1.0 Introduction
The present project is an attempt to study the use of English in spoken and written communication and attitudes towards English in the Union Territory of Chandigarh using the framework and principles of Sociology of Language. Sociolinguistics has been defined as "the study of language in relation to society" and Sociology of Language has been defined as "the study of society in relation to language" (Hudson 1980: 4 & 5). However, different sociolinguists have studied language in relation to society from different points of view. Therefore, it is worthwhile to survey the different principles and approaches underlying sociolinguistics and to arrive at an approach that will be most suitable to study the use of language in a multilingual setting like India.

1.1 Approaches to the Study of Language

1.1.1 Intra-lingual Varieties
Many sociolinguists have been interested in intra-lingual varieties. Halliday et al (1964) distinguish intra-lingual varieties into basically two categories - a variety distinguished according to the user and called a dialect and a variety distinguished according to use and called a register. These intra-lingual varieties are as much related to society as to linguistics. As a language can have a number of dialects at different levels, Gregory (1967) terms them 'dialectal varieties'. Gregory and Carroll (1978: 12) use the term 'dialect' for the relationships of language habits with the speaker's place on dimensions of individuality, time, place, social class and speech community. On the basis of these dimensions, they describe different dialectal varieties - temporal, geographical, social and idiolect.
Temporal Dialects: The grammars and lexicons of 'Old', 'Modern' or 'Contemporary' English can be treated as useful exemplification of temporal dialects in English in a broad sense. In recent times, linguists have described specific linguistic features as they spread from age group to age group or from class to class. Therefore, "By looking at the differences in dialects of different periods and at the differences in the speech of successive generations the linguist can determine whether a variable is spreading or receding in the community" (Gregory and Carroll 1978: 15).

Geographical/Regional Dialect: Halliday et al. (1964) point out that it is the region of origin of a person which determines the dialectal variety of a language that the language speaker uses. Gregory and Carroll (1978) also point out that the term dialect is considered by many as a regional or geographical variation and terms like British, American, Indian or Nigerian English are treated as geographical or regional dialects and it is assumed that each one of the regional dialects of English is spoken by a relatively homogenous population.

Social Dialect: Language can also reflect social 'space' between the speakers and this can be achieved through social dialects. In the case of the social dialect, it is the class membership which determines the social dialect a speaker uses and this class membership may be determined by birth, education, profession, wealth, race or religion. Whether one acquires the social dialect through birth or education or profession or a combination of more than one dimensions mentioned above varies from society to society.
Standard Dialect: As it happened in the earlier centuries, because of little mobility between dialect communities, some languages like Chinese developed dialects which are mutually unintelligible. Therefore, such a situation is resolved by the emergence of a standard dialect which is understood by the speakers of all the dialects of the language. Gregory and Carroll (1978: 21) point out that it is possible for all the members of the community to speak a standard variety. However, it is only in the case of highly industrialized modern states, where there is hundred percent education, that all the members of a community may be able to speak the standard dialect but in the case of poor under-developed countries, where only one-fourth or one-fifth of the people are educated, it is not possible for all the speakers to use the standard dialect.

Idiolect: Halliday et al (1964) and Gregory (1967) do not give any explanation of idiolect. Gregory and Carroll (1978) point out that an idiolect is a configuration of the features of temporal, geographical, social and standard or non-standard dialect.

Register: Halliday et al (1964), Gregory (1967) and Gregory and Carroll (1978) recognise three dimensions of variation — field, mode and tenor — within a register. Field of discourse, according to Halliday et al (1964) means the area of operation of the language activity and thus is treated as the subject matter. Therefore, there are registers of politics, personal relations, technical registers etc. However, Gregory (1967: 186) mentions "Subject matter itself represents a possible abstraction from the habitual co-occurrence of certain linguistic items with certain situational features".
Mode of discourse, according to Halliday et al (1964), refers to the medium or mode of the language activity and it determines the role played by the language activity in the situation. The primary distinction on this level can be between spoken and written language. Gregory (1967) gives a detailed description of the user's medium. This description has been adopted by Gregory and Carroll (1978) as follows:

A detailed discussion of the above figure can be found in Gregory (1967) and Gregory and Carroll (1978).

Tenor of discourse, or what Halliday et al (1964) call 'style of discourse', refers to the relations among the participants. Crystal and Davy (1969; 73-74) call this dimension 'status', which is actually variations in "the relative social standing of the participants in any act of communication regardless of their exact locality". Joos (1962)
has postulated five degrees of formality - frozen, formal, consultative, casual and intimate - with reference to the relations among the participants. But Crystal and Davy (1969) consider this distinction premature. However, it is needless to say that the variations in the linguistic features of an utterance are directly related to the variations in the relationship between participants.

A large number of books and articles have appeared based on the research in the area of register analysis. Crystal and Davy (1969) describe the linguistic features of the language of conversation, unscripted commentary, religion, newspaper reporting, and legal documents. Chiu (1973) describes the lexical items of the register of government administration. Siliakus (1984) has described the syntactical features of linguistic texts. Thomas (1982) has described some of the registers in Welsh and Garcia et al (1985) have described some features of written Spanish in the United States.

This intra-lingual variety approach in sociolinguistics can be very useful for the study of the non-native dialects of English and the registers in the non-native varieties of English. An important area which still remains untapped is the comparison of a particular register in Indian English and a native variety of English and for this the Crystal and Davy (1969) and the Ure (1982) models can be very usefully applied.

1.1.2 The Language Deficit Theory

The work and theory of the British sociologist, Basil Bernstein, have been extremely influential in establishing the language deficit theory. His theory, though controversial and criticised by Labov (1972b) Dittmar (1976) and Edwards (1979a) briefly means that the organisation
of the linguistic message of a member of a society is associated with the social class to which he belongs. In two of his earlier papers, Bernstein (1958 and 1959) introduced the terms 'public' and 'formal' language. 'Public language' is used by the working class and 'formal language' is used by the middle class. Public language has emphasis upon the "the emotive rather than the logical implications" (Bernstein 1958, 164) of language. Bernstein (1959) provides a list of attributes of 'public' and 'formal' language. Later, Bernstein (1962, 1972) uses the terms 'restricted' and 'elaborated' code for 'public' and 'formal' language respectively. Dittmar (1976, 21) criticises Bernstein's (1959) characteristics on the grounds that 1) they give us a very global idea of the differences between the two codes and 2) the division between the linguistic level and other levels is not clarified.

Bernstein's theory resulted in a number of studies in Europe and the U.S.A. with a view to verifying his theory empirically. Bernstein (1960) found that the inferior verbal ability of the working-class boys is due to their deficient education. Hawkins (1969) showed a series of four pictures to five-year old middle-class and working-class children and asked them to tell the story. He found that middle-class children use more nouns and are able to modify the nominal group. The lower-class children, on the other hand, use more pronouns and use limited modification of the nominal group. Edwards (1979a) points out that these stories are hypothetical as Hawkins himself made them up. Secondly, Trudgill (1975) points out that, as Hawkins was present when the children constructed the stories, it is possible that the working-class version, with a predominance of pronouns, is more appropriate in the context than the middle-class version.
Labov (1972b) feels that the language of disadvantaged children is not deficient but different with respect to that of the middle-class. Taking examples from black English, a variety spoken by the blacks in the U.S.A. and thus a variety used by disadvantaged black children, Labov points out that black English is rule-governed and is not an inadequate or substandard variety of English. Labov (1972b; 197) goes on to say that the lower-class speech is more direct and powerful than the middle-class speech. He also points out that "in many ways working-class speakers are more effective narrators, reasoners, debaters than many middle-class speakers who temporize, qualify, and lose their argument in a mass of irrelevant detail" (Labov 1972b; 193).

Hudson (1980) mentions that if quantity is the main criterion to consider syntax and vocabulary, then it may favour many lower-class children because they are bilinguals. Britain and the U.S.A. do not give much credit to their citizens who are bilinguals in their mother-tongue and English and are thus able to switch between the two. Similarly, 'monolingual' lower-class children can switch between the varieties of the home and school; hence such children know more linguistic items than the upper class children who have no motivation to learn a non-standard dialect. Therefore, in most of the experiments conducted for such a research the experiment situation is such that an upper-class child is playing 'at home' but the lower-class child is playing 'away'; thus the lower-class child is not able to use the language in which he is most confident.

Gregory and Carroll (1978) mention that Labov's work refers to the features of Black English and thus only reflects the features of the user. Therefore, they feel that "the studies done on Black English have concentrated on structure and have not dealt with the distribution and use of restricted code" (Gregory and Carroll 1978; 84)

1.1.3 Linguistic Variation in Society

Much of the work in this category of sociolinguistics has been influenced by Labov (1966). The study of sociolinguistic variation essentially means the description of the differential use of language by different social groups or social classes. The basic principles behind this kind of research can be described by referring to Labov (1966, 1968, 1972a).

1. Social Class: Labov (1966) relies heavily on the class rankings developed by Michael (1962) for a sociological survey called the 'Mobilization for Youth' (MFY). Labov (1966) quantifies a socio-economic class (SEC) by means of a 'ten-point socioeconomic index'. He combines three objective characteristics - occupation, education and family income. Each respondent can be considered on a point between 0 to 3 with reference to each of the three dimensions mentioned above. The SEC of a respondent is the sum total of these three dimensions. Therefore, SEC can range from 0 to 9. Labov has to club two or more points on the ten point scale to establish the social classes. For example, 0 - 1 = Lower Working Class, 2 - 4 = Upper Working class, 5 - 6 and 7 - 8 = Lower Middle Class and 9 = Upper Middle Class.

2. Context - Specific Styles: Labov (1968; 241) mentions "To study social variation, it was first necessary to define and isolate a range of contextual styles with the linguistic interview". Therefore, five speech styles ranging from least formal (casual style) to most formal (minimal pair style) were established. Casual style refers to the speech produced by a respondent when the constraints of interview are absent, e.g., when a person describes some intense experience. Careful style refers to an interview in which an individual answers questions put by a stranger.
And reading style includes a) a passage of continuous prose, b) a word list of single lexical items and c) minimal pairs.

3. Socio-linguistic Variables: Labov has developed the concept of sociolinguistic variable as the unit of analysis. A socio-linguistic variable is a linguistic element which co-varies with social variables like social class, age, sex or contextual style. Labov (1972a) divides socio-linguistic variables into indicators and markers. Indicators show a regular distribution over socio-economic, ethnic or age groups, but are used by each individual in more or less the same way in any context. Markers, on the other hand, are highly developed socio-linguistic variables and not only show social distribution but also stylistic differentiation.

4. Stratification Studies: Most of the studies analysing linguistic variation also look at the social stratification of particular speech communities. Sociolinguists studying linguistic variation and social stratification pay a great attention to methodology. Hudson (1980; 144) presents five stages for stratification studies:

A: selecting speakers, circumstances and linguistic variables;
B: collecting the texts;
C: identifying the linguistic variables and their variants in the texts;
D: processing the figures;
E: interpreting the results.

The major findings of Labov (1966, 1972a) are that higher social class groups use that form of a linguistic variable which is standard, women use more standard forms than men and speakers generally use more standard forms as they move from informal to formal style.
Labov (1966) finds a social and stylistic stratification for final and pre-consonantal (r) in New York. Trudgill (1974) studied 16 linguistic variables in four contextual styles by five social classes in Norwich. Cheshire (1978) investigates the present tense verbs in the vernacular working-class English spoken in Reading. Macaulay (1978) studies variation and consistency in Glaswegian English. Romaine (1978) using Labov's (1966) paradigm, studies the sound change of /r/ in progress in Edinburgh English. Reid (1978), using Labov's (1966) methodology, examines the age variable and gives evidence to demonstrate the growth of social and stylistic variation in the speech of young children. Milroy and Milroy (1978) using five phonological variables demonstrate that phonological changes are taking place in Belfast English and these shifts are revealed by age, sex and areal patterning.

Fishman et al (1968) investigate the context-specific bilingualism (Spanish - English) of Puerto Ricans living in New York. Instead of using social class as a criterion, they use demographic variables of sex, age, education and birthplace. They use three contextual styles and seven Spanish and ten English variables for the analysis of the data. They find that in the case of Spanish the contextual rather than demographic factors are responsible for linguistic variables. On the other hand, in the case of English, the linguistic variables are influenced by demographic factors and not by contextual factors.

Milroy (1980), rather than using Labov's (1966) socioeconomic index uses the concept of social network. She points out that the low-status dialect users may be members of 'closed network' and the high-status dialect users may be members of an 'open personal network'. 'Closed network' is called 'high density' and 'open network' is called 'low density'. There are five factors responsible for the membership
of 'high density': 1) membership of a high density territorially based cluster, 2) substantial ties of kinship in the neighbourhood, 3) working at the same place as two others from the same area, 4) the same place of work as at least two others of the same sex from the area and 5) voluntary association with workmates in leisure hours. On the basis of these five factors, a 'network strength score' (NSS) is calculated and then an overall correlation of a linguistic variable with NSS is studied.

1.1.4. Ethnography of Communication

Ethnography of Communication is that branch of sociolinguistics that deals with the use of language in social context as shown in the daily life of a speech community. Dittmar (1976) treats it as the anthropological tradition of the study of language. "Its method is ethnography, supplemented by techniques developed in other areas of study such as developmental pragmatics, conversation analysis, poetics and history" (Duranti 1988; 210). The job of a sociolinguist, therefore, is to study "how speech is related to and is constructed by particular aspects of social organization and speaker's assumptions, values, and beliefs about the world" (Duranti 1988; 210). Therefore, the meaning of speech for speakers in particular social activities is the central concern of ethnography of communication.

The concept of communicative competence is central to ethnography of communication. Communicative competence is the term Hymes (1972a) used for the knowledge the participants use in verbal interaction to communicate with one another. Such competence is far wider than Chomsky's (1965) competence and also includes grammatical competence. As Hymes (1972a; 277) explains:
"We have... to account for the fact that a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as what to talk about whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to evaluate their accomplishment by others."

Therefore, communicative competence, in addition to grammaticality, also includes acceptibility.

Units of Analysis in Communication: Hymes (1972c) suggests three units of communication - situation, event and act. The most important of these units is the communicative event.

Communicative Situation: The communicative situation is the context within which communication takes place. A communicative situation can be a church service, a trial, a cocktail party, a class in school etc. The change of location may not change the situation, but the same location may have a different communicative situation.

Communicative Event: Saville-Troike (1982; 29) considers communicative event "the basic unit for descriptive purposes" and spends a full chapter (4) on it. Hymes (1972b) has attempted to isolate and describe the eight components of the communicative event. Later Hymes (1972c) gives sixteen components grouped under eight main headings by means of an acronym SPEAKING. These components are situation, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms and genres.

Communicative Act: According to Hymes (1974) a speech event may consist of a single or several speech acts. According to Saville-Troike (1982; 29-30) the communicative act is "generally coterminus with a single interactional function, such as a referential statement, a request, or a command and may be either verbal or non-verbal". Hymes (1974) illustrates by pointing
out that a party may be a situation, a conversation during the party an event, and a joke within the conversation an act.

Saville-Troike (1982; 150) points out that part of the task of analysing a communicative event "is discovering which components are relevant within the particular speech community under investigation." She also gives sample analysis of communicative events based on the descriptions by former graduate students of Georgetown University. An analysis under this category focuses its attention on the sociolinguistic rules. These rules are community specific. Ervin Tripp (1972) describes the sociolinguistic rules of address. She describes American rules of address and then compares them with Korean rules of address. She also describes the two choice systems of nineteenth century Russian and Yiddish address system.

Referring to Fishman's (1972b) concept of diglossia and bilingualism, Saville-Troike (1982) coins two terms, dinomia and biculturalism. Dinomia is defined as "the coexistence and complementary use within the same society of two cultural systems" (Saville-Troike 1982; 59). Saville-Troike (1982; 59) gives the following figure to compare her concepts of dinomia and biculturalism with Fishman's concepts of diglossia and bilingualism.

**Figure 1.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Code</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>bilingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She points out that dinomia, like diglossia, is a societal state of affairs, and biculturalism, like bilingualism, refers to individual distribution. For example, a dinomic society may have different set of cultural norms at home and school, or at home and place of work. She points out that there may be cases of biculturalism with or without dinomia, as well as, dinomia with or without either bilingualism or diglossia.

1.1.5 Study of Bilingualism

1.1.5.1 Bilingualism

For Dittmar (1976; 170) "Bilingualism or multilingualism is the term given to the linguistic situation where two or more languages coexist within the bounds of one society, or are kept in constant contact by politically and economically determined interests". However, Weinreich (1953) and Mackey (1962) consider bilingualism a property of the individual. The difference in approach is not because of a difference in the understanding of the term bilingualism but the different approaches applied in the description of the phenomenon of bilingualism.

The most popular view of a bilingual has been a native command or equal mastery of two (or more) languages or "alternately using two languages" (Weinreich 1953; 1). However, Haugen (1978; 4) mentions that such a definition of bilingualism leaves factors as frequency of alternation, proficiency of use and distance between the languages. Haugen (1953; 1) has broadened the definition of bilingualism as the ability to produce "complete meaningful utterances in the other language". Diebold (1961) goes to the extent of considering the ability to understand sentences in a second language as a criterion for bilingualism.

The description of bilingualism is based on four questions posed by Mackey (1962; 52):
1. How well does the individual know the languages he uses? How good is his command of each of the two or more languages he uses?

2. In what functions does the bilingual use the two or more languages?

3. To what extent does he alternate between the languages? How does he change from one language to the other and under what conditions?

4. How well does the bilingual keep his languages apart? To what extent does he fuse them together? How does the use of one language influence that of the other?

1.1.5.2 Interdisciplinary Theory of Bilingualism

Fishman (1968a) states that three different disciplinary traditions - psychology, linguistics and sociology - have approached the phenomenon of bilingualism in isolation from each other. If we want to arrive at an integrated sociolinguistic theory of bilingualism, we need to review the account of these three disciplines in relation to bilingualism.

A. Psychology: Psychological research on bilingualism has been primarily carried out to test the intelligence, educability and school success of bilingual children. Fishman (1968a) mentions that it is a mistaken assertion that children taught two languages are handicapped in both and thus bilingual education is damaging for the intellectual development of children. Dittmar (1976; 171) points out that the argument that bilingual education is damaging for the language development of children is wrong for two reasons: "first because it does not distinguish between bilingualism in itself and the socioeconomic handicaps suffered by bilingual members of the working class; secondly, because there is no correlation at all between bilingualism and intelligence".
In addition, Fishman (1968a) also finds fault with the methodology used in the measurement of bilingualism. A large body of psychological research on bilingualism depends on the notion of speed, which means the greater the speed in the use of a language, the greater the mastery in it. Fishman (1968a; 24) points out that "to the sociologist or social anthropologist speed appears to be an exceedingly odd if not spurious measure of bilingualism". Moreover, psychologists also feel that their measures of bilingualism are context-free (i.e. they are unrelated to motivation, social class, education, interlocutor etc.).

Another faulty notion of bilingualism put forth by psychologists has been that a bilingual who is equally proficient in each language is a balanced bilingual. On the other hand, a bilingual who produces language X more rapidly than language Y is an X-dominated bilingual. However, this view of bilingualism is very unrealistic because 'dominance' or 'balance' must be related to specific contexts and cannot be used as a general phenomenon. Cooper (1969) has attempted to relate the psychological bilingual measurement techniques of word naming, picture naming, word association, recall, word frequency rating to three variables - domain, role-relationship and interaction-type and thus has attempted to integrate the psychological and social models of bilingualism.

B. Linguistics and Bilingualism: The study of languages in contact considers those "instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e., as a result of language contact, will be referred to as interference phenomenon" (Weinreich 1953; 1). Therefore, the linguist's job is to discover what structures (phonological, grammatical, lexical) of language X are transferred to language Y,
and vice versa. Mackey (1962), in addition to the above three levels, also includes cultural and semantic interference as part of the description. Fishman (1968a; 27) censures linguists for their preoccupation with interference and amusingly compares their activity to that of "a housewife looking for smears of wet paint". He argues that bilinguals are people like other people and constitute speech communities and therefore, the structures of their varieties of talk must be approached in an unbiased manner. Mackey (1962; 69) points out that "the interference may vary with the medium, the style, the register and the context which the bilingual happens to be using". In this sense, Mackey's (1962) and Fishman's (1968a) views seem very similar, i.e., the amount and kind of interference can vary from variable to variable (e.g., from person to person, from medium to medium etc.).

C. Sociological Inquiry in Bilingualism: Fishman (1968a) points out that sociological inquiry into bilingualism has concentrated on data on large aggregates: countries, census tracts, school systems etc. This type of sociological research on bilingualism is chiefly oriented towards quantitative (statistical) analysis based on self-reports of bilinguals and no attempt has been made to find out the relationship between self-reported bilingualism and actually observed and measured bilingualism. Secondly, Fishman (1968a) criticizes the sociologist's over-dependence on analysis via social categories, such as ethnic or religious group, which are too crude to understand bilingualism. The concept of bilingualism and social interaction can be substantiated through more detailed, naturalistic, small group behaviour.
A Sociolinguistic Model for the Study of Bilingualism: All the three disciplines - psychology, linguistics and sociology - are deficient with respect to the study of bilingualism. Therefore, Fishman (1968a) presents an interdisciplinary theory of bilingualism, generally based on sociology but making basic provision for psychology and linguistics.

1. Language Related Values of a Speech Community: In a speech community which maintains two languages, each language must be associated with a particular subset of complementary community values. In a diglossic situation there may be a H(igh) and a L(ow) speech variety. Fishman (1968a) points out that at the higher order of abstraction, the term 'diglossia' seems to be more appropriate than 'bilingualism' which may be used to refer to individual behaviour. Fishman (1972b) indicates four possible configurations of diglossia and bilingualism. These have been discussed in more detail in section 1.1.5.2.

An individual's use of a H or L variety "is predictable in terms of whether an interaction in which he engages is viewed by his culture as normally an L-related or an H-related interaction. More specifically, his use of H or L becomes predictable in terms of his own acceptance of (identification with and involvement in) each of the two major value clusters in his culture" (Fishman 1968a; 36). Such acceptance or identification can be found out by a trained observer, a skilled interviewer who reviews with a subject his daily activities or through a self-reported questionnaire.

2. Domains: Fishman (1972c) proposes that there are certain institutional contexts, called domains, in which one language variety is more dominant or appropriate than another. Domains are themselves abstracted from factors such as location, topic, and role-relationships. Typical domains in a society can be family, friends, religion, education, occupation etc. and
these domains (institutional contexts) in a society may be related to diglossia, i.e., some domains are more formal than others. Fasold (1984: 183) explains this by mentioning that "In a community with diglossia, the Low language is the one that will be selected in the family domain, whereas the High language will most often be used in a more formal domain, perhaps education".

D3. Role-relationships: According to Fishman (1972c: 251) "Each domain can be differentiated into role-relationships that are specifically crucial or typical of it..." Mackey (1962, 1966) simply specifies family members: father, mother, child, domestic, governess, tutor etc. Therefore, the use of the two languages in a bilingual community may vary according to the role-relationship.

D4. Topic: Fishman (1972c: 246-47) points out that "two individuals who usually speak to each other primarily in X nevertheless switch to Y (or vacillate more noticeably between X and Y) when discussing certain topics leads us to consider topic per se as a regulator of language use in multilingual settings". Mackey (1966: 85) uses the term context for topic. He says "bilinguals often talk about their families in one language and about their jobs in another". It is not just enough to find out what topics are dominated by either of the two languages but it is also important to know why a language community uses one language for a particular topic than the other language.

D5. Locales: As in face-to-face language interaction, the appropriateness of topics is indicative of societal patterns, and just as role appropriateness is important, the locale appropriateness in face-to-face language choice is very important.
D6. **Dimensions of Social Relationship:** The level of analysis lower than the domain is the reciprocal relations between individuals, which can be termed closed or open networks. Closed network relations are governed by single, overriding fully formed set of specifications, whereas open network relations permit alternative values, alternative interests, alternative self-views and alternative other views. Therefore, closed networks may permit either the H or the L language variety, whereas the open networks may permit both. Network types are abstractions which are abstracted from more precise and real role-relationships.

1.1.5.2 **Diglossia**

As mentioned earlier in section 1.1.5.1. in a multilingual society, different languages may be assigned different tasks. "The relationship of language from social function has been much studied from the perspective of a phenomenon known as diglossia" (Fasold 1984; 34). The term diglossia was first used by Ferguson (1959) in his classical article on diglossia. According to Ferguson (1959), there can be two distinct varieties of a language, which perform different functions in a speech community. One of the varieties is H and the other L variety and these are strictly divided according to their functions, The "H is employed, for example, in radio news broadcasts, public institutions, literature, political speeches, church etc; L serves as a means of understanding in all informal and unstructured situations, e.g. for conversing with friends and colleagues, at home or as a language for giving instructions to employees and workers" (Dittmar 1976; 120). The differences between the H and L varieties of a language are also indicated in the grammar, lexicon and phonology.
Fishman (1967 and 1972b) has expanded the concept of diglossia. Fishman makes a distinction between diglossia and bilingualism. Whereas bilingualism refers to an individual's ability to use more than one language variety, diglossia refers to the distribution of more than one language variety to perform different functions in a society.

Fishman (1972b; 36) also mentions that "... diglossia exists not only in multilingual societies which officially recognize several "languages" and not only in societies that utilize highly divergent and even genetically different vernacular and classical varieties, but also in societies which employ separate dialects, registers or functionally differentiated language varieties of whatever kind". Fishman (1972b; 137) presents the relationship between bilingualism and diglossia in the form of figure 1.2, reproduced below:

---

**Figure 1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diglossia</th>
<th>Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Both diglossia and bilingualism</td>
<td>2. Bilingualism with diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism without diglossia</td>
<td>4. Neither diglossia nor bilingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fasold (1984; 40) mentions that the term bilingualism in the above table should be understood in a somewhat special sense to mean something like "control of both H and L is found throughout the society". Diglossia would then mean the functional distribution of H and L.
Studies on Bilingualism: Rubin (1968) describes the use of Spanish and Gurani in Paraguay vis-a-vis various social identities or role-relations. Fishman and Greenfield (1970) discuss the roles of Spanish and English in the Puerto Rican community in New York city. Whitley (1974) reports the results of an extensive survey of language use in multilingual Kenya. Heye (1975) describes the extent of multilingualism in the Canton of Ticino in Southern Switzerland. Tucker (1978) describes the extent to which English is used in different contexts by various groups of Jordanians and the extent to which the formal programme of English language teaching in the school meets the respondents' needs. Pandit's (1978) study on the Punjabi language in Delhi indicates the relative use of English, Hindi, and Punjabi in various domains. Prasher's (1979) study reveals that English and Indian first languages exist in a diglossic relationship with certain domains like home, neighbourhood and friendship associated with first language and certain others like work, education and government associated with English. Gridner's (1982) study on English in South Indian Urban Context reveals that the mother tongue is used in the intimate domain and English is used in the professional context. Sadanand's (1983) research shows that English is associated with position, power, knowledge and social status among the people working in industries in Andhra Pradesh.

1.2.5.3 Code-switching/ mixing

Kachru (1983) explains that code-switching is the ability to switch from code A to code B and this alternation of codes is determined by the function, the situation and the participants. Code-mixing, on the other hand, means transferring linguistic units from one code into another. Saville-Troike (1982) referring to Gumperz (1976), makes a distinction
between code-alteration, code-switching and style shifting. Code-alteration means change in language according to domain, code-switching means change in languages within a single speech event and style shifting refers to change in language varieties or changes within the same language. Blom and Gumperz (1972) distinguish between situational code-switching and metaphorical code-switching. Situational code-switching is the result of a change in topics and participants or when the communicative situation is redefined. However, metaphorical code-switching may occur when any of the components of a speech situation is redefined or adds meaning to any of the components of the speech situation. For example, there may not be a change in the participants in a speech situation but there may be a change in their role-relationships. Therefore, we may conclude that code-switching is determined by a change in domain or situation. If it is a change in situation, it may be the result of a change in topic or participants and sometimes code-switching may be the result of different role-relationships played between the same participants.

Code-switching, therefore, is an important aspect of bilingualism because "whatever specific functions are served by code-switching within a community, it adds to the verbal strategies that speakers have at their command, and is to be recognised as a dimension of communicative competence" (Saville-Troike 1982; 71).

It is equally important for a sociolinguist to study the attitudes of the speech community towards code-mixed languages. In certain contexts a multilingual person has "the possibility of a choice between code-mixed... or non-code-mixed languages" (Kachru 1975; 78). However, the selection of a particular 'code' depends on the attitudes of a person towards a language (code-mixed or non-code-mixed) or the prestige of the language in the speech community.
In sections 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4 and 1.1.5, we reviewed the different approaches to language study—intralingual varieties, the language deficit theory, linguistic variation in society, ethnography of communication and study of bilingualism. Since the language deficit theory has been criticized and its utility has been doubted, we shall not discuss it further. Otherwise, depending on the focus of research, one can use any one or more of the other four approaches to study the use of language in a multilingual community. Once the distribution of the H and L languages in relation to different domains is established, one can use other approaches to study the language community in detail. For example, once it is established that most of the members of a bilingual speech community prefer to read newspapers in the second language (e.g., English), one may use the Crystal and Davy (1969) or the Ure (1982) model to analyse the register of English newspapers in this community and even compare it with the register of English newspapers in Britain or the U.S.A. Or, for example, after the dominance of the H and L language varieties in different domains has been established, one can study the linguistic variation within the H language in relation to domains. The question one needs to answer in this situation is whether a linguistic variable of the H variety, which is L2 for the speech community, has two or more variants, and whether the use of a variant depends on the domain in which the H variety is used. Similarly the relationship between diglossia and dinomia can be studied in detail. If a H variety, which is an L2 for the speech community, dominates a domain then one needs to study whether the L2 or the mother tongue (L1) rules of interaction and norms of interpretation are used by the community. Therefore, we can conclude that it is necessary to start the analysis of a multilingual speech community by using the interdisciplinary approach to bilingualism.
and then use other approaches for a deeper and detailed understanding of the community. Thus we find that the principles of intra-lingual varieties, linguistic variation in society and ethnography of communication complement the principles of an interdisciplinary theory of bilingualism. Since the present project is the first attempt to study the use of English in the Union Territory of Chandigarh, we shall limit ourselves to the application of Fishman's (1967, 1968a, 1971b, 1972b, 1972c) principles of 'Sociology of Language', as discussed in section 1.1.5.

Before we discuss the framework to be used in this study, we shall examine the concept of language attitudes and their study in social psychology. The study of language attitudes has to be an integral part of any study on the use of language because it can tell us whether the attitudes of a bilingual towards his L1 and L2 influence his use of language. Therefore, in addition to the principles of 'Sociology of Language', the principles of language attitudes will help us evolve a framework that will suit this study on the use of English in Chandigarh. In developing the framework for the present study, apart from the theories discussed earlier, we have drawn ideas from Kachru's (1965) description of the scale of bilingualism in India, as discussed in section 2.1.1.3, chapter 2.

1.2 Language Attitudes

1.2.1 The Concept of Attitudes in Social Psychology

McDavid and Harari (1974; 85) define an attitude as a "relatively stable system of organization of experience and behaviour related to a particular object or event". Attitude is a hypothetical construct, as many other similar concepts in psychology are, and it refers to something that cannot itself be directly observed. Nevertheless, attitudes can be inferred indirectly from their effects on behavioral actions (such as judgments and choices), which are directly observable.
Some psychologists have been interested in studying attitudes to find out the extent to which attitudes predict behaviour. LaPiere (1934) found that attitudes by themselves are not very accurate predictors of behaviour.

1.2.1.1 A Theory of Reasoned Action (The Fishbein-Ajzen Model)

Fishbein-Ajzen (1975) developed a theory of reasoned action by which we can predict specific behaviour based on an analysis of factors that affect the way people make decisions. According to this theory, "an intention to perform a specific action is a function of the person's attitude toward the action and the person's perception of how other people will evaluate the action, referred to the subjective norm" (Tedeschi et al 1985; 168). Thus:

\[
\text{Intention} = \text{Attitude} + \text{Subjective Norm}
\]

The components of this theory are shown in figure 1.3. This figure indicates that the individual has certain beliefs about the probable consequences of the specific act that are the determinants of the attitudes towards the act. In addition, the actor attributes specific behavioral expectations to reference groups, individuals, or other social agents. The totality of these expectations, as perceived by the individual, constitute the 'subjective norm' concerning the behaviour in question. "Thus a person's behavioral intention is viewed as a function of two factors: his attitude toward the behavior and his subjective norm" (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975; 16). Attitudes are one of the factors that influence behavioral intentions; the other factor being the subjective norm. Intentions usually lead to good predictions of specific behaviour. People may not carry out their behavioral intentions because they lack the necessary resources or have limited opportunities (Liska 1934).
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1.2.1.2 **Global and Specific Attitudes**

Many studies of attitudes show that measures of general or global attitudes are not a good basis for predicting very specific behaviour. Global attitudes are not consistent with specific behaviours, but they do predict global behaviours. A measure of global behaviour can be obtained if we observe the person across a number of relevant situations. For example, it is not enough to ask a person what he thinks of writing letters in English/mother tongue. One needs to ask a respondent what he thinks of writing personal letters in English/mother tongue to his father, mother, brother, sister etc. or what he thinks of writing official letters in English/mother tongue to his boss for leave, to the principal of his child(ren)'s school etc.

1.2.1.3 **Measurement of Attitudes**

The cognitive and affective components of attitudes cannot be perceived directly because they are not part of physical reality. Therefore, one can only infer about these internal psychological states on the basis of observations of what people say and do. The most popular methods for measuring attitudes consist of paper and pencil scales and these are Thurstone, Likert and Semantic Differential scales.

1.2.2 **Study of Language Attitudes**

The discussion of attitudes in section 1.2.1. has made it clear that in order to study language attitudes, a linguist has to draw inferences and even use the methodology adopted by sociologists and/or psychologists. Giles (1979: 1) mentions "if we are going to understand why individuals acquire, use and react to language and its varieties in the way they do we require a greater understanding of the dynamics of attitudes, motivation, identities and intentions, that is social psychological phenomena".
Cooper and Fishman (1974; 6) define language attitudes in terms of its referent. Thus language attitudes can include attitudes towards a language, or towards a feature of a language, or towards language use or towards language as a group marker.

1.2.2.1 Measurement of Language Attitudes

Different sociolinguists and social psychologists use different techniques to measure language attitudes.

A. Matched-Guise Technique: Lambert (1967) developed the procedure called "matched-guise technique" that "makes use of language and dialect variation to elicit the stereotyped impressions or biased views which members of one social group hold of representative members of a contrasting group" (Lambert 1972; 336). The procedure for this technique is to record the speech of perfect bilingual speakers in one of their languages and later a translation equivalent of the same passage in their second language. Then the respondents are asked to listen to the recorded speech of the bilingual speakers in both the languages and are asked to evaluate the personality characteristics of each speaker on a semantic differential scale. Lambert (1967) mentions that this technique is very useful in measuring group biases in evaluative reactions. It has very good reliability as the same results are obtained when different respondents (judges) are taken from the same sub-population.

Lambert (1967) used the matched-guise technique to study the attitudes of English Canadian and French Canadian bilingual students towards English and French. Shuy and Williams (1973) used this technique to study the attitudes of the Detroit respondents towards five English dialects - Detroit Speech, White Southern Speech, British Speech, Negro
Speech and Standard Speech. Wölck (1973) studied the attitudes towards Spanish (a H-language) and Quechua (a L-language) in Peru. He used three informants in such a way that they represented two social and two linguistic groups. Carranza and Ryan (1975), using the matched-guise technique, tried to find out whether the choice of English and Spanish is regulated by the contextual domains among the Mexican Americans and Anglo students. El-Dash and Tucker (1975) used a variety of the matched-guise technique to study the attitudes of Arab students towards five language varieties - Classical Arabic, American English, British English, Egyptian English and Colloquial Arabic. Giles et al (1975) used a variant of the matched-guise technique to study the attitudes towards the RP and Birmingham dialect. They used the matched-guise technique with the stimulus speaker present face-to-face with the listeners rather than using the artificial taped stimulus as used in the above mentioned studies. Edwards (1979b) used a variety of matched-guise technique to study i) whether there are negative evaluations of disadvantaged speech in Ireland, ii) how confident the speech raters are in their judgements and iii) whether judgemental differences are attributable to the sex of the speaker and especially to the sex of the rater. Similarly, Rickford (1985) used the matched-guise technique to study the attitudes to the Guyanese creole continuum, that is, basilectal (deep creole), mesolectal (mixed creole/English) and acrolectal (standard English).

Al. Subjective Reaction Test: Labov (1966; 405 - 50) employed Lambert's 'matched-guise technique' to study the attitudes of respondents towards particular variants of given phonological variables. In the subjective reaction test "the same speakers are heard reading sentences which differ
principally by their treatment of the linguistic variable being studied" (Labov 1972a; 185). Respondents are asked to indicate the type of job for which the speech heard on the tape would be acceptable. Labov (1966) used a scale of 7 marks (specified as different occupations) to collect the responses of his respondents.

B. Direct Questionnaires: Another technique used to study language attitudes is to make respondents evaluate a number of statements. This technique also has its variations.

Bl. Completion of Statements: Respondents are given a number of incomplete statements and are asked to complete each statement item with the help of four given responses. Respondents are asked to rank each response on the basis of their liking. The four choices may represent the combinations of two dimensions, one named sentimental-instrumental and the other private-public. Haugen (1972a) used purely an evaluative question to test the attitudes of Danes, Norwegian and Swedish respondents to one another's language. The question was: "How do you like the sound of Y?" The response alternatives were (a) "compared with X (the informant's own language), Y is: more beautiful, equally beautiful, less beautiful". (b) "compared with Z (the third language), Y is: more beautiful, equally beautiful, less beautiful" (Haugen 1972; 227). Hofman (1974) studied attitudes towards language along two dimensions: sentimental-instrumental and private-public. He had ten items and each item contained a stem introducing the topic with four choices and the respondents were asked to rank each choice in order of preference. Hofman (1977) again used this technique as one of the instruments in his study.

B2. Degree of Agreement/Disagreement with Reference to a Statement: A number of statements usually half positive and half negative about
a language are given and respondents are asked to rate each on a scale (usually a Likert type scale). By using this method, one can study "cognitive beliefs more directly (Schmied 1985: 251).

Herman (1961) used a brief questionnaire (dealing mainly with questions relating to the prestige of various languages) administered to 84 students. The students were given a list of major languages spoken in Israel and were asked to rate each language on a five point scale — 'very high', 'high', 'medium', 'low' or 'very low'. They were also asked to indicate how they thought the languages were rated by the public.

Taylor (1975) used a Language Attitude Scale (LAS) to study what teachers think about nonstandard and Black English. The LAS is a Likert type scaling instrument and involves self-evaluation of opinions, on a five point scale, on a set of language statements. Zughoul and Taminian (1984) studied the linguistic attitudes of Arab University students through a questionnaire. The questionnaire comprised twenty-nine items and the respondents were asked to rate each statement on a five point scale — 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'neutral', 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. Similarly, one of the tests used by Schmied (1985) to study the respondents' attitudes to English in specific sociolinguistic situations in Tanzania consisted of ten statements with a positive English load and ten statements with a negative English load. The respondents were asked to rate each statement on a six point scale, ranging from 1 = I disagree completely to 6 = I agree completely. Van Hout and Münstermann (1988) studied the attitudes of the respondents towards Dutch dialects in contrast to standard Dutch. They reported the Nijmegan investigation carried out by Van Hout (1979), in which he used a questionnaire and asked the subjects to give their judgements on the use of the Dutch.
dialect on a six point scale, ranging from very unsuitable (1) to very suitable (6) for the domains or situations.

Other variations of this direct method could be interviewing respondents and asking them direct questions on the prestige and use of the language or making respondents write an essay on the topic concerning the choice/use/prestige of a language or even asking respondents the usefulness of a language for a given occupation/profession. Cohen (1974) in his study of the attitudes of Mexican-Americans towards Spanish and English used the interview procedure with the immigrant Mexican-American parents. The questions were as follows:

Where do you think the best Spanish is spoken?

Who do you think speaks the best Spanish around here?

Do you ever try to get your children speak that way?

These three questions were repeated for English too. Sibayan (1975) made a survey of language and attitudes of Filipinos towards language. One of the questionnaires labelled Householder (HHQ) yielded information on the language background of the respondent and his family, his opinions and preferences regarding language use, his attitudes towards variation in language and his knowledge and preferences concerning language in school. One of the questions on how useful a language is in the pursuit of certain occupations was: "Would a person need to know ______(language) to be successful in the following occupations in your community?" The occupations were carpenter, farmer, clerk, doctor, lawyer, mayor etc. Llamzon (1986) adopted the questionnaire used by Sibayan (1975) and elsewhere to study the attitudes of Filipinos towards English. The respondents were asked which language they considered necessary to
succeed in 21 different careers.

Van Hout and Münstermann (1988) discovered low correlations between the domain scores based on the questionnaire and the matched-guise factors. The reason for the low correlation could be that the matched-guise technique only covers the hidden less conscious part of the language attitude. On the other hand, a domain questionnaire, or for that matter any statement/ item in a questionnaire brings out "the social desirability of certain types of behaviour" (Van Hout and Münstermann 1988; 122).

The domain judgements reflect the norms of language behaviour can be in conflict with attitudes towards the object in question. In a matched-guise technique "attitudes are measured in an artificial context in which the attitude object is presented without any reference to concrete situations or people..." (Van Hout and Münstermann 1988; 122)

The present research is based on domain analysis and, therefore, it was decided not to use the matched-guise technique but to use the direct method technique. We have followed the technique used by Taylor (1973), Zoughol and Taminian (1984) and Schmied (1985). We felt that this direct technique would be most appropriate for our investigation because it would help us study the opinions of our respondents towards English, Hindi, Punjabi or the code-mixed variety of English—mother tongue in a variety of contexts and for a variety of purposes which the matched-guise technique would not be able to achieve.

1.3 Framework for this Study

The framework to be used for the present project depends on the objectives of this study.
1.3.1 **Objectives**

A. The objectives of this study are to study:

1. the individual's assessment of his own and his family members' language skills, i.e., reading, writing, speaking, and understanding in English, mother tongue and other languages.

2. the extent to which English or the mother tongue dominates mass media.

3. the extent to which English and the mother tongue dominates spoken communication.

3a. whether intuitively isolated domains of home, friendship, neighbourhood, education, shopping, place of work and government have a significant effect on the reported language used.

3b. whether interlocutors have a significant effect on the reported language used.

3c. whether diverse topics have a differential effect on the language used.

4. the extent to which English or the mother tongue dominates personal and official written communication.

4a. whether role-relationships affect the language used for either personal or official communication.

5. the attitudes of the respondents towards English vis-à-vis other Indian languages.

6. whether the respondents' socio-cultural characteristics have any effect on the language used for mass media, spoken communication and written communication, and whether the socio-cultural characteristics influence the respondents' attitudes towards English, Hindi and the mother tongue.
Some additional objectives of this study are to test the following hypotheses:

1. relatively more respondents read English newspapers, magazines and novels and the respondents have equal preference for English and Hindi radio and T.V. newscast.
2. there is relatively more use of English in the domains of education, place of work and government than in the other domains.
3. the use of English varies with the change in the role-relationship in the same domain.
4. the use of English varies with the change in the topic in the same domain.
5. there is wider use of English for personal and official communication.
6. English being the H language in India, the respondents have positive attitudes towards the use of English i) for impersonal use, ii) for communication between people from different states, iii) in most of the domains except shopping and home, iv) as a language of education. The respondents may have neutral attitudes towards English for personal use and they may have negative attitudes towards code-mixing.
7. A respondent's age, education, occupation, mother tongue, sex and exposure to English are closely associated with his use of English, i.e., relatively higher use of English in Chandigarh is associated with the younger age group, the higher education group, the higher occupational group, the female sex and a high exposure to English.
8. It is also hypothesised that apart from retaining English on the one hand and Punjabi or Hindi on the other for different domains, the bilinguals in Chandigarh also use a mixed style of speech, i.e., they use a mixture of the mother tongue and English. Kachru (1986; 62) says "It has, however, been shown that out of the total code repertoire the bilingual tends to
make two types of code alterations, termed here code-switching and code-mixing". We would not maintain such a distinction and will only use a general term 'code-mixing' in the present study.

C. It is also the objective of this study to discuss the implications of the results of this study for language planning and for a further detailed study on the use of English in Chandigarh and to frame revised tools and improved methodological procedure for data collection on the basis of the results of this study.

1.3.2 The Framework Suitable for this Study

The suitability of a framework for any sociolinguistic study depends on the objectives of the study. The objectives of this study, discussed in section 1.3.1., have made it clear that in order to study the use of English in Chandigarh, we need an eclectic framework based on the frameworks and studies presented by Mackey (1962, 1966), Fishman (1967, 1968a, 1972c), Kachru (1965, 1966, 1969, 1975, 1983), Taylor (1973), Zughoul and Taminian (1984) and Schmied (1985).

The use of a language by a speech community can be observed or studied in relation to speaking, writing, reading and, if possible, understanding. This use of a language can be studied by using the principles of Sociology of Language. Related to the use of language by a speech community is the question of the attitudes of the speech community towards language A and/or B in a bilingual speech community and this is part of social psychology. The diglossic relationship between language A and B is not as neat as discussed by Fishman (1967, 1972b). When a non-native H language has been used by a bilingual speech community over a long period of time, the neat diglossic relationship between the H and L
languages may change into a H language dominated or L language dominated code-mixed language. Therefore, it is important to study the extent to which the two languages (H and L) are kept apart or mixed in a domain. Since a domain is a configuration of role-relationships, topics, situations, and locales, one needs to go into a detailed study of each domain. However, we shall limit ourselves to the study of role-relationships and topics only.

In the case of mass media, one can only study the preference for a particular language as a code-mixed variety of language is not usually used in mass media. Similarly, in the case of written communication, one may restrict oneself to the study of the preference for language A or B with reference to role-relationships. We hypothesise that code-mixing is more dominant in spoken communication than in either written communication or mass media.

The framework to be used for this study has been shown in figure 1.4. As shown in this figure, the use of the H and L language in a multilingual diglossic speech community can be studied at two levels - language behaviour and intention. Language behaviour can be studied using the principles of sociology of language and intention to use a language can be studied using the principles of social psychology. As mentioned earlier, language behaviour can be studied at various levels - mass media, spoken communication and written communication. The main unit of spoken communication is domain. In addition, one needs to study the effect of intention on the use of language and the relationship of language behaviour and intention. Demographic variables can also affect the choice of either H or L language in a domain or the attitudes of a user; hence, these demographic variables need to be accounted for in any framework.
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The use of the above framework will help us conduct basic research in the use of English in Chandigarh. Basic research, according to Kachru and Quirk (1981; xviii), means "descriptive and empirical studies of English in different settings; fact finding (supported by relevant statistics) at international, national, regional, and local levels in relation to roles, functions, attitudes, expectations, achievements etc...".

The basic tool to conduct such a basic research is the survey technique. Moser and Kalton (1971; 1) mention that "surveys are concerned with the demographic characteristics, the social environment, the activities, or the opinions and attitudes of some group of people". Therefore, a survey is never chiefly interested in individuals. It is more like a census. Kelkar (1975) calls one phase of a survey "a census of a rather specialized kind - a census that tells us how many there are of speakers in whom we find more-than-chance correlation between the chief habit in question and other characteristics such as geographical location, age, and generation, literacy, sex, caste and class, and area of language use" (Kelkar 1975; 7). Therefore, as mentioned earlier, the survey method will be the most useful type of study, though "the practical organization of a bigger survey had to contend, among other problems, with pressures out of linguistic and other loyalties that militate against the scientific objectivity and validity of the results of the survey" (Kelkar 1975; 12). However, Sadanand (1983; 44) points out that the problems mentioned by Kelkar (1975) can be minimized by using a tighter design. She goes on to say "greater concentration on planning and organization and methodology evolving from an exploratory study or a pilot survey can prove useful" (Sadanand 1983; 44).
We need to modify the framework presented in figure 1.4. in order to use the survey technique in the present study. Though the study of intention gives us a better understanding of the relationship between language behaviour and intention, we shall limit ourselves to the study of language attitudes. This has been done in order to keep the questionnaire within manageable limit. Therefore, we shall not attempt to study the delicate and refined relationship between attitude and subjective norm. However, it is assumed that even this modified framework will give us an understanding of the attitudes of the respondents towards H and L languages. It is also assumed that, depending upon the positive relationship between the attitudes and the subjective norms of respondents, language attitudes can predict language behaviour. The modified framework is given in figure 1.5.