This chapter summarizes and concludes the outcome of the study in relation to its objectives. In the following sections, a summary of findings is presented. Subsequently, the research questions are addressed. Implications of the study to the related field as well as recommendations for future research are also included, all of which is significant in achieving the aims of the study.

5.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In Chapter 4, a summary of findings has been respectively discussed in section 4.1.6 for lexical features and section 4.2.7 for syntactic features. For a more comprehensive overview, a summary of the findings of lexical and syntactic features are presented in Table 7 and Table 8 respectively. Based on these findings, the research questions are addressed and some conclusions can be subsequently drawn, as follows:

RQ 1 What are the lexical and syntactic features of Malaysian English used in the data?

As thoroughly discussed in Chapter 4 and summarized in the two tables, a number of lexical as well as syntactic features of ME are significantly present in the data, all of which is identified and described based on the various characteristic features of ME.

RQ 2 To what extent does the movie portray the features of Malaysian English and thus contribute to the understanding of the nature of ME?

With a total of 462 instances of lexical items and 75 syntactic items identified and described as ME features, it can be said that the movie portrays a great extent of ME characteristics that make up the data of the study. This is shown not only in terms of the frequency of utterances but also in terms of their unique features that warrant description in comparison to the standard variety (SBE). Besides, the data also proves the claim that ME comprises a continuum, another unique characteristic of ME established by previous studies. With these features established, this study is potentially helpful in contributing to one's understanding of the nature of ME.

The author would like to re-stress, nonetheless, that the selected movie which makes up the data of this particular study is not a representation of the vast majority of Malaysian produced English movies, nor does it feature the way Malaysians speak English in totality. However, based on the background of the characters involved as well as the transcribed dialogue, it is gathered that the data is reliable as a tool in examining some of the unique features of ME that would be useful in the study of this variety of English. Since these features have mostly been identified in previous studies, the data gathered in this study acts to confirm the features and thus contributes to a better understanding of the nature of ME.

Table 7: Summary of Findings on ME lexical features

No.	Features	Sub-types/ Functions	Examples/ Page References	Frequency of Utterance	References/Framework
1	Local Language Referents	1.1 Cultural/ Culinary Terms	*tapao* *ong* *char kway teow* *teh tarik tongkat ali*	1 2 2 5	1. Baskaran (2005) 2. Ooi (2001) 3. Pillai & Fauziah (2006)
		1.2 Emotional/ Cultural Loading	*Datukship* *tauke* *kao tim* *kiasu*	2 3 3 1	
2	Standard English Lexicalization	2.1 Polysemic Variation	*Uncle*	2	
		2.2 Informalization	*Spend* *Blur* *Follow* *Fellow*	2 2 3 3	1. Collin's Cobuild Concordancer (2007) 2. Encarta World English Dictionary (2009) 3. Suad & Hajar (2008) 4. Wikipedia Dictionary (2009)
3	Particles	3.1 *ah* a. keeping two elocutors in contact b. pause c. consolation d. persuasion e. indicating annoyance f. indicating sadness g. grammatical tag, a hedge	Pages 59 -68	221	1. Gupta (1992) 2. Baskaran (2005) 3. Kwan-Terry (1978) 4. Low & Brown (2005)
		3.2 *lah/la* a. to point out the obvious b. to express disagreement/ disapproval/ contradiction c. to persuade d. to express annoyance e. to suggest/approve	Pages 68 – 70	113	1. Tay (1977) 2. Platt & Ho (1989) 3. Low & Brown (2005)

		3.3 *one*
		    a. a restrictive relative pronoun
		    b. a marker for definitive
			Pages 70 – 71	32	

		3.4 *what*
		    a. seeking for approval
		    b. expressing contradiction
			Pages 71 – 73	7	

		3.5 *hor*
		    a. eliciting agreement from
		       interlocutor
			Page 73	5	1. Ling & Adam (2005)
					2. Wong (1994)

		3.6 *lor*
		    a. expressing resignation about
		       someone's action/belief
			Page 73	3	

		3.7 *mah/ma*
		    a. stating the obvious
		    b. expressing belief/assertion
			Page 74	9	1. Wong (1994)
					2. Smith (1985)

		3.8 *meh*
		    a. expressing surprise
		    b. expressing indignation
			Page 75	3	1. Wong (1994)

4	Word Formation	4.1 Affixation	*Datukship*	2	1. Baskaran (2005)
		4.2 Compounding	*Handphone* *because why* *last time*	2 1 1	2. Collin's Cobuild Concordancer (2007) 3. Encarta World English Dictionary (2009) 4. Asmah (1997)
		4.3 Reduplication	Pages 80 – 82	5	1. Quirk et al (1985)
		4.4 Repetition	Pages 82 - 83	9	2. Heah (1989)
		4.5Conversion-Verbalization of Noun	*to recommendation* *can song* *to thanks*	3	1. Aitchison (1989) 2. Bauer (1983) 3. Bhat (1994) 4. Cannon (1985) 5. Quirk & Greenbaum (1987*)* 6. Quirk et al. (1997)
5	Exclamations	5.1 *Aiya*h	Page 86	5	1. Tsen (1994)
		5.2 *Aiyoh*	Page 87	7	
		5.3 *Wah*	Page 87	3	
			Total	**462**	

Table 8: Summary of Findings on ME syntactic features

No.	Categorizations/ Features	Sub-types/ Pragmatic Functions		Examples/ Page references	No. of instances	References/ Framework
1	Noun Phrase Structure – Pronoun Ellipsis	1.0	Description of TP, MT, and DT in subject omission	Pages 89 – 92	4	1. Leong, in Low & Deterding (2005) 2. Firbas (1992)
2	Clause Structure Interrogative Clause Variation	2.1	Wh-element in ME Sentence Final Position	Pages 92 – 93	3	1. Baskaran (2005)
		2.2	ME Interrogative Tag Varieties	a. *or not* b. *is it*	8 1	
3	Copula Ellipsis	3.1	Interrogatives	Page 98	4	1. Low & Brown (2005)
		3.2	Statements/Declarations	Page 98	9	1. Baskaran (2005) 2. Platt (1980) 3. Platt & Wong (1983) 4. Alsagoff (2001)
4	Absence of Operator 'do	4.1	Interrogatives	Pages 99 – 100	8	
5	Sentence Construction due to Localization of	4.1	Direct Sentence Translation from Malay to English	Page 100	6	1. Baskaran (2005) 2. Low & Brown (2005) 3. Bao (1995)
		4.2	ME Sentence Construction due to Localization of Phrases	a. *can or not* b. *no need*	1 2	
		4.3	ME Sentence Construction due to Localization of Words	a. *can* b. *cannot* c. *also* d. *got* e. *already*	6 3 10 5 5	
				Total	**75**	

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

In the field of linguistics, ME is generally recognized as a new variety of English, apart from other varieties within the concentric circles. As seen in this study as well as in the previous ones, its unique structure as compared to the standard form of English is prominently evident due to the process of lexical nativization as well as syntactic influence of the first language. As reviewed and reflected in Chapter 2, the recognition of the many varieties, one of which is ME, has significantly raised the issues of standard and standardization of language, as well as mistakes versus deviations. Acknowledgment of these issues may contribute to more critical and comprehensive linguistic investigations of ME within the scope of World Englishes in the future.

Whenever implications are discussed in the field of language teaching and learning, the issues of language policy, pedagogy and attitudes could not be left out. The author has intentionally taken the descriptive and qualitative approach in analyzing the ME features as relevant to the research objectives. It is thus not the aim of this study to propose specific pedagogical methods in ELT, nor measure the awareness and attitudes of the teachers and learners towards ME. The implications discussed henceforth are thus based mostly on her own discretion and awareness of ME as a variety of English, and own experience as an ESL educator.

In the ESL context of Malaysia, the issue of how to cope with the standard and non-standard forms of English in the language classrooms has been receiving continuous yet inconclusive responses. Samuel (1997) outlines two broad pedagogical responses that teachers can adopt

in relation to this issue: Pedagogy of Exclusion, and Pedagogy of Dialogue. The former explicitly forbids students from using or even discussing ME, or sanctions may be imposed when ME is used or even mentioned in class. Another approach is for teachers to remain silent about the existence of ME. The latter, on the other hand, "offers an invitation to students to critically examine different varieties of English in order to construct for themselves a sense of what is appropriate, and to articulate reasons for their choice" (Samuel, 1997: 31)

Reflecting on Samuel's (1997) categorization of pedagogical responses, the Pedagogy of Dialogue is highly proposed. However, it is crucial to realize that if not treated accordingly, inserting ME as an aid in the ESL classroom may cause confusion amongst the students, and dilemma on the part of the teacher. Thus, in an attempt to contemplate the place of ME as input into the ESL classroom, the teacher must beforehand understand the broader conceptual issues of varieties of English, as well as being able to distinguish the structural elements. Contrary to being perceived as a manifestation of learning errors or an approximation of the target language, such second language characteristics warrant a descriptive rather than a prescriptive approach.

The awareness of ME features in comparison to the standard English should be developed earlier in the lower secondary school level, regardless the students' level of proficiency. Having provided with the basis of 'correct' English in the primary school, the author believes that students are generally more mature and open to 'differences' when they enter the secondary level. Students, with close guidance from teachers, should be able to distinguish the differences in order to construct between themselves a sense of what is appropriate and

intelligible based on contexts and contact of communication. Sources of authentic spoken discourse (e.g. movies, chat rooms, talk shows, etc.), and written discourse (e.g. newspaper reports, a student's journal, cartoon strips, etc.) should be carefully selected and brought into the classroom for this purpose.

The teacher's role is indeed crucial here. Some might pessimistically think it is difficult for students of low proficiency to even spell a simple English word, let alone distinguish the differences between ME and the standard English features. However, catering to the different levels of students should be solely based upon the teacher's wisdom and 'manipulation'. Teachers have been doing this all the time: the national curriculum specifications have never been specific enough as to give the teacher detailed instructions on how to handle 40 individuals in a classroom. So if comparatively good students can handle syntactical differences between "You think this is what?" and "What do you think this is?", another group may start with distinguishing the lexis 'spend' as used in ME in comparison with the usage in standard English.

It is also important that learners are made aware of the presence of ME continuum that represents varieties within the variety itself. Based on that, they should realize that most of them do speak and write some level of ME in their daily use of English. Features of ME, regardless their position along the continuum, should not be labeled as a downright error or a total rejection. Instead, students should be told when and where to use them. For example, the particle 'lah' may not be appropriate in a formal, academic writing, but can be used in the spoken discourse between local speakers. In fact, 'lah' is generally recognized as uniquely Malaysian by the native speakers of English and foreigners in this country, thus understood

and tolerated by them. Again, intelligibility and appropriateness are crucial. Highly-educated ME speakers are generally able to switch along the line of the continuum to suit the context and their respondents. A lawyer like Soosay in the movie, for instance, uses acrolectal variety in the courtroom but casually switches to mesolectal and even basilectal when speaking among friends.

Whilst it is advisable that we encourage students to use the English as modeled by SBE, it is also crucial that we make them aware of the differences between SBE and ME. Simultaneously, they should be made aware that there is variety within ME itself, and that we should use the vocabulary appropriately according to whom we speak to and what context is involved. In any situation, intelligibility is a crucial factor. For a group of students of this level of proficiency, what we could do is help our students become autonomous learners and empower them to make decisions about the forms they want to use to express themselves, fully understanding what their choices mean. One thing we should recognize is that our students are not automata; they are human beings and they make choices - about what language to learn, how well to learn it, and what varieties of that language to learn. As stressed by Habibah Salleh (1997: 61), "ME is not to be condemned as an unacceptable variety simply because we do not encourage its use in the English language classroom. What would perhaps be more prudent is for the classroom to explore ME intelligently and turn it to its advantage for an interesting learning experience: an awareness of ME as a variety of English".

5.3   RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated earlier, a movie could be an addition to the many sources of ME corpus. Not being authentic in its nature does not mean that the language used in a movie could not be real. Being a popular medium of entertainment, a movie appeals to learners of all ages, thus would be attractive as a resource material to study language.

There have been opinions for and against the use of movies as an aid in the language classroom. As stated by Dündar & Simpson (2009), "the use and feasibility of feature films in the classroom have inevitably evoked controversy among classroom teachers who have a curriculum to follow and limited time to allocate. Some teachers still view movies as a medium of entertainment that has no place in a pedagogic setting, or, at most, as only outside classroom assignments or as a treat" (http://www.developingteachers.com).

This statement highlights the concern about the practicality of using movies as an aid in the classroom. A number of factors such as the duration of movie, time allocation, syllabus and technical requirements are crucial considerations in utilizing movies as an educational aid. Another related issue is the reliability of the movies themselves as data in representing the target language. The answer lies on the credibility of the scripts themselves in contributing towards the understanding of the target language.

Since the use of movies in language study is relatively new, it is hoped that in the future more movies are used as an instrument to analyze the features of ME, both in the level of school and higher institutions. If this study particularly focuses on lexis and syntax, future studies

could serve to analyze features of ME in other aspects of linguistics such as phonology and semantic, in a greater detail. It would also be interesting to make a comparative study between English as used in a Malaysian-produced movie with say, Singaporean- produced movie, in addition to the previous ones in sitcoms.

The limited number of locally produced English movies that meet the relevant criteria might hinder the growth of future studies. Thus, in short, more movies with authentic language as spoken by ME speakers should be produced by our film makers, contributing not only towards the growth of the film industry but also the cultural identity of the nation and linguistic diversity, as a whole.