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Abstract:
Anthropological studies of India’s post-liberalisation middle classes have tended to focus mainly on the role of consumption behaviour in the constitution of this class group. Building on these studies, and taking class as an object of ethnographic enquiry, I argue that, over the last 20 years, class dynamics in the country have been significantly altered by the unprecedentedly important and complex role that the English language has come to play in class production and reproduction. Based on 15 months of ethnographic fieldwork—conducted at commercial spoken English training centres, schools, and corporate organisations in Bangalore—I analyse the processes by which this change in class dynamics has occurred, and how it is experienced on the ground. I demonstrate how, apart from being a valuable type of class cultural capital in its own right, proficiency in English has come to play a key role in the acquisition and performance of other important forms of capital associated with middle-class identity. As a result, being able to demonstrate proficiency in English has come to be experienced as critical in order to claim and maintain a space in the middle class, regardless of the other types of class cultural capital a person possesses.

¹I conducted the research on which this article is based during my PhD studies at the University of Cambridge, UK. I am grateful to the Cambridge Commonwealth Trust for generously funding my research, to the Board of Graduate Studies at the University of Cambridge for supporting my fieldwork expenses, and to Darwin College and Santander Bank for providing additional financial support. I am also extremely thankful to my interlocutors in Bangalore, and to all those who provided valuable feedback on my drafts, particularly James Laidlaw, Romelia Calin, and the two anonymous reviewers.
‘There is now a new caste system that divides people—either you have English or you don’t. Instead of BPL [Below Poverty Line] I would like to propose BEL…Below English Line…the new cut off…it determines whether you belong to the haves or the have nots.’

—Vanamala Viswanatha (Writer and teacher educator)

Since 1991—with the implementation of policies of economic liberalisation—the category of the Indian ‘middle class’ has come to occupy a prominent position in public discourses in the country, and in the national imagination. Nevertheless, who constitutes this middle class is ambiguous. This demographic has most commonly been defined by scholars in terms of income levels, and consumption patterns, though some have used criteria like level of education and type of occupation, or a combination of these variables. Estimates of the size of the middle class vary considerably based on the definition used. Furthermore, these definitions of the middle class don’t necessarily correspond to people’s lived experiences of middle-classness. As Dickey argues—based on her fieldwork in Madurai—an increasing number of people are identifying as middle class, many of whom would not be included within this category based on analysts’ definitions. This article is not concerned with trying to define the middle class ‘objectively’, but joins a growing body of scholarship which has focused on exploring how India’s post-liberalisation middle class think about and experience their class identity. Following this scholarship, I find it productive to think about class as a cultural practice or process rather than a static social category. As Herring and Agarwala observe, ‘at the micro-level, where all of us live, are the day-to-day practices through which classes define and reproduce themselves’.

Anthropological studies of India’s post-liberalisation middle class have tended to concentrate mainly on the role of consumption practices in the production and reproduction of this class group, discussing the kind of consumption that is important, and also the type of middle class body that must be cultivated in order to successfully carry out such consumption. However, the role of the English language in the production of the middle-
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2 From her speech at the Regional Institute of English’s All India Seminar on ‘Second Language Teacher Education: Issues and Challenges’ in February 2012.
5 A. Beteille, ‘The Social Character of the Indian Middle Class’ in *Middle Class Values in India and Western Europe*, I. Ahmad and H. Reifeld (eds), Social Science Press, New Delhi, 2001, p. 76.
class body and in middle-class formation more generally, has attracted little attention. A small number of studies have examined English language proficiency and class in contemporary India, through a focus on English language instruction and English-medium schooling. These studies have investigated topics such as parents’ views on the importance of English for their children’s lives and future prospects; the manner in which English-medium and vernacular-medium education is imagined and experienced; and the pedagogical practices employed in the English language classroom and in English-medium schools, and their outcomes. However, they do not offer a comprehensive, ethnographically-grounded analysis of the role of the English language in people’s class projects. In this article, I will demonstrate that such an analysis is critical in order to complete the picture of class in post-liberalisation India.

The article draws on 15 months of ethnographic fieldwork conducted in Bangalore—the capital of the south Indian state of Karnataka—between 2010 and 2012. Over the last 20 years, Bangalore has gained iconic status as the ‘Silicon Valley of India’, because of the growth and success of its Information Technology (IT) industry. At schools in the city run by the state government, the medium of instruction is Kannada, a Dravidian language with over 50 million speakers, which is the official language of the state. However, the vast majority of private schools, from elite ones to low-cost ones, teach in English (or claim to do so), in response to the great demand for ‘English-medium’ education. Indeed, there has been a dramatic growth of private low-cost English-medium schools, and these are attended by the majority of the city’s school-going population. Furthermore, the city has seen a proliferation of privately-run English language Training Centres, offering spoken English courses for adults.

I had three main fieldsites, at which I conducted interviews and participant observation: English language Training Centres (hereafter ETCs), government and private schools, and workplaces conducting English language training for their staff. At all three fieldsites I worked as an English trainer, and also had the chance to observe the classes of my students. Of the vast number of ETCs in the city, I selected three to form my fieldsites: the suburban Hindi-medium Primary School, the middle-class English-medium Secondary School, and the low-cost English-medium Commercial Training Centre.


11 According to NASSCOM (The National Association of Software and Services Companies), in 2012-2013, Karnataka was responsible for $45 billion of the country’s $118-billion IT business, and the state’s contribution to India’s IT industry increased from 33 per cent to 38 per cent between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (The Times of India, ‘Karnataka Is Way ahead of Others in IT Sector, Govt Says’, in The Times of India. 13 November 2014a, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/tech/tech-news/Karnataka-is-way-ahead-of-others-in-IT-sector-govt-says/articleshow/45129659.cms, [accessed 15 December 2014].)

12 A small percentage of state schools offer instruction in one of the eight ‘mother tongues’ that the State recognises as belonging to its major linguistic minorities.

My interlocutors included students and staff at ETCs, staff at schools, parents of school-going children, and English trainers and employees at the workplaces at which I conducted fieldwork. In this article, I will demonstrate how—among my interlocutors—proficiency in English had come to be perceived and experienced as a particularly significant marker of middle-class modernity as a class identity, a fine differentiator of status within and among the middle classes, and an important vehicle of class mobility.

My interlocutors, who came from a range of socio-economic, educational, and occupational backgrounds, all identified as ‘middle class’. Though the term ‘middle class’ was one that everyone appeared to be familiar with (it was quite common for even people who knew very little English, to use the English words ‘middle class’ to refer to themselves), my interlocutors more commonly spoke of class in terms of the English word ‘level’. For instance, one of my interlocutors told me that she didn’t like to go to Parent-Teacher meetings at her daughter’s school because she couldn’t speak English properly. ‘[…] It won’t look good, no, if we speak Kannada?’ she observed. ‘It will be below our level’.  

A man who came to inquire about English courses at Ascent—one of the ETCs at which I worked as a trainer—explained to me that he wanted to improve his English in order to get a job. He clarified that he had been able to get a sales job at a mall and an insurance company, but his older brother had advised him against taking these jobs because they weren’t suitable for people of their level. One of the branches of Ascent at which I taught was located right above a bank. A middle-aged woman who worked at the bank, Veena, was a student in my class. Pushpa, who worked as a cleaner in the same bank, would sometimes come upstairs to give us our electricity bill, and the counsellor and I often chatted with her (at an ETC, a ‘counsellor’ was a person who met with inquirers, and found out the reasons for which they wanted to learn English). Pushpa didn’t speak English and was highly critical of Veena’s attempts to learn the language. ‘I wonder why she needs to learn English,’ she would remark caustically, rolling her eyes. ‘She isn’t of that level’. The clerical staff at Netra, a hospital in the city, complained to me that some patients liked to speak in English in order to ‘show their level’. When my interlocutors referred to their own or another person’s ‘level’ in all these cases, they were not simply making distinctions between the ‘middle class’ the ‘high class’ and the ‘poor’. More often, they were engaged in the task of ranking people within the middle class. Far from being a space in which everyone was at the same level, the middle class was experienced as an arena of continual competition. Proficiency in English was viewed not just as an important type of capital required in order to claim membership in the middle class, but also as an important means of ranking within the middle class.

What constituted proficient or good English varied depending on whom one asked. However, in broad terms, my interlocutors spoke about good English as being the product of correct grammar, a good vocabulary, and a good accent. All regarded a ‘foreign accent’ (UK
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14 I worked as an English trainer at two ETCs, and conducted interviews and some participant observation at ten others. Similarly, I worked as a conversational English teacher at two schools (one government-run and one private), and conducted interviews and some participant observation at twenty others. I also conducted fieldwork at three workplaces in the city which were conducting English classes for their employees: a multinational bank, a multinational IT consulting company, and a well-reputed private hospital in the city. At the bank, I observed a week of English communication skills classes being conducted for employees who were about to start working at the bank’s call centre, and conducted interviews with the trainers. At the IT company, I taught an 80-hour English communication course for 20 newly-recruited hardware engineers. At the hospital, I observed a spoken English course being conducted by a trainer from a popular ETC for some of the hospital’s clerical staff.

15 All text that appears in italics was spoken in Kannada; words that don’t appear in italics were spoken in English.

16 In order to protect my interlocutors’ anonymity, I have used pseudonyms and also changed certain details of people’s stories. I have used the real names of people and organisations only in cases where I have written about things that are in the public domain.
or US) as being unsuitable for an Indian person. The accent that was viewed as desirable was what ETC trainers referred to as a ‘neutral accent’: a pan-Indian educated accent that was free of ‘Mother Tongue Influence’ or ‘MTI’ (though not all my interlocutors used these particular terms). ‘Fluency’ was also widely regarded as an attribute of good English; my interlocutors would tell me that it was important to be able to speak without ‘hesitation’. ‘Without giving gap you should speak continuously,’ Kaveri an ETC student of mine, explained to me. ‘You shouldn’t think when speaking: You should just keep speaking’. Some of my interlocutors also spoke about tone (you should sound polite), volume (you shouldn’t speak too loudly or too softly) and speed of speech (speaking too fast was a common Indian error and should be avoided). They used a handful of terms to make distinctions between the different types of Englishes they heard being spoken in the city. Most commonly, they made distinctions between ‘local English,’ ‘normal English,’ and ‘hi-fi’/ ‘hi-tech’/ ‘professional English’.

While the term ‘local English’ was usually used to refer to error-ridden English spoken with MTI, ‘normal English’ referred to English that was largely correct but not stylish, and ‘hi-fi English’ referred to very stylish English (a ‘big’ vocabulary, an MTI-free accent, and the confidence that came with such English).

During their interviews with me, most of my interlocutors stressed that good English didn’t necessarily mean stylist English, and it was more than enough if one spoke ‘normal English’ as long as one was able to communicate with and understand others. However, outside of the interviews, nearly all spoke about the importance of speaking with ‘style’, with ‘a modern touch’, and in an impressive manner. ‘Just you think [just think about it]. If we want to be above them...we are educated, we must learn high English.’

My interlocutors appeared to view a person’s class position, or their ‘level’, as being a configuration of various types of capital which they possessed. In informal conversations, discussions, and interviews, I noticed that certain types of capital were most frequently referred to: cash wealth, consumption practices, profession, the potential to be ‘mobile’, educational qualifications, English proficiency and—more generally—a style of communication coded as ‘modern’. In the first section of this article, I will describe how, apart from being a valuable type of class cultural capital in its own right, English had come to play an important role in the acquisition and performance of other important forms of class cultural capital. In the second section, I will argue that these various forms of capital were not spoken of, or experienced as, independent variables, but as being mutually constitutive.

17 Dickey describes people using the English word ‘normal’ when speaking in Tamil, in much the same way that my interlocutors used it (S. Dickey, ‘The Pleasures and Anxieties of Being in the Middle’). Both Dickey’s and my interlocutors used the word to mean ‘average’.

18 Those among my interlocutors who had attended relatively elite schools and were proficient in English, made an entirely different set of distinctions between the different types of Englishes spoken in the city.

19 The kind of English a school was viewed as being able to teach its students was a major factor parents took into account when selecting a school for their children. My interlocutors categorised and ranked schools in various ways, using terms like ‘convent school’, ‘fully English-medium’, ‘hi-fi’, ‘international’ to designate the ones which were imagined to equip students with a good level of English proficiency. The vast majority of schools at which it was imagined hi-fi English was used and taught were not affordable to my interlocutors. Most selected a school for their children which they felt was good for their ‘level’. Similarly, when inquirers came to ETCs, the English of the counsellors and trainers they met played a big role in their decision to enrol for a course. While a counsellor/trainer who spoke ‘local’ English could damage business, I was told by more than one ETC proprietor that staff who spoke ‘hi-fi’ English could intimidate and scare away prospective students.
Section 1: English and the acquisition of class cultural capital

1.1 English and jobs

Many anthropological studies of the post-liberalisation middle classes in India have made reference to the ambivalent impact of the policies of liberalisation on the lives of this demographic. While a small section of the middle class—sometimes referred to as the ‘new rich’—have benefited as a result of these policies, it is said that the impact on the majority has not been so straightforward. It has been argued that while economic restructuring has reduced secure public sector jobs (typical avenues of middle-class employment), secure sources of employment in the private sector have not increased proportionately. These studies bring out the struggles of middle class people to negotiate an economy experienced as lacking sufficient opportunities for suitable employment. I would argue that my interlocutors experienced the economy of Bangalore slightly differently. Unlike in the Kolkata that Donner describes, the Meerut that Jeffrey describes, or the Varanasi that LaDousa describes, where it appears that the benefits of IT were not felt tangibly by people, in Bangalore there has been a proliferation of employment opportunities in the city’s IT and ITES (Information Technology Enabled Service) sector. A wide range of employment opportunities have also been created with the growth of the city’s non-IT-related service sector (e.g. malls, hospitals, hotels). Unlike government jobs, my interlocutors told me, these private jobs could not be got with ‘influence’ and the payment of bribes, but only through ‘merit’. These employment opportunities in the new sectors of the city’s economy had then not only come to be viewed as acceptable—indeed desirable—alternatives to traditional middle-class employment in the public sector (which is becoming harder and harder to obtain), they also provided a route for new sections of the population, who till now did not identify as middle class, to begin to make claims to middle-class status. Although I do not wish to suggest that jobs in the new


21 H. Donner, ‘Children Are Capital, Grandchildren Are Interest’.

22 C. Jeffrey, Timepass; C. Jeffrey, ‘Timepass’.

23 C. LaDousa, Hindi Is Our Ground, English Is Our Sky.

24 Employment in the ITES sector includes jobs in call centres, back office operations, medical transcription, medical billing and coding etc.

25 Nisbett warns against accepting at face value the rhetoric of IT-based meritocracy, demonstrating how having social contacts in IT-ITES companies can be helpful in getting a job, though it does not guarantee one a job (N. Nisbett, Growing up in the Knowledge Society: Living the IT Dream in Bangalore, Routledge India, New Delhi, 2009, pp. 181-182). See also C. Upadhya, and A.R. Vasavi, ‘Work, Culture and Sociality in the Indian IT Industry: A Sociological Study’, Final report submitted to Indo-Dutch Programme for Alternatives in Development, School of Social Sciences, National Institute of Advanced Studies. 2006, p. 29, http://www.nias.res.in/docs/idpadfinalreport.pdf, [accessed, 17 February 2015]. Though some of my interlocutors did speak about a friend who had told them about a vacancy in his/her company, or a relative that had got them an interview, they still maintained that it wasn’t necessary to possess such connections to get these jobs, and indeed most of my interlocutors who had jobs reported having got these jobs without having had to draw on social contacts.

26 With increasing privatisation, there were fewer government jobs available. I was told that, even more than in the past, having ‘influence’ (social connections) and paying bribes had become crucial for getting any kind of government job. Though some of my ETC students spoke about secure government jobs as being the best kind of employment a person could have, most were not actively seeking government jobs.
sectors of the city’s economy were bringing about a revolution and shaking up the class system, it would be incorrect to assume that they brought about no socio-economic mobility. Based on his fieldwork among young men in Bangalore, Nisbett describes how new hierarchies were emerging in the city based on the type of employment a person held, and stresses that these new hierarchies did not merely reflect older ones. This trend was something that I noticed during my own fieldwork.

All my interlocutors, without exception—in interviews and informal conversations with me—spoke about Bangalore as being a city of opportunities, based on the jobs available in the new sectors of the city’s economy. Some of them, who weren’t from Bangalore, said that they had moved to the city precisely for this reason. Nevertheless, a number of these same people struggled to find the kind of jobs they wanted or felt they were qualified for. This was, however, frequently explained as being more a result of their own ‘poor communication skills’ (in English), rather than inadequate jobs in the economy. Manu Joseph, an Indian journalist, observes that ‘there is not a single well-paying job in the country that does not require a good understanding of [English]’. While the accuracy of this statement is questionable, many of my interlocutors appeared to feel that this was indeed the case, at least in Bangalore. They spoke about how—with respect to jobs in the private sector—having good educational qualifications/technical skills/talent did not amount to much and might not be recognised if one were not proficient in English, and also about how English proficiency was often the main skill based on which people were hired. Furthermore, an extremely wide range of jobs now required people to be able to communicate in English: it was not just software engineers and call centre workers in multinational companies who were required to be proficient in English, but also salespeople in malls and waiters in cafes (though of course the level of English proficiency expected varied). There was also a strong feeling that, with time, the importance of English for getting a job would only keep increasing. One of my interlocutors, who worked as a cook, told me, ‘I don’t need education to cook, sweep and swab. But even there [with this job] a need for education may come in the future. When you become older, maybe you will want an educated, English-speaking cook, I don’t know. After a few days [some time] even this type of job may not be available for me.’ My interlocutors described to me how knowing English could lead to growth in any kind of job: if you were a software engineer, knowing good English could mean being promoted to a managerial level; if you worked in a mall, knowing English could mean getting a better paying salesperson position instead of a backroom position; waiters said that learning English would allow them to get jobs in a better quality of restaurants and hotels. I was told that even state government jobs—which had for decades required only proficiency in Kannada—now required one to be competent in English, and it was only the low-rank government positions that were accessible to those who weren’t proficient in the language (this was also something that newspapers reported). The kind of jobs for which English made one eligible, not only provided
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27 N. Nisbett, ‘Friendship, Consumption, Morality’.
29 When I use terms like ‘good English’ and ‘proficient English’ I am referring to my interlocutors’ assessments. Of course, different people meant different things by these terms.
30 For example: Azmath, ‘Wanted: English-Speaking Policemen’, in The Times of India. 22 June 2005, http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2005-06-22/bangalore/27863546_1_constables-control-room-english, [accessed 18 July 2013]. In 2014, in the months preceding the highly competitive Indian Civil Service Examination, there were street protests regarding one component of this exam: the recently introduced Civil Service Aptitude Test. Protestors argued that this test demanded a level of proficiency in English that most students who hadn’t attended an English-medium school didn’t possess, and thus was biased against such students. The government eventually announced that students’ marks in the English component of the test would
increased income, but also job designations that were viewed as valuable sources of capital in themselves. As Nisbett writes, ‘Bangalore’s role as an industrial and high-tech capital of software production and outsourced employment is never far away from middle-class strategies of identification and social reproduction’.31

Given the importance of English in the job market, proficiency in the language was experienced as a powerful vehicle of socio-economic mobility. The view that English was a ‘social good’ that enabled socio-economic upliftment and advancement was widely expressed—by the students and staff at ETCs, by NGOs working in the field of education, by parents of school-going children, and in the media. In one Deccan Herald article, for instance, we read about the son of an illiterate security guard who, by learning English, was able to ‘escape’ from the course his life would have taken and become a marketing executive. He is quoted as saying that this twist of fate was possible ‘only because I can speak English’.32 I encountered numerous stories like this in the course of my fieldwork. Most of my interlocutors could tell a story about how a friend/relative/neighbour had—despite their poverty—invested in an English-medium school for their children, and how these children had subsequently got good jobs and had bought a car or bike/were renting a better house. Indeed, some of my interlocutors told me about how English had turned around their own lives. Furthermore, many of the inquirers we got at ETCs spoke about their difficult economic circumstances, and how they wanted to learn English in order to be able to get a better-paying job.

1.2 English and educational credentials

Apart from the fact that they were an important marker of middle-class identity in their own right, educational credentials were also valued as a means to get jobs. My interlocutors told me that in order to be eligible for a wide-range of jobs in the new sectors of the city’s economy, one had to have an undergraduate degree,33 and in order to get even menial jobs a pre-university degree was often necessary.34 Many of my interlocutors felt that it was possible through education for people to enter into a totally different social station in life than their parents. Vishala described to me how she’d taken on various jobs—from working as a nanny, to working as a cook, to doing some tailoring—in order to supplement her husband’s income (he worked as a tailor) so that they would be able to provide their daughter with the kind of education which would enable her to get a good job: first an English-medium school, and then an engineering college. ‘We were middle class,’ she told me. ‘My daughter has moved from middle class to high class. How? Because of the foundation I laid.’ She went on: ‘A girl in a slum [can become] an engineer […]. Today becoming an engineer is not a big thing. A sweeper’s daughter [can become] an engineer. Whether her mother scrubbed the floors, washed the bathrooms, or cooked, does not matter. Education is so important.’

The role of English in the seeking and using of educational capital was overdetermined. To begin with, many of the more prestigious degree programmes were taught only in English (science, engineering, and medicine programmes for instance). In any case, given the importance of English on the job market, almost all of my interlocutors felt that studying for


33 See also N. Nisbett, ‘Friendship, Consumption, Morality’; N. Nisbett, Growing up in the Knowledge Society, p. 53.
34 Pre-university courses (usually 2-years-long) are intermediate courses attended by graduates of Standard 10.
any degree in a Kannada-medium institution was a waste. ‘What is the point of learning accounts in Kannada? When you start working everything will be in English.’ Kaveri, a student of mine at Ascent who was in her early 20s, came from a town in north Karnataka. She had studied in a Kannada-medium school there, done a D.Ed (diploma in teaching) in a government-run Kannada-medium college, and then moved to Bangalore when she got married. Her family had not even considered putting her in an English-medium school, she reflected. It was only now that they had understood the value of English. Kaveri told me that when she first moved to Bangalore, a few years ago, she had wanted to study for a Bachelor’s degree. Her mother had told her, ‘If you do a degree now, you’ll have to do it in Kannada-medium. It won’t be of any use. Instead of doing a degree why don’t you go for an English course?’ All of the young parents I met at Ascent told me that it was best to put one’s children in an English-medium school right from the start of their education. Many of them had attended Kannada-medium schools themselves and felt that this had put them at a major disadvantage when they joined English-medium colleges later. They described to me how they’d struggled to read their textbooks, write answers in exams and even understand the questions. They didn’t want their children to have to face the same problems. Secondly, as I have already described in the previous section, it was strongly felt that possessing good educational credentials in the absence of English proficiency did not amount to much. Ascent was full of people who possessed educational qualifications but were not able to get jobs because they couldn’t speak English properly.

1.3 English and being a ‘mobile’ person

Another dimension of being successfully middle class that emerged powerfully from my fieldwork, was the potential to be mobile and function competently in a community of mobile people. For this, proficiency in English was viewed as a crucial skill. As an outcome of increasing migration from other parts of India into Bangalore (the most recent wave being the result of the IT-ITES boom), in many places in the city—malls, restaurants, banks, hospitals—one couldn’t rely on Kannada to be able to communicate with members of staff. Furthermore, jobs in the new sectors of the city’s economy had created opportunities for an unprecedentedly large section of people in Bangalore to interact, on an everyday basis, with people from other states and countries (both in person, and via telephone or email), and to travel on work both within and outside India. In fact, in order to be eligible for a job at many multinational companies, or MNCs as they were known, a person had to possess a passport. English was thus viewed as an important ‘all India language’ and ‘global language’, in a first-hand manner.

Constructed in opposition to the mobile person, I came across the category of the ‘local’ person in my interlocutors’ comments and conversations. I quickly learnt that being local did not mean that one was from Bangalore or Karnataka. Indeed, from time to time, I heard people from the neighbouring states of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh—who had recently moved to Bangalore in search of work, and didn’t know much English—being referred to as local people. The term ‘local’ was used to refer to someone who didn’t know English or was not very educated, and consequently was not capable of being mobile in the same way as English-speaking people. This lack of English- and education-enabled mobility was imagined to result in a parochial outlook. When students and trainers at ETCs described to me why people felt under pressure to speak English in places like malls and restaurants, a frequent observation that would be made was that people who spoke broken English or Kannada would be viewed as ‘local’ people and wouldn’t be treated with respect. Some of my interlocutors self-identified as ‘local people’. Rajani, who worked as an ‘attender’ (housekeeping attendant) at Ascent, for instance, was a Kannadiga, born and brought up in
Bangalore. She was in her 50s, and spoke very little English. She regularly complained to me about how the staff at malls, banks and restaurants often spoke to her in English. ‘They know we are local, but they still speak to us in English,’ she said angrily. They did this, she told me, in order to show their own level.

The word ‘local’ had come to be imbued with negative qualities to such an extent that it was sometimes used as an adjective that meant ‘of poor quality’/‘bad’. As I’ve described earlier, I heard people use the term ‘local English’ to refer to broken English. One of my interlocutors complained to me that many English-medium schools in the city didn’t teach English properly. ‘They [students of such schools] learn English in a local way,’ she said. ‘It won’t go to their mind properly.’

1.4 English as consumption

As I described earlier, an important theme in anthropological studies of the post-liberalisation middle classes in India has been the central and constitutive role of consumption in middle-class identity.35 Liberalisation policies have created opportunities for production and consumption on a much larger scale than before, with the result that there has been a significant increase in the quantity and variety of consumer goods in Indian markets, and the section of the population to whom these goods are accessible. Consumer goods—ranging from cellphones to motorbikes to ‘fashionable’ clothes—have thus come to be experienced as an important means of producing and claiming distinction, and are viewed as potent indices of a person’s background and identity. Dickey writes: ‘Whilst the use of consumption to create distinction has a centuries-long history in South Asia, contemporary consumption differs in the breadth of consumer goods available, their accessibility to a wider range of consumers, and the more finely nuanced distinctions that they enable.’36 Liechty, writing about the middle classes in Kathmandu, also describes how consumer goods have come to be harnessed as important social currency in local class projects.37 Liechty writes: ‘middle-class consumption is less about having or possession than it is about being and belonging. As such middle-class consumption is “about” middle-class production; it is in the practice of consumer regimens (from “doing fashion” to restaurant going to watching videos) that the middle class performs its cultural existence, day by day’.38

The consumption of English, so to speak, has received only passing mention in the accounts of these anthropologists. English’s transformation into an important type of social currency in people’s class projects in many ways parallels that of consumer goods as described above. In response to the increasing demand for English, there has been a ‘democratisation’ of access to instruction in the language: there has been a mushrooming of privately-run low-cost English-medium schools, government schools have begun teaching English earlier, and an entire industry has developed around the teaching of spoken English to adults. This has led to an unprecedentedly large section of the population experiencing proficiency in the English language as a new mode of claiming distinction available to them, as well as a norm expected of them. In many ways the manner in which my interlocutors experienced the need to be able to ‘display’ English, strikingly resembled the way Liechty

38 M. Liechty, Suitably Modern, p. 34.
and Dickey describe how their respective interlocutors felt the need to be able to own and display various consumer goods associated with middle-class identity.

Liechty and Dickey describe how, among their interlocutors, a person’s consumption practices were thought to determine to a great extent the impression that other people formed of them. People felt that in order to ‘count’ in society and be treated with respect, acquiring and displaying the consumer goods and engaging in the consumer practices associated with middle-class identity was necessary. For instance, one of Dickey’s informants says that if one didn’t own ‘up-to-date’ consumer goods, ‘you don’t get people’s attention, you don’t get their respect, and then you are just like a small insect crawling around’. First impressions, particularly, were thought to be made on the basis of a person’s consumption behaviour. Thus, even if a person possessed other less immediately visible forms of capital and social prestige (like education and caste status)—which formerly guaranteed middle-class distinction—their failure to engage in appropriate consumer behaviour would result in them being written off. On the other hand, consuming appropriately could create new ‘identity possibilities’ for a person, allowing them to ‘pass’ as someone of higher social standing than they actually were. Liechty relates a story that he frequently heard from informants. One of his informants told it like this:

These days even an ordinary person—even a peon—if they go somewhere suited and booted, with a tweed coat and tie, if he goes to the [government] minister’s office, even he will be immediately respected. But if the same person goes without this, he’ll be stopped at the door.

People who couldn’t afford to engage in appropriate consumer behaviour reported suffering from inferiority complexes. Anxiety about how they would be perceived by the ‘relevant communities’ around them—based on the commodities they owned, and the way they dressed—weighed heavily on their minds and ‘played with their brains’, putting pressure on them to engage in certain consumer behaviours or at least hide any evidence that they weren’t able to do so. Dickey illustrates well how people felt that they were always at risk of being ‘assessed’. Ranging from a disparaging look from a fellow passenger on the bus to being explicitly rejected at a job interview because of the way one was dressed, assessments could come in various forms and have a wide-range of repercussions. But as Dickey observes, ‘all serve to alter or reinforce a person’s worthiness, opportunity, and belonging within a class’.

Apart from indexing modernity, sophistication, a person’s membership to a particular socio-economic background etc.—which consumer goods are also described as indexing—being proficient in English was, in addition, strongly associated with being socially skilled, well educated, intelligent, and ‘professional’. As Srivastava notes, mastery over English has come to be viewed as a measure of competence and skill. This made proficiency in the language an exceptionally potent index of value and vehicle of claiming distinction.

41 M. Liechty, Suitably Modern, p. 138.
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Among my interlocutors, a person’s ability to speak English—and the kind of English they spoke—was experienced as shaping significantly how they were viewed and treated by others, in an increasing number of spaces and contexts in the city. Not being able to demonstrate competence in English was imagined to reveal one as uneducated, unintelligent, rural, and of low socio-economic background, among other things. Anxiety about how they would be ‘assessed’, based on their English, ‘played with [my interlocutors’] brains’, shaping their behaviour and affecting their self-confidence and sense of self-worth.

Very interestingly, many felt that even if the people one was speaking with didn’t understand English, speaking the language could still be advantageous. One of my interlocutors, Somanath, told me:

SO: The very fact you speak English, people will start looking at you at a totally different level. At work, and even in private life. […] When you talk [in Kannada], automatically whether you want it or not, some English words will come. Suppose you talk in Kannada and a few English words appear in your talk, people observing you will say ‘Oh, this man has good knowledge’. Even if they don’t understand [English]. The manner in which those English words flew across [naturally], those people will say, ‘Oh, this man knows beautiful English’. If you know English people look at you differently.

INT: In what way?
SO: Basically he is knowledgeable, capable and […] intelligent … ok, suppose I go in a market, maybe I may not say I am a manager in a bank. But the manner in which I behave, the manner in which I talk, people think maybe he is holding a very important position.

Somanath describes the power of these unintentional displays of English, almost making proficiency in the language appear like a fancy watch or piece of jewellery, a glimpse of which conveyed powerfully a person’s social station. Even the people I interviewed who had gone to elite English-medium schools and were proficient in the language, observed that if one wanted to ‘kick up a fuss’ about something, it was best to do it in English—again, even if the people to whom one was speaking didn’t know English. It could be said then that English, almost like a mantra, had a certain ‘performative efficacy,’ in that people did not have to understand what was being said in order for it to have. So while on the one hand, English was experienced as a valuable skill, it was also experienced as a commodity, the mere display of which earned one status and respect.

1.5 English as an agent of transformation

However, the role of English proficiency in people’s lives was experienced as going beyond the indexical. English proficiency was seen as not just being an index of social skill, sophistication, competence and intelligence, for instance, but also actually engendering these things in a person. An improvement in a person’s English, ETC trainers would tell me, led to certain other changes: changes in personality, attitude, behaviour, way of thinking, way of dressing, demeanor, and overall confidence. As a way of illustrating the power of English, trainers, and sometimes even students, would describe how a particular student had been very quiet, introverted and unsure of themselves when they had first started ETC English classes and then—as their English improved—their confidence had increased, they had started dressing more stylishly, their body language had changed, and they had become more polite and refined. Some of my students even told me that when they’d enrolled for an English

47 See also: V. Bénéï, Schooling India: Hindus, Muslims, and the forging of citizens, Permanent Black, Ranikhet, Bangalore, 2008, p. 44; S. J. Tambiah, ‘The Magical Power of Words’. Man, vol. 3, issue 2, 1968. Interestingly, a common critique of the way English was taught in Kannada-medium schools was that students there learnt English as if it was a mantra—they committed their English lessons to memory, without understanding them.
course, they’d expected to gain more from it than just increased proficiency in English. Satish—a student of mine at Ascent—for instance, told me: ‘[I thought if I learn English] I can develop in all kinds of ways. I thought if I join English classes I can improve my fluency, develop my personality... If you learn English, your behaviour, character, everything will change.’

In this regard, the way my interlocutors imagined the benefits of knowing English showed some strong parallels to the way the young men Jeffrey et al. worked with imagined education.  

Jeffrey et al.—based on their fieldwork in rural Uttar Pradesh—observe that ‘young men’s belief in education was not founded solely or even primarily on their conception of its transformative potential in the economic sphere’. Rather, education was valued for other transformations that it was felt to bring about, and capabilities it was believed to instill in a person. Some of the transformations that education brought about in a person were seen to be related to the practical skills—reading, writing, mathematics—that one learns in school. The inability of the illiterate to read shop signs, bills, legal documents, medicine prescriptions and so on, was thought to render them unable to negotiate their lives competently and confidently, making them dependent on others, and susceptible to being cheated. Education enabled a person to become independent, competent and confident of handling whatever came their way. However—interestingly—education was also imagined as having a ‘civilising’ effect on a person, instilling in them good manners, refinement, moral strength, and right conduct. Their informants derived great enjoyment from telling stories of ‘uneducated incompetence’, which involved imitations of the way the uneducated carried themselves and behaved, and portrayed them as being dull, backward, and uncultured. Jeffrey et al. write, ‘In the narratives of educated young men, education [...] has also come to define what it means to be civilised’. Sarangapani—in her ethnography of a village school in Delhi—also writes about similar embodied capital resulting from education, using the concept of ‘bol-chal’ (literally, ‘talk-walk’).

My interlocutors experienced English as being required for a wide-range of purposes: in order to get a job, perform well in one’s job, play the role of a parent, play the role of a spouse, and negotiate many parts of the city. Unsurprisingly then, many spoke about how their lack of proficiency in English had made them feel inadequate, dependent on others, and unable to cope with their roles and responsibilities. Proficiency in English, it was imagined, led to a person becoming more confident, capable, and independent. Some of my interlocutors also spoke about how learning English made a person more knowledgeable because of the kind of information that became available to him/her through the language. In my interlocutors’ comments and discussions about the importance of learning English, English was constructed as a language that gave one greater access to ‘knowledge’ and information than Kannada or other Indian languages, and also to the ‘latest’ and most ‘updated’ information. Most higher education options were available only in English-medium, my interlocutors would tell me, and the information on the internet was not accessible to people who didn’t know English. Venkatesh, a student of mine, asked me, ‘If you didn’t know English, do you think you could be doing a PhD?’ He answered for me: ‘No. Do you think you’d have been able to find all the books you’re referring to in Kannada?’ Satish, another student of mine, told me:
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48 C. Jeffrey et. al, Degrees without Freedom?
49 C. Jeffrey et. al, Degrees without Freedom?, p. 76
50 C. Jeffrey et. al, Degrees without Freedom?, p. 67
51 C. Jeffrey et. al, Degrees without Freedom?, p. 76
If I learn English] my conversation will develop...I will get a broad mind...there will be a change in my thinking level. English is a global language, a world language. [...] Kannada students will have a lower thinking level. Meaning they won’t be able to think in a global manner. Their thinking will be within one state [Karnataka] only. If they learn English, they will get a broad mind. If you want to study, better to study English books than Kannada books. English books contain more knowledge. More information. Eighty per cent of the education system is in English.

He gave me an example to illustrate this point: if you knew only Kannada, he said, you could watch only Kannada news channels and read only Kannada newspapers and books. This would result in a limited kind of thinking. However, if one knew English there was no limit to the kind of information one had access to. One’s thinking would become global.

Another set of transformations that English proficiency was imagined to bring about relate to English’s central role in performing a cultural style locally coded as ‘modern’ and—depending on the context—‘professional’. Performing this style involved speaking, interacting with others and carrying oneself in a certain way. Interestingly, this cultural style was imagined as being closely related to English proficiency, or even an extension and development of English proficiency. Communicating well in English—as most of my interlocutors described it—meant not just speaking the language proficiently, but also being able to perform this cultural style. As one trainer at an ETC put it, ‘It’s not enough if you talk English. You also have to walk English, think English, eat English, and drink English’. Being able to perform an English cultural style was thought to be advantageous not only at the workplace, but in the increasing number of ‘English spaces’ in the city. Just as the educated informants of Jeffrey et al. enjoyed performing ‘uneducated incompetence’, during my fieldwork I noticed how a common strategy through which people who were relatively proficient in English (corporate trainers, for instance) performed a lack of competence, sophistication, or social skill was by speaking in what was ostensibly constructed as the opposite of this style, and marked—particularly—by ungrammatical English spoken with ‘Mother Tongue Influence’.

Many of my interlocutors spoke of this English cultural style as being a natural and automatic accompaniment of increased proficiency in English. ‘Once you start thinking in English, you cannot come out of it,’ Tanvi, a colleague of mine at Ascent observed. ‘It affects your personality.’ ‘How?’ I asked. She explained:

In many ways. Have you seen women in foreign countries? They talk so loud. [laughs] I talk so loud now. [...] With language comes behaviour, with language comes personality. [...] Mannerisms...everything changes. The way you talk, the way you dress up, your composure, your body language, your gestures, everything changes when you pick up English. You definitely no longer remain very feminine in your approach. The other day I was talking to one of my friends and we had a very good observation. I used to have long hair before marriage. I was telling her, ‘Prachi, you know I was more soft and feminine when I had long hair. I used to put proper clips and everything...But the moment I cut my hair in a step cut [laughs], that softness has gone, and I’ve become more outspoken, and outgoing’. These same kind of changes can happen with language as well. When you pick up English you become more outspoken, more confident...and sometimes even when it’s not required [laughs].

53 By this, he did not mean that one should literally eat English food, but that one needed to completely immerse oneself in the English language.
54 A term widely used in ETCs to refer to the influence of a person’s mother tongue on their way of speaking English.
In Tanvi’s view, then, acquiring an English cultural style was an inevitable effect of becoming proficient in English. Languages brought with them ways of behaving and interacting. When one became proficient in English, that proficiency changed the way you felt and the way you behaved.

That the inherent properties of English allowed for and led to certain ways of being and sounding was a view that was expressed by many others too. For instance, I kept coming across the view that English was a language that enabled a person to be more polite and refined. Chacko, the founder of English Academy—one of the ETC’s at which I taught—told me that one of the benefits of learning English was that it made one more polite:

I think I learnt a lot of manners and good things through English. I mean in my language [Malayalam] also we are well-mannered, but English has got a lot more [scope for politeness]. For example, to make a request you can say, ‘I was wondering…..’ [he said this in an extremely polite tone, his entire body language changing as he spoke these words]. You can start like that…You feel much more comfortable in formal situations [where you need to be polite] when you know English.

Biju, a student of mine at English Academy, reflected:

Sometimes I love English more than Malayalam [his mother tongue]. Because the accents and the behaviours and the way they are expressing the attitude. Very good, actually. Polite language. ‘Could you possibly give your pen?’ [when he said this his tone became markedly polite, and he appeared to be savouring the way the words rolled off his tongue]. I used to say sometimes: ‘Please give your pen’. But that is a command actually. Actually in Malayalam also [you could say things politely], but the way it is expressed in English [is so much better].

Satish, a student of mine at Ascent, was not proficient enough in English to be able to converse in the language with me comfortably. When I interviewed him, we spoke in Kannada. Satish chatted with me in unselfconscious and animated Kannada right through the interview. However when I was speaking (in Kannada), he would lean back in his chair and say, ‘Sure, sure’ in English. During the time that he said these words his tone, posture and body language were visibly altered. He appeared to experience himself as being more refined, more sophisticated, during these moments of English. ‘When I speak English I feel professional,’ he told me at one point in the interview. ‘It really creates a good impression when you speak English.’

Sharon, the proprietor of one of the ETCs I visited, told me that English was inherently a more refined language than Kannada, Tamil, and other Indian languages. ‘Kannada and Tamil sound rude even without meaning to,’ she explained to me. Somanath, who taught English in schools and to people in his neighbourhood, as a kind of social work, felt that the ‘sweet’ and ‘smooth-flowing’ qualities of English could even rub off on one’s Kannada:

A village boy, the manner in which he speaks Kannada, his roughness, the type of words he uses, the methodology, the manner in which he pronounces... You [teach him English] for three or four months [and see what happens]. English is a very sweet language. That which is [there] in Kannada—the stress letter, big alphabet, small alphabet—these are not there in English. It’s a smooth-flowing language. So the moment you put him on [spoken] English […] methodology, the softness […] which he is able to pick up [through] this language [English], he starts applying to his own mother tongue. The manner in which I was speaking Kannada before I was able to converse in English, and the manner in which I am able to speak Kannada now, there is a huge change. This change I am [noticing] among people whom I am teaching English.

From the way some of my interlocutors spoke about this cultural style, they viewed it as stemming from not just the inherent properties of the language but also a certain confidence
often associated with English proficiency. Nadia, the proprietor of one of the ETCs I visited—after telling me that it wasn’t enough just to speak English and that one also needed to ‘behave English’—added that it wasn’t possible to teach people how to behave English:

I believe that you can’t teach body language. Body language is a manifestation of your attitude. You can’t fake it. If you are faking it, you can fake it only for about three minutes. I don’t teach people to fake body language. I help them to change their attitudes which, in turn, will take care of the body language. That’s how it is. And English is one aspect of this. Because confidence….very many people don’t have confidence, for the simple reason that they are not good at English. So when they start improving in English and speaking English, everything about them changes.

Nevertheless, most ETCs attempted to teach this ‘English cultural style’ by offering courses and modules named ‘Soft Skills’, ‘Social English’, ‘Body Language’, ‘Personality Development’ and so on, in addition to grammar modules. In fact, ETCs often positioned English language proficiency as the foundation of this style by offering English grammar courses at the beginner level, and then introducing courses like ‘Accent Neutralisation’, and ‘Social English’ at intermediate and advanced levels.

Thus, much like the descriptions Jeffrey et al. give of the way their informants imagined education, among my interlocutors, English proficiency was seen as something that didn’t simply index who a person was, but was capable of altering a person intimately and powerfully, and enabling them to function more competently.

**Section 2 : The gauging and performing of ‘levels’**

As I argued earlier, people experienced their ‘level’ as being a configuration of various types of capital. These different types of capital were not viewed or experienced as independent variables, but as intersecting and interacting with each other in various ways, as I will attempt to illustrate. How a person’s configuration of capital was viewed (or assessed) appeared to be, to some extent, dependent on place, and the age of the person concerned. For instance, the English proficiency of a person above a certain age might be viewed as a less powerful indicator of their ‘level’ than the English proficiency of someone who was younger. Furthermore, some of my students spoke about how it was alright not to be able to speak in English in certain other cities and towns, but in Bangalore it was important to able to demonstrate proficiency in the language in order to maintain one’s level. In addition, how a person’s level was assessed also depended on the assessor. Just as how what constituted good English or proficient English varied depending on whom one asked, people’s views on what different configurations of capital amounted to were not uniform.

Many of my ETC students perceived a ‘mismatch’ between their level of English proficiency, on the one hand, and the other sources of capital they possessed, on the other hand. A common type of mismatch people experienced was between their educational qualifications or technical knowledge/skill, on the one hand, and their English proficiency, on the other hand. Quite a few of my students had Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, and felt that their English was not reflective of these credentials. Also, many felt that though they had ‘subject knowledge’ and ‘technical knowledge’, and were intelligent and competent, their English portrayed them as lacking in education and intelligence. Another type of mismatch people experienced was between their English and their profession. It was generally expected—my interlocutors felt—that people in certain kinds of professions would be able to speak English proficiently. Those of my students who were software engineers or—more generally—those who worked at MNCs, for instance, felt that it was particularly embarrassing that their English wasn’t good (‘How does it look for a software engineer not to be able to speak English properly?’). The more senior a person was in terms of job title, or
the more work experience they had, the more shameful a lack of proficiency in English was experienced as being. A conversation I had with Venkatesh, a student of mine, illustrates how these ‘mismatches’ could be experienced as embarrassing:

INT: So none of your colleagues at work goes for English class?
V: If they go also, they won’t tell, no?
INT: Why?
V: Suppose if they say they are going for English class, people may think, ‘Why is this fellow going for English classes at this age?’ Naturally, nobody will tell others if they are going for classes.
INT: If they were younger, do you think they would tell others they’re going for English classes?
V: Depends upon his education. And depends on his position. Suppose if a person is tenth standard pass, 55 then he will tell, ‘I’m going to English Centre to learn good English’. He will tell people. But if it’s a BTech or MTech fellow, 56 or a fellow in a high position, then he may feel ‘What will people think?’

Though these other types of capital were seen as being important and valuable, my interlocutors felt that in an increasing number of spaces and contexts people gauged a person’s ‘level’—at least initially—based on their English proficiency. My interlocutors thus worried that their English would be viewed as a ‘badge’ of their identity, making less visible the other social currency they possessed that should otherwise have allowed them to make certain status claims. Karthik, a student of mine at Ascent, who worked at an accountancy firm, told me:

K: Most of our clients are English-speaking. When they came to us first [initially], they thought I knew only Kannada. 57 They did not think I knew English. So first, they were not talking to me at all, they were only talking to my boss. I felt bad. If I didn’t have the knowledge, then I would not have felt bad. But I had the knowledge. Language was my problem.
INT: Did these clients know Kannada?
K: Yes they knew. But they didn’t speak to me, because they didn’t think I knew English.

Karthik felt that these clients were dismissive of him because they thought he didn’t know English, which led them to assume that he was not very knowledgeable. He tells me that he wouldn’t have minded so much that they were dismissive of him, if he hadn’t had ‘the knowledge’; what upset him was that he felt he did, but it wasn’t recognised because of his English. Many of my other interlocutors also described similar situations where they felt they had been viewed or treated poorly because of their English. What was striking was that it was not so much that they were concerned that their English would reveal/expose their level, but that they were concerned that their real potential, their actual level, would not be recognised because of their English.

By the same token, being proficient in English could also provide an exaggerated sense of the other types of capital a person possessed. Mohini, who did clerical work at a hospital, told me: ‘If you speak in English, they give you more respect. Wherever you go it’s like that. Shops, hotels...if you speak English they give you more respect. They will think she must have studied a lot, she must be in a high position [job].’ Vishala, a middle-aged woman who worked as a cook, and her husband Manjunath, who worked as a tailor, had—despite their

55 Somebody who has graduated from Standard Ten at school (the end of high school, in most Indian schools), but has no further educational qualifications.
56 Person who has a Bachelor of Technology or Master of Technology degree
57 Karthik said that the clients had got the impression that he knew only Kannada, because when they’d first met him, his boss had been speaking to him in Kannada.
difficult financial situation—put their daughter, Ramya, in an English-medium school and then sent her to an engineering college. Ramya now worked at an MNC and earned a good salary. Vishala told me that Ramya’s job, and the manner in which she spoke (in English) and dressed, all successfully hid her background. She said:

At her work place, nobody knew how [small] her house is. She would get off [the office shuttle bus] at the main road. People think she must living one of those big houses on the main road, because of the way she speaks, clothes she wears, her style. She gets respect automatically, wherever she goes.

A few months before this conversation with Vishala, Ramya had got married to a well-to-do engineer. Her husband and his family were under the impression that Vishala worked as a receptionist (Ramya had felt ashamed to tell them she was a cook). ‘If I had known English, I could have become a receptionist, or managed a shop...,’ Vishala mused. ‘I would have spoken to customers in English. They would not have figured out I was not educated. Even now, nobody can make out I am not educated. I wear ironed clothes, have a neat plait.’ The last line of this quote illustrates another point: for someone of Vishala’s age, not being proficient in English was less of an indicator or predictor of education and socio-economic status than it was for someone of Ramya’s age.

The ‘identity possibilities’ that English proficiency could create were also something about which many of my interlocutors were resentful. Mahesh, a student of mine who had an engineering degree, felt angered that when he went to a mall, he ended up feeling inferior to a salesperson (who was less educated than he was, and in a less prestigious job), because the salesperson spoke better English. He said:

If you go [to] any mall....Yeah they [salesman] may speak in good English. But they didn’t study anything, they have passed only SSLC [Standard Ten]...but they are good in English. Even though I am engineering student, in front of them, I’ll hesitate to speak with them. He speaks good English, I don’t know English, I will feel like that.

English could thus, to some extent, temporarily unsettle or displace existing hierarchies and level the playing field in a way that my ETC students who possessed relatively prestigious educational qualifications and job credentials found unsettling. Like Karthik, whom I quoted above, and many of my other interlocutors, Mahesh appears to feel that English was a superficial index of a person’s level and therefore ranking people on the basis of their English was not accurate. He seems to feel that educational qualifications are a more accurate basis on which people should be ranked, and that this English-speaking salesperson is wrongly coming across as superior, just because he speaks more proficient English. This kind of distortion of hierarchies was perceived to take place in situations which had more of a serious impact on my interlocutors’ lives too: job interviews, for instance. Many of my interlocutors complained that people who possessed less impressive educational credentials than they did were frequently more successful than them in the job market, because in job interviews English proficiency was often one of the main criteria based on which people were hired. There was thus a tension between the view that English transformed a person, made them smarter, more competent, more ‘professional’—all views that Mahesh and many others had voiced at other times—and the view that it was wrongly taken as an index of things it wasn’t.

The figure of the English-speaking bus-conductor or auto-rickshaw driver—which I came across several times in the course of my fieldwork—was viewed differently from the English-speaking salesperson. This auto-rickshaw driver/bus conductor was a tragic figure: a person
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58 When students pass Standard Ten at schools that follow the state syllabus, they are awarded a Secondary School Leaving Certificate (SSLC).
whose linguistic capital suggested that they should be in a better station in life, and yet they were driving an auto-rickshaw or selling tickets on a bus for a living. What made them tragic, rather than threatening, was that their lack of capital besides English was very obvious.

Just as people’s levels were gauged based on their English proficiency, their levels of English proficiency were often guessed/assumed based on the other kinds of capital they possessed, or were imagined to possess. This was why people sometimes reported feeling insulted when they were addressed in Kannada—they viewed it as an unfavourable indicator of how their level had been assessed. On several occasions, salespeople—in malls, restaurants—pointedly responded to me in English (or sometimes, if they were very uncomfortable speaking in English, in Hindi) when I addressed them in Kannada.

My interlocutors told me that possessing other forms of capital would not necessarily guarantee status and respect unless one was also proficient in English. A person who possessed excellent educational credentials or had a prestigious job would likely still feel inadequate and insecure if their English was not good. While these other sources of capital might be necessary, they were not sufficient. Sakshi, an Ascent counsellor, described how her husband—despite the fact he had more prestigious educational credentials than she did—was less confident and self-assured than she was because of his English:

> Wherever I go, I speak and people tell me, ‘Your communication skills are good. You don’t have mother tongue influence also. Your accent is very clear’. See, I’ll tell you one thing, one example—don’t think I’m putting down my husband, he is BE [Bachelor of Engineering] and I am only BA [Bachelor of Arts]—but he cannot speak English like me. And I have that confidence that ‘I can do’. He will think that he might go wrong, he has less confidence. He can speak, but not like me. My communication skills are much better than him.

Kaveri, one of my students at Ascent, said, ‘These days people don’t look at clothes and jewellery. […] These days everyone has clothes and jewellery. If I go to a wedding reception with my husband and someone talks to me in English, and I can’t reply, then they may feel I’m not a good match for my husband’. Similarly, Uttara, a trainer at Ascent, said, ‘My sister-in-law, she’s [a millionaire] with ten servants and all, but I still have an edge over her because I can speak English and communicate well. When we go for parties she feels insecure and envies me because I can speak confidently to everyone.’ It was also felt that even if one was not able to perform other class behaviours, and exhibit other signs of middle-class identity, being competent in English would still ensure social standing and the respect of others. Rajani, an attender at Ascent, told me, ‘Even if you don’t have one rupee in your pocket you can have attitude if you speak English. People will respect you.’ Like her, many of my interlocutors appeared to feel that the power of English was so strong that being proficient in the language could allow one to make certain claims to status, even in the absence of other important forms of capital (e.g. money, educational qualifications). Vishala told me that while she needed to wear a certain amount of jewellery to be able to present herself as being of a certain level, I—because of a look of affluence, conveyed by the way I spoke [in English] and the way I dressed—could afford to wear no jewellery. ‘If I don’t wear this jewellery for a week, people will think, ‘Auntie must be having difficulties!’ They give you respect even if you don’t wear all this,’ she observed.59

59 Liechty tells us about how one of his interlocutors spoke about upper-class students having a ‘certain (perhaps cultivated) indifference’ to appearances. He writes: ‘These students […] have nothing to prove—and their families’ financial security allows them to “just throw something on”. On the other hand […] The insecurity of middle-classness breeds a kind of focused earnestness about dress and the need to boast about new acquisitions. For them proper clothing is a “big deal” and constitutes an important part of their claims to membership in the urban middle class’ (M. Liechty, Suitably Modern, p. 136). Similarly, most of my interlocutors who had attended relatively elite English-medium schools felt under no pressure to be able to demonstrate their English
Just as Vishala described consciously displaying some kinds of capital that she possessed in order to compensate for a lack of other kinds of capital, I also came across cases of people attempting to ‘enhance’ their English in various ways in order to compensate for other perceived lackings, and present themselves as belonging to a particular level. Cheryl—a corporate trainer I knew—told me that she altered her English accent depending on whom she was speaking to. She said that if she was being interviewed by someone, and she felt a bit nervous thinking that she might come across as not being qualified enough or not having enough work experience, she’d ‘put on a slight accent’ (speak in what she felt was a ‘sophisticated’ accent) to give the impression that she’d ‘roamed the world’. She said people were impressed more by accent than by vocabulary. Cheryl and I had both taught an 80-hour English course at a leading IT company in the city. Cheryl said that when she’d spoken on the phone to Angela—who worked in the company’s training department, and who had coordinated the English course—Angela had said, rather apologetically, that Cheryl had a ‘bit of an accent’ and that this might ‘alienate her students’ (the implication being that they were not very good at English and so would not be comfortable if their trainer spoke stylishly). Cheryl told Angela that since she was talking to a fellow trainer, this ‘accent may have come’, but she wouldn’t have it when she talked with her students.

However, my interlocutors’ comments, observations and experiences also suggested that a person’s ability to perform other class behaviours—and the other sources of capital that they commanded—determined to some extent how the use of English on their part would be interpreted and perceived. While some people’s use of English might be viewed as a ‘natural’ reflection of their education, economic position and urbane qualities, other people’s English use might be interpreted as merely an attempt at claiming distinction that was not in keeping with the rest of their class capital. My interlocutors—ranging from the students and trainers at ETCs, to the auto-rickshaw drivers that I interviewed to teachers and students at schools—all made reference to people who spoke in English, and sometimes even pretended they didn’t know Kannada, in order to show off and act as if they were ‘high level’ people. In a conversation with Parthasarthy—who worked as a driver—about language use in the city, I asked whether it would be acceptable to speak in English at one of the city’s bus stations, or at a vegetable market. After a moment’s thought, he explained that Kannada would be the best language to use in such places. While it was possible to get by speaking in English at the bus station or the market, it did not ‘suit’ these environments. If he were to speak English at such places, he told me, people would think he was trying to be arrogant and ‘show his level’ because they would be able to tell that he was ‘Kannada-speaking’. If I were to speak English at the bus station on the other hand, while I ran the risk of being viewed as too stylish and arrogant, it would be slightly more acceptable—though still not appropriate—as I looked English-speaking.

**Conclusion**

As I have illustrated in this article, my interlocutors experienced the middle class as a field of competition. Unlike in the case of caste where a person’s ‘level’ was to some extent stable, a person’s class position was always a work in progress. Liechty, in his writing on the middle class in Kathmandu, captures this very well. He observes: ‘[...] the middle class is a kind of proficiency. Indeed, some of them told me that—unhappy about how Kannada was disappearing from an increasing number of public spaces in the city—they’d started making an effort to speak Kannada more, and encouraged others (salesmen, auto-rickshaw drivers) to speak in Kannada.
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performative space characterised by constant alignment and realignment with class others, and where goods play active roles. Ultimately, middle-class membership is not about fixing rank but about *claiming* and *maintaining* a place in the ongoing debate*. Though he draws on the language of debate, Liechty does not have much to say about the role that people’s speech and language practices play in this process. In this article I have argued that—in Bangalore—being able to demonstrate proficiency in English was becoming increasingly important in order to claim and maintain a space in the ongoing debate, regardless of the other types of class cultural capital that a person possessed.

English’s emergence as a key index of middle-class status differentiation could be attributed to two things. Firstly, as I have described, the role that English played in people’s class projects was overdetermined and different from that played by any other type of class cultural capital. English language proficiency was viewed and experienced as more than a form of consumption; it was also an invaluable skill on the job market and necessary for the acquisition of information, ‘knowledge’, and educational credentials. English’s role in people’s class projects, however, went even beyond being a skill, experienced as it was as an agent of transformation. Secondly, the relative complexity and difficulty of acquiring English language skills could also be said to contribute to its key role in middle-class differentiation. Though one’s economic resources undoubtedly determined the kind of English-medium instruction one had access to—and therefore the kind of English one acquired—English proficiency could not, obviously, simply be purchased in the way that consumer goods could. Writing about the new consumption possibilities that IT jobs in Bangalore enabled, Nisbett describes how the sharing of consumer goods that took place within friendship groups allowed even those without such jobs to assume the look of an IT worker. Again, there were no such short cuts or quick fixes available in the case of acquiring English proficiency. Furthermore, unlike formal educational qualifications, acquiring English proficiency was not simply a matter of completing a programme or course. As Chang observes, one cannot memorise or improvise one’s way to fluency in the language. Possessing proficiency in English meant being able to demonstrate it.

Being proficient in English was thus usually viewed as being the result of a person’s ‘background’ (rather than more recent economic circumstances). More specifically: having had adequate exposure to good English when one was a child, usually by having attended a ‘good’ school, which was typically made possible by one’s family’s economic position. Such a background, combined with the proficiency in English that it enabled, was strongly associated with certain kinds of competencies, educational credentials, and jobs. For all these reasons, a person’s level of English had come to serve as a reliable index and predictor of other key forms of class capital, apart from indexing something beyond them. Furthermore, given that consumer goods, and even educational credentials and job designations, were increasingly becoming relatively widely acquirable currency, a person’s English proficiency was experienced as a very important, relatively reliable and easily visible (or rather, audible) measure for ranking within the middle class.

61 M. Liechty, *Suitably Modern*, p. 115
62 Of course, as Liechty illustrates, demonstrating appropriate consumer behaviour is also not a matter of simply purchasing goods—one has to know how to display the goods one buys. For instance, he argues that ‘doing fashion’ involved more than just wearing certain kinds of clothes and make-up: it also involved cultivating a certain kind of demeanour, comportment and manners. Nevertheless, I would argue that performing English proficiency was still more difficult than performing consumer behaviour.
63 N. Nisbett, ‘Friendship, Consumption, Morality’.
65 There was an awareness that there were people who had managed to learn good English despite having attended a Kannada-medium school/ ‘local’ private school, and such people were usually respected.
66 See also N. Nisbett, *Growing up in the Knowledge Society*, p. 184.
I have also demonstrated how English was experienced as a double-edged sword by my interlocutors. On the one hand, it was experienced as being a powerful vehicle of class mobility, which made it a highly valued form of capital. English was widely spoken of as a social good and a tool of empowerment. On the other hand, for precisely the same reason, it was also experienced as very threatening, particularly to people who possessed other forms of class cultural capital, the meaning and value of which had in various ways come to be altered, diminished or perceived differently because of their English. While people on the one hand spoke of the transformative potential of English, they also spoke of it as a superficial index of value, and something that could prevent their ‘actual level’ and ‘real potential’ from being seen.

Sugata Srinivasaraju, an Indian journalist and writer, observes: ‘It is truly sad that the subaltern communities, who have been oppressed for centuries, have been trapped in the argument that the English language will create a level playing field and it alone will ensure their leap to freedom. They will soon realise that there are different kinds of Englishes and economic and social exclusion will take place on this basis’. As I have demonstrated in this article, my interlocutors were very much aware that there were different types of Englishes being spoken in the city, and that some types were more valued than others. Or, to go back to Vanamala Viswanatha’s idea of a ‘Below English Line’, they were aware that there was not one but many ‘English lines’. It was precisely this awareness that made people invest heavily in admitting their children to a school at which it was felt they would learn good English, and go to great lengths to improve their own English, in order to be able to claim, maintain, or raise their position in the middle class.

---
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