WORLD ENGLISHES

World Englishes, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 251–268, 2011. 0883-2919

South African Indian English: A qualitative study of attitudes

LISA WIEBESIEK*, STEPHANIE RUDWICK** AND JOCHEN ZELLER***

ABSTRACT: This paper focuses on attitudes towards South African Indian English (SAIE), an L1 variety of English spoken in South Africa. The attitudes of the participants are considered against the backdrop of the socio-political history of this variety and its speakers, and in contrast to their attitudes to what they perceive as 'good' English. While the research methodology is primarily based on lengthy, semi-structured interviews with twenty young South African Indians (i.e. ingroup members), the paper also includes a discussion of some of the linguistic features of SAIE, which is mainly motivated by methodological considerations. Through an examination of SAIE wh-questions, we show that the grammar of this variety differs systematically from that of the reference variety. Using examples of these wh-questions, we elicited grammatical judgments from participants and compared these judgments to the attitudes of the participants as expressed in response to open-ended questions in interviews. On the basis of the empirical data that we obtained and analysed, we argue that the young South African Indian students who participated in our study have a profoundly ambiguous attitude towards the variety associated with their own ethno-linguistic group.

INTRODUCTION

Studies of the linguistic features and sociolinguistic functions of different varieties of English have been a steady theme among South African researchers. A discussion of varieties of English in South Africa cannot be considered outside of the context of the social complexities of South African society; many of which, as a result of Apartheid, continue to be at least in part mediated by racial issues. The continued use of racial labels to refer to different varieties of English is testament to the fact that this continues to be a salient identifier of linguistic varieties in this country (Coetzee-Van Rooy and Van Rooy 2005). Mesthrie (2010: 5) points out that Apartheid gave rise to what he refers to as "four main ethnic Englishes" in South Africa which he identifies as L1 White South African English (WSAE), Indian South African English (ISAE), Coloured South African English (CSAE), and other mainly L2 varieties including Afrikaaner South African English (ASAE) and Black South African English (BSAE).

Many linguists working on varieties of English in South Africa have focused on L2 varieties, particularly BSAE (e.g. de Klerk 1999; Makalela 2004; Van Rooy 2008). In this paper we focus on SAIE[1,2] a variety of English which, over the past fifty years, through the process of language shift, has become the L1 of the majority of South Africans of Indian descent (Mesthrie 1992a; Census South Africa 2001). SAIE is most widely spoken in KwaZulu-Natal, which is the province where most South African Indians reside and where our research was conducted.

As Makalela (2004: 355) points out, there is not yet a codified standard South African English. The absence of such a prescriptive form of English in relation to which two or

*Human Sciences Research Council, Private Bag X07, Dalbridge, Durban, 4014, South Africa. E-mail: lwiebesiek@hsrc.ac.za

**Linguistics Programme, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. E-mail: rudwicks@ukzn.ac.za

***Linguistics Programme, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. E-mail: zeller@ukzn.ac.za

more different varieties can be discussed gives rise to a challenge in terms of how to go about positioning different varieties of English in one geographical context in terms of the dimensions of grammar and attitudes. Nevertheless, for the purposes of the analysis and discussion of our data, it is necessary to identify a variety of English to which SAIE can be compared in relation to the dimensions mentioned above. This is, first, to avoid becoming entangled in the complexity of the Standard English debate in South Africa which is beyond the scope of this paper; and second, to avoid the excessive polarization of WSAE and SAIE. To mediate these issues we compare SAIE to what we will term the *reference variety*.

While this reference variety is grammatically closest to what has been referred to as WSAE in the literature, to use WSAE for the purpose of this paper would be controversial linguistically and socio-politically (Mesthrie 2010). Furthermore, in terms of our data it would not be an accurate reflection of our participants' perspective (which, after all, is our focus in this *emic* handling of our data). Our participants do not compare the variety of English they associate with South African Indians to a variety of English that they associate with White South Africans. Further, acrolectal SAIE has some degree of prestige within the South African Indian community and for speakers of BSAE (Mesthrie 1992a; Coetzee-Van Rooy and Van Rooy 2005). However, as Mesthrie (2010: 12) points out:

> English-speaking whites have been the most influential segment of the populace in terms of their socioeconomic position and prestige for two centuries. They initially predominated in the private and Model-C schools of the post-Apartheid era and still do in many such institutions.

As a result, the variety spoken by English-speaking Whites has and does form a prestige reference for many speakers of other varieties of English in South Africa.

In light of the above-mentioned complexities, we note that the argument in this paper is not concerned with positioning SAIE in relation to an as yet non-existent codified standard South African English, nor is it concerned with positioning SAIE in relation to WSAE exclusively. The focus of this paper is on the ambivalent attitudes of our participants towards SAIE. Thus, for the purposes of this paper, the reference variety to which we compare SAIE is defined as a prestigious variety of English, taught in schools, similar in structure to WSAE and the variety to which our participants refer as 'good' and 'proper' English.

In this qualitative study, we investigate the attitudes of South African Indian students on the Howard College Campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Durban) towards SAIE, the variety associated with their ethno-linguistic group. While our research is primarily based on lengthy, semi-structured interviews with 20 young South African Indians, the paper also includes a discussion of some of the linguistic features of SAIE, which is mainly motivated by methodological considerations. As we show, the grammar of SAIE differs systematically from the grammar of the reference variety in a number of respects. Because of these differences, it is possible to collect or construct sample sentences which, though ungrammatical in the reference variety, are well-formed according to the rules of SAIE. By presenting the participants in our study with these SAIE examples (together with comparable constructions generated by the rules of the reference variety grammar), we were able to elicit grammatical judgments about these data and then compare these judgments with the attitudes of our participants as expressed in the subsequent interviews. It is partly through this methodology that we gained important insights into the profoundly

ambivalent status of SAIE among this group of young, educated South African Indians. Importantly, as we have already mentioned, we present an emic perspective in this paper, in other words, the attitudes of our participants towards and experiences of SAIE.

This study, and indeed the development of SAIE, should be understood against the background of unequal power relations that characterized the linguistic landscape of South Africa during Apartheid, and continue to feature in this country post-Apartheid. These unequal power relations were established early on in the period of indenture and persist to some degree in post-Apartheid South Africa, though they are no longer as blatant and overt as they once were. In the next section we provide a brief background to the socioeconomic development of SAIE and its speakers. We then discuss some of the grammatical properties of SAIE in comparison to those of the reference variety, focusing in particular on a syntactic difference regarding the formation of so-called wh-questions. After outlining the methodology, we analyse and discuss the interview data and the most important results from our empirical study. Lastly, we offer some concluding remarks and suggest how this study could lead to further research in the field.

THE HISTORY OF SOUTH AFRICAN INDIAN ENGLISH

The socio-historical and linguistic background of South African Indian English (henceforth SAIE) has been well documented (see e.g. Brookes and Webb 1965; Meer 1980; Bhana and Brain 1990; Mesthrie 1992a; 1992b; 1996; 2002). Nevertheless, we provide a brief summary of the development of this variety and its speakers to provide a context for our analysis and discussion.

The system of Indian indenture was established in South Africa in 1860 and lasted until 1911, during which time approximately 152,000 migrants from north and south India arrived in South Africa to provide cheap labour for the Natal sugar cane plantations in particular. Smaller numbers of so-called 'passenger' Indians, traders mainly from western parts of India (Gujarat) who paid their own fares, followed after 1875 (Bhana and Brain 1990; Mesthrie 1992a; 2003). The linguistic background of these Indian migrants was diverse. The immigrants from the south spoke Dravidian languages (mostly Tamil and Telugu), as well as Dakhini (a southern variant of Urdu), while the North Indians spoke Bhojpuri, Awadhi and various Hindi dialects. Other languages were Gujarati, Marathi and Konkani (Mesthrie 1992a; 1992b; 1996). Importantly, none of these Indian languages were numerically or socially dominant enough to become a lingua franca of the Indian community in South Africa, and needless to say, none of these languages could be used for communication with White plantation owners or supervisors, or Black labourers. Furthermore the vast majority of Indian immigrants had no knowledge of English on their arrival in South Africa.

The working and living conditions surrounding indenture were similar to slavery (Tinker 1974; Mesthrie 1992a: 7). Although the South African government intended the Indian presence in South Africa to be temporary, and despite the poor living and working conditions and hostile legislation, many labourers chose to stay in South Africa and tried to make a living on the sugar cane plantations and mines, and by hawking, market-gardening and fishing (Naicker 1945: 27–8; John-Naidu 2005). Thus by 1886 there were already more 'free' Indians than indentured Indians in South Africa (Desai 1996). From 1860 until the early 1950s the process of learning English in the Indian community in South Africa took place in an environment of social, economic and political divisions along racial lines.

This environment provided little opportunity for contact with L1-speakers of English, and consequently, English was learnt, often with poor quality, as a second or third language at school or work. Due to the limited opportunities available to the Indian community to gain access to L1-speakers of English, exposure to the language in schools played a particularly important role in the process of language shift. However, exposure to English in schools was not without its own limitations. The quality of the schooling available to South African Indians during the late 19th and early 20th centuries was generally very poor, as the majority of teachers in Indian schools were non-native speakers of English trying to teach in a language in which they were not fluent (Mesthrie 1995). Furthermore, according to Mesthrie (1992a: 20), the Indian-school inspector reported in 1886 that an estimated 90 per cent of Indian children of school-going age did not even attend school. In short, for the first half of the 20th century, the L2 variety of English to which Indian children and adults who had access to education were exposed (both inside and outside of the classroom), did not provide the appropriate input for the perfect acquisition of English as a second language.

By the late 1950s, there had been a dramatic improvement in the quality of education available to South African Indians. Moreover, the number of Indian children who attended school had increased. One of the consequences of these developments was increased exposure to English in schools during this period. As a result, English began to be introduced into Indian homes and communities to a greater extent than ever before, while the variety of English that the majority of South African Indians were exposed to was still not an ideal model for second-language acquisition. In the 1960s and 1970s, English became the first language for the majority of Indian school children. The process of language shift can, thus, be thought of as having started in the 1960s (Mesthrie 1995; 1996). The distinctive character of SAIE today can be considered the result of imperfect learning conditions[3] during the period of language shift, and the fact that opportunities to learn the target language (TL) were limited (Mesthrie 1996).

According to the South African Government Census (2001), the Indian community is a minority in South Africa, forming approximately 2.5 per cent of the total population. The 2001 census suggests that 93.8 per cent of the South African Indian population speak English as an L1 (they report English as the language most often spoken at home). This means that SAIE is becoming the second major variety of English as a first language in South Africa.

While the L1 of most South African Indians is English, the community is highly heterogeneous, due to religious, class and educational differences. The nature of South African Indian identities has been discussed in recent years (see, for example, Desai 1996; John-Naidu 2005; Singh 2005), and will be addressed in more detail below. Suffice it to say at this point that the use of SAIE is more acceptable in certain contexts than the use of the reference variety, and that it may be employed as an identity marker (Mesthrie 1992b). Indeed, Mesthrie (1992a; 1995; 1996) argues that SAIE is associated with *covert* prestige within the ingroup. Furthermore as mentioned above, Coetzee-Van Rooy and Van Rooy (2005) show that SAIE in its acrolectal form enjoys prestige in the Black community. However, the covert prestige of the variety must not be overestimated for our participants given the attitudes expressed by them and reported on in this paper, particularly in relation to the reference variety.

The low social and economic status that has been, and often still is, associated with the South African Indian community as a result of its beginnings in the system of indenture

and Apartheid, and persistent racism in post-apartheid South Africa, as well as the fact that the grammar of SAIE differs noticeably from that of the reference variety gives rise to the perception of SAIE as not only different from, but in some respects inferior to, what for our participants is the reference variety. How this perception manifests itself in the attitudes of a selected group of South African Indian students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal is illustrated by our study.

SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF SOUTH AFRICAN INDIAN ENGLISH

The syntax of SAIE shows a number of characteristic properties that clearly distinguish it from the grammar of the reference variety.[4] While some of these properties are also attested in SAIE's antecedent language in India, Vernacular Indian English (see Bhatt 2000; 2004 for discussion), other grammatical features of SAIE are the result of its shift from an L2 to an L1 under imperfect learning conditions, its contact with other forms (both L1 and L2 varieties) of English spoken in South Africa, and substrate influences from Indian languages (Mesthrie 2004). A good illustration of the latter is provided by Mesthrie's (1992a: ch. 3) detailed discussion of various relativization strategies employed by speakers of SAIE that differ from those in the reference variety:

(1) [Which-car they supposed to give us], someone else got it.
'Someone else got the car they were supposed to give us.' (Mesthrie 1992a: 75)
(2) That's all [we had] trouble.
'That's all the trouble we had.' (Mesthrie 1992a: 76)

(1) depicts a so-called 'internally-headed' relative clause. The relative clause (in brackets) *includes* the head noun *car*, which is linked to the anaphoric pronoun *it* in the main clause. As Mesthrie (1992a) notes, this type of relative construction resembles the correlative relativization strategy found in Indian languages such as Gujarati. Another relative construction in SAIE that differs from the corresponding construction in the reference variety is illustrated by example (2), in which the relative clause *precedes* its head noun *trouble*. Mesthrie (1992a) observes that prenominal relative clauses without relative pronouns exist in Dravidian languages such as Tamil. Constructions such as (1) and (2) therefore illustrate the substratum interference in the TL English. Other distinguishing aspects of SAIE grammar noted by Mesthrie (1992a; 2004) are: a preference of parataxis over hypotaxis, the intrusion of features otherwise associated with head-final languages (such as the existence of postposition-like elements, clause-final conjunctions, etc.), the non-progressive use of auxiliary *be* + *-ing*, and the frequent use of topicalization structures (for more detailed discussion and further aspects of SAIE, see Mesthrie 1992a; 2004).

Our study of speakers' attitudes to SAIE explores another grammatical difference between SAIE and the reference variety noted in Mesthrie (1992a; 2004), which concerns the word order in questions. The reference variety requires the inversion of the subject and the finite auxiliary, copula or modal verb in non-subject wh- (= content) questions:

(3) a. **John** *will* meet Mary tomorrow.
b. Who *will* **John** meet tomorrow?
c. When *will* **John** meet Mary?

Subject-auxiliary inversion also takes place in yes-no (= polar) questions:

(4) *Will* **John** meet Mary tomorrow?

In simple tenses without auxiliaries, copulas or modals, the reference variety requires the insertion of the dummy auxiliary *do* in order to meet the inversion requirement ('*do*-support'). Tense and agreement are then realized on *do* while the lexical verb form is non-finite:

(5) a. **John** *bought* a car yesterday.
b. What *did* **John** *buy* yesterday?
c. When *did* **John** *buy* a car?
(6) *Did* **John** *buy* a car yesterday?

In striking contrast to the reference variety, SAIE has neither subject-auxiliary inversion nor *do*-support in content or polar questions:[5]

(7) a. Where **you** *are*? (Wiebesiek 2007: 110)
'Where are you?'
b. What **I** *must* do? (Mesthrie 1992a: 47)
'What must I do?'
c. What **I** *said*? (Wiebesiek 2007: 110)
'What did I say?'
d. How often **she** *goes* to her mother's place? (Mesthrie 2004: 979)
'How often does she go to her mother's place?'
(8) a. **You** *can* play tennis? (Wiebesiek 2007: 112)
'Can you play tennis?'
b. **You** *bought* cheese, Farouk? (Mesthrie 1995: 257)
'Did you buy cheese, Farouk?'

As the examples in (7) show, wh-questions in SAIE pattern with the reference variety in that they also require fronting of the questioned wh-constituents. However, in SAIE, this sort of wh-fronting is not accompanied by subject-auxiliary inversion or *do*-support. In (7a) and (7b), the copula and modal verbs still follow the subject. The examples in (7c) and (7d) lack *do*; the lexical verb follows the subject and is inflected for tense or agreement (*said*; *goes*). This later point demonstrates that these examples do not simply imply phonological deletion of a (potentially inverted) form of *do*; rather, (7c) and (7d) show that the grammatical operation of *do*-support genuinely does not apply in SAIE.[6] Finally, (8) illustrates the absence of subject-auxiliary inversion and *do*-support in polar questions, which means that their word order is identical to that of declaratives in SAIE.[7] In the remainder of this paper, we will use the label 'Subj-Aux inversion' as a cover-term for both subject-auxiliary inversion and *do*-support.

It is worth mentioning that the absence of Subj-Aux inversion in contrast to the other, relatively rare, relativization strategies illustrated by (1) and (2), is quite a prominent characteristic of SAIE. For example, Mesthrie (1992a) observes that this aspect of SAIE is occasionally even mentioned by people who have come in contact with the variety for the first time. The corpus of 111 examples of this construction, collected on the basis of

observation by Wiebesiek (2007), also supports the view that the absence of Subj-Aux inversion is a common feature of the speech of South African Indians.[8] This property of SAIE is therefore an excellent illustration of how two mutually intelligible varieties of a language can differ systematically with respect to some of their core grammatical operations. Some linguistic theories (such as Chomsky's 1986; 1995, principles and parameters approach) assume that the particular form of the grammar of a language is determined at least in part by the specific values of certain parameters, which are set in the process of language acquisition on the basis of linguistic experience. For proponents of such theories, the grammatical operation Subj-Aux inversion would be associated with such a parameter, and the difference between the grammars of the reference variety and SAIE with respect to the formation of interrogatives would simply be analysed as the result of different parameter settings. [9]

Importantly, as we show in the next section, the absence of Subj-Aux inversion in SAIE makes wh-constructions a useful tool for our study of the attitudes that English-speaking South African Indians have towards SAIE.

METHODOLOGY

Our study is based on lengthy interviews that were conducted with 20 participants individually.[10] During the interviews, valuable data were educed on the attitudes of a particular group of South African Indian participants towards SAIE. All participants were students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) in Durban during the time of the interviews. The interviews, which were recorded and transcribed, were semi-structured and proceeded as follows: each participant was first asked to perform a type of grammatical judgment task which involved presenting the participant with three sentences involving wh-constructions and asking them to choose a response to each sentence from a list A-D. In order to establish whether the mode of presentation affected the responses of the participants, 10 of the participants were presented with written and 10 with spoken data.[11] Below we provide an example of a set of three wh-questions, as well as the fixed responses A-D from which every participant could choose:

(i) Where you are?
(ii) When you did that?
(iii) Why didn't you tell me?

Responses (based on Trudgill 1983: 15):

A I use this kind of grammatical construction myself.
B I don't use this grammatical construction, but other English speakers do.
C I've never heard anyone use a construction like this, but I would guess that some native speakers do use it.
D Nobody would say this.

As the example shows, the first two of the three sentences we used to elicit data were always examples of interrogatives without Subj-Aux inversion. The third sentence, a wh-question exhibiting reference variety-type Subj-Aux inversion, was the control.

Since the absence of Subj-Aux inversion is a systematic and common characteristic of SAIE, the use of wh-constructions without inversion in the grammatical judgment

tasks allowed us to present the participants with the linguistic variety associated with their community without having to state explicitly that they were being interviewed about SAIE. (It should be noted that care was taken to ensure that none of the participants had studied linguistics in the past, or were studying it at the time.) At the same time, response B gave the participants the freedom to acknowledge that they were familiar with SAIE, while still allowing them to distance themselves from the use of it. Once the participants had completed the grammatical judgment task, they were engaged in a discussion about their responses. The general strategy of the interviews was to use the grammatical judgment task to establish whether or not the participants identified the wh-constructions that they were presented with as a feature of SAIE in a formal setting. The grammatical judgment task further provided an entry point into a discussion about SAIE and what they perceived as good/proper English, namely, the reference variety. It is in contrast to the participants' attitudes towards the reference variety that their attitudes towards SAIE become particularly clear.

The sociolinguistic variables were largely controlled through participant selection of *age*, *level of education*, *L1* and *sex*. Selecting all of the participants from the South African Indian student population at UKZN ensured that all of the participants were of approximately the same age (between 18 and 24), and had achieved the same minimal level of education (at least a matric). As an important facet of our argument is the role of formal education in the development and perpetuation of language attitudes, level of education was a particularly important variable. As noted above, English is the L1 for the majority of South African Indians (Census South Africa 2001), and of all the participants in this study. To keep sex a stable variable, 10 of the 20 participants were male and 10 were female. While selecting all of the participants from within the same context effectively controlled the above-mentioned social variables, it did give rise to context-specific results. However, our arguments are confined to our participants. We make no attempt to generalize our discussion and findings outside of the context in which the study was conducted.

Given that the main researcher is White, we took into account the potential effect of her 'outsider' status on how candidly the participants would possibly respond to questions about SAIE. We engaged an Indian research assistant with whom the main researcher conducted all of the interviews, thereby allowing the participants to direct their responses to the researcher or the research assistant.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In this analysis we are primarily concerned with participants' perceptions of SAIE vis-à-vis the reference variety. We focus on unravelling how young South African Indian students on the Howard College campus of UKZN perceive SAIE, the linguistic variety that is widely associated with their ethnic group. The analysis is organized according to themes that emerge from the comments and offers an emic, rather than an etic, perspective. In other words, we foreground participants' own perceptions and attitudes in order to expose linguistic and social consistencies and homogeneities as well as conflicting evidences and contradictions. Several of the quotes demonstrate a noteworthy rejection of or distancing from SAIE as an available speech variety. The constructions of identities displayed in most of the comments are that of highly educated and future upwardly mobile South Africans who want to be associated with speaking the reference variety rather than a variety of English that for them carries an ethnic and socioeconomic tag. It is important to note that

the participants' responses to the grammatical judgment task are not always consistent with their responses to the questions in the rest of the interview. This inconsistency suggests that the participants' attitudes towards SAIE are ambivalent, or that they do not have a concrete set of attitudes towards SAIE; rather they are fluid and can, in certain (social) circumstances, change or be renegotiated (see comments from P18 below).

Results of the grammatical judgment task

As outlined in the methodology section, participants were presented with three sentences (two SAIE non-subject wh-questions and one reference variety control), and were then asked to choose a response from a list of four options (see responses A–D above). There were two significant patterns of responses. Eight participants, of whom five were presented with written and three with spoken data, chose the answer pattern BBA. Choosing BBA allowed these participants to acknowledge the existence of a different way of forming wh-constructions without identifying *themselves* as users of this kind of construction, or as speakers of the variety with which its use is associated. The other significant pattern was AAA, which was chosen by six participants. One of these six was presented with written sentences, while five provided judgments on spoken data. In choosing AAA, the participants admitted using non-subject wh-questions that lack Subj-Aux inversion, thereby identifying themselves as speakers of SAIE. The remaining six participants each chose a different pattern of response. Three of these six gave the response patterns BAB, BAA, BBB respectively, which shows inconsistency with respect to the two SAIE sentences and an unexpected rejection of the reference variety wh-construction by two participants. Only three of the participants judged the SAIE wh-questions as clearly unacceptable in comparison to their reference variety counterparts, by producing response patterns BCA, DDA and DCA. The total number of Bs chosen by all twenty participants for the first two sentences was twenty-one; the total number of As chosen for these sentences was fourteen. This shows that the majority of the participants is at least familiar with SAIE. These results are summarized in Table 1.

As noted above, the participants who chose response A for all three sentences thereby identifying themselves as speakers of a variety of English which according to our participants appears to have differing levels of prestige from both inside and outside of the South African Indian community, as is illustrated by the ambivalent attitudes of our participants to this variety. It is noteworthy that five of the six participants who chose pattern AAA were presented with spoken data. This asymmetry may be due to the fact that constructions that differ from those in the reference variety appear more marked in written language, which is both subject to stricter standards of correctness than spoken language and is generally

Table 1. Grammaticality judgments of participants to sentences (1)–(3) in the data set

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
(i)	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	D	B	B	B	D	A
(ii)	C	B	B	A	B	B	A	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	D	B	B	B	C	A
(iii)	A	A	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

Notes: Rows are numbered (i)–(iii) for the sentences in the data set. Columns are numbered 1 to 20 for each of our participants.

more formal than spoken language. It is also worth mentioning that the participants who chose the BBA pattern in the grammatical judgment task in general gave much longer answers to questions in the subsequent interview.

Table 1 shows the close correspondence between the number of participants that chose AAA, thereby acknowledging use of the SAIE wh-construction, and the number of those who chose BBA and therefore distanced themselves from the use of the variety that differs from the reference variety. This illustrates the ambivalent attitudes of our participants towards the variety of English associated with their ethnic group. Further, it illustrates that although these young, educated South African Indians seem to be *familiar* with the variety of English associated with their ethnic group, they do not, in general, take *ownership* of this variety by identifying it as the way they speak themselves.

Standards of correctness

There is a clear sense from the majority of our participants that SAIE as a variety of English is not associated with ideas of correctness, 'good' and 'proper' English. Participant 1 stated that "there's a lot of grammatical errors in the way, *umm,* Indian South Africans speak and it's usually things like that: 'Where you are?'". Similarly, participant 3 said of SAIE that it is "bad English. You know what I mean? Especially when it's, like, grammatically wrong". The following comments from participants 4 and 6 provide further examples of this association:

> "it's not. . .proper English" (P4)
> "I don't think it's grammatically correct" (P6)

Similarly, when asked what the term 'South African Indian English' meant to her, participant 16 replied: "improper English".

During the interviews, we investigated the contrast between the participants' attitudes towards SAIE and their attitudes towards their ideas of 'good' and 'proper' English. Participant 2's value judgments on 'proper' English and SAIE illustrate this contrast:

> they [speakers of SAIE] really don't consider the fact that they're using the wrong type of English [and] in most instances it's people [who speak the kind of English this participant thinks is good English] that are more intelligent because they consider how they come across, and people who are more exposed to that kind of English. Someone who speaks that way is not exposed to people who speak proper English.

In reference to value judgments of speakers of 'improper' English, participant 1 claimed that "people who speak proper English, *ummm,* do think less of people who don't". Similarly, when asked if people are judged on how they speak, participant 14 responded that, "if people don't speak proper English they think they are lower class or even have a low status but if you speak really proper English it goes with a higher status or they're rich".

Our data show that the young South African Indian students who participated in our study draw a clear distinction between 'proper' English and SAIE. Importantly, this distinction implies (when it is not explicitly stated), the perception that SAIE is 'improper' English, although SAIE is an L1. Of course, from a strictly linguistic point of view, such a view cannot be maintained. As was noted above, SAIE and the reference variety count as

different (albeit mutually intelligible) linguistic varieties, since aspects of their grammars can be formally distinguished. SAIE differs systematically from the reference variety in that certain parameters (including the one that controls Subj-Aux inversion), are set differently in this variety. From this perspective, SAIE is not inferior to the reference variety. Speakers of SAIE are native speakers of English and, as Andersson and Trudgill (1990: 111) state, "native speakers do not make mistakes. Native speakers for the most part speak their native language perfectly". Hence, native speakers of SAIE do not speak 'bad' or incorrect English, but simply a different variety of this language.

This theoretically supported view stands in harsh contrast to the perceptions disclosed by our interviewees. It can be seen from the comments of participants 2 and 14 (quoted in this section) that attitudes towards varieties of English reveal how different groups of people are evaluated differently on the basis of language in terms of the social structure of society and their social standing. An important difference between the comments of participants 2 and 14 is that participant 2 is making a value judgment about speakers within her own ethnic group, while participant 14 seems to be remarking on value judgments directed at speakers of varieties that differ from the reference variety from the 'outside'. This difference illustrates how ambivalent and/or negative attitudes towards SAIE are levelled against its speakers from outside of the South African Indian community and from within the perceived 'ingroup'.

Distancing and 'othering'

Fought (2006) discusses how linguistic variation is significant for individuals within one language group as they seek to express who they are in relation to ethnic identity. Different varieties of English index different identities. While the use of SAIE may indicate an 'Indian' background, the use of the reference variety is associated by most people with a higher educational status, a higher socioeconomic class, and in South Africa is linked (perhaps more and more mistakenly), to the White English-speaking community. Because of what appears to be a diglossic situation with the reference variety as H-variety and SAIE as L-variety, some of our participants claimed to have made a conscious choice and a concerted effort not to speak SAIE. The comment by participant 6 below illustrates this point:

> [. . .] led me to make that decision because I don't speak like that but there are, there would've been **other** people in, in the classroom or people of different backgrounds *err*, that, that do use that sort of grammar. (P6)

The comments made by participant 6 above and participant 5 below reveal how language choice can be an act of identity, particularly when that choice entails becoming a speaker of a clearly marked, socially symbolic variety (Carter 1999). Further, participant 5's comment also speaks to the devaluation of one variety in favour of another:

> I probably used to speak like that, when I went to a Model C high school, and then I was, not corrected, but I heard it being spoken around me and people would giggle if I were to speak in that sort of grammatical sentence and I had to influence myself to change it, so I don't really look upon them as, like, inferior or, or as if, like, I should correct them, I just, like, leave them alone. (P5)

This participant explained that it was his 'decision' to speak the reference variety rather than SAIE and also described how some people ridicule speakers of SAIE, due to its association with lower education and socioeconomic situation. Edwards (1982) argues that the function of language or a particular linguistic variety as a boundary influences how we perceive and position ourselves in life. If a linguistic variety is closely linked to a certain ethnicity or a particular socioeconomic class, but there are members of this ethnic group who do not or at least claim not to speak the variety, then these members are likely to see themselves in a different position than the average member of this ethnic or socioeconomic group. Unsurprisingly, then, many of our student participants made a point in the individual interviews to distance themselves from the use of SAIE and describe those who speak it as 'others':

> [T]o **them** that, that's right. That's the way **they** were taught and that's the way **their** parents spoke at home and that's the way **they** were brought up and **they** feel that that's right because that's what **they** were exposed to. What I was exposed to was something different so I feel that what I'm saying is grammatically correct. (P6)
>
> [I]t's just, like, the way Indian people are brought up, their culture, so **they** learn to speak like that. Not because they have a choice . . . other people around them speak like that so **they** learnt it themselves. **They** picked it up from people around them speaking like that and that's what I think. (P12)

While participants 6 and 12 evidently did regard SAIE as a less prestigious variety of English and consequently did not consider themselves members of this group of speakers, they acknowledged nonetheless that speaking in this way is fairly 'natural' in a particular social environment. In other words, they themselves did not take any ownership of SAIE but did think South African Indians are the owners of this variety, resulting in participant 12, for instance, making a direct link between language and culture. Participant 3 commented explicitly on a sense of ownership of English for speakers of SAIE:

> [i]t's sort of like the English language has become **their** own that, like, it's become **their** own language. You know **they've** taken it and . . . done things to it that makes it **theirs**. *Ummm*, you know, grammar, like, you know might as well add in that accent and stuff like that. **They've**, like, changed English to become, like . . . South African Indian English. (P3)

This response, however, suggests in some respects that in the process of making it "their own", something 'went wrong' to yield this 'improper' version of English.

Indeed, the use of pronouns such as *they* and *their* is striking in many of our participants' comments. Participant 14 claimed that SAIE is "a combination of English broken down into simpler forms of English . . . and I'm sure Indians break down language and don't use the full extent of the word". It is evident from this comment that for participant 14 the sense that she has of SAIE as 'incorrect' is part of the reason for her distancing herself from the use of the variety. Participant 10 went so far as to state that he sometimes has difficulty understanding speakers of SAIE: "Indian speakers, they don't particularly care about their English, I mean half the time you really don't know what they're saying unless you're actually from the same area as them".

Ambivalence

In this section we discuss how SAIE and the reference variety can be seen as "taking on subjective values in different contexts" (Garret et al. 2005). While the participants whose comments we discussed in the preceding section distanced themselves from the use of SAIE, a number of participants exhibited a noteworthy ambivalence towards SAIE. This was revealed, first, by their mixed use of the third and first person pronouns during interviews, and second, by inconsistencies between their responses in the grammatical judgment tasks and their responses to more detailed questions in the interviews. This shall be described in more detail below.

Participant 13 indicated that she uses SAIE by choosing AAA in the grammatical judgment task. However, she distanced herself to a degree by saying "I think it's, like, [err], like, the type of English that **we you** [sic] learn, like, as you growing up or something, like, [err] your type of family, like, the area which you come from". Participant 18, who is quoted below, ultimately admitted in the interview to speaking SAIE in some contexts and with certain family members despite having chosen the BBA pattern of response in the grammatical judgment task.

> A lot of people on this campus, their parents don't have the education per se that **we** do and when **they** spend a lot of time during the holidays with their parents **they** tend to speak like **their** parents. **I** know **I** start to speak like my mum, like, 'it's paining'. On campus **I** would never use – **I**'ve got a degree in English, right? (P18)

The above comment illustrates the context-dependent nature of SAIE usage. While participant 18 admitted to speaking SAIE with her mother in the domestic setting, she regards it as absolutely unacceptable to speak in this way at the university where she obtained her degree in English. However, what seems particularly noteworthy in our specific data set is the contradiction in some participants' responses. It can be assumed that some participants reflected on their own attitudes towards SAIE vis-à-vis the reference variety for the first time in the interview. Participant 7's responses are noteworthy in this regard: This participant's response to the grammatical judgment task was BAA, which means that she did not consistently identify examples of SAIE non-subject wh-questions as part of her own linguistic repertoire. Furthermore, she claimed first that older people like her great-grandmother would use SAIE wh-constructions, whereas younger people would not because they are "more prone to speaking English". However, despite this distancing, she made the following statement: "I mean **we** speak English the way **we** speak it. And other people speak it differently but **we** don't speak it the way it should be spoken".

Similar inconsistencies emerged in the interview with participant 12, who is already quoted in the preceding section. Remarkably, although this participant chose AAA during the grammatical judgment task, thereby acknowledging the use of a characteristic feature of SAIE, he distanced himself from the use of SAIE through the consistent use of the pronoun *they* to refer to SAIE speakers during the remaining parts of the interview. There are hence interesting mismatches between participants' reported language uses and their reported language attitudes.

Moreover, we also noticed a mismatch between the *observed* and the *reported* language use with some participants. When participant 4 was questioned about the use of wh-constructions without Subj-Aux inversion after the grammatical judgment task, he

responded: "well for me, my group of friends or any people I associate with don't usually talk like that, so the only time I've ever seen that is, like, people who are not native to this country". However, both the main interviewer and the research assistant had clearly overheard participant 4 talking to a friend before the interview, asking "Where I must meet you?", and thus producing exactly the type of wh-construction without Subj-Aux inversion which he later ascribed to non-native speakers and denied using himself. Interestingly, the response of participant 4 to the grammatical judgment task also reflects this inconsistency: his chosen response pattern was BAB.

Participant 10's reported speech behaviour was also contradicted by his actual language use. This participant chose BBA in the grammatical judgment task and remarked on the first two SAIE-sentences that "[i]t's sad . . . that people speak like that". However, he went on to say: "when people ask 'when you got your license?', 'how did you know this?' and stuff like that. I would say 'when you went to get your license?' ". Despite this participant's attempts to distance himself from the use of SAIE, this comment clearly indicates that he does, in fact, use wh-constructions formed in a way characteristic of SAIE.

Not all the interviews with our participants revealed this kind of discrepancy between reported and actual language use. For example, participant 11 chose AAA in the grammatical judgment task. During the rest of the interview he stated that "it's mostly the Indian race that speaks like that" and went on to say "I know that I do use these kinds of constructions". Nevertheless, our results suggest that the majority of the participants do not actually see themselves as speakers of SAIE, due to what they report as the negative perceptions often associated with this variety. However, even with those participants who claim to use the reference variety predominantly, we observed that the SAIE wh-question formation strategy slips into the speech of some of the participants (e.g. participant 4), from time to time. It is not unlikely that in certain social contexts (in particular in a non-university environment, in conversations with family members and friends, etc.) even the young educated South African Indians who participated in our study use SAIE or at least certain grammatical features associated with this variety. This obviously does not imply that these participants have been dishonest or deliberately misleading during the interviews. However, we have good reason to believe that the self-assessment of the students questioned about the usage of a clearly marked ethnic variety of English that they do not associate with education in a formal setting such as a university may not always be consistent with their actual language performance, particularly in less formal contexts.

Education and class

In contemporary South Africa, there are generally great differences between the English spoken by learners educated in former DET (so-called 'Indian' or 'Black') schools, and the English spoken by learners educated in multiracial schools (so-called 'ex-Model C') schools. Until the end of 1990, Model C schools were completely funded government schools, which admitted White learners only. In 1991, these schools were converted into state-aided schools that also admitted Indian, Black and Colored learners (also see Mesthrie 2010 for a discussion of the role played by schooling at ex-Model C schools vs. DET schools in language attitudes and behavior). It is these schools which are rightly associated with a 'better' standard of education. Many Indian and Black schools are notoriously under-resourced, and their staff consists of less qualified teachers. For our participants, the reference variety is associated with ex-Model C schools:

> I probably used to speak like that, then I went to a Model C high school. (P5)
> I went to a Model C school, not a private school or a government state school but a Model C school which is a mixture of *err* . . . students of different incomes whose parents are in different income groups. So . . . I don't speak like that. (P6)

In fact, in most of our data, the association of the reference variety with good education (and by extension, intelligence) stands in contrast to the association of SAIE with a lack of good education and intelligence. Several participants mentioned that those who speak SAIE are probably not as educated as those who do not, or as those who choose not to speak SAIE in certain contexts, at university for example. Participant 1 explicitly stated that SAIE is "usually spoken in communities where people haven't been fully educated". Participant 7 claimed that people who did not speak the reference variety should learn to speak it, because otherwise people "think that you aren't educated".

Participant 2, however, appeared to disagree. She claimed to know doctors who "speak wrong English". She did, however, qualify this statement by saying "actually, in most instances it's people that are more intelligent [who speak 'proper' English] because they consider how they come across". While this participant did not explicitly mention education, there is an implied connection between language use, education and intelligence.

Education is often associated with class or economic status in South Africa, since wealthier families tend to send their children to schools where they are more likely to receive a good quality education in the reference variety. Participants 3, 6 and 14 directly linked class or economic status to education and, by extension, language use. Participant 6 suggested that people from a lower income group who have had poor quality education use SAIE. The same holds for participant 3, as the following quote demonstrates: "I guess it kind of depends on their upbringing and education . . . I'd just narrow it down to a lower income group, *err*, which may not have the same quality of education as others". Participant 14 did not mention education, but was quite clear that "if people don't speak proper English they think they are lower class or even have a low status but if you speak really proper English it goes with a higher status or they're rich".

Commenting particularly on language attitudes relating to the use of standard and non-standard English in education, Edwards (1982: 27) argues that: "[i]t is the educational setting . . . where such attitudes may have the greatest importance . . . In particular, the school encourages and reflects 'Standard English' practices and, consequently, the way in which it deals with those whose dialect is non-standard may be of some relevance". The clear equation in our data of the use of the reference variety with education, and the use of SAIE with a lack of or a poorer quality of education illustrates how prescriptive practices of enforcing the use of a particular variety of English in education, particularly in the context of ex-Model C schools and at university, may foster ambivalent or even negative attitudes towards SAIE in contrast to that variety.

Participant 18 spoke at length about the connection between SAIE and education. She stated:

> [W]hen they were telling me that they were 'look aftering someone' then I'm like ahhhh no! I'm like 'on the light and off the light'? So I'm like huh?! When people talk sometimes you want to say, you know, you got that education, why do that? And if you know that's wrong why keep using it? (P18)

These attitudes are informed by the idea that a good education gives speakers access to the reference variety which they then have an obligation to speak. This participant seemed

to disregard the fact that a particular speech variety may also be employed in order to demonstrate solidarity and belonging. For this participant and others quoted above, the use of SAIE is not consistent with an appearance of being well-educated. Since speakers gain access to the reference variety through education, the assumption is that the choice of SAIE over the reference variety is an indication of poor education and, more generally, lower socioeconomic standing.

CONCLUSION

According to Fishman (1972: 142), language attitudes are more strongly adhered to in a multilingual setting where the knowledge of a particular language or linguistic variety is associated with a particular 'social' or 'economic type'. This is salient as proficiency in the reference variety is widely associated with a certain socioeconomic environment and a good educational background. Furthermore, language behaviour in a multilingual, multicultural setting such as South Africa is closely related to language choice. The decision of an individual to speak or not to speak any particular language variety or a negative behaviour towards a language variety, even the one associated with his/her own ethnolinguistic group, is a matter of choice and potentially represents an act of identity.

The present study indicates that the reference variety and SAIE are differentiated as linguistic varieties that carry certain identities which surpass a simple 'White' versus 'Indian' dichotomy in contemporary South Africa. There seems to exist a group of young, educated South African Indians who regard those who speak SAIE as 'others' and do not consider themselves as part of the ingroup of SAIE speakers. Those for whom the reference variety is the main medium of communication appear to consider themselves in a different 'category' to those whose main medium of communication is SAIE, both socioeconomically and metaphorically. They choose to speak a variety of English which is more prestigious than the one ordinarily associated with their ethnolinguistic group because it is believed, at least by some, that it indicates a higher socioeconomic standing and better education. In this way the reference variety can act as a dividing agent in the South African Indian community creating a boundary between those who speak it and those who do not.

In our presentation of the responses of our participants, and our discussion thereof, it is noteworthy that some of our participants feel ambivalent towards SAIE. While most acknowledge its existence and its association with the Indian community, the majority of the participants in this study distance themselves from the use of SAIE. Those students who did admit to making use of SAIE in certain settings only did so with apparent reluctance. For our participants SAIE is clearly positioned ambiguously. Not only did attitudes among the different interviewees vary to a large extent, but individuals had contradicting views concerning the position of SAIE.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that the specific design of this research and the fact that the students were interviewed in a fairly formal setting played a role in the data and results obtained. This study was based on a group of university students as participants and the research setting was relatively formal. Hence, we would recommend expanding on this line of research on SAIE with a different methodological frame. It might be valuable to replicate this study by conducting more informal interviews (in participants' homes, for example), with participants of the same age group who have no access to higher education. It can be hypothesized that the data elicited in this setting will, at least to some extent,

yield different results in comparison to those generated by our study. Further, it would be worthwhile to explore the link between attitudes towards and the (non-)use of SAIE and the construction of identities (which we only marginally addressed in this paper). A promising possibility for future research is an examination of the positioning of different varieties of English in a context of increasing deracialization in many facets of life in South Africa.

NOTES

1. In this paper we continue to refer to the variety of English spoken by South Africans of Indian descent as South African Indian English, following Mesthrie's use of the same term in earlier publications (e.g. 1992a; 1992b; 1996).
2. While we acknowledge that the continued use of race-based categories and labels such as SAIE in post-Apartheid South Africa is problematic (Coetzee-Van Rooy and Van Rooy, 2005), we employ this term in this paper as it continues to be the most commonly used label to identify the variety associated with the South African Indian community.
3. Imperfect learning occurs as a result of a lack of sufficient exposure to the target variety of the TL (in this case, English), and limited opportunities to make use of the TL.
4. See Mesthrie (1992a: ch. 5) for a discussion of morphological, phonological and sociolexical features of SAIE that make it distinct from other varieties of English. A close analysis of these features is beyond the scope of this study.
5. Interestingly, Vernacular Indian English also lacks subject-auxiliary inversion and *do*-support (See Bhatt 2004). This suggests that this aspect of SAIE was inherited from the antecedent variety. However, according to historical records, up to 90 per cent of Indian immigrants arrived in South Africa without any previous knowledge of English (Mesthrie 1992a: 12; 1992b: 339). Consequently, Mesthrie (1992a: 17) does not rule out the possibility of convergent developments in both varieties as a result of comparable substrate influences and similar processes governing the acquisition of the L2.
6. Mesthrie (1992a: 48; 2004: 978) notes that SAIE behaves like the reference variety in that it has *do*-support in negation contexts (*I don't know this*), which supports the view that *do*-support is a last resort operation which can be independently triggered by different syntactic requirements in different contexts.
7. In yes-no questions, this strategy is also used in informal English as well as in other varieties of English spoken in South Africa (Mesthrie 1992a: 47).
8. An interesting complication, which we ignore here, concerns the fact that both SAIE and Vernacular Indian English exhibit inversion in embedded questions, that is, in exactly those contexts where the reference variety does not have them (See Mesthrie 2004: 979; Bhatt 2004: 1020).
9. For an influential analysis of Subject-Aux inversion within the principles and parameters theory, see Pesetsky and Torrego (2001). Wiebesiek (2007) discusses the absence of Subj-Aux inversion in SAIE in light of Pesetsky and Torrego's theory.
10. Given the qualitative nature of this study, this sample size yields sufficient data for the argument of this paper. See Kehler and Martino (2007).
11. The written data was printed on a response sheet. Rather than presenting the participants with a recording of spoken data, a South African Indian research assistant read out the sentence in the data set in an effort to keep the interviews as informal as possible.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Lars, and Trudgill, Peter (eds.) (1990) *Bad Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Bhana, Surendra, and Brain, Joy (1990) *Setting Down Roots. Indian Migrants in South Africa 1860 – 1911*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Bhatt, Rakesh M. (2000) Optimal expressions in Indian English. *English Language and Linguistics 4*, 69–95.

Bhatt, Rakesh M. (2004) Indian English: syntax. In Bernd Kortmann and Edgar W. Schneider (eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. *Volume 2*: *Morphology and Syntax* (pp. 1016–30). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brookes, Edgar H. and Webb, Colin de B. (1965) *A History of Natal*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Carter, Ronald (1999) Standard grammars, spoken grammars: some educational implications. In Tony Bex and Richard Watts (eds.), *Standard English: The Widening Debate* (pp. 149–166). London: Routledge.

Census South Africa (2001) *Census South Africa*. Cape Town: Statistics South Africa.

Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Knowledge of Language*. *Its Nature, Origin and. Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, Susan, and Van Rooy, Bertus (2005) South African English: labels, comprehensibility and status. *World Englishes 24*, 1–19.

De Klerk, Vivian (1999) Black South African English: where to from here? *World Englishes18*, 311–24.

Desai, Ashwin (1996) *Arise ye Coolies: Apartheid and the Indian 1960–1995*. Johannesburg: Impact Africa Publishing.
Edwards, John R. (1982) Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers. In Ellen B. Ryan and Howard Giles (eds.), *Attitudes towards Language Variation* (pp. 20–33). London: Edward Arnold.
Fishman, Joshua A. (1972) The relationship between micro-and macro-sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when. In John B. Pride and Janet Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*: *Selected Readings* (pp. 15–32). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
Fought, Carmen (2006) *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Garret, Peter, Williams, Angie, and Evans, Betsy (2005) Attitudinal data from New Zealand, Australia, the USA and UK about each other's Englishes: recent changes or consequences of methodologies? *Multilingua 24*, 211–36.
John-Naidu, Aline J. (2005) The struggle to be South African: cultural politics in Durban, contesting the Indian identity in the public sphere. Masters Dissertation, University of KwaZulu-Natal: Durban.
Kehler, Michael D., and Martino, Wayne (2007) Questioning masculinities: interrogating boys' capacities for self-problematisation in schools. *Canadian Journal of Education 30*, 90–112.
Makalela, Leketi (2004) Making sense of BSAE for linguistic democracy in South Africa. *World Englishes 23*, 355–66.
Meer, Y.S. (ed.) (1980) *Documents of Indentured Labour – Natal 1851–1917*. Durban: Institute of Black Research.
Mesthrie, Rajend (1992a) *English in Language Shift: The History, Structure and Sociolinguistics of South African Indian English*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
Mesthrie, Rajend (1992b) *A Lexicon of South African Indian English*. London: Peepal Tree Press.
Mesthrie, Rajend (1995) South African Indian English: from L2 to L1. In Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Language and Social History* (pp. 251–63). Johannesburg: David Phillip.
Mesthrie, Rajend (1996) Language contact, transmission, shift: South African Indian English. In Vivian de Klerk (ed.), *Focus on South Africa* (pp. 79–97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Mesthrie, Rajend (2002) From second language to first language: Indian South African English. In Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Language in South Africa* (pp. 339–55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mesthrie, Rajend (2003) Children in language shift – the syntax of fifth generation, pre-school, Indian South African English speakers. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies 21*, 119–26.
Mesthrie, Rajend (2004) Indian South African English: morphology and syntax. In Bernd Kortmann and Edgar W. Schneider (eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. *Volume 2*: Morphology and Syntax (pp. 974–92). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Mesthrie, Rajend (2010) Socio-phonetics and social change: deracialisation of the GOOSE vowel in South African English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics 14*, 3–33.
Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy (eds.) (1993). *Real English: The Grammar of the English Dialects in the British Isles*. *Real Language Series*. London: Longman Publishing.
Naicker, G. Monty (1945) *A Historical Synopsis of the Indian Question*. Durban: University of Natal Press.
Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego (2001) T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language* (pp. 355–426). Cambridge: MIT Press.
Singh, Anand (2005) *Indians in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
Tinker, Hugh (1974) *A New System of Slavery*. *The Export of Indian Labour Overseas 1830–1920*: London: Oxford University Press.
Trudgill, Peter (1983) *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers Limited.
Van Rooy, Bertus (2008) An alternative interpretation of tense and aspect in Black South African English. *World Englishes 27*, 335–58.
Wiebesiek, Lisa (2007) Addressing the 'Standard English debate' in South Africa: the case of South African Indian English. Masters Dissertation, University of KwaZulu-Natal: Durban.

(Received 9 July 2010.)