CHAPTER I

1.0.0 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1.0 Different Approaches to the Study of Language

The present project is an attempt to examine the use of English for oral communication in industries in Andhra Pradesh within the broad framework of the approach to the study of language known as the 'sociology of language'. In order to appreciate the relevance of this approach for a study of the impact of language behaviour and social behaviour on each other in a multilingual setting, it would be worthwhile looking at some of the other approaches to language.

The multifaceted nature of language lends itself to various directions that the study of language in its social context can take and has taken in the past. The study of language use in its social context is one of the two main ways of studying language, i.e. the competence oriented approach and the sociologically oriented approach. These do not suggest a dichotomy but indicate emphases on different aspects of language.

The competence oriented approach is characterized by the Chomskyan onslaught against the structuralist point of view. American structuralists had aimed at^* 

^Based on Roulet, 1975.
a) describing the current spoken language of an individual or of a community,

b) limiting the area of language to be described by emphasizing language form as the single objective, observable and verifiable aspect of language, thus relegating meaning to a subordinate place,

c) carrying out this programme of description by means of a systematic, objective and rigorous procedure allowing the analyst to derive the grammar of a language from a corpus of recorded data in a quasi mechanical way.

Chomsky's major criticisms against the structuralist point of view were:

a) that structural grammar limited itself to the inventory and analysis of utterances from a corpus without seeking to characterize the rules which permit all native speakers to produce an infinity of grammatical utterances,

b) that it did not take into account intuitively recognized linguistic facts e.g. declarative, interrogative, negative and passive paraphrase relationships of a single utterance,

c) that in remaining at the surface structure level it missed making a number of deep generalizations.

Chomsky and the generativists too seek to discover for each language a system of formal principles that can determine the grammatical sentences in that language, but with a difference. To fill the gaps in the structuralist approach Chomsky conceived of transformational generative grammar as a system of rewrite rules which, beginning from the initial

*Based on Roulet, 1975.
symbol S plus a lexicon, permitted the generation of a series of deep structure symbols containing in principle all the necessary semantic information for the interpretation of sentences. A second group of rules (transformational) modified the order of the symbols in these strings and assigned to each sentence a surface structure. Chomsky makes it clear that it is impossible to arrive at these deep structures via direct observation and by analysis of the products of a corpus as was maintained by structuralists. Thus what was necessary for linguists was the characterization in the form of an abstract hypothesis, that system of rules which permits us to understand and generate an infinite number of new sentences. For scientific analysis this constituted a step forward whereas for structural linguists and its predecessors the object of inquiry was language, for Chomsky the focus of inquiry is grammar. According to Chomsky his approach to the study of language "is based on the assumption that knowledge of language can be properly characterized by means of a generative grammar, i.e. a system of rules and principles that assigns structural descriptions to linguistic expressions." (Chomsky, 1981:9)

Despite their differences all these linguists tried to make the study of language as scientific as possible. This approach to the study of language may be said to have the following implications for linguistics:
a) Language is described in terms of a network of formal relations. The focus is similar though the emphasis is different.

b) The sentence, which is most convenient to operate with, is the unit of formal analysis.

c) A person's knowledge of a language is equated with his

1) ability to produce grammatically acceptable sentences i.e. produce sentences that conform to the rules that govern the relationships of form within the sentence;

2) ability to choose a string of items appropriate for categories such as declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives, etc.;

3) ability to identify certain processes such as complementation, passivization, etc. in sentences.

The meaning of a sentence is its linguistic meaning determined by the sets of substitutable elements in the given context. Language is thus studied as an isolated idealized abstraction in a homogeneous community.

This approach to the study of language brings to mind the following questions:

1. Is there a determinate set of sentences to be characterized as grammatical? Fillmore says,

"The decision to define the set of 'grammatical' sentences in a language as the data to be explained by a theory of grammar ... requires a reliance on certain sorts of intuitive judgements of native speakers ... Unhappily, the
recurrent embarrassment of the generative grammarian is that his students and his critics are forever contriving situations in which the sentences he had needed to believe were ungrammatical turned out to be completely appropriate." (Fillmore, 1972:273-74)

ii. Is the knowledge of grammatical sentences enough to enable appropriate use of these sentences in a given situation or a socio-cultural context?

e.g. (a) Boss: A, could you send B and C upstairs?
   A: Yes. I'll shunt them upstairs straightaway.
   - Register confusion in A's reply.

   (b) A: I'm sorry to hear that your son met with an accident.
   B: It's all right
   'It's all right' is used in reply to 'I'm sorry' only when the latter is used for an apology, and not when it is used to express one's sympathy.

Can this production of grammatically acceptable sentences be equated with 'knowing' the language?

iii. Can the description of a language divorce language from its use? Fillmore recommends a movement from the actual language in use to the rules of grammar. He thinks that

"a theory of grammar must be informed by a theory of conversation ...." (Fillmore, 1972:275)
iv. Is language a static entity? Languages constantly come into contact with each other for varying lengths of time, and as a result of this contact the chances of a language not going through a process of change are rare.

v. Is the language of a speech community uniform? Even within the same community there are varieties determined by area, social class, style of discourse. Uniformity of language and variety are mutually exclusive. The existence of the varieties of a language renders uniformity unrealizable in the real world. Social interaction focusses attention on (linguistic) contexts larger than sentences, and on interpretation of utterances extending beyond the boundary of a sentence. In the larger context of social interaction isolated sentences that would be ambiguous and analysable only in terms of formal relations can be 'disambiguated'. Sentences are ambiguous only when they are out of context.

  e.g. Flying planes can be dangerous.

  Transformational Grammar accounts for the ambiguity in this sentence.

  In a social context however, it does not remain ambiguous at all.
A: Where has Rajan been all morning?
B: He's been learning to fly at the flying club.
A: Flying planes can be dangerous.

vi. Can form and function be divorced?

*e.g.*

A: You're looking pretty today.
B: Thank you.
A: You're welcome.

"You're welcome" is grammatical but cannot function as a reply to "Thank you" for a compliment, considering that the function of "you're welcome" is partly that of acknowledging that one has done somebody a favour.

A socially realistic linguistics thus recognises the existence of

i) a relationship between form and function;

ii) inter-language and intra-language varieties;

iii) no language apart from the language in use;

iv) appropriateness as an essential element in social interaction;

v) language use as a process, i.e. part of other processes such as language contact and consequently language change;

* taken from Fillmore, 1972.*
vi) a unit larger than the sentence for the analysis of discourse, written and spoken;

vii) a context that can help to 'disambiguate' the 'ambiguity' of utterances.

The concept of the study of language in social context which has had a slightly different perspective for different linguists or groups of linguists, had its origin much earlier than we might believe. One of the perspectives on the study of language in its social context is context oriented. William D. Whitney used the word situation for the first time in 1875 in *Life and Growth of Language*. "He ["the child"] does not see why each should not have an own name given alike in all situations." (1901, p.14) (quoted in Germain, 1979:2) Ten years after Whitney, the German philologist Philip Wegener used the term *situation* in linguistics in his book *Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen des Sprachlebens* (1885). He attempted to formulate a *Situationstheorie* in which he distinguished between three types of situations: situation of representation, situation of memory, and situation of consciousness. It was Wegener who was to provide the impetus for theories of situation in England. In fact Bromislav Malinowski (1952) and Gardiner (1951) borrowed the word *situation* which, since Malinowski, has usually been associated with the word *context* to form the expressions *situational context* or *context of situation* in the English School of Linguistics. Context, for some linguists, has a very general meaning which includes situation. In Malinowski's
work The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages (1952), context designates the total linguistic setting of a word as well as situation and all sociological and ethnological knowledge of the anthropologist. In Coral Gardens and Their Magic (1965), his concept of context is enlarged. It includes verbal context, grammatical context, paralinguistic context (gestures, facial expressions, body movements, rhythm, accents, etc.), and cultural context which includes situational context and all the extralinguistic knowledge of the anthropologist. Language is, he maintained, a 'mode of action', not a 'countersign of thought'. For Malinowski context of situation was 'a bit of the social process which can be considered apart' or an ACTUAL observable set of events. He considered the sentence as the most important social tool because the sentence was the basic and primary unit of meaning. J.R. Firth borrowed the idea of studying language in a context of situation, but refined the method and preferred to see context of situation as part of the linguist's apparatus in the same way as are the grammatical categories that he uses. It was used as 'a suitable schematic construct' to apply to language events and he suggested the following categories:

A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities
   i. The verbal action of participants
   ii. The non-verbal action of the participants.
B. The relevant objects
C. The effects of the verbal action.

For Firth, therefore, 'context of situation' was one of the techniques of description of the same abstract nature as other techniques such as grammar. Halliday, who derives his perspective on language from Malinowski's and Firth's heuristic approach to language among others, has similar views on context. According to him context designates the relation between linguistic form (grammar and lexicon) and 'associated non-linguistic facts', that is situation. He later considers language as a 'product of the social process' and says that it arises in the life of the individual through an ongoing exchange of meanings with significant others. The formulation 'language as social semiotic' according to him means interpreting language within a sociolinguistic context. "At the most concrete level, this means that we take account of the elementary fact that people talk to each other." (Halliday 1978:2). Talking of the ideas expressed in 'Language as Social Semiotic' Halliday says that they are the outcome of the ongoing exchange of meanings that somehow add up to a coherent 'context of situation'. The latter is that in which language is used reflexively to explore itself. Halliday's consideration of his study of language, has for its organizing concept system not structure. In relating language to social context he says that the functional
components of the semantic system provide the key. The components of the content i.e. a 'field' of social process, (what is going on), a 'tenor' of social relationships (who are taking part) and a 'mode' of symbolic interaction (how the meanings are exchanged) are systematically related to the components of the semantic system i.e., experiential, interpersonal and textual. Variation in language is considered more an outcome of the inherent nature of language itself than a product of the social system. But in the last analysis, the linguistic system is, in fact, the product of the social system. In his dissertation entitled Language and Situation Wilkins attempted to study experimentally "the nature of the relationship between the verbal action and elements of the non-verbal situation." (p.2). (Quoted in Germain, 1979:51) He examined the extent to which the different categories of the "context of situation" could influence verbal action, from the point of view of Firth and the neo-Firthians Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964). The results of the experiment showed that only nine out of one thousand sixteen utterances, that is, less than 1% were determined by a social situation. It was also demonstrated that most of the utterances were either produced in response to other utterances or determined by non-observable factors, especially those of a psychological nature — individuals' personalities, for example. Wilkins finds it difficult to
accept the idea that we would only have to be able to define the types of 'contexts of situation' in order to be able to establish 'registers'. (Wilkins 1966, p.4) (cited in Germain 1979:51-52).

Whatever meaning the 'context of situation' or the 'situational context' may have had for different linguists, the terms represent a descriptive tradition in linguistics that builds up theoretical concepts for studying language in its social context.

Another quite different perspective on the study of language in its social context is variation-oriented. The main exponents of this approach are Labov (U.S.) and Trudgill (U.K.). Labov has suggested that one of the fundamental sociolinguistic principles is that "there are no single-style speakers". (Labov 1970:180). The theoretical viewpoint with which Labov approached the description of language in society was an important contribution. He attacked the goal and scope of linguistic theory and methodology of linguistic research and disapproved of the dichotomy between historical and descriptive linguistics. It was according to him more insightful to combine synchronic and descriptive linguistics, synchronic and diachronic studies. This main approach to synchrony and diachrony may be shown diagrammatically as follows:
components of the semantic system provide the key. The components of the content i.e. a 'field' of social process, (what is going on), a 'tenor' of social relationships (who are taking part) and a 'mode' of symbolic interaction (how the meanings are exchanged) are systematically related to the components of the semantic system i.e., experiential, interpersonal and textual. Variation in language is considered more an outcome of the inherent nature of language itself than a product of the social system. But in the last analysis, the linguistic system is, in fact, the product of the social system. In his dissertation entitled Language and Situation Wilkins attempted to study experimentally "the nature of the relationship between the verbal action and elements of the non-verbal situation." (p.2). (Quoted in Germain, 1979:51) He examined the extent to which the different categories of the "context of situation" could influence verbal action, from the point of view of Firth and the neo-Firthians Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964). The results of the experiment showed that only nine out of one thousand sixteen utterances, that is, less than 1% were determined by a social situation. It was also demonstrated that most of the utterances were either produced in response to other utterances or determined by non-observable factors, especially those of a psychological nature — individuals' personalities, for example. Wilkins finds it difficult to
accept the idea that we would only have to be able to define the types of 'contexts of situation' in order to be able to establish 'registers'. (Wilkins 1966, p.4) (cited in Germain 1979:51-52).

Whatever meaning the 'context of situation' or the 'situational context' may have had for different linguists, the terms represent a descriptive tradition in linguistics that builds up theoretical concepts for studying language in its social context.

Another quite different perspective on the study of language in its social context is variation-oriented. The main exponents of this approach are Labov (U.S.) and Trudgill (U.K.). Labov has suggested that one of the fundamental sociolinguistic principles is that "there are no single-style speakers". (Labov 1970:180). The theoretical viewpoint with which Labov approached the description of language in society was an important contribution. He attacked the goal and scope of linguistic theory and methodology of linguistic research and disapproved of the dichotomy between historical and descriptive linguistics. It was according to him more insightful to combine synchronic and descriptive linguistics, synchronic and diachronic studies. This main approach to synchrony and diachrony may be shown diagrammatically as follows:
The diagram yields four different models:

1. Description of language as of today.
2. Comparison of two languages as of today.
3. Description of language from the point of view of historical development.
4. Comparison of two languages in terms of historical development.

Methodologically, Labov, though he uses a previously existing sociological model, makes a radical break with the cumbersome and often unreliable traditional dialect questionnaire interviews in his work on *English in New York City* (1966). His study also used randomly selected informants, which was a departure from the established tradition in linguistics of the selection of particular types of informants in a non-random fashion. In addition to his innovations in sampling procedure, Labov made important changes in the construction of the interview. He attempted to isolate four different contextual styles by giving different tasks in the interview and looking
at the use of his phonological variables in each of the styles. The end-result showed a continuum of styles which ranged from formal to informal speech. Labov's use of taperecorded spontaneous conversation in his sociolinguistic analysis was another valuable innovation. In the tradition of the Linguistic Atlas, single items and any possible variants for these items were elicited, but no study was usually done of the use of these items in a spontaneous conversation. As we shall see later Labov's investigation into the variability in use of language was conducted in a society in which English is the dominant language of the people. It did not take into account variability of language use in more complex bilingual/multilingual societies as in Asia where each individual knows two or more languages/dialects equally well and alternates between these distinct local languages/dialects for purposes of communication just as speakers in monolingual settings alternate between styles of the same language. Also, Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1974a) have worked with relatively stable societies and have introduced such concepts as variable rules and diasystems. But linguists (e.g. Le Page, 1973, Bickerton, 1971), working with unstable societies which are undergoing rapid and radical change, have found it difficult to do this. The social, political, cultural and religious conflicts that obtain in such societies before they achieve any semblance of stability are reflected in their verbal behaviour also. Many
linguists (De Camp, 1971; Bickerton, 1971; Le Page, 1979) have criticized Labov's concept of 'variable rule' as an extension of conventional generative rules through quantitative measures of linguistic environment and extralinguistic content. Le Page (1979) considers variable rules as a vain attempt to weld into one abstract system several partial but socially marked systems an individual creates for himself to negotiate a variety of social encounters. The status of these rules in a grammar remains problematic and "it is not clear whether they reflect speakers' basic capabilities or merely temporary manifestations of their speech behaviour" (Dittmar, 1976:184). In fact Labov himself was aware of the difficulties involved in the analysis of the verbal behaviour of societies in a state of flux. He quotes a passage with 'strange mixtures' from the speech of a New York Peurto-Rican bilingual and concludes,

"So far no one has been able to show that such rapid alternation is governed by any systematic rules or constraints, and we therefore must describe it as the irregular mixture of two distinct systems." (Labov 1971:457)

C.J.N. Bailey (1973) De Camp (1971), and Bickerton (1971, 1973, 1974) have dealt with linguistic variation in their own ways, but in spite of differences in approach they have, on the whole, all been primarily concerned with the formulation of rules, their order and their incorporation into a system.
Another group of sociolinguists, e.g. Gumperz and Hymes, examine the study of language from the point of view of 'ethnography of communication'. Gumperz (1972: Introduction) is of the view that correlational studies of linguistic and social variables, though important, "leave unanswered a number of basic questions concerning the nature of the relationship of linguistics to social facts" (Gumperz 1972:13). They do not, for instance, tell us why some societies such as those of South and Southeast Asia maintain major distinctions of language in spite of centuries of intensive contact, while elsewhere as in Europe, North and South Americas, groups tend to give up their native tongues after only a few generations. Gumperz dealt with complex multilingual situations, and he (1964a) showed how in Delhi, contact between Hindi and Panjabi led to the emergence of a mixed style of speech. In such cases it was not relevant to speak of interference, for this style evolved as a result of the need to express a distinct identity. In Gumperz and Wilson (1971) two unrelated languages, Marathi and Kannada in Kupwar village, Maharashtra, are shown as having converging structures. Realizing that the tools used for homogeneous communities could not be used to describe multilingual societies, Gumperz introduced concepts like Speech Community, Speech Event, and Verbal Repertoire (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972). This ethnography oriented approach differs from the correlation approach of Labov in that it lays emphasis on an enquiry into the nature of communication processes.
through a study of social interaction as it actually obtains in groups, rather than quantifying frequencies of occurrence of a particular feature. An attempt is also made to discover rules that characterize communication. Dell Hymes (1972) considers ethnographic information as useful for suggesting considerable cross-cultural variation in rules of speaking. Diversity of speech presents itself in many spheres of life — education, national development, transcultural communication. However, there is yet no body of systematic knowledge and theory. "There is not even agreement on a mode of description of language in interaction with social life." (Hymes 1972:38). Adequate descriptions of the interaction of language and social life are necessary for the development of models and theories of this interaction.

Another perspective on the study of language in its social context has a sociological orientation. The work and thinking of Bernstein and Fishman, for example, have this orientation. Bernstein (1970) has been interested in the educational problems of socially disadvantaged children. He makes a distinction between 'elaborated' and 'restricted' speech codes. The 'elaborated' code, associated with the middle class, is more complex and provides access to social success. The 'restricted' code, associated with the working class, is grammatically simple and prevents social success.
A natural consequence of such an analysis was the introduction of compensatory programmes in education for the benefit of lower class children. Dittmar (1976) in his discussion of Bernstein's position shows how the assumptions underlying this 'Deficit Hypothesis' and educational programmes based on it have dangerous social consequences. The 'Deficit Hypothesis' implies that lower-class children are culturally and linguistically deprived and that their language is incapable of handling complex thought in a logical manner.

Fishman (1972:1) defines the 'sociology of language' as "the entire gamut of topics related to the social organization of language behaviour including not only languages per se but also language attitudes and overt behaviours toward language and toward language users." The relevant question for the sociology of language concerning the relationship between language, culture and society began to evolve during the Renaissance mainly in Europe. Luckmann (1975) briefly examines the historical evolution of the problem of relating language and society. According to him, "The views of Wilhelm von Humboldt on the relationship between language and world view, the theory of Emile Durkheim on the influence of social structure on cultural configurations and the arguments of George H. Mead on the role of communication in socialization processes can be regarded as classical statements on the various perspectives in which language appears to be of
utmost significance in the emergence and survival of human societies." (Luckmann 1975:19). The problems of a sociology of language as questions that required treatment in a sociological context, slowly began to emerge from the background formed by the development and specification of the above statements in linguistics, the philological disciplines, cultural anthropology and social psychology. Nevertheless, in the past sociology of language did not gain the status of a major sociological discipline. Attempts in this direction though unsuccessful were made by some linguists such as Marcel Cohen (1956) and Hertzler (1965). Cohen provides a good deal of bibliographical and factual information of considerable use to the sociologist but does not develop any systematic sociology of language. Hertzler views the sociology of language as a discipline in its own right rather than as finding its raison d'être either in its contribution to linguistics on the one hand or to sociology on the other. Though this point of view is the same as that of Fishman, his discussion of questions such as the 'unification' of language reveals little understanding of the role of planned language change (cf. Fishman 1967:586-604). It is with the work of Fishman that the field has gained in importance. He has as Hymes says in the foreword to the Sociology of Language (1972), provided the subject 'with its first modern text'. Fishman has conducted research in several major areas of the
field -- language loyalty, language development, language planning, bilingualism. The sociology of language has, as we have seen from Fishman's statement quoted earlier, acquired a very general character. It can cover discourse analysis, aspects of anthropological linguistics, as well as the social psychology of language and is generally associated with bilingualism, diglossia, verbal repertoire, code-switching, language loyalty, etc. Fishman extended the notion of diglossia earlier introduced by Ferguson (1959) to characterize different multilingual situations. He (1965, 1966, 1968) also introduced the concept of 'domain' into linguistic analysis. Though the ultimate objective of such an analysis is to make predictions about the particular variety likely to be used in a given role-relation in a given domain, Fishman's own experience reveals that it is not always easy to identify domains and formulate such rules. It calls for 'considerable insight into the socio-cultural dynamics of particular multilingual settings at particular periods in their history' (Fishman, 1966:429). Considering the large variety of problems and purposes that emerge from the use of language in stable as well as unstable bilingual/multilingual societies, Fishman finds it difficult to conceive of a sociology of language as being either methodologically or theoretically uniform. The present study concerns itself with that part of the sociology of language which Fishman calls
It is clear from what has been said so far that language is a multidimensional and polysystemic activity. Linguists like Chomsky are interested in examining language not in terms of its function in a sociocultural network but in terms of its own internal systems. The question that he is seeking to answer is: how do the nuts and bolts of a language organize themselves into a system to make a human language function effectively as a rule-governed creative system? Sociologists, on the other hand, are interested primarily in studying society as a network of sociocultural relations and language as one of its subnetworks. The focus in sociolinguistics is on the functioning of language as a network of formal relations in a bigger network which is that of sociocultural relations. In addition to these three approaches to language in society, we have a fourth where the focus is on society and on the social uses of language. These four approaches may be labelled: Formal Linguistics, Sociology, Sociolinguistics and Sociology of language. It may be represented diagrammatically as follows:
I have started with the assumption that language is basically a social tool, and have therefore decided to examine language choice and language use carefully. As the 'use of language' is one of the main concerns of a socially realistic linguistics, of a sociology of language as also of this study, I shall examine briefly what 'the use of language' signifies in the context of multilingual communities.

1.2.0 Language use in its social context

A consideration of 'language use' has the underlying assumptions:

a. that a language is essentially a tool for communication between two or more human beings and "has no existence independent of those who speak it." (Le Page, 1967:143)

b. that communication presupposes the existence of at least two people — the speaker and the listener and of a process — the encoding of a message by the speaker and the 'decoding' of that message by the listener;
c. that the process of decoding a message can occur only if the listener shares the same code as the speaker;

d. that a 'code' shared by any group of people who communicate with each other need not be identical with that of any other group of people;

e. that differences in 'code' may be differences between two languages or between two or more different varieties of a language;

f. that the varieties of a language may be determined by the geographic region to which a person belongs, or by the social class, caste to which he belongs, or by the topic under discussion, or by the relationship between the participants in an interaction, or a combination of these factors;

g. that within a geographically marked region people can speak many languages and within each language many varieties. All these can co-exist, each acquiring a societal function;

h. that though each language and language variety is said to have a function, it would be difficult to enumerate the number of clear-cut 'uses' to which it can be put;
i. that the societal FUNCTION a language performs is equivalent to its USE.*

j. that an important societal FUNCTION affecting the use of a language is the prestige that that language may enjoy in a particular social context.

Fig. 1: Relationship between use, USE and FUNCTION

1.2.1 The use of language in multilingual communities

These assumptions are, however, only a partial reflection of the complex and multidimensional nature of language.

*USE — Though this does not imply that the sum of particular instances of use to which a language is put by individuals in a society necessarily comprises USE by those individuals. In turn, the USES which go to make the societal FUNCTION are not necessarily an arithmatic sum of uses. The relationship between use, USE and FUNCTION is diagrammatically represented in Fig. 1.

'Function' or 'use' of a language here is distinct from Halliday's use of 'function' of language. (Halliday, 1978:45-51)
and language use in multilingual communities. We shall consider these assumptions in greater detail below.

A consideration of the use of language as a means of communication among members of a community is the second of the two main perspectives on the study of language. The one examines language as unique sentences emerging from the individual mind and thus takes up the idealized sentences of an idealized speaker as the object for the study. Language then is reduced to a formal system as Chomsky was successfully able to show, and as long as the idealized speaker and the idealized sentence is maintained, language can be represented as ordered rules. The other perspective examines language as a social phenomenon and studies it as a phenomenon arising out of the need for people in society to communicate with each other. It serves this need by performing the functions required of it in a particular social context.

Since the purpose of language/communication, the latter can take place only if the participants in an interaction use a code that gives them a sense of shared 'meaning'. The listener can decode the meaning only if what has been said means almost the same to him as it does to the speaker in terms of their socio-cultural setting. A 'shared' code by any group of people in any one setting might differ from a shared code by the same group in another setting or by another group in the same setting, for the variables that operate in
an interaction are innumerable. This is due to the fact that the existence of a completely homogeneous and isolated community e.g. Iceland, with a more or less uniform language is very rare. Within one theoretically identifiable language there can be many varieties. In English, for instance, there are (a) dialectal varieties such as Cockney spoken in London, the Yorkshire and Somersetshire dialects, and in Hindi, for instance, there are dialectal varieties such as Bhojpuri, Awadhi and Brajbhaasha, (b) registeral varieties such as English used by doctors, lawyers, (c) socially marked varieties that distinguish the various classes in a community, such as the Brahmins and non-Brahmins in Tamil Nadu in India; (d) stylistic varieties, ranging along a formality-informality cline depending upon the relationship obtaining between participants in an interaction along both the horizontal axis i.e. according to social functions and roles, and the vertical axis i.e. according to social status. There could, for instance, be a boss-subordinate, teacher-student, doctor-patient, colleague-colleague kind of relationship or a stranger-stranger, parent-child, brother-sister, friend-friend kind of relationship obtaining between participants in an interaction. According to Heller et al "language choice implies interpretations linked to the social position of the interlocutors and the possibility of political connotations is always present." (Heller et al:8).
Yet another dimension of the use of a language and its varieties is the choice that a member of a group has to make from a whole range of socio-cultural systems that are common to the whole community, and as Halliday observes, "using language means making choices in the environment of other choices." (Halliday 1978:52). Though 'choice' may tend to indicate a deliberate, predetermined one in every act of 'communicating', it may not always be predictable and may depend on how the individual relates to the group with which he communicates. The individual in this sense as well speaks more than one language, and has a range of repertoires (Gumperz 1971:114-127) with which he operates in his community. Le Page aptly says "... each individual's competence subsumes partial knowledge of many socially-marked systems, and each individual's performance reflects choice among those systems, constrained by the social and psychological factors operating upon him at any given moment." (Le Page, 1979:9) Members of a multilingual community may in fact know a number of languages and varieties of languages each of which they would use in accordance with the socio-psychological factors operating upon them. One of the constraints on the use of a language is the function that it acquires politically from time to time in a particular setting and its importance in the context of any given moment. The FUNCTION of any one language or variety of a language, in a
given social context, however, cannot be separated from its use, for it is use that reflects the function e.g. the use of English in India for official communication by the States and the Union Government is a reflection of its function as the associate official language, or the use of English as a medium of instruction for science and technology reflect, its function as a means of access to modern science and technology, or the most frequent use of English among the educated would reflect its status as the language of those who have had a certain amount of education. Conversely, the use that a language is put to by the majority of the members of a community tends to be defined by the function it acquires for the entire community through powerful political influence or an effective educational system. "... the behaviour of individuals within a community and hence of the community itself", according to Le Page "is focussed, made more uniform by various agencies such as close daily interaction, or an external threat or the emergence of a powerful model such as an education system or a literary or political leader may provide, or else it is made more diffuse by the lack of any political or social cohesion, by cultural contact providing fresh models ..." (Le Page, 1979:3) For instance, the use of Bahasa Indonesia or Malay as a language of modern life and culture in a large area and the transformation "from a more or less unintegrated, pidgin-like lingua franca into
the official language, the language of modern life and culture in an area as large as the whole of Europa." (Alisjahbana, 1976:51) is evidence of the role of focussing agencies such as the Government and various committees in bringing about 'planned' change in the function and status of the language for the Indonesian and Malaysian communities, and helping it to develop into a full-fledged modern language comparable to English, French, German, Japanese, etc. to perform the functions of a modern language. An example of the influence of powerful agencies on the role, and consequently, the use of language in multilingual settings is Bill 101 in Canada. Heller et al report a case study of the process of 'francisation' or the implementation of the French language in a Montreal brewery after Bill 101 was passed in 1977. It is designed to allow French to become the de facto language of work, though English is allowed to retain its hegemony as the language of commerce. They state, "As concerns situations of contact between English and French (and between anglophones and francophones) we can see that the law and the pressure of numbers (as well as economic changes) produce over time new linguistic practices. To the extent that the imposed situation is perceived as irreversible conventions, notably those of lexical use, form; new norms of language use establish themselves (as concerns appropriateness, especially of language choice), and finally, a new equilibrium takes
over among the linguistic groups that work together on an
everyday basis." (Heller et al, n.d. Conclusion) A lan-
guage in a multilingual community may thus acquire the status
and function of a first language (L₁), a second language (L₂)
or a foreign language (FL) or all the three. It is natural
for countries that have English as their L₁, for example, to
use it in administration, education, politics and every conceivable sphere of public life. In private life the use of
English by non-native bilinguals is very restricted though its use by those whose mother tongue it is, is constant.
English has, for countries like the USA, UK, Australia, for
instance, the status and function of an L₁. Bilingual/multilingual communities that have another language or other languages as their L₁ or L₂ and recognize the importance of
English as a world language for international communication,
have assigned to it the status of a foreign language to be acquired only by a small number of people for communicating with the rest of the world and for professional advancement e.g. Japan, the European countries, Vietnam, etc. English in some other bi/multilingual communities, having been the inheritance of British rule has come to stay and has acquired the status of L₂ mainly. It is used in administration and occupies an important place in the educational system and in public life. A knowledge of English is considered essential for a successful career and as a means of advancement
in one's social status. Language policies of governments and consequent upon these, educational policies have been acting as strong focussing agencies in such communities e.g. in India, Singapore and East Africa. Government policies, however, are not static; nor are the function and status of a language. A recent decision made by the Burmese Government (1981) to reintroduce English from the first standard to raise the standards of attainment in the language so that they are on par with international standards may have far-reaching effects on the use of English by the Burmese people, and their attitudes toward it. The Indian Government's decision to accelerate the pace of modernization of Indian languages might, in the course of time, affect the status and function of English in India. The exact nature of the change in function and status and consequently its use is not, however, easy to predict; for language change and language use are ongoing dynamic processes, not static results. They evolve out of a conglomeration of factors within and outside the individual.

The present study on the use of English in industries, we feel, will throw light on the nature of the methodological problems that arise in an attempt to assess the extent to which this conglomeration of factors within and outside the individual relate to his use of English vis a vis the Indian languages in the professional context.
1.3.0 The study of the use of English in a multilingual setting

Empirical work on the study of the use of English in its social context received a strong impetus in the United States in the sixties (Labov 1966) and in Britain in the seventies (Trudgill 1974). The setting for these studies is what we call a 'monolingual setting', in the sense that only one language (including its varieties) is the dominant language of communication — the national language used in administration, in politics and in education. The majority of the members of the community have English as their first language. Even those who do not have it as their first language because they are immigrants from other countries, adopt English as the language in public life e.g. the Puerto Ricans, the Norwegians and the Chinese in the U.S., and the Indians, the West Indians and the Poles in the U.K. This does not imply that the process of adopting English is simple or that the result of the adoption is a uniform variety of English very much like a native variety. It does, however, mean that contact between two languages results in different varieties of English. The first language of the immigrant community acquires a place subordinate to that of English and a restricted function as well. The emphasis of studies conducted in a monolingual setting is by and large on the use of the stylistic, registeral, and dialectal varieties of the English language by members whose mother tongue it is or on
the behaviour and attitudes of immigrant bilinguals regarding the two languages they know -- an investigation of who speaks what language to whom and when (Fishman et al, 1971a) in a setting where the dominance of English in public life is unquestioned.

In contrast to these are studies of the use of English by bi/multilingual speech communities in a bi/multilingual setting, into which English has been imported over a long period of time. The difference we think lies more in the setting than in the behaviour of bi/multilinguals. And this difference in setting is embedded in history. A 'multilingual setting' for our purpose then is one in which a number of theoretically discrete and identifiable languages (including a number of varieties within each language) coexist, each one developing in its own right and performing its own function. Sometimes more than one language is used to perform a certain function e.g. two official languages, English and Hindi used by the Union Government in India. African countries provide an example of a multilingual setting, for there are a large number of groups each speaking a different language. They have a link language for inter-group communication and to serve as the national language e.g. Swahili in Tanzania. This forms the background for the use of yet another language -- a foreign language, English or French, which is an inheritance
from foreign rule. There is a shift in focus — in a monolingual setting foreign people speaking different languages migrate to that setting and adopt the language spoken there, as in America. In a multilingual setting, on the other hand, a foreign language comes to stay, gains in importance, and for want of a common link language at some point in history, becomes the language of administration and education until a native language is equipped to perform these functions. Hence two official languages, as in East Africa, West Africa, India. In some countries the situation is even more complex — in Singapore, for instance, there are four official languages. We will not venture to discuss types of bi/multilingual communities, for one is confronted with an incredibly large number of variables which makes the task a complex one (Kloss 1966, Fishman 1971c:15). Different combinations of these variables lend themselves to the uniqueness of each bi/multilingual setting. Suffice it to say that approaches to and objectives for the study of the use of English in countries like the U.K. and the U.S.A. generally differ from approaches to the study of the use of English in countries like Africa, India, Malaysia and Singapore for the following possible reasons:

(a) The status of English in the two types of setting is different. In the U.S., Australia and the U.K. English has unquestioned supremacy over the other
languages — the languages of the immigrants. It is the first language of a large majority of inhabitants. In Africa, India, Malaysia and Singapore, on the other hand, English has the status of either a second language or a foreign language.

(b) From the different statuses that English has in the two settings, it would naturally follow that the societal function of English as a first language and as a dominant language would differ from the societal function of English as a second language. The former would be much more widely used while the latter acquires a more and more restricted use with the passage of time and is used by a comparatively small number of people.

(c) The use of English in the two settings would have different implications for language planning and educational policy.

(d) The uniqueness of the situation in each country even within the same kind of setting in terms of its history lends itself to a uniqueness in the kinds of problems to be studied.

(e) The aim of each study on the use of English determines the methodological approach.
Given a uniquely complex multilingual setting like the one in India, a study of the use of English is challenging. This will become clear as we examine briefly the Indian setting and the place of English in it.

Bilingualism/multilingualism in India has been described as stable (Pandit 1975:81), for the languages of the States do not have a dominance configuration that States in Western Europe have. For example, a second generation native of Poland in France gives up Polish and accepts French as his native language. Commenting on bilingual competence in India at the colloquial level P.B. Pandit says it is "much more widespread than the census figures would make us believe — that in 1961 only 15.1 percent of Indians were bilingual." (Pandit, 1977:5-6). He goes on to point out that it is significant that there are a large number of bilinguals in the country despite the high rate of illiteracy and the absence of an established tradition of formal teaching of minor Indian languages. "Functional bilingualism", he says, "is not maintained by the formal educational processes, it is a part of the non-formal learning." (Pandit 1977:6).

1.3.1 **The Place of English in the Indian Setting**

It is in this setting that yet another language — a foreign language i.e. English gradually gained in importance as the language of the ruler, became the language of administration, education and law, and a means of intranational/
international communication in the absence of a common Indian language for the whole nation. English is listed as one of the fifteen major languages in the census of India 1961. Though it is not listed in the VIII schedule of the Indian Constitution, and though the recommendations of the Education Commissions 1966 and 1971, and the Government of India's Draft on the National Policy of Education 1979 limit the function it is to perform, English continues to retain its importance in public life. "Considering such factors as functional value and prestige, it is obvious that some languages are more important than others. At the top of the hierarchy in terms of importance are English and Hindi. Both are 'link' languages and are used for official and unofficial communication in much of the country." (Apte 1976:155).

"English is used by a large community of people and by a number of institutions in a wide range of contexts. These people are by and large bilinguals or multilinguals whose second or third language is English." (Verma, 1978:1)

H. Spitzbardt (1979) includes English in three of the five bilingual or multilingual types of language combination that play a major role in the communication among different groups of population. The combinations are:

a. Mother tongue and another regional language
b. Mother tongue and Hindi
c. Mother tongue and English
d. Mother tongue, Hindi and English

e. Mother tongue, Hindi, English and one or several other regional languages.

The types of combination that reflect the complexity of the Indian multilingual setting and are of concern to us for the present study are (c), (d) and (e). Of these (d) and (e) are types reflected in the Draft of the National Policy of Education, 1979 i.e. a reiteration of the three-language formula and its implementation at the secondary stage. It includes "the study of a modern Indian language preferably a South Indian Language, in addition to Hindi and English in the Hindi-speaking States, and of Hindi in addition to the regional language and English in the non-Hindi speaking States". The medium of instruction at all stages shall be the regional language except at the primary stage where it will be the mother tongue.* The educational system requires an Indian child to learn at least three languages, and four if the mother tongue and the regional language are not the same. Type (e) may also be a consequence of increasing urbanization and increased inter-State mobility, due to

*It is paradoxical that (i) while the Union Government has reiterated the three-language formula, some States e.g. Tamil Nadu and Utter Pradesh, in fact follow a two-language formula and exclude either Hindi or a South Indian language from their programme of education; (ii) while the Union Government has stepped up aid for the development of the languages of the States and for Hindi, English continues to be widely preferred for inter-State communication as is evident from our study. It may be noted, however, that one organization -- the Central Board of Secondary Education -- has faithfully implemented the three-language formula.
which an Indian may be required to learn the local language of the area to which he moves in search of a job. A knowledge of English in this case would not help him to identify himself with the local people. Thus there are conflicting pressures at work on Indians in the modern context (a) the pressure of Government policy, (b) the pressure of authority (in whatever form), (c) the pressure of the language group, with which they would like to identify themselves to satisfy their emotional and cultural needs, (d) the pressure of the peer group (which may as well have people from different language groups) with which they identify themselves for the purpose of projecting their personalities and examining themselves in relation to their interaction with them, (e) the pressure of the local group of the area in which they live and work to satisfy their professional need. Fig.2 constitutes in a way the profile of an educated English-based bilingual.

These pressures operate on the individual so that he uses the various languages he knows and is in the process of learning, and often switches from one to the other or mixes codes depending on the domain (office, canteen, home, social get togethers etc.), the situation (formal → informal), and the relationship of the participants in the interaction. Code-switching and code-mixing do not, however, always follow a predicted pattern and become part of an Indian bi/multi-lingual's normal linguistic behaviour. At home, for instance,
Fig. 2: Profile of conflicting pressures on an average educated English-based bilingual.
he would by and large use the first language(s) of the family and/or a mixture of English and these languages. With friends belonging to different language groups he might use the local language (of the region) with some English or another common regional language. In the office his use of language would vary according to his relationship with the interlocutors i.e. whether they are his superiors, equals, or juniors, whether they belong to the organization or are outsiders, whether they belong to his division or to another division within the organization, etc. Thus he constantly adjusts himself to the demands of the group(s) with which he interacts. I will not discuss in greater detail the multidimensional nature of the use of language in the Indian setting. We have seen that in the Indian setting, English coexists with the other Indian languages, is used for oral and written communication in specific contexts, influences the Indian languages and is influenced by them owing to constant contact with them. The Indian languages, as they pass through processes of modernization have to equip themselves to record advances in science and technology, in literature and art in the modern world. In order to do this they are naturally making innovations, creating new words or borrowing words from English or even Sanskrit. (c.f. Verma, 1982, Alisjahbana, 1976:31-81) Needless to say that the process of borrowing is not a simple one, and is an important feature of a language contact situation on the one
hand and a process of modernization on the other. English on the other hand has been constantly used in a socio-cultural setting that is foreign to it. In order to meet the needs of this setting, English is acquiring a local colour and is becoming Indianized (Kachru 1978:484 ff). It is the use of English in an Indian professional context that we concern ourselves with in the present investigation.

1.3.2 The suitability of the type of study adopted

Sankoff in his discussion of the types of sociolinguistic study that can be used to study language use in multilingual societies suggests that "one can either study the function the language used has for ongoing social interaction ..., or one can take the reverse point of view and attempt to see to what extent the (broadly social) factors present in the communication situation influence what is expressed linguistically." (Sankoff 1971:35). It is broadly on the lines of the second type of study that a large number of surveys are conducted in developing nations with bi/multilingual settings e.g. in Jordon, the Philippines, East Africa, West Africa, Malaysia, Singapore and India where the Language Survey of India undertaken and completed by Sir George Grierson in 1927 was the earliest and perhaps the most exhaustive of linguistic surveys undertaken in modern times by one scholar. Ohannessian and Ansre (1975:51-69) consider the survey useful for those nations that have speakers of different languages
and different varieties of languages, for it provides them with (i) information regarding the number of languages and their varieties, (ii) knowledge of languages that have a script, literary tradition, etc., (iii) an accurate picture of language use in a particular society, and (iv) feedback for formulating or revising their decisions on language policy and educational policy with a view to giving the population at large and the student a clear sense of the worth of the language in the society as well as a better sense of national identity. They discuss the use of sociolinguistic surveys and their impact with reference to language use and language teaching in Eastern Africa.

A survey is never chiefly interested in individuals. It is more like a Census. Kelkar (1975) calls one phase of it "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). For this kind of investigation the survey is the most useful type of study, though "the practical organization of a bigger survey has to contend, among other problems, with pressures arising out of linguistic and other loyalties that militate against the scientific objectivity and validity of the results of the survey."
(Kelkar 1975:12). A tighter research design, however, would probably minimize these problems. To facilitate this, greater concentration on planning and organization and methodology evolving from an exploratory study or a pilot survey can prove useful. Lieberson (1967:286-295) and Kloss (1967:296-316) consider some problems that are not dealt with in censuses and others that are outside the framework of censuses and mention a number of non-census studies of bilingualism that can be referred to for better procedures. They recommend the need for more and more private and semi-private surveys conducted in more defined contexts on specific problems.

This project centres on the use of English vis-a-vis the Indian languages in more defined contexts by a more defined group of people i.e. industrial organizations and employees in industrial organizations, so that we may be able to eliminate some of the unwieldiness and unreliability characteristic of the census. It is an exploratory study that attempts to evolve a suitable method and tools for the investigation on hand with a view to using them for a bigger survey. We have chosen to study the use of English for the following reasons:

(a) English, as we have seen, occupies a uniquely important place in the Indian multilingual setting.

(b) Though a number of observations based on census reports and other Government documents have been made on the
status of English in the Indian setting with reference to its place in the educational policy and language planning of the Government, (Khubchandani 1969a, 1969b, 1973, 1978, Apte 1976, Bose 1969, Das Gupta 1976) very few (if any) empirical studies have been conducted on the use of English in India in general and in specific professional contexts in particular. A large number of studies conducted in India in the past have concentrated on the use of Indian languages (e.g. Taylor, Mahadevan and Koshal, 1978; Gumperz 1964a, 1971; Pandit 1978). Some studies on the use of English (e.g. Kachru 1976, Sridhar, 1982) concentrate on the use of English by college and university students, and though Sridhar's survey includes employees the latter comprise less than one third of the total sample.

(c) An empirical study helps to confirm/negate some obvious hunches like the ones cited above -- about the use of English in the Indian context in general and in industry in particular and this enables one to consider the extent to which it is feasible to predict 'contexts' in which English is used.

(d) The relative importance of English vis-a-vis the Indian languages in terms of the extent to which it is used, in relation to the age, occupation and education of participants in an interaction, their role relationship and the setting i.e. the organization and the attitudes of the users toward it, serves as necessary background information for a more
detailed study of the kinds of English used and of the process of acculturation.

The study of the use of English here extends beyond the classroom to a professional context, i.e. industry, which is of interest to me for the following reasons:

(a) There is increasing urbanization in India and consequent upon that, increasing industrialization and mobilization of population, so that increasing numbers of Indians seek employment in industries. According to Dube, "India today, in absolute terms, is one of the leading industrial countries of the world, urban India in terms of population, represents one of the major populations of the world." (Dube 1977:90). Mobilization of population has led to the convergence of a large number of Indian languages and of English, each of these finding its function in a particular context, depending on the users and their communication network. The large numbers of employees in industry we felt would provide us with subjects with varied linguistic backgrounds, age groups, educational attainments, and status, and thus a wide spectrum of the Indian population.

(b) An investigation of the use of English in specific professional contexts can serve as important feedback for educational planning and policy in terms of relating the actual need for English in different professional contexts to
(1) the number of years English is to be taught at school, and (2) the kinds of courses in English required at school and at college to meet that need.

(c) Communication is the backbone of industrial organizations. Interaction in an organization is much more complex than it is between two individuals or two groups of individuals. It may take place at different levels i.e. between individual and individual in industrial groups, one group and another, a group and the organization, one organization and another, and an organization and the public. The study of the use of English in professional contexts, however, is not entirely new. A large number of research reports in the United States on the language of the law, the language of Medicine, the language of advertising, language in Education, the language of pharmacy, have appeared in journals such as Discourse Processes and the Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (1979).

All these reports concentrate broadly on discourse processes with a view to recommending how the results of linguistic research can be used in these settings. Shirley Brice Heath makes recommendations on the basis of her fieldwork in two communities of the Southeastern United States. The work of linguists in such settings according to her "can supplement materials used in professional training programs, periodic evaluations of institutional effectiveness
in meeting communication goals, and revamping of social service agencies to meet the needs of a diverse clientele." (Heath 1979a:18). Studies such as the one conducted by Bruton et al (1974) on how doctor-patient discourse may have pedagogical implications, and by Candlin and Murphy (1975–76) on Engineering discourse and Listening as part of an overall scheme for developing communication skills among undergraduates in faculties of Medicine and Engineering at King Abdul Aziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia are similar in design. Gumperz analysed employer-employee interaction in the United Kingdom to examine problems of communication between the immigrant worker and the native speaker. (The interviews appeared on BBC Television in a series called "Cross Talk"). Sue Fisher (1980) examines how the exchanges of information in medical interviews is organized and how that organization produces and constrains the negotiation of treatment decisions.

Thus these studies of the use of English in professional contexts differ from the present project in that (a) they are by and large studies of discourse processes in those contexts and examine problems of communication; (b) they examine problems arising in a monolingual setting where English is the language of administration and education and is the mother tongue of the majority of people. Other studies on the use of language in professional contexts, such as the one
by Heller et al in a Montreal brewery after Bill 101 (initial report n.d.) examine elements of the change in progress, a change from the use of English to the use of French as the language of everyday life in the business. This change came about as a result of the Bill that has made francisation obligatory for all commercial enterprises in Quebec. The evolution of some of the brewery's formal efforts towards francisation are discussed and the attitudes of anglophones and francophones towards the francisation process are looked at through analysis of conversations. It differs from the present study in that the latter does not analyze the language used in terms of text and register in industrial organizations, nor does it closely examine strategies of interaction, but seeks to examine the use of English vis-a-vis the Indian languages in a broader context of language use -- of who speaks what language to whom and when as a first step to studying discourse processes in intra-inter group interaction professional contexts and the place of English in such interaction. It is an exploratory study of how the reported use of English vis-a-vis the Indian languages by employees in industrial organizations in the State of Andhra Pradesh co-varies with their socio-cultural background. Its main objectives are:

(a) to investigate whether there is significant association between the use of English in a given context and the social variables -- type of industry, location
of industry, age, education, occupation, medium of instruction, extent of exposure to English, function and if there is, the extent of the association;

(b) to test the following hypotheses --

1) The use of English is much greater in urban industries than it is in rural* industries.

2) In urban industries employees in the private* sector use more English than those in the public* sector. The structure of an organization, in other words, may affect the use of English.

3) English is more frequently used with seniors than with equals and juniors.

4) At the work place English is more frequently used in the office than in the canteen or at a social get-together.

5) An employee's occupation and education are closely associated with his use of English, i.e., the higher the occupational status and the higher the educational qualifications the more the chances of his using English.

*For definitions of concepts like 'rural', 'public', 'private' please refer to pages 72-73 and 53-58.
6) The use of English is greater among employees who had English as the medium of instruction at school than those who had a regional language as the medium of instruction.

7) An employee's age is closely associated with his use of English i.e., the older the employee the more English he is likely to use due to the existence of a different system of education when he went to school.

(c) to examine the extent to which psychological factors i.e. the attitudes of the employees in industries towards English relate to their use of English with superiors, equals and juniors, and to their age, level of occupation, education, medium of instruction, function and exposure to English.

(d) to discuss the implications of the pattern of the use of English in industries for language planning and language policy.

(e) to frame revised tools and improved methodological procedure for data collection for a bigger project on the basis of the researcher's experience of the efficacy of the tools and method used for this exploratory study.

It might be argued that the hypotheses to be tested are obviously true. But empirical evidence gives us tangible proof of what may otherwise exist only as a hunch, and as I.W. Oller says, "The rationale for demonstrating what may already be obvious to a great many people is that it is apparently not obvious to a good many others" (Oller, Obrecht 1968:172).