

C-M GRAMMAR AND RELATIVIZED CONSTRAINTS: A STUDY IN KASHMIRI-ENGLISH MIXING

Sajad Hussain Wani

Introduction

Code mixing (CM) involves mixing of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, phrases or clauses) primarily from two participating grammatical systems within a sentence. This intra-sentential mixing is constrained by grammatical principles and may be motivated by social and psychological factors. To quote Kachru, "Code mixing entails transferring linguistic units from one code to another ... one may consider code switching as a process which can result in code mixed varieties. A multilingual or multidialectal person is generally able to associate a function and an effect with various types of language or dialect mixes". (Kachru 1983). It is also important to point out that code mixing here refers to the phenomenon whereby one base language can be easily identified. Furthermore, the unit of analysis for code mixing is a clause or what has been called as CP in generative grammar. Code switching on the other hand is taken as a process involving two base languages and the unit for analysis of code switching is above a clause (or CP) since a base language cannot change within a single Clause.

Kashmiri language forms the mother tongue of most of the population in Kashmir whereas Urdu and English have entered the linguistic scene of the valley through institutional intervention. Both Urdu and English have a history of more than one century in the valley. This tri-lingual contact has multiple implications at different levels. Kashmiri language now-a-days is regularly used with English and Urdu in the speech of educated Kashmiris with Urdu forming the primary choice for code switching and English forming the primary choice for code mixing for the majority of educated Kashmiri population (Kak and Wani 2005). This can be understood by taking into consideration the higher number of Urdu proficient Kashmiri native speakers as compared with the English proficient ones.

Strategies of Neutrality or Relativised Constraints

In code mixing literature, the search for relative constraints or strategies of neutrality started during the mid-1980's. This search for relativised constraints resulted from the interaction of universal principles and aspects particular to each code mixing situation. This search becomes essential in relation to sizeable cross-linguistic data. The search for strategies of neutrality or relativised constraints further widens the

scope of the concept of neutrality on the theoretical level. "Relativised Constraints" or "Strategies of Neutrality" are certain strategies used by native speakers during CM to adapt foreign elements or embedded language (EL) constituents in the matrix language (ML). There are different mechanisms which take place when elements from two languages interact through various language interaction phenomena like code mixing, code switching and borrowing. Some important strategies of neutrality during code mixing include:

Homophonous Diamorphs

In closely related languages, neutrality can be achieved by a word being phonetically identical or very similar in both the languages. This idea is systematically explored by Crama and Van Geldern (1984) in Dutch-English mixing. Consider the following example.

1	weet	Je	what	she	is	doing?
	do you	Know	what	she	is	doing?
Do you know what she is doing?						

(Van Geldern 1984: From Appel and Muysken 1987, p.126)

Neutralization by morphological means

Morphological means are very frequently used to achieve neutrality. With nouns case-suffixes are used which function as morphological neutralizers. An example may be drawn from the Hindi-English data in Discuillo, Muysken and Singh (1986):

2.	bread	ne	naas-maar	diya
	bread	erg	Ruin	auxiliary
The bread ruined it.				

(Discuillo, Muysken and Singh 1986 : From Appel and Muysken 1987, p.127

Perhaps, the ergative particle 'ne' serves to neutralize the offending English element "bread" to which it is attached. Similarly, in 3

3.	telephone	Ke	taar	kaT	gaye
	telephone	Dat	Wire	cut	went
The telephone wires are damaged.					

(Disuillo, Muysken and Singh 1986 : From Appel and Muysken 1987, p.127)

Here dative "ke" serves to neutralize "telephone". Thus, nouns and adjectives were found to be neutralized by morphological case markers which could be free or bound morphemes. A large number of verbs were similarly found to be neutralized by the introduction of a helping verb, often a form such as "make" or "do". This is very common in Indic languages. Examples include Surinam Hindustani, Dutch and English mixed verb. (Kishna 1979)

onti kare " to hunt" (Surinam)

beer kare " to bury" (Surinam)

train kare " to train " (English)

bewijs kare " to prove " (Dutch) (Kishna 1979)

Note that the above process does not apply to borrowings only but it is a completely productive process. In fact, there is a lexical structure of the type (V kare) available to insert alien elements in which "kare" (do) serves as the helping verb. Thus, here helping verb can be thought of as forming a complex with the verb from other languages and acting as a neutralizer of these mixed elements.

The doubling strategy

Languages with different word orders were found to use verbs from both the languages (the doubling strategy) as in Japanese-English code mixing. Similarly, there can be a number of such strategies interacting with the general constraints mentioned before.

These strategies of neutrality occur when two languages interact so that the lexical properties of both, the matrix and the embedded languages are satisfied. This paper considers these strategies of neutrality a result of interaction between ML content morphemes (open class items) and EL content and functional items (closed class items) according to the principle of lexical satisfaction (PLS). Hence, it is not ML which provides strategies of neutrality but it is a type of interaction in which the lexicon of both the languages participate actively.

Are There Code Mixing Grammars?

The question of a code mixing grammar is as old as it is new as the boundaries regarding code mixing grammars are yet to be drawn. The earliest proposal regarding code mixing grammars were those of Ervin Tripp (1968), Oksaar (1972), Sankoff and Popiack (1980) and Pandit (1990). Recently, MacSwan (2001) evaluated his Spanish-Nahutal code switched data in the minimalist framework as proposed by Chomsky (1995) and concluded:

1. Nothing constrains code switching apart from the requirements of the mixed grammars, an assumption which makes use of minimal theoretical apparatus (corresponding to "virtual conceptual necessity").
2. Native bilingual code switchers are exquisitely sensitive to the subtle requirements of the languages they use, just as non-code switchers are.
3. Code switchers have the same grammatical competence as monolinguals for the languages they use.

Thus, throughout code mixing literature the question of code mixing grammar has been asked and there is enough evidence to show that the possibility of code mixing grammars cannot be totally ruled out. This paper takes code mixing grammar as a set of definite rules which results from a regular interaction of the lexicon of both the languages or which can be formulated on the basis of many strategies of neutrality found for a given language pair and can account for all the code mixed structures; no matter whether ML or EL grammatical rules contribute more quantitatively, as it seems that ML by providing main grammatical particles (outer system morphemes (Myers Scotton and Jake 2002)) is the grammar providing language. This paper involves a discussion of various strategies which are involved when two languages interweave a network of composite structures by mixing with each other in many interesting ways. This paper looks at the phenomenon of code mixing from a different perspective. Though there is involvement of a base language, it is not the base language which provides the strategies to accommodate the elements from the host language but it is only an agreement between two linguistic systems where content words of one language system (guest language) interact with the functional items of another language system according to the principle of lexical satisfaction (PLS). If Myers-Scotton's 4-M model is taken into consideration, it is then more logically an agreement between the content morphemes of guest language and outer system morphemes of matrix language (ML). This paper examines how these strategies of neutrality point to a different rule system which can be called a code mixing grammar. This paper also discusses how these strategies of neutrality favour a certain kind of structures and correspondingly decreasing structures of other types which are otherwise unmarked in both EL and ML. This is mainly shown with respect to mixing of English nouns and verbs in Kashmiri which happen to be the most frequent classes of words being mixed in Kashmiri-English code mixing as in many other code mixing corpora. Thus, the code mixing grammar which is proposed here involves the conception of a separate rule system which can be formulated for code mixed structures.

Methodology

The data for this paper was collected by direct observation and tape recording of conversations in naturalistic situations. Care was taken to keep the settings as informal as possible. The data collected

amounted to about four hours of tape-recorded conversations. The data was then transcribed and subjected to rigorous analysis. In addition, wherever necessary, data from Kak (1995) and Wani (2005) was also used.

Analysis

Consider examples 4 (K), 5 (K-U) and 6 (K-E)

4.	tem	-is	che	ni	neek	insaan	-l	slnz	pehCaan. (K)
	he	dat	be-pr-fem	not	virtuous	person	dat	Of fem-gen	identity
He can not identify a good person.									

5	me	EEs	ni	patah	ki	is	rishte	ki	keemat	itni	sasti	hogi (K-U)
	I-dat	be-fem-pst	no	know	th	this	relatio	of-fem-gen	value	suc	low	Will
I have never imagined that this relationship will have such low value.												

6.	tem	-is	Kus	business	chu	father	karaan	Su	chu	varlyah	intelligent.(K-E)
	he	- dat	which	business	is	father	doing	he- nom	be-pr-mas	very	intelligent.
Which business is his father in? He is very intelligent.											

The above three examples are representative of language interaction phenomena occurring in present day Kashmir with Kashmiri-Urdu code switching as unmarked behavior of speech on the one hand whereas Kashmiri-English code mixing as unmarked speech behavior on the other hand. It is important to point here that it does not exclude Kashmiri-English code switching (with higher levels of English proficiency) and Kashmiri-Urdu code mixing which are also observed. However, the most frequent mode of speech interaction is as specified in the above given examples, which is liable to change with the fluctuations in various factors in addition to temporal changes.

Taking the example of English nouns, it is observed that English nouns when incorporated in Kashmiri have been found to be neutralized by Kashmiri suffixes indicative of changes in number, gender, person, etc. E.g.

bus+l (fem- pl.) = buses

bus+an (masc- pl- erg) = (in) the buses

bus+i (fem- sing- dat) = of bus.

computer+uk (masc-sing- gen)= of the computer.

computer+an (masc- pl- dat)= computers.

cardboard+iC (fem- sing- gen) = of the cardboard.

book+l (fem- pl) =books.

Thus, it is observed that when a noun which is gender-wise neutral in English language is used in Kashmiri ML, it is assigned a gender. This assignment of gender can not be explained in terms of ML phonology alone but this assignment of gender is a matter of interaction of linguistic principles of both ML and EL in accordance with PLS, in addition to how a particular EL item is cognitized by the bilingual speakers. Whereas "bus" is assigned a feminine gender, "computer" is assigned masculine gender. To further provide reasoning to the above mentioned statement, consider the word "kaar". Phonologically it is equivalent to the English word "car" and to the Kashmiri word "kaar" meaning "work". In spite of the phonological similarity, these two words when used in Kashmiri are provided different genders; the English "car" is assigned feminine gender and the Kashmiri "kaar" is assigned masculine gender. Examples like these indicate that ML phonology alone cannot be said to be the main determining factor for the assignment of gender. Similarly, many other homophonous words are assigned different genders on the basis of how these are cognitized by the bilingual speakers. Overall, it can be said that a number of factors come into play in this phenomenon, it can be the ML phonology which may be playing an important role, it may be the phonological shape of the EL item, it may be how a particular EL item is cognitized by the bilinguals and so on. Consider the following examples:

7.	tim	-av	che	factory	treevmlts. (K-E)
	they	-erg	be- fem	factory	start-pst
They have started the factory.					

8.	tim	-av	chu	karkhaanl	troovmut.(K)
	they	-erg	be-masc	factory	Start-pst.
They have started the factory.					

9.	*tim	-av	chu	factory	troovmut. (K-E)
	they	erg	be-masc-sing	factory	start-pst-masc
They have started the factory.					

10.	*tim	-av	che	karkhaanl	treevmits. (K)
	they	-erg	be-fem-sing	company	started-fem
They have started the company.					

11.	dancing	che	tem'sinz	hobby. (K-E)
	dancing	be-fem-sing	her- nom- gen- fem	Hobby
Dancing is his/her hobby.				

12.	natsun	chu	tem'sund	shagul (K)
	dancing	be-masc-sing	his-nom-gen-mas	hobby
Dancing is his/her hobby.				

13.	*dancing	chu	tem'sund	hobby.(K-E)
	dancing	be-masc-sing	his- nom- gen-mas	hobby
Dancing is his/her hobby.				

14.	*natsun	Che	tem'sinz	shugul.(K)
	dancing	be-fem-sing	her- nom- gen-fem	Hobby
Dancing is her/his hobby.				

In the above examples (7-14), "factory", "dancing" as well as "hobby" are neutral in the EL ; whereas the Kashmiri equivalent of "factory" i.e. "karkhaan" is masculine and takes masculine grammatical particles ("chu" (be-masc-sing), "troovmut" (start-pst-masc)); the EL lexical equivalent "factory" in Kashmiri-English code mixed sentence takes feminine grammatical particles ("che" (be-fem-sing). Here, ML phonology plays a primary role in assigning female gender to "factory" which is quite opposite to the previously mentioned example of "car". Same applies to the ML element "shagul" which takes masculine grammatical particle("tem'sund" (his-nom-gen-masc)), whereas in code mixed utterances it's lexical equivalent "hobby" takes a feminine grammatical particle ("tem'sinz" (her-nom-gen-fem)). But the case of "dancing" is interesting, there are no homophonous words or similar sounding words in Kashmiri phonology but all the code mixed nouns ending with suffix "-ing" (gerundive nouns) have been found to assume feminine gender whether it is "fighting", "reading", "swimming", "writing" etc. Thus, these code mixed nouns have assumed a gender irrespective of whether their lexical equivalent is a masculine noun or independent of ML phonology. The lexical equivalent of "dancing" ("natsun") is cognitized as a

masculine noun in ML and its phonology also confirms to masculine nouns like "pakun" ("walking"), "tsaTun" ("cutting"), "tarun" ("crossing") but equivalent lexical items, "dancing", "walking", "cutting" and "crossing" have confirmed to the rule of code mixing grammar which makes all English nouns of such structure mixed in Kashmiri assume feminine gender in code mixed structures. Furthermore, non-dependency of ML phonology is proved by the fact that EL predicative adjectives ending with "-ing" like "cunning", "charming" take masculine as well as feminine gender governed by their head nouns. Thus, through this illustration of gender distribution in ML, EL and code mixed utterances; it becomes clear that code mixed utterances follow a different gender system which is not totally governed by either of the two languages but is a result of the interaction of the two language systems in question.

The above given examples illustrate that although some of grammatical particles or more truly outsider late system morphemes (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2002) are contributed by the ML, it is not the grammar of ML which is adhered to but there is a strategy of compromise between ML and EL lexical and functional items, and the shape of ML grammatical particles is determined by the lexical properties of the EL particles. The explanation provided for the above code mixed utterances (7-14) is that EL elements in code mixed situations interact not only with the ML functional items but also with the content morphemes of ML satisfying lexical properties. Accordingly in this process a different syntactic form results which is different from both the ML and the EL and a different rule system or code mixing grammar is followed which is quite regular when the two languages maintain a code mixed relationship.

Thus, some rules governing mixing of nouns in the case of Kashmiri-English can be formulated as under:

1. When an English noun is mixed with Kashmiri (ML); it is assigned a gender which is not totally determined by ML.
2. English gerundive nouns (ending with -ing) when mixed in Kashmiri always assume a feminine gender.

Like nouns, hundreds of English verbs have also been found to occur as code mixes in Kashmiri language but the incorporation of English verbs is not random but rather involves a number of compromise strategies which are almost evident with every mixed verb. Similar to what Kishna (1979) postulated, in Kashmiri-English code mixing also, a structure (V kar) is available in which verb is inserted. Auxiliary "kar" (do) with its different forms like "karl" (will do), "karaan" (doing), etc was said to be a strategy provided by the ML. However, there is another way of looking at it i.e. EL verbs dictate the framework by demanding auxiliaries from the ML for acceptability of the code mixed structure. This systematicity can be explained by the fact that "code mixing" grammar contains a higher frequency of constructions involving auxiliary verbs as almost every EL verb must be accompanied with a ML auxiliary (or operator) in order to exist in a code mixed structure. It can well be said that the shape of auxiliary is determined by the EL verb and not by the ML; thus again a compromise strategy and a resulting "separate rule system" or "code mixing grammar". e.g.

15 and 16.

15.	tem	-is	chu	lecture	prepare	karun.(K-E)
	he	dat	be-masc-sing	lecture	prepare	to do
He has to prepare the lecture.						

16.	tem	-is	chu	software	Install	karun.(K-E)
	he	dat	be-masc-sing	software	Install	to do
He has to install the software.						

17.	asi		Kor		enjoy. (K-E)
	we -erg		do-pst-masc		enjoy
We did enjoy.					

18.	tem	-is	chu	soorui	calculate	karun.(K-E)
	he	dat	has-pst-masc	all	calculate	to do
He has to do all the calculation						

19.	tem	-is	gov	Vaariyah	feel. (K-E)
	he	dat	happen-pst-masc	Very	feel
He felt it badly					

20.	tem	-is	gov	<i>hurt.</i> (K-E)
	he	dat	happen-pst	Hurt
He was disgusted.				

21.	tem	-is	gatshi	<i>programme</i>	<i>terminate.</i> (K-E)
	he	dat	happen-fut	Programme	terminate
His programme will terminate					

22.	film		geyi	<i>end.</i> (K-E)
	film -nom		happen-pst	end
The film ended.				

It has been observed that no verb from English can be mixed until it is supplied by an auxiliary from the ML, or English verbs when mixed in Kashmiri always demand an auxiliary and can never occur singly. Broadly speaking, English verbs can be classified into two types in Kashmiri-English code mixing depending on the auxiliary they take when mixed in English. English verbs taking auxiliary "karun" (to do) and its different forms like "kari" (do-fut), "kor" (do-masc-pst), "ker" (do-fem-pst), etc will be referred to as active verbs as these auxiliaries are always governed by agentive verbs or associated with agentive verbs. English verbs taking auxiliary "gatshun" (to happen) and its various forms like "gov" (happen-pst-masc), "geyi" (happen-pst-fem), "gatshi" (happen-fut), etc will be referred to as passive verbs as these verbs are governed by object verbs or verbs associated with the patient. All English verbs when mixed with Kashmiri fall in either of these two classes and never occur singly.

Some code mixing rules governing the mixing of English verbs in Kashmiri can be formulated as under:

1. English verbs when used in Kashmiri-English code mixed structures can never occur singly but always demand an auxiliary from the ML whose shape these essentially determine. On the basis of the auxiliary, EL verbs can be classified as active and passive verbs in the code mixed structures.
2. Those English verbs which demand Kashmiri auxiliary "kar" (do) and its different forms are called active verbs. e.g., "calculate", "enjoy" and "prepare" as in examples 15, 17, and 18.
3. Those English verbs which demand Kashmiri auxiliary "gov" (happen-pst) and its different forms are called as passive verbs. E.g. "feel", "hurt" and "end" as in 19, 20 and 22 examples above.

Thus, in code mixing structures, certain type of structures are favoured in preference to the structures of ML and BL . The various strategies of neutrality definitely point to a code mixing grammar where mostly certain kind of structures are favoured resulting from the compromise strategies between the given languages. It must be pointed out that code mixing grammars are neither static nor stable systems, but these definitely shape the structure of the ML as hundreds of code mixes may attain the status of borrowings and these code mixed structures get integrated in the structure of the ML as is the case of hundreds of *Urdunized* expressions in present day Kashmiri. (Kak and Wani 2006).

Conclusion

In Kashmiri-English code mixing at present in Kashmir, Kashmiri definitely can be identified as a base or matrix language (ML) and the various criteria proposed by Myers-Scotton, et al (1993, 2000, 2001, 2002) seem valid to a great extent whether it is the concept of MLF or 4M model. In addition various sociolinguistic and psychological considerations also point to Kashmiri as a base language (Kak and Wani, 2005). However, from various examples in Kashmiri-English code mixing data, it is clear that a "separate rule system" or "Code mixing grammar approach" is the best solution for the explanation of code mixed structures. It becomes clear that mixing definitely involves certain strategies of neutrality which in turn result in a particular type of structure which can be explained in terms of certain rules which can be best attributed to the notion of code mixing grammar. Kashmiri-English code mixing data also strongly support the existence of a "code mixing grammar" advocated by many linguists like Ervin Tripp (1968), Kachru (1975), Sankoff and Poplack (1980) , Pandit (1990) and Macswan (2001), although these scholars have used different approaches and different explanations for the existence of a code mixing grammar. By correlating various strategies of neutrality and code mixing grammar , it becomes clear that lexicon of both languages play an active role in shaping this code mixed grammar and thus "code mixing grammar" is a result of a reaction between the "different types of lexicon" (ML functional and content morphemes and EL content morphemes mainly) of the two participating languages.

References

- Appel, R. and P. Muysken. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London : Edward Arnold.
- Azuma, Shoji. 1993. The Frame-Content Hypothesis in Speech Production: Evidence From Intra-sentential Code Switching. *Linguistics*. 31. 1071-1093.
- Bhatt, R.M. 1996. Code-Switching, Constraints and Optimal Grammars. *Lingua*. 102. 223-251.
- Crama, R. and, H. Van Gelderen. 1984. *Structural Constraints on Code Mixing*. MA diss., Un. van Amsterdam.
- Di Scullo, A.M., P. Muysken & R.Singh 1986. Code mixing and Government. *Journal of Linguistics*. 22. 1-24.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M. 1968. An Analysis of Interaction of Language, Topic and Listener. Fishman(ed.), *Readings in The Sociology of Language*. The Hauge: Mouton.
- Freidan, R. 1992. *Foundations of Generative Syntax*. Massachusetts: MIT Press

- Gardner-Chloros, P. and M.Edwards, 2003. *Assumptions Behind Grammatical Approaches to Code-Switching: When the Blueprint is a Red Herring*. Paper presented at Birkbeck College.Un of London.
- Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life With Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. and E.Hernandez-Chavez. 1971. Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication.W.H.Whitely(ed.) ,*Language Use and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru,B.B. 1978. Code-Mixing as a Communicative Strategy in India.J.E.Alatis(ed.), *International Dimension of Bilingual Education*. Washington: Georgetown Univ. Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1983. *The Indianization of English*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kak, A.A. 1995. *Acceptability of Kashmiri-English Mixed Sentences: A Sociolinguistic Study*. M. Phil. Diss. Un. of Delhi.
- Kak, A.A. 2002. Language Maintenance and Language Shift in Srinagar. Ph.D Diss. Un. of Delhi.
- Kak, A.A. and S.H. Wani. 2005. *Case for Base: A Study of Kashmiri-English Code Mixing*. Paper presented at South Asian Linguistic Analysis 25 (SALA 25) at The Deptt. of Linguistics, The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champagne, USA.
- Kak, A.A. and S.H. Wani. 2006. *Kashmiri-Urdu Contact: Interference or Congruent Lexicalisation*. Paper presented at the National Seminar on Linguistics of Contemporary Hindi and Urdu at the Deptt. Of Linguistics, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.
- Kishna, S. 1979. *Lexicale Interferentie in het Sarnami*. MA Diss. Un. van Amsterdam.
- Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code Switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2001. The Matrix Language Frame Model : Development and Responses.Rodolfo Jakobson(ed.), *Code Switching Worldwide* 11. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oksaar, E.1972. On Code Switching: An Analysis of Bilingual Norms.Quistgaard, et al(ed.) *Proceedings of Association International De Linguistique Apliques Third Congress*. Heidelberg: Julius Gross Verlog .
- Pandit, I. 1990.Grammaticality in Code Switching .Rodolfo Jakobson(ed.), *Code-Switching as a World-wide Phenomenon*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pfaff, C. 1979. Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language*.55.291-318.

Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y Termino Espanol: Towards a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics*.18.581-618.

Timm, L.A. 1975. Spanish-English Code switching: El porque [sic] and how-not-to. *Romance Philology*.28.473-82.

Wani, S.H. 2004. *Formal and Functional Aspects of English-Kashmiri Code Mixing*. MA. Diss., Un. of Kashmir.

Woolford, E. 1983. Bilingual Code-Switching and Syntactic Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* .4/3.520-536.

List of Abbreviations

nom = nominative

dat = dative

gen = genitive

erg = ergative

masc = masculine

fem = feminine

sing = singular

pl = plural

pp = preposition

pr = present

pst = past

fut = future

Neg = Negative

* = ungrammatical sentence or construction

K-U = Kashmiri-Urdu code switching

K-E = Kashmiri-English code mixing

K = Kashmiri