilingual situation. This study attempts to relate the use of the global language to that of the local languages in the Malaysian banking sector which plays a dominant role as an economic powerhouse. Within this financial sector, the matrix of language as a medium of expression provides a setting for investigating situated norms of language choice and use among multilingual employees in the Malaysian banking sector. Data were collected via a survey questionnaire. Fishman's (1972) theoretical framework is adopted and extended to the workplace context in order to examine the intricacies of the norms of language choice and use in relation to specifically the listening and speaking skills. These two language skills have been prioritized by Malaysian employees as the most needed in the workplace (Abdullah *et al.*, 2010). The study gives focus to these two skills and the specific domains of use to illustrate the competing patterns of language choice in a multilingual Malaysian workplace.

INTRODUCTION

The roots of the present linguistic landscape in Malaysia could be traced back to the

British colonial times. The education scene then was one of accommodation and in some sense also of imperialistic dominance. While native schools were allowed (such as the Malay-, Chinese- and Tamil-medium schools), the British introduced the English-medium schools, which were set up mainly by missionaries to propagate their beliefs and systems. Pre-independence schools were of a medley resulting in differing emphases given to the development of languages. This development was very much left in the hands of various influential organizations giving them a free hand to determine language learning directions and status. Post-independence in Malaysia witnessed a major change in the education system as it became more formalized with a local flavour with the passing of legislation to govern its structure and development. In order to understand the present day use of the dominant languages in Malaysia – Bahasa Malaysia (henceforth BM), English, Chinese and Indian – some information about language development would situate language use.

Language choice and use in Malaysia is determined by a number of factors, among which, is the sociological make-up of her multi-ethnic and multilingual society. The three major ethnic groups are the Malays, the Chinese and the Indians. Each of these groups speaks their own ethnic languages and also often uses English as well. The languages spoken by each ethnic group may transcend ethnic boundaries. For example, a Malay may speak other ethnic languages besides BM. Similarly, a Chinese may speak other ethnic languages besides a Chinese language. However, BM is accorded the status and role of national and official language in the country. On the other hand, Mandarin and Tamil are the recognized vernacular languages which are used as mediums of instruction in vernacular primary schools. English has emerged and has been recognized as the second most important language in the country because of its role as an undisputed global language of the 21st century. As a result, English is learned by all in Malaysian schools. Thus, it could be said that the language policy in Malaysia is one that promotes multilingualism (Kärchner-Ober, 2011, p. 24).

Under the Federal Constitution of Malaysia, BM is "the national language" of the country, for "official uses", that is to say, for "any purpose of the Government, whether Federal or State, and includes any purpose of a public authority" [Federal Constitution, Article 152, (1) & (6)]. The Constitution has thus elevated the status of BM, as well as defined the domains of its functions and use. In other words, the Constitution has provided both corpus and status planning for the language. In a similar vein, the Government has also done the same for the vernacular languages. The English language is emphasized in schools and reflects acquisition planning. These government-led policy initiatives were well implemented especially within school confines. However, the beyond school-confined language practices speak of changes that had mutated into a

fashion far diverse from that of the formal education practice. This may be evident in the workplace, where a covert language policy appears to have evolved. The covert language policy in a workplace situation appears to be determined by a myriad of operations that include the nature of business, staff, corporate ideology and other pragmatic issues. Any language choice and use decision is thus located in very complex and often unpredictable situations. In face of the dynamism of change and growth in a linguistic environment, research into the area of language use invites further participation and is invigorating. The study of language choice and use acts as a store of history and contributes to human knowledge; it is interesting in itself. From the investigative process, outcomes could provide unique views on a particular linguistic ecology that could speak of notable synergy in language practices and its sustainability.

SOME RELATED STUDIES

Government-led language policies are well-defined by Cooper (1990). However, it is clear that policies can also be institutionally led, as pointed by Poon (2000), who sees 'language policy as either a macro- or micro-sociological activity that involves deliberate and organized efforts to solve language problems' (p. 117). Using Cooper's seminal ideas as a pivot, Poon postulates that language policy derived from language planning can be viewed from four angles. The first relates to the normal government-led language policy that is closely tied to corpus planning. The other arises in the absence of formal language planning. This is associated with acquisition planning. Non-government-led language policies deal with acquisition planning or corpus planning (2000, p. 125). Thus, there can be an explicit and official policy (dealing with status planning or corpus planning) or an implicit and unofficial policy that arises if it is institutionally-led, for example, in the workplace domain. While language planning is often government-led, language policy is not necessarily so. In fact, different language policies could operate in a wider range of situations. These situations may extend to the workplace and often exhibit particular norms of language use.

Spolsky (2009) uses the term language policy in a more encompassing manner. He says it refers to 'all the language practices, beliefs and management decisions of a community or policy' (p. 9). In other words, language practices are situated in the ecology of a language and emphasize actual language use in different contexts and for various reasons, echoing Fishman's postulations. Spolsky prefers the term 'language management' rather than language policy to refer to specific actions undertaken to intervene in or influence language practices. He also points out that the domain of language management can be used to explain the state of multilingualism and social structure. In using the model, it could lead to the formulation of more precise hypothesis about language use which could contribute to a theory of language management. Moreover, language planning and policy decisions are power-related and

are always 'socially situated and continually evolving' (Ricento, 2000, p. 2). In view of these elaborations, language can be said to be a social institution that appears to be used for multiple purposes such as in politics, literature, economics, religion, and education.

Language planning and policy is further complicated when nations are multilingual. As a result of multilingualism, language disputes are often evident in communities around the world which have differences in opinions about language prioritization issues and problems. This is particularly so among developing nations who are still "finding their feet" in national and social spheres. Malaysia is one such example, where multilingualism is thriving, and as a result, the language policy of the nation must take into account this linguistic phenomenon to accommodate the language needs of the communities which would be responsible for language use. According to Crystal (2000), language diversity that could arise from multilingualism, in fact, is important for a number of reasons. We have to recognize that language ecology is diverse, and is closely linked to identity. In this study, identity is assumed to be of a corporate nature in data interpretation.

According to Grin (1996), the connection between language and economy is an aspect of sociolinguistic study that is seen as an emerging field. He identifies one of the key issues that could influence research as that of "language-based distributional inequality" and this applies to the economics of language, whereby economic variables will have a part to play in determining the norms of language choice and use. Therefore, there can be a focus on language as a medium of trade with concepts of supply, demand and the market applying to language goods. He concluded that studying the relationship between economics or economic activity and language would lead to an essential understanding of language-related processes that would also have implications for language policy studies.

Linked to language policy and planning is also attitudinal change. In his work, Jenkins (2006) said that the use of English, as the language of globalization and also as a super-ordinate language, has given rise to a sense of inferiority among the non-native speakers of English. However, he believes that this sense of inferiority can diminish as the majority of speakers of other languages see themselves as at least equal alongside native speakers of English. This gradual development to minimize linguistic insecurity would take time but he affirms that it eventually could be overcome.

Similarly, Mufwene (2008) opines that language change is gradual and cumulative. The restructuring process is reflected in his case studies which demonstrated how the ecology of a language is able to influence its evolution. He compared language spread to a model from virology. He also elaborates on the metaphor of a flu epidemic that can be caught in the process of transmission and acquisition brought about through interactions. His reference links social dynamics in ecology such as population movement, contact and hybridism, to explain how languages evolve.

In terms of language practices, as part of social dynamics that influence a language policy, Chan *et al.* (2008) investigated norms of language use in the Malaysian workplace. They discussed pragmatic rationalizations that affect English language use, which is linked to the issue of advantages and rewards. Useful language practice is efficient and delivers products and services faster, better and cheaper. The production and delivery of goods and services is in synergy with social interactions and communication often determined by prior education experience. They concluded that a new economic-driven culture characterizes the 21st century Malaysian workplace, and this culture emphasizes and exerts new demands on employee skills (which includes communication skills), which in turn, places new demands on the provision of education. Similarly, Gill (2002) also states that Malaysians must be pragmatic in their quest to achieve global competitiveness in the context of education, community and the nation.

FOCUS OF THE STUDY

This paper locates language choice and use as a field of inquiry with a focus on the Malaysian banking workplace domain. The framework is grounded on Fishman's (1972) theory of language choice which uses domain analysis as a method of data collection. Domain analysis, in simple terms, refers to "*who* speaks *what language* to *whom* and *when*" (our italics). Fishman also asserted that "Proper usage indicates that only *one* of the theoretically co-available languages

or varieties *will* be chosen by particular classes or *interlocutors* on particular kinds of *occasions* to discuss particular kinds of *topics*" (1972, p. 15). This study analyzed language choice and patterns of language use in the banking domain from the social and socio-psychological perspectives that could lead to an illumination of a language policy in practice. However, only two skills (listening and speaking) were analyzed in this paper. These two language skills have been prioritized by Malaysian employees as the most needed in the workplace (Abdullah, Chan, & Talif, 2010). The aural-oral tradition normally provides the starting point of language learning, and therefore, the relevance placed on these two skills, especially, when speaking is a skill that is 'heard' and is prominently used at the frontline for business transactions.

METHODOLOGY

For this paper, the respondents were selected from the banking industry in the state of Selangor. Selangor was chosen as the research site as it houses most of the major financial institutions in the country. The number of respondents is 39, and they were from 8 different banking institutions. Undeniably, 39 is a small number, but it could still be considered as a fair number to give sufficient initial data for the analysis. In addition, the banking industry is not an open institution in which research can be conducted easily. Most of the professionals are extremely busy and would decline to participate in studies that they perceive as having little relevance to their work. As

such, personal contact was a determining approach taken in obtaining data for this study.

A questionnaire was designed and administered to obtain the relevant information. The questionnaire attempts to capture information. The questionnaire is organized accordingly in sections: a) attitude towards languages, and b) language use in banking in relation to frequency of use and skill ability. A five-point Likert scale was used to elucidate responses to the questions according to domains of use. The results were analyzed and presented in the form of frequencies and percentages.

To exploit domain use of language, contexts of language use had to be established. Fishman (1968) explains domains in the following way:

> *Domains are defined in terms of institutional contexts or socio-ecological co-occurrences. They attempt to designate the major clusters of interaction situations that occur in particular multilingual settings. Domains enable us to understand that language choice and topic… are … related to widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations.* (p. 176)

It is clear that language choice is a sociolinguistic phenomenon which refers to the selection of languages for different purposes in different contexts. The choice of languages may be conscious or unconscious, but it does not happen in a vacuum; rather, language operates in a context which is situated in a speech community. Multilingual speech communities inevitably face conflict over language choice. Language choice and use in multilingual speech communities can take place at two levels: macro and micro. The next section discusses the findings obtained.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

An item total reliability index was calculated (Cronbach Alpha), which turned out to be very high (i.e., 0.98). Information on the racial composition of the respondents is as follows: Chinese (46.2%), Malays (38.5%), and Indian (15.4%). In terms of gender, 26.6% were male and 74.4% female. As for age, the respondents are of: 21-30 years (76.9%), 31-40 years (10.3%), and 41-50 years (12.8%). The data also revealed their job descriptions as: managerial (20.5%), executive (51.3%) and clerical (25.6%). Only 5.1% reported that the English language is their mother tongue, while 35.9% claimed BM as their mother tongue, and 43.6% the Chinese language. The respondents' educational background is as follows: certificate-level (23.1%), degree (64.1%), post-graduate (7.7%) and professional (5.1%). They were attached to various departments: sales and marketing (38.5%), finance (18%), credit and leasing (25.7%), and international banking (15.4%).

General Attitudes toward Languages

Nine questions were asked to ascertain the general attitude toward the different major languages used in Malaysia – Bahasa Malaysia, English, Chinese, and Indian.

The responses were categorized into those that refer to the affective, motivation and language maintenance. For the affective category, questions were asked as to whether the language is important, beautiful to speak, good for expressing emotions and thoughts. Generally, the respondents strongly agreed that English is a beautiful language to speak (69.2%), followed by BM (48.6%), and Chinese (54.3%). There is a similar pattern for the response to the language as being very important for Malaysia. The figures revealed this pattern [Agree (A) to Strongly Agree (SA)]: English (A=25.6%, SA=69.2%), BM (A=43.2%, SA=45.9%), Chinese (A=37.1%, SA=25.7%) and Indian (A=9.4%, SA=15.6%). It is obvious that the English language is considered to be very important, followed by BM, Chinese and Indian. It is interesting to note that the strongly agree (SA) data show English as the most prominent and the Indian language has the lowest rating. In addition, it seems that English is the language that the respondents felt was best for expressing emotions [English (A=20.5%, SA=74.4%), BM (A=27.0%, SA=37.8%), Chinese (A=22.9%, SA=34.3%) and Indian (A=12.5%, SA=9.4%)] and thoughts [English (A=10.3%, SA=79.5%), BM (A=35.1%, SA=45.9%), Chinese (A=17.1%, SA=37.1%) and Indian (A=9.4%, SA=6.3%)]. It appears that English has transcended cultural boundaries in the use of language in these two affective domains.

As for motivation, it is again English that dominates. The figures are as follows: using this language will allow me to have a more comfortable life (English: A=10.3%, SA=89.7%' BM: A= 27.0%, SA=40.5%; Chinese: A=25.7%, SA=40.0%; Indian: A=6.3%, SA=9.4%). In this domain, BM and Chinese were rated in almost a similar manner. This appears to suggest that both these languages have dominance in the relationship between language and motivation.

When asked whether learning the language was boring, the respondents felt that learning languages is generally boring. This is shown in the following figures: BM (A=33.3%, SA=27.8%), English language (A=21.1%, SA= 23.7%), Chinese (A=20.6%, SA=11.84%) and Indian (A=12.9%, SA=3.2%). Among the languages, the interest level for learning BM appears to be very low, whereas the interest level for English was relatively higher.

The next section focuses on the listening and speaking skills. The respondents believe that speaking the language correctly is not a priority. Data on the item of speaking accuracy revealed a strong sense of pragmatic competence. The following results were obtained for accuracy: English (A=15.4%, SA=12.8%), BM (A=5.4%, SA=16.2%), Chinese (A=2.9%, SA=11.4%) and Indian (A=12.5%, SA=9.4%). These figures are relatively low and thus appear to support the notion of pragmatic consideration over accuracy.

English was most prominently placed about wanting generational continuity in language use (A=23.1%, SA=71.8%). This was followed by BM (A=32.4%, SA=54.1%), Chinese (A=38.2%, SA=32.4%), and Indian

(A=25.0%, SA=18.8%). For the languages to be maintained by the Malaysian society, it could be said that English is placed as the most important for maintenance. BM is also highly emphasized, with the Chinese and Indian languages given less emphasis but with notable figures.

Language and Banking

It was reported that the language that is most frequently used in the banking sector is English, followed by BM, Chinese and Indian, in that order. Three questions were asked about language and career. They were: whether language will take one further in his career, if it will help one to get a job easily, and if one can earn more money if one is proficient in the language. From the data, it seems clear that English dominates the other languages in being the necessary language for career advancement (A=13.2%, SA=78.9%), ease of getting a job (A= 23.2%, SA=75.2%) and the potential to earn more money (A= 22.4%, SA=71.3%).

Frequency of Used Based on Sub-skills

In terms of the sub-skills, what stands out most as the most frequently used skill is listening. This appears to support research conducted at Universiti Putra Malaysia (Talif *et al.*, 2010), which investigated language use in the Malaysian workplace. The findings of the study also pointed out that listening is the most needed skill in the Malaysian workplace. Meanwhile, data for the present study showed that the least used skill is writing for all the languages being investigated: BM (44.5%), English (8.1%),

Chinese (68.8%) and Indian (93.5%), although the figures revealed that writing in BM is less frequent than writing in English. The two other languages were considered to be infrequently used for writing.

Language Choice and Use for Listening and Speaking in the Banking Workplace

The data are presented in percentages to reveal the relative proportions of the frequency of use for a particular language event or situation in terms of the three major languages (BM, English and Chinese) in the banking work domain. The number of participants who use the Indian language (less than 5%) for this work domain was extremely low; therefore, it was discounted for reporting in this section. The data for *agree* and *strongly agree* were also collapsed for ease of discussion in this section. The two language skills are also reported together as they are strongly associated in the manner of use.

Table 1 shows the listening and speaking activities that take place in the banking workplace. English is obviously the dominant language used in the listening and speaking activities. As reported by the participants, use of English was most often in the domains of meetings and using the telephone. The activities that had responses of 80 per cent and above were talking to clients, as well as conversing with peers and superiors. In the case of BM, it is clearly the second most often used language in the banking sector. However, the percentages showed a marked difference when compared to English. The highest percentage recorded

for the use of BM in the list of listening and speaking activities was 56.7% (social activities). Therefore, it seems that the proportion of English used for banking workplace activities is very high. Pragmatic competence in the English language ranks high among the languages in this work domain. Compared to English and BM, the Chinese language is not as regularly used. This is not surprising as the Chinese language is considered a vernacular and therefore not emphasized. However, it is not a language to be discounted as the data also revealed that there is noticeable use of the language in the workplace, particularly in social activities, talking to clients, training and conversing with peers.

Language Ability (Listening and Speaking) for Use in the Banking Workplace

Table 2 shows language ability for use in the banking workplace for specific workplace activities. It seems that the ability to use the English language for activities like problem-solving, greetings, giving directions and

giving training is rated high. Interestingly, the respondents also rated themselves as very highly (100%) for problem solving in the ability to use the English language. For BM, the lowly rated abilities were giving directions and giving instructions. In this sense, abilities could be linked to frequency of use. If this is the connection, then it could be that English is the preferred language for the functions identified. It may be that the workplace has conditioned the nature of language use as associated with specific work functions. Therefore, there is likelihood that giving directions and instructions are traditionally more grounded in the use of English rather than in BM.

On the other hand, handling questions and giving replies (83.3%) and greetings (72.3%) were two the functions that were most highly associated with the BM. The two functions seemed to be more social-cultural in association. BM appears to evidence its acceptance as the intra-national language for wider communication in Malaysia. It could also be the case that

TABLE 1
Listening and Speaking Activities in the Banking Workplace

Listening and Speaking Activities	Often to Very Often (%)		
	BM	English	Chinese
Training	43.6	92.4	20.6
Meetings	41.0	97.4	18.0
Talking to clients	48.6	84.9	30.6
Social activities	56.7	92.3	38.8
Conversing with peers	37.8	89.7	20.6
Conversing with superiors	29.7	87.2	14.7
Conversing with subordinates	25.1	94.9	19.6
Answering telephone calls	43.2	97.4	17.7
Presentations	32.4	92.3	11.7

a response given may be dependent on the first instance of language used by the initiator in the communication. The Chinese language appears to be quite well-grounded in use among bank employees judging by the response of a reasonable proportion of Chinese language users who were confident enough to say that they are able to use the language for a variety of functions. In particular, their responses (Agree to Strongly Agree) ranged from 37.2% to 42.9%. The functional abilities in English and Chinese were rather consistent while that in BM appeared to fluctuate more. This could mean that the setting of the banking workplace had a great influence on language use, i.e. the setting predominantly favours the use of the English language. It is also interesting to note that as a result of the setting, the dominant language (BM) learnt at school was not likely to experience a transfer to being the most dominant language in the workplace situation.

CONCLUSION

The language situation in Malaysia reflects a state of co-existence of languages and must be regarded as an asset rather than a liability. Since monolingualism among language users is the exception rather than the rule, and as has been acknowledged universally, a bilingual scenario of this nature is most desirable. In effect, mastering two languages or three has always been promoted by the educational management in Malaysia and ample opportunities have been given to students to acquire a second or a third language. As a result of historical developments, Malaysian students have been moulded to become multilinguals.

Multilingualism allows people to access two or more languages, giving a choice in using languages for different purposes in different contexts. Language choice may be constrained by several factors, and these include language attitude, interlocutor, setting and profession. Within the profession,

TABLE 2
Language Ability (Listening and Speaking) for Use in the Banking Workplace

Language ability	Agree to Strongly Agree (%)		
	BM	English	Chinese
Handling questions and giving replies	83.3	89.7	37.2
Giving information about bank services	66.6	89.7	40.0
Giving directions	48.6	92.3	37.2
Giving instructions	53.8	87.2	37.2
Persuading clients to buy products	63.9	84.6	37.2
Greetings	72.3	92.3	42.9
Reassuring clients	66.7	87.1	37.2
Giving training	61.1	90.1	37.2
Conduct meetings	63.9	87.1	37.2
Making oral presentations	66.7	87.1	37.2
Problem-solving	69.4	100.0	40.0

there are different domains of use and these domains are similarly influenced by the factors that affect language choice.

According to the Harvard Education Gazette, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Sommer (2011), is strongly putting the case that a multilingual society is a rich one, full of nuances and possibilities for expression impossible in just one language. A multilingual culture, she said, is also necessary so that differences can coexist in the world today. She also goes on to say that developing an appreciation for the limits of one's own language, as well as for other cultures, tongues, and people, is increasingly necessary in today's world because trade is not the only thing that is being globalized. She emphasizes that modern life, in effect is a multilingual space.

The data suggest that of the languages used in Malaysia, English has been clearly identified as having a distinct relative advantage over other languages and its status is confirmed by the emphasis given by workplace employees in the banking sector in this study. Its use pervades in all the domains of listening and speaking, ranging over 80% in frequency of use for the identified activities. Rewards are clearly economic, related to job opportunities and career advancement. Hence, the ability to use English proficiently is perceived by most employees as a necessity.

In terms of ability, all the incumbent employees believe that they have a very strong ability to use the English language to carry out the tasks demanded by the job. BM was rated second in the magnitude of

use with the Chinese language showing that it has a more significant placing than the Tamil language. This trend reflects the entrenchment of the use of the global language, English, with local languages thriving and competing in the multilingual environment.

However, it was surprising to note that many of the employees claimed that they were more able to use English than BM in the discharging of their workplace duties. Though BM is a language learnt at school, it appears to have suffered some dislodgement in the banking workplace. This could also likely lead to a state of language attrition due to lesser use and contact with the language learnt in school and used as a medium of instruction.

The sample size in this study is rather small to make board generalizations about language choice and use in the banking sector. However, the consistency of the statistics on the language phenomenon does point to several implications. The most obvious is the operation of a covert language policy or language management that appears to be institutionally-led, a notion suggested by Poon (2000) and Spolsky (2009). Secondly, it appears impossible to stop the tide towards the creation of what Sommer notes as "multilingual space" in the modern world. It gives cognizance to the fact that modern life assumes and exudes a mood of language accommodation with realizations that there are limitations of one language to perform all societal functions in a community, and by extension to the workplace community. Thus, there

is the possibility of peaceful coexistence of different cultures and tongues in the community.

In face of language diversity and multilingualism, and a natural, relentless subversive march of one language to dominate over another or others, there are concerns expressed about the loss of languages and language types (Gupta, 2001). Studies of language change have recognised that language is a social construct related to human behaviour. As such, any language shift is seen to occur in the context of cultural change, which is a natural consequence over time. With change comes eventual acceptance, and as Gupta says, the change is not "to be deplored nor celebrated". Rather, the situation acknowledges linguistic diversity and language rights. Language planners could give due consideration to the sustaining of the vitality of languages, coupled with an understanding of the social economic ecologies under which language continues to evolve from stage to stage.

Malaysia is in no way unique in using English as the dominant language in a workplace. In line with modernization, international recognition, and the desire for progress, the English language seems to be the logical language of choice, and likely a language for the educational authorities to promote for workplace needs. The national and official language, BM, together with the English language, seems to be best suited to accomplish this goal of economic and industrial development. English, as an ESP subject, will continue to have relevance for workplace preparation, as evident in the language curriculum of many Malaysian universities. There is much to be done to ensure that these courses provide the needed experience to meet the functional needs in the workplace, and much thought has to be given to how these courses should be designed (refer to Fadhil Mansor, 2001, for an illustration of ESP design in a university language curriculum) to satisfy pragmatic competence without sacrificing linguistic competence. However, other languages will continue to play their roles as parts of the multilingual's repertoire of languages which can be drawn upon constantly for the context of operation. This multilingual competency is a desired state and should be encouraged, given the robust realities of language choice and use.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, A. N., Chan, S. H., & Talif, R. (2010). The language experience of incumbent workers: Some pragmatic insights. *Jurnal Bahasa Jendela Alam*, *6*, 776 – 788.

Barber, B. R. (1995). *Jihad versus McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world*. New York: Ballantine.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Chan, S. H., Abdullah, A. N., & Talif, R. (2008). *Language needs situated in a context-sensitive workplace*. Paper presented at 6th Language for specific purposes international seminar 'LSP: Interfacing; language with other realms', 9-10th April 2008, Persada Johor International Convention Center, Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia.

Cooper, R. L. (1990). *Language planning and social change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mansor, F. H. (2001). A case of an extra-sensitive perception of ESP. GEMA *Online Journal of Language Studies, 1*(1), 1-12.

Fishman, J. A. (1968). *Readings in the sociology of language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). Domains and the relationship between micro- and acro sociolinguistics. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 435-453). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Gill, S. K. (2002). *International communication: English language challenges for Malaysia*. Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

Grin, F. (2006). Economic considerations in language policy. In Ricento.T. (Ed.), *An introduction in language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 77-94). Oxford: Blackwell.

Gupta, A. (2001). Realism and imagination in the teaching of English. *World Englishes, 20*(3), 365–381.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157–81.

Kärchner-Ober, R. (2011). Effects of national language policies and linguistic reorganization. In Varcasia, C. (Ed.), *Becoming Multilingual: Language Learning and Language Policy between Attitudes and Identities* (pp. 17-37). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Mufwene, S. (2008). *Language evolution: Competition and change*. London: Continuum.

Poon, A.Y.K. (2000). *Medium of instruction in Hong Kong: Policy and practice*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Potier, B. (2004, May 6). Conference looks at benefits to bilingualism: Two is better than one. Harvard News Office. Retrieved from *http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2004/05.06/12-bilingual.html*.

Rosli Talif, Chan. S. H., Ain Nadzimah Abdullah, Wong, B. E., Noor, R., & Rashid, S. M. (2010). Perspectives and defines of workplace English in Malaysia. Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Ricento, T. (2000). Ideology, politics and language policies: Introduction. In Ricento, T. (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 1-8). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.