CHAPTER 3

BILINGUALISM AND SECOND LANGUAGE RESEARCH

3.1. Bilingualism

Second Language (L₂) learners are not monolinguals but bilinguals with a unique compound system of multi-competence. Psycholinguistic research on bilinguals has shown a relationship between the bilinguals’ two linguistic codes. It has also shown that certain psychological mechanisms are involved in language processing. It is said that when a bilingual is presented with material, he/she first identifies the language in which this material is presented and then processes the information. Analysing the effects of language acquisition context on bilingual organization, Lambert, Havelka and Crosby (1958) demonstrated that separate acquisition contexts for each language (as for example, when one language is learned at home and the other at school) led to more functional separation between the bilingual’s two codes.

3.2. Theories of Bilingualism

Many theories have been given to explain the bilinguals’ acquisition of language. They are:

i. Switch Mechanism

ii. The Transfer Theory of Language Acquisition
iii. The Inter-language Hypothesis

3.2.1. Switch Mechanism

Switch mechanism [Penfield and Roberts (1959)] implies the existence of two psycholinguistic systems, one for each language and explains that when one linguistic system is in operation, the other one is automatically shut.

Switch hypothesis was tested using a number of experimental techniques called Stroop Tests(1935)\(^2\). These experiments relied on distractors presented in another language when testing the processing in one language. For example, the distractors will be in language B when the test is for language A. Stroop Tests verified the possible interference between semantic and physical characteristics of a stimulus word. The task consisted in naming the colours- red, green etc. written in different coloured inks ignoring the meaning of the word. The results of the experiment have shown evidence against the Switch Mechanism. Macnamara(1967) proposed a Two-Switch Model, one Switch for the verbal input controlled by the environment and an independent output Switch under the subject’s control.

2. Stroop Test: Developed in 1935. In this test, the subject is required to attend to one characteristic of a stimulus word in one language while the word is presented in the other language.
This mechanism would allow the bilingual to encode in one language, while decoding in the other. Thus, the two languages would be simultaneously activated but independent from each other.

Triesman (1969) postulated a variation of the Switch Mechanism. Studies showed that the output switch operated somewhere in the on-line of output processing and the major source of interference came from factors like semantic similarity. Caramazga, Yeni-Komshin and Zurif (1974) tested the Two-Switch Model and concluded that at the phonological level a Switch Mechanism had to be postulated.

3.2.2. The Transfer Theory

Selinker’s Transfer Theory of Second Language was perhaps the most important concept in the theory and practice of Education. The principle of Transfer referred to the hypothesis that the learning of task A will affect the subsequent learning of task B and it was this expectation that justified educational training. The operation of Transfer was implicitly assumed both within the Language learning situation and in the applicability of the course instruction to skills the individual will be called upon, in using the Language outside the classroom.
Studies conducted by Uriel Weinrich on Language Transfer have provided insights for work on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) in those groups of learners who are “developing bilinguals”. Weinrich (1953) presented the concept of “interlingual identification” which he believed to be the basic learning strategy in SLA. Weinrich discusses “interlingual identification” in terms of interference. The term “language transfer” is used by Selinker (1966, 1969) to refer to this phenomenon. Language Transfer occurs in a bilingual’s speech which varies depending on factors like the socio-cultural setting of language contact. The bilingual is tempted to identify phonemes that have physical resemblance. Allophonic distribution also affects the bilingual’s use of a particular sound. Interlingual identification also occurs in grammatical relationships such as Word Order. Weinrich points out that if a bilingual speaker identifies a morpheme or grammatical category in one language (A) with one in another language (B) he/she may apply the B form in grammatical functions which he/she derives from the system of A. He states that “formal similarity or a similarity in pre-existing functions” leads the bilingual to establish interlingual equivalence of morpheme categories.

Green (1986) has distinguished three stages of a language acquisition system:
i. a selective stage, which played a role in controlling speech output

ii. an active stage i.e., language played a role in ongoing processing

iii. a dormant stage, in which language stayed long term memory.

Green assumed that bilingual speech processing was the outcome of interplay between resource, activation and control. He proposed that when speaking LA, devices for recognizing LA were activated and those for producing LA were selected; selection included activation of LA and suppression of LB. In Code Switching, there was no suppression of LB but regulation occurred in such a way that the syntactic rules of both languages were observed.

Language Transfer could not explain fully the Language processing of bilinguals. Bilinguals control their language of output, but they cannot avoid decoding in both languages. Experiments conducted in the study by Hamer and Lambert (1974) showed that there was a degree of independence between decoding and encoding mechanisms but failed to prove the existence of a Switch Mechanism. Obler and Albert (1978) proposed that a bilingual processes verbal input through a continuously operating monitor system which controlled the input through an analysis-by-synthesis device i.e., by constantly listing inputs against their potential
correctness. This took into account the fact that all verbal input was processed, that a subject could constrain output to a single language, but allowed borrowing and Language Switching when appropriate. These studies showed that the problem of interdependence between the two languages occurred at a deeper level of processing than the access mechanism. At the same time there was a certain degree of independence between the input and output process and that somewhere on the on-line processing the subject was in control of the output language. This became apparent from the preceding studies and from the existence of simultaneous interpreter. Altenberg and Cairns (1983) showed that a lexical decision task called for one language only. Mack (1983) argued that, language interdependence was not limited to the semantic level but already existed at the syntactic level and that, because the bilingual could not suppress the automatic activation of one language in one rapid on-line processing, he was more likely to use his two languages in active restructuring either of his languages.

Grosjean and Soares (1982) observed that recognition of code switched words depended on:

i. the frequency of the word

ii. preceding context

iii. cognitive knowledge
iv. speaker’s habits and attitudes.

However, the Input-Switch Hypothesis was disproved in experiments in which a continuous text was used.

**3.2.3. The InterLanguage Hypothesis**

The InterLanguage Hypothesis (IL) grew out of the observation that adult learners of Second Language produce speech which differs from the speech of native speakers of the Target Language (TL) in ways which are not always the result of transfer from a learner’s Native Language (NL). The IL differs from the NL of the learner and the TL norm and, therefore, can be seen as a linguistic system in its own right. IL is seen as a linguistic system like any Natural Language with its own system of linguistic rules.

Corder has suggested the term “transitional competence” to describe the set of Grammatical intuitions about an IL which the learner possesses at any given point in time. From the description of the learner’s InterLanguage as it develops and changes, one can infer

3. InterLanguage Hypothesis: Weinrich’s studies have provided valuable insight into the discovery of InterLanguage. Weinrich points out that when two languages are in contact, one is influenced by the other. This he calls “Interlingual Identifications”. This occurs because of physical resemblance in phonetic renditions and in grammatical relationships, such as Word Order.
what sort of psychological and linguistic processes underly the process of Second Language learning. The transitional competence may have its reflections in speech forms produced by a learner. Inferences based on textual data alone lead only to a partial discovery of a learner’s competence. This competence must be tapped by means of “intuitional data”.

3.2.3.1. The Four Observables

Selinker, Swain and Dumas (1975) suggested four “observables” in the Interlanguage hypothesis. These four “observables” are:

a. Mutual intelligibility
b. Systematicity
c. Stability
d. Backsliding.

a. Mutual Intelligibility: The notion of “Mutual Intelligibility” refers to the ability of a group of language learners to communicate verbally with one another in a language other than their NL.

b. Systematicity: This refers to the internal consistency in the rule and feature system which makes up the IL. It suggests an organised set of rules and basic elements (lexical items, phonological units, grammatical categories etc). Learners make use of learning strategies in their attempt to form the systematicity of
the language system they are attempting to acquire. Relative to the TL, the use of these categories sometimes result in:

i. the improper formulation of a rule

ii. the improper assignment of a feature

iii. the incorrect specification of a phonological unit. These may also result in the correct formulation of a characteristic of the TL system.

**c. Stability:** Stability, the third property suggested by Selinker and others states that “when more than one strategy intersects in Second Language acquisitions, there will be more “power” or “stability” in the resultant IL. This stability may result in “correct” or “incorrect” forms, but relative to the IL system itself. A learner consistently uses a particular linguistic element or rule to generate speech forms. Selinker(1972) explains that stability occurs “by a process of Fossilisation”. Selinker has noted that the process of Fossilisation may lead to the freezing of the IL at a plateau beyond which the learner either can’t or won’t progress. All learners tend to fossilise particular forms or particular parts of their Grammar. Selinker mentions that widespread Fossilisation of phonological units or syntactic strings is unique to a learner’s speech and is, therefore, one of the unique properties of ILS. Some learners do not freeze their IL at a plateau but continue their linguistic evolution
towards the TL form. These speakers show another process called "Backsliding".

**d. Backsliding:** Selinker and others define Backsliding as the regular reappearance of fossilized errors that were thought to be eradicated. Backsliding is one of the properties which distinguishes IL from other language systems. In IL evolution the ultimate goal of Second Language learning is to replicate the system of the IL in the learner’s language and acquisition device. In an ideal learner, the IL will constantly move towards the TL norm. We have evidence of “Backsliding” if the result was less TL like, and “learning” if the result was more TL like.

The theories of Language Transfer, Interlanguage and Fossilisation have provided valuable insights on Second Language Learning. They have also provided impetus towards Second Language Acquisition Research which in turn has given rise to new educational methodology in Second Language Teaching.

### 3.3. Second Language Research

In early Second Language Research, the key concept was ‘Interference’. Interference is defined as ‘those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occurs in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language’. (Weinrich, 1953). Interference, according to
Weinrich, happens on two dimensions – the actual speech of the bilingual and the bilingual’s knowledge of the language. Weinrich also suggested that there possibly existed three types of concept/word (signified/signifier) relationship between the languages, in the mind of the bilingual. They were:

**i. Coordinative Bilingualism:** The two language systems exist side by side.

  e.g. they know what English ‘book’ means and they know what Russian ‘kniga’ means.

**ii. Compound Bilingualism:** The two languages are linked in the minds at the level of concepts.

  e.g. they have a single concept of a ‘book’ which is related to two different words /kniga/ and /buk/

**iii. Subordinate Bilingualism:** The concept leads to the $L_2$ word via the $L_1$ word.

  e.g. An English speaker of Russian might connect the Russian word /kniga/ directly to the English word /buk/ rather than to the concept ‘book’.

  Weinrich defines ‘Bilingualism’ as “the practice of alternately using the languages”. (Weinrich, 1953, p.1)
3.3.1. Lado and Contrastive Analysis:

Robert Lado’s influential book ‘Linguistics Across Cultures’ (Lado, 1957) describes a system of Contrastive Analysis (CA) with the overall objective of helping language teaching. The book lays down how to carry out a rigorous step by step comparison of L₁ and L₂ in terms of:

i. phonology

ii. grammar

iii. writing systems

iv. cultures.

He describes how Spanish learners add an “e” before English consonant clusters starting with /s/ so that /sku:l/ becomes /esku:l/ in order to conform to the syllable structure of Spanish. The most difficult areas are those that differ most from the L₁. Consequently language teaching should concentrate on points of difference.

The procedure involved first describing comparable features of the two languages. (E.g. Tense, Verbs, Consonant Clusters etc), and then comparing the forms and resultant meanings in order to spot mistakes that would predictably give rise to interference.

3.3.2. Error Analysis
The next paradigm to replace CA was Error Analysis (EA). Error Analysis involves first independently or ‘objectively’ describing the learner’s Interlanguage (IL) (a term used by Selinker for the L2 learner’s independent language system), followed by a comparison of the two, so as to locate mismatches. The Interlanguage concept provided SLA research (Second Language Acquisition research) with an identifiable field of study.

Selinker’s research methodology is concerned with the description of learner’s speech. If a child says, “This mummy chair”, it is interpreted as ‘evidence’ that he/she is in the process of acquiring language. Similarly a sentence such as “You didn’t can throw it” should not be considered a mistake so much as a sign of the L2 learner’s own Interlanguage. The L2 learner’s sentence is correct in terms of the learner’s own Interlanguage grammar. Sentences produced by L2 learners are signs of their underlying Interlanguage, not of their deficient control of the L2. This led to the complete methodology for studying Second Language Acquisition known as Error Analysis (EA), which approaches L2 learning through a detailed analysis of the learner’s own speech.

Corder proposed three stages of Error Analysis:

a. Recognition of Idiosyncrasy
The researcher looks at the learner’s sentence to see if it conforms to the $L_2$ grammar. Such analysis involves reconstructing what the learner was attempting to say by asking him or her what was intended (an ‘authoritative reconstruction’), or by inferring the learner’s intentions from our interpretation of the whole content of situation (a ‘plausible interpretation’) (Corder, 1973, p.274). This stage should yield a grammar of the learner’s own Interlanguage.

b. **Accounting for the Learner’s Idiosyncratic Dialect**

The researcher sees how the learner’s Interlanguage sentence can be described; the methodology of description is, needless to say, fundamentally that of bilingual comparison.

c. **Explanation**

The researcher tries to explain why the deviations from the grammar of the Second Language have arisen. The main explanation put forward by Corder(1971,1973) is interference from $L_1$ ‘habits’ on the lines of Lado, and learning by ‘hypothesis testing’.

### 3.3.2.1. Error Analysis Methodology

The Error Analysis methodology, as systematized over the years, became a fruitful source of research ideas. In itself, Error Analysis was a methodology for dealing with data rather than a theory of acquisition. The facts to be explained are to be found in
the learner’s speech; the proper description of these suggests explanations in terms of the processes of L\textsubscript{2} learning and of their sources in the L\textsubscript{1} or L\textsubscript{2}. This method is a scientific one that tries to find regularities in the collection of facts. The method analyses the learner’s performance. A number of issues were raised by the early researchers concerning the relationship of the L\textsubscript{1} to the L\textsubscript{2}. They were:

i. Concept of Interference.

ii. Concept of Bilingualism

iii. The Nature of L\textsubscript{2} Learner’s Grammar.

Many of these ideas and much of the research methodology came out of contemporary First Language Acquisition Research (LAR). The popular research question was whether these two processes of L\textsubscript{1} and L\textsubscript{2} learning were in fact the same.

SLA research grew out of many language related disciplines. Language teaching was brought in by applied linguists trying to teach language through a better understanding of language learning. Knowing a Second Language is a normal part of human existence, even if few knew L\textsubscript{2} to the same extent as L\textsubscript{1}. All human beings are capable of acquiring and knowing more than one language, at least to some extent.

\textbf{3.4. Indian Bilingualism}
The Indian subcontinent can boast of a linguistically and culturally pluralistic society. English enjoys a special status in this pluralistic society and the socio-cultural context in which this language exists in India is different from that of The United States, Australia or Britain. The process of acculturation is such that Indians can talk in terms of an Indian English. Indian English has certain linguistic characteristics evident in:

i. the sound system (phonology)
ii. sentence construction (syntax)
iii. vocabulary (lexis)
iv. meaning (semantics).

The reasons for this are found in the history of the English Language in India.

3.4.1. English in India

The English Language came to India in three phases. The first phase was the missionary phase (when the Christian missionaries came to the Indian subcontinent to proselytize). The second phase was essentially that of local demand for English, during which prominent Indians such as Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772 to 1833) made efforts to persuade officials of the East India Company to impart instructions in English so that young Indians would be exposed to the scientific knowledge of the West. The third phase began after 1865 when the political manoeuvering resulted in the
stabilization of the Company’s authority. The ‘Minutes of Macaulay’ was passed on 2nd February, 1835. Macaulay’s aim, as he indicates in ‘The Minutes’, was to form a sub-culture in India: “a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect”.

Macaulay’s resolution formed the cornerstone of the implementation of a language policy in India, and ultimately resulted in the diffusion of Bilingualism in English. In the years that followed, Anglicisation of Indian education became greater and slowly English Language gained deeper roots in an alien linguistic, cultural, administrative and educational setting. By 1928, English had been accepted as the language of the elite, of the administration and of the Pan-Indian press.

3.4.2. Indian Bilinguals

If we analyse the group of learners learning English, we come upon an interesting state of affairs. We realise that there is a high incidence of multilingualism involving regional, social and institutionalized varieties. We also find the phenomenon of linguistic convergence i.e. the tendency for the languages in contact to adopt one another’s formal features, resulting in the formation of South Asian “linguistic area”. From the data obtained
on speaker-competence in different languages, it is seen that the presence of a substantial number of Minority Language speakers in every state and every district has given India the status of a multi-lingual state.

We find in India a complex pattern of variation within languages in an area. The types of variation include regional varieties; for example, the Malayalam spoken in the Southern districts of Kerala varies from that in the Northern districts and these vary from the type spoken in the Central districts of the state. We also have what can be termed as the Caste Dialects; the Malayalam of the Namboodiris in Kerala and that of the Muslims are noted for their special characteristics. The other communities (the Christians, the Ezhavas etc) have their own distinctive flavour. A similar situation prevails in the case of other languages in the country. The speaker of a Minority Language (e.g. the Malayalee in Maharashtra) tends to be bilingual in the Regional Dialect of the dominant language of the area for economic reasons. He knows the standard variety of the Regional Language as well as Hindi and/ or English. In addition many Indians speak one or more languages of the Minorities in their region or the language of the neighbouring state. Some speakers learn one of the Classical Languages, like Sanskrit or Arabic.
The incidence of Bilingualism is substantially higher among the speakers of Minority Languages than among the speakers of the Regional Languages. English and the Classical Languages are learned through formal instruction, while Bilingualism in the Regional Languages and Hindi are acquired as much through informal contact as at school.

Studies conducted by a team of linguists from the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, provided an extensive and detailed picture of languages used in a multilingual state. In interpersonal communications the Regional Language is used in the family, though English is used in educated urban families. There is a choice between Regional Language and English in urban areas for the educated people in “business transactions”. Religious ceremonies are carried out in a Classical Language. In the Mass Media, English, Hindi, and the Regional Language claim a major role with Regional Dialects and Minority Languages playing a minor role. The emphasis is on English and Hindi for Pan-Indian programmes and the Regional Languages for State-wide programmes. Hindi is extremely popular in the entertainment media. Hindi movies and film songs find wide patronage all over India. English movies are popular in urban areas.

In the formal domain, a two-tier system is found. The Regional Dialects, Minority Languages and the Regional Languages
are used in communication at the lower levels of administration, courts of law, and education. The Regional Language is also used in written communication at this level. However, English is still the preferred choice of language in the written mode and at the higher levels, while the Regional Languages are increasingly used in education up to the Pre-degree level (Plus two or Higher Secondary). English is the primary medium of instruction at the graduate and post-graduate levels, especially in Science, Engineering and Medicine. Thus the Minority Languages/ the Regional Languages and English stand in an ascending hierarchy of functional roles, with Hindi in the same position as the Regional Languages in the Hindi areas and below the Regional Languages in non-Hindi areas.

The use of different languages carries different connotations. The Regional Languages are symbols of cultural identity. English is associated with upward socio-economic mobility, national mobility, authority, modernization and westernization. Hindi carries connotations of nationalism and is considered a politically advantageous asset. The educated speakers of Indian Languages use English for academic and professional use. An important aspect of Bilingual Language is the use of mixed codes involving the two separate languages.
The Indian English speaking community spectrum comprises at one end Educated Indian English and at the other end Kitchen English. The standard variety of Indian English is used by those bilinguals who rank around the central point on the cline of Bilingualism. English is the main medium of instruction in most institutions of higher learning at the post-graduate level. It is taught as a Second Language at every stage of Education in all States of India. English has been the most powerful tool, both before and since India’s independence, as a medium for inter-state communication. Educated Indians show variation in the spoken form of English. Their spoken language shows characteristics of class, area, and education. An Indian English user’s English might display features which reveal his/her Mother Tongue. The phenomenon of variation is not unique to Indian English. However, there are characteristics which educated users of English share. Therefore, an educated Indian English speaker instinctively recognizes another Indian English speaker.

The study of Indian English is essentially a study of a Second Language in a bilingual or a multilingual context. In such a context the concept of ‘transfer’ or ‘interference’ has to be considered. The transfer is generally from a dominant language (Mother Tongue) to a less dominant language (the Second Language). We thus find the Indianisation of English. However, there are cases of Englishisation
of Indian Languages too. This influence is seen on their sound systems, grammar and, of course, on their vocabularies (Kachru 1978 and 1979). The extent of interference is closely linked with Bilingualism.

### 3.4.3. Indian English

The peculiar features of Indian English come under various categories depending on the areas of difference.

**a. Systemic differences**

They refer to the differences in the vowels and consonants between Indian English and British Standard English (RP). Some of the consonants of English (RP) [  ] do not occur in the Indian Languages. This leads to the substitution of [  ] for these sounds in Indian English.

**b. Distributional Differences**

They are seen in the distribution of the Consonant Clusters. The distribution of Consonant Clusters [ st, sk, sp ] in English is different from that of the Indian languages. So we find that English ‘station’, ‘school’, ‘speech’ are pronounced as [ istei n ], [ isku:l ], [ ispi:t ].

**c. Series Distribution**
This means that a complete series of consonants from an Indian Language are transferred into Indian English. This is seen in the substitution of a retroflex series for the English alveolar sounds. Another area of difference is the deviation in the stress system. English is a Stress-timed Language as opposed to most other Indian Languages which are syllable-timed. This difference between English and the Indian Language results in distinct rhythms.

d. Differences in Rhythms

In Syllable-timed Rhythms, the arrangement is between long and short syllables. In a Stress-timed Language, the Rhythm is between stressed and unstressed syllables. This is one of the main factors which affect the intelligibility between an Indian English speaker and a native English speaker (Bansal 1969 and Nelson 1982).

e. Grammatical Characteristics

Certain grammatical characteristics also distinguish educated Indian English from the native varieties of English. Indian English has a tendency to use Complex Nouns and Verb Phrases and rather long sentences. At the Phrase level (Verb Phrase or Noun Phrase) the be+verb+ing construction is one in which the Indian English users ‘violate’ the selectional restrictions applicable to such constructions in the native varieties of English. As there are no such restrictions in the Indian Languages, the tendency is to use
the Progressive form in Indian English. Another feature is the use of the Articles ‘a’, ‘an’ and ‘the’. Dastoor (1954, 1955) has categorised Indian deviations in the use of the articles as “missing and intrusive”, “wrong, usurping and dispossessed articles” in Indian English.

The next characteristic, which distinguishes Indian English from the native is the formation of interrogative construction. Indian speakers do not change the position of the subject and auxiliary items: e.g. expressions like

“Where you are going?” are common.

The tag question also shows the Indian influence. The use of ‘no’ and ‘it’ in all tag questions are commonly seen.

e.g. “She has eaten, isn’t it?”

“You like it, no?”

Indian English has a lexis of its own. There are two characteristic types. A large part of Indian English vocabulary is used in Indian contexts alone. Another group of words has been assimilated in the lexicon of the English language, for example, words like ‘lathi-charge’, ‘tiffin carrier’, ‘brahminhood’, ‘coolidom’, ‘goondaism’ etc. It is however seen that Indian English is intelligible to all educated Indians, but is not intelligible at times to the native speaker, especially if there are certain typical features in pronunciation.
English continues to hold its ground in India. The diffusion of Bilingualism in English, creative use of English in the country and its use as a Pan-Indian link language have continued during the post Independence years. The spread of English has enabled educated Indians to exchange ideas in conferences and elsewhere. It has been a significant factor in the advancement of science and technology, commerce and industry, and law and administration. English has also made Indians aware of the strong currents of world culture.

In India the English language functions as a Second Language. It is used in cross-cultural contexts and in I.E.Writings. Indians are bilinguals in that they use English as a “complementary language” in typically Indian contexts. Studies of the Language have shown the role of the process of transference. This involves transfer of linguistic items, transfer of context etc. We also find contextualisation.

The Indian bilingual’s verbal repertoire has the following features:

i. It is complex and diverse

ii. It is high on the border areas

iii. Among the educated population there is a high incidence of multi-lingualism

iv. There is widespread use of ‘mixed’ language varieties
v. There is the tendency for languages in contact to adopt one another’s formal features.

The Indian bilingual learns the ‘Official Language’ i.e. the Language of the Federal Government- Hindi. He/She also learns the ‘Regional Language’ i.e. the Primary Language of the linguistically organised States (e.g. Gujarati in Gujarat, Malayalam in Kerala etc). He/She may also be a speaker of a ‘Minority Language’. In that case he/she tends to be a bilingual in the Regional Dialect of the dominant language of the area. Depending upon the extent of schooling attained, he/she may also know the standard variety of the Regional Language, as well as Hindi and/or English.

The speakers of the Minority Languages are aware of the limited utility of their languages and strive to equip themselves with linguistic skills that would enable them to transcend these limitations. This provides conditions for the use of mixed codes. The register range of Regional Languages expands because of the ‘modernisation’ process involving borrowings from English. An important aspect of bilingual use of mixed codes resulting in language types involving the combination of words, phrases, sentences from the separate languages within simple sentences resulting in ‘Hinglish’ (Hindi+ English), ‘Manglish’ (Malayalam + English) etc. Code-mixing (CM) has been recognised as an aspect of the proficient bilinguals’ language use. Code-mixing is an
interesting area of research in Indian Bilingualism, because India is an excellent testing ground for various types of hypotheses on this topic. It is also because of the varieties of bilingual situations found here.

An important result of research in this area is detailed ethnographic studies of the function of Code-mixing in stable urban and rural bilingual communities with different languages and populations with different educational and social backgrounds.

Some of the studies dealing with code-mixing and bilingual’s language use are the following:


Examples of Code-mixing are given below:

1. nam tande airport- ge hogiddare
   
   (My father has gone to the airport)

2. avaru committee chairman a:go:du nange istaillo
   
   (I don’t like his becoming the committee chairman)

   The above examples are from Kannada-English bilingual speech (Kamal K.Sridhar,1989).

3. tum nahi janti, he is chairman Mr.Mehta’s bestfriend.
(Don’t you know that he is the best friend of Chairman, Mr. Mehta)

4. khane ke liye weit mat karma.
   (Have lunch. Don’t wait for me).

   The above examples are from Hindi-English bilingual Speech (Braj B. Kachru, 1983).

5. meeting-kku yaarum varala
   (Nobody came for the meeting) – (Tamil-English bilingual speech)

6. namakku kuttikale paa:sa:kkam
   (We will give the students a pass) – (Malayalam-English bilingual speech).

7. enikku vendi waiteeyo?
   (Will you wait for me?) – (Malayalam-English bilingual speech).

   The last two examples are from this researcher’s observations of the Malayalee’s use of language.

   Code-mixing (CM) is extremely common among bilinguals. The bilingual has a remarkable ability to keep his language systems separate. It has been found that when all the participants in a speech situation share a bilingual background, CM becomes the norm rather than the exception. Code mixing refers to the transitions from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses etc)
of one language to using those of another within a single sentence. The primary language of the discourse is called the ‘host language’, and the source language of the mixed elements, the ‘guest language’. Even when there is extensive mixing of elements from another language, speakers and listeners usually agree on which language is being spoken in a given sentence or discourse.

Bilingualism, Code-mixing, and borrowings from those languages the speakers come in contact with, facilitate Error. This emphasises the need for a scientific description and classification of errors committed. It is imperative that an Educator, who is also an Investigator, must be aware of the Error Analysis Methodology that Second Language Acquisition Research has provided. A study of the techniques of description and classification adopted by other Applied Linguists is appropriate in this context.