CODE-SWITCHING IN SPOKEN INDIAN ENGLISH: A CASE STUDY OF SOCIOPOLITICAL TALK

Suneeta Thomas
Missouri State University
sthomasacademic@gmail.com

In India, the prevalence of (Indian) English and code-switching between languages is not new. However, there has been a dearth of research that explores code-switching in Indian English (IE) within the genre of sociopolitical talk in Indian English tv talk shows. The current study is a part of a larger longitudinal study that analyzes code-switching patterns across the previous decade in Indian English tv talk shows and is the first in the series of follow-up studies. This study qualitatively examines an episode of an Indian English tv talk show to determine code-switching (CS) patterns and functions in IE. The study employed linguistic analysis, Meyerhoff's (2007) accommodation theory, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jeferrson's (1974) conversation analysis methodology, and a world Englishes framework to discover the forms, functions, and motivations of CS in an English matrix context. Findings confirm Si's (2010) results that speakers preferred higher number of English alternations and insertions than Hindi code-switches, while Hindi-only turns were relatively few. Functions of analyzed code-switches also indicated intentions to reformulate, repeat, quote, connect with or diverge from other interlocutors, and generate emphasis in discourse. The study concludes with implications for Indian English and avenues for future research.

Keywords: Indian English, Hinglish, TV talk show, world Englishes, Conversation Analysis

ПРОМЕНАТА НА КОДОВИТЕ ВО ГОВОРНАТА ВАРИЈАНТА НА АНГЛИСКИОТ ЈАЗИК ВО ИНДИЈА: СТУДИЈА НА СЛУЧАЈ ВО СОЦИОПОЛИТИЧКИ ГОВОР

Сунита Томас
Државен универзитет во Мисури
sthomasacademic@gmail.com

Во Индија присуството на индиската варијанта на англискиот јазик и промената на јазични кодови не е нов феномен. Сепак, има малку истражувања што го испитуваат овој феномен во жанрот социополитички говор, во телевизиските емисии (ток-шоу), во кои се користи индиска варијаната на англискиот јазик. Ова истражување е дел од долгогодишна студија што ги анализира шемите на промена на кодовите во вакви емисии снимени во последната декада и е првото истражување во низата истражувања. Преку квалитативна анализа на ток-шоу на индиски англиски, ќе се обидам да ги одредам шемите на промена на кодовите и нивните функции. Истражувањето вклучува лингвистичка анализа, поточно, се користи теоријата на приспособување на Мајерхоф (Meyerhoff, 2007), конверзациската анализа на Сакс, Шеглоф и Џеферсон (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jeferrson, 1974) и рамката на светски варијанти на англискиот јазик, со цел да ги открие формите, функциите и мотивацијата за промената на кодови во англиски контекст. Резултатите ги потврдуваат сознанијата на Си (Si, 2010) дека говорителите повеќе преферираат промена на англиски варијанти и вметнувања отколку промени во хинду и промените само на хинду се многу ретки. Функциите на анализираните промени на кодови исто така укажуваат на намери да се реформулира, да се повтори, да се цитира, да се поврзе или да се оддалечи говорникот од соговорниците и да се создаде нагласување во дискурсот. Заклучокот ги презентира импликациите за индиската варијанта на англискиот јазик и овозможува идни истражувања.

Клучни зборови: индиска варијанта на англискиот јазик, Хинглиш, светски варијанти на англискиот јазик, конверзациска анализа

1 Introduction

Code-switching boasts of being a multi-disciplinary field of theory and research in areas ranging from language, and communication to psychology, world Englishes, and linguistics. In the case of multilingual India, code-switching is an everyday practice among speakers who share or know more than one code or language (Verma 1976: 156). Indian English which is largely a lingua franca in the region among speakers with zero shared languages has also shown code-switching characteristics (Gargesh and Sharma 2019). Unfortunately, except for Gargesh and Sharma (2019), in-depth descriptions of code-switching patterns in *spoken* Indian English are sorely lacking in research. Some studies on code-switching in the Indian context have described characteristics of this variety in the creative, literary, and written genre (Kachru 1983: 42, 73, 85; 1986: 159; Sridhar 1978), while others have largely focused on speakers who code-switch and code-mix *to English*, the borrowed code, within their first or other regional language (Kachru 1983g, 1986d; Sridhar 1978; Verma 1976). However, what about the converse scenario in an authentic spoken discourse? In what authentic spoken contexts do Indian speakers of *English* code-switch to an Indian language or dialect? What are the forms, motivations, and functions of these code-switches? Can observations of code-switching *in spoken Indian English* directly correlate with code-switching observations found in Hindi or other regional languages? With the advancement of globalization and technology, plethora sets of data can be found in media that can be used to analyze authentic spoken discourse. Thus, in addition to already established literature, descriptions and sociolinguistic analysis of this converse phenomena would be equally beneficial and significant in mapping language change in India. Specifically, "understanding how these circumstances and users affect the use of English will help…further assist in critically assessing our epistemologies and assumptions about the spread of English," (Thomas 2021: 1) as well as its code-switching mechanisms in multilingual contexts. This study, thus, attempts to fill this gap in research by investigating the phenomena of code-switching and code-mixing in spoken Indian English. It additionally chooses the genre of sociopolitical talk in Indian English tv talk shows as its site of investigation since it readily lends itself to dynamic interaction, and the investigation of Indian media contexts has already been established in code-switching research (Gardner-Chloros and Charles 2007; Gargesh and Sharma 2019; Sailaja 2011; Si 2010; Thomas 2010).

1.1 Indian English and code-switching through a world Englishes lens

1.1.1 What is Indian English?

Before describing the code-switching mechanisms in spoken Indian English, it would be useful to describe what Indian English is and discuss some of its characteristics. Kachru, one of the most prominent and revered scholars of Indian English

and world Englishes, defines Indian English as an "institutionalized second-language variety of English" that has "a long history of acculturation" and "a large range of functions in the local, educational, administrative, and legal systems" which has "developed nativized discourse and style types and functionally determined sublanguages (registers)" (1986a: 19). He compares the phenomenon of Indian English, a sociolinguistic consequence of colonialism, to similar varieties developing in countries such as those found in Nigeria, Kenya, Bangladesh, Philippines, etc. Circumscribed within Kachru's (1985:12) Concentric Circles Model framework, such countries are referred to as Outer Circle countries, whose English varieties are different from those found in countries where English is largely a native language (Inner Circle countries such as the USA, UK, Canada, etc.), and those found in "Expanding Circle" countries that had zero to minimal colonial history with Inner Circle countries (countries such as Russia, Greece, Korea, Nepal, etc.). Additionally, Parasher defines Indian English (IE) as "that variety of English which is learnt and used by a large number of educated Indians as a second language… IE is a cover term to refer to the forms of English used in India. IE, like any other national variety, exists in its sub-varieties – regional, registral, ethnic and proficiency levels" (1991: 48). Kachru (1983) and Kachru (1986) are seminal anthologies of Kachru's several published papers on the history, characteristics, and phenomenon of IE. Kachru (1983c: 68) first provides a historical understanding of English language contact in India, before describing the variety's characteristics. Like Parasher (1991), Kachru (1983c: 69) notes that variation in Indian English use and differences in proficiency levels should be expected in India's multilingual context and regional English varieties such as Gujrati English, Marathi English, Tamil English, etc. have also been researched (ibid., 70). More importantly, Kachru (1983e: 129-130) notes that speakers of IE varieties rank within a *cline of bilingualism*, that has a zero point, a central point, and an ambilingual point. In the Indian context, a language user who ranks around the zero point is a "minimal bilingual" with minimal proficiency in English and is a native speaker of an Indian language, while a person who ranks around the central point uses IE effectively and "has adequate competence in one or more registers of IE (say, for instance, the register of the law courts, administration, science)". In contrast, a standard educated speaker of Indian English would additionally be intelligible to not only other fellow IE speakers, but also educated native speakers of English. However, they may not be ambilingual, as this is considered "a rare, if not impossible, phenomenon" (ibid., 129). Kachru, thus conceptualizes the cline of bilingualism as that which marks monolingualism at one end of the spectrum, and ambilingualism at the other end of the spectrum, with varying levels of bilingualism in between. Kachru regards Indian creative writers of English as ranking close to the ambilingual point on this cline. While describing all features of standard Indian English is beyond the scope of this paper, I briefly summarize some of its key features identified in literature, including the phenomenon of code-switching and code-mixing, which is relevant to this study.

The different educated varieties of Indian English possess shared characteristics in their phonology, morphology, lexis, syntax, and semantics (Kachru 1983c: 74). For instance, in phonology, since Indian languages are syllable-timed and English is a stressed-timed language, such a difference leads to prosodic transfer in IE that

is not found in native varieties of English (ibid., 76). Another conspicuous difference found in Hindi and Urdu speakers of IE are substitutions of initial consonant clusters such as *st-, sk-, sp-* in *station*, *school*, and *speech* with *ist-, isk-, isp-* to generate pronunciations such as *is-station*, *is-school*, and *is-speech*. This is because such consonant clusters are not found at the beginning of a word in Hindi or Urdu. Morphologically, several productive and hybrid processes in IE have been identified that contain Hindi or English morphemes attached to a root Hindi or English morpheme. Example words that show Hindi inflectional or derivational morphemes with an English root are those that represent plurals, gender-markers, and nominalization of nouns into abstract nouns such as the following (Kachru 1983g: 199): agency—*ejensi+ya* (agencies), company—*kampani+ya* (companies), tie—*tai+ya* (ties), car—*kar+e* (cars); master—*master+in* (f.), inspector—*inspektr+in* (f.); doctor—*daktar+i* (the job of a doctor), governor—*gavarnar+i* (the job of a governor). Some instances of words in IE that contain English derivative suffixes with a Hindi root morpheme are, *sadhu*+hood, *Upanishad*+ic, *coolie*+dom, etc. (Kachru 1983f: 159). Such morphological processes allow for lexical innovations in IE. Additionally, in terms of lexis, compounding processes where either the head noun or the modifier is in English or Hindi or another South Asian language have also been identified (Kachru 1983d: 112; Kachru 1983f: 157-158): *bidi-smoking, rail-gadi* (vehicle), *school bhavan* (building), *bazaar* (market) *musician, coconut payasam* (dessert) etc. Finally, syntactically and semantically, Kachru (1983b: 78-79) has also identified reduplication as a popular characteristic of IE: *he sells different different things, I have some small small things, give them one one piece.* Other formal features of IE are further described in detail in the above cited works. While these formal characteristics only describe a few significant aspects of Indian English, the multilingual context of India prevents the disassociation of the phenomena of code-switching and code-mixing from Indian English and requires further attention. These processes are discussed below.

1.1.2 Code-switching and code-mixing: Integral components of the world Englishes' framework

In world Englishes, the sociolinguistic realities of bidialectism, multidialectism, bilingualism, and multilingualism or plurilingualism in contexts that use multiple varieties of English, often amidst other languages, is inevitably always brought to the fore. Kachru (1986b: 57) expounds at length of how English functions as a part of the bilingual's (or a multilingual/plurilingual's) "code repertoire". He argues that a bilingual or a multilingual has multiple 'codes' or languages and linguistic systems, including their vernacular or first language, within their 'code repertoire' (ibid., 58). Depending on the context, such a user may alter or switch between codes, or even code-mix for communicative purposes. Both code-switching and code-mixing mechanisms, he theorizes, are "two types of code alterations" employed by a bilingual/multilingual (ibid., 62). Kachru further contends that the competence of switching between codes is considered as "a mark of an educated or cultivated speaker of a language" (ibid., 64). Thus, if code-switching and code-mixing in a multilingual or bidialectal context is inevitable, it would be helpful to identify how

these mechanisms are different or overlap with one another. Kachru provides examples to distinguish between the two terms. When it comes to code-switching, Kachru cites an example of a telephone conversation where the speaker addresses his phone-interlocutor in one code (English), but code-switches to Kashmiri when addressing his wife in the room. He then code-switches back to English as a sign of return to the telephone conversation, and later on code-switches to Hindustani when chiding his children in the room, before eventually switching back to English on the telephone. Thus, Kachru conceptualizes that in code-switching, it is not necessary that the hearer be multilingual or bidialectal for productive communication to take place (ibid., 65). That is, multiple and separate conversations can occur at the same time where the speakers employ separate codes that are intelligible to their hearers. Code-mixing, in contrast, can be linguistically more complex as it "entails transfer of the units of code *a* into code *b* at intersentential and intrasentential levels" resulting in a code-mixed variety. Specifically, Kachru argues that the user functions in a "disystem" where "the resultant code has formal cohesion and functional expectancy with reference to a context" (ibid., 64). Unlike a code-switching (CS) context where interlocutors may not share all the same codes, the hearer in code-mixing (CM) contexts share the codes used by the speaker (ibid., 65). Kachru theorizes that this process includes the assimilation of an 'absorbed code' (or an embedded language), into an 'absorbing code' (or the matrix language (Si 2010)) that generates a formally cohesive code (ibid., 64). The units transferred may be morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, or full sentences, along with idioms or cliches. He cites the following example as an instance of code-mixing:

(1)   *tum nahi janti, he is chariman Mr. Mehta's best friend yahan do char din*
        ko hi aaye hai. maine socha, I should not miss the opportunity.
        'You don't know, he is the chairman. Mr. Methta's, best friend is here only
        for a few days. So, I thought I shouldn't miss the opportunity' (adapted
        from Kachru 1983g: 195).

However, this does not mean that the two terms do not overlap, they certainly do. Vaid has observed that traditional bilingualism has tended to focus on "the ability of bilinguals to keep their languages separate in the encoding or decoding process" (1980: 37). But with the advent of CM and CS she realizes that the two languages in a bilingual's repertoire need not be mutually exclusive of each other. Consider the following example which might appear to be code-mixing (at the intersentential level), but Kachru (1983g: 194) identifies it as an instance of code-switching. Here, a speaker code-switches from Hindi to Awadhi in the same utterance, and the function of the switch is to represent disapproval, as well as in-group membership with the hearer:

(2)   *mai sab samajhta hu. tum bhi khanna ki tarah bahas karne lage ho. Mai*
        satve aur nave ka pharak samajhta hu. [Switch to Awadhi] hamka ab
        prinspali kare na sikhav bhaiya. Jonu hukum hai, tonu chuppe kari aut
        karom samjhyo nahi.

> *'I understand everything. You also have started arguing like Khanna. I understand the difference between seven and nine. [Switch to Awadhi] Don't teach me, dear, how to be a principal. Whatever is the order, you should carry it out quietly. Do you understand or not?'* (adapted from Kachru 1983g: 194)

The overlap in the concepts of code-switching and code-mixing is evident in (2): Even though the speaker code-switches, it is understood that the hearer in this instance shares and understands the same codes as the speaker (which Kachru has described as a characteristic of code-mixing). However, a good way to distinguish between the two is that in code-switching, the grammar and structure of the new/second code is not altered to fit in with the previous/first code. In contrast, code-mixing entails the embedding of smaller lexical units of one code into the structure and grammatical system of the larger code. Kachru (1983g: 194) postulates that code-switching can be used to indicate or express disapproval, in-group membership, extreme anger, asides, as well as solidarity.

Code-switching studies in the field of pragmatics have also made similar observations. Paraskeva (2010) observes that there have been two main trends in published literature: The structural which focuses on the grammaticality of CS at the syntax level (Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton 1993), and the pragmatic that studies the social/interactive and pragmatic nature of CS (Gumperz 1982: 108). Gumperz's (1982) research in this regard has been significant since he introduces the idea of CS as being interactional, and possessing social motivations. Furthermore, Aeur (1995) suggests that CS can perform several verbal functions like, "change of topic, emphatic repetitions, indirect speech rendition and change of addressee… which can replace other communicative strategies used by monolingual speakers, such as prosodic features." (as cited in Paraskeva 2010: 109).

1.1.3 Code-switching and code-mixing in Indian English: The Hinglish phenomenon

The understanding of code-switching and code-mixing, particularly in Indian English, would be remiss without the understanding of Hinglish, an ongoing and developing linguistic phenomenon in India, and of significant relevance to this study. Hinglish, which is a code-mixed variety, has been defined in literature as a mixed language containing elements from both Hindi and English, akin to Spanglish (Spanish + English) and Franglais (French + English) (D'Souza 2001: 7). Exact numerical data on the users and uses of Hinglish and how widespread it is particularly in North India where Hindi is a common regional language is not readily available, although some studies analyze this phenomenon (D'Souza 2001; Orsini 2015). Yet, since Hindi is one of the most prominent, official languages of India, the phenomenon of Hinglish, as a consequence of linguistic contact between English and Hindi, has been found to be widespread and merits attention. Orsini (2015), for instance, observes uses and users of Hinglish in journalism, politics, at the workplace, in education and college life, and in films and television. It has been argued that the development of code-mixed varieties such as Hinglish is an example of nativization

of English in the Indian context (Kachru 1986c: 121). Specifically, it is a consequence of the 'Englishization of Hindi' which equips "the Hindi language with the functional range of English, which, consequently, might lead toward an "upward" move of Hindi in the hierarchy of linguistic roles. This would mean that the range of the functional uses of Hindi would be extended…[and] lead to the eventual replacement of English by Hindi in the roles which the former has occupied" (Kachru 1986d: 149). Kachru's prediction might need to be empirically assessed, but recent research has shown that speakers may be more proficient in Hinglish alone rather than being simultaneously proficient in Hindi or English (Orsini 2015: 209). In his earlier publication, Kachru (1983g: 195) provides examples of relevant sociolinguistic indicators of code-mixed varieties that is evident in Hinglish, namely: (a) a marker of *westernization* and (b) *register-specific mixing* or *Englishization* (or Persianization, or Sanskritization):

(3)   *bhej do. Another fifteen minutes and I am off to the station. lautne tak kaafi raat ho sakti hai. khaane ke liye weit mat karna.*
        'send it. In another fifteen minutes, I will be off to the station. I might be very late getting home. Don't wait for me to have dinner.'
(4)   *kisi ne driver ka driving license cheena, kisi ne registration card, koi back-view mirror khat khatane laga, koi truck ka horn bajane laga....*
        'somebody stole some driver's driving license, somebody (stole somebody's) registration card, somebody began to tap on the back-view mirror, somebody began to honk their truck's horn…' (adapted from Kachru 1983g: 195).

Examples (1) and (3) are similar in their code-switching and code-mixing patterns. According to Kachru, they are representative of socially accepted markers of westernization where one's social class, and education is evident. In contrast, example (4) portrays 'Englishization of Hindi' or register-specific mixing where lexical items from English have been inserted into a Hindi code. Kachru notes that such lexicalization is common and to be expected in administrative, political, and technological registers (1983g: 197). Of significance, is that in examples (1) – (4) and published literature, the Hinglish variety is understood as that which employs a Hindi matrix language/grammatical system (or the 'absorbing code') and incorporates various English language items (as the 'absorbed code') ranging from lexicon to phrases, clauses, and sentences. This is a current phenomenon evident in various Hindi language movies, Hindi TV, and reality shows. D'Souza (2001: 9) calls this variety as 'Hinglish A'. However, due to the wide use of Indian English in various domains in India, a converse code-switching and code-mixing phenomena have also developed where Indian English is the matrix language, and it embeds various Hindi language items ranging from lexicon to phrases and clauses. While scholars have identified this variation as Hinglish too, D'Souza (2001: 9) termed this variation as 'Hinglish B'. We believe this distinction is necessary as code-mixing processes may disclose language-specific patterns based on the matrix language.

More importantly, as this study will show, in a bilingual and multilingual context, the phenomenon of code-switching allows for multiple and embedded layers

of code-mixing resulting in users of Indian English not only code-switching and code-mixing with Hindi, but also with 'Hinglish A'. Research on this embedded code-mixing and code-switching phenomena in the larger spoken Indian English variety is lacking. While some discussions of IE have largely been based on written, creative, literary works of Indian authors in English (Kachru 1983: 42, 73, 85; 1986: 159; Sridhar 1978), with regard to spoken discourse, Kachru (1986b: 79) too has observed that "we still have far to go to understand the pragmatics of non-varieties of English". He further added, "there is a great need of sociolinguistic research on the roles of Hinglish and bazar Hindustani in modern India" (Kachru 1986d: 154). This study, thus, takes up such an endeavor by analyzing the spoken discourse of Indian English within the context of sociopolitical talk in Indian English tv talk shows aired in India. The motivations for this are explained in the following two sections.

1.2 TV talk shows as a rich site of code-switching phenomena

In India, the prevalence of English and code-switching between Indian languages and English is not new, and has been well-documented (Kachru 1978, 1983, 1986; Parasher 1991; Srivastava and Sharma 1991). Studies on code-switching among Indian speakers have been observed in Hindi movies/Bollywood (Sailaja 2011; Si 2010; Thomas 2010), among Hindi-English bilinguals (Klingler 2017), and among Kannada-English and Malayalam-English bilinguals (Hegde et. al 2011), among several others. One resource in observing rich code-switching phenomena would be electronic media such as films (Si 2010) or TV talk shows that contain high instances of authentic code-switching sequences that are representative of conversational norms in current day Indian societies. As a product of the twentieth century broadcasting (Timberg and Erler 2010), the tv talk show is a genre that discusses at length various informational, political, or entertainment-oriented topics (Oyeleye and Olutayo 2012), which are decided by the talk show hosts or their broadcasting company. Depending on the orientation of the show, tv talk shows invite a panel of experts, one or multiple celebrities, or other types of guests for a conversation, debate, or confessional/therapeutic interactions. While various classifications of tv talk shows have been offered, this study follows Uddin and Sharmin's (2019) broader classification of tv talk shows as primarily host-guest or public affair shows. Host-guest shows are those where a guest(s) is invited for an interview or conversation. In contrast, public affair shows depict at length current socioeconomic, political, and everyday issues at the societal level, thus, reiterating their currency and consumption by local and national audiences, alike.

The tv talk show genre in India, has been a staple of entertainment consumption for at least five decades (Gardner-Chloros and Charles 2007). As a country of 22 official languages, an Indian tv talk show can attract different types of audience based on content and the language they conduct their programs in. In North India, a majority of popular tv talk shows classify under the host-guest format. Such shows have an entertainment/celebrity, or a comedy orientation, and include well-known titles such as *The Kapil Sharma Show, Koffee with Karan, Kaun Banega Crorepati, Son of Abish, Aap ki Adalat,* etc. Public affair talk shows, in contrast, are fewer in number

and far in between and include titles such as *We the People, Nation Wants to Know*, and *Satyamev Jayete*. As their respective titles suggest, the medium of communication in these tv talk shows is either Hindi or English or the code-mixed variety of Hinglish. Out of the public affair shows, *We the People,* and *Nation Wants to Know* tv talk shows depict social, political and/or heated debates with an invited panel of experts, politicians, journalists, and/or other media representatives, with sometimes a live audience participation. They are primarily conducted in English with some sections depicted in Hindi, or Hinglish use. As a public affair talk show, experts or invited guests are expected to have opinions and argue on topics of national, social, or political interest. The host typically acts as a moderator, a questioner, and engages in various strategies to allow for turn-taking among participants. Depending on the context, and the topic being discussed, the host applies specific strategies to manage the conversation and the debate at hand. While previous studies have discussed different types of interactions in the tv talk show genre, studies on code-switching and turn taking patterns in Indian TV talk shows genres are scarce. Specifically, discussions of code-switching patterns in sociopolitical talk in Indian English tv talk shows have lacked research attention in literature. Sociopolitical talk can be defined as a type of spoken discourse that involves the discussion of topics related to society and social factors such as age, gender, social class, ethnicity, caste, religion, occupation, etc., and politics among a pair or group of participants. As a type of spoken discourse, the parameters of 'sociopolitical talk' in spoken communication naturally follow rules of contextual pragmatics that are different from rhetorical conventions found in creative, literary, and written discourse. Thus, in response to the call for further research in this area (Gardner-Chloros and Charles, 2007; Kachru 1986b; 1986d), this present study, presents a micro, qualitative conversational analysis of an episode of an Indian English TV talk show to disclose the types and functions of code-switching patterns employed in such unique interactions. The current study is a part of a larger longitudinal study that analyzes code-switching patterns across the previous decade in Indian English tv talk shows and is the first in the series of follow-up studies.

1.3 Previous literature on code-switching in Indian media

Previous studies on code-switching in Indian media have been few and adopted varied approaches to analyzing conversational data. The genres of investigation and the matrix language (Myers-Scotton 1993)—the language of larger communication in the context examined—have also differed. For instance, Gardner-Chloros and Charles (2007), conducted a macro-overview and analyzed code-switching in news bulletins, entertainment magazines, drama serials, and situation comedy aired on Zee TV that were predominantly in the Hindi language. Sailaja (2011) conducted a detailed examination of code-switching patterns in the popular 2007-released Hindi movie *Jab We Met*, while Si's (2010) study provided an in-depth analysis of code-switching and turn taking in two movies per the decades of the 80's, 90's, and the 2000's, both of whose data were in Hindi as a matrix language. Thomas (2010), similarly, investigated code-switching patterns in Hindi movies across every decade between the 1950s up until the 2000s. Finally, Gargesh and Sharma's (2019) study broke ground by conducting a macro and micro linguistic analysis of three

political discussions in the genres of debate, interview, and an altercation between a moderator and a guest. While Gargesh and Sharma discuss pertinent linguistic features in 'verbal disputes' depicted on national television, code-switching featured only as one element among several other analyzed features.

This current study, thus, seeks to fill this research gap in Indian media, spoken Indian English, and world Englishes studies by focusing on the phenomenon of code-switching in sociopolitical talk in Indian English tv talk shows, through a combination of linguistic and conversation analysis methodologies. Overall, the motivations for this study are four-fold. One, the type of interaction and genre merits in-depth attention: All previous studies have not focused on the phenomenon of *code-switching* in the *sociopolitical tv talk show genre* in Indian media at length. Two, all previous studies, except for Gargesh and Sharma (2019) have analyzed conversational data in Hindi as a matrix language, while the current study analyzes Hindi and Hinglish code-switching occurrences in Indian English data at length. This has implications for code-switch occurrences based on IE as the matrix language. Furthermore, the study is not an analysis of linguistic features in Indian English per se (such as those expounded in section 1.1.1.), but rather is the analysis of code-switching occurrences that have been found to be an integral characteristic of a variety of Indian English as elaborated in sections 1.1.2. and 1.1.3. Three, while previous studies have attempted macro-overviews, there is an equal need to conduct micro-overviews to record the types of interaction and code-switching patterns in authentic, spoken Indian English media interactions. In line with the Kachruvian paradigm in world Englishes (Kachru 1978b), such an investigation merits attention and provides further evidence in the motivations for codeswitching, and the sociolinguistic intricacies of the Indian English variety presented in the media. Fourthly, unlike previous studies, the current study combines linguistic analysis with a qualitative conversation analysis methodology. Beginning with a micro-analysis of a single episode, the research questions (RQs) that guide this case study are as follows:

1) What are the forms of code-switches?

2) In what ways are code-switches introduced in a televised sociopolitical Indian English discussion?

3) What are the functions of the various forms of code-switching (CS) in the context of a sociopolitical discussion?

2 Theoretical frameworks

Apart from viewing the study through a world Englishes framework (see Section 1.1), this study also employed a combination of Meyerhoff's (2007) accommodation theory, and Sacks, Schegloff's, and Jefferson (1974) conversation analysis methodology to analyze data. Meyerhoff (2007: 72) summarizes accommodation theory as a set of "principles that are intended to characterize the strategies speakers use to establish, contest or maintain relationships through talk". She states that the most crucial characteristic that governs the theory is the process of *attunement*. "The idea is that we all tailor, or attune, our behaviours according to the interaction, and this process of attunement involves a range of communicative behaviours,

like speech styles. Attunement renders the addressee(s) as equally important as the speaker…" (ibid., 72-73). Meyerhoff further explains that attunement can occur in either of two ways: convergence or divergence. Convergence takes place when a speaker feels the need to identify with his/her interlocutor and adjusts the way he/she speaks to heighten the similarities with the other. "It involve[s] approximating norms that the speaker believes (incorrectly) are characteristic of their addressee" (ibid., 73). Whereas divergence can entail emphasizing one's differences while speaking, either, because of a negative attitude towards the other group, and/ or to accentuate one's own cultural identity. Thus, while convergence "facilitate[s] comprehension, divergence in language choice can serve as a shield" (ibid., 74).

In the conversation analysis (CA) approach, Sacks et al. (1974) argue that in conversation, there are a certain set of rules that are followed, that governs "turn construction, providing for the allocation of a next turn to one party, and coordinating transfer so as to minimize gap and overlap" in social interaction (ibid., 704). Psathas (1995) in relation to formal structures in sequences, further adds: "this discovery of structure in interaction sequences proved to be an important finding because it confirmed what had been proposed in ethnomethodology from the outset, namely, that there is order to be found in the most mundane of interactions…" (ibid., 16). The field of CA had thus stemmed from ethnomethodology and the theory of social action whose major pioneers were Talcott Parsons and Harold Garfinkel (Heritage 1984; Wei 2002). Parsons did not believe in the positivistic theory of action, since it implied that the actor's action is conditioned by the environment (Heritage 1984: 12-13). He rather believed that norms of the society are internalized by the actor to such an extent that all actions thus conducted, are at a level, institutionalized and also harmonious and non-coercive (Heritage 1984: 18). Furthermore, "social organization—the persistence of stable patterns of activity—is viewed as the product of the internalization of normative patterns as need-dispositions" (Heritage 1984: 75). Parson, thus, believes that actors behave the way they do because the norm forces them.

On the other hand, Garfinkel who approaches this idea from a Schutzian framework, sees social organization as "a product of coordinated 'accommodative work'" (ibid., 75). Garfinkel believes that "the common norms, rather than regulating conduct in pre-defined scenes of action, *are instead reflexively constitutive of the activities and unfolding circumstances to which they are applied*" (original emphasis, Heritage 1984: 109). Thus, the actors react reflexively to the interaction event. It is how they maintain and follow the normative rules of interaction. Actors 'coordinate' their actions during the interaction to enable communication. For instance, as Heritage quotes examples of greetings, actors respond back to a greeting through reflexivity. By returning the greeting, the actor reinforces or "ratifies" the norm that is to be followed as a consequence. The scene, according to Heritage, of course changes or is "reconstituted," or "is unavoidably transformed". But it is from the same norm that actors can "*sanction departures from its dictates*" too (emphasis added: 106, 107).

Furthermore, Wei explains that the CA approach essentially analyzes recorded data that is transcribed "for evidence of procedures whereby the participants accomplish an interactional task, such as disagreeing or changing a topic" (2002:

162). In terms of methodology, the focus is always on the sequential turns in conversation (Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 5; Sacks, 1984) Conversation analysts do not look for implications behind said utterances such as identity of the speaker, or the environment in which the conversation takes place, or the relationship between the speakers. These external factors are ignored not because they are insignificant, "but simply that it is not assumed" (ibid., 162). And although the CA approach is criticized for this, Wei clarifies that CA requires not to be content with "interaction-external interpretation" but rather what is needed is "a detailed turn-by-turn analysis of the participant's conversational work, which can demonstrate how such issues as attitude, preference and community norms have been "brought about" in the actual contributions of the participants" (ibid., 168).

In applying the CA framework to CS, Paraskeva (2010) observes that this in turn is beneficial in understanding CS better: "the gist of the framework under consideration lies in the priority given to participants and their intrinsic inferential procedures, without analysts having to stipulate classes in which a particular occurrence of CS falls" (ibid., 111). Following Wei (2002), and Paraskeva (2010), this study thus employs a conversation-analysis-focused methodology to interaction data aired in an Indian English tv talk show.

3 The study

As a part of a larger study that looks at CS patterns in Indian English TV talk shows across the previous decade, this paper is the first in the series and reports findings of CS patterns in an episode of the Indian English talk show titled *We the People*. *We The People* is a popular, English language talk show in India hosted on NDTV 24x7, that bagged the Best Talk Show award at the Asian Television Awards ceremony for two years in a row in 2009 (NDTV Correspondent, 2009), and featured among the top 3 "Indian talk shows that hooked the audience" (Charu, 2014). As a highly opinionated show, it serves as a unique platform for the discussion of current affairs and debates on topics of national interest. The show invites knowledgeable experts and popular celebrities in the field and encourages discussion between them and a small, live audience. There is a spontaneity in communication. The responses and reactions of the people in the discussion may or may not be well-thought but it is certainly natural since the heated discussions encourage revealing of personal opinions. The news channel on which the show is aired, NDTV 24x7 is a 24-hour English language television news channel based in New Delhi, India.

The motivations to choose an episode that aired at the end of year 2009 are three-fold. Firstly, the previous study that describes code-switching patterns in Indian media in depth is by Si (2010) who analyzes code-switching patterns in Hindi movies from the years 1982, 1990, 1992, 2001, and 2004. His analysis describes code-switching patterns up until the early 2000s. In order to follow a chronological norm in published literature, it therefore seemed fitting to analyze code-switching trends that was beginning to develop at the end of the 2000s decade and into the 2010s (the chosen episode, aired towards the end of December, 2009). Secondly, the episode chosen was cited as one of the best episodes of *We the People* in 2009 by the news channel (Best of We The People, 2010). Thirdly, most of the 'best' nominated

episodes of the show in that year did not show many instances of code-switching. Since the object of the study was to look at code-switching sequences, this specific episode received preference because comparatively, it showed the highest number of code-switching sequences.

3.1 Background of the episode

While the choice of this episode is based on the factors mentioned above, the topic of discussion in the episode happens to be a sensitive one. In order to show deference, respect, and anonymity to the participants, their names have been substituted with random alphabetic letters. The topic is sensitive in that the episode seeks to find accountability for the suicide death of a teenage girl- B, who committed suicide four years after she was abused by a ranking police official at the age of fourteen. It is believed that she was driven to her death because her family suffered criminal intimidation from various political forces when they tried to seek justice. After nineteen years of struggle, the said officer only received a 6-month imprisonment and a bail of Rs. 1000. The implications of this are tremendous and form the backdrop of the episode. The speakers in the excerpts are mainly experts in their fields who have been called to discuss the issue while an additional three persons are the immediate family members of B. They are as follows: V- a police officer, X- a lawyer, Z- a politician, S- a professor, T- another politician, D- father of B, J- B's best friend, L- J's father and – M the host. The topic of debate is a highly controversial one and emotional for certain members of the panel too.

4 Methods

Since this study specifically analyzes spoken discourse, studies in pragmatics (Klingler 2017; Si 2010), were chosen to guide the methodological process of this research. First, lexical transcription of the entire episode spanning approximately an hour was conducted in two rounds to ensure reliability of transcription. Since the study does not focus on the phonological, or morphological characteristics of IE but rather examines code-switching occurrences and characteristics of Hinglishes elaborated in sections 1.1.2 and 1.1.3, the transcript was split into sections and coded for all code-switching and code-mixing occurrences to facilitate further analysis. As a native speaker of the linguistic variety in discussion, and due to the small size of the data, the coding process was relatively straightforward, and intuitive to perform. The transcribed data was also coded and rechecked in four separate rounds to ensure accurate checks and correction of any accidental errors or miscategorizations in the data. To identify every instance of code-mixing and code-switching, every instance of Hindi language in the transcript was identified and classified as either alternations or insertions as defined by Muysken (2000: 3) and elaborated by Si (2010).

The operationalization of these terms were conducted as follows: Muysken (2000: 3) defines insertion as the "**Insertion** of material (lexical items or entire constituents) from one language into a structure from the other language," whereas alternation is classified as "**alternation** between structures from languages" (original emphasis). In Kachruvian terms, these two concepts are similar to Kachru's

concepts of code-mixing (see example (4)) and code-switching (see example (2)), respectively. Therefore, insertions in this study are coded as any single item (such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) or constituent units (such as compounds or modifier + noun/adjective units) of an embedded language (or the 'absorbed code') inserted into a matrix language (or into the 'absorbing code'). Consider the following examples from the current study:

(5)   *He thinks that its sazaa [punishment sentence] is enough. Six months is enough. Bail out is enough. Smiling is enough.*

(6)   *The whole mohalla [neighborhood] knows this thing.*

(7)   *Sir, explain uh ki [that] the pressure you felt.*

(8)   *Agar unn dino mei e-complaints system hota—aur jo <u>abhi</u> bhi nahi hai— agar e-complaint system hota, uski complaint, aaj unki complaint unki website mei hoti?*

        'If an e-complaints system existed—and even now it doesn't exist—if an e-complaint system existed, then their complaint would exist in their website, would it not?'

Examples (5) – (7) represent exchanges uttered in the Indian English matrix language embedded with insertions of Hindi lexical items such as *sazaa* (punishment sentence), *mohalla* (neighborhood), *ki* (that) which do not alter the grammar of IE. In contrast, example (8) is an instance where the matrix language is Hindi, but we see several instances of insertions of English lexical items and constituent units such as *e-complaints system, complaint,* and *website*. Following Muysken (2001), the three Hindi words in examples (5)–(7), and the three English words in (8) would be coded as six individual instances of insertions. On the other hand, phrasal, clausal, or sentential units that retain the grammar and structure of the embedded language within the larger matrix language are coded as alternations. Consider the following examples from the current study:

(9)   *I said what is he doing here? He said "Beta yeh haath haina yeh sab log haath ki ungli hai. Sab alag alag hote hain khaatein time sab mil jaate hain." That is what is going on here.*

        '...here? He said, 'Son, do you see this hand? All these people are like the fingers of a hand. Everyone pretends to mind their own business, but when it comes to (the time of) eating, they all come/band together.' That is…'

(10)   *I think the problem is in the registration of crime across the country. Crime yahaan register nahi hota hai. Not. Registration is an exception, is an exception, and not the rule. The rule is non-registration.*

        'I think the problem is in the registration of crime across the country. Crime does not get registered here. Not. Registration is an exception…'

In example (9), the switch from Indian English to Hindi is starkly evident. The speaker wants to quote another speaker's Hindi speech and thus code-switches or alternates to the grammar of another language to accomplish this. He then switches back to English at the end of the Hindi quote. Similarly, in (10), the

speaker code-switches to 'Hinglish A' in the second sentence (we know this because the second sentence is not exclusively in Hindi or English but entails the mixture of the two languages or 'Hinglish A' as described in Section 1.1.2.). The speaker then code-switches back to English in the third sentence. Since two switches take place in (9), and two switches take place in (10) they are counted as four individual instances of alternations. Furthermore, to mark for switches and code-mixing instances between the different linguistic systems, this study's data was further classified into the modified code-switching types, adapted from Si (2010): Hindi insertions into an English sentence/clause, English insertions into a Hindi clause/phrase, alternation to Hindi, alternation (back) to English, Hindi only turns, largely English turns with Hindi alternations or insertions, and largely Hindi turns with English alternations or insertions. All CS sequences were then qualitatively analyzed through the conversation analysis method and grouped under themes/functions to reveal larger CS patterns in the data. The following results are thus organized to account for quantitative frequencies of turn types, CS categories and types, and their examples. This is followed by a qualitative analysis and discussion of some representative CS functions that were identified. The findings are then reinterpreted through the world Englishes framework in the discussion section (Section 7).

5 Results

This section largely answers RQ1: What are the forms of code-switches?

The episode begins in English, the larger matrix language of the show. Since it is an English language show, English turns in the episode were not counted. Table 1 represents the turn types in the episode, most of which contain single or multiple instances of CS-insertions and CS-alternations. Table 2 further helps contextualize the data by reporting the raw frequencies, types, and categories of CS in the episode, along with lexical identification of CS-insertions. Based on Si's (2010) assumption on counting, the raw counts for insertions in this study were expected to be higher in number than CS-alternations, but the results show that their raw counts are approximately the same. This would indicate that the alternations in the data set had far more weightage and semantic force, than insertions alone, as assumed in Si's (2010) methodology. When perusing the results, it is not a surprise that Hindi turns were relatively low since the medium of communication is English. Only 5 turns were exclusively in Hindi while another 18 turns were in the Hindi frame/matrix but had multiple English insertions or alternations. The results in this study also show a tendency towards English turns with Hindi insertions or alternations (28) than vice-versa.

Table 1. Turn types and their frequencies

Turn type	Count
Hindi only turns	5
Largely English turns with Hindi alternations or insertions	28
Largely Hindi turns with English insertions	18

Table 2. Code-switching types and their raw frequencies

CS Category	CS type	Count
Insertions	Hindi insertions [Nouns (3), Particle (1), Address Form (2), Discourse marker (1), Adverb (1)]	8
	English insertions [Nouns (40), NP (1), Verbs (14), Adjectives (2), Adverbs (2)]	59
	TOTAL	**66**
Alternations	Alternation to Hindi, alternation (back) to English	**62**

5.1 Insertions

As table 2 shows, insertions in Hindi were only 8 occurrences, while English insertions accounted for 59 occurrences. All insertions reflected a political semantic sense that underlined the topic of the episode. Hindi insertions in English turns observed in themselves reveal no specific pattern and require a larger contextualization of conversational turns to understand their use. (Examples (5) – (8) cited in Section 4 are repeated here for elaboration.) For instance, in (5) the speaker questions the appropriateness of the punishment met out to the person in question and uses the word 'sazaa' which refers to 'punishment'. Here, they repeat the same noun used by a previous interlocutor. Hindi insertions were also used for addressing a person with respect such as the use of the honorific 'sahaab' for 'sir;' or to show lexical borrowing as in (6) which also represents a local flavoring in English. The use of the particle 'ki' in (7) is another typical use of Hindi insertion in Indian English, and refers to 'that'.

(5)   *He thinks that its sazaa [punishment] is enough. Six months is enough. Bail out is enough. Smiling is enough.*
(6)   *The whole mohalla [neighborhood] knows this thing.*
(7)   *Sir, explain uh ki [that] the pressure you felt.*

In contrast, English insertions in Hindi turns were more varied but still reflective of the sociopolitical discourse. A high number of them occurred as modifier+noun constituents or nouns as in 'e-complaints system' and 'complaint' in (8), or 'higher court' in (11). A sizable number of them were also verbs as in 'register' and 'investigate' in (12), 'oppose' in (13) and 'recommend' in (14).

(8)   *Agar unn dino mei e-complaints system hota—aur jo abhi bhi nahi hai—agar e-complaint system hota, uski complaint, aaj unki complaint unki website mei hoti?*
        'If an e-complaints system existed—and even now it doesn't exist—if an e-complaint system existed, then their complaint would exist in their website, would it not?'

(11)   *Tho aap yahi kahenge ki woh higher court par jaaye.*
        'So, you would only state that they take the issue to a higher court?'
(12)   *Pehle register nahin hona, phir investigate nahin hona, phir trial ke liye*
        unees saal kaun ladega.
        'First, one is unable to register their case, and if they do, they are unable
        to investigate the case (in a timely fashion), and if such is the state of
        affairs, who would fight for nineteen years to secure a court trial?'
(13)   *Aapne kyun oppose nahin kiya?*
        'Why did you not oppose?'
(14)   *Aur recommend kiya. Woh kehna bhul gaya.*
        'And they recommended him. He forgot to mention that.'

Finally, of significance are nonce borrowings, which are English words that
are borrowed, despite an equivalent word present in Hindi, and become nativized
into Hindi phonology or take on Hindi inflections (Sailaja 2011: 477; Si 2011:
395). While it can be argued that they might be a part of the Hindi lexicon, further
research is required to justify this claim. Therefore, instances of nonce borrowings
are treated as insertions in this study and include examples such as 'time', 'papers'
for newspaper, and 'party' in (9), (15), and (16), respectively.

(9)   *I said what is he doing here? He said "Beta yeh haath haina yeh sab log*
        haath ki ungli hai. Sab alag alag hote hain khaatein time sab mil jaate
        hain." That is what is going on here.
        '…here? He said, 'Son, do you see this hand? All these people are like
        the fingers of a hand. Everyone pretends to mind their own business, but
        when it comes to (the time of) eating, they all come/band together.' That
        is…'
(15)   *Usko usko dil tho dukhaani pad rahi thi naa. Kyunki papers mei aagaya*
        tha.
        'She was upset because the news had come out in the newspapers.'
(16)   *Uh Mr. T-ji itna gusa hai poore desh mein baar baar aappki party naam*
        aata hai…
        'Mr. T, there is a lot of anger in the nation, and your (political) party's
        name is mentioned time and again…'

5.2 Alternations

Unlike insertions, alternations have been found to be a much more complex cat-
egory of code-switching. They typically involve multiple constituents and tend to
occur at clausal boundaries in order to prevent the violation of either language's
syntax (Muysken 2000; Poplack 1980: 586). Therefore, code-switching at clausal
boundaries becomes much easier to execute. The raw count for CS-alternations in
the episode was 62, while largely English turns with Hindi insertions/alternations
spanned 28 occurrences, and largely Hindi turns with English insertions/alterna-
tions spanned 18 occurrences. In (9), (repeated here for convenience) the speaker
begins his turn in English, but as he attempts to quote somebody, he alternates to

Hindi. Once he is done quoting, he alternates/code-switches back to English. In (10), the speaker is speaking in an English frame, but alternates to Hindi in the second sentence. She then alternates back to English in the following sentence. Since alternations such as these and others are complex and varied, they require further attention. Therefore, the next section qualitatively discusses alternations at length.

(9)   *I said what is he doing here? He said "Beta yeh haath haina yeh sab log haath ki ungli hai. Sab alag alag hote hain khaatein time sab mil jaate hain." That is what is going on here.*
         '…here? He said, 'Son, do you see this hand? All these people are like the fingers of a hand. Everyone pretends to mind their own business, but when it comes to (the time of) eating, they all come/band together.' That is…'

(10)   *I think the problem is in the registration of crime across the country. Crime yahaan register nahi hota hai. Not. Registration is an exception, is an exception, and not the rule. The rule is non-registration.*
         'I think the problem is in the registration of crime across the country. Crime does not get registered here. Not. Registration is an exception…'

6 Qualitative analysis through conversation analysis

This section answers RQ2: In what ways are code-switches introduced in a televised sociopolitical Indian English discussion? and RQ3: What are the functions of the various forms of code-switching (CS) in the context of a sociopolitical discussion? In order to qualitatively answer RQ2 and RQ3, all CS sequences in the data were thematically analyzed through conversation analysis (CA) and recognized for their CS functions. This section provides representative excerpts for each CS function followed by a micro interpretive analysis of gestures, breath movements, and the various motivations for code-switching by each participant in each excerpt. Additionally, CA transcription conventions have been maintained, Hindi sequences are presented in italics, and their translations are provided in indented single quotes in the following line.

6.1 CS in opening of a new topic/addressing a new speaker

     Excerpt 1 (transcript #1):
1   J: And umm my outlook towards life changed totally. Umm .hh #I:: the male psychology.
2   I wanted to understand it now. I had many questions for my mom which she could not
3   answer some↑times↓(0.5)
4   M: Why would a man do this.
5   J: uhh yes.
6   M: Starting with that basic question. And to me the more basic question=how does he
7   get away with it and walk out of court with that smile on his face.

8   M: *.hhhhhhhhh (1.0) D sahab (0.5) aapne aur meine kayin baatein ki hai*
        iss hafte.
        'D sahab, you and I have spoken a lot during this week.'
9   The one thing that you said really bothered you was that smile.
10   D: Yes. I don't want to see smile on his face. (0.5) He is ((begins to almost
        cry)) smiling↑.
11   (0.5) He is <u>still</u> smiling. (2.9) .hhhhhhh This are very sorry state of affairs.
        hhhhh (4.0)

In excerpt 1, line 4, M the host, adds information to what J (B's best friend), said in line 2, a possible question that J used to ask her mom. M then introduces a new topic or puts forth a new question in lines 6-7. She then code-switches, *addressing* a new speaker, D (B's father), in line 8. The action met out by the code-switch is the presentation of a factual statement in line 8. Till line 7, M speaks only in English to speaker J, who is much younger than D. But the long in-breath in line 8, and the two pauses signify the patience with which M approaches D. The pause and code-switch signify her aligning towards D. M indicates that she knows of D's situation as they have spoken to each other a lot in that week. Although she introduces a new topic in lines 6-7, M does this more for the public audience. However, her code-switching to D, directs the question to him and sets the topic in motion. Notice that she speaks in Hindi in line 8, and then switches back to English in line 9. Looking at the data, this probably explains why D decides to respond in English in lines 10-11, even if the switch to Hindi by M was to enhance alignment.

6.2   CS in reformulation

Excerpt 2 (transcript #3):
1   M: [But if V says] that there is a
2   conspiracy of silence of you scratch my back and (.) I scratch yours. L is the
3   ###a as really the person who has fought this fight along with your daughter.
        Because I
4   mean the D family was traumatized, their son was slapped with false cases. .hhh
5   What was the most difficult thing for you. ***Aap unees saal se yeh lad rahen***
6   ***hain=sabse mushkil kya tha?***
        'You have been fighting this for nineteen years=What was the most difficult
        thing for you?'
7   L: (3.0) The most difficult job was to maintain myself in service. (0.5)
        Under these
8   corrupt officers for these nineteen years. So who so ever government
        bureaucrat. Maybe
9   (bureaucrat person 1). Maybe (bureaucrat person 2). Every time they told
        me, either
10   you leave this case (0.2) or you will have to face consequences. And one
        fine morning on
11   twenty second June. It was message of Mr. (name of a politician). Through the

12   (office of a bureaucrat person) (name of bureaucrat person). Who was
        considered to be the most honest
13   officer. Who called me and said either you help Mr. E and test the get the case
14   withdrawn. Or we are doing away with you from your ser[vice.
15   M: [He said this openly to you?
16   L: Openly to me. And it is in the record also=in the high court. And I told
        him simply.
17   ee: (.) for (.) before (0.4) me. In comparison to my daughter's honor. I can
        leave this
18   service but I can't leave the honor of my daughter.

        Excerpt 2 is in a way similar to excerpt 1. The host M selects a new speaker
L, J's father who helped fight the case in discussion; M starts a new topic and
code-switches in a new turn construction unit (TCU) in line 5 where she seems to
be aligning herself with the speaker. However, unlike the previous excerpt, L re-
quires introduction (lines 2-3) since this is the first time that he is vocally invited to
speak. She then provides a factual report of what had occurred with the victimized
family in line 4. The host then starts a new topic with a question, first in English
in line 5, and then code-switches to *reformulate* the same in Hindi. The action
conveyed through this code-switching is to initially present a fact, evoking pathos
in the viewer and the audience, followed by reformulating what seems to be an
emotional question. M, as she did with D in excerpt 1, seems to be code-switching
to express *sympathy* and align with speaker L. In response, in line 7 we see that L
takes a three-second-long pause to answer M's question. Unlike what we observed
in the previous excerpt where D responds back in the same code that is addressed to
him, here speaker L replies in English. From looking at the immediate data, we may
interpret that the pause is instrumental and perhaps helpful for him to start speak-
ing English. But unlike D, what is interesting about L is that he does not speak in
Hindi (except for one instance, see excerpt 5) during the entire show and explicitly
communicates in English and seems comfortable doing so. Speaker D on the other
hand, code-switches back and forth between Hindi and English in several instances
throughout the episode.

6.3 CS when quoting somebody else

Excerpt 3 (transcript #3):
1   M: [But do you take responsi]bility for your own party=because ↑no
        party is
2   willing to get up and say we've made a mis↑take. [(0.2)] I mean T will be
3   Z: [Well]
4   M: joining us on the show=he has been (.) throughout saying *(XYZ political
        party) ki galti hai.*
5   (XYZ political party) is saying ## *(name of politician 1) ki galti hai,=*
        (name of politician 2) ki galti hai. Where does this
6   ↑stop?

'He has been saying that this is XYZ (pseudonym) party's fault, XYZ party
is saying it is this person's fault, that person's fault. Where does this stop?'
7   Z: I am not in the business of apportioning blame. (1.0) I think all those
who were
8   responsible or all those who were in office during that period #ff starting from
9   nineteen ninety till now. All of them are equally res[ponsible.]

Several instances in the episode showed speakers code-switching when they
wanted to quote or paraphrase another entity or speaker. In excerpt 3, M is address-
ing politician Z, and through questioning in line 1 wants to "apportion blame" on
some government/political party or the other. She first expresses her complaint in
lines 1-2 where "no party is willing" to take the blame, but then she reformulates
her statement in line 5 by *quoting*. She does this by code-switching. She first quotes
T in Hindi (line 4), and then quotes XYZ political party in Hindi (line 5) one after
the other. Notice only the quotes are code-switched. They take place in the middle
of the TCU, and goes back and forth. By serving the purpose of only quoting some-
one, the code-switch intends to be a form of divergence, as slated in communica-
tion accommodation theory. The host, here, emphasizes "difference and increase[s]
social distance" (Meyerhoff 2007: 73) thus diverging herself from aligning with
whom she is quoting. However, she ends her turn with a question in English. The
alternation back to English carries emphatic force as it brings everyone's attention
to the matter at hand: Who must take responsibility for the situation? Z takes the
code-switch cue and responds back in English. Even if Z refuses to give a straight
answer to M's question in lines 7-9, his response shows that he aligns with his
interlocutor's opinion, both through his linguistic-code choice (English), and in
semantic content. Another instance of quoting that occurs a little later is analyzed
in the following excerpt.
    Excerpt 4 (transcript #3):
1   X: I remember a long time back when I was in the income tax office I saw
a junior officer
2   walking out of the appellate office. And there was a senior old wizened
chap sitting
3   there=I was much younger then. I said what is he doing here. He said *beta yeh*
4   *haath haina yeh sab log haath ki ungli hai. Sab alag alag hote hain,*
5   *khaatein time sab mil jaate hain.* That is what is going on here. (0.2) We
       'He said, 'Son, do you see this hand? All these people are akin to the fingers
       of a hand. Everyone pretends to go about their own business, but when it
       comes to (the time of) eating, they all come/band together.''
6   have to find out who this people are. And there is a way of going about it.
       investigate at
7   each stage. (.) These are all the people who have abetted the
8   commission of an offence. (0.2) Abetted the destruction of evidence.
       [Obstructed justice.]

In this excerpt, we see a similar instance of *quoting*. Speaker X, a lawyer, is
narrating an incident and continues his turn in English. At the end of line 3, he

code-switches to Hindi when quoting someone. Similar to excerpt 3, only the quotes are code-switched, and they take place in the middle of a TCU. But what is interesting here is that the code-switched quoted phrase is also a proverbial usage. The phrase is a metaphor and functions as a euphemism that is best understood in Hindi rather than English. By choosing to code-switch in Hindi a proverbial phrase, X maintains the integrity of the original quote and simultaneously highlights the implication behind the phrase, which can be seen in the provided translation, and is rightly achieved. Thus, unlike excerpt 3, the speaker in spite of code-switching, does not wish to diverge from what he narrates. Rather he shows alignment by divergence. This relates to Gumperz's (1982) concept of 'we-code' vs. 'they-code' and the idea of inclusion vs. exclusion.

6.4 CS to show emphasis; CS in repetition

Excerpt 5 (transcript #4):
1   M: [Mr. L?]   [quickly.] before that we need to prepare for a break
2   V: (0.2) [because non-]registration [definitely]<
3   M: [Yeah]
4   L: [aa..##] (1.0) In this case is different. Ms. B, Mr. D, myself. Went to the
5   police station on *atthaara-aath-nabbe* and instead of FIR, it is DDR. And no
action 'eighteen-eight-ninety (reference to date 18/8/90)'
6   (unclear) taken on DDR.=
7   V: =*(Name of location) killings mei tho bhi yeh hua th .hh.* (Name of location) also
       '(Name of location) killings also experienced this same predicament.'
8   [had the same::]
9   M: [Explain] to our viewers what's a DDR.=
10   V: =ohh. It's a Daily Diary entry. It's not a
11   cognizable offence.=It's just a record that you came. It's a record of your
       coming and
12   going. But, even that if a cognizable offence is made out, a case ought to
have been registered.

In excerpt 5, we see two code-switching instances, one in line 5 and another in line 7, both of which signify emphasis. In line 1 we see M, the host, selecting L to speak. L, J's father, presents factual information in lines 4-6 but he chooses to code-switch only the date, 18th Aug. 1990. As mentioned earlier, this is the only instance where L code-switches. There seems to be only one motivation for this, which is to assign emphasis to the date as a piece of significant factual information. We can say this with some certainty because there are other instances in the episode where L mentions dates in English with more ease. The second code-switch occurs in line 7 where V, a police officer, provides another piece of factual information through repetition. V initiates the switch in the discourse in line 7, a new TCU, and switches back to English, repeating the same phrase. Before she has the opportunity to elaborate, V gets interrupted by the host in line 9. The alternation to Hindi and the repetition in English this sequence clearly signifies emphasis.

6.5 The complexity in CS-alternation: A final representative sample

While the previous analyses revealed the various functions accomplished through code-switching, the interaction complexity that is plausible through CS-alternation requires further consideration. Excerpt 6 represents a large CS sequence, partially due to a speaker who largely converses in Hindi with some English insertions, while the rest of the panel code-switches back and forth to remain in sync with English, the larger matrix language of the show. The excerpt due to its length is not included but can be requested from the author. This excerpt apart from highlighting certain actions that we have already discussed also reveals other instances where CS can take place. The most significant part of the exchange is when the host M, speaks to T, through a video conference on the show. T chooses to respond only in Hindi, irrespective of the code he is addressed in. This is not uncommon as political figures in India tend to communicate in the local lingua franca in order to be able to connect with their voters and followers. What is more interesting therefore, is not how T responds, but how M constantly code-switches during the conversation with T. In the following analysis, each paragraph analyzes a subsequent adjacency pair as a unit. In the excerpt, the first instance of CS takes place in lines 9-10 by Y. The host M first makes a comment on how young girls have become used to being "felt up" in public places which makes Y interrupt her. Y starts her turn in English but then code-switches to Hindi. It is evident that she is making a *complaint* and chooses to do so in Hindi. A little later in the transcript we see similar instances of complaint in code-switching. In lines 11 and 13-14, Y proposes a solution by having a senior organization become more efficient about police reforms. But, in line 21, when M announces that T is available to chat, she cuts Y short and diverts the attention of the show to him. As we saw in excerpt 2, here too M *introduces* T, but in a negative tone in lines 20-22. The moment she addresses T, she code-switches in lines 23 and 24, expressing a complaint that is similar to what we saw in lines 9-10. She then switches back to English to put forth her question. T's response as mentioned earlier, is in a continuous Hindi turn where the speaker expresses *sympathy* about the issue being discussed. He also *responds* to M's question.

This creates a reaction from the audience (line 30) and M replies back in Hindi, repeating the same words that T had said a moment earlier (line 31). This *repetition* is done clearly to reiterate the implied "insensitivity" with which T had addressed the issue. After doing so, M immediately senses the audience's response and addresses them by showing *sympathy* and *alignment* at their cynicism in English, in lines 31-32. When she reverts back to T with her next question, she begins in Hindi and code-switches to English in a subordinate clause introduced by '*ki*' or 'that'. This is reflective of not violating the syntax of either language as stated by Poplack (1980: 586). As M code-switches, it is evident that on one hand she attunes to T by converging, using the code that he uses and understands. Yet at the same time she always seems to make an effort to code-switch back to English, thus preserving a sense of social distance between herself and her interlocutor. For instance, in lines 22-23, she first introduces a new topic to him (line 22) and then proceeds to question in English (line 23). In lines 31-33 too, she responds back in Hindi to her speaker (line 31), expresses sympathy to her audience in English (lines 31-35), and

then code-mixes when she addresses T again in a new TCU (lines 32-33). What is interesting in this turn is that M does not pause when she code-switches from Hindi to English (line 31). In fact, we almost see a latching between the switches clearly indicating that there is no space for a transition relevance place (TRP). M in both these instances maintains a longer turn, making it possible for her to code-switch back and forth between the two languages thus, creating social distance. In addition, her code-switching and addressing two different speakers/audiences in the same TCU (line 31), discloses her dexterity in alignment with the audience and managing her responsibility as the show's host. In lines 34-41, T once again responds to M's question in Hindi and presents a historical and factual account of how his party responded to the situation.

M, in her next turn (lines 42-43) *counter-attacks* T's statement in a largely Hindi turn (with English insertions and does not alternate to English). This is significant since she is putting forth a *complaint* and does not feel the need to expound on what she just said. Unlike her longer turn in lines 31-33, there are no signs of reformulation or repetition in English, here (lines 42-43). This suggests that her statement is powerful enough to convey her complaint, both to the audience viewers or, on their behalf, and to the speaker himself. When T responds back in lines 44-49, he maintains his turn in Hindi. But this time the audience responds more visibly in lines 45 and 47. He presents his response to M's question and explains a factual occurrence. The moment he expresses that the recommendation is a factual and a natural occurrence carried out by the government, he immediately incurs disapproval from the audience.

M in her next turn (lines 50-52) does not delve into T's previous response, probably because she is under a time constraint, or at least chooses not to refute T. She instead starts a new topic by stating that she has one more question for the politician. She begins a new TCU in Hindi but code-switches back to English (line 50). When M switches to English in the middle of the TCU, she seems to be echoing her audience's questions. This is interesting because if we look back at all her previous turns in the conversation, she always begins in Hindi when she addresses T, right from line 22 onwards. This as mentioned earlier, might indicate that she converges to T's discourse so that he can understand her better. Yet she does not seem to do a good job of it since she keeps switching back to English and T understands the English switches just as well. Therefore, her code-switching choice might indicate that she identifies with speaker, T, but her need to switch back to English also reflects that she aligns more with her audience. Her switches to English also shows her preference to *include* the audience in the discussion, since the matrix language of the show is English. If she code-switched to Hindi completely while speaking to T, she would be indirectly excluding the audience from the conversation. We thus see a sense of exclusion vs. inclusion taking place, or Gumperz's (1982) concept of 'they-code' vs. 'we-code' in action. By switching back and forth, M thus seems to be acutely aware of her role as a moderator and host. T's response is naturally in defense to the series of questions M raises in lines 50-52. T's response is the longest turn in the entire conversation sequence ranging from lines 53-63. The data shows that T maintains his turn in Hindi, in spite of being interrupted twice by the host, in lines 55 and 61. Throughout the turn T performs the action of providing a

factual report of the different governments governing in the past, and how they are responsible for their respective turn of events. In the process he tries to absolve his government/party from blame.

When M speaks in line 64, she mentions T's name indicating the end of the conversation. The viewers are not shown any other explicit way as to how M and T end their conference, apart from this. When M begins to laugh right after, in line 64, she creates a relevant TRP for X to jump into the discussion. What is significant is that the code-switching that occurs from this point on is completely different from the one that we have just seen. When X speaks in Hindi in line 65, he seems to be almost *quoting* T and expressing *sarcasm* at the same time. As we saw in our previous analyses in excerpts 3 and 4, here too, CS also takes place when the speakers wish to quote somebody else. M in line 66 follows suit and echoes X's words in Hindi twice, thus again performing the action of quoting. J too in line 68, is seen to be quoting a previous statement of T (as seen in line 28). This clearly creates a sense of divergence where she wishes to disassociate herself from the person she quotes, since she is also seen speaking in English throughout the episode, and code-switches only to quote T. The three instances of repetition (lines 65, 66, and 68-69), one after the other creates a sense of unity in terms of opinion among the interlocutors. This again reflects Gumperz's (1982) idea of inclusion vs. exclusion.

In summary, what we have seen in this section are CS instances that occur when a speaker: *addresses* someone new; wants to *reformulate* a sentence to create emphasis or explication; *quotes* someone so as to identify themselves separately from whom they quote; *repeats* a statement to generate emphasis. We also saw instances of *complaint* in the analysis. By using the CA approach, we have been able to see interesting instances of how speakers convey meaning through code-switching. Although Paraskeva (2010: 118) follows Schegloff (1984) and believes in the importance of location in the CA approach to CS, this study further shows the importance of the *action* conveyed through the CS that generates meaning in the sequential context. More importantly, as Wei states, "the CA approach focuses on collaborative achievements of the conversation participants, especially the methods and procedures they deploy in achieving understanding" (2002: 177). However, it would be helpful to further examine these findings within the world Englishes framework. This is discussed in the following section.

7 Discussion: Interpretation of findings through the world Englishes framework

Kachru (1983g: 193) has argued that in any given context, the "alternation of codes is determined by function, the situation, and the participants". He theorized that nativization processes such as code-switching and code-mixing as discussed in sections 5 and 6 are the consequences of "productive linguistic innovations which are determined by localized functions of a second language variety, the "culture of conversation" and communicative strategies in new situations, and the "transfer" from local languages" (1986a: 21-22). Kachru (1986c: 119-120), thus proposed the following *parameters* to account for differences that we find in English varieties

such as IE: (a) context of situation, (b) participants in the speech event, (c) cline of intelligibility, and (d) roles and types of linguistic interaction.

Applying these parameters to the current study, we recognize that the 'context of situation' is a televised debate conducted largely in Indian English with several instances of code-switching and code-mixing with Hindi and 'Hinglish A'. The matter of discussion is a sensitive and a sociopolitical one. The active 'participants' of the debate are a panel of experts from different professions such as a lawyer, a professor, a couple of police officers, a politician, and family members and friends who knew the suicide victim. Other active participants include the larger audience on the set who interact with the panel by asking them questions. A final category of 'participants' might be considered as that of the viewers watching the show from home or elsewhere. All participants present in the tv talk show can be argued to be performing the social roles of engaged citizens coming together to discuss pertinent social and political issues that strongly impact their lived experiences in society.

Since the participants and viewers of the show are from different walks of life having different first languages, and the show is televised on an Indian English channel, NDTV (New Delhi TV), it is not surprising that those interacting in the show largely do so in IE, but also code-switch to Hindi or 'Hinglish A,' since the official language of Delhi is Hindi. The free use of code-switching mechanisms throughout the televised show, indicates that both Hindi and 'Hinglish A' rank high on the users' "code hierarchy" (Kachru 1986b: 59). This, more importantly, highlights the social value assigned to Indian English, Hindi, and 'Hinglish A' in this context. Such a 'context of situation' in turn allows for the 'intelligibility' of the various codes in use among the speakers. It further discloses the language attitudes of the users since such attitudes have significant linguistic implications and could lead to code-standardization (ibid, 62). Future studies will need to determine whether code-standardization is occurring in 'Hinglish A' or 'Hinglish B'. Finally, the nature of 'linguistic interaction' has been qualitatively analyzed in depth in section 6. It would be helpful, however, to view the various *functions* and *motivations* for the code-switches observed through the world Englishes framework. These are summarized below.

Kachru (1983g: 197) identified the following *motivations* for code-switching and code-mixing from Hindi to English or another regional dialect:

(a) Both mechanisms can be used to mark one's identity, state an aside, or indicate a specific role.

(b) It may be used to "reveal or conceal" one's region, religion, and social class.

(c) When employed in an aside, it may be used to signify a person's non-membership to an inner group.

In other words, the above statements provide an answer to the question, "why does a speaker code-switch?". It is also important to note that Kachru made these observations of a variety where the matrix language is Hindi and code-switches occur in another language. When applying these factors to an Indian English matrix context, such as in this study, the findings show that the reasons for code-switches to Hindi or 'Hinglish A' are not as explicit. For instance, we find that in the current study, speakers portray their identities through code-switching in much subtle ways. This is because, unlike English, which might be the speakers' second language,

Hindi is their first (or a near native) language. Thus, code-switching to one's first language would be fairly intuitive. It further indicates more technical motivations for code-switches as described in Section 6. While this is the case for code-switches, commentary on the use of IE would be beneficial too. Of relevance is the marker of class that is achieved through IE use. All panel members and audience members who speak in IE in the episode could be classified as standard (or near standard), educated IE speakers. This is because most panel members are identified in the show through their profession which in turn indicates their educated backgrounds and their economic class. This coupled with their proficiency and dexterity in IE speech are clear markers of their language proficiency and indexes their respective socioeconomic identities. While a majority of the panel members navigate between IE and Hindi or 'Hinglish A' varieties, two speakers, Mr. L and Mr. T communicate in their larger code of choice, IE and Hindi, respectively. Mr. L, except for one instance of CS (see Section 6.4), communicates in Indian English throughout the entire episode. As with other speakers, this is an intentional choice and a marker of speaker identity. From this intentional choice, it is evident that Mr. L wants to communicate and be intelligible to a larger audience who may not know Hindi, since Indian English is largely a lingua franca in India between speakers of zero shared languages. Mr. T, in contrast, indexes his identity of a politician by using Hindi and 'Hinglish A' which is code-mixed with register-specific English lexical items. This is also an intentional choice as Mr. T intends to come across as accessible and intelligible to his political constituents. Orsini (2015: 206) substantiates this intention of the speaker in her review. She reports that Hinglish is sometimes resorted to in political discourse to align with a political party's constituents.

Furthermore, we see instances of code-switching being employed as an aside in sections 6.3 and 6.5. In Gumperz (1982), this is theorized as 'they-code' vs. 'we-code'. In the employment of an aside, speakers indicate their alignment, affiliation, and identification with an inner group that they share the aside with. This in turn classifies and further distances the external speaker as a non-member of the inner group. In summary, we find Kachru's *motivations* of code-switching playing out in the interactions described in this study. Kachru (1983g: 197), in addition, cites the following *functions* of code-switching. These statements can be interpreted as answering the question, "how are the various code-switches achieved?":

(d) Through *register identification*, such as using relevant lexemes from the registers of administration, politics, law, or technology.

(e) A device for *elucidation* and *interpretation*.

(f) As a function of *neutralization*, or *automatization*, or *backgrounding* (Kachru 1986a: 60). This refers to the use of lexical items that are "attitudinally and contextually neutral" (Kachru 1983g: 198).

(g) As a function of *foregrounding* or bringing attention to code-switches in speech.

Although the data in this study has been analyzed from a conversation analysis perspective, the findings are not far removed from Kachru's mapping of *motivations* and *functions* of code-switching. All code-switches and code-mixing occurrences in this study have shown a formal "cohesion" which Kachru (1983g: 198) defines as the "integration of the units of another code into the system of the receiving code,

and organizing the units from two codes in a semantic relationship". In this study's data, we find that when code-switches such as insertions of single or double lexical items occurred in Hindi or in English, *register identification* was one of the major functions of this type of code-mixing. As elaborated in section 5, these lexical items included words such as *complaint, website, crime, government, register, ground, investigate, trial, suspend, recommend, department*, etc. in English, and *sazaa* (punishment sentence), *chasmadeed gavaa* (eyewitness' account/statement), *ki* (that), *mohalla* (neighborhood), *sahab* (sir), *arey* (discourse marker), etc. in Hindi reflecting the sociopolitical theme of the conversation. While Hindi insertions only constituted eight occurrences, English insertions, in contrast, occurred an impressive 59 times, the majority of which were nouns or noun phrases (41 occurrences), followed by 14 occurrences of verbs. This stark contrast of insertions between the two languages may indicate a pattern of favoring inserting English lexical items in Hindi matrix code-switching contexts, over Hindi lexical items in Indian English matrix contexts.

Additionally, many a times code-switches were used for the function of *elucidation* and *interpretation* which was operationalized through the term "reformulation" in the analysis (see Section 6.2). Kachru argues that such a function is employed to avoid "vagueness or ambiguity" and used to "redefine in English what has already been expressed in Hindi, or a term in Hindi is used as a gloss for a term in English" (ibid, 197-198). The function of *neutralization* has been defined as a mechanism where code-switching can help neutralize *in English* what would have otherwise been an attitudinally marked term in Hindi or a regional dialect. For instance, Annamalai (1978) has observed several occurrences in Tamil where such a device was employed to "avoid revealing social, regional, or caste identity" (as cited in Kachru 1986a: 60). Kachru maintains that such a mechanism is intended to reduce the difference between speakers and is "a linguistic attempt to achieve "accommodation", and "almost in-groupness". Since the matrix language of the episode was already in Indian English, a neutral-functioning language in certain determined contexts, and the topic of discussion was not related to caste, region, or religion, the function of a plausible neutralization in a regional language such as Hindi was not evident in the data. In contrast, the function of *foregrounding* which has been established as directing attention to certain elements in the conversation, was markedly evident in the data. For instance, when CS in Hindi was used to quote another speaker (section 6.3), or when it was used to address a new speaker or a new topic (section 6.1), or used to indicate emphasis. These findings imply that while foregrounding is an effective function when code-switching to Hindi or 'Hinglish A', the same cannot be expected for the function of neutralization (where Indian English is the matrix language and a regional language is the embedded language), since Hindi and Hinglish A are attitudinally marked in the North Indian context.

In summary, this section provides an interpretation of the study's findings through the world Englishes framework. We have seen that speakers in the study are interpreted as having specific motivations and functions in adopting code-mixing and code-switching mechanisms in spoken Indian English which are similar to speakers who code-switch in Hindi or other regional languages, with the exception of the neutralization function.

8 Conclusion

This case study has presented a systematic analysis of code-switching patterns in spoken Indian English in the genre of sociopolitical talk in an episode of an Indian English tv talk show. The analysis was conducted through a conversation analysis methodology, followed by an interpretation of findings through the world Englishes framework. The findings revealed that even if code-switching and code-mixing mechanisms occurred in Indian English, the number of English insertions and alternations within Hindi phrases were much higher than that of Hindi insertions and alternations in English clauses and units. This also confirm Si's (2010) results where speakers preferred higher number of English alternations and insertions than Hindi code-switches, while Hindi-only turns were relatively few. The qualitative analysis revealed that speakers code-switched to Hindi or 'Hinglish A' when addressing another speaker, reformulating or explicating information for emphasis, quoting another speaker so as to distance themselves from whom they quote, or share a complaint. Interpreting these findings in the world Englishes framework we found that speakers code-switched to subtly mark their identities and state asides to in-group members. In terms of functions, speakers were found to use code-switching as a device for registral function, elucidation and interpretation, and foregrounding content. The neutralization function was not evident since Hindi or Hinglish codes as embedded codes were typically attitudinally marked. Even so, the manner in which code-switching and code-mixing took place in the episode disclosed that all three codes of Indian English, Hindi, and 'Hinglish A' ranked relatively high in most of the speakers' code repertoires. Since this case study is the first in a series of follow-up replication studies, future research might additionally investigate the semantic prosody of insertions found in the sociopolitcal talk genre and the ways in which it may affect the code-switching patterns in spoken Indian English. Exploring the function of neutralization in newer studies would also help qualify if the current finding about it is a stable or a chance occurrence. Diachronic studies might further examine if and how the trends of code-switching are gradually changing in spoken Indian English. Systematic studies of IE code-switching in other regional varieties would also present a holistic understanding of India's multilingual, "uninvestigated linguistic "iceberg"" (Kachru 1986b: 80).

Bibliography

Alatis, J. E. (1978). *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.). *One speaker, two languages*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, L. (ed.). (2010). *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*. Volume 16. Newcastle upon Tyne: CRiLLS.

D'Souza, J. (2001). Indian English and Singapore English: Creativity contrasted. In E. Thumboo (eds.). *The Three Circles of English*, 3–17. Singapore: Unipress.

Gardner-Chloros, P. and Charles, R. (2007). Subiko welcome- Hindi/English code-switching in the British-Asian media. *BISAL*, 2: 89-122.

Gargesh, R. and Sharma, A. (2019). Indian English in political discussions. *World Englishes,* 38: 90-104. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12394

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

Hegde, M., Alva, D., Oommen, S. G., and Bhat, S. (2011). Discourse functions of code-switching among normal Kannada-English and Malayalam-English bilinguals—A pilot study, *Asia Pacific Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*, 14 (4): 211-216. https://doi.org/10.1179/jslh.2011.14.4.211

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. and Atkinson, J.M. (1984). Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jefferson, G. (1978). Sequential aspects of storytelling in conversation. In J. Schenkein (ed.). *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction,* 219-248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1978). Toward structuring code-mixing: An Indian perspective. In B. B. Kachru and S. N. Sridhar (eds.). *Aspects of Sociolinguistics in South Asia*. Special issue of *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 16: 27-46.

Kachru, B. B. (1983a). Introduction. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 1-14. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983b). English in South Asia: An overview. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 17-65. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983c). Indian English: A sociolinguistic profile. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 66-95. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983d). Contextualization. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 99-126. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983e). The Indianess. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 128-144. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983f). Lexical innovations. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 147-164. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983g). On mixing. In B. B. Kachru, *The Indianization of English,* 193-207. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1983). *The Indianization of English*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (eds.). *English in the world: Teaching and learning of language and literature,* 11-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986a). Institutionalized varieties. In B. B. Kachru, *The Alchemy of English,* 19-32. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986b). English in the bilingual's code repertoire. In B. B. Kachru, *The Alchemy of English,* 57-80. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986c). New Englishes and old models. In B. B. Kachru, *The Alchemy of English,* 115-123. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986d). Englishization and language change. In B. B. Kachru, *The Alchemy of English,* 147-155. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The Alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.) (1995). *One speaker, two languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyerhoff, M. (2007). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orsini, F. (2015). Dil maange more: Cultural contexts of Hinglish in contemporary India. *African Studies*, 74 (2): 199–220.

Parasher, S. (1991). *Indian English functions and form*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Paraskeva, M. (2010). Code-switching in London Greek-Cypriots: A conversation analysis account. In L. Bailey (ed.). *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*. Volume 16, 108-121. Newcastle upon Tyne: CRiLLS.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics,* 18: 581-618.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Qualitative Research Methods Series. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Oyeleye, A. L. and Olutayo, O. G. (2012). Interaction management in Nigerian television talk shows. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2 (1): 149–161. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p149

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language,* 50: 696-735.

Sacks, H. (1984). Notes on methodology. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 21-27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sailaja, P. (2011). Hinglish: code-switching in Indian English. *ELT Journal*, 65 (4): 473-480.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984). On questions and ambiguities in conversation. In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 28-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. New York: Academic Press.

Schenkein, J. (1978). *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Si, A. (2010). A diachronic investigation of Hindi-English code-switching, using Bollywood film scripts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15 (4): 388–407. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1367006910379300

Sridhar, S. N. (1978). On the Functions of Code-Mixing in Kannada. *Aspects of Sociolinguistics in South Asia: Issue 16 of International journal of the sociology of language*, 16: 141-153.

Srivastava, R. and Sharma, V. (1991). Indian English today. In R. Gupta and K. Kapoor (eds.), *English in India: Issues and problems* (pp. 189–206). Delhi: Academic Foundation.

Thomas, S. (2010). Emergence, usage, and implications of Hinglish in Bollywood films. Paper presented at the 16th International Association of World Englishes conference, Vancouver, Canada.

Thomas, S. (2021). English in the United Arab Emirates. *World Englishes*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12560

Timberg, B. M. and Erler. R. J. (2010). *Television Talk: A History of the TV Talk Show*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Uddin, M. N. and Sharmin, S. (2019). The role of gender in TV talk show discourse in Bangladesh: A conversational analysis of hosts' interaction management. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9 (6): 22-36. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p22

Vaid, J. (1980). The form and function of code-mixing in Indian films. *Indian Linguistics,* 41 (1): 37–44.

Verma, S. K. (1976). Code-switching: Hindi-English. *Lingua,* 38: 153-165.

Wardhaugh, R. and Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.

Wei, L. (2002). "What do you want me to say?" On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society,* 31: 159-180.

NDTV (2010, January 3). *Best of We The People*. [Video]. NDTV Available from: https://www.ndtv.com/video/news/we-the-people/best-of-we-the-people-121524 [Accessed: January 1, 2021].

Charu. (2014). 10 Indian talk shows that hooked the audience. [Online]. Available from: https://www.businessinsider.in/10indian-talk-shows-that-hooked-the_audience/articleshow/31999043.cms [Accessed: January 1, 2021].

Klingler, A. (2017). Changes in code-switching behaviour among Hindi-English bilinguals in Northern India. [Online]. Lifespans and Styles, 31 (1): 40-50. Available from: http://journals.ed.ac.uk/lifespansstyles/article/view/1827 [Accessed: February 1, 2021].

NDTV Correspondent. (2009). Yet another award for NDTV's *We The People*. [Online]. Available from: https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/yet-another-award-for-ndtvs-we-the-people-406095 [Accessed: January 1, 2021].