The Intersection of Policy and Practice: Two Cases of English Language Programs in Southeast Asian Law Enforcement Academies

Lottie Baker
United States Department of State

Follow this and additional works at: https://gbl.digital.library.gwu.edu

Lottie Baker
United States Department of State

The Intersection of Policy and Practice: Two Cases of English Language Programs in Southeast Asian Law Enforcement Academies

Abstract: The emergence of English as a *lingua franca* in Southeast Asia has meant that government officials are increasingly required to use English. Law enforcement officers are no exception; police interact with international tourists, communicate across borders, attend international conferences, and participate in deployments overseas. The practical need for English is accompanied by national policies prioritizing English instruction across educational and governmental institutions. As a result, law enforcement academies increasingly prioritize English language programs to support the English proficiency of their cadets. This article describes case studies of English language programs at two law enforcement academies in Vietnam and Indonesia. Data was originally collected and analyzed as separate needs assessment evaluations designed for each institution. Findings were later compared and reinterpreted through a language policy and planning lens. Common to both cases was the demand to prepare cadets for the dual challenge of conducting specific police duties in English and of achieving high scores on academic English exams. Recommendations are provided for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in the field of Language for Specific Purposes.

Keywords: English for Specific Purposes, language policy, law enforcement, program evaluation, Southeast Asia

With an estimated one in four people across the globe who use the language "at a useful level" (The British Council, 2013), English is a common-sense choice for business across borders, cementing its role as a *lingua franca* for the foreseeable future. As home to some of the world's fastest-growing economies, Southeast Asia has embraced English for communication among leaders from countries in the region. Since the beginning of the 21st century, the region has witnessed an increasing number of policies that authorize English as the working language in business and as the medium of instruction in schools (Kirkpatrick, 2012). The wholesale acceptance of English in much of Asia is not without its critics; indeed, prioritizing English use in public spaces may threaten local languages (Kirkpatrick, 2012) and perpetuate linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). However, it is undeniable that English has emerged as a useful, perhaps essential, *lingua franca* within and beyond the region. This proliferation of the language has spurred demand for education in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in government and business sectors.

Law enforcement in Southeast Asia is no exception to the growth in ESP. Globalization in the region means that officers interact with tourists and expatriates, collaborate across borders on transnational crimes, attend international trainings, and participate in deployments overseas. These contexts often demand English, albeit sometimes limited to specialized uses (de Silva Joyce & Thomson, 2015). New police officers face the task of learning when and how to conduct business in English, along with learning the skills required of police. Although scholars share a general sentiment that some degree of specialized English is important for law enforcement

officers, the specific kinds of English and the mechanisms through which this English is learned is not well understood.

This article presents two case studies of law enforcement English language programs in Vietnam and Indonesia, countries that have experienced a rapid increase in English language demands in the 21st century (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Findings hold implications for ways that language curricula designed for vocational training interacts with national policy and initiatives. In the following section, literature on English for law enforcement is summarized, followed by a description of the study methodology and findings. The discussion then offers common themes and recommendations for the field of Language for Specific Purposes (LSP).

Background

Literature on English for Law Enforcement Officers

Research on LSP for police and security forces is incipient but growing (de Silva Joyce & Thomson, 2015), not unlike the broader field of LSP in all disciplines. With LSP journals and conferences on the rise, the field has emerged as a "mainstay" in language scholarship at the dawn of the 21st century (Doyle, 2013). Within the police profession, the language used on the job is sufficiently unique to warrant a subfield in LSP (Chersan, 2015). In terms of English, Chersan (2015) has pioneered efforts to document the specialized lexicon of what she calls, "law enforcement English." She took inventory of over 2,000 technical words and phrases from police-related documents and noted hundreds of lexical items specific to law enforcement. Chersan (2015) concluded that law enforcement English be recognized as a "distinct, complex, and self-sustainable lexicon" (p. 58). Her discourse analysis work has become the foundation for curriculum materials (e.g., Boyle & Chersan, 2009) and serves as grounds for further research.

Research in LSP for police or military consists of target language needs assessments, curricula development, and perceptions of learning by officers. Much of the scholarship focused on officers learning English as an additional language in countries that have not historically used English as the primary language. Studies are small-scale with attention to the specific needs of officers in particular contexts. Researchers span the globe from the Middle East (e.g., Alhuqbani 2014; Aldohon, 2014), Western Europe (Orna-Montesinos, 2018), South Africa (Makoni, 2017), and South America (Baron, 2013). Common data sources are surveys, interviews, and analyses of policy documents or curricula. Findings addressed various perspectives and topics, including officers' attitudes and motivations towards learning English (e.g., Aldohon, 2014; Alhuqbani, 2014); the influence of standardization of English requirements for military officers engaged in international missions (Orna-Montesinos, 2018); community stakeholders' perceptions of the language that police should know (Makoni, 2017); and pedagogical approaches used in English courses for police (Baron, 2013). Examples of research also include case studies of instructors designing LSP courses based on target language needs analyses for police (e.g., Gishbaugher, 2015) or for military (e.g., Casey, 2015).

Researchers in ESP for military and police all acknowledge, and at times emphasize, the role context plays in determining *what* language to teach, *how* to teach it, and *to whom* to teach. The emergence of law enforcement English and implications for practice do not occur in a vacuum from the policy discourse and community contexts for policing. Therefore, this study examines English programs within law enforcement academies in the context of national English language policies. The case studies situate ESP teaching and learning within larger policy

landscapes, described next, that call for increased English language use among government officials, raising questions about how to deliver ESP instruction within the practical constraints of the real world.

Setting: Two Policy Contexts

National police academies in Vietnam and Indonesia served as the contexts for this study. These countries were selected as convenience samples. The author had previously conducted a needs assessment evaluation of the national security academy in Vietnam and the national police academy in Indonesia. While not representative of police academies across Southeast Asia, academies in Vietnam and Indonesia represent examples of how two government institutions undertook the ambitious charge to train officers in English. Next, I situate each institution within the historical and contemporary political contexts that shaped English language teaching for police and security officers.

Vietnam's English Language Policy

While Vietnamese is the national language and the indigenous languages of the over 50 ethnic minorities in the country are spoken, English has been a major part of Vietnam's policy initiatives since *Doi Moi* in 1986, a period of accelerated economic growth and renovation in 1986. Government educational reforms resulted in a required English curriculum for secondary schools and a move towards student-centered pedagogies and use of textbooks produced by anglophone countries (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2019). Most recently, schools from primary to higher education have felt the influence of the government's National Foreign Language Project 2020 (NFLP 2020), a policy implemented beginning in 2008 with ambitious goals for all citizens to achieve intermediate English proficiency by 2020. The policy states that Vietnamese youth who graduate from vocational schools, colleges, and universities should "gain the capacity to use a foreign language independently" (MOET, 2008, p. 1). As with prior language education reforms, the goal of NFLP 2020 is to expand modernization and development through improving language proficiency across a wide swath of the population. Although NFLP 2020 addresses all foreign languages, leaders interpret the policy as largely related to English, the most popular foreign language seen as a necessity for career advancement (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2019).

At the post-secondary level, NFLP 2020 stipulated two reforms. First, universities were directed to use the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) or the Vietnamese version CEFR-V, which adapted the CEFR to reflect the local context of Vietnamese learners (Foley, 2019). CEFR level B1 (intermediate) was originally set as a graduation requirement for bachelor's degrees, but due to the few numbers of students achieving B1 level, leaders later revised the requirement to be A1 (Foley, 2019). Second, the NFLP 2020 called for increasing the number of courses that are taught through English medium instruction (EMI) to bring Vietnamese universities on par with internationally ranked universities. Although the country has seen progress in its international ranking on English language proficiencies, Vietnam has fallen short in meeting its own ambitious goals for 2020. Nguyen and Nguyen (2019) summarized that, "policy goals are hard to reach within the intended timeframe (by 2020) due to an inadequate evaluation of the country's physical and human resources" (p. 196). Nonetheless, this context forms the backdrop for English language programs across all universities, including law enforcement training institutes.

Vietnamese Law Enforcement Training

Vietnam Academy[1] (VA) is a training institute for pre-service and in-service security officers. Academy graduates are responsible for ensuring national security and, as such, work within and across national borders in high-level government offices. VA cadets are awarded the equivalent of a bachelor's degree after four years of study and assigned to positions that align to their specialization (e.g., surveillance, information technology, criminal investigation). As a nationally recognized institution, the VA is expected to implement policies under the NFLP 2020. The VA is separate from training institutes for general police, which are also part of Ministry of Public Security and offer English language courses but not within the scope of this study.

English instruction at the VA is located within the Department of Foreign Languages, along with programs in Chinese and Russian language. The graduation requirement is CEFR level B1 on a standardized reading and listening assessment. VA has provided English instruction for decades, but the exit proficiency requirements have only been in place since the implementation of the NFLP 2020. In addition to offering courses dedicated to English language, the VA has undertaken a pilot project of teaching selected content areas using English to a small group of cadets with demonstrated high performance. The decision of the courses to be taught in English was determined based on the availability of instructors who had attended higher education in English-speaking universities or who otherwise demonstrated English proficiency. The move to EMI is a direct response to accommodate NFLP 2020.

Indonesia's National Language Policy

With approximately 13,000 islands and 700 indigenous languages, Indonesia has worked hard to unify its young nation through a shared national language, Bahasa Indonesian (Bahasa). Even before declaring independence from the Netherlands in 1945, Indonesians named Bahasa their official language at the first All-Indonesia Youth Conference in 1928. Since then, the nation has worked to solidify Bahasa as the national language; Bahasa is widely accepted by the population as the national lingua franca as it is currently used in government, education, administrative, and media sectors (Widodo, 2019). Local languages are maintained, particularly Javanese, Sundanese, and Balinese, but Bahasa is the language of schooling, business, and government.

Given efforts to maintain Bahasa, Indonesia has not benefited from the same government support of English compared to some of its regional neighbors. Still, Indonesian leaders have long recognized the importance of English as a language for global communication (Widodo, 2019). Since Indonesia's independence, English has been taught in primary and secondary schools, and a 1989 law makes English compulsory as a first foreign language. Scholars note that English is perceived as both utilitarian as well as a threat to the national unity that leaders have carefully worked to construct with Bahasa (Lauder, 2008). The nation could be seen as having an ambivalent attitude towards English, at best (Lauder, 2008). For instance, a 2003 regulation for schools to hold EMI courses was canceled ten years later amid public outcry that prioritizing English would undermine the role of Bahasa in schools.

---

[1] Institution names are pseudonyms

Therefore, Indonesians see English as useful for those students who wish to pursue education or careers abroad (Widodo, 2019). A government effort to increase the number of Indonesians studying at international universities was the establishment of the Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education in 2010. The organization disperses scholarships for graduate education to leaders in particular government sectors, including law enforcement. To take advantage of these scholarships, however, officers must meet eligibility requirements that include advanced (i.e., CEFR C1) English proficiency on internationally recognized exams.

Indonesian Law Enforcement Training

This case focused on the Indonesian Academy (IA), a government law enforcement academy for new officers. As with the VA, IA is a competitive four-year academy that awards students the equivalent of a bachelor's degree. The officers who graduate from IA are positioned to become future police leaders. Approximately 300 students comprise each class, for a total of about 1,200 cadets who live and study on the campus. All cadets study the same curriculum of general education, but cadets in each class are divided into eight different cohorts ("batches") based on their holistic academic and physical performance upon entrance to the school. Example course topics include law enforcement operations, criminal investigation, security, and leadership. Of the total 145 required credits that cadets take over the course of four years, eight are dedicated to English language, though leaders are considering increasing this amount. Apart from the required courses in English, all instruction is delivered through Bahasa Indonesian.

Methodology

A multiple methods case study methodology (Merriam, 2009) informed this investigation of language training programs for police and security agencies in Vietnam and Indonesia. Two cases were investigated: the case of the security academy in Vietnam (VA) and the case of the police academy in Indonesia (IA). Aside from the fact that the same investigator conducted the evaluation, the cases were unrelated to each other. Data collection occurred during the summer of 2018 for the VA and the summer of 2019 for the IA. This current study includes a subsequent analysis and interpretation of findings.

The same research question guided the inquiry into each case: How and to what extent does English programming support goals for officers to learn English? Baldauf and Kaplan's (2005) language-in-education policy framework informed my approach to this question, presented in more detail below. Although the initial and immediate goal of these case studies was to provide recommendations to local leaders for improving English, the aim of this article is to probe the relationship between national policies and ESP programs in the institutions.

Data Collection

Data collection measures included document review, interview and focus groups, classroom observations, and surveys. Participants represented diverse stakeholders, including cadets, alumni, officers in language training, instructors, and administrators. The extent to which each stakeholder group contributed to the data varied by case, depending on availability and their involvement in English language programming. These are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Methods for Case Studies

Academy & Date	Participants	Methods
Vietnam Academy (VA) July–August 2018	Administrators (n=3) English language instructors (n=26) Subject area instructors (n=45) Cadets (n=33) Officers, alumni of VA (n=9)	Individual interviews 2 Focus groups with cadets 3 Focus groups with subject area instructors 3 Focus groups of English instructors 1 Focus group of alumni Survey of English instructors Survey of subject area instructors Survey of students Observation of English classes Document review of strategic plan drafts, curriculum, and textbooks
Indonesian Academy (IA) July–August 2019	Administrators (n=5) English instructors (n=6) Subject matter instructors (n=4) Cadets (n=284)	Individual interviews Multiple, ongoing focus groups with English instructors Survey of cadets Observation classes Document review of curriculum, texts, and locally produced assessments

Interviews

Individual interviews were conducted with the administrators of each institution. Some administrators were tasked with broad, division-level programmatic duties that encompassed the English language training; others managed tasks specific to English language teaching. Interviews provided general program contexts and processes that impact English teaching and learning. Interviews with instructors offered candid opinions and anecdotes. An informal, semi-structured interview protocol was used.

Focus Groups

Focus groups were held at each institution with instructors, students, and alumni. For all groups, an academy staff member assisted in interpreting and translating. The focus groups

with the instructors ranged between four and 21 participants. Separate groups were held for subject area instructors who had expertise in law enforcement topics and for English language instructors. Focus groups with students ranged from five to 50 students. During the large groups, participants were divided into smaller teams for discussion activities to elicit needs for learning English and opinions on strengths and weaknesses of their English programs.

Survey

Surveys were administered to instructors and students in each case to elicit opinions from individual instructors and students. The instruments used in each case were unique but shared a common design and many items. Each survey consisted of Likert-type statements and open-ended questions with four sections: 1) demographic background; 2) self-assessment of English skills; 3) perceived uses for English among officers; and 4) perceived strengths and weaknesses of the institution's English program. As the researcher, I drafted items and then worked with an instructional leader at each institution to ensure content of the surveys targeted the circumstances of each stakeholder group. Surveys were translated into the national language (i.e., Vietnamese or Bahasa Indonesian) for respondents who felt uncomfortable responding to the English versions. Administration occurred over the period of three weeks either via an online survey software or via paper-and-pencil then transferred to the online software. In some cases, surveys were distributed at the end of the focus groups. Vietnamese respondents included: 32 cadets, 45 subject area instructors, and 20 English language instructors. Respondents in the Indonesian case included: 284 cadets and six English language instructors.

Observations

Observations of classroom instruction were conducted at each institution. These included three 90-minute sessions in English for law enforcement and public speaking at the VA and three 100-minute sessions in general English at IA. Instructors for each session had between four and 20-years' experience teaching English, and all held degrees in English linguistics or TESOL. During all observations, I participated as an observer, took open-ended notes during the class, and reviewed the text and workbook used. For the three IA sessions, I held a post-observation interview with each instructor where I learned about the instructor's lesson planning process and clarified questions I had during the lessons.

Document Review

Relevant text and online artifacts related to the English language programming were gathered prior and during the on-site visits. Specific items reviewed included English course syllabi; curriculum and textbooks; locally produced end-of-course assessments; aggregate data on student performance; and information on academy websites.

Methodological Limitations

These cases described are limited by size and scope; I spent one month at each institution and was limited in my perspective as an outsider with no proficiency in Bahasa or Vietnamese. Rather than offer generalizable data, findings shed light on how particular

institutions approach language instruction within their unique policy contexts and can offer implications for those who confront similar challenges.

Data Analysis

Analysis was an iterative and ongoing process. Data from interviews, focus groups, and observations were transcribed or summarized within several days of data collection. The researcher read over the material multiple times and developed thematic codes that emerged from the data. Common codes were combined and informed themes. Through this process, the researcher conducted member checks with participants to clarify information and verify conclusions. Analysis of the survey data consisted of computing descriptive statistics and analyzing open-ended responses for themes.

Findings were first organized as areas of strength and need for each institution. Recommendations specific to each institution were made based on the unique resources available in the institution and the goals of the decision-makers. In this article, data is reexamined by comparing the results from each case with attention to overarching policy contexts. Findings were interpreted through a language policy and planning framework, which is described next.

Language Policy and Planning Framework

Scholarship in language policy and planning has largely examined the place of language learning within compulsory education systems. For instance, Pearson (2014) explored the ways that Rwandan teachers implemented national policies for teaching English as a medium of instruction. Likewise, Hamid and Nguyen (2016) reviewed literature on how primary and secondary teachers implemented English policies in various Asian countries. They concluded that effective policy implementation requires an investment in personnel resources and training. In the context of Vietnam, the past decade is characterized by a rise in work that examines how teachers exert agency in the face of Vietnam's national foreign language initiatives (e.g., Nguyen & Bui, 2016; Tran, 2018).

The analysis for this study drew on Kaplan and Baldauf's language-in-education framework, initially described in their 1997 book and further refined in subsequent publications (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005). Kaplan and Baldauf explained that education systems are means to enact government policies about language use, and as such, deserve careful analysis in conjunction with the larger policy goals. They discuss language-in-education policy as human resource development and situate it within a larger feedback loop that informs national language policies. Although the present study did not examine the kind of planned national language-in-education policy for which the authors originally designed their model, English language programs in national police training academies are levers that support— or complicate—progress towards national initiatives to improve English language proficiency among sectors of the population. Thus, broadly understood, Kaplan and Baldauf's language-in-education framework offers a useful frame to interpret findings about goals for learning English and the processes to achieve these goals within law enforcement academies.

Baldauf and Kaplan (2005) enumerate seven areas of focus for language-in-education implementation: access (who learns); curriculum (what languages are taught when); personnel (who teaches and how they are trained); materials and methods (what texts and pedagogy to teach); community (attitudes and support from stakeholders); resources (what financial and in-

kind assets support the program); and evaluation (how short-term and long-term outcomes are measured). Each of these areas have implications for "micro-level" players (e.g., students, teachers), meso-level (e.g., school), and "macro-level" (e.g., government). Because this study examined how law enforcement institutions operationalize aspects of language-in-education policies, findings are analyzed through the lens of Kaplan and Baldauf's (1997) language-in-education policy aspects.

Results

Access: Who Learns English?

Both academies upheld a requirement for cadets to complete general English and offered English for law enforcement to some or all cadets. English for law enforcement was reserved for officers who had completed general English courses. At the VA, all cadets took a sequence of general English courses, but only those with strong English performance took courses in English for law enforcement. Additionally, cadets specializing in English language took specialized courses such as public speaking, interpretation, and translation (English/Vietnamese). At IA, all cadets took the same English course sequence: a series of general English courses on the four skills followed by courses on English for police. At the time of the study, administrators were planning for future English language test preparation courses, to be delivered to select students with strong performance in English courses. They explained that the goal was to identify graduating cadets who had the potential to pass the standardized English exams required for the government scholarship with additional training. Academy leaders were also considering ways to collaborate with the in-service language training institutions to offer test preparation classes for these students immediately after graduation.

The VA has historically supported an English program designed to prepare officers for duties in translation and interpretation. However, the number of English students in this program has decreased due to an overall reduction of security officers. A minority of VA cadets have access to certain courses in English as part of a pilot initiative to teach courses in EMI. These cadets are considered "high quality," which refers to cadets that enter the academy with overall high academic ranking. Many, but not all, of these top-tier cadets have strong English skills. Likewise, some cadets outside of the top range may have strong English. Long-term plans were to increase the pool of security cadets that have access English through EMI.

Personnel: Who Teaches English?

Both institutes employed full-time English language instructors who held graduate degrees in English linguistics or TESOL. These instructors were a mix of civil servants and police officers, with a few who had worked in the police force prior to teaching. At the time of the study, all the instructors were multilingual, having learned English as an additional language to their national and local languages. The English language faculty at VA consisted of 26 instructors, compared to 6 instructors at IA. For each institute, an administrator who had management and leadership qualifications, but not necessarily English or teaching experience, oversaw the English language faculty.

All English instructors from each institute indicated on the surveys that they were generally confident to teach in English. However, in focus groups, instructors described needs for training on contemporary language methods, oral language, and designing materials. National

policy demands appeared to impact the perceived needs for professional development: at the VA, instructors expressed concerns about designing and delivering EMI courses; at IA, instructors stated that they were unsure about the best approach to prepare cadets for international exams.

An issue unique to personnel context at the VA was the English language qualifications of content area instructors who would be expected to deliver EMI courses. These instructors held graduate degrees in their area of expertise (e.g., law, security), but did not necessarily have education in English. When rating their abilities in the four skills from 1 ("very weak") to 5 ("almost like a native"), the subject area instructors indicated an average of 2.2 ("weak"). Listening and speaking was listed as the "most difficult part about English" for 24 (53%) of the instructors. Only, six (13%) of the instructors agreed or strongly agreed that they felt confident to teach their subject in English.

During focus groups, instructors in both cases expressed the need for more professional development. They gave examples of prior training opportunities, but the majority of these sessions were singular rather than part of an ongoing improvement process. VA English faculty, for example, described plans to host the inaugural conference on English Education for Vietnamese Police, which was held in 2019 in collaboration with the Ministry of Education's NFLP 2020. IA instructors explained that training related to English language teaching usually occurred through the in-service language training center, possibly because the language training center was located in the capital and consisted of nearly three times the number of English teachers than those that worked at the IA. English instructors from the academy sometimes participated in training alongside their colleagues at the in-service training center but expressed desire for visiting professors or trainers and on-site professional development tailored to their English teaching context at the academy.

In general, students from all the institutes indicated satisfaction with their English instructors. During the focus groups in VA, all students agreed that their English teachers were proficient in the language, and when asked on an open-ended item what helps them learn English, 7 (22%) VA cadets referenced their English teachers. On the IA student surveys, the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their instructors are "good at teaching English" (n=110; 78% and n=75; 91%, respectively).

Curriculum and Materials: What English is Taught?

Both academies had a set curriculum and textbook for general English and English for law enforcement that guided all instruction. Each course was matched with a textbook, student objectives, and assessments. Students were expected to pass courses in general English classes before moving to law enforcement English courses.

Historically, general English curricula in both the IA and VA emphasized written grammar and were aligned to exams; however, heightened policy expectations for cadets' English have brought forth curriculum reform that replaces goals of grammatical accuracy with communicative proficiency in the four language skills. At VA, faculty are matching general English expectations with CEFR to work towards the NFLP 2020's goal that cadets graduate at a level B1. At IA, the need to prepare officers to study abroad led to the adoption of test preparation textbooks that were being used for these courses.

The curriculum for English for law enforcement at each institute was, at least in part, tailored to the local and national context. Texts consisted of a combination of both commercially produced and locally created materials, some of which were translations of law enforcement

documents. A persistent concern among English instructors in both cases was the challenge in identifying or creating materials that were relevant to officers and updated to reflect the current culture. Instructors in both cases acknowledged the importance of conducting needs assessments to determine the precise language that officers need to learn, but they explained that they were limited in time and expertise in creating ESP curriculum. Instructors also emphasized their lack of authority in making substantive changes to curricula.

Methods of Teaching: How is English Taught?

Methods of teaching refer to the pedagogical techniques that teachers use in delivering language instruction. English instructors in both countries agreed that communicative language teaching (CLT) was the most effective method to teach but acknowledged barriers to implementing CLT in the context of police institutions. They also revealed various understandings of CLT but seemed to agree that the method involved student interaction and integrating oral skills. During focus groups, instructors at both VA and IA described how cadets were accustomed to receiving instruction passively (e.g., listening to lectures). They also pointed out that the police academy culture rewarded uniformity which discouraged the risk-taking that is helpful in speaking a new language. Another obstacle to CLT for instructors was expectations that academy leadership had for a traditional classroom culture; as one Indonesian instructor stated, leaders did not want "to hear too much noise."

All observations of General English and English for Specific Purposes courses revealed that, although instructors stated challenges to using CLT, they demonstrated efforts to implement contemporary teaching practices. Instructors communicated student-centered objectives, modeled language use, scaffolded student output, engaged students in pair-work, and supplemented multimedia into textbook lessons. At IA, the same class was observed with different instructors. All sessions followed the same textbook lesson, but the ways activities were structured, and specific examples of the lesson theme were unique to the instructor.

Community: Why Do Students Learn English?

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) discuss community policy in terms of the attitudes that the larger population holds towards the target language being taught. Within the scope of the current cases, I understood community to be relevant in how participants—students, instructors, leaders, and officers—perceived English use for law enforcement in their respective contexts. In general, all participants agreed on the importance of English for law enforcement, though there was not consensus that all officers needed the same kind, level, and intensity of English training. Goals for learning English fell into two major categories: to achieve passing scores on standardized tests of academic English and to carry out police duties.

English for Standardized Tests

One goal for learning English was to pass standardized tests, an aim that appeared to be driven by national policy initiatives. In focus groups and surveys, VA instructors and students expressed concern about reaching the level established by the Ministry of Education (CEFR B1). Likewise, IA instructors and leaders unanimously agreed that a top concern was how to increase the number of cadets who could meet the requirements for the government scholarships.

Instructors also mentioned that not all officers were motivated to learn English or to pursue graduate study overseas.

English for Police Duties

A second goal for learning English was related to job functions. In Vietnam, all but one instructor (n=70, 99%) and the majority of students (n=23, 72%) agreed or strongly agreed that it is important for cadets to learn English. When officers use English, over half of respondents provided general reasons, such as "information for their job," "practice," "when their job requires," or "read materials." Others referenced personal professional development, such as "English is an advantage. If I have English, I have more chances."

Indonesian police cadets also acknowledged the importance of English to their duties to at least some extent. About half (48%) indicated the primary reason for learning English was "to conduct police duties in Indonesia." When giving examples of instances when they might use English, 40% of the responses addressed helping foreigners or expatriates, and 11% of the responses addressed reading English material to understand directions or assignments in Indonesia. Other examples included: assisting foreigners with directions, informing foreigners of rules or regulations, and understanding English-speaking foreign witnesses. Indonesian cadets also wanted to learn English to participate in international missions, which are regarded as prestigious assignments that come with financial incentives. This goal was reflected in the large number of Indonesian U.N. Peacekeepers, many of whom come from the police force.

Motivation for learning English to conduct police duties was not shared among officers in both cases. One Vietnamese English instructor explained that only "a few" officers needed an advanced level of English proficiency for translating and interpreting. She said that many alumni who specialized in English language work in positions that do not require their English because of the scarcity of interpreting and translating jobs. Eight (25%) of the VA cadet respondents indicated that they did not think they would use English in their future work, though three of these still stated it was important to learn English for personal reasons, or simply and for "life" in general. One cadet wrote that learning subjects in English "is only helpful if we get a job actually using [it]; if not, it is totally useless."

Discussion

English language programs in law enforcement academies in Vietnam and Indonesia were analyzed through a language policy and planning lens. Findings revealed ways law enforcement academies in Vietnam and Indonesia approached English language training under national policy imperatives to improve English language skills among government officials. Although each case was unique, stakeholders across the board shared a commitment to meeting national policy demands, or at least striving towards the ambitious aims of their governments. These policies posed challenges to both institutes in efforts to deliver high quality, relevant English instruction to cadets. The following discussion examines the (dis)connection between policy and practice and the implications for teaching English to law enforcement cadets.

Mismatches between Policy and Practice

Findings from each needs assessment revealed a mismatch among national policy goals, practical language needs of officers, and resources that training institutions have on hand. Institutions in both countries faced the dual challenge of teaching officers the academic English required to meet national policy demands as well as the specific English necessary to carry out police duties. In the case of Vietnam, NFLP 2020 goals for EMI instruction were ambitious for traditional universities that have historically supported academic English programs (e.g., Hamid, Nguyen, & Baldauf, 2013). The challenge was intensified for law enforcement academies that must ensure cadets learn technical skills, engage in rigorous physical exercise, and participate in disciplined routines. In contrast, administrators at traditional four-year universities focus primarily on academic content. Although not affected by far-reaching national initiatives like NFLP 2020, Indonesian law enforcement institutes were tasked with increasing the number of officers who have English proficiency to study abroad. Such a lofty aim was difficult to achieve given that not all officers were motivated to study abroad and that instructors did not have extensive training or materials in teaching academic English skills.

The discrepancies between national policies and the local law enforcement contexts are reminiscent of Pearson's (2004) "policy without a plan" (p. 51). Pearson (2004) explored the implementation of an English as a medium of instruction policy in Rwandan secondary schools from the perspective of teachers, concluding that national language-in-education policy "first passes through layers and around ideological and implementational spaces that form when institutions and individuals interpret and appropriate [EMI] policy" (p. 51). An absence of sufficient planning to accompany large scale policy goals inevitably leads to "post-hoc strategies… to ensure the success of the policy" (Pearson, 2004, p. 53). The cases in the present study demonstrate how national language-in-education policies were required for law enforcement academies not equipped with the resources or personnel to implement policies as designed. As a result, institutions established measures that appeared to support policy goals (e.g., adopting test preparation books as texts; assigning instructors who had studied abroad to teach in English before providing training in EMI methodology; translating domestic law documents into English for use as EMI materials), but that did not necessarily accelerate officers' capacity to communicate in English in professional settings. Thus, while the end goal of English language policies in both Vietnam and Indonesia was to enhance participation in global business arenas, interpretation of the policies at law enforcement academies resulted in sacrificing instruction in the very language needed for professional and business communication.

Local Agency

At the same time, seemingly unattainable policy goals may also have encouraged innovation among stakeholders at the local level, including administrators, instructors, and students. Evidence from the case studies suggest that instructors at the law enforcement academies carved out agency to advocate for professional development and innovative teaching methods. One example is the initial solicitation of the needs assessments: pressures to meet policy goals prompted leaders from both agencies to seek evaluations of their programs. At the local level, classroom observations in both cases revealed that instructors creatively integrated their experiences and resources into class sessions that were designed to follow exercises in grammar-based texts. For instance, VA English instructors took on leadership roles to organize

the inaugural conference on English language teaching in coordination with NFLP 2020. An Indonesian instructor's reflections about her use of the textbook captures how policy initiatives motivated her to integrate new strategies in the classroom. She said, "we have to use [this book] but it's most important now to push, push, push [cadets] to learn, to do self-study."

While practitioner agency can be seen as a hopeful outcome of policies, it should not obfuscate the need for national policymakers to attend to local resources and needs. Teacher agency arose as a result of what Hamid and Nguyen (2016) call "policy dumping." Using examples from Southeast Asia language policies, the authors explain that this dumping occurs when "traditional policy actors take credit for policy initiation, but the onus of implementation is left with those at the lower strata of the policy hierarchy" (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016 p. 36). Policy actors do not always bring knowledge about effective pedagogical approaches or the resources and constraints of individual institutions. National policies are necessarily decontextualized to apply to various contexts, providing little guidance to practitioners on how to transform the policies into practice. Hornberger and Johnson (2007) use the metaphor of an onion, explaining that policy "texts are nothing without the human agents who act as interpretive conduits between the language policy levels (or layers of the LPP onion)" (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016, p. 528). Agency has little chance for sustainability without ongoing support, resources, and achievable benchmarks from policymakers.

Recommendations

In the introduction to the 2020 volume of *Global Business Languages*, Risner and Long ask "if and how might there be an exchange of models and ideas . . . lessons to be learned from each other" among "divergent" LSP fields (p. xiv). These case studies of law enforcement academies offer a resounding affirmative response to this query. I conclude with recommendations for how sharing can occur among LSP leaders in policy, instruction, and research.

First, national policies might be revised to differentiate language proficiency requirements by professional role. Language requirements should be driven by real needs of students within specific professional fields instead of top-down policies. While high-stakes assessments benchmarked by international standards are rigorous, requirements to achieve intermediate and advanced levels are not practical nor useful for many law enforcement officers, particularly those who do not work in areas where the target language is widely used. Kirkpatrick (2012) has argued for a move to an English as a *lingua franca* standard, in which the goal is to communicate in multilingual contexts rather than achieve near-native proficiency. In reimagining English competence for law enforcement officers, leaders might embrace Kirkpatrick's English as a *lingua franca* model. I suggest we interrogate the underlying logic upon which English policies were developed, asking the question: *to what end?* when designing English programs for professionals. Scholars have long argued that the wholesale adoption of English as a *lingua franca* may represent linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) and privilege upper-class sectors of societies. For instance, Orna-Montesinos's (2018) study of Spanish military officers shows how high-stakes English requirements position those with relatively limited English skills at a disadvantage to their peers, regardless of qualifications in other areas. Her call for "more adequate re-planning of institutional language policies in supranational contexts that takes into consideration the hybridity of multilingual and multicultural communication in the military context" (Orna-Montesinos, 2018, p. 108) is relevant for language policies for law enforcement

institutes. Policy refinement and considerations for implementation necessitate a bottom-up process in which professionals can inform political leaders about on-the-ground needs.

Second, a recommendation for language education practitioners is to align LSP and general or academic language curricula. The demands to meet international benchmarks are unlikely to disappear in the near future. Students in training institutes will continue to face dual goals: academic language proficiency and communicative competence in the technical language required to carry out duties specific to professions. Separate courses for LSP and general English can result in doubling the time and work for students and instructors, proliferating silos that hinder collaboration. It is worth questioning the notion expressed by stakeholders in these cases that general English is a prerequisite for English for law enforcement (i.e., LSP). Language instructors might collaborate with subject area experts to determine the specific language necessary for law enforcement officers and then align these tasks with the demands in general English classes. The LSP field demonstrates an incipient but growing precedence for this kind of work (e.g., Lear, 2012; Long & Uscinsnki, 2012; Sánchez-López et al., 2017). Assessment tools such as ACTFL's Oral Proficiency Levels in the Workplace serve as a useful launching pad for practitioners, but more research is needed to uncover precise language functions and forms required in various professions.

Finally, in terms of research, these case studies suggest the need for additional work in how law enforcement academies, and professional training institutions more generally, respond to institutional and national language policies. The current work was limited to particular institutions and to a relatively short amount of time in the field. Future research on language policy implementation might take an ethnography of policy perspective to peel back the layers of the policy onion that Hornberger and Johnson (2007) reference. This article revealed agency and motivation among English language educators in law enforcement academies. Stakeholders in all arenas would be well-served to nurture these attributes and harness the knowledge and experience of practitioners when developing and implementing language policies

References

Aldohon, H. I. (2014). English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for Jordanian tourist police in their workplace: Needs and problems. *International Education Studies, 7*(11), 56–67.

Alhuqbani, M.N. (2014). An investigation of the English language needs, motivations, and attitudes of Saudi police cadets. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3*(2), 201–213.

Baldauf, R. & Kaplan, R. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013–1034). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baron, M. J. B. (2013). Building ESP Content-Based Materials to Promote Strategic Reading. *PROFILE, 15*(1), 139–169.

Boyle, C., & Chersan, I. (2009). *English for law enforcement*. Macmillan Education.

The British Council. (2013). *The English effect: The impact of English, what it's worth to the UK and why it matters to the world.* https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf

Casey, S. (2015). Challenges in converting training needs analysis (TNA) findings into a comprehensive language for defence purposes (LDP) course. In H. de Silva Joyce & E. Thomson (Eds.). *Language in Uniform: Language analysis and training for defence and policing purposes* (pp. 105–131). Cambridge Scholars.

Chersan, I. (2015). An overview of law enforcement English. In H. de Silva Joyce & E. Thomson (Eds.). *Language in Uniform: Language analysis and training for defence and policing purposes* (pp. 41–60). Cambridge Scholars.

de Silva Joyce, H. & Thomson, H. (2015). *Language in Uniform: Language analysis and training for defence and policing purposes.* Cambridge Scholars.

Doyle, M. S. (2013). Continuing theoretical cartography in the LSP era. In *Scholarship and Teaching on Languages for Specific Purposes*, L. Sánchez-López (Ed.). University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Foley, J. A. (2019). Issues using CEFR in the region. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal,* (12) 2, 28–48.

Gishbaugher, J. (2015). Developing an English curriculum for the Indonesian National Police: A case study. In H. de Silva Joyce & E. Thomson (Eds.). *Language in Uniform: Language analysis and training for defence and policing purposes* (pp. 41–60). Cambridge Scholars.

Hamid, M. O., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2016). Globalisation, English language policy, and teacher agency: Focus on Asia. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 15*(1), 26–43.

Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: context, processes and outcomes, *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14*(1), 1–15,

Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509–532.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory.* Multilingual Matters.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an Asian lingua franca: The 'Lingua Franca Approach' and implications for language education policy. *Journal of English as Lingua Franca, 1*(1), 121–139.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Social Humaniora, 12*(1), 9–20.

Lear, D. (2012). LSP Curriculum Creation and Implementation in Service to the US Community. *Modern Language Journal, (96)*1, 158–172

Long, M., & Uscinsnki, I. (2012). Evolution of Languages for Specific Purposes Programs in the US. *Modern Language Journal, 96*(1), 173–189.

Makoni, S. B. (2017). Language planning, security, police communication and multilingualism in uniform: The case of South African Police Services, *Language & Communication, 57*, 48–56.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* Jossey-Bass.

Ministry of Education and Training (MOET), Socialist Republic of Vietnam. (2008). *Teaching and learning languages in the national educational system, period 2001–2020.*

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Bui, T. (2016). Teachers' agency and the enactment of educational reform in Vietnam. Current Issues in Language Planning, 17(1), 88–105.

Nguyen, X., & Nguyen, V. (2019). Language education policy in Vietnam. In A. Kirkpatrick & J. Liddicoat (Eds.). *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia.* Routledge, pp. 185–201.

Orna-Montesinos, C. (2018). Language practices and policies in conflict: an ELF perspective on international military communication, *JELF, 7*(1), 89–111.

Pearson, P. (2014) Policy without a plan: English as a medium of instruction in Rwanda, *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(1), 39–56.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Risner, M., & Long, S. S. (2020). Introduction to the special issue. LSP vectors: Strengthening interdisciplinary connections. *Global Business Languages, 20*, viii–xv.

Sánchez-López, L., Long, M. K., and Lafford, B. A. (2017). New Directions in LSP Research in Higher Education. In M. K. Long (Ed.). *Languages for Specific Purposes: Trends in Curriculum Development* (pp. 13–34). Georgetown University Press.

Tran, H. (2018). Teacher agency in times of educational change: The case of transitioned teachers in Vietnam, *Current Issues in Language Planning, 20*(5), 544–559.

Widodo, H. P. (2019). Language policy in practice: Reframing the English language curriculum in the Indonesian secondary education sector. In A. Kirkpatrick & J. Liddicoat (Eds.). *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia.* Routledge, pp. 127–151.