

## Unravelling the Nature of Sociolinguistic Phenomena

Prakash Mondal\*

### Introduction

Sociolinguistics has long been involved in uncovering how language and society interact with and influence each other in a complex and rich dynamics. Several emergent patterns have been discovered to be coming out of the strong natural interaction between society and language at different levels in the widest possible range of situations and contexts. These are sociolinguistic phenomena or constructs like *register*, *code switching*, *code mixing*, *dialect*, *variety*, *repertoire*, *diglossia* (or *triglossia* or *multiglossia*), *accent*, *style*, *argot* etc. All these are not properly linguistic phenomena in that they cannot appear if language is confined to itself without being put into use in society at large. Only when the use of language is implemented in society, do such phenomena appear on the scene. This shows that these are emergent phenomena, since one cannot get the phenomena by analyzing either society or language separately alone: the phenomena are unexpected outcomes of the complex interactive dynamics of society and language.

In this paper what would be argued is that all these sociolinguistic phenomena are organically and functionally related to each other, so one phenomenon cannot be found in isolation with the other phenomena. What this means is that they are found always together in real time not only in terms of their existence, but also in terms of their function. Functionally register, for example, seems to have something to do with dialect or with code switching in one way or another.

Though it may be argued that functions of register do not necessarily or directly entail the functional existence of dialect or code switching, but if register has some use in society it can serve its functions only in being in

---

\* Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi, India.

relation to the functions of dialect or code switching. But the most important point is that their functional and existential relatedness and interconnection to one another in actual speech use varies in degrees in several circumstances. They do not exist as mixed to the fullest extent all the time; rather, what we find is that in diverse range of actual uses of speech, a cline of their mixture appears- sometimes all the phenomena may appear, another time, say, only a few of them appear and again another time in another situation one or two will be found to be existent in speech.

### **Relation of Sociolinguistic Phenomena to Social Variables and Categories**

Sociolinguistic phenomena in general are bound up with other sociological structures or variables, as sociolinguistic phenomena are truly sociolinguistic because of their origin from a concentrated interaction of those sociological structures with language. It is beyond doubt that in society at large there are myriad conventions, mores, norms, rules, restrictions, customs, values, cultural patterns, Gumperz's (1982) notion of "social meaning" etc. which in tandem influence, sometimes determine human behavior, habits, thinking patterns, above all human existence in society. Humans cannot exist beyond the boundaries of society, and within society there must be those rules, patterns, norms etc. These, at least or at best, influence individuals and also communities.

Speech functions are also part of those sociocultural norms, conventions, and rules. These can be together called *sociocultural settings*, which are repositories of these norms, conventions, customs including speech functions and norms. They are also under the influence of political equations of power and dominations (Laponce, 1987), since it is true that cultural systems are hardly "politically neutral" (Gal, 1998). They are settings in that they are open to modulating operations among one another, that is, they constantly but in a dynamic way are linked to one another- they are open to mutual interaction and influence. These sociocultural settings are, therefore, both ubiquitous and relative; they are ubiquitous in that they are present everywhere in the world (of course where humanity exists), they are relative in that their forms may vary from place to place, from community to community, though they have the same underlying

purposes or patterns. Sociocultural settings are specific neither in structural form, nor in number; because they intersect one another, and there is considerable overlap among them. This also lines up with Philip K. Bock's (1968, p. 221-222) view that units of "social space" and "social roles" overlap one another. These social categories and variables cannot just be taken for granted; they are never independent of social practices and norms (De Fina, 2007). At the macro level socio-cultural settings appear specific in structural form or number, but at the micro level a closer look reveals that they do not exist in specific separate forms, but exist overlapping one another. And age, religion, sex, education, role, status, manner, relationship, attitude, ideology etc. are factors or parameters that determine or influence those social norms, conventions, rules socio-cultural settings are composed of. And modes of production, participations in them, gender coupled with ideologies (which are also part of sociocultural settings) make for different implementations of language structures and linguistic practices with different types of shifting in style (Innes, 2006).

### **Relation of Social Categories and Variables to Linguistic Uses**

In sociolinguistics it is generally accepted that speech functions and norms are always linked to, associated with and influenced by social systems, factors, conventions, norms, rules etc. (Pride & Holmes 1972; Friedrich, 1979; Wardough 1993; Labov 1994; Hudson 2001; Stockwell 2002; Chambers 2003). And such form-function variations are inherently associated with socio-cultural variables (Poplack, 1993). Under the umbrella of socio-cultural settings, these conventions, norms, customs including speech functions and norms are linked to one another through mutual influence and interaction. To these one should perhaps add another great factor that mediates between macro level structures like those social categories mentioned above (gender, ideology, attitude, education etc.) and other micro level categories like text, talk- it is social cognition (Van Dijk, 1998). So, this way speech functions and norms are bound up with socio-cultural norms, customs, conventions etc. These setups formed through an amalgam of speech functions and norms tied to social norms, customs, conventions etc. can be called *dimensional frames*.<sup>2</sup> These dimensional frames have within themselves elements of "communicative competence" (Dell Hymes 1971), which involves sociolinguistic interference through

---

interaction of production and perception, of competence and performance based on the concepts of verbal repertoire of speakers, speech habits and social spheres of speech; elements of Gumperz's notion of communication process that is effected through a transformation of external stimuli into communicative symbols to be at least influenced and shaped by social and situational restrictions or conventions. The notion of these dimensional frames can be cast in the light of Asif Agha's (2007) notion of "enacted representations" organized through the forms of socio-cultural reflexive modes of social activity. It is the semiotic pattern of activity of individuals or groups of individuals through which the speech functions and norms become anchored into socio-cultural patterns of norms, conventions, customs, values, practices etc. And this semiotic pattern of activity is through the use of "enacted representations". So "enacted representations" are actually patterns of *dimensional frames* in the sense above.

Dimensional frames involve any type of binding of speech functions and norms with socio-cultural norms, restrictions, and conventions in this way. So, conceptualization of dimensional frames is also related to accommodation theory, where Taylor, Giles & Bourhis (1973) posit that speakers and listeners adjust their speech norms and habits to the socio-pragmatic situations according as they allow them to do so (Coupland 1997). In addition, it has its relation to Ervin Tripp's (1972) notion of components of speech necessary for communication, namely, participants, i.e. speakers and listeners, sociocultural situations, forms of communications (determined by channel, code or variety, variants and paralinguistic features), speech act, topic and message, and functions of interaction, because in normal conversation these things or components go together to make communication possible through the same principle of binding of speech functions (functions of interactions) and norms through code or variety, channel (written or oral) with the sociocultural situations in speech act involving a message or content or messages.

These dimensional frames are infinite, unlimited in number. Dimensional frames formed up by the binding of speech functions and norms with the socio-cultural norms, conventions etc. are infinite in society as a whole in that specific number of speech functions and norms binding up with

specific number of socio-cultural norms, conventions etc. create unlimited number of dimensional frames unlimited and infinite times. Some are temporary and some are more durable. Humans do all these things. Since there is relativity of social functions and norms (along with universal functions and features of speech) among myriad number of communities, this infinity crosses over intra-social boundaries to inter-social boundaries. The notion of dimensional frames can be conceptualized as

$$D_{\alpha} = f(S_i, Sp_k).$$

Here  $D_{\alpha}$  – infinite dimensional frames,  $S_i$  – socio-cultural norms with specific number 'i',  $Sp_k$  – speech functions and norms with a specific number 'k' when  $i \neq k$ . Dimensional frames are not at all static; they change over the course of time, as social conventions, norms, and speech functions and norms themselves are dynamic. Therefore, dimensional frames always change, are modified, remolded, reshaped, and transformed with time, because society as a whole does not remain static. And another important factor is that every individual locates himself/herself in a multi-dimensional map of age, sex, education, thoughts, manner, religion, status, position etc. (Hudson 2001), so each individual maps social norms and conventions onto speech functions and norms in a different way.

### Methodology

In this study speech samples were taken from 9 Indian languages, namely, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, Hindi, Bengali, Marwari and Assamese. Speech samples from only these 8 languages were taken, but not from other Indian languages. It is not because of lack of interest in other Indian languages, but because of a lack of time and difficulty in visiting all linguistic regions of India. Speech samples were collected from different places of India where those languages are spoken. With the help of familiar native speakers of those languages, speech events in real time were recorded. People were caught speaking and the recording was done during that time without any awareness among the speakers/listeners that their conversations were being recorded. For the purpose of this study only short conversations were recorded, or sometimes in necessary cases logically consistent and coherent portions of them were recorded. And then the recordings were analyzed again by taking help of those individual native speakers. After a preliminary analysis, the recordings were verified



by those individual native speakers and then the analyses made were checked for any errors that could have slipped into the analyses. After that a final version of the data was prepared to fit them into the framework which has been developed here. The analysis of the data within the generalizations specified at the beginning of the paper is presented below. When the data are analyzed, a general framework of the kind used by Pfaff (1999) has been taken into account with the relevant calibration onto the concept of dimensional frames.

### Analysis

Below are speech samples from some languages.

In all the speech samples below, underlined words denote loan words or words resulting from code mixing.

#### (1)

Father: *Ticket book maadida dinawee hoo guttiya?*

‘Will you go on the same day as was preplanned?’

Son: *hmm. solpa munche hoodare olleyadu.*

‘If I go a little earlier, it’s better’

Father: *Noodadu, vichara maadu, beekadare solpa mundakke haaka.*

‘Think, if you need, you can postpone your journey’

Son: *Beeda matte ticket cancel maada beeku, adella tonbare.*

‘No, if I’ve to postpone it, I’ve to cancel the ticket and that is troublesome’

#### (2)

A: *Hey, Inttida habba hee gittu?*

‘How was your birthday party? Was it grand?’

B: *Eemu illa Hindi film ‘Don’ noodalu hoogiddevu film tumbaa chemaagide.*

‘No, there was nothing special. We went to watch the Hindi film ‘Don’.

The film was very good’

A: *Deevasthanakke hoogiddiraa?*

‘Did you go to a temple?’

B: *Illa.*

‘No’

#### (3)

A: *Adake kooydraa?*

‘Have you plucked areca nuts?’

B: *Illa maaraaya yaaru aalu sikkila. Nimdu aaytaa?*

'No, not yet, dear. We've not still found any workers. Have you finished?'

A: *Haan. monneyee aayatu.*

'Yes, it got over the day before yesterday'

(4)

Student: *Hello, medam, chennaagiddiira?*

'Hello, madam, how are you?'

Teacher: *Naanu chennaagiddeene. Niinu heegiddiira? Matte, MA heege nade yuttide?* 'I'm fine. What about you? Then, how is your MA going on?'

Student: *Paravaagilla medam. Innu eradu sem ide complete maadalu.*

'It's ok, madam. I've to complete two more semesters'

Teacher: *Sariyappa. Chennaagi oodu.*

'Ok, dear. Study well'

### (Kannada)

Here in the conversation (1) the dimensional frame is of a within-family social situation and norm bound up with speech functions and norms appropriate to that particular situation, where the son determined to go on a journey speaks to his father, who advises him different ways whereas in (2) the dimensional frame is of an outdoor social situation in which friends speak to one another tied to specific speech conventions and norms appropriate to that type of situation. In (3) the dimensional frame is of a rural social situation consisting of farmers speaking to one another with speech functions and norms attached to that kind of situation. And in (4) the dimensional frame is of a teacher-student relationship based social situation bound up with speech functions and norms as appropriate to that situation. In (1) the father first uses a greater degree of mixture through the introduction of code-mixing with English words with "Ticket book", but in the next turn reduces the degree by dropping any type of code-mixing, so does the son but in the reverse way. This is possible only in a specific repertoire of Kannada of the speakers, and the register of the speakers constrains the manifestation of the variety of Kannada in question that mixes the codes. Similar things happen in (2) as speaker A uses code-mixing inserting the English word "hey" in the first turn, but later reduces the degree of mixture by not using code-mixing. The speaker B does the

same through using “(Hindi) film Don”, but in the next turn stops this. Similar considerations apply to (4) when the student keeps up the same degree of mixture using code mixing in both turns but the teacher varies it through using code mixing in the second turn with “MA”. A particular accent of a variety prevalent in rural areas interacts with the farmer specific semi-formal register, the elements of repertoire of the two speakers (the use of that variety) in (3). This is a pattern of a kind of organic coexistence of the phenomena in the conversation as a whole.

Let’s turn to the data in Marwari below.

(1)

A: *Parme maure friends haathi Nagarjuna Sagar jaanu thu.*

‘The day before yesterday, I was to go to Nagarjuna Sagar with my friends’

B: *Au, karu riyu?*

‘Oh, how was it?’

A: *Jeru karhu thu, veru ve ni hakiyu.*

‘It didn’t happen the way we wanted it to’

B: *Vatai ni geeya, tau pase kaa keedhu?*

‘Since you didn’t go there, what did you do?’

A: *Pase mai log beejaa thakaune geeyaa- Golkonda and Hussain Sagar.*

‘Then we guys went to other places –Golkonda and Hussain Sagar’

(2)

X: *Suresh bhaisa, aaj dekaana ni... kaa tha kaa vuvayi?*

‘I’ve not seen Suresh since morning. I wonder what might have happened’

Y: *Thaan thaa ni? Vanau atai tau chori vuyi hai!*

‘You don’t know! There has been a theft at their place!’

X: *Au haeng kadi vuv?*

‘When did all these happen?’

Y: *Aajis. Bepalla.*

‘Today itself. This afternoon’

(3)

Mother: *Kaa karai reeyo hai? Maumaa atai hee jaanu? Diwalira daurai atri vera karai reeyo hai.*

‘What are you doing? Don’t you want to go to uncle’s house? On the day of Diwali, you are delaying a lot’



Son: *Arre ki haaba karai? Thodi veraa laagi.*

'Oh, why are you scolding me? It'll take some time'

Mother: *Moo tau thaakauni thanai kaeh kareh.*

'I'm tired of telling you again and again'

Son: *Bas kar thaaru. Aavai reeyo hoon. Katri veera kaehu padi?*

'Now stop it. I'm coming. How many times have I to tell you?'

### (Marwari)

(1) is the dimensional frame of a social situation where friends speak to one another; in (2) the dimensional frame is of an outdoor social situation and norm involving grocers and businessmen and in (3) there is a dimensional frame of a within-family situation involving mother-son relationship and its social norms linked up with the speech conventions and norms associated with that kind of situation. In (1) the speaker A varies the degree of mixture by not using code mixing in the next turns, while employing it in the first turn with "friends". Speaker retains the same level of mixture. A manifestation of the organic coexistence of a particular variety of Marwari (the standard), the accent of that variety, elements of repertoire of the speakers (in the use of the standard variety), (spoken) register emerge quite clearly in (2) and (3).

### (Telegu)

(1)

A: *Ikkada dhagarlo bus stand akkada undi?*

'Where is the nearest bus stand here?'

B: *Ikkadiki dhagaralona, kani meeru akkadaku vellali?*

'It's near, but where do you want to go?'

A: *Charminar vellali.*

'I want to go to Charminar'

B: *Charminar ki ayte ikkada bus stand-lo busulu agavu. Kabati meeru koncham munduku vellile autoalu vuntaye. Aiydu rupayalu thisukuntaru.*

'Buses won't stop here for Charminar. You've to go ahead for this purpose and there you can find autos. They'll charge five rupees.'

A: *Sare*

'ok'

(2)

Father: *Pandugaku selavulu vunnaya?*

'Do you have holidays for festival?'

Son: *Vunnay, kani anni rojulu istaro theleyadu.*

'Yes. But I don't know how many days'

Father: *Selavulu iste intiki ra. Bandhuvulu vastunaaru. Chalapani vundi.*

'Come home if there are any. Relatives are coming. Lot of work is here'

Son: *Sare. Thappakunda.*

'Ok. Sure'

(3)

Worker: *Saru, naku inka jeetam ivvaledu.*

'Sir, I've not got my salary'

Superior: *Avunu! Kani pi office nunchi order raledu. Koncham time panduthundhi.*

'Yes! Order is to come from head office. It'll take some time'

Worker: *Chala ibbandiga undi saru. Intlo panullanni agipotunae.*

'Sir, it's very troublesome. All the work at home is coming to a standstill'

Superior: *Avunu nijame kani nenu ami cheyagalanu. Anta avasara maite nenu koncham dabbulu istanu jeetam ragane ichhaye.*

'Yes, it's true, but what can I do? If you really need money, I'll give you some money. Repay me soon after getting your salary'

Worker: *Meeru istara? Vaddhulendi sir.*

'You will give? No, sir'

(4)

X: *Amandi Krishnagaru? Me pillaliki tapakailu konnara?*

'Krishna, have you bought crackers for your children?'

Z: *Abbe, inka ledhandi. Mari me sanghato.*

'No, not yet, what about you?'

X: *Ah, konnanandi! Dharalu chala akuvaga vunnayee.*

'Yes, I did. They are very costly'

Z: *Ami chestammandi? Panduga vacclundante boledantha karchu. Thappedu kada.*

'What can I do? It becomes very expensive if any festival comes. No escape from this'

X: *Me arogyam ala vundi?*

'How are you in health?'

Z: *Doctorgaru chusarandi. Ippatidhaka ayte bagane undi.*

‘Doctor checked me. It’s ok till now’

**(Telugu)**

Here in (1) the dimensional frame is of an on-the-street social situation and norm bound up with speech conventions and norms related to that kind of situation. In (2) we have a typical dimensional frame of a within-family social situation bound up with the speech functions and norms relevant to that context. In (3) the dimensional frame can be specified as a social situation involving a worker and his superior tied to speech functions and norms found in that context and situation and in (4) the dimensional frame is of an outdoor social situation in which two fathers speak to each other on a socio-familial issue bound up with speech functions and norms attached to that situation as they generally speak in that context. The organic coupling of a particular variety of Telugu (the standard), the particular accent of that variety, spoken register and the elements of repertoire of the two speakers comes clean out of the data above. In (1) the speaker A in the first turn uses code mixing with the use of “bus stand” and so varies the degree of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena, but does not use any in the next turns; while speaker B employs that in the second turn with “bus stand” and also loan word “*busulu*”, “*autolu*” thus varying the degree in the next turn. In (3) important to note is the fact that the worker maintains a speech style of remaining dominated, and the superior that of domination, though for the present purpose their using a particular style each is more important. However, the worker here retains the same degree of mixture in the first and second turns through using loan word mixing with “*saru*” and in the last turn through using code mixing with English word “sir”. The superior creates a greater degree of mixture in the first turn through code mixing with “order”, “office” etc., but reduces it in the next turn. Similar things happen when the speaker Z in (4) varies the degree of mixture through using loan word mixing with “*doctorgaru*”. Now a look at the Tamil data below can throw further light on the matter.

**(1)**

Father: *Saapptiya?*

‘Have you taken food?’

Son: *Illa, inine daan.*

'No, I'm going'

Father: *Modalla poi adha pannu.*

'Go, eat soon'

Son: *Unakku venumaan nee poi sappidu.*

'If you want, you can go and eat'

Father: *Naa sabten. Nee karthaleeundu sapdala...*

'I've taken food. You've not since the morning...'

Son: *Seri, seri. Poren.*

'Ok, ok. I'll go'

(2)

Lady: *Thakkaali evlo maa?*

'How much are the tomatoes?'

Vendor: *Kilo pattu ruva.*

'Ten rupees per kilo'

Lady: *Mattha kariyarum vangano. Solli kudunga.*

'I've got to buy other vegetables as well, consider the price'

Vendor: *Ore vela dhaan ma. Engulukum kattupadi agnomilla?*

'There cannot be any change in price. Even we've to survive, right?'

Lady: *Vendekka evallavu?*

'How much are the ladies fingers?'

Vendor: *Kilo aaru ruva.*

'Six rupees a kilo'

Lady: *Murungakka?*

'Drumsticks?'

Vendor: *Onnu naal ruva.*

'Four rupees each'

Lady: *Aagasa vela solra.*

'Your prices are sky-high'

Vendor: *Venumaa vendamaa?*

'Do you want it or not?'

Lady: *Seri, seri. Rendu kilo thakkaali, one kilo vendekka and moonu murungakka....Apram and inji, karveppila. Oru anju ruva korachikkoye?*

'Ok, ok. Two kilos of tomatoes, one kilo of ladies fingers, three drumsticks and... ginger, coriander. Can you reduce five rupees?'

Vendor: *Mundiayave mudiyadhu. Injiyum, karuv- epilaiyam venunaa freeya tharer.*

‘No, no way. If you want, I can give you ginger and coriander for free’

(3)

Sp1: *Thirumathi Priya Rathnavel avanga sonnamaadhiri...naama kuzhandhai thozhil vallarpidamaa irrukardhu gramamnu mattu nenachukka koodhaadhu.*

‘Like Mrs. Priya Rathnavel, we must not think of villages alone as cradles of child labour’

Sp2: *Adhella saridhaa, but naatu nilamaiya parthing ana ungalakku onnu nallave puriyum. Adhaavadhu, grammangalla dhaan kuzhandhaigala mudkalla vayalla velaykku anupparaya.*

‘All that is fine, but if you look at the affairs of the country, you’ll realize one thing that it’s in village where children are first sent to work in schools’

Sp3: *Ore chinna korikkai. Vendugolnu venunaalum vetihu kalaam.*

‘One small proposal; you can even take it as request’

Sp2: *Enna?*

‘What?’

Sp3: *Kuzhandhai thozhila patthiyum kuzhandhai thozhailalargala pattiyum naraya pesitto. Inine enna seyalaam?*

‘We’ve spoken enough about children and child labour. What can we do from now on?’

Sp1: *Pettrorgal kittadhan arambikkanum...*

‘We must have to start with the parents’

Sp3: *Avanga ariyaamaiya pokkanum.*

‘We must stem their ignorance’

Sp2: *Enna poruth avaraikkum awareness programmes ellan vaithila saapaailadhavanukku udhavaadhu. Pesardha nirithitu seyalla avangalukku edavadhu pannano.*

‘According to my opinion, awareness programs are of no use to a person with impoverished bowels. Let’s stop talking and do something for them’

(4)

A: *Ennadaa... Assignment midichirrupiye?*



'Hey.... have you finished the assignment?'

B: *Adhula yema doubtu?*

'What is doubt in that?'

C: *Ivalaan colleguku varadhe vestu. Velaikkaavamaataa.*

'People like him are a waste in college'

A: *Machaa, avanavudhu padikkatume da!*

'Dude, let him study at least'

C: *Amaala apuro naama eppidi indha galeeju subjectslaan pass avamudiyum?*

'Yes, how else can we pass these dull, boring subjects?'

B: *Kanna! Endha subjectu javvunu nenachadha...*

'Every subject is rubber-like only if you think so'

A: *Porum!*

'Enough'

C: *Ippa nee bladu podaadha.*

'Now, you don't bore us'

### **(Tamil)**

(1) is the dimensional frame of a within-family social situation associated with speech functions and norms specific to that context. In (2) the dimensional frame can be characterized as having an outdoor market situation involving a vendor and a customer linked to speech functions and norms common to that situation. (3) involves a dimensional frame of an outdoor social situation of common people speaking to one another and (4) has a dimensional frame involving a social situation of friends. In (1) we have an integrated coexistence of a particular variety of Tamil (the standard), the accent of that variety, father-son relationship based spoken register, the repertoire of the two speakers (the use of standard here), diglossia (this piece of conversation is in low but standard Tamil with high Tamil influence), formal style. Both speakers retain virtually the same degree of mixture. In (2) the vendor increases the degree of mixture in the first and third cases through using code mixing with "kilo" and in the last turn through using loan word mixing with "freeya", but in other intervening turns lowers the degree. The lady in the sixth turn increases the degree of mixture through employing code mixing with words "one kilo", "and", but in the beginning maintains the same level. In (3) there is a

remarkable (co-)existence of diglossia (low standard Tamil with high Tamil influence, the high Tamil words like “*adhaavadhu*”, “*vendugolnu*”, “*korikkai*”, “*udhavaadhu*” etc.) within the space of the elements of repertoire of the speakers; here speaker 2 employs a greater degree of mixture in the first and third turns through using code mixing with “but”, “awareness programs”, but the other two speakers keep up the same degree of mixture. Similar cases are found in (4) in the code mixing by speaker A with ‘assignment’, in the speaker B changing the degree using loan word mixing with “subject” and slang mixing in the second turn and in speaker C who in the second turn changes the degree through using slang mixing, code mixing and loan word mixing with “*galeeju*”, “pass” and “*subjectslu*” respectively, but in the last turn lowers the degree by not using slang mixing and code mixing.

The Assamese data below can help us look into the diversity of patterns so far discussed.

(1)

Father: *Hera, ki kari asa he?*

‘Hello, what are you doing?’

Mother: *Moi etiya pakgharat randhat besta.*

‘I’m busy in cooking in the kitchen’

Father: *Bapu, college or para ahilne?*

‘Has Bapu come from college?’

Mother: *Nai, etiyao aha nai.*

‘No, he has not come yet’

Father: *Ajikali, hi ahat bahut deri kare.*

‘Nowadays, he comes late’

Mother: *Hi jowa mahat tuition loise.*

‘He joined tuition last month’

(2)

A: *Hera, Bora, kenekuwa he?*

‘Hello, Bora, how are you?’

B: *Sarma, beya nahay, asu aru konomate. Apunar kenkuwa?*

‘Sarma, not bad, somehow managing to live. How are you?’

A: *Bhalei, sab thikethake saliaase, ajikali apuni kat thake?*

‘Good, fine, everything is going on well. Nowadays where do you stay?’

B: *Jowa mahat mor Jorhatala transfer hol, etiya Jorhatate.*

'I was transferred to Jorhat last month. I stay at Jorhat now'

A: *Moi khabaorto powai nasilu. Abeli ebar ahibasun.*

'I didn't get the news. Do come in the evening once'

B: *Haba baru. Abeli log pam.*

'All right. We'll meet in the evening'

A: *Thik ase.*

'Ok'

(3)

X: *Kalita, ahak ahak.*

'Kalita, welcome'

Z: *Dhanyabad.*

'Thank you'

X: *Pariyalak nanile je?*

'Haven't you brought your family?'

Z: *Sowalijanir pariksha saliasse. Moi officeor para bahire bahire ahilu.*

'My daughter's exam is going on. I've directly come from my office'

X: *Hoi neki? Iyate bahak sun.*

'Is it? Please sit down here'

Z: *Dhanyabad.*

'Thanks'

X: *Khana nakhawakai nejeba kintu.*

'Don't leave without eating food'

Z: *Haba baru.*

'Ok'

### (Assamese)

(1) is the dimensional frame of a social situation of a within-family indoor affairs tied to the speech functions and norms relevant to that situation in that context; (2) involves the dimensional frame of an outdoor social situation with familiar friends and in (3) the dimensional frame is based on a social situation of a party and its norms linked up with speech functions and norms appropriate to that situation. Here the father speaks to the mother on the son's returning home. So, here we get a mixture of a particular variety (the standard variety of Assamese), the accent of that variety, the repertoire of the two speakers in that context (here only the standard variety), code mixing, husband-wife and father-mother

relationship based spoken register, semi-informal style. In (1) the father changes the degree of mixture in the second turn by applying code mixing with “college”; while the mother increases the degree by employing code mixing in the last turn with “tuition”, but not in the first two turns. But in (2) the speaker B in the second instance introduces code mixing with “transfer” and so varies the degree of mixture, but speaker A retains the same degree of mixture in all turns. Similarly in (3) the speaker X retains the same degree of mixture, but speaker Z varies the degree by increasing it in the second turn through loan word mixing with “officeor”, but decreasing it in all other turns. In all cases the code mixing is made possible only within the space of the register and the repertoire of the two speakers mediated by a specific variety of Assamese.

**(Malayalam)**

**(1)**

Son: *Acha, onningu varumo?*

‘Father, could you come here once?’

Father: *Enta, mone?*

‘What, son?’

Son: *De, eepusthakam eduthu tharavo?*

‘Could you bring that book for me? I can’t reach it’

Father: *Da, varunnu.*

‘Yeah, I’m coming’

**(2)**

A: *Dei innathe pathram vayuho? Petrolinte vela enuyum koodan pouva.*

‘Hey, have you read today’s newspaper? The price of petrol is to be hiked again’

B: *Iniyum koodiyal evide chennu nilkum! Auto kkuli koottathe vere vazhiyalla.*

‘Where the price will reach, if they increase it again! There is no other way out but to increase the auto fare’

A: *Athinee sarkar sammathi kkumo? Parimudakku nadathana samkhadanayude theesuman.*

‘Will this government agree to this? Association has decided to go on strike’

B: *Athu mathrame nadakku. Allengil ee pani muthalakilla.*

‘Only that is going to work or else this job is not profitable’

(3)

Interviewer: *Thangal, KD& KD company thiranjedukkanulla karanam entham?*

‘What is the reason for your choosing KD & KD company?’

Person: *Perum, prasasthiyumulla KD & KD companyil joli cheyyuka entham ente aagrahamam, sir.*

‘Sir, it’s my desire to be an employee of a reputed company like KD & KD’

Interviewer: *Thangalude ishta vinodam entham?*

‘What is your hobby?’

Person: *Oru pratyeka vinodamam sir. Kannadachu kondu sabdathil ninnu jeevikale thirichariyuaka- atham ente vinodam.*

‘It’s a peculiar hobby. Closing my eyes and identifying the animals by listening to their sound- that is my hobby’

Interviewer: *Thangale evide kaavalkkaranayi niyamikkananu uddesikkumathu. Aatte enthamu thangalude kuravukal?*

‘We intend to appoint you as the security here. By the way, what are your shortcomings?’

Person: *Athu sir, ethramathram prasakthamanem ariyilla. Pakshe enikku oru kuravundu. Njan there kurache urangaruloo. Enikku urakkam varaila.*

‘I don’t know how relevant it’s. But sir, I’ve a shortcoming. I don’t feel sleepy and I sleep very little’

### **(Malayalam)**

(1) is a typical within-family social situation and its conventions associated with and linked up with speech functions and norms as are found in that situation. (2) involves the dimensional frame of a particular variety (the standard), the particular accent of that variety, repertoire of the speakers involved, auto drivers’ relationship based spoken register, loan word mixing, code mixing, semi-informal style and finally the dimensional frame in (3) is of a social situation involving an interview. Interesting to note is that speaker A in (2) in the first turn uses a greater degree of mixture by using loan word mixing with “petrolinte”, but reduces it in the next turn; whereas speaker B does the same with “auto”. In similar terms, in (3) we see that the interviewer in the first turn uses a greater degree of



mixture by using code mixing with “AD & KD company”, but reduces it in other turns; the person (the interviewee) increases the degree in the first turn through loan word mixing with “*companyil*”, but lowers the degree in the rest.

We can now turn to the Bengali data below.

(1)

Mother: *Tubai, soon, parchhis tui, thalata niye ja to.*

‘Tubai, are you reading? Listen, come here and take the dish from here’

Son: *Han, han. Parchhi. Darao, aschhi.*

‘Yes, I’m reading. Wait, I’m coming’

Mother: *Taratari ai.*

‘Come soon’

Son: *O, chitkar koro na to.*

‘Oh, don’t shout’

Mother: *Tui khub beyadop hoye gechhis.*

‘You’ve been very arrogant’

Son: *Balo.*

‘Say, what should I do?’

Mother: *Niye ja aita.*

‘Carry it over there’

Son: *Achhchha.*

‘Ok’

(2)

A: *Ki holo ki karchhis?*

‘What has happened? What are you doing?’

B: *Are sei chengra amar cycle niye chole gechhe.*

‘That chap has taken my cycle’

A: *Kano?*

‘Why?’

B: *Bololo je ak chakkor mere aschhe.*

‘He said he would take a round and come back’

A: *Oke cycle dis na, akebare baje chengra ache, dekhga machh kachhchhe.*

‘That guy is very bad; don’t ever give him cycle for driving, see somewhere playing some game’

B: *Tai naki. Aar di, matha kharap.*

'Oh, it is so! Am I mad? I'll never give him my cycle for driving'

(3)

X: *Are kaku kothai jachhchen?*

'Uncle, where are you going?'

Y: *Ektu bजारer dike jachchhi.*

'I'm going to the market'

X: *Bhalo achhen?*

'How are you?'

Y: *Chole jachchhe. Tomar parasuno kamon cholchhe?*

'Going on well. How are your studies going on?'

X: *Bhaloi.*

'well'

Y: *Achchha pare dekha habe, barite akbar eso.*

'Well, I'm going, see you later. Come to our house if you can'  
(Bengali)

(1) characterizes the dimensional frame of a within-family situation and its conventions keyed to the speech norms and practices as relevant to the context. In (2) there is another dimensional frame of an outdoor social situation with common people present and its social conventions linked up to speech conventions and norms applied to that context. And the dimensional frame in (3) consists of an outdoor social situation where an elderly person and a young person very familiar with each other meet one another. What is interestingly clear in (2) is that the speaker B employs a greater degree of mixture in the first turn by using loan word mixing with "cycle", but reduces the degree in other turns. Speaker A uses a greater degree of mixture in the third turn by using in addition loan word mixing and argot with "cycle" and "*machh kachhchhe*", which is possible only in an informal style (a part of register) and in the colloquial code within the diglossic set of codes (in Chalit Bengali this means a specific meaning for a particular youngsters' group-playing some kind of nasty game or making love). Thus the naturally formed coupling of diglossia, the accent of the code in the variety in question and the spoken register with the repertoire of the speakers (here the standard) are quite perspicuous in the data above. Now the Hindi data below can be looked at.

(1)

Sp1: *Kaise hai aap? Sab thik hai na?*

'How are you? Is everything ok?'

Sp2: *Han, sab thik thak chal raha he.*

'Yes, everything is going on well'

Sp1: *Abhi me upar jana chahata hoon.*

'Now, I want to go upstairs'

Sp2: *Upar jana mana hai. Upar mat jao.*

'Today there is prohibition on going upstairs'

Sp1: *Kyon?*

'Why?'

Sp2: *Are kiya bataoon, ye larke larke upar ja kar kiya sab kam karte hai.*

'What is to be said? These boys and girls go upstairs and do this and that'

SP1: *Suicide karte hai kiya?*

'Do they commit suicide?'

Sp2: *Upar ja ke bo log bahot kharap kam karte hai, bo to mei abhi bol nahin sakta.*

'Going upstairs they do other bad things that I can't now totally mention'

Sp1: *O, to ye bat hai. Thik hai. Thik hai.*

'Oh, so this is the case. Ok, ok'

(2)

A: *Achchha is box ka kitna dam hai?*

'How much for this box?'

B: *Tinso rupaiya.*

'Three hundred rupees'

A: *Aap to bahot dam bol rehe hai.*

'The price you mentioned is very high'

B: *Aisa chis aapko kahi nahin milega.*

'You'll not get such a thing of such a quality'

A: *Aur bo chis ka dam kiya hai?*

'What is the price of that thing?'

B: *Kansa chis?*

'Which one?'

A: *Are boh.*

'Oh, that one'

B: *O, ye, ye to cartridge hai.*

'Oh, that one, that is cartridge'

A: *Haan haan, bohi.*

'Yes, yes, that one'

B: *Iska dam ekso assi rupiya hai.*

'Its price is one hundred eighty rupees'

A: *Acchha thik hai, mein badme aonga.*

'Ok, I'll come later'

(3)

S: *Aap kahake rehenebale hai?*

'Where are you from?'

T: *Mein UP ka hoon.*

'I'm from UP'

S: *Aap ihaan kitne din se hai?*

'How many years have you been here for?'

T: *Panra sal se.*

'For fifteen years'

S: *Phir to aap ihaan ke experinced aadmi hai.*

'Then, you're a very experienced man here'

T: *Haan.*

'Yeah'

S: *Ihaan niyam kaisa hai?*

'How are the rules and regulations here?'

T: *Bahot sakt hai.*

'Very strict'

S: *Thik hai, kisi chis ki jankari chahiye to mein aap se badme punchh  
linga. Dhanyabad.*

'Ok, then, if I need any information, I'll ask you later'

T: *Thik hai.*

'Ok'

(Hindi)

In (1) we have a dimensional frame of an outdoor social situation with a guard and a student in an institution and its norms tied to the speech conventions and norms appropriate to the context. (2) involves a dimensional frame of an outdoor social situation involving a customer and a seller and in (3) the dimensional frame has to do with an outdoor social situation involving an elderly person and a young person not so familiar with one another, who meet one another. In (1) the speaker 1 increases the

degree of mixture in the fourth turn by using code mixing with “suicide” in addition. Speaker 2 maintains the same level of mixture. In (2) the speaker A uses a greater degree by employing loan word mixing with “box” in the first turn than in other turns; while B increases the degree in the fourth turn by using code mixing with “cartridge”, lessens the degree in other turns. Similar patterns follow in (3) in the use of code mixing with “experienced” by the speaker S with the speaker T maintaining the same degree all along the whole conversation.

Here can be seen an organically constituted *mélange* of a particular variety of Hindi (Hyderabadi Hindi), the accent of the variety, the repertoire and the spoken register of the speakers which mediate the code mixing.

### **Discussion**

Here speech samples have been taken and analyzed against the background of several settings, such as family settings, settings in educational institution, outdoor settings, etc. This does not necessarily imply that conversational interactions are peculiarly or uniquely specific to those situations or settings, many of those conversational interactions may well be generic or general and easily found in other circumstances or mundane conversations as well. They are not bound to those specific situations (Drew, 2003). Above all, context is itself a fluid and flexible entity made up and molded by participants, social practices, situation of speech interaction etc. (Glenn 2003). So, there is no assumption taken here that those settings must have particular speech behaviors, rather the assumption is that those sorts of speech practices are the norms in those specific settings or situations. Everything is in the process of fluidity and change in speech-society interaction. Nothing is rigid. Settings of language use are not independent of speech functions- both define and implement one another. That is why the *dimensional frames* or Agha's *enacted representations* in the above speech samples show such patterns of variability and liquidity. However, the speech samples clearly show that in real time speech varied sociolinguistic phenomena exist in different degrees of integration. This has also something to do with the multiple points of functions of language, since most of language functions are not equally, but differentially found in the languages of the world- they are points on a continuum, which represents different types and typologies of

---



languages (Fasold, 1984). This is mostly due to considerable flexibility of speech functions and norms and, of course, of dimensional frames. Now a question may arise: how large can the continuum be? Or how does it expand and contract differentially? It perhaps depends on what has been termed *fine internal layering* by Nicolai (2005). According to him, *fine internal layering* refers to the capability of any restructuring and reworking in a range of layers formed by the lattice of lects, languages, mores, practices, norms, standards, forms etc. which together characterize linguistic exchanges. Such a *fine layering* enforces that layers of sociolinguistic constructs like registers, dialects, sociolects, argot, code-switching etc. undulate, split up, merge up in *continuous stratification* (Nicolai, 2005) in a hyper-dimensional collective space where all interact with each other at varying temporal scales. Those functions cluster up in a wide range of mixtures in response to symbiotic interaction with socio-cultural norms, conventions, practices, behaviors etc. And those patterns of clusters in speech practices show up as multiple points of gradation in the integration of sociolinguistic phenomena like register, accent, style, sociolect, dialect etc.

### **On the Origin of the Continuum of Mixture of Sociolinguistic Phenomena from Dimensional Frames**

One may now speculate why there will appear a cline or continuum of a mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena at all. Is there any naturally plausible answer? The answer is –yes. But the reasons should be made clear. Against the setting of dimensional frames, the existence of sociolinguistic phenomena can be set up. Sociolinguistic phenomena have their existence not beyond human society or more sharply beyond these dimensional frames. These phenomena can only be seen clearly against the background of dimensional frames. Thus phenomena or/and constructs like dialect, variety, register, repertoire, code switching, code mixing, diglossia are in reality an organic part of every human utterance, however long or short; one cannot take out or single out one phenomenon and say it is a particular phenomenon occurring in an utterance separately without taking into consideration its relation to other phenomena or constructs. But their mixed existence varies from society to society, from place to place, from person to person, and even intrapersonally from one situation to

another. So, we can talk about degrees of mixture of those sociolinguistic phenomena or/and constructs. Dimensional frames themselves modulate, control the proper channeling of those phenomena in real speech. They set forth the limits within which the phenomena have to operate and progress in relation and connection to one another. It also filters out unnecessary interactive mixtures of those phenomena, at the same time it reinforces other mixtures as far as they are in synchrony with the dimensional frame in the proper situation. That is why we find emerging a continuum of combined existence of several sociolinguistic phenomena. So what matters is the degree of mixture, not the patterning or ordering. The continuum can be fleshed out this way- the continuum represents on one side the most mixed scale and on the other the least mixed. Here the continuum represents different degrees (d) of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena, which can be conceptualized as  $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, \dots, d_n$ .

Put into a time frame, these degrees of mixture change with the smallest fraction of time, but this does not necessarily mean that the degrees of mixture of those sociolinguistic phenomena will be the same all over one day or degrees of mixture will vanish one day and there will be only one type of mixture. These two possibilities are unlikely- as long as each individual is different from another; asymmetries remain among societies regions in terms of education, development, sex, manner, class structure, natural and geographical distribution, culture, religion, economy as a whole etc., there must not appear the same type of mixture or same degrees of mixture everywhere. The continuum of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena (or/and constructs) can be represented the following way

$$C=f_x (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, \dots, d_n)$$

when  $C$ = continuum,  $f_x$ = a new function and  $(d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, \dots, d_n)$  - degrees of mixture.

But these degrees of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena always remain against the background of or in relation to dimensional frames, so the mathematical representation should look like

$$C = f_x (d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, \dots, d_n, D, t).$$

when  $D$ - dimensional frames,  $t$ - specific time frame.

This means that only in the existence of dimensional frame(s) different degrees of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena can be found.

### Conclusion

From the above discussion it becomes evident that persons involved in speaking, remaining in a particular dimensional frames constantly change the degree of mixture of sociolinguistic phenomena in all types of conversation- this is a micro-level state of the elements of the continuum. The macro-level state, on the other hand, shows that in any conversation as a whole the degree keeps changing with several constraints thrown open by the dimensional frames with the language specific situation operating on that. But the main argument of this paper has been evidenced from several types of conversations from different languages. It is not surprising that more often persons use same pattern of degree- that is mainly because of the fact that several sociolinguistic phenomena/constructs must exist in any language in the world, for instance, variety, register, repertoire and accent. But variations in mixture remain with other phenomena taking their parts off and on. This is again related to another intrinsic nature of human communication that communication in society as a whole is a much broader task not to be captured only by simple variables either linguistic or social, since language is both a cognitive and a social task and in addition, language use has many layers of activity, for instance, time, place of conversation, medium of conversation, participants, activities during conversations etc. (Clark 1996). Not only that, language is also multi-channeled and multi-variable entity with the capability of vast modifications easily detected by the users of language (Giles & Clair 1979). The whole discussion has some relation to Decampian type of "implicational analysis", where there is a continuum on which different combinations of features exist for different types of varieties. The main difference is that here the continuum incorporates more sociolinguistic parameters on a broader scale at the same time being within a delimited framework. This lines up with the main idea of heterogeneity of speech

behavior in sociolinguistics. Labov talks about “ordered” heterogeneity of speech behavior in sociolinguistics (Labov, 1994), here this hypothesis also tries to capture that fact through the exposition of a continuum that exists in both apparent time and real time with its own ordered variation and heterogeneity, in that the different degrees of mixture of diverse sociolinguistic phenomena are not just random or chaotic, they are functions of sociolinguistic parameters.

This study has some limitations, as the whole argument is here presented in the form of a generalized hypothesis, but the speech samples taken and collected are not that comprehensive- here the study does not cover a lot of languages of the world, but only several languages, most of which are from a multilingual country like India. But it is, of course, true that the canonical situation of linguistic communication is multilingualism (Nicolai 2005). If this fact provides any explanatory value to any sociolinguistic analysis, this hypothesis will be able to account for linguistic communication in general given that differentiation always emerges out of the fabric of apparent linguistic uniformity. This relates to another problem. There are some common problems in sociolinguistic research in particular and in social sciences in general. The fact that some social variables have no concrete values other than their abstract conceptualization sometimes creates problems for an adequate sociolinguistic analysis that attempts to bridge the gap between those abstract variables and concrete manifestation of other variables. Social norms and conventions are certainly abstractions, but they have manifestations in concrete situations, which have their values attached to language in general. That linguistic parameters have concrete values at the production level has something to do with the manifestation of those sociocultural abstractions left open by socio-structural socialization processes. Attitudes, age, sex, role, status, income, membership, group relationship, rank, education etc. are social categories important in sociolinguistic analysis which are never permanent frozen variables, rather they are both relative and subject to change given several situational, intra-social and inter-social constraints (Dittmar, 1976). Variations from individual to individual are so great that even intra-community and inter-community variations make hard-and-fast generalizations impossible.

---

Milroy's network analysis, for example, has also exceptions, as Gunnstein Akselberg shows, as has been found in a village in Norway, where the network strength does not provide for an adequate analysis of speech variations of that place (Verma, 1998). What is constant today changes tomorrow. That is why sociolinguistic analysis should be fitted into a broader systematic framework that allows for divergence, inconsistency or at least predictability of that sort.

### Notes

1. Here the term 'emergent' is used as it is generally understood in the natural sciences; it may also be taken in the sense applied by Sealey and Carter (2004), where they have raised the issue of emergence in the case of language, and they have argued that language is a culturally emergent phenomenon coming out of the interaction between human activities and the natural world.
2. It may be asked why such a new term has to be added to the battery of terminology already existing in the literature. There is no specific reason for inventing such a term; this term shall be used just for an analytical purpose beyond which it has perhaps no other theoretical use.

### References

- Agha, Asif. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Block, Philip K. 1968. Social Structure and Linguistic Structure. In Joshua Fishman, A. (ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Chambers, J. K. 2003. *Sociolinguistic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, N. 1997. *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*. New York: St Martins Press Inc.
- De Fina, Anna. 2007. Code Switching and the Construction of Ethnic Identity in a Community of Practice. *Language in Society* 36. Pp. 371-392.
- Dittmar, N. 1976. *Sociolinguistics*. London: Edward Arnold.



- Drew, Paul. 2003. Comparative Analysis of Talk-in-interaction, In Philip Glenn J., Baron ,Curtis Le & Mandelbaum, Jenny (eds.). *Different Institutional Settings:A Sketch*.New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. 1972. On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence. In John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Friedrich, P. 1979. *Language, Context and the Imagination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gal, S.1998. Cultural Bases of Language Use Among German Speakers in Hungary. In Trudgill, Peter and Cheshire,Jenny. (eds.) *The Sociolinguistics Reader. Multilingualism and Variation*, Vol. 1. London: Arnold.
- Giles, H and Clair, R. 1979. *Language and Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, R. A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Innes, Pamela. 2006. The Interplay of Genres, Gender and Language Ideology among the Muskogee. *Language in Society* 35.Pp. 231-259.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change: Internal Factors*, Vol 1. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laponce, J. A. 1987. *Languages and their Territories*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Nicolaï, R. 2005. Language Theory and Description of Language Change. In Frajzynger, Zygmunt, Hodges, Adam and Rood, David S. (eds.). *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pfaff, Carol. 1999. Changing Patterns of Language Mixing in a Bilingual Child. In Extra, G. and Verhoeven, L. (eds.). *Studies on Language Acquisition: Bilingualism and Migration*, Vol. 14. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Poplack, S. 1993. Variation Theory and Language Contact. In Preston, D. (ed.). *American Dialect Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
-

Pride, J. B., and Holmes, J. 1972. *Sociolinguistics*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Sealey, A. and Carter, B. 2004. *Applied Linguistics as Social Science*. London: Continuum.

Stockwell, P. 2002. *Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. 1998. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. In Trudgill, Peter and Jenny. Cheshire. (eds.). *The Sociolinguistics Reader, Gender and Discourse*. Vol. 2. Arnold: London.

Verma, M. K. 1998. *Sociolinguistics: Language and Society*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Wardhaugh, R. 1993. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

