CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Background

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the opinions of various scholars regarding bilingualism, code switching, Malaysian English, and domain of language interactions.

2.1 Bilingualism

Many scholars have discussed the issue of bilingualism and have given various definitions to the concept of bilingualism. Mackey (1968) considers bilingualism as the "alternate use of two or more languages". This study has taken Mackey's term of bilingualism to include multilingualism as well.

Mackey (1967: 555) suggests that there are four questions that must be addressed in a description of bilingualism, and they are the "degree", "function", "alternation", and "interference" of the languages that a bilingual knows. The question of the "degree" of bilingualism relates to the proficiency of the languages of the speaker. The role of "function" in bilingualism relates to the uses of the speaker's languages. "Alternation" refers to the extent to which the speaker alternates between the languages that he knows. "Interference" relates to the extent to which the speaker manages to keep the languages that he knows separate, or whether they are fused.

Mackey (1968: 565) also claims that factors such as age, sex, intelligence, memory, language attitude, and motivation are likely to influence the bilinguals' language use.

Mackey (1968) cites five levels that must be possessed by a bilingual in the two languages that he knows. The five levels are as shown:

- phonological level,

- lexical level,

- semantic level,

- stylistic level, and

- graphic level.

At the phonological and lexical level, a bilingual can understand a particular spoken language. However, he may not be able to read the script of that language. Mackey cites the case of a Punjabi speaker in Britain, who understands spoken Punjabi, but is unable to read the Gurumukhi script in which the language is written. In this case, the listening and speaking skills of the particular Punjabi bilingual may be good, but his writing and reading skills may not be very good.

Mackey also explains that a bilingual's phonological ability too might differ in the two languages that he knows. A bilingual might have learnt a second language only for reading purposes, and he might use the other language that he knows for listening purposes. Most bilinguals also show different degrees of ability in their reading and writing. Thus, many bilinguals will have different levels of lexical knowledge, and this contributes to the imbalance in proficiency in one of the languages that the bilingual knows. At the semantic level, a bilingual may be able to express meaning better in one language than another, and this is particularly so, in relation to certain topics, or in certain contexts. For example, a language that is informally used at home may not be used for talking about school topics, if the school system is in another language (Romaine, 1996: 13). A bilingual's ability to

use different styles and to exploit the stylistic range of a language will differ depending on his ability, and the topic in discussion.

Siguan (1987: 13) explains that bilingualism can be viewed both "individually" and "collectively". "Individual" bilingualism refers to a person who knows his first language A, and another language B. An individual is an "ideal" or "perfect" bilingual if he is able to use either of the language that he knows equally well. According to Siguan, this definition of "ideal" bilingualism can be used as a yardstick to measure the degree of bilingualism of an individual. This is because in real life, individuals will differ in their proficiency between the two languages that they know. Thus, the idea of perfect bilingualism is rare because individual bilinguals will use the two languages that they know, in various levels and degrees. An individual bilingual will also be able to use the two languages that he knows according to circumstances. He can also keep the two codes that he knows, separate and at the same time move effortlessly, from one language system into another, according to the situation and context in which he functions. For example, two people who are using Language A, and at the same time know Language B, can switch rapidly, effortlessly, and automatically to language B, in the course of their conversation.

"Collective" bilingualism refers to the use of two languages in a society or group for communication. The choice of the use of either of the languages at any one situation is usually in the hands of the bilingual. This is because a bilingual usually knows the advantage and the disadvantages that result in the choice of the languages that he or she uses. For example, for a bilingual immigrant in a foreign country, the use of the language of his ethnic group can give him a sense of companionship, and

even support, or assistance. In fact, according to Siguan, if a group of people use a common language between them, then the language used by them will act as:

- group identity marker,

- group loyalty marker,

- cultural identity marker,

- system of moral value marker,

- an indicator of the way of living, and

- a determiner to evaluate the conception of the world in which a bilingual views the world.

Collective bilingualism helps bilinguals to use a particular language as individual ethnic or group markers. Collective bilinguals can also strengthen their cultural identity, solidarity and loyalty through the common language that they know. The particular bilingual group can also share a common way of living, and convey specific moral values and connotation of life, through the use of a shared language. Collective bilingualism also helps a particular bilingual society or group to evaluate the immediate world in which they are living, and to make decisions. Many bilinguals also resort to translation in the course of their communication with other fellow bilinguals. This is because bilingual translation is an important tool that can be used to express specific meanings.

2.1.1   Translation and Bilingualism

The issue of bilingual translation is important to this study because of the presence of certain translated words in the participants' conversations. In fact, a bilingual is able to express the same meaning in any of the two languages that he knows, and he

can also translate the meaning of something in Language A into Language B. For example, a bilingual can use language B to continue a conversation that he had started in Language A. In other words, a bilingual can transfer the same meaning from one language into another language that he knows. A bilingual translates mainly because not all meanings can be expressed in another language. In fact, according to Siguan (1987) some of the meanings and words that need to be translated in a bilingual situation are:

- words which reflect specific cultural differences.
- unique meanings pertaining to a certain culture that cannot be translated into another language. For example, Siguan (1987) cites the example of the word "mother" which may have the same meaning in Language A and Language B. However, according to Siguan, the word "mother" will have "different affective connotations and meanings for people of different culture and with different mother tongue".

Thus, this explains why there is a need to address bilingual translation in the process of analysing recorded conversations and interviews pertaining to bilingualism. In fact, the analysis of bilingual translations will help reveal the pattern of linguistic behaviour of the bilingual group or community in study.

2.2   Origin of Bilingualism in Malaysia

According to Conrad (1993: 60), "although there are no accurate data it is clear that in the beginning of the nineteen century Malaya was fairly homogeneous in terms of racial structure". This is because although the Malays who lived in small villages along rivers and coastal areas spoke different dialects of Bahasa Melayu,

they were largely a monolingual society. The "orang asli" or aboriginal population lived in the interior and there were also a small group of Chinese (The Babas) population in Melaka, who spoke a Malay dialect as their language.

However this pattern changed with the economic development of Malaysia. For example, the Tamils were brought into Malaysia as indentured labourers to do the agricultural work of various sorts, especially on rubber estates. Other Indians came to Malaysia on their own will, and became shopkeepers and labourers in urban areas, and some even became clerks in government offices. This phenomenon added Tamil and Malayalam into the linguistic scenario in Malaysia (Turnbull, 1989: 176).

The colonial government in Malaya expected the labourers to go back home after their term. Some of the labourers left but many others stayed, and slowly they and their family became part of the Malaysian society. At that time, the Malay pidgin that is, "Bahasa Pasar" or "Bazaar Melayu" was used in the inter-ethnic communication. The introduction of bilingual education in Malaysia contributed to the bilingual and multilingual nature of the Chinese and Indians in Malaysia. After independence bilingualism became the tool of unity and national development in Malaysia. Bilingualism and development went hand in hand in Malaysia, and many bilingual Tamils were employed as clerks, and supervisors by the government.

Gaudart (1990) explains that many families became bilingual in English and one other language, and there are some families that have English as a first language. According to Gaudart, most of the Indian children learn their native languages and dialect at home. For example, a Telegu child learns Telegu from his parents at home, and a Malayalee child learns Malayalam from his parents at home. Similarly, Tamils

learn Tamil at home if the Tamil language is their L1, and also from Tamil schools, if they go to the Tamil primary schools.

Researchers like Asmah Haji Omar (1987) have also studied the use of different languages in the communication process of Malaysians. According to Asmah Haji Omar (ibid: 14) language communication in Malaysia can be viewed at two levels, that is, the "official level" and the "unofficial level". Since Bahasa Melayu is the National Language, it plays the role of the "official language" and is used in formal settings such as in government agencies and in official functions. English, Tamil, Chinese, and other languages, on the other hand, are used in specific situations, and according to the needs of the speakers. However, both Bahasa Melayu, and the other languages are also used in the in the family, and friendship domains.

Asmah (ibid: 17) also acknowledges, that those, who speak English particularly at the inter-group level showed variations such as code switching between English and their own mother tongue languages. Table 2.2 shows the language choice of Malaysians at the "unofficial" level.

Table 2.2: Language Choice at the Unofficial Level in Malaysia

Language	Language Use
Malay	Within the Malay group. Among the non-English educated people of various groups.
English and Mother Tongue	Among English-educated people at the intra- and inter-group level.
Mandarin	Among Chinese-educated Chinese.
Tamil	Among Tamil-educated Indians, and among first speakers of Tamil.
Mother-tongue	Within each specific group.
Neighbour's mother-tongue	Various groups.
Pidgins	All groups with pidgins of their choice.

Source: Asmah Haji Omar, (1987: 15). <u>National Language in Multilingual Societies</u>, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

According to Asmah (ibid: 17), the pattern of linguistic interaction in Table 2.2 is based on her interactions with the Malays as well as the non-Malays. English is used among English-educated people at both the intra-group and inter-group levels.

Many Tamil-educated people in Malaysia use Tamil in their daily communication. Tamil is also used by people who consider Tamil as their first language. Many educated Malaysian Tamils, due to their bilingual nature, tend to code switch in their communication. For example, many Malaysian Tamils tend to use Bahasa Melayu and Tamil in their English conversation with others.

Much research has also been done on the use of Bahasa Melayu and other lexical items in the conversations of Malaysian bilinguals. For example,

Balasubramaniam (1987: 198), explains that Bahasa Melayu words are used in Tamil for reasons such as necessity, that is, for mentioning of Malay place names, food names, and names of fruits, and vegetables. Another reason, cited by Balasubramaniam is that linguistic elements in Bahasa Melayu are easier express and also certain Bahasa Melayu do not have equivalents of the same strength in Tamil. In fact, Balasubramaniam also claims that in certain cases, Tamil bilinguals frequently prefer to use Bahasa Melayu words, even though there might be perfectly acceptable words in the Tamil language (ibid: 198). This is because many of the Bahasa Melayu words are easier express, and also many of the words are commonly used in the communication with other people such as the Malays and Chinese. Thus, the presence of linguistic phenomenon such as code switching, in the speech of Malaysian Tamils, is something that cannot be avoided because of the multi-linguistic scenario in Malaysia.

2.3   Code Switching

Many people who speak English in Malaysia, particularly at the inter-group level code switch between English and their own mother tongue (Asmah, 1987: 15). Thus, an analysis of the types of code switching will be done in this section, in order to understand better the element of code switching found in the communication of Malaysians, particularly Malaysian Tamils. In analysing the code switching phenomenon of the participants, this study takes into consideration the definition of code switching given by Gumperz (1972). Gumperz categorized code switching into two types:

- <u>Situational switching</u> - the speaker, setting, and topic of the speech situation determine situational switching. However, situational switching can also be prompted by the low language proficiency of the speaker, and to fill in the lexical gaps that exists between languages. Situational switching can also occur when the speaker wants to speak to a person with lower language proficiency to oneself.

- <u>Metaphorical Switching</u> - Metaphorical Switching is used in a "speech situation when citing or quoting a third party". Metaphorical Switching can also occur when one is "repeating a message in two codes for emphasis".

Gumperz (1977: 41) in his study, tape-recorded conversations of three different groups of people to find out the element of code switching in their conversations. The three groups studied by Gumperz were:

- A group of Austrian village farmers and labourers along the Austrian-Yugoslavian border.

- Some Indian college students from urban Delhi. All the students are native speakers of Hindi who have had all their secondary education in English. ·

- A group of Chicano college students, and urban professionals who were born in the United States and are largely of economically deprived backgrounds. These students and professionals speak Chicano Spanish at home to their elders, and English in many of their work, and friendship domain.

All three groups of participants in Gumperz's study claimed that they only use Slovenian, Hindi and Spanish as the "we" code suitable with kin and close friends. The participants claimed that they use German and English as "they" code, whereby

these languages are used with outsiders, or for formal discourse. However, Gumperz found out that code switching were used by these participants as:

- Quotations - The participants used code switching as "direct quotations" or as "reported speech".

- Addressee Specification - This kind of code switching serves to "direct the messages to one of several possible addresses".

- Interjection - Code switching also serves to "mark an interjection or as sentence fillers".

- Repetition - a message is usually repeated in the "other code", either literally or in somewhat "modified form". "Repetition" is also used by a bilingual speaker to "clarify what is said and to amplify, or emphasize a message".

- Message Qualification - Code switching also acts as "sentence or verb complements" or as "predicate following a corpula".

- Personalization versus Objectivization - Code switching that relates to things such as the "distinction between talk about action, and talk as action". Personalization versus Objectivization also relates to the "degree of speaker involvement in a conversation".

Gumperz also found out that among the Chicanos, Spanish statements were used in more personalized situations and that English was used in situations which reflect more distance, such as in official situations. In short, Spanish was used as the "we" code, and English as the "they" code. However, according to Gumperz, some of the classification of code switching such as personalization versus objectivization, are only rough labels. Thus, Gumperz stresses that it is more worthwhile to take a more semantic approach in the analysis of code switching. A more semantic approach in

the analysis of code switching will reveal how code switching constrains the process of conversational inference. However, Gumperz warns that in order to arrive at the ultimate semantic effect of code switching, a complex interpretive process is necessary.

Other researchers on bilingualism such as Pascasio (1978), used the model suggested by Gumperz (1977) to define code switching, conversational code switching, and borrowing, in a study on code switching in the business domain in Manila. According to Pascasio:

- <u>code switching</u> - is the "meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must posses as string forms according to the internal syntactic rules of two distinct systems of languages". For example:

  "O, di mabuti ... papupuntahin ko sila doon, tapos bumalik sila // if it's not yet their turn."

Note: (// refers to code switching from one language L1 to another language L2.)

- <u>conversational code switching</u> - conversational code switching as the "juxtaposition of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems, within the same exchange". Most frequently, the "alternation takes the form of two subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses a second language to reiterate his message or to reply to someone else's statement". The example below indicates this phenomenon:

  <u>Two friends greeting each other</u>:

  A: Hi, ano, kumusta ka!

  B: Hi, long time no see.

- <u>borrowing</u> - is the introduction of short frozen idiomatic phrases from one language into the other. The borrowed items are incorporated into the

grammatical system of the borrowing language. For example, according to Pascasio, "titser" is an English word borrowed into Pilipino, but is pronounced with Pilipino pronunciation.

Pascasio also limited her study to the business domain area whereby she recorded conversations from a hotel, a financial corporation, a dairy plant, a garment company, an insurance company, and the public relations department of San Minuel Corporation. The common topic in the business domain that were discussed in her study are:

- inquiries,

- application for loans,

- follow-ups, and

- business reports.

Similar to Gumperz's view, Pascasio's finding also show that code switching is used in the business domain in Manila as quotations, addressee specification, interjections, repetitions, as message qualification, as personalization versus objectivization whereby a speaker at times, distinguishes between opinion and fact by code switching, and as inquiry versus information. Pascasio found that code switching occurred at the word, phrase, clause, and discourse levels in the study. There were also elements of borrowing from the Pilipino language into English. The data of Pascasio's study indicate the use of code switching in various speech functions such as to:

- request things,

- advise the listener,

- give information,

- give directions,

- converse casually, and

- persuade others.

The study found out that English was used to explain technicalities such as in the application of loans, follow-ups, and in business reports. However, Pilipino was equally important in the business domains in the Philippines because business negotiation rely so much on communication strategies and the use of languages like English and Pilipino.

Similarly, Li Wei (1995) in a study on the Tyneside Chinese community in the North East of England analyses conversational code switching by speakers of different generations. Li Wei explains how an understanding of the meaning of bilingual code switching can be achieved, and how speakers with different abilities and attitudes to the languages communicate with each other in close and informal encounters. The subject were divided into three different groups as shown:

- the "first generation immigrants".

- sponsored immigrants, who are "either immediate kin of the first generation migrants or have personal connections with people already established in England".

- the "British born".

The findings show that the subject code switch to Chinese to mark preferences, such as acceptance or refusal of an offer, agreement or disagreement, and as politeness strategy, to reduce face threatening acts, to request for help, and as a

discourse strategy to accommodate and collaborate with each other. By code switching from one language to another, the speakers also indicate their awareness of trouble spots in their interactional process. Li Wei also concludes that the failure to code switch according to the contextual cues and conventions, accepted by the co-interlocuters, can lead to a potential threat to interpersonal relationships.

In addition, Sounkalo (1995) in a study regarding the issues of discontinued lexical development, lexical attrition and lexical deficiency in the speech of Mauritanian speakers who had their formal education in French, and had no formal instruction in their own native language, found that:

- code switching occurs because of the lexical deficiency in the native language.

- subjects with low proficiency code switched more than subjects with high native language fluency.

- younger subject code switched more and they also had lower vocabulary and fluency ratings than older subjects.

According to Saunkalo, factors that influence code switching are the topic, setting, and interlocutor, fluency, education, and age of the subject. The level of exposure to the native language, and the level of interaction with ones parents and family members also indicate the level of code switching from one language to another. Furthermore, the dominant language of a person, and the psychological satisfaction that the person derives by code switching are factors that influence the use of words, phrases and sentences in the code switching process.

Similarly, Canagarajah (1995), in a study on the function of code switching to Tamil in the teaching of English of twenty four secondary school teachers in Jaffna

(Sri Lanka), claims that the unintentional code switching in the class prepares the students for their sociolinguistic life outside.

According to Canagaraah (ibid), English is not spoken as English in Jaffna, because it is mixed with Tamil, and can be termed as a new code: "Englished Tamil". Canagarajah also claims that the linguistic and psychological, and social conflicts of the Jaffna Tamil community are reconciled through code switching activity. This is because code switching enables them to use English, and claim the values and entities it symbolizes, in a largely Tamil matrix or base, which actually assures the vernacular solidarity of the Jaffna Tamil society.

Among the functions of code switching in Canagarajah's study, that may influence the sociolinguistic function of the students outside the domain of education, are negotiating direction, requesting help, managing discipline, compliments, admonitions, pleading, explanation, and for unofficial interaction, and to explain cultural aspects. In fact, Canagarajah explains that Tamil is used for interactions that are considered personal, personalised, unofficial, or cultural. Tamil is also used in all other contexts because it emerges as informal, personal, spontaneous, involved, and homely (ibid: 190). Canagarajah's views are applicable to the linguistic scenario of the Malaysian Tamils because Tamil also emerges as an "informal, personal, spontaneous, involved, and homely" language of the participants of the study.

2.4 Malaysian English

Besides code switching in Bahasa Melayu, Tamil, Chinese, and in other languages that they know, Malaysians also tend to code switch to "Malaysian English" in their communication. A term used to refer to the Malaysian variety of

English is "Manglish". "Manglish" is the combination of the words "Malaysian" and "English". However, it does not mean that Malaysians speak "mangled" English. "Manglish" or Malaysian English is actually a distinct variety of the English language and has it's own collocations, syntax, vocabulary and idioms and metaphors. Malaysian English is full of lexical items, expressions, collocations, idioms, metaphor and various other forms of linguistic phenomena from the vernacular languages in Malaysia such as from Bahasa Melayu, Tamil, and Chinese.

According to Lee, (1998: 11), most Malaysians who have a command of English know how to speak proper English, and also know when, and how to switch to "Manglish". Malaysians usually speak "Manglish" in informal setting, and when one wishes to converse in a casual manner.

Many studies are done on the area of Malaysian English by researchers like Platt and Weber (1980), and Wong (1982), refuse to consider Malaysian English as "substandard". Hamida (1985) claims that Malaysian English is used nationally rather than regionally. Hamida also says that Malaysian English has emerged in a systematic and consistent manner in both the spoken and written forms. Platt and Weber (1980) define Malaysian English as a "continuum ranging from the basilect to the acrolect level". Wong (1982) and Chia (1985) equate the acrolectal form of Malaysian English, with the variety of English spoken by the English-medium educated people in Malaysia. However, the acrolectal level of English-educated people can easily switch to the non-acrolectal sub-varieties in informal speech situations, or when communicating with people who are in the basilectal level of mastery.of English.

According to Lee Wei (1990: 200), the vast majority of Malaysians have remade the English Language in the image of their mother tongue. This is because

changes in languages, particularly in non-native varieties, in a common phenomenon. Researchers like Kachru (1978) and Moag and Moag (1977) say that the process of nativisation and indigenisation brings permanent additions and modifications to a language, and this can reflect the cultural embedding as well. Thus, even an acrolect speaker with near native syntax, will betray himself in his spoken language by "colouring" his speech with the speech patterns of the local languages (Kee, 1984: 17).

Lee Wei (1990) in a study on 83 full-time students and 251 students from the National University of Malaysia (UKM) regarding the use of Malaysian English, says that the grammatical difference between Malaysian English, and Standard Malaysian English is still small. For example, Malaysians tent to use fillers like *"lah"*, *"what"*, *"one"*, and *"man"*. Malaysians also have a tendency to disregard the distinction between countable and uncountable nouns, non-agreement between subjects and verbs, and a simplification of question structures (Lee, ibid: 201). There is a lot of lexical borrowing from the local languages that are used widely as Malaysian English words. Bahasa Melayu words like *"jaga"* (guard), and *"ulu"* (backwater region) are used as Malaysian English. Words like *"towkay"* (rich man/boss) is borrowed from Chinese, and words like *dhobi"* (laundry) comes from the Tamil language. Lee also says that many of the borrowed words have also acquired meanings different from their origin language.

Lee's study also show that the Malaysians still reject Malaysian English in formal contexts. However, they use Malaysian English in their spoken form and this is especially so in the younger generation of Malaysians. Lee concludes by saying that the spoken form of Malaysian English is already the unofficially accepted model of English of the society in Malaysia. For example, Malaysians who speak English in

casual and informal domains such as in the domain of friendship, tend to use the Malaysian variety of English in their conversation for various reasons such as for solidarity and closeness. The next section discusses the various aspects related to the domain of language interaction

2.5   Domains of Language Interaction

The study has adopted the domains of Fishman as its model of study. Fishman (1952: 569), states " . . . domains refer to gross norm-related and institutionally recognized regularities". Some of the domains of interaction mentioned by Fishman are family, friendship, education, religious, worksphere, and government domains.

A domain can be a close or open network of interaction. Fishman (1952: 569) claims that a close network allows either the High or the Low variety of a certain language in use. On the other hand, on open network may use both the High as well as the Low variety of the particular language in use.

The next important aspect in a domain-related language situation is the role-relationship. For example, some of the role-relationships that can be studied in the domain of family are parent-child role-relationships, husband-wife role-relationships, sibling-sibling role-relationships, and others.

Another important aspect that should be taken into consideration about the domains of language interactions is the fact that domains are abstractions. Domains are only realizable in real concrete situations. There must be face-to-face interaction between the interlocutors and they must also be in the appropriate situations and role-relationships (Fishman, 1952: 569).

Time, is another aspect that is important in the role-relationships of language interaction in specific domains. For example, if a researcher intends to analyse the talk of a doctor-patient relationship, the setting should be the doctor's clinic and the appropriate time should be office hours.

2.5.1 Origins of the Concept of Domains of Language Behaviour

Fishman (1968: 80), cites that domains of language behaviour received attention in Germany in pre-World War II multilingual settings. German settlers came into contact with non-German speaking population in various contact settings and this brought gradual socio-cultural change processes. According to Fishman (ibid: 80) the concept of domains were first recommended by Schmidt-Rohr. Schmidt-Rohr (1933) selected nine domains of language behaviours that were used as study areas. They are:

i.   the family.

ii.   the school – subdivided into languages of instruction, subject of instruction, and languages of recess and entertainment.

iii.   literature.

iv.   the press.

v.   the military.

vi.   the church.

vii.   the courts.

viii. the playground and street domains.

ix.   the government bureaucracy (Verwaltung) – is a "social nexus which brings people together for a certain cluster of purposes, primarily within a certain set of status, role, and environment co-occurences".

Fishman and Cooper, and Ma (1971) in their study of the Puerto Rican community in New York city arrived at a list of five domains in which either Spanish or English was used. Observations and interviews were conducted in the domains of family, friendship, religion, employment, and education of the Puerto Rican community in New York city. These domains served as anchor points for the distinct value systems embodied in the use of Spanish as opposed to English. The study showed that each of these domains carried different expectations for using Spanish or English. The finding of the study showed that Spanish was mostly used in the family domain, followed by friendship, religion, employment, and education.

Other researchers like Blom and Gumperz (1966), and Greenfield (1968) also used Fishman's model of language study in their research regarding bilingualism and bilingual speakers. For example, after more than a year of participant observation and data gathering in the Puerto Rican speech community, Greenfield (ibid), tentatively labeled five domains as a means of collecting valid self-reporting data on normative views regarding the language choice of individuals. The domains are similar to Fishman's (1971) category of domains, and they are the family domain, friendship domain, religious domain, educational domain, and employment domain.

Barber (1952) studied the trilingual nature of the Yaqui Indians and formulated and divided domains into various levels such as the intimate level, informal level, formal level, and intergroup level. For example, the "formal" level of domain was found to coincide with the religious ceremonial activities of the Yaqui Indians. The "intergroup" domain consisted of economic and recreational activities as well as the interaction of the Yaqui Indians with the government authority and others. According to Fishman (1968) the various division of domains suggested by

Barber (1952), may enable researchers to study language choice of individuals and societies in multilingual settings, in new and fruitful ways.

2.6 Studies on Lexical Items

According to Anthonisamy (1997: 37), studies on lexical items in non-native environments are not a linguistic innovation but a social approval given to the local variety of English.

Gonzales (1981: 150-170) in a study on Philippines English found that lexical features are the most evident feature in Philippines English. Gonzales also explains that some types of the lexical items are noticeable because they are unusual and are irregular to a native speaker of English. Gonzales also feels that these lexical items should be pointed out so that the message may come across.

Similarly Augustine Simo Bobd (1994: 245-260) on a study on Cameroon English shows that there is difference in the lexical items used in the Cameroon English and British English. Due to these lexical differences, Cameroon English is not understood by many speakers of "other Englishes" including British English speakers as well. This is also because Cameroon English has its own ways of innovating its lexical items. For example, the process of word formation in Cameroon English has increased its divergence from British English. This phenomenon has made it even more difficult for speakers of "other Englishes" to understand Cameroon English. Thus, more detailed studies on the use of lexical items of Cameroon English will help in creating a better understanding of Cameroon English by speakers of "other Englishes".

Baskaran (1987) in a study of Malaysian English syntax explains that many Malaysian English terms are used in the English spoken by Malaysians. According

to Baskaran (ibid: 80) there is a need to use "local lexical items" or "Malaysian English" terms in the English conversations of Malaysians because:

"Although, on the whole, there is sameness of reference, the degree and nature of the sameness of meaning between the local lexeme and its English equivalent is variable - thus the need to maintain the local form."

Baskaran's study indicate, among others, that there is a need to use local terms in the English conversations of Malaysians in order to mention local words such as "gotong royong" (collective charity work), and to mention emotional and cultural words such as "kampung" (village). Culinary terms such as "satay" (barbecued meat) are also best expressed in their original language. Other words with semantic restriction such as "dadah" (drugs), even though can be translated, will not convey the exact connotation of "dadah". This is because, according to Baskaran, the word "dadah" is a cultural and uniquely Malaysian word that refers to the misuse of drugs that are usually brought illicitly into the country, and is misused mainly by youths. Baskaran's views can also be applied to the linguistic scenario of the Malaysian Tamils who speak English in the domain of friendship.

When a traditional society becomes modern, many changes will occur in the sociolinguistic situation of the society. These sociolinguistic changes can be traced from the use of lexical items from the languages used in the society. Mohammad Hassan (1995) in his study on the influence of Hebrew and English lexical items in the Arabic spoken by a group of people in Zalafa, in the north of Israel, found out among others, that:

- Hebrew and English lexical items are being used increasingly by the people of Zalafa due to modernization in the family units, food and drink, transport, clothing, and building systems.

- both the male and female participants use Hebrew and English lexical items in their Arabic conversations.

- the participants who are higher educated use more Hebrew and English lexical items in their conversations.

- people of all walks of life such as workers, professionals as well as housewives also use Hebrew and English lexical items in their Arabic conversations.

Mohammad Hassan's study indicates that the people who were interviewed in his study used lexical items from languages such as Hebrew and English for various purposes according to their age, education, and occupation. Mohammad Hassan's study also found out that Hebrew and English lexical items are also used:

- in intimate and casual every day speech at home,

- in informal situations such as when "no attention is directed to language",

- with close friends,

- with very close relatives, and

- with lovers.

This phenomenon indicates that an individual's contact with different languages will influence his language speaking and communication with other people. Lexical studies conducted on the languages spoken by a society or group can reveal interesting linguistic findings about the particular society or group. These findings

can be used to understand the linguistic behaviour and linguistic adaptation of the particular society or group.

2.7 Conclusion

This study will use Fishman's model of "domain" in analysing the English conversations of the participants. The issues related to bilingualism, and the various discussions related to code switching discussed in this chapter will be used in explaining the linguistic change, and the language adaptation of the participants of this study. Chapter III will discuss in detail, the methodology adopted for this study.