CHAPTER 17

OVERVIEW OF MAIN CATEGORIES, SUB-CATEGORIES

AND TYPES

In this chapter, the researcher will summarize and discuss the main features and possible reasons for the usage of all the thirteen categories of non-native lexis, as well as the several sub-categories and types into which these have been sub-divided. She will also summarize all the common features of the lexico-semantic categories and sub-categories and comment on overlapping areas. Finally she will give some recommendations for further research.

The researcher has re-grouped all the main categories under two large groups, namely main categories which have been sub-divided into formal sub-categories, main categories which have been sub-divided into types. Only one main category has not been sub-divided at all, namely `Register Mixing' .

17.1 Main Categories sub-divided into Sub-categories

17.1.1 Lexico-semantic Reduplication
17.1.2 Lexico-semantic Redundancy
17.1.3 Non-native Idioms

17.2 Main Categories sub-divided into Types

17.2.1 Similar Expression Substitution
17.2.2 Semantic Shift
17.2.3 Collocational Variation
17.2.4 Derivational Variation
17.2.5 Variation of Reciprocals
17.2.6 Local Compound Coinages
17.2.7 Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue
17.2.8 Ellipsis
17.2.9 Semantic Extension

Table 17.1 below shows the quantitative analysis of all the main categories which have been sub-divided into sub-categories.

Table 17.1

Main Categories Sub-divided into Sub-categories

Main Category 1: Lexico-semantic Reduplication			
Sub-categories		Numbers	Percentages
1.1 Juxtaposed Reduplication	-	15	21%
1.2 Non-juxtaposed Reduplication	-	29	41%
1.3 Root-Sound Reduplication	-	16	23%
1.4 Lexical Double Effects	-	11	15%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis		176	100%

Main Category 2: Lexico-semantic Redundancy			
Sub-categories		Numbers	Percentages
2.1 Redundant Synonyms	-	43	51%
2.2 Redundant Superordinates	-	15	18%
2.3 Redundant Expressions	-	26	26%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis		84	100%

Main Category 3: Non-native Idioms			
Sub-categories		Numbers	Percentages
3.1 Non-native Metaphors	-	36	34.0%
3.2 Local Idioms	-	8	7.5%
3.3 Adapted Idioms	-	62	58.5%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis		106	100%

17.1 Main Categories sub-divided into Sub-categories

From Table 17.1 it can be seen that in Lexico-semantic Reduplication, `Non-juxtaposed Reduplication' is the largest sub-category, consisting of 41% of the total number, while `Juxtaposed Reduplication' and `Root-Sound Reduplication' comprise smaller but equally balanced percentages: 21% and 23% respectively. `Lexical Double Effects' has the smallest percentage, namely

15%. The sub-categorization of Lexico-semantic Reduplication into 4 sub-categories has revealed an important observation. Previous researchers of non-native Englishes such as Platt and Weber(1980), Pandharipande(1987), Adegjiba(1989) and Anthonysamy(1997) only gave examples of `Juxtaposed Reduplication' when they referred to `Ellipsis'. However, in the present researcher's corpus, this sub-category only consists of 21% of the total number of non-native lexis under Lexico-semantic Reduplication. The largest sub-category appears to be Non-juxtaposed Reduplication, and this has not been identified by previous researchers. It consists of 41% of the total number of non-native lexis in this category. Hence, if the Lexico-semantic Reduplication in this study is representative of the pattern of usage among ME users, one can assume that ME users are twice as likely to use Non-juxtaposed Reduplication than Juxtaposed Reduplication.

In the case of Non-native Idioms, `Adapted Idioms' form the largest sub-category, namely 58.5% of the total. `Non-native Metaphors' and `Local Idioms' form smaller sub-categories. This large percentage as well as the fact that there are six types of adaptations observed in the data, proves the point that ME users are more likely to adapt native English idioms than to translate idioms or expressions from vernacular languages into English or to create new ones.

17.2. Main Category 4 Subdivided into Types (1)

Table 17.2 on the next page shows the quantitative analysis of possible reasons for `Similar Expression Substitution. Since the numbers are too small, the researcher has not changed them to percentages. However, it is obvious at a glance, that the most frequent tendency is for Lexical Substitution.

Table 17.2

Main Category 4 Sub-divided into Types (1)

Main Category 4: Similar Expression Substitution	
Types	Numbers
4.1 Lexical Redundancy	6
4.2 Lexical Substitution	13
4.3 Preposition Substitution	5
4.4 Lexical Reversal	4
4.5 Semantic Distortion	4
	32(total no. Is 61)

Table 17.3 highlights the breakdown of types under `Semantic Shift' and

`Collcational Variation'.

Table 17.3

Main Category 5 and 6 sub-divided into Types(2)

Main Category 5: Semantic Shift			
Types		Numbers	Percentages
5.1 Denotative Semantic Shift	-	10	50%
5.2 Connotative Semantic Shift	-	10	50%
Total No. Of Non-Native Lexis	-	20	100%
Main Category 6: Collocational Variation			
Types		Numbers	Percentages
Collocational Variation involving			
6.1 Adjective and Abstract Noun	-	23	14.1%
6.2 Adjective and Concrete Noun	-	16	9.9%
6.3 Verb and Abstract Noun	-	75	46.3%
6.4 Verb and Concrete Noun	-	33	20.3%
6.5 Verb and Adverb	-	6	3.7%
6.6 Adverb and Adjective	-	5	3.2%
6.7 Connotational Variation in Metaphor Usage	-	4	2.5%
Total No. Of Non-Native Lexis	-	162	100.0%

17.3 Main Categories sub-divided into Types(2)

Where Semantic Shift is concerned, the findings of this study do not confirm

the observations of other researchers such as Dubey(1991) that when the

user of English tries to meet the requirements of Indian communication, he or she is faced with socio-cultural and linguistic constraints. On the other hand, the researcher believes that an important function of Semantic Shift is to adapt the English language to the socio-cultural realities of Malaysian society in order for `English-educated' Malaysians to express their cultural concepts more efficiently in expressions or words that are easily understood by all of them. For example, in this study it was seen that native English words undergo Semantic Shift and acquire a different connotative sense in order to convey the socio-cultural values of Malaysian Indian society. An example of a change from a negative to a positive sense is in the word `pride' in `my pride as a young woman.' Two more examples of this connotative change was seen in the data under Semantic Extension. The first example was the word `member' which has a neutral connotation in native English, but has acquired a positive connotation of having close friends in ME. This tendency has also been interpreted as evidence of `Semantic Transfer' in the section entitled `Lexico-semantic Tendencies of ME Users'.

Of all the lexico-semantic categories, Collocational Variation takes the lion's share - it consists of 162 out of the 779 examples of non-native lexis or 20.8% of the non-native lexis (see Table 17.7). Among the 7 types of Collocational Variation which have been identified by the researcher, `Collocational Variation involving verb and abstract noun' comprises the largest percentage of Collocational Variation, namely 46.3%. An example is seen in the following sentence: `As you know, everyone is **searching** for health.'

In this example the collocation of `searching for health' is non-native. In a native sense one does not search for health but everyone wants to be healthy.

356

The second-largest type of Collocational Variation which consists of 20.3% is `Collocational Variation involving between verb and concrete noun'. An example of this is: `attending a phone call.'

These two types of Collocational Variation show that ME users often use `concrete' verbs for abstract nouns, and `abstract' verbs for concrete nouns.

Table 17.4 below shows the quantitative analysis of Derivational Variation, Variation of Reciprocals and Local Compound Coinages.

Table 17.4

Main Categories Sub-divided into Types (3)

Main Category 7: Derivational Variation		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
7.1 Non-native Abstract Nouns :	18	25.7
7.2 Non-native Personal Nouns :	5	7.2
7.3 Non-native Adjectives :	9	12.9
7.4 Non-native Superlatives :	2	2.9
7.5 Non-native Adverbs :	9	12.9
7.6 Non-native Verb Creations :	26	37.0
7.7 Non-native Discourse Marker :	1	1.4
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis -	70	100%

Main Category 8: Variation Reciprocals		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
8.1 Antonym Substitutes	8	53.3%
8.2 Reversal of Word Order	7	46.6%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis	15	100.0%

Main Category 9: Local Compound Coinages		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
9.1 Adjective-Noun	12	41.4%
9.2 Noun-Noun	7	24.1%
9.3 Preposition-Noun	5	17.2%
9.4 Verb-Noun	4	13.8%
9.5 Verb-Verb	1	3.5%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis :	29	100.0%

17.4 Main Categories sub-divided into Types(3)

From Table 17.4 it can be seen that of all the types of Derivational Variation, `Non-native Verb Creations' form the largest group, namely 37% of the total number of examples. This refers to the creation of verbs from nouns or prepositions which is never converted in this way in native usage, such as `bicycling', `paining' or `onning'. These constitute new non-native creations developed from non-native affixation of native root forms.

The second largest type of Derivational Variation which constitutes 25.7% of the total is `Non-native Abstract Nouns' which is basically the formation of abstract nouns through non-native derivations. Some of these are variant forms of native derivatives, such as `permanency' (permanence), `pitiness'(pity) and `recognization' (recognition).

Others are new creations such as `stickability', `fellowshipping', `toastmastering' and `moisturization'. The second type seems to reflect the ME need to create words which meet the needs of certain specific groups of people.

The next category, `Variation of Reciprocals' has been analyzed into two types, namely `Antonym Substitutes' and `Reversal of Word Order'. The first type involves the use of antonym substitutes such as `borrow' instead of `lend', `bring' instead of `take' and `find' instead of `search for'. The second type involves reversal of word order at the sentence level such as can be seen in the following example:

`Other activities **must entertain** the students.'
(The students must be entertained by other activities)

The first type, namely `Antonym Substitutes' seems to be the more easily detectable type of Variation of Reciprocals and there are altogether 8 examples of this in the study. The second type, namely `Reversal of Word Order' at the sentence level, is still a prevalent part of ME speech as there were 7 examples of these in the data.

Where Local Compound Coinages are concerned Table 17.4 shows that there are five types based on the word class of the component words. The largest type of Local Compound Coinages is the `Adjective-Noun' type such as `Handicapped Home' and it consists of 12 out of 29 or 41.4% of the total number of Local Compound Coinages. This type is probably the easiest to coin for most ME speakers as Malaysians have a tendency to take verbal short-cuts — they often avoid longer phrases by linking words together, such as `jobless rate', `Handicapped home' and `Sick Board'.

The `Noun-Noun' type is the second largest number, and it consists of 7 out of 29 or 24.1% of the total number. The `Preposition-Noun' type consists of 5 out of 29 or 17.2% while the `Verb-Noun' type consists of 4 out of 29 or 13.8% of the total number. The `Verb-Verb' type consists of only 1 out of 29 or 3.5% of the total number.

Table 17.5 on the next page shows two more Lexico-semantic categories which have been analyzed into types, namely Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue and Ellipsis.

Table 17.5

Main Categories Sub-divided into Types (4)

Main Category 10: Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
10.1 Semantic Underdifferentiation	6	28.6%
10.2 Omission of Words	2	9.5%
10.3 Direct Translation of Idioms	13	61.9%
Total No. of Non-Native Lexis :	21	100.0%

Main Category 11: Ellipsis		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
Word Omission from Multi-word Units	11	15.2
Omission of Prep. From Phrasal Verbs	7	9.6
Omission of Preposition	19	26.0
Omission of Units of Measurement	7	9.6
Omission of Pronouns	5	6.8
Omission of Verb	12	16.4
Omission of Noun after Adjective	8	11.0
Omission of Part of Compound Word	2	2.7
Omiss. Of Object after Transitive Verb	2	2.7
Total No. Of Non-Native Lexis :	73	100.0

17.5   Main Categories sub-divided into Types(4)

Table 17.5 shows that there are three types of non-native usage under this category. `Semantic Underdifferentiation' (Heah, 1989) involves direct translations of vernacular prepositions, adjectives, adverbs or verbs by non-native speakers due to the fact that the vernacular languages use more limited lexical terms for the same entity compared to the English language.

An example of a direct translation of a preposition is `Look **down** the TV' (`di bawah') in a situation where a native speaker would have used the preposition `under'.

There are altogether 6 examples of this type of Semantic Transfer from

360

Mothertongue in the data. The second type of Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue involves the omission of certain words such as prepositions, the translations of which would have been considered redundant in the vernacular languages. An example of this is given in the sentence below while the native equivalent is given in brackets:

`Derek, don't **play water.**'(play **with/in** water)

The third type of Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue is the direct translation of idiomatic expressions from Bahasa or other vernacular languages into English. An example of this is shown below:

`**catching two fish with one hook.**'(`Menangkap dua ekor ikan dengan satu matakail')

Table 17.6 below shows Semantic Extension which has been subdivided into types:

Table 17.6

Main Categories Sub-divided into Types

Main Category 12: Semantic Extension		
Types	Numbers	Percentages
12.1 Denotative Semantic Extension	40	69
12.2 Connotative Semantic Extension	18	31
Total No. Of Non-Native Lexis	58	100.0%

17.6 Main Category Sub-divided(5)

The above table shows the two types of Semantic Extension. There seems to be a similarity in this sub-division with `Semantic Shift' as both main categories involve the usage of native terms with new denotative and connotative senses. In the case of Semantic Shift, the old sense is abandoned, but in the case of

361

Semantic Extension the old sense remains and is joined by new senses.

The only category which has not been sub-divided in this study is Register Mixing as the sample consists of only 8 items. Most of the examples of Register Mixing in the present study involve the use of informal English for formal contexts.

There are certain verbs which are often used in informal native conversation which are also used by Malaysians in formal writing thus rendering them non-native in usage. An example of this is `looked at' which was seen in a Masters thesis, and `say' and `heard from' which were seen in Business news articles in the newspapers.

Table 17.7 below shows the total numbers and percentages of all the main categories in this study, and the discussion which follows highlights the predominant non-native patterns of usage of ME users which have been deduced from all the data analyzed in this study.

Table 17.7

Total Numbers and Percentages of Main Categories

Main Category	Total number	Percentage
1. Lexico-semantic Reduplication	71	9.1
2. Lexico-semantic Redundancy	84	10.8
3. Similar Expression Substitution	61	7.8
4. Non-native Idioms	109	14.0
5. Semantic Shift	20	2.5
6. Collocational Variation	162	20.7
7. Derivational Variation	70	9.0
8. Variation of Reciprocals	15	2.0
9. Local Compound Coinages	29	3.7
10. Semantic Transfer from MT	21	2.7
11. Ellipsis	73	9.3
12. Semantic Extension	58	7.4
13. Register Mixing	8	1.0
Total No. of Non-native Lexis:	**781**	**100.0**

17.7 Non-native Patterns of Usage of ME Users

17.7.1 Substitution

Table 17.7 reveals the most common tendency of ME users is substitution, namely to use non-native substitutes for native words. One category which illustrates this at the syntactic level is Collocational Variation which is the largest category in this study as it comprises 20.7% or 162 out of the total figure of 781 examples of non-native lexis.

Another category which illustrates this tendency for substitution at the syntactic level is Similar Expression Substitution which comprises 7.8% of the total figure. Elements of substitution are also found in smaller categories such as 'Register Mixing' and 'Variation of Reciprocals'.

17.7.2 Semantic Transfer

Another predominant tendency of ME users is for semantic transfer. This is the use of English words or expressions to communicate typically Malaysian values, beliefs activities and lifestyle habits. This tendency is exemplified in several categories, namely Non-native Idioms, Local Compound Coinages, Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue, Semantic Extension and Semantic Shift.

Non-native Idioms constitutes the third largest category of non-native lexis and comprises 109 out of the 781 examples or 14.0% of the corpus. Within Non-native Idioms, there is a sub-category called 'Local Idioms' in which the English language is a medium for the expression of attitudes and lifestyle habits of Malaysians. Examples which illustrate this are 'No money no talk' and 'Long time no see' both of which may be direct translations from a Chinese dialect.

363

In addition, some of the non-native lexis under Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue and Local Compound Coinages also reveal aspects of semantic transfer in ME. The combined percentages of all these categories is 20.4% of the total or 159 examples out of 781 examples of non-native lexis.

In the case of Semantic Extensions ME users add new meanings which are polysemous or metaphorical extensions of the native meanings of words in English. Sometimes the connotative sense is changed as in the case of 'member' which has a neutral connotation in native English, but has acquired a positive sense of group acceptance in the ME context. Such changes in connotation are also seen in Semantic Shift in the expression 'pride as a young woman' in which the word 'pride' has a positive connotation in that particular ME usage while it has a negative connotation in its native counterpart.

17.7.3 Language Transfer

Another tendency of ME users is language transfer which is the tendency to transfer certain linguistic patterns of Bahasa Malaysia or the vernacular languages to ME. This is seen in one aspect of Lexico-semantic Reduplication namely 'Juxtaposed Reduplication', which could be the influence of Bahasa as in BM 'Juxtaposed Reduplication' has the grammatical function of conveying plurality such as 'orang-orang'(people).In the case of ME the reduplication could be conveying a sense of abundance such as the expression 'many many' heard during a Sai Baba seminar:

'Actually we can hear him in **many many** voices.'

A sub-category which exemplifies language transfer is 'Redundant Superordinates' under Lexico-semantic Redundancy which consists of many examples of Language Transfer such as 'red colour' and 'Year 2002' which is

language transfer from Malaysian languages such as Tamil and Bahasa, in which such superordinate usage is commonplace.

The tendency for omission of words or expressions is another aspect of language transfer. This is clearly evident in Ellipsis which consists of 73 out of 781 or 9.3% of the total number of examples of non-native lexis. Aspects of omission are also seen in the sub-category `Adapted Idioms' under Non-native Idioms in which some of the adaptations of native idioms reveal a tendency to omit certain word classes such as prepositions.

17.7.4 Language Creativity

ME users also seem to be a very creative group of language users. Firstly, they reveal a certain degree of morphological creativity as shown in the large number of examples of Derivational Variation, namely 70 which represent 9.0% of the total. Another feature of the creativity of ME users is revealed in the large number of examples of Lexico-semantic Reduplication(71) and Lexico-semantic Redundancy (84) which represent 9.1% and 10.8% respectively, of the 781 examples of non-native lexis in this study.

Other examples of language creativity are seen in Non-native Idioms, Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue and Local Compound Coinages.

Based on the above discussion, Table 17.8 on the next page shows the four non-native patterns of usage reflected in Malaysian English lexis and the lexico-semantic categories which may illustrate these patterns of usage. Some of these categories can be attributed to more than one pattern of usage, for example `Non-native Idioms' can be attributed to both `Semantic Transfer' and `Language Creativity', but in the table on the next page it has only been attributed to `Semantic Transfer':

Table 17.8

Non-native Patterns of Usage of ME Users

Non-native Patterns of Usage	Lexico-semantic Categories	Percentages
a. Substitution	1.Collocational Variation	20.3%
	2.Lexico-semantic Substitution	14.2%
Total % for Substitution		**34.5%**
b. Semantic Transfer	3.Non-native Idioms	12.2%
	4.Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue	2.4%
	5.Semantic Extension	6.7%
	6.Semantic Shift	2.3%
	7.Local Compound Coinages	3.3%
Total % for Semantic Transfer		**26.9%**
c. Language Transfer	8. Lexico-semantic Reduplication	8.2%
	9. Lexico-semantic Redundancy	9.7%
	10. Ellipsis	8.4%
Total % for Language Transfer		**26.3%**
d. Language Creativity	11. Derivational Variation	9.7%
	12. Variation of Reciprocals	1.7%
	13. Register Mixing	0.9%
Total % for Language Creativity		**12.3%**

In Table 17.9 below shows the total percentages of all four non-native patterns

of usage:

Table 17.9

Total Percentages of Non-native Patterns of Usage

Non-native Patterns of Usage	Percentages
Substitution	34.5%
Semantic Transfer	26.9%
Language Transfer	26.3%
Language Creativity	12.3%
Total % of Non-native Patterns of Usage	100%

From Table 17.9 it can be observed that `Substitution' is the most common non-

native pattern of usage, as it accounts for 34.5% of all the data and this

comprises large categories such as `Collocational Variation' and Similar Expression Substitution. `Semantic Transfer' and `Language Transfer' are 26.9% and 26.3% respectively, thus equally prominent as non-native patterns of usage. `Language Creativity' seems to play a smaller role in terms of patterns of usage.

In the following section, the researcher will briefly summarize the similarities and differences among the 13 main categories of non-native variation as well as among some of the sub-categories.

17.8 Similarities and Differences between the Lexico-semantic Categories

The main similarity between Lexico-semantic Redundancy and Lexico-semantic Reduplication is that both involve the element of repetition. However, the main difference is that while in the case of Lexico-semantic Reduplication the repetition is at the phonological and syntactic levels, in Lexico-semantic Redundancy it is at the semantic and syntactic levels.

The main similarity between Lexico-semantic Redundancy and Similar Expression Substitution is that both involve the usage of variant forms of words or expressions. However, the main difference between Lexico-semantic Redundancy and Similar Expression Substitution is that in the case of the former, the redundancy or repetition is apparent at first glance while in the case of the latter, a non-native substitution has taken place, namely the usage of an expression which does not collocate with the rest of the sentence, from a native viewpoint.

Hence, there are similarities between `Similar Expression Substitution' and `Collocational Variation' as well, especially in the case of `Similar Expression

Substitution. However, there is a similarity. Most of the examples of Similar Expression Substitution have the variation at the syntactic, semantic or phonological levels just as in the case of Collocational Variation.

From the above discussion, it may be deduced that Lexico-semantic Reduplication, Lexico-semantic Redundancy, Similar Expression Substitution, Collocational Variation, Variation of Reciprocals and Register Mixing may be grouped together as these categories seem to involve similar elements such as repetition, addition and substitution.

In the same way, one can also group together Semantic Shift and Semantic Extension as these categories involve the concept of `Meaning Changes' of native vocabulary which was highlighted by Platt and Weber(1980). Both Semantic Shift and Semantic Extension involve changes in connotative or denotative meanings.

The third large grouping is that of Non-native Idioms, Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue and Local Compound Coinages which involve elements of language transfer to convey the socio-cultural aspects of Malaysian society in the English used. Lastly, Ellipsis involves the element of omission which is also reflected in some of the examples of Non-native Idioms and Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue.

17.9   Recommmendations for Further Research

There could also be further research done on any of the 13 lexico-semantic categories used in this study as well as the four patterns of usage observed by the researcher, namely `Substitution', `Semantic Transfer', `Language Transfer' and `Language Creativity'.

Substitution. However, there is a similarity. Most of the examples of Similar Expression Substitution have the variation at the syntactic, semantic or phonological levels just as in the case of Collocational Variation.

From the above discussion, it may be deduced that Lexico-semantic Reduplication, Lexico-semantic Redundancy, Similar Expression Substitution, Collocational Variation, Variation of Reciprocals and Register Mixing may be grouped together as these categories seem to involve similar elements such as repetition, addition and substitution.

In the same way, one can also group together Semantic Shift and Semantic Extension as these categories involve the concept of `Meaning Changes' of native vocabulary which was highlighted by Platt and Weber(1980). Both Semantic Shift and Semantic Extension involve changes in connotative or denotative meanings.

The third large grouping is that of Non-native Idioms, Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue and Local Compound Coinages which involve elements of language transfer to convey the socio-cultural aspects of Malaysian society in the English used. Lastly, Ellipsis involves the element of omission which is also reflected in some of the examples of Non-native Idioms and Semantic Transfer from Mothertongue.

17.9 Recommendations for Further Research

There could also be further research done on any of the 13 lexico-semantic categories used in this study as well as the four patterns of usage observed by the researcher, namely `Substitution', `Semantic Transfer', `Language Transfer' and `Language Creativity'.

17.10 Universal Categories Across the Globe

The findings of the various New English researchers have revealed that all the non-native lexico-semantic and grammatical features of the New Englishes can be categorized according to their forms, functions or origins into common categories.

Later researchers have adapted some of the categories of the earlier researchers, such as the adaptation of Adegjiba's (1989) categories by Anthonysamy (1997) and the categories of Platt et.al. (1980) by Baskaran (1987), Yen(1990), Dubey(1991) and Pandharipande(1989).

This further supports the stand by researchers such as Platt et.al. that there can be common classification of the non-native lexis in the New Englishes. Though the background languages may differ, the processes reflected in the non-native Englishes appear to be similar, namely processes such as repetition, substitution, reversal and omission.. One example of repetition is the use of repetition or Lexico-Semantic Reduplication such as `hot hot'. Earlier researchers have already established that some common lexical items are used in the non-native Englishes spoken in certain Commonwealth nations such as Singapore, Nigeria and India. Examples of these are `compound', `outstation' and `stay'.

The reason for this could be that the speech community in each of these countries must have been taught by an earlier generation of native English teachers. They taught the same lexical items that were current at that time, to several non-native communities at the same time.

Finally, another reason for the apparent linguistic similarities are the socio-cultural similarities that exist in all these countries. One socio-cultural factor is

the concept of filial piety which has contributed to a certain degree of respect accorded to elders in all these nations. This has led to the respectful ways of addressing older members of the communities, with appropriate kinship terms such as 'mother', 'father', 'auntie', 'uncle', 'brother' or 'sister'.

There seems to be a common ground whereby in all these Asian or African countries, members of the same community are considered 'family' and elders are not addressed by name as in the West but are addressed with more appropriate kinship terms depending upon the speaker-listener age difference.

17.11 The Contribution of this Study

It is hoped that this study will contribute in a meaningful way to the global library of research on non-native varieties of English. It attempts to give a greater degree of depth and substance to the meaning of 'Malaysian English lexis' as it is a very extensive piece of research into non-native lexis present in Malaysian English.

This study has explored 13 main categories of lexico-semantic variation in the lexis of ME users, three of which have been further sub-categorized into a total of 10 sub-categories, and nine of which have been further analyzed into a total of 42 types. This study has also suggested four main patterns of usage of non-native lexis namely, 'Substitution', 'Semantic transfer', 'Language transfer' and 'Language creativity'.