

# IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM LINUS BAHASA INGGERIS 2.0

Abu Bakar Bin Yusuf; Nik Mohd Zaki Bin Nik Mohamed; Zaini Bin Abdullah; Nur Adibah Binti Abdul Latif; Ikhsan Bin Othman  
Fakulti Pembangunan Manusia  
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.  
abubakar.y@fpm.upsi.edu.my

**Abstract:** The study aims to identify the implementation processs of English 2.0 Linus Programme using Stufflebeam Model (CIPP). The study is carried out in all primary school in the district of Lipis, Pahang involving Year 3 English teachers. The research methodology uses quantitative method with support from quantitative method using likert scale questionnaires and free questions items. The quantitative data is analysed amd interpreted using frequency, mean and percentage. The qualitative data is analysed by decoding respondents' feedback. Findings show teachers in the district of Lipis are knowledgeable regarding the implementation of 2.0 Linus Programme. Moreover, the English Language teachers carry out the English Language Linus Programme according to the specified standard. The achievement of Linus students in Lipis is satisfactory with 82.4% students acquiring all the Linus constructs. However, the teachers have to face a few obstacles in the implantation of the programme. 55.6% of the teachers disagree the 2.0 English Language Linus Programme can increase the literacy level of of students in English Language and propose suggestions to overcome the limitations to ensure students in the Linus Programme is able to acquire literacy skills after 3 years of learning in primary school.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Literacy and Numeracy Programme (Linus) is a programme formed under the third National Key Result Area (NKRA) which aims to widen the access to quality education. The literacy skills which involve speaking, reading, writing and countil skills are considered as basic skills that should be acquired be every individual in the education system not only in Malaysia but worldwide.

The implementation of the programme require commitment from all parties starting with policy makers to implementors i.e. teachers, schools and the students. A programme or curriculum needs continuous evaluation to ensure the prorgamme implemented fulfils the objectives, carried out according the the givem standards and is able to produce the expected output. Evaluation is done to answer two major issues which are how far the programme, area dan learning opportunity build and arranged can produce the desired output and hor far can the programme be improved (Glatthorn et.al)

The Purpose F The Study

The study is planned using Stufflebeam Evaluation Programme (CIPP) to survey the implementation of Linus Programme in primary schools involving teachers' knowledge, delivery process of the programme, achievements, limiations and suggestions for improvent to ensure the programme can be manifested as planned.

### Problem Statement

The English Language 2,0 Linus Programme has been implemented for five years. Based on the findings in the Yearly Report of the National Transfformation Programmes GTP 2017 , it is found that the The English Language 2,0 Linus Programme has shown 95.7% achievement of 12 constructs. The finding shows a remarkable value but has yet to achieve the target of 100% students getting through the placement tests in Year 3 (KPM, 2015), This is alarming because referring to the objective set by ministry, after three years of learning, an individual should be able to acquire literacy skills before entering Phase 2 and being exposed to a more complex learning context.

Besides, if compared to LBM and NUM, LBI has a special placement test in Year 4 for students who fail to get through in the second placement test in Year 3. The question is why is this happening? The Linus placement test instrument used is suitable and possess high reliability and validity to be an indicator for students' literacy skills achievement. Hence, is there other factors such as teachers' knowledge and surroundings which contribute to the existing situation? Zahanim Ahmad (2017) stated that though Linus Programme has shown an increase in literacyand numeracy skills among students at an early age since it was introduced, there are still issues and challenges which had to be faced by teachers in its implementation.

According to Liyana, Maisarah & Fairos (2016) limitations faced by teachers include the time used for streaming which coincide with the learning and teaching timetable disrupt the actual teaching and learning process. The large number of students involved also means more time is needed, the absence of a remedial English Language teachers and documentation work which disrupt teachers' actual work. Moreover, Bokhari, Rashid and Heng (2015) stated that more time is needed to prepare lesson plan, teaching resource materials and caring out streaming during the teaching and learning of ordinary classes.

Moreover, though it has been five years, the achievement and implementation of the programme remain unnoticed among administrators and teacher who are not involved with Linus Programme. Focus is given to Year 6 students' performance in UPSR. This is because performance in UPSR is the determining factor to determine the grade and band of a school. This is the reason why the implementation of Linus is neglected and is not properly administered which in turn affect students' literacy achievement. (Ambotang & Hong, Borneo ; Februari 15, 2017). Hence, this study is planned to obtain the picture of the implementation of Linus Programme and to identify existing factors which influence the implementation of English Language Linus Programme.

#### Objectives Of Study

The study is carried out to observe the implementation of English Langauge 2.0 Linus Programme in primary schools in the district of Lipis, Pahang. Based on the problem statement, the objective of the study is:

To identify the knowledge of teachers regarding the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme in primary school in the district of Lipis.

To identify the method of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme To identify problems in the implantation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme To identify teachers' acceptance of the effectiveness of the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme in primary schools in Lipis.

#### Problem Statement

Based on the objectives of study , the problem statements are as follow:

How much does the teachers know about the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme in primary schools in the district of Lipis?

Is English Language 2.0 Linus Programme in primary schools implemented using the standard given?

What are the students' achievement in the English Language 2.0 Linus Programme placement test.

What are the limitations faced by the Linus primary schools teachers in the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme?

The acceptance level of the teachers regarding the effectiveness of the implememntation of English Language Linus 2.0?

#### Literature Review

Literacy is defined as the ability to read, write and understand simple and complex words and sentences and to apply knowledge in every daily learning and communication (UNESCO ;KPM, 2011)

The high level of literacy in a country reflects the effectiveness of the education system and will be able to determine the human development which will contribute to the economic, social and political development in the country (Roser & Ortiz, 2017) . The increase of literacy level in a country will decrease the gap of achievement between countries. Maz Roser & Esteben (2017) also stated the high literacy level in a country reflects the effectiveness of the education system human development which will contribute to the economic, social and political development in the country

Literacy skills is also crucial in the development of a nation civilization because the ability to acquire literacy lower errors, enabling an individual to be confident of his knowledge without depending on others (Lammers&Jayne; Curwood; Scott; & Marie, 2012). Child Fund International (2017) stated literacy skills and educational opportunity are crucial especially in developing countries because with knowledge, children will be able to have a brighter future and eradicate poverty. Child Fund International (2017) menyatakan bahawa kemahiran literasi dan peluang pendidikan adalah sangat diperlukan

In Malaysia, expanding access to quality education and making it available to all is the top priority of the government and Ministry of Education so that the standard of education is at par with developed countries globally.(Yasin, former Education Minister, 2013

Studies have shown factors contributing to dropouts among students is the result of inability to receive what is being taught (Ambotang, 2012) Low literacy level will give students difficulty to think in the scope of the subjects taken. (Borneo, Jan 27, 2017)

#### The Implementation of Linus 2.0 Programme

Despite the various efforts carried out to ensure every individual in the education system in Malaysia is equipped with literacy skills, the occurrence of dropouts still prevails (Ahmad, 2017) . In 2011, it was reported 11 000 youths selected for the national service were illiterate. (Luyee, 2015). Before Linus Programme was formed, efforts had been taken to ensure literacy skills are acquired by all students.. For example, KIA2M programme which focus on reading and writing skills among Year 1 students, followed by PROTiM which was a basic remedial reading, writing and counting programme for Level 2 students. However, due to several issues, it was replaced by Literacy and Numeracy Programme (LINUS) in 2010. (Nordin, 2014.; Sani, 2013; Ahmad, 2017).

Linus Programme 1.0 focused on 12 constructs with Malay language reading and writing skills and Numeration Mathematics skills. The implementation of Linus 1.0 has shown the level of literacy acquisition among Level 1 students. (Nordin, 2014; Luyee et, 2015; Ahmad 2017

However, 2014 GTP Annual Report stated a high literacy level of 98.7% and 98.9% for numeracy but are still below the 100% KPI. Therefore, Linus Programme has been improved through Linus 2.0 Programme.

Linus 2.0 Programme is developed to enhance the success of 1.0 Linus Programme. Linus 1.0 Programme has been updated by making a few changes. Some of the changes include the implementation of placement test which includes all Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 with the exclusion of children with special needs. The placement test for Linus 2.0 Programme include all mainstream students and Linus students compared to 1.0 Linus which was carried out on Linus students who did not pass the placement before.. The most obvious change is the additional of English language literacy to ensure every student acquire basic English literacy skills because many students are still unable to use English as their second language.

Linus 2.0 Programme focuses on three main principle which are improvement of access, improvement of quality and improvement of justice (GTP, 2014)

#### Evaluation Model

A curriculum or programme which is formed has to go through a continuous cycle that involves the setting of objectives and aim, content, methods to achieve the aim and evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme or curriculum implemented. Evaluation can be done before or after the programme is implemented.

#### The Rationale of Using Stufflebeam Evaluation Model (CIPP)

Ornstein & Hunkins (1988) stated that Stufflebeam model is an evaluative comprehensive model which contributes significantly to curriculum selection and management. Stufflebeam combines four components representing the overall structure of a programme. The component will clarify the purpose of a programme, resources needed, method of implementation and the output of the programme.

According to Stufflebeam (2000) , any individual or organization can use the model to find out the strength or limitations of a programme. According to Nasrudin (2004) & Aun (2014) the model give a comprehensive guideline based on context evaluation dimension, evaluation of input, evaluation of process and product for improving curriculum which has been implemented.

Researches which had used this model were able to obtain findings regarding the true nature of the programmed implemented and was also able to formulate alternatives and suggestions for a curriculum programme. For example, Nurulhuda (2014) had identified confusion of knowledge as a result of Mecatronic Programme carried

out in Polytechnic, the next finding explained the cause of unemployment in the field. Aun (2014) stated inculcation of patriotism did not bring any impact to students and some of the causes was teachers' competency.

Other researches to evaluate whether a programmed had been planned, the output of a programme and to identify unexpected needs which occurred during a programme had been carried out by Shahar (2012), Mahmud (2013), Mat & Hakeem (2013), Foong (2014), Hassan & Norazilawati (2016).

This model is also widely used abroad to evaluate the implementation of a program for example, a research carried out by Chen (20019) in Taiwan, Castro (2011) in Philipines and Wahid, Khatoon, Zamil (2014) in Pakistan .. In Malaysia, this model is used by policy makers namely KPM for example in its 2005 research to survey the implementation of programme and the national education curriculum.

#### (Linus 2.0 Programme)

Programme is a collection of systematic activities and designed to achieve specific objectives . (Royse, Thyer, & Padget , 2006), stated Linus Programme increase the interest to study.. However, the study did not explain in detail whether or not the increase in is able to increase acquisition of literacy and numeracy. According to Liyana (2016) placement test instrument used in Linus placement test is suitable and it has reliability and significant validity as indicators of students' literacy skills achievement.

However, a newsreport in Sinar Harian dated 30 March 2018 stated almost 44% students cannot read when they enter Year 1.. World Bank Group (2018) in Deloitte performance audit identified several weaknesses in the filtering process which resulted in inaccuracy of evaluation of students' ability like inconsistent comprehension of marking among teachers, inadequate time duration for meaningful remedial measures, Linus constructs which were too basic and not in accordance to the mainstream curriculum, Linus teachers being burdened by administrative functions and multi function of school and curriculum. There was also a lack of teaching aids for remedial and teaching support for Linus students.

Moreover, compared to LBM and Numeracy, LBI does not have remedial teachers and remedial classes have to be carried out inclusively during mainstream classes. Bokhari, Rashid and Heng (2015) regarded this as unfair as teachers have to teach both students simultaneously and this is not easy.

## II. METHOD

The research is carried out quantitatively and is supported by qualitative data using survey method of sample consisting of Year 3 English Language Linus 2.0 teachers.

The research is carried out in all primary schools in Lipis. Lipis is chosen as the location for easy data collection since the researcher is teaching in a school in the district. There are 54 primary schools in the district; 38 Sekolah Kebangsaan, 6 SK for indigenous students, 6 Chinese national types schools (SJKC) and 4 Tamil national type school (SJKT).

#### Instrument of Study

The instrument consists of two sections. Section A and B. Section A consists of demography items that include school code, option, teaching experience in school and English Language teaching experience. Section B consists of 5 constructs which are teacher's knowledge, method of implementing programme, students' achievement, problems in implementation of programme and the level of acceptance for program effectiveness. The item constructs for knowledge cover purpose, administrative of placement test, resource materials and support and follow-up action.

For the level of achievement constructs, items consist of open items covering number of Year 3 students, the number of students acquiring constructs 1-12, number of students not acquiring constructs 1-2 and number of students not acquiring constructs 3-12. Next are constructs regarding limitation in the implementation of programme and the fifth construct is the level of teacher's acceptance of the effectiveness of the implementation of English Language Linus programme. The level of acceptance is stated using Yes/No items and teachers are required to justify their answers. Teachers' level of acceptance constructs also covers suggestions for improvement from teachers to improve the effectiveness of the programme.

The questionnaire uses a 5 point Likert scale and open-ended questions. The Likert Scale questionnaire is used for constructs regarding knowledge, implementation method and limitations. The open questionnaire is used to derive data on achievement level and the level of acceptance of the effectiveness of programme.

#### Data Analysis

Data collected from the questionnaire is analysed using Version 2.0 SPSS programme. The data collected will be entered using constructs and items prepared in the questionnaire. Descriptive analysis is used to obtain frequency, min and standard deviation for all items for knowledge construct, method of implementation and limitations. Description of opinion from samples refers to min score and interpretation stated in Table 1.

Table 1: Min Score Interpretation Table : (Adapted from Nunnally dan Bernstein, 1994 ; Azhar, 2006; Zawawi Ismail)

Mean Score	Level	Interpretation
1.00-2.00	Low	Strongly disagree/ Never
2.01-3.00	Medium	Disagree/Rare
3.01-4.00	High	Agree/Quite often
4.01-5.00	Very high	Strongly agree/Always

2008; Zainora Daud 2015.)

The study also involve qualitative data analysis from the findings of the open questionnaire. This is because, according to Chua Yan Piaw, 2014, the answers collected from free items will be listed in categories to be explained in the qualitative analysis. For open items, data analysis is done through theme assigned from the answers given for every item.

#### Findings

##### Summary of Respondent Demography

Table 2: Teachers Demographic Information

Bemographic Information	Category	Frequency N= (...)	Percentage (%)
School code	SK	40	74.1
	SJKC	6	11.1
	SJKT	4	7.4
	SK (JHEOA)	4	7.4
	Optionist	20	37.0
Option	Non-optionist	34	63.0
	1 - 5 year	18	33.3
Teaching Experience in School	6 - 10 year	20	37.0
	11 - 15 year	9	16.7
	16 - 20 year	5	9.3
	More than 20 year	2	3.7
	English Language	Less than 1 year	5
Linus Teaching Experience	1 - 2 year	38	70.4
	3 - 4 year	11	20.4

Findings from the research show majority of the respondents are novice teachers and advance novice teachers. This shows teachers who are new in the education sector and teaching and learning. Besides, findings show the majority of the respondents are non-optionists (65%). Demographic factor does not mean the level of teacher's knowledge in the implementation and method of Linus Programme implementation. It can be seen as external factor which can be taken into

consideration to increase the effectiveness of the programme. This according to Jamil, Shamimi & Yahya (2009) in Hassan (2014) in a study on teachers' competency found that teachers had difficulties to prepare task due to lack of experience and knowlwdge.

The level of teachers' knowledge in regard of the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme.

Table 3: Data Analysis of The level of teachers' knowledge in regard of the implementation of English Language 2.0 Linus Programme Lipis district primary schools.

Bi 1	Item	Frekuensi Skala					Min
		Likert					
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	English Linus Programme focus on speaking, reading and writing skills.	3	1	3	30	17	4.05
2	The objective of Linus Programme is to ensure students master the 12 assessment constructs.	2	0	2	31	19	<u>4.20</u>
3	The main objective of Linus Programme is to ensure students acquire literacy skills after 3 years of learning in school..	2	1	0	21	30	4.40
4	Placement test should be carried out during lesson.	5	2	2	22	23	4.03
5	The administration of reading placement test can be done in groups of not more than 3.	5	0	6	29	14	3.87
4	The administration of reading placement test can be done in groups of more than 3.	24	8	6	10	6	2.37
5	The administration of reading placement test can be done individually.	3	1	5	26	19	4.05
6	The administration of writing placement test can be done in groups of not more than 3.	13	13	4	17	7	2.85
7	The administration of writing placement test can be done in groups of more than 3.	2	1	6	23	22	4.14
8	The administration of writing placement test can be done individually.	5	6	5	23	15	3.68

9 BPPI forms should be competed during placement test	5	2	4	28	15	3.85
10 Teachers can assist students during placement test.	0	3	1	36	14	4.12
11 Teacher reads the questions for students.	9	12	3	24	6	3.11
12 Teacher reads and translate the questions.	0	11	5	25	13	3.74
13 Teacher prepares teaching aids during placement activities.	4	11	8	21	10	3.40
14 Students who do not acquire any construct during placement test should be given remedial lesson.	0	0	4	31	19	4.27
15 Remedial activities should be carried out during mainstream lesson.	6	8	4	25	11	3.50
Likert Scale	9.59	8.71	7.41	45.9	28.3	
Percentage	%	%	%	7%	2%	

Findings show teachers responsible to carry out the English Language Linus Programme are knowledgeable in the implementation and administration of programme. This is derived from the ability of teachers to state objective, the administrative of placement activities, resource materials, and upport and remedial activities stated in the placement activities administrative manual supplied by KPM and LPM. Summary of Data on Teachers' Knowledge of English Language Linus 2.0 Programme in primary schools in the district of Lipis.

The conclusion for dimension input which covers the four constructs show teachers are knowledgeable in English Linus Programme with an overall score of 45.97% of the teachers agreeing, 28.32% strongly agreeing, 9.5% strongly disagreeing, 8.71 disagreeing and 7.41% uncertain. In general, teachers who answer the questionire show thay are clear and are prepared in term of knowledge to carry out the programme. However, a small percentage of the teachers still need guidance and clear explanation of the administration and structure of the programme.

Is the implementation of the English Language 2.0 Linus Programme in accordance of the specified standard .

Findings from the study clearly show teachers in Lipis district implement Linus through placement and remedial activities according to the given standard . Though a small number of teachers are still unclear and do not totally adhere to the given standard because the mean for questions is high at 4.00 for implementation of programme construct , 3.29 for material and supporting materials construct and 3.34 for remedial activities construct. This shows respondents who are English Language teachers

adhere to the specified standard. The finding clearly show the implementation of the programme I on the right track.

Students Achievent Level in English Linus 2.0 Placement Activities.

**Table 4:** Analysis of Students Achievement Level in English Language Linus Programme 2.0 in Lipis District Primary Schools

Item	Frequency N= (....)	Percentage (%)
Students acquiring constructs 1-12	1091 52	82.4 3.92
Students do not acquire constructs 1-2	141	10.65
Students do not acquire constructs 3-12		
Total of Students	1324	100

Data analysis of the study shows the level of students' achievement in placement activities in Lipis is satisfactory with the passing percentage of all constructs is 82.4%. However, 14.7% are still unable to acquire all constructs with 3.92% unable to acquire the most basic construct 1-2. This 14.7% students are a challenge for teachers because they only have 4 months before the second placement to make sure students acquire all the constructs. Limitations faced by primry Linus teachers in implementing English Language Linus Prgramme.

**Table 5 :** Analysis of Data of Limitation of Implementation of English Language Linus Programme 2.0 in Lipis

Bil	Item	Min	Std. Deviation	Interpretasi
1	Reading placement phase is inadequate	4.09	. 75906	Totally agree
2	The duration of reading placement is inadequate	3.81	1.06530	Agree
3	Reading placement instrument is difficult to carry out.	3.22	1.05806	Agree
4	Writing placement writing instrument is difficult to carry out.	3.16	1.12853	Agree
5	Reading placement is not suitable for all students' background.	3.88	. 83929	Agree
6	Writing placement us not suitable for all students. background	3.83	. 96642	Agree
7	The admintiration of placement activities disrupt teaching and learning activities.	4.05	. 83365	Totally agree

Bil	Item	Min	Std. Deviation	Interpretasi
8	Documentation of placement activities is complicated	3.92	. 77342	Agree
9	Administration Manual does not help implementation of placement activities	2.59	1.31060	Disagree
10	Teacher is not trained to implet placement activities..	2.37	1.10396	Disagree
11	Teacher is not exposed to the teaching of Linus in mainstream classes.	3.90	. 59140	Agree
12	Remedial activities disrupt mainstream classes.	3.94	. 97935	Agree
13	Remedial activities has to be carried out outside mainstream classes	4.07	. 82076	Totally agree
14	The planning of teaching and learning mainstream students and Linus remedial is difficult to implement.	3.96	. 97057	Agree
15	Teaching aids to teach Linus remedial Linus is not enough.	4.05	. 65637	Totally agree
16	Other responsibilities disrupt the implementation of English Linus Programme.	4.25	. 85086	Totally agree

In general, the findings show limitations which influence the implantation process of English Language Linus Programme. These limitations involve time management, documentation of programme and advanced and remedial activities. Data analysis shows time management involved the durations of placement activities being carried out. Placement activities have to be carried out during lesson and have to be carried out according to teachers' abilities to divide between time to teach subject content and to carry out placement. The duration to carry out reading placement activities is four weeks whilw the duration for writing placement activities is only two weeks. English Language Linus teachers find the duration for reading and writing placement activities are not enough.

The process of administration of placement , the process of teaching and learning together with prepeparation of lesson plan function inclusively between Linus students and mainstream students. Therefore, teachers have to divide time between carrying out placement and carrying out teaching mainstream classes. Besides that, analysis of data also shows teachers have to face challenges of preparing programme documentation besides remedial and advance activities . The implementation of Linus program besides placement activities need management of documents and report of various standards which have

been specified. Documentation of management has to be done simultaneously with placement activities. As a result, teachers cannot concentrate on mainstream lesson and placement activities.

The level of teachers' acceptance of the effectiveness of the implementation of English Linus 20

**Table 6: Data analysis of Teachers' Acceptance Level of English Language Linus Programme 2.0 in Lipis**

Does the English Language Linus Programme 2.0 increase students' English Language literacy level?	Frequency N= (....)	Percentage (%)
Yes	24	44.4
No	30	55.6

In general, it is found that the higher percentage shows that teachers disagree the implementation of English language Linus bring impact to the achievement of literacy skills. Teachers also stated factors that influence their statement regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of Linus towards the achievement of students literacy skills. Among the main factors mentioned by teachers are literacy skills which do not include speaking skill, the lack of remedial and enrichment activities due to lack of time and other workload, and the level of literacy skills which is not parallel with subject curriculum

However, some respondents agree with the effectiveness of the implementation of English language Linus with a difference of 1.2%. Some of the contributing factors is that Linus program is seen to be capable of helping teachers to identify the abilities of students. Furthermore, from that teachers will be able to plan to increase students' achievements. Research findings also state that teachers agree the role of Linus program to identify students' level for the purpose of intervention and helping students to overcome literacy problem. However, the effectiveness of the program cannot be expressed in general due to limitations mentioned in the findings of the limitation in the implementation of the program before the findings in this program will show results.

### **III. DISCUSSION**

The program has been carried out well according to the standard and guidelines.

In general the findings have clearly shown the program is implemented in accordance to the standard and guidelines provided. The teachers are knowledgeable of the program concept and are able to implement the program using the given guidelines. From the perspectives of the implementation of the programme which include placement activities and the practice of Linus, it is found that teachers in Lipis district are on the right track. However the achievement level and remedial action based on the findings need to be increased and given special attention

Modification of the program implementation which needs to be carried out.

Findings show that there are problems in the implementation of the English Linus program in Lipis district. The problems are caused by several factors including construct and placement content, the technical structures of placement activities and intervention and advance activities. Three factors which are considered important and influence the implementation of the program are construct and placement content, the technical structures of placement activities, and intervention and advance activities.

**Construct and placement content.**

Construct and placement content should be given emphasis from two aspects, first the construct ability to achieve the objective of programme. This is because the constructs listed only emphasize on reading and writing skills. The second aspect is the relationship between placement construct and the subject standard of curriculum which is not parallel. Findings also show several respondents disagreeing that Linus program can increase students' level of literacy because the placement construct are different from the subject content. Skills in Linus program and standard of curriculum content are the same namely reading, writing and speaking. The only difference is the level and focus of the skills. The ambiguity according to Hafiz Tarmizi 206 is although students overcome past Linus placement they are still unable to adapt to the learning in mainstream classes.

**Structure of technical placement.**

According to the guidelines in the Administration of Linus the main aim of the program is to increase students English oral, reading and writing skills. This can be done starting from reading and writing placement test carried out twice a year. However, the issue is the emphasis given on technical structure and achievement orientation overlooking the afford to increase students literacy level. Technical placement structures for example the use of red and blue pen for marking, the use of blue and black pen to record individual performance BBPI form, the accurate way of marking, recording of dates and time of teaching and learning activities are seen as irrelevant and disruptive to the whole process of teaching and learning in class.

**Intervention and advance program activities**

Referring to the implementation of Linus program emphasis should be given to the students literacy skill. So placement is carried out as indicator of students performance to carry out intervention. Emphasis is given on placement compared to intervention and advance activities. This is because the Linus is carried out by subject teachers during mainstream lessons. They also do not have enough time to carry out remedial activities. There is also a difference in content in Linus program and subject content standard. Teachers have to carry out

different lesson in a short time. So there is no impact from the intervention activities.

### Implication Of Study

The implication of the study involve policy maker curriculum leaders and implementors. The findings in this research can be used to ensure the success of English Linus 2.0.

#### Policy maker

Policy maker are Ministry of Education through the Examination Council should consider the improvement that can be taken in the implementation of the Linus programme in primary school. Feedback from implementors should be taken as indicator for the ability of the programme and what should be done for further development. The research shows teachers are still supporting the policy despite the challenges they have to face. Improvement should be done especially in the technical structures of the implementation of the programme and its effectiveness of the content knowledge regarding students' literacy skills.

#### Curriculum Leaders

Curriculum leaders are administrators at school, district and state education. Access that can be provided by State Education Department (JPN), District Education Office (PPD) through Facilinus found in PPD is to create opportunity for teachers to increase skills and knowledge to carry out Linus Programme. Teachers should be guided and supplied with the latest information regarding the placement and intervention of Linus Programme. Remedial and preparation of teaching aids workshops should be organized. At school level, administrators should be alert of the programme as a whole.

#### Implementors

Implementors should be open and prepared to carry out the programme. Commitment given by teachers will influence the result greatly. Teachers should adapt to changes and should try overcome problems at their own initiatives. Teachers should take the initiative to attend workshops and courses organised by non-governmental organisations.

### IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study carried out should prove the credibility of teachers to carry out English Linus Programme. Commitment should be taken despite the limitation and challenges faced. In reference with teachers willingness to carry out programmes should be supported with assistance. This include the preparation of teaching aids and to increase teachers' content knowledge in accordance with the constructs to be assessed.

Besides, the programme structures should be reevaluated to balance the need for literacy skills and the need of knowledge according to the standard syllabus content. Setting targets which are too high will only add pressure to the implementors. Future research should be

carried out to suggest improvement approaches which have been proven effective to increase students' literacy level. The English language Linus programme is a good move and should be supported to focus on students' literacy level which is the basic skill of students to acquire knowledge and other skills. It is hope that the study will contribute to the effort of making sure there is no drop out.

### REFERENCE

- [1] Ambotang, Abdul Said, Mohamad B., Abdullah M. Y., Taat M. S., Talip R. (2012). Kajian Terhadap Faktor Penyumbang Terhadap Pencapaian Sifar UPSR di Sarawak. Universiti Malaysia Sabah. Diperoleh pada November 20, 2017 daripada <http://www.fb.utm.my/ePusatSumber/listseminar/medc2012/pdf/51.pdf>
- [2] Ambotang A. S. & Hariana A. Hong, Utusan Borneo ; Februari 15, 2017
- [3] Rahim A., Ahmad A. R. & Ahmad A. (2010). Penilaian keberkesanan pelaksanaan kurikulum masa pelajaran Sejarah Menengah Rendah tingkatan 2 di sekolah-sekolah menengah semenanjung Malaysia. Dalam Prosiding Seminar Penyelidikan Siswazah UKM. Jilid 3. 2010, 77-88.
- [4] Mahmud A., Nor Hayati Hj. Alwi, Sulaiman T. & Hassan A. (2013). Penggunaan model CIPP dalam penilaian kurikulum separa perubatan. Dalam Prosiding Seminar Penyelidikan Pendidikan dan Pembangunan Sumber Manusia (PPPSM 2013), 28-29.
- [5] Bahagian Pembangunan Kurikulum. (2012). Dokumen Standard Bahasa Inggeris Tahun 3. Putrajaya : Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- [6] Castro, F. M. C. (2011). Evaluation of the PISD teacher Induction program using Stufflebeam's CIPP model. Papersinc-the Philippine Educational System in a Blog. Diperoleh pada November 20, 2017 daripada <http://papersinc.wordpress.com/>
- [7] Peng C. F. (2015) Pelaksanaan program literasi dan numerasi (Linus) di sekolah rendah. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Melayu ; Malay Language Education (MyLEJ), 5(2), 1-11.
- [8] Luyee E. O, Roselan F. I., Anwardeen N. H., & Fatin Hazirah Mohd Mustapa (2015). Suitability of the Literacy and Numeracy Screening (Linus) 2.0 Programme in assessing children's early literacy. The Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Science,3(2), 37-42.
- [9] Glatthorn, A. A., & Glatthorn, A. A. (2012). Curriculum leadership: Strategies for development and implementation. Thousand Oaks, Calif : SAGE Publications.
- [10] Jamil, Shamimi & Yahya (2009), Pembelajaran Informal bagi Guru Mata Pelajaran Teknologi Kejuruteraan: UTHM.
- [11] Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia. (2011). Buku Panduan dan Pengoperasian, Program Literasi Dan Numerasi (Linus) : Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- [12] Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia. (2015). Buku Panduan dan Pengoperasian, Program Literasi Dan Numerasi (Linus) 2.0 : Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- [13] Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (2018). Panduan pentadbiran saringan Linus 2.0 2018.
- [14] Lammers, J. C., Curwood, J. S., Magnifico& Alecia Marie. (2012). English Teaching: Practice and Critique. Journal Articles; Reports - Research,11(2), 44– 58 Jul 2012.
- [15] Liau Swee Foong (2014). An evaluation of teachers' perceptions of the KBSM music programme in lower secondary schools in Malaysia based on the CIPP model. Tesis PhD yang tidak diterbitkan. Kuala Lumpur : Universiti Malaya.
- [16] Max Roser and Esteban Ortiz-Ospina (2017) Literacy. Diperoleh Disember 7, 2017 : <https://ourworldindata.org/literacy>.
- [17] Mohamad Fadzil Che Amat, & Abdul Jaleel Abdul Hakeem. (2013). Menilai keberkesanan pelaksanaan program diploma perguruan lepas ijazah pendidikan Sejarah sekolah rendah di institut pendidikan guru kampus Pulau Pinang. Dalam Prosiding seminar

- pendidikan Sejarah dan Geografi. Kuala Linus : Universiti Malaysia.
- [18] Mohd Hafiz Mohammad Tarmizi (2016). Tahap kefahaman membaca antara murid pasca linus dan murid arus perdana. Tesis Sarjana: UPSI
- [19] Mohd Razak Mohd Nordin, Shaharuddin Shaari, & Normah Kamarodzan (2014). Cabaran guru program Linus (literasi) di sekolah murid orang asli negeri Perak. Jurnal Penyelidikan Dedikasi. Diperoleh Disember 7, 2017 daripada <http://www.ipgmipoh.edu.my/journal/index.php/dedikasi/article/view/45>.
- [20] Muhamad Abdul Wahid Usmani., Suraya Khatoon., Marwan M. Shammot., & Ahmad Zamli. (2012). Meta evaluation of a teacher's evaluation programme using CIPP model. ArchivesDes Sciences,65(7), 230-252. Diperoleh November 20, 2017 daripada from <http://www.duhs.edu.pk/qec/doc/>
- [21] Nazariyah Sani (2014). Pelaksanaan program literasi & numerasi (Linus) :satu analisis. Tesis PhD : Universiti Malaya.
- [22] Noraini Idris. (2013). Penyelidikan dalam Pendidikan Edisi Kedua. Shah Alam : Mc Graw Hill Education.
- [23] Norfairos Hadzir, Aini Munirah Alias, Aimi Liyana Kamaruzaman, Hanis Maisarah Mohd Yusof (2016).Teacher's perception on literacy, numeracy and screening (Linus 2.0) assement features based on year 1 student's performance. Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL), 4(1), 2395-2636.
- [24] Nunally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: Mc Graw Hill
- [25] Ornskein, A.C & Hunkins, F.P (2009). *Curriculum : Foundations, principles, and theory*. 5th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [26] Pelan pembangunan pendidikan Malaysia manifestasi transformasi kerajaan. (2013). Diperoleh Disember 6, 2017 daripada <http://www.mstar.com.my/berita/berita-semasa/2013/09/06/pelan-pembangunan-pendidikan-malaysia-manifestasi-transformasi-kerajaan--mulyiddin/>.
- [27] Roslan Abu Hassan (2014). Kompetensi guru bukan opsyen yang mengajar kemahiran teknikal di kolej vokasional negeri Pahang. Tesis sarjana tidak diterbitkan. Johor : UTHO.
- [28] Rosseliah Bokhari, Sabariah Md Rashid, & Chan, S. H. (2015). Teachers' perception on the implementation of the literacy, numeracy and screening (Linus LBI 2.0) programme among lower primary ESL pupils. Malaysian Journal of ELT Research,11(1), 108-121.
- [29] Sekaran, U. (2003) *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*. 4th Edition. New York : John Wiley & Sons.
- [30] Sharifah Nurulhuda Tuan Mohd Yasin (2014). Kajian keperluan : Isu dan masalah di industri graduan politeknik program mekatronik. Dalam Prosiding CIE-TVET2014 (m.s.32-34) Johor : UTHO.
- [31] Stufflebeam, D.L. (2000) CIPP evaluation checklist. A tool for applying the fifth installment of the CIPP model to assess long term enterprises. Diperoleh Disember 5, 2017 daripada [https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippchecklist\\_mar07.pdf](https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippchecklist_mar07.pdf)
- [32] Tajul Arifin, H. (2010). Minat dan Penggunaan Pelajar Dalam Mata Pelajaran Pengurusan Makanan di SMT (ERT) Azizah. Tesis Sarjana Muda. Johor Bahru.: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
- [33] Tan Kok Aun (2014). Pelaksanaan unsur-unsur patriotisme dalam mata pelajaran Sejarah tingkatan lima di SMK Tiong Hin, Sibu.Tesis Sarjana yang tidak diterbitkan, Tanjung Malim : UPSI.
- [34] Zahanim Ahmad (2017). Perlaksanaan literasi dan numerasi di sekolah rendah. Diperoleh Disember 7, 2017 daripada [http://conference.kuis.edu.my/recit2016/images/eproceeding/ZA\\_HANIM.pdf](http://conference.kuis.edu.my/recit2016/images/eproceeding/ZA_HANIM.pdf).
- [35] Zelzy Shahar Al-Johary, (2012) Pengaruh ilmu pedagogi, pengetahuan, kandungan dan latihan mengajar terhadap penilaian program perguruan. Diperoleh November 20, 2017 daripada <http://eprints.ums.edu.my/11591/>.
- [36] Zulkifli Hassan & Norazilawati Abdullah (2016). Penilaian guru sekolah rendah di daerah Kinta Utara terhadap pentaksiran aktiviti jasmani, sukan dan kokurikulum (PAJSK). JPBU Edisi Khas 2016, 19-24 .