

## STRUCTURAL NATIVIZATION IN PAKISTANI ENGLISH: EXPLORING PREPOSITIONAL VERB IDIOSYNCRASIES

Bisma Butt (Corresponding author):

University of Lahore [bisma.butt@ell.uol.edu.pk](mailto:bisma.butt@ell.uol.edu.pk)

Dr. Behzad Anwar

University of Gujrat [behzad.anwar@uog.edu.pk](mailto:behzad.anwar@uog.edu.pk)

Dr. Shahnila Tariq

University of Management and Technology [shahnila.tariq@umt.edu.pk](mailto:shahnila.tariq@umt.edu.pk)

Sitara Kanwal

[sitara.kanwal@umt.edu.pk](mailto:sitara.kanwal@umt.edu.pk)

### Abstract

*This paper is an attempt to find out how innovative prepositional verbs (PrVs) such as discuss about, discuss on, comprise of and demand for have become so deeply rooted within the linguistic system of written Pakistani English (PE). Using a corpus-based approach, this study compares how these PrVs and their corresponding single-word verbs (SWVs) comprise, demand and discuss are used in Pakistani English newspapers. It is hypothesized that there are systematic structural differences between the PrVs and their corresponding SWVs which reveal certain aspects of structural nativization in PE.*

**Keywords:** Non-native English, Prepositional Verbs, Single-word Verbs, Structural Nativization,

### Introduction

In Pakistani English (PE), nativized prepositional verbs (PrVs) which are typified by the ubiquitous *discuss about*, are the bane of the purists. They are frequently marked as "redundant" by the authors of the textbooks and the workbooks across the globe (Spahiu & Kryeziu, 2021). In order to educate and inform general public, different newspapers have dedicated the whole sections regarding the ungrammaticality of the PrVs and other linguistic structures across the globe. The following excerpts show some reservations regarding their prevalence:

I'm writing to propose that somebody from *The Star* check at the publication's faults.... I've observed some obvious mistakes, such as *discuss about/voice out*. I've highlighted them as examples of "Error Identification" and very bad English in our newspapers (Noreen, 2010).

People may make the error of saying "*discuss about* our health" in certain cases while "the meaning of *discuss*" is already "speak about." So, "*discuss* our health" is the right grammar. (Ooi, 2010)

It's possible that the teacher is not an ideal role model of the language... It is not unexpected if students may write "I'm going to *discuss about* the causes and effects of unemployment in my essay" when a preposition is used by an English language teacher even though it isn't necessary, such as "Now let us *discuss about* the unemployment problem among graduates for composing your essay" (Haja Mohideen, 2011).

Despite getting a lot of attention, these PrVs are still used by many Pakistanis in their speech and writing. What inner-circle English speakers immediately understand (see, for example, (Akinlotan, & Housen, (2017)), that one does not necessarily say *discuss about* as the concept of *about* is already incorporated in *discuss*, is simply far more complex for PE speakers. The words "*demand for*," "*talk about*," and "*discuss about*" have been thoroughly embedded in the written PE linguistic system. In this study, a comparison has been done that how these PrVs and their

associated single-word verbs (SWVs) such as *comprise*, *require*, and *discuss* are being used in Pakistani English newspapers by using an approach which is corpus-based. It is hypothesized that the PrVs and their associated SWVs have systematic structural differences that reflect specific structural nativization facets in PE.

### **Language contact, group SLA and Pakistani English**

In this study, the emphases has been laid on the significance of interpretation of outer-circle Englishes' nativized elements within their sociolinguistic contexts, as defined by Winford (2003, pp.235-47) framework of group Second Language Acquisition (group SLA). As stated by Winford (p.242), English is usually propagated through English-medium education in the nations where the language was transplanted as a result of British and American colonization (see also Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008, p.156)). These kinds of varieties necessarily show linguistic changes which are related to those "variable and ephemeral" (Winford, 2003, p.236) changes that happen, when an individual acquires or learns a second language. According to him, the aforementioned phenomenon is referred to as individual SLA.

Nevertheless, as many of these local variants turn into everyday vernaculars for local people, some of these unique SLA traits turn into "fixed and permanent" (ibid.) changes. These changes, in a lot of cases, indicate ethnic and national origins of the speakers of these new Englishes. Normally, it is neither a formal nor an intentional process that results in the selection and institutionalization of some SLA traits and the abandonment of others in group SLA. Instead a process that manifests itself as the continual use of the second language in a sociolinguistic setting shaped broadly by "the demographics of the groups in interaction, the relationship of power between the groups, the attitude they have for each other, and so on." This ongoing "competition" inside the community between multiple SLA systems "finally resolved into a common/shared communal system" (Winford, 2003, p.236).

In Pakistan, there is a continuous and strong contact of English Language with a variety of different and theologically unique languages such as Urdu, Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashto etc. (Ali & Sheeraz, 2018). Urdu and Punjabi are the most significant in influencing changes in the linguistic system of Pakistani English. Many kinds of contact-induced alterations in PE have been observed as a result of widespread bilingualism in several combinations of these languages amongst individuals who have learned English as a second language and, in certain cases, continue to use the language in a lot of other everyday situations. In the last few years, studies conducted on Pakistani English have been able to substantially improve our understanding and knowledge of the language system and the sociolinguistic perspective of Pakistani English.

Lately, Schneider's "Postcolonial English" (2003) shows that in what way transplantation of English into a variety of "colonial-contact setting(s)" has resulted in patterns of linguistic change that are mainly governed by the fact that how English-speaking colonists and local residents create and rewrite their identities. His research on Pakistani English published in "Evolutionary Patterns of Pakistani English," focuses on various contact-induced alterations which have impacted the language during its different evolutionary phases. He gave a thorough list of phonological, morphological, and syntactic aspects in his description of structural nativization of Pakistani English (pp.56-9). However, there is still a lot to learn regarding structural nativization influence on Pakistani English, specifically regarding the particular processes that led to the production and extensive adoption of novel PrVs. This gap has been tried to be filled in this paper.

### **Method**

Unlike most prior studies on PE, which looked at random examples of language use, the current study used a corpus of Pakistani English newspaper articles (hence referred to as the Pakistani English Newspaper Corpus (PENC)) in order to find evidence of linguistic change. This method has been claimed to be significantly more rigorous because it allows for the comprehensive extraction of accurate use of the traits that are in question (see, for example, Kennedy (1998, pp.88-203) "Corpus-Based Descriptions of English"). More importantly for this study, this approach permits systematic comparison of the PrVs' contexts with their comparable SWVs. This makes it much easier to track down any structural peculiarities in the four PrVs, allowing for a more thorough investigation of the mechanisms that drive structural nativization in PE. Following in the footsteps of Sinclair's seminal "Corpus, Concordance, Collocation," a lexicogrammatical approach has been adopted in this study to: (1) determine whether there is any semantic or syntactic difference between the nativized PrVs (*comprise of, demand for, discuss about, and discuss on*) and the 'standard' SWVs (*comprise, demand, and discuss*) in PE; and (2) recommend competing substrate and superstrate structures that might result in the improvement of the collocational strength of *comprise* and *of, demand* and *for, discuss* and *about, and discuss* and *on* in PE.

This makes it much easier to track down any structural peculiarities in the four PrVs, allowing for a more thorough investigation of the mechanisms that drive structural nativization in PE. Following the footsteps of Sinclair's seminal "Corpus, Concordance, Collocation," a lexicogrammatical approach has been adopted in this study to: (1) determine whether there is any semantic or syntactic difference between the nativized PrVs (*comprise of, demand for, discuss about, and discuss on*) and the 'standard' SWVs (*comprise, demand, and discuss*) in PE; and (2) recommend competing substrate and superstrate structures that might result in the improvement of the collocational strength of *comprise* and *of, demand* and *for, discuss* and *about, and discuss* and *on* in ME.

The results are being utilized to put some light on the core processes that have resulted in structural nativization in PE. Mike Scott's corpus analysis software tool WordSmith Tools 5 has been used to obtain data from the PENC. Using WordSmith's concordance tool, seven concordances were obtained semi-automatically from (PENC). The lists included: (1) the SWV *comprise* 799 times; (2) the PrV *comprise of* 29 times; (3) the SWV *demand* 257 times; (4) the PrV *demand for* 15 times; (5) the SWV *discuss* 796 times; (6) the PrV *discuss about* 7 times; and (7) the PrV *discuss on* 26 times.

This list consists of the finite verbs as well as the non-finite verbs that act as a noun, adjective, or adverb. Grasping all occurrences of each PrV was somewhat more difficult than the below picture suggests. Because of the verb and the preposition's random non-contiguity (see the concordance's lines 1, 6-15, and 19-26 for the purpose of discussion in Figure 1), it was normally essential to refer to the larger context of these PrVs (see Baldwin and Villavicencio, "Extracting the Unextractable" for a more detailed account of facing the difficulty in extraction of "verb-particles" from corpora). It was only done as all the occurrences of the four PrVs could be extracted, independent of the amount of words coming between the verb and the preposition.

Fig.1. Concordance for *Discuss on* from the (PENC)

|   |                                                                |         |                                                         |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | The alternative to unilateral action is for all countries to   | discuss | and decide collectively, under the United Nations, on   |
| 2 | "Our plan in this first phase is to get everyone to            | discuss | on a blueprint for motorsports, which my Ministry has   |
| 3 | one-stop centre for writers, literary figures and culturist to | discuss | on the identity of Malays by looking at a global point  |
| 4 | and Nadzmi) will meet the coaches first next week to           | discuss | on the programmes. After that, we will bring the matter |

|    |                                                              |            |                                                           |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 5  | ranking system,” he said. The IBF are expected to            | discuss    | on the current world ranking system at their executive    |
| 6  | each problem. “I will look into every problem and then       | discuss    | with Europlus or the related local authority on the       |
| 7  | with his employers). Once Kah Yew joins us, we will          | discuss    | with him on whether action will be taken against Watson.  |
| 8  | programme geared towards the qualifying rounds. We will      | discuss    | with Jalani Sidek (the Nusa Mahsuri president) and        |
| 9  | witness Alex’s debut.” Hishammuddin said he will also        | discuss    | with Stoddart on how to further develop motorsports in    |
| 10 | service at Kuala Lumpur International Airport, is going to   | discuss    | with the Entrepreneur Development Ministry on the effect  |
| 11 | the remaining shooters in the Games’ list. “We will have to  | discuss    | with the coaches on this but I don’t think this is a      |
| 12 | that such issue did not exist and that Siemens would         | discuss    | with the new board of Sepang Power on the fate of its     |
| 13 | needed by the village was a multi-purpose hall. “I will      | discuss    | with the council on ways to solve this matter as we want  |
| 14 | the technical aspects and marketing strategies and we will   | discuss    | with the state government on the number of units and      |
| 15 | the code, by reducing overtime or working hours and          | discuss    | with union officials on possible measures before          |
| 16 | in Iran, especially at the border with Afghanistan. “We also | discussed  | on the need for an Afghan government with                 |
| 17 | them to power.” Dr Mahathir also said that the council       | discussed  | on the reported underground anti-government activities    |
| 18 | an eye on the late teens to mid-20s group. They are already  | discussing | on how packages can be customised to suit their budget.   |
| 19 | to society,” he said. Mustafa said his department was        | discussing | with a semi-government institution of higher learning     |
| 20 | KUALA LUMPUR: The Human Resources Ministry is                | discussing | with labour unions and the employers’ federation on       |
| 21 | Dr Ling Liong Sik on Tuesday said the Government was         | discussing | with Malaysia Airlines’ management on potential financial |
| 22 | house here yesterday. Samy Vellu said that he would be       | discussing | with PLUS soon on ways to prepare for a smooth balik      |
| 23 | young budding athletes in Noraseela and Saiful. We are       | discussing | with the NSC on whether we should send them overseas      |
| 24 | KUCHING: Sarawak is                                          | discussing | with the US National Cancer Institute and the Coral       |
| 25 | for the Minardi team next season, said the ministry was      | discussing | with the team on how it could help promote the count      |
| 26 | cases. “The Pahang Foundation is in the midst of             | discussing | with the relevant quarters on the quantum to be give      |

Despite their frequent occurrence in PE, the four inventive PrVs are substantially underrepresented in comparison to the 'standard' SWVs in (PENC). This does not imply that the PrVs are essentially weaker variations of the SWVs, as there are small but substantial differences of semantic and syntactic type between the two, which is explained in the section below. It is obvious from the evidence of use that, although every instance of a PrV may be substituted by its corresponding SWV without losing meaning or structure, the opposite is not correct.

That is because there are some SWVs that cannot logically be substituted by a nativized PrV, and this is what explains why the latter is still relevant in PE. The semantic and syntactic peculiarities of the four PrVs are described in the next two sections. However, the applicability and the inclusion of the extracts from the (PENC) have also been done.

### Semantic Idiosyncrasies

As previously stated, this research considers creative PrVs in PE as manifestations of lexicogrammatical alterations that can only be fully understood by comparing them to their related SWVs. The contrast in the usage of these PrVs and the 'standard' by PE speakers explains the superstrate and substrate effects at work in the nativization of the prior. For the comparison of the meanings of PrVs to their equivalent SWVs, every instance of these verbs in the text has to be analyzed and deduced in the (PENC). Tables 1, 2 and 3 demonstrate the range and prevalence of the meanings for the PrVs and their related SWVs as an outcome of this study. Three of the four PrVs (apart from *demand for*) are very idiosyncratic in the sense that they do not have the same variety of interpretations as their related SWVs.

**Table 1: Meanings of *Comprise* and *Comprise of***

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><i>comprise</i><br/>(n=799)</p> | <p>1. “to consist of” (n=762)<br/>The crew <i>comprising</i> [postgraduates Ali, Fahad, Murtaza and Sadia, all from the English department], left the hall with the winning trophy.</p> |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | <p>2. “to make up” (n=22)<br/>It is unfair to think that it is applicable for our society, who <i>comprise</i> [different groups of people]</p> <p>3. “to include” (n=7)</p> <p>4. “to mean,” “to be equal to” &amp; other minor senses (n=8)</p> |
| <i>comprise of</i> (n=29) | <p>1. “to consist of” (n=29)<br/>According to the survey, the customers <i>comprise of</i> [150 Indians, 57 Chinese and 16 from other nations].</p>                                                                                               |

**Table 2: Meanings of *Demand* and *Demand for***

|                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>demand</i><br>(n=257)    | <p>1. “Require something urgently” (n=123)<br/>She was standing alone in balcony when the man with the knife attacked her and <i>demand</i> [her purse].</p> <p>2. “in need of something” (n=55)<br/>The researcher also <i>demand</i> the reading pleasure in the form of maximum plot writing and...</p> <p>3. “to claim what one is legally entitled to” (n=22)<br/>During lockdown, the police forces <i>demand</i> ID cards randomly.</p> <p>4. “to ask to be informed of something” (n=2)<br/>I demand to know why this copy of letter is yet to be sent.</p> <p>5. “requiring a lot of effort” (participial adjective <i>demanding</i>) (n=46)</p> <p>6. “to require as just or right” (n=9)</p> |
| <i>demand for</i><br>(n=15) | <p>1. “Require something urgently” (n=8)<br/>Her husband got furious over her behavior and demanded for [her mobile phone].</p> <p>2. “to require, to have a need of” (n=2)<br/>There is a growing need as people are beginning to <i>demand for</i> alternative choices to commercial counter brands.</p> <p>3. “to claim what one is legally entitled to”(n=4)</p> <p>4. “to ask to be informed of something” (n=1)</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Table 3: Meanings of *Discuss*, *Discuss about* and *Discuss on***

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>discuss</i><br>(n=796) | <p>1. “to talk over something” (transitive) (n=766)<br/>DAS is trying to have a meeting with CEO to <i>discuss</i> [the poor quality of work].</p> <p>2. “to hold a discussion” (intransitive) (n=30)<br/>He <i>discussed</i> with me the whole matter and I got agreed too.</p> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                               |                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>discuss about</i><br>(n=7) | 1. "to talk over something" (n=7)<br>The chairperson requested the society to not merely <i>discuss about</i> [the plague of societies but act accordingly]. |
| <i>discuss on</i><br>(n=26)   | 1. "to talk over something" (n=26)<br>Family is already <i>discussing on</i> [Ali's marriage proposal].                                                      |

It was found through the analytical study of 799 occurrences of *comprise* and 29 occurrences of *comprise of* (see Table 1 containing the summary of the outcomes), the SWV *comprise* is polysemous, having capability of demonstrating as a minimum three main meanings, that are "to consist of," "to make up," and "to include" – as well as numerous minor ones. The usage of the PrV *comprise of* is just done to denote/indicate the meaning; "to consist of." The uniqueness of the PrV *comprise of* is difficult to be suitable, owing to absence of agreement, even between the inner-circle speakers, on the 'appropriate' utilization of the word *comprise*, and indeed on the precise meaning of this word.

Though a lot of these definitions are outdated or extremely rare, the Oxford English Dictionary Online has nine distinct definitions for the word *comprise*. The definition given by maximum dictionaries of the word *comprise* as "to consist of, to be composed of," implying that the verb will be followed by an entire list of the elements by which the subject is made up (e.g., The country *comprises* twenty states). Conversely, there is a second, more widespread use of *comprise* that has driven a number of dictionaries to add a corresponding definition – "to make up, to compose" (e.g., These articles, along with those which are in this collection/volume, *comprised* C. S. Lewis's whole articles on literature).

In PE, the usage of the SWV *comprise* is, for the most part, is aligned with the inner-circle recommendations which are stated above. The PrV *comprise of*, which has 29 occurrences in the PENC, or in around 4% of the instances where inner-circle speakers might possibly have utilized the SWV *comprise*, is the source of the divergence. This is largely considered to be a mistake (Turton & Heaton, 1997). In comparison to the several definitions of *comprise*, the PrV *comprise of* has only one definition: "to consist of." As a clear example, observe the following:

1. According to the survey, the customers *comprise of* [150 Indians, 57 Chinese and 16 from other nations].

As evidently shown by the (PENC), the SWV *discuss* is also polysemous, with mainly two meanings: "to talk over something and to conduct a discussion" (see Table 3). The very first connotation of *discuss*, that has 766 of the 796 occurrences, necessitates "verbiage", the topic of the debate (Butt et al., 2000). As a result, the SWV *discuss* uses a direct object (shown below in the square brackets) and is obviously transitive in active constructs, as shown below in the example:

2. DAS is trying to have a meeting with CEO to *discuss* [the poor quality of work].

Nonfinite clauses and passive forms similarly show the intrinsic transitivity of this connotation of *discuss*. The wordings in the following example puts stress on the intrinsic transitivity of *discuss*:

3. The report said Foreign Minister Datuk Seri Syed Hamid Albar had met US Secretary of State Colin Powell to *discuss* [a meeting between the two leaders].
4. [All aspects of FDI] will be *discussed in earnest* by the leaders, Government senior officials and members of the private sector.

The other connotations, on the other hand, are intransitive and appear in the 30 concordance lines. The language is not expressed clearly, but it is commonly inferred from the background. The occurrence of *discuss* without a direct object is shown in the following example:

5. He discussed with me the whole matter and I got agreed too.

This second connotation is never expressed using the words *discuss on* or *discuss about*. The first connotation "to talk over or consider" is expressed by all the occurrences of these PrVs in the (PENC):

6. The chairperson requested the society to not merely discuss about [the plague of societies but act accordingly].

7. Family is already discussing on [Ali's marriage proposal].

A probable connection between the occurrences of these PrVs and the SWV *discuss*' semantic adaptation in PE is pointed out by the semantic idiosyncrasies of *discuss about* and *discuss on*. The verb *discuss* is extremely transitive in inner-circle Englishes. Most inner-circle speakers would see the usage of *discuss* intransitively to express "to hold a conversation," which is very prevalent in PE, as odd which is in reality incorrect (Deshors, Götz & Laporte, 2016). The significance of the PrVs *debate about* and *discuss on* appears to have been supported by the semantic adaption and resultant polysemous characteristic of the word *discuss* in PE. Thus, the usage of the PrVs *discuss about* and *discuss on* is an unconscious approach to stress that the verb has been used by the speaker in a sense that is transitive. The matter of the PrV *demand for* is not as much definite, as there are a lot of connotations of it which are common with SWV *demand* (look at Table 2). The words *demand* and *demand for* occur 257 and 15 times correspondingly in the (PENC). In comparison to the three PrVs explored so far, the variety of connotations, which *demand for* could be able to convey is fairly unremarkable when compared with *demand*. *Demand* and *demand for* convey the similar basic connotation: "to ask for something in an urgent, demanding, or other manner." 123 of the 257 concordance lines of *demand* and 8 of the 15 concordance lines of *demand for* express this connotation. Below are some examples given of *demand* and *demand for*:

8. She was standing alone in balcony when the man with the knife attacked her and demanded [her purse].

9. Her husband got furious over her behavior and demanded for [her mobile phone].

There are five more definitions of the word *demand* in the (PENC), in addition to the basic one. "To require, having a need for," "to ask for something authoritatively, to claim what one is lawfully or rightfully entitled to," and "to ask to be told of something" were three among them which are also given meaning by *demand for*. In short, the (PENC) data imply that three of the four PrVs analyzed here are semantically idiosyncratic that they are not perfect in terms of semantic equivalents of their respective SWVs. After the syntactic idiosyncrasies of these nativized components are examined in the next section, the significance of these findings for the interpretation of the wider perception of structural nativization in PE will become more evident.

### **Syntactic Idiosyncrasies**

The four PrVs are syntactically distinct from their respective SWVs, in addition to their clear semantic differences. The seven concordance lists were analyzed and found to behave steadily like other more traditional or 'standard' PrVs, as well as being syntactically distinct not only from their respective SWVs, but even from other forms of verbs having multi-words. Similar to most 'legitimate' PrVs *Comprise of*, *demand for*, *discuss about*, and *discuss on*, take a prepositional object, that is normally realized by a noun phrase (NP). On the basis of the contexts of their use

as detailed in the (PENC), the major structural design for these nativized PrVs is NP + verb + preposition + NP. This pattern can be seen in both finite and non-finite clauses, as shown below:

10. We also *discussed on* [the need for an Afghan government with representatives from all ethnic groups in Afghanistan].

11. He said he would meet the barge operator to *demand for* [compensation].

Besides noun phrases, the prepositional object can also be realized by two types of nominal clauses—*ing*-clauses and *wh*-clauses, as demonstrated below:

12. Omar said the leaders would be *discussing about* [“enhancing the climate for foreign direct investment through smart partnership”].

13. They are already *discussing on* [how packages can be customized to suit their budget].

An impression may be given by these examples that these nativized PrVs and their corresponding SWVs are not meaningfully different other than the relational meaning expressed by the preposition. The notion that the prepositional object that precedes a PrV is semantically alike to the direct object that precedes a transitive SWV in a way that they both give reference to a person or a thing and answer *wh*-questions that are constructed with the words *who* or *what*, may contribute to this perception. On the other hand, in a syntactic way, some nominal phrases can work as a direct object but they do not function as a prepositional object. *That*-clauses and elliptic *that*-clauses are two cases which are currently being focused. The usage of the direct object of the verb *demand of* as *that* clause and an elliptical *that*-clause are illustrated in examples 14 and 15. It is highly improbable that these phrases would be used as the prepositional object of *demand for* (examples 16 and 17):

14. The nation will *demand* [that the Government explains itself on certain issues].

15. His voice was muted by the heckling from some delegates who *demanded* [he be replaced by his deputy]\*.

16. The nation will *demand for* [that the Government explains itself on certain issues].\*

17. His voice was muted by the heckling from some delegates who *demanded for* [he be replaced by his deputy].\*

The flexibility of PrVs when it comes to adverbials is one of their most distinguishing features. Adverbs and prepositional phrases that function as adverbials could appear not merely before (e.g., The authority is merely *demanding for* [explanations.]) and after the PrV (e.g., to *discuss about* [the news network] before its launch the next day.), as well as within it, as illustrated in:

18. The Brunei team comprise mostly of [players who featured in Premier II of the M-League this season].

19. Hishammuddin said he will also *discuss* with Stoddart on [how to further develop motorsports in Malaysia] during his visit.

The tolerance of particle movement is one property that separates PrVs from their closest relatives that are the phrasal verbs. The "particle" (a term that is used by Quirk et al., (1985)), in a multi-word verb for referring to the preposition or spatial adverb can be positioned either before or after the object noun phrase in most transitive phrasal verbs. The following cases of a nativized phrasal verb that is *raise up*, taken from the (PENC) reflect this feature:

20. They *raise up* [the issue on the New Poor] but when asked to define the concept, they do not even know how to categorize or explain its exact meaning.

21. It is better for him to do the right thing and *raise* [her] *up* to the status of wife.

Particle movement is not permitted by PrVs. This means that the particle always comes before the object-noun phrase in PrVs. Despite the fact that there is an intervening component within



the PrV, like an adverb or a prepositional phrase, this arrangement is followed in all 77 occurrences of the nativized PrVs that are being analyzed in this research:

22. They *demand for* [full attention] from the adults around them.

23. Perak has been unable to complete some RM2mil worth of projects, *comprising* mainly of [community halls and food stalls] before the Dec 31 deadline.

24. We will *discuss* with Jalani Sidek (the Nusa Mahsuri president) and Misbun Sidek (the chief coach) on [how we can work together].

The four PrVs discussed here would have been categorized as single-object PrVs by Biber et al. (1999) – a direct object is not taken by them hence only needing a prepositional object. Single-object PrVs are uncommon in the passive voice, contrasting to transitive SWVs and two-object PrVs (ibid.). This study has undoubtedly verified this inclination to be taking the active voice. Only one of the 77 occurrences of nativized PrVs examined which occurred in the passive voice:

25. It is refreshing to see Jones portray a character who is *comprised of* morality and susceptibility.

In comparison, the SWVs *demand* and *discuss* readily take the passive:

26. [The role of the family in strengthening young children] will be *discussed* by Ruth Liew, from the Malaysian Child Resource Institute.

27. [What] is *demanded* by a bank is usually respectfully obeyed by the borrower with no questions asked.

It is obvious that, despite their association with 'non-standard' English, the four PrVs analyzed here have particularly stable usage patterns. Evidently, the ungrammaticality stems from the point that they appear in settings where inner-circle speakers might have usage of the matching SWV, as there is no proof of uncertainty or inconsistency in the contexts of their usage.

### **Group SLA and structural nativization in PE**

Several conclusions about the underlying mechanisms that lead to the production of these PrVs may be drawn based on the semantic and syntactic distinctions between the four nativized PrVs and their respective SWVs. Firstly, substrate impacts appear to be playing a role. The duality in the meaning of *discuss* bears a strong resemblance to how the Urdu equivalent, *batana*, is used. Depending on the affixes surrounding it, *batana* can be either a transitive (*batlaya*) or an intransitive (*bataya*) verb. The influence of Urdu could have resulted in the semantic adaption of *discuss* in PE (and possibly other native languages). When faced with a dual meaning of verb such as *discuss*, PE speakers may use the prepositions *about* and *on* to underline the link between the verb and the object while the verb's transitivity is intensely specified. The point that the terms "*discuss about*" and "*discuss on*" are used solely in PE to imply "to talk over (something)" gives credibility to this finding. Influence from the substrate may potentially play a role in the formation and maintenance of the PrV *comprise of*. The Urdu equivalent of *comprise* is the multi-word form *mushtamil hona* (literally, "is formed of"), which may have been the model for the PrV *comprise of*.

The generalization of 'legitimate' noun + preposition combinations is another possible underlying procedure in the nativization of the four PrVs'. Because the choice of preposition in the formulation of the PrVs studied in this research is not random. Constructions like *discussion on*, *discussion about*, and *demand for* may play a role in justifying the usage of the PrVs *discuss on*, *discuss about*, and *demand for* in PE. Regardless of the negative publicity that these nativized elements frequently attract, there is one characteristic of nativization which is hard to discount, that is its inherent logic. The fundamental properties of *on* and *about*, for example, must help the creation of *discuss about* and *discuss on* which dispose these prepositions to co-occurrence with

a wide range of communication verbs in order to create collocational combinations like *ask about, brag about, comment about/on, complain about, debate about/on, enquire about, gossip about, inquire about, lament about/on, lecture about/on, rave about, speak about/on, talk about/on, to talk about/on, touch on, write about/on*, etc. With these kinds of forms, the preposition usually connects the verb to an object, underlining that the noun phrase which occurs after the preposition is the verbiage of the operation of the verb. It appears eminently logical to conclude that these prepositions may be similarly effective when used in pair with the verb *discuss*. The importance of the PrV *demand for* can also be linked to the frequency with which the word *for* is utilized in English. The preposition *for* is frequently employed for reinforcing the link between various communicational verbs and their respective objects and also for highlighting the transitivity of the formation. There are quite a lot of semantically comparable PrVs that indicate to this particular function of *for* like *beg for, Appeal for, fight for, ask for, press for, call for, push for, opt for, plead for, pray for, and yearn for*.

The fact that the PrVs that are innovative like the ones examined in this study have been found in a number of other outer-circle Englishes, such as the Standard Nigerian English (Akinlotan & Housen, 2017), and Philippine English (Biermeier, 2017) which implies that, combined with the current structure of English, it is this core logic that makes these characteristics transmittable more than the substrate impacts.

### Conclusion

This sort of structural nativization is linked to the complexity of English prepositions, according to Kachru and Smith (2008). The fact that "the usage of prepositions is governed partly by their meaning and partly by their formal grammatical necessity with no reference to their meaning" (ibid) poses a challenge for outer- and expanding-circle speakers, as per their opinion. There was no evidence of arbitrary verb and preposition combinations that might indicate such difficulty in the current study. The PrVs' syntactic environment that is studied here, on the other hand, implies that their users have mastery of English prepositions and PrVs. The semantic intricacy of some SWVs is undoubtedly an aspect that contributes to the significance these PrVs for PE users. This combined with the non-arbitrary selection of preposition in the construction of certain PrVs implies that the users of PE are attempting to adapt the structure surrounding specific verbs in a systematic way, so that the semantic accuracy could be achieved. PE is not the only domain where adaptation happens. For example, using data drawn from the central corpus of the Birmingham Collection of English Texts, Sinclair (1991), it illustrates the connection between the multiple definitions of the word *yield* and the patterns that it acquires. He discovered six examples of *yield up*, where *up* appears to be employed to highlight *yield's* transitivity in the meaning of "to give way, submit or surrender, as by force or persuasion" (ibid). "Up appears to be acting semantically as a completive, but syntactically it appears to be acting to make a transitive structure sound normal," he writes (ibid, p.57).

On the basis of evidence of use, it is reasonable to conclude that the four PrVs investigated in this study are the outcome of the PE users' need to get "maximum transparency" and "maximum salience" (García-Castro, (2020). The necessity to be as clear as possible is possibly backed by the polysemous nature of the SWVs comprise and discuss, which is linked in some instances, to substrate impacts. Clearly, the semantic complexity of these SWVs puts greater responsibility on ME users to have more control "in keeping track of their own production," (ibid.) and therefore the 'redundant' prepositions are produced. PE users can also increase salience by highlighting the transitive connection between the verb and the object, with these prepositions. To consider them redundant and to consider these PrVs as errors only because they deviate from inner-circle use

might call into question the fundamental concept of grammaticality and how it's been applied and used in English language.

## References

- Akinlotan, M., & Housen, A. (2017). Noun phrase complexity in Nigerian English: Syntactic function and length outweigh genre in predicting noun phrase complexity. *English Today*, 33(3), 31-38.
- Ali, M., & Sheeraz, M. (2018). Diachronic variations in Pakistani English newspaper editorials: A case study. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry*, 16(2), 1-20.
- Biermeier, T. (2017). Lexical trends in Philippine English revisited. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 19, 25-44.
- Butt, David, Rhondda Fahey, Susan Feez, Sue Spinks, and Colin Yallop. *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, 2000.
- Deshors, S. C., Götz, S., & Laporte, S. (2016). Linguistic innovations in EFL and ESL: Rethinking the linguistic creativity of non-native English speakers. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research*, 2(2), 131-150.
- García-Castro, L. (2020). Structural Nativization in Postcolonial Englishes: The Complementation Profile of REMEMBER As a Case in Point. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 19(1), 175-204.
- Haja Mohideen bin Mohamed Ali. "Error Analysis: Contributory Factors to Students' Errors, with Special Reference to Errors in Written English." *The English Teacher XXV* (1996). 13 March 2011 <<http://www.melta.org.my/ET/1996/main4.html>>.
- Kachru, Yamuna, and Larry E. Smith. *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Kennedy, Graeme. *An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics*. London/New York: Longman, 1998.
- Mesthrie, Rajend, and Rakesh M. Bhatt. *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Noreen Retnam. Letter. *The Star Online* 5 Feb. 2010, sec. Mind our English. 1 May 2010 <<http://thestar.com.my/english/story.asp?file=/2010/2/5/lifefocus/5606193&sec=lifefocus>>.
- Ooi, Christina. Letter. *The Star* 10 Jan. 2002. *Oxford Dictionaries Online*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 18 September 2010 <<http://oxforddictionaries.com/?attempted=true>>.
- Sinclair, John. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Spahiu, I., & Kryeziu, N. (2021). Grammatical mistakes of Albanian students in learning English as a foreign language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 814-822.
- Turton, N. D., and J. B. Heaton. *Longman Dictionary of Common Errors*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Essex: Pearson Longman, 1996.
- Winford, Donald. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2003.