Linguistic hybridization in a television talk show: A sociolinguistic analysis

A R M Mostafizar Rahman [a] [1] , Abu Rashed Md. Mahbuber Rahman [b]

ªKhulna University, Post code-9208, Khulna, Bangladesh
ᵇUniversiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia

Abstract

This paper aims to determine the functions of hybridizing languages in the television talk show discourses in Bangladesh. Though hybridization of Bangla is harshly criticized in the media discourses for its alleged pollution of Bangla language, this linguistic practice, which seems to be rampant and pervasive in the society, is demonstrated not only as part of their habitual and natural linguistic behaviour but also to accomplish certain discourse functions. Analysing the video-recorded episodes selected from the archives of "Tritiyomatra"*,* a popular television talk show broadcasted on Channel i, a privately owned satellite television channel in Bangladesh, this study reveals that the speakers are found to use hybrid Bangla in their talk show conversation for a variety of discourse functions such as to establish cohesion in the discourse, to clarify concepts, to give emphasis and focus on the particular notions, to draw glocal attention, and to make the discussion more topic-specific and relevant. Moreover, the speakers are found to perform these discourse functions through the hybridization of languages very strategically and purposively.

Keywords: linguistic hybridization; linguistic behaviour; discourse functions; media discourse; talk show

1. Introduction

Linguistic hybridization, a fusion of multilingual features, seems to be a natural language behaviour of the people in a multilingual ecology where languages remain in contact. In language contact situations, languages borrow and share linguistic features as a consequence of interaction with each other. As Bangladesh is a multilingual ecology dominated by Bangla, the national language, along with English, the second language; Arabic, Sanskrit, and Pali, the religious languages of the Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists respectively; Chakma, Santali, Munda, Manipuri, and so on, the ethnic tribal languages, hybridization seems to be a natural linguistic practice of the people in this country. Patterns of language choice and use of the people, as well as the language landscape of the country, demonstrate that the hybridization of Bangla with different languages of the ecology is longstanding, rampant, and pervasive. This hybridization of Bangla is harshly criticized by a section of the society for its alleged pollution of the Bangla language. As Bosu (2019) reports, the young generation now

---

[1] Corresponding author.
 E-mail address: mostafizar@eng.ku.ac.bd

delves into borrowing from other languages, especially English, and creating their own brand of a *mongrel* language, which is meaningless. Hossain (2019) also says that the hybridization of Bangla with English, Hindi, Urdu, and Farsi is rampant, and the intrusion of foreign words into Bangla in the name of modernism is polluting and distorting the language. Such observations are just a few examples of the numerous similar arguments to be found in the media discourses like newspapers, talk-shows, and social media. These observations seem to suggest that the mixing of multilingual features with Bangla is not pragmatic, thought-provoking, and objective oriented, but a linguistic deviance and malpractice. Under the circumstances, it appears worthy to explore whether the hybridization of Bangla has any discourse value or performs any discourse functions.

1.1. Literature review

People, in language contact situations, communicate choosing languages from their linguistic repertoire constrained by political situations, social systems, and collective as well as individual psychological needs (Coulmas, 2005; Wallwork, 1981). They may be found to exercise their choice differently in different contexts of interaction. For example, a multilingual speaker may choose one language (e.g., language A) in one domain (e.g., home), while another language (e.g., language B) in another domain (e.g., office) and this is what many of the sociolinguist's term as "language alternation" (Thomason, 2001) or "situational codeswitching" (Blom & Gumperz, 1972). Moreover, the speaker may choose one language (e.g., language A) in talking about one topic, while another language (e.g., language B) for another topic in the same domain and such a linguistic behaviour is termed as "metaphorical codeswitching" (Blom & Gumperz, 1972). Furthermore, the speaker may use elements from more than one language in a conversation or utterance within the same speech context and this is referred to as "conversational codeswitching" (Blom & Gumperz, 1972) or "classic codeswitching" (Scotton, 1993) or "intra-sentential codeswitching" (Poplack, 1980). There is also "inter-sentential codeswitching" (Scotton, 1993). Instances (i) and (ii) below exemplify intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching respectively between Bangla and English:

   (i)   *Amader mojar* group*e* join *korun* please! (Please join our fun group!)
   (ii)   *Ki hoyese*? Would you please share with me? (What has happened? [...]

The intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching are, however, labelled as "codemixing" and "codeswitching" respectively (Thomason, 2001, p. 132). Codeswitching, as Thomason (2001, p.132) says, is the use of material from two or more languages by a single speaker in the same conversation where all the other participants also speak, or at least understand, both or all the languages. According to Halliday (1978), codeswitching is actualized as a process within the individual: the speaker moves from one code to another and back, more or less rapidly, in course of a single sentence; and codemixing, according to Bhatia and Ritchie (2004), is mixing of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses and sentences) primarily from two participating grammatical systems within a sentence. Codemixing is where "pieces" of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language. The pieces taken from another language are often words, but they can also be phrases or larger units (Gumperz, 1977; Hill & Hill, 1980; Parasher, 1980). According to Poplack (1980), the term codemixing refers to the mixing of words from various languages within the same sentence, while the term codeswitching refers to the mixing of words from various languages at the clause level or above in a fully grammatical way. Bokamba (1998) defines both the concepts as:

> Codeswitching is the embedding or mixing of words, phrases and sentences from two codes within the same speech event and across sentence boundaries… Codemixing is the embedding or mixing of various linguistic units, i.e., affixes, words, phrases and clauses from

two distinct grammatical systems or subsystems within the same sentence and the same speech situation (p. 24).

Though some people distinguish between the terms "codeswitching" and "codemixing", other scholars, however, disregard any distinction between these terms. Above all, codeswitching and codemixing are generally perceived as a combination of two separate codes in multilingual speech. Recent scholarly arguments admit that multilingual linguistic behaviour cannot simply be considered a combination of two or more supposedly distinct codes, but a "pragmatically unified" (Urciuoli, 1985, p. 383) linguistic practice of multilingual speakers in their everyday speech. Thus, many of the scholars prefer terms like "code-crossing" (Rampton, 1995), "linguistic hybridization" (Gutierrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999), "translanguaging" (Garcia, 2009), "metrolingualism" (Pennycook, 2010), "code-meshing" (Canagarajah, 2011), and "polylanguaging" (Jorgensen, Karrebaek, Madsen, & Moller, 2011), since these terms connote dynamic use of multilingual resources in their everyday linguistic practices. Following Gutierrez et al. (1999), this study uses the term "linguistic hybridization" to include all phenomena where elements from at least two linguistic systems (separate languages or distinguishable varieties) are used in the same speech situation within the same sentence and/or across sentence boundaries. While the notion of linguistic fusion is found to be conceptualized and discussed under several terms, as mentioned above, "hybridization" is more common as a general term than its possible alternatives (Pieterse, 2001, p. 237). The term not only refers to the mere combination of two or more separate codes but also pragmatic unification of codes (Urciuoli, 1985, p. 383) or creative blending of languages in linguistic practices (Manyak, 2001).

Hybridization is a term used across the disciplines such as biology, cultural studies, music, painting, film, literature, language, and translation studies. Etymologically the term "hybrid" derives from a Latin word *hybrida,* more correctly *hibrida (ibrida),* that denotes "offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar" and hence, of human parents of different races, "half-breed" (OED). In arts, humanities, and social sciences, the term refers to "anything derived from heterogeneous sources or composed of different or incongruous elements" and in Philology especially, "a compound formed of elements belonging to different languages" (OED) as Morris (1872, p. 39) says "Sometimes we find English and Romance elements compounded. These are termed *hybrids*."

The concept of hybridity is found to be discussed in cultural studies, postcolonial studies, and globalization studies where the works of Homi Bhabha, Nestor Garcia Canclini, Stuart Hall, Gayatri Spivak, and Paul Gilroy have phenomenal significance and contribution. The notions of hybridity in cultural studies and postcolonial studies closely link to the concept that captures the mixture and interrelations between previously separate units or to overcome what is perceived as a problematic conception of clearly distinguishable cultural units. In globalization studies, the notion of hybridity is related to the discussion about the distinction between the local and the global and to other conceptual attempts to overcome this dichotomy and stress the interdependence and conflation of scales, places, and practices, notably Robertson's term 'glocalization' (1995), when the world is characterized by increasing cultural exchange across borders and continents both in terms of institutions and processes, such as media and migration, and in terms of ideas and cultural products and practices. With regard to language and linguistics, the term hybridity entered the discipline in the 19th century to refer to the notion of mixed language. It is argued that every human language (probably except the first one) is a mixture of some other languages, such as Bangla is a mixture of Sanskrit, Persian, Dutch, Arabic, Hindi and some others. Bakhtin (1981) conceptualizes linguistic hybridization as:

> A mixture of two social languages within the limit of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor. (p. 358)

Bakhtin's hybridity as Young (1995) postulates, "describes the process of the authorial unmasking of another's speech, through a language that is "double-accented" and "double-styled" (p. 20); it represents a doubleness that "brings together, fuses, but also maintains separation" (p. 22).

Researchers have long been studying the linguistic behaviour of the speakers in language contact situations and found numerous explanations for why people practice linguistic hybridization. According to Takashi (1990), there are five reasons for linguistic hybridization. First, mixed foreign words fill the lexical gap because there is no native equivalent. Second, they are technical terms that are used in similar circumstances, but they are more technical and special than the native equivalents. Third, because of euphemism, the mixed foreign words avoid direct expressions in some topics such as sex. Fourth, mixed foreign words provide special effects that convey a modernity and sophistication about the subject under discussion. Fifth, they are trade names that are used directly without translation. Moreover, Li (1997) talks about the "Principle of Economy" to explain Cantonese speakers' lexical choice between Cantonese and English with reference to the situations in Hong Kong. He observed that speakers prefer inserting English words into Cantonese utterances if the English words are shorter than the Cantonese equivalents. In addition to the concept of the principle of economy, Li (2000) provided three more motivational reasons. The first reason is a euphemism. English alludes to the same referent and does not explicitly describe potential embarrassing notions. The second reason is specificity. An English expression is preferred because it is more general or specific compared with its near-synonymous Chinese words. Another reason is bilingual punning. It is a deliberate attempt to create double meaning utilizing the similarity in pronouncing between the English and Cantonese elements. Researchers also identify some other purposes of linguistic hybridization such as to influence interpersonal relations (Scotton, 1988, p. 218), to express social solidarity or distance (Homes, 2001, p. 36), to assume and negotiate identity (Wardhaugh, 2002, pp. 108-110), to accommodate in multilingual societies (Homes, 2001, p. 230; Wardhaugh, 2002, p. 112; David, 2003, p. 3), to indicate politeness strategies (Yoon, 1996), to signal language shift (David, 2001; Teo, 2003), to demonstrate overt and covert prestige (Bullock & Toribio, 2016), to help students reduce their foreign language anxiety and motivate them towards learning (Sameem, Farid, & Hussain, 2021), to facilitate learners' understanding of grammar or vocabulary items and make the class stress free (Istifci, 2019), to highlight fashion, ease, and technological advancements in commercials (Riaz, 2019), and to attain discursive functions (Gumperz, 1977, 1982). According to Gumperz, linguistic hybridization is a conscious choice on the part of the speakers in order to quote, reiterate, elaborate, clarify, specify, emphasize, focus, attract or retain attention, personalize or objectivize, and realign or shift topic and roles among others (also McClure 1998, p. 133). Callahan (2004: 70) also talks about different discourse functions of this linguistic practice, such as referential, vocatives, expletives, quotation, commentary and repetition, directives, discourse marking, and setting phrases, tags, and exclamations. Similarly, Kemaloglu-Er and Oʐata (2020) report that this linguistic practice in group work serves mainly four types of purposes: search for equivalence, meaning clarification, following task procedure and emotional expression.

A review of related literature suggests that linguistic hybridization practice in the television genre in Bangladesh, particularly in the talk shows, has not been investigated so far though codeswitching phenomena have been studied in some domains such as academia (Rashid, 2014; Suchana, 2014; Sultana, 2014), office (Alam, 2006), commercial signs (Banu & Sussex, 2001; Tina, 2014), and different social strata (Hasan & Akhand, 2015). Moreover, these prior studies have investigated the hybridization phenomenon from the structural or descriptive linguistic perspectives; the functional perspective is yet to be explored. Hence, this study was conceptualized to explore the discourse functions of using hybrid Bangla in the television talk shows in Bangladesh.

1.2. Research questions

This study aims to answer the following research question: (i) What are the discourse functions of hybridizing Bangla in the television talk shows in Bangladesh? (ii) How strategically the speakers hybridized Bangla with other linguistic features?

2. Theoretical framework

Linguistic hybridization can be described and analyzed from different perspectives and theoretical frameworks based on whether it is perceived to be a "product" or a "process". If the linguistic hybridization is viewed as a product, it is considered a feature of the discourse but if it is viewed as a process, it is considered the user's behaviour, an aspect of the user's linguistic performance (Muller & Ball, 2005, p.51). Linguistic hybridization can be approached from structural, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic perspectives. While the structural approach is concerned with the structure of linguistic hybridization at different levels such as phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax, text, and semantics; the psycholinguistic approach is concerned with the cognitive mechanisms of linguistic hybridization and the sociolinguistic approach is concerned with the relationships between linguistic hybridization and different social variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, culture, power, attitudes, ideologies, domains of use, and language functions (Marasigan, 1983, p.7). The sociolinguistic approach to linguistic hybridization studies the social, pragmatic, and discourse functions (e.g., quotation, repetition, interjection, addressee specification, emphasis, clarification, elaboration, focus, attention attraction or retention, personalization versus objectivization, topic shift, and role shift) it fulfills for the individuals as well as the social groups. Within the sociolinguistic approach, the micro-sociolinguistic approaches examine linguistic hybridization from individual speakers' perspectives of socio-pragmatic and discourse functions of linguistic hybridization (Gumperz, 1982, pp. 75-83), whereas the macro-sociolinguistic approaches investigate linguistic hybridization from larger society's perceptions of linguistic hybridization as a mode of discourse, its attitudes towards the participating languages, and their speakers (Callahan, 2004, p. 16). This study investigated the use of hybrid Bangla in television talk shows from the micro-sociolinguistic perspectives, especially from the discourse functions perspective.

3. Method

The data used in this study were video-recorded episodes of a popular television talk show called "Tritiyomatra" broadcasted on Channel i, a privately owned satellite television channel in Bangladesh. Tritiyomatra is an award winning popular one-hour talk-show in Bangla broadcasted twice a day. Tritiyomatra refers to a 3rd dimension or neutral viewpoint about the matters related to a variety of social, political, cultural, religious, administrative, business, and international relations. The programme invites guests from various professions and sectors of the society (e.g., government officials, sports personalities, celebrities, politicians, representatives of the civil society, professionals like teachers, doctors, engineers, and lawyers). A total of 10 episodes on a variety of themes such as family affairs (Episode 4788), sports (Episode 4600), mental health (Episode 4678), medical science (Episode 4825), narcotics control and prevention (Episode 4708), road safety (Episode 4814), law and order (Episode 4803), economics and development (Episode 4833), politics (Episode 4747), and international affairs (Episode 4822) were selected from the Tritiyomatra archives for analysis. The video-clips of these episodes were orthographically transcribed using version 6.0 of Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2015), one of the popularly used software packages for speech analysis. Bangla utterances are transcribed in Roman scripts, an accepted form of transcribing Bangla as many other researchers such as Al-Azami (2006), Al-Azami, Kenner, Ruby, and Gregory (2010), Blackledge and Creese

(2009), and Sultana (2014) transcribed Bangla in Roman scripts. Besides, Bangla elements in Roman scripts are italicized in order to differentiate them from English elements. Moreover, specific examples are made bold. The transcribed data were then analyzed to determine the discourse functions of the speakers' linguistic hybridization as well the speakers' strategies of hybridizing Bangla.

4. Results and Discussion

A careful listening to the selected videoclips and repeated reading of their transcripts reveal that the speakers naturally hybridize Bangla while participating in the talk shows which perform a variety of discourse functions, as presented below under several headings.

4.1. Marking cohesion

Speakers are found to insert English words into the Bangla sentence structures which mark cohesion in the discourse, as can be seen in the following examples:

(i) **Even** *ami tokhon* university*te shikhokota kortam* (Episode 4788, Timestamp: 507.437) [Even I used to teach in a university that time.]

(ii) … *sobkisui posondo* **but** *Eider din beshir vag* traditional *Khabar thake* (Episode 4788, Timestamp: 189.495) [... like everything but there are mostly traditional foods in the day of Eid]

(iii) *T20* match*tai erokom eto* shorter format*e khela* **plus** *amra* ... (Episode 4600, Timestamp: 195.221) [The T20 match is a play of such a shorter format plus we]

(iv) (a) … player*ra kintu khub valo ekta pray ek masher* training camp *korese; apni janen Khulnate dui soptah, ek soptah Chittagonge,* **so** *ekta khub valo kisu* tactical *jinish niye tara kaj korese* … (b) *je* match*gula amader pach o sat tarikhe silo savabik karone amra khelte parini* **because** *amra* Asia cup final *khelesi* …(c) **So eventually** it was a good decision **because** *amra kintu ar* Asia cup*er* final*er cheye valo* practice match*to asole amra okhane giye kortam na* (Episode 4600, Timestamp: 221.208) [… the players have had a very good training camp of about one month; you know two weeks at Khulna, one week at Chittagong, so they have worked with some very good tactical things …we could not normally play the matches scheduled on 5th and 7th because basically, we would not have a better practice match than that of the Asia cup final there]

(v) **Actually,** acceptance *kototuku hoyese janina* **but** *eta niye kothabarta hosse* (Episode 4708, Timestamp: 388.484) [Actually don't know how far acceptance has been achieved but it is being talked about]

In example (i), the speaker is found to use the adverb "even" in the beginning of a sentence while discussing his past activities. This adverb was used firstly to focus on the fact that he was a university teacher at that time, and secondly, to connect this professional information with his other past activities. So, this English adverb "even" is used here as a cohesive device. The English conjunction marker "but" in examples (ii) and (v) and "plus" in example (iii) are found to connect two clauses. In examples (iv (b & c)), "because" is found to connect two clauses of cause-effect relationship. The linker "so" in example (iv (a)) binds two clauses when the word "so" refers to the concept "for that", while in (iv (c)), "so" connects two sentences to mean "as a result". The linker "eventually" in (iv (c)) and "actually" in (v) are found to connect the sentences in which they appear with their preceding ones when these two adverbs mean "in the end", especially after involving a lot of effort and time. The speakers are found to use these English cohesive devices to mark cohesive links in Bangla sentences when all these English cohesive devices have their equivalence in the Bangla language. The speakers have inserted these English words into the Bangla sentence structures in such a manner that they have neither violated the syntactic rules of Bangla, nor of English. For instance, where and how the English

word "but" is found to be used in examples (ii) and (v), its equivalent Bangla word "kintu" could have used in the same places in the same manner. Moreover, the speakers are assumed to perceive the functions of both "but" and "kintu" and hence, they are found to use "but" in place of "kintu". This suggests that the speakers can interchangeably and strategically use cohesive devices from both languages without much effort.

4.2. *Clarifying concept*

Speakers are found to practice hybridization in order to clarify concepts, as can be in the following examples:

(vi)   (a) *je* **victim** *jara durghotonar shikar* *tader protinidhi hisebe asen* … (b) **multistake holder** *bivinno je pokho ase* … *(Episode 4814,* Timestamp: 565.359, 604.908*)* [There is a representative of the victim, those who are sufferers from accident]

(vii)   *jesob* **victim** *jara rogi* *jara amar* clinic*e ashtese ora derite ashtese* (Episode 4708, Timestamp: 434.003) [those victims who are patients, who are coming to my clinic are coming late]

(viii)   *ei* field*e jara kaj korsen tader je* **professionalism** *ba* **professional development** *ki rokom hose* … (Episode 4678, Timestamp: 251.003) [How are their professionalism or professional development happening who are working in this field …]

(ix)   *jara* **counselling psychologist** *hisebe ba* **counsellor** *hisebe kaj korse* … (Episode 4678, Timestamp: 247.531) [Those who are working as a counselling psychologist or a counsellor …]

(x)   *amader oi* warm up match*gula* ***amra ki korbo mane*** **management***er torof theke* …(Episode 4600, Timestamp: 297.707) [what should we do in those of our warmup matches meaning from the side of the management …]

(xi)   *ar ditiyota ase apnar* **line***e mane* ***jara*** **telivision film** *banato bisheshkore* (Episode 4788, Timestamp: 243.034) [and the second one is in your line means those who used to make television film specially]

(xii)   (a) *Eider din beshir vag* **traditional** *khabar thake oi* ***shemai, misti*** *beshi hoy…* (b) *ami sesomoy* **publishing***er kaj koresi,* **editing***er kaj koresi* (Episode 4788, Timestamp: 192.503) [In the day of Eid there are mostly traditional foods like shemai, sweet …]

In example (vi (a)), the speaker is found to use the English term "victim" which is clarified by a Bangla phrase "*jara durghotonar shikar*" [sufferers from accident], while the same term "victim" is found to be clarified as "*jara rogi*" [patients] in example (vii) by another speaker. In the examples, the speakers are sometimes found to clarify an English term by a Bangla term such as in examples (vi (a, b)), (vii), and (xii (a)); sometimes a Bangla term by an English term as in the example (x); sometimes an English term by another English term as in examples (viii), (ix), and (xii (b)); and sometimes an English term by a mixture of English and Bangla terms as in the example (xi). It appears that when the speakers feel that a particular term might seem unintelligible, incomprehensible, or ambiguous to the audiences, they clarify the concerned term by another term(s), native or foreign. As in the example (x), the speaker might have thought that the term "amra" [we] might seem ambiguous to the audiences on the assumption that who are included in "amra" and hence, the speaker used the English term "management" to clarify the notion that it is none but the members of the team management. Clarification is made through a number of techniques such as specification, exemplification, and simplification, as discussed below.

4.2.1. Specification

Speakers are found to hybridize for clarification via specification of notions. In the examples (vi(a)), (vii), (x), (xi), and (xii (b)), hybridization between Bangla and English words is practiced in order to specify the notions. For instance, in the example (xi), the term "line" is specified by *"jara telivision film banato bisheshkore*" and in (xii(b)), the term "publishing" is specified by "editing". Publishing includes various activities by different people. The speaker might have thought that it was necessary to specify what particular task of publishing she was engaged with and hence, she specified with the term "editing".

4.2.2. Exemplification

Exemplification is another technique that is found to be employed to clarify the concept. In the example (xii (a)), the notion "traditional" is specified by particular food items such as "*shemai*", "*misti*". The speaker might have realized that the term "traditional" might need further specification and hence, she mentioned the name of particular traditional food items.

4.2.3. Simplification

Like specification and exemplification, simplification is another technique through which the speakers are found to clarify a notion. In example (viii), the speaker is found to simplify the term "professionalism" by the term "professional development" and in (ix), the term "counselling psychologist" by the term "counsellor". The speaker might have thought that the term "counselling psychologist" might be difficult to understand since this is a very technical term and hence, a simple and general term "counsellor" was found to be used instead.

4.3. Repeating concepts in bilingual terms for multiple functions

It is found from the conversations that the speakers express particular notions through repeating lexical items selecting from the participating languages, i.e., English and Bangla. Often the lexical items they use are not likely to be very technical, meaning that they may not necessarily be registers but everyday use vocabulary, as can be seen in the examples below.

(xiii) 'X' *sitke gelen nirbachon theke* … 'X'*er moton ekjon protivadhor bakti kivabe* **out hoye giyesilen** … (Episode 4822, Timestamp: 413.497, 426.303) ['X' went out from the election… How the talented person like 'X' went out …]

(xiv) *oti somproti Chiner* president *o bishwo*bank **prodhan** Dhaka *ghure gelen … bishwobanker* **president** *ebong Chiner* president *... dujonei rater .....* (Episode 4833, Timestamp: 107.899, 146.725) [Very recently the president of China and the chief of World bank visited Dhaka … the president of World bank and the president of China … both in the night …]

(xv) (a) *jodi aponar* **inequal** *hoy*, **somota na thake,** *tahole kintu teksoier proshnota ashe* … (b) *amra jodi dekhi tahole ekhono dekhbo je* **in general,** *sadharon vabe daridro har komese* (Episode 4833, Timestamp: 332.634, 339.655) [if being inequal, there is no equality, then there is a question of sustainability … if we see then will still see that in general, in general the rate of poverty has been decreased]

(xvi) *ekta dike valo kotha amader* poverti*te unnoti hoyese eigula* **welcome** *... ebong bishwobanker sikritikeo amra* **sagoto** *janai* (Episode 4833, Timestamp: 687.905) [in the one side there is a development in our poverty which are welcome … and we welcome the recognition of the World bank]

(xvii) *taderke niyei amader ei* **songothon** *ba* **platform** *toiri kora* (Episode 4814, Timestamp: 608.180) [This stage or platform of us is made with them]

(xviii)(a) *amader poribare sokoler sathe sokoler* bondage*ta ebong* interaction*ta etake* **smooth** *rakhte hobe etake* **gotishil** *rakhte hobe* … (b) *eta ei mashe* **cholte** *thakbe ebong eta er porobortiteo* **continue** *korbe* (Episode 4708, Timestamp: 222.372) [the bondage and interaction among all of us in the family should be kept smooth, it should be kept continuous … it will be continuing in this month and it will continue in future]

(xix) *eti ek dhoroner rog jeti shorirer* **har** *ba* **bone***ke* guroguro kore fele … *amar baye bosha asen* … medical *bishwobidyaloyer* rheumatology *bivager* chairman **odhyapok** Dr. 'X' *ebong amar dane royesen* … hospital*e kormoroto batha bisheshoggo* **Professor** Dr. 'Y' (Episode 4825, Timestamp: 112.144, 138.942) [it is a kind of disease that turns the bone of the body into powder … to my left Prof. Dr. 'X', chairman of the department of rheumatology of …. medical university and to my right Professor Dr. 'Y', pain specialist at …hospital]

(xx) *amader manobdehe dusho soyti* **har** *ba* **bone** *ase ebong ei* **har** *ba* **bone** *protiti kintu ekek dhoroner kaj ase* (Episode 4825, Timestamp: 207.107) [There are 206 bones in our body and each bone has a specific function]

(xxi) *ektu* **ghasho** *silo* live **grass** green *tar sathe kintu* wicket*ta apnar* slow*o silo* (Episode 4600, Timestamp: 344.335) [There was a little grass, live green grass plus the wicket was also slow]

(xxii) **Understanding** *eshe jay*, **bojha** *jay* (Episode 4788, Timestamp: 572.486) [There comes understanding]

In these examples, the speakers are found to express each single particular concept using two terms–one from English and another from Bangla. The terms in pair such as "*sitke* vs. out *hoye*", "*prodhan* vs. president", "*somota na thaka* vs. inequal", "*sadharon vabe* vs. in general", "*sagoto* vs. welcome", "*songothon* vs. platform", "*gotishil* vs. smooth", "*cholte* vs. continue", "*har* vs. bone", "*odhyapok* vs. professor", "*ghash* vs. grass", and "*bojha* vs. understanding" are not very technical either in Bangla or English; neither they are very passive terms. In some cases, Bangla terms have been used for already used English terms such as "*somota na thaka*" for "inequal" in (xv(a)), "*sadharon vabe*" for "in general" in (xv(b)), "*sagoto*" for "welcome" in (xvi), "*gotishil*" for "smooth" in (vi(a)), and "*bojha*" for "understanding" in (xxii); while in some other cases, English terms have been used in place of already used Bangla terms such as "out *hoye*" for "*sitke*" in (xiii), "president" for "*prodhan*" in (xiv), "platform" for "*songothon*" in (xvii), "continue" for "*cholte*" in (xviii(b)), "bone" for "*har*" and "professor" for "*odhyapok*" in (xix), "bone" for "*har*" in (xx), and "grass" for "*ghash*" in (xxi) which show that the speakers can choose such terms from either language without much effort. This indicates that all these terms belong to the speaker's linguistic repertoire which is made up of Bangla and English languages. It could be said that when a speaker chooses these terms in their daily conversations, they may choose them as "linguistic features" without discriminating them as Bangla or English terms and such a practice of choosing bilingual terms could be considered natural to them.

It does not seem that the speakers doubt the capacity of understanding of the audience in comprehending these terms in either language. If it were so, the speakers would have never used an English term in place of an already used Bangla term since Bangla is the L1 of the audiences (in case of examples xiii, xiv, xvii, xviii(b), xix, xx and xxi). Moreover, it would not have been found to use a Bangla term for already used another Bangla term in "*eti ek dhoroner rog jeti shorirer har ba* bone*ke guroguro kore fele erokomi sohoj* **Banglay** *ba sohoj* **vashay** *chikitshokra bole thaken* (Episode 4825, Timestamp: 112.144)". Such use of linguistic terms might have been for achieving a particular discourse function. It could thus be said that the speakers' strategy of "repetition of concepts in bilingual terms" might have been to perform certain discourse functions such as to give further clarification, emphasis, and focus as in "*somota na thaka*" for "inequal" and "*gotishil*" for "smooth", to give emphasis and focus as in "grass" for "*ghash*" and "bone" for "*har*", to give further clarification

and emphasis as in "*bojha*" for "understanding", and to give further clarification as in "*sadharon vabe*" for "in general" and "platform" for "*songothon*".

4.4. Giving emphasis through repeating English terms

Speakers are found to repeat not only bilingual terms but also English terms in order to emphasize particular notions or issues in their conversations, as can be observed in the following examples.

(xxiii)*apni jodi abar dekhen je daridro har* **concept***ta,* poverty **concept***ta ekta* absolute **concept** *orthat etei bojha jasse je ekhane osamootata koto beshi* (Episode 4833, Timestamp: 346.483) [if you see that the concept of the rate of poverty, the concept of poverty, absolute concept, i.e., it is understood from this here that how big the inequality is]

(xxiv)*samyo* **inequality** *kome jawa kina … jodi aponar* **inequal** *hoy somota na thake tahole kintu teksoier proshnota ashe …* **opportunity inequality***r ekta karon hosse je* **opportunity** *'***inequity** in **opportunity***' amar je sorkar je sujog subidhaguli disse, bazar orthonitite bazare je sujog subidhaguli disse … etakinto ekta dekha jasse je* intergenerational *ekta* **inequality** *orthat ekta* cycle*er moto* (Episode 4833, Timestamp: 325.569, 332.634, 440.721, 490.222) [is it a decrease of inequality or not … if it is inequal, if there is no equality then there comes the question of sustainability … one of the causes of opportunity inequality is that opportunity 'inequity in opportunity', the opportunities our government are offering the opportunities market economy are offering in the market … it is seen that there is an intergenerational inequality, i.e. it is like a cycle]

(xxv) *aage tader sathe ekta somporko* parent*der,* family*r,* **develop** *kora* **build up** *kora* **sustain** *kora* (Episode 4708, Timestamp: 206.921) [first to develop, build up, sustain a kind of their relationship with parents, family]

(xxvi)*gonosochetonota toiri korte* awareness *toiri korte apni je kothata bollen je* **acceptance** *… ei je madoker je somajer* **acceptance** *etake toiri korte kintu sorkar ebong somajer sokol storer loker proyojon ase,* actually **acceptance** *kototuku hoyese janina* but *eta niye kothabarta hosse apni onek* program*oi koresen* (Episode 4708, Timestamp: 366.191) [what you said in order to create mass awareness, to create awareness that the acceptance … the acceptance of drug in the society, in order to create this (it) requires both the government and people from all walks of life in the society, actually don't know how far acceptance has been achieved but it is being told about, you have done a number of programs]

In example (xxiii), the word "concept" has been found to use repeatedly in order to give emphasis to the notion of poverty; in example (xxiv), the word "inequality" and "opportunity" have been found to use repeatedly to emphasize that economic disparity between those having opportunities and those who are denied of opportunities is huge in Bangladesh; in example (xxv), the terms "develop", "build up" and "sustain" have been found to use to emphasize strengthening of relationship and bondage between young members of the family and their parents and guardians in order to check drug addiction of the young adults in the society; and in example (xxvi), the word "acceptance" has been found to use to emphasize how awareness regarding drug addiction could be developed in the society.

4.5. Drawing glocal attention through using organization name in English

Speakers are found to switch to English from Bangla when they uttered the name of an organization. For example: *sekaronei ei je* "**Safe, Roads and Transport Alliance**" *eta kintu shudhu durghotonar bishoy noy …* "**Society for Emergency Medicine**" *tader eya asen,* driving school *toiri korse ei dhoroner seba prodan kari songstha* "**BRAC**" *ase* (Episode 4814, Timestamp: 383.794, 575.163). Such a tendency of switching code could be due to their intention to draw the attention of a wider audience both local and global towards the name and scope of the organization.

4.6. Expressing registers to make the discussion topic specific

Speakers are found to use registers in order to make the discussion more topic specific and relevant. For example: family register such as "compound" (Episode 4788); sport registers such as "one-day cricket", "ranking", "T20 format", "qualifying round", "fixture", "warm up match", "practice match", "wicket", and "player" (Episode 4600); mental health registers such as "counselling psychologist", "psychotherapist", "transactional analyst", "mental health professionals", and "counselling" (Episode 4678); medical science registers such as "rheumatology" and "osteoporosis" (Episode 4825).

The above findings and discussion reveal that hybridization in talk show discourses in Bangladesh is pervasive. With reference to the first research question, it could be said that the speakers are found to hybridize Bangla for a variety of purposes and discourse functions such as to make the discourse cohesive so that the discourse becomes coherent, to clarify, specify, emphasise, and focus certain concepts and issues in the discourse, and to make an issue or topic of the discourse glocal. Many of these discourse functions of hybridization are, however, found to be aligned with the findings of Callahan (2004), Gumperz (1977, 1982), Li (2000), McClure (1998), Takashi (1990).

Though the speakers are found to hybridize Bangla for a variety of discourse functions, they are found to hybridize Bangla and English elements very carefully and strategically. Since they are found to insert English elements into Bangla syntactic structures, they are seen to maintain Bangla syntactic rules properly. English adverbs such as "even", "eventually", and "actually" are used in (i), (iv(c)), and (v) respectively in such a position and manner that they perfectly fit into the Bangla sentence structures. Their Bangla equivalents such as "*emonki*", "*obosheshe*", and "*prokritopokkhe*" respectively could have been used in the same position in the same manner, if they were used. These three English adverbs are found to be used without any modifications or transformations. The adverbs "even" and "eventually", despite having the same roots, denote different notions and the speakers are thought to perceive their conceptual differences which is demonstrated in their use of these two words in two different ways to express two distinct meanings for two different purposes. Thus, it could be said that the use of these English adverbial words in the Bangla sentences is very strategic.

As for insertion of the English adjectives such as traditional (ii, xii), shorter (iii), tactical (iv(a)), inequal (xv), smooth (xviii), live, green, and slow (xxi), absolute (xxiii), and inequal and intergenerational (xxiv), syntactic rules of both Bangla and English are maintained. Among the adjectives, "traditional" in "traditional *khabar*" (ii), "tactical" in "tactical *jinish*" (iv(a)), "professional" in "professional development" (viii), "live" in "live grass" (xxi), and "absolute" in "absolute concept" (xxiii) are attributing nouns followed by them, i.e., "*khabar*", "*jinish*", "development", "grass", and "concept" respectively. This construction (i.e., adjective + noun) is common both in English and Bangla. Moreover, "counselling", a present participle functioning as an adjective in "counselling psychologist" (ix), is another common use of adjective both in Bangla and English where a present participle is followed by a noun. Furthermore, "training" in "training camp" (iv(a)), "practice" in "practice match*to*" (iv(c)), "warm-up" in "warm-up match*gula*" (x), "television" in "television film" (xi), "medical" in "medical *bishwobidyaloyer*" (xix), "rheumatology" in "rheumatology *bivager*" (xix), and "poverty" in "poverty concept*ta*" (xxiii) are nouns but functioning as adjectives, hence called a "classifier" or "Noun Adjective", in the sentences and such a construction (i.e., Classifier/ Noun Adjective + Noun) is also commonplace in both Bangla and English. Since the notion of adjective and its use are similar both in Bangla and English, the speakers are found to insert English adjectives into the Bangla sentence structures without much difficulty.

Noun is found to be the most frequently inserted category of English word into the Bangla sentence structures. The English nouns such as camp (iv(a)), final (iv(b)), acceptance (v), victim (vi, vii), professionalism and development (viii), psychologist and counsellor (ix), president (xiv), platform

(xvii), chairman and Professor (xix), bone (xx), grass (xxi), understanding (xxii), inequality, opportunity, and inequity (xxiv), family (xxv), and awareness and acceptance (xxvi) are used without any restructuring and modification in their form and causing no violation in the syntactic norms of both Bangla and English. Moreover, some of the English nouns are found to be used suffixing by Bangla postposition such as "*te*", as in "university*te*" (i) and "povert*ite*" (xvi) which is equivalent to English preposition "in", whereas some other English nouns are used suffixing by Bangla postposition "*e*", as in "format*e*" (iii), "field*e*" (viii), "line*e*" (xi), and "hospital*e*" (xix) which is also equivalent to English preposition "in", and another English noun is used suffixing by Bangla postposition "ke", as in "**bone***ke*" which is equivalent to English preposition "to". What it suggests is that though Bangla postpositions "*te*" and "*e*" are deemed equivalent to English preposition "in", these two Bangla postpositions are suffixed with different sets of English nouns strategically. Furthermore, some English nouns are used suffixing by Bangla postposition "*er*", as in "cup*er*" and "final*er*" (iv(c)), "management*er*" (x), "publishing*er*" and "editing*er*" (xii(b)), "bishwobank*er*" (xvi), and "cycl*er*" (xxiv) which is equivalent to English preposition "of". In all these cases Bangla suffix "*er*" is added with singular English nouns, whereas the speakers are found to use Bangla suffix "*der*" to mark plural as in "parent*der*" (xxv) which is also equivalent to English preposition "of". This suggests that the speakers can strategically suffix Bangla postpositions with English nouns to mark their number. Also, a few English nouns are used suffixing by Bangla determiner and singular number marker "*ta*", as in "bondage*ta*", "interaction*ta*" (xviii), "wicket*ta*" (xxi), and "concept*ta*" (xxiii) which is equivalent to English determiner "the", whereas a couple of other English nouns are used suffixing by Bangla plural number markers "*ra*" and "*gula*", as in "player*ra*" and "match*gula*" (iv(b)) respectively which are equivalent to English plural marker "-s/-es". Even, some English nouns are used adding Bangla suffix to mark emphasis such as "*tai*" in "match*tai*" (iii) and "*oi*" in "program*oi*" (xxvi). Still, another Bangla suffix "*to*" is found to be added with English noun as in "match*to*" (iv(c)) in which "*to*" has no major grammatical function but ornamental for creating a phonetic effect. Adding different Bangla suffix with English nouns to mark numbers, prepositions, emphasis, and ornamental phonetic effect appropriately is found to be tactic, creative, and strategic.

With regard to English verb insertion into the Bangla sentence structures, it is found that the speakers are found to use English verbs according to the morphological and syntactic rules of both Bangla and English. While "welcome" (xvi) is used according to the English morphological norm, "out *hoyegiyesilen*" (xiii), "continue *korbe*" (xviii), "develop *kora*" (xxv), "build up *kora*" (xxv), and "sustain *kora*" (xxv) are used according to the Bangla morphological norm because the use of the joint verb is the norm in Bangla. To illustrate, if the verb "develop" is used in an English sentence it is used as a single word such as "develop", "develops", "developed", or "developing" but if it is inserted into a Bangla sentence it is used as a joint verb such as "develop kora", "develop kore", "develop koria", "develop korbe", "develop korlo" and so on. The speakers are found to use English verbs in the Bangla sentences very creatively and strategically.

Not only in the use of parts of speech, the speakers are found to be very strategic in making Bangla complex sentences blending the English and Bangla clauses. In example (iv(c)), the principal clause "So eventually it was a good decision" is exclusively in English but the subordinate clause "because *amra kintu ar* Asia cup*er* final*er cheye valo* practice match*to asole amra okhane giye kortam na*" is a mixture of Bangla and English. While the subordinate clause starts with the conjunction of reason "because", an English clause marker, the remaining part is a hybrid of Bangla and English. This sentence is constructed so strategically that the intended meaning is conveyed intelligibly.

The above findings and discussion respecting the strategic hybridization of Bangla find an alignment with Sultana (2014) who reports that the participants use linguistic and semantic forms of both English and Bangla very creatively, strategically, and pragmatically. Hence, with reference to the

second research question, it could be said that the speakers have hybridized Bangla with English very tactically, creatively, pragmatically, and strategically in the television talk show discourses.

5. Conclusions

It is evident from the analysis of data that the speakers are found to hybridize Bangla and English elements in their television talk show conversation for a variety of discourse functions such as to establish cohesion in the discourse, to clarify concepts, to give emphasis and focus to particular notions, to draw glocal attention, and to make the discussion more topic specific and relevant. Though in some cases, particular terms are available both in Bangla and English, but the speakers are found to use these terms from either or both languages without much effort which indicates that the linguistic repertoire of the speakers are made up of Bangla and English and they can easily use linguistic features from their repertoire without making discrimination between the linguistic systems. It also indicates that the speakers can purposively and strategically switch between these two languages without compromising lexical, syntactic and semantic features and traditions. As this study has not approached the data from structural perspectives in detail, a further investigation from structural perspectives is thus called for which would help us to know their nature of linguistic hybridization. Moreover, further analysis may explore other types of discourse functions which would inject fresh insights into the existing body of knowledge in sociolinguistics.

References

Alam, S. (2006). Code-mixing in Bangladesh: A case study of non-government white-collar service holders and professionals. *Asian Affairs*, *28*(4), 52-70.

Al-Azami, S., Kenner, M. R., & Gregory, E. (2010). Transliteration as a bridge to learning for bilingual children. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(6), 683-700.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: four essays (Discourse in the Novel).* In M. Holquist (Ed.), 259-422. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Banu, R., & Sussex, R. (2001). Code–switching in Bangladesh: A survey of hybridization in proper names and commercial signs. *English Today*, *17*(2), 51-61. Doi: 10.1017/S0266078401002061

Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2004). Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 336-352). Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). Because tumi Bangali. *Ethnicities, 9*(4), 451-476. Doi: 10.1177/1468796809345605

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Reprinted in Li Wei (ed.) (2000) (q.v.)

Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2015). Praat: doing phonetics by computer (V 6.0). http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/ (accessed 10 August 2016)

Bokamba, E. G. (1998). Code-mixing, language variation and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu language. *Lingua, 76,* 21-62.

Bosu, S. (2019, February 21). Importance of Bangla on the wane. *Independent*. http://www.theindependentbd.com/home/printnews/188542

Bullock, E.B., & Toribio, A.J. (2016). Themes in the study of code-switching. In E. B. Bullock, & A. J. Toribio (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching* (pp.1-18). Cambridge Books Online. Doi:10.1017/CBO9780511576331

Callahan, L. (2004). *Spanish/English Codeswitching in a Written Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of *Translanguaging. Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401-417. Doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David, M.K. (2001). *The Sindhis of Malaysia: A sociolinguistic account*. London: Asean Academic Press.

David, M.K. (2003). Role and functions of Code-switching in Malaysian Courtrooms. *Multilingua, 22*, 1-20. Doi: 10.1515/mult.2003.005

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.

Gumperz, J.J. (1977). The sociolinguistics significance of conversational code-switching. *RELC Journal, 8*, 1-34. Doi: 10.1177/003368827700800201

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

Gutiérrez, K.D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the Third Space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6*(4), 286-303. Doi: 10.1080/10749039909524733

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hasan, M. K., & Akhand, M. M. (2015). Reviewing the Challenges and Opportunities Presented by Code Switching and Mixing in Bangla. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(1), 103-110.

Hill, J., & Hill, K. (1980). Metaphorical switching in Modern Nahuatl: change and contradiction. *Papers from the Sixteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 121-33). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Second ed. England, UK: Longman.

Hossain, K. (2019, February 21). Bangla bhashar bikriti dushon dekhbe ke. *Amadershomoy.com*. http://www.dainikamadershomoy.com/post/184004

Istifci, I. (2019). Code-switching in tertiary level EFL classrooms: perceptions of teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *15*(4), 1287-1299. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.668428

Jorgensen, J.N., Karrebaek, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Moller, J. S. (2011). Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 23-37.

Kemaloglu-Er, E., & Oʻzata, H. (2020). Codeswitching in group work in EFL classes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(3), 1443- 1457. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.803847

Li, C.S.D. (1997). The Plight of the Purist. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.), *Language in Hong Kong at Century's End* (pp. 161-190). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Li, C.S.D. (2000). Cantonese-English code-switching research in Hong Kong: A Y2K review. *World Englishes, 19,* 305-322. Doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00181

Marasigan, E. (1983). *Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in Multilingual Societies*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

McClure, E. (1998). The relationship between form and function in written national language-English codeswitching: Evidence from Mexico, Spain, and Bulgaria. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching Worldwide* (pp. 125-150). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Morris, R. (1872). *Historical outlines of English accidence, comprising chapters on the history and development of the language, and on word formation*. London: Macmillan.

Muller, N., & Ball, M. J. (2005). Code-Switching and Diglossia. In M. J. Ball (Ed.), *Clinical Sociolinguistics* (pp. 49-62). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

OED. (2018). *Oxford English Dictionary: The definite record of the English language*. Oxford University Press. www.oed.com

Parasher, S. V. (1980). Mother-tongue-English diglossia: a case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use. *Anthropological Linguistics, 22,* 151-68.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.

Pieterse, N.J. (2001). Hybridity, so what? The anti-hybridity backlash and the riddles of recognition. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *18*(2-3), 219-245. Doi: 10.1177/026327640101800211

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: Towards a typology of code switching. *Linguistics, 18,* 581-618. Doi: 10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Rahman Z. (Founder, Director & Host). (2016). *Tritiyomatra*. Dhaka: Channel i. http://www.tritiyomatra.com/program-archive

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing, Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rashid, M. H. O. (2014). Bangla and English Code Switching in the University Classroom: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *SUST Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(2), 24-31.

Riaz, M. (2019). Language variation: Code-mixing and code-switching in Pakistani commercials. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *15*(2), 411-419. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.586085

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. M. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). London: Sage.

Sameen, S., Farid, A., & Hussain, M.S. (2021). A critical discourse analysis of impact of code-switching on modern adult language learners' motivation in Pakistan. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(Special Issue 1), 109-121.

Scotton, M.C. (1988). Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Code switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 151-186). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Scotton, M.C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suchana, A. A. (2014). Code Switching of Bilinguals in Content Area Classrooms at Tertiary Level. *Journal of SUB*, *5*(1), 77-89.

Sultana, S. (2014). Young adults' linguistic manipulation of English in Bangla in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*(1), 74-89, Doi: 10.1080/13670050. 2012.738644

Takashi, K. (1990). A sociolinguistic analysis of English borrowing in Japanese advertising tests. *World Englishes, 9,* 327-341. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00270.x

Teo, K.S. (2003). *The Peranakan Chinese of Kelantan: A study of the culture, language and communication of an assimilated group in Malaysia*. London: Asean Academic Press.

Thomason, S.G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tina, A.A. (2014). Bengali-English Code-Switching in Commercial Signboards in Bangladesh. *Proceedings of the 12th Asia TEFL and 23rd MELTA International Conference, 28-30 August 2014, Malaysia.*

Urciuoli, B. (1985). Bilingualism as code and bilingualism as practice. *Anthropological Linguistics, 27*(4), 363-386.

Wallwork, J. F. (1981). *Language and People*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Yoon, K.K. (1996). A Case study of fluent Korean-English bilingual speakers: Group membership and code choices. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25,* 395-407. Doi:10.1016/0378-2166(94)00099-9

Young, R.J.C. (1995). Hybridity and diaspora. In R. J. C. Young (Ed.), *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture, and race* (pp. 1-26). London: Routledge.

AUTHORS BIODATA

A R M Mostafizar Rahman from English Discipline, Khulna University, Post code-9208, Khulna, Bangladesh. A R M Mostafizar Rahman received his PhD in Language Studies from the National University of Singapore (NUS) and is currently a Professor in English at Khulna University, Bangladesh. His research interests include sociolinguistics, discourse studies, applied linguistics and ELT.

Abu Rashed Md. Mahbuber Rahman from Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia. He is a PhD candidate at the Department of English, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He received his B.A (Hons.) in English & M.A in (ELT) degree from Aligarh Muslim University, India. His research interests include discourse analysis, educational technology, sociolinguistics, English language teaching, linguistics, and SLA.