This thesis, titled "The Optimal Grammar of Code-Switching Between Kannada and English," has been modified from the form in which it was originally published. Specifically, this thesis has been modified in the following ways:

- The Table of Contents has been replace to update section names and page numbers in pages 1-11.
- Pages 1-11 have been replaced to correct citations.
- Pages 38 and 39 have been replaced to add two references.

The body of this thesis has not otherwise been affected by these modifications.

DATE: August 1, 2016

THE OPTIMAL GRAMMAR OF CODE-SWITCHING BETWEEN KANNADA AND
ENGLISH

BY

CHAITRA SHIVAPRASAD

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign, 2015

Urbana, Illinois

Master's Committee:

  Professor Rakesh M. Bhatt
  Associate Professor Marina Terkourafi

ABSTRACT:

Through this study I argue that code-switching between Kannada and English follows the five socio-cognitive constraints- FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE and PERSPECTIVE provided in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011). Informal semi-structured interviews were conducted among Kannada speaking young adults in urban and semi-urban Karnataka. The results show that they code-switch between Kannada and English at intra-sentential and inter-sentential levels to reflect their traditional-modern and local-global identity. Although the extent of code-switching is quite high, making the code-switched variety the unmarked variety in conversations among the members of this group, the placement and the content of the switches show that the five principles still control the grammar of these bilinguals. The interaction of these principles gives rise to a ranking amongst them which accounts for the uniqueness of the grammar of code-switching between Kannada and English of this speech community.

Key words: Code-switching, bilingual grammar, Kannada-English bilinguals, Optimality Theory, optimal grammar

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:

Codeswitching, as a common characteristic of bilingual/multilingual language use, has been the focus of many recent sociolinguistic studies (e.g. Gumperz, 1982; Heller, 1992, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 1993b; Li, 1994, 2002; Auer, 1995, 1998; Myers-Scotton&Bolonyai, 2001; Bolonyai, 2005; Bhatt, 2008). Codeswitching (CS) is the intersentential alternating use of two or more languages or language varieties in the same stream of speech (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Ferguson, 2003; Heller, 1988; Jacobson, 1990; Kachru, 1978; Kamwangamalu & Lee, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Rubdy, 2007), while codemixing, refers to the intrasentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language, and is often used in studies of grammatical aspects of bilingual speech (Muysken, 2000; Poplack & Meechan, 1995). Although traditionally a distinction is made between codeswitching and codemixing, current literature generally uses the term codeswitching as a cover term for all instances of bilingual language alternation, whether intra- or inter-sentential, which will be the case in this thesis as well.

CS has been examined in terms of grammatical structure and social functions, separately and together. CS as a topic of inquiry has evolved through multiple stages, from being considered abnormal and unacceptable, to providing valuable insight into language behavior of bilinguals. One of the pivotal ideas in the field of CS is put forth by Gumperz, who supports the idea that CS is not meaningless or a deficit to be stigmatized. Rather, it serves a wide range of functions in bilingual interactions, such as to express modernization, confidentiality, solidarity or in-groupness identity, sympathy and intimacy, social advancement, globalization, self-expression, personal intention and more. The most important of these, according to the researchers, is the function of CS to make communication effective. Researchers have tried to

explore CS from the point of view of communicative strategy (Adendorff, 1996; Grosjean, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Kachru, 1978, 1989; Myers-Scotton, 1995).

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011), in an attempt to address both the structural and functional aspects of CS and the interplay between them, provide a framework for the theoretical understanding of the socio-cognitive bases of CS in terms of five general principles - FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE and PERSPECTIVE. In this thesis, I argue that CS between Kannada and English follows the five socio-cognitive constraints provided in Bhatt and Bolonyai (henceforth B&B, 2011). The grammar of CS between Kannada and English among English speaking Kannadigas (native speakers of Kannada) is dictated by the ranking between these constraints. This study aims to explore the patterns in CS which will aid a deeper understanding of bilingual grammars and explore the motivation for CS among bilinguals. The multilingual nature of India makes it important to study the phenomenon of CS, and what it contributes to the larger study of Linguistics.

This study was motivated by basic questions about bilinguals- Why do bilinguals switch between languages? Particularly, why do Kannada speakers achieve by switching between Kannada and English? What makes CS between a particular set of languages unique? What is the unique grammar of Kannada-English bilinguals?

The thesis is organized as follows: Chapter 1 outlines the different definitions and theories of code-switching. Optimality Theory is briefly introduced, and the theoretical framework given in B&B is explained. Chapter 2 describes the setting and the methodology of the research project. The data are analyzed in chapter 3, and the discussion and conclusion are given in chapter 4, along with future directions for research.

CHAPTER 1: CODE-SWITCHING

1.1. Understanding code-switching:

A few decades ago, many scholars considered CS to be a sub-standard use of language (Weinreich, 1953). Since the 1980's, however, most scholars have recognized it as a normal, natural product of bilingual and multilingual language use. While CS is viewed as a sign of bilingual language proficiency among linguists and language educators (Brice & Brice, 2009; Goldstein & Kohnert, 2005; Kohnert et. al., 2005; Gutierrez-Clellen, 1999), the general public might not share the same perception (Anderson, 2006; Balam, 2013). For a linguist, an act of CS can be studied as a reflection of social constructs and of the cognitive mechanisms that control language switching. A significant body of research has amply demonstrated that CS does not represent a breakdown in communication, but represents the skillful manipulation of two language systems for various communicative functions. (Bullock & Toribio, 2009)

CS is considered a random and spontaneous process by some (Adendorff, 1996; Labov, 1971; Tay, 1989), while others believe that it is rule-governed (Gumperz, 1976; McClure, 1977; Pfaff, 1978; Romaine, 1995). In the area of CS, researchers have worked on two major topics - one is the structural features of CS (Bokamba, 1989; Joshi, 1983; Muysken, 2000; Poplack, 1978, 2001,2004), where studies have focused on the understanding of CS from a more cognitive perspective, giving preference to the linguistic constraints that limit the switch from one language or dialect, that is code, to another. These scholars have been able to contribute to the general understanding of language and its universalities by delimiting the switches to a purely grammatical artifact. Although these studies have touched upon the sociolinguistics aspect of CS, they tell us little about the social domains in which these switches happen. The seminal work of Gumperz and Hymes (1972) has been able to open a new path of research that takes the

cognitive level a step beyond. Their interest is in the contextualization cues that speakers obtain which are rooted in situations and culture, which in turn, will affect the way speakers use their repertoire. It is this line of research that breaks from the static use of language and urges for the understanding of language that is context-dependent.

Another common comparison that is drawn is between CS and borrowing. Borrowing across languages is defined with reference to the 'end product' rather than the process (Kamwangamalu, 1996; p. 296). Gumperz (1982) defines borrowing as the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another. When a linguistic item is borrowed it is integrated, phonologically, morphologically and syntactically, into the grammatical system of the borrowing language (Poplack, 1981). In some cases, however, the borrowed items may resist integration. Poplack (1978) calls such items 'nonce borrowings', and defines them as linguistic items from one language used in discourse in the other language which do not show any adaptation, at least in their written form, to the linguistic system of the borrowing language. Borrowing, whether nonce or integrated, does not require or presuppose any degree of competence in two languages, but CS does. To rephrase, borrowing can occur in the speech of both monolingual and bilingual speakers alike; however, CS is strictly speaking a characteristic feature of the linguistic behavior of bilingual speakers. Also, in terms of function, generally speakers use borrowing to fill lexical gaps in their languages. However, they engage in CS for a variety of reasons, such as the following: to express in-group solidarity, to exclude someone from a conversation by switching to a language the person does not understand, to emphasize a point by repeating it in two languages, etc. (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Further, unlike borrowing, CS can lead to the formation of mixed language varieties including pidgins and creoles.

Auer (1995) refers to the alternating use of two or more languages as code alternation. He uses the term code alternation to cover 'all cases in which semiotic systems are put in a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such' (1995; p. 116). Code alternation, remarks Gumperz (1982), is one kind of 'contextualization cue'. Contextualization cues are "constellations of surface features of message form . . . by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows" (Gumperz, 1982; p. 131). As a contextualization cue, CS "signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes. It generates the presuppositions in terms of which the context of what is said is decoded" (Gumperz, 1982; p. 98).

The interactional approach is at the heart of John Gumperz's research into CS. Its focus is not so much on constituent structure but rather on the social meaning of CS and, as Milroy and Muysken (1995) note, on the discourse and interactional functions that CS performs for speakers. Myers-Scotton (1993: 57) comments that within the interactional approach, speakers are understood to use language in the way they do not simply because of their social identities or because of other factors. Rather, they exploit the possibility of linguistic choices in order to convey intentional meaning of a socio-pragmatic nature. Code choices then, including CS, are not just choices of content, but are discourse strategies. Gumperz's interactional approach to CS is mostly known for the distinction it makes between *situational codeswitching and metaphorical codeswitching*. Situational CS (i.e. external or sociologically conditioned CS) has to do with the social factors that trigger CS, such as the participants, the topic, and the setting. The bilingual's code choice is partly dependent on them. Metaphorical CS (i.e. internal or psychologically conditioned CS) concerns language factors, especially the speaker's fluency and his/her ability to

use various emotive devices. The Gumperz approach has been criticized for its taxonomic view of CS (Myers-Scotton, 1993), which lists the functions of CS in a particular speech situation. The criticism stems from the fact that language is dynamic. Not a single individual speaks the same way all the time, nor does anyone, including monolinguals, use a single register or style in every speech situation. Also, there are a variety of domains, topics and situations in which bilingual speakers may use CS. Therefore, listing the functions of CS, as the Gumperz approach does, distracts from the search for generalizations on the functions of CS in multilingual societies.

The Markedness Model developed by Carol Myers-Scotton (1993) is one of the more complete theories of motivations for CS. It posits that language users are rational, and choose a language that clearly marks their Rights and Obligations (RO sets), relative to other speakers, in the conversation and its setting. When there is no clear unmarked language choice, speakers practice CS to explore possible language choices. The markedness approach has evolved from Myers-Scotton's research into CS in East Africa, especially in Kenya. The main claim of this approach is that all linguistic choices, including CS, are indices of social negotiations of rights and obligations existing between participants in a conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1993). These RO sets are said to derive from whatever situational features are salient to the exchange, such as the status of the participants, the topic and the setting. It is the interplay between these features and more dynamic, individual considerations that determines the linguistic choices that individuals make about media for conversational exchanges. The markedness approach predicts CS as a realization of one of the following three types of negotiations. First, in conventionalized exchanges, CS may be an unmarked choice between peers, unmarked in the sense that it is the expected choice for the exchange in question and its use signals solidarity and in-group identity amongst the participants. Second, with any participants in such exchanges CS may be a marked choice, that is, it is the unexpected choice in

that exchange and therefore signals social distance amongst the participants. And, third, in non-conventionalized exchanges or uncertain situations, CS is an exploratory choice presenting multiple identities. It is explained that in these situations, since there is no apparent unmarked choice, speakers nominate an exploratory choice as the basis for the exchange. In other words, speakers 'negotiate' one code first as a medium for the exchange and, depending upon the outcome of the negotiation, they may negotiate another code until they are satisfied that they have reached the balance of rights and obligations required for that particular conversational exchange. The markedness approach has indeed contributed significantly to our understanding of why bilingual speakers use their languages the way they do in their communities. However, it has been criticized for being too static to account for the social motivations for CS across languages and cultures (Kamwangamalu, 1996; Meeuwis & Blommaert, 1994).

CS has also been studied under the framework of Conversation Analysis (CA). Scholars of CA such as Peter Auer and Li Wei (Auer, 1998; Li, 1994 & 2002) argue that the social motivation behind CS lies in the way CS is structured and managed in conversational interaction, i.e., the question of why code-switching occurs cannot be answered without first addressing the question of how it occurs. Using CA, these scholars focus their attention on the sequential implications of CS. That is, whatever language a speaker chooses to use for a conversational turn, or part of a turn, impacts the subsequent choices of language by the speaker as well as the hearer. Rather than focusing on the social values inherent in the languages the speaker chooses ("brought-along meaning"), the analysis concentrates on the meaning that the act of CS itself creates ("brought-about meaning").

1.2. Bhatt and Bolonyai's framework:

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) provide a framework for the theoretical understanding of the socio-cognitive bases of CS in terms of five general principles - FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE and PERSPECTIVE. 1. *Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness* (FAITH) says 'social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. Actors code-switch to the language that more faithfully and economically captures the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, often socio-culturally or ideologically grounded, meaning.' 2. *Principle of Symbolic Domination* (POWER) says 'social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or construct power, status, authority, social difference and/or difference between self and other(s).' They argue that the strongest principle that seems to influence language identity is Power and it has a tacit presence even in domains that predominantly reflect Solidarity. Their notion of power is highly influenced by Bourdieu's (1991) theoretical notions of Symbolic Power and Communicative Economy. According to him, every linguistic interaction bears the traces of the social structure in which is based on the linguistic market of that structure. For him, questions of interest included: what are those linguistic exchanges? Why are they exchanged? What is their value and what can they tell us about the linguistic capital? These questions invite us to find answer as to the interplay between global and local interactions of particular speech communities. 3. *Principle of Social Concurrence* (SOLIDARITY) says 'social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize social affiliation and solidarity in relational practice. Actors switch to another language that is best positioned to index or create solidarity, affiliation, connection, intimacy and/or similarity between self and other(s).' 4. *Principle of Face Management* (FACE) says 'social actors switch to another language if it

enables them to maximize effective maintenance of "face" or public image of self in relation to others. Actors switch to the language that is best positioned to manage their interpersonal relations consistent with face needs of self and/or others (e.g. appreciation, tact, deference, respect, positive or negative politeness).' 5. *Principle of Perspective Taking* (PERSPECTIVE) says 'social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize perspectivity in interaction. Actors switch to a language that is best positioned to signal what is assumed to be currently salient point of view and socio-cognitive orientation in discourse.'

Given the potential conflict between these universal constraints and their violability, B&B propose "that a 'particular' bilingual grammar is a set of hierarchically ranked conflicting universal constraints" (p. 535). They provide empirical instances of Kashmiri-Hindi-English (see next section) and Hungarian-English CS to illustrate that the optimal bilingual grammar in each of these bilingual/multilingual communities ranks the universal constraints proposed in their study differently. They conclude that such difference in ranking the universal constraints accounts for the inter-community variability in patterns of CS. This calls for more studies to be carried out to figure out how other bilingual/multilingual communities behave with respect to this model and how this optimal bilingual grammar can explain the motivations for code-switching in different bilingual speech communities, and the current study aims to contribute to this model.

1.3. Optimality theory and code-switching:

Optimality Theory (OT) is a linguistic model which focuses on the surface representation of languages to explain how they work (Prince & Smolensky, 2004). Based on this theory, an output representation is the optimal candidate selected amongst all possible candidates generated based on the input. The optimality of a particular candidate is governed by how a particular set of

languages ranks the universal constraints, i.e. a candidate which avoids violation of a higher-ranked constraint in a situation where two or more constraints are interacting, is said to be the optimal choice.

Adopting Optimality Theory, B&B propose a sociolinguistic grammar which accounts for the underlying individual and social motivations of CS as well as its inter-community variation. Their model uses five general principles/constraints which are generalizations of different functions assigned to CS in different studies. These principles encompass different views which have attempted to explain the functions and motivations for CS, including socio-functional and conversation analytic models. B&B claim that their model can be applied universally in all speech communities to account for the output form selected amongst the potential candidates to convey the optimal socio-pragmatic meaning, given the socio-cognitive constraints. The universal principles/constraints proposed by B&B are FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE.

The computation process of the optimal output within this optimality-theoretic framework is done through functions GEN (Generator), EVAL (Evaluator), and CON (Constraints). The linguistic items from two (or more) lexicons (e.g. the lexicons of Kashmiri, Hindi, and English) provide the input for the function GEN. This function mixes the linguistic items and generates multiple surface forms or outputs, i.e. candidate1 in Kashmiri, candidate2 in Hindi, etc. These candidates are then evaluated by function EVAL, taking into consideration the community-specific ranking of universal constraints on CS that are fed into EVAL through function CON. That is, function CON provides function EVAL with the set of language-specific constraints for a particular community (e.g. Kashmiri-Hindi-English bilingual community). Finally, function EVAL selects the optimal output amongst all the potential surface form

candidates generated by function GEN. For instance, in a given context, if function GEN

generates candidate1 in English which is the POWER code, and candidate2 in Hindi, which

helps convey the meaning more faithfully in this context; and if function CON specifies that

FAITH outranks POWER in the Kashmiri-Hindi-English community, function EVAL will then

select candidate2 as the optimal surface output to satisfy the higher-ranked constraint FAITH at

the expense of violating the lower-ranked constraint POWER.

Citing an example from the Hindi-Kashmiri-English speech community studied in B&B,

it can be seen from the table given below that the bilingual option is the optimal choice rather

than the monolingual English one, even though English is the language that signals POWER.

The grammar of the speech community ranks FAITH above POWER, and this is illustrated with

the example (1): "The *saat pheras* around the *agni* serves as a *lakshman rekha*." ("The seven

circumnavigations around the fire serve as a line one does not cross.") (p. 538). The constraint

hierarchy evaluates both candidates, and the bilingual grammar chooses the most optimal

candidate. Here, candidate (b) does not violate POWER, but violates FAITH, which is the

highest ranked constraint. Candidate (a) violates POWER, but not FAITH, and as FAITH is

ranked higher than POWER, candidate (a) becomes the optimal choice.

Table 1.1. B&B illustrating the interaction between FAITH and POWER

Candidates	FAITH	PERSP	FACE	POWER	SOLID
☞ a. The *saat pheras* around the *agni* serves as a *lakshman rekha*				*	
b. The seven circumnavigations around fire serves as the line (one never crosses)	*!				

CHAPTER 2: SETTING AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. English in India:

To discuss CS into English in India, it is first important to understand the status that the English language enjoys in India, in relation to the other languages in the repertoire of the target community. In the present global scenario, the importance of English cannot be undermined. It has become an international language and the language of science and technology. It is being used as a global lingua franca in many countries, India being one of them. It is among the five languages that claim maximum number of speakers in the world (Kachru, 1993) with Chinese at the top and Hindi-Urdu, Russian and Spanish following in that order. In such circumstances, 'the ideological, cultural and elitist power of English' (Kachru, 1997) is evident. Colonization is an important factor responsible for the development of bilingualism in general (Kachru, 1986; Bolton 2002), and the same holds true in the Indian scenario where the British started ruling in the 18th century. The education policies of Lord Macaulay, especially his idea of 'black men with white thinking' played a significant role in the development of English language in the subcontinent, placing India in the 'Outer Circle' according to the Three Circle Model of English proposed by Kachru (1992). With its increasing presence in various social contexts, English has made its way into code-switches with many languages in the urban and semi-urban[1] areas of the country, depending on the language being spoken in the region. The ability to speak English, as a *cultural capital* (Bourdieu, 1991), offers prestige- i.e. *symbolic capital-* and job opportunities- i.e. *economic capital-* to these speakers. Given the capitals English offers to these speakers, it has the most *symbolic power* (Bourdieu, 1991) amongst Kannada-English bilinguals as it is the

---

[1] Semi-urban: Although there is no general definition as to what a semi-urban town or city is, here I refer to towns/ cities with a population between 100,000 and 500,000 people which are in close proximity to at least one metropolitan city and have a municipal corporation and graduate education facilities.

medium of instruction in higher education and the lingua franca at most work places, compared to Kannada which is the language used with family and friends to express solidarity (more in sec. 2.2). In this study, the data comes from conversations about daily life which revolves around the participants' home, family, friends and work. English retains its symbolic power in these scenarios, unlike in other specific contexts like rituals, religious ceremonies etc. where Sanskrit has symbolic power over English.

As Li (2000) states, 'Language is a human faculty: it coevolves with us,' and unilingualism which even in normal circumstances is a rare phenomenon (Wardhaugh, 1998) is beyond imagination in situations where English has coexisted with the indigenous languages over a long period. Also English still is the official language of the country and documentation at higher level takes place in this language. It is taught as a second language in schools, colleges and universities and is used as the language of education, science, economics etc. There is English inside the classrooms at the university level, at the college level and even at the school level, which is reflected in the 'Three Language Policy' of the Indian education system which makes it compulsory for English, Hindi and the regional language to be learnt till Grade 10 (Mallikarjun, 2002) . It is the lingua franca at most work places in urban and semi-urban areas. CS has now become a legitimate interactional practice, especially among the young, English-knowing bilingual middle class[2] (Bhatt, 2005).

In this thesis, I discuss the CS between Kannada and English. As mentioned before, the presence of English at least in urban and semi-urban areas of India has only increased in recent

---

[2] Middle class: A lot has been debated and discussed about the middle class, including its definition. Here I categorize 'middle class' based on income, which has been defined by the World Bank as $5-$10 per day.

years. English has grown and spread widely enough to be regarded as the language of POWER, with its growing presence in the globalized world. It can be said without hesitation that forces of globalization play a very important role in identity construction, as discussed by Bhatt (2010). The attempt of the educated Indian middle class to strike a balance between the existing indigenous-local and the colonial-global identity which is discussed in the paper is reflected in the CS between Kannada and English, which is the focus of the present study, set in the city of Bengaluru where the predominant language is Kannada.

2.2. Kannada and Kannadigas:

Kannada is a language spoken predominantly in the state of Karnataka, India. Native speakers called Kannadigas number roughly 40 million in India (2001 Census). The Eighth Schedule to the Indian Constitution- which mandates the creation of states along linguistic lines- lists Kannada among the official languages of the Indian Union. It is one of the scheduled languages of India and the official and administrative language of the state of Karnataka, whose capital city is Bengaluru.

Fig. 2.1. Location of Bengaluru within Karnataka, India.

Kannada is a diglossic language (Nayak, 1967). The written variety is seen only in literature and formal contexts. The spoken variety is used in daily speech and informal contexts. Only the spoken variety is considered in this research project, as it is used in daily speech. Kannada is the local language of Bengaluru. It is the language of the home domain of most native Kannadigas in the city. Kannada is also used to express intimacy or solidarity. (Ex: While bargaining with shop keepers, people tend to use the native language of the shop keeper in order to establish solidarity and get the goods at a lower price.). According to Ferguson's (1959) popular High/ Low distinction, Kannada can be classified as the Low language used in day to day communication, and Sanskrit and English share the domains of High language with Sanskrit being used in religious contexts and English in the domains of education, science etc.

Bengaluru has earned the label of being cosmopolitan due to the variety of its inhabitants. Even though it is the capital city of Karnataka, a very large percentage of the population is made up of non Kannada speakers. This is mainly due to the large number of young adults who come to Bangalore from all over the country for employment, especially in the IT sector. This has led to Kannada not being used as a language of communication between colleagues and peers, and being replaced by English or Hindi, as will be exhibited by the data discussed in this paper. The linguistic situation in urban and semi-urban Karnataka is at an interesting point now as I will explain with my study and the analysis of the data. For native Kannadigas, Kannada still remains the language used in the home domain, friend circle and daily public interaction, but the Kannada that they identify with has undergone a change. Pure Kannada without the mixing of English has become marked, and the code-switched variety, with almost half the words being in English, has become the unmarked way of speaking. This is very prominent in young adults who are working in Bengaluru, who were the participants of this study.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the language used by the youth in areas around the city of Bengaluru in Karnataka, India, and map the patterns of CS between Kannada and English. The data was collected through semi-structured informal group interviews and was audio recorded and transcribed.

2.3. Methodology:

2.3.1. Participants:

The target group for this research was young adults of both genders, i.e., between 18 and 30 years of age. These were native speakers of Kannada who use Kannada at home. They were originally from Tumakuru, a semi-urban town 70 km from Bengaluru, having completed their primary and secondary education in Tumakuru, and currently working in Bengaluru city. Some of them also went to Bengaluru and other cities/ towns for higher studies. There were 5 males and 3 females.

2.3.2. Data Collection:

The data was collected through semi-structured informal participant interviews. The researcher talked to the subjects in groups of 3-5 and asked questions about the language they use and their attitude towards it. Their opinions were asked about English and Kannada, and the CS between them in everyday speech. They were also asked if the language changes according to the social context, i.e. at home while talking to family members, while spending time with friends, or at the work place with their colleagues, superiors and subordinates. The interviews were conducted at the researcher's home or in public places like coffee shops. The researcher also participated in the conversation to make it informal in order to reduce Observer's Paradox.

16

The participation of the researcher also helped to draw on first-hand observations through her membership in the community. Each group interview lasted about an hour and was audio-recorded using a digital voice recorder, and transcribed. The researcher's lines are initialed 'I'.

A list of questions (see Appendix) was used to elicit responses from the participants and maintain the direction of discussion. It included questions about their feelings towards English and Kannada, and the CS between them. The interview was not restricted to these questions as it was important to make the interview less formal and more like a conversation.

CHAPTER 3: DATA AND ANALYSIS

Given below is the tabulation of 10-minute stretches of conversation combined from all the interviews. The given word count is only of the participants' speech; the interviewer's speech has not been included. Proper nouns like names of people, places and professions have not been counted as English or mixed words (words with English root and Kannada affix). English words which have clitics separated by an apostrophe are counted as a single word (Ex. 'they'll'). Mixed words which are orthographically separated by a space but are equivalent to a single word in English are counted as single words (Ex. 'use *maaDtaane'* = 'use.PRES.3p.Sg.Mas.').

Table 3.1. Number of words spoken in 10 minutes combined from all group interviews

	Combined	Male	Female
Total number of words	1027	509	518
English words	499 (48.6%)	261 (51.3%)	238 (45.9%)
Mixed words	32 (3.1%)	23 (4.5%)	9 (1.7%)

The data shows that about half the words used were English with not much difference between males and females. Most of the switches did not flag any particular constraint most of the time, making CS between Kannada and English an unmarked phenomenon among this group of bilinguals (as shown later in excerpt 1), but the positioning and content of many other switches can be interpreted as being constrained by the five socio-cognitive principles as shown later with excerpts. As B&B explain in their theoretical and methodological assumptions for the

framework, they "focus on CS… that contributes to "meaning-making", i.e. when CS, a functional choice, is conceivably involved in indexing and/ or creating particular socio-pragmatic effects." The framework is applicable only to the strategic/ marked switches and not the unmarked ones. Following are excerpts that demonstrate both unmarked and marked switches, and subsequently the marked switches are analyzed using B&B's framework.

3.1. Unmarked code-switching:

An excerpt from the conducted interviews is presented below, which is typical of the speech of the community being interviewed. The Kannada words and morphemes are in normal font and the English ones are in bold. The English translation is given in italics.

EXCEPT #1: unmarked CS

1   K: **Work place**-ge hOdre **guarantee** Kannada tumba kammi. maataaDtivi. nand En gotta?

(work place-to go-if guarantee Kannada a lot less. We talk. Mine what know)

2   nandu **Marketing. Local language**-alli maataaDadu tumba **important**.

(mine marketing. Local language-in speaking very important)

3   **I used to go to institutions when I was working in Pearson Education**-al iddaaga.

(Pearson Education-in when was)

4   Naav **institution**-g hOgi avrge idella **presentations**-ella maaDbEkittu.

(we institutions-to go for them all this presentations-all had to make)

19

5   **So**… ad En gotta, naanu… **I used to mix languages-** Kannada, English maataaDtini.

(so… that what know, I…)   (speak.PRES.1P.Sg)

6   English jaasti **use**-maaDtidde **but** Kannada-nu maataaDtini. Nan **Marketing**-al En gotta?

(English a lot used.1P but Kannada-also speak. My marketing-in what know)

7   **Kannada is a must**. **Local language** kELE kELtaare. Ivaga **I got place-**

(Local language (emphasis) they ask. Now I got place-)

8   nanige **college**-inda **placement** aaytu.

(to-me college-from placement happened)

9   Nanginta channaagi **academically** channaagiddauru**, foreign**-inda ella bandirauru,

(more than me well academically those who were good, foreign-from all those who had

come)

10   aurna **select** maaDlilla. Why **because local language was**… gottirlilla.

(them select didn't.)   (didn't know)

11   **Local language**-u nam **profession**-alli tumba **important**.

(local language our profession-in very important)

"When we go to the work place the amount of Kannada is definitely very less. We do talk (in

Kannada). You know what my situation is? My field is Marketing. Speaking in the local language

is very important. I used to go to institutions when I was working with Pearson Education. We

had to go to institutions and make presentations for them. So… you know what? I used to mix

languages. I speak in Kannada and English. I used to use a lot of English, but I speak Kannada

too. You know how it is in Marketing? Kannada is a must. They will definitely ask for local

language. I got placed from college. They did not select people who were academically better

than me, even people who had come from foreign countries, because they did not know the local

language. Knowing the local language is very important in our profession."

As it can be seen, there is a lot of CS, both at the intra-sentential and the inter-sentential levels. Although there is a large presence of CS in the conversations of the bilingual urban and semi-urban youth in Karnataka, certain switches have specific semantic-pragmatic import. These switches flag one or more of the five principles of FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE and PERSPECTIVE over and above the other switches that are "unmarked". Only these switches are analyzed in the next section, and the unmarked switches are not considered.

3.2. Analysis of marked code-switching:

In excerpt 2, J is leaving to go home and I is asking her to eat before leaving. At the same time, C is trying to give her opinion on the ongoing discussion. C tries to get I's attention initially in Kannada, which is the matrix language of the ongoing discussion. When I fails to take notice, C switches to English in line 8 clearly assuming POWER to get I's attention. This switch ranks POWER higher than SOLIDARITY.

Excerpt #2: POWER >> SOLID

1   I (to J): You have to go-**aa**? WHAAT??

'*You have to go, is it? What?'*

2   C: **innond Enu andre-**

'*One more thing is that-'*

3   I (to J): **Samosa tindkoND hOgu. kootko.**

'*Have samosa before you go. Sit.'*

4   C: **kELE illi**

'*Listen to me'*

5   J: I've got seven missed calls

6   I (to J): It's ok, I'll give you fifteen missed calls

7   **C: I'm talking something, Miss Chaitra.**

Consider C's turns in lines 2, 4 and 7. Her matrix language in this excerpt is Kannada,

which she uses in lines 2 and 4. Kannada is the language that is used in this group during

informal conversation, and therefore it is the language of SOLIDARITY that the members of the

group use to identify with each other. When C fails to get the attention of the listener (I), she

switches to English in her next turn. Through her switch in line 7, C is distancing herself from I

and is assuming the stance of POWER by switching to English, which she thinks will help her

succeed in getting I's attention. English is considered the language of power and prestige in

postcolonial India (see section 1.5). This explains the pragmatic import that C's switch to

English has. This interaction between the constraints POWER and SOLID are explained through

OT analysis below. C could have continued in Kannada to maintain SOLIDARITY, but she

chooses to violate that constraint and switch to English to signal POWER. This switch results in

the constraint POWER ranking above SOLID.

Table 3.2. Interaction of POWER and SOLID (POWER>>SOLID)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSP	FACE	POWER	SOLID
☞ a. I'm talking something…					*
b. naan eno heLtidini…				*!	

In excerpt #3 the participants are talking about language use at their work places. As most

of them work in the IT sector in Bengaluru, they primarily use English at the work place to

communicate with colleagues who are from different parts of India. Here, R is talking about the

necessity to use English in the workplace as a result of globalization and English being accepted

as a neutral language of communication in India. He speaks in English to best explain this

scenario and giving an 'insider's perspective' as a part of the rapidly growing corporate world in

present day India during most of the conversation, but finally switches to Kannada in line 5

signaling a shift from his global identity to the local, and presenting an 'outsider's perspective'

as a member of the Kannada speech community.

Excerpt #3: PERSPECTIVE >> POWER

1   R: Once you enter professional life or something, you start. Because it demands you to

          speak in English. You are-

2   C: Nothing like that.

3   J: Yeah, it demands-

4   R: Because it's a global language where others can understand.

5   **Ella ..ellargu Kannada gottiralla.**

      '*Everyone will not know Kannada.*'

The matrix language of this part of the conversation is English, as the topic of work place behavior in India lends itself to the use of English, which is the lingua franca in most work places in Bengaluru. C and J express opposing opinions in lines 2 and 3 to R's explanation. In a move to bring about consensus among the group, R switches to Kannada in line 5. This seems like a move for SOLIDARITY, but switching from English to Kannada would challenge the above established hierarchy where POWER ranks above SOLIDARITY. In this case, the switch in line 5 is not coded as SOLIDARITY, but as PERSPECTIVE- R's PERSPECTIVE as a member of the Kannada-speaking community. It is this PERSPECTIVE that forces the switch from English to Kannada. The OT analysis below shows that POWER is violated in this case, but PERSPECTIVE is not, which gives it a higher ranking, i.e. PERSP>>POWER.

Table 3.3. Interaction of PERSP and POWER (PERSP>>POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSP	FACE	POWER	SOLID
☞ a. ellargu Kannada gottiralla				*	
b. Everyone won't know Kannada		*!			

Considering excerpts 1 and 2, it can be observed the POWER ranks above

SOLIDARITY, and PERSPECTIVE ranks above POWER, which gives the following ranking

between the discussed constraints:

PERSP>>POWER>>SOLID

In Excerpt 4, the participants are discussing the superiority complex associated with

speaking in English as opposed to speaking in Kannada. Although the ongoing discussion has

English as the matrix language, K switches to Kannada in line 10 as a face saving act, while

trying to convince the other participants that he does not feel inferior while speaking in Kannada.

There is incongruence between the topic being discussed and the language being used. The

participants are trying to argue that they do not feel inferior while speaking in Kannada, but the

argument is expressed in English. This incongruence gives rise to a face threatening situation,

which can only be resolved by a face saving act. In this case, the face saving act is the switch

from English to Kannada, which is executed by K in line 10.

Excerpt #4: FACE >> POWER

1   I: So is there like a pride factor associated

2   **anta kELtidini.**

       I'm asking

3   R: For me? No.

4   I: Like, no. If they… like-

5   R: Many people. Many people.

6 I: What are you talking about? Kannada or English?

7 R: No. They wanna talk in English because they wanna look cool.

8 K: Yeah.

9 R: Or probably because they wanna, like, make others feel that they also know English.

10 K: **yeshT jana Kannada yeshT channag maataaDtaro aur bEku antaane (English-alli) maataaDtaare. English-alle**

'A lot of people, even though they speak very good Kannada, deliberately speak (in English). In English only'

11 they try to convey. Even though they don't…

12 R: **nangEn aatara illa.**

'It's not like that for me.'

13 K: **nangEn hangillappa.**

'*It's not like that for me.'*

The matrix language in the above conversation is English. R starts talking about how there is definitely a sense of superiority and inferiority associated with English and Kannada respectively amongst the youth. He says that he personally doesn't feel that way, but is convinced that others do. He says all this in English, and then K switches from English to Kannada in his second turn in line 10 (having used English in his previous turn in line 8) in a move to bridge the gap between what is being said and the language in which it is being said.

The irony in this conversation is that R is talking about having no inferiority complex about speaking in Kannada, but he is conveying this thought in English. This gives his opinion a sense of insincerity, since there is a mismatch between what is being said and how it is being said. This is, to R, a face threatening situation. To redeem himself from the possibility of being perceived as insincere, he needs to change the code that he is using, and switch from English to Kannada. This is a face saving act, as he is trying to convince others that he does not feel inferior talking in Kannada by switching to Kannada. This switch from English to Kannada violates the constraint POWER in order to maintain FACE, ranking FACE over POWER. The switches by I in line 2 and K in line 11 do not signal any constraints, as the topic sentence in both the utterances are in English. The position of FACE over POWER in the constraint hierarchy is further strengthened when R also switches to Kannada in line 12, validating K's earlier switch to save face.

Table 3.4. Interaction of FACE and POWER (FACE>>POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSP	FACE	POWER	SOLID
☞ a. nanigen aathara illa				*	
b. It's nothing like that for me			*!		

Comparing excerpts 1, 2 and 3, the following ranking emerges between the constraints:

{FACE, PERSP}>> POWER>>SOLID

There is no interaction between FACE and PERSP in the available data, therefore they occupy the same position in the order, and are not mutually ranked.

The next excerpt is taken from a conversation on people's perception of those who speak in English. C is talking during most of the conversation and gets stuck while looking for the appropriate word in line 4. M supplies a word in Kannada in line 5, which is a switch from English used in line 4. The word that M contributes has connotations which are stronger than its English equivalent, which brings with it 'interpretive faithfulness' and makes it a meaningful switch in comparison to the other unmarked switches in the rest of the excerpt.

Excerpt #5: FAITH>> POWER

1   C: but **En gotta, kelarvana naan nODidini**…

         But you know what, I've seen some people

2   I don't know… there's a group of people

3   **aayta.. Enaadru** English-**al maataaDdre scope andkotaare,** attitude **andkotaare,**

         amele…

         I don't know… there's a group of people alright… If you speak in English, they think

         you're showing off, showing attitude and…

4   what else?

5   M: **duraahankaara**

         arrogance

6   C: **andre** style, **duraahankaara, Kannada gottidruu English-al maataaDadu,**

         haagella andkotaare

as in style, arrogance, speaking in English in spite of knowing Kannada, they'll think that

way

While discussing the topic of why Kannadigas use English, M hardly says anything, as most of the talking is done by C. It is important to look closely at the language here to determine the matrix language of the conversation. C's exhibits extensive CS in the excerpt, but pauses after line 4, which is in English. In line 5 where M supplies the word, he could have chosen to continue in English, but he chooses to switch to Kannada. The word 'duraahankaara' in Kannada, which closely translates into 'arrogance' in English, is a very strong word, which gives it a 'marked' status in a conversation that uses many English words to describe people's attitudes towards language use. Here, 'duraahankaara' is contrasted with the other words that C uses in 3, 'scope' (slang meaning 'show off') and 'attitude', which are in English, although in a Kannada matrix sentence. This switch by M in line 5 brings along with it a Kannadiga's judgment about a Kannadiga who prefers speaking in English. The disapproval is encoded in the Kannada word rather than any other English word, which is consistent with the constraint FAITH. Since line 4 is in English, the switch in line 5 gives FAITH a higher ranking than POWER, hence causing the switch to Kannada.

Table 3.5. Interaction of FAITH and POWER (FAITH>>POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSP	FACE	POWER	SOLID
☞ a. durahankaara				*	
b. arrogance	*!				

Combining the rankings from all the previous excerpts, the mutual ranking of constraints that has emerged is as follows:

{FAITH, PERSP, FACE}>>POWER>>SOLID

There is no interaction between the constraints FAITH, FACE and PERSP in the available data, therefore they occupy the same position in the order, and are not mutually ranked.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4.1. Discussion:

The range of ideologies and identities that the speakers wanted to establish and convey gave rise to the possibility of coding particular switches for more than a single constraint. When such clashes have occurred in the data, I have chosen the constraint that best explains the switch and hence gets a higher ranking in the entire constraint hierarchy. For example, excerpt 4 has instances of PERSPECTIVE, SOLIDARITY as well as FACE. In line 10, K switches from English, which is the matrix language of the ongoing conversation to add pragmatic import to the point he is making, i.e. that he does not have an inferiority complex while speaking in Kannada. He shifts his 'PERSPECTIVE' from his earlier 'yeah' in line 8 which is in English. Therefore, the switch in line 10 can be coded as PERSP. But this constraint has already been explained in excerpt 3, and the hierarchy established. So in this particular conversation, the focus is on line 12 where R also switches to Kannada as opposed to English in his previous turns. This switch is a FACE-saving act, brought on by K's switch in line 8. It can also be interpreted as SOLID, where R is trying to align himself with K's stance, but given the sensitive nature of the topic being discussed, FACE is the constraint that is most strongly coded.

There were individual differences in the data, but none of them affected the claims made above. Although the sample size was small, I feel that it was sufficient for the generalizations that have been made based on it. But only an actual study on a larger scale can confirm or refute this claim. Initially, I wanted to look into the presence of Hindi as well, but the data proved that Hindi does not figure in the CS that happens in the target speech community. It is restricted to interactions with Hindi speakers. The above examples of conversation among young urban and

semi-urban Kannadigas provide a multi-layered understanding of the role that language plays in everyday situations, and how they use it to create, project and project their identity. The seamlessly multilingual nature of India, and specifically the cosmopolitan nature of Bangalore give rise to a lot of code-switching between languages.

4.2. Significance and future directions:

It is interesting to note that the ranking given above that emerges for the Kannada-English speech community in Karnataka in south India is exactly the same as the ranking that emerges for the Hindi-Kashmiri-English speech community examined in B&B. Since these constraints perform 'local' functions but are instantiations of 'global' principles, it can be argued that the 'local' spans the entire country. There are multiple differences between the two speech communities under consideration: 1. The language families are different. Kannada belongs to the Dravidian family, and Hindi and Kashmiri belong to the Indo-Aryan family of languages. The only common factor here is English, which is a very important part of the CS that takes place in both speech communities. 2. The geographical and cultural areas are different. India is broadly divided into north and south India, and the cultural differences that exist between these two regions are the result of historical influences. The grouping of the languages in these two regions into different language families strengthens this dissimilarity. In spite of this, there seems to be an undefinable unifying factor that makes the culture and practices in both these regions and speech communities 'Indian'. D'souza's (1986) claim that "[I]n India certain pan-Indian forces are at work in society" explains the similarity in the socio-pragmatic constraints that control language use in these two communities, and possibly in the entire country.

This study on the Kannada-English speech community serves to support the theoretical understanding of the framework presented in B&B. It provides empirical evidence and validates the five general principles that explain CS. There have been other recent studies which have adopted B&B model and have focused on different communities – Azeri-Farsi-English communities in Iran and US (Sharifi, 2015), Korean-English community in the U.S. (Lee, 2014), Spanish-English community in the U.S. (Evensen, 2014), and Catalan-Spanish community in Spain (Stillwell, 2014). It is interesting to note that the interaction between the constraints POWER and SOLID are dependent on whether the speech community in question is an indigenous or a diaspora community. POWER seems to outrank SOLID in indigenous communities, whereas SOLID outranks POWER in diaspora communities as exhibited by the Hungarian-English community studied in B&B. Comparing the ranking to that of Hungarian-English in B&B, it can be noted that POWER outranks SOLID in both the speech communities situated within Indian cultural borders, as opposed to diaspora bilingual communities. It is possible that SOLID outranks POWER in diaspora Kannada-English communities, but that can only be confirmed through further study. Sharifi (2015) argues that "the only salient difference between them has to do with the relative 'value' each community places on the two relational constraints: POWER and SOLIDARITY." It would be interesting to explore Kannada-English diaspora communities in different parts of the world and compare the ranking of the constraints in the analysis of their CS. It is difficult to explore all the possible motivations for CS dealt with in this study, but I hope to look into them in later studies.

4.3. Conclusion:

In this thesis, I have argued that the CS between Kannada and English among the youth in urban and semi-urban Karnataka obeys universal constraints. The claims made were based on the framework proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011), where they provide five meta principles for the socio-cognitive bases of CS that constrain any bilingual grammar- FAITH, POWER, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and PERSPECTIVE. The ranking that emerges between the five principles explains the uniqueness of the grammar of CS between Kannada and English:

{FAITH, PERSP, FACE}>>POWER>>SOLID

Questionnaire with Kannada translation:

1. Do you like hearing Kannada?

   nimage kannaDa ke:Lokke ishTana?

2. Do you like speaking in Kannada?

   nimage kannaDadalli ma:ta:dakke ishTana?

3. Are you proud of Kannada?

   nimage kannaDa ande hemmena?

4. While at home, do you prefer using Kannada or English?

   maneyalli idda:ga ni:vu kannaDa maata:Dti:ra, athava Englishaa?

5. While with friends, do you prefer using Kannada or English or Hindi or a mix of either two or all three?

   nimma friends jote iruva:ga, ni:vu yEn ma:ta:Dakke ishTa paDti:ra? Kannadana, Englishaa, Hindinaa, athava mixaa?

6. What kind of language do you use at your work place? Is it the same with peers, superiors and subordinates?

   nimma office-alli ya:va thara bhaashe upyo:gsti:ra?

7. What do you feel about English? Is it a language of modernity/ opportunity?

   English bagge nimagiro opinion ye:nu? Adu modern language antha ansatta:?

8. Is it cool to speak in English?

   English ma:ta:Dadre 'cool' anta ansatta:?

9. What do you feel about Hindi?

Hindi bagge ye:n ansatte?

10. Do you think there is an increasing number of English and Hindi words in Kannada? Why do you think so?

itti:chege KannaDadalli tumbaa English/ Hindi padagaLanna upayo:gista:re anta ansatta? Yaake hi:g a:gide anta ansatte?

11. Who mostly uses this mixed variety of Kannada- old people or young people? Why do you think they do that?

yaaru jaasti mixed Kannada upayo:gistare- young people aa, athava vayas aadavra? Ye:nakke haage?

12. Do you think switching into another language is a betrayal of the traditional identity of Kannadigas?

i:thara Kannadadalli English/ Hindi baLasudre kanndaigara traditional identityge mo:sa maaDdha:ge ansalva?

13. What do you think of the term 'Kanglish'? Is it an apt coinage to describe what is going on?

i: thara ma:ta:Do:danna 'Kanglish' anta karibahuda?

14. Do you use 'Kanglish' more while talking to friends from Tumkur, or from Bangalore? If there is a difference, why so?

ni:vu 'Kanglish' yaavaaga jaasti baLasti:ra- nimma Tumkur friends jote na, athava Benglu:r friends jote na? Yaake?

REFERENCES

Anderson, T. K. (2006). Spanish-English Bilinguals' Attitudes toward Code-switching: Proficiency, Grammaticality and Familiarity. (PhD thesis). The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1998). (ed.) *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity.* London: Routledge.

Balam, O. (2013). Overt Language Attitudes and Linguistic Identities among MultilingualSpeakers in Northern Belize. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 6(2).

Bhatt, R. M. (2005). Expert Discourses, Local Practices, and Hybridity: The Case of Indian Englishes. In S. Canagarajah (ed.) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 25-54.

Bhatt, R. M. (2008). In other words: Language mixing, identity representations, and third space. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 12*(2), 177-200.

Bhatt, R. M. (2010). Unraveling Post-Colonial Identity through Language, *The handbook of language and globalization.* Oxford: Blackwell. 520-539.

Bhatt, R. M. & Bolonyai, A. (2011). Code-switching and the optimal grammar of bilingual language use. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition. 14*(4), 522-546.

Bokamba, E. (1989). Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing?. *World Englishes*, 8.

Bolonyai, A. (2005). "Who was the best?": Power, knowledge, and rationality in bilingual girls' code choices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(1). 3-27.

Bolton, K. (ed.) (2002). *Hong Kong English: Autonomy and creativity.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. 324 pp.55.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brice, A. & Brice, R. (2009). (Ed.s). *Language development: Monolingual and bilingual acquisition*. Old Tappan, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Bullock, B. E. and Toribio, (2009). Almeida J.: *Themes in the study of code-switching*.

Census report on Indian Languages. (2001). Retrieved from http://www.censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/Statement1.htm

D'souza, J. (1986). Language Modernization in a Sociolinguistic Area. *Anthropological Linguistics*.

Evensen, K., M. (2014, March). *The grammar of bilingual Spanish-English speakers in Chicago.* Paper presented at 2014 AAAL Annual Conference, Portland, OR.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325-340.

Goldstein, B.; Kohnert, K. (2005). Speech, language and hearing in developing bilingual children: Current findings and future directions. *Language, Speech and Hearing services in Schools* 36 (3): 264–67.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutierrez-Clellen, V. (1999). Language choice in intervention with bilingual children. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 8: 291–302.

Heller, M. (1992). The politics of codeswitching and language choice. In Carol Eastman (ed.) *Codeswitching*, 123-142. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society, 24,* 373-40.

Kachru B. (1986). *The Alchemy of English*. London. Routledge.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. (2nd Ed.). Champaign, IL. University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1993), THE EMPIRE TALKS BACK. World Englishes, 12: 393–399.

Kachru, Braj B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17: 66-87.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (1996). Multilingualism and Codeswitching in Education. In Hornberger, N. H. & McKay, S. L. (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and Language Education (116-142). New York: Multilingual Matters.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. and Cher-leng, L. (1991). Chinese-English code-mixing: a case of matrix language assignment. World Englishes, 10: 247–261.

Kohnert, K.; Yim, D.; Nett, K.; Duran, P. F.; Duran, L. (2005). Intervention with linguistically diverse preschool children: A focus on developing home languages(s). *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools* 36 (3): 251–63.

Lee, Y., S. (2014, March). *Code-switching and the optimal grammar of Korean heritage students in the United States.* Paper presented at 2014 AAAL Annual Conference, Portland, OR.

Li, W. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Li, W. (1998). The 'Why' and 'How' Questions in the Analysis of Conversational Codeswitching. In P. Auer. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*. London: Routledge. pp. 156–76

Li, W. (2000). *The Bilingualism Reader*. London. Routledge.

Li, W. (2002), 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society, 31*, 159-180.

Mallikarjun, B. (2002). Language Policy for Education in Indian States: Karnataka. *Language in India, 2*.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa.* Oxford: Clarendon (Oxford University Press).

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching.* Oxford: Clarendon (Oxford University Press).

Myers-Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society, 30*,1-28.

Muysken, P. *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000

Nayak, H. M. (1967). *Kannada, Literary and Colloquial: A study of two styles*. Mysore. Rao and Raghavan.

Poplack, S. (1980). *Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching.*

Prince, A., & Smolensky, P. (2004). *Optimality Theory: Constraints interaction in generative grammar.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sharifi, F. K. (2015). *Mobility and Optimal Grammar of Bilingual Language Use: Azeri-Farsi-English Code-switching in Indigenous and Diaspora Contexts*, (Unpublished Qualifying Paper). Urbana, IL. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Stillwell, K. (2014, March). *Code-switching and the optimal grammar of Catalan-Spanish bilinguals.* Paper presented at 2014 AAAL Annual Conference, Portland, OR.

Wardaugh, R. (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.