CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Preliminaries
This chapter offers the theoretical framework for the present research. It puts emphasis on language as a social phenomenon and tries to depict the nature of language from sociolinguistic perspective. As the present research is the study of code-mixing, it examines the sociolinguistic setting in India and its impact on Indian literature in English. The bilingualism and multilingualism are highlighted taking into consideration the Indian scenario on which the novels are based. This chapter depicts the nature of code-mixing. It also focuses on the various methods applied for identifying the code-mixing and puts forward a suitable frame for analysing the code-mixing in the novels under consideration.

2.2 Language as a Social Phenomenon
The human beings communicate in their own language with their respective speech communities. Language is a universal characteristic of the human species. Language connects the individuals together. It has a power to bring the people together and make a speech community. A society grows and develops its native culture. Therefore, the main purpose of speech community is to preserve, nurture and sustain its respective culture. It is possible to preserve any culture with the help of language because language is the vehicle of culture. Every person belongs to a particular speech community, which speaks a particular language in a particular way. Language is a complex network of interrelated systems, closely associated with the communicative needs of the society. Therefore, Trudgill (1974:13)
points out that “Language is not simply a means of communicating information about the weather or any other subject. It is also a very important means of establishing and maintaining relationships with other people.”

Language is closely connected with the social structure and value systems. The impact of social environment is seen in the language as it is reflected through the vocabulary which is used by the people of certain speech communities. For example, a society’s kinship system is generally reflected in its kinship vocabulary. This is one of the reasons why anthropologists tend to be interested in this particular aspect of language. In addition to environment, social structure, the value system of the society can also have an effect on its language. The most interesting way in which this happens is the phenomenon known as taboo. Hudson (2007:120) thinks that “every language seems to have linguistic items that reflect social characteristics of the speaker.” It shows that each community uses the language in a different way than the others.

Language is a social behaviour. Any language can be learned in the society because society consists of groups of people. Language unites these people in the society because they share some common values. Naturally, it makes them use a particular language which turns a society into a particular language community. Therefore, people who speak the same language in different regions always are united. People share language in a particular socio-cultural setting. It comes into existence in society as the basic need of expression and for transmission of thoughts and ideas. Even it is used for describing things and objectives peculiar to that society. Each and every society
has its own language and culture. Culture nourishes language, society preserves it and speakers or users of language develop it. Culture is the storehouse of knowledge and language is the transmitting vehicle of this knowledge.

2.3 Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics and it has a great scope. According to Bell (1976:23), “It is significant that the majority of sociolinguists see themselves as linguists, with the avowed aim of attempting to discover regular correspondence between linguistic and social structure and, moreover, see their role as calling into question some of the assumptions of linguistics in order to arrive at a fuller and more satisfactory description of language.” Thus, the sociolinguistic study is the study of language in relation to society. It examines language and its various functions taking into account its various sociolinguistic factors.

According to Spolsky (2003:03), “Sociolinguistics is the field that studies the relation between language and society, between the uses of language and the social structures in which the users of language live.” It gives the idea about the use of language in society. Labov (1966:25) defines sociolinguistics “as a description which takes into account the distribution of language difference throughout the community and necessarily preserves the data on the age, sex, education, occupation, and ethnic membership of the speakers studied.” It focuses on the important role of language in the community. Fishman (1971:05) defines sociolinguistics “as the study of the characteristics of the speakers as they constantly interact and change within a speech community.” These characteristic features
change the individual and his community. Trudgill (1974:32) explains sociolinguistics “as a part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon.”

Sociolinguistic approach studies various functions of language in different setups. It also deals with the relationship between language and society. Society focuses different social groups and different geographical backgrounds. Hence, language varies according to ethnic group, social status, etc. It shows that language deals with the social structure and system of society. According to Hymes (1977), “we look simultaneously at language in social metrics and at society at its linguistic medium.” The use of language depicts the social reality. Holiday (1978:2) argues that “Language is the most effective communication system to signal ‘social reality’ or ‘culture’ and is characterized by its highly organized system of human communication.” The choice of language is an important subject of sociolinguistics. According to Gibbon (1987:11), “Sociolinguistics as a field concerns itself with the complex yet systematic relations between social factors and choices both between languages and within a language.” Therefore, the study of language in relation to society plays a crucial role in understanding language, individual and society.

2.4 Sociolinguistic Setting in India

India is one of the most diverse linguistic and cultural areas in the world. This awesome diversity leads to a number of difficulties. It is difficult to classify and label languages in India. In addition to this most of the Indians know only their own language. Hindi is accepted as the national language of India even though it has some regional limitations. English is the most widely spoken second language. Even
it plays a useful role as a lingua franca. There are considerable numbers of English speakers in India. Their number is increasing day by day. According to Crystal (2001:41), “In terms of numbers of English speakers, the Indian subcontinent ranks third in the world after the USA and UK.” South Asian English comes into existence because of the contact with British people. In 1600, Indians came in contact with British as British East India Company established its foundation in India and started its trading stations in Surat, Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta. During the independence, English became the language of administration and education. In 1835, Thomas Macaulay proposed and introduced English in India for educational purposes. After that many universities were established in India i.e. Bombay, Calcutta and Madras and then there was rise of colleges and universities. It made English the academic language of India. The use of English as a language of instruction made it prosper in India.

The conflict among the supporters of Hindi, English and regional languages has created some difficulty in setting up a single language as an official language. In India, the orientalists were in the favour classical languages of Indian tradition, such as Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic, which were not spoken as native languages. The anglicists supported English. Both these groups didn’t oppose the use of vernacular language. On the other hand, they supported the use of vernacular language at the primary stage. Hindi seemed to be a suitable substitute as an official language because it had more native speaker’s compared to other Indian languages. Fasold (1984:24) pointed out that “in Tamil Nadu, and south very few people were familiar with Hindi. Therefore, in 1967, the law was passed to allow Hindi and English for all official purposes. Even today the same situation exists.”
English has become a linguistic tool for the effective administration in India. It serves as a language of wider communication. It performs various relevant and appropriate roles in the social, educational, administrative and business world. According to Kachru (1987:220-221) “the spread of English and its intercultural uses raise questions concerning diversification, codification, identities, cross-cultural intelligibility and power and ideology. The ultimate danger could be decay or even loss of international intelligibility.”

In India, English has grown into regional, social and occupational varieties due to multilinguistic, multicultural, multireligious setting in India. The Indian culture represents unity in diversity. India is a mixture of different religions. It is such a country where people belonging to different castes, creeds, religions stay together. Each and every religion presents different beliefs, faiths, rituals, etc. This diversity is seen in their language families. It promotes multilingual, multicultural and multireligious diversity. This diversity promotes cultural harmony in India.

Many Indian systems contribute to its multicultural setup of the nation. Its economy centres around agriculture. Even it highlights feudal and capitalist structures. The Indian political system has connections from panchayat system to international political systems. Indian tradition shows how India itself is a variety which consists of verities in it. Indian industry reflects its nature which ranges from small-scale industries to information technology. The legal system of India also ranges from local panchayat system to Supreme Court. Indian people are composite groups of caste and class, which has given them
particular identity. It shows that the socio-cultural changes are integrated in the diverse socio-linguistic setting of India.

Different regional languages are spoken in different parts of India. Hindi is the national language of India, it has become national heritage. English being an international language and lingua franca is used by the majority of the educated elites in India. English in India is supposed to be the language of intellectual make up and status. Naturally, speakers of Hindi mix English in their interaction and vice versa. It is often seen that educated people in India shift to English from their regional language or mother tongue very easily and comfortably. Ellul (1978:22) thinks that, “The speaker’s education is certainly a determining factor in the choice of a linguistic code.” The linguistic code of an educated person is the evidence of his bilingual competence. This bilingual competence of educated Hindi speakers promote them to use some English words so naturally, easily and effectively that their typical mixing and switching shows that such mixing and switching has emerged a new mixed variety of Hindi English. This variety is called as Hinglish. Pandit (1986:83) argues, “It is quite possible that when two languages come in contact, a third code might emerge.” Urdu language is the best example of this fact, as it is a mixture of Persian, Arabic and Thet Hindustani or Khari Boli. It is a variety of Hindi spoken in North Eastern Hindi speaking belt of India. The indianization of the English language is a consequence of multilingual scenario which leads to interference. These interference varieties are so widespread and of long standing in the communities that they are adequate enough to be institutionalized in their own way. This sociolinguistic setting in India concentrates on multilingualism in
the Indian society. Consequently, Indians use code-mixing naturally and effectively.

2.5 Indian Literature in English and Code-Mixing

Indian English Literature is a fast growing body of literature written by Indians using English as a second language. Indian socio-cultural and linguistic background has affected features of English language in India. Therefore, many educated Indians mix or switch to English so naturally and effectively that sometimes they are not aware about their mixing and switching in their own communication. This typical use of words has given a new spirit and flesh to the Indian Writing in English.

India is the third largest English book-producing country after the United States and the United Kingdom, and the largest numbers of books are published in English. Sanyal (1987:7) claims that, Indian writing represents a new form of Indian culture. It has become assimilated and is today a dynamic element of the culture. It can be said to be a challenge for the Indian novelist to write about his experiences in a language which has developed in a very different cultural setting.

The term 'Indian English' is commonly used to describe English as used by educated Indians. The English spoken in India is different from that spoken in other parts of the world. Indian English has accorded the status as the unique variety of English. The difference between Indian English and other varieties of English is based on phonology, morphology, lexeme, syntax and grammar. Indian English is not a substandard variety. It is not just British English with a few spices added to it. It has its own distinct identity and features. In India,
English is now the language of business, commerce, education, government, industry, justice, law, mass media, politics, sciences, technology, trade, etc. English has also been the language of India’s freedom struggle. The Indian multilingual and multicultural scenario leads to the contact situation where use of two or more languages comes into contact for political, geographical, historical or educational reasons. The changes are taking place in English which can be seen in the corpus of Indian English.

The problem of interference of mother tongue has become very common in India. Indian English becomes more complex because there are several languages being spoken in Indian subcontinent. It throws light on India as a multilingual, multicultural and multi-religious country. Iyengar (1962:3) points out that “Indian writing in English is one of the voices in which India speaks. It is a new voice, no doubt, but it is as much Indian as others.”

The Indian spirit is reflected through the variety of languages and dialects in India, which find expressions in the form of code-mixing and code-switching in Indian English. Many Indian novels in English are set against multicultural background, where we come across sections of the societies. It is essential to understand sociolinguistic factors as they contribute to the making of language. It is interesting as well as useful to understand different social, cultural, political, historical and religious factors as they contribute to the making of language.
2.6 Bilingualism and Multilingualism

Bilingualism means ability to master the use of two languages, and multilingualism is the ability to master the use of more than two languages. Bilingualism and multilingualism often involve different degrees of competence in the languages involved. A person may control one language better than another, or a person might have mastered different languages better for different purposes, using one language for speaking, and other for writing. Different languages are used by people for different purposes. Many educated people are seen using different languages at different places. The language they speak at home may be different than the language they use in the office. The different purposes and contact gives bilingual or multilingual competence.

Bilingualism in any speech community is the result of two or more languages coming in contact. According to Fasold (1984:01), “A large number of countries are so linguistically diverse that it is not uncommon for even children to be bilingual or multilingual.” Weinreich (1953) regards bilingualism as the practice of using two languages alternatively. S.V. Parasher (1991:106) thinks that certain social factors like education, social status and the locale of the interaction may govern the bilingual’s language choice.

In bilingual societies, people acquire one language naturally as members of the society and the other as a second language through practice of using two languages alternatively. When people of different culture and background live together in a geographical region over a considerable length of time, sharing common socio-economic and political activities of the community, bilingual or multilingual societies
are formed. Hosali (2000:57) shows that “the British came to India with the English language and, in due course the native took the language and the Englishmen took over the land. It was later realized that English had much deeper roots in India than the Raj had. The Raj crumbled and became a part of history; but the English has been indianized and has become a part of the culture of this vast area.”

Bilingualism can be seen in all classes of the societies, in almost every country of the world. Bilingualism shows the ability of an individual to use more than one language. This bilingual competence enables the bilinguals to mix lexical items or switch from their first language to other or vice versa. Languages in contact situation make us think about the code-mixed utterances. It is interesting to study and understand various reasons that lead to language shifting, which results in code-mixing and code-switching.

India is a pluralistic nation, in terms of, culture, language and religion. India shows a high degree of multilingualism. The significant feature of Indian multilingualism is that it is complementary. An individual may use a particular language at different places like home, office, market or in certain formal domains such as education and administration. This is not only true of individual but such patterns of selection of different languages for day to day uses are revealed by the groups of populations as well. An individual usually is well acquainted with his/her mother tongue. Even he/she is able to use his/her regional and state language. In addition to that attempts are made to learn national and international languages for communication with others. As a result of which, Hindi and English, are the part of the linguistic repertoire of a sizeable number of Indians. In India, linguistic diversity
is not by accident, but it is inherited in the process of acquiring the composite culture of the nation. This linguistic diversity has become an integral part of the Indian composite culture.

In India, bilingualism or multilingualism has never been regarded as a social or individual deficiency. On the contrary, it has always been appreciated. Bilinguals are always respected as persons with superior qualifications. They are respected because of their ability to communicate with speakers of two or more languages to transmit their thoughts. Bilingualism and multilingualism is considered as a social need. In the past, bilingualism and multilingualism helped people to practice their faiths and religious activities. For example, Siddhartha stressed the importance of Pali and Ardhmagadhi to show the importance of the Brahmanical concepts and their linguistic counterparts expressed mainly through the Sanskrit language. The followers of Buddha mixed Pali, Ardhmagadhi and Sanskrit in their actual communication. This resulted in a new style of Sanskrit called Buddhist Sanskrit, which was understood by both the common people and the elites of the time. It shows that bilingualism and multilingualism is not a new product but used in India from ancient times. In ancient India, people used to switch from Pali, Sanskrit, Tamil, etc. During the Mogul period, many scholars had mastered Sanskrit and Persian/Arabic.

This multilingualism is a great strength of India. It enables the speakers of different linguistic communities to maintain their contact with one another. Indian history shows that different groups and races came in contact with one another through migration from one region to another. It has spread multilingualism. The Indian culture is the product of
many languages, races, cultures, and religions. In contrast to this, language uniformity is considered necessary for the economic development; therefore, English is accepted in India for all purposes such as education, law, administration, and business as a language of communication.

The Indian education system is truly multilingual in its nature. The Municipal Corporations in different states run primary schools in different languages giving priority to their regional languages. The secondary schools in many states give options to the students to select a particular language. The three-language formula is widely used in the country which aims at developing and strengthening the multilingual nature of our educational system. There are some problems in implementing the three-language formula. For example, there is no reference to the mother tongue, classical language and foreign language in the formula. Therefore, some states like Tamilnadu teach only Tamil and English, Gujarat follows Gujarati and Hindi. Many Hindi states substitute Sanskrit, a classical language. This situation has created contact situation, which leads the speaker towards code-mixing.

2.7 Code-Mixing Defined
The present study is an attempt to consider code-mixing as a separate phenomena. There is a plethora of definitions of code-mixing that illustrate several aspects and communication strategies in correspondence with cultural situations. It is therefore insightful to go through some significant definitions of code-mixing. Some definitions and views on code-mixing and code-switching are given below that show the similarity and differences between the two terms:
Muysken Pieter (2000:1) uses the term code-mixing “to refer to all the classes where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence.”

Weinreich (1953:73) thought that “intra-sentential code-mixing was a song of bilingual proficiency and interference.”

Di Sciullo, Anne Marie, Pieter Muysken and Rajendra Singh (1986:1) think that “code-mixing is a form of linguistic behaviour which produces utterances consisting of elements taken from the lexicons of different languages.”

Pfaff (1979:295) employs the term “mixing” as a neutral cover term for both code-mixing and borrowing.

Bhatia and Ritchie (2004:336-352) state that code-mixing refers to mixing of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses and sentences) primarily from two participating grammatical systems within a sentence.

Hock and Joseph (1996) propose that code-mixing occurs when content words are placed or inserted into the grammatical structure of another language.

Hamers and Blanc (2000:260) define code-mixing “as a type of insertional code-switching, where a constituent from language A is embedded into an utterance in language B, and where language B is clearly the dominant language.”
Bokamba (1988:24) differentiates code-switching from code-mixing. According to Bokimba, “the two phenomena make different linguistic and psycholinguistic claims. Code-switching does not require the integration of the rules of the two languages involved in the discourse, whereas code-mixing does. Moreover, he insists on the fact that “code-mixing” be selected as the appropriate term to denote alteration within the sentence and “code-switching” to denote alteration beyond the borders of a sentence in order to emphasize the fact that two phenomena make distinct claims”.

Muysken, Pieter (2000:35) thinks that, “the most important contribution of the study of code-mixing to linguistic theory concerns the division of labour between the lexicon and the grammar of the language in defining it as a unique system.”

Weinreich (1953:73) thinks that, “intra-sentential code-mixing was a sign of lack of bilingual proficiency and interference.”

Di Sciullo, Anne Marie, Pieter Muysken and Rajendra Singh (1986:1) think that, “Code-mixing is a form of linguistic behaviour which produces utterances consisting of elements taken from the lexicons of different languages.”

Tay, Mary W.J. (1989:408) tries to define the distinction between code-switching and mixing. “Code-switching is generally considered to be intersentential whereas code-mixing is intrasentential”.
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These definitions roughly outline the characteristics of code-mixing as a language phenomenon. While code-switching involves the embedding or mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two codes within the same speech event and across sentences boundaries, code-mixing involves the embedding or mixing of various linguistic units, i.e. morphemes, words, phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical systems or subsystems within the same sentence and same speech situation.

Sridhar (1978:111) points out that “the term code-switching is employed to refer to the alternative use of two or more languages or varieties in distinct or functional domain. The single most important characteristics of code-switching seems to be that the switch from one code to the another, signals a corresponding switch in the social situation. This is precisely not the case with code-mixing as the above text illustrates, the switching (or mixing) takes place rapidly, frequently and almost unconsciously, within a single social event, within a single text, and even several times within a single sentence.”

Sridhar considers language alternation in code-mixing as intrasententially without a shift in speech situation. When lexical items and phrases of one language are mixed into another, their mixing is labelled as code-mixing and when there is a switch from one language to another in a unit of discourse; it is called as code-switching.

alteration of codes is determined by the function, the situation and the participants. In other words, it refers to categorization of one’s verbal repertoire in terms of functions and roles. Code-mixing, on the other hand, entails *transferring linguistic units from one code into another.* Kachru thinks of code-switching as the use of one or more language systems in different functional context, and code-mixing as the use of two or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language to another.

Kamwangamalu (1989:321) explains that, “Code-mixing (CM) is one of the commonly observed linguistic behaviours in the speech of bilingual or multilingual speakers. Linguistically, CM is the intrasentential use of linguistic units (e.g. words, phrases, clauses) from two distinct languages or varieties of the same language by a bilingual individual within the same speech situation.”

McCormick (1995:194) points out that code-switching involves the “alternation of elements longer than one word”, while code-mixing involves “shorter elements, often just single words.”

**2.8 Nature of Code-Mixing**

Code-mixing is a widespread phenomenon in bilingual communities where speakers use their native tongue (L1) and their second language (L2) in certain domains. In bilingual speech communities, there is a natural tendency among the speakers to mix lexical items, phrases, clauses, and sentences during interaction. It has given rise to code-mixing and code-switching, which are supposed to be very common tendencies in the present multilingual scenario.
The distinction between code-mixing and code-switching is made by some researchers. The overlapping between code-mixing and code-switching has created problems for the researchers to draw the clear cut boundary line between the two processes. Sridhar (1978), Braj B. Kachru (1983), Anne Marie Di Sciullo, Pieter Muysken and Rajendra Singh (1986), Bokamba (1988), Mary W.J. Tay (1989), etc. have made attempts to separate both code-mixing and code-switching strategies. But many scholars like Poplack (1980), Malik (1994), have tried to explain intersentential and intrasentential switching as types of switching. Whereas those who think of code-mixing and code-switching as separate strategies, accept intrasentential code-switching as the code-mixing.

The nature of code-mixing is not as simple as the term seems to be. On the contrary, the available research on code-mixing and code-switching shows how complex it is to differentiate both these terms from each other. There are other terms like language interference, acquisition, borrowing, lexical insertion, matrix language, embedded language, etc. which focus various aspects which need to be clarified for further understanding.

Muysken, Pieter (2000) in his book, *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*, points out opinions of several researchers and tries to elaborate different concepts and terms in bilingual speech. He uses the term code-mixing to refer to all cases where lexical items and grammatical feathers from two languages appear in one sentence.
2.9 Views of Scholars on the Process of Code-Mixing: A Synoptic Survey

Gumperz John is a well-known sociolinguist acknowledged for his research in code-switching. In his article, ‘Hindi-Punjabi Code-Switching in Delhi (1964:1115-1124)’, he made data based study of Punjabi and Hindi speakers in Delhi and observed the differences in the speech of bilingual Punjabi. These differences create interference. It extends to all levels of grammar—morphemic, morphophonemic and phonological—as well as to lexicon.

Bloom and Gumperz (1972:407-434) in their paper ‘Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-Switching in Norway’, elaborate sociolinguistic views on code-switching practices. Gumperz and his associate Jan-Peter Bloom developed the notions of situational and metaphorical code-switching as a result of intensive field work in a small Norwegian community, where they investigated code-switching practices between two Norwegian dialects, Bokmal and Ranamal. Gamperz points out that communication is not governed by fixed social rules. It is a two-step process in which the speaker first learns from the outside environment and then evaluates at his level considering personal and cultural background and then decides the norms that apply to the situation at hand. These norms determine the speakers’ selection from the available communicative options.

Gumperz defines the situational and metaphorical switching. The situational code-switching occurs when the language change accompanies a change of topic or participant. Style can shift in situational code-switching depending on the participants.
Metaphorical code-switching adds meaning to the conversation as it is defined by the relationship with the participant. Gumperz differentiates borrowing and code-switching. Borrowing is a process where the items of one language are incorporated in the grammatical system of another language. On the other hand, code-switching is defined as a process which depends on the ‘meaningful juxtapositioning’ of two grammatical systems. In borrowing, the ‘conversational effect’ of the utterance is that of a single variety and not of two.

Gumperz (1982) in his article, ‘Conversational Code-Switching’, refers to the ‘we-code’ and ‘they-code’ to refer to contextual code-switching on the basis of the knowledge of the bilingual. Gumperz uses the term ‘we-code’ for minority language and ‘they-code’ for majority language.

Sridhar S.N. (1978,16:109-117)in his article, ‘On the Functions of Code-Mixing in Kannada’, points out that the term code-switching is used to refer to the alternative use of two or more languages or varieties in distinct or functional domain. The most important characteristic of code-switching seems to be the switch from one code to the other in the social situation. This is precisely not the case with code-mixing. The switching takes place rapidly, frequently and almost unconsciously, within a single social event, within a single text, and even several times within a single sentence. Sridhar considers language alternation in code-mixing as intrasententially without a shift in speech situation. When lexical items and phrases of one language are mixed into another, their mixing is labelled as code-mixing and when there is a switch from one language to another in a unit of discourse it is called code-switching.
Sridhar argues that, “the more educated a person, the more he tends to mix elements from English in his Kannada, the more earthy and physical a person the greater the mixer of Perso Arabic elements in his Kannada.” (1978:113). He also states that the speech of all the educated characters is marked by different degrees of code-mixing with English, for example the language Kannada mixed with English is supposed to be a reflection of the status of English as an elite language.

Sridhar and Sridhar (1980, 34(4):407-416) in their article, ‘The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code-Mixing’, examine the syntax and psycholinguistics of code-mixing and give new insight to the study of code-mixing. Sridhar and Sridhar point out that the internal structure of the guest constituents not necessarily confirms the structure of the host language, so long as its placement in the host sentence obeys the rules of the host language.

Poplack (1980, 18:581-618) in her article, ‘Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in English y Termino en Espanol’, tries to highlight syntactic constraints on code-switching. She discusses two constraints on code-switching: a free-morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. According to Poplack, an alternation of code may occur at any point of the discourse at which it is possible to make a surface constituent cut and still retain a free morpheme. Therefore, any constraint within the sentence can be altered to another code at least one free morpheme. This is called the free morpheme constraint. A free-morpheme constraint states that a switch cannot occur between a lexical form and a bound morpheme unless the former has been phonologically integrated into the language of the latter.
The equivalence constraint states that the words order immediately before and immediately after a switching point should exist in the two languages to make it possible for a switch to take place. The two languages involved can then be interchanged freely. Poplack refers to an equivalence constraint or rule which states that bilinguals in uttering sentences may use constituents of one language at one point and those of another at another point as long as the order of these constituents is shared by the two languages.

Grosjean (1982) in his book, *Life with Two Languages*, discusses bilingual as a unique person who uses two languages for different purposes and with different people. The bilingual person is familiar with his personal code. It is seen that bilinguals do not speak in a haphazard way. Code-mixing, code-switching and lexical borrowings are rule-governed phenomena. The bilingual’s fluency in each language reflects the need for that skill in that language. The analysis emphasizes that the needs and skills differ according to the language history of the bilingual and the domains of use of each language. Grosjean observes that bilinguals are rarely equally fluent in their languages. Some speak one language better than another, while some use their languages in specific situations and others still can read and write one of the languages they speak.

Grosjean emphasizes that the bilingual develops proficiency in his/her language based on the communicative needs. Hence, the bilingual can never be totally fluent. It is acknowledged that in the bilingual communities several language varieties are developed. According to Grosjean, the bilingual chooses his/her language depending on the
situation, topic, and the interlocutor. Switching or mixing takes place if the environment permits. Grosjean also proposes that the numerous single word items that occur in bilingual discourse as ‘speech borrowings’ or ‘nonce borrowings’.

Grosjean gives a psycholinguistic interpretation to code-switching. Grosjean’s theory focuses on single word elements that can be analysed as either code-switching or borrowing. It is observed that the elements are perceived by bilinguals to be either code-switching or borrowing depending most significantly on the phonological effect of the base language on the word. Grosjean thinks that a base language is chosen by the bilingual may ‘decide’ to switch the base language during the conversation. This decision is also referred to as the ‘language choice’ of the bilingual. Accordingly, language mixing occurs when the bilingual decides to bring in other-language elements into the already chosen base language. If a word, phrase or a sentence is taken from another language then there is a ‘language’. This observation emphasizes that the bilingual negotiates the base language depending on external as well as internal variables. This observation acknowledges the social and psycholinguistic constraints governing language mixing in bilingual societies, which cannot easily be comprehended by monolingual language norms.

Grosjean and Soares (1984, 12:380-386) in their article, ‘Bilinguals in a Monolingual and Bilingual Speech Mode: The Effect on Lexical Access’, explain that the challenge for psycholinguists interested in studying mixed language processing will be to explain how communication in mixed language takes place so rapidly and so
efficiently despite what they have seen as some rather intricate operations and strategies.

**Kachru Brij B.** (1983) in his book, *The Indianization of English*, defines the difference between the code-mixing and code-switching. According to him, code-mixing entails transferring linguistic units from one code into another whereas the code-switching is the use of one or more language system in different functional context.

Kachru (1986) in his book, *The Alchemy of English, The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-Native Englishes*, points out that the process of mixing is shown to be not a random but a rule governed process with constraints on mixing the units of two or more codes.

Kachru (1986:140-149) in his article, ‘Non-native Literatures in English as a Resource for Language Teaching’, points out how use of non-native texts is a challenge not only to the non-native teachers and learners but also to teachers and learners who use English as their native language. The classroom situation in India is such where both teachers and learners use English as an institutionalized non-native language.

The most important study in code-mixed varieties in the former colonies of the British Empire was made by Kachru. He (1983:200-201) refers to three types of code-mixing to identify the type of code-mixed varieties used in India, with special reference to their use of communicative strategies.
1. **Englishization**: It is a marker of modernization, Socio-economic position and membership in elite group. In stylistic terms, it marks deliberate style. The widest register range is associated with code-mixing in English. It continues to be in those contexts where one would like to demonstrate authority, power and identity with the establishment.

2. **Sanskritization**: This type of mixing, which is shared by all Indian languages, results in Sankritization. In stylistic terms, it may mark religion and caste, as we have in the case of Kashmiri. It also has developed registers for philosophy, literary criticism and religious discourse. In other contexts, Sanskrit lexicalization marks ‘pedantic style’ in oratorical style, Sanskritization is associated with rightist, revivalist politics, for example, that of the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh and Arya Samaj.

3. **Persianization**: This type of mixing spreads to all those parts of words which came under the domain of Muslims during the Muslim period of Indian history. In registral term, it is associated with the legal register, primary that of the lower courts. In certain parts of India, it is also a marker of religion and occupation. The story of code mixing with Persian in south India, however, can be different.

development of the conversation. Language alternation shows structural distinctions between units and points in a conversation. The unit of conversation deals with transfer and point in the conversation deals with code-switching.

Auer (1988:187-213) in his article, ‘A Conversation Analytic Approach to Code-Switching and Transfer’, summarizes some main findings of an analysis of code-switching and transfer carried out among the children of Italian migrant workers with Southern Italian background. Auer tries to point out that language alteration can be approached from a number of perspective. His research shows that Italian children change language either for individual lexical items or for whole sentences. In Intersentential switching grammatical restrictions do not tell anything about interactional value or meaning.

In the introduction to ‘Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity’, (1998) Auer outlines his ideas to conversational structure of code-switching arguing that neither the sociolinguistic nor the grammatical approach to code-mixing can account for virtually all instances of code-switching. He criticizes macro-sociolinguistic approaches as to include references to topic, participant and setting however, often lacking an explanation as to how these aspects directly influence a conversation. Auer claims code-switching to be an element of conversational structure which is sufficiently autonomous both from grammar and from the larger societal and ideological structures to which the languages in question and their choice for a given interactional episode are related.
Auer Peter Carol M, Eastman(2010:84-112) in their paper,’ Code Switching’, highlight the terminological issue, historical overview of code switching social and interactional meaning from sociolinguistic perspective and grammatical constraints on code switching and puts forward future dimension in code-switching.

**Fasold** (1984) in his book, *The Sociolinguistics of Society*, thinks that code-switching and code-mixing cannot be separated. There is overlapping in the functioning of these two terms. The two terms are distinguishable only in terms of grammar of a clause i.e. if a person uses a word or a phrase from other language; he has mixed, not switched. On the other hand, if one clause has the grammatical structure of one language and the rest is constructed according to the grammar of another a switch has occurred. Fasold explains four different kinds of historical patterns that can lead to societal multilingualism. These patterns are migration, imperialism, federation and border area multilingualism. Fasold observes that languages are linked with the identity and ethnicity of social groups. He notes that attitudes are a valuable tool that reveals the ‘social importance’ of language and how it is used as a ‘symbol of group membership’ in society. The interpretative study of code-mixing or conversational code-switching reveals some fascinating similarities in situations from around the world. Fasold tries to show striking agreement on how to interpret switches between High and Low languages within single conversation. Fundamentally of course, using the high language means the speaker is invoking the values and states of the wider community.

It is observed that the low variety (in this case the mother tongue) is preferred over the high (English) in the family domain and English is
the preferred language in the employment, education and government domains which is the expected result. Interestingly, it was observed that there was very little use of Hindi or other regional dialects in the domains that were expected to rate the local languages higher over English. English dominated in the friendship domain and had the highest ratings in the neighbourhood domain, which is ‘surprising’. The high variety is reserved for the formal domains. Fasold proposes that language ‘understood by participants’ is a crucial factor in language choice and emphasizes the significance of the use of the vernacular in low domains.

**Heller Monica** (1988:265-272) in her paper, ‘Where do we go from here?’, shows that the study of code-switching is also the study of maintenance, change or breakdown of social barriers, and of the sequences of those processes for individuals’ access to important social and economic resources. Code-switching can be understood as an element of both personal and social mobility.

Heller Monica (1988:77-96) in her article, ‘Strategic Ambiguity: Code-Switching in the Management of Conflict’, explains that how code-switching is used when ambiguity is created. Heller shows that people get choice to decide the selection of the available options. It shows that code-switching can be used as a conversational strategy.

Monica Heller thinks that code-switching is a common characteristic of bilingual speech. This sociolinguistic phenomenon has a major contribution in the creation of new varieties of English. It has helped in a transition of the norms of British and American English to local
English. The code-switched or code-mixed varieties help in the process of nativization and indigenization of English.

Monica Heller (1995:158-174) in her article, ‘Code-Switching and the Politics of the Language’, emphasizes the significance of code-switching as a communicative strategy in society especially for subordinate groups. Code-switching strategies such as assimilation, brokerage and collective mobilization are listed as methods used by subordinate groups in a society to ‘resist’ or cope with the domination of dominant groups. Focusing on Anglophones and Francophones in Canada, the role of language in imposing domination and exercising domination by members of dominant groups over subordinate groups is discussed. Elaborating further on code-switching as a conversational strategy, Heller describes it as a tool or instrument through which ‘social, economic and political’ goals are achieved. Heller proposes a framework where language is seen as related to power in two ways: a process of social action and interaction and a process to gain access to and exercise power.

Heller Monica and Pavlenko Aneta (2010:71-83) in their paper, ‘Bilingualism and Multilingualism’, make attempts to find out what does multilingualism tell us about linguistic structure and psychological dimension of human capacity for language? This paper tries to focus the uses of cognitive, social, psychological, psycholinguistics, sociological and anthropological dimensions of multilingualism. It also focuses the issue of language policy in the collapsing monolingual nation. The attempts are made to point out the use of multilingualism in order to know how we use language to link up the cognitive organization of the world with our organization of our
social relations. It allows us to grasp the politics of multilingualism. This paper contributes an imperial basis to social and cognitive theory and their applications in language teaching and language policies.

**Myers-Scotton** (1988:151-186) in the paper, ‘Code-Switching as Indexical of Social Negotiations’, explains code-switching using East African data base. This paper shows how social consequences as motivating linguistic code choices are used by the speakers to arrive at intended consequences. Code-switching is presented as both the marked and unmarked choice of the speaker. It also shows that code switching is a strategy which has multiple identities.

Myers-Scotton (1989,8(3:333-345)) in the paper, ‘Code-Switching with English: Types of Switching, Types of Communities’, tries to explain a type of code switching and tries to show different patterns of code-switching. A natural theory of markedness and indexicality is assumed as part of communicative competence. This theory tries to show the speakers ability to select specific choices of markedness for a specific exchange.

Myers-Scotton (1993) in the article, ‘Social Motivations for Code-Switching: Evidence from Africa’, defines code-switching as the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language in utterance of a matrix language during the same conversation. Myers-Scotton is known for her Matrix-Language-Frame Model and her Markedness Model on code-switching. The Model ‘Matrix Language Frame’ is based on extensive field work carried out in 1988 in Nairobi. Carol Myers-Scotton proposes a matrix language frame model (MLF) in an attempt to explain intra-sentential code-
switching patterns found in Swahili-English. The MLF theory is used to explain insertions, which exclude established loan words. The theory proposes that a set of abstract principles govern intra-sentential code-switching and forwards an abstract frame governed by a dominant language to interpret bilingual data.

The MLF model suggests that there is a dominant language that provides the morpho-syntactic frame for the bilingual utterance and this dominant language is named the ‘matrix’ language (ML). The other language that acts as a guest in the utterance is the ‘embedded’ language (EL). The model presumes that the code-switching utterance contains ML islands and EL islands. In the MLF model, the word order of the utterance is governed by the matrix language. Several structural features of the matrix language were outlined for it to be identified.

Myers-Scotton distinguishes the two languages involved in code-switching into a Matrix Language which provides more morphemes in interaction types including intrasentential code-switching and an embedded language which is essentially a part of code-switching but to a lesser extent. This hierarchy is backed by her consideration that code-switching does not allow for both languages to be activated at the same rate at the same time. Correspondingly, Myers-Scotton does not presume speakers to be equally fluent in both languages; on the contrary, she stresses the importance of the matrix language when stating that for intrasentential code-switching, speakers must have more ability in the matrix language than embedded Language.

Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model takes the social context of conversational code-switching explicitly into consideration, when
assuming that code choices are understood as indexing rights and obligation sets between participants in a given interaction type. The markedness model predicts switching as a realization of one of three negotiations: in conversational exchanges, switching may be an unmarked choice between bilingual peers, or with any participants it may be a marked choice; in non-conventionalized exchanges, switching is an exploratory choice presenting multiple identities.

Myers-Scotton’s markedness model proposes that speakers have a ‘sense of markedness’ in the use of the linguistic codes available to him/her and that all code choices can be explained in terms of speaker ‘motivations’. Accordingly, speakers make the ‘unmarked’ choice for safer and simpler reasons. Myers-Scotton suggests that the ‘unmarked’ code generally acquires ‘fewer distinctive features’ and represents ‘greater frequency’. In essence, the language that is less expected to be used at a given interaction with an interlocutor represents the ‘marked code choice’.

Myers-Scotton (1998) in the paper, ‘Structural Uniformities vs. Community Differences in Code-Switching’, explains bilingualism and the nature of matrix language. This paper focuses roles of socially based and structurally based factors in explaining code-switching patterns. The social and psychological factors effect on the performance of code-switching. This paper tries to focus the Matrix Language Frame Model. All the patterns of performance can be accommodated in it. It shows that code-switching is structurally limited.

Batia Tej K. (1989, 8(3):265-276) in his article, ‘Bilinguals’ Creativity and Syntactic Theory: Evidence for Emerging Grammar’, examines quantitative analysis of 200 intrasentential code-mixed sentences drawn from 24 issues of a film magazine entitled Stardust. It focuses on ‘Filmy English’ highlighting code-mixed variety of English and Hindi’. The attempt has been made to show the innovative varieties of English. This article tries to examine the formal and functional aspects of Filmy English. Code-mixing is not syntactically cosmetic in nature; on the contrary, it has a far reaching syntactic impact on the host language. The code-mixed Hindi terms in this study are familiar terms, titles of respect, cultural terms, idioms, common expressions of Hindi and emotive and gossip vocabulary. The functional goals of Hindi mixing in Filmy English are: stylistic motives, creation of lexical options, triggering, etc. The presentation of identifiable hybrid grammatical system and efforts of new grammatical system show that code-mixing does not represent surface level phenomena.

Bhatia and Ritchie (2004:336-352), in their article, ‘Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing’, point out that participant’s role and relationship play an important role to decide agreement and disagreement of the choice of language. Some languages are more
suitable to participants’ setting, and topic. The factors like religion, class, age, gender can affect the pattern of code-mixing and code-switching. In some societies, it is seen that the code-mixing of women is different from the code-mixing of men. It shows that gender affects the language choice. Even the use of code-mixing depends on the society whether it accepts code-mixing positively or negatively.

Bokamba (1989, 8(3):277-292) in his article, ‘Are There Syntactic Constraints on Code-Mixing?’, differentiates code-switching from code-mixing. He makes different linguistic and psycholinguistic claims and points out that “code-mixing” is the appropriate term to denote alteration within the sentence and code-switching to denote alteration beyond the borders of a sentence in order to emphasize the fact that two phenomena make distinct claims. Bokamba notices that a careful examination of the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic literature suggests that code-switching and code-mixing are constantly viewed as communicative strategies of bilingual and multilingual speakers. Their occurrences in natural conversation are reflective of a code/language choice. It means that the speaker, who possesses a range of languages and language-varieties, can choose which one of these codes is appropriate for a given contest of situation. While explaining the characterization of code-mixing, Bokamba explains code-mixing as “the embodiment of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes) words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical (sub-) systems within the same sentence and speech event. That is CM is intrasentential switching.”

Bokamba examines that major surface constraints deemed to have universal acceptability and shows on the basis of cross linguistic data
that none of them is universal. It is argued in the light of this finding that the postulation of universal syntactic constraints on code-mixing may be premature and that the constraint-oriented theory of this phenomenon is descriptively inadequate because it fails to explicate its socio-psycholinguistics.

**Cheng and Butler** (1989:8(3):299-303) in their article, ‘Code-Switching: A Natural Phenomenon vs Language Deficiency’, use code-switching as a cover term. They attempt to show levels of code-switching. They argue that code-switching occurs at the lexical level, as well as the syntactic, morphological and phonological levels of language. The emerging multicultural and pluralistic background of America is taken into consideration. Code-switching is considered as a very important aspect of bilingualism. It is a natural occurrence when two bilingual persons engage in discourse. Most of the times, they are not consciously aware about their code-switching. The type of code-switching and its impact on the listeners’ behaviour is examined to understand how code-switching serves as an important social function. When code-switching is used to maximize communication and to strengthen not only the content but the essence of the message, it can be considered an asset, not a deficiency. But excessive use of code-switching interferes with communication. The degree of code-switching takes into consideration different variables like cultural experiences of the individuals, the bilingual linguistic competence of the individual, and the social context of the discourse, which includes home, school, work and community.

**Kachru Yamuna** (1989:311-319) in her article, ‘Code-Mixing, Style Repertoire and Language Variation: English in Hindi Poetic
Creativity’, tries to point out that in studies on code-mixing considerable attention has been paid to certain genres of writing in prose. But it should be applied in poetry to assess poetic creativity. This article examines the Hindi poetry of last three decades to determine the effects. The study tries to depict functions of code mixed varieties in Hindi literary works in general. The attempt is made to illustrate the analysis of mixing in the poetic works by Madan Vatsyayan, Muktibodh and others. The tolerance of mixed codes in Hindi creative literature is perhaps what makes Hindi attractive. The study points out that the whole south Asia is an interesting field of research.

**Kamwangamalu** (1989:8(3):321-332) in his article,’ Code-Mixing and Modernization’, points out that code-mixing should be considered as a cross cultural phenomenon. This article explains important aspects of code-mixing. The attempts are made to highlight the characteristic features of code-mixing in every bilingual community from socio-functional perspective. Code-mixing may result in the creation of new styles and registers of language use. The different functions of code-mixing can be explored to highlight the exact nature of code-mixing. This article clears up that English is continuously under the dynamic process of modernization.

**Sridhar K.K.** (1989) in her book, *English in Indian Bilingualism*, states that intrasentential switching of languages is extremely common among bilinguals. She further mentions that code-mixing is not random but rule-governed and that is used to achieve a variety of communicative goals, such as, conveying emphasis, verisimilitude, role playing, technical and socio-cultural authenticity and so forth.
Code-mixing refers to the transition from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, etc.) of one language to using those of another within a single sentence. Code-mixing is to be distinguished from the ‘code-switching’ in two respects: (1) each instance of language alternation in code-mixing is not accompanied by a shift in the speech situation and (2) the language alternations take place intra-sentientally.

She tries to present code-mixing different from borrowing in many ways(1)the mixed elements do not necessarily ‘fill lexical gaps’ in the host language;(2)the mixed elements are often sequences longer than single words;(3)the mixed elements are not restricted to a more or less limited set accepted by the speech community of the host language, on the contrary the entire second language system is at the disposal of the code-mixer;(4)the mixed elements are not necessarily assimilated into the host language by regular phonological and morphological processes .The difference between the code-mixing and borrowing is further stated in relation to the speaker. Borrowing can occur in monolingual speech, while code-mixing is necessary a product of bilingual competence.

Tay, Mary W.J. (1989, 8(3):408-418) in the paper, ‘Code-Switching and Code-Mixing as a Communicative Strategy’, tries to define the distinction between code-switching and mixing. Tay, Mary W.J. (1989:408) states that “code-switching is generally considered to be intersentential whereas code-mixing is intrasentential.” Thus while code-switching involves the embedding or mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two codes within the same speech event and across sentences boundaries, code mixing involves the embedding or mixing of various linguistic units, i.e. morphemes, words, phrases and clauses.
from two distinct grammatical systems or subsystems within the same sentence and same speech situation.

The formal characteristics of code-switching and mixing, such as free morpheme constraints and equivalence constraints have been well documented across a variety of languages, relatively little is known about how code-switching and mixing are used as communicative strategies in a multilingual community. Tay examines various spoken texts in Singapore, such as English, Mandarin, Hokkien and Teochew. The analysis demonstrates how code-switching and mixing are used as a communication strategy, as a device for elucidation and interpretation to establish solidarity and rapport in multilingual discourse.

Tay (1986 a, b) states that new varieties of English should not be treated as deviant forms of some native variety but as independent system. Tay tries to highlight that Singapore English has become far richer than e.g. British English, because of its contact with other languages spoken in Singapore. Instead of merely documenting purely formal or pure functional characteristics of bilingual speech, there is the urgent need to look at bilingual speech as primary act of communication.

Malik, Lalita (1994) in her book, *Socio-Linguistics: A Study of Code-Switching*, deals with the role of code-switching/code-mixing in the formation of Indian English. She recorded data from Hindi-English speakers’ especially graduate students, administrators and lecturers of English. Even her written data from newspapers show the cultural and linguistic network of India. She exploited various linguistic processes
and devices to develop functional and communicative varieties to perform different roles. She also traced educational implication of code-switching in Indian English.

Muysken, Pieter (2000) in his book, *Bilingual Speech*, argues that the most important contribution of the study of code-mixing to linguistic theory concerns the division of labour between the lexicon and the grammar of a language in defining it as a unique system. Appel Rene and Muysken Pieter (1987) in their book, *Language contact and bilingualism*, raise various questions about code-mixing and code-switching and try to explain code-mixing and code-switching not as a sign of linguistic decay but the central part of bilingual discourse. Muysken suggests that there are three main code-mixing patterns which are found in bilingual speech communities: *insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization*. In the insertion, one language determiners the overall structure into which constituents from the other languages are inserted. In the alternation process, both the languages occur alternatively each with their own structure. In congruent lexicalization the grammatical structure is shared by languages A and B and words from both languages are inserted more or less randomly.

Celic, Mehmet (2003:361-369) in the article, ‘Teaching Vocabulary Through Code-Mixing’, focuses usefulness of code-mixing as a technique in teaching of vocabulary. According to Celic, code-mixing can be used to vocabulary teaching in EFL classes. This article discusses the processes involved in vocabulary learning and explains the use of code-mixing to introduce vocabulary. The new vocabulary items can be introduced by using pictures, mimicry, contrast, remuneration, explanation and translation. The impact of code-mixing
can be observed through pedagogic and mental processes of learners. It is seen through this study that using code-mixing to utilize L1 words in teaching L2 vocabulary items does not negatively affect the acquisition of new vocabulary except minor spelling problems. This study shows that careful and appropriate use of code-mixing can lead to successful teaching and learning of new vocabulary in the classes.

**Winford, Donald** (2003) tries to explain in the book, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, linguistic structure of code-switching. According to Winford, inter-sentential switching involves utterances that follow the grammar of one or the other language, whereas intra-sentential switching produces different kinds of hybrid structures that require explanation. Many researchers use their own theoretical perspective to specify structural aspects of code-switching and that leads to structural constraints on code-switching. Winford shows that code-switching involves several types of bilingual language mixture which includes alteration of between clausal structures and insertion of lexical elements from one language into the other.

**Hinrichs, Lars** (2006) in the book, *Code-Switching on the Web: English and Jamaican Creole in Email Communication*, focuses the different ways in which the writers characterize themselves and others by their uses of linguistic forms. The writer focuses code switching in narratives and spoken form and tries to show how writer focuses his/her identity through codes. In spoken conversation more examples of code switching are found. The writer tries to focus how ‘We code’ and ‘They code’ are used in communication. ‘We’ code is used for in group communication. It is used in the family for intimate conversation. It has low prestige. It uses native language, where as
‘They’ code focuses on group communication. It is used in workplace for official communication. It uses second language. It has prestige and it is used only when necessary.

**Kim, Eunhee** (2006:43-61) in the paper, ‘Reasons and Motivations for Code-Mixing and Code-Switching’, tries to point out that the code-mixing and code-switching of the bilinguals depend on the languages they know and speak. This paper focuses the positive factors of code-mixing and code-switching for language education by discussing different societal factors which are the reasons and motivations for understanding code-mixing and code-switching. This paper proposes the three basic processes of code-mixing: Insertion, alteration and congruent lexicalization. It further reveals on language attitudes, dominance and security as the qualitative and quantitative properties of language mixing. It lays emphasis to introduce bilingual education to the students.

**Hok-Shing, Brain Chan** (2007:189-202) in the paper, ‘Hybrid Language and Hybrid Identity: The Case of Cantonese-English Code-Switching in Hong Kong’, refers Hong Kong as a meeting point of East and West by the tourist associations. Hong Kong culture is called hybrid because it compromises Chinese and Western elements. It is commonly assumed that Chinese culture has western elements in it due to Honk Kong being a British colony. It is observed that many people in Hong Kong speak hybrid language and some English elements are phonologically assimilated in Cantonies. The emergence of code-switching has given Hong Kong exposure to adopt western culture. This paper tries to examine the hybrid language, hybrid identity and hybrid culture. In this paper the term code-switching is used to refer
the use of more than one language in a single conversation. The writer tries to point out that in 21st century Cantonese-English code-switching is vibrant and common in informal speech within families and peer groups. The writer further tries to explain that hybrid language does not necessarily focus hybrid culture. English used in Hong Kong is for communicative purpose. Moreover, people have strong sense of Eastern/Chinese, Hong Kong identity. It projects duel identity. Even it is observed that many people in Hong Kong call themselves not as Chinese but Hongkongers. It shows that many people think of themselves as Hongkongers and not as hybrid identity.

Verschik, Anna (2008) in the book, *Emerging Bilingual Speech: From Monolingualism to Code Copying*, focuses contact induced language change in a former monolingual community Estonia in Russia, which has been in the process of bilingualism for the past 15 years. The present study tries to understand and contribute to a general understanding of contact induced language change. The writer used Code Copying Model. The writer points out those structural and sociolinguistic factors needs to be studied for understanding constraints on contact induced language change. In this model the writer avoids the terms like marked choice, code-mixing, borrowing, interference, and transfer to avoid ambiguity. The writer focuses the sociolinguistic situation in Estonia by relating Russian speaking community to their sociolinguistic history. The writer attempts to explain how multilingual communication is emerged in Russia. The writer focuses the code-copying and linguistic items which are copied. While dealing with code-copying, the writer deals with the structural properties, meaning and degree of coping. The writer points out that the need of
communication, pragmatic goals and individual factors are responsible for code copying.

**Kite, Yuriko** (2010:312-328) in the paper, ‘English Japanese Code-Switching among Students in an International High School’, tries to show that Japan is supposed to be a monolingual country but in international schools in Japan, so many children are learning in English. Though these schools are not accredited by the Japanese Ministers of Education and sending children in such schools is supposed to be violation of law. Even though, it is seen that the majority of the students in such international schools are Japanese. This learning in English has created bilingual situation in Japan. Naturally, they try to cope with the linguistic and cultural encounters.

This paper focuses the alternative use of Japanese and English among the school children of international schools whose age is 14 to 17. Through interview, questionnaire and discussion, their survey is carried out with the intention to search code switching among them. This paper deals with domain and markedness model. While considering domain, interlocutors, topic, setting and language choice is taken into consideration. The markedness model is also used to see how speaker makes the language choice, how speaker chooses code as a tool of negotiation. This study tries to investigate code-switching among the Japanese-English bilingualism in the educational community of international school. It tries to understand the relationship with the various domains of interaction: school, home or the community.
The evaluation of the students has shown that though code-switching is generally evaluated negatively as a grammarless mixture of two languages, the students have evaluated code-switching favourably. In teachers’ evaluation, it is accepted that use of code-switching on the campus is natural. The teachers have given some reasons of code-switching among the children. They think that code-switching is useful for enhancing their discourse in order to be more expressive. Code-switching is also used as communication enhancing strategy. It is also used as compensatory strategy. When students don’t know vocabulary, they use code-switching as compensatory strategy. It is also observed that multilingual teachers think of code-switching as membership marking. Code-switching is a useful skill for classroom management. It is observed in case of some teachers that those who think of code-switching as a negative strategy themselves are seen using it. The result of this exploratory study shows that code-switching is an unmarked choice for peer team interactions in the variety of settings among the children of international school. Code-switching is seen as linguistic repertoire used in their community. It is seen that there is no negative correlation between code-switching and academic performance. Some students who have used code-switching as their unmarked choice were later enrolled in top ranking universities.

Ugot, Mercy (2010, 8(2):27-35) in the paper, ‘Language Choice, Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in Biase’, examines the language choice of code-switching and code-mixing in a multilingual Biase local government area in cross river state, Nigeria. The paper shows different languages spoken in Biase including English. Biase falls under a heterogeneous local government area. English is used as the official language in Nigeria. It is also used as an important language in
Biase local government area. Therefore, code-mixing and code-switching are viewed as natural linguistic behaviour of people as they perform linguistic, socio-linguistic, and socio-psychological and socio-culture functions. This paper also raises the question of promoting the use of local languages by the government by providing scholarships to the learners of minority languages.

Kamisah, Arffin and Husin, Misyana Susanti (2011, 5(1):220-247) in their paper, ‘Code-switching and code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia’, find out that code-switching and code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia occur extensively in the interlocutors speech in classroom situations. This paper highlights the frequency of communicative behaviour of the instructors and students along with their attitude towards code-mixing and code-switching. This study shows that speakers code-mix or code-switch for a variety of reasons. The students with less English language competence are seen in favour of code-mixing and code-switching as it became an aide for them in comprehension. This study has shown that code-mixing and code-switching in both Bahasa and English have become the code-choice in the classroom instruction.

Meakins, Felicity (2011) in the book, “Case-Marking in Contact: The Development and Function of Case Morphology in Gurindji Kriol, examines the inflectional morphology in different language contexts such as borrowing, code-switching, pidgin and creole languages, and mixed languages. The writer tries to focus typology of the Gurindji – Kriol. The attempt is made to examine the patterns of code-switching in the Gurindji-Kriol by understanding insertional and alternational code-switching. This study focuses some important characteristics of
Gurindji-Kriol code-switching. The direct objects are commonly switched whereas pronouns are never switched. It is observed that the code-switching in Gurindji-Kriol has preceded the formation of the mixed language. The attempts have been made to find out the matrix language taking into consideration various empirical and theoretical techniques and Kriol is identified as the matrix language as it provides verbal inflection. Alternational pattern is seen in the Gurindji -Kriol code-switching through clause switches, switch of constituents and switches of syntactically integrated elements like discourse markers. The different models indicate that alternational models show alteration of structures from different languages whereas insertion models focus on grammar.

Treffers-Daller, Jeanine (2011:75-89) tries to find out similarities and differences in the contact patterns through the article, ‘Contrastive Sociolinguistics: Borrowed and Code-Switched participles in Romance Germanic-language Contact’. According to the writer the complete understanding of the contact patterns is possible only when sociolinguistic and structural aspects of language contact in multilingual society are taken into consideration. In a situation of borrowing the words are borrowed first, when the language contact becomes more intense due to social pressure or more intimate forms borrowing occurs. The another language change takes place due to interference through shift. In this paper the writer tries to focus more on structural approach than sociolinguistic approach. This paper focuses on borrowing which is called insertion of single words. The code switching is supposed to be more wide-spread phenomenon in Strasbourg than in Brussels.
2.10 Patterns of Code-Mixing

Muysken (2000) in his book, *Bilingual Speech: A typology of code mixing*, suggests that there are three main code-mixing patterns which may be found in bilingual speech communities: insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization.

1. **Insertion**: The concept of insertion is defined as insertion of material such as lexical items or entire constituents of one language into a structure of other language. Muysken explains the grammatical dimension of insertion. Functional elements account for insertional mixing. The insertion process always occurs to the base language. In insertional code-mixing, a constituent is inserted. These inserted constituents are mostly nouns, adjectives and verbs. Noun phrase is also clearly of the insertional type.

2. **Alternation**: It is a very common strategy of code-mixing. Alternative patterns often show some diversity of elements switched. The content words come in insertion whereas discourse particles and adverbs may be alterations. It is a form of code-mixing in which two languages remain relatively separate. This type of alternation includes adverbial modifications, switching at periphery of the clause, flagging, tag-switching and the use of syntactically integrated discourse markers.

3. **Congruent Lexicalization**: The notion of congruent lexicalization underlies the study of style shifting. Congruent lexicalization is frequent in bilingual setting because there is an overabundance of homophonous words that serve as bridges. The reason is that there is a general structural equivalence which makes code-mixing possible.
There is a hierarchy in the degree to which congruent lexicalization occurs in different communities.

2.11 Framework of Analysis
In the present framework, the categorized code-mixed examples are put into their grammatical categories and they are explained at literal, general and contextual level.

2.12 Conclusion
This chapter has highlighted language as a social phenomenon. The sociolinguistic approach to code-mixing has to deal with multicultural and bilingual scenario taking into consideration Indian sociolinguistic setting. The attempt is made to focus on the Indian literature in English. The different views of scholar are taken into account along with their processes of code-mixing. The nature, definitions, types, and patterns of code-mixing are highlighted along with the framework applied for the present study.