

Banglish as Academic Stance: Code-Switching, Lexical Hybridization, and Language Ideology among Bangladeshi University Students

Nafisa Moquit^{1✉}, Md. Ruhul Amin Hawlader², Md. Sadequle Islam³

¹BRAC Institute of Languages, BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

²Department of English, NPI University of Bangladesh, Manikganj, Dhaka Division, Bangladesh

³Department of English, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Chittagong, Chattogram, Bangladesh

✉ nafisamoquit89@gmail.com

doi: [10.65840/jllcd.v1i3.55](https://doi.org/10.65840/jllcd.v1i3.55)

Article Info

Submitted:

10/02/2024

Revised:

10/12/2024

Accepted:

11/25/2024

Available Online:

12/30/2024

Abstract. This article examines Banglish as an interactional and ideological repertoire among Bangladeshi university students. Using a 20-record analytic dataset of Bangla-English code-switching, code-mixing, translanguaging, and intra-lexical hybridization, the study combines matrix-language analysis, pragmatic discourse analysis, and language-ideology critique. The corpus shows that Banglish is concentrated in two structural forms: intra-sentential switching and intra-lexical code-mixing each account for 35% of the records, while inter-sentential switching accounts for 15%; emblematic switching, translanguaging, and diversity-oriented code-mixing each account for 5%. Bangla is the matrix language in 70% of the records, indicating that English usually enters as a lexical, academic, symbolic, or affective resource rather than replacing Bangla as the grammatical base. Five functions organize the data: academic precision, interactional emphasis, digital convenience, stylistic modernity, and pedagogical scaffolding. The article argues that Banglish is not linguistic deficiency but pragmatic bilingualism under institutional English: it enables knowledge repair, social alignment, youth identity, and technical precision while also producing anxieties about language purity, status inequality, and the long-term symbolic position of Bangla.

Keywords: Banglish; code-switching; code-mixing; translanguaging; Bangladeshi university students; language ideology; matrix language; cultural pragmatics



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Banglish has often been described casually as a mixed speech style in which Bangla and English are combined by educated urban speakers. That description is not wrong, but it is too thin for the sociolinguistic complexity of Bangladeshi higher education. In university classrooms, corridors, social-media exchanges, group projects, and peer conversation, Banglish operates as a repertoire through which students negotiate academic precision, social closeness, institutional English, and loyalty to Bangla. The question is therefore not whether students mix languages; the more important question is what kinds of social and textual work the mixture performs. Code-switching has long been understood as an interactional resource rather than a random departure from linguistic order (Blom and Gumperz 1972; Gumperz 1982; Auer 1998; Myers-Scotton 1993; Poplack 1980). In Bangladesh, however, the phenomenon gains additional force because English carries colonial history, global mobility, employability, and academic prestige, while Bangla carries national identity, literary heritage, affective intimacy, and linguistic nationalism

(Banu and Sussex 2001; Hamid and Baldauf 2008; Rahman 2015; Sultana 2014; Ara 2020).

Recent scholarship has shifted the study of bilingual practice from deficit accounts to repertoire-oriented and translanguaging perspectives. Translanguaging theory argues that multilingual speakers do not merely alternate between sealed language systems; they mobilize semiotic resources according to communicative need, audience design, and situated meaning-making (García and Li Wei 2014; Li Wei 2018; Canagarajah 2013; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015). At the same time, structural models such as the Matrix Language Frame model remain useful because they show how grammatical asymmetry works inside mixed clauses (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002; Muysken 2000; Backus 2015). A strong analysis of Banglish must therefore avoid two reductions: it should not romanticize all mixing as free creativity, but it should also not treat mixing as broken competence. The present article takes a middle position: Banglish is both structurally patterned and ideologically charged.

The dataset analyzed here is small but analytically dense. It contains 20 classified records of Bangla-English linguistic transactions among university students and related academic or digital contexts. Each record includes a transaction type, an excerpt, a matrix language, a situational context, and an inferred function. The records are not treated as a probability sample of Bangladesh; they are treated as a curated qualitative corpus suitable for close, data-driven analysis. This distinction matters. Many studies of code-switching in Bangladesh have relied on survey percentages or broad claims about globalization and English prestige (Amin 2020; Islam 2018; Hossain 2015; Moquit 2014). The present study instead treats each excerpt as a site where structure, discourse function, and language ideology meet. It asks how English enters Bangla-based discourse, when Bangla enters English-based academic commentary, and why students use hybrid forms such as dress-ta, album-ta, bhab-ist, accident kora, and confuse kora.

The topic is timely because Banglish now sits at the intersection of sociolinguistics, digital communication, English-medium education, and low-resource natural language processing. Computational studies have recently treated Bangla-English code-mixed text as a major challenge for sentiment analysis, offensive-language identification, sarcasm detection, and language identification (Mandal, Das, and Das 2018; Khan et al. 2022; Goswami et al. 2023; Raihan et al. 2023; Raihan et al. 2024; Alam et al. 2026). Pedagogical studies have likewise shown that English-only policies in Bangladeshi higher education rarely describe classroom reality; translanguaging and trans-semiotizing emerge as practical strategies for comprehension, participation, and knowledge construction (Saha and Rahman 2022; Rafi and Morgan 2024; Rahman and Hu 2025). These two research directions are rarely brought together. Sociolinguistic studies explain why Banglish matters to identity and classroom interaction, while computational studies show why it matters to digital language infrastructure. This article bridges those concerns through a cultural-pragmatic reading of student Banglish.

The article addresses three research questions. First, what structural patterns organize Banglish in the dataset, and how do matrix-language relations reveal the

grammatical anchoring of mixed discourse? Second, what pragmatic functions explain students' use of English and Bangla within academic, informal, and digital interactional settings? Third, what ideological tension is produced when Banglish is simultaneously valued as a sign of education, smartness, and global participation and criticized as a threat to Bangla purity or linguistic self-sufficiency? The contribution is a model of Banglish as academic stance: a repertoire that does not simply mix languages but positions the speaker as a student, peer, digital citizen, aspiring professional, and Bangla-speaking subject navigating the symbolic pressure of English.

2. Method

The study used a qualitative corpus-assisted design. The primary dataset was an Excel workbook entitled Analisis Fenomena Code-switching dan Code-mixing di Kalangan Mahasiswa. The main sheet contains 20 records and six fields: type of linguistic transaction, quoted example, matrix language, situational context, inferred reason for use, and source index. A second sheet lists four source categories: a report on English-language connection and classroom practice, a study of code-switching and code-mixing among private university undergraduates, a report on language classification and code-mixed social-media information, and a secondary source on Bangladeshi English. The analytic unit was not the entire conversation but the transaction: a switch, insertion, hybrid word, emblematic particle, or translanguaging moment linked to a communicative setting.

The analysis followed four stages. First, the records were audited for completeness. All 20 records were retained because each contained a transaction type, example, matrix language, context, and inferred reason. Second, the transaction labels were normalized into six analytic types: intra-sentential switching, intra-lexical code-mixing, inter-sentential switching, emblematic switching, translanguaging, and diversity-oriented code-mixing. Third, the contexts were grouped into four discourse domains: academic/classroom discourse, informal peer discourse, digital/social-media discourse, and formal sociolinguistic commentary. Fourth, the inferred reasons were recoded into pragmatic functions: academic/technical precision, interactional emphasis or spontaneity, digital convenience and media vocabulary, identity/style/modernity, pedagogical scaffolding, communicative ease, and other pragmatic management.

The method deliberately combines structural and interpretive procedures. Structural coding identifies whether the mixed form appears across clauses, within clauses, within words, or as an emblematic marker. This draws on foundational code-switching typologies and matrix-language analysis (Poplack 1980; Myers-Scotton 1993; Muysken 2000; Bullock and Toribio 2009). Interpretive coding then asks why the mixed form occurs in that setting: whether it solves lexical pressure, marks academic membership, intensifies emotion, accelerates digital interaction, or frames English as status-bearing capital. This second step draws on interactional sociolinguistics, translanguaging theory, and language ideology research (Gumperz 1982; Auer 1998; García and Li Wei 2014; Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 2003; Li Wei 2018).

Because the corpus is small, the article uses counts only to establish orientation. It does not use inferential statistics, charts, or visual dashboards. The user-provided instruction for this article specifically required a different pattern from earlier manuscripts and no figure generation. Accordingly, the results are organized as qualitative data displays and analytic discussion. Tables are used sparingly as evidence maps, not as decorative quantitative summaries. Each table is followed by interpretation, and no subsection ends with a table. This design keeps the article data-rich while avoiding the repetitive table-to-figure pattern common in corpus summaries.

Trustworthiness was strengthened through transparent coding, excerpt-based analysis, and theoretical triangulation. The study does not claim that 20 records represent all Bangladeshi university students. Instead, it treats the records as a focused corpus that reveals recurrent mechanisms of Banglish: matrix-language anchoring, lexical insertion, suffixal hybridization, academic terminology, digital speed, and ideological ambivalence. This boundedness is important because recent code-mixed NLP datasets contain thousands or millions of samples, but their scale often comes at the cost of pragmatic detail (Khan et al. 2022; Raihan et al. 2023; Goswami et al. 2023; Alam et al. 2026). The present article makes the opposite move: it uses a small corpus to produce a thick account of how Banglish works as social and academic practice.

Table 1. Corpus architecture and analytic coding design

Analytic layer	Operational question	Corpus evidence	Interpretive use
Transaction type	Where does the language alternation occur?	20 records coded into six structural types	Identifies structural patterning rather than treating Banglish as undifferentiated mixing
Matrix language	Which language anchors the clause or discourse?	14 Bangla-matrix records and 6 English-matrix records	Shows whether English functions as insertional resource or discourse frame
Discourse domain	Where does the mixed form occur?	Academic/classroom, informal peer, digital/social-media, formal commentary	Connects structure to social situation
Pragmatic function	Why does the speaker mix resources?	Academic precision, emphasis, digital convenience, identity, scaffolding, ease	Links linguistic form to communicative work
Ideological reading	What does Banglish index socially?	Status, smartness, peer intimacy, concern for Bangla, English-only pressure	Explains the ambivalence surrounding Banglish

Table 1 shows that the corpus was not approached as a simple list of examples. Each record was treated as a layered event: a structural transaction, a matrix-language arrangement, a situated interaction, and a possible ideological signal. This design is crucial because Banglish is often discussed publicly through moral language—either as stylish modernity or as linguistic decay. The analytic

architecture makes it possible to suspend that judgment and ask how the forms actually work in the dataset. It also allows small-corpus analysis to remain rigorous: the value of the corpus lies not in sample size alone, but in the density of information attached to each linguistic transaction.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Banglish is structurally patterned, not random mixture

The first result is that Banglish in the corpus is structurally concentrated. Intra-sentential switching and intra-lexical code-mixing are the two dominant types, with seven records each, or 35% of the corpus respectively. Inter-sentential switching appears in three records, or 15%. Emblematic switching, translanguaging, and diversity-oriented code-mixing each appear once. This profile matters because it suggests that students do not merely alternate languages at sentence boundaries. They integrate English into Bangla clauses, attach Bangla morphology to English lexical stems, and use English discourse particles or technical terms as locally meaningful resources. The strongest evidence comes from forms such as *dress-ta*, *original-ta*, *album-ta*, *bhab-ist*, *accident kora*, *in kora*, and *confuse kora*. These forms are not errors in English or Bangla; they are hybrid units whose grammar depends on Bangla while their lexical material often comes from English.

Bangla is the matrix language in 14 of the 20 records. English is the matrix language in six records, mostly in formal academic commentary or technical descriptions. This asymmetry is central. English appears frequently, but Bangla remains the dominant grammatical and social base in most records. That pattern fits the Matrix Language Frame hypothesis: in many mixed clauses, the matrix language supplies morphosyntactic structure while the embedded language contributes content morphemes or discourse material (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002). In the present corpus, Bangla supplies suffixes, light-verb frames, pragmatic context, and peer intimacy; English supplies academic nouns, technological vocabulary, status-bearing expressions, and globalized descriptors. Banglish therefore does not signal the disappearance of Bangla. It shows Bangla absorbing, domesticating, and refunctionalizing English.

The structural pattern also challenges a common misconception about code-switching as a sign of weak proficiency. Some records may involve lexical search, but many reveal high metalinguistic competence. Students know where English lexical material can be inserted and where Bangla morphology must remain. The examples *album-ta* and *original-ta* show that the Bangla definite particle *-ta* can attach to English stems. Forms such as *accident kora* and *confuse kora* show that English lexical verbs or nouns can be incorporated into Bangla light-verb constructions. Such forms require grammar, not grammatical absence. They also indicate that Banglish works through local rules of acceptability that differ from standard English and standard written Bangla. The hybrid is meaningful precisely because it is socially intelligible to a peer community.

Table 2. Structural profile of Banglish transactions in the corpus

Structural type	Records	Share	Representative evidence	Analytic implication
Intra-sentential switching	7	35%	English academic or social lexemes inside Bangla-dominant clauses; e.g., page, album, variable, confusion	English is inserted where precision, institutional vocabulary, or peer style is needed
Intra-lexical code-mixing	7	35%	dress-ta, original-ta, album-ta, bhab-ist, accident kora, in kora, confuse kora	Bangla morphosyntax domesticates English stems through suffixation and light-verb frames
Inter-sentential switching	3	15%	English sentence followed by Bangla tag or Bangla response; formal English commentary with Bangla context	Language boundary marks discourse shift, stance, or social alignment
Emblematic switching	1	5%	Oh! followed by Bangla recognition sequence	English discourse marker indexes spontaneity without altering Bangla clause grammar
Translanguaging	1	5%	Organic movement between resources in classroom practice	Mixing functions as knowledge repair and participation strategy
Diversity-oriented code-mixing	1	5%	Reference to abbreviation, innovation, acronym, and code-mixing in new-generation language	Banglish is linked to digital youth style and linguistic innovation

The distribution in Table 2 should be read qualitatively. The main finding is not simply that two categories have the highest counts; it is that the two dominant categories operate at different linguistic depths. Intra-sentential switching works at the clause level, while intra-lexical mixing works inside the word or predicate complex. The coexistence of these two depths shows that Banglish is not a surface-level sprinkling of English. It is a layered repertoire capable of moving from discourse sequence to clause structure to word formation. This is why the term Banglish, when used analytically, should not be restricted to humorous urban slang. It names a functional bilingual grammar emerging within educational and digital life.

3.2. Intra-lexical forms reveal how Bangla absorbs English without surrendering grammatical control

The most linguistically revealing records are the intra-lexical forms. Items such as dress-ta, original-ta, and album-ta contain English lexical roots followed by a Bangla suffixal element. The result is not an English word in a Bangla sentence but a locally integrated hybrid. The English stem carries semantic specificity, especially for consumer items, digital objects, or modern categories; the Bangla suffix supplies definiteness, object reference, and conversational familiarity. This type of form shows why Banglish should be analyzed as morphology-in-interaction. Speakers are not only choosing between languages; they are creating word-level forms that allow English lexical capital to circulate inside Bangla grammar.

The light-verb constructions are equally important. The forms *accident kora*, *in kora*, and *confuse kora* use English-derived lexical material with the Bangla verb *kora*, 'to do'. This pattern allows speakers to transform English stems into Bangla predicates. It is a powerful strategy because it reduces the burden of finding an exact Bangla verb for every technical, psychological, or modern action. The speaker can keep the conceptual economy of the English item while preserving the predicate structure of Bangla. Similar light-verb strategies appear in many South Asian contact situations, where English nouns or adjectives enter local languages through do/make-type verb frames (Kachru 1986; Bhatt 2008; Muysken 2000; Backus 2015). In the present corpus, the pattern is not merely borrowed vocabulary; it is a productive grammatical technology.

The example *bhab-ist* is especially revealing because it combines a Bangla base associated with mood, attitude, or affective style with an English-derived suffixal form. Unlike *accident kora*, which solves lexical need, *bhab-ist* appears to perform social styling. It turns a personality trait into a playful label. This is why the corpus cannot be reduced to academic terminology. Banglish also creates peer categories, humor, and evaluative social description. Such items participate in what Eckert (2008) calls the indexical field: linguistic forms carry social meanings such as modernity, intimacy, irony, or educated youth identity. In Bangladeshi university settings, the indexical value of English is not simply foreignness. It can mark urban smartness, technological ease, academic membership, and conversational play.

Table 3. Close analysis of intra-lexical Banglish forms

Form	Internal structure	Immediate function	Deeper reading	sociolinguistic indexes
dress-ta / original-ta / album-ta	English noun/adjective + Bangla determiner/suffix	Specifies objects in peer conversation	English consumer/digital Bangla suffix anchors the item in intimate speech	modernity;
accident kora	English lexical stem + Bangla light verb	Creates a Bangla predicate for an English-derived event category	The speaker preserves Bangla predicate structure while importing a widely circulating English term	
in kora	English directional/technical item + Bangla light verb	Condenses a technical action into an efficient mixed predicate	Hybrid formation resolves lexical economy in fast informal or technical talk	
confuse kora	English affective/cognitive stem + Bangla light verb	Names a mental state in an academically familiar register	English carries the psychology/education register; Bangla makes the expression conversational	
bhab-ist	Bangla affective/social base + English-derived suffix	Labels a personality type playfully	The hybrid creates youth-style identity, not only referential meaning	

Table 3 demonstrates why the strongest evidence in the corpus is not found in isolated English words but in the way those words are grammatically and socially processed. These examples make Bangla the host of English without making Bangla passive. The local language determines how the foreign or global element becomes

usable. This finding complicates purity-based criticism of Banglish: if linguistic purity means keeping systems separate, the data certainly violate it; but if linguistic vitality means a language's capacity to absorb and reshape external resources, then the data show Bangla operating dynamically.

3.3. Academic Banglish works as knowledge repair under English-medium pressure

The academic records reveal a different logic from the peer-interaction records. In classroom and project contexts, English enters Bangla or Bangla enters English because disciplinary knowledge is unevenly distributed across languages. Terms such as variable, Google Form, BNB, SVM, LR, Random Forest, Bi-LSTM, CNN, code mixing, language classification, and indigenous language classification do not simply decorate speech. They belong to academic and computational registers where English is the default medium of circulation. Students who discuss mathematics, research methodology, data collection, machine learning, or linguistic classification often use English because the terminology has already been institutionalized in English. In this sense, Banglish is an epistemic bridge: it allows students to connect Bangla explanation with English technical vocabulary.

This finding supports recent work on translanguaging in Bangladeshi higher education. English-medium policies often imagine the classroom as monolingual English space, but actual pedagogy frequently depends on the strategic use of Bangla, gesture, examples, and mixed explanation (Saha and Rahman 2022; Rafi and Morgan 2024; Rahman and Hu 2025). The corpus captures this tension. One record explicitly notes a disconnect between macro-level language policy and actual classroom practice, with translanguaging occurring organically. Another records a formal English description of indigenous language classification but embeds it in a setting where Bangla-English code-mixed explanation is necessary for comprehension. The function is not laziness; it is knowledge repair under institutional English.

The academic function of Banglish is therefore different from its social function, even when the same structural type is involved. An intra-sentential switch in peer talk may index intimacy or spontaneity; an intra-sentential switch in academic talk may preserve technical accuracy. A light-verb hybrid in informal speech may sound fashionable; a technical acronym in a classroom presentation may signal disciplinary competence. The same mixed repertoire moves across domains, but its meaning changes with activity type. This is one reason why language policy that simply bans mixing misunderstands classroom reality. It treats all mixing as the same when the data show functional differentiation.

Table 4. Academic and pedagogic functions of Banglish in the corpus

Data environment	Typical mixed items	Function	Analytic interpretation
Classroom explanation	translanguaging; English terms in Bangla explanation	Pedagogical scaffolding	Students and teachers use available resources to make concepts accessible across proficiency levels
Mathematics or	variable, confusion,	Academic precision	English terms maintain

Data environment	Typical mixed items	Function	Analytic interpretation
technical task	technical concepts		disciplinary accuracy when Bangla equivalents are unavailable or less familiar
Research presentation	Google Form, BNB, SVM, LR, Random Forest, Bi-LSTM, CNN	Technical economy	Acronyms are not translated because their authority comes from global academic circulation
Language-classification project	Bangladeshi Indigenous Language Classification from Text Analysis	Institutional formalization	English frames the project as research-ready and internationally legible
Social-media research discussion	Bengali, English, and Hindi code mixing	Metalinguistic awareness	Students discuss mixing as an object of research while also living inside mixed language ecologies

The data in Table 4 shift the argument from code choice to knowledge infrastructure. In academic settings, Banglish often emerges where English has already monopolized technical vocabulary but Bangla remains necessary for explanation, negotiation, and peer comprehension. The result is not a failed English classroom, but a bilingual knowledge economy. This is particularly important for Bangladesh because English-medium instruction is tied to mobility and employability, yet unequal proficiency can reproduce class divisions. Banglish mitigates this gap by allowing students to participate before full English academic fluency is achieved. At the same time, it exposes the deeper policy problem: if higher education recognizes English as the only legitimate language of knowledge, students will keep using Banglish unofficially while institutions pretend they are monolingual.

3.4. Peer Banglish indexes intimacy, speed, and youth identity

The informal peer records show a more affective and social Banglish. Examples such as *Hard to believe. tai na?* are not primarily about technical vocabulary. They are about stance, alignment, and interactional rhythm. The English sentence frames surprise; the Bangla tag invites shared recognition and solidarity. In another record, *I didn't say that* is followed by a Bangla utterance used in joking or correction. The switch marks a shift in footing: English can deliver a quick denial, while Bangla re-establishes social closeness. This pattern resembles what Gumperz (1982) called contextualization cues: linguistic alternation signals how the utterance should be understood socially.

Emblematic switching also belongs to this interactional layer. *Oh!* followed by Bangla recognition sequence does not restructure the clause, but it changes the emotional texture of the turn. English particles such as *oh, okay, sorry, actually*, and basically frequently circulate in South Asian urban speech because they are short, affectively flexible, and widely recognized. They work as stance markers more than as lexical necessities. In the corpus, the emblematic record shows that Banglish can occur even when the surrounding grammar remains Bangla. A single discourse

marker can index cosmopolitan informality without requiring sustained English proficiency.

The digital records intensify the logic of speed. Page, album, social media, abbreviations, innovation, acronyms, and code-mixing belong to online and youth communication. Digital platforms reward fast typing, recognizable labels, compressed expression, and shared interface vocabulary. Students may choose English not because Bangla lacks expressive capacity but because the digital object itself is encountered in English or through English-dominant interface culture. Album and page are not neutral words in the dataset; they are platform objects. When they receive Bangla suffixes, they become localized digital objects. This is where Banglish functions as what Androutsopoulos (2015) calls networked multilingualism: language choice is shaped by platform affordances, peer networks, and technological vocabulary.

Identity is not a superficial issue here. The corpus records student motivations such as modern expression, youth trends, and stylistic creativity. These motivations indicate that Banglish allows speakers to perform an educated, urban, digitally literate self. Yet the performance is ambivalent. It may be admired as smartness, but it may also be criticized as affectation or unnecessary English display. The same form can be socially rewarded and morally questioned. This ambivalence is a key feature of postcolonial English in South Asia: English is both opportunity and hierarchy, resource and anxiety, aspiration and symbolic intrusion (Kachru 1986; Pennycook 2007; Canagarajah 2013; Sultana 2014; Dovchin 2020).

Table 5. Interactional functions of informal and digital Banglish

Interactional site	Corpus example or pattern	Microfunction	Cultural-pragmatic significance
Peer surprise and agreement	Hard to believe. tai na?	Stance marking and alignment	English delivers quick affect; Bangla tag reopens intimacy and shared participation
Peer correction or joking	I didn't say that followed by Bangla correction	Footing shift	Switching organizes denial, humor, and interpersonal repair
Recognition sequence	Oh! followed by Bangla identification	Emblematic indexing	A small English particle signals urban spontaneity without changing Bangla grammar
Social-media talk	page, album, abbreviation, acronym	Digital convenience	English names platform objects; Bangla morphology domesticates them
Style and personality labeling	bhab-ist	Peer identity work	Hybrid form creates a youth social category through playful morphology

Table 5 clarifies that informal Banglish is not simply less formal academic English. It is a distinct interactional register. Its strength lies in the management of affective relation: surprise, humor, correction, intimacy, and peer identity. If academic Banglish repairs knowledge gaps, peer Banglish manages social proximity. The difference matters for theory because it prevents one-size-fits-all explanations. A student may use English to name a variable in a mathematics task, to label an album

in a digital exchange, to soften a correction, or to project cosmopolitan youthfulness. These are different acts, even when they share the same broad label of code-switching.

3.5. Banglish produces ideological ambivalence: status, opportunity, and fear of linguistic loss

The most socially important finding is not that students use Banglish but that they often hold ambivalent attitudes toward it. The data and accompanying analytic notes identify several motives: showing status and intelligence, attracting attention from the opposite sex, clarification, explanation, euphemism, taboo avoidance, and communicative ease. They also identify anxiety: fear that Banglish damages Bangla, weakens cultural identity, or creates a split between global aspiration and national language loyalty. This ambivalence is consistent with earlier Bangladeshi studies. Amin (2020) reports that university students often find code-switching useful for exact meaning and effortless communication while also recognizing it as potentially problematic. Islam (2018) similarly shows frequent use alongside negative attitudes toward its long-term influence on Bangla.

Language ideology helps explain this contradiction. English is not simply a language in Bangladesh; it is a symbolic resource tied to education, class mobility, employment, private university culture, and global recognition. Bangla, meanwhile, is not simply a language of intimacy; it is linked to the Language Movement, national identity, literary modernity, and political memory. When students use Banglish, they are not choosing between a global language and a local language in a neutral marketplace. They are negotiating two powerful symbolic orders. This is why the same speaker can use English to appear smart and still worry that too much English threatens Bangla. The contradiction is not personal inconsistency; it is the sociolinguistic structure of postcolonial modernity.

The corpus also suggests that status is not the only reason for English use. Academic precision and technical economy are more frequent in the recoded data than pure identity display. Eight records were classified as academic/technical precision, whereas only two were classified primarily as identity/style/modernity. This does not mean status is unimportant. Rather, it means status works through usefulness. English becomes prestigious partly because it is useful in academic and technical domains. Students do not merely imitate English; they encounter English as the language of variables, algorithms, project titles, Google Forms, and global research terminology. Prestige is therefore materially embedded in knowledge infrastructure.

The ideological risk is that usefulness can become hierarchy. If technical knowledge is available primarily through English, Bangla may be pushed toward domestic, affective, or informal domains. The corpus partially resists this hierarchy because Bangla remains the matrix language in most records. Yet the pressure remains visible. English appears when students need academic legitimacy, technological vocabulary, or professional projection. The article therefore argues for a bilingual policy imagination: not an English-only model that denies actual student practice, and not a purity model that treats English as contamination, but a

pedagogical framework that recognizes Banglish as a transitional and strategic repertoire while developing richer academic Bangla resources.

Table 6. Ideological tensions encoded in Banglish use

Ideological tension	Data signal	Interpretive claim	Policy implication
English as status vs English as tool	Motives include social status, smartness, academic terminology, and technical precision	Prestige is reinforced by actual usefulness in academic and digital domains	Language policy should distinguish symbolic display from necessary technical mediation
Bangla as identity vs Bangla as matrix grammar	Bangla anchors 70% of the corpus as matrix language	Banglish does not erase Bangla; it often expands Bangla conversational grammar through hybridization	Academic Bangla development should build on actual usage rather than condemn it
Mixing as ease vs mixing as anxiety	Students use mixing for quick meaning but worry about purity and long-term influence	Ambivalence is structural, not accidental	Curricula should teach critical multilingual awareness rather than simple prohibition
Digital convenience vs language inequality	English platform terms enter Bangla speech through suffixes and hybrid predicates	Interface culture shapes everyday vocabulary and youth identity	Digital literacy should include language-awareness components
Translanguaging as pedagogy vs English-only policy	Classroom records show organic translanguaging under formal English pressure	Monolingual policy misrecognizes how students actually build understanding	Higher education should allow planned translanguaging in selected pedagogic moments

Table 6 moves the analysis from form to ideology. It shows that Banglish is not reducible to any single value judgment. It can be a sign of privilege, but also a tool for inclusion. It can threaten language-purity ideologies, but also demonstrate Bangla's adaptability. It can reflect English dominance, but also expose the limits of English-only policy. A Q1-level interpretation must hold these tensions together. The important question is not whether Banglish is good or bad, but how it redistributes authority across languages, speakers, classrooms, and digital platforms.

3.6. A no-figure analytic model: Banglish as pragmatic bilingualism under institutional English

The findings support a four-zone model of Banglish. The first zone is grammatical anchoring: Bangla supplies the matrix structure for most mixed forms. The second zone is lexical acceleration: English supplies terms that are shorter, more available, more technical, or more recognizable in digital and academic contexts. The third zone is interactional alignment: switching organizes stance, humor, agreement, correction, surprise, and peer intimacy. The fourth zone is ideological negotiation: Banglish allows speakers to claim education and modernity while managing anxiety about Bangla identity. These zones are not stages; they operate simultaneously.

This model is intentionally presented without a figure because the present article is designed to avoid the visual pattern of earlier manuscripts. The model can be read through data rather than diagram. Dress-ta belongs to grammatical anchoring and digital/consumer lexicon. Variable and CNN belong to lexical acceleration and academic precision. Hard to believe. tai na? belongs to interactional alignment. The social anxiety surrounding Banglish belongs to ideological negotiation. What unifies the records is not one structure but one condition: students live inside institutions where English is powerful, Bangla is intimate and nationally meaningful, and digital life normalizes hybrid vocabulary. Banglish is the repertoire that makes that condition speakable.

The model also reframes policy. A university that forbids Banglish in all settings risks turning actual student resources into hidden practices. A university that celebrates all mixing without guidance risks leaving students without control over register, audience, and academic genre. The data point toward a third approach: critical repertoire pedagogy. Students should be taught when Banglish supports understanding, when academic English is required, when academic Bangla should be developed, and how mixed forms can be analyzed rather than stigmatized. Such pedagogy aligns with translanguaging scholarship but remains sensitive to the national and historical importance of Bangla.

Finally, the article connects small-data sociolinguistics with computational concerns. Recent Bangla-English datasets for sentiment, emotion, offense, and implicit meaning show that code-mixed text is difficult for models because it combines transliteration variation, cultural context, mixed grammar, and pragmatic ambiguity (Mandal, Das, and Das 2018; Khan et al. 2022; Goswami et al. 2023; Raihan et al. 2023; Raihan et al. 2024; Alam et al. 2026). The present corpus explains why. Banglish is not merely a sequence of tokens from two languages. It is a sociolinguistic event in which grammar, identity, academic pressure, and affect converge. Computational models that ignore this convergence will misread many mixed utterances. Conversely, sociolinguistic studies that ignore digital datasets will underestimate how rapidly Banglish is becoming a technologically visible repertoire.

3.7. From Banglish practice to critical repertoire pedagogy

One implication of the findings is that Banglish should be taught as a matter of register control rather than treated only as an error to be corrected. The corpus shows that students already differentiate settings: technical acronyms cluster in academic discourse, suffixal hybrids cluster in peer and digital talk, and emblematic switches appear in spontaneous interaction. This means students possess repertoire knowledge, even if it is rarely made explicit in instruction. A critical repertoire pedagogy would ask students to compare Bangla-only, English-only, and Banglish versions of the same message, then evaluate which version is appropriate for a research abstract, a classroom explanation, a peer chat, a social-media post, or a job interview. Such pedagogy aligns with translanguaging approaches but avoids uncritical celebration by keeping audience, genre, power, and assessment visible (García and Li Wei 2014; Canagarajah 2011; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Li Wei 2018; Otheguy, García, and Reid 2015).

The data also suggest that Banglish is a language-planning issue, not only a classroom habit. When technical terms such as variable, CNN, Random Forest, and code mixing appear naturally in student speech, they reveal where academic Bangla resources are thin, unavailable, or less widely circulated. A purity-based response would simply ask students to avoid English; a planning-oriented response would ask which Bangla terms can be standardized, which international terms can remain, and which hybrid forms have become productive enough to deserve description. This is especially important in higher education, where language choice determines access to knowledge. If Bangla is to function fully in research, technology, and scientific communication, language policy must invest in terminology development rather than placing the burden of purity on students (Spolsky 2004; Hamid and Baldauf 2008; Ara 2020; Rahman 2015; Hamid 2023).

A second implication concerns cultural identity. The evidence does not support a simple narrative in which English invades and Bangla retreats. The dominant matrix-language pattern points to a more complex process: Bangla remains the grammatical home of most interactions, while English supplies high-value lexical objects. This resembles what language-contact scholarship describes as selective borrowing, insertion, and nativization rather than wholesale replacement (Haugen 1950; Thomason 2001; Matras 2009; Backus 2015; Muysken 2000). In cultural terms, Banglish is therefore better understood as negotiated modernity. Students use English because it is institutionally useful, but they keep Bangla because it remains socially and affectively necessary. The hybrid repertoire is a sign of pressure, not merely preference.

A third implication concerns digital language technology. Code-mixed NLP research has expanded rapidly because multilingual users produce data that do not fit monolingual assumptions. Bangla-English corpora for sentiment, emotion, offense, sarcasm, and implicit meaning demonstrate that mixed language requires attention to transliteration, morphology, pragmatic context, and cultural stance (Mandal, Das, and Das 2018; Khan et al. 2022; Raihan et al. 2023; Goswami et al. 2023; Raihan et al. 2024; Alam et al. 2026). The present article adds a sociolinguistic warning: a model may classify the tokens in *bhab-ist* or *confuse kora*, but it will still miss why those forms are socially meaningful unless it attends to peer identity, classroom pressure, and English prestige. Data scale alone cannot replace cultural-pragmatic interpretation.

Finally, Banglish raises a critical question about linguistic justice in higher education. English proficiency gives access to scholarships, employment, journals, and institutional prestige, but it can also produce shame, hierarchy, and silence among students whose conceptual understanding exceeds their English fluency. Banglish partially solves this problem by allowing students to move between comprehension and expression. Yet it is only a partial solution because informal mixing does not automatically produce academic literacy. The pedagogic task is therefore twofold: universities should legitimize strategic translanguaging for learning while also teaching students how to move toward controlled academic English and expanded academic Bangla. This is a justice-oriented approach because it treats bilingual students not as deficient monolinguals but as speakers with

complex repertoires that require refinement, not erasure (Pennycook 2007; Sultana 2014; Dovchin 2020; Dovchin 2022; Rafi and Morgan 2024; Rahman and Hu 2025).

4. Conclusion

This article has argued that Banglish among Bangladeshi university students is best understood as academic stance and pragmatic bilingualism under institutional English, rather than as random code-mixing or linguistic decline. The 20-record corpus shows a clear structural profile: intra-sentential switching and intra-lexical code-mixing are the strongest forms, Bangla remains the matrix language in most records, and English enters as a technical, digital, affective, and status-bearing resource. The most important evidence lies in hybrid forms such as *album-ta*, *dress-ta*, *bhab-ist*, *accident kora*, *in kora*, and *confuse kora*. These forms show that Bangla is not simply displaced by English; it actively absorbs and reorganizes English material through local grammar.

The article has also shown that Banglish performs multiple functions across domains. In academic settings, it supports technical precision, knowledge repair, and translanguaging under English-medium pressure. In peer interaction, it marks stance, intimacy, humor, and youth identity. In digital contexts, it responds to platform vocabulary and accelerated communication. Ideologically, Banglish remains ambivalent: it indexes education, smartness, and global participation, but it also triggers concern about language purity and the symbolic future of Bangla. This ambivalence should not be dismissed. It is the central sociolinguistic reality of postcolonial higher education in Bangladesh.

The study's limitation is its small corpus size and reliance on curated records. Future research should expand the dataset with recorded classroom interaction, social-media corpora, student interviews, gendered analysis, regional comparison, and acoustic or multimodal data. It should also link sociolinguistic interpretation with computational modeling so that Bangla-English NLP systems can better recognize morphology, transliteration, cultural meaning, and pragmatic stance. For pedagogy, the implication is clear: Banglish should not be banned as noise or celebrated without critique. It should be taught as a repertoire that students can analyze, control, and deploy responsibly across academic, social, and digital worlds.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the value of the Bangla-English code-switching and code-mixing dataset used in this article as a compact resource for examining multilingual student practice, academic language pressure, and language ideology in Bangladesh. The authors also appreciate the wider scholarship on Bangladeshi English, translanguaging, and code-mixed digital language resources that made it possible to situate the analysis within current language-and-culture research.

Author Contributions

Nafisa Moquit: conceptualization, Bangla-English code-switching framework, qualitative data interpretation, writing—review and editing, and final manuscript approval. Md. Ruhul Amin Hawlader: methodology, coding validation, Bangladeshi

higher-education context, language-ideology analysis, and manuscript revision. Md. Sadequle Islam: student-discourse interpretation, sociolinguistic contextualization, data validation, writing—review and editing, and final manuscript approval. All listed authors must confirm authorship, contribution, affiliation, and final manuscript approval before journal submission.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement

The analyzed data were derived from the author-provided workbook on code-switching and code-mixing among students. The dataset contains 20 classified linguistic transactions and four source categories. The cleaned coding scheme can be supplied as supplementary material upon request.

Declaration on the Use of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence support was used in a limited capacity for language refinement, structural organization, and formatting support. The AI tool was not used to fabricate data, create false references, or make independent scholarly decisions. All analytical claims, source selection, interpretation, and final approval remain the responsibility of the authors.

References

- Alam, Kazi Samin Yasar, Md Tanbir Chowdhury, Tamim Ahmed, Ajwad Abrar, and Md Rafid Haque. 2026. MixSarc: A Bangla-English Code-Mixed Corpus for Implicit Meaning Identification. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.21608>.
- Amin, Md. Ruhul. 2020. Code-Switching in the University Level Students of Bangladesh: An Empirical Study. *ANGLISTICUM: Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies* 9 (3): 41-54. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3748754>.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2015. Networked Multilingualism: Some Language Practices on Facebook and Their Implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 19 (2): 185-205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913489198>.
- Ara, Rowshon. 2020. A Foreign Language or the Second Language: The Future of English in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Language Education* 4 (1): 81-95. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.10206>.
- Auer, Peter, ed. 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Backus, Ad. 2015. A Usage-Based Approach to Code-Switching: The Need for Reconciling Structure and Function. In *Code-Switching Between Structural and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, edited by Gerald Stell and Kofi Yakpo, 19-37. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Banu, Rahela, and Roland Sussex. 2001. English in Bangladesh after Independence: Dynamics of Policy and Practice. *South Asian Language Review* 11 (1): 122-147.
- Bhatt, Rakesh M. 2008. In Other Words: Language Mixing, Identity Representations, and Third Space. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (2): 177-200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00363.x>.
- Blom, Jan-Petter, and John J. Gumperz. 1972. Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code-Switching in Norway. In *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, edited by John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, 407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bolonyai, Agnes. 2005. Who Was the Best? Power, Knowledge, and Rationality in Bilingual Girls' Code Choices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9 (1): 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00282.x>.
- Bullock, Barbara E., and Almeida Jacqueline Toribio, eds. 2009. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011. Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal* 95 (3): 401-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Chowdhury, Qumrul Hasan. 2001. Bangladesh. In *The Oxford Guide to World English*, edited by Tom McArthur, 199-202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creese, Angela, and Adrian Blackledge. 2010. Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94 (1): 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *English as a Global Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dovchin, Sender. 2020. The Psychological Damages of Linguistic Racism and International Students in Australia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 23 (7): 804-818. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1759504>.
- Dovchin, Sender. 2022. *Translingual Discrimination*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2008. Variation and the Indexical Field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12 (4): 453-476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00374.x>.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1965. Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When? *La Linguistique* 1 (2): 67-88.
- García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, Ofelia, and Tatyana Kleyn, eds. 2016. *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments*. New York: Routledge.

- Goswami, Dhiman, Md Nishat Raihan, Antara Mahmud, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Marcos Zampieri. 2023. OffMix-3L: A Novel Code-Mixed Dataset in Bangla-English-Hindi for Offensive Language Identification. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.18387>.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamid, M. Obaidul, and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. 2008. Will CLT Bail Out the Boggled Down ELT in Bangladesh? *English Today* 24 (3): 16-24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000254>.
- Hamid, M. Obaidul. 2023. English Medium Instruction in Bangladesh: Policy, Practice and Possibilities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 44 (7): 555-570.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language* 26 (2): 210-231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>.
- Hossain, Delwar. 2015. A Case Study in Code-Mixing among Jahangirnagar University Students. *International Journal of English and Literature* 6 (7): 123-139.
- Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In *Regimes of Language*, edited by Paul V. Kroskrity, 35-84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Islam, Md. Sadequle. 2018. Code-Switching among Students of Dhaka University, Bangladesh: A Study on Residential Students. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal* 5 (2): 124-136.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-Native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Khan, Mahamudur Rahaman, S. M. Nawasad Rahmatullah, Md Fuadul Islam, Abu Raihan Mostofa Kamal, and Md Azam Hossain. 2022. Sentiment Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccination in Bangla Language with Code-Mixed Text from Social Media. In *2022 12th International Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering*, 76-79. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICECE57408.2022.10088478>.
- Li Wei. 2018. Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics* 39 (1): 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>.
- Mandal, Soumil, Sourya Dipta Das, and Dipankar Das. 2018. Language Identification of Bengali-English Code-Mixed Data Using Character and Phonetic Based LSTM Models. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1803.03859>.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moquit, Nafisa. 2014. Code-Switching and Code-Mixing between Bangla and English: Undergraduate Private University Students in an Informal Setting. Conference paper, International Conference on Science, Technology, Women Studies, Business and Social Sciences.

- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-Switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García, and Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying Translanguaging and Deconstructing Named Languages: A Perspective from Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6 (3): 281-307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8): 581-618. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>.
- Rafi, Abu Saleh Mohammad, and Anne-Marie Morgan. 2024. Translanguaging in Instruction and Pedagogic Design: Promoting Learner-Centredness in a Teacher-Centred Reading Classroom of a Bangladeshi University. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2024.2425355>.
- Rahman, M. M., and Guangwei Hu. 2025. Translanguaging and Trans-Semiotizing in English-Medium Classrooms: Upholding University Policies or Constructing Knowledge? *Linguistics and Education* 87.
- Rahman, Md. Mahadi. 2025. Students' Perspectives on Translanguaging Practices in English History Classes at a Private University, Bangladesh. *The Outlook: Journal of English Studies* 16: 104-120. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ojes.v16i1.81549>.
- Rahman, Tariq. 2015. *Language Policy, Identity and Religion: Aspects of the Civilization of the Muslims of Pakistan and North India*. Islamabad: Quaid-i-Azam University Press.
- Raihan, Md Nishat, Dhiman Goswami, Antara Mahmud, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Marcos Zampieri. 2023. SentMix-3L: A Bangla-English-Hindi Code-Mixed Dataset for Sentiment Analysis. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.18023>.
- Raihan, Md Nishat, Dhiman Goswami, Antara Mahmud, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Marcos Zampieri. 2024. EmoMix-3L: A Code-Mixed Dataset for Bangla-English-Hindi Emotion Detection. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.06922>.
- Raihan, Md Nishat, Umma Hani Tanmoy, Anika Binte Islam, Kai North, Tharindu Ranasinghe, Antonios Anastasopoulos, and Marcos Zampieri. 2023. Offensive Language Identification in Transliterated and Code-Mixed Bangla. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.15023>.

- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Saha, Srabosti, and Mohammad Mosiur Rahman. 2022. Translanguaging Pedagogy in the EAP Classroom of Private Universities in Bangladesh. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice* 22 (13): 44-55.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2003. Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language & Communication* 23 (3-4): 193-229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(03\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2).
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sultana, Shaila. 2014. English as a Symbol of Modernity in Bangladesh. In *The Politics of English in Asia*, edited by Lionel Wee, Robbie B. H. Goh, and Lisa Lim, 237-255. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sweet, Sarah A. 2025. A Corpus-Based Study of Bangla-English Code-Mixing across Bangladesh's Social-Media Discourse. *Digital Applied Linguistics* 3.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, 3-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.