CHAPTER VII
PATTERNS OF INTER-ETHNIC COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNICATIVITY

“If you want to converse with me, define your terms — Voltaire

The peopling of Manipur (described in Chapters III&IV) as seen today has been the result of gradual influx of Tibeto-Burman branch of languages at different periods of time, more frequent in the late 19th century. This unique pattern of peopling or ethnic distribution, in which each ethnolingual community concentrates in a discrete territory thereby maintaining distance from each other, has designed and moulded a remarkable inter-ethnic communication pattern. It also resulted in a significant variation of linguistic diversity. As analysed in Chapter V, the diversity index greatly varies within the state ranging from near homogeneity (0.04 in Thoubal sub-division) to almost total diversity (0.90 in Churachandpur sub-division) or non-communicativity. Therefore, an attempt is made to illustrate how these myriad ethnic groups communicate in such areas, where each speech community is distinctly placed and linguistic diversity much more than simple.

VII.1. METHODOLOGY:

Besides illustrating the peculiar inter-ethnic communication encountered, it is also intended to examine and measure the potential of a particular language or dialect to act as means of communication in the state or within any society. The technique to measure ‘index of communication’ confusion is derived from Greenberg’s diversity methods to assess the probabilities of communication - later extended by Lieberson (1904) Kuo 1979). Kuo (1979) used the extended version in Singapore and West Malaysia, both being multilingual societies. The extended formula of Kuo (1979:329), also called “Communicativity

1. Greenberg’s H. method (or Index of communication) measures communication between two or more spatially delineated populations or between society, defined subpopulation or a larger aggregate.
Index or Index I is:

\[ I_{am} = (P_{am})^2 \]

In this formula, \( P_{am} \) is the proportion of a given population and, who can understand a some language \( a \). Kuo suggests that this index can also measure the potential of a given language as a medium for inter-ethnic communication and adjusted the formula to:

\[ I_{am} = (P_{am})(P_{an}) \]

Here, \( P_{am} \) is the proportion of people in group ‘\( m \)’ who know language ‘\( a \)’, and \( P_{an} \) is the proportion of people in group ‘\( n \)’ who know the same language.\(^3\)

VII.2. PATTERNS OF ETHNIC COMMUNICATION:

To derive a cogent illustration, the study of inter-ethnic communication patterns is examined at 3 main levels. They are -

1) Within a speech community (at the micro-level). A further examination is done (a) within one Kuki-Chin tribe, (b) within a Naga tribe, and (c) within Meitei group.

2) Inter-tribe communication (meso-level). Under this, three more sub-levels are identified - (a) among Kuki-Chin, (b) among Naga groups, and (c) between Kuki and Naga ethnic groups. and

3) Over all communication patterns in the State (at the macro-level), which includes both the native tongue speakers and the Indo-Aryans, etc. Here the pattern of communication observed in the state among its ethnic groups-viz. a) Meiteis, b) Kuki-chins, c) Nagas, d) ‘Panghans’ (Muslims), and e) Mayangs (outsiders) is analysed. It is therefore believed that this study on ethnic communication in a multilingual area will reveal the existence of diversity within a small community and area.

The study of inter-ethnic communication patterns in Manipur is mainly based on (a) participant observation, (b) (field work in some selected village),

(c) Census reports, especially 1961 data, (d) statistical techniques as formulated by Greenberg and Kuo, and (e) secondary sources like research papers, books, etc.

VII.2.A. COMMUNICATION PATTERN WITHIN A TRIBE (AT MICRO-LEVEL):

The tacit impression generally held is that similarity in speech or mother-tongue indicates homogeneity in culture and ethnicity of vis-a-vis. To a great extent it appears to be true, but not in a multi-speech area as encountered here. Often, similarity in speech does not necessarily mean homogeneity in innate traits or ethnic cohesion.

VII.2.A.(i). Within a Kuki-Chin Tribe:

Variations in the same speech can be seen within most Kuki-chin tribes. However, this does not mean that each clan has a separate mother-tongue or patois. Only in some communities, slight speech peculiarity mainly typical to a particular village, is noticed. The variations are usually phonetic rather than lexical or morphological and could not affect the inter-clan communication. In some cases, speed or flow, style of pronunciation, added-expressions, etc. are the differentiating elements. Therefore, they can not be called different dialects.

Within a Kuki-Chin tribe, dialect dissimilarity is uncommon. Cases of total unintelligibility have not been encountered or reported. Among the many Kuki-Chin speech groups about 3 of them have ‘within’ variations which as pointed out earlier, is only a village based. Otherwise, there exist no great differences that could incommodate communication.

Two main forms of speech can be associated with the Thadou speaking community.4 They are:

(i) Proper Thadou tongue, as spoken in Sadar Hills in North District. Speakers of this form use longer sentences, slower speed, more wavy flow, and (ii) the Haokip form. This variation is more coarse, faster, ends abruptly, usually with

4. Thadou dialect groups (some prefer it to Kuki) has the largest speakers among the tribal dialects. The geographical distribution has great impact upon the speech, especially the vocabulary and flow. The Thadou groups also appears to be the most “ethnoconscious” community among the tribal groups.
shorter sentences, and higher pitch. Most of its speakers are found in South, East, West, and Tengnoupal districts. They constitute about 70% of the Thadou-Kuki population. However, intra-clan communication is not impaired by such variations and the need for ‘link-dialect’ does not arise.

Similar kind of variations are also noticed within the Hmar and Paite dialects. Hmars are mainly found in Tipaimukh and Churachandpur sub-divisions. Within the Hmars it is believed that smaller clans like Thiek and RQl1a once possessed slightly different forms. But such variations seem to have disappeared.

Paite dialect is seen to have 3 varieties, usually village forms. But it must be noted that such variations reported do not have any impact on intra-clan communication. Speakers of this dialect concentrate densely in Thanlon and Churachandpur sub-divisions. The 3 forms reported are from the villages of (a) Bukpi, (b) Lamjang, and (c) Dapjal. Like in the case of the Thadou, the differences seem to be in the flow, speed and pronunciations.

The overall pattern of communication within a Kuki-Chin tribe (intra-clan or tribe) is illustrated by Fig. no. 32. Cases of variations within Thadou and Paite, the two prominent Kuki-Chin groups are shown below:

**COMMUNICATION WITHIN A CLAN/TRIBE (KUKI-CHINS)**

1. THADOU
   a) Thadou Proper  b) Haokip
2. PAITE
   a) Bukpi  b) Lamjang  c) Dapjal form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THADOU-KUKI</th>
<th>(PAITE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table no VII(1): shows the two speech communities of Kuki-Chins and its variations or forms. The arrows indicate direction of intelligibility.

**VII.2.A.(ii). Within a Naga Clan/Tribe:**

Interestingly, it appears that variations or village forms of speeches are

---

5. The three Paite forms of speech are named after the villages as Bukpi-Poo, Lamjang-pao, and Dapjal-poo. The term “poo” in all Kuki-Chins means “tongue” or speech. Such differences seen among the Kuki-Chins can be compared to English regional variations, as found in Australia, America, and England.
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found to be more and varied within a particular Naga community. In most cases, it is seen that most of the villages have their own variety usually unintelligible to others. The best example which illustrates the presence of various village speeches is encountered in East district, and to a lesser degree in West and North districts. Sometimes one wonders if the speeches/patois are ever related. The village forms are used mainly within the village, household, and between nearer kiths and kins. Therefore, this 'village patois' identify and determine the ethnicity of its speakers. Another remarkable phenomenon seen in this is the degree of unintelligibility among these speeches. Therefore, inter-village or inter-clan communication, which creates social distances, was infrequent and difficult. This necessitates the need for 'link-dialect', within and between the clans or villages. Hence, in most Naga areas the tongue of the dominant village or clan is adopted as the lingua-franca. And the speakers consequently identify themselves to that ethnicity. The best example of such incidence is found in East district. Here, although the area is multilingual the communication lacuna has been bridged with the use of Tangkhul as the koine dialekte throughout the district. Tangkhul dialect which is being used as link language appears to be the original patois of Ukhrul village. The survival and presence of myriad village speeches with discrete territorial extent within related communities often baffled scholars and they wondered if these speeches belong to a proto-language or were related at all.

Figure No. 33 highlights 2 important facets of communication patterns within the Tangkhuls. First, each village in East district has its own patois or village tongue, mainly used for communication within the village. Every village adopts Ukhrul patois (Tangkhul) for verbal interaction with outsiders or other villagers belonging to the same tribe and area. Secondly, only closely situated villages

---

6. The Greek term 'koine dialekte' is sometimes used in preference to its English translation 'common' (common tongue/dialect/language, etc.). 'koine' has thus come to refer a form of speech shared by people of different vernaculars—though for some of them the koine itself may be their vernacular (Petyt, 1980, p. 25).

7. Ukhrul was originally a large village. It is now a developing town and headquarter of the district, serving as the core or nodal centre.
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could communicate without any link-dialect. But this happens only in a few places. The reason for non-intelligibility could be because these communities must have, long ago, migrated together or belonged to the same family.

Another incident of "within differences" in speech is also seen in Tamenglong area, among the sub-clans of Kabui or Zeliangrongs. Way back in 1873 Brown, a Political Agent in Manipur, reported the presence of L.Clan wise dialects and the pattern of communication in such areas. He observed that "Among the three sub-divisions of the Kowpois tribe the language differ much; indeed, so great is the difference, that these sub-divisions have, in their intercourse with each other, to revert to the Manipur language as a means of communication. which language, it may be here remarked, is the lingua franca of these hills, and is spoken by many individuals among the tribes, especially those lying in more immediate contact with the Manipur valley". But in recent years the situation had changed. Instead of Meitei-Lon, the Tamenglon dialect or Rongmei has been widely spoken by most of the clans, whether related or not. This has been due to the resurgence of ethnicity and solidarity within the so-called 'Kabuis', who prefers to be named either 'Rongmeis' or 'Zeliangrongs'.

VII.2.B. INTER-TRIBE COMMUNICATION PATTERN (AT MESO-LEVEL):

The nature of inter-tribal patterns of communication, as depicted by Fig. nos. 34, 35, & 36, can be well comprehended only if one cares to study their past history. Among the tribals interaction was selective and occasional. It appears that differences in "cultural value or images" one has about the other groups, either influenced or created gaps in inter-ethnic interactions. Sometimes, a situation of "non-communication" among the tribes exist, and some tribes are unaware of the existence of other communities who have different dialects and settled far away within the state. Certain plausible explanations and reasons

---

8. For instance, Hundung Village in Ukhrul Central sub-division is claimed by some villagers to be their original or parent village. They believed they were dispersed from Hundung long time ago and settle in nearby villages.

put forth for such haphazard interactions or selectivity and limited communication among the tribes are, natural constraints (geographical location), the presence of intense ethnocentricism, animosity resulting to frequent raids and rendering enemies to slavery, etc., which ensued to 'head-hunting', — once a celebrated practice. Moreover, if one peruses their history, it is mainly filled with inter-tribe or clan warfares, raids, migration, etc.\textsuperscript{10} Therefore, the only time and type of interaction for most of the different ethnic communities was during war, raids, and negotiations. This insidious animosity was not only confined to inter-ethnic groups. Its presence could be felt, sometimes more intensely, even within the community or intra-tribe. Hence, inter-ethnic communication had been greatly attenuated, creating isolates within isolates and maintaining own speeches.

Inter-ethnic communication patterns in Manipur can be illustrated at three broad levels, which can be further analysed to expose 'within differences'. The three main broad patterns are- a) within the tribal groups, b) within Meitei community, and c) among the Other Indo-Aryan population. The patterns resulting from the analysis of these 3 broad levels is the actual communication scene in the State.

VII.2.B.(1). Communication Pattern Among Tribal Groups:

Generally, the entire tribal population\textsuperscript{11} in the state can be segmented into 1) Kuki-Chin groups, and 2) Nagas. All the major tribes have different languages and are dominant in specific areas. Therefore, the actual communication patterns in tribal areas illustrate a very interesting mosaic. As will be seen, space alone does not influence language, and in some cases, related dialects sharing a common culture tend to have greater inclination to fuse into a koine.

Patterns of inter-tribal communications can be shown at three levels,

\textsuperscript{10} History played a vital part in moulding the present inter-tribe communication patterns in the State. Besides, it is greatly felt that due to such animosity dialects or patois have concentrated undisturbed and survived undiluted after emerging as distinct village or clan speeches for several years. This resulted to frequent resurgence of new identity or ethnicity as encountered in these areas.

\textsuperscript{11} There are 29 scheduled tribes in Manipur. They constituted about 28 per cent (1981) of the total population. Each tribe has its own dialect which in most cases, has any similarity.
They are as follow - 1) within Kuki-Chin tribes, 2) within the Naga groups, and 3) between Kuki-Chin and Naga tribes. For a clearer comprehension, separate chart are provided (for each level) showing the patterns encountered and described.

VII.2.B.(1).(i). Inter-Tribe Communication within Kuki-Chins:

Of the total 29 recognised tribes, about 16 of them 12 can be classed as tribes or communities of Kuki-Chin group. Each has its own dialect and are found concentrated mainly in South, North, and Tengnoupal districts. However, Kukis are found clustering in all districts of Manipur. It appears that each speech community has been in contact for a long time, even before they entered Manipur - prior to the mid-Nineteen Century (around 1850) in Burma. In the course of their search for a new land, they migrated, settled down, re-migrated, got dislocated by tribal wars and raids, and later inhabited the present areas in succession at different points of time. The old-Kukis entered before the ‘new-Kukis’. They are mainly nomadic and their village sites are not permanent, unlike the Nagas. This migratory nature has its advantage. It especially effectuates verbal interaction or mutual intelligibility. Besides, the dialects are "genetically related" and frequent interactions have, to a certain degree, homogenized their lexical, phonetic, and other dialectal features. Many of them have common words and terms. Even the folklores or tales are similar. The degree of intimacy among the dialects is so great that it is quite difficult to distinguish which 'core vocabularies' are 'inherited' or 'acquired' from which dialect (Matisoff, J.A.: 1983, 60). Hence, the ethnolingual situation is not very involute and mutual intelligibility is common among the different clans or tribes.\(^{14}\)

The chart (Fig. no. 34) illustrates that the direction of intelligibility among the

---

12. Of late, some of the Kuki-Chin tribes have claimed to be Nagas. However, linguistically speaking, the claim do not hold water. This incident occurred due to resurgence of identity and ethnicity.

13. 'Genetically related' means dialects belonging to the same family, and assumed to be originating from a single 'proto-language' (ancestor language).

14. Though communication or ethnolingual situation is not very complicated or involute, locational difference do hinder mutual intelligibility to a great extent. E.g. Kuki-Chins of North district often fail to comprehend other dialects, though closely related, of South district.
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Kuki-Chins is multidirectional. It means that each dialect can be understood, at least partially, without adopting a 'koine' or lingua franca. An exceptional case can be encountered with the Koms and Hmars—bordering Mizoram. These two groups have closer affinity than any other dialects and both have/use the alphabet 'r', uncommon among other Kuki-Chins. In their case, mutual intelligibility is within the clans and direct verbal contact with other groups requires 'link dialect', or bilingualism on the part of the smaller groups. However, it does not mean that core vocabularies, phonology and grammatical features, etc. are entirely different. Their dialects could be mildly understood by others. This happens due to lack of frequent interaction, as the Kom and its allied groups concentrate in areas away from the main Kuki-Chin core areas. They are mainly found clustering at the foot of the hills, nearer to the plain areas - between the Meiteis and the other tribals. This necessitates, as shown in the Chart (Fig. no 34), the use of a third dialect or speech like Meitei-Lon or English (among the elites or educated few) to serve as lingua franca. However, this study discovers that most speakers of Kom, Aimol, Koireng, etc. could speak other dialects of Kuki-Chins. However, they pretend not to know, or hesitate to speak other dialects, if and when ethnic status or identity seems threatened. Such a situation of shifting ethnicity and clanism is quite prevalent, and of late, some of them claim to be Nagas.

Communication among Kuki-Chin group is not complicated, especially in North, South and Tengnoupal areas, because the frequency of interaction is great. Their communication pattern is also vividly depicted by South district, especially in Churachandpur sub-division. Here most of the 17 Kuki-Chin tribes are concentrated within their own exclusive area. But a third dialect is not adopted or regarded as essential for communication.

VII.2.B.(1). (ii). Inter-Tribe Communication within Nagas:

As illustrated in earlier Chapters on ethnic classification and linguistic diversity, the lingual mosaic among or within the Nagas of Manipur appears to
be more involute than among their counterparts, the Kuki-Chins. The main Naga speeches are Tangkhul, Kabui, Mao, Maram, and Kaccha Naga (mainly Liangmeis). Each of them has a distinct core territory, where they are almost exclusive, without any discrete peripheries or areas of clustering. Among the Nagas, inter-tribe intermingling in a village is rather rare. Most of the villages are ‘monolingual’ or ‘single-patois unit’ and each village has a distinct tongue or patois different, even from the nearest village-as encountered in the East.

Linguistically, the Naga dialects fall under two sub-branches of Naga language (Grierson, G.A.:1903). They are -(a) Naga-Kuki sub-group (Kabui, Khoirao, Kacha-Naga), and (b) Naga-Kuki sub-group (Tangkhul, Mao, Maram, etc.). These divisions suggest that the dialects are not ‘cognate’ as experienced among the Kuki-Chins. Differences in core vocabularies and other features, coupled with inter-tribe animosity have distanced people and led to maintenance of village speeches undiluted for years.

The ‘not-too-amicable’ ethnolinguistic situation experienced in the state necessitates the use of link-language in this area. Thus, the Nagas rely more on the use of ‘Meitei-Lon’ for communication, within and among themselves. It should be noted that Meitei-Lon has become a lingua franca out of necessity or compulsion due to the presence of myriad dialects among the tribals. But the language itself as does not ascribe ‘prestige’ or social status to the speakers.

Distribution of different Naga tribes in the state illustrates area-wise dominant dialects. In the North Mao, Zemi, and Maram dialects are widely spoken; in the West, mostly Ruongmei and Liangmei; in the East it is mainly Tangkhul; and in Tengnoupal areas those dominant are Maring and Lamgang. Most of the predominant dialects have an exclusive territorial boundary. Generally, most of them do not have shared morphology, vocabulary, etc. and therefore cannot be fused to form a common koine. Thus, Meitei-Lon has been widely used for wider communication. Of late, English has gained tremendous popularity, especially among the educated elite. The trend shows that it can very soon
equal Meitei-lon, especially for inter-tribe communication. The pattern described above is shown by the Fig. no. 35.

VII.2.B.(1).(iii). Inter-Tribe Communication Between Kuki-Chins and Nagas:

History apprised us that usually the inter-tribe interactions in the state (both within and between Kukis and Nagas) was seldom and never amiable. Speakers of the same dialect group cluster themselves in a discrete space. Besides, languages do not mix well and establish cultural boundaries. If spatially dynamic it leads “to occupy a geographical niche that is exclusively its own; languages reject other languages” (Laponce, J.A.: 1984; p.92). Within the population, “to speak the same language expresses solidarity and differences expresses distance or even hostility” (Leach, E.R.: 1954). Thus, many distinct “speech niches” or isolates are encountered in tribal areas and inter-tribe communication (especially among unrelated dialect groups) was sometimes not possible. In most situations, communication among members of sub-group generally takes place in the language of the sub-group itself.

As described earlier, intense inter-tribe animosity once prevailed in the state. However, time brought reforms and changes. Today, no community lives in complete isolation and inter-ethnic communication or interactions have been more frequent, with greatly reduced misunderstandings and ethnic tensions. It is made possible, largely, because of increase in literate or educated population and other socio-economic pressures. Besides, the impulses of modern technology-leading to better livings, perceptions and developments-brought myriad people together, which allowed speakers of different tongues to pursue a common goal.

Fig. No. 35 depicts inter-tribal communication patterns as experienced today. The graphic presentation reflects that communication do exist among the various ethnic groups inhabiting the hilly areas. But interaction could only be effectively transmitted with the use of Meitei-Lon and English as link languages. The preference given to English is a recent phenomenon, exclusive to the
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educated few or elites. In some cases, certain communities deliberately prefer English to Meitei-Lon because of ethnic prejudicism, and fear that when in contact the dominant language tends to suppress the weaker one. Therefore, language being the main ethnic indicator, every community wants its survival, and to maintain and guard their own linguistically homogeneous territory. It must be noted that although inter-ethnic communication occurred, as described here, complete intelligibility or interaction does not prevail. Still, for many people inter-communication is difficult if they happen to live in remote areas, away from the Meitei speakers and other speech groups. This means that only a small percentage of people from different speech communities interact, as will be illustrated by the number of bi-linguals in each group. Even the number of bilinguals from the different districts are very less. Therefore, it can be stated that inter-ethnic communication do exist in all the areas but within a limited population. The degree and density of bilingualism and its impact on moulding a link language in the state will be better comprehended from an analysis of index of communication and 'communicativity', in the following pages.

VII.B.(2). WITHIN MEITEI/CASTE COMMUNITIES:

Unlike among the tribals, communication, within the different Meitei castes, patterns rather favourably without any hindrance.

The degree of intelligibility within the group is very high. The need for a link language does not arise. Such a situation of total intelligibility is possible due to intense pressure exerted by the dominant tongue, Meitei-Lon. Besides, religious elements and size of population greatly steer the societal behaviours. Meiteis are mainly Hindus and the most dominant community. They alone constitute about 68 percent of the total population. Their proselytisation to Hindu religion created divisions within the community. Those who refused to convert are not

15. Detail statistics on bilingualism is available for 1961. Most of the major groups have very less percent of bilinguals. Tangkhul have about 30.4, Thadou with 32 percent, Mao with 9.5 percent. Those with comparatively higher bilinguals are Kom (40.6), Maring (53.9), Anal (57.62), and Vaiphei (40.0). All the bilingual population mainly speak Meitei-Lon.
considered as pure Meitei. They are those who constitute the present Scheduled Caste population in the state and are 7 in number. Of these, some of them have separate dialects but are not conspicuous. These dialects, like the tribal speeches, have discrete territories where they are dominant and are spoken in its undiluted form. The two dialects are found among/in Sekmai and Andro inhabitants. These communities are considered to be 'impure' and seem to profess a different primitive type of religion.

Brown (1874) recorded that "The Loe’ee is not recognised as a pure Manipuri; they appear to be descendants of the former inhabitants of Moirang, one of the original tribe which formerly occupied the valley of the south.....the name Loe’ee or “subdued”, which was given them after their subjection...... Manipuris are frequently degraded to Loe’ee as punishment....... The Loees appear to have a separate language. One village of them called Sengmai, speak a language only understood by themselves; this language is said to have affinity with the Burmese". But the presence of distinct dialects could not affect seriously the within communication, due to the fact that these dialects are rendered insignificant or weaken by the pressures exerted by the dominant Meitei-Lon. However, in the villages the patois are preserved and used effectively.

VII.B.(3). COMMUNICATION WITHIN NON-NATIVES:

Inter-ethnic communication among the different Indo-Aryan speech groups (and between them and the native population) reflects a slightly unusual pattern. The main communities found in Manipur with varying population are Bengali, Punjabi, Hindi speakers, and Telugu. They are all emigrants mainly engaged in trade and commerce, services, labours, etc. Collectively, they are not significant in terms of population, but contribute largely to the economy. The

16. Scheduled Castes constitute roughly 2 percent of the population. The Castes are: 1) Dhupi or Dhobi, 2) Lois (spelled Loe’ee by R.Brown: 1874), 3) Muchi or Ravidas, 4) Namasudra, 5) Patni, 6) Sutradhar, and 7) Yaihibi.
18. The Hindi speakers consist of Bhojpuri, Garhwali, Khariboli, Maithili, Marwari, Rajasthani, etc.
1961 census showed that bilinguals among the Indo-Aryans is comparatively less. Even among the bilinguals, people speaking local tongues are very less. The main tongue preferred and spoken widely happens to be Hindi and English.

Gumperz (1969) reminded us that "...... no human group of any permanence can exist without regular and frequent communication". Though there exist linguistic differences between the Indo-Aryans and native population, communication or interaction do prevailed by learning the second useful language, for mutual benefits and to ease ethnic tensions. As Tabouret-Keller (1968) puts it. "All migrants into a different speaking area have this in common: they cannot avoid acquiring a more or less thorough knowledge of the language of the country of their adoption. But we also notice their need to keep up atleast language-links with the land of their origin." He also believes that the factor most fundamentally influencing speech configuration is the social necessity for the spoken use of second language. However, this social necessity is different in rural and urban environs. Interaction is much more frequent though mostly isolated to commercial purposes in the urban areas. Here, the common link language used is Meitei-Lon, which is followed closely by the use of Hindi, especially in Imphal area. But among the Indo-Aryans themselves the link language is Hindi and no any other tongue.

Local variation in communication pattern is seen between the tribals and Indo-Aryans. For example, in Churachandpur town, there is no common language. Since dialects are closely related, degree of mutual intelligibility is high in which no link language is required. Therefore, this situation compelled the Indo-Aryans to acquire a second language, any local tongue, for better interaction. In tribal areas the required second tongue is usually the dominant local vernacular and not Meitei-Lon, though used as lingua franca in the state. Meitei-Lon cannot be


the link language in most of the districts because the hill inhabitants themselves are not fluent with the language, and other local tongues are more prevalent.

VII.2.C. OVERALL COMMUNICATION PATTERN IN THE STATE:

From the above description on inter-ethnic communication patterns, it is fairly clear that though the areas have several dialects, where ethnic bilinguals are comparatively less, communication do prevailed. The patterns described here is the communication situation prevailing among the five different ethnolingual groups in the state, i.e. a) Meitei, b) Kuki-Chins, c) Nagas, d) Panghans, and e) Mayangs. A detail description of each group is been attempted in Chapters III and IV. It is found that each speech community has distinct area concentration where each group is absolutely dominant. Therefore, as illustrated in the above pages, communication patterns itself differently in the districts and among the various ethnic groups.

Figure No. 36 illustrates the overall communication patterns observed among the different, linguistically unrelated, communities in Manipur. As the chart shows, the option available to them is either Meitei-Lon or English for wider inter-ethnic intelligibility. It is interesting to note that the two tongues used as lingua franca have their own distinct speakers or users. The first tongue Meitei-Lon, generally speaking, is the most widely used by all the groups. But mainly spoken in Central district, where it accounted for more than 95%. It is even used by tribals, especially in the rural areas. On the other hand English has mainly 'elite' speakers and its usage also assigns certain social standing among the speakers. Besides, since English is the medium of instruction in most of the educational institutions and emerges as the second official language in the state, superceding Meitei and Hindi in government offices, etc. the number of its speakers has increased considerably. One advantage English has over Hindi or Meitei-Lon is the increasing preference shown by most of the tribal elites. However, the spoken English as used by the people needs serious modification or regulation.
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The popularity of English as compared to other languages like Hindi and Meitei-on in the tribal areas—can be attributed to two vital reasons. First is the role played by educational establishments in the areas. Most schools have Christian underpinnings where the medium of instruction is English. Besides, English appears to have wider utility than others. The second reason is rather local. As encountered among the ethnic groups and in their areas, only native speeches are dominant. Bilingualism or multilingualism is a common phenomenon. The trend of bilingualism, however, has an interesting pattern. For instance, in Kuki-Chin areas the people are already bi- or multilinguals even before coming into contact with Meitei-On, Hindi or English, though in their own niches they use one tongue. Then, later in schools or market areas they pick up English or Meitei-On. Since the children are first of all sent to schools, they learn English first. Hence English has more speakers and its popularity greater than Meitei-On or Hindi.

Broadly speaking, all the speech groups have a sizable population of bilinguals. But the trend or situation leading to it has an interesting pattern, which in fact affected the communication scene:-

(a) Among the tribals, the second tongue usually learned or spoken is another tribal/clan speech in the neighbourhood or within the area. Then, in due course, the child picks-up the third language in schools or other places. This usually happens to be English or Meitei-on, depending on the situation. Gradually the child becomes multi-lingual.

(b) To the Manipuri community the situation is the opposite. A Meitei child can directly learns English or Hindi as the second tongue outside his locality. Bilingualism in this case is against the tribal languages. So, bilingualism or multilingualism to Meiteis means rather fluency in English or other Indian languages and not towards the tribal dialects.

(c) The pattern is slightly different with the Mayangs or speakers of Indo-Aryan or Dravidian languages. They are mainly traders, army personnel, or government servants. So, even before coming to Manipur they are already
bilinguals. To them, the sources of multilingualism could be towards most ethnic dialects, depending on their settlement. But since all of them come first to Central district, they first learn Manipuri. Later on the scope of multilingualism and fluency expands as they reside in the state.

Next to English, Hindi has a large population, and is widely used for communication within Indo-Aryan groups. The use of Hindi is therefore limited within Mayangs and in commercial ventures. Somehow, it fails to assert itself among the local/native inhabitants, except with the Meiteis. Nayar (1969) observed that "In the eastern zone, the people of Manipur are by far the most enthusiastic about Hindi except for those hill tribes which are under the influence of Christian missionaries and consequently favour English."\(^{21}\) However, the popularity of English will not be prophelactic or an elixir to the tribal's dialectal problems, despite its convenience.

The magnitude of dialectal diversity ensued to the emergence of unique ethnic communication patterns. As depicted by communication at different levels the territorial discreteness of speeches, coupled with historical settings appear to widen inter-ethnic interactions which greatly affected the socio-economic standard. Dialect seems to function as ethnic boundary and hence each group maintains its identity. It also acts as a indicator or marker of social categories, maintenance and manipulator of social relationships and networks within and among the population (Saville-Troike: 1982, 21 & 28). This examination apparently reflects the nature of ethnic socio-psychology or behavior and placed the inhabitants in isolation for decades. However, gradual contacts brought discernible changes. Although the state remained a multispeech area, inter-ethnic animosities, hiatus in communication, etc., are slowly subsiding, paving way to better and meaningful relationships.

---

VII.3. MEASURING "COMMUNICATIVITY":

After examining and grasping the actual inter-ethnic communication patterns in the state, it will be pertinent to illustrate the actual medium of communication. Therefore, as an appendage to the above exploration, it is intended to measure the index of communication and communicativity. The formulae or methods use are those formulated (or extended/modified) by Greenberg (1956), Lieberson (1964), and Kuo (1979). These methods of measurement are the best available quantitative tools. Fasold (1984) summed up their importance stating, "The Greenberg-Lieberson diversity and communication indexing methods are the most sophisticated tools for the measurement of social multilingualism and communication yet available, and their value was extended by Kuo's 'index of communicativity'. The Greenberg-Lieberson indexes can be modified to take multilingualism and partial interlanguage intelligibility into account, but usually data required by these modifications are not available." Therefore, these methods are applied here to enable us to endorse the communication patterns analysed and help in explaining the involute and interesting ethnolingual mosaic in the state.

Two important features of communication is intended to be shown or exhumed by adopting these formulae. The main intentions are -a) 'to measure and illustrate the potential of a particular language to act as the means of communication in a society' and b) to assess "the value of a given language as a medium for inter ethnic communication" in the state and among different ethnic groups (Fasold: 1984, p.133). Besides, it is believed that the formulas will also exhibit clearly the diversity and "communication between two or more spatially delineated populations or between socially defined subpopulations of a larger aggregate" (Lieberson: 1964, p.526).

Data for computing indexes of communicativity is mainly based on 1961
census, and partially on 1971. Only 1961 census reports gave detailed statistics on bilingualism. Hence, being left with no alternative, the whole shebang is derived from census reports of that year. Besides, the analysis is interlarded with recent situations as encountered in some selected villages, i.e. during 1987-89.

VII.3.(a). Density and Distribution of Bilinguals:

Before computing communicativity levels in the State, it will be relevant to highlight the distribution and density of bilinguals as reported by 1961 census. Knowledge of the strength of ‘persons speaking a language subsidiary to mother-tongue’ and its area-wise population will explain clearly why effective communication among groups could not be effectuated as anticipated.

Strength of bilinguals are, as shown by the census, usually few—be it among the tribals, within meiteis, and other population. Even the district-wise percentage of bilinguals are insignificant. Table below gives details of bilingualism among the major ethnic groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect/Speech Group</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent Monolinguals</th>
<th>Percent Bilinguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEITEI</td>
<td>5,02,838</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TANGKHUL</td>
<td>43,943</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>30.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THADOU</td>
<td>30,205</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KABUI</td>
<td>29,219</td>
<td>77.67</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MAO</td>
<td>28,810</td>
<td>90.82</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. KUKI</td>
<td>17,792</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PAITE</td>
<td>17,029</td>
<td>80.20</td>
<td>19.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HMAR</td>
<td>15,365</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NEPALI</td>
<td>13,571</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. BENGALI</td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. KACHA-NAGA</td>
<td>9,734</td>
<td>76.84</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL TRIBES</td>
<td>2,49,049</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>28.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1,79,006)
Table No VII (2): From the above figure it is clear that bilingualism is not prevalent among the different groups. Even groups with high density do cross 35%.

DISTRICT-WISE BILINGUALS (1961)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Bi-Linguals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. STATE</td>
<td>7,80,087</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>111,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CENTRAL</td>
<td>5,32,739</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>46,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UKHRUL</td>
<td>48,590</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>13,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MAO &amp; SADAR</td>
<td>72,039</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>14,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TAMENGLONG</td>
<td>36,518</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>5,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CHURACHANDPUR</td>
<td>62,418</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>17,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TENGNOUPAL</td>
<td>27,679</td>
<td>46.41</td>
<td>12,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. VII (3): Shows the bilingual situation in the state. Bilinguals in the state is not very large, least in Central district.

VII.3.(b). Computation of Communicativity Indexes:

As mentioned earlier, it is intended to measure the potential of a given language/dialect to perform as "medium of communication". Therefore, Kuo’s Index I, defined as the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a certain group or groups can communicate with each other in a given language” (Kuo: 1979, 328), is adopted. Also to examine whether "other native", can function effectively as alike for inter-group communication.

Data on different languages/dialects suggests that inter-tribe’s speech competence is low and insignificant. Therefore, communicavity index values of Meitei-Lon, English and Hindi is measured. Mainly, Meitei-Lon communicavity in the state will be stressed, and its potential to act as the link language examined. Meiteis are the most populous group and the language is spoken by 73.43% of the total population. Hence, Meitei-Lon has the potential and possibility to act
as language for wider communication. The analysis will illustrate the competence of Meitei-Lon both among the major speech groups and in the different districts.

VII.3.(b).(i). Techniques of Communicativity:

Data showing language ‘competence’ the different speech groups are presented below: (on this data the index of communicativity is computed). This table shows the percentage in the total population. Another table is also given to indicate the strength among the bilinguals.

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION SPEAKING OTHER LANGUAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>MEITEI</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>HINDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEITEI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TANGKHUL</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THADOU</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KABUI</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MAO</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. KUKI</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PAITE</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HMAR</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NEPALI</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. BENGALI</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL TRIBES</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. VII (4): Illustrates the strength of different ethnic groups who can understand the 3 main languages. The major trend shown is towards Meitei-Lon, except for Nepalis who have more Hindi speakers.

Table above appears to suggest that only very few of the population from the different ethnic groups could understand other languages. It is therefore reflecting that the inter-ethnic communication scene will be pathetic or at a low note which will be better understood from the ‘index’ results.

The formula for communicativity (index I) of a particular language ‘a’;
within a given group \( m \) is simply,
\[ I \text{am} = (P \text{am})^2 \]

The possible values from this formula range from 0 to 1, which means that values nearer to zero indicate fewer or insignificant persons in the community who can speak the language in question. Here, the 'given language' to which communicativity is measured is Meitei-Lon. The value of Index \( I \) reaches unity when every individual in the community can speak the tongue.

Example: Since 28.31\% of Tangkhul population could understand Meitei-Lon (based on Table No. VII (4), the communicativity Index of Meitei (among Tangkhuls in Manipur) is \((.283)^2 = 0.08\). Another example can be given for the total tribal population. In 1961, the tribal population speaking Meitei was 23.4\% (out of the total tribal population). Hence, Index \( I(\text{communicativity}) \) of Meitei (among the tribals) has a very low value of 0.054 (i.e. \((0.234)^2 = 0.054\)). In other words, the probabilities in both cases, are 0.08 and 0.054 respectively, that two randomly selected adults could understand each other in Meitei-Lon. The indexes reflect a very low communicativity of Meitei-Lon among the tribals, although it is the most dominant ethnolinguial group/sub-population. However, the picture is different among bilinguals as described in the following pages.

VII.3.(a).(ii). Communicativity Among Bilinguals:

A different and much higher values of index \( I \) are highlighted from the bilingual population. The table below (Table no. VII. 5) presents bilingual population by ethnic communities.

**PERCENTAGE OF ETHNIC-WISE BILINGUALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups Bilinguals</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Meitei</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEITEI</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>46.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TANGKHUL</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THADOU</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KABUI</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table no VII.5: The table shows that most bilinguals of the various ethnolinguistic groups speak Meitei-Lon, except Nepalis and Bengalis. These two have larger speakers of Hindi and English.

Calculation of Index I from among different bilinguals of each group indicates better communicativity than as seen in the above case. In this case also the same Sample groups are taken. Therefore, Index I for Tangkhul is as follows. Here, out of the total bilinguals, 93 percent understand Meitei-Lon. The communicativity index of Meitei-Lon within Tangkhul bilinguals is (.93)^2=0.865. For the whole tribal population Index I of Meitei-Lon is (81.64%)(.816)^2=0.66. The probability is 0.86 and 0.66 respectively, which is very high. The Index values obtained from bilinguals (towards Meitei-Lon communicativity) give very high probability for all the ethnolinguistic communities as given in Table no. VII.7. The values suggest that the potential of Meitei-Lon as link language is great and seems to be the only language readily available. Hindi and English have very little potential, but much greater than other native dialects, in general.

INDEX I VALUES (GENERAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Group</th>
<th>MEITEI</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>HINDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEITEI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TANGKHUL</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THADOU</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KABUI</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above figures are the values of Index I for the different ethnolinguistic groups. Among the 3 languages, Meitei has the highest Index value.

In general the communicativity of Manipuri is much greater than Hindi or English. For Hindi and English the probabilities indicated are very insignificant. Their communicativity potential is negligible. It should be noted that though Meitei has greater potentiality as shown by the values, it is not popular among the ethnic groups. The probability of randomly choosing two persons who can communicate in Meitei-Lon is rather slim, especially among the tribals. But the situation is much better among its bilinguals.

A different scene of ‘language competence’ among the bilinguals is presented by the table below. Here the communicativity (in Meitei) is quite high and the ‘Index’ values mostly show closer to unity or 1.

**COMMUNICATIVITY INDEX AMONG BILINGUALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Meitei</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MEITEI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TANGKHUL</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. THADOU</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. KABUI</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MAO</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. KUKI</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table No. VII. 7: As depicted by this table, most of the ethnic bilinguals could well understand/communicate in Meitei. The probabilities are very high, especially with Tangkhuls, Kabuis, and Kutis.

From the above measurements, it is evident that though Meitei is the most dominant or populous ethnic group in the state its popularity in the tribal areas is not impressive. However, as seen from the two communicativity computations, there are no other languages besides Meitei-Lon that has the highest potential to act as medium for wider communication. Though most communities have very less bilinguals, almost all of its bilinguals could well comprehend Meitei-Lon.

3.(b)(iii). Inter-Ethnic Communicativity Situation:

Index I is also applicable to illustrate inter-ethnic communication situation which is of great ethnolinguistic significance in multi speech societies. The index is used as a determinant of the most spoken language by the different groups. The formula is modified as,

\[ I_{amn} = (P_{am}) (P_{an}) \]

Here, \(P_{am}\) and \(P_{an}\) are the proportions of language a speakers among group ‘m’ and group ‘n’ respectively. This index will measure the potential of a given language as a medium for inter-ethnic communication. Therefore, the ‘index’ values obtained will be the probability that will determine the potential of a particular language used for communication by the different groups.

For instance, since 28.31% of Tangkhuls and 28.13% of Thadous could understand Meitei-Lon, the communicativity index (Index I) of Meitei-Lon for
Tangkhul-Thadou combination is (.283) (.281)=0.08. This means a very low probability of 0.08 that two randomly selected Thadou and Tangkhul in Manipur can understand each other in Meitei-Lon. The example is not among bilinguals but taking into consideration the entire population.

Based on the same method, communicativity index is calculated for most of the groups and the probability values are shown in the following table. Also, it shows the variations in the values among/within its bilinguals.

**INTER-ETHNIC COMMUNICATIVITY INDEXES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Meitei (I-values)</th>
<th>Meitei (Among/within I-values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tangkhul-Thadou</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tangkhul-Kabui</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thadou-Kuki</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kabui-Mao</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paite-Thadou</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bengali-Thadou</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table No. VII 8:* shows that Meitei generally serves as a weak communication. But its probability and potential is very high among the bilingual.

VII.4. DISTRICT-WISE COMMUNICATION ANALYSIS:

On a similar vein, as measured above, communicativity in different districts with respect to a given language can be shown using the same Index I. Here, it is intended to apply Index I to examine the likely inter-district communicativity with respect to the most populous language in the state, Meitei-Lon. The different products will explicitly explain the potential and nature of inter-ethnic

---

23. Index I value of the two largest groups is very less, which is rather pathetic. In 1971 the Index I value has slightly increased to 0.13. On the hand, it suggests that percentage of each monolingual is very large for the two groups.
intelligibility (as explained in Chapter VI, each district has high concentration of one dominant dialect).

The Index I values, for the different districts are represented by the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT(S)</th>
<th>MEITEI (Index I Values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CENTRAL</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UKHRUL</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MAO &amp; SADAR HILLS</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TAMENGLONG</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CHURACHANDPUR</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TENGNOUPAL</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STATE                | 0.54                    |

Table No. VII. 9: reflects the varying probabilities of Meitei-Lon to act as a lingua-franca in the districts. Besides Central, no other districts have high value or potential for Meitei. The value for Tengnoupal district is just sizeable but not significant.

Another 'communicativity index' is worked out to examine the inter-district communication with regard to Meitei-Lon, and the values are is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>VALUE OF INDEX I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CENTRAL-UKHRUL</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UKHRUL-CHURACHANDPUR</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TAMENGLONG-UKHRUL</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TENGNOUPAL-CENTRAL</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MAO &amp; SADAR-TAMENGLONG</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CHURACHANDPUR-TAMENGLONG</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CENTRAL-TAMENGLONG</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CENTRAL-CHURACHANDPUR</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. MAO & SADAR-TENGNoupAL
10. MAO & SADAR-CHURACHANDPUR

Table no. VII.10: The above figures reflect that only in Central-Tengnoupal combination the probability of selecting randomly 2 persons knowing Meitei-Lon is high (0.25), the rest have very less probability.

VII.5. CONCLUDING STATEMENT:

From this study on 'Inter-ethnic communication patterns and its measurements’ many significant ethnolingual features peculiar to multilingual societies are discerned. The results are summed up below:

1. In a multilingual state like Manipur each speech tends to concentrate in a delineatable territory, creating a vast communication gap, only narrowly bridged by the most dominant language in the state.

2. Though Meitei-Lon is not so widely spoken as in Central district, (94.55%) its usage for wider communication in the districts and among the tribes or communities is greatly felt, especially among the bilingual population. English and Hindi could do only little justice as means of wider communication. Though English is widely used in schools and other institutions, its application for verbal intelligibility has been restricted to the cream of the society, but has gained ground lately.

3. The bulk of monolinguals is large in all ethnic groups farther widening the existing communication hiatus.

4. Most bilinguals of each group are usually the educated few or those engaged in services, etc. They have immensely reduced 'incommunicado' situation in the state.

5. Speaking ethnically, it appears that the Naga communities are usually more prone to be multilingual than their other compatriots. More speeches or dialects are encountered in their areas.
6. Greenberg’s method and Kuo’s index of communicativity have very well assisted in proving the existence of linguistic diversity, and checking the potentiality of any language to be used for inter-ethnic or inter-district communication. Though not really significant, Meitei-Lon has emerged as the only possible tongue with the highest potential to act as lingua franca, followed by English.

7. From this exploration of inter-ethnic communication, it becomes apparent that Meitei-Lon and English, under different circumstances, could ease the communication lacuna. However, in reality, no single language or dialect can serve effectively as lingua franca for all the sub-groups and in all the speech territories. As seen in Chapter IV and V, the distribution of ethnic groups is so discretely patterned that at least no two or three dialects are sued or spoken in all the areas, except with slight exception in Churachandpur sub-division. Therefore, the Index I in most situations is very low, barring Central district.

The study appears to indicate that the state is a multilingual area encompassing many ethnic communities each possessing its own language. It also explicitly portrays that homogeneity of culture or racial similarity does not necessarily mean homogeneity of language. Besides, Kuo’s communicativity index has further affirmed the above findings and assured us that no single language, though tremendously dominant, will not automatically emerge as a ‘Koine’ or lingua franca, especially in such area, repleted with myriad identities and political ideologies. The advantage and utility of the formula is undeniable. In Kuo’s own words, the utility has been described as “Index I is a useful indicator of language status and communication situation in a society. It is an important supplement to the previous measures proposed by Greenberg and Lieberson for the following reasons:

(1) The language data needed to calculate Index I are more commonly
available in most societies. As a contrast, most of the Greenberg and Lieberson indexes require rather complicated information which are often unavailable in most societies.

(2) Index I provides quantitative measures for comparison of language status for different language in a group or for inter-group communication between any two groups, whether or not from the same society.

(3) The index also makes it possible to compare the status of a given language in different societies.

(4) For the same reasons, the changing status of a certain language or languages over time can also be identified and compared. (Kuo: 1979, 329).

The study also indicates that interestingly only Kuki-Chin communities inhabiting South district are mostly 'trans-lingual'. They can speak to each other in their own dialects and understand each other without any interpretation. If such a situation of 'translingualism' prevailed throughout the state, no particular dialect will be required to act as 'link language'. The inter-ethnic interaction will then be uniform, and contribute greatly to the socio-economic development of the society. The findings, therefore, suggest that 'a multilingual society or area without any effective means of communication frustrate socio-economic development'. Hence, based on this hypothesis co-relational and comparative analysis (between areas of linguistic diversity and development indicators) will be further examined. (See Chapter VIII). From the results of the intended analysis, it is expected to unearth certain remedial measures for socio-economic parity in a 'poly-ethnic' area, such as Manipur.

24. The term 'trans-lingual', as quoted by Kuo, was suggested by the then Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, in a public statement regarding language situation in Singapore. Mr Yew suggested that "During this period of transition into effective bilingualism, we should encourage those who cannot be bilingual to be "translingual", that is, to speak to each other in different languages, and to understand each other without translation. ..." A speaks to "B" who understand Hokkien, replies in Mandarin, and is understood by "A" (Straits Times, March 25, 1979; quoted by Kuo: 1979, 320)"