

**CODE SWITCHING AND CODE MIXING : A STUDY OF
TAMIL-ENGLISH BILINGUALS**

*Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the award of the Degree of*
MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

S. MAHALAKSHMI

**CENTRE OF LINGUISTICS AND ENGLISH
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110 067
INDIA
1998**

To my parents, Poornima and my informants



CENTRE OF LINGUISTICS & ENGLISH
SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES

जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

NEW DELHI - 110067 INDIA

CERTIFICATE

21st July, 1998

Certified that the dissertation entitled “**CODE SWITCHING AND CODE MIXING : A STUDY OF TAMIL-ENGLISH BILINGUALS**” Submitted by S. Mahalakshmi, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**, has not been submitted so far in part or full, for any other degree or diploma of this or any other University and is her original work. This may be placed before the examiners for the award of the Degree of Master of Philosophy.

R.S. Gupta
Prof. R.S. GUPTA
SUPERVISOR

Ayesha Kidwai — 21/7/98
Dr. AYESHA KIDWAI
CO-SUPERVISOR

H.C. Narang
Prof. H.C. NARANG
CHAIR PERSON

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My work would be incomplete without a word of acknowledgement to Dr. R.S. Gupta, my supervisor for his valuable guidance and suggestions and for bearing with the delay in the submission of drafts.

My sincere thanks are due to Dr. Ayesha Kidwai, my co-supervisor who provided insights into my data and gave a definite shape and structure to my rather incoherent thoughts.

This work would not have seen the light of the day without the help of Lalitha and J.B Iyer, Prof. Aditi Mukherji, Dr. Parasher and the ever helpful staff of the CIEFL library.

Thanks to Reshma, Shruti, Sunita, Neeta, Lisa, Soheli, Srija, Partho and Vrinda for their innumerable suggestions and help.

Gomati, Jhulik, Rupa, Varuni and Rahul deserve a special mention for the continuous support and encouragement.

Uncle, Aunty and Deepa, thank you for the constant encouragement and affection especially during times of need.

Thanks to Kanaka and Ramesh for their help and guidance.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aim	1
1.2 Location	2
1.3 Informants	3
1.4 Methodology	4
1.4.1 Observation	5
1.4.2 Individual Interviews	5
1.4.3 Questionnaire	6
1.4.4 Tape recording of Discourse	7
1.4.5 Native Speaker's Intuition	8
1.5 Chapter Outline	8
1.6. Basic Definitions	11
1.6.1 Bilingualism and Bilingual Speakers	11
1.6.2 Monolinguals	12
1.6.3 Code	12
1.6.4 Linguisticity	13
2. THEORITICAL FRAME WORK	14
2.1 Approaches to Indian English	15
2.2 Standard	16
2.3 The Indian English Speech and Tamil English Speech Communities	19
2.3.1 The Tamil English bilingualism	22
2.3.2 The Status of English in India	25
2.3.3 Indianization of English	27
3. CODE SWITCHING	29
3.1 Definition of Code Switching	30
3.1.1 Situation	31
3.1.2 Topic	33
3.1.3 Participants	35
3.2 Scope of Switching	38
3.2.1 Tag Switching	38
3.2.2 Inter Sentential Switching	39
3.3 The Grammatical effect of Switching	40
3.3.1 Word order change	41
3.4 The sociolinguistic effect of switching	42
3.5 Constraints of switching	43

4.	CODE MIXING	46
4.1	Word Level Mixing	48
4.1.1	Mixing for Emphasis	49
4.2	Borrowing and Mixing	49
4.3	Mixing Below the Word Level	51
4.3.1	Affixation of Case Markers	54
4.4	Mixing Specific to Groups and Individuals	56
4.5	The Mixed Lexicon	57
4.6	Conclusion	59
5	CONCLUSION	60
	REFERENCES	66
	APPENDIX	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Almost every human being speaks a particular kind of a language and uses it quite comfortably for the purposes of communication. We come across speakers who are monolingual, bilingual and multilingual. The “mixed” code of speech is not only a result of the fact that he/she has the knowledge of two or more languages and controls them with great ease, but also because of the speaker’s belief of being understood and taking part in a communicative act. As Gumperz remarks, “Communication is a social activity, requiring the coordinated efforts of two or more individuals.”¹ Our enquiry aims at studying code mixing and code switching of Tamil English bilinguals.

1.1 Aim:

The purpose of the study is to examine the following questions.

- Whether standard Indian English exists at all?
- Is there a homogeneous speech community for Indian English and Tamil English?
- How do the phenomena of code switching and mixing take place?

¹ Gumperz (1982): Discourse Strategies

- Is there a difference between them?
- What is the distinction between mixing and borrowing?
- Whether there exists any mixing at the morphological level against the popular belief that lowest level of switching is at the word level?
- What are the constraints involved?

To seek answers to these questions, we proceeded with certain premises like Indian English as a variety does not have a standard, there does exist a speech community for Tamil English bilinguals and both the phenomena of switching and mixing can be put under a cover term as switching, but there needs to be a distinction nevertheless. So we tried to find a certain valid distinction. We also expected that the two phenomena would be rule-governed and would follow the established pattern of constraints. While attempting to study the behaviour of the bilinguals with respect to code switching and mixing, we looked at both the grammatical and pragmatic aspects of the phenomena.

1.2. Location:

To seek answer our queries we decided to study Tamil English bilinguals in two different geographic locations. The areas chosen for study were Tiruchirapalli, located in central Tamilnadu and the capital of the state

Chennai, located in the north. The reasons for choosing these two areas were:

- Because of the fact that they were accessible.
- They would provide insights into how the nature of the switch and mix differed from a city and a town.
- Though Tiruchirapalli is accorded the status of a city recently, we would not equate it with Chennai as a city, which is cosmopolitan in nature.
- Tiruchirapalli being my home town and Chennai being a familiar place, people could be approached more easily and they would not shy away as they would to a stranger.

The study could have involved a wider section of the society but for time constraints. A further research, if undertaken, should involve a bigger territory for data collection to make it more authentic and provide a larger view of the patterns of the two linguistic phenomena discussed.

1.3. Informants:

The people chosen for the study were not restricted to one particular age or class restrictions. Bilinguals ranging from eight to sixty years formed our group of informants. They were people from various walks of life. School

and college students, house wives and professionals were interviewed, with the objective of seeing the difference in the way the codes are switched or mixed by different people, their attitudes behind these two language phenomena and their reaction to this kind of speech etc. The informants belonged to various economic classes like upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class and the poor. The level of exposure to the English language differed from person to person.

1.4. Methodology:

Research in sociolinguistics has involved a variety of techniques for collecting the data. The task was to collect the primary data from the source and the sampling method was used. The techniques of the data adopted were on the lines of linguists like Labov (1966), Gumperz (1971), and Gupta. (1978). The techniques included

- Observation
- Individual interviews.
- Questionnaires
- Tape-recording of discourse by groups.
- Native speaker's intuition

1.4.1. Observation:

The day-to-day speech of individuals in various situations was observed. This was noted immediately down along with the sociolinguistic variables like name, age, sex, social and economic status and educational qualifications etc. It would not be out of place to mention here that a few examples of the data were actually the observations as long as a few years back that was unconsciously recorded in the brain of the researcher. It would not be very difficult to understand that anything that is peculiar to hear does get registered and remains in the mind for over a long period of time.

1.4.2. Individual interviews:

This is the technique we adopted next and by then we had a rough idea about who mixed and switched, what were the kinds of mixing done and at what levels .

The interviewees were asked a variety of questions like:

- Do you switch from Tamil to English or English to Tamil or both?
- How often do you do it?
- With whom do mix or switch?

- In what kind of situation do you generally mix or switch?
- What would you choose to call this kind of a code?
- What is your reaction to the younger generation's frequent switch at the morphological level?
- Do you think this kind of a language mixture is corruption of the language?

A few switched and mixed sentences, clauses, phrases, words were also shown to them and we asked them if they found them acceptable or not. Around twenty five people were interviewed thus for our purpose of evolving a pattern..

1.4.3. Questionnaire:

The third technique to be adopted were the questionnaires. The questionnaires had three sections. The first part contained the sociolinguistic variables like age, class, sex, educational qualifications mother tongue etc. The second part dealt with questions similar to the ones asked in the individual interviews. The third part again consisted of mixed words , clauses , phrases and sentences etc., on the same lines like those asked in the interviews. Though the interviews and the questionnaires had a similar approach there was a difference.

The interviews demanded an immediate response and were much more personal. The questionnaires on the other hand gave time for the informants to think and answer. Thus these two techniques together helped us collect data from quite a number of people. The techniques would help us understand the nature of the two linguistic phenomena in use and also help us in tracing a pattern.

1.4.4. Tape recording of the discourse:

We recorded the discourse of our informants in a natural environment when they were engrossed in a conversation. This provided better insights as they were not contrived and were also authentic.

Four kinds of speech were recorded. Of them, two were informal, and personal and the others were semi-formal and formal. The first speech that was recorded was between a group of college goers. They discussed a variety of topics like their college, subject, teachers, music and television programmes. The second speech was recorded when a mother was talking to her two daughters about their careers, the way of life, how to organize their time schedules, how to take even failures in their stride. The girls participated equally in the conversation and thus we had quite a bit of the required data in our

hands. The third speech was a semiformal monologue by an executive on the concepts of selling to his subordinate at his house. The last piece was a teacher's speech on his retirement and hence it was formal. The speeches had different levels of mixing and switching. Though the participants were conscious of the tape recorder, they forgot all about it when they got engrossed in their speech and other heated discussions. The recorded texts were noted down and transcribed. We have used the phonetic transcription for Tamil expression, while we have written down the English expressions as they are.

1.4.5 Native speaker's intuition:

We also based our conclusion on the intuition of the researcher who is a native speaker of Tamil. The reasons for certain kinds of mixing has been based on what the native speaker feels about them and the possible explanations of such language behaviour.

1.5 Chapter outline:

Chapter 2 begins with the discussion on the classification of the varieties of English across the world as native versus non-native and how this classification is not valid. The notion of arriving at a standard for Indian

English is another aspect we discuss in this chapter. We see the characterization of a particular variety of Indian English as a standard as unacceptable. The chapter also seeks to investigate if there exists a homogeneous speech community. We define the Tamil and Indian English speech communities as those that have groups whose characteristics can be perceived and these groups need not exhaust the entire population. The speakers need not necessarily share these common features of language behaviour. Thus we have instances in the data that are individual-specific, group-specific and family-specific. This definition is substantiated with examples from the data. The chapter also discusses how the transfer of strategies are treated as 'englishization' of Indian languages or 'indianization' of English and concludes that it cannot be dismissed as just these processes. It explains how the strategy transfer is a result of a certain kind of a relationship that the two languages bear to each other in the mind of the bilingual.

Chapter 3 deals with the first phenomenon of our study code switching. The linguistic phenomenon is looked at from both the sociolinguistic and the pragmatic angles. We also discuss why there is a regularised pattern in switching unlike mixing. The other questions we

examine are why do speakers switch, where they switch, and what effect it has on the discourse produced.

Chapter 4 discusses the phenomenon of code mixing. We try to arrive at a distinction between switching, mixing and borrowing. We treat the mixing at the and below the word level as mixing and above the word level as switching. There is not a very clear distinction as regards the distinction between mixing and switching. Linguists like Gumperz (1982) see both the phenomena as switching, though he talks about two kinds of the same phenomenon, one within the sentence boundary and one beyond the sentence boundary. Though Kachru tries to make a distinction, he calls switching at all levels as mixing.(1983: 201) As we thought a distinction at the grammatical level would explain the processes clearer, we distinguish them in terms of above and below the word level. We define borrowing as we see that words that do not have equivalents are borrowed items. Another aspect we deal with here is that of the well-formedness criterion set by Tamil to English to accommodate the mixed discourse. This where the idea of a dominance relation of Tamil over English in the bilingual's brain bears relevance. We also speculate about the existence of a set of mixed lexicon that do not specifically belong to either of the mixed or switched languages, but can be used in both.

1.6 Basic Definitions:

In the last section of this chapter, we would like to define certain terms used in this work to make it clear as to what we intend to convey while using them.

1.6.1 Bilingualism and bilingual speakers:

There are various definitions formulated by different linguists. It is defined “... in terms of categories, scales and dichotomies such as ideal vs. partial, co-ordinate vs. compound etc. which are related to factors such as proficiency, function etc.” Bloomfield says that, “Native like control of both languages is bilingualism”. (Quoted in Romaine:1989:10) Haugen’s view is that, “...bilingualism begins when a speaker of one language can produce meaningful utterances in the other”. (Quoted in Romaine: 1989:10) In Gupta’s (1978) view, “... a bilingual individual is one who is proficient in the receptive and productive control of the two languages concerned and who can use them alternatively in socially significant interaction and as a part of different communicative networks”. (1978:9) Though we see the Tamil English bilinguals as those who can use Tamil and English with equal ease in various speech situations and while discussing various topics,

our view on bilingualism differs from the above because we perceive a certain kind of a dominance relationship that the L1(in this case Tamil), bears to L2 (in this case English). We also see the relationship between the two languages in question not as diglossic where English is the High variety and Tamil the Low variety as claimed by Dasgupta (1993) in reference to English and Indian languages.

1.6.2 Monolinguals:

By monolinguals what is meant here is a speaker who has a good active and passive control of just his mother tongue. In other words, he can speak and understand his mother tongue in a variety of situations. We would also make a mention here that monolinguals also use a few words from the other language, in this case English, and believe they are a part of their mother tongue, but they can neither understand the other language nor use it with as much ease as they use their mother tongue.

1.6.3 Code:

Code has a reference to anything ranging from a speech variety to a language. The term code is used in this work in the sense of a distinct language. Thus, the two languages English and Tamil have

been called two codes. A mixture of both the languages has been termed as 'mixed code'.

1.6.4 Linguisticality:

The term has been used by Prabhu (1994). We use it in this work to refer to the linguistic capability of the bilingual individual. In other words, it shows the capacity of the individual to use either of the two languages in a particular situation, which makes it creative and meaningful.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.

This chapter seeks to investigate the status of Tamil English (TE) in the mind of the speaker and Tamil speaking speech community. It also explores the status of “Tamil English” vis-a-vis “Indian English” (IE) and debates the question of whether there exists a speech community for IE and TE. We demonstrate that, in terms of standard definitions of what constitutes a speech community, neither TE nor IE can be argued to have a speech community. The apparent sharing of norms by TE and IE speakers is argued to be the result of the ‘dominance’ relation English bears to the mother tongue (MT) in the bilingual’s mind, whereby the mother tongue or the language first acquired forms the basis of evaluation for the logical “well-formedness” of certain aspects of TE / IE . This explains how the strategies of MT or (L1) are transferred into TE / IE or L2 . The chapter has three sections . Section I deals with the standard view of IE and critiques many of its assumptions. Section II presents the analysis encapsulated above. Section

III examines the sociolinguistics of English in Indian and Tamil speech communities.

2.1 Approaches to Indian English:

Kachru (1983) in his much influential work presents many of by-now standard arguments for a category called Indian English and consequently for an IE speech community. He suggests that the English spoken in India is “non-native” transplanted variety that possesses both a speech community as well as a standard. This section takes issue with all this three major claims of Kachru. We will first consider the notion of IE as a transplanted “non-native” variety.

Much of the discussion around the status of English in India has been based on the premise that English spoken across the world can be dichotomised as old /native and new/ non-native. While British, American and Australian English fit into the former class, the latter has under it Indian, Nigerian and Singaporean English. This means that speakers of some English are native speakers and speakers of some are not (R. Singh, 1994 pp 285). This distinction, it must be realised, is based on the assumption that only speakers of British English (BE) are the real speakers of a non-transplanted native variety of English. However, the difference between Australian English and American

English from British English is as much as the difference between Indian English and Nigerian English. Hence the grouping is not because of the similarities that these Englishes share with British English, but one that arises out of racial discrimination. So this classification too has little value as it does little more than identify the racial distinctions between speakers of different varieties of English. Following Mohanan (1994: 286-88), we hold that the relevant distinction is one expressed in terms of the order of acquisition. The so-called 'native varieties' are the ones generally acquired as L1 and the 'non-native varieties' are generally acquired as L2. Speakers when they acquire a language spoken in their environment do not distinguish between native and non-native tongues e.g. English language in India. Thus, speakers of Indian English, Singaporean English, Nigerian English are as much native speakers of English as are speakers of British English as R. Singh (1994) points out speakers acquire the languages in their environment uncanny of whether they are native or non-native in their origin.

2.2 Standard:

Another notion in relation to language varieties that is disputable is "Standard". Arriving at a standard would entail "an unfair asymmetry"

(Mohanani: 1994: 286-88). The standard IE argument links the notion of standard to the particular variety that is accorded a superior status. In Britain the Received Pronunciation (RP) is the standard. In India, we have different varieties of English, which have been classified in relation to the language spoken in various geographic regions as Tamil English, Bengali English etc. Hence, considering one of these as a standard would be an injustice to the other. In fact, there is usually great resistance to identifying a standard for Indian English. Speakers of English in India are affronted when identified as Tamil English speaker, Bengali English speaker etc as this indicates that they speak a non-standard variety.

Our view that there is no standard Indian English directly contradicts Kachru (cited in Dasgupta 1993), who holds that English spoken by the middle class, elite or the metropolitan English is taken as the standard setter. (Dasgupta:1993:126) Kachru's notion of standard, "...delimits the scope of Indian English too narrowly to community setting of the elite middle-class."(Srivastava:1994: 294). It also, "...attributes a disparaging meaning to all other varieties of English, which fall below his central point on the scale of bi-lingualism." (Srivastava: 1994:294). Further more, as Dasgupta (1993) points out, Kachru's focus on 'educated variety' of English destroys the distinction he draws between 'mistake' and 'deviation.' Kachru suggests that

the transgressions perceived in Indian English (as against British English), should be properly seen as 'deviations' and not 'mistakes'. But when it comes to his own analysis he terms certain culture-specific expressions as 'register-confusion' i.e., mistakes of a sort. For example, flower-bed is used in the sense of nuptial-bed by B.Bhattacharya in his novel *Music for Mohini*. Kachru (1983), says, 'The collocation has been used in the same contextual unit /phu:l sOjja/ that operates in Bengali culture. As mentioned earlier, in this case the 'register- confusion' could be avoided by the use of an item like nuptial bed.' (Dasgupta:1993:126). These value judgements are borne of Kachru's decision to take the educated middle-class English as a standard. Further, different strategies are at work depending on the well-formedness conditions set by different languages on the variety of spoken English. Thus, beautifully becomes / beautiful-aa/ in a Tamil sentence, whereas remains 'beautifully' in a Hindi sentence. The use of phrase final, 'only' in Hindi English is for emphasis, whereas in Tamil English 'only' is used for both emphasis as well as an exclusivity operator. In Tamil English, 'I got a book only' can either mean, 'I got a book' or 'I got only a book'. But in Hindi English, it means (preferably) only the former. Therefore, it cannot be presumed that a standard Indian English exists given the kind of variation.

2.3 The Indian English and Tamil English speech communities.

In Kachru's view, there is a bona fide Indian English speech community. Our argument is similar to Probal Dasgupta's question, "What if contrary to Kachru's assumption, the users of English in India do not constitute a speech community?" (Probal Dasgupta, 1993 :119). Let us take a look at a few definitions of a speech community. "A speech community is not a collection of individuals with similar individual systems, it is a community that is operating a shared system as a social organ." (Prabhu:1994:). Tamil English bilinguals do not fit into this paradigm of a speech community. They do not have a universal set of strategies, or shared system, which are transferred in a particular way. The data shows that there are code mixed utterances that are individual-specific, family-specific and at times specific to a certain group of individuals.

Example: /təɖapudality/, means ceremonious. This is individual-specific.

/dɑːktən/ meaning doctor is used as a marker for disrespect. This is family-specific.

/frend/ becomes /frendi/ as a marker of feminine gender by College students, thus this is group specific.

Hence there does not exist a homogenous speech community.

Another assumption of a speech community is that the speakers formulate a certain kind of verbal behaviour that resembles a certain group or groups with which they would want to identify themselves. This implies that the individual consciously makes a decision and adjusts his verbal behaviour to suit his needs and the group that he wants to belong. While this may be true, it is our conjecture that this is not a conscious manipulation of the verbal behaviour by the individual. Rather, even while it may hold for large chunks of an individual's verbal behaviour it does not generalize for all the uses of language. To make conjunct words with borrowed lexical items from Tamil, English puts the verb in a gerundive form. Tamil has very rich nominal morphology eg., nouns are morphologically distinguished from verbs. The well-formedness conditions on Tamil English set by Tamil requires that the Tamilian variety of English also express this distinction. The use of the gerundive is in accordance with these conditions and is not a conscious adjustment. Thus the individual speakers' cognitive and linguistic capabilities appear to be at the core of the speech community.

La page's (1968) (cited in Hudson 1980) approach of fitting bilinguals into groups whose distinctive characteristics can be perceived, appears relevant to our case in point. These groups are perceived by the speaker and not by a linguist or a sociologist using objective methods of analysis. The groups need not exhaust the entire population, but may represent certain social types (Hudson 27). Such an individual perception of groups and its associated characteristics stems from a belief system that exists in a bilingual's mind. Choudhry (1997), remarks, "The speaker believes something about another speaker. This is determined by his experiences with and the perception of other members of that variety." An example from our data substantiates this view: /*tadapudal -ity/ - ceremonious*. The speaker is a columnist and the hearer is a professor of English. There is a tacit understanding or belief that exists in the mind of the speaker that his creativity will be understood and accepted without him having to explain what he means. It is there in his sub conscious that such a usage will not come as a shock to the hearer.

TH-7358

Our inference is that the speakers perceive groups based on a particular belief system that operates sub consciously and decides the nature of his interaction and adoption of strategy transfer. If our contention that no uniform speech community exists for Tamil English or Indian English

DISS

P,31:(T;332)

N8



speakers is true, then the logical question is how, despite this absence, speakers of Tamil who also speak English actually exhibit shared chunks of verbal behaviour. In the next section, we argue that this apparent sharing of norms could be due to the way the two languages are stored in the brain of the bilingual and the relationship the two bear to each other .

2.3.1 The Tamil English Bilingualism:

Romaine (1989) identifies six types of childhood bilingualism. The type 6 bilingualism is stated as follows: Type 6 -parents -bilingual, community -bilingual , strategy -parents code switch or mix.

This type of bilingualism accomodates most of our informants who use Tamil and English at home , place of work, etc. Both English and Tamil are used for various purposes as the situation demands, and at various levels. The question we try to answer is how these two languages are stored in the bilingual's brain and their relationship with each other.

Romaine (1989) makes a reference to Paradis' 'extended system hypothesis', which states that there is a large stock in the brain that contains elements from both the languages and when the second language is learnt its sounds are treated as allophones or variants of phones already established in the first language." (cited in Romaine:1989:84). Thus bilinguals can speak

the second language using the phonological system of the first language. She also posits another view of Paradis which is the dual system hypothesis. It states that ,“ the two language systems are represented separately although they are stored in the same general language area.”(Romaine:1989:84) This would indicate atleast some neural independence for languages at some level. If we take the view of the extended hypothesis, we can see that Tamil English bilinguals tend to treat certain English sounds like /t/ and /d/ as they treat the Tamil retroflexes. Nevertheless, this argument wouldn't stand if we consider the fact that the native speaker who doesn't get to hear the alveolars will be in no position to treat the alveolars and retroflexes as allophones. The allophonic argument does not hold good because there are no alveolars in Tamil English and there are no allophonic variations either. The dual hypothesis does not hold good because it does not explain how the transfer of strategies occur if the languages are kept strictly independent.

Our view is that the relationship between Tamil and English in the bilingual's brain is that English, in spite of being the language of status and Prestige, is represented in the brain at a level subordinate to the L1 by which it is evaluated for the 'well-formedness' in certain areas of grammar by the

standards set by the grammar of Tamil. Tamil (L1) thus bears a dominance relationship to English, in that it creates the 'well-formedness' criteria for the subordinate languages spoken by the speaker. The speaker is free to borrow a strategy from Tamil to meet these criteria to make up for the lack that is evidenced in the grammar of English(L2). An example that substantiate our view is / *Hopping paṇṇu*/. Tamil requires nominals to be strongly marked in such verb constructions as these , but English lacks morphological marking for nominals everywhere expect for gerundive morphology. Since English verb becomes a part of the Tamil verbal complex, it behaves as per the rules of Tamil grammar. Thus, Tamil sets the well-formedness criterion and the speaker goes to the English morphology chooses the bound morpheme -ing for nominalizing the verb, but follows the rules of Tamil..

Tamil English speaker will accept both /hopping paṇṇu/ and /hop paṇṇu/, which are used in variation as both the speakers share the same evaluative relationship between Tamil and English in the brain. The maximum of the shared usages will then be the consequences of the fact that the speakers arrive at the same appraisal of a 'lack' in English given by the 'well-formedness' criteria set by Tamil.

2.3.2 The status of English in India:

English has been in India for over a century now. It enjoys constitutional status of the associate official language of the union. English is a part of any urban educated bilingual's verbal repertoire though the levels of usage depend on the degree of his/her competence. The question we intend to explore is whether English is in a diglossic relationship with the other codes that exist in the social environment.

Fergusson defines a diglossic relationship as one which involves high and low varieties of the same language where the higher variety is a part of a "large and respected body of literature" or learned largely by formal education and not used by any part of the society for ordinary conversation. (Hudson:1980:54) Thus it implies that there would exist for every language a diglossia, where written formal variety is H or the high and the spoken informal variety will be the L or the low variety. Das Gupta (1993) holds that the relationship between English and the regional languages is one of diglossia, where English is the High variety and the regional variety is the Low variety. "In the speech communities of India, it is English that counts as the Fishmanian H. This is a case of H/foreign rather than H/archaic; the spontaneity of L is here suppressed or held in check not by the domination of the otherness of the past time but by the domination of

the otherness of the foreign space whose global power English embodies.”(Das Gupta:1993:72)

This idea contradicts the situation that exists in Tamilnadu. The use of English in the state is more out because of the antipathy towards Hindi, which is thought of as an imposition. The reason for English language being used for the purposes of negotiations between the state and the centre is because of the absence of a common language between them and not because English has a superior status. The argument against the diglossic relationship between Tamil and English would come from the fact that they can both be freely used in written/formal situations. There may be a H/L distinction in certain social classes, but even that could be argued as to be +register bound variations of the two codes. English is chosen in formal writing in some cases because that is the register it is bound to. It is also used in informal situations by the youngsters because their register has English bound to it. If a college goer uses English to talk to his professor, that is demanded of him in that situation. In any case, he would use English or Tamil as he pleases among his friends

2.3.3 Indianization of English:

Transfer of strategies has also been discussed under the standard view of English (Kachru), where it is argued to a strategy of 'indigenisation', a term that we do not agree with. The term indigenisation has a social implication that the native speaker is conscious of the foreignness of English and that the process is as conscious as it is political. The term lacks explanatory depth as it cannot explain why the indigenisation process is restricted to some areas of grammar for example, making of nominal and adverbial morphology. If every native speaker indigenised English, the strategies would be transferred at all levels of grammar to the same extent. Thus, an individual does not consciously decide to indigenise another language to sound like his own. In that case, the same kind or level of transfer of strategies should exist in all cases of bilingualism for which we have found no conclusive evidence. Our conclusion is that strategies are transferred from Tamil to English in order to enable English to meet the well-formedness criterion set by Tamil. This not only explains why strategies are transferred, but also why there can be speaker variations even in these areas. Even these apparent shared norms may not be universal and depends on how the linguisticity that exists in the brain of the individual gets tapped and may or may not match with the rest of the speakers. Thus, /beautiful-aa/

is used by all, whereas /tadapudality/ is not. Hence, the manifestation of the linguisticity in the speech of individuals decides the similarity that is perceived. The high incidence of /beautiful-aa/, will follow not from a shared set of norms decided by a speech community but from the cognitive nature of Tamil English bilingualism. Over and above this common shared level, the linguisticity may express itself in ways typically associated with the presence of speech communities defined in the sense of La Page. This evaluative relationship notwithstanding, the two codes are treated as independent in terms of other areas of grammar though there is an interface at the level of syntax. The syntax and the morphology of these two codes are considered autonomous and as we shall see in the next chapter, a uniform pattern can be drawn in the strategy of code switching.

CHAPTER 3

CODE SWITCHING

Code-switching is a linguistic phenomenon that comes naturally to any bilingual speaker. Speakers communicate fluently and maintain an even flow of talk while alternating the codes. Code-switching is perceived as automatic when speakers are immersed in the interaction and are concerned mainly with the effect of communication. Romaine (1989 :82) talks about code-switching not only in terms of treating two different codes, but also two different varieties of one language as two codes that are switched. We would also like to disagree with Krishnaswamy, Nagarajan and verma (1992 : 49) that due to switching the LI loses its status and its growth is inhibited. It is wrong to perceive switching as a strategy adopted because one is ashamed of using his language. Switching is a rule-governed communicative strategy adopted by speakers of bilingual societies for a variety of reasons. We will restrict our analysis of code switching to two languages English (L1) and Tamil (L2). In this chapter we explore this kind of a code-alternation with specific reference to Tamil English bilingual speakers. We seek to answer three basic questions.

- Why and when speakers switch? While answering this, we consider two types of reasons for this, 1) sociolinguistic, pragmatic reasons 2) grammatical reasons.
- Where do speakers switch?
- What effect do the switched items have on the discourse produced? This again is looked at in terms of sociolinguistic and the grammatical aspects.

3.1 Definitions of code switching:

Before proceeding further into answering these questions, we shall define the phenomenon of code switching. According to Gumperz, (1982:59), code-switching is, “the juxtaposition within the same speech, exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems.” The resultant discourse, which has switched items forms a part of a single speech event. Code switching is a natural phenomenon and is not a conscious effort at reproducing the items already learnt and stored in the brain. Depending on the effectiveness and appropriateness of what has to be conveyed, a speaker switches. There are a variety of factors that decide the ‘effectiveness and appropriateness’ of a particular switched discourse. Further, code-switching does not imply incompetence or inability to produce

meaningful utterances in one language continuously. It is a rule-governed activity and is not an adhoc switching or mixing of the items as a speaker pleases to do.

We now move on to a discussion of the empirical evidence for code-switching as a rule-governed phenomenon. Consider the following extracts from our data set. We begin with our I question, in this section, of when and why speakers switch codes. We look into the following sociolinguistic aspects. Three factors that determine the process of switching are 1) situation 2) topic 3) participants. Gumperz puts these components together that control a particular type of code switching called situational code switching. Speakers participate in a variety of speech networks and are aware of when they should switch from one language to another. The first factor taken into account is:

3.1.1 Situation:

Situations can be formal, semi-formal and informal and determine the nature and the extent of the switch. Formal situations demand the usage of one particular variety, which leads to the inference that switching is more prevalent in semi-formal and informal situations. Below we cite examples from our data of formal situations that demand the use of English and Tamil respectively.

Example 1

Speaker:1 *Madam can I meet you tomorrow and discuss my credits?*

Speaker:2 *I am busy tomorrow. Why don't you drop by my place in the evening?*

In this situation use of English is appropriate because the speaker is a student of literature and is talking to her teacher in the teacher's cabin. Use of any other language or switching from one to the other will be deemed inappropriate.

Example 2: Speech delivered on retirement.

/niingaḷ nalla piḷḷaiḡaḷ/ /vaalkayil sariyaaga munneri
 you all good children life in properly progress
 inḍa naṭṭay perumaikkullaakkuviir endrU nambugiren/
this country proud of make .pl.mkr thus I believe.

*You are all good students. I believe you will all progress in life a
 make this country proud.*

A shift in the situation at times leads to a shift in the language variety. For example, two participants participate in an informal conversation among themselves, but when the teacher walks in the situation becomes one of formal and there is a switch from Tamil to English. The participants are students of English Literature and it is understood that all their speech

exchanges that are formal with superiors and colleagues within the class room should be carried out in English. The mixed code itself is a scene setting device as it indicates either a semi-formal or an informal situation.

Example 3

Speaker 1:

/ey maha naan HOD ay meet paṇṇa poren /

hey maha I HOD instru.mkr meet do am going

Hey maha I am going to meet the HOD.

Speaker 2:

/naanum varen /

I also come+fut.mkr

I will also come.

Example 4

Speaker 1:

Madam can I meet you tomorrow to discuss my credits?

Teacher:

I am busy tomorrow. Why don't you drop by my place this evening?

(switch to English to her friend also.)

How about you? Are you free today?

3.1.2 Topic:

The second factor that determines switching is the topic. Nature of the topic also decides the nature of the switch because the topic of the discourse demands the use of different codes. Technical topics might lead to a switch to a switch into the language in which the subject is learnt. In the data, a speaker begins the conversation in Tamil, but switches to English while discussing a topic in Economics as the subject is taught in English and she is familiar with the terms in English

Example 1

/dipresion podu buying of securities people ooda purchasing power ay
dipression during buying of securities people of(poss) purchasing power
the

increase paṇṇaraḍUkkU/increase do to. Buying of securities during
depression is to increase the purchasing power of the people.

Example 2:

A general topic on Shakespeare.

/Shakespeare plays eludi paper-la pooṭu kaasu sambaadicaar/

Shakespeare plays wrote paper in put money earned.

Shakespeare wrote plays got them published and made a lot of money.

Here, there isn't much technicality as regards the topic and so just the nouns are switched. Thus, certain cases of code switching are topically motivated.

3.1.3 Participants:

The third factor that motivates switching is the role of the participants. Code-switched passages may also serve the purposes of directing a particular message to a particular addressee or of excluding a third party from the conversation. Speakers do understand each other and generally agree on what is being said and the essence of communication. Often, the oppositions' like 'we' versus the 'they' code are discussed with reference to code-switching. 'We' code is associated with in-group activities, while 'they' code is associated with 'out-group' activity. The following is an example from the data to explain the above said motivations.

Example 1

Speaker1: /naan solradai kelu/

I tell what listen.

Listen to what I say.

Shall I tell you about one writer who lived till 93 and laughed and made us laugh? P. G. Wodehouse.

/ennadu? Niing solradu Leave it to Psmith-nnu ninaikiren/

what? You tell what Leave it to Psmith that think I.

What? I think what you say is Leave it to Psmith.

The speaker knows that what she says will be understood by the listener. The listener is also familiar with the subject and knows how the speaker usually talks. The same speaker does not switch while in direct conversation with her maid. Thus the entire conversation goes on in Tamil. This also proves the claim that switching also depends on addressee specification.

An example of the 'we' versus the 'they' code from the data which results in the concept of in-group and out-group is :

Example 2 :

Speaker keeps talking in Tamil.

/NetrU nagay kaḍaykkU ponen/

Yesterday jewel shop to went

Yesterday I went to the jewel shop.

/enna vaaṅginay?/

What buy did you

What did you buy?

Seeing that the maid walks in the speaker switches to English.

I bought a pair of bangles.

The grammatical aspect of where the speakers actually switch is the next point we discuss here. The speakers switch when they report a direct speech situation.

Example 3:

/avan appaa kiṭṭa transfer vaāṅga maattēnnu sonnaḍukku
he father to transfer get no will not tell because father
 do whatever you want-*nnu* sonnar/
do whatever you want-so told he +mkr resp
When he told father that he wouldn't apply for a transfer,
Father said, " Do whatever you want . I will not interfere.

Speakers also switch while they use quotations in their speech.

Example 4:

/ennai correct pannaḍay. I call a spade a spade./
me correct don't do . I call a spade a spade.
Don't correct me. I call a spade a spade.

Sometimes, a code mixed item triggers a switch.

Example 5 :

/ei Meenakshi books paḍipiyaa?/
hey meenakshi books read do you?
Hey Meenakshi, do you read books?

/ava voracious reader/

she voracious reader (is)

The discourse begins in Tamil and the speaker mixes the English adjective voracious. Thus, it triggers a switch to English because voracious obviously cannot take a noun in Tamil. /ava voracious paḍippaali / is ungrammatical.

3.2: Scope of switching :

We now move on to the second question posed, where do the speakers switch? Three types of switching are mentioned by Romaine (1982). Tag-switching, Inter-sentential switching, and intra sentential switching. We shall explain these with respect to the data.

3.2.1 Tag-switching:

This involves the insertion of a tag from one language into an utterance without much of violation of syntactic rules.

Example 1:

/avan evvaḷavU sambaadicaan Muscat pooi? You know?

he how much earned Muscat after going? You know.

He has earned so much money after going to Muscat, you know?

3.2.2 *Inter sentential switching:*

This involves a switch at a sentence boundary. It indicates fluency of the speaker because the utterances should, “conform to the rules of both the languages.” (Romaine 1982:113). In our data, switches are seen at phrasal boundaries. Examples of this are :

- Switch at NP boundary.

/ adanaala poona voḍane NP [the way in which you sit,

so go as soon as, the way in which you sit

NP [your body language, S [ellaame perfect-aa irundaa

your body language, all that perfectly has to be

taan, S [you will get noticed.

then only, you will get noticed.

As soon as you go the way in which you switch, your body language

everything should be perfect. Then only you will get noticed.

- Switch at a verb phrase.

/gaudy-aa VP [irUkka kuudaadU

gaudy be should'nt

(It) should not be gaudy.

- The third type of switching that occurs within clauses is intra sentential switching. The example shows a switch at a noun phrase boundary within a prepositional phrase.

/ irandaavadU PP [in the first five minutes NP [prospect

secondly, in the first five minutes prospect

ooda nature-ay assess panṇa teriyaṇum. /

of the nature assess do know should.

Secondly, in the first five minutes you should know how to assess the prospect's nature.

Thus switching takes place at grammatical boundaries and is not a sudden shift done at random.

3.3 The grammatical effect of switching:

The third question that is taken up for discussion here is what effect the switch has on the discourse. The switched word or phrase or sentence can be shifted from the canonical base-generated to sentence-initial or sentence-final position for discursal effect..

Example 1:

/approach-kku munnaaḍi orU particular thing, you have to take into account.

approach the before one particular. thing, you have to take into account.

You have to take one particular thing before the approach.

The sentence was in Tamil. Initially a null subject+ object +verb construction would have been created, but mixing at the object level created a switch. The English grammar subsequently treated the object as topicalized.

3.3.1 Word order change:

The switched expressions of English when appear within a Tamil sentence, change their word order to suit Tamil grammar.

Example 1:

Exchange pleasantaries becomes pleasantaries exchange.

/Product knowledge perfect-aa irUkkanum/.

Product knowledge perfectly be should.

The knowledge ^{of ike product} should be perfect.

Knowledge of the product becomes product knowledge when mixed into a Tamil sentence.

Thus from the above cases we can say that syntax of both languages have an equal status and depending upon which language the switch occurs the syntactic constructions change. Thus they conform to the rules of grammar of either language as the case may be.

3.4: The sociolinguistic effect of switching :

The effect of switching at the sociolinguistic level can be seen in terms of the speaker's attitude and the hearer's perception of it. In the sample data, the speaker is a senior executive and talks to his subordinate at his place about selling. The speaker switches very often to make the other person comfortable. It is also a marker of politeness, friendliness etc.

In the second text, one speaker keeps switching more often than the others. This could be taken as a reflection of her personality and as an assertion of the fact that she is well educated. Switching is often perceived as a device, a marker of style in which urban bilinguals speak. Our data shows that youngsters from the age group 8-25 mix more than their parents generation and those living in a city mix or switch more compared to those who live in a town. Switching from Tamil to English as a phenomenon is becoming more prevalent because of the entry of English in day to day affairs, conversation, schools and colleges. In fact, it has become a part of even the satellite television channels. Thus, it has become very common and has come to be associated with a variety of parameters like being fashionable, being a part of the younger generation, etc.

3.5: Constraints of switching:

The following are the general constraints of code switching cited by various linguists. We shall see if our data follows these or not.

- Phrasal constraints: Phrasal elements cannot be mixed because they are atomic in nature. This has been proposed by Lipski

(cited in Joseph Foley:1988 pp85)

Article+ noun: This kind of a switching is allowed in Tamil English code

switching. Example: The /paal/ is spoilt . The milk is spoilt.

Determiner+ noun: Samples of the data show that mixing of determiner of English and Tamil noun and vice versa are allowed in the Tamil English mixed speech. Drink that /paal/ which means drink that milk is perfectly grammatical in the mixed discourse.

Auxiliary + main verb: Our data follows this constraint. I must /po/ i.e., go is ungrammatical.

Particle to + infinitive: Our data conforms to this constraint also. I want to /sapiḍu/ i.e., I want to eat is wrong.

Negation of verbal element: This constraint follows as regards the Tamil English mixed speech. I don't drink coffee cannot be said as /I don't kuḍi coffee/.

Prepositional phrase: Our data does not conform to this constraint. Thus, mixing is allowed within the prepositional phrase. Example: /inside the pātram/ meaning inside the utensil is considered grammatical by the Tamil English bilinguals.

- Conjunction constraint: Our data does not follow this constraint and Hindi English code switching also does not conform to this constraint. (Kachru 1978) (cited in Foley 1988) At the phrasal level, the English conjunctions cannot conjoin with non-English NPs and VPs. /paṇṇu and let's see/ /paṇṇu/ is do.
- Semantic constraint: Linguists like Gumperz (cited in Foley 1988) talk about this kind of a constraint. Our data too follows this constraint. One can't say 'the country has gone to dogs' as /the naḍḍu has gone to dogs/ or 'the country has gone to the naigal' /naḍḍu/ is country and /naigal/ is dogs.
- Free morpheme constraint: (Poplack:1979) (cited in Foley 1988). The root of one morpheme cannot be mixed to bound morpheme of the other. But our data shows such mixing in both the languages. /saregal/ for sarees and /kuṭṭis/ for /kuṭṭigal/ meaning small girls.

Thus a variety of sociolinguistic and grammatical factors determine the process of code switching. The point we try to make is most linguists under the heading of code switching also discuss mixing (gumperz:1982) (Hatch:976) (cited in Gupta: 1978). Our data suggests the universal patterns may be isolated for codeswitching and codemixing, especially at the morphological level is distinguished by the absence of a uniform pattern as exhibited by the data. In the next chapter, we discuss code-mixing distinguishing it from both borrowing and code-switching and how the wellformedness criterion set by L1 results in mixing.

CHAPTER 4

CODE MIXING

Code mixing, the second phenomenon discussed in this work, is also a code alternation that forms a part of any bilinguals discourse. There exists more than one possible definition as regards code mixing. Code switching and code mixing are treated as mixing from the level of word to sentences. Kachru (1983) claims that the lowest level in the hierarchy of mixing is at the word level, while the highest level is at the sentence level. We would like to view switching at and below the word level as mixing. We shall take the view of John Gumperz here to justify our stand. "Often code switching also takes place within a single sentence." (Gupta:1978:56). Gupta (1978) talks about three kinds of switch between different languages depending on situations and contexts switch within one interactional situation where a bilingual may switch from one code to another and switch within a single sentence. The distinction between switching and mixing in terms of internal and external switching. At the sociolinguistic level, code switching is relatively more of a scene-setter, whereas code mixing is used in most of the semi-formal and informal situations. At the linguistic level the distinction is

one of description wherein code switching is actually mixing over a long time or code mixing is a temporary switch with respect to time. Hence, we use a purely formal definition of the phenomenon in our discussion, but would like to reiterate that the distinction is of relevance only in terms of its sociolinguistic effects.

Code mixing is often treated as a result of indigenisation. As suggested in the second chapter, these characterisations are imprecise. If every Tamil speaker wants or consciously decides to indigenise English, he would be treating English as a foreign language, which is not the case. Also, there would be equal amount of mixing at all levels of grammar, which our data disputes. The very fact that our data shows excessive amount of mixing at the word level and below the word level shows the bilingual's linguisticity and he puts it to use creatively. In our view both L1 and L2 share a particular kind of a relationship in the bilingual's brain, by which the mother tongue sets the criteria for well-formedness. If we take a case specific example, Tamil has a dominant status over English in the Tamil English bilingual's brain and sets the well-formedness condition that gives rise to certain shared norms. We, therefore, see mixing as a transfer of strategies from the mother tongue, but we give content to that transfer as motivated by a certain kind of

bilingualism. This mixing is largely unconscious and relatively unaffected by sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

4.1 Word level mixing:

Mixing at the word level is often done by bilinguals. The mixing results in a variety of combinations, where there is an English noun added to a Tamil adjective, Tamil noun added to an English adjective etc. This kind of a mixing is quite uniform and is done by most of the members of the speech community. For example, /rayil nilayam/ - railway station. Here the English noun and a Tamil noun are mixed to form a combination. For example, /red pudavay/ - red saree. The English adjective and the Tamil noun are mixed to form a /pacay car/ - green car. Sometimes similar to what motivates a switch, a topic that is technical can trigger mixing of a single word or a lexical item. Egs., words like experiment, apparatus, etc.

To cite a few more examples of word level mixing, certain English nouns take the Tamil equivalent of 'put' in a Tamil sentence. /liivU poturuken/ means, "I have availed myself of leave." Leave of absence

becomes leave + put. “To put leave”, is not acceptable in English though in Tamil ‘put leave’ for ‘taking leave’ is a correct construction.

Another example that we take for analysis is that some nouns while entering into constructions of Tamil sentences take inchoative feature. /absent aaiyutēṅṅ/, /present aaiyutēṅṅ/, /ready aaiyutēṅṅ/. To become absent is not a perfect construction in English, but it is perfect in Tamil. These are general cases of mixing.

4.1.1 Mixing for emphasis :

There are certain words in English, that take their exact equivalents of English and used in Tamil constructions for the sake of emphasis. /adi bottom/ -/aḍi/ also means bottom .

Similarly /naḍu centre/ where /naḍu/ also means centre.

4.2. Borrowing and mixing:

If we consider mixing at the word level as consistent, then the question arises as to how we distinguish between mixing and borrowing. The general distinction between mixing and borrowing is made with reference to the degree of integration of the items borrowed. If we go by this distinction, the entire language system of a speech community need to be studied

exhaustively. We follow Pfaff (1976) who claims that if one has to examine the status of a word as to whether it is borrowed or mixed, one has to look at the equivalents. (cited in Romaine:1989) If equivalents exist and still speakers still use words from L2 it can be termed as mixing. But existence of equivalents in certain forms of speech, say the speech of the purists or in some written texts cannot be a deciding factor. One has to find out if it really exists in the active or passive lexicon of the individuals and the societal groups they owe allegiance to. For example, the Tamil equivalent for 'tea' is /teeniir/ but is used very rarely and does not exist in the active vocabulary of the individuals. Thus 'tea' could be treated as borrowing. It might so happen that an equivalent might exist for a certain group of people who use it in their discourse, and might not for some other group. So borrowing or mixing can be decided on the basis of existence of equivalents among specific groups of people and how much it is in use among them. Conscious coinages of equivalents cannot be considered as equivalents. Borrowing in other words could be done to fill lexical gaps, whereas mixing is not. Borrowing could most often be a conscious choice. As an equivalent doesn't exist, a speaker tends to borrow, whereas mixing is a subconscious phenomenon. At the surface level though, the distinction between mixing and borrowing can be blurred, as the items most frequently mixed begin to

be treated as integrated borrowed items. For example, father etc. A clear case of borrowing can be seen in the speech of monolinguals. They incorporate certain words into their vocabulary without being aware of the fact that these words belong to a different language. A Tamil rustic speaker uses words like time, duty, service, etc, as a part of his day to day conversation strongly believing that it is a part of the Tamil vocabulary.

4.3. Mixing below the word level:

Mix at the morphological level of adding affixes could be because of the fact that the speaker is sure that what he says is acceptable to the hearer. It could be a shared strategy transfer between participants or it can reveal the participants' attitude of being fashionable. Morphological mixing is an integral part of the younger generation. Mixing at the lexical level is done by all people of different age groups, whereas morphological mixing is done at all informal contexts. As it is said, exception proves the rule, our sample shows certain shared norms of mixing. While adding the English suffix -fy to Tamil verbs to emphasize, is quite common among the present and the previous generation, adding the suffix -aa to English verbs to make them adjectival and adverbial predicates is a universal phenomenon among Tamil English bilinguals. As we have been

discussing time and again, Tamil sets the dominance relation and decides the well-formedness in the mixed speech. This explains the lack of universal norms of transfer of strategies. We need to look into some examples to show how the Tamil English mixed speech is not an ad hoc mishmash of words but a rule governed activity. Thus it is our inference that though mixing is largely unconscious, there are a few cases of mixing like adding the English suffixes -ity, fy, and the Tamil suffix -ii where speakers consciously mix for purposes of identity, fashion, to reveal their personality etc. On the other hand certain cases of mixing are done unconsciously like those in /hopping paṅṅu/, /discussion paṅṅaḍay/ where mixing is done because of the well-formedness criterion set by Tamil.

Example:1 An example from our data, which is an instance of mixing at both the lexical and morphological level is that of /hopping paṅṅu/ The dominance relationship of Tamil over English and sets the well-formedness criterion is /hopping paṅṅu/ -hopping +do. To make conjunct verbs with borrowed lexical items in English, Tamil English puts the verb in the gerundive form. Tamil requires nominals to be strongly marked in such verb constructions and English lacks morphological marking for nominals every where ,with the exception of gerundive morphology. The choice of the

gerundive is therefore not forced by reasons internal to English grammar, but because Tamil sets the norm by which conjunct verbs are formed by a morphologically marked nominal and a verb. As soon as the English verb becomes a part of the Tamil verbal complex, it must behave as per the rules of Tamil grammar. This can either be done by affixing the Tamil case markers or by implementing the Tamil strategy into English. Thus, to make the nominalization of hop, the speaker goes to English morphology, but follows the rules of Tamil thus setting the well-formedness criterion. The reason for treating this as mixing at both word level and below the word level is because there is mixing of the bound morpheme from English i.e., -ing and mixing at the word level where it takes /paṇṇu/ from Tamil.

Example 2 :

Certain verbs while entering into Tamil constructions, take the verb 'do' along. For example /discuss paṇṇaday/ discuss+do not. There is also a variation to it which is /discussion paṇṇaday/. Similarly /tense paṇṇaday/ and /tension paṇṇaday/ are used in variation. Thus, the verb 'do' results in a morphological change of the English verb into a noun which is ungrammatical in English but grammatical in Tamil, which sets the well-formedness criterion.

Example 3:

The addition of the Tamil suffix -a in words like perfect, right, etc., /perfect-aa/ means perfect. Thus the adverbial marker -ly is replaced by a Tamil marker when used in a Tamil sentence. Thus Tamil sets the well-formedness condition that -aa should be marked for predication when these norms are used in a Tamil sentence.

Example 3 :

The addition of the suffix -ana for adjectival predicate, when qualifying a noun. Thus, beautiful-ana pudavay means a beautiful saree.

Example 4:

The example that invokes our interest here is an equivalent of -feeling happened. /feeling aaiyuducu/ A bad feeling could arise on account of somebody close to a person being hurt. This kind of a feeling is always referred to by most Tamil speakers as 'a feeling happened', which obviously means that the person saying so is also hurt. There is a semantic shift while using the verb feel in the sense of 'to feel something'. /feel panreen/, i.e, feel + the verb do. If a person says feeling + happened or feel +do , it means he felt bad about something and was affected in the process.

4.3.1 Affixation of case markers:

From the perspective we are taking, the oft-noted phenomenon of the affixation of the case markers to English nouns can also be seen in terms of a subset of a well-formedness criterion that is set by Tamil. The question here is why can't Tamil retain the rules English case markings while mixing English words into Tamil sentences? The fact is that Tamil takes its own case markings and thereby sets the well-formedness criterion. This is how we explain the dominance relation that Tamil bears to English in the bilingual's brain. Let us take a look at the *nominative case* first. It does not need a case marker by the rules of Tamil grammar.

Accusative case: English object takes -ai following the rules of Tamil grammar. (/road-ai cross paṇṇu/. Cross the road.)

Instrumental case: -aal ,oḍu - of , with. /Delay-aal/ because of the delay. /chappal oḍu uḷa varaḍai/. Don't come with chappals inside.

Ablative case: -il, in, irundu. /Dream il irundu veliya vaḷ/ Come out of your dream.

Dative case: -kku -for. Loanukku apply paṇṇiyirukku/ I have applied for a loan .

Genitive case: -/uḍaiya/ - car uḍaiya meaning of the car (possession).

Thus Tamil sets the criteria of well-formedness to English while mixing into English so switched English nouns have Tamil suffixes or particles affixed to them .

There are also a few particles like ‘-o’, ‘-e’ etc. used for emphasis. eg. /studies-e vendam/ means studies are not required. /parents-o old fashioned/ meaning parents are old fashioned. While stating an opinion with a feeling of ‘nothing can be done about this’ or ‘sarcasm’, these expressions are used .

4.4 Mixing specific to groups and individuals:

Mixing of a particular item into Tamil or English can vary from individuals to groups. There are instances that are specific to an individual, a particular group or a family. To cite a few examples , /tadapudal-ity/ meaning ceremonious has been used only by one speaker. This has a variety of sociolinguistic and linguistic implications. The speaker is a journalist and talks to a professor of English . Thus this construction is readily accepted and understood by the hearer. Hence various factors like participants , speaker’s creativity , and the way of operating on the basis of a ‘belief system’ results in these mixing. Similarly, words like /un-sagik- able/ is used in an old Tamil

movie with the expectation of being understood. Mixing that is group specific -/friend/ becomes /friend-ii/ to mark the feminine gender. The -i suffix from Tamil is a feminine gender marker that is mixed into English which is very popular among college goers. On the other hand adding -fy to verbs to make nouns (eg./kuḷapy-fy/ meaning to confuse) is added for emphasis. Further extensions like /kuḷapyfying/ , /kuḷapyfication/ etc. is used not only by the youngsters but also a generation above them. Thus code-mixed items need not necessarily be a part of every bilingual's verbal repertoire but can be anything ranging from individual specific to group specific to family specific etc. For example mixed item that is family specific doctor becomes /docton/ if a person wants to show disrespect because '-r' is a marker of respect in Tamil whereas '-n' is a marker of disrespect.

4.5. The mixed lexicon:

Sometimes English words are used with semantic shifts in English as well as Tamil sentence. For example the word, 'nicely', in the sentence, "He came back nicely", means, "He came back surreptitiously." we consider such words as a part of the mixed lexicon. By mixed lexicon, what is meant here is the creation of certain words as a consequence of Tamil English

bilingualism, but belong to neither Tamil nor English strictly, but can be used in these meanings even in English or in Tamil. The case in which the meanings coincide with English are those where the words are not from the mixed lexicon, but the ones with the regular English meaning.

Example 1:

/perfect-aa/ is used in the regular sense of the English perfect.

Example2:

/clean-aa/ in Tamil, /cleanly/ in English both are used in the sense of perfect. Thus, this belongs to the mixed lexicon.

Example 3:

/nice-aa/ in Tamil and nicely in English is used in the sense of quietly, surreptitiously, etc., belongs to the mixed lexicon.

Example 4:

/personality-aa/ is often used in the sense of handsome. Thus this also belongs to the mixed lexicon.

There are also certain words, which are taken from English and used in both English and Tamil sentences with new meanings and without any Tamil affixation.

Example:1

`dead of ' means too packed with work or too much of work load that will kill you.

Example:2

`acting off ' means to show one's superiority or power.

4.6 Conclusion:

Thus we would like to consider mixing as a quick switch from the language in which the discourse begins at the word level or morphological level and immediately reverting back to the same language ,which was used initially. Thus, switching can be used as a cover term for switching and mixing though we would like to draw a distinction at the level of word and morphology to differentiate the phenomenon of mixing from borrowing. This way we can also explain the presence of a separate set of lexicon that forms a part of the mixed code, but can also be used in both English and Tamil constructions though with different meanings. To conclude , mixing as we have defined it is also a rule governed activity though all instances of mixing are not necessarily universal .

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Sociolinguistics generally deals with the language use by a variety of speakers in a variety of situations. As we all know, one of the main purposes of speech is communication. The communicative process involves several factors like situation participants, etc. This is context bound and Gumperz calls it conversational inference. It is, “situated or context bound process of interpretation by means of which participants in an exchange assess other’s intentions and on which they base theirs .” Thus the whole act of communication takes place under the premise of common belief systems that the speakers share. The communicative purpose being the main goal, the participants also take care of the situation in which he uses the language. They build on their own and the audience’s abstract understanding of the situational norms and communication.

When we talk of language behaviour of individuals, a variety of them do come to mind. In cases where the speakers are bi/multilinguals, they mix and switch. Our study was based on these two phenomena. When we set out to study these two, we had in mind a few questions and we arrived at the

following conclusions. While studying Indian English as a speech variety, we looked at the following aspects. The distinction drawn on the varieties of world Englishes by linguists is unacceptable because they choose to call American, Australian Englishes as native varieties, while Indian, Nigerian, Singaporean Englishes are new, non-native varieties. As per their own distinction, any variety other than British English is transplanted. Such a classification is not convincing and in fact gives an impression of a racist tendency. We also believe that there cannot exist a standard for Indian English because of the presence of a large number of varieties within Indian English itself. Thus arriving at a standard is not only difficult but also unreasonable as no particular variety can be thought of as a standard at random above others.

The inference we draw after studying the speech community of Tamil English bilinguals is that it is heterogeneous. Thus we place this as per the definition of Le Page, where there are groups whose distinctive characteristics are perceived. Thus, these groups do not exhaust the entire population, but represent certain social types.

After a study of the two phenomena, we make a distinction between switching and mixing. For us, switching is done at the phrase, clause and sentence level and mixing at the word level and at the morphological level.

Another aspect that we have come across is that while switching follows a regular pattern, mixing can range from individual-specific to family-specific to group-specific. The sharing of norms we see as the relationship that Tamil bears to English in the bilingual brain. Tamil has a dominance relationship towards English that makes it adopt certain strategies to meet the well-formedness criterion set by it .

Yet another conclusion that we have drawn after the research is that these two phenomenon are not mere indiginization of English or englishization of the Indian languages. English is not treated as a foreign language and if at all Indians want to make English sound like any Indian language, they would do the same in all the other cases of bilingualism which is not true.

As regards the constraints of mixing and switching, our data shows a lot of mixing at the level of morphology against the popular belief that the lowest level of mixing is at the word level. Also, mixing is done within certain grammatical categories which are said to be unbreakable. For example, in an English sentence the determiner and noun are considered atomic. In a mixed speech, the English determiner can be followed by a Tamil noun.

While examining the mixed data, we also did come across certain syntactical aspects like topicalisation, compounding etc. We have made a mention of these and have not elaborated because the aim of the study was to look at the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of the two phenomenon in question. Hence we could not devote much of a time to these aspects. A further research can take care of this in the future.

We now proceed to discuss the methodology used. We adopted the following four techniques namely, observation, questionnaires, individual interviews, tape recordings. The first technique wasn't really tough as it just involved observing people in their natural environment and noting them down.. The questionnaires were also distributed to about 40 informants who ticked whether the given mixed and switched words, phrase, clauses and sentences were acceptable, not acceptable. This elicited good response because the informants didn't have to speak out as they were required to in the interviews. Interviews were the toughest because the informants were conscious of talking and giving their opinions, but they later were comfortable because of the familiarity and the encouragement of a few fellow participants who were forth coming and the researcher too. Further more, we could not interview more than twenty-five people due to a variety of reasons like people being more comfortable with writing

down their opinions rather than speaking, our own constraints of time, the hectic life-style of a few of our informants who could not spare much time talking to us, etc.

We also noticed while interviewing people that they mixed or switched because they could not think in just one language. We would not attribute this to imperfect knowledge of either of the grammatical systems. It was also quite surprising that people of the older generation did not approve too much of the younger generation's mixing at the morphological level and even a few of the younger generation believe that this kind of language mixture is language corruption. It is our inference that the two phenomena are rule-governed though the speaker would not consciously realise that he has to mix in one particular situation and only these particular grammatical categories, etc. At the same time, they do not randomly mix or switch. At the subconscious level they have the grammatical rules and follow certain norms while mixing or switching. The point we would like to make clear here is the younger generation mix due to a variety of social factors like group identity, fashion, and to carve an image for themselves.

Another main observation of the speakers reveal that switching is done more by the college goers in Chennai than in Tiruchirapalli. The reasons could be that in Chennai, the exposure to the English language is

more because it is a metro. This once again does not reflect any kind of imperfect knowledge among the speakers in Tiruchirapalli. It just goes to show that the more the exposure to a language, the more the person uses it with ease.

Yet another inference is that mixing and switching have become extremely common nowadays and we perceive it more because of the advent of satellite television. In many programmes, the comperes are college goers and so they reflect their group identify as that of the younger generation. This results in a cyclic relationship. Thus the two linguistic phenomena have become concepts of identity.

REFERENCES

- Annamalai, E. 1986. Some syntactic differences between spoken and written Tamil in BH. Krishnamurti ed., South Asian Languages: Structure Convergence and Diglossia, Delhi: Motilal BanarsiDass.
- Baumgardener.J. 1996. South Asian English, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Roger.T.1976. Sociolinguistics, London: BatsFord.
- Choudhury, Reshma Nasreen. 1997. Dialectical variation between Upper and Lower Assamese Varieties and its Sociolinguistic Significance, M Phil Dissertation Jawaharlal Nehru University.
- Das Gupta, Probal. 1993. The Otherness Of English, NewDelhi: Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, Charles. A. 1996. English in South Asia: Imperialist Legacy and Regional Asset in J.Baumgardner ed., South Asian English, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gumperz, John. J. 1982. Discourse strategies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, John. J. 1971. Language in Social Groups, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gumperz, John . J. 1971. Hindi Punjabi Code switching in Delhi in John.J. Gumperz ed., Language in Social Groups, Stanford, California: Stanford University press.

Gumperz. John. J. 1982. Language and Social Identity, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gupta, R.S. 1978. A Sociolinguistic Study of the use of Mixed Hindi and English in Metropolitan Delhi, Ph.D Thesis, University of York.

Gupta, R.S. 1991. English and Indian Languages: Code-mixing in R.S. Gupta and Kapil Kapoor eds., English in India : Issues and problems, NewDelhi: Academic Foundation.

Hudson, R. A. 1980. Sociolinguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Braj. B. 1982. The Other Tongue. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, Braj. B. 1983. The Indianization of English: The English Language in India, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru. B. Braj. 1996. South Asian English: Toward an Identity Diaspora in J. Baumgardner ed., South Asian English, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kaleem, Nafeesa. 1981. English Loan words in Tamil. An Ethno semantic study, Ph.D Thesis, CIEFL.

Krishnaswamy, S. K. Verma and M. Nagarajan. 1992. Modern Applied linguistics, Madras: Macmillan.

Lehiste, Ille. 1988. Lectures On Language Contact, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Moag, Rodney F. 1996. The case Study of Non- Native Englishes: A Case Study in Braj. B. Kachru ed., The Other Tongue, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Muysken, Peter. 1998. We are all Native speakers, But of which Language? in R. Singh ed., The Native speaker: Multilingual perspectives, NewDelhi: Sage Publications.

Nanjappa, Shruthi. 1997. Modernity and Identity: A sociological analysis with special reference to linguistic identity in India, M.phil Dissertation, Jawharlal Nehru University.

Rahman, Tariq. 1990. Pakistani English, Pakistan: National Institute of Pakistani Studies.

Rajamanikkam, M. 1932. Tamil Grammar, Triplicane, Madras: Palaniandi pillai & co. Educational Publishers

Rajaram, S. 1972. Tamil Phonetic Reader, Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1989. Bilingualism, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Samarin, William. J. 1967. Field Linguistics, Newyork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shantha, K.M. 1971. Malayalam-English Code switching: Form and Function, Ph.D Thesis, CIEFL

Singh, Rajendra. "New /non -native Englishes: A Quartert" in Journal of Pragmatics, March, 1994.

Singh, Rajendra. "New /non-native Englishes Revisited: A reply to my colleagues" in Journal of Pragmatics, April, 1995.

Srivastava, R .N. 1994. Bi/Multi Lingualism, Delhi: Kalinga publications.

Tung, Tan Peck. 1988. A Description of Patterns of Code-mixing and Code-switching in a MultiLingual Household in Joseph Foley ed., New Englishes: The Case of Singapore, Singapore : Singapore University Press.

Vaid, Jyotsna. 1987. Visual Field Asymmetries for Rhyme and Syncntactic Category Judgments in Monolinguals and Fluent Early and Late Bilinguals in Harry and Whitaker eds., Brain and Language , Vol: 30, pp 263-275, SanDiego, NewYork: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.

Wardaugh, Ronald. 1986. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Oxford:Basil Blackwell.

Weinreich, Uriel.1962.Languages in Contact,The Hague: Mouton.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire 1

Name:

Age:

Sex:

Mother Tongue:

Other Languages Used:

Educational Level:

Profession:

Father's Educational level:

Mother's Educational level:

Husband's/Wife's Mother Tongue:

Husband's/ Wife's Educational level:

Economic Status:

Questionnaire.2

1. Do you mix or switch in your speech?

- With friends and colleagues?
- On formal occasions?

- On informal occasions?
- With parents?
- With husband or wife?
- With domestic servants?
- With shop keepers?
- With neighbours?
- With superiors?
- For discussing academic subjects?
- For discussing politics and sports?
- For discussing scientific matters?

2. Where do you come across this kind of mixing or switching?

- On television or radio?
- In advertisements?
- In films?
- In journals and magazines?
- In novels?

Questionnaire.3

1. Please tick **acc** for acceptable and **Nacc** for not acceptable in the following mixed and switched expressions:

	Acc	Nacc
/ko <u>l</u> apare <u>s</u> on/:		
/docto-n/:		
/correct-aa/		
/nice-aa/:		
/t <u>a</u> d <u>a</u> p <u>u</u> d <u>a</u> l-ity/:		
/na <u>d</u> an <u>d</u> u-fy:		
/o <u>d</u> u-ling/:		
/hopping pa <u>n</u> nu/:		
/hopp pa <u>n</u> nu/:		
/walking-po/:		
/doct-ii/:		
/boys-ga <u>l</u> /:		
/saree-ga <u>l</u> /		
/friend-ii/		

2. Say if the following switched sentences are acceptable or not and say acc. or Nacc. accordingly:

Acc.

Nacc.

Go to that kaḍay.

Idon't know yaarunnu.

Avan varamaṭṭaannu I think.

She sonnaa this is bad.

Attention-ay catch paṇṇaṇum.

Avan kiṭṭa respect very much.

Drink that paal.

My appa told, nii varvaynnu.

Nii very mean.

This place is vaḷUki-fying.

Text: 1 Tape recordings: Rustic Discourse

/maṭṭaykkU rate/

Rate for dried coconut branch.

/Service aaiyUḍUcU/
/daily kuulii/

Service here means getting used to.
daily wages.

/SaavUra time/
to die

time to die

/automatic-aa/	automatically
/machine araykkum/ grind will	machine will grind
/pleasure-la pooraan/ car in going	he is going by car, pleasure is car for them.
/Checking paṅṅraṅga/ do they	they will check.

Text 2.

Speaker: I: eḷundU varappove happy-aa irUkkiye, enna viṣayam? T.V.-la venumngara programme ellaam paaTiyaa? Sari inniki enna samayal paṅṅalaam?

You look so happy even as you get up. What is the matter? Have you been watching your favourite programmes on T.V.?

Okay what shall we cook today?

Speaker2: Vegetable rice pannu.

Cook vegetable rice.

Speaker1:/paayasam/

Kheer?

Speaker:2 No maa . adu time-consuming.

No mother. It is time-consuming.

Speaker:1 Not at all.

Speaker:2 Sugar eedoo vaangaṇumnu sonniye/

You said you had to buy sugar.

Speaker1: /vaangiyacu. You don't worry. Naan ellaam preplanned-aa paṇṇiteen. niikum teriṅju vecUkkaṇum. Plan your work and work your plan taan un motto-vaa irukkanum. Poori-kkum naan idaye taan solren puriyardaa? Clear?/

I have bought it . You don't worry. I had planned it much before. You should also know this. Plan your work and work your plan should be your motto. I tell this to Poori also. Do you understand? Clear?

Speaker:1: nii week magazine paaTiyoo? Lalitha oru article eludi irUkkaa.

Cinna vayasileye ava romba talented. Avalai taan nii role-model-aa vecUkaṇum. Time-ai waste paṇṇa kuudaadu. Positive-aa think paṇṇaṇum. Poori, vaa happy new year.

Did you see the week magazine? Lalitha has written an article. She was talented even when she was young. You should have her as your role-model. You should never waste time. Think positive always. Hi Poori! come happy new year to you.

Speaker 3: Thanks mom. What are you guys upto?

Speaker1: cummaa pesindUirukkoom.

We were just talking.

Speaker2: So? How is the preparation for XLRI?

Speaker3: Two days taan irUkkU. I am very apprehensive.

Just two days left and I am apprehensive.

Speaker2: Don't worry. You will make it somewhere. IMS -la irUkkara passages paaTukkoo. Then look through Ramya's GRE book.

Don't worry You will make it somewhere. See the passages that are there in IMS and also look through Ramya's GRE book.

Speaker 3: Last time they had asked about Stock holm syndrome. Ennooda greatest anxiety ennannaa eedaavadu teriyada topic -la question

kettaa, I'll be in trouble.

My greatest anxiety is that if they ask a question in some unknown topic, I will be in trouble.

Speaker 2 : You have prepared well. And our best wishes are with you.

So kavalay padaaday.

So don't worry.

Speaker1: adaan ooreḍiyaa manasay pottu kolappikaaday. Relax pannikoo. Refresh pannikoo. Fruits vegetables ellaam saapiḍu. veendaamnnu sollaaday. NaalaykkU hostella irUkka pooray. Life aṅga romba easy illay.

Don't confuse yourself so much. Relax. Refresh. Eat properly. Don't say you don't like fruits and vegetables. You are going to live in a hostel. Life is not so easy there.

Text3:

Speaker1: un kiṭṭa onṇu sollaṇum. nii romba manasay varuttinḍU paḍikkaray. Take life easily. Sirikka palagU. Delhi-la naan Deepa, Rupa, Gomati, Jhilik ellaarum vennunṭe sit before the T.V. and pass comments

and keep on laughing. Others get bugged. But we don't care. It makes life much

better if you laugh and enjoy even for trivial things.

I have to tell you something. Don't strain yourself so much. Take life easily. Learn to laugh and enjoy.

Text 4. Semi-formal conversation.

Seling-la, you must take into account, the various aspects of human psychology. Poogum poode , modalla, you must be in a position to assess the mood of the prospect. avan enda maadiri behave panraancold-aa behave panraanaa, receptive-aa irUkkaanaa appadingaradai within three minutes you should assess. adanaalay ponaavanay the way in which you sit, your body language, ellaame perfectaa irundaa taan you will get noticed. IrandaavadU, the first five minutes prospect oda chamber-la spend panaradu very important. You must catch his attention. Attentionay eppadi catch panaradu? Product knowledge-ai perfect-aa vecukkanum. At the same time onoda approach also . Approach-kku munnadi , oru particular thing you have to take into account. That is the way you dress etc. Gaudy-aa irukka kuudaadu. At the same time appear in such a way that you command respect. Appearance respect-ai command pannanum.avan vandu he must

think that you are a person of consequence. Otherwise, he will throw you out by saying that he is not interested. Adanaalay eduttavodanaye visayattukku varama pleasantaries exchange pannanum. Boost his ego and drag him into a conversation. Then slowly convince him into buying your product.

In selling, you must take into account the various aspects of human psychology. As soon as you go you must be in a position to assess the prospect's mood . You should be able to perceive his mood , how he behaves, whether he is cold or receptive within three minutes. So after you reach, the way you behave, your body language etc., should be perfect, then only you will get noticed. Secondly, the first five minutes you spend in the prospect's chamber is very important. You must catch his attention. How do you catch his attention? You should have a perfect knowledge of your product. At the same time, you should also have the right approach. Before the approach, you have to take a particular thing into account. You should be dressed properly. Your dress shouldn't be gaudy. You should appear in such away that you command respect. He must think you are a person of consequence. Otherwise, he will throw you out by saying that he is not interested. So without starting the conversation abruptly exchange

pleasantaries, boost his ego and drag him into a conversation. Then slowly convince him into buying his product.

Text 5

layf-la successful-aa varanumnu sonnaake siruvargal olungaa college pooitU, vaadyaar solraday olungaa kettu notes eludi netU panni first class-aa paricay eludi taan munnUkkU varuvaangaradu is an idiotic belief endU I think. Majority of such people munnUkkU varadillay. seriyaa, suyamaa, independent-aa think panra pasanga taan munnUkkU varuvaa. Vaadyaar solradU seriyaa, tappannU cross check seiya kuudiyaa mentality irukkanum. Sila boys vaguppil attention pay pannama iruppa. anaa they will get very high marks and progress in life. adippadyaa fundamental fault namma paada tittangalla irUkku. adU namma pasangalai semi literates-aa maataraade tavira, but not learned. inda kolarkUkkU, what is the cause? Adarkku moola karanam politicians. English anniya molinnu koocal poodaraa. They have double standards. People should realize this and not get deceived.

If students have to be successful, they should go to college regularly, listen to teachers intently, and take down copious notes, get them by heart and write

their exams well. I think this a idiotic belief. Majority of such people do not progress in life. Boys who think independently progress in life. Students should have the mentality to cross check if whatever the teacher says is right or wrong. Some boys do not pay attention in class but score very high marks come up in life. The fundamental fault lies basically within our education system. It just makes our students only semi-literate and not learned. What is the cause of this problem. The politicians are the basic reason for this. They make a hue and cry saying that English is a foreign language and it has to be scrapped. They have double standards. People should realize this and not get deceived.

Observation:

- Tamil suffix-aa

Sudden-aa	suddenly
real-aa	really
hopeless-aa	hopelessly

- Play verbs.

Hopping paṅṅu	do hopping
skipping paṅṅu	do skipping
running catching paṅṅu	do running catching

- English suffix-fy:

kulapi-fy

to confuse

nookki-fy

to see

- Tamil suffix-ii:

friend-ii

friend (female)

- English suffixes:

tadapudali-ty

ceremoniously

kolapiresan

confusion

un- sagikk-abl

intolerable

- Term of endearment

yes-a

yes dear

no-a

no-da

- Phonological change:

ite-athUkkU

for the item.

- Words with similar meaning:

nadu centre

Cup vaaṅgaradu

to get a cup

to fail in the exams