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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study of language borrowing process of English in Patani-Malay. The objectives of this study are to examine the phonological, morphological, and semantic changes of English lexical items used in Patani-Malay in order to identify their types of borrowing; as well as to sort and allocate these English lexical items into their respective semantic fields.

The corpus of English lexical items used in this study was collected from various Patani-Malay printed media written in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts. They were analysed based on the works of Haugen (1950), Heah (1989), and Haspelmath & Tadmor (2009).

The findings reveal that the data can be classified into various borrowing types under three borrowing processes i.e. Importation, Substitution, and Native Creation. In terms of the classification of the data into semantic fields, the data occur most in the semantic field of Modern World. It is followed by the semantic fields of Social and Political Relations, and Cognition.
ABSTRAK

Disertasi ini merupakan satu kajian tentang proses peminjaman bahasa Inggeris dalam dialek Melayu-Patani. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk menyelidik pertukaran dari segi fonologi, morfologi, dan semantik yang berlaku bagi kata-kata pinjaman Inggeris dalam dialek Melayu-Patani untuk mengenalpasti jenis dan medan makna kata-kata pinjaman.


Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa data boleh dibahagikan kepada pelbagai jenis pinjaman di bawah tiga proses pinjaman iaitu pengimportan, penggantian, dan perekaan natif. Dari segi klasifikasi medan makna, ‘Dunia Moden’ adalah medan makna yang mempunyai jumlah kata pinjaman yang terbesar, diikuti dengan medan makna ‘Sosial dan Perhubungan Politik’ dan ‘Kognisi’.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Language is a human genetic identity which is employed as a tool of communication among members of a society. It is not only the most significant device of human communication, but also a system that can reflect ideas, thoughts, values, norms, and history of speakers in a particular society. Language is also a tool that links people from different nations by means of their cultural contact. There are numerous languages used throughout the world. Linguists have classified them into certain language families according to their origins.

Whenever people from different societies are in contact, their political, economic, and cultural values are shared and exchanged, including their respective languages. Apart from the contact between speakers from distinct speech communities, languages can also be transmitted via language contact within a multicultural society where different groups of people who speak different languages coexist resulting in the development of language. People borrow words freely from foreign languages that they are in contact with, in a direct or indirect manner. The borrowed words are termed ‘borrowings’ or ‘loanwords’ (Ruikuo, 2005: 7).

Thailand is a multilingual country that hosts many languages of various minority groups. It is a country where its citizens comprise people of different ethnic backgrounds e.g. Thai, Chinese, Malay, Indian, Pathan, Mon, Khmer, and many groups of hill tribe people. Each ethnic group has its own identity and language. They use Standard-Thai as the official language. Standard-Thai is used as the medium
of instruction in Thai compulsory education and in other social domains. Other minority languages such as Chinese dialects, Malay dialects, Urdu, Hindi, Pashto, Mon, Khmer, and tribal languages are used widely by their native speakers. Wongsothorn et al. (1996) stated, “Officially there are no second languages in Thailand. In practice, two commonly used foreign languages that almost attain the status of second languages in certain parts of the country are Pattani Malay and Chinese (Tae Chiu)” (p. 95).

Patani-Malay (henceforth PM) is a dialect of Malay language which is categorised under the Austronesian language family. It is used in PM speech community of southern border provinces of Thailand, namely Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and some parts of Songkhla. The PM speech community, where the Malay-Muslim ethnic group is the dominant one (approximately 80-85 percent of the total population), utilises PM in every domain either publicly or privately. PM speakers call their dialect as baso nayu or bahaso nayu which means Malay language. They see themselves as orae nayu which means Malay-Muslim people who kecek nayu or speak the local Malay dialect instead of orae siye or Thai-Buddhists who are the minorities in the area (Yusuf, 2009: 45). The word nayu is a shortened form of the word Melayu or Malay.

Apart from the PM speech community, Malay language is also used in other provinces in southern Thailand such as Satun, Patthalung, Nakhon Sri Thammarat, Surat Thani, Trang, Krabi, and Phuket. Moreover, a Malay dialect called ‘Bangkok-Malay’ (Umaiayah, 2003a) is used in some provinces of central Thailand, namely Bangkok, Chachoengsao, Ayutthaya, Nakhon Nayok, Prathumthani, and Nonthaburi. The speakers are descendants of captives of the Patani-Siam wars in the 18th century (Umaiayah, 2003a: 16-19) and were mainly from (what are today known as)
the provinces of Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and Songkhla in southern Thailand and the states of Kelantan, Kedah, Perlis, and Penang in Malaysia.

From a linguistic perspective, the use of Malay language in the central part of Thailand seems to be decreasing and may finally become extinct as the speakers are more likely to be influenced by Standard-Thai which is the dominant language. In contrast, PM might not be faced with a language loss situation, at least, for the time being. The assumption comes from the fact that the dialect is used widely by the PM speech community. However, the linguistic situation of PM is still volatile since it is challenged by the fact that the younger generation of the PM speech community appears to employ more Standard-Thai as well.

PM not only plays a significant role in the minority group of the Malay-Muslims in Thailand, but also plays a crucial role as a dialect which is in contact with many other languages in Southeast Asia region. The area of the PM speech community is bordered by two prominent language spheres: Standard-Malay and Kelantanese-Malay from the south and Standard-Thai from the north. With this geographical position, it is not surprising that PM and the neighbouring areas are in contact in terms of social, education, cultural, historical, and linguistic aspects. When many languages are in contact, borrowing of foreign words is a common process that occurs across languages.

Many English lexical items that have been used in Malay and Thai languages since the coming of the British to this region in the 18th century appears to be the reason these words have been fused into PM.
1.2 General Background of Patani-Malay Speech Community

Before entering the main subject of this study, it would be appropriate to begin with a general background of the area under study i.e. the PM speech community.

1.2.1 Brief History of Patani-Malay Speech Community

The PM speech community is an area comprising the modern southern border provinces of Thailand, namely Pattani, Yala, and Narathiwat and five districts of Songkla province i.e. Chana, Thepa, Nathawi, Sabayoi, and Sadao (Baru, 1991: 56 as cited by Khreedaoh, 2007: 8). Its history can be traced back to the era of the ancient Malay kingdoms of ‘Langkasuka’ and ‘Patani Darussalam’.

According to a record during the Liang Dynasty of China, Langkasuka was established in the first century (Hamsan, 1967, as cited by Hattha, 1998: 34). It covered the area from Hujung Tanah (land’s end) or the modern Singapore, the modern Malaysia, the modern provinces of Narathiwat, Pattani, and Yala up to the Isthmus of Kra, in the modern Kra Buri district of Ranong province in the upper part of the modern southern Thailand (A. Bangnara, 1976: 15). It is believed that Langkasuka and Patani Darussalam were most probably centred in today’s Pattani province i.e. modern Yarang and Mueang districts (Madakakul, 1976).

The area where the ancient Malay kingdoms of Langkasuka and Patani Darussalam was located was a great trading centre of the Malay Peninsula. It was an international port where sailors and missionaries from around the world came for business engagements and religious missions. Claudius Ptolemy, a Greek geographer called the Malay Peninsula as Golden Khersonese and it was also called Suvanadvipa which
means ‘Golden Land’ by ancient Indians (Wheatley, 2010). This peninsula was well known as a tremendous resource of gold ore, wild animals, and spices of the world.

Patani Darussalam was considered as the ‘Cradle of Islam in Southeast Asia’ (Winzeler, 1975: 92, Wyatt & Teeuw, 1970: 4, Pitsuwan, 1985: 47, Che Man, 1987: 52). According to A. Bangnara (1976: 13-15), Islam first arrived in Patani Darussalam in the 10th century brought by Arabic merchants. Islam grew tremendously in the area and its reputation as the cradle of Islam attracted many Muslim students from various countries in Southeast Asia region such as Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia, and the Philippines to come and study at traditional religious schools called Pondok in the kingdom (Mohd. Zamberi A. Malek, 1994: 93, Madmarn, 2000: 123). Besides, Patani Darussalam was also renowned as an Islamic centre of the region; designated as 'the Mirror of Mecca' (Wan Mohd. Shaghir Abdullah, 1992: 58) as well as a land filled with people, education, economy, and architecture which were profoundly recognised. It was during this period that Patani Darussalam and other Malay states adopted Arabic script called Jawi to be used in their writing system.

The Kingdom of Patani Darussalam gradually increased its prosperity and reached its peak as a religious and major trading centre of the region during the reign of its four queens. According to Mohd. Zamberi A. Malek (1994), the queens were Raja Hijau (The Green Queen, 1584-1616), Raja Biru (The Blue Queen, 1616-1624), Raja Ungu (The Purple Queen, 1624-1635), and Raja Kuning (The Yellow Queen, 1635-1686). It was in the 16th and 17th centuries that Patani Darussalam became a regional administrative and economic centre. Trading vessels from China, India, Japan, Arab countries, and European countries such as Portugal, Holland, and England travelled
to and from the international port of Patani Darussalam (Hattha, 1998: 35-41). English pioneers, including Peter Floris arrived in Patani Darussalam in 1612. He noted that:

“Patani was trading with virtually the whole of Southeast Asia, with ships arriving from and departing for Ayudhya, Brunei, Jambi, the north coast ports of Java, Makasar, the Moluccus, China, Japan, Cambodia, and Sumatra, as well as dealing with the Dutch, the English and the Portuguese, the first Dutch ship reaching Patani in 1601 and the English in 1612” (Teeuw & Wyatt, 1970: 13 as cited by Bougas, 1994: 41).

This clearly indicates that Patani Darussalam was a great and powerful kingdom and was an emporium of regional and global trading. The kingdom ended upon its annexation by Siam after the ‘1909 Anglo-Siamese Treaty’ between Britain and Siam. The area of the modern provinces of Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and Satun which was once a district of Kedah, became a permanent part of the Thai territory (Pitsuwan, 1985: 31).

1.2.2 Sociolinguistic Context of Patani-Malay Speech Community

The PM speech community lies on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula in the south and connects to the Gulf of Thailand in the north. It encompasses historically, geographically, and linguistically with the states of Terengganu, Kelantan, and Kedah of Malaysia. Existing between the two different cultural worlds of Malay and Thai, the people of the PM speech community have varying social and cultural traditions compared to other Thai population in the north who mostly are Buddhists and other Malay people from the neighbouring areas in the south who mostly are Muslims, both of which have their respective strong and unique identities. The long-term relationship between the different cultural domains has resulted in the existence
Standard-Thai when communicating with other ethnic groups. However, in terms of language attrition, a recent study on language usage in the PM speech community reveals that PM younger generation, especially those who are educated and live in urban areas, tends to code switch PM with Standard-Thai when communicating among themselves (Burarungrot, 2010: 2).

In the past, PM was also widely used by non-Malay-Muslims living in the area. These were mainly Thai-Buddhists who spoke Standard-Thai as their first language and were exposed to PM through their interaction and association with Malay-Muslims. Presently, there are fewer non-native speakers of PM. There are attempts to introduce PM and Standard-Malay to Thai-Buddhists by setting up special courses in public and private sectors.

In education system, students are exposed to many languages depending on the schools and programmes they attend. In general academic schools, Standard-Thai is used mainly as the medium of instruction. English is taught as a compulsory subject while other languages such as Standard-Malay, French, Chinese, and Japanese are also offered. In Islamic private schools, which provide Islamic education together with the general Thai education for Muslim children, Arabic and Malay languages are used in teaching of religious subjects with textbooks written in both Arabic and Malay using Jawi and Roman scripts. Standard-Thai is used as the medium of instruction of compulsory academic subjects such as mathematics, sciences, and social studies, while English is also taught as a compulsory foreign language subject. In traditional Pondok system, which is an oldest Islamic education system that has played a highly significant role in the society since the era of Patani Darussalam Kingdom, young people are trained in the Islamic way of life by learning and practising Islamic rules in depth whilst
residing at the Pondok. Most of the textbooks used in this education system are written in Malay using Jawi script. Arabic textbooks are also used widely. PM and Arabic are the mediums of instruction.

The Thai government promotes the use of PM by having signboards, documents, textbooks, journals, newspapers, advertisements, and notices written in both Jawi and Roman scripts. Thai script is also introduced as an alternative written form of PM in textbooks and story books in schools. Two television channels, namely National Broadcasting of Thailand (NBT) and Modern Nine TV also broadcast in PM. NBT has a branch station in Yala province for providing local programmes such as news. Modern Nine TV incorporates Jawi subtitles for news. Some local radio programmes are broadcasted in PM. PM is also used in many radio advertisements and this could be an indication of the size of the intended target group. Besides, it is widely used in the entertainment industry especially the traditional performances such as sitting dance Dikir Hulu, Anasheed (Islamic song), Shadow Play, and music.

One of the government strategies towards solving the current unrest in southern Thailand is having officers understand PM. Police Colonel Tawee Sodsong, the Director of the Southern Border Provinces Administration Centre (SBPAC), as cited by Din-a (2012), states that to solve the crisis in the south, the government needs to give priority to language concerns. The Colonel calls on the government to promote the use of PM together with Standard-Thai as the mediums of instruction in primary public schools in order to forge better understanding among teachers, students, and parents. It is also hoped that using the bilingual education system will help students gain better understanding towards academic subjects. Moreover, the PM speech community is an important gateway to link Thailand with other Malay speaking countries.
in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) including Malaysia, Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam, and Singapore. Hence, good command of languages such as PM, Standard-Malay, and English among the locals is highly necessary in preparation to enter the ASEAN Economic Community in the near future.

1.3 Contact between English and Patani-Malay

In 1780, the second president of the United States, John Adams, as cited by Dyer (2012), predicted that:

“English will be the most respectable language in the world and the most universally read and spoken in the next century, if not before the end of this one”.

This prediction proved to be true. English has been used as a lingua franca in many speech communities throughout the world for centuries. As reported by Weber (1997), the status of English as a linkage language has finally placed it as the most influential language of the world. It has spread via the world market of education and global developments in science, business, technology, popular culture, and mass media (Lin, 2013). Apart from that, English has also become a prominent language globally due to its flexibility in borrowing from a variety of languages which has enhanced its very own vocabulary (Hoffer, 2005: 54).

Bougas (1994: 50) and Uthai (2008: 235) pointed out that the contact between PM and English first occurred in 1612 during the reign of Raja Hijau upon the arrival of English traders who came to the region via Patani port. It was during this period that the Kingdom of Patani Darussalam attained its greatest economic success as an international port of the region frequented by many merchants from around the world including England. When Raja Hijau appointed an English man named John Smith
to be an advisor to Patani Darussalam Kingdom (Mohd. Zamberi A. Malek, 1993: 49), English became more significant the society.

According to Moreland (2002: 63), Peter Floris whose record of a visit to Patani Darussalam in 1612–1613 contributed major advances to an understanding of the situation during that era. Peter Floris penned memoirs of his journey in the region, including the story of Raja Hijau. In remembrance of the Queen’s kind hospitality, Peter Floris stated that he and other English merchants were welcomed and treated well by her. They were once invited by the Queen to a party together with the Dutch people. The locals of Patani Darussalam warmly welcomed them with a beautiful traditional dancing performed by local women and children. Moreover, Peter Floris also stated that there was a negotiation between the Queen and English merchants in setting up a warehouse for English merchants in the kingdom. In relation to this, Raja Biru, who was the successor, followed Raja Hijau’s state of affairs when dealing with foreign merchants. Besides, Wattananikorn (1988: 111-112) stated that Raja Biru was a great queen in ruling the state and taking care of foreign traders. The Queen lent them money and protected them from violence or conflict among themselves.

After some period of time, there was a gap between PM and English for decades until the British returned to Southeast Asia during the colonisation period in the 18th century. It is believed that English items were not actively used during this gap. In other words, it is not easy to clarify the existence of English items used in PM during that time period due to limited historical verifications. However, the influence of English towards PM is still very strong to date even though the direction of the contact between the two languages is not in a straight forward manner as it was before. English borrowings
have been brought into PM through Malay (Shintaro, 2001: 74) and Thai languages (Uthai, 2005: 16).

In the 18th century during the colonisation period, an Islamic scholar from Patani Darussalam, Sheikh Wan Ahmad Al-Fatani, played a crucial role in helping Patani and Kelantanese people to understand the importance of learning and using foreign languages such as English and Arabic. He suggested that there were a lot of benefits in acquiring the new languages. Individuals who had a good command of various languages would be confident of communicating with foreigners from around the world. This would help them to be open-minded and up-to-date (Wan Mohd. Shaghir Abdullah, 1992: 59).

After the 1909 Anglo-Siamese Treaty and the annexation of the PM speech community by Siam, there was a major change of the status of PM in the society. PM has been used only among Malay-Muslims whilst Standard-Thai is introduced to the community through the Thai compulsory education system, media, and official business. However, PM speakers still maintain contact with Malay speakers in the neighbouring state of Kelantan in Malaysia. Thus, English items continue to be absorbed into PM through the contact with Kelantanese-Malay and Standard-Thai.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

This study is under the umbrella of sociolinguistics which studies linguistic phenomena in relationship with society. As an outcome of the PM speech community contact with neighbouring speech communities in Malaysia and Thailand, words and concepts of English used in Malay and Thai languages have been borrowed into PM. In recent years, there has been an increase in interest on the study of PM. Pioneer researchers
have contributed a substantial understanding in many aspects of linguistic phenomenon of PM and have laid the foundations for other researchers in the field. However, no systematic investigation has been made on the English borrowings in PM. Thus, this study aims to explore the foundations that have been laid by earlier researchers on English borrowing in PM. The focus of this study is on changes in terms of phonological, morphological, and semantic features of the English lexical items used in PM. The problem will be approached through a comparison between sound, form, and meaning of the donor and the recipient languages, which in this study are English and PM respectively. Grouping the English lexical items used in PM including PM idiomatic expressions with impetus from English into various semantic fields will also be carried out. This will be performed by determining the frequency of occurrence.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are:

1. To examine the phonological, morphological, and semantic changes of English lexical items used in PM including PM idiomatic expressions with impetus from English; and

2. To sort and allocate English lexical items used in PM including PM idiomatic expressions with impetus from English, into semantic fields.

In relation to this, this research attempts to answer these two research questions:

1. What are the borrowing processes that English lexical items used in Patani-Malay undergo?

2. In which semantic fields do English lexical items used in Patani-Malay occur most?
1.6 Significance of the Study

This study will provide a better understanding of language contact phenomenon in the PM speech community. PM is unique as it is a Malay dialect that is used in the Thai world. Findings from this study will provide a glimpse on English lexical items used in PM which in addition to being of interest to linguists, it would also be of interest to anthropologists on the worldview of PM speakers. Documentation and availability of the findings should generate awareness and interest among scholars on PM as a potential area to research. This study aspires to promote the use of PM among the native speakers especially the younger generation in order to preserve its important status in the society.

1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study is restricted to the lexical level of English items used in the writing system of PM, a dialect of the people of the southern border provinces of Thailand, namely Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and some parts of Songkhla. The English lexical items will be gathered only from selected printed media published between the years 2006 to 2013 and will be limited to dictionaries, newspapers, news scripts, and signboards. The texts written only in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts will be employed.

1.8 Definition of Terms

The following list includes definitions of key terms used in this study.

1) Speech community: “A group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language” (Yule, 2006: 253). In this study, speech community also refers to an area in which population share linguistic identity.

2) Patani-Malay (PM): A Malay dialect under the Austronesian language family used mainly by Muslim population in the area of PM speech community who are mostly
Thai citizens adhering to Islam and ethnically Malays having descended from the Malay-Muslim race.

3) Patani: Sociolinguistic setting of PM speech community that covers the modern southern border provinces of Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and five districts of Songkla province i.e. Chana, Thepa, Nathawi, Sabayoi, and Sadao. It is also used as the name of a Malay dialect employed in the area, Patani-Malay (PM).

4) Pattani: A Thai derivation of ‘Patani’ which is used as the name of one of the three southern border provinces of Thailand, Pattani.

5) English: English lexical items which are used in PM are taken from printed media published in the PM speech community.

6) Borrowing: The linguistic phenomenon that occurs when speaker(s) of one language take word(s) of another language into their own language. The term ‘borrowing(s)’ is also used to refer to the borrowed word(s).

7) Borrowing Process: Reproduction of foreign elements that are borrowed into another language (Haugen, 1950: 230).

8) Semantic Field: “A set of lexemes which cover a certain conceptual domain and which bear certain specifiable relations to one another” (Lehrer: 1985: 1).

1.9 Conclusion
This dissertation is organised into five chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction of the study which expounds the background, purposes, and fundamental contents of the study. Chapter 2 is devoted to a review of related literature of the study, which includes the previous studies on English and PM, and the concept of language borrowing. Chapter 3 offers a conceptual framework used in the study as well as a research design of data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 reveals findings of this study. Finally, Chapter 5 presents a conclusion of the study.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter demonstrates how previous researches are related to the analysis of the English lexical items used in PM and aims to provide a conceptual framework that can be applied for the purpose of this study.

The survey of literature is divided into two major sections. The first section deals with previous studies on English and PM. It includes studies on English as an influential language focusing on how it influences other languages and studies on PM dialect covering linguistic features of PM, dictionaries of PM, phonology of PM, morphology of PM, PM in social aspect, language borrowing in PM, and status of PM in the language policy. Apart from that, PM writing system is also included. The second section provides procedures of determining the concept of language borrowing. The review begins with definition of language borrowing, classification of language borrowing, types of language borrowing, and factors of language borrowing.

2.2 Previous Studies on English and Patani-Malay

In considering the nature of language, English and PM have significant differences. First, English is a ‘language’ that is used as a first language by approximately 400 million people around the world (Crystal, 2006: 424), while PM is considered as a ‘dialect’ used mainly in a small community of Malay-Muslims in southern Thailand. Second, both English and PM belong to entirely different language families. English is of the Anglo-Frisian sub-group of the west Germanic branch of the Germanic
family which is a member of the Indo-European languages whereas PM is of the Malayo-Polynesian group within the Austronesian language family. Not surprisingly, this creates a vast difference between the two. However, no matter how different English and PM are, English has still managed to find its place in PM vocabulary.

2.2.1 Studies on English as an Influential Language

The main objective of this section is to provide a brief background of the influence of English on other languages under the following sub-headings.

2.2.1.1 English as a Global Language

It may be debatable whether English is the most popular language in the world or not, yet we cannot deny that it is one of the most influential languages. According to Kachru (1992), English is used widely as the first, second, and foreign language by people across the globe. It is also commonly used as a lingua franca for trade, travel, tourism, and educational purposes in many speech communities. In most education system nowadays, English is taught at every level. It is used and adapted accordingly to grammatical rules and spoken patterns of other languages.

2.2.1.2 English in Asia

English holds an important status in Asia. Yoneoka (2002) stated in her study entitled ‘Englishes in Asia’, which was aimed at exploring the status and attitudes towards English throughout Asia, that “…as Asia is predicted to be a future power economically, the survival of English as an international language within the region depends crucially on whether it is accepted as a valid Asian variety” (p. 1).
In Japan, Japanese people started using English items in their daily lives during the late 18th century. The use of English gradually increased. However, in 1930s, the government put a ban on foreign culture including English usage. It was after the World War II that foreign cultures once again penetrated the society and English equated to modernisation among Japanese people (Chan, 2003: 6). Nowadays, apart from using English as the medium of communication with English native speakers who live in Japan, Japanese people also use English to communicate with the Chinese, Koreans, Bruneians, Thais, Malaysians, Singaporeans, and other Asians as well as Europeans, Africans, Arabians, South Americans, and many others (Honna, 2005).

According to Takashi (1990), the majority of English names have been used for Japanese products despite the fact that only some of these products are marketed internationally. The main purpose of using English for brand names is to make these products seem more sophisticated and modern. In terms of linguistic adaptation, English borrowings have been heavily localised by Japanese speakers in many ways including pronunciation, writing, meaning, and grammatical aspects. One of the reasons that Japanese speakers tend to localise English is because English contains more vowels and consonants compared to Japanese which has only five vowels and 16 consonant sounds (Ruikuo, 2005: 48).

Considering the linguistic situation in China, Standard-Chinese or Mandarin is the world’s most used language while English is the world’s strongest lingua franca. Both are considered the most spoken human languages (Li & Thompson, 1979: 295). Hence, the language contact between the two giant linguistic communities is of interest to many researchers. According to Jingjing (2004: 17), the contact between Chinese
and western languages, including English, began since the late 16th century when western missionaries came to China. It resulted in language borrowing among them. Chinese has borrowed many words from English into its vocabulary. Similarly, a number of Chinese borrowings have also been adopted into English vocabulary such as ketchup, tea, longan, and tofu (Yang, 2009: 98-99). The contact has led to changes within the two languages in many ways. Asia (2002) investigated language change of English words that were borrowed into Chinese in terms of phonological, morphosyntactic, semantic, and sociolinguistic aspects. She concluded that, like in any other contact situation, English borrowings were adapted accordingly to phonological rules of Chinese sound system as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: English Sound Change to Chinese (Asia, 2002: 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>English Sound</th>
<th>Change to Chinese</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>pizza/ bisa, micro/ maike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>CV.CV</td>
<td>aspirin/ asipilin disney/ disini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>CV (null)</td>
<td>bar/ ba, cartoon/ katong, model/ mote, guitar/ jita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>CV.CV</td>
<td>jeep/ jipu, tank/ tanke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CVN, CVM</td>
<td>CVNG</td>
<td>system/ xitong, -phone/ feng, romance/ langman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RV/LV</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>romance/ langman, radar/ leida, karaoke/ kalaok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In India, a country that has different groups of people and varieties of language communities, English has played a crucial role in Indian dialects as well. In investigating the contact between English and Urdu languages, Sipra (2013: 205) stated that the borrowing process could be in direct borrowing with a little change and
even without any change in the original word. His findings revealed that many English borrowings in Urdu undergo certain changes. For examples, the English word ‘ambulance /ˈæmbjələns/ is pronounced as /ˈæmbələns/ in Urdu. The phonetic sound /jə/ is replaced by /o/. Another example is the word ‘chair’ /tʃə/ which is pronounced as /tʃeər/ in Urdu. /tʃ/ is clearly pronounced at the end as it is pronounced in several American dialects.

2.2.1.3 English in Southeast Asia

All the countries in Southeast Asian region, except Thailand, were colonised by various European powers. The colonial masters were of different linguistic backgrounds such as Portuguese, Dutch, Spanish, English, and French. For this reason, Yoneoka (2002: 10) claims that there are varying degrees of attitude towards English as well as degrees of assimilation of the language within the 10 countries in the region. In some countries like Singapore and Malaysia, English has been used as an official language and as a second language respectively, whilst in Thailand, English is a foreign language.

In the 19th century, Burma (or Myanmar) became a British colony. English held an important role as a privileged language that was used among Burmese people rather than the other languages that used to be in contact with Burmese language. A study done by Chang (n.d.) on the adaptation of English borrowings into Burmese revealed that some English items in Burmese underwent phonological modification reflecting the Burmese phonological system and eventually some of these borrowings did not retain any original Burmese characteristics. Another study on English borrowings in Burmese was carried out by Rashid (2009) who analysed types and manners of the data using Haugen’s (1950) and Heah’s (1989) frameworks. Her findings revealed that English items in Burmese were mainly found in the partial
phonemic substitution type of adaptation. It was because the English items had gone through a phonemic transformation before they were accepted into the language.

Considering Kachru's 1985 'Three Circles of World Englishes', English language in Thailand is classified into the ‘Expanding circle’ group (Kachru, 1992). Among few foreign languages that are used in Thailand, English is the most familiar one to Thai people. It has been taught as a tool of communication to Thai people by native speakers with various accents such as American English, British English, Canadian English, Australian English, Indian English, and Burmese English (Kullavanijaya, 2002: 4). Therefore, the pronunciation of English used in Thai language is varied due to the influence of the instructors.

When looking at English influences in Malaysia, many studies have reported that English has made many changes in Standard-Malay such as grammatical adaptation and an introduction of English words into Malay vocabulary. Heah (1989) studied sociolinguistic aspects e.g. historical background of Standard-Malay, language contact situation of Standard-Malay and English, and factors of English influence on Standard-Malay. She mainly focused on how English borrowings influenced Standard-Malay on lexical expansion in terms of phonology, morphology, and semantics by identifying the assimilation process of English based on Haugen’s (1950) assimilation process theory. She found out that there were three kinds of assimilation processes, namely Importation, Substitution, and Native Creation. In relation to these three processes, English borrowings in Standard-Malay were sorted out into six categories which were Pure Loanwords, Loanblends, Loanshifts, Apt Equivalent Substitutes, Hybrid Creations, and Induced Creations. Another study was done by Aishah Mahdi (1991) who determined the process of meaning transfer
of English borrowings in Standard-Malay quantitatively and qualitatively. The findings revealed that some data underwent certain changes in terms of meaning while some retained their meanings as found in original English.

The brief description of English language used in the languages in Asia and Southeast Asia provides a picture of how English has spread and influenced other languages and how it is related to this study. It can be seen that English borrowings in each language have their own characteristics and developments. It is because English has different relationship with different languages in terms of period of time, historical, and cultural settings.

### 2.2.2 Studies on Patani-Malay Dialect


#### 2.2.2.1 Linguistic Features of Patani-Malay

Considering the variation of PM, Uthai (2005) found that PM consisted of 10 variations, each of which found in 10 different areas of the PM speech community as follows.

1) Bangpu village, Bangpu sub-district, Yaring district, Pattani province

2) Phithen village, Phithen sub-district, Thungyangdaeng district, Pattani province
3) Puyud village, Puyud sub-district, Mueang district, Pattani province

4) Thannamsai village, Thannamthip sub-district district, A. Betong, Yala province

5) Toknah village, Namngam sub-district, Raman district, Yala province

6) Benaekuwae village, Bannangseta sub-district district, Bannagseta, Yala province

7) Lahan village, Palura sub-district, Sungaipadi district, Narathiwat province

9) Bao village, Thungpho sub-district, Sabayoi district, Songkkla province

10) Buaibon village, Nod sub-district, Sabayoi district, Songkhla province

According to Sama-alee et al. (2008), PM has certain general characteristics as shown below.

1) PM words are disyllabic base word e.g. /nasi/ 'nasi’ (n. rice), /makan/ ‘makan’ (v. to eat).

2) PM is not a tonal language.

3) Long consonants or stretched initial consonants or words are a special characteristic of PM which can change meanings of words.

For example,

/ḍła/ ‘telur’ (n. an egg) while /ttḍła/ ‘telur’ which is stressed at the initial syllable means ‘to lay eggs’ (v.).
4) Changes of intonation in sentences can cause changes of meanings. For example,

\[ /gi\ tani\|/ 'pergi\ Pattani' \] (go Pattani) with falling intonation at the end of the sentence means go to Pattani (affirmative sentence).

\[ /gi\ tani\|/ 'pergi\ Pattani' \] (go Pattani) with rising intonation at the end of the sentence means go to Pattani? (Question sentence).

5) Meanings of words do not change according to shortness or length of vowel sounds.

6) There are only three consonant sounds that occur at the end of PM words i.e. /η, h, ʔ/. For example,

\[ /mimən/ 'minum' \] (v. to drink), /habih/ 'habis' (v. to finish), and /anʔ/ ‘anak’ (n. kid).

7) There are many foreign words found in PM. Four major source languages of borrowings in PM are from Sanskrit, Arabic, English, and Thai.

From the above mentioned, one of the best known features of PM is the change of final /-an/ to /-ən/ or (/ə/) which is similar to Kelantanese-Malay. PM and Kelantanese-Malay consist of three final consonant sounds i.e. /f/, /η/, and /h/. Moreover, the vowel /a/ followed by nasal consonants /-an/ and /-am/ in Standard-Malay are changed to /ə/ both in PM and /ə/ in Kelantanese-Malay (Daranee, 1985 as cited by Uthai, 2005: 19).
The similarity between PM and Kelantanese-Malay occur because of their close contact linguistically and historically. PM and Kelantanese-Malay speech communities have been in contact through various aspects such as language, geographical location, religion, and social culture. They have shared the same historical background since they were under the same regime of Langkasuka and Patani Darussalam Kingdoms. The identical sharing has developed a tight sense of brotherhood and sisterhood among the people of the two worlds. However, recently PM and Kelantanese-Malay have become slightly different from each other in terms of phonology, morphology, and semantics of certain words, due to the influence of other languages. PM is influenced by Standard-Thai while Kelantanese-Malay is under the influence of Standard-Malay as well as English.

2.2.2.2 Dictionary of Patani-Malay

Much of the earlier work on PM dealt with dictionaries which were published in many versions. They were mainly compiled for foreign missionaries who came to the area for religious purposes. At the present time, as PM is a unique dialect and has been considered as the identity of Malay-Muslims in the area, many PM dictionaries have been compiled, somehow, to preserve the uniqueness and identity of the society.

Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983: 3) stated that, in 1970, a group of Christian missionaries who worked as nurses at Saiburi Hospital set up a PM-English dictionary to be used as a manual for the Christian missionaries to communicate with the locals. In 1978, Masmintra Chaiyanara published a Thai-PM dictionary using Thai script in transcribing the phonology of the dialect as a reference for interested persons.
Later, another PM dictionary was compiled by Wilding in 1979 (Songmuang et al., 2008: 9).

In 1984, Christopher Antony Court, a linguist from Australia and members of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus, established a collaborative project. The team undertook a survey on PM and compiled a PM-Thai dictionary (Pisan, 2010). In 2008, the Institute of Southeast Asian Maritime States Studies at Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus, published the first combined Thai-PM and PM-Thai dictionary (Baru et al., 2008). The dictionary uses Thai script to transliterate PM pronunciation.

2.2.2.3 Phonology of Patani-Malay

Researches on phonological system of PM had been carried out by many earlier scholars such as Wilding (1979), Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983), Saleh (1991), Uthai (1993, 2005), and Kaseng (2001). Their findings were presented in the following sub-sections.

(a) Consonant Phoneme

Wilding (1979) investigated the sound system of PM by interviewing and recording speeches of PM native speakers who lived in Mueang district of Pattani province to compile a dictionary of PM named ‘Pattani Malay Dictionary for Fellow-Workers in South Thailand’. He reported that there were 23 consonant phonemes in PM as shown in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2: Consonant Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Wilding, 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Place of Articulation</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
<th>Pharynx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Unaspirated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Plosives</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Nasal</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Semi Vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983: 28) however claimed that there were 25 consonant phonemes of PM as shown in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Consonant Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Masmintra Chaiyanara, 1983: 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Place of Articulation</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labio-Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Unaspirated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Aspirated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>t&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>c&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>k&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Plosives (Unaspirated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j (dʒ)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Nasal</td>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1991, Saleh studied the sound system of PM in greater detail. She categorised consonant phonemes of PM into primary phonemes and secondary phonemes as shown in Table 2.4 and Table 2.5. The first primary phonemes consisted of 24 sounds while the second consisted of five sounds. The secondary phonemes could only be found in foreign borrowings. Normally the five secondary phonemes of PM could replace or could be replaced by some similar elements of the primary ones. /f/ could be replaced by /p/, /ʃ/ could be replaced by /s/, /x/ could be replaced by /kʰ/, /ð/ could be replaced by /d/, and /r/ could be replaced by /ɻ/.

**Table 2.4:** Primary Consonant Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Saleh, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Place of Articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilabial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Unaspirated)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Plosives</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Fricatives</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Fricatives</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Lateral</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Nasal</td>
<td>mʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Semi Vowels</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.5:** Secondary Consonant Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Saleh, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Place of Articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilabial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Trill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uthai’s (1993: 90) finding shown in Table 2.6 was comprehensive and incorporated the findings by Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983) which did not include Semi Nasal i.e. /m̩, n̩, ŋ̩, and η̩/'. Uthai (1993) found that the Glottal /ʔ/ existed in PM while Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983) was silent on this.

**Table 2.6:** Consonant Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Uthai, 1993: 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Place of Articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilabial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Unaspirated)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Plosives (Aspirated)</td>
<td>pʰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Plosives</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless Fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Vowels</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uthai (1993) also found that a double consonant or natural lengthened consonant appeared at the beginning of a syllable in PM. For example, /llabʰ/ ‘labah’ (n. spider) and /bbuŋ̩/ ‘bunga’ (v. to bloom).

**(b) Vowel Phoneme**

Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983: 16-22) identified that there were 12 vowel phonemes in PM as shown in Table 2.7. He also identified that there were five diphthongs in PM, namely /æ/, /aɪ/, /əɛ/, /əo/, and /au/.
Table 2.7: Vowel Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Masmintra Chaiyanara, 1983: 16-22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td>Unrounded</td>
<td>Rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>u, ŭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Close</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Open</td>
<td>ə, ĕ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ə, ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>a, ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uthai (1993: 92-93) concurred with Masmintra Chaiyanara’s (1983) concept of PM vowel phonemes and presented his concept on PM vowel phonemes as shown in Table 2.8. He further stated that there were five diphthongs in PM, namely /æ/, /aɪ/, /æ/, /æ/, /ao/, and /au/. This was similar to the finding of Masmintra Chaiyanara (1983).

Table 2.8: Vowel Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Uthai, 1993: 92-93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>u, ŭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ə, ĕ</td>
<td></td>
<td>a, ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on further investigation into special features of PM, Uthai (2005: 74) introduced a fourth tongue position and also identified and incorporated 10 diphthongs into his PM Vowel Phoneme Table as shown in Table 2.9.
Table 2.9: Vowel Phonemes of Patani-Malay (Uthai, 2005: 74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>u, ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Low</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>ê, ĕ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ə, õ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>a, ā</td>
<td>(α)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongs</td>
<td>(ai), (au), (ae), (ao), (aê), (āu), (āe), (āo), (āê)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Syllable Structure

There are four types of syllabic structure in PM (Uthai, 1993: 93, 2005: 27-28).

(i) CV        /wi/ 'beri’ v. to give
(ii) CVC      /doʔi/ 'duduk’ v. to sit
(iii) CCV      /cca/ 'air buangan’ n. dirty water
(iv) CCVC     /ttoʔi/ ‘datuk’ n. grandparent

(d) Word Structure

There are three types of word structure in PM (Uthai, 1993: 93-94, 2005: 28-29).

(i) Monosyllabic

1) CV        /wi/ 'beri’ v. to give
2) CVC      /doʔi/ ‘duduk’ v. to sit
3) CCV      /cca/ 'air buangan’ n. dirty water
4) CCVC     /ttoʔi/ ‘datuk’ n. grandparent
(ii) Disyllabic

1) CV /matɔ/ ‘mata’ n. eye
2) CV CVC /gaŋɔh/ ‘gajah’ n. elephant
3) CCV CV /ppalɔ/ ‘pala’ n. head
4) CCV CVC /ŋakeŋ/ ‘penyakit’ n. disease
5) CVC CV /tɔ?ca/ ‘tokca’ n. monk
6) CVC /ta?moh/ ‘tak mau’ v. to do not accept
7) CCVC CV /dda?peŋ/ ‘depan’ prep. in front
8) CCVC CVC /dda?taŋ/ ‘di atas’ prep. Above

(iii) Trisyllabic

1) CV CV CVC /pəyaboŋ/ ‘perabung’ n. roof
2) CV CV CV /kɔɣeŋɔ/ ‘kereta’ n. car
3) CV CVC CVC /bɔdaʔɔh/ ‘bedooh’ adv. too much
2.2.2.4 Morphology of Patani-Malay

According to Uthai (2005), there are four types of word formation rule in PM as shown below.

(a) Affixation

There are four kinds of affixes in PM, namely prefixes, infixes, suffixes, and confixes (Uthai, 2005: 29-40).

(i) Prefixes

1) Prefix: {p̣-}

a) /p̣l-/ is used only with a root word /ɪa]-'ajar’ (v. to teach). It becomes /p̣l-ajər/ ‘pelajar’ (n. student) afterwards.

b) /p̣m-/ is used with root words that begin with /p-/. The /p-/ is deducted afterwards e.g. /p̣ge]- ‘pegang’ (v. to carry) becomes /p̣mage]- ‘pemegang’ (n. carrier).

c) /p̣n-/ is used with root words that begin with /t-/. The /t-/ is deducted afterwards e.g. /taṇd/- ‘tanda’ (v. to mark) becomes /p̣naṇd/- ‘penanda’ (n. marker).

d) /p̣c/- is used with root words that begin with /s-/- /c-. The /s-/- and /c-/- sounds are deducted afterwards e.g. /səpə]- ‘sepak’ (v. to kick) becomes /p̣əpə]- ‘orang sepak’ (n. (football) player) and /cuyi]- ‘curi’ (v. to steal) becomes /p̣uyi]- ‘pencuri’ (n. thief).
e) /pʊŋ-/ is used with root words that begin with /k-/ /r-/ and /h-/. The /k-/ /r-/ and /h-/ sounds are deducted afterwards e.g. /kayoh/ ‘kayuh’ (v. to paddle) becomes /pʊŋəʊh/ ‘pengayuh’ (n. oarsman), /ruko/ ‘ukur’ (v. to measure) becomes /pʊŋruko/ ‘pengukur’ (n. measure), and /hubon/ ‘hubung’ (v. to connect) becomes /pʊŋrubon/ ‘pengubung’ (n. coordinator).

f) /pʊ/ is used with root words that begin with initial consonants other than the above mentioned e.g. /mina/ ‘minat’ (v. to be interested in) becomes /pʊmina/ ‘peminat’ (n. fans).

2) Prefix: {pʊŋ-}

a) /pʊ-/ is used with root words that does not begin with /h-/ and /r-/ e.g. /gʊŋ/ ‘harga’ (n. price) becomes /pʊŋgʊŋ/ ‘memberi harga’ (v. to set the price).

b) /pʊŋ-/ is used with root words that begin with /h-/ and /r-. The /h-/ and /r-/ are deducted afterwards e.g. /haco/ ‘hancur’ (adj. wrecked) becomes /pʊŋraco/ ‘menghancurkan’ (v. to wreck) and /ruba/ ‘ubat’ /pʊŋruba/ ‘mengubat’ (v. to treat/cure).

3) Prefix: {bʊŋ-}

a) /bʊ-/ is used with root words that do not begin with /h-/ and /r-/ e.g. /janji/ ‘janji’ (n. promise) becomes /bʊŋjanji/ ‘berjanji’ (v. to promise).
b) /burγ-/ is used with root words that begin with /h-/ and /ʔ-/ e.g. /hiŋuh/ ‘hingus’ (n. snot) becomes /burγiŋuh/ ‘berhungus’ (v. to snivel).

c) /bul-/ is used only with a root word /ʔaŋ/ ‘ajar’ (v. to teach). It becomes /bulŋaŋ/ ‘belajar’ (v. to study) afterwards.

4) Prefix: {tury-}

a) /tuŋ-/ is used with root words that do not begin with /h-/ and /ʔ-/ e.g. /lupɔ/ ‘lupa’ (v. to forget) becomes /tuŋlupɔ/ ‘terlupa’ (v. to be forgotten).

b) /tury-/ is used with root words that begin with /h-/ and /ʔ-. The /h-/ and /ʔ- are deducted afterwards e.g. /ʔiŋaŋ/ ‘ingat’ (v. to remember) becomes /turyiŋaŋ/ ‘teringat’ (v. to recall).

5) Prefix: {mum-}

a) /mum-/ is used with root words that begin with /l/, /m/, /ŋ/, and /ŋ/ e.g. /ŋaŋiŋ/ ‘nyanying’ (v. to sing) becomes /mumŋaŋiŋ/ ‘menyanyi’ (v. to sing).

b) /mum-/ is used with root words that begin with /p/. The /p/ is deducted afterwards e.g. /paŋeŋ/ ‘panggil’ (v. to call) becomes /mumŋaŋeŋ/ ‘memanggil’ (v. to call).
c) /mun/- is used with root words that begin with /t/. The /t/ is deducted afterwards e.g. /tuleh/ 'tulis' (v. to write) becomes /munuleh/ 'menulis' (v. to write).

d) /mun/- is used with root words that begin with /h/, /k/, and /l/. The /h/, /k/, and /l/ are deducted afterwards e.g. /ajak/ 'ajak' (v. to invite) becomes /munajak/ 'mengajak' (v. to invite).

e) /mun/- is used with root words that begin with /s-1/ and /c-1/. The /s-1/ and /c-1/ sounds are deducted afterwards e.g. /sapuh/ 'sapu' (n. broom) becomes /munapuh/ 'menyapu' (v. to sweep).

f) /munu/- is used with monosyllable words e.g. /sah/ 'sah' (adj. valid, lawful) becomes /munusah/ 'mengesahkan' (v. to validate).

6) Prefix: {sur-}

It is used to indicate singularity and entirety e.g. /la/ 'helai' (n. piece) becomes /sula/ 'sehelai' (n. a piece of).

(ii) Infix: {-ul-}

There are a few words that are used with the infix {-ul-} e.g. /tuno?/ 'tunjuk' (v. to point) becomes /tuluno?/ 'telunjuk' (v. to point) and /tapo?/ 'tapak' (n. sole (of foot)) becomes /tulapo?/ 'tapak kaki' (n. sole (of foot))'.
(iii) Suffix: {-ɛ}

It is used generally at the end of PM words e.g. /kutē/ ‘ketam’ (n. crab) becomes /kutame/ ‘pengetam’, /kisal/ ‘kisar’ (v. to blend) becomes /kisayɛ/ ‘pengisar’ (n. blender).

(iv) Circumfix: {k-w-ɛ}

It is the only one circumfix in PM. Its usage is, for example, /ba-ɛʔ/ ‘baik’ (adj. good) becomes /kutba-ɛʔkel/ ‘kebaikan’ (n. goodness), /busa/ ‘besar’ (adj. big/ great) becomes /kutbusayɛ/ ‘kebesaran’ (n. greatness).

(b) Compounding

There are four types of compound words in PM (Uthai, 1993: 120-131).

(i) Compound Nouns

1) Noun + Noun e.g. /hubaʔ/ ‘ubat’ (n. medicine) + /ŋamɔʔ/ ‘nyamuk’ (n. mosquito) becomes /hubaʔ ŋamɔʔ/ ‘ubat nyamuk’ (n. mosquito-repellent).

2) Noun + Transitive Verb e.g. /kɔyɛʔ/ ‘kereta’ (n. car) + /tɔlɔʔ/ ‘tolak’ (v. to push) becomes /kɔyɛʔ tɔlɔʔ/ ‘kereta tolak’ (n. pushcart).

3) Noun + Intransitive Verb e.g. /ʔa-ʔɛl/ ‘air’ (n. water) + /tuŋŋ/ ‘terjun’ (v. to jump) becomes /ʔa-ʔe tuŋŋ/ ‘air terjun’ (n. waterfall).
4) Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /ɔŋɔŋ/ ‘orang’ (n. human) + /sakət/ ‘sakit’ (adj. hurt) becomes /ɔŋɔŋ sakət/ ‘orang sakit’ (n. patient).

5) Noun + Preposition e.g. /sɔluwa/ ‘seluar’ (n. trousers) + /dala/ ‘dalam’ (prep. in) becomes /sɔluwa dala/ ‘seluar dalam’ (n. underwear).

6) Noun + Numeral Adjective e.g. /kaki/ ‘kaki’ (n. foot) + /limə/ ‘lima’ (num adj. five) becomes /kaki limə/ ‘kaki lima’ (n. footpath).

7) Noun + Classifier e.g. /ubat/ ‘ubat’ (n. medicine) + /butə/ ‘butir’ (clas. pellet) becomes /ubat butə/ ‘ubat butir’ (n. small pill, tablet).

8) Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /jungkat/ ‘jungkat’ (v. to rise and fall) + /cangkun/ ‘cangkun’ (n. squat) becomes /jungkat cangkun/ (n. seesaw board).

9) Transitive Verb + Noun e.g. /renang/ ‘renang’ (v. to fry) + /pisang/ ‘pisang’ (n. banana) becomes /renang pisang/ (n. deep-fried sliced banana).

10) Noun + Noun + Noun e.g. /ubat/ ‘ubat’ (n. medicine) + /akət/ ‘akar’ (n. root) + /kayu/ ‘kayu’ (n. wood) becomes /ubat akar kayu/ (n. herb).

11) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /kain/ ‘kain’ (n. fabric) + /sapu/ ‘sapu’ (v. to wipe) + /muka/ ‘muka’ (n. face) becomes /kain sapu muka/ (n. handkerchief).
12) Noun + Transitive Verb + Noun e.g. /kapa/ ‘kapal’ (n. ship) + /tubɛ/ ‘terbang’ (v. to fly) + /musoh/ ‘musuh’ (n. battle) becomes /kapa tube musoh/ ‘kapal terbang musuh’ (n. warplane).

13) Noun + Noun + Intransitive Verb e.g. /hubaʔ/ ‘ubat’ (n. medicine) + /pɛlɛʔ/ ‘pelita’ (n. light, lamp) + /pɛciʔ/ ‘picit’ (v. to squeeze) becomes /hubaʔ pɛlɛʔ pɛciʔ/ ‘ubat pelita picit’ (n. flashlight battery).

14) Noun + Preposition + Noun e.g. /luwaʔ/ ‘luar’ (prep. outside) + /nɛɡəɾi/ ‘negeri’ (n. country) becomes /luwaʔ nɛɡəɾi/ ‘orang laur negeri’ (n. foreigner).

15) Noun + Noun + Transitive Verb e.g. /tekeʔ/ ‘tiket’ (n. ticket) + /kapa/ ‘kapal’ (n. ship) + /tubɛ/ ‘terbang’ (v. to fly) becomes /tekeʔ kapa tube/ ‘tiket kapal terbang’ (n. airplane).

16) Noun + Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /kumɪɲ/ ‘cermin’ (n. mirror) + /matəɾ/ ‘mata’ (n. eye) + /panɔʔi/ ‘pendek’ (adj. short) becomes /kumɪɲ matəɾ panɔʔi/ ‘cermin mata pendek’ (n. myopia glasses).

17) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Intransitive Verb e.g. /kɔda/ ‘kedai’ (n. shop) + /jʉwuːj/ ‘jual’ (v. to sale) + /kaiʔeŋ/ ‘kain’ (n. fabric) + /kəɭuɓonʔ/ ‘kelubung’ (v. to cover) becomes /kɔda juwa kaiʔeŋ kəɭuɓonʔ/ ‘kedai jual kain kelubung’ (n. hijab shop).

18) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Transitive Verb e.g. /lɔɣeʔ/ ‘orang’ (n. human) + /wɔʔi/ ‘bawa’ (v. to carry) + /kapa/ ‘kapal’ (n. ship)
+ /tube/ ‘terbang’ (v. to fly) becomes /ɔɣe wɔʔ kapa tube/ ‘orang bawa kapal terbang’ (n. pilot, flier).

19) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Noun e.g. /kɔda/ ‘kedai’ (n. shop) + /juwa/ ‘jual’ (v. to sale) + /cumij/ ‘cermin’ (n. mirror) + /matɔ/ ‘mata’ (n. eye) becomes /kɔda juwa cumij matɔ/ ‘kedai jual cermin mata’ (n. optics shop).

20) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Preposition e.g. /kɔda/ ‘kedai’ (n. shop) + /juwa/ ‘jual’ (v. to sale) + /baʁɛ/ ‘barang’ (n. stuff, product) + /luwa/ ‘luar’ (prep. outside) becomes /kɔda juwa baʁɛ luwa/ ‘kedai jual barang luar’ (n. imported product shop).

21) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Noun + Noun e.g. /kɔda/ ‘kedai’ (n. shop) + /juwa/ ‘jual’ (v. to sale) + /hubaʔ/ ‘ubat’ (n. medicine) + /ˈlakaʔ/ ‘akar’ (n. root) + /kaju/ ‘kayu’ (n. wood) becomes /kɔda juwa hubaʔ ˈlaka kaju/ ‘kedai jual ubat akar kayu’ (n. herb shop).

22) Noun + Intransitive Verb + Noun + Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /ɔɣe/ ‘orang’ (n. human) + /wɔʔ/ ‘bawa’ (v. to carry) + /lagu/ ‘lagu’ (n. song) + /ɔɣe/ ‘orang’ (n. human) + /puteh/ ‘putih’ (adj. white) becomes /ɔɣe wɔʔ lagu ɔɣe puteh/ ‘orang bawa lagu orang putih’ (n. western song singer).

(ii) Compound Verbs

1) Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /suwaʔ/ ‘suap’ (v. to feed) + /duwiʔ/ ‘duit’ (n. money) becomes /suwaʔ duwiʔ/ ‘suap duit’ (v. to suborn).
2) Intransitive Verb + Intransitive Verb e.g. /kəpeʔ/ ‘kepit’ (v. to squeeze) + /təŋə/ ‘tanya’ (v. to ask) becomes /kəpeʔ təŋə/ ‘kepit tanya’ (v. to investigate).

3) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Noun e.g. /punəh/ ‘punah’ (adj. lose) + /namə/ ‘nama’ (n. name) becomes /punəh namə/ ‘punah nama’ (v. to be disreputable).

4) Transitive Verb + Transitive Verb e.g. /gi/ ‘pergi’ (v. to go) + /jəle/ ‘jalan’ (v. to walk) becomes /gi jəle/ ‘pergi jalan’ (v. to travel).

5) Intransitive Verb + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /makə/ ‘makan’ (v. to eat) + /bəsəl/ ‘besar’ (adj. big) becomes /makə bəsəl/ ‘makan besar’ (v. to have a luxury meal).

6) Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /cəhəjə/ ‘cari’ (v. to find, search, look for) + /jəle/ ‘jalan’ (n. way) becomes /cəhəjə jəle/ ‘cari jalan’ (v. to attempt, seek).

7) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Preposition e.g. /panəl/ ‘panas’ (adj. hot) + /dəle/ ‘dalam’ (prep. inside) becomes /panəl dəle/ ‘panas dalam’ (v. to have a canker sore).

8) Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /ʔanəjə/ ‘angin’ (n. wind) + /təjɪ/ ‘tinggi’ (adj. high) becomes /ʔanəjə təjɪ/ ‘angin tinggi’ (v. to have a highbrow).
9) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /hitə/ 'hitam' (adj. black) + /manih/ 'manis' (adj. sweet) becomes /hitə manih/ 'hitam manis' (v. to have a tanned skin, have a good-looking).

10) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Noun e.g. /kəyah/ 'keras' (adj. hard, strong) + /pəyoʔ/ 'perut' (n. stomach) becomes /kəyah pəyoʔ/ 'keras perut' (v. to refuse to obey).

11) Descriptive Verb + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /dəme/ 'demam' (v. to become ill) + /panah/ 'panas' (adj. hot) becomes /dəme panah/ 'demam panas' (v. to have a fever).

12) Transitive Verb + Noun e.g. /na-ʔeʔ/ 'naik' (v. to go up) + /ʔanjiŋ/ 'angin' (n. wind) becomes /na-ʔeʔ ʔanjiŋ/ 'naik angin' (v. to be energetic).

13) Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /makə/ 'makan' (v. to eat) + /pəŋə/ 'pam' (n. pump) becomes /makə pəŋə/ 'makan pam' (v. to be fond of flattery).

14) Descriptive Verb + Noun + Intransitive Verb or Adjective e.g. /sakeʔi/ 'sakit' (v. to be hurt) + /pəyoʔi/ 'perut' (n. stomach) + /pulah/ 'pulas' (v. to twist) becomes /sakeʔ pəyoʔ pulah/ 'sakit perut pulas' (v. to be constipated).

15) Descriptive Verb + Noun + Noun or Adjective e.g. /hija/ 'hijau' (v. to be green colour) + /pucoʔi/ 'pucuk' (n. top) + /pisə/ 'pisang'
(n. banana) becomes /hija pucoʔ pisɛl ‘hijau pucuk pisang’ (v. to be green colour).

(iii) Compound Adjectives

1) Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /ʔainiʔ ‘angin’ (n. wind) + /tiŋgi/ ‘tinggi’ (adj. high) becomes /ʔainiʔ tiŋgi ‘angin tinggi’ (adj. highbrow).

2) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /hitam/ ‘hitam’ (adj. black) + /manis/ ‘manis’ (adj. sweet) becomes /hitam manis/ ‘hitam manis’ (adj. good-looking).

3) Descriptive Verb or Adjective + Noun e.g. /keras/ ‘keras’ (adj. hard, strong) + /perut/ ‘perut’ (n. stomach) becomes /keras perut/ ‘keras perut’ (adj. stubborn).

4) Intransitive Verb + Noun e.g. /makan/ ‘makan’ (v. to eat) + /pam/ ‘pam’ (n. pump) becomes /makan pam/ ‘makan pam’ (adj. flattered).

5) Descriptive Verb + Noun + Noun or Adjective e.g. /hijau/ ‘hijau’ (v. to be green colour) + /pucuk/ ‘pucuk’ (n. top) + /pisɛl ‘pisang’ (n. banana) becomes /hijau pucuk pisang/ ‘hijau pucuk pisang’ (adj. light green colour).

(iv) Compound Adverbs

1) Noun + Noun e.g. /kaki/ ‘kaki’ (n. foot) + /haje/ ‘ayam’ (n. chicken) becomes /kaki haje/ ‘kaki ayam’ (adv. barefoot).
2) Noun + Descriptive Verb or Adjective e.g. /kaki/ ‘kaki’ (n. foot) + /peka/ ‘peka’ (adj. lame) becomes /kaki peka/ (adv. limply).

3) Noun Classifier + Noun e.g. /səkəliʔ/ ‘sekelip’ (n. split second) + /matə/ ‘mata’ (n. eye) becomes /səkəliʔ matə/ ‘sekelip mata’ (adv. suddenly).

4) Adverb + Adverb e.g. /sijə/ ‘siang’ (adv. in broad daylight) + /małeʔ/ ‘malam’ (adv. overnight) becomes /sijə małeʔ/ ‘suang malam’ (adv. all day and all night, round the clock).

(c) Reduplication

There are five types of reduplication in PM (Uthai, 1993: 131-135).

(i) Noun Reduplication

Noun reduplication in PM indicates plural nouns as shown below.


/ʔadeʔ - ʔadeʔ/ ‘adik - adik’ (n. younger sibling - younger sibling) means younger siblings.

(ii) Verb Duplication

1) Duplication of Transitive Verbs or Intransitive Verbs

/katəʔ - katəʔ/ ‘katok - katok’ (v. to hit - to hit) means to hit someone or something repeatedly.
/lɔpaʔ - lɔpaʔ/ ‘lompat - lompat’ (v. to jump - to jump) means to jump repeatedly.

2) Duplication of Descriptive Verbs or Adjectives

/mɛɣɔh - mɛɣɔh/ ‘merah - merah’ (v., adj. to be red, red) means be not red/ quite not red.

3) Duplication of Descriptive Verbs or Adjectives

/mɛɣɔh - mɛɣɔh/ ‘merah - merah’ (v., adj. to be red, red) means be quite red/ quite red.

4) Duplication of some parts of Transitive Verbs or Intransitive Verbs

/makɛ/ ‘makan’ (v. to eat) is used together with /makɔŋ/ ‘makong’ when the speaker does not want someone to eat something. It is usually used after /tɔʔɔsɔh/ ‘tak sah’ (v. to do not do something). For example, /tɔʔɔsɔh make makɔŋ/ ‘tak sah makan makong’ means do not eat.

(iii) Adjective Reduplication

1) Duplication of Descriptive Verbs or Adjectives

/mɛɣɔh - mɛɣɔh/ ‘merah - merah’ (v., adj. to be red, red) means quite not red.

2) Duplication of Descriptive Verbs or Adjectives

/mɛɣɔh - mɛɣɔh/ ‘merah - merah’ (v., adj. to be red, red) means quite red.
(iv) Adverb Reduplication

1) Duplication of Descriptive Verb, Adjective, or Adverb e.g. /dɔ̞h - dɔ̞h/ ‘deras - deras’ (v., adj., adv. to be fast - fast) means faster.

2) Duplication of verbs e.g. /ma-ʔen - ma-ʔen/ ‘main - main’ (v. to play) means frivolously.

(v) Preposition Reduplication

Preposition reduplication in PM indicates doubtfulness or estimate as below.

/tɔŋəh - tɔŋəh/ ‘tengah - tegnah’ (prep. in the middle of - in the middle of) means (maybe) at the middle of.

/bɔwɔh - bɔwɔh/ ‘bawah - bawah’ (prep. under - under) means (maybe) under.

(d) Conversion

There are eight types of conversion in PM (Uthai, 1993: 135-139).

(i) Conversion between Verb and Adverb

/mmapoh/ ‘mampus’ means (adv.) mortally and (v.) to kill.

(ii) Conversion between Noun and Verb

/lutuʔ/ ‘lutut’ means (n.) knee and (v.) to be hit with the knee.

(iii) Conversion between Noun and Classifier
/piŋe/ ‘pinggan’ means (n.) plate and (clas.) number of plate.

(iv) Conversion between Verb and Adjective

/basa/ ‘besar’ means (v.) to be big and (adj.) big.

(v) Conversion between Verb and Classifier

/jəpuʔ/ ‘jemput’ means (v.) to pick and (clas.) a handful of.

(vi) Conversion between Verb, Noun and Classifier

/titeʔ/ ‘titiik’ means (v.) to drop, (n.) drop (of water) and (clas.) number of drop.

(vii) Conversion between Verb, Adjective and Adverb

/batol/ ‘betul’ means (v.) to be straight, (adj.) straight and (adv.) directly.

(viii) Conversion between Verb, Adverb, Classifier and Preposition

/kəlinʔ/ ‘keliling’ means (v. to surround), (adv. in a circle), (clas. cycle, number of time) and (prep. around).

2.2.2.5 Patani-Malay in Social Aspect

Research on PM in terms of its social aspects was carried out by Baru (1990) who highlighted the influence of Standard-Thai on PM. The study reveals that the influence of Standard-Thai words towards PM has gradually increased especially at lexical level. The degree of the use of Standard-Thai and PM depends on social setting and level. Gender, age, education, occupation, and living area of PM speakers are other contributing factors of the influence of Standard-Thai on PM.
In 1999, Baru completed his PhD research on government policies and their impact on Malay language in Thailand. According to the findings of his study, the Thai government’s assimilation policy has somehow discredited the identity of the local people. For example, the use of the term ‘Thai-Muslim’ instead of ‘Malay-Muslim’ for Patani people. Moreover, there has been an intervention and enforcement on the educational system of the children, which leads to Thai language to play a more important role in the society while PM is on the decline. In relation to this, Shintaro (2001), who studied sociolinguistic situation in Malaysia and Thailand, states that, compared to other parts of Thailand, Standard-Thai is used less by Malay-Muslims in the three southern border provinces. Faced with this linguistic situation, the Thai government is attempting to expand the use of Standard-Thai among PM speakers in order to decrease the use of PM especially in the administration and the education system. Currently, most of PM native speakers have finally become bilinguals of PM and Standard-Thai. The code-mixing between the two languages is clearer. PM speakers tend to use Standard-Thai words and structures in their daily conversations. It has resulted in a declining of PM usage and the change of language structure.

2.2.2.6 Language Borrowing in Patani-Malay

In the current period, many researchers are interested in the study of language borrowing in PM. It is found that PM is filled with many foreign words from languages such as Mon, Khmer, Sanskrit, Arabic, English, Chinese, Portuguese, and Thai.

Baru (1990) studied linguistic influence of Thai on PM based on the borrowing theory that was introduced by Bloomfield (1933). He examined the characteristics
of Thai borrowings in PM, the similarities and the differences of the two languages in terms of vowels, tones, consonants, and the structure of the syllables, morphemes, and construction.

Khreedaoh (2007) investigated linguistic influence and borrowing processes of Standard-Thai in PM used in Chana district of Songkhla province. The theory of borrowing process used in his study was taken from the one that was introduced by Haugen (1950). The data were collected from written and spoken sources which made his study more comprehensive. It was found that there were two borrowing processes that were found in Standard-Thai and PM used in Chana, i.e. Importation and Substitution. Apart from the borrowing processes, the study also made an observation of phonological change of Standard-Thai in PM used in Chana focusing on vowel and consonant sounds. It revealed that Standard-Thai borrowings had assimilated into the language system of the recipient language. This study was parallel to that of Kaseng (2001) who explored the sound system, sound change, and semantic change of Arabic borrowings in PM. Kaseng (2001) found that there were changes in terms of the sound system and word structure in the recipient languages when they borrowed words from the foreign language. He pointed that the sound system of Arabic borrowings consisted of less consonant and vowel phonemes than that of PM. Final consonants were found to have greater change than those of the initial ones. He concluded that the Malay dialect consisted of only 24 phonemes in which the sounds of /f/ and /z/ were only found in Arabic borrowings used in PM, not in the original vocabulary of the dialect.

Apart from being a recipient language, PM has sometimes been a donor as well. According to Wacharasukhum (1991), there were many PM words that had been
borrowed into Southern-Thai dialect. The sound of PM words were changed accordingly to the Thai dialect. Moreover, forms and meanings of PM words were also changed. For example, the initial syllable of PM word /dʒaŋ/ ‘jagung’ (n. corn) was omitted and its sound was changed to be /koŋ/.

2.2.2.7 Status of Patani-Malay in the Language Policy

PM has been limited and monitored in terms of its usage among Malay-Muslims. It can be seen from the government’s control through its various institutions in the education system (Mudmarn, 1988: 4).

According to Khreedaoh et al. (2013: 1-2), in 1921, the Thai government led by Field Marshal Plaek Piboonsongkram, promulgated the education law that it was compulsory for all Thai children to attend school and use Thai language as the medium of instruction. To promote the use of Thai language, the government did not allow Malay-Muslim students in the PM speech community to use PM at schools. The students have faced problem in the learning process in the educational system that uses Thai language as the medium of instruction. These students find that they do not fully understand their lessons because of their weakness in Thai language. Obviously, the Ministry of Education is concerned with this issue. Many strategic methods have been applied in an attempt to solve the problem. For example, teaching Thai words to students, teaching Thai language without translation, or teaching Thai language together with correction of students’ pronunciation of Thai. Many linguistic methods have also been applied in various activities in order to gain more effective results.
Khreedao et al. (2013: 3-5) state further that a bilingual system of Standard-Thai and PM project was initiated in 2006 by the Office of the Inspector General Area 12 emphasising on listening and speaking skills. Researchers from the Resource Centre for Documentation and Revitalisation of Endangered Languages and Culture (RILCA) at Mahidol University, however, state that, to solve the problem, improving only listening and speaking skills is not sufficient. The students need to improve in all four skills which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing of both Standard-Thai and PM. The focus groups who are Malay-Muslim students in the PM speech community have performed better academically after participating in the bilingual system education. They can adjust themselves faster since they understand the lessons better. However, some locals who are Malay loyalists are not satisfied with the project, especially in terms of using Thai script in transcribing PM words. They are concerned that their children will lose their Malay-Muslim identity and PM may diminish over time, and finally lose its place in their society.

This raises various questions about the status and the importance of PM in the society especially in the education system of Malay-Muslim younger generation who uses PM as their first language; to what extent PM can contribute itself to the education system of the Malay-Muslims in the area? Is PM allowed to be used at schools? And does PM help in increasing students’ academic performance? Nonetheless, from a linguistic perspective in terms of language development, all the challenges that have been mentioned are typical situations that can occur in every multilingual community. Despite the various challenges, PM holds a strong status as a dialect which is still used widely in the society.
From the studies above, it can be seen that linguistic contact occurs because of cultural, social, political, and geographical contact between the lenders and the borrowers. Borrowed words might fill lexical gaps in particular languages, but they also vary according to the borrowers’ native languages, when the form and structures of the borrowers’ languages may be altered.

### 2.2.2.8 Writing System of Patani-Malay

The arrival of Muslim scholars in the 10th century introduced a new civilisation to the region, especially during its beginning period. One of them was the development of Malay writing system. Many Malay states including Patani Darussalam adopted the Arabic script to be used as their writing system and called it Jawi. The use of the Arabic script became widespread throughout the region since then. Many written texts have been published, most of which are religious books or *kitab* written by Patani Islamic scholars or *Ulama*. Apart from the Jawi script, Roman script is also used in PM writing system. Besides, Thai script, with government support, is currently in use to convey PM in certain contexts, especially in non-formal education or in teaching PM for Thai government officials (Gilquin, 2005: 53). The three forms of PM writing system are used both in private communications among PM native speakers and also in public places such as signboards, books, and newspapers.

#### (a) Jawi Script

The Islamic power has played a significant role towards language use in the region, covering Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, Singapore, Indonesia, and southern Thailand, especially in the writing system. Seock (1986), as cited by Yusoff (1994: 84) stated that the Jawi script had been used widely in Malay literary context e.g. religious textbooks,
newspapers, magazines, and other printed media since the beginning of Malay history. It was used as the official Malay writing system until the arrival of the Europeans in the following decades during which the Roman script was first introduced. Since then, the Jawi script was used together with the Roman script which then became the official Malay writing system used in Malay states. Slowly, the Jawi script had become less important. However, in the PM speech community of Thailand, Jawi script has been continuously used widely, especially in religious books and has still retained its important status in the society.

According to Hamdan (1999: 3), there are 30 letters in the Arabic language. They are as follows.

ا ب ت ث ج ح د ذ ر ز ش ظ ص ض
ط ظ ع غ ف ق ك ه 

The 30 Arabic letters do not represent all consonant phonemes of Malay language and its dialects including PM. Five consonant phonemes which are چ، ڤ، ڠ، ڬ and ڽ were created to codify the Malay phonemes as well as PM. Moreover, the ڦ is also modified to represent the phoneme /v/ of English borrowings in Malay language.

In a research entitled ‘Using Jawi Alphabets to Develop Patani-Malay Writing System to Help Preserving and Reviving the Dialect and Local Culture’ which aims to create and develop a new PM writing system that can represent all sounds of PM and borrowings from Arabic, Thai, and English; Isaya et al. (2010) state that the Arabic alphabetic symbols can be used to create the writing system of PM and also record every phoneme in the dialect. There are 35 Jawi letters that are used
to represent local PM words, Arabic, Thai, and English borrowings in PM. However, to support some consonant phonemes which are different from Standard-Malay, eight consonant phonemes were developed for aspirated plosive phoneme /pʰ, tʰ, cʰ, kʰ/ with ڤ, ت, ﺶ, ك and half-nasal phonemes m̃, ñ, ٍ with ؤ, ٌ, ٍ, ڠ respectively. It is found that the aspirated plosive phonemes are mostly found in Thai borrowings used in PM. In terms of PM vowels, originally, there are only three vowels i.e. ی, ٞ or /i, u, a/ which actually do not represent all vowel sounds of PM. Isaya et al. (2010), thus, developed additional vowel phonemes to support vowel phonemes of PM. The new writing system of PM, however, is practically not used by the locals as they feel more comfortable using their existing writing system.

(b) Roman Script
Malay language adopted the Roman script into its writing system in 1940. Later, Zainal Abidin Bin Ahmad or Za’ba updated the writing system of Malay in 1947. The Roman script has been widely used in Malay community, including the PM speech community until today. Like English, Roman script consists of 26 letters as follows.

Lower case: a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

(c) Thai Script
There are 44 consonant letters in Thai writing system. They are taken together with Thai 32 vowels to codify PM sounds used in some written text e.g. dictionaries. The Thai letters and vowels are as follows.
Consonants: กขฃคฅฆงจฉชซฌญฎฏฐฑฒณดตถทธนบปผฝพฟภมยรลวศษสห

Vowels:

Apart from the Thai letters listed above, there are a few special Thai letters that have been developed to represent all sounds of PM. According to (Baru et al., 2008: 15), some Thai letters are used with dots, underlines, and apostrophes to adapt their phonemic sounds to PM words as follows.

Table 2.10: Special Thai Letters Developed to Represent All Sounds of Patani-Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Thai Letters Usage</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Letter with Dots</td>
<td>/g/ แกะ/geh/  n. gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/z/ ฉะเชษ/  n. dozen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/dʒ/ จีดีเช/  n. jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ӡ/ จีดีเช/  n. movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Letter with Underlines</td>
<td>/θ/ ทีธาธ/  n. stair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋ/ งิริเบ/  v. to borrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ñ/ นิวส์/sūñdī/  n. joint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/m̃/ มนิเว/kam̃uh/  v. to bury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Letter with Apostrophes</td>
<td>/k/ กขด/kkaŋkə/  n. frog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ŋ/ งิง/nɡniːkoʔ/  v. to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/s/ ชำงต/ssakɔʔ/  n. heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous studies on PM have not only helped the researcher with an understanding of its grammatical structure and pronunciation, but also with the process of data analysis. The researcher has compiled a phonetic transcription system of PM based on Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts for the purposes of this study and is shown in Table 2.11.
Table 2.11: Phonetic Transcription Based on Jawi, Roman, and Thai Scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>Jawi Script</th>
<th>Roman Script</th>
<th>Thai Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>บ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ฎ, ฏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ทร, ศ, ษ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>พ, ย, ญ, ย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k, q</td>
<td>ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>/kh/</td>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ข</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>پ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>พ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f, ph</td>
<td>อ, ภ, ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ร</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>ธ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ฮ, ช, ธ, ส, ษ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ش</td>
<td>sy, sh</td>
<td>อ, ย, ฉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ป, ผ, ป</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ย, อ, น, ว, ง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>sy, sh</td>
<td>อ, ย, ฉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>/θ/</td>
<td>ث</td>
<td>ts, s</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>/θ/</td>
<td>ظر.ذ.</td>
<td>dh, z</td>
<td>ฮ, ผ, ป</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>v, w</td>
<td>ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>و</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>ظر.ذ.</td>
<td>dh, z</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g, j</td>
<td>ย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>/dz/</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>g, j</td>
<td>ย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>/c/</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>อ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>/ch/</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>ฉ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 The Concept of Language Borrowing

According to Muhvic-Dimanovski (n.d.), studies on linguistic contact were widespread among linguists after philologists found out that foreign words existed in every language and the influence of these foreign words was at different levels. It can be traced back to the 18th century at the time when lexicographers started to collect and systemise vocabulary to compile dictionaries. They found many foreign words in the languages they studied which they had to decide whether to put them into the dictionaries. At that time, the interchange of languages was termed ‘language mixture’ and ‘mixed languages’. The terms were changed to ‘languages in contact’ and ‘linguistic borrowing’ during the 20th century after the publication of Weinreich’s book ‘Languages in Contact’ and Haugen’s influential article on ‘Linguistic Borrowing’ in 1953 and 1950 respectively. However, the term ‘borrowing’ was not that new. As a matter of fact, Sapir had introduced this term in a chapter in his book ‘Language’ as early as 1921. In fact, an interest in linguistic problems of language contact, language borrowing, bilingualism, code-switching, and other fields of linguistic studies started since that point of time (Muhvic-Dimanovski, n.d. : 3)

Language borrowing does not only enrich the amount of vocabulary of the recipient language or fulfil its lexical gap, but also helps people of different linguistic and cultural groups to have a better understanding of each other. Language is about culture. It is a part of a community used to represent ideas, thoughts, and beliefs of a particular speech community. The following sub-headings are brief descriptions of the concept of language borrowing.
2.3.1 Definition of Language Borrowing

Language borrowing is a widespread sociolinguistic phenomenon that occurs when two or more languages are in contact and their speakers adopt or take words from each other into their native language.

The Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2010) defines ‘borrowing’ as “a word, a phrase or an idea that somebody has taken from another person’s work or from another language and used in their own” (p. 166). It is similar to what the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2005) describes: “something such as a word, phrase, or idea that has been copied from another language, book etc.” (p. 164-165). Apart from that, borrowing also means “…a process by which one language or dialect takes and incorporates some linguistic elements from another” (Arlotto, 1972: 184 as cited by Karavi, 1996).

Haugen (1950: 81) explained language borrowing as an attempt by speakers of a language to reproduce patterns that were previously found in another language. It is a process in which foreign elements are taken and used in another language. Gleason (1955), as cited by Karavi (1996), also agreed that language borrowing was a copy of linguistic items from speakers of another speech form.

Ruikuo (2005: 7) stated that the adopted words or patterns from another language into one’s native language were termed ‘borrowings, or loanwords’. However, Jacques (2010: 14) stated that the term ‘borrowing’ was used for the whole process of borrowing, whereas the term ‘loanword’ referred to a borrowed word taken from a foreign language. Both terms are often interchangeable. Nonetheless, it is a consequence of cultural contact between two language communities where sounds
and grammatical structures of certain words may be borrowed. The speakers of the recipient language might partially or totally adopt a foreign word into their own language system. They may also retain certain phonology, morphology, and semantic features of the source words (Jacques, 2010: 12).

2.3.2 Classification of Language Borrowing

Various scholars’ classification of linguistic borrowing helps in providing a guideline or framework for language users in dealing with language borrowing situations. According to Bloomfield (1933: 444), linguistic borrowing could be classified into three following types.

1) Cultural: borrowing process that occurs within linguistic communities that share common geographical and political boundaries. Words such as new concepts, ideas, and things are taken e.g. the words ‘rough’ and ‘garage’ that English borrows from French into its vocabulary.

2) Intimate: borrowing process that occurs when two or more languages are used within the same geographical and political domain where the higher language becomes the source of language borrowing for language with lower linguistic status.

3) Dialect: borrowing of words within the same speech community.

According to Peperkamp (2001), as cited by Jacques (2010: 13), who distinguished types of borrowings according to the period when the borrowings were in use, there are two types of language borrowing. The first one is called ‘historical loanwords’ which are words that have been used in a recipient language for so long and commonly used by monolingual speakers who are not aware of the foreign elements or have never heard the foreign original forms of the words. The second type is ‘on-line adaptation’ which includes on-going borrowings of foreign words. This kind of borrowing becomes
historical loanwords after the foreign elements are fully adapted or assimilated into the language and are not changed further.

2.3.3 Types of Language Borrowing

Haugen (1950) classified types of borrowings under two distinguished processes, namely Importation and Substitution. The Importation of words occurs when the original language structure and pronunciation of a borrowing are retained as part of the transfer process whereas the Substitution of words occurs when the original language structure and pronunciation of a borrowing are changed as part of the transfer process.

As regards to the types of language borrowing, Haugen, (1950) has categorised the lexical borrowings into three major types which are Loanwords, Loanblends, and Loanshifts under the processes of borrowing. The details are as follows.

i) Loanwords occur through a complete morphemic importation without substitution. Sounds and meanings of borrowed words may or may not be changed. They can be classified into none, partial, or a complete phonemic substitution of the borrowed form.

ii) Loanblends occur through a combination of partial morphemic importation of borrowed words with native morpheme substitution in the same item.

iii) Loanshifts represent complete morphemic substitution without importation. They can be called ‘loan translation’ or ‘semantic loans’ as a foreign item is translated into the receiving language.
According to Heah (1989), English lexical expansion process in Malay can be divided into three processes i.e. Importation, Substitution, and Native Creation. Under each process, the English borrowings in Standard-Malay are categorised into six types which are Pure Loanwords, Loanblends, Loanshifts, Apt Equivalent Substitutes, Hybrid Creations, and Induce Creations according to the degree of assimilation.

### 2.3.4 Factors of the Language Borrowing

There are many factors that play an important part in the borrowing process between donor languages and recipient languages. Below are some samples of the factors.

#### 2.3.4.1 Language Contact

A close relation of two cultures can lead to language contact. The linguistic phenomenon causes the languages in contact to transfer and exchange their elements with each other. Sapir (1921), as cited by Muhvic-Dimanovski (n.d.), stated that cultural contact could lead to inter-linguistic influences and borrowing of words is the simplest way whereby one language could influence another. The expansion of religions is another obvious factor for language contact such as Christian missionaries from western countries who brought English and other languages into Southeast Asia region or the spread of Arabic language which was due to influence of Muslim scholars and traders in the past centuries.

In terms of linguistic features, language contact can lead to several changes of certain aspects of vocabulary items as well. Some foreign words are used without adaptation, while others have been changed or adjusted to suit the pronunciation and grammatical patterns of the recipient language. This situation may not happen consciously as foreign
words have been used for so long until nobody recognises or is aware of their origins especially the younger generation.

2.3.4.2 The Lexical Gaps

Things or concepts may exist in one language but not in another. The absence of some lexical items representing things, concepts, or objects might lead to misunderstanding when two languages come into contact. The inadequacy of one language would require its speakers to develop words to express the new things, ideas, and concepts. Hockett (1958: 405) called this inter-lingua borrowing ‘need-feeling motive’; whereby the borrowing language takes some words from donor language to refer to new things that have no equivalent items in its vocabulary. It appears to be a convenient manner for speakers to term the new things.

2.3.4.3 The Prestige

Normally, language borrowing between two languages can occur in both directions. Language A may borrow from language B and vice versa. However, the degree of borrowing is often not asymmetrical due to different numbers of borrowings that are typically borrowed by speakers of each language. This situation happens when one language in the contact situation has more prestige in terms of politics, social status, economy, or technology. Barber (1993) agreed with that and stated that the language of a nation with a higher power in politics, commerce, and culture could cause some changes in neighbouring languages. The rapid development of science and technology is another reason that helps a particular language gain a prestigious position in the world of language. In recent centuries, the development in the English-speaking countries has led to wider borrowing by speakers of other languages.
Political prestige, military conquest, and colonisation are other reasons that can influence a language, for example, a large influx of French words that entered English after the Norman conquest of England in 1066 and the use of Chinese characters in Japanese as a result of the Chinese’ flourishing power, economy, and superior culture since ancient time. Another good example that clearly shows this incidence is the use of English in Southeast Asia. A huge amount of English borrowings used throughout the region is one of the successes of the British colonial power. English is thought to be a language of the educated or modern people. This emphasises the importance of the language in the region. Apart from being a dominant language in the region, English is also the most prestigious language and the greatest donor language on earth.

2.4 Conclusion

The review of literature is closely related to this study in terms of framework, methodology, and data analysis. It helps the researcher considerably in understanding how language borrowing occurs and also enables the researcher to obtain a better understanding of approaches towards the subject of language borrowing to devise a suitable methodology to assess and analyse the data in PM in the subsequent chapters.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the methodology employed in this study, which includes the conceptual framework for data analysis, research design, and selection of data. Apart from that, the methods utilised for data analysis are also discussed.

3.2 Conceptual Framework

In this study, the conceptual frameworks used for the purpose of analysis the language borrowing processes and the classification of semantic fields of English lexical items used in PM were based on the works of Haugen (1950), Heah (1989), and Haspelmath & Tadmor (2009) as illustrated in the following sections.

3.2.1 Language Borrowing Processes

3.2.1.1 Haugen’s Framework

Haugen (1950) defined borrowing as “the attempted reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another” (p. 212). It is a reproduction of a word from its original pattern or ‘the model’ into a borrowing language which results as ‘the replica’. He distinguished the borrowing pattern into two distinct processes of reproduction, namely Importation and Substitution. Importation occurs when the original form and pronunciation of the borrowings remain unchanged, while Substitution occurs when the borrowings are changed or reproduced in form or pronunciation. Considering the extent of morphemic substitution of a borrowing, Haugen (1950: 214) established the categorisation of borrowings as none, partial,
or complete. Complete morphemic substitution precludes phonemic substitution, but within the morphemic importation there may be a division of more or less phonemic substitution. Consequently, borrowings can be grouped into three major types, namely Loanwords, Loanblends, and Loanshifts based primarily on the relationship between morphemic and phonemic substitution at the lexical level.

(a) Loanwords

Loanwords show morphemic importation without substitution. Any morphemic importation can be further classified according to the degree of its phonemic substitution: none, partial, or complete. That is, the importation of form and meaning of a borrowing may occur with different degrees of phonological assimilation.

(b) Loanblends

Loanblends show morphemic substitution as well as importation. All substitution involves a certain degree of analysis by the speaker of the model that he is imitating; only such 'Hybrids' as involve a discoverable foreign model are included here. In other words, Loanblend is a combination of foreign and native words.

(c) Loanshifts

Loanshifts show morphemic substitution without importation. These include what are usually called 'Loan Translations' and 'Semantic Loans'; the term 'shift' is suggested because they appear in the borrowing language only as functional shifts of native morphemes. In short, in Loanshift, a foreign concept or meaning is interpreted in a native word.
3.2.1.2 Heah’s Framework

Heah (1989) examined English influence on the lexical expansion of Standard-Malay on phonology, grammar, semantic structure, and orthography with the aim of investigating how the English borrowings affected the structure of Standard-Malay based on Haugen’s (1950) framework.

Heah used Haugen’s classification of the borrowing process as a starting point. Nonetheless, she (1989: 24-25) pointed that Haugen’s method in classifying the borrowings had certain limitations when applied to all contact situations as it focused mainly on bilingualism and oral borrowings whereas there were many other linguistic contact situations that took place in monolingual contexts and some borrowings were made not only in the spoken form but also in written form. It was clear that, Haugen’s criterion in classifying ‘Loanwords’ into the degree of its phonemic substitution as none, partial, or complete “can be applied only for oral borrowings, where the morpheme and its phonemic shape are imported simultaneously. It cannot be applied to transliterated borrowings where the morpheme alone is imported, without the simultaneous transfer of its phonemic form” (Heah, 1989: 25).

Therefore, further classification of ‘Loanwords’ into orthographic or spelling criterion was needed for written data. Besides, Heah also stated that Haugen’s scheme had been developed in a contact situation of cognate languages i.e. Norwegian and English. The classification of borrowings was not adequate for classifying language contact between non-cognate languages such as English and Malay. This could be seen in ‘Semantic Extension’ which was classified by Haugen into ‘homonymous’, ‘synonymous’, and ‘homologous’ extensions. These three classifications were deemed impractical for contact situations of non-cognate languages like English and Standard-Malay since the majority of extensions were viewed as ‘synonymous’.
Heah suggested that apart from the processes of Importation and Substitution, Native Creation, which showed how English had stimulated and influenced the word-formation processes in Standard-Malay, was also involved as one of language borrowing processes in her study.

Under the three language borrowing processes of English in Standard-Malay, namely Importation, Substitution, and Native Creation, Heah divided the English borrowings into different major types, namely Pure Loanwords and Loanblends under the process of Importation, Loanshifts and Apt Equivalent Substitutes under the process of Substitution, and Hybrid Creations and Induced Creations under the process of Native Creation. Apart from that, she established further a number of sub-types of borrowing according to the degrees of linguistic adaptations of the English borrowings in Standard-Malay under each major type.

In this study, the recipient language, PM, is a dialect of Standard-Malay and the donor language is English. The English words and expressions were introduced into PM through Standard-Malay and other Malay dialects whilst the data were extracted from Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts. As such, Heah’s classification was most suitable to be used as the framework with Haugen’s classification being retained.
(a) The Process of Importation

Heah (1989) sub-classified Importation into two main types, (i) Loanwords and (ii) Loanblends; these were further classified into seven and four sub-types respectively.

(i) Pure Loanwords

Pure Loanwords are direct borrowings from English. Their morphemic shape is recognisably English and they are not fused with Malay words, although, some phonemic substitution may occur.

Heah established seven sub-types of Pure Loanwords according to their degrees of adaptation as reflected in the spelling system.

1) Unassimilated Loanwords

Unassimilated Loanwords are borrowings that are not changed in terms of orthography in any way. Form and meaning used in the English model and the replica in Standard-Malay are identical. They are mostly found in the language of advertising, particularly noticeable in trade names and in the technical sphere. In written Standard-Malay, the Unassimilated Loanwords are usually used in italics, quotation marks, brackets, or in explanatory and translational devices.

For example, in an advertisement, “Kini harga Breeze telah diturunkan!” (Berita Harian 28/5/79), the brand name of detergent ‘Breeze’ is taken directly from English without any changes and is mentioned in Standard-Malay, in italics.
2) Partially Assimilated Loanwords

Partially Assimilated Loanwords are borrowings that undergo a slight degree of orthographic adaptation. However, features which are not part of Standard-Malay orthography are retained such as consonant clusters in word initial and final positions as found in the word *skrip* ‘script’, the consonant letter-sequence in the final position of the word is reduced by omitting the final component *t* where the initial consonant letter-sequence *skr* is however retained.

3) Wholly Assimilated Loanwords

Wholly Assimilated Loanwords are borrowings that have been completely assimilated in terms of orthography and sound system which only a few speakers are aware of with respect to their English origin. These are terms which have been used in Standard-Malay for many years and have become a regular part of Standard-Malay vocabulary or ‘established’ Loanwords.

For example,

\[ \text{kabin ‘cabin’, saman ‘summons’, opis ‘office’, sekeru ‘screw’,} \]
\[ \text{loyar ‘lawyer’, leterik ‘electricity’, inci ‘inch’}. \]

4) Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords

Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords are borrowings that are adapted by being re-spelled in Standard-Malay reflecting their pronunciation in the original English. In Standard-Malay, they are pronounced as in English; but spelled differently in terms of its orthographic form.
For example,

*bil* ‘bill’, *cek* ‘cheque’, *gazet* ‘gazette’, *pas* ‘pass’.

5) Fused Compounds

Fused Compounds are English compound words that are borrowed into Standard-Malay as single units in which their bimorphemic identity is not retained as they are completely fused into indissoluble units. For example,

*lokap* ‘lock-up’, *mekap* ‘make-up’, *gostan* ‘go astern’ (to reverse the car).

6) Analysed Compounds

Analysed Compounds are English compound words whose morpho-syntactic order is adapted as analysed units to the patterns found in Standard-Malay. For example,

*bom atom* ‘atomic bomb’, *muzik pop* ‘pop music’.

From the samples provided, the word-order of English Modifier + Head has been changed to Standard-Malay word order Head + Modifier.

7) Truncated Loanwords

Truncated Loanwords are English words with more than three syllables that have been abbreviated. For instance, consonants or whole syllables are pared, and the remaining syllables are sometimes rearranged as evident in.

For example,

*lamnet* ‘lemonade’ or *kamsen* ‘commission’.
Besides, abbreviations can also occur in English compound words where only one part of the compound unit remains representing its structure and meaning as in **stereng** for ‘steering-wheel’, **motor** for ‘motor-car’.

(ii) Loanblends

Loanblends or Hybrid Loanwords are a combination of morphemic importation and native morphemic substitution in the same item. Part of a Loanblend is a native word and the other is a borrowed one. English Loanblends in Standard-Malay are distinguished according to its imported part as follows.

1) Marginal Loanblends

Marginal Loanblends are borrowings in which the stem is a Standard-Malay word combined with an affix taken from English. There are only five Marginal Loanblends found in Heah’s study which are **anti-pencemaran** ‘anti-pollution’, **anti-dasar** ‘anti-policy’, **anti-seni** ‘anti-art’, **pro-kerajaan** ‘pro-government’, and **sub-golongan** ‘sub-group’.

2) Nuclear Loanblends

Nuclear Loanblends are a combination of an English stem with a Standard-Malay affix.

For example,

*kestabilan* ‘stability’, *pemuzik* ‘musician’, *berdigniti* ‘dignified’.
3) Compound Loanblends

Compound Loanblends are a substitution of an independent morpheme. It comprises a mixture of an English morpheme with a native word. There are two types of Compound Loanblends;

3.1) Nuclear Compound Loanblends where the nucleus is imported.

For example,

*jet pejuang* ‘fighter jet’, *krisis perlembanga* ‘constitutional crises.

3.2) Marginal Compound Loanblends occur when the modifier is imported.

For example,

*bantuan moral* ‘moral support’ and *sebutan standard* ‘standard pronunciation’.

4) Tautological Loanblends

Tautological Loanblends are pairs of English words with native words denoting similar referents.

For example,

*mangkuk bol* ‘bowl’, *kasut but* ‘boots’, *api lektrik* ‘electricity’. 
(b) The Process of Substitution

Heah (1989) sub-classified Substitution into two main types, (i) Loanshifts and (ii) Apt Equivalent Substitutes; each of which was further classified into two sub-types.

(i) Loanshifts

Loanshifts indicate ‘morphemic substitution without importation’ (Haugen, 1950: 215). The morphemes are all native terms designating new concepts expressed in English based on models of English items. There are two sub-types of Loanshifts.

1) Loan Translations

Loan Translations are where the native terms appear in a new arrangement on the model of English lexical items. They are divided into the following sub-sub-types.

1.1) Literal Loan Translations in which the model is reproduced by an element in the borrowing language. It can be seen clearly when involving derivatives.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monolingual</td>
<td>ekabahasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decolourise</td>
<td>(me)nyehwarna(kan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In compound words, the word-order of English lexical items is adapted to Standard-Malay pattern.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plane angle</td>
<td>sudut satah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold war</td>
<td>perang dingin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, there are a number of cases, where the word-order is not reversed. They are usually official titles.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>Perdana Menteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Timbalan Pengarah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2) Loan renditions in which “the model compound only furnishes a general hint for the reproduction”, as mentioned by Weinreich (1953: 51).

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Model</th>
<th>Malay Replica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>black market</td>
<td>pasar gelap (dark market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guided missile</td>
<td>peluru berpandu (guided bullet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3) Syntactic Calques are borrowings whose phrases are direct translations of fixed expressions in English that may be based on English prepositional phrases, stylistic or idiomatic expressions.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malay Calque</th>
<th>English Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>berhubun(an) dengan</td>
<td>in connection with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sebagai akibat dari</td>
<td>as a result of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidak dapat dinafikan bahawa</td>
<td>It cannot be denied that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Semantic Extensions

Semantic Extensions are Loanshifts in which the ‘shift of context’ refers to the semantic field of the native morpheme. They are the result of the application of an existing Standard-Malay term to cover the semantic dimension(s) of an English item. In other words, the meanings of Standard-Malay words are extended while retaining its original form. This type of borrowing involves partial semantic similarity between a Standard-Malay term and an English term which functions as its model.

For example, before borrowing, Standard-Malay word *arus* ‘current’ shared with the English model *current* the designative function of reference to the flow of a stream of water. With the English contact, a shift in the designative function of Standard-Malay word occurred to include a new designative function, that is, reference to the movement of electricity.

(ii) Apt Equivalent Substitutes

Apt Equivalent Substitutes are a different form of Substitution in which English model is not involved. However, Apt Equivalent Substitutes are considered as part of the Substitution process as they are Standard-Malay
words responding to English lexical impact. There are two sub-types of Apt Equivalent Substitutes as follows.

1) Direct Equivalent Substitute

Direct Equivalent Substitute is a process in which Standard-Malay words or expressions are used for concept embodied in English terms.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Term</th>
<th>Malay Equivalent Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td>logam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat</td>
<td>haba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estuary</td>
<td>kuala</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes, English phrases, compound words, or economic expressions are also substituted for by simple words in Standard-Malay.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Term</th>
<th>Malay Equivalent Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lowland</td>
<td>pamah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overflow</td>
<td>limpah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Equivalent Substitute also involves the use of Malay idiomatic expressions in place of English words and expressions.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word/ Expression</th>
<th>Malay Equivalent Substitute</th>
<th>Literal Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anarchy</td>
<td>kucar - kacir</td>
<td>in disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluctuation</td>
<td>turun naik</td>
<td>up and down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in detail</td>
<td>panjang lebar</td>
<td>long and wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Indirect Equivalent Substitute

Indirect Equivalent Substitute is a borrowing from another language, for example, an Arabic word used in place of an English word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Arabic Substitute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>magazine</td>
<td>majalah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council</td>
<td>majlis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heah stated that, “Arabism could have been avoided by using Malay words, adapted English Loanwords which already have some currency in the language, established Sanskrit Loanwords or even fully integrated Arabic Loanwords known to the majority of Malay-speakers”.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Word</th>
<th>Substituting Arabicism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>republic</td>
<td>jumhuriyah (instead of ‘republik’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>natijah (instead of the older Arabic Loanword ‘akibat’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) The Process of Native Creation

Heah (1989) sub-classified Native Creation into two main types, (i) Hybrid Creations and (ii) Induced Creations. Of these, Induced Creations were further classified into five sub-types.

(i) Hybrid Creations

Hybrid Creations are lexical forms with a combination of native and imported elements. Sometimes, they are confused with Loanblends as they resemble in being composed of both borrowed and native material.
Nonetheless, Hybrid Creations are not imitations of English models rather they are filled with loan morphemes into Standard-Malay models.

Hybrid Creations which make use of established English Loanwords are found mainly in the daily language of the community.

For example,

\[
\textit{doktor gigi} \text{ ‘dentist’ (from the Loanword } \textit{doktor} \text{ ‘doctor’ + gigi ‘teeth’)}
\]
\[
\textit{kertas ditto} \text{ ‘stencil’ (from } \textit{kertas} \text{ ‘paper’ + the Loanword } \textit{ditto)}
\]

In coining scientific and technical terms, the examples of Hybrid Creations are as follows.

\[
\textit{hampagas} \text{ ‘vacuum’ (from } \textit{hampa} \text{ ‘empty’ + the Loanword } \textit{gas)}
\]
\[
\textit{sel pulihan} \text{ ‘accumulator’ (from the Loanword } \textit{sel} \text{ ‘cell’ + pulihan ‘restoration’)}
\]

Hybrid Creations also make use of loan affixes from English.

For example,

\[
\textit{cerpenis} \text{ ‘short story writer’ (from } \textit{cerpen} \text{ ‘short story’ + -is)}
\]
\[
\textit{pro-agama} \text{ ‘sympathetic to religion’ (from } \textit{pro-} + \textit{agama ‘religion’)}
\]

In the area of idiomatic expression, Hybrid Creations are as follows.

\[
\textit{kelas kambing} \text{ ‘low-class’ (from } \textit{kelas} \text{ ‘class’ + kambing ‘goat’)}
\]
\[
\textit{poket kosong} \text{ ‘to be broke’ (from } \textit{poket ‘pocket’ + kosong ‘empty’)}
\]
(ii) Induced Creations

Unlike Hybrid Creations, Induced Creations are formed entirely from native word material. Heah (1989) examined them into five processes they were created, namely Affixation, Compounding, Blending, Reduplication, and Circumlocution as provided below.

1) Affixation

1.1) Prefixation

The most common prefixes used to create new words are *me-*, *ber-*, *pe-*. For example,

*memusat* ‘centripetal’ The verbal (transitive) prefix *me-* is attached to a noun *pusat* ‘centre’.

*berkadar* ‘proportional’ The prefix *ber-* is mainly used with transitive verbs. It is used to derive a “verbal adjective” from a noun *kadar* ‘rate’ with the sense of ‘having’ or ‘being endowed with’.

*pembuluh* ‘vein’ The noun forming (agentive) prefix *pe-* (in its phonological variant *pem-*) is attached to *buluh* ‘bamboo’, modifying the meaning of the word in the process.

1.2) Suffixation

Many new words have been formed by the use of the nominal suffix –*an* which usually indicates the result of an act.

For example,

*rintangan* ‘resistance’ (engineering) where a noun has been formed from the verb *rintang* ‘to bar’.

*lebihan* ‘surplus’ (economics), a noun is derived from an adjective *lebih* ‘more’.

1.3) Prefixation + Suffixation

The most common pairs of prefix-suffix which have been used to form new words are: *pe-an, ke-an* which give rise to abstract
nouns indicating ‘process’ and ‘state/condition’ respectively; and
me-kan which is usually used to form transitive verbs.

For example,

- pencemaran ‘pollution’. The prefix pe- (in its phonological variant pen-) and the suffix -an is attached to noun cemar ‘dirt’.
- kelembapan ‘humidity’. The pair of prefix-suffix ke-an is used to form a scientific concept from the adjective lembap ‘moist, damp’
- menyelaraskan ‘to co-ordinate’. A transitive verb has been derived by attaching me-kan to an adjective selaras ‘concordant’.

1.4) Infixation

Infixation involves the insertion of an infix after the first phoneme of the root word. The infixes in Standard-Malay are limited to –en, -el, -em.

For example,

- gerigi ‘serrated’, from gigi ‘tooth’ and the infix -er.

1.5) Affixation + Other Processes of Word Formation

1.5.1) Affixation + Reduplication

Affixation is attached to words which have been reduplicated.

For example,

- kebarat-baratan ‘Western-like’ the prefix ke- and suffix -an are attached to the word barat ‘West’ which has been reduplicated.
1.5.2) Affixation + Compounding

New words are derived by attaching appropriate affixes to words which have been first formed by compounding.

For example,

\[ \text{penyalahgunaan} \] ‘abuse’ the normal prefix and suffix \[ \text{pe-an} \] are attached to the compound word \[ \text{salahguna} \] ‘misuse’.

2) Compounding

2.1) Compounding Based on Root-Words as Constituents

The combination of root-words is by far the most common method of compound formation. Any part of speech can be combined with another.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>+ Noun</th>
<th>English Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rumah</td>
<td>pangsa</td>
<td>flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(house)</td>
<td>(segment fruit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>+ Verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapal</td>
<td>selam</td>
<td>submarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ship)</td>
<td>(to dive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In compound formation with root-words, two further sub-types maybe distinguished.

2.1.1) Compound with Bound Morphemes as the First Constituent

The majority of words involved in this type are words borrowed from Sanskrit.
For example,

- **maha** + **guru** (big) (teacher) -> **professor**
- **tata** + **bahasa** (order) (language) -> **grammar**

### 2.1.2) Compounds with Specific Words as the First Constituent

It involves the use of a small group of words which have been given a specialized meaning so that they now function as word-formative element providing the bases from which a whole series of words can be derived.

For Example,

- **Juru** + **terbang** (to fly) -> **pilot**
- **Juru** + **bahasa** (to write) -> **interpreter**

### 2.2) Compounding Based on Derived Words or a Derived Word and Root-Word as Constituents

Compounds which have one or more derived forms as their constituent are mostly formed with a derived word and a root-word as constituent.

For example,

- a) **Root-Word** + **Derived Word**
  - **kilang** (factory) + **penapis** (that which filters) -> **refinery**
- b) **Derived-Word** + **Root-Word**
  - **pungutan** (gathering) + **suara** (voice) -> **referendum**
- c) **Derived-Word** + **Derived-Word**
  - **sukatan** (measurement) + **pelajaran** (learning) -> **curriculum**
3) Blending

Blending is a new morphological process that has been introduced into Standard-Malay to create words to match those in English especially in the scientific and technical fields. There are basically five types of blending used in Standard-Malay.

3.1) Combination of the first syllables of the words in an expression

For example,

*cerpen* ‘short story’ (from *cerita* ‘story + *pendek* ‘short’)

3.2) Combination of the first syllable of the first word with the last syllable of the second word

For example,

*hakis* ‘to erode’ (from *habis* ‘complete’ + *kikis* ‘to scrape’)

3.3) Combination of the first syllable of the first word with one complete word

For example,

*purata* ‘average’ (from *pukul* ‘to hit’ + *rata* ‘level’)

3.4) Combination of the first word in its entirety with the first or last syllable of the second word

For example,

*tairidra* ‘dance-drama’ (from *tari* ‘dance’ + drama)

3.5) Assimilation of identical phonemes or syllables in the constituent words
For example,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{gambar} & \text{rajah} & \text{gambarajah} \\
\text{(picture)} & \text{(figure)} & \text{(diagram)} \\
\text{debu} & \text{bunga} & \text{debunga} \\
\text{(dust)} & \text{(flower)} & \text{(pollen)} \\
\end{array}
\]

4) Reduplication

There are three main semantic functions of reduplication as follows.

4.1) to extend the meaning of a word

For example,

\[
\text{cair ‘watery’} \rightarrow \text{cecair ‘liquid’}
\]

4.2) to indicate similarity

For example,

\[
\text{lembing ‘spear’} \rightarrow \text{lelembing ‘spear-like’}
\]

4.3) to indicate dimunitiveness

For example,

\[
\text{rambut ‘hair’} \rightarrow \text{rerambut ‘capillary’}
\]

5) Circumlocution

Circumlocution or descriptive periphrasis tends to describe the new cultural item usually in terms of its appearance or functional utility literally.

For example,

\[
\text{lapisan pembawa air ‘water carrying layer’ for vector}
\]

\[
\text{aquifugeekurangan zat makanan ‘deficiency of nutritious food’}
\]
3.2.2 Classification of Semantic Fields

In this study, the researcher basically adapted Haspelmath & Tadmor’s (2009) classification of semantic fields used in ‘The Loanword Typology Project’ (henceforth LWT). LWT was a typological study of lexical borrowing in 41 languages worldwide conducted from 2004-2009 by linguists led by Haspelmath and Tadmor who were the editors of the project.

There were 1,460 lexical meanings listed in the project. They were categorised into 24 semantic fields, 22 of which were retained from Buck’s (1949) list and Key’s Intercontinental Dictionary Series’ (IDS) list, although some of them had been renamed. Two fields that were added were ‘Modern world’ and ‘Miscellaneous function words’ (Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009: 6). Haspelmath & Tadmor (2009) emphasised that each list “is a meaning list, not a word list. The items on the list were meanings that could be relevant in any language, not words of a particular language” (p. 5).

The 24 semantic fields were provided in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Semantic Field</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Semantic Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Physical World</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Food and Drink</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Clothing and Grooming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The House</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Agriculture and Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Basic Actions and Technology</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Spatial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sense Perception</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Emotions and Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Speech and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Social and Political Relations</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Warfare and Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Religion and Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Modern World</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Function Words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Research Design

This study employed qualitative and quantitative approaches to describe and interpret the findings in relation to the theories of language contact and language borrowing. A variety of reference information had been studied to increase understanding of the history and linguistic phenomenon of the PM speech community in the southern border provinces of Thailand, namely Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and some parts of Songkhla, as well as the concepts of language contact and language borrowing.

3.3.1 Data Collection

The overall data of this study consisted of 507 English lexical items. They were authentic texts collected from a series of printed media, namely dictionaries, newspapers, news scripts, and signboards written in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts. The printed media were published in the PM speech community of Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat, and some parts of Songkhla from 2006-2013.

3.3.1.1 Materials

(a) Dictionaries

There were two dictionaries used as the main sources of data in this study. The first dictionary was ‘Patani-Malay - Thai and Thai - Patani-Malay Dictionary’ published in 2008 by the Institute of Southeast Asian Maritime States Studies, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus. It was written in Thai script and compiled by a group of scholars and lecturers who were experts in PM and Standard-Malay. The dictionary consisted of 596 pages and divided into two sections: (i) PM-Thai; and (ii) Thai-PM. It provided definitions
and stressed marks as well as usage of the words in form of examples (See Appendix A1).

The second dictionary was ‘Dictionary of Patani-Malay – Standard-Thai – Standard-Malay for Basic Education and Communication’ published in 2008. It was compiled by a group of PM local experts with the aim of introducing PM vocabulary that were commonly used by the local speakers in their daily lives. The items were written in Thai script and categorised into 22 semantic fields. The meanings of each word were provided in Thai using Thai script and in Standard-Malay using Roman script (See Appendix A2).

(b) Newspapers

Two Standard-Thai and PM bilingual newspapers, namely ‘Aman Damai’ (Peace) and ‘Suara Fathani’ (Voice of Patani) using Thai and Jawi scripts were selected as another data source in this study. The data that were written in Jawi scripts were taken from two issues of ‘Aman Damai’ published during 15 December 2006 – 15 January 2007 (See Appendix A3) and 15 January – 15 February 2007 (See Appendix A4), and one issue from ‘Suara Fathani’ published between 1 - 15 February 2007 (See Appendix A5).

(c) News Scripts

The data in this study were also taken from news scripts written in Roman script (See Appendix A6). The news scripts were provided by a PM news reporter from NBT Channel. The researcher visited branch station of the television
channel in Yala province to request for the data. The contents of the news scripts were mostly documentaries about administration and political issues in the PM speech community broadcasted in 2010. The titles of the documentaries were listed in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title of the Series</th>
<th>Title of the Documentaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is Constitution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative Law</td>
<td>Learning Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Constitution of Rights and Freedoms of People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Children Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Consumer Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Older People's Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A Teacher who Follows “Understanding, Reaching Out, and Development” Royal Principle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Salapao United</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Solving the Problems, Understanding, Reaching out, and Development for Suan Pa Ta Huan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Protect our Hometown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Love our Homeland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Narathiwat Central Prison: Opportunities of Wrongdoers</td>
<td>Follow the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Creative Media for Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Journalist Leader for Peaceful South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A Village Headman: Developer, Accessible, and Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Study Centre of Sufficiency Economy: A Model Farm at Piya Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Signboards

Finally, the English borrowings used on signboards such as shop signboards, destination signboards, and signboards of government places written in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts were also taken through on-site observation in Yala and Narathiwat provinces (See Appendix A7).
The above printed media were selected as data sources so as to cover a wide range of English borrowings that were used by PM users. To ensure that the English borrowings were lexical items not phrases, the data were cross-checked using the following dictionaries.


3.3.1.2 Procedure

(a) Time

In this study, data collection was divided into two time periods. The first period took from September 2010 until March 2011 during which data from dictionaries, newspapers, and news scripts were collected. To clarify the initial analysis of the data and related issues, individual consultations were conducted
with lecturers from Thaksin University, Thailand, and Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, in October 2011 and May 2012.

The second period started from July 2012 until January 2013 during which on-site observations were carried out to collect data from signboards in Yala and Narathiwat provinces.

(b) Selection of Data

In selecting data, the researcher marked out the English borrowings from the dictionaries, newspapers, and news scripts page by page. Subsequently, the researcher randomly collected data from various signboards in Yala and Narathiwat provinces as part of her fieldworks. Due to unrest situation in the area under study, the researcher faced difficulties to collect data in Pattani and Songkhla provinces and rural areas of Yala and Narathiwat provinces. Therefore, the researcher mainly sought data in big cities of the provinces of Yala and Narathiwat. During this process, for data compiled from shop signboards, the researcher requested for permission to take the photos of the signboards from shop owners and explained to them that the photos would be used for study purpose only.

All English lexical items obtained were recorded. However, the items that were recorded were not listed again.
(c) Transcription of Data

Basically, the English lexical items written in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts were transcribed into PM phonemic transcriptions using the simplified International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) transcription system according to how they were pronounced by PM speakers. Each word was clarified by PM native speakers to check on the pronunciation.

3.3.2 Analysis of Data

All data in this study that were transcribed into PM phonemic transcriptions were arranged in English alphabetical order (See Appendix B).

The data were firstly analysed at their lexical level in terms of phonological, morphological, and semantic changes. They were further analysed into their sub-types.

However, data written in Jawi and Thai scripts were not evaluated under some of Heah’s (1989) sub-types i.e. Unassimilated Loanwords, Partially Assimilated Loanwords, Wholly Assimilated Loanwords, and Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords as the analysis for these sub-types were based on comparing words written only in Roman scripts.

Secondly, the data were classified into different semantic fields as proposed by Haspelmath & Tadmor (2009). Such guideline provided researchers with a fairly accurate prediction regarding in which semantic fields the English lexical items used in PM were likely to be found.
3.4 Conclusion

This chapter explains the conceptual frameworks that were utilised in the study. The adopted frameworks were well-suited and adaptable to answer the research questions appropriately. Furthermore, research design was planned step by step and explained in detail. The next chapter is a discussion of data analysis and research findings.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is a presentation and discussion of research findings in tandem with the two research questions of this study.

To answer the first research question, ‘What are the borrowing processes that English lexical items used in Patani-Malay undergo?’, the analysis will be performed in section 4.2 Classification of Patani-Malay Lexical Formation from English. The Importation and Substitution processes will be discussed in sub-section 4.2.1 and Native Creation process will be discussed in sub-section 4.2.2.

To answer the second research question, ‘In which semantic fields do English lexical items used in Patani-Malay occur most?’, the analysis will be reported in section 4.3.

4.2 Classification of Patani-Malay Lexical Formation from English

In this section, the data were analysed to classify PM lexical formation from English. Two sub-classifications of PM lexical formation from English were identified, namely Borrowings and Native Creations. Their frequency and percentage according to types of borrowing were shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Types of Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Formation</th>
<th>Types of Borrowing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jawi</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings</td>
<td>Loanwords</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loanblends</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loanshifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apt Equivalent Substitutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>487</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Native Creations  | Hybrid Creations (including idiomatic expressions) | 20    | 0     | 0    | 20   |
|                   | Roman                                   |       |       |      |      |
|                   | Jawi                                    |       |       |      |      |
|                   | Thai                                     |       |       |      |      |
| Induced Creations | 0                                       | 0     | 0     | 0    | 0    |
| Total             | 20                                       | 0     | 0     | 0    | 20   |

Total Number of Lexical Items: 507 (100%) 31 (6.12%) 117 (23.08%) 359 (70.80%)

4.2.1 Classification of Borrowings in Patani-Malay

In this sub-section, the findings will be reported under four classifications of types of borrowing, namely Loanwords, Loanblends, Loanshifts, and Apt Equivalent Substitutes which were found in PM through Importation and Substitution processes.

4.2.1.1 Loanwords

PM Loanwords in this study were sub-classified using Heah’s (1989) framework and Haugen’s (1950) framework (See paragraph 3 in Section 3.3.2 of Chapter 3 for justification). Data were identified and could only be classified in five sub-types; Unassimilated Loanwords, Partially Assimilated Loanwords, Wholly Assimilated...
Loanwords, Analysed Compounds, and Truncated Loanwords, out of the seven classifications of Heah (1989). Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords and Fused Compounds were not found in this study; but the data could be classified into all the three classifications of Haugen (1950) i.e. None Phonemic Substitutions, Complete Phonemic Substitutions, and Partial Phonemic Substitutions. For a more detailed analysis, refer to Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Loanwords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Sub-type of Loanwords</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jawi</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.52%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heah’s classification on Loanword</td>
<td>Unassimilated Loanwords</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partially Assimilated Loanwords</td>
<td>(5.00%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wholly Assimilated Loanwords</td>
<td>(0.26%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fused Compounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysed Compounds</td>
<td>(2.63%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truncated Loanwords</td>
<td>(3.70%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haugen’s classification on Loanword</td>
<td>None Phonemic Substitutions</td>
<td>(6.05%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Phonemic Substitutions</td>
<td>(48.68%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Phonemic Substitutions</td>
<td>(33.16%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Unassimilated Loanwords (Heah’s)

English Borrowings in PM that had not been orthographically adapted in any way were classified as Unassimilated Loanwords.

Two items (0.52% of 380 Loanwords or 0.41% of 487 Borrowings and 0.39% of all 507 items in the corpus) written in Roman script were found i.e. “farm” and “DJ” and the excerpts are shown below:
“Dalam Farm contoh ini selain daripada petani dapat buat kerja…”
(Source: News script entitled “Study Centre of Sufficiency Economy: A Model Farm at Piya Village”)

“Tuturan kata daripada DJ muda suara lemah lembut daripada sebuah bilik studio Radio…”
(Source: News script entitled “Creative Media for Development”)

The excerpts above showed that the two Borrowings that were written in Roman script remained unchanged.

(b) Partially Assimilated Loanwords (Heah’s)

English Borrowings in PM were classified as Partially Assimilated Loanwords when there was orthographic adaptation to PM phonological system.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>botik</td>
<td>/bu̯tik/</td>
<td>n. boutique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>/ɔːdə/</td>
<td>v. to order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikologi</td>
<td>/sɪkoˌlo̞di/</td>
<td>n. psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teknik</td>
<td>/te̞nɪ/</td>
<td>n. technique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nineteen words (5.00% of 380 Loanwords or 10.06% of 487 Borrowings and 3.74% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. All were written in Roman script.

(c) Wholly Assimilated Loanwords (Heah’s)

English Borrowings in PM were classified as Wholly Assimilated Loanwords when ‘the words had undergone complete assimilation’ (Heah, 1989) in PM. This was an ideal situation and thus merely Heah’s examples were used as a parameter to identify
and confirm the word *koprasi* which was the only item to be classified as a Wholly Assimilated Loanword.

This was shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koprasi</td>
<td>/koːprəsi/</td>
<td>n. co-operative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This one word represented (0.26% of 380 Loanwords or 0.20% of 487 Borrowings and 0.19% of all 507 items in the corpus) written in Roman script.

**(d) Analysed Compounds (Heah’s)**

Compound English Borrowings in PM were classified as Analysed Compounds when the morpho-syntactic order of the words was changed to PM’s morpho-syntactic order.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stesen radio</td>
<td>/stesen rɔdiːjʊ/</td>
<td>n. radio station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اکاؤن بینک</td>
<td>/eʔkau bɛŋ/</td>
<td>n. bank account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เก็ง คอมพิวเตอร์</td>
<td>/geŋ kʰɔmpʰiwtʰ/</td>
<td>n. computer game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten words or 2.63% (of 380 Loanwords or 2.05% of 487 Borrowings and 1.97% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, two were written in Roman, three in Jawi, and five in Thai scripts.
(e) Truncated Loanwords (Heah’s)

According to Sama-Alee et al. (2008), PM words were disyllabic based words. Thus, truncation occurred in the process of borrowing to suit PM phonological system. In other words, the multi-syllabic English word was shortened whilst the English compound word was pared.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ซีกา</td>
<td>/si:ka:/</td>
<td>n. bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>แอยุฮ</td>
<td>/ʔε:dʒuh/</td>
<td>n. exhaust pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ซือแตเร็ง</td>
<td>/sɔːtɛ:ɾɛŋ/</td>
<td>n. steering wheel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteen words or 3.70% (of 380 Loanwords or 2.87% of 487 Borrowings and 2.76% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. All were written in Thai script.

(f) None Phonemic Substitutions (Haugen’s)

English Borrowings in PM that retained their phonological and morphological features were classified as None Phonemic Substitution. These words remained easily recognizable as English words.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>اينساریت</td>
<td>/ʔinstiːtut/</td>
<td>n. institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سكوف</td>
<td>/skuːp/</td>
<td>n. scoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>โคموا</td>
<td>/kʰoːmaː/</td>
<td>n. coma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุกกี้</td>
<td>/kʰuːkiː/</td>
<td>n. cookie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty three words or 6.05% (of 380 Loanwords or 4.72% of 487 Borrowings and 4.53% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, four were written in Jawi and nineteen in Thai scripts.

(g) Partial Phonemic Substitutions (Haugen’s)

Partial Phonemic Substitution was used to describe Borrowings with some degree of phonemic substitutions yet the English words were still more and less recognisable.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>موديل</td>
<td>/moːde/</td>
<td>n. model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>کولیج</td>
<td>/kʰoːde/?</td>
<td>n. college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>อาเจ้นเดอ</td>
<td>/ʔaːdʒɛndə:/</td>
<td>n. agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ออโตแม็ติ</td>
<td>/ʔɔːtɔːmeːtɪ/</td>
<td>adj. Automatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred eighty-five words or 48.68% (of 380 Loanwords or 37.98% of 487 Borrowings and 36.48% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, forty-seven were written in Jawi and one hundred thirty-eight in Thai script.

(h) Complete Phonemic Substitutions (Haugen’s)

Complete Phonemic Substitution referred to English Borrowings that were hardly recognizable after having gone through phonological transformation over time and had been adapted to PM phonological system.
The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>จะกอและ</td>
<td>/caʔkə:leʔ/</td>
<td>n. chocolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ปาซือนีเย็ง</td>
<td>/paʔzəniiɗəŋ/</td>
<td>n. passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>อว่ิล</td>
<td>/ʔuʔniʔ/</td>
<td>adj. unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>มินดา</td>
<td>/mindaʔ/</td>
<td>n. mind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred twenty-six words or 33.16% (of 380 Loanwords or 25.86% of 487 Borrowings and 24.85% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, fourteen were written in Jawi and one hundred twelve in Thai scripts.

### 4.2.1.2 Loanblends

Loanblends or Hybrid Loanwords were PM borrowings containing a combination of importation of English morpheme and substitution of PM morpheme in the English borrowed word. According to Heah (1989), there were four types of Loanblends i.e. Marginal Loanblends, Nuclear Loanblends, Compound Loanblends, and Tautological Loanblends. There were only three types found in the corpus leaving out Marginal Loanblends. For a more detailed analysis, refer to Table 4.3 below.

#### Table 4.3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Loanblends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-type of Loanblends</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jawi</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Loanblends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Loanblends</td>
<td>13 (12.63%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound Loanblends (Total)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nuclear Compound Loanblends</td>
<td>34 (33%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marginal Compound Loanblends</td>
<td>33 (32.04%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautological Loanblends</td>
<td>23 (22.33%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103 (100%)</td>
<td>7 (6.80%)</td>
<td>46 (44.66%)</td>
<td>50 (48.54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a) **Nuclear Loanblends**

Nuclear Loanblends were Borrowings containing affixes from PM and the stem was derived from English.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>کستابیله</td>
<td>/kɔːstəˈblæɡ/</td>
<td>n. stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berدموکراتی</td>
<td>/bərdeˈmoːkraːti/</td>
<td>adj. democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ญือกิ</td>
<td>/ɲuːkiʔ/</td>
<td>n. gib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirteen words or 12.63% (of 103 Loanblends or 2.66% of 487 Borrowings and 2.56% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, three were written in Roman, nine in Jawi and one in Thai script.

(b) **Compound Loanblends**

Compound Loanblends were Borrowings with one of the two morphemes replaced with a native morpheme. Heah (1989) proposed two types of Compound Loanblends i.e. Nuclear Compound Loanblends and Marginal Compound Loanblends.

(i) **Nuclear Compound Loanblends**

Nuclear Compound Loanblends were Borrowings with an imported nucleus in one morpheme and native modifier in the other morpheme.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sistem keadilan</td>
<td>/ˈsɪstəm kəˈdeːlən/</td>
<td>n. justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ليکا دنیا</td>
<td>/lɪɡə duːˈniə/</td>
<td>n. world league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>มีซิง ถิ่นเตาะง</td>
<td>/mìsɨŋ guːtəŋ/</td>
<td>n. rubber machine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-four words or 33% (of 103 Loanblends or 6.98% of 487 Borrowings and 6.70% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, one was written in Roman, seventeen in Jawi, and sixteen in Thai scripts.

(ii) Marginal Compound Loanblends

Marginal Compound Loanblends were Borrowings with an imported modifier in one morpheme and native nucleus in the other morpheme.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kedai</td>
<td>/kurda: kem/</td>
<td>n. game shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>باهْن كيْميا</td>
<td>/ba:han kʰi:mja:/</td>
<td>n. chemical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ปากู ซือมิง</td>
<td>/pa:ku: sumin/</td>
<td>n. cement nail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-three words or 32.04% (of 103 Loanblends or 6.77% of 487 Borrowings and 6.50% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, two were written in Roman, sixteen in Jawi, and fifteen in Thai scripts.

(c) Tautological Loanblends

Tautological Loanblends were Borrowings with pairs of words that create a blend - one a Malay word, the other a loan - denoting similar referents.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>api</td>
<td>/ʔapi: ʔi:leʔtriʔ/</td>
<td>n. electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بوروغ فينكوين</td>
<td>/bu:γoŋ penkwin/</td>
<td>n. penguin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ตือปง เคะ</td>
<td>/tu:poŋ kʰeʔ/</td>
<td>n. cake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-three words or 22.33% (of 103 Loanblends or 4.72% of 487 Borrowings and 4.53% of all 507 items in the corpus) were identified. Of these, one was written in Roman, four in Jawi, and eighteen in Thai scripts.

4.2.1.3 Loanshifts

Loanshifts occurred through substitution process where PM words were used to designate new concepts expressed in English based on models of English items. There were two types of Loanshifts; Loan Translations and Semantic Extensions. For a more detailed analysis, refer to Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-type of Loanshifts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jawi</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan Translations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Literal Loan Translations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loan Renditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Syntactic Calques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Extensions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Loan Translations

According to Heah (1989), ‘In Loan Translation, the form and meanings of the English word, instead of being carried over into Bahasa Malaysia as a unit, is merely employed as a model for a native formation’. She proposed three types of Loan Translations i.e. Literal Loan Translations, Loan Renditions, and Syntactic Calques.
In this study, no data were found in Loan Renditions and Syntactic Calques.

(i) Literal Loan Translations

In Literal Loan Translations, the English models were reproduced element by element in PM.

Three data were found and shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ตีมาแล มือตือรี</td>
<td>/t:i:mːaːlː m’hɔːtɔːrǐ:/</td>
<td>n. Deputy Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ตีมาแล ปือดานอ มือตือรี</td>
<td>/t:i:mːaːlː pʰoːdɑːnɔː m’hɔːtɔːrĩ:/</td>
<td>n. Deputy Prime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ปือดานอ มือตือรี</td>
<td>/pʰoːdɑːnɔː m’hɔːtɔːrĩ:/</td>
<td>Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ปือดานอ มือตือรี</td>
<td>/pʰoːdɑːnɔː m’hɔːtɔːrĩ:/</td>
<td>n. Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three words or 100% (of 3 Loanshifts or 0.51% of 487 Borrowings and 0.59% of all 507 items in the corpus) written in Thai script were found.

4.2.1.4 Apt Equivalent Substitutes

Apt Equivalent Substitutes were not Borrowings as defined, they were substituted for English words which otherwise could had been directly imported into the language (Heah, 1989). According to the numbering in Heah (1989), there were two sub-types of Apt Equivalent Substitutes, namely Direct Equivalent Substitutes and Indirect Equivalent Substitutes (no data found under these two sub-types). Nonetheless, the researcher opined that examples of Malay Idiomatic Equivalent Substitutes, which were stated by Heah (1989: 191) without a numbering, did exist in PM. The researcher was making an additional numbering to this sub-type as data were found in the corpus. For a more detailed analysis, refer to Table 4.5 below.
### Table 4.5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Apt Equivalent Substitutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-type of Apt Equivalent Substitutes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Jawi</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apt Equivalent Substitutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct Equivalent Substitutes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indirect Equivalent Substitutes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay Idiomatic Equivalent Substitutes</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Malay Idiomatic Equivalent Substitutes

Malay Idiomatic Equivalent Substitutes in PM were used to describe English words and expressions by comparing the meaning of both Malay and English expressions before matching them as equivalent.

One data was found as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>บรำหาสอ ปุติห์</td>
<td>/ba:haso pu:teh/</td>
<td>n. English language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perception of PM speakers on English language was that of a language spoken by the *orang putih* or the people with fair complexion or ‘white man’. The term *bahaso putih* came into use in PM when they related human skin colour to language.

This one word represented 100% of one Apt Equivalent Substitutes or 0.20% (of 487 Borrowings and 0.19% of all 507 items in the corpus).
4.2.2 Classification of Native Creations in Patani-Malay

Native Creations were not strictly a case of Borrowings as they were created within PM rather than a direct imitation of English models. According to Heah (1989: 201), “these native creations owe their existence to the stimuli provided by English, that is, due to the need to express concepts embodied in English terms” and there were two types of Native Creations; Hybrid Creations and Induced Creations. No evidence of this particular example was found under Induced Creations.

4.2.2.1 Hybrid Creations

Hybrid Creations were lexical forms with a combination of PM and English words but were different from Loanblends in that Hybrid Creations were not imitations of English models rather they were filled with loan morphemes into PM models.

The examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ตาลีแอจี</td>
<td>/ta:li: ?ɛɭci/</td>
<td>n. rope + n. inch =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ตางอลิฮ</td>
<td>/ta:θuː lih/</td>
<td>n. tapeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เบงดูวิ</td>
<td>/beʔ du:wiʔ/</td>
<td>n. staircase + n. lift =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n. escalator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n. bag + n. money =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n. purse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hybrid Creations were also found in idiomatic expressions of PM and some examples were shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Phonemic Transcription</th>
<th>Literal Meaning</th>
<th>Meaning of Idiomatic Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ปูเนาะฮ ฟอม</td>
<td>/purnah fon/</td>
<td>v. to destroy</td>
<td>one’s projected image is exposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>มาแก ป็อง</td>
<td>/mak:pong/</td>
<td>v. to eat</td>
<td>like to be flattered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ v. to pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ยูโตะซง</td>
<td>/dyatoth ren/</td>
<td>v. to fall</td>
<td>lost direction (in life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ n. rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>อาทิ ซัพปะ</td>
<td>/attisamp/</td>
<td>n. heart</td>
<td>to be sporting/ generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ n. sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of twenty Hybrid Creations were found representing 100% (of 20 Hybrid Creations or 100% of 20 Native Creations and 0.39% of all 507 items in the corpus) and all were written in Thai script.

4.3 Semantic Fields of English Lexical Items Used in Patani-Malay

In this section, the data were grouped into the respective semantic fields. Haspelmath & Tadmor’s (2009) system was used as the basis to sort and allocate the data into various semantic fields. The semantic field was a meaning list and not a ‘word list’. There were 24 semantic fields and this list was used in the Loanword Typology (LWT) project (41 languages) led by the two authors.
The findings were presented in Table 4.6 and reported in a descending order with the highest frequency presented first, followed by the next highest and henceforth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Semantic Fields</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern World</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social and Political Relations</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Basic Actions and Technology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speech and Language</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clothing and Grooming</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Motion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emotion and Values</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Body</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The House</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Food and Drink</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Warfare and Hunting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Spatial Relation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Physical World</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Agriculture and Vegetation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Religion and Belief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Function Words</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sense Perception</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the frequency scoring, the highest numbers of English lexical items were in this order: 1) Modern World, 2) Social and Political Relations, and 3) Cognition. The lowest were in this ranking: 1) Time, 2) Animal, 3) Kinship, and 4) Miscellaneous Function Words. No data could be sorted and allocated into the semantic field of Sense Perception.
The semantic field of Modern World in which the data in this study occurred most (170 words or 33.5% of all data), dealt with modern lifestyle including new developing things and concepts. Therefore, most of the words associating with Modern World were borrowed into PM to meet the lexical demands found in this field.

4.4 Conclusion

From the analysis of data in terms of phonological, morphological, and semantic changes according to PM lexical formation from English, it was found that there were two classifications of the data, namely Borrowings and Native Creations. There were four main types of ‘Borrowings’ i.e. Loanwords, Loanblends, Loanshifts, and Apt Equivalent Substitutes found in the corpus of this study whereas there was only one type of ‘Native Creations’ found in this study which was Hybrid Creations. The findings revealed that the linguistic features of English lexical items used in PM were changed to suit PM linguistic rules and were presented as types and sub-types under different classifications.

The data were classified into the semantic fields according to the meaning they were used in PM. The analysis discovered that the English lexical items used in PM occurred most in the semantic field of Modern world which was associated with human’s modern life.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This study seeks to investigate the English lexical items used in PM including PM idiomatic expressions with impetus from English in order to examine their phonological, morphological, and semantic changes as well as to sort and allocate these English lexical items into the respective semantic fields. The findings of this study have established the main types and sub-types of the English lexical items used in PM according to their changes as well as the various semantic fields in which the English lexical items occur most.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The summary of findings was given below.

5.2.1 Corpus

The corpus of English lexical items used in this study was collected from various printed media written in Jawi, Roman, and Thai scripts. They comprised a total of 507 words (See Appendix B). Of these, 487 words were Borrowings comprising 96.05% of the total number of the corpus, with only 20 Native Creations making 3.95% of the total number of the corpus.
5.2.2 The Phonological, Morphological, and Semantic Changes that English Lexical Items Used in Patani-Malay Undergo

The phonological, morphological, and semantic changes of the English lexical items used in PM were identified according to PM lexical formation from English as follows.

5.2.2.1 Classification of Patani-Malay Lexical Formation from English

There were two classifications of PM lexical formation from English, namely Borrowings and Native Creations. Each classification comprised of different types of lexical items.

(a) Types of Borrowings in Patani-Malay

There were four main types of ‘Borrowings’, namely Loanwords, Loanblends, Loanshifts, and Apt Equivalent Substitutes found in the corpus of this study.

(i) Loanwords

Loanwords formed the largest classification of lexical items (380 items or 78.02% of all Borrowings and 74.95% of the items in corpus). The finding was consistent with the works of Haugen (1950) and Heah (1989) who stated that Loanwords were the most easily borrowed items. The Loanwords were classifiable into five sub-types of the seven sub-types of Heah’s (1989) framework and all the three sub-types of Haugen’s (1950) classification.

Orthographically Assimilated Loanwords were not evident in the corpus of this study because it concerned both orthographical and phonological systems of the
English items. It meant that only items written in Roman script could be considered to fit in to this sub-type. However, due to the limited data written in Roman script (31 items or 6.12% of all corpuses); they all had been orthographically and phonologically changed. For example, the word ‘quality’ was spelled as *kualiti* and pronounced as /kʰuːwɔːliːtiː/ according to PM phonological system.

As for Fused Compounds, even though it was not found in this study, some of them are used in spoken PM. For example, the word *gostan* ‘go astern’ is widely used among PM native speakers referring ‘to reverse a car’.

(ii) Loanblends

Loanblends was the second largest classification (103 words or 21.14% of all Borrowings and 20.31% out of the items in corpus). There were three types of Loanblends found in the corpus of this study, namely Nuclear Loanblends, Compound Loanblends, and Tautological Loanblends leaving out Marginal Loanblends.

There was no evidence of Marginal Loanblends in this study. PM speakers use the word *nentang* pronounced as /nɯːteː/ for English prefix ‘anti’. For example, *nentang agama* /nɯːteː ʔaːgaːmɔː/ ‘anti-religion’.
(iii) Loanshifts

Loanshifts was ranked as the third classification with only three items (or 0.51% of all Borrowings and 0.59% of all items in the corpus). Only one type of Loanshifts was found in this study i.e. Loan Translations.

As in the case of Semantic Extensions which was not evident in the corpus, it may probably be due to the linguistic context of PM. PM is a dialect employed by a small minority group in a certain area; not an official language whereby the linguistic situation is constantly changing e.g. the extensions of meanings of Standard-Malay words due to direct linguistic contact with English language. Another reason could be that modern PM does not have any direct contact with English.

(iv) Apt Equivalent Substitutes

Apt Equivalent Substitutes was ranked as the fourth classification with only one item found. It represented 0.20% of all Borrowings and 0.19% of all items in the corpus.

According to Heah (1989), there were two sub-types of Apt Equivalent Substitutes, namely Direct Equivalent Substitutes and Indirect Equivalent Substitutes. There was no evidence of data under both sub-types in this study.
(b) Types of Native Creations in Patani-Malay

The findings revealed that there was only one type of ‘Native Creations’ found in this study which was Hybrid Creations leaving out Induced Creations.

(i) Hybrid Creations

A total of twenty Hybrid Creations found in this study represented 100% of Native Creations and 0.39% of all items in the corpus.

Hybrid Creations in the corpus was lexical forms with a combination of PM and English lexical items used in PM. They were also found in idiomatic expressions of PM.

5.2.3 Classification of English Lexical Items Used in Patani-Malay into Semantic Fields

From the classification of semantic fields, the data occurred most in the semantic field of Modern World. It was followed by the semantic field of Social and Political Relations and Cognition respectively.

5.2.4 Results of the Borrowing Process of English in Patani-Malay

The geographical setting of the PM speech community is caught in between the two speech worlds i.e. Malay and Thai. There is no geographical barrier between the Malay world of Kelantan and the area of PM speech community; and no barrier between the PM speech community and northern parts of Thailand. PM speakers have linguistic contact with their neighbours. Therefore, many English words and concepts have slowly
been absorbed into their own dialect due to the geographical contiguity. From the data collection in this study, there are over 500 hundred English lexical items found in PM. PM native speakers use English lexical items naturally in their daily lives. Some of the educated native speakers are aware that they are using English words while most of PM speakers do not realise the foreign elements of the words they are using.

5.3 Significance and Implications of the Study

The findings of this study reveal that although there is no direct contact between modern PM with English language, English lexical items have been brought in to the dialect via Malay and Thai languages. Whatever the reason, channel, or period of time we may attribute to the coming of the English lexical items used in PM, English language which is one of the most influential languages in the world has now become part of PM’s history over many decades.

This study has attempted to collect and identify English lexical items used in PM with the intentions of shedding light on the linguistic phenomenon of the relationship between PM and English. It would also help to generate greater interest and awareness among scholars to conduct research on related issues. Furthermore, this study is also hoped to reconsider the issue of language maintenance and foreign language influence in the languages of minority groups and to promote the use of PM among native speakers especially the younger generation in order to preserve its important status in society.
5.4 Recommendations for Further Research

From the findings of this study, there is definitely wider scope for further research. The interplay between Malay, Thai, and English languages in PM can itself be a huge area of interest for many researchers. With regards to this, a study of the direction of English borrowing in PM could be carried out. It can be studied in relation to the sociolinguistic background of the speakers and historical evidence of the languages involved. A systematic comparative study of English lexical items used in Standard-Malay, PM, and Standard-Thai could also be taken into consideration to examine the adaptation of the English lexical items. The findings could be applied to a further study on spoken discourse in PM to investigate the adaptation of the English lexical items.

Attitudes towards the use of English lexical items used in PM could be conducted in relation to the policy of the ASEAN Economic Community that has placed English as the official language of the members of ASEAN.

Greater attention should also be given to language policy of PM as a minority language in Thailand. As the area of the PM speech community is located in between two different linguistic worlds, namely Malay and Thai, studies on language policy making and planning of the Thai government towards PM would contribute great influence towards the linguistic situation in society.
5.5 Conclusion

The language contact phenomenon in the area is part of its multi-ethnic and multicultural environment, and also, its geographical position between Malaysia-Thailand borders. Trading transactions with the west and the east over a period of centuries is also a contributing factor of the linguistic situation in the area.

The use of English lexical items in PM has brought about interesting language features into the community. It is hoped that this linguistic study can contribute to a better understanding of a particular dimension of linguistic phenomenon specifically in multilingual societies and also contribute in terms of awareness of the importance of English language as an influential world language.

Apart from that, this study also hopes to raise awareness of the importance of PM in the society. As stated earlier, although PM is used commonly in the area nowadays, it cannot be denied that there is a possibility of its speakers losing PM’s identity one day. As it can be seen that although the command of Thai among children in the area is not good enough, it is gradually improving whereas their proficiency of using PM is slowly decreasing. It is a rather serious language issue that locals are concerned about, especially the older generation, educators, and religious leaders in the area. Yet with research such as this, there is hope that PM will maintain its identity for many more years to come.
REFERENCES


