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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Sociolinguistic Perspective on Language Variation.

Until a few years ago a non-native variety of English, such as Indian English, scarcely aroused serious academic interest. This apathy towards non-native varieties can be attributed chiefly to two reasons:

(i) the prevalent attitude which regarded these varieties as corrupt, distorted and debased versions of the standard, native form(s), and

(ii) the theoretical position adopted by most linguists, who tended to concentrate wholly on structure abstracted from use.

(i) and (ii) are not unrelated, for the emphasis on structure predisposed linguists to look at language as a simple, single code - usually represented by the standard form - used in the same manner by all people in all situations, rather than as the sum-total of varieties - stylistic, social, dialectal, etc., each functioning in a particular way. Traditionally interested in completely regular or predictable behaviour, linguists generally shied away from what Fishman has called "sometimes things" (1972:10).
Indeed, with the exception of certain dialectologists and anthropologists, seldom have they really been in close contact with language as it is actually used in all its varied complexity. Consequently they sought to describe only such phenomena about language that are either completely determinable occurrences or non-occurrences, defining anything less determinable as 'exolinguistic', as 'free variation', as outside the realm of linguistics proper.

In fact, for the past half a century the most influential linguists have concentrated on invariant samples of language. For example, Bloomfield's (1926:155) definition of language as "the totality of utterances that can be made in a speech community" (emphasis mine) clearly identifies the system as the primary concern. Hoping to make linguistics 'scientific', he was prepared to exclude certain aspects of language as not (or not yet) open to precise 'objective' description. By comparison, the assumptions underlying the now pre-dominant generative-transformational model are even more austere. In Chomsky's famous statement:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance.

Chomsky (1965:3)
The special domain of linguistics is defined here at a level far removed from 'actual speech'. Any given body of speech can be no more than a partial and distorted representation of the rules underlying it. The linguist's concern is to study these rules which represent the speaker's knowledge of the language apart from the uses to which the knowledge is put.

Chomsky takes the same line as de Saussure had taken earlier in assuming that it is competence (corresponding to the Saussurean langue) which is the elemental essence of human language - the norm which underlies all its aspects. Performance (corresponding to the Saussurean parole) is seen as representing aspects which are peripheral and which conceal the underlying system.

In fact, Chomsky goes a step further. He argues that one does not even have to study the actual use of the language made by the individual, but may rely solely on his intuitions about language - mainly his judgements as to which sentences are related, which sentences mean 'the same' and so on - since these are bound to be representative of the common system shared by the whole speech community.
It is just this clear demarcation of competence and performance that Hymes finds difficult to accept. He points out that by concentrating on competence, Chomsky has narrowed the range of linguistics to the study of structure to the exclusion of function. This kind of linguistics is "not a theory of language, but only a theory of grammar" (Hymes 1972:313). Chomsky's linguistic theory assumes that the ability to produce appropriate sentences - i.e. to use the language in actual situations - is an automatic result of learning the language system. Thus it looks at language as an ideal abstraction and leaves out socio-cultural features that might enter into its description. Such a theory of competence is inadequate as it does not account for the following observed phenomena:

(i) differential competence within a heterogeneous speech community;

(ii) dual competence in reception but single competence in production;

(iii) a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical but also as appropriate - the rules of use are therefore not a late grafting.
Indeed if we look at language more realistically, without isolating it from the contexts in which it is actually used, and the functions it performs in these contexts, we find that, as Firth maintained even as early as in 1935, "Unity is the last concept that should be applied to language", for "there is no such thing as une langue une" (1957:29). Linguistic variation exists in all but the most isolated communities. All natural languages are diverse and subject to change, because all human communities are functionally differentiated to varying degrees. In fact, the more heterogeneous a society, the more heterogeneous its language.

It is now common knowledge that most societies have not only several regional and social varieties but also other varieties which are reserved for (or conventionally associated with) particular activities.¹ Even so-called 'simple' societies differentiate between colloquial speech and the 'higher' or more formal styles reserved for ceremonial and other occasions (Geertz 1960). Hymes (1964:36) has observed that probably every community has at least three style-levels, however structurally defined and differentiated.

¹For instance, the High (H) and Low (L) varieties of a language used in a diglossic situation, the most important feature of which is the specialization of function for H & L.
While in monolingual societies style-shifting, i.e. "co-occurrent changes at various levels of linguistic structure within one language" (Ervin-Tripp 1971:31) (emphasis mine), may signify different types of appropriate behaviour, in bilingual or multilingual societies distinct languages may function as stylistic variants or alternates carrying social meaning (Gumperz 1972). That is, from the point of view of their social function, it is irrelevant whether the codes are "different languages" like Spanish and Guarani (Rubin 1962), or varieties of the "same language", like high, low and middle Javanese (Geertz 1960), or Egyptian and classical Arabic, French and Haitian Creole (Ferguson 1959).

In a multilingual or plurilingual community the extent and range of variation is even greater than in monolingual speech communities, for the situation is further complicated by the co-existence of a number of languages, each with its own varieties and sub-varieties. Linguistic variation is greatest in language-contact situations where phenomena such as bilingualism, diglossia, code-switching, interference, pidgins and creoles and other contact varieties are widespread. Furthermore, while one can speak in terms of a virtually complete separation of codes in diglossic situations in which speakers interact by using two or more different
varieties/languages under different conditions (Ferguson 1959), code-switching and code-mixing, interference (i.e. the simultaneous application of the patterns of two languages to the same item) (Weinreich 1953), and integration (the complete adaptation of items from one language to the phonology and morphology of another language) (Haugen 1956:40) illustrate the possibility of their coalescence or merging and raise questions as to whether one can obtain a rigorous determination of a code at all. In such cases, the multilingual seems to have a unified linguistic competence rather than a separate one for each of his languages (Swain 1971:30).

Similarly, recent evidence from contact situations, where distinct and structurally unrelated languages have converged to form pidgins and creoles (Hall 1966, Hymes 1971), offers a number of challenges to the central linguistic concept of system (Labov 1971). Where a creole and a standard language are used in the same geographical area, overlapping co-existent systems are often found in what is known as the "post-creole continuum", and each of these systems may have several sub-systems (Day 1974). Commonly, within such communities an individual speaker may understand a large part of this continuum or scale and use a considerable range. He will thus represent a 'span', not a point, in this continuum. Of course, his choice may normally incline towards
one end of the continuum or the other. But he may also shift to and fro along it in a single conversation, even a single sentence, without being conscious of the change. The co-existence of a prestigious and a socially stigmatized vernacular can thus bring about extensive cross-reference (Bailey 1966:2). Often there is no regular rule to predict which of the various forms will be selected or distinguished. Such situations are surely at an extreme end from Chomsky's idealized speaker-hearer in a homogeneous speech community. To reject these variable relationships on the ground that they are matters of 'performance' rather than 'competence' is unhelpful. Chomsky's definition of language is too restricted.

Hence the need for what Hymes (1964, 1971) calls the ethnography of speaking, a widening of view to take in the context in which speech is used and the rules of appropriateness which may govern particular linguistic choices. From this point of view a description of language will rest on "a theory of speech as a system of cultural behaviour" and of linguistics as a social science. (Hymes 1971:51).

A 'socially realistic linguistics' is not concerned with idealized speakers, but with 'persons in a social world' who must know "when to speak, when not, what to talk about, with
whom, when, where and in what manner" (Hymes 1972:277). The difference in perspective is obvious in the challenge which Hymes throws out to theoretical linguists to extend their inquiry from the limited notion of linguistic competence to the more comprehensive goal of communicative competence, "in which the systematically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behaviour" (Hymes 1972:286). The implications of this more integrated theory - now known as 'sociolinguistics' - are that language is viewed as the social phenomenon it is, and social structure is seen as one of the important factors determining speech and language behaviour.

Contained in this wider concept of competence is a different view of what constitutes 'correctness' in speech. From the perspective of generative linguistics correctness is a matter of grammar alone. But from the sociolinguistic rules that he has learned alongside the rules of grammar, a competent member of the speech community will know that what is formally correct will sometimes be socially impractical or even socially dangerous. What is appropriate as well as correct "is not a property of sentences, but of a relationship between sentences and contexts" (Hymes 1972:321).
The recognition of the relationship between language(s) and social structure has now made it possible to ask questions such as how a language functions not only in different situations but also in diverse geographical and socio-cultural settings, and further, what changes it undergoes in its form as a result of its changing functions and roles in these different settings. It has now become relevant too to define the exact nature of these changes and to determine the implications that they may have for language change in general.

An important outcome of this broadening of linguistic perspective is that linguists are no longer obsessed with 'standard' languages as the only object worthy of serious attention. It is now accepted that "standardization is not a property of any language per se, but a characteristic societal treatment of language ..." (Fishman 1971:229). More recent studies done by Labov (1968), Wolfram (1969) and Pasold (1972) have also demonstrated that non-standard dialects are not any the less systematic than standard dialects, but differ from these "in regular and rule-governed ways" (Labov 1969:32). As a result, the stigma that was attached to all non-standard dialects simply because they did not conform to the norms of the 'standard' is now recognized as stemming purely from the
social attitude towards the speakers of these dialects rather than from any inherent weakness in the varieties themselves as coherent systems of communication.

The same kind of stigma was associated in the past with non-native varieties such as second language varieties, immigrants' speech, foreigner talk and contact varieties like pidgins and creoles. The attitude that prevailed - and still does in some cases - toward colonial varieties of English is typical. One reason for this is that few of these varieties have been linguistically defined in any formal terms. Although it is now generally recognized that these 'derived' dialects have diverged from their original models in several important ways and have acquired a set of marked linguistic features that distinguish them from native dialects of English, the exact nature of the changes that have occurred has received little attention so far. This again is because the data generally presented by these varieties, far from being the patterned and predictable phenomenon linguists have been looking for, create problems for the linguistic describer owing to their heterogeneous and variable nature.

In the light of the recent developments in sociolinguistics, however, it is clear that such problems should no longer stand in the way of research in these areas. For if the broadening
of linguistic perspective has made it possible to look at language in all its varied manifestations, on the same principle, there should be no reason why non-native-English-at-large should not be considered worthy of something like the sociolinguistic scrutiny which, for example, so-called Black English in the U.S. has attracted. As Pride (1978) rightly demands: "If Black English, why not Indian English? Or Philippine English? Or Singaporean English? Or Malaysian English? Or Zambian English? Or...?"

1.2. What is Indian English?

In several parts of the world where English is a native language linguistic divergences have given rise to varieties such as American English, Australian English, Canadian English, etc. For the past two decades there has been an intermittent debate concerning the varieties of English which have emerged in those areas of the world where English is a widely used second language. Initial reluctance to take these varieties seriously has given way to a more tolerant attitude in recent times. The result is a slow but sure recognition of several new Englishes in different parts of the world, and for the linguist, an opening up of new vistas for inquiry and research. Indian English (hereafter IE) is one such variety that has been put on the linguistic map in recent years.
The claim that IE is a distinct variety presupposes that the English language in India has undergone a process of "Indianization" and that this manifests itself formally more or less in the same way as does the process of Americanization, Australianization or Canadianization of the English language. Indianization has resulted in IE having distinct Indian characteristics at all linguistic levels. In other words, although it is still closely related to the core grammar of British English, IE deviates from it in several respects, and seems likely to continue to do so. What's more, it appears that any attempt to prevent it from developing along its own lines is unlikely to succeed.

Recognition of IE as a separate variety with an identity of its own has aroused considerable academic interest in recent years and has even led to the view that it would now be more realistic to adopt educated IE as an instructional model in the country (Bhatia 1972). The general trend of thought now is that transplanted in an alien land, amidst an alien culture, the English used in India is bound to have developed certain distinct characteristics of its own.

There are still a few dissenters, however, who question the validity of IE as a distinct viable entity, particularly in view of the fact that while IE is structurally largely
isomorphous with British English, on which it is modelled, those features which are peculiar to IE are not prevalent in the same degree: some are common enough without being very common; others are universal or almost universal, while still others seem to occur in a random, erratic fashion. Those who question the validity of IE as a separate variety ask, if there is such a variety in existence, what are the distinctive characteristics which enable us to recognize it? And are these differences significant enough to warrant considering IE an autonomous variety? Besides, they argue, before IE can be adopted as a model for teaching in school, we need scientific descriptions of it. Not only must this model be a living one, but there must also be a significantly large number of speakers interacting through this model. These speakers should be clearly identified both for the learners and teachers. And finally, there must be some way to codify it prior to its use in learning and teaching situations.

The demand for a scientific description of IE seems a reasonable one to make. While there is no doubt that IE exists, it has not been easy to define it in precise linguistic terms. Does one recognize IE merely on the basis of its distinctive phonological features which manifest
themselves in a recognizable Indian accent of English? Or does one look for evidence of the Indianization of English in the lexical innovations that occur when Indians use English to talk about Indian ways of life and culture? Again, is one justified in accepting the 'syntactic irregularities' that appear in the spoken and written forms of IE as typical Indian variants? Or does IE merely comprise divergent norms of appropriate usage - of what has currently come to be known as "sociolinguistic rules" (Ervin-Tripp 1972) or "rules of speaking" (Hymes 1974) - that have developed from constant use in a different socio-cultural setting? Because various studies have concentrated only on one or the other aspect of IE, the full complexity of this variety does not become evident. Extensive research is required in order to determine scientifically what really constitutes IE, to isolate its regional and social varieties and to determine which of these varieties should be considered standard before it can be codified.

Accurate statements about IE can be made only on the basis of an accurate description of IE. Such a description will have to take note of the modifications that the English language has undergone at the different levels of phonology, syntax and semantics as a result of its use as a second language in the Indian socio-cultural context. Given this
variety called IE, which differs perceptibly from other varieties of English, we may ask, how it reflects those facets of cultural history and physical environment which are peculiar to the English-speaking people of India, and which they do not share with speakers of English elsewhere on the globe. In short, how does IE reflect the Indian ethos? And further, what language processes have operated to produce such differences between British Standard and IE, and how have these operated? Since this means isolating analytically the linguistic features of a particular socio-cultural stratum of a particular ethnic group, the answer will require extensive sociological and anthropological research as well as linguistic research.

The task is far from an easy one. Even a linguistic description poses problems on account of the complexity of the situation. IE is not uniform from region to region, but tends to vary in accordance with the different linguistic and ethnic background of its speakers, e.g. certain features may stand out as markedly South Indian, certain others as peculiar to the northern regions of India, reflecting the substratum influence of the Dravidian and Indo-Aryan language groups respectively, which must needs affect the English usage of most Indians.
Apart from this, Indian users show a wide variation in their proficiency in English depending on their competence in the language. IE is therefore best regarded as forming a continuum or a cline extending from non-educated varieties of English at one end to an internationally accepted standard form of English at the other. In between these two ends we have a great range of variation. This continuum aspect of IE creates problems for the descriptive linguist. The term 'IE' could be used to refer to any or all of these varieties that exist along this continuum. Each of these varieties will reveal different features at the levels of phonology, semantics and syntax. It is not possible to describe the whole continuum all at once, and any attempt to do so will lead to a distorted picture of IE. A majority of the studies done so far have treated the whole continuum as if it were a single system. This approach is misleading as features which rightly speaking belong to several co-existent systems are treated as belonging to a single system. In any systematic study of IE, it is in fact necessary to isolate more or less discrete points along this continuum and to specify which of these varieties or systems one is setting out to describe. A number of descriptions of this kind of the varieties that occur at the different points on this continuum or cline will be necessary before a complete description of IE - both in the spoken and written form - can be possible.
1.3. Aim and Scope of the Present Study

This study is an attempt to describe what has come to be known as the educated variety of IE on the basis of data comprising a restricted but representative corpus of semi-journalistic written texts. Although it is true that IE is most readily distinguishable from other varieties of English in terms of its phonological and phonetic features, we will not be concerned in this study with its phonology.

The data used for this study consists of articles from 6 issues of The Illustrated Weekly of India and some 600 samples of readers' correspondence from daily newspapers, some with national and others with regional circulation. One of the reasons for selecting The Illustrated Weekly is that it contains a fairly representative sample of the kind of English educated speakers in India read and write because it is one of the most widely circulated weeklies in the country. Secondly, while the non-technical nature

2 Bansal (1966) and Masica (1972) have used the term 'General Indian English' to refer to the 'accent' of English characteristic of educated Indian speakers of English all over the country.

3 The written nature of our data precludes this possibility anyway. Besides, this aspect of IE has received the greatest attention from scholars in the past and the phonological differences generally found in IE have been fairly well-documented.
of its content matter makes it accessible to the average educated Indian, at the same time it ensures the use of English for a more general purpose, i.e. to write about topics of general interest rather than any specialized branch of knowledge, and in a style the average reader can cope with. Indeed, the middle brow nature and the topicality of much that appears in The Illustrated Weekly is largely responsible for its popularity and nationwide readership. As is shown by the content analysis of one of the issues selected at random from our corpus (The Illustrated Weekly of India, Vol. XCVII-28, July 11-17, 1976), it has a fairly wide coverage of a number of diverse topics of current interest; 'Asians, Quit Britain' (politics and racial hatred), 'Southall Revisited' (immigration), 'Fergusson College' (education), 'Transmigration of Souls - in Films' (cinema), 'Soyabean for More Protein' (food and nutrition), 'Quest for Olympic Gold' (sports), 'The Painter of Signs' (short story), 'Birth of a Butterfly' (natural life), 'Madhvi Parekh' (art and artists), including the regular features: the 'Editor's page', 'Readers Write', 'In the news and Out of it', etc.

Those who contribute to The Illustrated Weekly include, apart from the professionally trained team that constitutes its editorial staff, persons eminent in their own spheres
of work and areas of study, other well-known writers, artists, musicians, scientists, historians, philosophers, teachers, sportsmen and athletes, film stars, and so on. The data it presents thus adequately exemplify the kind of English written by educated IE users at a fairly high point on the cline of IE bilingualism.

The samples of readers' correspondence taken from the various national and regional level dailies comprise valuable supplementary data as they ensure a certain amount of spontaneity in the use of English. Contributors to these columns generally constitute a cross-section of educated IE users writing on issues that they feel most strongly about. These range from complaints about postal delays, train accidents, inadequate bus service, violation of traffic rules, price hike, drought, pollution, inflation, taxes, pay scales, etc. to specific views on education, examinations, elections, cinema and T.V., family planning, temples, godmen, secularism, national integration, human rights, the law and liberty, dictatorship and democracy, music, and so on. It is true that among the correspondents, there are likely to be some who are reasonably proficient users of English, such as college and university teachers, high-ranking officers from the armed forces and public services, members of the
professional classes like doctors, engineers, lawyers and business administrators, etc. and others whose competence in the language must needs be relatively less, such as persons belonging to the lower professional cadres (clerks and stenographers, policemen, bus conductors, railway workers, factory workers, etc.). The fact remains, however, that all of them - whether writing to carp about social and economic injustice, the evils of establishmentarianism and the abuse of power, the inefficiency of those in authority, or merely to discuss issues nearest their heart - seemed to have felt the urge to express themselves in the English language. This being so, these letters constitute genuine samples of IE written by educated Indians, not particularly trained to write professionally, but perhaps prompted to choose English by the following considerations: They feel sufficiently at ease in the language to voice their views on these topics; or because many educated Indians, being singularly unaccustomed to writing letters in the L1 or any other Indian language, prefer to use English at least for this purpose; or/and also because this enables them to gain the attention of a qualitatively (in most cases in India this could mean academically, socially and economically) superior audience. The letters to the editor from these newspapers are expected to present a more heterogeneous sample of data and
reflect a slightly lower degree of proficiency relative to the material from The Illustrated Weekly.

We have said that IE is best regarded as a cline or continuum and following Kachru and other bilingual studies (see Chapter II, p. 65) we locate what we call educated IE between the topmost or ambilingual point and the central point on this cline. Within this span on the continuum we have further isolated 3 arbitrary points representing 3 different levels of competence which we have assumed in this study. The material from The Illustrated Weekly, the letters from the national level newspapers, and the regional level newspapers constitute these 3 points in that order.

We intend to treat IE as a non-native dialectal variety of English, i.e. by isolating a body of linguistic items from the data under investigation we hope to obtain a general idea of the structure of this variety at the levels of syntax and lexico-semantics, including collocation, style and register.

Our assumption is that at the level we are describing IE, it does not differ markedly from the syntax of standard native English, except in certain restricted areas, and that the similarities between IE and native English in this area
are far greater than the differences. Significant differences between IE and native varieties should exist in the use of lexical items and in stylistic and registral features. These will generally be more marked if the topic of discourse is culture-bound or is discussed from a specifically Indian view-point than if it were, say, a more universal one.

We hypothesize that since the 3 points on the cline we are examining represent 3 different levels of competence, as we move lower down the cline, the incidence of Indianisms should increase. We aim to discover whether the increase is merely quantitative (i.e. pertaining only to token) or is qualitative (i.e. pertaining to type) as well. We will also attempt to examine the processes involved in the development and emergence of these features.

In the description of a non-native variety such as IE, two alternatives offer themselves - one, to write a separate grammar of this variety starting from scratch, as linguists do when they encounter new and unknown languages; the other, to assume a 'common core' or nucleus which it shares with all other Englishes and to isolate features in which it differs from some standard variety of English. In this way we can identify the formal (and sometimes substantive) criteria or markers of the variety under consideration. Since a great bulk of the grammar and lexicon of IE is commonly
shared with other Englishes, it appears wasteful and unnatural to attempt a fresh description of this variety in all its aspects as this will involve a considerable amount of duplication. It seems more reasonable therefore to take the second course, i.e. to assume a common core which it shares with standard varieties of English and treat all departures or deviations from some specific standard variety as the characteristic features of IE. If a regular pattern of deviation is observed, by classifying and describing these patterns in linguistic terms it should be possible to build up a fairly representative picture of educated IE.

The reference to deviations in IE calls for a word of explanation. All non-native varieties of English are based on or have derived from a native model, normally either British or American English and through constant use in a foreign socio-cultural milieu have acquired certain identifiable features of their own. In a descriptive study of such a variety then, comparisons with the native model will be inevitable. However, we wish to point out that in making such comparisons no value judgements are implied. The deviations or departures from these models which will be termed features of IE are not to be regarded as corrupt, 'substandard' or undesirable but merely as different forms of the language.
It is important that such a study is not looked upon as an exercise in error analysis just because the features described are just those which are divergent from the norms of native varieties of English. The error analysis approach to non-native varieties makes the assumption that standard British/American English is 'correct' and that all departures from standard English usage are necessarily errors that need to be eradicated. While we recognize that some of the deviations or marked features that constitute Indianisms might have initially started off as errors, we take note of the fact that they have become a permanent and stable part of educated Indian usage through constant and widespread use in similar situations. As Kachru has pointed out (see Chapter II, p. 58), these 'deviations' may involve differences from the norm but may be necessary in the actual context in which a language functions - an adaptation of structure to new situations, so to say, and to new functions. Inasmuch as these features have currency in educated IE, they may even be looked upon as contributing to a new Indian 'norm' of English.

Underlying this claim is the sociolinguistically valid assumption that the Indianization of English is an ongoing process resulting from the interaction of Indian bilinguals in an Indian context with a language alien to them.
Sociolinguistic studies of bilingualism have shown that in such a community speakers are known to generate their own norms of correctness which may differ from corresponding monolingual norms (Haugen 1953, Fishman et al. 1968). In accordance with the more tolerant view taken of contact varieties in modern linguistic theory for the purposes of the present study we consider all 'deviations' at the level we are describing IE as reflecting an ongoing process towards achieving an Indian norm in English language behaviour - a norm, not necessarily guided by British or American notions of appropriateness, but by what is acceptable and appropriate in the Indian context. Not all the deviations found in the data are expected to gain this status, but some of them will, provided that the language continues to develop along the lines at present. Others will probably remain features of colloquial or spoken IE. However, at the level on the cline of IE which we are concerned with here, such elements constitute only a small part of the Indianess of IE. A much larger part of the Indianness of IE at this level is made up of those features which English needs for purposes of communication in the Indian socio-cultural context. This point is discussed at greater length in Chapter II.
Another point we wish to make is that although the occurrence of certain elements in IE may be accounted for in terms of interference from the mother tongue/first language of these speakers, this study cannot be considered a study of language interference either. Rather, we are interested here in isolating patterns which have become established and institutionalised in a manner akin to those that are found in the dialectal varieties of a language. Therefore, although a study of second language variety such as this will bear a certain amount of resemblance to studies of interference and error analysis, it must be borne in mind that the distinction between interference and established dialectal variation is an important sociolinguistic matter in that the latter do not call for correction but constitute the elements of the synchronic description of the dialect.