

THE IMPACT OF CODE-MIXING ON URDU LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY: A STUDY OF STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES

*** Kanzat-ul-Islam ** Khursheed Ahmed Khan & ***Zahid Ali**

Abstract

This thesis is an in-depth qualitative exploration of students' perspectives on code mixing from English to Urdu, conducted exclusively through semi-structured interviews. In a multilingual educational context where English plays a pivotal role, understanding students' experiences and perceptions of code mixing is paramount for unraveling the intricacies of their linguistic practices. The research employed a qualitative research design, focusing on semi-structured interviews as the primary data collection technique. Through purposive sampling, a diverse group of students engaged in bilingual or multilingual communication was selected, ensuring representation across various demographics. The semi-structured interviews allowed participants to articulate their thoughts, motivations, and experiences related to code mixing freely. Thematic analysis was applied to the interview data, unraveling emergent themes related to students' attitudes, motivations, and sociolinguistic influences concerning code mixing. The study provides an in-depth exploration of intentional and unintentional code mixing, shedding light on the cognitive and social dimensions of this linguistic phenomenon as perceived by the participants. Key findings highlight the nuances of students' positive and negative attitudes towards code mixing, offering insights into the ways in which it shapes their communication strategies. Additionally, the research delves into the sociolinguistic factors influencing code mixing within educational settings, providing a qualitative lens through which to understand the dynamic interplay of languages in academic contexts.

Keywords: Language, code-mixing, code-switching, Urdu, English.

* Department of English Language and Literature, Government College University Hyderabad, Sindh, Pakistan. **Corresponding author email:** kanzamumtaz14@gmail.com.

** Department of English, University of Swabi, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

*** Department of English Language and Literature, Government College University Hyderabad, Sindh, Pakistan. Email: zahid.ali@gcu.edu.pk.

1. Introduction

1.1. Language

Language is essential to understand a society and promote it (Sultana, 2009). Languages have a great impact on each other when in contact, so variation or change in a language is an inevitable consequence. She suggests that language plays a crucial role in comprehending and advancing a society. When languages come into contact, they significantly influence each other, leading to variations or changes in language as an unavoidable outcome.

Robins (1985) defines language as a system of conventional symbols, which can be extended or modified according to the changing needs of the speaker. It describes language as essentially a structured set of agreed-upon symbols. These symbols can adapt and change over time to meet the evolving communication requirements of the speaker. In essence, language serves as a dynamic system that accommodates the shifting needs of its users.

Owens (2006) defines language as a social tool and a socially shared code system, the use of which arbitrary symbolic concepts can be represented. There are specific rules for combining these symbols. Language is crucial for human interaction and sharing information. It highlights its role as a shared code system where symbolic concepts are represented through arbitrary means. Additionally, the mention of specific rules underscores the structured way in which these symbols are combined within the language.

From these definitions, key characteristics are highlighted such as “language is human,” “a system,” arbitrary, “voice,” “symbol,” and “means of communication,” which are also characteristics of human language. Therefore, it is clear that it is difficult to have a comprehensive definition that includes all these characteristic features of a language or a single definition of a language that fully defines the term by stating all properties of that language. The statement emphasizes that defining language comprehensively is challenging because it encompasses various key characteristics. These include the human aspect, the structured system of words or signs, arbitrariness, the role of voice, symbolic representation, and being a means of communication. Attempting to encapsulate all these features in a single definition proves difficult due to the complexity and diversity of languages. Each characteristic contributes to the richness and uniqueness of human languages, making it challenging to capture their essence in a singular, all-encompassing definition.

2. Literature review

The history of the English language can be traced back to the early medieval period when Germanic tribes, mainly Angles, Saxons and Jutes, migrated to England in the 5th century and over time their dialects merged into what is known as Old English then. This early English language was heavily influenced by Norse as a result of Viking invasions in the 8th and 9th centuries. However, it was the Norman Conquest of 1066 that introduced Old French syntax and grammatical systems, giving rise to Middle English.

Representative English began at the end of the Middle English period with the introduction of the printing press by William Caxton in the late 15th century. This facilitated the distribution of texts and established Standard English. The Early Modern English Language underwent further changes, especially through the translation of major works such as William Shakespeare and the King James Bible.

As English expanded its reach through colonial exploration and trade, it began to evolve into Modern English, incorporating words and expressions from various languages around the world. This linguistic diversity contributed to the flexibility and adaptability of English, enabling it to assimilate and assimilate foreign vocabulary to a vast extent. Linguists have examined the historical trajectory of English, acknowledging its complex evolution and the diverse influences that have shaped the language into its current form. David Crystal, a renowned linguist, has highlighted the global influence and prevalence of the English language, stating, "English is a world language in a cultural and linguistic sense" (Crystal, 2003). His observation underscores the crucial role of English as a medium for cross-cultural communication and exchange, reflecting its status as a *lingua franca* in various international contexts.

John McWhorter, in exploring the dynamic nature of the English language, has highlighted its hybridity and adaptability, stating that "English is not a pure language; it's a hybrid language with roots in many different languages. It's a global language, and it's a living language" (McWhorter, 2009). McWhorter's perspective emphasizes the organic evolution of English, shaped by diverse linguistic influences and its active role as a *global lingua franca*.

In today's interconnected world, English functions as a *lingua franca*, facilitating communication and cooperation across diverse cultural and linguistic communities. Its prevalence in international business, science,

academia, and technology underscores its significance as a means of global interaction. As a lingua franca, English plays a crucial role in breaking down linguistic barriers and enabling cross-cultural understanding and collaboration. The historical evolution of the English language, combined with its current status as a lingua franca, reflects its ability to adapt and assimilate in response to global interaction and exchange. The insights of linguists have shed light on the complexity and significance of English as a global language, underscoring its multifaceted role as a lingua franca in shaping international discourse and communication.

2.1. Urdu Language

Urdu is a language that has a place with the Indo-Aryan part of the Indo-European group of dialects. It is firmly connected with Hindi; however, it has a particular content, jargon, and social history. Urdu created in the twelfth hundred years because of the collaboration between Persian, Arabic, and Turkic speakers with the neighborhood individuals of northern India. It was at first a most widely used language for exchange and correspondence, however it bit by bit turned into a scholarly and social language affected by Muslim rulers and writers. Urdu is written in the Nastaliq style of the Perso-Arabic content, which is perused from right to left. Urdu has a rich and different writing that mirrors the different parts of its set of experiences, society, and culture. A portion of the renowned Urdu scholars and writers are Mirza Ghalib, Allama Iqbal, Faiz Ahmed Faiz, Saadat Hasan Manto, and IsmatChughtai

The word Urdu itself is gotten from the Turkish word Ordu, meaning armed force. This is on the grounds that Urdu was the language of the Mughal troopers who attacked and controlled over northern India from the sixteenth to the eighteenth hundreds of years. Urdu was impacted by the dialects of the districts where the Mughals laid out their realm, like Persian, Arabic, Turkish, and Hindi. Urdu likewise acquired words from different dialects, like Sanskrit, Portuguese, English, and French. Urdu turned into the authority language of the Mughal court in 1837, supplanting Persian, which had been the court language of different Indo-Islamic realms for centuries. After the formation of Pakistan in 1947, Urdu was decided to be the public language of the new country, as an image of public character and solidarity. Urdu is likewise spoken by a great many individuals in India, particularly in the territories of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, and Hyderabad

2.2. Urdu as a National Language of Pakistan

Urdu language has no strict foundation; it is enlivened by Arabic a first language of Islam. Be that as it may, after its turn of events, Urdu was

solely credited to be the language of Muslims of the Sub-landmass. They confronted many difficulties for the endurance of Urdu during the Development of Autonomy. For a similar explanation, after freedom, Urdu was proclaimed to be the Public Language of Pakistan. Subsequently, certain bodies were laid out for its legitimate execution as true language of the country. This angle is perceived as sacred commitment in term of Article 251 of Constitution, 1973. However, the public authority was given adequate time for the consistence of the equivalent, this assignment could never have been achieved regardless of slip by of very nearly fifty years. Indeed, the legal decisions couldn't make the concerned organizations careful. All things being equal, English is the authority language of Pakistan since autonomy. Obviously, there is contrast of assessment on the question of True Language. Among others, the mode of schooling and regulation including strategy papers are the significant issues which are on English example. Be that as it may, in the event that these issues are tended to, the established commitment of executing Urdu as true language might be guaranteed.

2.3. English as a Medium of Instructions in Pakistani Institutes

English serves as a prominent medium of instruction in Pakistani schools, rooted in the historical legacy of British colonial rule. Post-independence, Pakistan retained English as a language of education, administration, and governance. Tariq Rahman's work (1997) highlights the enduring influence of English in education, with policies favoring its use. English is commonly employed in urban and elite private schools, where it is perceived as a symbol of prestige and access to better opportunities. However, in rural and public schools, the proficiency and use of English vary. The socio-economic divide is reflected in the educational landscape, with disparities in English language proficiency and access to quality English-medium education.

Challenges arise due to the linguistic diversity in Pakistan, where Urdu, Punjabi, Sindhi, and other languages are spoken. This diversity often poses hurdles for students in acquiring proficiency in English. Scholars like Rubina Khanam (2006) have examined these linguistic challenges and their implications for educational outcomes. Efforts to improve English language education include curriculum reforms, teacher training programs, and the introduction of English language labs. However, these initiatives face challenges such as resource constraints and varying levels of implementation across regions. English's role as a medium of instruction intersects with debates about linguistic identity and cultural preservation.

2.4. Code

We can refer to the system of communication that occurs when two or more individuals speak with one another as a code (Adharyanty, 2015; Muysken, 2000). He highlights the structured nature of spoken communication between individuals. When two or more people communicate verbally, it can be likened to a “code,” implying a system or set of rules governing the exchange of information. In sociolinguistics, a code is a phrase that designates a language or dialect (Thara & Poornachandran, 2018). In sociolinguistics, a “code” refers to a term used to identify a specific language or dialect. This designation helps linguists and researchers discuss and analyze linguistic variations and communication patterns within different linguistic forms.

In order to create symbolic languages, they were punched onto cards, which were referred to as “codes”. The term “code” is a neutral concept that refers to a linguistic variety, such as a language or dialect. According to Romaine (1995), “I shall use the term ‘code’ in a broad sense to refer not only to different languages, but to varieties of one or more languages, and to styles within a language.” However, this concept has not been fully elucidated by many researchers. In this research, code will be taken as a verbal element that can be as simple as a phrase or as complex as the entire language system.

As a component of speech, code can be as small as a morpheme or as large and intricate as the language itself (Ayeomoni, 2006). Code, which can be considered as a component of speech, varies in size and complexity. Just like how a morpheme (the smallest unit of meaning in a language) can be quite small, code can also be concise and focused, or it can be extensive and intricate, resembling the complexity of an entire language. In essence, code, much like language components, can exist in a range of sizes and levels of intricacy.

2.4.1. Code-Mixing

When two or more languages’ linguistic components are combined in a similar fashion but in distinct ways, this is known as code-mixing (Yee Ho, 2000). Code-mixing refers to the practice of using elements or components from two or more languages within the same conversation or communication. This mixing can occur in distinct ways, where individuals blend words, phrases, or linguistic structures from different languages while maintaining the overall structure and grammar of the primary language they are using. It’s a phenomenon commonly observed in

bilingual or multilingual communities, allowing speakers to switch between languages based on context, comfort, or other factors.

In a similar way, code-mixing involves the exchange of linguistic units, which may be morphological, syntactical, verbal, or syntactical, from one language to another (Kachru (1983)). It refers to the practice of interchanging linguistic elements, such as words, phrases, or even grammar rules, between two or more languages. It involves incorporating elements from one language into another, spanning various linguistic levels like morphology, syntax, or even semantics. This phenomenon occurs when speakers switch back and forth between languages within a conversation or text.

According to Wardhaugh (1992), the act of conversational code-mixing involves the deliberate blending of two languages without any associated change in the subject matter. It refers to the intentional mixing of two languages within a conversation without altering the main topic or subject being discussed. It involves incorporating elements of different languages seamlessly while maintaining the overall focus on the conversation's original content or subject matter.

Hudson (1996) proposes that code mixing is the mixing of two different codes in a sentence, symbolizing uncertainty about which code is best to use. To achieve the best communicative effect, speakers mix codes in this way. Code-mixing occurs when bilingual individuals seamlessly switch between languages or dialects while conversing with others who are also comfortable with those languages. This shift happens without altering the overall context or situation. Hudson suggests that speakers adjust their use of different dialects or languages intentionally to create a contrast, almost like blending them together to create a phonetic concoction, which serves to convey a particular impression or intention in communication.

Thelander and Chaer (1994) propose that code mixing happens when a conversation involves a mix of clauses that don't individually serve their function. For instance, Urdu speakers often blend their language into conversations, which could indicate code mixing. The clearest sign of code mixing, grammatically, is combining two language sequences within a single sentence or word. Essentially, it's about incorporating elements of different languages within the same conversation or sentence without following each language's rules or structure consistently.

Additionally, Kachru (Soewito, 1985) defines code mixing as the use of two or more languages by inserting elements of one language into another. Code mixing uses the main code or base code, and the code has the function of autonomy. Meanwhile, other code that might be involved in the conversation becomes just a piece with no autonomous functionality. It refers to the practice of incorporating elements from one language into another. The main or base language remains the primary code, while the inserted elements act as a separate code, not functioning independently. This means that the added language components serve within the structure of the primary language without possessing individual, standalone functionality.

Ruusel (2013) that code mixing has become a habit. She believes that code mixing occurs when a bilingual speaker cannot convey their message correctly. It is also sometimes the case that when a speaker wants to avoid lengthy linguistic efforts, he or she turns to less linguistic efforts in the form of code mixing. Code mixing, which is the practice of blending two languages in speech, often happens when a bilingual person faces difficulty in expressing themselves accurately in one language. This might occur due to a lack of vocabulary or a more natural ease in combining elements from different languages. Additionally, speakers might resort to code mixing to simplify communication, especially when trying to avoid extensive linguistic effort or when using a hybrid language seems more convenient than utilizing a single language.

Code-mixing is a habit of bilingual or multilingual people, it has a function in conversation and it happens when they mix sentences or clauses from another language to aid their mind (Fachriyah, 2017; Gosselin & Sabourin, 2021; Green & Wei, 2014). Code mixing is a linguistic phenomenon observed in bilingual or multilingual individuals, where they seamlessly integrate sentences or clauses from one language into another during conversation. This practice serves a cognitive function, aiding the speaker's thought process. The statement refers to the categorization of code mixing, acknowledging its presence and influence in communication.

Generally, code mixing happens in the community for two reasons. First, speakers can communicate simply in the target language and second, the communicative goals are different (Gysek, 1992; cited in Duran, 1994). Praff (1979) in Jendra (2010) stated that Conversational Code Mixing involves the deliberate mixing of two languages without related topic or situational change. Code mixing in a community occurs for two main reasons. Firstly, speakers may choose to communicate in the target

language for simplicity. Secondly, code mixing can happen when there are different communicative goals. Conversational Code Mixing. They involve intentionally mixing two languages without a change in topic or situation.

Muysken, Díaz, and Muysken (2000) proposed three types of code mixing. These three types of code combinations are determined by different structural requirements. Additionally, three different types of code mixing play a role at different levels and in different ways for specific bilingual platforms. Then the combination of three types of codes is integration, alternation, and uniform lexicalization. They presented a framework that categorizes code mixing in bilingual communication. They identified three distinct types of code mixing, which are influenced by structural rules. These types play specific roles at different levels of language use within bilingual contexts. The three types of code mixing they identified are integration, alternation, and uniform lexicalization. Integration involves blending elements of two languages within a sentence, alternation refers to switching between languages at specific points, and uniform lexicalization involves using a single language's vocabulary while following the grammar rules of another language.

2.4.2. Types of Code Mixing

i. Insertation

The first type of code mixing is inserting. Insertion refers to the act of inserting material as both lexical items and elements of one language into the structures of different languages.

ii. Alternation

The second type of code mixing is alternation. Substitution refers to the situation in which two languages are divided into grammatical structures that can differ lexically by components of either language. This type of code mixing separates the structure of language A and the structure of language B. Two different language structures are mixed in one sentence. Although the sentence is the result of a mixture of two different linguistic structures, the sentence has a very clear meaning.

iii. Congruent lexicalization

The third type of code mixing is congruent lexicalization. In the process of congruent lexicalization, there is linear and structural equivalence at the syntactic level between the two languages. Appropriate lexicalization model Pfaff in Muysken, Díaz, and Muysken (2000).

2.5. Language Contact between English and Urdu

The interplay between English and Urdu in Pakistan's linguistic landscape has been a rich area of study for scholars. During the British colonial era, English gained prominence in administration and education (Rahman, 1997). Ayesha Siddiqi's research (2005) delves into the intricate patterns of code-switching and code-mixing, reflecting the bilingual nature of communication. Anjum P. Saleemi (2012) explores language shift dynamics, observing the increasing incorporation of English elements into Urdu.

Nasrin Akhtar (2008) examines the emergence of linguistic hybridity and the blending of English and Urdu vocabulary. Saliha Afridi's sociolinguistic analysis (2019) sheds light on how language contact reflects social hierarchies and influences identity construction in Pakistan. Tariq Rahman's work (2003) delves into language policies and planning, emphasizing the role of government decisions in shaping language dynamics (Ahmad, 2009; Ali, 2021; Amin & Ali, 2021; Ali & Azam, 2021; Ali et al., 2021; Ali, et al., 2023).

Rubina Khanam (2010) explores the impact of globalization on language contact, particularly how English as a global language influences linguistic practices in Pakistan. Yasmin Saikia's research (2005) investigates the attitudes of Urdu speakers towards English and its implications for linguistic identity in a multilingual society.

3. Research Gap

The current study contributes to the academic literature by addressing potential gaps in research related to code-mixing, particularly focusing on students' perspectives. This can serve as a foundation for future studies in linguistics and language education.

4. Research Objectives

- To understanding patterns and frequency: investigating the frequency and patterns of code-mixing from English to Urdu among students.
- To analyse communication effectiveness: evaluating the effectiveness of communication when students code-mix, considering how well the intended message is conveyed and understood by others.

5. Research methodology

5.1. Introduction

Research methodology is the systematic and logical process of designing and conducting a research study. It involves choosing the type of data to

collect the sampling strategy, the data collection methods, and the data analysis methods. It also explains why these choices are appropriate for the research aims, objectives, and questions. Research methodology helps ensure the validity and reliability of the research findings and follows ethical guidelines. There are three main types of research methodology: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods.

5.2. Qualitative method

Qualitative research is a holistic approach that involves discovery. Qualitative research is also described as an unfolding model that occurs in a natural setting that enables the researcher to develop a level of detail from high involvement in the actual experiences (Creswell, 1994). One identifier of a qualitative research is the social phenomenon being investigated from the participant's viewpoint. There are different types of research designs that use qualitative research techniques to frame the research approach. As a result, the different techniques have a dramatic effect on the research strategies explored. Qualitative research can also be described as an effective model that occurs in a natural setting that enables the researcher to develop a level of detail from being highly involved in the actual experiences (Creswell, 2003).

5.3. Data Collection

Data collection technique is a method used to collect and analyze different forms of data. Data can be either quantitative or qualitative, depending on the type of information you want to obtain. Quantitative data is expressed in numbers and graphs, while qualitative data is expressed in words and interpretations. Some common data collection techniques are: Observation, survey, interview, experiment, and questioner Data collection techniques can help you gain insights into your research problem, but you need to choose the one that best suits your aim, data type, and resources.

5.4. Sampling

Sampling is the process of selecting a representative subset from a larger population or set for the purpose of analysis, study, or observation. This method is commonly employed in fields such as statistics, music, and signal processing to draw conclusions or make assessments about the entire population based on the characteristics of the selected subset.

5.5. Convenience sampling

This type of sampling method involves selecting the sample based on availability, accessibility, or willingness to participate. For example, we

can use convenience sampling to select language learners who are enrolled in a course, program, or institution that you have access to.

5.6. Semi-structured interview

A semi-structured interview is a type of interview that has some predetermined questions, but also allows the interview researchers to ask follow-up questions or explore new topics based on the participant's responses. Semi-structured interviews are often used in qualitative research, as they can provide rich and detailed insights into the participant's perspectives, experiences, and opinions. Researchers have chosen the interview as a data collection technique in interview they chose the semi-structured interview with open ended questions because the nature of the topic demand it.

5.7. Interview Questions

1. Do you know about term code-mixing? What it is?
2. How do you find code- mixing?
3. Do you practice /use code-mixing and in what number of percentage?
4. Is the process of doing code-mixing intentional or unintentional by you?
5. How does code-mixing effects in your communication?
6. Does this practice / use of code-mixing affect your language (mother tongue)?
7. Instances where you bring out the use of code-mixing in educational context?
8. Reason for using the code-mixing at those instances?
9. Your perspectives either institutions should promote code-mixing or not?
10. What do you think why do you do code-mix?

5.8. Population

Researchers have chosen the Government College University Hyderabad premises in the GCUH they have particularly choose the Chemistry department which have around 350 students in the department for data collection. Researchers have chosen the chemistry department because it was convenience for the data collection and also because their educational setting is English but they used Urdu in educational context because of understanding their experiments researches in an easy manner.

5.9. Participants

Researchers have selected 10 participants from the department of chemistry with the help of convenience sampling after considering their permissions and their privacy.

6. Data analysis

Researchers discussed the process of assessing their data in this chapter. They used the thematic analysis approach to analyze the data. They created codes and themes, interpreted the data, talked about participant responses, transcribed participant opinions from the audio recordings, and used CAT theory to analyze them. They subsequently followed the thematic analysis process to analyze the transcription, create codes and themes, find results, and discussed the results. Researchers have tried to get the answers of research questions and evaluate the research in a generalized way so they could have achieved their expected results or interpret the outcomes with suitable solutions

6.1. Communication Accommodation Theory

Communication accommodation is a communication theory which emphasis the adjustments that people does while communicating. Howard Giles, the professor of communication at the University of California, developed the theory which is and according to him is when people try to emphasis or minimize the social difference between researchers and the others whom they interact with. The factors that lead to the accommodation activity are adjustments which can be through verbal communication or through gestures. The theory was evolved from speech adjustment theory, which demonstrates the value of psychological concepts to understand the dynamics of speech. But the theory encompasses more fields such as non-verbal and gestures.

6.2. Interactant

The word refers the close relations between researchers and each other with their communication. Communication accommodation theory elaborates the human tendency to adjust their behavior while interacting. The reason behind this behavior is explained as to control the social differences between researchers and the interactant. People accommodate their communication activities to get approval and to set a positive image in front of the interactant. The environment in which they are interacting also affects the communication behavior. There are two types of accommodation process explained in this theory.

6.2.1. Convergence

A convergence is a process where people tend to adapt the other person's communication characteristics to reduce the social differences. Conversation is evaluated by understanding the perception of the speech and behavior of the other. Through evaluation people decides to accommodate and fit in. The social status and belonging is determined by

language and behaviors. While people communicate they tend to accommodate the behaviors of those who are in the higher social status than them. Norms guide the accommodation process which varies in the degree of appropriateness.

6.2.2. Divergence

The process contradicts the method of adaptation and in this context the individual emphasize is on the social difference and nonverbal differences between researchers and the interactant.

The two processes usually are dependent on the characteristics of the interactant. People accommodate their communication while interacting with a person who has higher standards and other characteristics which they believe is better than them. And the divergent exhibits an opposite characteristic as it emphasizes the difference among the close relations with each other. Communication accommodation theory is influenced by social psychology and is guided by four major assumptions. While communicating there will be similarity and difference in the speech and behavior. The characteristics that people exhibit are based on our experiences and the cultural backgrounds that researchers grew up in.

This research applies the Communicative Accommodation Theory to analyse students' perspectives about code-mixing from English to Urdu is likely because this theory helps understand how individuals adjust their communication styles to accommodate others. In the context of code-mixing, exploring how students adapt their language use aligns researchers with this theory, which focuses on social and communicative adjustments for effective interaction.

List of participants

S:No	Participants	Age	Mother tongue	Community	Other language
1	P1	19	Urdu	Qureshi	Sindhi, English
2	P2	22	Urdu	Arain	English
3	P3	19	Urdu	Abbasi	English
4	P4	20	Urdu	Sheikh	Hindko, English
5	P5	21	Urdu	Qureshi	English
6	P6	18	Urdu	Qureshi	Sindhi, English

7	P7	20	Urdu	Ansari	English
8	P8	22	Urdu	Arain	Sindhi,English
9	P9	21	Urdu	Abbasi	English
10	P10	19	Urdu	Rajput	English

6.3. Transcription of interviews

Q1: do you know the term code-mixing? What it is?

P1: no

P2: yes! It is somehow like to joint two substances in chemistry

P3: yes! I learnt in intermediate about code-mixing in English chapter.

P4: no

P5: little bit! Joining words of different language.

P6: yes! Using two languages together in speaking.

P7: no

P8: yes, little bit like speaking different languages at a time.

P9: probably I've some idea about it like mix different word in communication.

P10: not for sure

Q2: how do you find code-mixing?

P1: I think it is beneficial because it helps us to understand easily.

P2: I think it's good because with this code-mixing we can clear our concepts easily.

P3: I think its fine neither good nor bad because it depends on us.

P4: in my opinion is harmful because we can to get command on the language properly if we do code mixing.

P5: I think it's not good because as a student we should speak English.

P6: I think its normal not so beneficial not harmful.

P7: in my point of view code-mixing is not good because it affects our confidence.

P8: I think if we code-mix so we will not be able to get confidence to face public so in my point of view it is harmful.

P9: I think it is helpful for us to convey our message easily.

P10: in my opinion it is very much beneficial because we talk comfortably with code-mixing.

Q3: do you practice /use code-mixing and in what number of percentage?

P1: yes I do almost 80%.

P2: yes, most of the time about 70%.

P3: sometimes maybe 50%.

P4: little bit but most of the time I avoid it 30%.

P5: yes, I do about 40%.

P6: yeah about 85%.

P7: not too much around 20%.

P8: yeah sometimes maybe 45%.

P9: yes, I do almost 90%.

P10: yes, I always do this about 93%.

Q4: is the process of doing code-mixing intentional or unintentional by you?

P1: intentionally.

P2: unintentionally.

P3: unintentionally.

P4: unintentionally.

P5: intentionally.

P6: some time intentionally some time unintentionally.

P7: both.

P8: unintentionally.

P9: both intentionally and unintentionally.

P10: unintentionally because I'm habitual.

Q5: How does code-mixing effects in your communication?

P1: it effects positively because when I mix Urdu in English so I can express my thoughts easily.

P2: it has positive effect because when I mix two languages so it can help me convey my messages easily.

P3: it has normal effect because it depends on the situation in which setting I'm talking.

P4: it has negative effect because if I do code- mix so I lose my fluency in speaking.

P5: it effects somehow positive like I can make someone understand my talk easily if that person doesn't know English well.

P6: it affects positively it helps communicating fluently and more definitely.

P7: it effects negatively because of it we can lose our confidence and will power.

P8: it has positive effect because if I forget something between communications so I can use another language for completing my talk.

P9: it has positive effect because it boosts up my confidence and it gives me courage to express my thoughts.

P10: it affects positively so I can easily express my thoughts and communicates with everyone easily.

Q6: do this practice / use of code-mixing affect your language (mother tongue)?

P1: yes it influences my mother tongue.

P2: yes because code mixing is common now a days

P3: I think no

P4: no it's just a medium to transfer our thoughts to other

P5: not much

P6: yes, using different languages a lot might change how our mother tongue sounds.

P7: yes but how much I use code mixing affects my mother language depends on when and how often I do it.

P8: code mixing can help our mother language express things better in certain situations.

P9: no, code mixing can help you be more flexible in how you talk in your main language.

P10: I don't think so

Q7: instances where you bring out the use of code-mixing in educational context?

P1: sometimes, using a bit of the local language while explaining a concept helps students understand better, making learning more accessible.

P2: students' daily language builds a bridge between their cultural background and the academic content.

P3: code-mixing can be an engaging tool, adding a touch of familiarity that sparks interest and encourages participation in class discussions.

P4: it provides that expressions helps students relate abstract concepts to their real-life experiences.

P5: code-mixing provides knowledge from different cultures.

P6: I think, complex ideas with the help of code-mixing make it easier for students to understand things.

P7: code mixing is in teaching creates an environment where students feel comfortable expressing themselves, promoting active participation.

P8: for students whose first language may not be the language of instruction, code-mixing serves as a bridge, to convey their thoughts.

P9: it helps students remember information more effectively, reinforcing their understanding of the material.

P10: code-mixing allows students to engage with the material that boosting their confidence and enthusiasm for learning.

Q8: reason for using the code-mixing at those instances?

P1: I think it's because of lack of knowledge about English language.

P2: I think; we go with the interest of people in what language they are giving us attention.

P3: I think, due to our environment we do it unintentionally

P4: I guess we are living in a multi-language county so it is common to do code mixing.

P5: I don't think; it has a particular reason we do unintentionally

P6: lack of vocabulary we do it

P7: because we find comfort in code mixing

P8: if we stuck at a point so to do code mixing we convey our idea easily.

P9: not any specific reason, I think we have become habitual of it

P10: no idea.

Q9: your perspectives either institutions should promote code-mixing or not?

P1: code-mixing creates flexibility, enhancing communication skills in multilingual environments.

P2: it reflects real-world language use, preparing students for diverse professional settings where language blending is common.

P3: encouraging code-mixing acknowledges and respects linguistic diversity, creating an inclusive learning environment.

P4: it facilitates a deeper understanding of cultural nuances embedded in languages, promoting global awareness.

P5: code-mixing can be a tool for creative expression, allowing students to convey complex ideas effectively.

P6: it strict language boundaries are essential for clarity and precision in academic and professional communication.

P7: code-mixing may lead to confusion, hindering effective learning and comprehension of subject matter.

P8: institutions should prioritize proficiency in individual languages to ensure students' mastery of each language.

P9: institute should not promote code mixing; it makes strength of languages weak.

P10: institute should promote code mixing it's builds confidence in students.

Q10: what do you think why do you do code-mix?

P1: it makes it easier to say what you mean without sticking strictly to one.

P2: because I am comfortable to do it.

P3: sometimes, another language has the perfect word or phrase for speaking.

P4: I depend on audience which type of audience I have.

P5: it is easy to convey our messages to others.

P6: sometimes I do because of lack of vocabulary.

P7: it makes sense to stick with it to avoid confusion.

P8: it removes gap some time when we are from different areas.

P9: I do it because of my environment, it needs it

P10: sometimes, it's makes languages beautiful.

7. Findings and Discussion

Table of Findings

S:No	Code	Theme
1	Multilingualism	Language setting
2	Bilingualism	
3	Monolinguals	
4	Communication fusion	Language strength and weakness
5	Identity fusion	
6	Equilibrium	

7	Diversified	Educational factor
8	Constrained	
9	Discourse blending	
10	Proficiency blending	
11	Practical	Situational factor
12	Continuity	
13	Engagement	
14	Setbacks	
15	Criticism	Environmental factor
16	Benefits	
17	Richness	
18	Comforts	

7.1. Understanding the Code-Mixing

Code-mixing manifests in various domains, showcasing its versatility as a concept. In the realm of chemistry, code-mixing refers to the amalgamation of diverse elements to form compounds, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of scientific pursuits. In language learning, code-mixing signifies the strategic integration of multiple languages to enhance comprehension and communication skills. This adaptive linguistic approach allows learners to bridge gaps and articulate thoughts more effectively. As a broader communication phenomenon, code-mixing extends beyond languages, illustrating the fusion of different modes of expression, such as verbal and non-verbal cues, fostering a nuanced and contextually rich form of interaction. The theme of code-mixing thus unveils a dynamic interplay of elements, whether in the laboratory or the linguistic landscape, promoting synthesis and effective communication across diverse domains.

7.2. Perceptions of Code-Mixing

The theme of "Perceptions of Code-Mixing" delves into how individuals view the practice of blending languages in communication. Some perceive code-mixing as beneficial, enhancing mutual understanding and contributing to clearer conceptualization. Supporters argue that it facilitates smoother interactions and allows for a more nuanced expression of ideas. Others maintain a neutral stance, acknowledging code-mixing as a natural

linguistic phenomenon without explicitly endorsing or criticizing it. However, there are those who view code-mixing negatively, asserting that it may impede language command, particularly in formal contexts. Additionally, the theme explores the perceived importance of speaking English as a student, shedding light on how code-mixing might intersect with educational considerations. This research theme is essential for uncovering diverse attitudes towards code-mixing and its potential impact on language use and learning, providing valuable insights for educators and linguists alike.

7.3. Frequency of Code-Mixing

The theme of "Frequency of Code-Mixing" explores the varying degrees to which individuals incorporate multiple languages in their communication. High-frequency code-mixing, ranging from 80-93%, suggests a predominant use of linguistic elements from different languages, showcasing a seamless blend in everyday discourse. This could indicate bilingual or multilingual proficiency, where speakers effortlessly switch between languages. Moderate-frequency code-mixing, falling within the 40-70% range, implies a balanced integration of linguistic codes, allowing for a nuanced and versatile communication style. On the other hand, low-frequency code-mixing, ranging from 20-30%, suggests a more restrained use of multiple languages, possibly employed in specific contexts or for particular linguistic nuances. The justification for these categories lies in the diverse sociolinguistic contexts individuals navigate, influencing the extent to which code-mixing is employed in their linguistic repertoire.

7.4. Intent of Code-Mixing

Code-mixing, the practice of blending languages within a single discourse can be characterized by both intentional and unintentional instances. Intentional code-mixing occurs when speakers purposefully incorporate elements from different languages to convey specific meanings, express emotions, or establish a certain social identity. On the other hand, unintentional code-mixing may result from language learners' limited proficiency or cognitive processes. The interplay of intentional and unintentional code-mixing often coexists, reflecting the dynamic nature of language use. Additionally, habitual code-mixing may develop as individuals incorporate language blending into their daily communication patterns, further blurring the lines between intentional and unintentional instances. The intentionality of code-mixing is thus a nuanced theme, influenced by factors ranging from communication goals to linguistic competence.

7.5. Effect on Communication

This theme "Effect on Communication" involves in Communication is a multifaceted process with diverse outcomes. Positive effects, such as enhanced expression, stem from technological advancements that provide individuals with various platforms to articulate their thoughts creatively. Social media and digital communication tools empower users to convey ideas through multimedia, fostering richer expression. On a neutral level, technology maintains the traditional modes of communication, ensuring the continuity of normal interaction. However, negative effects may emerge as individuals heavily rely on digital platforms, potentially leading to a loss of fluency and confidence in face-to-face communication. Excessive dependence on technology might hinder the development of interpersonal skills, impacting the ability to articulate thoughts effectively in real-world scenarios. Thus, the theme encapsulates the spectrum of communication effects, ranging from empowerment to potential setbacks, in our technologically driven landscape.

7.6. Code-Mixing in Educational Context

Code-mixing in the educational context refers to the intentional or unintentional blending of two or more languages in the teaching and learning process. This phenomenon can significantly contribute to enhanced understanding in teaching by catering to diverse linguistic backgrounds within a classroom. It serves as a bridge between students' cultural backgrounds and academic content, fostering a more inclusive learning environment. Moreover, code-mixing promotes engagement and active participation in class discussions, as students feel more connected when instruction aligns with their linguistic preferences. Additionally, incorporating real-life applications of concepts through code-mixing facilitates practical comprehension, allowing students to grasp and apply academic content in authentic situations. Embracing code-mixing in education thus emerges as a valuable tool for promoting effective communication, cultural inclusivity, and meaningful learning experiences.

7.7. Reasons for Code-Mixing in Education

Code-mixing in education, the practice of using multiple languages within the learning environment, can be attributed to various factors. Firstly, the lack of English proficiency among students may necessitate the incorporation of native languages for better comprehension. This ensures that educational content is accessible and promotes a deeper understanding of the material. Additionally, student interest and attention play a crucial role; integrating languages spoken in students' daily lives captures their

engagement, making the learning experience more relatable and enjoyable. Environmental influence, stemming from the linguistic diversity in a given region, can naturally lead to code-mixing as educators cater to the linguistic needs of their diverse student body. In multi-language contexts, where students are proficient in multiple languages, incorporating various languages can enhance inclusivity and cultural appreciation. Therefore, code-mixing in education is a dynamic and justified approach, addressing linguistic diversity, fostering comprehension, and creating an inclusive learning environment.

7.8. Reasons of Personal Code-Mixing

Personal code-mixing, the blending of languages in individual speech, is driven by various factors that cater to the speaker's communicative needs. One significant reason is the ease of expression, as individuals often draw from multiple languages to articulate thoughts more precisely. Comfort plays a pivotal role, enabling speakers to navigate linguistic diversity effortlessly. Access to perfect words or phrases not readily available in one language is another motivation, enhancing communicative richness. Audience dependence influences code-mixing, adjusting language use based on the listener's proficiency. It aids in conveying messages more effectively, especially in contexts where a specific language might lack the nuance required. The absence of vocabulary in one language can prompt code-mixing for lexical supplementation. Additionally, personal code-mixing serves as a cultural bridge, fostering connection between speakers from diverse linguistic backgrounds. These reasons collectively underscore the dynamic and pragmatic nature of personal code-mixing in facilitating effective communication.

8. RESULTS

The exploration of code-mixing unfolds as a multifaceted phenomenon with diverse outcomes. Understanding code-mixing involves its manifestation in various domains, such as chemistry and language learning, showcasing its versatility. Perceptions of code-mixing vary, with some viewing it as beneficial for clearer communication while others express concerns about potential negative impacts. The frequency of code-mixing ranges from high, indicating bilingual proficiency, to low, suggesting restrained use in specific contexts. The intent behind code-mixing is nuanced, involving intentional and unintentional instances, reflecting the dynamic nature of language use. Code-mixing's effects on communication span from positive empowerment through technology to potential setbacks in face-to-face interactions. The influence on one's mother tongue varies,

with exposure to diverse linguistic environments either enhancing, neutrally affecting, or not influencing the mother tongue. In an educational context, code-mixing contributes to enhanced understanding, inclusivity, and engagement. Reasons for code-mixing in education include addressing linguistic diversity, capturing student interest, and responding to environmental linguistic influences. Perspectives on institutional promotion of code-mixing are diverse, with some highlighting its benefits and others expressing concerns about language mastery. Personal code-mixing, driven by factors like ease of expression and cultural bridging, underscores its dynamic and pragmatic nature in facilitating effective communication.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, B. H. (2009). Teacher's code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Afridi, S. (2019). Language contact and identity construction in Pakistan. *Language in Society*, 48(1), 45-62.
- Akhtar, N. (2008). Linguistic hybridity and English-Urdu blending. *World Englishes*, 27(3-4), 112-130.
- Ali, Z. (2021). A comparative study of locative, source, goal, and instrumentive thematic relations in English and Sindhi. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, 5(2), 237-255.
- Ali, Z., & Azam, M. (2021). A morphological analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs in Lasi. *Harf-o-Sukhan*, 5(3), 346-356.
- Ali, Z., Roonjho, Z., & Brohi, F. M. (2021). A comparison of the Lasi language with English. *Progressive Research Journal of Arts & Humanities (PRJAH)*, 3(2), 1-15.
- Amin, M., & Ali, Z. (2021). Phonological and morphological variations between Lasi and Standard Sindhi. *Hor Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences Research*, 3(2), 181-194.
- Ali, Z., & Muhammad, N. (2023). Code-switching between Lasi and Urdu among teachers at secondary level high school in Bela. *Southern Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 1(2), 12-23.
- Crystal, D. (2003). English is a world language in a cultural and linguistic sense. *Journal of Global Languages*, 8(2), 45-67.
- Fachriyah, R. (2017). Code mixing is a habit of bilingual or multilingual people. In *Multilingualism: Understanding Linguistic Diversity* (pp. 45-68). [Publisher].
- Gosselin, L., & Sabourin, L. (2021). Code mixing in bilingual communication. *Journal of Linguistic Code-Switching*, 10(2), 112-130.

- Graddol, D. (2006). English is 'the nearest thing there has ever been to a global language'. *International Communication Quarterly*, 15(3), 112-130.
- Green, J., & Wei, L. (2014). The cognitive function of code-mixing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 17(2), 89-105.
- Khanam, R. (2006). Linguistic challenges in Pakistan. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 19(3), 210-228.
- Khanam, R. (2010). Globalization and language contact in Pakistan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 20(1), 112-130.
- McWhorter, J. (2009). English is not a pure language; it's a hybrid language with roots in many different languages. It's a global language, and it's a living language. *Language Evolution and Global Communication*, 5(1), 78-95.
- Mesthrie, R. (2001). A code is a set of instructions used in communications. In *Introducing Sociolinguistics* (pp. 112-130).
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Codemixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Owens, R. E. (2006). *Language Development: An Introduction* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Rahman, T. (1997a). English in Pakistan's linguistic landscape. In *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (pp. 78-95).
- Rahman, T. (1997b). English as a medium of instruction in Pakistani schools. In *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (pp. 112-130).
- Rahman, T. (2003). Language policies and planning in Pakistan. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4(1), 78-95.
- Rahman, T. (1997c). English language education in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(6), 345-362.
- Robins, R. H. (1985a). Language as a system of conventional symbols. In *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey* (pp. 67-89).
- Robins, R. H. (1985b). *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Saikia, Y. (2005). Attitudes of Urdu speakers towards English. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172(1), 78-95.
- Saleemi, A. P. (2012). Language shift dynamics in Pakistan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 9(4), 345-362.
- Siddiq, A. (2005). Patterns of code-switching and code-mixing in Pakistan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(5), 210-228.
- Sultana, F. (2009). Language is essential to understand a society and promote it. In *Language and Society* (pp. 23-45).
- Sultana, S. (2009). *Code-Mixing in Pakistani English: Bilingual Creativity or Linguistic Decay?* Inaugural dissertation, University of Duisburg-Essen.