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Abstract
Since its introduction by Prince and Smolensky in the 1990s, Optimality Theory (OT) has been used for explaining grammars of different linguistic sub-systems (e.g. Kar 2009; Weijer 2002; Vinjen and Vago 1998; Williams 2009; Downing 2009). However, the use of OT to analyze bilingual/multilingual Code-Switching (CS) with a view to explaining the sociolinguistic grammar has been introduced recently. Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) offer a comprehensive model for explaining inter-community variation in the socio-pragmatics of CS based on empirical evidence from two communities (Kashmiri-Hindi-English trilingual community and Hungarian-English bilingual community) and propose community-specific constraint rankings of five socio-pragmatic principles of CS.

This study aims to investigate the CS patterns of a small bilingual community of international student from the perspective of the Optimality-Theoretic model proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai. While Bhatt & Bolonyai contends that bilingual socio-linguistic grammar is specific to discourse communities of bilingual speakers, this study investigates CS in a small alien discourse community. Also, the OT model has so far been used to investigate CS in relatively stable societies, while the subject community is an unstable with less than five years of residency for the members. Primary data were collected in the form of audio recording of 130 minutes from different contexts of interactions between members of the target community. The instances of CS in the data are classified and explained in terms of the five socio-pragmatic principles Faith, Perspective, Face, Power and Solidarity (which work as the constraints in the OT model of Bhatt and Bolonyai).

The analysis of the data indicate that the constraint hierarchy of the five principles is {Faith, Face} \succ \{Power, Perspective\} \succ Solidarity. The results of the study would
contribute to the better understanding of the inter-community variation of sociolinguistic grammar.
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Introduction

The study of code-switching in bilingual interactions has been a major point of interest among many researchers recently (e.g. Mayer-Scotton, 2006; Grosjean, 2010; Canagarajah, 1995; Wei 2002; Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai, 2001; Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2011). These researchers have adopted different theoretical frameworks to offer explanations to the nature, structure, mechanism and motivation behind the specific instances of bilingual code-switching.

This study is an attempt to investigate the sociolinguistic function of code-switching (CS) among the members of a small discourse community of international students which consists of Bangla-English bilinguals (originally from Bangladesh) living in Raleigh, NC. The study relied heavily on the Optimality-Theoretic Model of code-switching offered by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) as its basic theoretical framework. The general objective of this study is the overall understanding of the sociolinguistic functions of CS in the concerned bilingual community using the OT framework. More particularly, the study aims to propose the constraint ranking of the community grammar based on the five socio-cognitive principles (namely, Faith, Power, Solidarity, Face, and Perspective) as proposed by the OT model with a view to understanding the sociolinguistic grammar of the concerned community and also to contributing to the understanding of inter-community variation of the sociolinguistic functions of CS.

Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) contend that though the theories so far proposed contributed significantly to the understanding of the different socio-political functions of CS and how CS functions on the way of constructing and negotiating bilingual identities, still there is a lack of any coherent framework that can address the understanding of the general principles of bilingual
behavior underlying the specific instantiations of CS. Therefore, they come up with the idea of OT framework which would serve a universal tool to analyze the socio-pragmatic functions in bilingual/multilingual code-switching as well as to account for inter-community variation in CS. The present study is an attempt to analyze the socio-pragmatic functions of CS through this framework and thereby contribute to the understanding of the inter-community variation in CS.

**Background/Literature Review**

Interest in CS grammar is not a novel concept though there has so far been a lack of proper method to study it. Clyne (1987) reported the growing interest in studying the constraints of CS. He himself investigated the constraints of structural integrity, free morpheme, government, and semantic. Besides, he also looked at the assumptions underlying the constraints — stability and 'standardness' of grammatical systems in contact, grammatically, the inclusion of trigger words as part of the switch. To indicate to the universal features in instances of CS in any given bilingual community, Clyne (1987) contends that the theoretical studies available so far agree that “there are general constraints on code switching (between any pair of languages).”

To propose a universal theoretic model of CS grammar, Choi (1991) mentions that switch-alpha is a general rule that governs a CS grammar. Various constraints and rules on CS fall under the particular grammar of the particular language-pair CS. Switch-alpha is an unspecified universal rule in CS grammar. To define switch-alpha, Choi mentions, “Switch-alpha means switch anything anywhere, that is, any element can be switched in any place in a structure so long as the particular-language-pair integrity is maintained.”
Berk-Seligson (1986) reported linguistic constraints on intra-sentential CS and claimed the universality of three linguistic constraints of such types: an equivalence of structure constraint, a size-of-constituent constraint, and a free morpheme constraint.

Bhatt (1997) came up with the notion of optimal grammar (based on the Optimality Theory of Prince and Smolensky (1997), which proposed that universal constraints are prioritized: they are “defeasible”, but only in those contexts in which they conflict with another, presumably higher ranked, constraint. Bhatt applied this framework to provide a comparative-syntactic account of the properties of code-switching among a number of language situations including Kashmiri-English, Hindi-English, and Kashmiri-Hindi.

More recently, the Optimality-Theoretic model has been adapted by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) to study to socio-pragmatic functions of CS through the universal constraint ranking in bilingual CS. Here, they propose five basic principles operative behind the instances of CS.

To be more specific, Bhatt and Bolonyai’s OT model proposes a comprehensive model of sociolinguistic grammar using five general principles of CS “instantiated in different community grammars in terms of different order of computational hierarchy.” In their contention, the five general principles (Faith, Power, Solidarity, Face, and Perspective) proposed by them covers the basic aspects of meaning, such as conceptual, relational-interpersonal, and discourse that are “always available” in bilingual communication.

The exclusivity of the OT model of Bhatt and Bolonyai lies in the idea that this model provides the scope of a “multi-functional” view of CS, where the five principles can be ranked in the order of preference in any given speech community. This opens up the possibility of testing different optimization possibilities in different bilingual communities, thereby providing an useful framework to study inter-community variation of code-switching.
Core assumptions of Optimality Theory:

To Grimshaw (1997: 373), the basic assumptions underlying the OT framework are (a) constraints are universal, (b) constraints can be violated, (c) Grammars are rankings of constraints, and (d) the optimal form is grammatical; all nonoptimal candidates are ungrammatical.

In the contention of Kar (2009), OT works in a constraint-based competition system among a possibly infinite set of candidates. The classical version of OT involves two basic functions, GEN and EVAL. GEN’s function is to return a set of unique output candidates from an input, while EVAL functions to choose the optimal candidate that best satisfies a set of specially ranked constraints depending on the violation. Davenport and Hannahs (2005, cited in Kar, 2008) makes graphical representation to illustrate this mechanism (Fig. 1).

![Fig.1. Kar’s (2009) illustration of OT model](image)

Grimshaw (1997) maintains that constraints are inherently in conflict since they are formulated in a highly general fashion; and so ‘the satisfaction of a given constraint will lead to the violation of another’. Therefore, constraints in OT cannot be absolute, but have to be violable. This leads to the idea that constraints can be violated even in a grammatical structure, and a mechanism for resolving constraint conflicts is necessary to differentiate between grammatical and ungrammatical utterances/expressions.
Adaptation of Optimality Theory for CS study:

In Bhatt and Bolonyai’s adaption of OT for CS study, the translation equivalents of the code-switched linguistic items (coded as $Lex(L_1)$ and $Lex(L_2)$) work as the ‘input’ to the function GEN. Then, the function GEN generates a possible and potential set of candidates which is evaluated by the function EVAL to determine the optimal candidate. The process of determining the optimal candidate by EVAL is done on the basis of function CON which consists of a set of hierarchically-ranked universal constraints on CS (namely, Faith, Power, Solidarity, Face, and Perspective). Following is the graphical representation of the adapted model as proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai (Fig.2).

\[Lex(L_1), Lex(L_2) = \text{lexicon of a language}; \text{GEN} = \text{Generator function}; \ a, b, c, \ldots = \text{competing input candidates}; \text{EVAL} = \text{Evaluator function}; \text{CON} = \text{set of universal constraints on code-switching}\]

Figure 2. Bhatt and Bolonyai’s Optimality-Theoretic model of bilingual grammar.
**The Five principles:**

This section describes in brief the five principles (as proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai) which work as the constraints in the adapted OT model for CS analysis. Besides, examples from the collected data have been incorporated to illustrate these principles.

**Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (Faith)**

To delineate the concept of principle of interpretive faithfulness (Faith), Bhatt and Bolonyai, maintains that “Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression.”

Speakers switch their codes to express the concerned idea in least possible words/phrases. It is often found that the specific phrases for which the speakers switch the codes often have their localized and culture-specific meanings which cannot be translated with the similar effect and economy in the other language available at hand. Therefore, switching to the code provides the speaker with the opportunity to optimize the process of ‘creating’ (by speaker) and/or ‘interpreting’ (by listener) the message.

Extract (1) demonstrates an example of CS to address the principle of Faith by switching to English to ensure economy and efficacy of expression. While responding to the proposal (jokingly) giving some minor kind of punishment to a friend, A switches from Bangla to English to refer to the educational institution he (who is to be punished) attended. (In (1) and subsequent examples, normal font and bold-faced font have been used; bold-faced portions indicate code-switched parts.)
Extract 01:
[ Here and in the following extracts, code-switched items are bold-faced; English translation accompanies in regular-italics]

A: Oke eishob faltu shasti-er voi dekhie laav nai; o cadet college-e porhe eshese.

“It’s no use to cow him of such silly punishments; he studied in cadet college.”

Cadet colleges in Bangladesh are highly reputable secondary education institutions governed by the armed forces. The primary characteristics of the cadet colleges in Bangladesh is that students have to compulsorily reside inside the college premises, and abide by strict rules and regulations. Therefore, whenever somebody is referring to the term ‘cadet college’ the usual image is built up to be a highly strict and regulated atmosphere. Physical punishments are a regular phenomenon there. Though there are other institutions which offer similar or even better education than the cadet colleges, these institutions prevail to hold their reputation for having a comprehensive responsibility of developing all kinds of skills, both psychological and physical. Thus, a any student who graduated from a cadet college is surely believed to be a tougher person.

So, the speaker chooses to switch to the term ‘cadet college’ with the motivation that this term would be the best possible candidate to express the idea that the person is a tough person, and punishments are never anything painful for him.

Here is another example to illustrate the notion of Faith. Kulkhani is a religious ceremony for dead persons to pray for their souls. Typically this ceremony is conducted after one week of the death. This term has a deep realization of holy feelings among the cultural communities who use them. Therefore, a translated term would not bring about the similar meaning to those people. In Extract 02, A and B are talking about C’s going to his own country after the death of a close relative of C.
**Extract 02:**

a. A: Amar mone hoi onar deshe ekbar jawa uchit.  
   *I think he should go to his country.*

b. B: Ekhon gie ar ki laav! Shesh dekha to ar dekhte parlo na.  
   *What’s the benefit now! He couldn’t see him at the last moment of life.*

c. A: At least they can attend the **khulkhani**!  
   *At least they can attend the **khulkhani**!*

**Principle of Symbolic Domination (Power)**

In Bhatt and Bolonyai’s words, “Social actors switch to another language if it enables them to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice.” Under this principle, speakers make use of code-switching  with a view to indexing or constructing power, status, authority, social distance, and or/difference with the interlocutor(s).

The instance of code-switching in (3)c. shows an example of the principle of symbolic domination. L and N are female members of the Bengali community living in Raleigh. L and N are attending regular ESL classes at a community college. L is in level 4 while N is in level 5; however, L is elder than N in respect to age though the age difference may be 5 years only; and their community norm is that whoever is elder should be respected by her/his younger. They are almost at the end of a semester, and hoping to get promoted to the next higher level of class next semester. In their context, English is more prestigious than Bangla.

**Extract 03:**

[Regular font = Bangla; bold-faced = English; regular-italics = English translation]

a. L: Tomader **class** er shobai ki theke jachche, naki **level 6** e chole jachche.  
   *Are everyone in your class going to stay (in the same level next semester), or going to level 6?*
b. N: Keu keu theke jabe mone hoi. Apnake to mone hoi vayia [L’s husband] bolse ei level-ei theke jaite, na?

*A few might stay, I suppose. Your husband has told you to continue in the same level, hasn’t he?*

c. L: Ha bolse, **but I don’t care.**

*Yes, he told/suggested (me), but I don’t care.*

In (3)c. L includes a complete clause to switch to English. Since L is senior to N and expects some degree of respect from N, it is not comfortable for L when her status is threatened with the notion introduced by N that L has been solicited not take promotion to a higher level of classes. Therefore, L switches to English to reestablish her power over L in the speech context.

**Principle of Social Concurrence (Solidarity)**

Speakers of a language switch to another language if to maximize social affiliation and solidarity in relational practice. In such cases, they switch to the language which is capable of creating affiliation, intimacy, similarity, solidarity, etc. with the interlocutor.

Extract (4) is an illustration of the principle of social concurrence in action. Both A and B are members of the Bangladeshi community in Raleigh; however, A has been in the USA for more than 20 years while B has arrived several months ago. Presently, B is looking for a part-time job and asks the help of A to look for any opportunity for B. However, when the reply of A ((4)a.) in this regards seems a bit neutral and indifferent, B switches from English to Bangla to establish closer affiliation with A. This is an attempt from the part of B to minimize the distance between them and expect better treatment from B.
Extract 04:

a. A: I’ll try, but you know how difficult it is to find a job nowadays.

b. B: Yes, it’s true, but **apnar chhoto bhai hishebe ektu dekhben baparta.**

   *Yes, it’s true; but please see into my case (cordially) by considering me as your younger brother.*

**Principle of Face Management (Face)**

Bilingual speakers switch to another language ‘to maximize effective maintenance of “face” or public image of self in relation to others.’ Here, they switch to that alternative language which helps them convey appreciation, tact, deference, respect, positive or negative politeness, etc., and manage their interpersonal relations consistent with face needs of self and the interlocutor(s).

In (5), S is a former graduate from Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh. This university is ranked the best in the country for engineering study, and since there is a hard competition among students to secure admission here, the ones who finally achieve this are considered among the best students of the country. However, it is a clichéd expression in Bangladesh that when asked about the choice of present major, students would reply that it was their ‘long-cherished dream’ to study the subject concerned, though students can rarely choose from multiple choices due to high competition. Here, S encounters such a situation which threatens his face. Therefore, when J asked whether the admission into BUET was a childhood dream of S, he switches to English in case of those sensitive expressions (e.g. ‘passion’, ‘pressure’) to save his face. By switching code, he tries to show his politeness as well.
Extract 05:

a. J: BUET-e vorti hobar shopno ki chhotobelar naki?

b. S: Ashole . . . ami eta bolbo na je Engineering porha amar **passion** silo chhotobela theke; tobe amar basha theke ekta **pressure** silo. Baba-ma chiato je chhele engineer hobe.

The extract in (2) can also have the principle of Face working behind. N poses an explicit threat to the face of L by suggesting that she has been suggested to continue the same level which she is presently in, which means that she is possibly not making satisfactory progress. This might well be true, but such an utterance from N (who is younger by age) creates a face threat for L. This fact motivates L to switch to English to save her face that she knows English and also she is not going to listen to any suggestions.

**Principle of Perspective Taking (Perspective)**

Speakers switch to another language when the language enables them to maximize perspectivity in interaction. Common tactics include quotation, reformulation, elaboration, clarification, parenthetical remarks, off-stage talk, reiteration, repetition, emphasis to keep with the salient point of view in current discourse context.

Extract 06:

a. J: Tomar **university**-jibon kemon ges?

   *How was your university life?*

b. S: Ha, besh mojatei par korsi ar ki.

   *Oh yes, it was fun all through.*

c. J: Tai naki? Ki ki jinish **enjoy** korso?

   *Really? What things did you enjoy?*
d. S: Arey tar cheye bolen **enjoy** kori nai ki? Lekhaporar chap sara shob kisui **enjoy** korsi. [laugh]

   *Well, rather ask me, what didn’t I enjoy? I enjoyed everything except the load of study.*

   Extract (6) illustrates an instance of code-switching following the principle of perspective taking. The speakers here are the same ones in extract (5). The switching by S in (6)d. demonstrates that S is switching to English to emphasize the idea proposed by J. S, in fact, takes up the specific word (‘enjoy’) uttered by J to make this emphasis sound more familiar in the context. S even goes on repeating the word in the following sentence as well by making another switch.

   In (7), A and B are members of the Bangladeshi community in Raleigh. A is elder than B; they are in B’s apartment, A is seeking some information about buying shoes from B. However, B suggests that A might talk to C (another member of the community of about the same age like A) about this since C, according to A, knows better. However, while refusing her suggestion of consulting C, B makes a code-switch which is more like an off-stage talk. Thus, according the contention offered by Bhatt and Bolonyai, this switch follows the principle of Perspective. The phrase ‘frankly speaking’ here has little to do with the overall meaning development of the whole sentence. It rather only provides a scope to make the seeming unpleasant reply from B a bit more bearable.

*Extract 07:*

a. A: Assa B, juta kothai valo pawa jai jano?

   *Well, [addressing] B, do you know where I can find good shoes?*

b. B: Na apu, tobe apni C-ke jiggesh korte paren. O kintu onek jaiga chine.

   *No sister, but you can ask C. She knows a lot of places.*

c. A: Ashole, **frankly speaking**, oke kisu jiggesh korte valo lage na. kemon jeno ektu vaab ney shob shomoy.
Well... in fact, frankly speaking, I don’t feel good to ask her about anything. She seems to be snobbish most of the time.

**Method**

The subjects of the study were nine members of the Bangla-English bilingual people living in Raleigh. All of them are either graduate students at NC State University, or their spouses living with them. All of the subjects are from Bangladesh and are native speakers of Bangla language. The age of the subjects ranged from 26 to 33. The length of residency in the USA of them range from six months to six years. The subjects learned English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Bangladesh. In Bangladesh, they had no use of English in their day to day conversations. Learning English in Bangladesh takes place only through formal education in schools. Children start learning English as a compulsory course in every grade since the age of six.

Data was collected through semi-structured interview of all the subjects. Audio data of the interview conversations were recorded using Zoom H2 Digital Voice Recorder. The subjects were aware that they were being recorded. The topic of the conversations included normal day to day activities, or life experience, personal stories, life background, achievements and so on of the subjects. The duration of the recordings ranged from 10 to 25 minutes, accumulating to a total of 110 minutes.

The recorded data were then carefully transcribed keeping in special attention to the instances of code-switching. For the sake of wider accessibility, the data were transcribed mainly through transliteration of the Bangla speech. Where English words/phrases appeared, they were transcribed using the original English words/phrases for them. The English words/phrases were made bold-faced for the sake of easier identification of the instances of code-switching.
After that, the specific instances of CS were identified and analyzed recursively from the perspectives of the five major principles provided by Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) with a view to identifying the underlying contexts of CS operations.

Finally, the findings of the analysis were used to propose the constraint rankings of CS in the concerned community, and thereby proposing the optimal bilingual grammar of the Bangla-English CS.

**Findings**

*Optimal Bilingual Grammar: Bangla-English Code-Switching*

Initially, it was presumed that all the constraints are unranked with respect to one another. After that, instances of CS were put into Tableaux to investigate the dominance of one constraint over another.

Extract 03 demonstrates interplay between two constraints: Power and Solidarity. Tableau 2 illustrates this interplay. Since the speakers’ first language in Bangla and it works as the ‘base’ language for the community, use of Bangla enable the speakers to express solidarity. On the other hand, English enjoys more prestige than their first language to the community; so English is the index of Power here.

Tableau 1: Interaction between Power and Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ha bolse, <strong>but I don’t care.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monolingual Bangla</td>
<td>!*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Result: Power>>Solidarity*
Tableau 1 illustrates that Candidate a. violates the Solidarity constraint, but fulfills Power constraint. Contrarily, Candidate b. violates Power constraint, fulfilling Solidarity. However, since Candidate b. makes a lethal violation (the speaker trades off Solidarity to attain Power), it can be deduced that the constraint Power dominates over constraint Solidarity.

Next, Tableau 2 explains the ranking of Face and Power as demonstrated in Extract 04. This example shows that Power has been traded off to maintain Face. While English would bring the speaker power, a show of Power would possibly jeopardize the efficacy of the request of favor from the interlocutor. Therefore, Face dominates over Power.

Tableau 2: Interaction between Face and Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Face</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes, it’s true, but <em>apnar chhoto bhai hishebe ektu dekhben baparta.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monolingual English</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Result: Face >> Power*

So far, from the above analysis, it is found that Face dominates over Power, which again dominates over Solidarity. Tableau 3 provides evidence in support of this ranking between the three constraints (from Extract 05).

Tableau 3: Interaction between Face, Power and Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Face</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ami eta bolbo na je Engineering porha amar <strong>passion</strong> silo chhotobela theke; tobe amar basha theke ekta <strong>pressure</strong> silo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monolingual Bangla</td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Result: Face >> Power >> Solidarity*
Here, Candidate a. is the winner since Candidate b. makes lethal violation by violating Face, and the speaker trades off Solidarity for Face and Power. Therefore, the ranking so far (Face >> Power >> Solidarity) is confirmed.

Similar phenomenon takes place in Tableau 4 (explaining Extract 01), where Candidate a. is the winner since it fulfills the constraint Faith, while Candidate b. makes and lethal violation at the same place. Thus the Faith also is ranked over Power and Solidarity.

Tableau 4: Interaction between Faith, Power and Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Oke eishob faltu shasti-er voi dekhie laav nai; o cadet college-e porhe eshese.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monolingual Bangla</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result: Faith >> Power >> Solidarity

Now, Tableau 5 shows the interaction between Perspective and Solidarity in Extract 05. Here, the speaker switches to English to repeat the same word/phrase of the interlocutor to keep the contextual cue salient, and to do this the candidate monolingual Bangla would violate Perspective though it would fulfill Solidarity. In such case, the violation of Perspective by Candidate b. is a lethal one, which provides evidence that Perspective is ranked higher than Solidarity.

Tableau 5 (Extract 06) illustrates the interaction between Perspective and Solidarity. This illustration shows that candidate b. makes a lethal violation since monolingual Bangla would violate Perspective, which is higher ranked than Solidarity. Candidate a. is the winner even if it violates Solidarity because it fulfills Perspective.

Tableau 5: Interaction between Perspective and Solidarity
However, the following example shows that a lower-ranked constraint can sometimes dominate over a higher-ranked one only when a further higher-ranked constraint is intervening. Tableau 6 shows that Solidarity dominates over Power in the winning Candidate’s function, though it is a lower-ranked constraint than Power. But, this is possibly only when Faith, which dominates both Power and Solidarity, comes to intervene.

Tableau 6: Interaction between Faith, Power and Solidarity

Here Solidarity >> Power only because Faith is a high-ranked constraint.

Now, Tableau 7 demonstrates the interaction between Perspective, Power and Solidarity (Extract 07). Candidate b. comes with monolingual Bangla which violates Perspective since it avoids the some sort of parenthetical remarks (‘frankly speaking’). And this is a lethal violation due to which Candidate a. becomes the winning candidate. The interaction of Power and Solidarity re-confirms that Power dominates over Solidarity as it was in the earlier illustrations. Thus, the ranking between these three constraints is found to be –

Perspective >> Power >> Solidarity

Tableau 7: Interaction between Perspective, Power and Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is his <strong>kulkhani</strong> on Friday next week?</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Monolingual English</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Solidarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ashole, <strong>frankly speaking</strong>, oke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this way, the analysis of data showed that the constraint ranking in the given bilingual community was –

{Faith, Face, Perspective} >> Power >> Solidarity

**Conclusion**

This study reveals the constraint ranking of a Bangla-English bilingual community where Bangla is the base language. The constraint-ranking found in the study, {Faith, Face, Perspective} >> Power >> Solidarity, is similar to that of the Hindi-Kashmiri-English community reported in Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011).

Though there is no straightforward principle of framework available now to account for this similarity between the sociolinguistic grammar of the two communities, a look at the genealogy of the languages and also the social position of the languages in relation to English among the respective community members might give us some insight.

Bangla is an Indic language of Indo-European language family. More particularly, Bangla descends from the Indo-European ➔ Indo-Iranian ➔ Indo-Aryan genealogy. Similarly, Hindi and Kashmiri also are Indic languages and they also descend from the same genealogy of language. Regarding the social position of these languages, Bangla, alongside Hindi and Kashmiri, functions as the base language of the speech community. English was introduced in the Indian subcontinent during the colonial period, and since then it has been a language of opportunity and privilege, but rarely the language of home. Therefore, the social position of these languages might
have some effect on the choice of codes from the available choices, which, in fact, reflects the underlying sociolinguistic grammar of bilingual language use in these communities.

In this paper, I have used the OT model proposed by Bhatt and Bolonyai to investigate CS grammar in a small international student community. Yet, a vital question remains unanswered. Bhatt and Bolonyai contends that bilingual socio-linguistic grammar is specific to discourse communities of bilingual speakers; but the question is would the socio-linguistic grammar would be the same to another community with the same base and guest languages at another geographical region? To provide an example, would the CS grammar of the Bangla-English bilingual community living in Bangladesh, or of a Bangla-English bilingual community living in a state in the USA, or Bangla-English bilingual community living in any other place be the same? Only further studies on other speech communities with the same language matrix can help us understand this phenomenon.
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