

## English for Non English Departments at Brawijaya University: How Essential?

Indah Winarni, et al.\*  
*Brawijaya University*

**Abstract:** For years, English has been a compulsory subject for the students of non-English departments (henceforth English for SNED). The success of English for SNED at the tertiary level of education has largely been questioned due to various constraints in all levels of its operation. Related to the large resources involved, overall evaluation is necessary. This can be started with analysis of needs, which, in a large organization like university, should be done in two stages (Coleman, 1988). While the present study does not pretend that it could be regarded as Coleman's first stage of needs analysis, it would offer a significant contribution to such an undertaking. Carried out in Brawijaya University, this study was aimed at describing, through a set of questionnaires, the perception of graduates, English instructors and subject lecturers on (1) the aim of English for SNED, and (2) the role of references written in English in the level of study programs. As previous studies suggested, conflicting aims of English for SNED in the perception of respondents were identified. This study delienated four different groups with regards to the use of references written in English in the level of study programs.

**Key words:** English for non-English departments, References written in English, Study Program.

English for SNED in Indonesia has been reported to have never achieved the set of aims intended as the purpose of teaching and learning due to several constraints influencing the implementation in all levels of its operation. This is indicated by the low proficiency of university graduates from 1969-1981 as described by Sadtono (1995) to be 60 percent in elementary level cate-

gory, 30 percent intermediate and 10 percent in advanced category. More updated data can be seen from the TOEFL-equivalent scores of newly admitted academic staff of Brawijaya University from 1989 - 2001 which shows that 55 percent of them were in the category of elementary, 25 percent in intermediate and 20 percent in advanced category. The depiction shows that the English proficiency of the university graduates seems to have never indicated significant improvements.

The role of English as the language of science and technology needs no further justification that it is deemed necessary for university students to acquire mastery of this language. This seems to have been reflected in the obligatory status of the language in non-English Department core curriculum for many years despite some suggestion of its omission due to the consideration of its not being worthwhile (Djiwandono, 1982; Sadtono, 1995)

The obligatory status of EAP for undergraduates has not carried its consequences in the level of its operation. In its actual practice, it is marginalized due to its weak, unestablished status of belonging to neither collection nor integration culture (Holliday, 1997:94). In this respect, it bears all the characteristics described by Coleman (1997:29-32) as *lacking prestige; lacking resources; taking place in large classes; timetabled for antisocial hours; allocated 2 sks (semester credit units) only; non selective by language competence; extremely heterogeneous both inter-institutionally and even intra-institutionally*. Sadtono's (2001) further analysis mentions technical, psychological and language aspects contributing to the failure of the English for SNED.

English has been compulsory in all thirty-three study programs in Brawijaya University. Following the curriculum applied nationwide, English is classified as either a Foundation Course for Professionals (Mata Kuliah Keahlian) or a Foundation Course for Character Building (Mata Kuliah Umum). Six thousand five hundred and thirty two students in the academic year of 2000-2001 (including Diploma and the Extension Program of S-1 students) are required to take the subject in the first (and second) semester and there are only fifteen English instructors. The class size ranges from seventeen to ninety. Informal coordination among the English instructors takes place as far as teaching load is concerned. Considering the large number of students taking the course, it is not uncommon to find some English instructors teaching at other faculties on request, nor is it to find part timers from outside the university teaching at certain faculties.

In general, EAP for undergraduates at Brawijaya University shares the common characteristics of EAP for undergraduates in Indonesia. As far as the curriculum is concerned, each faculty has its own policy in determining the allocation of time, the credits, class size and the semester for the course. In general, English is compulsory, taught at the first (and second) semester, takes place in large classes and lacks proper coordination in administrative, academic and professional terms.

The advancement of research on EAP for undergraduates seems to be in rhyme with the development of teaching and learning taking place so far. While Coleman (1988) concentrated on individual institution, i.e. Hasanuddin University, Sadtono (1975) and Ahmad (1994) were concerned with wide scale analysis of needs. While studies on wide scale analysis of needs are crucial as a basis for further decision-making concerning the English proficiency of SNED in general, more individual studies on the level of institutions as expressed by Coleman (1997), down to the level of study programs as suggested by Sadtono (1995) are needed to take necessary actions. This study would satisfy the need of such an undertaking.

The literature on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) categorizes English for SNED as belonging to English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Building on Streven's (1988) and Robinson's (1991) definitions, Dudley-Evans et al. (1998) formulate the characteristics of ESP, as having absolute and variable characteristics. In the teaching of ESP, these characteristics require analysis of needs, which has been recapitulated by Dudley-Evans et al. as consisting of target situation analysis (TSA), learning situation analysis (LSA), present situation analysis (PSA) and means analysis, analysis of socio-cultural factors of an institution.

Coleman's (1988) analysis of needs in Hasanuddin University led him to suggest that needs analysis in complex and large organization like a university should be done in two stages. The first stage is an analysis of the patterns of language use which requires an analysis of synchronic and diachronic dimensions of the patterns of interaction in the university. The first stage of the analysis is meant to lay some basis of identifying appropriate learners with regard to the wider institutional context in which this particular group exists and functions. The second stage of the analysis, analysis of learners' language needs can take place once the particular target groups are identified. Coleman's first stage of needs analysis seems to be encapsulated by Dudley Evans' means analysis and the second stage could be referred to

the analysis of learning and present situation. This study believes in Coleman's assertion that what he refers to analysis of the patterns of language use requires a rigorous undertaking involving a considerable length of time span. While the present study does not pretend that it could be regarded as Coleman's first stage of needs analysis, it would offer significant contribution to such an undertaking.

Johnson's (1990) framework of language education curriculum development mentions four stages i.e. (a) planning, (b) ends/means specification, (c) program implementation and (4) classroom implementation. The planning stage, where the aim of educational program is to be formulated, is said to be the most crucial (Rodgers, 1990). For this reason, this study was focused on the aim of English for SNED. Besides other socio-political factors that the planning stage has to consider, this study has identified TSA, reading RWE (References Written in English) as an important variable.

In an attempt to analyze the needs of Brawijaya University students in learning English through identifying the aim of English for SNED and the role of RWE in studying subject disciplines, this study accommodates Coleman's in carrying out analysis of needs in two stages. However, the role of reading RWE in the process of teaching and learning subject disciplines was carried out through a survey which involved S-1 program graduates, English instructors, and subject lecturers as the participants of English for SNED curriculum development, as the survey's respondents. The aim of the study is to obtain the profile of the perception of students, English instructors, and subject lecturers on the aim of English for SNED and the pattern of reading RWE on the level of study program. In this respect, the overall picture of the target situation of English for SNED could be identified.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a base line study of needs analysis. The respondents of the research were S-1 graduates in the academic year of 1997/1998, English instructors and subject lecturers in thirty three study programs in Brawijaya University. Data collection was carried out through a set of questionnaires administered to 804 S-1 graduates, 10 English instructors and 376 subject lecturers.

Research variables comprised the aim of English for SNED and the role of RWE in the lectures of discipline subjects. Cluster analysis and ANOVA were applied to analyze data from four variables i.e. the graduates' perception on (a) whether students could finish S-1 program without reading RWE, (b) whether RWE can improve grade point average (GPA), (c) whether subject lecturers assign students to read references written in English, and (d) whether students read references written in English in the accomplishment of S-1 study program.

## DATA ANALYSIS

### The Aim of English for SNED

The overall result of the research showed different perception of students, English instructors and subject lecturers on the aim of English for SNED. Answering the question of what the aim of English for SNED was, more than half of the graduate respondents answered that it was meant to help students read RWE. The same answer was given by the English instructors. However, most of the graduate respondents (64.5%, n-804) felt that what they gained from the teaching of English was that they improved their general English instead, in the sense that it did not specifically help them read references written in English.

The graduates' awareness concerning the role of English in the world of work was reflected in their opinion concerning which direction English for SNED should be geared to. When asked what should be the formulation of the aim of the English for SNED, most of them 51.9% ( n-804 ) answered that it should have been geared to helping them in their future job-related matters. But this, however, did not seem to be linked with what most of them thought about the role of English in the global world. When asked whether they thought English proficiency was necessary in the world of free market, 47% (n-804) did not answer, 13.1% said fairly necessary, 0.5% said "no", and 39.4% said "yes". A different picture was obtained from the subject lecturers. In answering the same question, 3.3% (n-376) gave no answer, 29.5% said fairly necessary, 65.1% said "yes" and 2.1% said "no".

The graduate respondents' fundamental assumption on the nature of language, specifically English, seemed to be affected by the tradition of oral language in Indonesian culture. When asked what language skill should be

prioritized in the teaching of English for SNED, most of the students, 61.6% (n-804) said it was the skill in speaking. This is contrary to what the English instructors in this study perceived and the policy statement of DGHE, as expressed by Brojonegoro (1998) which requires teaching English for SNED to be aimed at enabling students to read RWE.

### The Role of RWE in Discipline Subject Lectures

The following description on the role of RWE would further illustrate the conflicting aims of English for SNED as perceived by the respondents of this study. The insignificant role of RWE in subject discipline lectures could be seen from the respondents answers to the questions of (1) whether subject lecturers assigned students to read RWE, (2) whether students read RWE in accomplishing their study in S-1 program, (3) whether students could graduate without reading RWE and (4) whether RWE could improve students' GPA

That RWE played a minor role in subject discipline lectures could be seen from only 30.1% (n-804) of graduate respondents who reported that subject lecturers assigned students to read RWE. That this was so was admitted by 40.0% of subject lecturer respondents (n-376). Moreover, only 20.5% (n-804) of the graduate respondents admitted that they read RWE assigned by the subject lecturers. The small number of assignments on reading RWE and the tendency of using references written in Indonesian (henceforth RWI) according to subject lecturer respondents (n-149) was due to the limited number of references written in English (16.9%), RWE were difficult (3.2%), RWI gave sufficient information (71.3%), and the rest (9.1%) gave no answer. The graduate respondents (n-601) said that RWE were limited in number (14.4%), RWE were difficult (19.6%), RWI gave more information (30.2%) translated versions were available (21.1%) and the rest (14.7%) gave no answer.

Anticipation of reward might also serve as an explanation of the reason why students refused to carry out RWE reading assignment by the subject lecturers. When asked how the reading assignment was assigned, 20.6% (n-804) said they received feedback from the lecturers and 39.7% said they did not. 38, 6% said that it was assigned as an independent study, 11.1% claimed that subject lecturers asked them to translate RWE into Indonesian to be submitted without any follow-up, 11.5 % said that they were required to

translate RWE to be followed up by a discussion, and 9.1% reported they were given reading assignment followed up by a discussion.

The insignificant role of RWE could further be detected from over half of the student respondents (52.6%, n-804) who answered "yes" to the question whether students could graduate without reading RWE. For the same question, 45% of them (n-804) said "no", and 1.6% did not answer. Similar response to the same question was obtained from subject lecturer respondents (n-376), 52.3% of whom said "yes", 40.9% said "no", and 6.8% did not answer. However, when asked whether reading RWE could improve students' GPA, 45.6% of graduate respondents (n-804) said "yes", 20.1% said "no", and 34.3% did not answer. Subject lecturer respondents gave almost the same response to the same question, in which 38.9% (n-376) said "yes", 22.3% said "no" and 39.6% did not answer.

### The Role of RWE in Study Programs

Cluster analysis applied to the data collected from twenty eight study programs (data from five study programs were considered as not possessing adequate validity) resulted in four classifications of significantly different study programs ( $p < 0.01$ ) in the pattern of reading RWE according to the graduate respondents (Table 3&4). Four study programs with each of its characteristics are depicted in Table 5 and 6. These characteristics are the answers of the respondents to the questions (1) Can students graduate S-1 program without reading RWE? (2) Can reading RWE improve students' GPA? (3) Do lecturers assign students to read RWE? (4) Do students read RWE?

**Table 3. Significance of Multiple Comparison Between Study Program and Variabel**

| Dependent Variable | Cluster (K) | Cluster (L) | Significance |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| RWEGRAD            | 1           | 2           | .000         |
|                    |             | 3           | .105         |
|                    |             | 4           | .913         |
|                    | 2           | 1           | .000         |
|                    |             | 3           | .570         |
|                    |             | 4           | .030         |

| Dependent Variable | Cluster (K) | Cluster (L) | Significance |      |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|------|
| RWEGRAD            | 3           | 1           | .105         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .570         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .563         |      |
|                    | 4           | 1           | .913         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .030         |      |
|                    |             | 3           | .563         |      |
|                    | RWEGPA      | 1           | 2            | .001 |
|                    |             |             | 3            | .054 |
|                    |             |             | 4            | .047 |
| 1                  |             |             | .001         |      |
| 2                  |             | 3           | .987         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .978         |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .054         |      |
| 3                  |             | 2           | .967         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | 1.000        |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .047         |      |
| 4                  |             | 2           | .978         |      |
|                    |             | 3           | 1.000        |      |
|                    | 2           | .000        |              |      |
| RWELECTR           | 1           | 3           | .404         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .002         |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .000         |      |
|                    |             | 3           | .002         |      |
|                    | 2           | 4           | .990         |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .404         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .002         |      |
|                    | 3           | 4           | .009         |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .027         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .990         |      |
|                    | 4           | 3           | .009         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .005         |      |
| 3                  |             | .000        |              |      |
| RWESTUDNT          | 1           | 4           | .100         |      |
|                    |             | 1           | .005         |      |
|                    |             | 3           | .003         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .001         |      |
|                    | 2           | 1           | .005         |      |
|                    |             | 3           | .003         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .001         |      |
|                    | 3           | 1           | .000         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .003         |      |
|                    |             | 4           | .000         |      |
|                    | 4           | 1           | .100         |      |
|                    |             | 2           | .001         |      |
| 3                  |             | .000        |              |      |

**Notes:**

- RWEGRAD : students can graduate without reading RWE  
 RWEGPA : reading RWE can improve GPA  
 RWELECTR : subject lecturers assign students to read RWE.  
 RWESTUDNT : students read RWE.

**Table 4. Variable Significance Within and Between Clusters (ANOVA)**

|          |                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|----------|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| RWEGRAD  | Between groups | 8865.195       | 3  | 2955.065    | 16.026 | .000 |
|          | Within groups  | 4425.477       | 24 | 184.395     |        |      |
|          | Total          | 13290.671      | 27 |             |        |      |
| RWEGPA   | Between groups | 5985.481       | 3  | 1995.160    | 8.291  | .001 |
|          | Within groups  | 5775.073       | 24 | 240.628     |        |      |
|          | Total          | 11760.554      | 27 |             |        |      |
| RWELECTR | Between groups | 12933.726      | 3  | 4311.242    | 12.429 | .000 |
|          | Within groups  | 8324.601       | 24 | 346.858     |        |      |
|          | Total          | 21258.326      | 27 |             |        |      |
| RWESTDNT | Between groups | 9443.503       | 3  | 3147.834    | 19.315 | .000 |
|          | Within groups  | 3911.372       | 24 | 162.974     |        |      |
|          | Total          | 13354.875      | 27 |             |        |      |

**Notes:**

- RWEGRAD : students can graduate without reading RWE  
 RWEGPA : reading RWE can improve GPA  
 RWELECTR : subject lecturers assign students to read RWE  
 RWESTUDNT : students read RWE

**Table 5. Study Program Characteristics Related to the Role of RWE in the Completion of S-1 Study Program**

| ROLE OF RWE<br>Characteristics of Cluster | RWEGRAD | RWEGPA | RWELECTR | RWESTUDNT |
|---|---------|--------|----------|-----------|
|   | I       | YES    | YES      | NO        |
| II  | NO      | NO     | YES      | YES       |
| III                                       | NO      | NO     | NO       | YES       |
| IV  | YES     | NO     | YES      | NO        |

**Notes:**

- RWEGRAD : students can graduate without reading RWE  
 RWEGPA : reading RWE can improve GPA  
 RWELECTR : subject lecturers assign students to read RWE  
 RWESTUDNT : students read RWE

**Table 6. Cluster of Study Programs**

| STUDY PROGRAM I                   | STUDY PROGRAM II                   |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Law                            | 1. Accountancy                     |
| 2. Business administration        | 2. Plant disease                   |
| 3. Public administration          | 3. Agricultural Product Technology |
| 4. Economics (development study)  | 4. Soil Science                    |
| 5. Management                     | 5. Electrical Engineering          |
| 6. Agribusiness (Agriculture)     | 6. Mechanical Engineering          |
| 7. Social Economics (Agriculture) | 7. Biology                         |
| 8. Horticulture                   | 8. Physics                         |
| 9. Architecture                   | 9. Chemistry                       |
| 10. Civil Engineering             | 10. Animal Production Technology   |
| 11. Mathematics                   |                                    |
| 12. Animal Production             |                                    |
| 13. Social Economics (Fishery)    |                                    |
| 14. Management of animal resource |                                    |

| STUDY PROGRAM III   | STUDY PROGRAM IV   |
|---|--|
| 1. Water Resources Engineering<br>2. Agribusiness (Fishery) | 1. Medical Education<br>2. Social Economics (Animal Husbandry) |

**DISCUSSION****The Aim of English for SNED**

The conflicting perception of the respondents on the aim of teaching English for SNED serves as a reflection on how the aim has never been clearly formulated. In 1994 curriculum applied nationwide English is given the label of Basic General Subject (Mata Kuliah Umum / MKU) in such subjects as engineering and natural sciences. A different label, Basic Specific Profession Subject (Mata Kuliah Dasar Keahlian/MKDK) is given to English in such subjects as Agriculture and Economics. The principle underlying the classification does not seem to be well grounded because the 1994 curriculum applied nationwide itself defines the category of general subject courses as "...yang menunjang pembentukan kepribadian dan sikap ..." ("...supporting personality development and attitude ...") while it defines the category of basic profession subjects as "... yang ditujukan terutama untuk memberikan landasan pembentukan keahlian baik untuk kepentingan profesi maupun untuk pengembangan ilmu dan teknologi": ("aimed at laying down the basis for professional development whether it is for the development of the profession itself or for the development of science and technology"), Directorate General of Higher Education, 1994:43).

However, the Directorate General of Higher Education (2000:2) put English in the category of subjects for personality development with its description as *mengembangkan manusia Indonesia yang beriman dan ber-taqwa kepada Tuhan Yang Maha Esa dan berbudi pekerti luhur, berkepribadian mantap, dan mandiri serta mempunyai rasa tanggung jawab kemasyarakatan dan kebangsaan* ("...aimed at developing Indonesian people who have faith in God, people of high moral quality and of high integrity, people who are independent possessing the sense of national and social responsibility)

The problem is, it is hard to justify how English is categorized into subjects of ideology (general subjects or subjects for personality development) not being classified as the category of subjects of pragmatic (basic specific subjects in 1994 curriculum). For the terms ideology and pragmatic please refer to Allison, D. (1996), Pennycook A, (1997) and Widdowson, HG (1998). It seems to be for this very reason that the English instructors and the students were of the opinion that the aim of English for SNED was for academic purposes, pertaining to the disciplines that the students currently engaged themselves with. As understood, however, pragmatic constraints (Johnson, 1990) influence the decision-making processes of the various stages of its curriculum development. This includes the role of RWE in discipline subject lectures which has made the policy and pragmatic constraints incompatible.

### **The Role of RWE**

For the justifications described earlier, English for SNED should be put in the category of Basic Professional subject. However, considering the insignificant role of RWE, putting English in this category and expecting an outcome that would increase the students' competence in WRE would be of less relevance because the proper context of the English for SNED classified in this category is not provided. Other constraints on classroom implementation has resulted in the students' feeling that English for SNED did not help them read references written in English and most of them claimed that what they gained from the English for SNED was an increase in their general knowledge about the English language instead.

Various reasons were expressed for the small number of assignments to read RWE given by the subject lecturers and for the students not to read RWE. That reading WRE caused them considerable difficulty was expressed by only a small number of subject lecturers and graduate respondents. This seems to indicate a good balance of reading competence of the respondents in both Indonesian and English language. However, considering the English proficiency of either the students or the subject lecturers, it is doubtful that their reading competence in English is equal to that in Indonesian. It might be worth considering, however, what Sadtono (2001) claims that the respondents who were of the opinion that RWI had provided sufficient information might not possess adequate English proficiency in making any attempts to

read RWE. A different perspective on the role of RWE could be gained from analysis on the level of study programs, presented in the consecutive sections.

### **Study Program I**

The characteristics of Study Program I are (1) students can finish the program without reading RWE, (2) reading RWE will not improve GPA, (3) subject lecturers do not assign students to read RWE, and (4) students do not read RWE. It seems that this group of study programs would not provide a proper context for teaching English for academic purposes due to the obvious insignificant role of reading RWE. Abolishing English for SNED in the study programs under this category could be considered as a wiser decision.

### **Study Program II**

The characteristics of study program II are (1) students cannot graduate without reading RWE, (2) reading RWE does not improve GPA, (3) subject lecturers assign students to read RWE, and (4) students read RWE. Students belonging to the group of this study programs could probably be among those who claimed that subject lecturers assigned them to read more RWE than RWI. Since assignment on reading RWE dominates that on RWI, it is most likely that improving GPA through reading RWE would become less significant. Hence, students tend to think that reading WRE does not have any impact in the improvement of one's GPA. The characteristics of Study Program II seem to suggest that WRE plays an important role in studying discipline subjects. This would provide the proper context for the teaching of English aimed at helping students read references written in English. In study programs with the characteristics of study program II, the second stage of needs analysis persistent to "objective/perceived needs" and "want", as suggested by Coleman (1988) could be carried out. Cooperation between English instructors and subject lecturers would be needed to define the language needs of the students.

### Study Program III

The characteristics of study program III are (1) students can graduate without reading RWE, (2) reading RWE does not improve GPA, (3) subject lecturers do not assign students to read RWE, and (4) students read RWE. It is likely that students falling into the category of Study Program III were partly those who were of the opinion that that English was needed to face the global world but the lecturers of this group of study programs were those who expressed skepticism as to the role of English for the global free market. A different perspective however, would be that the students' motivation in reading RWE for some reasons skipped the subject lecturers' attention. In this kind of situation, the English instructor would face two conflicting cases. The result of this research is expected to be applicable in raising the awareness of the subject lecturers to be more appreciative regarding the students' motivation to read. This would add to the supporting factors for the English for SNED to succeed.

### Study Program IV

The characteristics of study program IV are (1) students can graduate without reading RWE, (2) reading RWE does not improve GPA, (3) subject lecturers assign students to read RWE, and (4) Students do not read RWE. In this group of study program, subject lecturers seemed to make efforts in assigning students to read RWE. However, this assignment did not appear to have given any significant effects on the students' intention to read RWE because they stucked to the opinion that without reading RWE they could pass and finish S-1 program, reading RWE would not increase one's GPA and accordingly, they did not read RWE as assigned by the subject lecturers. This was a different situation from that in Study Program II where the assignment of reading WRE was on par with the responsive attitude of the students in reading RWE.

It is necessary to point out some reasons underlying the students' response to the assignment of reading RWE given by their lecturers. Firstly, that some assignment of reading RWE was given as an independent task with no further follow up could be one of these, since it is doubtful that the learning style of Indonesian students would fit into such kind of task. Sec-

ondly, the assignment of reading RWE might not be connected directly with examination in which students were evaluated for what they had studied.

That subject lecturers assigned students to read RWE in this group of study programs could indicate their perception on the importance of reading RWE for the students. If this is to be the case, the assignment of reading RWE could be given in the way that would be more suitable to the learning style of the students such as to be followed up by some discussion on what they had read, as claimed by some respondents to have been the case. Independent study such as translating an article and submit it to the lecturers with no follow up activities might end up with students going to tranlation service for whatever quality of service they would get.

### CONCLUSION

In this study, the aim of teaching English for SNED has ben perceived and formulated in conflicting terms by the participants in its curriculum development. As a product of decision-making processes in the planning stage, this would provide policy constraints all the way through to the stages of ends/means, program implementation, and classroom implementation. It is the concern of the participants in the curriculum development that in this present study, has been identified as English instructors, students and subject lecturers to negotiate the aim of the English for SNED, as the necessary first step in the planning stage of its curriculum development. In a complex organization like a university, levelling down the task of needs analysis to smaller academic units of study programs is essential in an attempt of arriving at a coherent curriculum (Johnson, 1990).

Various patterns of reading RWE the present study has revealed indicate different decision-making required by each group of study programs for the English for SNED's curriculum development. Further analysis on individual study program, however, is required to take action on the findings of this study of this study.



## REFERENCES

- Allison, D. 1996. Pragmatist Discourse and English for Academic Purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 15 (2): 85-103.
- Brojonegoro, S. S. 1998. Higher Education Development 1995-2006: Paper Presented in the Second National Conference on NUESP, Ambon, 4-7 May.
- Coleman, H. 1988. Analysing Language Needs in Large Organization. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7:155-169.
- Coleman, H, 1995. Undergraduate ELT: Where Have We Been and Where Are We Going? In Coleman, H., Soedradjat, T.M. and Westaway, G. (Eds.), *Teaching English to Undergraduates in the Indonesian Context: Issues and Development* (pp.26-42). Bandung: ITB Press and School of Education, University of Leeds.
- Djiwandono, M.S. 1982. *A Study on the Effectiveness of the Teaching of English Reading Course (ERC) at IKIP*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Malang: FPS IKIP Malang.
- Dudley-Evans, T., and St. John., M.J. 1998. *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. 1994. Himpunan Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia tentang Kurikulum Nasional Program Sarjana. Jakarta: Departem Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Direktorat Jenderal pendidikan Tinggi. 2000. Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional nomor 232/U/2000 tentang Pedoman Penyusunan Kurikulum Pendidikan Tinggi dan Penilaian Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
- Holliday, A. 1997: Putting the Teacher Back in the Picture: A Liberal Approach to Special English. In Coleman, Soedradjat, Westaway (Eds.), *Teaching English to University Undergraduates in the Indonesian Context: Issues and Developments*. Bandung: ITB Press Institute Teknologi Bandung.
- Johnson, R. K. 1990. A Decision-Making Framework for the Coherent Language Curriculum. In Johnson, RK. (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. 1997. Vulgar Pragmatism, Critical Pragmatism, and EAP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(4):253-269.
- Rodgers, T. S., 1990. Syllabus Design, Curriculum Development and Polity Determination. In Johnson, R.K. (Ed.), *The Second Language Curriculum* (pp. 24-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sadtono, E. 1995. English at the College Level in Indonesia *In Perspective: Pengajaran bahasa Inggris di Indonesia* (pp.68-107). Malang: Satgas Dokumentasi dan Publikasi karya Ilmiah, Seksi Kajian Bahasa dan Seni FPBS IKIP Malang.
- Sadtono, E. 2001. Fighting a Losing Battle: English for Academic Purposes in Indonesia. *NUCB Journal of Language Culture and Communication* Vol 3 (pp.45-58)
- Widdowson, H.G. 1998. Communication and Community: The Pragmatics of ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17 (1):13-14.

\* **Researchers:** Indah Winarni, Purwatini Setijono, Sri Endah Tabiati, Retty Ratnawati (Brawijaya University); E. Sadtono (State University of Malang)