Chapter -II

Approaches towards Code Mixing and Code Switching

Sociolinguistics considers Code Mixing and Code Switching as the by-products of bilingualism. In Code-Mixing, a fluent bilingual changes the language by using words from other language without any change at all in situation, whereas in Code Switching, anyone who speaks more than one language chooses between them according to circumstances and according to the language comprehensive to the persons addressed, the purpose is to get the right effect of communication. With this primary understanding, we will consider these phenomena in some detail.

2.1 Nature and Scope

2.1.1 Two Different Views

At the outset, it is necessary to mention that, as per the available literature on CM and CS there are two different views about maintaining the distinction between CM and CS. Some scholars like Kachru (1983), Annamali (1989), Bokamba (1988), Sridhar and Sridhar (1980), Hamers and Blanc (1990), Bhatia (1992), Poplack (1980) treat these phenomena as the distinct manifestations. Some other scholars like Eastman (1992), Scotton (1992), however, consider that there is no distinction between them.

2.1.1.1 In Favour of Maintaining Distinction

Kachru (1983:193) observes, “There is a distinction between CM and CS, though they have been treated as the language contact phenomenon. The CS entails the ability to switch from code A to code B. The alteration of codes is determined by the function, the situation and the participants. It refers to categorization of one’s verbal repertoire in terms of functions and roles. The CM, on the other hand, entails transferring linguistic units from one code into another.”

Bokamba (1989), while maintaining difference in CM and CS, notes three points:
1) The two phenomena must be distinguished, because each makes a different linguistic and psycholinguistic claim. For instance, CS does not necessitate the interaction of the grammatical rules of the language pair involved in the speech event, whereas CM does.

2) CM exemplifies the most advanced degree of bilingualism to the extent that it requires considerable competence in the simultaneous processing of the grammatical rules of the language pair [cf. Kachru (1978, 1982 a), Sridhar and Sridhar (1980), Poplack (1990), Sankoff and Poplack (1981) and Bokamba (1988)]. Linguistically and perceptually, therefore, CS and CM cannot be constructed as the co-variant phenomena. The degree of bilingualism implied in the production of the code-mixed sentences suggests that only highly proficient bi/multilingual can successfully engage in sustained code-mixed production.

3) CM typically involves the use of two languages at a time, although occasionally three are used. Regardless of the number of languages involved in the discourse, the language that provides the grammatical structure into which elements are inserted is referred to as the host while the other is termed the guest language. (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1980).

2.1.1.2 Against Maintaining Distinction

According to Scotton (1992), the borrowed and code-switched forms behave in the same way morphosyntactically in the matrix language, hence should not be seen as distinct processes. Eastman (1992:1) notes that the urban language contact phenomena do not distinguish CM, CS and Borrowing. The urban settings where people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds regularly interact make it abundantly clear that in normal everyday conversation, material from many languages may be embedded in a matrix language regularly and unremarkably.

Though there are different views about the distinction between Code Mixing and Code Switching, some linguists, have used CS as the cover term to refer to these two phenomena. There are some others like Muysken (1997), who use these terms interchangeably. Muysken (2000) uses CS for alteration; Bhatia
on the contrary, uses CM as cover term for CM and CS. Clyne (2003:75) says, “We should reserve Code Switching for transference of individual lexical items through to whole stretches of speech; but we should adopt different terms like transversion for cases where the speaker crosses over completely into the other language.”

Though, Code Switching, as Gardner-Chloros (2009) points out, has gained wider currency in the language interaction phenomenon, on the whole, among most of the linguists, there has been a general agreement on maintaining the distinction. The discussion that follows further, elaborate this.

2.1.2 Definitions of Code Mixing

Many linguists and scholars have tried to define CM in their own way. According to Mary W.J. Tay (1989:408), “Code-mixing involves the embedding or mixing of various linguistics units, i.e. morphemes, words, phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical systems or sub-systems within the same sentence and same speech situation.”

Kachru (1978:28) uses this concept to refer to “the use of one or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language into another and by such a language mixture developing a new restricted or not restricted code of linguistic interaction.” Bokamba (1989:278) notes, “Code mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes) phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical (sub) systems within the same sentence and speech event. That is, CM is an intrasentential switching.” Weinreich (1963:1) uses the term ‘Interference Phenomena’ to imply the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language, such as the bulk of the phonemic system a large part of the morphology and syntax and some areas of vocabulary.

Crystal (1997:66), in ‘The Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics’, defines code-mixing as a linguistic behaviour that “involves the transfer of linguistic elements from one language into another.” Gumperz Hernandez-
Chavez (1978) notes, “Code-mixing is a type of borrowing, where depending on various linguistic factors speakers borrow items of various sizes.”

For Hudson (1996:53), CM takes place ‘where a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual changes the language without any change at all in the situation.’ The purpose of CM seems to be to symbolize a somewhat ambiguous situation for which neither language on its own would be quite right. To get the right effect, the speakers balance the two languages against each other as a kind of linguistic cocktail, a few words of one language, then a few words of the other, then back to the first for a few more words and so on. The changes generally take place more or less randomly as for as subject matter is concerned, but they seem to be limited at structural level.

2.1.3 Definitions of Code Switching

Hudson (1996:53) discusses CS as the ‘inevitable consequences of bilingualism, as any one who speaks more than one language chooses between them according to circumstances.’ Annamalai (1989:48) observed, “Switching is normally done for the duration of a unit discourse. A bilingual speaker can switch between mixed codes as he does between unmixed languages. Switching is found only in a balanced and stable bilingual.”

Crystal (1995) states, “Code or language switching occurs when an individual, who is bilingual, alternates between two languages during his or her speech with another bilingual person.” Halliday (1978:65) defines CS as ‘code-shift actualized as a process within the individual: the speaker moves from one code to another and back, more or less rapidly, in course of a single sentence.’

Verma (1976:156) focuses on Code Switching as ‘a verbal strategy used by speakers in much the same way as creative artists switch styles and levels (i.e. from sublime to the mundane or the serious to the comic or the vice versa) or the ways in which monolinguals make selections from among vocabulary items’ and concludes, “Each type of coding or CS is appropriate to the topical and situational features that give rise to it.” Weinrich (1953:73) elaborates, “The ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate
changes in speech situation, but not in unchanged speech situation and certainly not within a single sentence.”

Bokamba (1989:278) considers CS as ‘the mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical (sub) systems across sentence boundaries within the same speech event, in other words, intersentenstial switching.’ Ashok Kumar (1995:44) adds, “Code Switching which is influenced by extra-linguistic factors such as topic, interlocutors, setting etc. is the alternate use of lexical items, phrases, clauses and sentences from the non-native language into the system of the native language.” Gardner Chloros (2009) is of the opinion that CS may be used as ‘a general term covering all outcomes of contact between two varieties whether or not there is evidence of conversions.’ For her, Code Switching refers to the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by the bilingual people.

Regarding the precise definitions of CM and CS, it appears that it is extremely difficult to maintain the difference between CM and CS for all purposes. As CM/CS is a growth area in linguistics and as it is being studied from several different perspectives, it may be said that, one definition covers only one aspect/perspective of the huge phenomena of CM/CS. In this regard one may agree with what Milroy and Muysken (1995 in Gardner Cholros 2009:12) noted in the introduction to One Speaker Two languages about the confusing structure of CM/CS. They assert, “The field of CS research is replete with a confusing range of terms descriptive of various aspects of phenomenon. Sometimes referential scope of these terms overlaps and sometimes particular terms are used in different ways by different writers.” One observation in this regard is also right which reads, “CM/CS term distinction should be treated as research tool while describing the data only.”

2.1.4 Code Mixing, Code Switching and Borrowing

CM and CS are further compared by linguists with Borrowing. Borrowing is maintained as related to CM and CS, but also different from them.
2.1.4.1 Borrowing as Different from CM/CS

Kamwangamalu (1992) explains this phenomenon in detail. He notes, “Structurally, unlike CM and CS, Borrowing entails integration of linguistic units from one language into the linguistic system of other language. The linguistic units thus integrated become part of the linguistic system of the borrowing language they take on its phonological, morphological and syntactic characteristics, and enter into its lexicon [e.g. Gumperz (1982)]. Functionally, unlike CM and CS, Borrowing sometimes occurs to fill lexical gaps in the lexicon of the borrowing language.” Moreover, Borrowing may occur in the speech of monolingual and bilingual speakers alike, whereas CM and CS occur in the speech of bilingual speakers only. He presents these features in a table format (1992:174). Regarding this format, he notes that it is adapted from current works on the phenomena under consideration and in particular from the works of Kachru (1978), Sridhar and Sridhar (1980), Gumperz (1982) and Poplack (1990). The characteristics of CM, CS and Borrowing listed in the following table, are by no means exhaustive. They are simply indented to provide a background against which we can better categorize the data to be analyzed.

Table -3: Salient Features of CM, CS and Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salient features</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic units involved are essentially sentences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require speakers to share the same code repertoire</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes occur to fill lexical gaps in L1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require/imply changes (e.g. of topic, setting, participants) in the speech situation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occur to mark confidentially or an aside for explanation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes occur to mark eliteness and/or modernness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presuppose bilingual competence of the speaker but not necessarily of the hearer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entails integration (phonological, syntactic, and lexical) of L2 material in L1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as part of L1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon L1 equivalent exits.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide diffusion in the community</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted as one’s own L1 items</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hudson (1996) differentiates Borrowing from CM/CS on the basis of speech and language systems. He notes, “Whereas Code Switching and Code Mixing involved mixing language in speech, Borrowing involves mixing the systems themselves because an item is ‘borrowed’ from one language to become part of other language. For example - words for foods, plants, instructions, music and so on which most people can recognize as borrowings (or Loan-Words).”

SalMons (1990) uses four central criteria to distinguish Borrowing from Code Switching, following Scotton (1988):

A. *Frequency of occurrence* is often the most central criterion. The frequent items tend to be considered Borrowings, the infrequent ones more likely represent code switches or nonce borrowings.

B. *Phonological integration* is taken as the indication of Borrowing and lack of integration is understood as an indication of CS or nonce borrowings.

C. *Syntactic integration*, as with phonological integration, is taken as the indication of Borrowing; with lack of syntactic integration, it is understood as an indication of CS.

D. *Lexically*, Pfaff (1982:269-273) gives several directly relevant criteria for drawing a distinction when dealing with items of unclear status.

The relation between Code Mixing, Code Switching and Borrowing is extensively reviewed by Romaine (1989) and Myers-Scotton (1992) also. Boschoten (1998) points out that though any aspect of a language including its structures can be borrowed, the importance of this relation lies in the fact that ‘single word code-switches/loans are the commonest kind of Code Switching in many situations.’ As Poplack, Sankoff and Miller (1988; 62) note, ‘within single words, common nouns are the most frequency borrowed items.’ This observation is supported by three kinds of explanation. One is by Bynon (1977:231) who views it as reflecting the size of grammatical categories concerned. Another is suggested by Aitchison (2000:62), as the nouns are freer of syntactic restrictions than other word-classes. The third, which is a more sociolinguistic one, is that these are accessible to the bilinguals with any degree of competence, even
minimal, in the language from which the borrowing is taken (Gardner-Chloros, 2009).

2.1.4.2 Myers Scotton’s Views on Borrowing and Code Switching

Myers Scotton (1992) claims that CS and Borrowing are ‘universally related process.’ According to her Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model, CS occurs everywhere within a frame which is set by the matrix language. The term matrix refers to the language in which the majority of morphemes in a given conversation occur. The languages from which material enters a matrix language are referred to as embedded. Central to MLF theory is the idea that content (often nouns, verbs, etc.) and system (articles, inflections etc) morphemes in the embedded language are accessed differently by the matrix language. Myers Scotton is concerned with finding out which singly occurring embedded language lexemes are borrowings and which are code-switches, in light of the fact that both borrowed and code-switched forms behave the same way morphosyntactically in the matrix language. Her MLF model posits structural constraints which account for both borrowings and code switches.

She uses data from Kenya and Zimbabwe to explain her model. Swahili is the matrix language of Kenya and Shona is the matrix language of Zimbabwe. Her Matrix Language Frame Model provides a principled basis for considering both Borrowing and Code Switching processes to be a part of a single continuum. She explores four hypotheses:

1. Matrix language + embedded language [EL] constituents conform to the morpheme order of the matrix language and in ML+EL constituents articles and inflections (System morphemes with non-lexical information) come from matrix language.

2. The EL content morphemes that are not congruent with stored lemmas (lexical information in a mental lexicon are blocked from appearing in ML+EL constituents. (This is called Blocking Hypothesis)

3. Embedded language forms which cannot be accounted for by the blocking hypothesis are subject to an embedded language trigger hypothesis.
4. The peripheral and formulaic embedded language constituents may occur with relative freedom in a matrix language. (This is called EL Hierarchy Hypothesis)

On the continuum, the forms range from abrupt loans (e.g. the term *school fees* as used in shone language) to core borrowings (e.g. the term *weekend* in Swahili language), to actual instances of CS. According to Myers-Scotton, frequency is the best criterion to use to link borrowings to the mental lexicon in contrast to single form code switches. Yet, there is little reason to make a distinction between the processes. Neither morphosyntactic nor phonological integration criteria remain viable ways to decide whether embedded language material is the result of borrowing or code switching. For example the word *shule* (school) is a long established borrowing into Swahili (originally from German); however, the verb *stem-visit* and the noun *difference* are considered code switching forms, largely because they show no frequency of occurrence and occur only in one conversation in a set of 40 of the data.

The MLF model of CS which can account for single form code switches also accounts for borrowed lexical items. Single or multi-word code switches are retained in the mental lexicon of the embedded language, are lemma entries there, while borrowings continue to remain matrix language lexical items. All code switches structurally represent material embedded into a matrix language while all borrowings are matrix language material *par excellence*.

In accordance with this model, the English preposition *at*, for example, is blocked from appearing in the Swahili sentence *nilikuwa nataka kumpata stadium* which translates as ‘I wanted to find him stadium’ rather than ‘I wanted to find him at the stadium. *At* (or for that matter *the* as well) has no counterpart in Swahili, so *stadium* ‘occurs as a bare form’ making it look as much like a borrowing as a code-switch. In contrast, other English prepositions do have congruent forms in Swahili and may occur themselves as single code-switched forms (*kati ya* and *between* so match).
2.1.4.3 Borrowing and CS as Continuum

Shaffer (1978), while dealing with the place of CS in linguistic contacts, discusses ‘interlingual impact’ defined and studied by Weinreich (1963), Clyne (1967) and Haugen (1956). He accepts Haugen’s three stages of diffusion, namely CS, interference, and integration. As per this scheme, the switching constitutes the alternate use of the distinct codes; interference constitutes overlapping and integration constitutes interlingual impact only in historical sense.

According to Haugen’s scheme, interference and integration have in common a certain degree of leveling in the structural distinctiveness of both codes. By contrast, CS involves the stringing together of ‘unadopted’ words and phrases. [Haugen (1956:40), Haugen (1973:528)]. Interference is contrary to contemporary norms, whereas integration is in harmony with current norms.

The acceptance of Haugen’s diffusion concept is further modified by different suggestions: Interference will be confined to imperfect second language acquisition. So, interference will be recognized as restricting the native-like distinctiveness of the two codes available to bilingual. Thus, there appears to be a continuum between switching and borrowing. It also seems that some times switches are gradually borrowed. There would then be roads to lexical borrowing, instantaneous borrowing (as in the case of sputnik, borrowed from Russian overnight) and gradual integration of the lexical items used in frequent switches.

2.1.4.4 Borrowing and CM/CS in Urban Setting

According to Eastman (1992:1), the multilingual phenomenon in urban setting does not distinguish CM, CS and Borrowing. The urban settings where people from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds regularly interact makes it abundantly clear that in normal everyday conversation, material from many languages may be embedded in a matrix language regularly and unremarkably. At the same time, forms may be embedded noticeably. Where people use a mixed language regularly, code switching represents the norm (an unmarked choice after Myers Scotton 1983). Where people invoke another language is an
obvious way, position of relative social, political or economic strength is often being negotiated and Code Switching represents a *marked choice*. In addition, it is seen that the absence of CS in the multilingual urban contents may be indicative of the tacit acceptance of political, social, and/or economic power differences.

2.2 Syntactic Constraints

The syntactic constraints in CM/CS have been studied and commented upon time to time by the linguists while dealing with CM/CS phenomena.

The formal and theoretical oriented studies on Code Mixing started growing in the decade of 1970 with Tim (1975), McClure (1977), Lipski (1978), Pfaff (1979), Poplack (1980) and others. In the decade of 1980, the systematic attempts have been made by Wool Ford (1983) and Di Sciullo *et al* (1986) to develop a formal model of code-mixing within transformational-generative and government-binding frameworks, respectively. These models attempt to explain why some syntactic elements are subject to code-mixing while others are unlikely or impossible candidates for mixing. The models then go on to show that either the shared portion of the participating grammars (phrase structure rules etc.) or principles such as government set the stage for language mixing.

Bhatia’s (1989) study on bilinguals’ creativity and syntactic theory, however, draws two conclusions. One, the conception of the grammar of CM envisioned in the formal studies is too narrow in nature; and two, there is a pressing need for reexamination of such notions as ‘hybrid rules’ and ‘new grammar’. Evidence has been presented which supports the conclusions that a new grammar of Filmi-English is motivated by structural properties of Hindi and English principles of Universal grammar, whereas the rule of ‘*o*’ insertion in the derivation of infinitival verbs is motivated by the consideration of informal discourse. An attempt has been made to present identifiable and distinguishing properties of a hybrid grammatical system and a new grammatical system. Finally, it was shown that code-mixing does not represent a surface level phenomenon.
2.2.1 Possibility of Universal Constraints

Annamali (1989), in his research paper, ‘Language Factor in Code Mixing’, studies the universal constraints on CM and proposes that universal constraints are likely to exist if CM is a universal phenomenon. He means to say that any bilingual can mix his languages and any two languages can be mixed. He assumes that the mixed code has the properties of a natural language. The assumed linguistic properties of the mixed code, according to him, are- (a) Mixing is governed by levels of units such as word level, clause level, and so on; (b) It is sensitive to syntactic constituents like noun phrase, verb phrase, verb phrase, etc. and (c) It is a variable with reference to word classes such as nouns, verbs, etc. In other words, it has organizational property, configuration property and classificatory property. There are constraints which prohibit mixing within a word or a phrase which illustrates. There are constraints which prohibit partial mixing across constituents which illustrate. There are constraints which stipulate that mixing will follow a hierarchy of word classes, which illustrates, a) for example, if verbs are mixed, nouns would be mixed and mixing will include more items in the noun class than in the verb class. Further, the distinction between CM and CS is made in this study with regard to such constraints. Mixing, for example, is the linguistic strategy for discourse functions primarily involving social meanings and switching is a discourse strategy for linguistic (verbal) communication reflecting language competence and preferred language choice of the participants.

The switching is found only in a balanced and stable bilingual, while mixing appears in incipient and attrited bilinguals as well. The mixing is largely motivated by the need to fill gaps in the linguistic competence of the speaker. The constraints on mixing are not likely to be the same in stable, incipient and attrited bilinguals.

Further, by adopting the terminology such as MT for Mother Tongue and OT for Other Tongue, the universal constraint of mixing in two types of bilinguals is proposed. There are two types of bilinguals- balanced and imbalanced. According to him, the balanced bilingual mixes his MT with OT
more than the imbalanced bilingual. The imbalanced bilingual mixes with low frequency only with nouns.

Hudson (1996) is of the view that the syntactic categories used in classifying linguistic items may be independent of their social descriptions. At least some syntactic (and other) categories used in analyzing language are universal rather than tied to particular languages. He firmly states that there is no doubt that there are syntactic constraints; people who belong to code-mixing communities can judge whether particular constructed code-mixed examples are permitted or not, and these judgments are on the whole borne out by studies of texts.

### 2.2.2 Bokamba’s Negative Views on Syntactic Constraints

Bokamba (1989) also treats this ‘Syntactic Constraint’ aspect of CM. According to him, “conceptually, the basic assumption underlying almost all syntactic studies of CM is that the occurrence of code-mixed speech among bi and multilingual is fundamentally differ from the occurrence of other speech variants or registers. Hence, ungrammaticalities in the code-mixed speech are best treated as violations of syntactic constraints of the language-pair involved in the discourse rather than as violation of the morpho-syntactic rules governing that particular dialect. The code-mixed speech is characteristically and definitionally a dialect of the host language concerned and postulation of Syntactic Constraints to account for such speech varieties is both inadequate and misconceived.

This study claims that there are no general or universal surface syntactic constraints on CM, because these changes are naturally called for by the very nature of language as a linguistically structured and socio-psychologically rule–governed means of communication. The failure to discover and establish such constraints, it has been argued, is due to the narrow focus attributed to syntactic research on CM where crucial socio-psychological factors are left out of consideration. The postulation of the surface syntactic constraints, regardless of the scope of their validity (e.g. language specific of putative universal), is not only misguided but also unwanted at this stage of the research.
2.2.3 CS and Syntactic Constraints at Lexical level

Hussein (1993) studies the CS of Arabic-English bilinguals. It describes various syntactic constraints that govern this phenomenon in their speech, the susceptibility of particular sentence constituents to switching and the determination of the matrix language in their linguistic performance.

CS among the Arabic-English bilinguals, like other language contact situations, supports the fact that this phenomenon is not random but rule governed. The verbal behavior of the respondents utilized for this study clearly suggests certain linguistic constraints that not only determine the switches that occur in their speech but also the acceptability of these switches by the bilinguals.

While it is believed that extra-linguistic factors are the only means that motivate bilinguals to switch code styles, or registers, this study has attempted to deliberate syntactic restrictions in the speech of the Arabic English bilinguals. Pronominal subjects, objects and their verbs are considered the main restrictions against switching between Arabic and English; the pronominal subjects and objects and their verbs are tightly linked in a way that they have to adhere to the linguistic rules of a certain code rather than the mixture of two codes.

On the basis of the manner of CS experienced by the respondents, it is observed that the Arabic, the mother tongue of these bilinguals, is invariably the matrix language. In these sentences demonstrating CS, the matrix clause is in Arabic. Moreover, the English constituents in Arabic clauses are deemed to adapt to the morphological and phonological rules governing Arabic. Finally, this study points to the fact that both languages are independent and are unlikely to move towards merging; the linguistic constraints are, in fact, intrinsic to both languages and this an overwhelming evidence that each language is keeping its linguistic integrity at least for the foreseeable future.

Timm (1975) deals with the several constraints on Code Switching. The first category deals with switching of pronominal subjects or objects that were considered possible, although not common. It was noted, however, that expressions such as *they were chopeando, he was cahado*, etc. and English
loanwords which had been morphologically adapted to fit Spanish paradigms were possible.

Finally, within noun phrases, there is considerably more flexibility as regards to the possibilities of CS, although certain restrictions do appear. The data, which have been surveyed, suggest that the true model of bilingual competence may lie somewhere between the two diametrically opposite poles, being neither two completely distinct language systems nor one homogeneous amalgam. Those bilingual speakers capable of engaging in spontaneous CS apparently possess the ability to mentally compare equivalent sentences in the two languages for degree of syntactic compatibility and to code-switch only in those instances where such compatibility would be preserved.

2.2.4 Syntactic Constraints and Psychological Reasons

Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) investigate the syntax of Code Mixing in psycholinguistic perspective. The syntactic constraints dealt by them have the consequences for a psychological model of bilingual information processing. They present the ‘Dual structure Principle’ which is refinement of Poplack’s (1980) Equivalence Constraints and Hypothesis of Borrowing of Lipski (1978). This principle is stated as follows:

_Dual Structure Principle_: The internal structure of the guest constituents need not conform to the constituent’s structure rules of the host language, so long as its placement in the host sentence obeys the rules of the host language (Sridhar and Sridhar 1980: 209). The authors arrive at the following conclusions regarding its psycholinguistic aspects:

a) The entire rule system of both the languages, not just their respective lexicons are simultaneously active when mixed sentence types are produced. It rules out the possibility of a ‘single switch model’ during the code-mixing process.

b) The activation of one language system does not result in the non-operation of the other.
c) The two languages systems are neither ‘merged’ together, nor are they totally independent of each other. Rather, they interact in complex ways to produce complex code-mixed patterns.

2.2.5 Poplack’s Views on Syntactic Constraints

The paper by Sankoff and Poplack (1981) proposes a formal grammar of CS, accepting at the same time that the complete understanding of CS could only be achieved through combined ethnographic, attitudinal and grammatical study, i.e. an integrated analysis not only of when people code-switch but also how where and why (Sankoff and Poplack 1981:4).

Two constraints of language alteration between Spanish and English (‘free morphemes constraint’ and ‘equivalence constraint’) are posited. These constraints serve as the basis for the formal description of the syntax of Spanish-English Code Switching. The universality of these constraints is doubted, since it is held, and rightly so, that they may not operate with reference to English and some highly inflected or agglutinative language (e.g. Japanese and Turkish) or language with an actively different word-order (e.g. Hindi), because the constraints on CS are based on bilingual performance not transformationally generated. The authors believe in direct generation of CS sentences by a context-free grammar. The CS constraints are surface phenomena and can not naturally be generated in deep structure. Phrase Structure Grammar of L1 and L2 can be combined to from a Code Switching Grammar which generates grammatical monolingual sentences as well as those containing only valid code-switches. (Sankoff and Poplack 1981: 36).

2.2.6 Pfaff’s Views on Syntactic Rules in CM

Pfaff (1979) has considers the several aspects of Spanish/English intrasentential mixing. She found that speakers who code-switch are competent in the syntactic rules of both languages. She claims that the third grammar does not exist to account for the utterances in which the languages are mixed. Instead, the grammar of Spanish and English are meshed according to the given constraints: functional and lexical constraints, structural constraints, semantic constraints and discourse constraints.
2.3 Discourse Markers in CM/CS

Discourse Markers are the responses that indicate text as a conversation. Generally, they are in one word or two words. They do not have independent identity, but are very meaningful when they occur in conversation. O.K., Yes, No, I mean, of course, yeah, ouch, woo, nei, weel, you know are such English responses. In general, the educated Indian Speaker, while conversing in English, uses these English responses. However, it is observed that most of the times, he switches to his mother tongue only for the similar responses. For example, ‘Come on yaar, do not take it seriously’ or ‘we are going for shopping, you are coming na?’ In these examples, the speaker switches only for yaar and na. The CS is essentially a product of bilingual or multilingual phenomena and one of the major concerns of Sociolinguistics is to study the behavior of languages in such phenomena.

2.3.1 Functions of Discourse Markers in Code Mixing and Code Switching

Discourse Markers are defined by Schifrin (1987) as ‘contextual coordinates of talk’. They display coherence; some markers have referential or expressive meaning, others have interactional meaning and all markers may have various functions in the text. Though Schifrin (1987) suggests that many Discourse Markers are multifunctional, one can classify discourse markers according to their primary function; of course, their specific function depends on the context in which they are used. In her study, the Discourse Markers are multifunctional. They fall into the following categories:

1) Participation category (Y’ know and I mean): They have little semantic content serve as an interactional function.
2) Connectives (and and but) and markers of cause or result (because and so), both of which have semantic content.
3) and so functioning not as connectives or markers of a certain relation between clauses, but as fillers and clause initiators and thus with more interactive than semantic value.

Sal Mons (1990:453) reviews the role of Discourse Markers in code-switching that changes into Borrowings. Discourse Markers such as ‘well’ and
‘you know’ in English have been considered as ‘extra-sentenced or emblematic’ code-switching (Poplack, 1982). In American German varieties spoken in central Texas (and other areas), English markers are used in conversation to the normal exclusion of the German discourse-marking system.

English Discourse Markers themselves do not represent proper code-switching in his study, but instead have the status of borrowings (in line with recent discussions of that distinction), while the discourse making systems of German and English have undergone convergence, This conclusion is relevant to other bilingual situations and could entail reclassifying such phenomena as borrowings or convergence, where these have been assumed to represent switches. His analysis also underscores the necessity of including ‘convergence’ in addition to borrowings and code-switching in the study of bilingual/multilingual communities.

Gumperz (1982) treats such kind of switching as an integration or sentence filler. This occurs when languages merge into one another in language contact situation.

The studies mentioned above help us to arrive at the conclusion that the switched Discourse Markers are extra-sentenced, emblematic, sentence fillers, contextual coordinates having participatory value. Most of the markers are borrowed and become one with the common code. They are multifunctional and their specific function depends on the context.

2.4 Functional Aspects

Several studies have dealt with the functions of CM and CS. These functions vary as per the status of language pair involved, socio-cultural divergences and the situation in which they occur. It is also noted that CS functions as a symptom of quite opposite developments. It occurs in language accommodations, in language divergence, in language maintenance and in language shift. It reflects social differences and tendencies within the same society and language combination. This aspect is dealt in the studies of Li Wei,(1998a). On the contrary, in the studies of Poplack,(1988) and
McClure (1998), CS is dealt with social differences and tendencies between different societies and different language combinations.

2.4.1 Gumperz’s Observations on Functions of CS

Gumperz (1982:75-76) mentions various types of functions of CS:

1) Quotations: In many instances, the code-switched passages are clearly identifiable either as direct quotations or as reported speech. Where the quotations were originally in a code-mixed variety, they also appear in reported speech in the same variety.

2) Addressee specification: This function explains switches which serve to direct the message to one of several possible addressees.

3) Integrations: According to this function, the code switch serves to mark an integration or sentence filler. In the data from Singapore, numerous particles are found in conversation irrespective of what is the predominant language used. These are the results of various languages merging in contact with one another and evolving a common code with a common vocabulary. To treat such particles as mere interjections or sentence fillers seems counterintuitive.

4) Reiteration: Frequently, a message in one code is repeated in other code either literally or in somewhat modified form. In some cases, such repetitions may serve to clarify what is said but often they simply simplify or emphasis a message.

5) Message qualification: A large group of switches consists of qualifying constructions such as sentence and verb complements or predicates following a copula. In such cases, the main message is in language X, whereas a qualification of the message is given in language Y.

6) Personalization vs. objectivization: This dichotomy suggests a difference between talk about action and talk as action, the degree of speaker’s involvement or distance from a message, whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, or whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of a generally known fact.
2.4.2 CM as Mark of Modernization

Kamwangamalu (1989) demonstrates that CM is a cross-cultural phenomenon. To support his claim, he considers the functional use of CM, attitudes towards CM and the language change as the result of CM.

From a functional point of view, he focuses on CM as a mark of modernization. The use of CM for modernization is attested to in a variety of domains, for example, education, literature, science and technology. He points out that the use of CM is a character feature of the speech of the elite group or those who hold a higher socioeconomic status in their respective communities. CM is both to these speakers and the aspiring masses a model of language use with which to identify.

In attitudinal terms, it has been shown that, although CM proves to be the norm of speech most observed in bilingual communities around the world, the bilinguals do not always admit it. This is because CM is considered by some as a ‘corrupt’, an ‘impure’ linguistic behavior. If such contact takes place, there will be language change as a result of CM.

He further refers to Hymes’ observation that “the fact that English, a former immigrant language… has not prevented other immigrant language (e.g. Italian, Spanish, French and German) from not only being spoken, but also mixed with English. In that respect, CM sheds light on the current life of language in bilingual communities around the world.”

2.4.3 Code Mixing as Communicative Strategy

Tay (1989) focuses on the use of CM and CS as a communicative strategy in multilingual communities among proficient bilingual speakers. She uses the spontaneous conversations which involve code-switching and mixing between some of the major languages in Singapore, such as English, Mandarin, Hokkien. She stresses that, the typical code switcher or mixer is usually not aware of why he/she switches codes at certain points of the discourse; and, to try to evolve a functional typology to fit all situations, would, therefore, seem futile. Instead, it is suggested that total communicative impact created by the discourse should be looked as discourse and ask questions such as: Is the speaker trying to establish
rapport or is he distancing himself? She emphasizes that the communicative intent of the bilingual speakers is of ‘prime importance’; once we get the intention then, we might then be able to look at the various strategies used by them and how codes are manipulated to achieve these purposes. According to her, the effectiveness of a communicative strategy does not depend on the choice of the code as such but considerations such as- which code has the most colorful, expressive, shortest, most economic way of repeating or elaborating upon what was said earlier.

With regard to the study of the new varieties of English, she notes that, these varieties should not be treated as deviant forms of some native variety, but as independent systems. She has observed in this study that the treatment of Singaporean English as a learner variety is unsatisfactory, because it fails to capture the essential difference in motivation between two very different types of CM, one motivated by inadequate vocabulary on the part of genuine learner and the other motivated by the desire to communicate as effectively and expressively as possible on the part of the fluent bilingual. About Singaporean English, her observation is that it is far richer than, for example, British English because of its contact with other languages spoken in Singapore. Instead of merely documenting purely formal or purely functional characteristics of bilingual speech, there is the urgent need to look at bilingual speech as primarily an act of communication. Thus, those functions which are ‘communicative’ rather than act of communication (ritualistic) will be most relevant to the study of bilingualism. Similarly, form is to be perceived as the outcome of communication rather than the focus of bilingual speech.

2.4.4 Functions of Code Mixing in New Varieties of English

D’Souza (1992) deals with the relationship between CM and the New Varieties of English (NVEs). According to him, the NVEs are varieties of English that have emerged as a result of the colonial experience. This fact is important, because it contributes a great deal to making the NVE’s what they are. The NVEs have the following characteristics: They are the result of colonization, are instutionalized, have range and depth, are nativized and stable,
have developed through the educational systems in bilingual context and are creative.

Given these characteristics, one has to realize that in talking of an NVE one is not talking of a monolith but of a code that encompasses several sub-varieties. The NVEs then, like the Old Varieties of English, have a range of styles and registers and regional variation. But in addition, they have code-mixed styles and registers which are also so intrinsic to them that CM has to be added to the list of characteristics that define the NVEs. CM may be used for the following reasons in the NVEs:

a) To conceal speakers’ regional caste/religious identity.
   
   For example, Annamali (1978) notes that Tamil CM with English may be used to conceal caste identity when the term ‘brother-in-law’ is used instead of ‘maccan’ or ‘attimbeer’.

b) For register identification

c) To impress one’s interlocutors and force inferior status on others while claiming prestige for oneself. In the NVE countries, English is the language of Prestige and CM with English is used to impress.

d) To prove education, modernity urbanity etc. (Sridhar 1978:10)

e) As a neutralizing device: For example, in Kashmir, the word mond carries the annotations that the English equivalent ‘widow’ does not (Kachru 1986).

D’Souza questions the widespread assumption that CM is an essential feature of the NVEs. It claims that CM is the result of bilingualism and language contact and will be found in all such contexts even when English has become a world language and one result of its spread is that it plays an important part in mixing. The mixed varieties arise even in non-NVE contexts. To tie CM to the study of the NVEs is to blind ourselves to many crucial aspects of both phenomena and to claim that NVEs are in some essential way different from other codes.
2.4.5 CS and Preference of the Speaker

Chengappa (2005) has attempted to relate the amount of CS to the proficiency and preference of the speaker. The significance of the paper is in that, it is prepared by using the Matrix Language Frame given by Myers Scotton (1993 b). It makes distinction between the Western bilingualism and the Indian bilingualism as it notes, “The bilingualism in the western world is not at a grass root level as in India and the other Asian and African countries. So it is difficult to generalize results obtaining from the western studies into the Indian Context. The variety and the use of English spoken in India are also different and this may in turn affect the CS evidenced in the Indian context. It is noted that the operating mode of the speaker affects the amount and type of CS in the experimental situation. The operating mode of the bilingual changes from one instance to the other, depending on the community in which he is in.” Hence, the study tries to correlate the speech mode of a bilingual with the amount of CS seen. It also aims at comparing the CS across monolingual and the bilingual communicative situations.

2.5 Socio-cultural and Pragmatic Factor

Most of the scholars are of the opinion that the sociolinguistic factor is the key to understand why Code-switching takes the form it does in each individual case. This sub-section summarizes the studies of the scholars concentrating on the sociolinguistic and the pragmatic aspects of CM and CS.

2.5.1 Gardner-Chloros on CS and Sociolinguistic Factors

Gardner-Chloros (2009:42) discusses three types of factors contributing to the form taken by CS in a particular instance:

1) The factors those are independent of particular speakers and circumstances in which the varieties are used, which affect all the speakers of the relevant varieties in particular community- e.g. economic ‘market’ forces- covert prestige, power relations, and the associations of each variety, with a particular context or way of life.
2) The factors that are attached to the speakers, both as individual and as members of a variety of subgroups- their competence, their social networks and relationships, their attitudes and ideologies, their self perception and perception of other.

3) The factors that are within the conversations where CS takes place. CS provides bilinguals with tools to structure their discourse beyond those available to the monolinguals.

The other three sociolinguistic determinants of CS pointed out by her are:

1) Conversational/Pragmatic Motivations:
Myres-Scotton (1993a:49) deals with the distinctions between the *allocation* paradigm in which the social structure determines the language behavior, and the interactional one in which individuals make rational choices to achieve their goals.

Milroy and Gordon (2003) similarly make distinction between CS which exploits the symbolism or connotations of each of the ends and CS that purely exploits the context which the two varieties provide.

Gumperz (1982) makes the distinction between *we code* and *they code*, While dealing with the pragmatic function of CS.

2) Socio-psychological influences:
Accommodation, attitude and audience design are the concepts used by the socio-psycholinguists. CS is one of the possible ways of accommodating to the interlocutors linguistic preferences. It can serve as a compromise between two varieties, where these carry different connotations or social meanings for speakers and in the locators.

This compromise function is not limited to the spontaneous speech. It is also exploited by politicians in their speeches as comedians in their jokes. Generally, it is used in the media which aim at multilingual audiences for multiple functions.

3) Addresses Specification
Another major function of CS is what Gumperz called ‘addresses specification’. The use the appropriate language to address different
interlocutors allows the participants to continue the conversation smoothly.

‘Gender’ is also considered as one of the most important sociolinguistic categories. CS connects with gender issues.

2.5.2 CS Between Different Social Settings

Bloom and Gumperz (1972:409) have discussed the use of Ranamal (a rural district variety in Northern Norway) and Bokmal (the standard variety) as the symbols of local and national Norwegian social values. This study shows that it is possible to find patterns in the phonological, grammatical and semantic choices made by an individual, and predict their occurrence with the help of certain social factors. Therefore, the claim that there is a constant relationship between the linguistic and the social structures is not without basis. The authors examine the linguistic repertoire of the Hemnesberget community and report the formal and the functional distribution of the Ranamal and Bokmal. The analysis proves that distinction with regard to the socio-economic status of Hemnesbergst, their descent (local vs. non-local) and their use of and loyalty towards the dialect or the standard, tend to operate simultaneously. CS, in this setting, is considered to be narrowly constrained by the observable features of the situation (locale, participants, etc.) and also as a linguistic force capable of defining and altering that situation. The authors here make a basic distinction between a ‘situational’ type of CS which is governed by situational norms, and ‘metaphorical’ CS where alteration enriches a situation, allowing for allusions to more than one social relationship within the situation.

Gumperz (1964:1117) studies Hindi–Punjabi CS and observes, “The need for a number of individuals tends to reduce the language distance between codes. Linguistic overlap is the greatest in those situations which favor inter-group contact.” One reason for this distinctiveness is that, “they have coexisted with the same linguistic area as part of the same cultural complex for several hundred years”. The result, which Gumperz arrives at, indicates the differences in the speech of Punjabi-Hindi bilinguals to be mostly grammatical.
2.5.3 Conversational Code Switching

Gumperz (1982) focuses on the central issues of the CS phenomenon. His (1982) paper deals with ‘conversational Code Switching’ involving three language pairs: Spanish and English (Sp-E), Hindi and English (H-E): and Slovenian and German (Sl-G) in South Western United States, Northern India (Delhi) and Austria respectively. Gumperz here aims at investigating the communicative aspects of CS and “to show how speakers and listeners utilize sub-consciously internalized social and grammatical knowledge in interpreting bilingual conversation” (63-64). In other words, the study implies a need for exploring the strategies that determine the meaning potential of CS and the connection that holds between them and the socio-linguistic knowledge that speakers and listeners share among themselves. The important observations of this paper are:

1) CS, as a type of speech variation, reflects the role of verbal signals in human interactions;
2) CS signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is covered through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes. It generates the presuppositions in terms of which the content of what said as decoded. The speakers’ notion of a code is personalized and hence differs from that of the linguist. The speakers depend on these notions to relate their grammatical system to the extra-linguistic environment. (Gumperz 1982:98)

2.5.4 CS and Extra-linguistic Factors

Weinreich (1963: 3) while discussing ‘Interference phenomenon’ says, “The precise effect of bilingualism on a person’s speech varies with a great many other factors, some of which might be called extra-linguistic because they lie beyond the structural differences of the languages or even their lexical inadequacies.” Among the non-structural factors, he notes that some are inherent in the bilingual person’s relation to the languages he brings into contact. These factors are:
a) the speakers facilitating of verbal expression in general and his ability to keep two languages apart,
b) the relative proficiency in each language,
c) the specialization in the use of each language by topics and interlocutors,
d) the manner of learning each language,
e) the attitudes toward each language- whether idiosyncratic or stereotyped,
f) the size of bilingual group and its socio-cultural homogeneity or differentiation- its breakdown into sub-groups using one or the other language as their mother tongue, demographic facts, social and political relations between these sub-groups,
g) the prevalence of bilingual individuals with given characteristics of speech behavior in several sub-groups,
h) the stereotyped attitudes towards each language ‘prestige’, the indigenous or immigrant status of the languages concerned,
i) the attitudes toward the culture of each language community,
j) the attitudes towards bilingualism as such,
k) the tolerance or intolerance with regard to mixing languages and to incorrect speech in each language,
l) the relation between the bilingual group and each of two language communities of which it is a marginal segment,

Weinreich believes that it is in broad psychological and socio-cultural settings that the effects of bilingualism can best be understood.

2.5.5 Language Choice as per Situation

Hudson (1996) maintains the view that the choice of language is controlled by the rules. The members of the community learn these rules from their experience; so, these rules are the part of their total linguistic knowledge. For example, according to Denison (1971), everyone in the village of Sauris, in northern Italy, spoke German within the family, Saurian (a dialect of Italian) informally within the village, and standard Italian to outsiders and in more formal village settings (school, church, work). Because of this linguistic division of labour, each individual could expect to switch codes (i.e.
languages) several times in the course of a day. This kind of code-switching is called *situational* code-switching because the switches between languages always coincide with changes from one external situation (for example, talking to members of the family) to another (for example, talking to the neighbours).

The rules link the languages to different communities (homes, Sauris, Italy), so each language also symbolizes that community. Speaking the standard Italian at home would be like wearing a suit and the speaking German in the village would be like wearing beach-clothes in church. In short, each language has social functions which no other language could fulfill. These social functions are less arbitrary results of history; but they are no less real for that. The same seems to be typical of the bilingual communities in general. The main reason for preserving the language is because of the social distinctions that they symbolize. In clear cases, we can tell what situation we are in just by looking around us; for example, if we are in lecture–room full of people, or having breakfast with our family, classifying the situation is easy and if language choice varies with the situation it is clearly the situation that decides the language not the other way round.

### 2.5.6 CS as Identity Relationship with Language

McClure (1977) deals with CS in the bilingual Mexican American children. He finds that the language alternation marks a shift in identity-relationships. It is more common among the older children than the younger ones mainly because “the former have access to more identities” (McClure 1977: 105). Their knowledge of English increases with age, thus bringing about an increase in the number of identity relationships associated with English. Regarding topic, McClure feels that it does not have as much an influence in the choice of the code (Spanish/English), as do the participants: “The children are able to and in fact do, converse about any thing in their experience in both languages. When a topic which is habitually discussed in one language happens to come up in a conversation in the other language, there is high incidence of code-mixing and code-changing.”
2.6 Studies of CM/CS in Indian English


2.6.1 Kachru’s Studies of CM/CS

2.6.1.1 Speech Function

Kachru (1966) has studied the socially determined speech functions such as modes of address or reference, greetings, blessings, prayers, abuses, curses as being related to the Indian context of culture. In Indian languages, there are fixed format exponents for these contexts; but these are sometimes transformed to the L2 for those contextual units that are absent in the culture of the English language. Further, Kachru (1978 a) argues that a linguistic divergence is a result of CM. The divergence may take a more extreme form, as in Hindi and Urdu or Dakhini.

2.6.1.2 CM as Lexical Innovation

Kachru (1975: 62-63) makes a distinction between ‘lexical Innovation’ which includes the use of single lexical items and hybridization items (in South Asian English) and assimilated items or non-restricted items in the native varieties of English. For him, however, hybridized item is simply a lexical item which comprises of two or more elements at least one of which is from a South East Asian language and one from English. This includes both open set and closed system items of lexical and grammatical elements.

Kachru’s study on code-shifting is restricted to lexis. His is a data-oriented study and as such, both the data and the treatment are limited to some twenty-two imaginative writings by ten writers and some press materials chosen from twelve Indian Newspapers; the treatment is in terms mainly of ‘hybridization’ at the lexical level. He comes to the conclusion that ‘CM and CS need to be studied in a functional-context, both cross-linguistically and cross-culturally, and that ‘the Indian subcontinent provides a substantial data for the
study of code-mixing both diachronically and synchronically.’’ (Kachru 1983: 206)

2.6.1.3 Context of Situation

Kachru (1978) presents a theoretical framework which would relate the formal and functional aspects of such ‘language-mixing’ and view it in a pragmatic perspective in terms of the linguistic needs of the speech community. He follows mostly Firth’s framework. In Firth (1957a and 1957 b) and later in somewhat modified form in Mitchell (1957), Halliday (1959), Ellis (1966) and Kachru (1966), a schema has been presented towards delimiting texts with reference to their contextually relevant categories. Firth has suggested the following categories for the context of situation of a text:

A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
   i) Verbal actions of participants
   ii) Non-verbal actions of participants.
B. The relevant objects
C. The effect of the verbal action.
   The other features to be considered are –
   i) Economic, religious and social structures to which participants belong.
   ii) Types of discourse : monologue, narrative
   iii) Personal interchange: age of participants.
   iv) Type of speech- social flattery, cursing, etc.

CM is a role–dependent and function–dependent linguistic phenomenon. In terms of role, one has to ask who is using the language, and in terms of function, one has to ask what is to be accomplished by the speech act. In terms of role, then, the religious social, economic and religious characteristics of the participant in a speech act are crucial. On the other hand, in terms of function, the specialized uses to which the given language is being put determine the CM. In a sense, then, in several linguistically relevant situations there is a mutual expectancy between the formal characteristics of the language (in this case, a code-mixed language and its function). Kachru (1978) discusses the
phenomenon of CM in the theoretical framework of the ‘context of situation’. The concept, context of situation, provides a framework for relating language use and linguistic form to the ‘immediate’ linguistically relevant situation and also to the ‘wider’ context of culture.

A ‘contextual’ unit means those features of a text which contribute to its being assigned to a particular function. These features may be termed the contextual parameters of a text. These would comprise linguistically relevant clues, such as the participants, their sex, their positions on the social, caste or religious hierarchy.

In certain contextual units, a multilingual person has the possibility of choice between code-mixed (say Hindi and English or Persian) or non-code, mixed languages. In such situations, the selection of a particular ‘code’ is determined by the attitude of a person toward a language (or toward a certain type of code-mixing) or the prestige which a language (or a type of code-mixing) has in a speech community.

Formal appropriateness in CM may be judged by using the concept of formal cohesion. In other words, a particular type of lexical and grammatical cohesion is associated with a specific type of discourse or register. In linguistic terms, CM involves functioning at least in diasystem and as a consequence, developing another linguistic code comprising formal features of two or more codes. A linguistic code developed in this manner then develops a formal cohesion and functional expectancy.

One might then say that the function of the CM languages is between what is termed ‘digloassia’ and CS. In the ‘diglossia’ situation, there is a situationally determined use of two codes, and the codes involved are functionally mutually exclusive. In CS, on the other hand, the functional domains of the languages involved are determined by linguistically pluratic situations, for example- the Punjabi-Hindi Code-switching in Haryana.

2.6.1.4 Mixing of English and Indian Languages

Kachru (1983) has argued that CM once considered linguistic sin has now come to be recognized as a historically and sociologically determined
phenomenon with well-defined linguistic, pragmatic and attitudinal functions. Several mixed languages have developed as result of this process. He discusses CM with English in Indian languages and proposes ways of structuring the phenomenon (Kachru 1975, 1978, 1983).

As much of his work deals with lexical items, he uses CM as a cover term for CM/CS expressions. According to him, there are four broad types of mixing seen in Indian Languages: 1) Englishization 2) Sanskritization 3) Persianization 4) Pidginization.

Regarding the pragmatic functions of the code-mixed varieties in Indian languages, he notes that CM in Indian languages shows register identification (register-wise mixing), e.g. Englishization (mixing English words), Persianization (Persian words mixed in legal register – in lower courts), Literary Criticism and philosophical writing (Hindi-Sanskrit words mixed). It provides formal clues for style identification (Sanskrit, Persian and English). It is used as device for elucidation and interpretation. It is possible when terminologies of that language have not been stabilized or have not received acceptance. A person uses two linguistic sources in defying concepts or a term so as to avoid vagueness or ambiguity. It is used to redefine in other language (English) what has been already expressed in one language (Hindi). Sometimes mixed lexical items do not provide contextual clues and thus, language is used to conceal various types of identities. In order not to give away caste identity, a person prefers the English Kinship term brother–in-law, for the Tamil maccan or attimbeer. CM is a contextually determined device; therefore there is mutual expectancy between the type of CM and the contextual unit in which it functions.

With this explanation he further claims that in register identification and style identification, CM functions as foregrounding, because it is used to attract attention. On the other hand in neutralization, it is used for the opposite effect, i.e. to conceal the identity.

While observing the attitudes towards the functions of the code-mixed varieties, he points out that, in the multilingual settings, all the code-mixed
varieties do not evoke identical attitudinal responses. A multilingual person seems to choose CM of various types, pragmatically and attitudinally. He considers the attitudes towards four types of mixing mentioned above: 1) Code-mixing with English is a Pan-South Asian phenomenon. In attitudinal functional terms, it ranks the highest and cuts across language boundaries, religious boundaries and caste barriers. It is a marker of 1) modernization 2) socio-economic position 3) membership in the elite group. It makes deliberate style. The widest register range is associated with CM in English. It continues to be used in the contexts such as- to demonstrate authority, power and identity with the establishment. The evidence of this attitude is seen in the parents’ language preference for their children. It is also seen the in the choice of preferred language in the college. 2) The attitude towards sanskritization is seen in oratorical style associated with the rightist–Arya Samaj, whereas attitude towards desanskritaziation is seen in Dravid Communities’ oratorical style 3) Persianization spread in those parts of India that came under the Muslim domain, is associated with the legal register of the lower courts. The attitude towards Persianization varies from one part of India to another. CM with Persian is used in educational system in Kashmir or north India by Hindu Kashmir is and by Muslims. But CM with Persian in South India is different. In Karnataka, Sridhar (1978) observes that the educated Kannada speaker mixes English in his Kannada, and the illiterate (earthly) one mixes Perso-Arabic in his Kannada. 4) Pidginization which is low on the hierarchy is an attempt toward simplification of language used in situation. Here, the participants speak languages which are not mutually intelligible. This mixed type variety is called Bazar Hindi, Butler English or chi chi English (Kachru 1987 a).

The formal characteristic of CM texts is their lexis and lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hassan 1976 in Kachru 1983) “A user of a code-mixed variety intuitively applies the process of the first language to nativise the linguistic elements of the other code. In Hindi-English code-mixing, most of the productive grammatical processes of Hindi-Urdu are applied to English items.
For example, company-*companiya*, master-*masterin*, doctor-*doctarin*.” This also applies to inflection assignment and other grammatical categories.

There is a type of cline in mixing which starts with lexical mixing and then progressively extends to higher units, the maximum being an alternate use of sentences from two codes. The mixing at lexical level may show a lexical spread which is associated with a register (e.g. paragraph with Persian Lexical items typical of legal register in Indian language) (Persian +Hindi); on the other hand, there is almost an alternate use of units of Hindi and English (e.g. paragraph with switching between Hindi and English).

### 2.6.1.5 Code Mixing vs. Odd Mixing

About unacceptable CM, Kachru (1978b) comments that CM is both functionally and formally a rule governed phenomenon. It is not an open-ended process, but has various collocational and grammatical constraints. There is a point both in grammar and lexis when a user distinguishes between code-mixing and odd-mixing. The responses to the code-mixed items by the users of such varieties seem to vary from ‘yes, acceptable’ to ‘no unacceptable’ , ‘well depends’, and ‘I don’t know’.

### 2.6.1.6 Impact of CM on Hindi Syntax

There are several studies that concentrate on the phonological, lexical and syntactic aspects of Hindi with mixing of the Persian words, Hindi with mixing of the English words. Kachru (1983) summarizes the researches dealing with the impact of CM and CS on Hindi syntax:

1) There is *change* in *word order*. The preferred word order of Hindi is SOV as opposed to the SVO of English. In creative writing in Hindi and newspaper register, we find example of SVO too. This may be due to the influence of an English substratum (Mishra 1963 in Kachru 1983) and the practice of fast translation from primarily English texts in journalism broadcasting.

2) There is the introduction of *indirect speech*. In Hindi discourse, traditionally, no distinction is made between direct and indirect speeches.
But modern Hindi prose construction such as ‘NP said that he will read’ as against ‘NP said that will read’

3) There is the use of impersonal constructions. For example, ‘it is said’, ‘it has been learnt’, ‘It is claimed’, type of constructions. In Hindi newspaper, it is ‘kahajata hai’, - is now being used.

4) In the Indo–Aryan languages, in general, there is a tendency to delete the agent in passive communications. In new Hindi, Dwara, Jariye, are used because of the influence of English.

5) The use of post-head relative clause with ‘jo’ is also attributed to the influence of English and by some to the influence of Persian. For example, “Voh larka jo table par baitha hai mera bhai hai.” (That boy who is sitting on the table is my brother).

6) There are two views regarding the use of the parenthetical clauses. For some, they are the result of the English influence and for others; they are typically Indo–Aryan constructions.

2.6.1.7 Exponents of ‘Mixing’

The formal exponents of ‘mixing’, as stated in Kachru (1978 a), form a hierarchy. In this hierarchy, mixing of simple lexical items rank the lowest and the mixing of sentences rank the highest. They are NP insertion, VP insertion, unit hybridization, sentence insertion, idioms and collocation insertion, Inflection attachment and reduplication. This process includes the use of reduplication of English items. In some south Asian languages, reduplication has the function of marking identification, e.g. petrol vetrol, acting vekting, Taim vaim, kar var.

2.6.2 Shastri’s Study of CM

Shastri’s contribution to Indian English is worth noting, especially regard to the compilation of the two corpora on Indian English: Kolhapur corpus of Indian English (1988) and ICE-IND (2002). His research paper (1988) ‘Code Mixing in the Process of Indianization of English’ is based on Kolhapur Corpus of Indian English. As our present study is based on CM and CS in Indian English
speech and as it is based on ICE-IND, we have considered his paper here in some detail.

2.6.2.1 Code Mixing Process

Shastri (1988) considers CM of Indian languages into IE as an important contributory factor in the process of Indianization of English. He considers ‘hybridization’, ‘absorption’ and ‘assimilation’ as distinct stages, in that order, in the process of borrowing in languages. According to him, ‘absorption’ is a process of naturalization (the borrowed items which become stabilized by gaining linguistic and socio-culture sanctions at the local or regional level). The language speaking community tacitly accepts it. The term ‘assimilation’ is used for those that become part and parcel of the native varieties of English. The need for assimilating Indian elements into English has once again arisen especially in the Western World and in the fields of Fine Arts to cater for the desire for International understanding though cultural sympathy. So, a number of register-bound items have already found their way into standard British and American dictionaries. More striking forms of assimilation are those that borrow the abstract concepts of Indian socio-cultural phenomena and the Indian way of conceptualizing reality through the Indian language items.

2.6.2.2 Functions of CM in Indian Context

Kachru (1983) has suggested the pragmatic and the attitudinal functions of CM. The first manifests in the register-determined contexts and the second as markers of the social status and attitudes. Shastri’s (1988) study has revealed a third aspect, i.e. a deliberate attempt to Indianize English, indicative of the national aspiration typical of all the newly independent nations which expresses itself in different ways in different nations. This deliberate attempt is more like the early American efforts at the Americanization of English.

Moreover, it is a deliberate attempt not only at asserting the newly free nation’s distinct identity as strongly and emotionally as possible, but also at adapting the English language so as to bring it within the reach of an average educated Indian, a truly ‘socialistic motive’. This may well be labeled as a feature of pan-Indian English. Such attempts may range from genuinely
nationalistic to ridiculously parochial innovations. He gives a few examples: *Poorna-Swaraj, Azadi, Swadesh, Kala Parishad, Askashwani, Doordarshan, Sangeet Natak Akademi, Shri Shrimati, and Sarvashri.* There are quite a few new items, the most talked about being- *bundh, hartaI, gherao,* not to speak of *Dravida Munnetra Kazagam, Shiv Sena, Hindu Ekata etc.* - the kind of which have found their way into pan-Indian English, a kind of *lingua franca* typical not only of the press but popular English literature in India and the bulk of spoken English for everyday communication.

With regard to the formal treatment of CM, Shastri notes that, CM does not confine itself to any particular level of language structure. It tends to affect the code-mixed language at all levels. In phonology and morphology, it is most obvious or *transparent*; but at the level of syntax and specially semantics, it tends to be not so obvious or *opaque.* His corpus-based study deals with the structural variety of CM in detail and also notes some examples of exponents and constraints.

### 2.6.2.3 Structural Variety and Stylistic Motivation of CM

A) The details of the structural variety of CM marked in his study are as follows:

1. Basic NPs
   a. *N +N* Constructions in which the modifier N is an Indian item:
      *Tehsil level =level of the tehsil (administrative area) (All)*
   b. *N+ N* Constructions in which the head N is an Indian item:
      *Block Samiti= Committee to manage the block (All)*
      Here, the head nouns may be inflected the English way: as for example, *deeyas.*
   c. *Adj=N* Constructions in which the adjective is an Indian item:
      *Peria colony = big colony, really colony of the big (A09)*
      Here, too, the adjectives have their derivational affixes, *swadesh, jirki*
   d. Quantifier + *N* constructions in which the head N is an Indian items. :
      *Ten thousand paras (measure) (K01)*
      Notice the last phrase which is very English phrase.

2. Basic Coordinated NPs
   *N and N constructions in which either of the Ns is an Indian item:
      AIR and Doordarshan (TV)(CO9)*
3. Complex NPs with multiple premodification:
   a. All modifier Ns:
      * Siasm sag timber (All)
   b. Ns and Adjs
      * Purna Swaraj pledge (A10)

4. Complex NPs of sorts:
   * Badawar Tai (poor people’s mother) Indira Gandhi (A28)

5. Attributive constructions
   a. N + Adj. constructions in which the N is an Indian item:
      * mehandi-red (K10)
   b. N + V-ed constructions in which the N is an Indian item:
      * Rishabha-based (CO2)
   c. N+ V-ing constructions also as substantives in which the N element is an Indian item.
      * Chappal- throwing (B22)

6. Inflected Forms: Indian items with English inflections:
   A. Plurals in –s (simple forms)
      By far the most productive English inflection used is the –s plural inflection:
      * Hamals (A09), harijans (A22)
   B. Plurals in –s (complex forms)
      * Kabir panthis (A42)
   C. Adjectives in –te and –ist
      * Baîndavanite (CO5), harmonist (CO4)
   D. Abstract nouns in –ism:
      * Brahmanism (B10), Hinduism (C10)
   E. The –s Genitives:
      a. Possessive Genitive: Prana’s connection with Prajapati = Prana has connection with praJapati (D05);
      b. Group Genetive: raja of Dilwar’s cousin = the cousin of the raja of Dilwar (KO5).

7. Prefixes and Suffixes: trans-Jamuna (A37), filmwalahs (L05)

   Some of these features have no doubt been pointed out earlier by Kachru. But the analysis presented here not only confirms some of his hypotheses, but also indicates how CM in IE is a far more complex phenomenon affecting the very fabric of the language at all levels of delicacy, for example- the structural variety of the –s genitive in particular.

   He uses the term stylistics in the broadest sense of the term to include what the speaker wants to accomplish in a given context of situation.
B) Stylistically Motivated Code-Mixing:

Exponents of Code Mixing:

1. Single lexical items with restricted/extended meanings:
   i) …mass sterilization camps… which are little more than melas. (B14)
   ii) she would keep some of ….some of her charm for those …. who might go on the line after the tamasha (minister’s visit to the slum) was over. (K18)

No. i) is an illustration of exploitation of the associated meaning (-DESIRABLE) of the item mela which literally means a ‘fair’. No. ii) is an example of a similar phenomenon, the item tamasha which could have an associated component (+CONTEMPT) which otherwise literally means different things in different Indian languages. The example seem to indicate that there is a need for recognizing a fuller range of stylistic marking potential of the code-mixed items even at the single lexical item level.

2. NP insertion

There are instances of Indian language NPs inserted into English with or without English paraphrases. The writer’s decision to supply or not to supply paraphrase may be dictated by the audience readership he has in view or the desire to compensate for the inadequacy of one of the phrases.

For example: The succeeding thumr ki bandish based on ‘khamaj’, ‘Adana’ and ‘Bahar’ and the final ‘dadra’ were all redolent of the distinctive purab flavor (C04).

It fills a gap in the receiving language, but could have been phrased as the bandish of thumri; the motivation seems to be one of ‘Cohesion’ or may be of constraint.

3. Sentence Insertion
   a. Without paraphrase:
      Boja babuji? (Any load to carry Sir?) Those two words sent a shiver through my body. ‘Chalo, hamare sath’ (Come with me) I commanded her (K52)
   b. With paraphrases:
      Dramatic performance becomes, according to ‘Naatya Adriana’ an art when it arouses sentiments in the minds of the audience (Sabha yaanaam hridayam nartayati iti naatakam) (= That which makes the audience’s heart dance is a drama)(C07).

4. Modes of address
   i) ‘Yes, yes baba I am moving. I am moving’ and she tottered up the aisle of the bus. (K50)
   ii). ‘who is speaking? Jaydeep here. Yes Jaydeep, I am bit in a soup dafa. Won’t be able to come –yes.’(L01)

These examples of address- baba (daddy, meaning any one who assumes the role of one), Mai, ma (mother, one as good as mother), Beta (Son, one as good as son), Deva (God-Hindu), Inshaalla (God-Muslim), Atte (aunty –regional –Karnataka) suggest the wide range of modes of address with unmistakable social function.
5. **Interjections:**
   i) I bit a little *pedha* so that the remainder appeared, in my palm like the moon a few days before becoming full. ‘*Cha*’ I cried, spitting out what I had eaten. (K34)
   ii) Choma heard the landlord’s mother curse form inside the house ‘*Abba*, the insolence of these holeyas’. (K03)

   The interjections *Cha! Chee! Chee!* are pan-Indian expressions of strong disapproval: while *Abba* is limited to south Indian expressing shock at ‘temerity’ – the limit.

6. **Idioms and Proverbs:**

   This is all too common a phenomenon – the use of idioms, proverbs and sayings which are culture-bound and, as rule, untranslatable. Occasionally, parallel idioms occur in different languages. But the fact remains that these are the surest markers of socio-cultural traits.

   Regarding ‘constraints’ on CM, this study suggests that there are two kinds of constraints on CM: First, as discussed by Kachru (1978), the relevant to the *cline of acceptability*, and the second, the *language specific constraints*. This phenomenon seems to operate at the semantic level and, therefore, is likely to be reflected in the processes of lexicalization and affixation or the realization of open set items and closed-system terms.

   Shastri refers also to the near absence of mixing of verbs in Indian English. For example, *Gherao* (peaceful intimidation by crowding in on person(s)), in Hindi is a noun, one has to add an operator *karna* to derive a verb i.e. *gherao karna*. In the form *gheraoed* was obviously treating the item the *gherao* is treated as verb with the English past –*ed* inflection. He observes that there is a general tendency in Indian words to follow the English grammatical processes of affixation for realizing grammatical meanings. Only in the case of *film-wallah*, the affix *wallah* is from Hindi; but the root *film* itself is from English and the item *filmwallah* is borrowed back into IE. Barring such examples, he concludes surmises that the mixed items normally conform to the morphological patterns of the receiving language.
2.6.3 Verma’s Study of Socio-cultural Factor in CS

Verma (1976), in his paper ‘Code-Switching: Hindi-English’, begins with a distinction between linguistic competence and communicative competence. For him, “Linguistic competence does not necessarily mean communicative competence; but communicative competence subsumes linguistic competence, for it may be described as linguistic competence plus situational appropriateness. Linguistic competence is abstract, context-free, rule governed linguistic behavior; communicational competence is context-governed topic-oriented externalization of linguistic competence.”

This paper attempts to illustrate certain aspects of Hindi-English CS among the educated speakers of Hindi-English. English and Hindi have coexisted within the same linguistic area as part of same socio-economic complex for years. Both the codes have been serving important function in the daily social interaction. These speakers use different varieties of their mother tongue in various situations in life; but when they have to use the technical register, they normally switch over to English. This kind of register-oriented bilingualism is labeled as ‘registral bilingualism’ (Verma 1969:302). In fact, the situation is never as simple as this.

The chief regulations of Hindi-English CS or of mixture of Hindi-English styles are related to the level of education and the topic of discourse. The higher the level of education and more technical the topic of discourse the greater the degree of mixture and frequency of switching. It may, therefore, be said that the bilingual switching is patterned and predictable on the basis of topical and situational feature. He explains the dominance of Hindi/English by way of cline. At one end and in certain roles, these bilinguals use only English and at the other end and in certain other roles, they use only Hindi. English is used in highly formal situations to talk about technical topics; Hindi is used for intimate, informal, personalized statements. In between these two extreme ends, we find different degrees of English-dominated and Hindi-dominated mixtures.
The cline may be shown as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English dominated</th>
<th>Hindi dominated</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CS in multilingual settings is regulated by the topic of discourse and stylistic (formal/informal) considerations. In this regard Fishman (1972: 439) observes, “The fact that two individuals who usually speak to each other primarily in X nevertheless switch to Y when discussing certain topics leads us to consider topic per se as a regulator of language used in multilingual settings. The implication of topical regulation of language choice is that certain topics are somehow handled ‘better’ or more appropriately in one language than in other in particular multilingual contexts”. The speakers do not radically switch from one style to another; but they build on the co-existence of alternative forms to create meaning. Switching from one code to another is not a matter of free individual choice. It is affected by topical and situational features, which determine the speaker’s choice from among a set of available codes.

Regarding the ‘context’ in CS, Verma observes that the CS is context-governed. If the interlocutors have a degree in English and use English as their medium of lecturing or in their office work, they are likely to use information carrying items of English and linkers of Hindi. If their topic of discourse is technical, their registral items are likely to be from English and the grammatical items from Hindi. CS, one might say, is a marked badge of educated, urban bilinguals. The preponderance of a particular set of lexical items of a code, he notes, also depends upon our emotional and intellectual attachments to the code.

2.6.4 Ashok Kumar’s Study of CS and Motivation

Ashok Kumar (1987) focuses on ‘motivation’ for CS. He considers, apart from the communicative necessity on the part of the bilingual, there are some more reasons which are equally if not more effective in explaining this phenomenon. These have either been superficially dealt with, or have been totally ignored. His study of the Hindi-based bilinguals, both educated and uneducated indicates that the alteration from Hindi to English is dictated also by such considerations as a) Switching under emotional stress, b) Switching for
imposing authority, c) Switching for fashion, d) Inevitability, e) Technical CS, f) Switching for business, g) Switching in creative writing and h) Euphemistic CS.

He deals with some of the important formal and functional features of Hindi-English code-switching. The analysis of the linguistic aspects of Code-switching refutes some of the code-switching constraints. The functions of code-switching are more or less in line with Gumperz (1982), although they have been dealt with more elaborately in his study.

2.6.5 Other Studies of CM/CS in Indian English

Malik Lalita (1994) discusses the role of Code-switching in the formation of Indian English. On the basis of her investigation, she asserts that Code-switching in bilingual or multilingual speech is not a ‘grammarless language mixture’. On the contrary, morphological, semantic and pragmatic analyses show that there are marked linguistic, semantic and attitudinal functions of Code Switching. The process of CS plays a major role in the formation of Indian English; its contribution to the formation of IE is, no doubt, noteworthy. This study traces also the educational implications of Code-switching in Indian English.

Jyostna (1980) studies the formal functions of CM in Indian films. Her study is based on the data collected from the spoken media. She argues that CM may occur at a variety of grammatical levels. CM obeys certain syntactic constraints. It is restricted by social aspects; however, as she insists, CM has certain pragmatic advantages.

The work of Nirmale (2009) ‘A study of CS and CM in the selected fictional works by Indian Writers in English’, critically examines and investigate the phenomenon of code mixing and code switching as manifested in Indian writing in English in general and fictional work of M.K. Anand and Raja Rao, Farukh Dhondi and Shobha De’ in particular. The study probes into the process of nativization which mainly operates through the mechanism of CM and CS.

To conclude the discussion on Code Mixing and Code Switching, it may be observed that CM and CS have over years been the areas of great concern for the linguists and the researchers. Their scope is not limited to one language or
medium, one region or community, one field of knowledge or communication. In fact their scope is extended over to several languages and mass media used for information and communication by users all over the world. A number of linguistic, socio-cultural and pragmatic factors contribute to their formation and usage. That also explains the researchers’ keen interest in the study of CM and CS in Indian English.