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This pilot study addresses the distribution of nonstandard syntactic and lexical features in Indian English (IE) across a homogeneous group of highly educated IE speakers. It is found that nonstandard syntactic features of article use, number agreement and assignment of verb argument structure do not display uniform intragroup distribution. Instead, a relationship is found between nonstandard syntactic features and the sociolinguistic variables of lower levels of exposure to and use of English found within the group. While nonstandard syntactic features show unequal distribution, nonstandard lexical features of semantic reassignment, and mass nouns treated as count nouns display a more uniform intragroup distribution.
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INTRODUCTION

The need for further quantitative analysis of oral data in the field of Indian English (IE) studies has been clearly established by the work of researchers such as Sharma (2005:1), Sridhar, S.N. (1996), Sridhar, K. (1996) Sahgal and Agnihotri (1985) and Shastri (1996). This pilot study is designed to stimulate further research in the quantitative analysis of oral IE by providing an analysis of the nonstandard syntactic and lexical features of fifteen IE speakers’ oral narrative response to the Pear Story film (Chafe 1980, Erbaugh 2001). These IE speakers’ narratives have been compared against a standard variety of English found in the Pear Story narratives of fifteen highly educated American English (AmE) speakers, students at the University of California at Berkeley (Erbaugh 2001). Syntactic and lexical features found in the IE narratives and not attested to in the AmE narratives are considered “nonstandard.” The use of the term “nonstandard” is not intended to carry the meaning of “incorrect.” For the purposes of this study, the term “nonstandard” is simply a more efficient way of describing syntactic and lexical features that are not found in the oral narrative of standard AmE speakers. The definition of the term “standard” can be found in Bhatia (1978: 226) and issues regarding highly educated speakers providing standard speech for analysis are discussed in the next section of the thesis, Context of the Research.

In this study the nonstandard syntactic features found in the IE corpus are categorized according to type and discussed in relation to the research done on similar features found in other corpuses of IE. Nonstandard syntactic features are found in the categories of:

a. Agreement
b. Verbal argument structure
c. Subordinate clauses
d. Modifier placement

e. Article use

Nonstandard lexical features are found in the categories of:

a. Semantically based reassignment of words

b. Noun compounding

c. Use of Latinate terms

d. Mass nouns

e. ‘Mitigators’

f. Deictic adverb phrases

g. Proverbs

A possible relationship is found between these nonstandard features and the IE participants’ exposure to and use of English. A relationship is found between lower levels of English use and exposure in the group and the presence of nonstandard syntactic features. Lexical features not found in the AmE narrative are distributed more evenly throughout the group of IE speakers. However, greater percentages of use and higher numbers of speakers exhibiting features are still found in the lower levels of English exposure and use. This finding points to the need to address sociolinguistic variables in the study of linguistic features of IE.

Context of the Research

This purpose of this section is to situate the present study within the body of research done in IE. It also explains the underpinnings of the structure of the study. Previously, a desire to define a standard IE has led many researchers to study the speech of highly educated IE speakers (Dixon 1991, Sahgal & Agnihotri 1985, Shastri 1992, Sridhar, K. 1996). The sample of highly
educated IE speakers found in this study was chosen in hopes of complementing previous research done in this area. Bhatia (1978) lays the foundation for the choice of this sample of highly educated IE speakers. He begins by outlining two schools of thought towards IE - one, that there can be no “standard IE” because of the unsystematic nature of presence or absence of nonstandard features across different speakers’ language, and a reaction to that line of thought, namely that those who state IE is unsystematic have not chosen a homogeneous sample of speakers whose speech would reflect a standard, nor have they been sensitive to language variation in different socio-cultural contexts. (Bhatia, 1978: 225) Bhatia discusses the use of an abstracted standard of Educated Indian English (EIE), around which the different varieties of IE would vary according to the level of proficiency of the speaker, the situation and socio-cultural context in which the English was being spoken, and the varying functions for which the English was being used.

While various written forms of IE have been widely studied, oral data remains less attested to in the field. Research has been done on ‘written, edited and printed’ data (Shastri 1992:263), on the IE found in newspapers (Labru 1984) (Dixon 1991), on the written essays of college students (Sridhar, S.N. 1996), on the language found in guidebooks (Chelliah 2001) and in novels (Chelliah 2006). Written questionnaires have been administered by Dixon (1991) and Sahgal & Agnihotri (1985) in regards to IE speakers’ acceptability of attested IE features, and Sridhar, K. (1996) in an analysis of the request speech act. Researchers working with oral data include Sharma (2005a,b) with research on syntactic features and article systems, and Baldridge (2002) who investigates linguistic and social features of IE.

In many ways the study presented here is structured after Sharma’s work in 2005. In Sharma (2005a,b) participants’ nonstandard feature usage is correlated with the extent of the
participants’ English use in formal and informal contexts. English use in formal situations (education) and informal (daily use) is found to be an indicator of proficiency. The correlation is done in order to discern the difference between “second language acquisition (SLA) features and emergent dialect features.” SLA features are found to correlate with lower levels of formal and informal use of English. Emergent dialect features are seen in speakers with both higher levels of formal and informal English use and lower levels. In Sharma (2005a) an implicational analysis shows that nonstandard article use is perhaps more stable than variables such as nonstandard copula use and lack of agreement. However, a multivariate analysis shows that articles are also guided by proficiency. Sharma (2005b) continues working with the data obtained from these interviews to discern whether the article use of these speakers is systematically divergent from standard article systems.

Sharma’s findings on articles in IE do not agree with the article use displayed by participants in the present study, though Sharma does reference Tarone and Parrish (1988), saying that article use may be more standard in narrative genres “due to the greater communicative burden of precise and efficient reference” (2005b: 562). Sharma’s basic method of exploring the relationship between sociolinguistic variables and feature use in IE is used in this study to further investigate the potential effect of sociolinguistic variables on feature use.

Method

Data Collection

To obtain narrative from IE speakers in this study, The Pear Story film was shown to each participant, who was then asked to relate what he or she saw. The Pear Story film is a six-minute video designed by Dr. Wallace Chafe and a team of researchers in the 1970’s to elicit
narrative speech. It generates easily cross-analyzable narrative between speakers and provides potential for interdialect comparison as the narratives generated using the Pear Story film are international in scope. It is available for use at the website: http://www.pearstories.org/

The film does not use dialogue and depicts actions easily accessible cross culturally. It opens with a man picking pears in an orchard and a boy on a bicycle stealing a basket of those pears. The boy then hits a stone and falls off his bike after seeing a girl on a bike pass him on the road. A group of three boys help him to pick up the pears and his hat. He gives the boy who brings him his hat a pear for each of the three. The boys who helped the thief then pass by the man who was picking the pears. The man has noticed his missing basket of pears, and also sees the boys eating pears. Elements of this plot were designed to see how speakers describe cause and effect, unfamiliar objects, emotion, moral evaluation, and background elements that had little significance to the rest of the story (Erbaugh, 2001). The film has been used to elicit narratives in German, Mandarin, Greek, Thai, Quichan, Malay, Persian and many other languages (Chafe, 1980: xiv).

The narratives used in this study were recorded from fifteen IE speakers, each of whom were graduate students at the University of North Texas (UNT). The narratives were elicited on the UNT campus in fall 2005 by either the supervisor of the study, Shobhana Chelliah, or graduate students enrolled in Discourse Analysis at UNT. Each participant was shown the Pear Story film individually on the UNT campus and asked to record her or his narrative of the film in a room by themselves on a DAT recorder within five minutes of the viewing.

The graduate students who obtained the narratives wrote transcriptions of each recording in standard English orthography according to the general practice in this field. (Chafe, 1980) The transcriptions have also not been written in IPA as this study is not a phonological study. Further
transcription practices adhered to by the transcriptionists are found in Appendix A, before the corpus of transcripts. To ensure accuracy these transcriptions were checked against the oral recordings and all necessary corrections made by Jennifer Seale (native AmE speaker) and Shobhana Chelliah (IE, AmE speaker) in 2007. The transcriptions are located in Appendix A of this study.

After the elicitation of the narrative the participant was interviewed and demographic information was gathered to ensure the homogeneity of group, and to learn the extent of each participant’s English exposure and use. Participants were asked questions as to their age, which primary and secondary schools they attended, as well as the language used as the medium of instruction at these schools, the language they used with their father, their mother, their siblings, extended family and friends, their major, the place they were raised, and the length of time they had been in the United States. The questionnaire used to obtain this data is located in Appendix B. Participant answers to pertinent questions are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (in yrs)</th>
<th>Medium of Instruction Used in Schools</th>
<th>Language Used with Father</th>
<th>Language Used with Mother</th>
<th>Language Used with Friends and Siblings</th>
<th>Time in US (in mths)</th>
<th>Home State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hindi/English</td>
<td>Hindi/English</td>
<td>Hindi/English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mahrastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Marrathi, Kannada, English, Tamil, Telegu, Urdu, Hindi</td>
<td>Marrathi, Kannada, English, Tamil, Telegu Urdu Hindi</td>
<td>Marrathi, Kannada, English, Hindi Urdu, Kannada (Marathi with one)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Karnataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English, Telegu</td>
<td>Hindi, Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu, Tamil, Hindi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu, English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu, English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu, English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (in yrs)</th>
<th>Medium of Instruction Used in Schools</th>
<th>Language Used with Father</th>
<th>Language Used with Mother</th>
<th>Language Used with Friends and Siblings</th>
<th>Time in US (in mths)</th>
<th>Home State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Hindi, English, Telegu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu &amp; English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu, Hindi and English</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Hindi, Punjabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu, English, Hindi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu/English/Hindi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi, English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Hindi, English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Tulu, English</td>
<td>Tulu, English</td>
<td>Tulu, English, Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maharstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Telegu, English, Hindi</td>
<td>Telegu, Hindi</td>
<td>Telegu, English, Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>Telegu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coding Procedures**

In order to explore the relationship between the levels of English exposure and use and participant feature use, the participants are ranked from those with the highest level of English use and exposure to those with the least. To obtain the ranking, responses to areas of enquiry on English use are assigned scores. These four areas are: 1) the language spoken with the participant’s mother 2) the language spoken with the participant’s father 3) the languages spoken with participant’s siblings and friends. 4) the language used as the medium of instruction in the participant’s primary and secondary schools. The scores for these areas are totaled for each individual, then converted into a percentage, weighted and averaged with a weighted percentage
of time spent exposed to English language submersion in the United States. All five categories of use and exposure are weighted evenly. The categories of English use make up 80% of the final rating. The amount of time spent in the US makes up 20% of the final rating. An explanation of the scoring system is given below. Then the ranking system based on those scores is described.

Scoring System

‘2’ - English used as the primary medium of communication is assigned a rating of 2. When English is reported as the only language used in a particular personal network, it is assigned a 2. Schools in which the primary medium of instruction is English look like the following: teachers speak English with fewer stigmatized features, all classes and textbooks are in English, all lectures and class discussions are in English, students talk with friends in English with some code switching with a local vernacular. Information on English use in schools is found in Ramanathan (1999).

‘1’ - A mixed use of English and a L1 is given a rating of 1. The determination of a “mixed” use of language in personal communication is based on a participant report of the use of two or more languages in a given network (i.e. - with mother, father, friends and siblings). In schools reported as “mixed” teachers speak English with stigmatized features, all classes and textbooks are in English, and a L1 may be used in lectures and class discussion. Students and teachers freely use L1, talking with friends in L1 predominantly with code switching in English and Hindi. Information on English use in schools is found in Ramanathan (1999).

‘0’ - Use of an L1 as the primary medium of communication in personal networks and school settings is assigned a zero.


**Ranking Procedure**

To rank the participants, weighted scores in English use and in English exposure are added together. The procedure used to rank participants is outlined below.

**English Use**

Every category of English use may receive the highest possible score of 2. There are four categories, making the total possible score 8. To find the percentage of English use per speaker, each participant’s total score is divided by the total possible score of 8. This percentage is then multiplied by 0.8, which weights it as 80% of the total ranking score. The other 20% of the total ranking score comes from the amount of each person’s exposure to English submersion in the United States.

**English Exposure**

All participants included in this study have been in the United States a year or less. To gain the percentage of the time each participant had been in the US, the total number of months is divided by the total possible months (12). This percentage is then multiplied by 0.2, which weights it as 20% of the total ranking score.

Weighted scores for English use and exposure are then added to provide the total ranking score for each individual. These scores are used to rank the participants in order of the greatest levels of English use and exposure to the least. For the results of the coding, see Table 2. For the ranking see Figure 1.
Table 2

*Elements Used to Rank Indian English Speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE Speakers</th>
<th>Medium of Instruction</th>
<th>Language Used with Father</th>
<th>Language Used with Mother</th>
<th>Language Used with Siblings</th>
<th>Rating (1-100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coding System -**

- Medium of Instruction in School: Lang. other than English = 0, Mixed = 1, English = 2
- Speech with Fam/Friends: Mainly English = 2, Mixed English, L1 = 1, L1 = 0

![Participant Ranking by English Use and Exposure](image)

*Figure 1.* Participants ordered from highest to lowest use and exposure to English.
The distribution of the percentages of each participant’s nonstandard features along the ranking shown in Figure 1 is discussed after a discussion of which nonstandard features are found in the data. The features discussed in this study are not posited as salient, stable features in IE, nor are they labeled as second language learner error. There is a possibility that many of these features are the result of L1 transfer, however this study is not able to address L1 influence at length. The features discussed in the following section are simply a reflection of the nonstandard syntactic and lexical features found in the IE Pear Story narratives. Some features are of note as they have been previously recorded in research, and some may potentially be found in future research. The syntactic section is a record of the features found in:

1. Agreement
2. Verbal argument structure
3. Subordinate clauses
4. Modifier placement
5. Article use

The lexical section records constructions in:

1. Semantically based reassignment of words
2. Noun compounding
3. Use of Latinate terms
4. Mass nouns
5. ‘Mitigators’
6. Deictic adverb phrases
7. Proverbs

The reader may situate the examples of features within their respective narratives by referring to the transcripts provided in Appendix A.
NONSTANDARD SYNTACTIC AND LEXICAL FEATURES

Syntactic Features

The syntactic features of note in the corpus come under the following areas:

- Agreement
- Subordinate clauses
- Argument structure of verbs
- Null “be” verb
- Modifier placement
- Article use.

Sahgal & Agnihotri (1985:117) claim that, in English dialects, phonetic information varies from region to region in a way that establishes identity for the speakers of that dialect. They then go on to say that morphology is the next most common element to vary, but that syntax remains the most uniform, ‘the glue’ that holds the language together and provides the means of communication across the varying speakers of each dialect. The syntax in the corpus of the present study exhibits low percentages of use, which one might expect to find according to the findings of Sahgal & Agnihotri (1985).

Agreement

As the data was analyzed, it became clear that four areas of the syntax exhibit disparate constructions from those used by the AmE speakers. These categories include agreement between:

- Subject and verb
- Noun and demonstrative determiner
Subject-Verb Agreement

Lack of subject-verb agreement occurs in the data when the subject is singular and the verb is conjugated for the plural and when the subject is plural and the verb is conjugated for the singular. Examples include:

- **Plural conjugation for singular subject**
  - Speaker F: “When he get down from the tree.”
  - Speaker N: “And then a man with a goat pass over there.”
  - Speaker E: “The video end there.”

- **Singular conjugation for plural subject**
  - Speaker O: “And the three children sees his cap…”
  - Speaker I: “They goes back…”
  - Speaker J: “And they place them all into the basket and gives the basket to the guy.”

In keeping with Labru (1991), who notes a lack of subject-verb agreement as a recurrent feature of IE, Sridhar, S.N. (1996: 61, 62) finds a high frequency of subject-verb number disagreement in her corpus of written data. The data in this present study is in keeping with these findings as 11 of the 15 IE speakers displayed subject-verb disagreement.

Demonstrative Determiner-Noun Number Agreement

Lack of number agreement between a demonstrative determiner and the following noun has not been previously noted in IE research. It occurs one time in the data, when the noun is
plural and the demonstrative determiner is singular. The example is from Speaker K: “It seems to be a horror story cause of that noises.

Quantifier-Noun in Partitive

Two speakers exhibit a lack of quantifier-noun agreement in partitive constructions. In each case the noun in the partitive lacks the plural morpheme ‘s.’ The examples of quantifier-noun disagreement include:

- Speaker E: “He gives pears to each of the guy.”
- Speaker I: “And then they comes. One of the guy comes and gives him the cap.”

In Baldridge (2002) this same feature is noted as count nouns that have not been pluralized.

Pronoun-Antecedent

Lack of agreement between pronouns and their antecedents is found when pluralized referents to the ‘pears’ in the film are anaphorically referred to as “it” and when the mass noun “fruit” is referred to as “them.” In two examples “fruits” is later referred to with “it.” Lack of agreement between pronoun and antecedent is found in five speakers’ narratives. Examples include the following:

- Speaker K: “He is plucking up pears from the tree and keeping it in the basket over there.”
- Speaker J: “I have seen a man, a man, plucking some fruit from a tree and placing them on a basket.”

Null Possessive

Null possessive is found when the morphological example of the affix ‘s’ is not used. This is not found in other research and is an isolated incident in the narratives. An example is
Subordinate Clauses

Lack of Interrogative Transformation in Subordinate Clauses

There are examples in IE where an interrogative in a subordinate clause is presented with the syntax used for interrogatives in main clauses. A sample taken from Verma (1980), “I asked Hari where does he work,” exemplifies this lack of transformation. The question in a main clause would read, “Hari, where do you work?” The question in an AmE non-quoted subordinate clause takes out the “do” support, as in “I asked Hari where he works.” Labru (1991) notes as a characteristic of IE “the doubtful use of simple interrogatives and interrogatives in reported speech.” In Sahgal and Agnihotri’s 1985 study on IE speakers’ attitudes towards the acceptability of certain nonstandard features, they found that 57% of their speakers rejected the Verma example, “I asked Hari where does he work.” In the light of this negative response, Sahgal and Agnihotri go on to say that finding how much educated speakers actually use this construction is “a matter for empirical investigation.” The Pear Stories film did not lend itself to the formation of questions and only one speaker exhibits a lack of transformation in subordinate interrogative clauses. The one example of this feature is from Speaker I: “…asked them where did they get the fruits from.”

L1 Transfer/Re-analysis of "Do"

One participant, Speaker I uses the verb “do” to describe the action of helping and being “at fault.” Examples of this use are:

- Speaker I: “And later that guy, in like because of the help they did, he gives three pears…”
• Speaker I: “And this guy also doesn’t know like if they did the fault…”

Use of Conjunction "And" as Filler

In some examples the conjunction “and” appears between clauses, almost performing the same function as “uh” or “mmm.” Examples include:

• Speaker I: “One kid passes by and on his cycle, bicycle and he sees the basket full of pears…

• Speaker E: “They bring all of them together and all the fruits together and put them in a basket.”

• Speaker K: “In the beginning it seems to be a horror story cause of that noises. So, and there is one guy. He is plucking up pears from the tree…”

Omitted Relative Clause Marker (RCM)

Omitted RCM is found in the corpus in Speaker L’s narrative. The example is from Speaker L: “This is a story of a person cuts some fruits…”

Violation of Argument Structure

The examples of violation of argument structure found in this study include intransitive verbs used transitively, transitive verbs receiving an intransitive or ambitransitive status, and null indirect objects. IE, Dixon (1991:441) finds, has generalized ambitransitivity to many transitive verbs. Examples of this ambitransitivity include: “Did you enjoy the party?” “Yes, I enjoyed very much.” And “I’m afraid I’m busy this evening, I shall have to regret.” A verb lacking a direct object is structurally defined as an intransitive verb for the purposes of this study.
Intransitive Verb Used Transitively

Examples where a typically intransitive verb is reanalyzed and receives a direct object in the IE speech of participants in this study include:

- Speaker M: "they whistle him"
- Speaker H: "he got an accident with a stone"

Three out of fifteen speakers display this feature.

Transitive Used Intransitively

In this study some transitive verbs are found, in particular speakers, to be used intransitively, while in other speakers they are used both transitively and intransitively. The examples of intransitivity might also be seen as licensed by the discourse, where a previously mentioned item can be dropped. In every example that a direct object (DO) is missing, that object has been previously used in the discourse. Four out of fifteen speakers exhibit the lack of a DO. Examples of transitive verbs used intransitively and “ambitransitive” include:

- Transitive and Intransitive Use of “keeps” in Speaker K:
  - Transitive: “He is plucking up pears from the tree and keeping it in the basket over there.
  - Intransitive: “Then the man who is plucking pears from the tree come down and keeps in the basket.”

- Transitive and Intransitive Use of “put” in Speaker O:
  - Transitive: “…plucking and putting fruits in his apron.”
  - Intransitive: “They put all the fruits into the basket and they put on his bicycle.”

- Intransitive use of “arrange” in Speaker E: “…put them in the basket and arrange again.”
• Intransitive use of “return” in Speaker N: “So, one boy picked up hat and returned to that guy over there riding a bicycle.”

Null Indirect Object (IO)

Few examples of null indirect object occurred in the data. These examples include:

• Speaker L: “Let me tell about the story of the picture that I saw.” Speaker L does not include the IO “you” after “tell” in the above sentence.

• Speaker B: “Some other like, uhm, WASP boys help pick up all the thing that fall, uh, and in return he just gives three fruit, three of this pears and as he bikes, as passing by from the original site of the crime…” Speaker B exhibits null IO for “to the boys” in the above sentence. This null IO could possibly be an example of pro-drop, since the boys were mentioned at the beginning of the sentence.

Ambiguous Example of Transitive Verb used Intransitively

In the following example it is unclear as to whether Speaker L uses “that who” to mark the relative clause indicating “them” as the boys who stole the pears or if Speaker L rearranges the word order to put a direct object of “taken” - “that” in front of “who has taken.” In AmE the sentence might be realized as either, “He can’t tell if it is them that/who has taken that” or “He can’t tell them who has taken that.” Speaker L could possibly be indicating that the man picking pears should have spoken to the boys passing him by eating the pears. If Speaker L uses “that who” as a double RCM, this sentence is also an example of “taken” as a transitive verb used intransitively, or pro-drop of a DO. However, Speaker L does not include “if” or “it is” so the example has been excluded from the count of nonstandard RCM or transitive verbs used intransitively on the basis of ambiguity. Example: Speaker L - “He can’t tell them that who has taken.”
Null “Be” Verb

Every morphological example of “be” manifested as null in a speaker’s narrative is included as null “be” verb in this study. Null “be” is found in relative clauses, main clauses, coordinated clauses, and in pseudo clefts. Examples within these categories include:

- Null “be” for auxiliary “be” in a relative clause: Speaker N - “man who picking up mangos”
- Null “be” for auxiliary “be” in main clause: Speaker L - “They whistling.”
- Null “be” for auxiliary “be” in coordinated clause: Speaker E - “I don’t know whether these guys, whether this, uh this man is gonna take revenge on those, uh, those three guys or he gonna go then.”
- Null “be” for copula “be” in pseudo cleft: Speaker L - “But again, what he feels that he can get more. So, he totally takes the bunch.”

As in Sharma (2005a), examples of both null copula and null auxiliary “be” were included in the same category during this study. I find, in keeping with the findings of Sharma, that auxiliary ‘be’ has a higher rate of null examples. This, Sharma mentions, mirrors findings in child language acquisition, AAVE, and creoles (2005a: 199).

Modifier Placement

The placement of adverbs in IE occasionally varies from adverbial placement in AmE, as described in Nygaard (2003). This inversion of adverb placement includes the following:

- Speaker B: "he doesn't probably understand" for “he probably doesn’t understand”
- Speaker E: "and one basket only is full" for “and only one basket is full”
- Speaker L: “the movie was only with signs” for “the movie only had signs”
- Speaker I: “one basket is only full” for “only one basket is full”

Only one inverted adjective occurred once in the corpus. This occurs as an isolated event in the narrative of Speaker L: “more three fruits” for “three more fruits”
**Article Use**

Article use is suspected as one of the most stable nonstandard IE grammatical features (Shastri 1996:268) and a great deal of work has been done on the subject. (Baldridge 2002, Kachru 1982, Labru 1984, Shastri 1992, Sharma 2005b) Null article marking for familiar or given entities that would receive an article in AmE is the main issue at hand (Sharma 2005b: 545). The discourse givenness (or familiarity) of a noun phrase, along with the presence or absence of modification of the noun phrase, is found to affect article use the most in Sharma (2005b: 561). In her own words, “Both of these factors also exhibit a scalar effect; quantification favors null marking the most, modification slightly less so, and absence of all modification the least of all. Similarly, evoked NPs strongly condition null marking, inferable NPs slightly less so, and brand-new NPs least of all” (Sharma 2005b: 561).

Null Article for Definite Article

In AmE definite articles are used with nouns that have been previously mentioned in the discourse (Prince 1981). Prince (1981: 236) uses the term “textually evoked” to describe nouns that have already been used. The following examples show nouns with null article marking that are textually evoked, and thereby would receive a definite article in standard English.

- Textually evoked, bare nouns, “hat,” “pears,” “stone”
  - Speaker N - “The boy, uh saw a girl, where he lost his hat… So one boy picked up hat.”
  - Speaker D - “And he was doing this very meticulously and trying to make sure that each of pears was very good, and very safe
  - Speaker O: “He couldn’t watch the stone at the front and his bicycle has touched stone and he falls down.”
- Textually evoked, modified noun, “Pear Story” - Speaker D: “I just saw a clipping, a video clipping of a story called Pear Story.”
According to Sharma (2005b: 251) modified nouns in IE are more likely to receive null article marking than bare nouns, which is seen in the above example.

Null Article for Indefinite Article

In the AmE corpus, indefinite articles are used when entities are new to the discourse (Prince 1981). In Prince (1981: 235) when an interlocutor “creates a new entity” in the discourse, that is, uses a noun that has not been used before, nor has its referent been implied by any prior mention or the situation in which the discourse is happening, this noun is “brand-new.” An instance of null article marking for a brand-new noun is:

- Modified, brand-new noun, “kid” - Speaker J: “And then I’ve seen a man, ahh pass him, along with his goat. I don’t know the relevance but after that, small kid comes on his bicycle.”

According to Sharma’s data (2005b: 251), this noun phrase is more likely to receive the null marking because it is modified. It is also important to note that is a widespread areal feature among Indian languages is the lack of an overt definite article (Sharma 2005b: 538). This is possibly an example of L1 transfer.

Indefinite Article for Definite Article

While instances of null article use are commonly attested to in research on IE (Sharma 2005b, Kachru 1983), the use of an indefinite article, which, in a standard variety of English marks a new entity to the data, in place of a definite article, which marks a given entity (Prince, 1981) has not been widely attested. Only two examples of indefinite for definite article occur in the data. These are:

- Speaker N: “The three boys noticed that there is a cap and uh, belonged to that boy only who is riding the bicycle. So one boy picked up hat and returned it to the boy riding a bicycle.”
• Speaker L also uses “a” to mention a bowl that has been previously spoken of: “And they even, uh, put all the fruits in a bowl and uh, helps him.”

Definite Article for Indefinite Article

Definite articles commonly marking given entities and used in place of indefinite articles that mark new entities in standard varieties of English discourse (Prince 1981) are also not well attested in IE research. Examples of this nonstandard feature in the Pear Story corpus are:

• Speaker E: “I just want to talk about this clipping which was shown, uh, and actually the story begins like this. Uh, a man climbs to the top of the tree.”

• Speaker I: “First I saw one person who’s picking up the pears from the tree.”

There is no previous mention of ‘the tree’ in these narratives. In fact, both of these two quotes begin their respective narratives. There is a possibility that Speaker E and Speaker I thought that they were addressing an audience familiar with the film, in which case instances of ‘the tree’ would be instances of a “situationally evoked” or “given” noun because of extralinguistic context (Prince 1981: 236).

Definite Article for Null or Quantifier

Only one instance of definite article use with a noun for what could have been either a bare noun or a quantified noun was noted. This instance is found in the narrative of Speaker I.

• Speaker I: “First I saw one person who’s picking up the pears from the tree.”

There is a possibility that Speaker I believed he/she was speaking to an audience familiar with the film, and “The Pear Story” as a name does provide some context.
Nonstandard Lexical Features

Nonstandard lexical feature categories are:

- Semantic reassignment
- Innovative noun compounds
- Use of Latinate terms in place of Germanic
- Mass nouns used as count nouns
- Phrasal verbs for singular
- Deictic adverb phrases
- Mitigators
- Proverbs

Semantic Reassignment

A lexical item is considered as semantically reassigned when a word that would be accepted in AmE is replaced with another term. Known motivation for semantic reassignment includes cultural bias, as in the use of “mangos” and “guava” in this study and transfer from the speaker’s L1 (Sridhar, S.N 1996: 58-9). Examples of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs not used in the AmE speaker’s narratives are found in the present study. Sridhar, S.N. (1996: 58) finds L1 transfer from Kannada in cases when “an English lexical item is replaced by a related but semantically distinct word.” This to found when the “semantic space” taken by two English words seemed to be covered, in Kannada, by just one word. The majority of the speakers interviewed in this study are speakers of Telugu, a Dravidian language related to Kannada. Sridhar, S.N. (1996: 59), whose subjects are Kannada speakers, mentions instances of ‘see’ being used for ‘look’ (also ‘look’ for ‘see’), ‘house’ for ‘home,’ and ‘legs’ for ‘feet.’ The data in the
corpus studied here did reveal one non-nonstandard instance of ‘see,’ which was then self-corrected to ‘look.’ The following is a more in depth look at the instances of semantically based lexical reassignment found during this study.

Culturally Based Semantic Reassignment

In references to “pears,” four Indian English speakers used the term “mango” for “pear”; and two incorporated the term “guava.” Those with low percentages of the cultural reassignment often expressed uncertainty as to what they should call the pears. India is the largest producer of mangos in the world. Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh are the largest producers of mangos in India. (Padya, 2007) The speakers who used “mango” were raised in Andhra Pradesh, and though pears are grown in India (Thind, 2003), they choose the term mango. It is also of interest that the name of the film The Pear Story was made known to the participants, and yet participants still proceeded in calling the pears “mangoes” or “guava.” Examples of this culturally based semantic reassignment of terms include:

- Speaker N: “And actually the man who picking up mangos, when he saw the basket…”
- Speaker F: “Just uh, taking the goat away from the mangos.”

It is important to note that, although there are other nouns that could be reassigned (man, boy, tree, bike, paddleball, etc., the only word that is culturally reassigned in these narratives is the word “pear.” It seems that a different elicitation tool would need to be used to find other forms of culturally based semantic reassignment.

Semantic Reassignment of Verbs

In the reassignment of verbs, there is a preponderance to use the word ‘keep’ for ‘put.’
Examples of the semantic reassignment of ‘keep’ are listed below, after which examples of semantic reassignment in other verbs are listed.

- Speaker I: “He takes the basket full of pears, and keeps it on his bicycle…”
- Speaker I: “They sees him getting hurt and like and helps him, picks him up and his basket of pears and keeps his bicycle and uh, help him like to go away.
- Speaker K: “So, and there is one guy, he is plucking up pears from the tree and keeping it in the basket over there at the ground.”
- Speaker L: “And he keeps on his bicycle and he drives away.
- Speaker L: “The guy help him to keep all the fruits.”

In Shastri (1992:267) it is found that, in the IE use of ‘keep’ the semantic feature of + DURATIVE has been somehow suppressed and the semantic feature of + MOVEMENT is used instead. This change in semantic role occurs in our study with seven nonstandard examples of ‘keep,’ in all of which the same semantic reassignment occurs.

Other examples of semantically based nonstandard verb choices are:

- ‘cuts’ for ‘picks’ - Speaker L: “…and again he starts picking, I mean cutting the fruits.” Speaker L consistently uses the term ‘cuts,’ except in the above example where ‘pick’ is used and then self corrected to ‘cut.’
- ‘drives’ for ‘rides’ - Speaker L: “They try to handle his hat…”
- ‘spreads’ for ‘looses’ - Speaker L: “And he loses balance and fell from his bicycle and he spreads all the fruit over there.”
- ‘seeing’ for ‘looks’ - Speaker L: “He was surprised. He was seeing. There he looks. He looks. Who can it be?”
- ‘extrapolates’ for ‘thinks’ - Speaker E: “So he interprets, he just goes to him, he extrapolates that these guys, not extrapolates, in fact, he thinks, rather because this is not imagination…”
- ‘trips’ for “hits the stone”- Speaker A: “Or he misses the stone in front of him, and just he trips and the whole basket of fruits just, it just goes on the … It just falls.”
- ‘wraps’ for ‘cleans’- Speaker J: “And then he tries to grab one of the fruit that fell on the ground, wraps it with his scarf, and then places it again into the basket.”
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• ‘touched’ for ‘hit’ - Speaker O: “He couldn’t watch the stone at the front and his bicycle has touched stone and he falls down.”

More data and a greater knowledge of the speakers’ L1s are necessary to determine what motivates semantic reassignment in all these cases. As seen in earlier examples, the reassignment is widespread and varied.

Semantic Reassignment of Nouns

Examples of noun reassignment are listed below, along with the speaker and the noun substitution possibilities. In some cases a lack of recall seems to motivate word choice, while in other cases other motivating factors seem to be at play. The word ‘picture,’ originally from “motion picture” is commonly used in India for the terms ‘movie’ or ‘film’ (Sadaf Munshi, personal communication, July 28, 2007). More study is required to definitively assign categories to the semantic reassignment shown in Table 3, but they are included here for future consideration.

Table 3

*Semantic Reassignment of Nouns*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Attested Noun</th>
<th>Expected Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H deer</td>
<td>goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G calf</td>
<td>goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L tennis</td>
<td>paddleball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L theme</td>
<td>idea, matter or moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L bowl</td>
<td>basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L level</td>
<td>grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L way</td>
<td>place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L signs</td>
<td>gestures or sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L picture</td>
<td>film, clip or video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other motivating factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, E, G clipping</td>
<td>clip or video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, O persons</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some examples of nominal semantic reassignment include:

- Speaker L: “If there was ex, exact communication the farmer would have known who was actually taking away his bowl… And coming to the theme, I feel that um, um, I feel that richer gets richer and poorer gets poorer.”
- Speaker G: “There was a person coming down with a calf, just looking at the baskets of pears…”
- Speaker D: “Ok, I just saw a clipping, a video clipping of a story called Pear Story…”

Semantic Reassignment of Adverbs and Adjectives

The semantic reassignment of adverbs and adjectives is not as commonly found in this study as verb and noun reassignment. Neither are reassigned adverbs and adjectives very well attested to in previous research. Examples of reassigned adverbs include the following:

- Speaker O: “And the three children sees his cap laying down…”
- Speaker L: “Meanwhile, these three persons, three, uh, kids, they nicely have fun.”

While the adverb “down” is less acceptable in its context, the adverb “nicely” is a commonly noted adverb in IE. (S.L. Chelliah, personal communication, June 2007)

Examples of adjective reassignment are:

- ‘complete’ for ‘whole’ - Speaker O: “So he just robs the complete basket…
- ‘contentious’ for ‘angry’ - Speaker M: “He looked a little worried and a little contentious…
- ‘nice’ - Speaker M: “…and piled them up in a nice basket
- ‘total’ for ‘whole’ - Speaker M: “And the total theme looked as if the person is working hard and is worried…
- ‘bunches’ for ‘lots’ - Speaker L: “He saw the, uh, fruits container of bunches of fruits over there.”
- ‘exact’ for ‘clear’ - Speaker L: “If there was ex, exact communication, the farmer would have known…”
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Innovative Noun Compounds

Compound nouns not found in the AmE narratives can be found in the data at hand. Examples of these innovative collocations include:

- Speaker L: “He collects the fruits. They are the guava fruits.”
- Speaker L: “He saw the fruits container of bunches of fruits over there.”

Labru (1980: 46,76) finds that a preponderance towards using ‘modifier + head’ constructions in Indian languages manifests itself in innovative noun collocations in IE, some of which create a gap between what the speaker intends and what he/she actually said, for instance, a speaker might use “immoral charges” for “charges of immorality.” Perhaps the only true instance of Labru’s collocations found in the data was “fruits container” from “container of fruit.” However, there are some examples of nonstandard compound noun formation that do fit the ‘modifier + head’ grammatical structure. Other research that cites compound noun formation as a feature of IE includes: Baldridge 2002, Kachru 1982, Trudgill & Hannah 2002)

Latinate for Germanic Terms

The feature of Latinate choice of word form over Germanic has also commonly been cited as a feature of Indian English. Dixon (1991:440) claims that spoken (as well as written) IE is very similar to more formal, written modes of English, especially in the use of longer, Latinate terms for more “common monosyllabic words of Germanic origin.” Dixon lists the following terms as common in IE Latinate for Germanic substitution:

- ‘demise’ for ‘death’
- ‘require’ for ‘need’
- ‘request’ for ‘ask’
• ‘inform’ for ‘tell’
• ‘conceive’ for ‘think’
• ‘discuss’ for ‘talk’
• ‘inhabit’ for ‘live’
• ‘present’ for ‘give’ (440)

The following Latinate terms are found in this study’s corpus:

• containing
• initially
• observes
• transports
• exchange
• subsequently
• initially
• eradicate
• interprets

The etymology of the Latinate roots of each word has been checked in the current online edition of the Oxford English dictionary. In order to determine whether or not the IE speakers had a greater propensity towards using the Latinate terms than speakers of an AmE dialect of English, the words - ‘observe’ and ‘collect’ were chosen and searched for in the transcripts of the AmE speakers. This choice was based on the fact that the actions described by ‘observe’ and ‘collect’ commonly occurred in the film, and were in some way described by every narrator. Only one example of ‘collect’ is found in the AmE corpus. Words that are used in the place of ‘collect’
are ‘pick,’ ‘toss’ and ‘pick up.’ No examples of observe occur in the Berkeley transcripts. Words that are used in the place of ‘observe’ are ‘notice,’ ‘see’ and ‘look.’

**Mass as Count Nouns**

Mass nouns are used as count in two ways in the corpus at hand. Some mass nouns are pluralized, receiving the plural suffix ‘-s’ while others are used with a singular, indefinite article.

Mass Nouns Pluralized

The mass noun repeatedly used as a count noun by taking the plural morpheme ‘s’ is the word “fruit.” Examples include the following:

- Speaker L: “They even put all the *fruits* in a bowl”
- Speaker J: “And they pass the guy who was plucking the *fruits.*”

Many researchers note that IE speakers have a tendency to accept the pluralization of mass nouns. Baldridge (2002), Chelliah (2001), Trudgill & Hannah (2002). Sahgal and Agnihotri (1985) claim that pluralization of nouns in contexts beyond the mass noun is found acceptable, giving the following examples: “She’s a tease, she loves to pull your legs” and “In his hearts of hearts he knows he shouldn’t have done it.”

Mass Nouns with Indefinite Singular Article

Though less common, some mass nouns are used in conjunction with indefinite articles. Examples include:

- Speaker L: “If he had *a* good communication like, there was langu… there was, there was no sort of communication between the farmer and the three kids.”
- Speaker E: “Ah, so as *a* gratitude he gives each of the guy *fruit*.”
Phrasal Verbs for Single Verbs

Lexical substitution occurred in the form of phrasal verbs being substituted for singular verbs. The two verbs for which this happened include the phrasal verb ‘picking up’ for ‘pick.’ These are nonstandard as they refer to the man actually picking pears from a tree, rather than picking up pears from the ground or a table. A list of speakers and the number of times they use the phrasal for singular verb is as follows in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Phrasal</th>
<th>Number of Times Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>picking up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>picking up</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>picking up</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these nonstandard phrasal verbs include:

- Speaker N: “There is a man who picking up mangos from a tree.”
- Speaker I: “First I saw one person who’s picking up the pears from the tree.”
- Speaker G: “I saw a person picking up some pears from the tree.”

Mitigators

The word “mitigate” comes from the Latin word *mitigat* meaning ‘softened’ or ‘alleviated’ (OED, current online ed.). Here the term “mitigator” is used to describe the function “just,” “only,” and “kind of” perform in IE speech. This term has been suggested by S.L. Chelliah, and is used with her permission for the purposes of this study. The mitigator “just”
commonly occurs before a verb to lessen the importance of the action. “Only” occurs postpositionally and also performs this function of lessening the importance of an action.

Examples of “just” include:

- Speaker A: “A young boy, he just comes by on a cycle…”
- Speaker I: “He doesn’t know what to do, and like he just sees the guys going away, casually walking…”
- Speaker E: “…and just plucks some fruits. Rather I should say, the fruits are pears, and he just collects and puts, uh, put them in the baskets, uh basket.”

Examples of the post modifier “only” in IE found in the study at hand are very few, and include:

- Speaker N: “…belonged to that boy only.”
- Speaker F: “…on those three guys only.”

In the Dravidian language Kannada, the enclitic -e and post modifier ma:tra perform a function similar to the post modifier ‘only’ in IE. Both of them would translate into English as ‘only’ (Sridhar, S.N. 1996: 60). It is possible then that L1 language transfer is affecting the position of ‘only’ in IE speech.

**Deictic Adverb Phrases**

The deictic adverb phrases "there” and "over there” are used to refer to the extralinguistic space in which an action occurs. The deictic manner adverb “like that” is used to refer to how an action occurs. Examples of the deictic adverb phrase describing the place in which an action occurs include:

- Speaker E: “a man plucking, a man coming and stealing there”
- Speaker H: “There were three guys who were playing over there.”
‘There’ and ‘over there’ are commonly noted as a feature of Indian English. In the Pear Story IE narratives twelve spatial locations are referred to by the speakers with the phrases ‘there’ or ‘over there.’ These locations are as follows:

- Location of baskets
- Location of tree
- Up in the tree
- Introduction of man and goat
- Introduction of bike boy
- The bike accident
- The introduction of the girl
- The introduction of the three boys
- The hat on the ground
- Location of boy after being helped after accident
- Three boys in relation to the tree
- Location of whole story

The deictic manner adverb phrase ‘like that’ in IE occurs in Kannada as hi:ge, meaning “thus/in like manner” (Sridhar, S.N. 1996:61) It is notable as L1 transfer. Examples of the deictic adverb phrase indicating the manner in which an action is performed include:

- Speaker F: “He only saw these three guys with the mangos, I think, like that.”
- Speaker E: “He just goes on like that, like that, like that.”
Proverbs

Rephrased Proverbs

Not many proverbs occur in the IE corpus in this study, and the greater percentage are rephrased. Examples of these rephrased proverbs and their American English equivalents are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Rephrased Proverb</th>
<th>AmE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>“two minds mixed in”</td>
<td>“put two minds together”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&quot;the doubt will arise&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;the suspicion will fall&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>“richer gets richer and poorer gets poorer”</td>
<td>“the rich get richer, the poor get poorer”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Proverb

The only example of standard proverb use is Speaker E: "I don’t know whether these guys… whether this, uh, this man… he’s gonna take revenge on uh, those three guys or he gonna go and hit the ceiling or not."

This concludes the list of nonstandard features found in the Pear Story IE narrative corpus. Thus far the nonstandard syntactic and lexical features in the data have been categorized and discussed in relation to previous research in IE. It must be stressed that features in this list are solely reflective of the nonstandard features found in the corpus of IE narrative being studied. The determination of these features as “nonstandard” is a result of these features not being found in the corpus of standard AmE speakers’ oral narrative found online at
http://www.pearstories.org/ The nonstandard features discussed in this study are not posited as stable IE features or as second language learner error. In the next section the relationship of nonstandard feature presence with level of English use and exposure is examined.
DISTRIBUTION OF NONSTANDARD FEATURES

In this section possible relationships between nonstandard feature use and participant levels of English exposure and use are examined in the categories of:

- Article use – Includes the percentages of null article for definite or indefinite article, definite for indefinite article and indefinite for definite article.
- Argument structure violation – Includes percentages of intransitive verbs used transitively, transitive verbs used intransitively.
- Agreement – Includes percentages of lack of number agreement between subject-verb, demonstrative determiner-noun, and quantifier-noun in partitive constructions, and pronoun-antecedent.
- Semantic reassignment – Includes percentages of culturally motivated reassignment, verb, noun, adverb and adjective.
- Mass nouns treated as count nouns – Includes percentages of pluralized mass nouns and mass nouns that receive an indefinite singular article or quantifier.

The percentages and aggregates of feature presence per speaker within each category are first presented. Then the distribution of the aggregates along a ranking of English exposure and use is presented graphically (for the variables used to rank participants see Table 1). A possible relationship between lower levels of English exposure and use with nonstandard features in each of these categories are found. A stronger relationship between the syntactic features and lower levels of English exposure and use may exist than the relationship between the lexical features and lower levels of exposure and use.

The categories presented in this section have been chosen for analysis for two reasons:

1. They represent both the syntactic and the lexical categories of IE found in this corpus. This is important as it is thought that across dialects greater lexical variance is found than syntactic (Sahgal & Agnihotri, 1985).

2. The categories presented in this study are composed of features taken directly from the data. Some categories have many features, some categories have only a few.
Within the categories with few features, some features are more complementary to one another, and some are disparate. This is reflective of the nature of the features extant in the data. For example, in the category of mass nouns as count, the two features found in the data are “pluralized mass nouns,” and “mass nouns that receive an indefinite singular article or quantifier.” However, in the category of subordinate clauses, the three features found are: “a lack of transformation in subordinate interrogative syntax,” “the use of the conjunction ‘and’ as filler,” and “null relative clause marker.” There are only two examples of the lack of interrogative transformation, as the narratives did not lend themselves to question formation. There is only one example of null relative clause marker. Also, the features of “‘and’ as filler,” “lack of interrogative transformation” and “null relative clause marker” are very disparate from one another. The features found in mass nouns as count are more thoroughly attested in the data, and complement one another. Categories that exhibit these qualities are therefore chosen for analysis as they provide a more substantial database. The percentages of feature use in these categories and the distribution of the aggregates across the ranking of English use and exposure are now presented and discussed.

Percentages of Nonstandard Feature Use and Distribution of Aggregates

Nonstandard Syntactic Features

A possible relationship is found between feature use and lower levels of English use and exposure in the categories of:

- Article use
- Argument structure violation
- Agreement
Aggregate of Nonstandard Article Use

The possible relationship between nonstandard article use and lower levels of English use and exposure is seen in a predominance of nonstandard article feature usage in the aggregates of participants on the lower end of the ranking of English use. The percentages and aggregates are shown below in Table 6. The table is followed by a graphic representation of the distribution of the aggregates along the ranking of participants (see Figure 2).

Table 6

Percentages of Nonstandard Article Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Definite Null Article</th>
<th>Indefinite Article for Indefinite Article</th>
<th>Definite Article for Definite Article</th>
<th>Article for Null Article or Quantifier</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only two speakers in the upper half of the ranking exhibit nonstandard article use. Speaker D exhibits nonstandard article use in only one feature - null article use. Speaker E exhibits nonstandard article use in the sole area of definite article for indefinite article.

**Argument Structure**

There is also a possible relationship between argument structure violation and the amount of English exposure use. Examples of argument structure violation are not found in the narrative of those who use English the most. The percentages and their aggregates are shown below in Table 7. The table is followed by a graphic representation of the distribution of the aggregates along the ranking of participants (see Figure 3).
Table 7

*Argument Structure Violation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Intransitive as Transitive</th>
<th>Transitive as Intransitive</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. Aggregate of argument structure violation.*
It should also be noted that Speakers B, C and L exhibit 25% null indirect object use, while no other speakers exhibit null indirect object. Null indirect object is not included in the aggregate as percentages are disproportionately high due to low numbers of verbs with a valency that include an indirect object.

Aggregate of Agreement

The distribution of agreement features also displays a possible relationship. These features are more widely spread than other syntactic features. However, the speakers with the highest English use and exposure, Speakers A-D, do not exhibit a lack of agreement. The percentages and aggregates are shown below in Table 8. The table is followed by a graphic representation of the distribution of the aggregates along the ranking of participants (see Figure 4).

Table 8

Agreement Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Subject-Verb</th>
<th>Demonstrative Noun</th>
<th>Quantifier-Noun in Partitive</th>
<th>Pronoun-Antecedent</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.016%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The syntactic features are distributed most heavily among users who speak English less than others. In light of the research done in Sharma (2005a), in which lower levels of informal, or daily use of English and lower levels of formal English experience, or education in English, indicate proficiency, it might be said that lower proficiency in English is related to nonstandard syntactic feature presence within oral IE narrative. However, a greater body of IE oral narrative will need to be examined to gather statistically viable data on this issue.

Nonstandard Lexical Features

The distribution of nonstandard lexical features is more widespread than the distribution of the nonstandard syntactic features. The lexical features under consideration here are semantic reassignment and mass nouns treated as count nouns. Semantic reassignment occurs in every speaker’s narrative except that of Speaker C. It should be noted that there are greater percentages of semantically reassigned lexical items in the speech of those in the lower rankings. This could possibly indicate some amount of feature use motivated by a lower level of English use and
exposure. A similar pattern is seen in the distribution of mass nouns that are treated as count nouns.

**Semantic Reassignment**

Semantic reassignment is widely distributed among the IE speakers. Due to the nature of the variation among speakers (see Lexical Features, Section A), what motivates the semantic reassignment within IE remains elusive, yet L1 transfer definitely seems to be apart of the puzzle. The percentages and aggregates are shown below in Table 9. The table is followed by a graphic representation of the distribution of the aggregates along the ranking of participants (see Figure 5).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>10.75%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>9.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speaker F uses a culturally motivated reassignment for 100% of the word ‘fruit’ or ‘pear.’ This causes her/his aggregate percentage to be higher than the other percentages in the group.

*Aggregate of Mass Nouns as Count Nouns*

Again, as in semantic reassignment, we see a greater distribution of features across speakers. Also seen are higher percentages of use. However, there is a heavier distribution among speakers on the lower half of the ranking. As the greater percentage of the mass nouns as count under consideration here are actually examples of “fruit,” the data suggests that perhaps IE has reanalyzed “fruit” as a count noun. Further research needs to be done in order to get a clearer picture of how IE treats mass nouns. The percentages and aggregates are shown below in Table 10. The table is followed by a graphic representation of the distribution of the aggregates along the ranking of participants (see Figure 6).
### Table 10

**Mass Nouns as Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Mass Nouns Pluralized</th>
<th>Mass Nouns with Indefinite Article</th>
<th>Aggregate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>92.85%</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>54.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.** Aggregate of mass nouns as count nouns.
Features within the categories of semantic reassignment and mass nouns as count are widely distributed. Speakers with a lower level of English use and exposure display greater percentages of nonstandard feature presence. This is possibly an interesting mirror of what is going on in the syntactic categories, where feature use is predominately displayed by speakers with lower levels of exposure and use.
CONCLUSION

In this study oral IE narrative has been elicited by showing the Pear Story film (Erbaugh 2001) to Indian English speakers in graduate school in the United States. The Pear Story film as a tool elicits controlled natural speech that is easily analyzable across the speakers’ narrative of the film. Almost every narrator describes certain actions and entities presented by the story, and the lack of speech in the film itself suggests no wording to the narrator. All grammatical and lexical choices to describe the actions and entities in the film are completely left up to the narrator. The Pear Story film provides a narrative sequence of events that is simple and easily accessible cross culturally. It thus provides data for future narrative structure analysis as well. Furthermore it is designed to circumnavigate style shifting by asking that a narrative of the same story from every speaker be recorded while the speaker is alone. The same situation is presented to each participant, providing valid data for intra-group comparison.

The IE narrative gathered in this way during this study has been compared against a corpus of standard AmE narrative if the Pear Story film. The syntactic and lexical features in the IE corpus not present in the AmE corpus are considered nonstandard, categorized according to type and discussed. Percentages and aggregates of feature presence in each speaker’s narrative are calculated and the distribution of the features is analyzed along a ranking of speakers based on each participant’s level of English use and exposure.

The information on each speaker’s English use and exposure was gained through the interview held after the narrative was recorded. In Sharma 2005a it is found that exposure to an English language submersion setting (such as living in the US) does not affect proficiency because speakers found others who either spoke in their L1 or spoke with other IE speakers. The university setting in which the participants in this study were involved in guarantees English
exposure within the classroom setting, and therefore is an integral part of the variables which potentially affect nonstandard feature presence within speech.

A possible relationship is found between lower levels of English exposure and use and the distribution of nonstandard syntactic feature presence. A similar relationship is found, though to a lesser extent with nonstandard lexical feature presence. In Sharma (2005a) an implicational analysis points to a lack of proficiency as the motivation of nonstandard agreement feature use in IE. This same implicational analysis points to nonstandard article use in IE as a ‘more-stable, incipient nonstandard’ feature (Sharma, 2005a:194). A multivariate analysis run in that same study then indicates that both agreement and article use are motivated by proficiency. This motivation of proficiency may possibly be seen in the relationships shown in this study, granted that less English exposure and use is an indicator of less proficiency.

Analysis of the nonstandard syntactic and lexical features within a greater corpus of IE narrative is recommended in order to come to firmer conclusions. It is hoped that this pilot study will help to further work on a greater body of oral IE narrative. It provides a readily available structure for a further study on a large scale. All methods and materials are available for others to use in order to further this aim. A greater understanding of IE as a dialect will further sociolinguistics, variationist studies, and perhaps shed light on principles of discourse guiding language use. As definitive answers can be gained only by quantitative study, it is highly recommended that further IE oral data be gathered and analyzed to meet that end.
Transcripts of the fifteen IE narratives in this study are presented here in alphabetical order.

Transcription Key:

- A line is prosodically defined as sequence of words followed by a pause. The actual value for a pause (number of seconds needed to count as significant for the end of a line) varies by speaker. Thus in this study a pause is significant when accompanied by intake of breath.
- Period indicates the end of a sentence, which usually, but not always, coincides with the end of line.
- A series of periods indicates hesitation, which in these narratives often coincides with repetition or rephrasing.
- A comma is used to separate phrases within a line when the lack of a comma would hinder comprehension.
- A question mark indicates a question.

Speaker A

1. [First line lost]
2. And a goat..
3. And there probably singing or something.
4. And... uh... a guy...a small... a young boy...he just comes by on a cycle.
5. And he stops there and um
6. He tries to steal one fruit
7. But then I guess he wasn’t really satisfied with one
8. So he just carries the whole basket and he...
9. He moves on.
10. And um when he is cycling
11. When he’s going away from the place
12. A little further away
13. He just sees a girl... another young girl coming on a bike.
14. And um he just starts to looking at her...
15. And he misses the road ahead
16. Or he misses the stone in front of him
17. And just he trips
18. And the whole basket of fruit is just… it just goes on the... it just falls.
19. And um... there were another couple of guys over there.
20. They help him...
21. Ahh pick up the basket of fruits
22. Put the fruits into the basket
23. And um...
24. They just walk past.
25. And um and in return of that...
26. For their kind deed...
27. Ahh the boy who stole the fruit... he gives them each a fruit
28. And he just goes.
29. On the other end... the guy who was plucking the fruit from the trees...
30. He comes down
31. From the trees
32. And he’s like counting
33. He’s like oh my god there were three baskets and now there is just one ah...
34. There’s just two.
35. So that’s about it. So that’s the story over there.

Speaker B
1. I just saw uh this film
2. And uh whatchya call the uh pear story.
3. And it was about...
4. Probably it was a Hispanic man and he was in this tree... a pear tree among the pear fruit.
5. And this young boy
6. Probably around thirteen years old, comes along
7. And just steals a basket full of these pear fruit.
8. And...and then there
9. When he is going like he falls down
10. And uh some other like WASP boys help him to pick up all the thing that fall.
11. And uh in return he just gives three fruit
12. Three of his pears
13. And as these boys are passing by from the original site of the crime
14. This Mexican who was on top of the tree comes down and sees that
15. One of his baskets is missing
16. A basket full of fruit.
17. And then he sees these boys walking by
18. And he doesn’t...
19. Probably understand whether these boys are responsible for it
20. Or who has
21. And he is a bit confused.
22. Now what I'd try to conclude from all this is...
23. One thing is...
24. That uhm
25. The boy who stole all that was
26. Uhm that didn’t have much of moral values.
27. And secondly
28. Uh well at least seeing the kindness and goodness with of the other three boys
29. He should 'ah had the decency to return the stuff which he stole.
30. And uh regarding this...this Hispanic who discovered his things to be lost and he comes down and he sees the other three boys walking past.
31. Well its natural for every...anyone to be like perplexed
32. Perhaps probably thinking these three boys to be directly... indirectly responsible for this.
33. And well
34. That’s how life is... uh…
35. You always get…You have good and bad people
36. Just like ya' have all...like five fingers of the hand aren’t equal.
37. That’s it.
38. Thank you.

Speaker C

1. These are my comments on the movie that I just saw. It was named the pear story I think.
2. Um the movie was rather interesting I think.
3. Because...uh I went in thinking that
It would be something boring. But it was short like six minutes
And um...
Um that movie was like in a 1970s or 1980s format and
Just when maybe color prints were introduced or something.
Mmm and the setting was maybe Latin America or like Argentina or something.
Uh it’s a very rural setting
Because I think I saw a goat or something.
Mmm the...there's nothing much to the story except like
It shows a farmer plucking pears and putting them in baskets and
Uh a kid on a bike steals those pears.
Mmm uh he ann...he has a small accident.
And he's helped on again by some other kids who...
Like he gives them pears in exchange for their help.
Uhm and he like...by the time the farmer realizes that the pears are gone. He sees these three kids walking up holding the pears that were stolen from him, so
Its slightly comical I suppose?
Uhm well that’s where the story ended and uh
That was it.
Thank you.

Speaker D
Ok I just saw a clipping...a video clipping...of a story called Pear Story
And it was about...uh maybe a farmer
Who was trying to pick up some pears
From the trees
And filling up baskets.
Uh maybe he wanted to sell them
And um he was doing this very meticulously
And trying to make sure that each of pears were
Very good
And very safe, and
While he was doing so a small kid
On his bike
Was passing by.
And he saw that the farmer was not looking at him.
And he quickly took one of the baskets
Filled with pears
On his bike
And carried them away.
And as he was riding back.
He was riding on a rough track
And some of the pears were falling down
And
There was another girl
Coming from the other side of the track.
She was maybe going to school.
And this boy was
Looking at this girl
And didn’t realize there was a stone ahead.
Hit the stone
Fall down
All the pears fall down
And rolled away.
And there were three other kids standing aside watching all this
And
They came along to help him
Picked his bike
And helped him to put all the pears back into the basket.
And he went uh walking back on this track
The boy with the pears
And the three boys went on the other side
But while they’re walking
They saw that the hat
The boy was wearing was on the road
So they whistled at him
And called him back.

And when one of the boys went...went to him and gave him his hat back and in return he got three pears

For three of them.

So they’re enjoying the pears walking down.

In the meantime

The farmer got down from the tree

And found that one of the baskets was missing

And was thinking “Where the heck did they go?”

And what he sees is

Three little kids coming by

Having a pear each

And is thinking...“What’s going on?”

So that is all.

I just want to talk about this clipping

Which was shown.

Uh and actually

The story begins like this

Uh...a man climbs to the top of the tree

With the help of a ladder

And just plucks some fruits.

Rather I should say the fruits are pears.

And he just collects and puts uh put them in the baskets...

Uh basket.

And I found somebody else

Uh a guy coming by bicycle

And he stops over there

He observes these fruits and he observes the man who is plucking still on the top.

So...he...he...he actually...he actually...

I found that he is stealing the basket.
He steals the basket, rather.
And he takes off by bicycle.
That way
He just goes on like that like that like that.
On the way
He finds a girl coming in front of him.
The girl is really pretty good
And she is looking gorgeous.
And what happens is
Generally
This girl comes and
He drools at her...on her.
And uhm uh...at last...uh he drools over her.
And he keeps on staring at her.
And he goes like that like that.
<obs> he turns over at the back.
And he just go there.
And he hit a rock.
And fells down like that.
And uh I observe some guys...three of the guys...three guys playing some...
You know
Something with a small bat and a ball.
They...they see this man...this person...fall down.
And they comes over there and picks him up and help him.
And uh... also all the fruits fell all over the place fell all over the place all over the place.
So they...all the...bring all of them together and
All of the fruits together
And put them in the basket
And arrange again.
And also he injured his knee
I guess the guy who fell down injured his leg.
So they collects him and puts him
And they lift him up and they actually...
Ok...and...the guy starts moving
Also, so they helped him.
They become...all three guys and this person...both of them...those three people and this person...become friends and
They share some thoughts like that...and something...something funny like that.
And again
He starts his journey.
And because of this they help.
Aah...so...as a gratitude he gives pears to each of the guy...
Fruit to each of the guy.
And they take the fruit
They enjoy the fruit...
And they just go and uh..di...
Uh this guy...
Uh uh bicycle guy
Goes away.
And these three
Guys
With the fruit...with the pears in their hand
And just biting it like that like that.
And they go all the way.
And this person who was...
Who was uh initially plucking the fruits comes down from the ladder.
Uh he sees...
He observes these guys...these three guys...
Uh actually...sorry...
Before this we have something
He observes the basket
One uh...empty basket...one empty basket.
He fill two baskets initially full of fruits
And one basket is only full and the other basket is empty.
So uh that's really...I mean...he actually...he...he that's...that's astonishing for him
And he don't know what happened actually.
And he sees...he looks this side this side over there
Whether anybody...I mean...these were stolen or not.
But ok
Like that he thinks on.
And he observes these guys
Coming with the fruits
On their hands
Their fruits and they're biting like that...
And uhm so he interprets...
He just goes to him
He extrapolates that these guys...
Not extrapolates...
In fact he thinks, rather,
Because this is not imagination.
This is <obs> purely because he sees uh from his eyes.
So he thinks that these guys really...means...stole his fruits, so.
So they...he...he thinks that these guys are guilty.
And
These innocent guys go on like that and
I don't know
The video ends there.
And what happens next I don't know whether these guys...whether this uh this man...he's gonna take revenge on those uh those three guys
Or he gonna go...go then and hit the ceiling or not.
I don’t know.
I'll guess.
There's something...
The video...
I mean it's not really even good inference because I <obs> much inference.
This something...the video starts like this
A man plucking
A man coming and stealing there.
And a girl comes.
He looks over there.
And he falls down.
And after that the three people come and help him
And he gives...
Because of his gratitude and all and
He gives the fruits to them.
And they were there.
And they miss and this and it was a mista ahh and this guy he thinks
That these fellows...men robbed his fruits and they're guilty and like this.
And its not ok.
Its ok, its not quite interesting.
There’s not much masala in this.
Ok anyways
Uh...That's it. <obs>
Thank you.

Speaker F

Hi this is_________
And I just saw the film, yah.
Its quite good.
And actually what I just saw in that film is
One guy and he was plucking the mangos.
And first of all we saw a guy walking with an animal. I think it’s a goat, yah.
Even when we see that
We can know that the goat was
Seeing...seeing for...looking at those mangos.
And it was not moving.
And the man was asking the goat or just uh...
Taking the goat away from the mangos.
And then we saw a guy
Who comes and who steals a basket of mangos
And goes from there.
And then we saw
Three guys
Who help out that guy when he falls down from his bicycle.
And uh concept here which we understood is
What
This guy who...
Who has stolen the mangos
And he fell from the bicycle
And those three guys actually help him get all the mangos again into the basket and uh make him leave that place.
And when that guy who was plucking the mangos came down from the tree he saw these three guys
Because these three guys were eating one of the things they just they took...some three mangos from that guy
Who was riding the bicycle.
So actually what the man thinking will be here is
That these three guys have stolen the mangos or something because um basically the doubt will arise on
These three guys only...only
Because when he get down from the tree he only saw these three guys with the mangos.
I think like that.
Ok. Bye.

Speaker G
The six minute video clipping which I saw
Uh was...uh had uh different characters in that.
Uh I saw the name to be the Pear Story.
Where I saw a person picking up some pears from the tree
And filling up his basket.
Uh then uh there was a person coming down with a calf
And looking at the baskets of pears
And just leaving by the <obs>
A little boy comes down on a cycle.
10. Uh at first he tries to take one or two pears from the basket.
11. And then he sees that the person who was picking the pears was not at all looking at him.
12. Then he just goes there and then goes by.
13. Uh...as a person...as a kid uh...was going down the road he crashes with a girl who comes the other way.
14. And he falls down.
15. Along...along with him falls down all his pears.
16. Uh and he gets hurt.
17. Then uhm three other kids who were there...
18. Uh quite reluctantly...but comes down and uh helps the guy...helps the kid to get up...
19. And fills his basket of pears back.
20. And uhm...and the kid goes on his own way.
21. And the three kids go.
22. One of the three kids who helped the small boy uh sees that he forgot his cap on the road.
23. And uh and the gu-...and the small kid whistles back.
24. And gets the cap back to the small guy.
25. What else did I see? (laughter).
26. Uh the small kid uh uh was quite impressed with the help the three other kids has done...have done to him.
27. And then gives three pears back to him.
28. Uh in the meanwhile uh these three kids uh go back on their own way and the uh person who uh uh
29. Who was picking up the pears comes down and wonders where the other basket was.
30. At the same time he sees the three kids uh eating the pear and going by.
31. Uh he gets quite confused...like...whether these three kids have stolen the pears or was it someone?
32. And that ends the story I suppose.

Speaker H

1. Uh this is __________
2. Uh this story was interesting.
3. Uh it starts with a man who was plucking some fruits from the tree and those fruits were pears I suppose.
Then a man uh he filled two baskets with pears.
A man came near by and he was with a deer.
And he just uh gave a glance to the pears and he went away.
After that a small uh boy came on a bicycle
He...he took one basket with him
And uh on his bicycle, he went away.
Uh in the way he met a girl
He was looking at a girl.
And...and uh he uh uh he had a accident uh with a stone and he fell away and all the basket with the pears also fell away.
And
Uh there were three guys who were playing over there.
One of them
Uh like he pointed over to him.
And those three came and picked all the fruits and put it back in the basket.
Uh when they were leaving one guy came back and asked for uh three pears.
He took three pears from the guy
And he went away.
After that
Uh after that the man who was oily
Who was on the tree
He came down and stared at those three guys.
That’s all.

Speaker I

First I saw
One person...one person who’s picking up the pears from the tree
And there
One...one kid passes by and on his cycle...bicycle
And
He sees the basket full of pears.
And uh
Then he tries to take...tries to take
Two of...one or two of them...one or two of them
And observes that the person who is picking up the pears is not watching him.
And then he takes the basket full of pears and keeps it on his bicycle.
And he like umm g- goes on his way
Likes rides his cycle and goes away.
And while he’s going uh
A girl comes uh opposite to him
And like b- seeing him he hits a rock
And he falls down
And the basket full of pears also fall...falls down
And uhh he...he gets hurt.
And uh three kids are playing something over there and hey sees him getting hurt
And like and helps him
Picks him up and his basket of pears.
And keeps his bicycle
And uh help him like to go away.
And they pass...they goes back.
And like they recognize that he forgot his cap
And then they comes by
One of the guy comes back and gives him the cap.
And later
That guy in like
Because the help they did
He gives three pears for h...for them to eat
And he goes away.
And the three...the three kids
They like they eat and they are ea...um
And they walks by
And passes the pear tree
And like
The...the person who is picking up the pears sees them
And uh eating the pears
And he w...like he comes down the tree and wonders like why there’s no bas...
One basket is only full
And one basket is empty
And he at the same time he sees the three kids passing by eating pears
And he d- he’s really confused and he doesn’t know what to do and like
He just sees the guys
Going away casually walking
And sees li- like they’re not like um
They are...um they doesn’t know that those pears came from that basket
They’re just ca...casually passing by
And this guy also doesn’t know like if they did the fault
They must have been really like afraid before him
But they’re casually walking.
He’s like but amazed.
That’s it.

Speaker J

1. In this short film I have seen a man
2. Plucking some fruit from a tree
3. And placing them on a basket.
4. And then he tries to grab the one fruit that fell on the ground.
5. Then he wraps it with his scarf
6. And then places it again into the basket.
7. And then I’ve seen a man aaah pass him along with his goat
8. I don’t know the relevance but
9. After that
10. Small kid
11. Comes on his bicycle
12. And takes the basket from that
13. aaa basket that is placed there.
14. I guess he was stealing a basket.
15. And then he puts it on his bicycle
16. And then he goes along.
17. And then he sees a girl and he tries to turn back.
18. And then he falls down hitting a rock in front.
19. And then three guys try to help him.
20. One guy was playing ping pong.
21. And they um aah kind of pick up all of the fruits
22. And they place them all into the basket and
23. Gives the basket to the guy and then
24. And they suddenly see that the hat of the guy has also felled down.
25. So they pick it up and give them...give the hat to the guy.
26. And then the guy gives them fruits.
27. And they pass by the guy who was plucking the fruits.
28. And he wonders where the other basket has gone.
29. And he sees the three guys with the fruits and
30. And probably he assumes that they have stolen them or he’s confused.
31. That’s it.

Speaker K
1. Hi, this ___
2. So it wasn’t an interesting story.
3. In the beginning it seems to be a horror story
4. Cause of that noises.
5. So
6. And there is one guy
7. He is plucking up pears from the tree
8. And keeping it in the basket
9. Over there
10. At the ground.
11. And then uh
12. There comes a man with a goat.
13. And uh
14. He just looks at...looks at the pears
And just go away.
And then...
And then the man who is plucking pears from the tree come down and keeps it in the basket.
And then there is one little boy
Who is riding a bicycle
And he sees the pears and
And then uh he just takes it
Steals it, whatever.
And then he went away and then
He met...he met a girl.
Oh he didn't met a girl
But his cycle coli..
He was seeing a girl
And he fell off his cycle...bicycle.
And then all the pears were on the ground.
And then there were three good boys
Who helped him
Uh in moving the pears once again in the basket.
And then um
The boy calls one of them and gave him two pears.
And then
Uh I think that's it.

Speaker L

Mm let me tell about the story of the picture which I saw.
Um this is a story,
Initially a person cuts some fruits,
And he...he collects the fruits.
They are the guava fruits.
And um thing is he’s...he is cutting the fruits and he already fills one...one...um bowl.
And uh here
Next um...
Again he...he uh, 
Thing is there are...there are all together three bowls over there.
Uh he already fills up for the straw bowls and again he picks up...
He uh climbs on the tree and again he starts picking the...I mean...cutting the uh fruits.
Meanwhile,
Uh small kid uh...
Meanwhile a kid driving on a bicycle,
He was driving along the same path with where the person...where this person...the farmer who was cutting the fruits,
And he was passing by the same way,
And he saw the uh fruits container of bu bunches of fruits over there.
He uh tries to pick up one.
Initially he thought of up picking one fruit
From the bowl.
Um he picks one fruit,
But again what he feels that
He can get more
So he...he totally...to...totally...he totally takes the bunch.
I mean the whole uh bunch of fruits
And he keeps on his bicycle...on his bicycle
And he drives away.
He...he watches whether someone’s seeing him or not.
He...that kid...finds that nobody is watching...watching him
And even the person...even the farmer...who’s cutting the fruits
He also doesn’t see him.
Meanwhile he um...he starts driving along his way to home.
While...while he was driving
In the opposite direction
A girl... a lil... a kid... the girl... kid... a girl kid... girl, even she’s coming by opposite direction.
By seeing he
You know
Generally <laughter> um the people

You know

Girl and boy

They try to ride the same manner. This um fellow...this boy... this guy...he too saws that girl and he’s a really...he um...he just...he just watches her.

And he suddenly uh lo...loses his balance

And fell from his bicycle and

Uh he spreads all the fruit over there and

Uh he got injured

And that girl

She lefts uh...the girl

She left

She already lefts by the time he fell down.

And uh he tries to...he tries to get up but...but in the...at the same time three more kids are coming

They were coming from the same direction and they saw this guy...this kid fall down

And uh they uh helps this...they help...help the guy um

And um and help him to keep all the fruit.

And...and he says thanks.

He...he greets...he uh he greets them and he again...

These uh three kids...

They uh three gang...

Three people...

Three kids...

They help this guy.

And they even uh put all the fruits in the um...fruits and uh in...in a bowl and uh helps him.

And um meanwhile they uh three move away.

And this fellow

He uh even drives

And uh he um...

The thing is

His cap...his hat will be left with the three guys.
And they saw that he uh...he um...he um...he uh...I mean uh...the...the kid...the one who fell down has...has kept his um...

By mistaken...by mistaken that fellow hat will be with these guys.

They try to hand...to handle...handle uh his hat

And uh by whistling to that guy who was uh that was moving away...moving with his bicycle, they whistle him.

And when he hears the sound and he turns

And again they come back to him.

And they give the guy...the guy...he come back and give him...give him his hat.

Meanwhile he uh gives them more three fruits for helping them...

For helping him and also helping in...in helping him in getting his hat.

And um he went offs.

And meanwhile these three persons...three uh kids...they uh nicely have fun.

They whistle.

And they... while playing with the ten...tennis... and they...they move by eating the fruit.

And uh at the same time...

They reach the same way where the farmer... where the farmer was initially cutting the fruits.

Uh the farmer was uh was um completed...

The farmer... he’s done with his work by cutting the fruits.

And again he comes to fill up the bowl.

But he... he saw that uh um... he saw that his one of the bowls was missing.

Actually there was three bowls

But two bowls were uh full and uh one bowl was empty.

But when he saw... when he comes down from the tree and he saws that only two bowls

With one full and one and one is already empty, right?

So he was...he was...stands there.

He was surprised.

He was seeing there

He looks... he looks who... who can it be?

But... but meanwhile...

These three kids are coming...

But he couldn’t... he couldn’t uh recognize...
99. He can’t see them.
100. He can’t tell them that who has taken.
101. That was the story and coming to the moral...
102. The moral of the story
103. Here...here the main cause of this
104. Uh thing is
105. If he had a good communication like there was a language...
106. There was...there was...uh no sort of communication between the farmer and the three kids.
107. If...if you... if that person... if the farmers would have spoken to the three kids about uh...
108. About the uh about the bowl containing the fruits, they would have uh they would have said something, right?
109. They would have said maybe the bowl was with uh the other kid
110. Or that they would have said something else.
111. But there was no communication.
112. There was only [obs].
113. The movie was only with signs and with uh signs.
114. That’s it.
115. There was no communication exactly.
116. If there was ex...exact communication
117. The farmer would have known who was actually taken away his bowl.
118. [obs] And coming to theme
119. I feel that um um...
120. I feel that
121. Richer gets richer and poorer gets poorer.
122. When I was in... when I was doing my secondary sch...my secondary high sch...high level... in my sociology...
123. I heard that um that richer gets richer and poorer gets poorer.
124. It means that uh...
125. Due to lack of knowledge or due to lack of exact communication
126. Poorer people will be poorer.
127. If you have good communication
128. And if you speak to other people...
129. If he face... if he uh discuss the problems
130. To some extent we could solve the problems.
131. And um maximum extent we can eradicate crime.
132. That’s it.
133. Thank you.

Speaker M

1. Mmm the video clip started with
2. This farmer picking up
3. What looked like pears.
4. Uh and um
5. He was climbing up the tree.
6. There were three baskets.
7. He kept putting in the pears.
8. He climbed up the ladder
9. Went on top.
10. And he looked like he was from, maybe Mexican?
11. Somewhere from the Latin American countries?
12. Um after some time he, I mean, he kept doing this.
13. He kept picking up pears and putting them, collecting them
14. Going up, coming down the tree.
15. Uh subsequently
16. There was another farmer, I guess.
17. You could hear the bleating of a goat.
18. And then he came.
19. And he went past the farmer with his goat.
20. Uh
21. The farmer filled up
22. Two um baskets of fruit
23. And then went up again for the third one.
24. And
25. In the meanwhile
When he was up on the tree,

A young boy on a bicycle came.

He looked at the farmer up there.

He uh put his bicycle down

And then

He looked around

Picked up one pear,

And then decided to take the whole basket.

Initially I thought maybe

He was like doing the supplies or

I mean taking it to the market

But then I realized that

He had taken away the fruit.

He wanted to take the fruit.

After some time,

His um uh he was cycling down

With the heavy basket

Of fruit

And from the opposite side we could see a girl coming.

And for a moment he turned around to look at her.

He hit a stone and fell down.

And the whole basket of fruit came down.

He fell down.

He got hurt a little.

Just as he was trying to pick himself up

Three boys were coming from the opposite direction.

They helped him up.

They picked up the fruit.

Put it in the basket.

And uh

Saw that he went off in the opposite way safely.

They went on their way

And a little ahead they found his hat.
59. So this other boy whistled to him and called him back and went to g...return the hat to him.
60. And um this boy give them three pears.
61. Um the boy went on his way.
62. The other three boys went back
63. Went in the opposite way
64. In the direction of where the farmer was picking up the fruit.
65. Here
66. The farmer came down from the tree
67. To fill the third basket
68. And suddenly noticed that the basket was not there.
69. He looked around and in...
70. At the same time the three boys
71. Who had helped the other boy earlier
72. Who had taken the basket of fruit
73. Were coming in his direction.
74. And each had a pear in his hand.
75. The farmer looked stupefied and then
76. Wondering where the basket of fruit had gone.
77. The boys went in the opposite way.
78. And the farmer was left wondering where all his fruit has gone.

Speaker N

1. Uh uhm there is a man who picking up mangos from a tree…tree
2. And putting them in the baskets.
3. He already put mangos in two baskets
4. And uh picking up mangos
5. On the tree.
6. And then
7. A man with a goat uh pass over there.
8. After that
9. Uh a boy riding a cycle came there
10. And just wanted to pick one or two mangos.
11. But he noticed that uh the man who picking mangos is not uh noticing him.
12. So he picked up one basket of mangos
13. And he went away.
14. On his way
15. The boy saw a girl
16. Uh where he lost his hat.
17. And after that uh he got an accident like with a stone.
18. And there is the three boys playing there.
19. They helped him
20. And they put all the mangos in the baskets and then
21. And uh then…then went away.
22. On the way the three boys noticed that there is
23. A cap they thought that that belonged to that boy only who is riding the bicycles.
24. So one boy picked up hat and returned to the boy riding a bicycle.
25. And so the boy gave them three mangos.
26. And they shared them.
27. And actually the man who picking up mangos uh
28. When he saw that basket...that one basket is uh is not there,
29. And he saw that the three boys coming on the way eating mangos uh
30. And that's all.

Speaker O

1. I saw a movie today
2. Its uh
3. The main... uh the story was
4. The person was plucking some fruits.
5. And uh... I think
6. Uh it’s a...it’s a farmyard.
7. So he was uh plucking some fruits
8. And was uh wearing an apron
9. And was plucking and putting fruits in his apron.
And then
Uh after getting down from the tree
He just put all the fruits into the basket.
And after filling one basket.
While he was going up and the person
Who comes along with his goat
I think he’s taking his goat for some grazing.
And again this person climbs a tree
And he’s on his work
And at that moment when a child comes there
And he sees two baskets full of fruits
So
He first thought of taking one fruit and going
But uh
When he saw that person
Who was very busy in plucking the fruits... he uh
He got tempted
And he just uh
And he robs the complete basket
And puts on the bicycle
And he moves calmly without making any noise
From that place.
And the person doesn’t see him
And he’s busy concentrating on his work.
And this person... he... this child... he... this guy... uh this person has gone calmly
And was going on his bicycle.
So when he was on his way
He sees a girl
Coming from the other side
And he watches her
Turns back and sees her
And he couldn’t watch the stone at the front
And his bicycle hits the stone
And he falls down
And
At that moment
There are another three persons
Uh three children of, I think they are of the same age.
So the three people
One of them is holding a T.T. bat and a ball attached to it...
And was playing with it.
And those three boys comes and helps him in
Picking up the fruits
And they put all the fruits into the
Basket.
And they’ll put on his bicycle.
And uh they will send him
And uh as he will, as he was in fear
He will
Be uh moving from there
Suddenly
And the three children
Sees his cap
Laying down
And he picks that cap
And he calls him
By whistling it.
And that person... that child... turns back
And he asking him for the fruits.
And suddenly after those people...those three boys coming near
Uh gave him the cap
And in turn he gave him the three fruits for those three children
And the boy goes on his way
And he...and he easily escaped from that robbery
And these three children
Who were on the way to that farmyard
Uh to that tree
Uh they were holding those fruits and eating.
They...they were going to their home I think
And at that moment
The person who climbed that tree and was plucking those fruits, right?
That person got down and was searching for the another basket
At that moment he sees all these three children carrying their fruits in hand.
And he thinks that the three children have robbed his basket.
And that ends the story.
Thank you.
APPENDIX B

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
Thank you for participating in our project. Please tell us a little bit about yourself.

1. Your Name:

2. Do you have a nickname, what do your friends call you?

3. What is your date of birth:

4. What languages do your parents speak?
   a. Mother:
   b. Father:

5. What language(s) do you speak with your parents?

6. What language(s) do you speak with your siblings or cousins?

7. What language(s) do you speak with your friends in India?

8. What language(s) do you speak with your friends in the USA?

9. Do you find yourself using a different language depending on the situation? Tell us about your choice of language in two different situations for the following people.
   a. With Father:
   b. With Mother:
   c. With Siblings/Cousins
   d. With Friends in India
   e. With Friends in the U.S.A.?

10. Where did you grow up?

11. Did you move in the first 18 years of your life? If so, where are the different places that you lived?

12. What was the name of your primary school?

13. What was the name of your secondary school?
14. Was your schooling mainly in English medium schools? If not, in what other language medium(s) did you study?

15. How long have you lived in the United States?

16. What is your major or field of study?

Thank you!

Name of Interviewer ________________________

Date: ______________________________
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