Chapter - I

Indian English: Sociolinguistic Perspective

Indian English, or any non-native variety of English for that matter, is the product of language contact situation. Sociolinguistics is the discipline that encompasses its scope for each and every societal change that affects the language behavior. The present study is based on the Code Mixing and Code Switching in Indian English (IE) speech. In this chapter, Indian English is discussed from the sociolinguistic point of view. It also focuses on the socio-cultural factors that affect Code Mixing (hereafter CM) and Code Switching (hereafter CS).

1.1 Indian English and Non-native Varieties of English

This section deals with the synonymous terms for non-native variety, the placing of Indian English in circle concept and the role of Indian English as an interference variety.

1.1.1 Synonymous Terms

The area of non-native varieties of English has been explored by a number of linguists and scholars. The linguists have used different terms while dealing with the different aspects of the non-native varieties of English. For example, Williams (1987) uses the term NIVES-Non-native Institutionalized varieties of English; Kachru (1981, 83) World Englishes, Non-native Englishes; Schneider (2003) New Englishes; Quirk et al (1981) Interference Varieties of English; McArthur (1998) Standard Varieties of English and Sridhar (1996) uses the term Indigenized Varieties of English. Though they use different terms, the main thrust of their studies is non-native varieties of English. In this sense, it may be said that these terms are synonymous or near synonymous of the common term non-native varieties of English.

1.1.2 Indian English and Circle Concept

Kachru (1983:19) deals with the varieties of English and the place of Indian English in these varieties. His Circle Concept explains the relations of these English varieties in a better way. (See Kachru, 1982; Kachru, 1985;
According to him, “The spread of English may be viewed in terms of three concentric circles representing the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages”. His classification, at primary level, is user-oriented.

The Inner Circle refers to the traditional bases of English – the regions where it is the primary – the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The Outer (or Extended) Circle refers to the institutionalized varieties in non-native contexts. The outer Circle forms a large speech community with great diversity and distinct characteristics (India, Singapore, Nigeria, Zambia). English in this Outer circle may be considered traditionally 'un-English' in cultural contexts; it has a wide spectrum of domains in which it is used with the varying degrees of competence by the members of the society, both as an international and an intranational language and it has developed the nativized literary traditions in different genres. The third Circle is the Expanding Circle. The users of this Circle actually further strengthen the claims of English as an international or the universal language. This Circle encompasses vast populations of such countries as China, the USSR, Indonesia, Greece, Japan, Korea, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, and Zimbabwe. This circle is currently expanding rapidly and has resulted in the numerous performance varieties of English. All these various English languages have diverse socio-cultural contexts. Kachru (1990) terms this combination as World Englishes. Indian English, in his Circle Concept, may be located in the Outer Circle- the institutionalized variety in the non-native contexts.

It should be mentioned here that Quirk (1990) has expressed concern over the state of English in the Outer Circle. He expects that the native norms of English should be rigorously observed by the non-native learners of English. Quirk (1981:1) expresses similar concern while writing on the varieties of English. For him, “what we ordinarily mean by ‘English’ is a common core or nucleus which is realized only in the different forms of language that we actually hear or read”. Hence, the native norms of the common core need to be followed.
Kachru (1991) finds Quirk’s view (1990) as representative of the native speakers, the monolingual societies, which negate the linguistic, sociolinguistic, educational and pragmatic realities of the multilingual societies. These views on the Outer Circle position can be seen as a debate between the ‘Nativist Monomodel Position’ and the ‘Functional Polymodel Position’. Christensen (1992) supports Quirk’s (1990) view and points out that the non-native teachers of English cannot rely on intuition while teaching and must insist on language that follows the established rules.

McArthur (1998) also deals with the Circle Concept. According to him there is a Circle of World English, in which the hub is the World Standard English. There are regional varieties, such as American Standard English, British and Irish Standard English and South Asian Standard English. Beyond these, but linked to them, are the sub-varieties like Black English Vernacular, Welsh English and Indian English. So it may be said that McArthur places Indian English beyond the hub, the regional varieties, but linked to it.

Modiano (1999b) proposes the model of Global English. For him, the Inner Circle, i.e. the central position, is occupied by the proficient speakers of EIL (English as an International Language, a general term which includes all varieties which function well in the cross-cultural communication). These speakers need not necessarily be the L1 speakers. The L1 speakers with excessive regional accents, who are not capable of code-switching into EIL, are not allocated the central position. The proficient non-native speakers of EIL, rather than the native speakers who are not proficient in EIL, are better equipped to define and develop English in the situation of the cross-cultural communication.

As per Modiano’s model, one can not place Indian English totally at the central position; but those Indians who are the proficient, competent speakers of English and capable of code-switching into English as International Language, can share the central part of this circle.

Thus, these linguists have placed Indian English in various positions. Kachru placed it in Outer Circle; McArthur places it beyond the hub but linked
to it and Modiano places only the proficient speakers at the centre. Quirk places Indian English among the interference varieties. The world-wide varieties of English are as varied as their views.

1.1.3 Indian English and Interference Variety

Leech (1982) has classified all language varieties into two parts: i) Varieties according to users ii) Varieties according to use. Further he classifies users’ variety into sub-varieties pertaining to users’ region, social class membership, education, sex and age, and the use varieties into a number of domains in which specific registers of the language are used. Indian English may be described as a users’ variety. Quirk (1981), on the other hand, while writing on the varieties of English, distinguishes six kinds of varieties: 1) Region 2) Education and social standing 3) Subject matter 4) Medium 5) Attitude 6) Interference. Each variety has many sub-varieties. All these varieties and sub-varieties, he claims, are inter-related and there is a ‘common core’ that dominates all these varieties. As per this classification, Indian English comes under the varieties according to interference, where one can refer to ‘the trace left by someone’s native language upon foreign language he has acquired.’ Such type of language varieties, says Quirk, are so widespread in a community and of such long standing that they may be thought stable and adequate enough to be regarded as varieties of English in their own right rather than stages on the way to more native-like English.

1.1.4 Institutionalized Varieties of Non-native English

Williams (1987) describes the following features of the NIVEs (Non Native Institutionalized Varieties of English): i) The development through the educational system is the single most important criterion for classification as a NIVE. ii) There is a wide range of functional sociolinguistic uses. The NIVEs are used internationally between and among ethnic groups. iii) The NIVEs have undergone certain changes which distinguish them from the native speakers’ varieties. iv) Many NIVEs are stable in as much as any natural language is stable. But they are not static. The NIVEs are changing as all languages are. v)
There are many similarities among the NIVES. Indian English possesses all these features and can be called a ‘Non Native Institutionalized Variety of English’.

1.1.5 Indian English and New Englishes

Schneider (2003) considers the non-native English varieties as New Englishes and gives five phases in the development of such New Englishes. According to him, the first phase is ‘foundation’. In this phase, English begins to be used on a regular basis in a country that was not English speaking before, but because a significant group of English speakers settles there for an extended period. The second is the ‘exonormative stabilization’. The settlers have a conservative attitude about the standard of English. They feel that they are representatives of British culture on the foreign soil. But, at the same time, the adjustments to the local environment start to creep in. This gradually modifies English being spoken in the new country. An ‘English-cum-local’ identity emerges. This phase also marks the beginning of the ‘structural nativization’. The third is nativization. This is the most important phase. The process results in a kind of ‘semi-autonomy’. The Grammatical features of New Englishes emerge when the idiosyncrasies of usage develop into indigenous patterns and rules. The fourth is the ‘endonormative stabilization’. This phase is marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous norm. This phase typically follows the political independence. The community reaches an understanding that a new local norm, distinct from the norms of the mother country, is accepted as adequate also in formal usage. The new indigenous language variety is seen as homogeneous. The difference between phase 3 and phase 4 is that the label ‘English in X’ (e.g. ‘English in India’) is replaced by ‘X English’ (‘Indian English’). The fifth is ‘differentiation’. By this time the emergence of a new variety of English is a thing of the past. The process is now complete. But this is not the end. It is the beginning of the stage of dialect birth. A solid national basis has stabilized and the global position of the variety is safe and stable. This allows for the more internal diversification.

If we apply Schneider’s developmental model to Indian English, then it belongs to the fourth phase, i.e ‘endonormative stabilization’. 
1.1.6 Nativization of Non-native Englishes

The newness of the non-native Englishes is focused on by Kachru (1981). For him it is important that the non-native variety should be studied in the context of situation, the native one, which is appropriate to each variety and its use and the user. He finds that the ‘newness’ in the non-native varieties of English is not just because of the interference or a transfer from the native languages, but also due to the new cultural contexts in which English has been assigned various roles. As English goes through the process of acculturation in the non-native contexts, various degrees of culture-boundness are found in it. This is what he calls the ‘contextualization’, about which he has written extensively.

Kachru (1983) presents the uses of the non-native Englishes with four broad functions: the instrumental function, the regulative function, the interpersonal function and the imaginative/innovative function. In a culturally and linguistically pluralistic country like India, the instrumental functions refer to the status given to English in the educational system. The regulative function refers to the use of English in, for example, the legal system and administration. The interpersonal function “provides a clue to how a non-native language is used as a link language for effective communication between speakers of various languages, dialects, ethnic groups, and religions, thus providing a code of communication for diverse linguistic and cultural groups” (Kachru, 1983:215). The imaginative/innovative function has given rise to a large body of creative writing in English in various parts of the world.

About the objection that there is no uniformity in a non-native variety of English, he argues that even a native variety of any language is not homogeneous. Within a non-native variety, there is a cline of varieties. For instance, he makes a distinction between communicative competence for local, national and international uses.

Indian English, as a non-native variety of English, is used extensively in all these contexts in India.
1.2 Indian English and Other Englishes

A number of studies have been carried out on the several aspects of the non-native varieties of English. The focus has also been on new directions. These studies include the works on South Asian Englishes, Asian Englishes, World Englishes, International English and Global English. As Indian English shares some common features of these varieties, one should acknowledge these developments.

1.2.1 Indian English and South Asian Englishes (SAE)

South Asia comprises of India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Bhutan. These countries have many shared linguistic and cultural features. In order to study Indian English as a broad regional variety of South Asian Englishes, one should consider these shared items. Kachru (1986a) uses the term ‘South Asian English’ to refer to the variety of English used in the Indian subcontinent. He describes some features of South Asian English at the levels of phonology, grammar, lexis and collocations. At the level of phonology, he mentions the features like the non-occurrence of the consonant clusters/ sk/, /sl/ and /sp/ in the initial position and the distinctive prosodic features. In grammar, the features like deviations in the use of interrogative sentences and tag questions, reduplication and erratic distribution of articles are mentioned.

The use of words from Indian languages and the hybridized lexical items are among the lexical features of South Asian English. South Asian English collocations are the result of translation of words or phrases from the South Asian languages into South Asian English (like ‘twice-born’), the extension or analogies derived from English (such as ‘black money’ on the analogy of ‘black market’) and the formally non-deviant but culture-bound/context-bound/register-bound collocations (like ‘co-brother-in-law’ and ‘nose-screw’).

Sridhar (1996) makes an attempt in the direction of describing the syntax of South Asian English. He studies the features such as the use of ‘itself’ as an invariant reflexive for emphasis, the limiting function of ‘only’ and ‘subject-verb number disagreement’. 
There are studies on Pakistani English, Lankan English as sub-varieties of South Asian Engishes. According to McArthur (1998), in the Circle of World English, there are regional varieties, such as South Asian Standard English. Beyond them, but linked to them, are sub-varieties like Pakistani English, Bangladesh English, Sri Lankan English and Indian English. McArthur (2003) states that, “Asian English has been thoroughly indigenized”. He adds, “Whereas the centre of gravity of English as a native language continues to be the North Atlantic (in insular Europe and continental North America), the centre of gravity of English as a second language or lingua franca is manifestly Asian (especially in the South and East).”

1.2.2 Indian English and Asian Engishes

Kachru (2005), commenting on Asian Engishes observes, “All the varieties of English in Asia are transplanted varieties and these varieties consist of formal and functional distinctiveness of the ‘diaspora varieties’ of English in various degrees”. There is an extensive creativity in a broad variety of genres, found in all these varieties. But it is also true that the sociolinguistic contexts in which Asian Engishes function are not identical in each country. However, Kachru (2005) treats this phenomenon as ‘functional nativeness’.

1.2.3 Indian English and World Engishes

Brown (1995: 233) notes that the ‘World Engishes’ should deal with “three key elements: a belief that there is a ‘repertoire of models for English’, that ‘the localized innovations [in English] have pragmatic bases’, and that ‘the English language now belongs to all those who use it’”.

Kachru (2005) makes a distinction between ‘genetic nativeness’ and ‘functional nativeness’ in the contextualization of World Engishes. For him, the historical relationship, for example between Hindi and Bengali belonging to India’s Indo-Aryan group of languages is genetic. The functional nativeness is not necessarily related to the genetic mapping of a language. It is determined by the range and depth of a language in a society. ‘Range’ refers to the domains of function. ‘Depth’ refers to the social penetration of the language. He considers the following points in the functional nativeness: a) The sociolinguistic status of
a variety in its transplanted context; b) The functional domains in which the language is used; c) The creative processes used at various levels to articulate the local identities; d) The linguistic exponents of the acculturation in nativization; e) The types of cultural ‘cross-over’ contributing to a new canon; and f) The attitude specifying the labels used for the variety.

In this sense, the varieties of English in Asia are ‘functionally native’. Indian English is also functionally native as part of the linguistic recourses of the multilingual country.

1.2.4 International English vs. Global English


Fishman (1996:97) rightly points out, “whether we consider English as killer language or not ….its expansive reach is undeniable and for time being unstoppable.”

The extensive use of English in socio-cultural and pragmatic fields in Asian and African countries gave the peculiar identity to those varieties of English. Strewmen (1985:427) echoes this point of view when he asserts, “Whose language is it? It is Ours and Everyone’s- the English language is truly a world possession”. In this regard Svartvik and Leech (2006) have argued that
the future of English is inextricably tied up with the future of non-native varieties of English. Hence rather than regarding these varieties as corrupt, distorted and debased versions of the standard native forms, it is necessary to develop a positive attitude towards non-native varieties. Some special researches in this direction should be carried out for the growth and development of the non-native varieties of English.

Strevens (1982) points out the reasons why English occupies its present position in spite of the fact that it is a young language compared with Chinese, Greek or Sanskrit and that other languages, such as Portuguese, Spanish and Arabic which have also been used for exploration, trade, conquest and power. He opines, “There is an element of historical luck about it: the explorations of Captain Cook and Captain Vancouver, the establishment of trading posts in Africa and Orient, the colonial and penal settlements in North America and Australia, the profit-dominated grip on India, the early stages of the Industrial Revolution- all these and others since were happenings dominated by people who spoke English.” (Strevens 1982:29)

There are other languages, too, which have been used for international communication, i.e communication between two nations. The languages like French and Arabic have had this status, but only to a limited extent. They were meant for ‘international’ communication; but they were not the World Language (See Svartvik and Leech, 2006) or a Global Language (see Crystal, 1997); rather they call it an international language. But it is still called an international language by some. (See Ahulu, 1998a; Ahulu, 1998b and Modiano, 1999a)

Crystal (1995:106) points out, “The movement of English around the world began with the pioneering voyages to the Americas, Asia and Antipodes, continued with the 19th century colonial developments in Africa and South Pacific, and took significant further step when it was adopted in the 20th century as an official or semi-official language by many newly-independent states… It is this spread of representation which makes the application of the term ‘world language’ a reality”. He further states that present world status of English is mainly the result of two factors- the expansion of British colonial power and the
emergence of the United States of America as the leading economic power of the 20th century.

Crystal (1997) uses both ‘Global English’ and ‘World English’, but does not use the term ‘International English’. Crystal (1999) is of the view that the emergence of the hybrid trends and varieties raises all kinds of theoretical and pedagogical issues. For instance, they blur the long-standing distinctions between ‘first’, ‘second’ and ‘foreign’ language. He expects that a day will come when learners will have to adapt their British Standard English to an international norm, or vice versa. Crystal (2004) points out that the pull imposed by the need for intelligibility on a world scale has two opposite forces—centripetal and centrifugal—operating on English at present.

Crystal (2004) is of the view that its (of English) future will partly depend on the development of the internet—whether it continues to be dominated by English or other language, such as Chinese. Svartvik and Leech (2006) consider the possibility that just as 20th century was the century of US power, the 21st century is shaping up to be China’s century. Chinese will gain a more powerful role in the world in the times to come, along with the increasing power of the Chinese economy. Therefore, even if English will be required to some extent, its domination as the global language may decrease.

1.3 Institutionalization of English in India

1.3.1 Emergence of English in India

The phases of emergence of English in India and English bilingualism in India, have been marked time to time by the linguists. There has been a considerable amount of literature on this. In order to understand the features of Indian English one must consider its socio-historical context in which it emerged.

1.3.1.1 Three Phase Interpretation

Kachru (1983:19) considers three phases in the introduction of bilingualism in English in India. The first is the ‘missionary’ phase. The missionaries were allowed to use the ships of East India Company for
proselytizing and for introducing educational activities. The second phase deals with the ‘local’ demand for English. During this phase as Kachru says, “The prominent Indians such as Raja Rammohan Roy and Rajunath Hari Navalkar made efforts to persuade the officials of the East India Company to impart instruction in English, rather than Sanskrit (or Arabic) so that young Indians would be exposed to the scientific knowledge of the world.” This phase began after 1765, i.e. after the stabilization of the Company’s authority. Raja Rammohan Roy and his group strengthened Macaulay’s hand considerably in passing the famous minutes of 1835. Raja Rammohan Roy, thus, made important contribution to the introduction of bilingualism in English in the Indian subcontinent. It is he who preferred English to Indian language for academic, scientific and other international reasons.

The third phase is the ‘government policy’. The significant Minute of 1835 caused the debate and controversy. Kachru (1983) notes that, at that time there were primarily two attitudes towards introducing English on the Indian subcontinent. T.B. Macaulay was included in the Anglicist Group, and the Orientalist group was headed by H.T. Prinsep. The first group favoured English as the second was against the use of English as compulsory language. However, the Minute was approved and official regulation endorsing Macaulay’s Policy was passed. To this extent, the process of producing the English-knowing bilinguals in India established itself.

The next stage is the ‘diffusion’ of bilingualism in English. As per the government policy in 1854, three Universities were established in India. With the spread of colleges and the increase of Universities, the importance of English was raised. Thus, English became the official and academic language of India.

1.3.1.2 Five Phase Interpretation

Krisnaswamy and Krishnaswamy (2006) deal with the emergence of English in India. According to them, the history of English in India can be dealt with in five phases. The first phase refers to the exploration, the transportation, the establishment of the British East India Company and the arrival of
missionaries in India to educate Indians. The second phase is ‘consolidation’. It is about the need to appoint English knowing and loyal Indians in the offices, ‘area to form a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect’, need to train the ‘baboos to create clerks’. As a result, English was made the official language of education in 1873. The third phase is the ‘dissemination’ phase. In 1958, the Govt. of India came under the control of the British sovereign. They opened a number of schools, colleges and universities. The English education became the unifying principle for the Empire. The educated Indians used English for a different purpose in a different register. It was turned into a second language. The forth phase is the ‘identity’ phase. It is about the period after the Britishers left India that English became the associate official language of the independent India. Despite the opposition to English from some sections of the Indian society, English has not only retained its position but also has become more and more important. The Indian elites have been the English-educated people; English is now closely linked with the cultural power, the material progress and social status. Indian Writing has already established itself on par with British literature. English as used by the Indians has got its own identity with the enormous increase in the English speaking population and its use in the various registers. The fifth phase is the ‘globalization’ phase. The revolutionary change in Information Technology (IT) has given English language the global status. It has become a language of Internet and Information Technology. The Indians are now realizing English not as a symbol of colonialism but as a tool for global communication.

1.3.1.3 Other Interpretations of Emergence

Khubchandani (1996) points out that English has freed itself from its obligatory role of being a carrier of elitism. The reasons he gives are: a) The delinking of acquisition of English language from Western lifestyles b) The distancing of English usage from standard native models (British/American) c) The complementation of English and Indian languages in intra-group interactions, a societal diglossia, resulting in code-switching, code-mixing, etc.
Pingali (2009:95) traces some of the significant events that have contributed to the establishment of English in India. The phases she has considered are: 1) The Pre-British period (1498-1600), 2) The Pre-Macaulay period (1600-1835), 3) The Pre-Independence period (1835-1947), this period, she maintains, as the period of institutionalization of English education. 4) The Post-Independence period (1947-2006). She argues that while historical and political factors served to establish English as an important language in the country. This process had linguistic consequences.

1.3.2 Identity of Indian English

There are many scholars who have been arguing in favour of the identity of Indian English. They have all tried to define Indian English in their own way. However, in the beginning, much of the time and energy was wasted in questioning the very existence of Indian English. Later on, some scholars found sufficient systemacity in Indian English, whereas others regarded the status as a variety in strict theoretical terms. Apart from the isolated studies, there has been a collective effort made for arriving at some definite conclusions. It was the Seminar on Indian English held at the CIEFL Hyderabad in 1972. The seminar came to certain tentative conclusions as to what constitutes Indian English: “Indian English is not substandard English; it is not Pidgin English. Indian English is not just British English, English with a few Indian species added to it. It has its own distinct identity.” (Mohan Ramesh, 1978).

Kachru (1961) has identified Indian English as ‘a transference variety’ in his pioneering work. According to him, Indian English differs from Standard English (SE) at the level of the context of situation where the same linguistic form performs different speech functions. There are, he observes four types of ‘transfer’: 1) Transfer of context (caste system of India), 2) Transfer of formal items (salt-giver), 3) Transfer of speech functions (mode of address), 4) Transfer of meaning from L1 to L2 (brother-in-Law = sala).

Bansal (1967) has concentrated his attention mainly on the spoken English. His work in the field of phonology has provided a sufficient evidence to describe Indian English as a distinct variety. Verma (1972) comments on the
peculiar position that English holds in India: “Since English has been with us for a fairly long period of time and has yielded on offspring i.e Indian English we should treat it as an L2 with a distinct Indian flavor”. (In Mohan Ramesh (ed.) 1978:207)


Daswani (1975), however, sees no possibility of assigning to Indian English any position of variety. In his seminar paper (CIEFL) he pointed out that ‘it is not at all clear what Indian English is’. In his article on Indian English he claims that ‘the so-called Indian English is only a poor approximation of the standard variety’. It seems that he would like to include all the users of English in India on the cline of bilingualism as the English speech community and accept Indian English as a ‘product of language contact situation.’ This theoretical proposition is somewhat similar to that of Quirk et al (1972), i.e. as an interference variety. However, Daswani despairs that it is not attested by what we find around us and that English used in India is far from systematic.

1.3.3 Indian English Bilingualism

Many Indian scholars have tried to measure the proficiency of Indian English bilinguals. This section deals with variations based on proficiency, educated English and standard Indian English.

1.3.3.1 Variation based on Proficiency

As it is natural for any variety of language to display further variation based on region, education, subject matter and so on, Indian English, though it is a non-native variety, displays a number of sub-varieties. Kachru (1983) classifies sub-varieties of Indian English on three parameters: region, ethnic groups and proficiency. In the case of the second language, the variation based on proficiency becomes more crucial than that on the regional or the ethnic variations. The Indian linguists such as Kachru (1986a, 1983), Verma (1980),
Shastri (1988), Hosali (1984) and others have studied this ‘proficiency’ considerably with reference to the cline of bilingualism.

When Kachru (1983) describes Indian English or the process of ‘Indianization’ of English, he does not believe that there is uniformity in the use of English by all Indians. He argues that there is a cline of bilingualism in Indian English on which there is almost monolingualism at one end and absolute bilingualism at the other. The end of monolingualism is what Kachru (1986a) calls the ‘zero’ point. A person who belongs to this point has no knowledge of English. At the other end, there are a few people whose competence in English is near-native. Between these ends there is a lot of variation. Kachru (1983) explains the variations of Indian English based on proficiency with reference to the ‘cline of bilingualism’. The cline has been defined in terms of three arbitrarily determined “measuring points”, namely the ambilingual point, the central point and the zero point. These three points provide the indications of a speaker’s proficiency in the use of Indian English: The ambilingual point being the highest point on the scale and the zero point, the lowest. The zero point, however, is not the end point at the bottom. The users of English such as waiters, salesmen or tourist guides use English in their restricted spheres of activity; but their overall competence in the language is practically negligible. It is such English in India that is labeled as Babu English, Butler English, Bearer English and Kitchen English. The regional variation, according to him, coincides with the regional language and the ethnic variation cuts across regional language or dialect boundaries.

Daswani (1974) classifies the Indian speakers of English as adequate, inadequate and minimal bilinguals. The minimal is at the lower end, the adequate at the upper and the inadequate between these two points. He identifies Indian English speech community as inadequate bilinguals whose English is ‘deviant by definition’. Hosali (1984) points a cline of sub-varieties with basilect and acrolect as two extreme points with mesolect in the middle, corresponding to Kachru’s zero point, ambilingual point and central point, in both cases referring to ‘uneducated speakers’, ‘highly educated speakers’ and ‘less-well
educated speakers’. Shastri (1988) points a cline with the *heavily* Indian to *hardly* Indian within the educated variety (midpoint) on the basis of the genres of writing.

1.3.3.2 Educated English

This term is very much associated with the *central* point of the cline of Bilingualism.

Between the two extremes of the cline, there are several educated Indians—administrators, teachers, business executives, scientists and journalists - who use English in a variety of professional and social situation. The ‘educated’ Indian English is the term used for the English of these people. It is the *central* point between the two ends which Kachru (1983) is especially interested in and which he describes as educated Indian English.

Verma (1980), while describing the term ‘Educated English’, gives a long list of the kinds of usages of English in India. English is used in India by the University and college students, teachers, officers and clerks working in all India establishments, railway and travel offices, all India bodies (governmental and non-governmental) communicating with state level bodies; doctors, lawyers and other professionals; creative writers etc. These people are bilinguals or multilinguals. He observes that English in India represents a cline extending from non-educated varieties of English at one end, which are not intelligible, to an internationally accepted standard form of English at the other. These two ends do not represent English. What Verma (1980) calls educated Indian English is between these two extremes. It is marked by a number of syntactic patterns which may be found deviant if compared with the surface patterns of (native) English; but, he claims, a deep analysis of the syntactic systems of Indian English reveals that they are not oddities but just the rule-governed dialectal variations. It is not a corrupt language, it is just different.

1.3.3.3 Standard Indian English

The scholars have studied and explained the varieties of Indian English on the basis of different clines. However, the question remains which variety of Indian English is to be considered as the standard Indian English. Stephenson
(1977) considers Standard American English as “the usage of Best Education and most prominent members of speech community”. Quirk (1960) thinks, “Educated English … recognized as such by the educated native English speakers.” On this line, Kachru (1965, 1983) maintains that the standard variety of Indian English may be defined as the variety used by standard (or educated) Indian English bilinguals, i.e., those bilinguals who rank around the central point on the cline of bilingualism and who are intelligible not only to other Indians in different parts of the sub-continent but also, ideally speaking, to the educated native speakers of English. It does not mean, however, that an educated Indian speaker of English does not reveal some regional characteristics in his or her speech.

According to Subrahmanian (1977), educated Indian’s English is not ‘inferior’ or ‘superior’ to the British or American variety but ‘different’: “It has a special Indian tone, sensibility, vocabulary, and also to some extent syntax”. At present Indian English is gradually being accepted as a norm. Therefore, it may be tentatively said that Indian English has passed through the first two stages and is passing through the third stage. Standard Indian English is more of a concept now as it is still in the process of Evolution.

The analyses and descriptions of this ‘educated’ Indian English only can establish Indian English as a ‘standard’ variety.

1.4. Linguistic Description of Indian English

This section deals with the identity of Indian English in relation to its lexico-semantic, syntactic, phonological and stylistic properties. It also includes the contributions to the corpus based studies on Indian English.

1.4.1 Lexico-Semantic Level

Lexico-Semantics is the major category of language structure. A detailed study of lexis is the key to discover the features of language. For IE, this aspect has been studied by scholars like Hosali, Shastri, Parasher, Nihlani and Kachru. The sub-categories of Lexico-Semantics discussed and investigated by them are as follows:
1) IE Collocation: Certain formations which form part of both grammar and lexis are termed as IE collocations; whereas certain lexical items keep company with a set of other lexical items in BE. Such collocations mark IE as a distinct variety of English, e.g. America-returned, England-returned, Three-eyed, eating-leaves etc. There are certain words, translated from other languages, e.g. twice-born, dining-leaf, waist-thread, which make sense only in IE. (Kachru, 1983)

2) Loan-Words: There are ample loan-words which could be added to IE vocabulary. These words are especially borrowed from Hindi/Urdu and other Indian languages. Some of such words are: bondh, lakh, crore, bandicoot (The word of Telgu origin refers to a rat almost as larger as a cat.)

3) Wrong Collocatives: To have ears bored, (BE pierced), affable (BE polite), shoe – biting, (BE hurting or pinching).

4) Difference in Meaning: Busybody, (IE- a person who is very busy or heavily occupied). (BE – a meddlesome person, mischief-marker).

5) Extension of Meaning: Cot – in BE it is usually a small child’s bed or a bed in a hospital; in IE its meaning is wider and includes any kind of light bedstand.

6) Register Range Extension: ‘duck’s egg’– IE– used with the meaning ‘naught’, BE – the phrase belongs to the register of cricket as something of a technical term – being a batsman’s score of zero.

7) Neologisms: The term used for creation of new words which are not generally known to BS. i) Words created by Indian with the use of affixes: Freeship (BE Free Studentship), delink (BE remove, abolish), ii) Creation by analogy – Car-lifter (BS car thief), Cycle-lifter (BS Cycle thief), Compounds like – Chilli-green, chutney-green (BS Sea-green, bottle-green)

8) Code-mixing: In the paper entitled ‘Code-mixing in the process of Indianization of English: A corpus-based study’ Shastri (1986) refers to the types of code-mixing, and the correlation between genres of writing and the degree of ‘Indianness’ of their lexical component. The details are discussed in chapter- II.
1.4.2 Syntax

Kachru's (1969) contribution to identifying the Indianess of IE is of long standing. He has dealt with almost all aspects of IE. In particular, his work regarding the syntax, semantics and phonology of IE is worth noting.

i) Kachru's main claim is that in IE, there is a tendency towards complex sentences which results in large scale embedding (Kachru 1969). This he illustrates by giving an excerpt from Raja Rao's Novels.

ii) Regarding the 'be+ing+V' construction, he observes that the rules applicable to such construction are isolated by Indian users, e.g. the verbs of perception – see, hear, know etc. do not occur in progressive tenses in the native varieties. The reasons for such isolation, he thinks, could be absence of such restriction in the regional language (Kachru 1969).

iii) The use of reduplication he found on both levels, syntactic as well as semantic; e.g. He sells different, different things. I like hot hot coffee. (Kachru 1969). This reduplication may be used for emphasis.

iv) The deviant interrogative construction: He found some examples where in interrogative sentences, an auxiliary is not fronted. For example: 1) what you would like to eat? 2) Where you are going?

Though he discovered such deviations, he feels that since the status of IE is that of a L2 in a bilingual or multilingual context, the effect of 'transfer' cannot be ignored. Generally, the 'transfer' takes place from a dominant language (L1) to a less dominant language (L2). (Kachru 1969). However, he has been criticized by others who argue that the examples he gives are all from Indian English fiction.

Verma's research in the area of linguistics has produced the descriptions of some syntactic irregularities in IE. His paper (1972) summarizes them along with some 'surface facts' about IE. His analysis is based on English used by the college teachers of English and the top officials of a national bank. He has discovered a variety of deviations in the syntactic structures of his IE data and finds that the non-stylistic deviant syntactic patterns are typical not only of IE
but of all non-naive L2 varieties of English. The sentence types he has cited are as follows:

i) Inter-clause Sequence of Tense: ‘When I met him yesterday he said he is coming.’
   EE – When I met him yesterday he said he was coming.

ii) Conditional Sentences: ‘If it will rain this evening we will not go out.’
   EE – If it rains this evening, we will not go out.

iii) Indirect Questions: ‘Do you know where does he live?’
   EE – Do you know where he lives?

iv) ‘I do not know how far will it help me’.
   EE – I do not know how far it will help me.

v) Tag Questions: ‘You are coming, no? ’
   EE – You are coming, aren’t you?

vi) Tense and Aspect: ‘I have visited that place only last year.’
   EE – I visited that place only last year.

vii) Wh-questions: ‘What you say, Mr.Prasad?’
   EE – What do you say, Mr Prasad.

viii) 'What' type of verb + sentences: ‘I consider that he is a fool.’
   EE – I consider him (to be) a fool.

viv) Response type sentences: Q – ‘Aren't you coming this evening?’
   R – Yes, I am or No, I am not.

ix) 'Know' type of verb in its progressive aspects: ‘We are not having these items today’.
   EE – We do not have these items today.

x) Word order: ‘Your both hands are dirty.’
   EE – Both your hands are dirty.

xii) Relative clauses followed by correlative pronouns: ‘The three young men who visited you yesterday, they have come again to see you.’
   EE – The three men who visited you yesterday have come again.

xiii) Collocation: ‘This tea is too light for me.’
   EE – This tea is too weak for me.
The sentence types, given above show that, in IE there is a set of non-stylistic deviant syntactic patterns, which is common to other non-native varieties (i.e. French English, German English etc.). This reinforces the point that Indian English is a non-native variety in its own right.

Verma, in the end, admits that these syntactic irregularities, which are not restricted to any particular linguistic area in India, cannot be wiped out by setting up regular rules or systems. Compared with the number of deviant phonological and lexico-semantic features, the deviant syntactic patterns are limited, because a variety of language cannot move far away from the nuclear system of the main language.

Parashar's (1983) view is similar to Verma's, when he says that the educated IE does not differ much syntactically from British English (BrE). The difference lies in the areas of lexis and style. Because IE is a product of language contact and it is used in India for certain specific purpose in the Indian socio-cultural context. His hypothesis is that the educated variety of IE should conform to the major syntactic rules of BE and as a non-native variety, IE should show certain differences at the lexical and the stylistic levels.

Basing the analysis on data of correspondence between educated Indians, officers of Commercial Houses, he categorizes the syntactic features of IE as follows:

i) Nominals: In IE, pluralization of words such as breads, informations, advices is common; but these are unacceptable in BE, whereas in BE only certain non-count nouns are found to be pluralized (evidences, etc.)

ii) Determiners and Modifiers: There appeared to be a great amount of agreement on the use of the indefinite article, except a few minor differences. (few, a few)

iii) Word Order: IE users at a fairly high level of competence have a command of the basic SVO pattern of English. It is in certain minor subsets of rules of word order that they sometimes get confused.
iv) Verb Patterns: There is a tendency among Indians to use transitive verbs intransitively and vice-versa. 'to+infinitive' is also found in the place of present participle.

v) Auxiliaries: There was an unacceptability regarding the use of modals. A tendency to use 'would' where native speaker preferred 'will' was observed.

vi) Tense and Aspect: Indians tend to use the simple past tense where present perfect is expected. On the other hand, IE speakers tend to use the past progressive where native speakers prefer the simple past.

vii) Prepositions: His evidence suggests that there are three tendencies in IE: i) to delete, ii) to add and iii) to use certain prepositions inappropriately.

This may be due to the intrinsic complexity of English prepositional usage. Like the articles, English prepositions present a problem for L2 learners.

viii) Clause Connectors and Clause Structure: With regard to the clause structure, the British insisted on using a reduced relative clause (the interest (which was) due on), whereas Indians accepted these without deletion.

There is a tendency seen in Indians to insist on the rules of school grammars when they reject the indicative if + was construction in favour of if + were subjunctive.

ix) Subject-Verb Concord: In this regard IE conforms to the BE, since no significant deviations have been observed.

x) Constituent Structure and Categorical Structure: Some underlined expressions are deleted by native speakers whereas Indians accept them e.g. 1) the statement was duly signed by the director. 2) Receive the journal from next year onwards.

The expressions like stenography test, telephone conversation and nutrition programme, are preferred by native speakers whereas Indians accept expressions like stenographic test, telephonic conversation and nutritional programme. Thus, the evidence presented here proves his hypothesis that educated Indian English should conform to the major syntactic rules of BE. The differences and similarities between SE and IE syntax strengthen the claim that Indian English is a variety.
Hosali (1984), also has dealt with some grammatical categories like prepositions, articles, verbs, question forms, the comparatives, nouns, compounding etc. According to her, the meaning of preposition in most cases is unaffected by the deletion, insertion or wrong choice of preposition. However, in some cases meaning is affected as in: ‘The Minister admitted to the fact that inflation was still increasing’. In some cases, prepositions are superfluous and elsewhere they are redundant; of course, this would be recognized as deviant from the norm. Articles, as the prepositions, follow the same deviation patterns: deletion, insertion, and wrong choice of articles. Sometimes, these patterns affect the meaning, whereas in certain cases they do not affect the meaning.

According to Hosali (1984), the verb forms used in Indian English are as follows:

i) Verbs used without the reflexive pronoun:
   ‘Come and enjoy.’
   BE – enjoy yourself, (yourselves)

ii) Verbs used in the continuous form:
   ‘Are you having a cold?’
   BE – Have you got a cold?

It should be noted that British speakers use the non-possessive 'have' in the continuous form, as in 'I am having a guest for dinner this evening'. Indians use the continuous form for the possessive 'have' as well, as in the above sentence.

iii) Strongly Transitive Verbs used Intransitively as in: 'I would appreciate if you would reply quickly' (BE – appreciate it)

iv) Verbs followed by to + infinitive: ‘I am interested to have details about your company’ (BE – in having details).

v) Verbs in Present Prefect Tense: ‘I have read the book yesterday.’

vi) Verbs in Past Perfect Tense: ‘An American couple had adopted and orphan yesterday’

vii) Active Verbs used Passively: 'My son was graduated last Monday'
viii) Question Forms: There is a lack of inversion in questions as in 'How I shall do this?' and inversion in indirect questions as in 'I asked him how had he come?'

ix) Tendency of using Question-tag 'Isn't it?'. Regardless of the sentence to which it is conjoined.

x) The Double Comparative – ‘I like your car. It is more better.’

Nouns:
1) Pluralized Nouns: 'They were carrying a lot of baggages'
2) Compounding: 'She was age barred from promotion to a more senior post' (BE – barred by age);
3) Adj + noun: 'I bought it at a departmental store'
4) Compounding of Noun + noun: ‘We went by charter-bus.’ (BE – chartered bus):
5) Use of participle adj with–ed: 'We need someone a little more matured for this job.' (BE – more mature);
6) Hybrid Compounds: Some of the more commonly heard are 'lathi-charge', 'double-roti', etc. in IE whereas 'Baton-charge' and a 'loaf of bread' are used by British speaker.

The focus of Hosali’s (1984) attention seems to be on the lower end of the cline, i.e. the English used by the uneducated Indians for the practical purposes of communication and she claims this to be a kind of pidgin. However, in her attempt to deal with IE as a broader category of which basilect (lower end) is a part, she has indicated that as we move higher, the pidgin features tend to drop off and more and more SE features begin to appear.

Parasher (1991) studies IE in respect of functions and form. He points out that some stray observations about the grammar of Indian English have been made in isolation, without making an in-depth study of the grammar of IE. For making a survey of English usage in India, he selects the samples from letters written by educated Indians from a nationalized bank and an all-India level research institute. The results show that there are few violations of the major rules of English syntax and none of these occur with a high frequency and that more than 50% of the deviant forms found in the corpus are at the level of lexis
and style. Parasher (1991) concludes that Indian English used by educated people at a fairly high level of competence is not different from that in the educated native varieties in syntax.

So far as Grammar of Indian English is concerned, Kachru (1983, 2005) points out that a detailed grammatical description is not yet available. The recent books by Yadurajan (2001) and Sanyal (2006) are in the form of earlier books on the Grammar of Indian English; in a sense they deal with the possible errors and their correct forms (of British standard). Agnihotri et al (1984) analyze the errors in the use of verb phrase in Indian English; Bhatt (1995) describes features such as undifferentiated Tag Question and the use of the Progressive Aspect with habitual action. Sridhar (1992) analyses some aspects of the syntax of English used by the educated Indian English speaker. He observes the features such as the use of the Present Perfect for the Simple Past, absence of subject auxiliary inversion in questions and omission of direct object with some transitive verbs.

McArthur (1992) concentrates on the syntactic features in English used by the bilingual Indian speakers. They are: interrogative constructions without subject auxiliary inversion, the use of static verbs in the progressive aspect, reduplication for emphasis, using yes and no as question tags, using ‘isn’t it?’ as a generalized question tag and the use of only for emphasis. According to him, there is a great variety, from native-speaker fluency (‘acrolect’) to a weak command of many constructions (‘the basilect’). The middle level is ‘the mesolect’.

Researchers like Trudgill and Hanah (1985) and Agnihotri et al (1988) have carried out work on the syntax of articles, tenses and prepositions and it has largely been pedagogical in nature.

1.4.3 Style and Discourse

Indian English displays a number of stylistic features. The scholars such as Parasher (1983), Kachru (1969), Kindersley (1938), Subrahmanian (1977) have dealt with these features.

1) There is a tendency, in Indians to use nominal forms where native speakers prefer verbal forms:
‘This has reference to your letter’.    IE
‘This refers to your letter’.    BE
2) Indians rejected all ‘split infinitives’, as in: IE-request you to return immediately, BE-request you to immediately return.
3) Phrase-merging: A tendency toward phrase-merging (Goffin 1934) is determined by the structure of L1 and also by various types of collocational deviations. Kachru quotes examples from Goffin (1934): Himalayan blunder, nation-building, change of heart, dumb millions.
4) Some evidence to show that the IE users prefer indirect and roundabout expressions to the direct and specific ones, as in ‘However, it will not be out of place to request you to send us the details of chemicals etc.’
5) Clichés: Kindersley (1938) gives the following examples to illustrate the excessive use of clichés in Indian English: better imagined than described (easily imagined) do the needful, each and every, leave severely alone (for ‘leave alone’)
6) ‘Extremely polite style’ is seen in
   - ‘kindly please advise me.’
   - ‘I invite you to bring your kind attention.’
   - ‘I need your esteemed help.’
Indians are fond of an excess of polite forms. (Goffin 1934). The main reason for this is that originally the registers of English introduced in India were of administration and law; both these registers are full of polite forms and these became part of IE conversational English.
7) Archaic Nouns: (rare)
   - ‘His former abode was in Mangalore’.
   - BS – He used to live in Mangalore.
   - ‘I’d like you to meet my better-half.’ (BS-wife)
8) Latinity: There is a tendency toward a kind of Latinity in IE. An Indian, says Goffin (1934), would prefer demise to death, or pain in one’s bosom to pain in one’s chest.
9) Mixture of Formal and Informal items:
e.g. professor ‘X’ has just bagged an International prize of Physics.

I communicated my reflections to a chum, (a friend)

10) Yes-no ‘Confusion’: The selection of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in English mainly depends on the facts of the situation. If the situation is positive, the answer is yes; if it is negative, the answer is ‘no’. But in the spoken form of the Indian variety of English, “Yes” is answer to a negative question, for English “no”, i.e., “You have no objection”. Yes, I have no objection. (Kindersley 1938)

11) Less Conversational: As Mathai (1951) points out, IE was always inclined to be bookish, because the Indians learned their English from books; the phrases and the terms of expression taken from the great writers were used without proper recognition of their archaic or obsolescent or purely poetic character. The second reason in a way stems from the first. Spoken IE (/SAE) does not sound conversational, as the spoken medium has been seldom taught as an academic discipline in the Indian (South Asian) educational system. Thus, the IE/SAE speakers are not made conscious of the characteristics of spoken English.

12) Flowery Style: Subrahmanian (1977) attributes this influence of our regional literatures. He himself is in full sympathy with the flowery style of writing. He says, “There is no use of condemning the flowery expressions, because the English do not approve of them, even as there is no use condemning ‘sentimentality’, because the English disapprove of it. We are a sentimental people whether we like it or not and this should be reflected in our writings.” He further insists, “Style is not a natural thing; it embodies the characteristics of both the individual and the culture he belongs to”. The factors responsible for IE stylistic deviations may be cultural and sociological, as Kachru repeatedly insists.

13) Rank Reduction: British English - an address of welcome, a bunch of keys and love of God. In IE these are reduced to welcome address, key bunch, God-love.

The researchers have also shown a keen interest in the discoursal features of Indian English. For example, Pandharipande (1987) briefly compares the
paradigm structure of English with that of Marathi and other Indian languages including Indian English. Leitner (1990) who has empirically investigated certain features of Indian English strongly argues that differences between different varieties of English or within the same national variety are tied not only to regional or social differences, but also to the text types within each variety.

1.4.4 Phonology

There are a number of studies which have been devoted to the phonology of Indian English. Bansal and Harrison (1972) have done fundamental work in phonology and segmental features of what they call General Indian English (GIE). There is also a description of the segmental features of the phonology of Indian English in McArthur (1992). The studies of Bansal (1978) and Pandey (1980) attempt to describe the segmental and supra-segmental aspects of standard Indian English. Some researchers have carried out pedagogically oriented constructive studies between R.P. and a regional variety of Indian English, for example, Rajasthani English (Dhamija, 1976), Marathi English (Gokhale, 1978), Rubdi (1975) and Tamil English (Vijay Krishnan, 1978).

Sehegal (1983) and Agnihotri and Sehegal (1985) have analyzed the phonological structure of Indian English in terms of social and psychological background of its speakers. Nihalani et al. (1979) recommends educated Indian English as a model that must be adopted in school and colleges.

Bansal’s (1972) study was based on recorded speeches of educated speakers from various parts of the country. His aim was ‘to verify or modify’ the earlier descriptions, his own and those of an earlier study by Coline (1972). In this paper, he answers two common objections against such studies. The first objection is that “we can describe the phonology of a natural language – a language which is the L1 of a speech community and not a language which is acquired as a second or foreign language”. Bansal claims that though English is not the L1 of many people in India, it is extensively used all over India for a variety of purposes as a language of administration, higher education, business, academic discussions and creative writing and therefore deserves to be described. The second objection relates to the multilingual character of our
country. It was claimed that “English spoken by Indians with different languages as their L1s could not be described as one dialect”. According to Bansal, we can describe ‘a common core of language patterns’, as we can describe the similarities in human beings. Bansal treats Indian English as a distinct variety, and claims that there is a existence of ‘a standard pronunciation for Indian English’. Daswani (1974) rejects this claim by saying that there are factors which result in ‘phonic interference’ in Indian English. The factors are 1) Superimposition of the sound patterns of the L1s, 2) Deletion of lower-level rules of phonology like allophonic variance, 3) Semantically determined phonological rules, 4) Lack of control of phonological rules, 5) High degree of phonic interference from L1 in the English of inadequate bilinguals, 6) Lack of proper exposure resulting in a high degree of L1 phonic interference.

Kachru (1976), the pioneering investigator of the Indianization of English, argues in his study that the observations made in various studies on Indian pronunciation of English are useful in understanding ‘deviations’. Using these observations, ‘the transparent features’ of Indian English can be isolated.

Bansal (1969) has attempted to measure the ‘intelligibility’ of IE (73%). The aim of his study was to verify the earlier description of his own study. Having given the description of the phonemic patterns that emerged out of his analysis, he concludes that the divergences from R.P. in respect of prosodic features are typical of spoken English in India.

1.4.5 Corpus-based Studies

There have been a number of studies, as mentioned earlier, carried out on the nature of Indian English with respect to phonology, lexico-semantics, syntax and style. But they are of independent nature. Some times such studies yield stray and impressive observations without any substantial support. In order to make a comprehensive description of English there was a need to compile an authentic comprehensive data base with adequate representation of the educated Indian English. This need was fulfilled in building two corpora. The first is the Kolhapur Corpus of Indian English compiled by Shastri et al (1986). It is a corpus of Written Indian English (500 Texts). The second is the International
Corpus of English-Indian Component, compiled by Shastri and Leitner (2002). This corpus includes 300 Spoken and 200 Written texts. The detailed information about these corpora is given in the chapter on ‘Materials and Methodology.’

With the help of these two corpora as the source materials, several studies on the different aspects of Indian English have been carried out at many places in India and also outside India for comparative studies on different aspects of varieties of English. Leitner (1990), for instance, illustrates three metaphors of English in South Asia – ‘bad, different or new’ using the Kolhapur Corpus.

Katikar (1984) interprets the meaning of the modals in Indian English and points out certain syntactic irregularities in the use of the modals in Indian English. The most common slip seems to be a failure to conform to the rules of the sequence of tense. There are instances of the use of a present tense form of the modal where a past form is required and vice versa. For example, ‘This was the support price which would not hit the small farmers … etc., and the interest of the consumers will be saved;’ ‘If prison industries are run on proper lines… the tax payers would be saved from any burden of prisons’. There is an overall predominance of the past forms of the modals in Indian English as compared to the native English. In the case of the modality of hypothesis, Katikar observes, the Indian user of English seem to find it difficult to cope with the complicated syntactic structure. This is suggested by the considerable number of instance of idiosyncratic use of modals in such constructions.

Shingate’s M.Phil study (1986) of ‘verb-particle construction with up and down in Indian English’ notes the peculiar semantic features: 1) VPCs in which a different verb or particle synonymous with the Standard English verb or particle occur, e.g. billow up = send up, draw up a chair = draw out a chair. 2) Transitive VPCs used intransitively; e.g. Vinayak Shastri looked up at him. 3) Peculiar collocation with the subject, object and complement NPs; e.g., Organization… make up its mind. 4) Non-causative VPCs used causatively; e.g., the tube will be sprung up. 5) VPCs in which the particle is superfluous; e.g., dig up wells. 6) VPCs in which the particle is redundant; e.g., Rise up, stoop down.
7) VPCs used in the passive or attributively; e.g., He was settled down in New Zealand. 8) Idiosyncratic use; e.g. If we cut up your goat... 9) VPCs used with a creative meaning; e.g., Willie’s eyebrows arched up a good quarter inch. 10) VPCs which seem to reflect some kind of Indian social or cultural reality; e.g. If the previous evening his favorite foot ball team has lost the match, he beats up his children for no reason.

Ramtirthkar’s M.Phil. study (1987) also demonstrates that the behavior of *some* and *any* in Indian English conforms to that of Standard English to the extent of 95.6%. Thus, there is hardly any difference between Standard English and Indian English in the use of *some* and *any*. This shows that IE shares the common core of syntactic and semantic systems of BE in this area, thus supporting the claim that Indian English is a variety of British English.

Some of the major syntactic deviations in the use of *some* and *any* in Indian English listed by Ramtirthkar (1987) are: i) Inversion rule is violated as in—‘But seldom anyone responded…’ (BE—‘But seldom did anyone respond…’) ii) ‘Any’ is used instead of ‘a’ as in – ‘We have been saying that this is not a matter of confrontation between any state and the centre.’ iii) ‘Any’ is used where it is not necessary. For example – ‘They had known neither any great sorrow nor exceptional pleasure’. iv) Conjoined predicates with ‘no/any’. For example—‘There is no moralizing tone or any attempt to offer dramatic justification for the hero’s odd behaviour. (BE’ There is no moralizing tone nor is there any attempt to…)’ v) The position of ‘neither… any’ as in – ‘Consequently, the existing bureaucracy neither had any experience nor the foresight to run the democratic system’. (BE –‘… the existing bureaucracy had neither any experience nor had the foresight…’) vi) ‘Any + Neg’ as in – ‘But in a democratic set up like our any new programme of collection… is not possible’. (BE – ‘…no.. programme is possible’) vii) ‘Any’ for ‘some’. For example – ‘I searched and searched the whole of his life for any meaning…’. Such restricted studies also have contributed considerably to the syntactic description of Indian English.
Karande’s study (1994) on acoustic features of educated Indian English speech is based on the texts of News Broadcast from ICE-IND. The significant observation of this study is: The variety of English used by the Indian news readers has been claimed as Educated Indian English speech. The EIE Speech conforms to British English in a certain features and still it maintains its own identity. Acoustically, it differs from native speech in certain areas such as, ‘duration’, ‘diphthong quality’ and ‘word stress’.

The major findings of Babar’s study (1996) on Adjective-Noun Collocation in Indian English are: 1) The majority of instances of the use of nodes (adjectives) studied conform to the native English usage. The percentages of Indian English collocations are very low. This shows that Adjective Noun collocations in Indian English as distinct from other native varieties of English. 2) Indian English collocation behavior is less idiomatic than that of English and also the collocational pattern is weaker than British. 3) Indian English collocations are determined by peculiar socio-cultural context of situation in which they occur in India; e.g. strong –language (Indian English) , Powerful –language (BrE), big moon (IE) , large moon (BrE), bigger risk (IE), greater risk (BrE), small brother (IE) little brother/younger brother (BrE). 4) This study supports the hypothesis that Indians may not be able to differentiate between synonymous very clearly. They use big instead of large and large instead of big. 5) Indians ignore the collocational restrictions and form the new typically Indian English collocations. These collocations have additional Indian meaning; i.e they are Indian components having (+INDIAN) feature. For example, smaller-gods should be understood in the Indian socio-cultural examples context.

Gokhale’s study (2008) ‘The verb phrase in Indian English’, analyses the sentences collected from various sources and comments on the formal and functional features of the verb phrases occurred in Indian English. However, the major sources are ICE-IND and The Kolhapur Corpus of Indian English. It reveals that there is a close relationship between the distinctive patterns in Indian English and the core grammar of British English. The main observations of this study include: 1) As in BrE, the present tense is used to express futurity and talk
about the factual and universal things in Indian English. 2) There is a tendency in Indian English to use the simple present tense instead of the perfect progressive. In most such cases, the lexical verb ‘be’ is used. The past tense is also used as substance for the present perfect in Indian English. 3) The frequency of the deviant occurrences of if-constructions in case of five categories of the Kolhapur Corpus and two categories of the ICE-IND Corpus reveals that there are only marginal differences between if-constructions in BrE and IE.

Kawale’s study (2009) ‘The Passive in Indian English’ deals mainly with form, functions and frequency of the passive in Indian English. The study analyses and describes the passive types, the types of passive clause, the frequency of passive in various registers in Indian English. The data used for this study are the occurrences of the passive found in The Kolhapur Corpus of Indian English (253 texts) and the International Corpus of English – Indian Component (ICE-IND) (260 texts). The model used for this study is Svartvik’s model of the Description of the use of the passive in English.

In addition to these, the researchers have explored several other areas of Indian English. Salunkhe’s study (1986) of ‘Indian English newspaper headlines’, Patil’s investigation (1986) on ‘the nature of if-constructions’, S.K. Shinde’s study (1995) on ‘conditional clauses’, are some of the major studies carried out by using the Corpus.

The ‘restricted’ studies, discussed above, have considerably contributed to the semantic, syntactic and phonemic description of certain areas of Indian English.

The significance of Shinde’s study (1991) dealing with the ‘Semantic Behaviour of a Selected Set of verbs in Indian English’, lies in the fact that this has been the first ever study of Indian English, using the entire one million word corpus as the source material. Moreover, the analysis and the interpretation are carried out only after going systematically through different stages for the selection of the peculiar Indian English data: referring the examples to the Collins COBUILD Dictionary for assessing conformation to the native English usage, referring the remaining examples to the LOB (BE) and the Brown (AmE)
Corpora, submitting the remaining examples to the attestation by the native speaker. The verbs selected for the study are: *get, take, give, do* and *make*.

His study supports to some extent the initial hypothesis that in Indian English there is a tendency towards the use of two-part verbs instead of one-part verbs, e.g. ‘took his stand’ for ‘stood’, ‘had given predictions’ for ‘predicted’, ‘gave production’ for ‘produced’. This study also reveals that Indian users use certain verbs in the context where native speakers would use different ones. For example: ‘getting a top edge’ (*taking*), ‘to get access’ (*to have access*), ‘get symptoms’ (*show*). However, such collocations, he mentions, were acceptable to the native speakers as non-native speakers’ expressions. The native speakers might prefer other expressions in that context, if it comes to using them. The study also records the expression which are not acceptable to the native speakers, e.g. ‘get the habit’ (*acquire /have*), ‘took a hard drive’ (*made*), ‘give attitude’, (*adapt/take*), ‘do progress’ (*make*), ‘make the first try’, (*have*). These expressions, which appear to be peculiar to Indian data, support the statement that the verbs under study are used by Indian users to cover more general and wider range of activities than they do in Standard English. Thus, Indian users seem to overgeneralize and ignore collocational restrictions. He concludes that the absolute frequencies of deviant instances in the Indian data are low. This confirms the common core hypothesis regarding the variety features. He observes that the bulk of Indian English data conforms to the native English usages. Nevertheless, the conformity is perhaps limited to the ‘forms of linguistic items, the verbs and expressions containing them.’

Regarding the recent studies on Indian English, Sridhar (1992:141) comments, “The study of Indian English has made major strides in the last quarter of a century, moving away from the prescriptivist paradigm, (‘Indianisms’ or common errors in Indian English approach) to what Kandiah (1991) has referred to as the ‘Kachruvian paradigm’ in which the distinctive characteristics of Indian English are viewed as natural and necessary developments as a transplanted language which is used to express a unique socio-cultural context.”
1.5 Code Mixing and Code Switching in English: Indian Context

Multilingualism, the language setting in India, the three-language formula and the socio-cultural dynamics are the important factors related to Code Mixing and Code Switching in Indian English.

1.5.1 Multilingualism in India

When two or more language groups interact with each other, the language contact is inevitable. In such situations, the speakers try to communicate by using two or more languages alternatively with the linguistic interference. In India, at present, there are twenty-eight states and seven Union Territories. Most of them are committed to the linguistic identity. This makes India a Multilingual mosaic.

1.5.1.1 Heterogeneous Linguistic Setting

The Indian multilingualism is huge in size with over 1576 mother tongues including 400 tribal languages, eighteen scheduled languages, 96 non-scheduled languages for more than 110 crores population. There are 47 languages used as the media of instruction in education system, 87 languages used in Press, 71 in Radio-media, 13 in cinema and 13 at state level administration. India is said to be a ‘sociolinguistic giant’, the nerve system of this giant is multilingualism (Annamalai, 2001:36). All these scheduled, non-scheduled, tribal languages originally belonged to four major language-families: Indo-Aryan, Dravidian, Austro Asiatic (Austric) and Tibeto-Chinese.

The Constitution of India has adopted and maintained the policy of multilingualism. It has specified Hindi and English as official languages. The other scheduled languages are: Assames, Bengali, Gujrathi, Hindi, Kashmiri, Kannada, Kokani, Malyalam, Manipuri, Marathi, Nepali, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Sindhi, Tamil and Urdu. These languages are spoken by 96-29% of the population and the remaining 3.71% of the population speaks the rest of the languages. The following table (1) records (Census-2001) the number of Indians using different Indian languages as their mother tongues.
Table -1 : Number of Indians Using Different Indian Languages as their Mother Tongues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of language</th>
<th>Number of persons using the language as mother tongue</th>
<th>Name of language</th>
<th>Number of persons using the language as mother tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ASSAMESE</td>
<td>13,168,484</td>
<td>12. MANIPURI</td>
<td>1,466,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BENGALI</td>
<td>83,369,769</td>
<td>13. MARATHI</td>
<td>71,936,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BODO</td>
<td>1,350,478</td>
<td>14. NEPALI</td>
<td>2,871,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DOGRI</td>
<td>2,282,589</td>
<td>15. ORIYA</td>
<td>33,017,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GUJARATI</td>
<td>46,091,617</td>
<td>16. PUNJABI</td>
<td>29,102,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HINDI</td>
<td>422,048,642</td>
<td>17. SANSKRIT</td>
<td>14,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. KANNADA</td>
<td>37,924,011</td>
<td>18. SANTALI</td>
<td>6,469,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. KASHMIRI</td>
<td>5,527,698</td>
<td>19. SINDHI</td>
<td>2,535,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. KONKANI</td>
<td>2,489,015</td>
<td>20. TAMIL</td>
<td>60,793,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. MAITHILI</td>
<td>12,179,122</td>
<td>21. TELUGU</td>
<td>74,002,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MALAYALA</td>
<td>33,066,392</td>
<td>22. URDU</td>
<td>51,536,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Hindi and its various dialects are spoken in the heaving populated northern states. In the East, the major languages are Bengali and Oriya, whereas in the West the major languages are Marathi, Gujratih, Konkani. South India has four major languages belonging to the Dravidian language family- Kannada, Telugu, Tamil and Malayalam.

1.5.1.2 **English in Indian Linguistic Setting**

English does not figure among the eighteen languages of India listed in the eighth schedule of the Constitution. However, the Constitution of India grants English, the status as an official language of the Union, by Article 343, for a period of 15 years (since 1950). The status as an official language was extended to English, along with Hindi, for an indefinite period of time, through the Official Language Act, 1963. (along with Hindi).

The constitution also assigns it the specific role to function. The states are to determine their official languages and English is always an option open to them. Some states such as Nagaland and Mizoram in the northeast have designated English as their official language. Regarding the orders and the rules the Constitution states that the rules, the regulations, the bye-laws shall be in
English and that the language of the High Court and Supreme Court should be English.

1.5.1.3 Three Language Formula

After Independence, there were several commissions established to look into the educational matters. In this regard, Pingali (2009:112) observes, “Ideologically, English was not favoured, but it was seen as necessary. In 1986, the National Policy on Education recommended the three-language formula at secondary school level. In brief, the languages to be learnt were the native language, Hindi and English. If the native language was Hindi, another modern Indian Language was to be learnt preferably one from the south”.

Though the central government has accepted this formula, in many states it was not observed in totto. “Tamil Nadu resisted Hindi, the north resisted English. Officially, the three-language formula still stands, for school education. Each state determined what actually happens independently.” (Pingali 2009:112)

The place of English in three Language formulas and the status as ‘associate official language’, made English a lingua Franca, a common link language in the Indian linguistic scenario. Thus, the use of English and Hindi (also an official language), along with other Indian languages, presents a complex picture of the linguistic heterogeneity.

1.5.2 Individual and Societal Multilingualism

This heterogeneous language setting in India has exposed several languages to Indians at their disposal. There are places in India, as pointed out by Shastri et al (1997), where one language may be used in the home, another in the profession(s), another passively for listening or reading, yet another spoken but not uniformly nor in the same combination across the nation. In Bombay, people may have varying acquaintance with Marathi- the state language of Maharashtra, Hindi- the national official language, English- the national associate official language and an important language of business and culture in the city and Gujrati the language of two important minority groups, the Gujratis and Parsi; in such a setting, a few people are unilingual.
As India has three-language formula as its official language policy in education, every ‘educated’ Indian can be regarded as a multilingual. The Individual multilingualism of this kind is a consequence of ‘societal’ or ‘official’ multilingualism. This does not, however, mean that the ‘uneducated’ Indians are not multilingual. In all large cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi and Madras, individual multilingualism is widespread even among the ‘uneducated’ people.

Sometimes, multilingualism brings problems for the governments, the individuals and the groups of individuals, especially those who are members of the linguistic minorities. Unlike members of the majority language group, the children from the linguistic minorities have to learn to read and write in a language/dialect which is completely different from their own and they also have to acquire proficiency in at least two languages before they can function as full members of the national community in which they live. Sometimes, government regards the linguistic minorities as threat to them as they may react very differently. Their fears, from their point of view, may be justified. In such condition, the language loyalty can be a powerful weapon and has been used to the political advantage. Thus, the societal multilingualism has posed some crucial problems with the central government and the state governments of India.

The adoption of lingua franca has been proved to be a good solution to the problems raised in the multilingual countries. A lingua franca is a language which is used as a means of communication among people who have no native language in common. In India, Hindi and English are used as lingua franca. Hindi is used as a lingua franca in much of the northern part of the country. It has the advantage of being a native rather than a colonial and foreign language like English; but it has also the disadvantage of benefitting the native speakers to the detriment of others who have to learn it as a second language. English, on other hand, operates as a lingua franca throughout the country, but tends to be used only by the relatively educated speakers, as detailed below.
### Table -2 English- speaking Population in India (Census – 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% English Speakers</th>
<th>Eligible Population</th>
<th>Total English Speakers</th>
<th>As First Language</th>
<th>As an Additional Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>1,100,000,000</td>
<td>232,226,449</td>
<td>226,449</td>
<td>223,000,000 second language speakers, 8,773,000 third language speakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures include both those who speak English as a second language and those who speak it as a third language. 1991 figures for second, third. 2001 figures for native language. The figures include English speakers, but not English users. Had the English user number been included, then the total number would be well over 750 million.


### 1.5.3 Socio-Cultural Fields for Code Mixing/Code Switching

The huge multilingualism in India, its heterogeneous linguistic setting, the position of English in this linguistic setting, the individual and the societal levels of multilingualism have provided Indians the ground requisite for Code Mixing and Code Switching.

1) Code Mixing and Code Switching occur in India at various levels: between two standard language varieties, between two sub-standard language varieties, between dialects, between two standard and sub-standard varieties.

2) The most obvious phenomenon of CM/CS observed in India is the English bilingualism. However, it is quite unevenly distributed in India. The functional importance of English, Hindi and other Indian languages varies from state to state and from person to person. The English language is used mostly in the urban area rather than in the rural area.
3) English bilingualism in India gave a crucial identity to Indian English. As mentioned in the foregoing section, it has gained the identity as a legitimate standard non-native variety of English.

4) In addition to other features, the socio-cultural context makes an equal contribution in the “being of Indian English”. Kachru (1966) says “The Indian socio-cultural and linguistic setting has affected features of the English language in India.” Indian English is used as a component of Indian culture ‘to express a culturally determined network of activities that are typically Indian’. Indian English is expected to function in i) Administration– for inter-provincial administration and central administration, ii) Commercial field– commerce and industry, iii) Educational field– teaching scientific, technical and other subjects, iv) Literary field–creative writing, and provincial and national Indian English newspapers, and v) Social field– conversation in sophisticated Indian circles, inter-provincial parties and gatherings and phatic communion. Some of the social contexts in which Indian English is used in India are: a) religion, b) ceremonies and rituals, c) dress and ornaments, d) food and food habits, e) marriage, f) politics (Kachru, 1983).

Thus, there is a tremendous scope to unveil the cultural association as far as the use of code-mixing and code switching is concerned.

5) Raja Rao (1938, Second Edition 1974) considers Indian English as, the language of the ‘intellectual make up’ of Indians. The use of English as a link-language has created a Pan-Indian literature which symbolizes the cultural and the socio-political aspirations of Indians. As he maintains, English has become more culture-bound in India than Persian and Arabic were in the times of the Muslim rulers. English has become Indianized through a long process of acculturation. As K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar (1977) comments, there are possibly more varieties of ‘Indian English’ than of the English written in UK. The reasons are obvious: firstly, India is a far-flung multi-lingual country; secondly, English is cultivated in India in, what Prof. Bowen calls the ‘second-language situation’ and thirdly, although Indian writing English
has a century-old history at least, ‘a literary tradition as such is yet to gain general acceptance’.

6) Though it is used in direct conversation and in telephone conversation with family members and friends, English has the restricted use. In such situations, the topic being discussed is a determining factor for the language. Politics, education, medicine are likely to be discussed in English. However, relationships and emotions are likely to be discussed in one’s own language.

7) The use of English plays an important role in media, in public speech, in television and radio programmes such as broadcast news, interviews, sports commentaries, debates and demonstrations of various activities. In the educational field, English is used more at the college and University level.

The study of Indian English as a non-native variety of British English is essentially the province of sociolinguistics, because it is this discipline that studies language in relation to society. In this chapter Indian English is discussed in the context of the Indian Society. It deals with its status as a non-native variety, its emergence and institutionalization in India and its identity as a standard educated variety from the point of view of its distinctive linguistic features. The focus is on the Indian socio-cultural background and the function English serves. This brief sociolinguistic perception is very much necessary for the proper understanding of Code Mixing and Code Switching in Indian English speech.