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ABSTRACT

This dissertation compares the learning environment of elite military academies in the U.S. and Malaysia, namely the United States Military Academy, New York (West Point) and the Military Academy of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur (MAM). The dissertation began as an investigation of the place of e-learning and simulation technologies in educating future military officers. It was assumed that as modern technologies for war and defence have changed, so too must the military academies accommodate to that – especially in producing the right kind of officers who will lead the defence of the nation. Research in West Point and the MAM, however, revealed much more significant and deeper differences between the two learning environments. These are also analysed in this dissertation on the basis of in-depth interviews with staff at both academies and responses to some 241 questionnaires returned by the cadets.

One of the most important findings in this study is that the learning environment at West Point is informed by the Thayer System which, in turn, is based on principles strongly reminiscent of the constructivist school of pedagogical inquiry. The impact of the Thayer System on the learning environment is analysed, as are the essential features of constructivism. In Malaysia, by contrast, the learning environment in the academy is driven by teacher-oriented practices that are not sensitive to the needs of students. Moreover, the broader authoritarian tendencies in Malaysia, have encouraged the entrenchment of didactic modes of teacher-student exchanges in the classroom. These were found not to be conducive to creative, student-centred learning processes capable of producing the kind of officers who can lead the Malaysian military at a time of growing regional insecurity in the Asia Pacific.
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CHAPTER 1

MILITARY EDUCATION AND INSTITUTIONS

This dissertation analyses the characteristics of learning environments in two very different military academies, the United States Military Academy, New York (West Point) and the Military Academy of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur (MAM). The question addressed in this study is how cadets can be provided with a more effective learning environment in an era of modern telecommunications. Implementing new technologies in the working and learning environment could prepare future generations for the new global economy. This is as relevant to military academies as to other tertiary institutions. In this dissertation, the MAM is an example of a tertiary military academy in a developing country. Yet, the use of new technologies, without due attention to pedagogical approaches, is insufficient to ensure appropriate learning, as this dissertation will demonstrate. The key question is what can the MAM learn from the world’s leading military academy, West Point?

1.1 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS DISSERTATION

Since the time of Plato, military personnel have often been called the ‘guardians’¹ (of the people) and the public have respected them as such (Ambrose, 1999, p.1; Lord, 1989, p.320; Stiehm, 2002, p.1). Given their special role and prestige, most governments need to ensure that their military institutions are ready to defend the country and such readiness depends critically on learning programmes that can prepare the guardians accordingly. Continuously improving these learning programmes for the military has, therefore, become one of the most important aims of governments. Depending on the national defence strategies and foreign policies of a country, its needs and aspirations will be reflected directly and indirectly in the learning programmes of its military institutions.

¹ Guardians are mentioned throughout Plato’s Republic (translated by Waterfield, 1998) especially in the chapters titled “Primary Education for The Guardians” and “The Guardians’ Life and Duties.”
The purposes of this study are threefold:

a) to investigate the functions of and the need for e-learning and simulation technologies at military academies

b) to identify and analyse the learning and teaching challenges at the MAM

c) to analyse e-learning and simulation strategies at West Point in order to see how these differ from those at the MAM and whether the MAM has anything to learn from the U.S. example.

Why the U.S. Military?

There are three reasons for using the U.S. as a benchmark against which the current practices and the future needs of the MAM can be compared. First, the U.S. is a global superpower and to a considerable degree this position depends on the power of the U.S. military.2 As Table 1.1, Table 1.2 and Figure 1.1 show, U.S. military expenditure in 2007 vastly outstripped the top ten military powers in the world, using expenditure as a rough measure of military power.

Malaysia has been added to Table 1.1 to show how it differs from the U.S. in terms of scale of expenditure. Malaysia was ranked the 41st largest military spender in 2007. U.S. military spending keeps growing each year. According to one source,3 the U.S. accounted for 33 percent of world military expenditure in 1999.4 By 2002, the percentage had increased to 40 percent (Huisken, 2002, p.21) and in the fiscal year 2007-08, U.S. military spending5 was 47 percent of the world’s total military expenses. Figure 1.1 and Table 1.2 compare the Malaysian and U.S. economies using three indicators: Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Military Expenditure and Total World R&D Expenditure. These indicators are normally used to assess the relative weight a country has in terms of world power (Davis & Shapiro, 2003, pp.8-9). This evidence confirms that Malaysia, relative to the U.S., is a small military player.

---

2 It is noted that the superiority of the U.S. military originates from the technology, scientific ability, research and development or R&D investment and generous funding (Deitchman, 2000, p.133; Emmert, 2002, p.1; Huisken, 2002, p.25; The Status and Significance of the Superpower Strategic Balance: Differing U.S. Views, 1978, p.64).


4 This is the latest WMEAT report published on 6th February 2003.

5 U.S. Military Spending versus the World, Centre for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, 5th February 2007.
### Table 1.1
World Military Expenditure in 2007 (Top Ten Ranking and Malaysia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>495,300</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>103,956</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>53,128</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>31,384</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>38,044</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>31,384</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>23,726</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>20,313</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Figure 1.1
A Comparison between the U.S. and Malaysian’s GDP and Military Expenditures 2005 (in percentages)

![Figure 1.1](image_url)


### Table 1.2
A Comparison between the U.S. and Malaysia’s Total World R&D Expenditures 2002 (USD Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>575.6</td>
<td>676.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>197.3</td>
<td>276.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second reason for benchmarking the MAM against West Point is that the U.S. military has been the biggest spender on e-learning and simulation programmes. In fact the U.S. military has been the most active developer and user of e-learning and simulation technologies (Aldrich, 2005, p.195). It was reported that the U.S. military through its Department of Defence spent about USD$2.2 billion for the development of its education technology programme in the 2003-04 fiscal year (Wilson, 2004, p.1). On a per employee basis, U.S. military expenditure outstripped the expenditure of corporate America. This conclusion is based on the most recent survey of the American Society for Training and Development (Analytics: Understanding the Economics of Learning, 2003, p.2). The study of more than 367 major companies in 2002 led to the conclusion that U.S. organisations dedicated about two percent of their annual budgets to learning expenses that are related to e-learning and simulation technologies. On a per employee basis, this meant a spending of more than USD$700 annually. In the same year, the U.S. military spent about USD$7.5 billion on the use of modern electronic technology to support training for military personnel (Operation and Maintenance Overview, 2002, pp.177-178). The total number of active military and reserve personnel was 1,414,000 and 1,259,300 respectively (The Military Balance 2002, 2002, p.16). This meant that the U.S. military spent about four times more than the investment of the leading U.S. corporations – about USD$2,800 per employee. These expenditure patterns cannot be automatically ‘connected’ to West Point, but as it is one of the premier defence academies, one could expect that West Point incorporates the most advanced e-learning and simulation methods into its training programme.

Third, the education of U.S. military officers is a specific and systematic process as indicated in Figure 1.2. The officers receive extensive training as part of an ongoing learning process that does not have a definite end point. Figure 1.2 shows the stages of a U.S. military officer’s career development from day one of enlistment until retirement. Phase One starts at the age 6 In 1998, Malaysia’s R&D expenditure (as a percentage of Gross National Income – GNI) was 0.42 percent (The Project on Human Development website, 2007).

7 See Chapter 2 for more details on e-learning and simulations expenditures of the U.S. military.

8 The stages are a universally accepted standard around the world, albeit with some variations.
of 18 to 19 years and officers in the last phase can be between 50 and 55 years old. Throughout this long career path, e-learning and stimulation technologies play a role of growing importance to the professional competency of U.S. officers (Macedonia, 2002, p.159). However, this is not the only factor that accounts for the successes of West Point (see Chapter 4).

**Figure 1.2**
The Stages of U.S. Military Officers’ Career Development

![Stages of U.S. Military Officers’ Career Development](image)

Sources: Keaney (2002, p.151); Maxwell⁹ (2005)
*CAPSTONE is a six-week programme for general/flag officers conducted by the National Defence University (NDU) Washington. This programme is a statutory requirement of the Department of Defence Reorganisation Act of 1986 (The NDU Washington website, 2007)*

**The Hypothesis and Research Questions**

Preliminary analysis of the secondary literature (see Chapter 2) and discussions with military personnel at various institutions in Australia, Canada, Malaysia and the U.S. have led to the formulation of the following hypothesis and four key research questions. The hypothesis is that:

**The introduction of e-learning and simulation technologies could provide appropriate learning strategies for students at the MAM. These strategies are crucial for the development of the knowledge and skills required in a 21st century military force.**

This hypothesis will be accepted, rejected or modified depending on the results of the research findings.

Behind this hypothesis stand the following four research questions:

a) What are the main constraints on the development of high quality graduates at the MAM? Are technological constraints more important than other factors?

---

⁹ Based on personal communication with Lieutenant Colonel (R) Russell Maxwell, Deputy Commandant, Australian Defence College, Weston Creek, Canberra, Australia, 23rd March 2005. However, his analysis starts with a stage (not in Figure 1.2) from high school military education and stops at the fourth stage, that is, the Senior Stage, perhaps reflecting the career development of Australian Defence Force officers.
b) What has been the role of new technologies in the teaching and learning strategies of military students at West Point and the MAM?

c) What stage has been reached by the MAM in adopting e-learning and simulations as learning tools? Should the MAM move further in the direction of the U.S. model?

d) What has been the main pedagogical approach at West Point? Could the MAM learn something from the learning environment at West Point?

In seeking answers to these questions, the West Point model will be used as a benchmark for assessing the experiences of the MAM. However, in order to do that, it is first necessary to explain not only what the MAM seeks to do but also its place within the Malaysian Armed Forces (MAF). The next section contextualises the MAM within the security policies of Malaysia.

1.2 MALAYSIA’S DEFENCE STRATEGY AND FOREIGN POLICY

Graduates of the MAM will serve in the MAF. To comprehend the aspirations and needs of these services, the national defence strategy and foreign policy are analysed first. This is followed by a discussion about the key characteristics of the MAM, which is Malaysia’s leading military training academy.

Malaysia’s current approach to defence takes a comprehensive ‘multi-dimensional, multi-layered and multi-focal’ perspective, aiming to meet both military and non-military threats. Emphasis is given to develop capacities to counter a whole spectrum of possible threats from low to high intensity conflicts (McNally & Morrison, 2002, p.109). Malaysia’s national defence strategy today identifies three key areas of interest. Firstly, there are national strategic interests that involve the immediate territory surrounding Malaysia, the region and the international arena. Secondly, the policy speaks of Malaysia’s defence principles which include deterrence, forward defence and total defence (Mohd Najib Abdul Razak, 2006, pp.161-163). While deterrence means that Malaysia has the capability to attack and hopefully prevail when provoked, forward defence suggests that Malaysia will avoid conflicts taking place on its own territory. Total defence relates to a total and integrated effort by the government, non-governmental agencies, the public sector and citizens to defend the country. Lastly, the strategy revolves around three main principles that are defined as: (a) self-reliance, (b) regional cooperation, and (c) foreign assistance. The principle of self-reliance is further supported by two elements, namely having the capacity to act alone without any outside assistance in: (a) all matters pertaining to internal security, and (b) defending Malaysia’s sovereignty and security interests within its immediate neighbourhood from low and medium level external threats (National Defence Strategy, 2003, p.1). In short,
these defence strategies emphasise the strength of the armed forces and their potential offensive and defensive capability (Jeshurun, 1980, p.133).

Malaysia’s foreign policy is designed to support the defence strategies through diplomatic, trade and ‘soft power’ approaches. No foreign policy can be formulated without proper contexts – it must relate to a dynamic setting. Malaysia’s foreign policy is no exception. Both it and the conduct of the country’s international relations are shaped by various factors, including geography, history, social and political determinants. Further, the external environment or what may be termed as the systemic determinant becomes increasingly important with the advent of globalisation and in an epoch of information communication technology (ICT) (National Foreign Policy, 2004, p.4). Nevertheless the fundamental objective remains the same – that is, the pursuit of Malaysia’s national interest at the international level.

Malaysia’s clear foreign policy goals in respect to defence and security, development and trade, international cooperation and diplomacy determine the pattern of relations that the country establishes with its neighbours. The policy relates to frameworks established by the Association for Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Asean Regional Forum (ARF), the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), the South-South Cooperation, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Commonwealth, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), the United Nations (UN) and other regional and international organisations. Beyond these multilateral arrangements, developing close bilateral relations with its neighbours remains a high priority for Malaysia. A consultative approach is taken to resolve outstanding problems including those related to overlapping claims and the determination of land and maritime boundaries. Every diplomatic effort is made to ensure that bilateral relations do not become unfavourably affected on account of such problems (National Foreign Policy, 2004, pp.1-4). In disputes about overlapping territorial claims, for instance over Sipadan Island with the Philippines and Batu Putih Island with Singapore, Malaysia agreed to refer the problems to the International Court of Justice.¹⁰

Further, the establishment of separate joint commissions between Malaysia and Brunei, Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Laos and Vietnam has also provided a useful framework to develop wide-ranging bilateral cooperation in fields of mutual interest. These agreements and approaches provide the scaffolding for Malaysia’s defence policies and should determine the nature of curriculum provided by the country’s military academy and colleges. Even if Malaysia has ambitions to become a major economic leader, there is no

¹⁰ See the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia website (2007).
evidence to show it plans to assert any political power over its neighbours or within the region. At the same time, the changing security scenarios in the Asia Pacific region continue to compel Malaysia to adapt its defence and foreign policies to the shifting priorities of other national governments in the region. The next part explores some of these historical details.

Over the years, Malaysia’s defence strategy and foreign policy have undergone tremendous changes. This historical evolution provides the key to understanding current policy positions. After gaining independence in 1957, Malaya, the old name before Malaysia was established, developed relations with its neighbouring countries. In the early 1960s, the Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, suggested the establishment of Malaysia. However, this proposal was vehemently opposed by Indonesia and led to the confrontation between Malaya and Indonesia in 1963. The collapse of Saigon in Vietnam and the withdrawal of British and U.S. troops from the region between 1960s and the mid-1970s brought further changes to the national defence strategy and foreign policy as new fears emerged. Earlier, by 1965, Singapore withdrew from Malaysia and emerged as an independent nation. That began a considerable economic rivalry that persists today.

After Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammad took over the political stewardship in 1981, economic development increased. Due to the political and social stability built by previous Malaysian Prime Ministers, Mahathir Mohammad was able to take a different approach to Malaysia’s development. During his period in office, the military was given the task of ensuring and maintaining internal stability (Nesadurai, 2004, p.8). Improvements to military education were a critical part of this programme and had widespread support in the Malaysian parliament. Abdullah Ahmad (1990, p.117) explains,

> Malaysia should tighten its economy, strengthen its defence capabilities, improve and consolidate the national solidarity for there is nothing the enemies would respect more than the nation’s strength.

Malaysia’s current defence strategies stem from a document published in 1997 and republished on-line in 2003. Similarly, Malaysia’s most recent foreign policy statement was published on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2004. Together these documents provide classical statements about the manner in which a rising middle power in

---

11 The proposal involved the establishment of Malaysia incorporating Peninsular Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak, Singapore and Brunei into one country.


13 The Honourable Datuk Abdullah Ahmad was a member of parliament Kok Lanas, Kelantan 1986-1990.

14 The 2003 national defence strategy was a revised version of 1997 documents and had been used to formulate the national military strategy (*Ministry of Defence Malaysia’s Annual Report, 2005*, p.113).