



An analytical overview of linguistic features in Banglish

Aysel Soltanova

To cite this article: Aysel Soltanova (28 Sep 2026): An analytical overview of linguistic features in Banglish, Asian Englishes, DOI: [10.1080/13488678.2026.2732795](https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2026.2732795)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2026.2732795>



Published online: 28 Sep 2026.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



An analytical overview of linguistic features in Banglish

Aysel Soltanova 

Department of Foreign Languages, Baku Engineering University, Baku, Azerbaijan

ABSTRACT

This article offers a qualitative analysis of linguistic contact between Bangla and English and examines how lexical, morphological, syntactic, phonological, and sociolinguistic features are expressed in Banglish. The study is based on a comparative analysis of published studies and secondary scholarship, rather than new participant data. Based on theories of code-switching, borrowing, hybridization, and the Matrix Language Frame model, it explores how English elements are integrated into Bangla grammar and how bilingual speakers use mixed linguistic resources. The study indicates that Banglish is a dynamic consequence of sustained language contact, and its forms are shaped not only by structural linguistic factors but also by vocabulary use, educational environment, social background, and the extent of language contact. Since this study is conceptual and literature-based, findings about phonological and social variation are interpretive, and further empirical work with recordings, interviews, and sociolinguistic sampling is needed to systematically investigate these patterns.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 3 February 2026

Accepted 4 September 2026

KEYWORDS

Language contact; speech units; language transfer; linguistic features; hybridization; bilingualism

1. Introduction

Cultural diffusion has contributed to the emergence of hybrid communities, the transformation of societies, and the assimilation of peoples and languages. Code-switching is a key factor in the formation of hybrid language units. Depending on language choice, language proficiency, history, and the variety of contact-induced cases, the reasons for using code-switching vary. Inter-sentential, intra-sentential, or tag switching impact the formation of hybrid linguistic units, also known as contact-induced change. According to Thomason & Kaufman, the intensity of contact between two languages creates the possibility of contact-induced language change (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988). The concept of hybridization, a term that has become widely discussed in the last decades, is largely associated with H. K. Bhabha. Following the publication of Bhabha's influential book *The Location of Culture* (1994), hybridity became a prominent concept in post-colonial sociocultural studies. European societies were influenced by Eastern cultures until the fourteenth century, and Europe had become culturally dominant only by the nineteenth century. This change happened at a time of increasing cultural diversity not only in the small industrial countries but also in the huge and complex capitalist societies.

Bhabha describes hybridization as a process of mutually dependent colonial relations that produce shared subjectivities (Literariness, 2016). While some scholars (e.g., Georg Simmel, Alfred Schütz) were against hybridization, others (Gilberto Freyre) viewed cultural hybridization in colonial Brazil as a positive phenomenon. The present usage of hybridization has also reflected the lived experience of intercultural exchange in post-imperial societies, and has also drawn attention to the inequality, power, and privilege that exist in such a society (Stockhammer, 2012, p. 45).

From a linguistic and literary perspective, Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) was an important early theorist of hybridization (Bakhtin, 1981). Bakhtin's concept of linguistic hybridity influenced later approaches to cultural hybridity, while Bhabha (1994) developed the concept of the “Third Space” to explain the emergence and negotiation of cultural meaning in intercultural encounters. For Bhabha (1994), the “Third Space” provides a site in which cultural meanings and identities can be negotiated and transformed.

English postcolonial theorist Robert J. C. Young writes in *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race* that hybridization and creolization can occur both consciously (e.g. through purposeful racial or cultural policies) and unconsciously (e.g. through natural linguistic assimilation) (Young, 1995, p. 25). From the 1960s onward, linguists have stressed that linguistic differences are not solely a matter of geography: social class, gender, education, history, and ethnicity are all important. So, hybridization is not tied to a specific territory but comes about through social interaction (Alam, 2018, p. 28).

This raises important questions: Why do we use the term hybridization? Should it remain central to linguistic research, or should an alternative term be adopted? Although the concept briefly fell out of use after the colonial period, it later re-entered academic discourse – particularly within cultural studies – particularly within cultural studies – in discussions concerning concepts such as ‘purity’ and ‘authenticity’ (Stockhammer, 2012). In linguistic contexts, hybrid word formation refers to the incorporation of borrowed elements into a language, producing new etymological structures.

2. The development of Banglish through linguistic mixing

Theories of hybridization also appear in Weinreich's work (Weinreich, 1953), where he describes hybridization as a new type of linguistic transfer: a structural blending of compatible languages. Such a blending usually results from language contact. For example, the English word *folksong* was modeled after the German *Volkslied*. Hybrid languages do not represent an equal 50–50 split of the source languages. At different times, one language might have more power. According to Myers-Scotton (1993), in bilingual code-switching, the Matrix Language provides the morphosyntactic frame within which elements from the Embedded Language are incorporated.

Lexical borrowing is no less important than grammatical influence, but the balance between the two varies. English itself is considered a hybrid language, shaped heavily by Germanic and later Romance influences.

One of these hybrid languages is the Indo-Aryan language Bangla, which has its roots in Sanskrit, the native language in Bangladesh and West Bengal in India. The reason it is a hybrid language is that the majority of the vocabulary of this language is derived from many languages (English, Dutch, Persian, Arabic, Portuguese), and the smallest

proportion is from Sanskrit. Although the language is rich in words from other languages, the most dominant one is English, and the reason is directly related to English colonization, which is also the reason why English is the second most influential language in the region. As such, the use of English as a language of communication increased so much that we have a mix of Bangla and English variety – Banglish (Alam, 2018). In Bangla, a language that integrates the Bangla matrix and English vocabulary is present. Banglish integrates a Bangla grammatical matrix with English lexical elements. One of its most prominent features is code-switching (Tahereen, 2016a). One of the most important linguistic sources is Sanskrit, but its vocabulary includes a lot of borrowings from English, Dutch, Persian, Arabic, and Portuguese. English became a common language during British colonial rule of the world, and it was the language of administration, politics, and education. Continuous contact brought the various speech units together to form Banglish, which is a mixture of English and Bangla. It was particularly popular among the bilingual urban people, and then it became accepted by monolingual speakers as well.

Bangladeshi migration to the UK intensified the linguistic blending. By the early nineteenth century, many Bangladeshis had settled in Britain and eventually constituted 0.7% of the population of the United Kingdom. More than half of the migrants considered Bangla as their mother tongue, and the other half identified English as their primary language. Both physical and virtual communication contributed to the introduction of Banglish to the eastern parts of the UK, leading to the emergence and widespread usage of the language in the region. Colonial history also made the spread of this hybrid language to South Asia easier.

The use of Banglish not only facilitated intercultural communication but also contributed to social, political and economic development. It became so widespread that business names, advertisements and shop signs increasingly displayed mixed Bangla–English expressions.

3. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the most central concepts of contact linguistics, especially the frameworks of code-switching and borrowing and their contribution to the design and development of Banglish. Building on Poplack's (1980) typology of code-switching, we investigate how bilingual Bangla-English users switch between two languages with tag-switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching. This model helps to explain the structural conditions and syntactic environment where switching occurs, so we can identify structural constraints and syntactic mechanisms through which the switching occurs. The framework also supports discussion of how words in English become incorporated into the Bangla language when they are integrated through phonological, morphological, and semantic change. While code-switching and borrowing are still the subjects of debate, variationist approaches have been developed (Meechan & Poplack, 1995) to elucidate the quantitative and qualitative differences between these two types of contact phenomena. Although most of the theorists think that these two concepts are almost the same, Haspelmath (2009, pp. 40–41) points out the difference between code-switching and borrowing and mentions two ways to do it: 'frequency of use' and 'degree of integration or adaptation'.

Moreover, this paper draws on Myers-Scotton's model of Matrix Language Frame (MLF) and provides a structural basis to understand mixed Banglish. In the MLF model, one language, usually Bangla, provides the grammatical frame, whereas English is the embedded language that generates content morphemes. This model is particularly useful for understanding the structural stability of Banglish in which English lexical items are embedded in Bangla morphological and syntactic structures (Myers-Scotton, 1993). So, with these theoretical perspectives, Banglish can be viewed as a product of continuous bilingual contact, and these perspectives will help us to understand the linguistic development and sociolinguistic factors that lead to language mixing in Bangladesh.

3.1. Methodological approach

This study is qualitative, analytical, and comparative. It does not report newly collected experimental or participant data. Instead, it draws on the existing literature on Bangla-English contact and linguistic examples in the literature to identify recurring patterns of code-switching, borrowing, morphological integration, syntactic organization, and phonological adaptation. The analysis is guided by the contact-linguistic frameworks discussed above, primarily Poplack's typology of code-switching and Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model. Social and educational factors are considered as interpretive variables in the context of previous research that has shown the connection between them. Therefore, the study aims to develop a structured conceptual account of Banglish rather than make population-level quantitative claims.

4. Code-switching in Bangla: causes, contexts, and communicative functions

Research into Bangla-English language mixing has grown significantly in the past three decades, reflecting the growing interest in bilingual practices in South Asia. Banu and Sussex (2001) documented English use and code-switching in Bangladesh and discussed how globalization, education, and technological breakthroughs have contributed to increasing exposure to English, and the development of Banglish as a hybrid communicative variety. They emphasize that mixing Bangla and English is not random and is driven by social, cultural, and communicative factors. Alongside code-switching, borrowing has also made its way into the conversation of Banglish. Alam (2018), and Myers-Scotton (1993) suggest that English words can be fully integrated into Bangla through phonological and morphological change. English lexical items may take Bangla grammatical markers, illustrating the morphological integration of English elements into the Bangla grammatical frame (Myers-Scotton, 1993). For example, *meeting-ta* and *call-er* combine English lexical items with Bangla grammatical markers. However, many scholars have found it difficult to distinguish borrowing from code-switching in cases of single-word use. Malik (1994) proposed ten communicative functions to explain why speakers switch languages and used them as the basis for this study. The ten functions are summarized below (Alam, 2018, p. 5)

4.1. Lack of facility

This type of switching occurs when speakers are unable to find a word or expression in their native language and instead have to rely on the same word in the second language. For example, Muthusamy (2009, p.4) points out that Malay speakers may use the English term ‘social drinker’ because an exact parallel does not exist in Malay, as Malay culture has cultural restrictions on alcohol consumption.

4.2. Lack of register

In some cases, speakers switch to another language because the term in L2 more accurately conveys the desired meaning or sounds more appropriate than the one in L1. Malik (1994) illustrates this with the sentence, ‘La clase de hoy fue way over my head,’ in which the English expression ‘way over my head’ more precisely conveys the idea of being beyond one’s comprehension.

4.3. Mood of the speaker

A speaker’s emotional state can also cause code-switching. Strong emotions, such as anger, excitement, joy, fear, exhaustion, or distraction, can trigger a shift from one language to another. Crystal (1987), as cited in Skiba (1997), notes that emotional arousal is often a major factor in bilingual speakers’ language choices.

4.4. To emphasize a point

Speakers may switch languages to underscore an important idea or to enhance the effect of their message. Malik (1994) explains that repeating a statement first in L2 and then in L1 can enhance emphasis. Taha (2008, p. 341) observed that Arab teachers often present a point in English and then repeat it in Arabic to reinforce the explanation.

4.5. Habitual experience

Code-switching can also occur subconsciously as part of a speaker’s routine linguistic behavior. Things like ‘you know,’ ‘I mean,’ and ‘like’ may come naturally in discourse because speakers are used to using them.

4.6. Semantic significance

Speakers are free to switch languages to convey a particular social or linguistic nuance. Such deliberate use of L2 can convey a speaker’s attitude, communicative intention, or emotion more effectively. Choy (2011, p. 25), in his undergraduate thesis titled Functions and Reasons for code-switching on Facebook by UTAR English-Mandarin Chinese Bilingual Undergraduates, describes semantic significance as a ‘verbal strategy’ through which code-switching conveys meaningful linguistic and social information.

4.7. To show identity with a group

Code-switching can signal solidarity and group affiliation. Speakers may consciously switch languages to align themselves with a particular social community or create a sense of shared identity and empathy. According to Crystal (1987), this type of switching can help build rapport and make communication easier.

4.8. To address a different audience

Speakers can switch languages at the start of an interaction in order to connect to their audience or to get into the communicative mode. This may be the case with people from different linguistic backgrounds or even those who speak the same language (Malik, 1994).

4.9. Pragmatic reasons

Sometimes code-switching is used to draw attention to a new segment of the conversation or to signal a contextual shift. A speaker may start a discussion in L1 and switch to L2 in the next part to highlight a different context or topic.

4.10. To attract attention

Malik (1994) mentions that switching languages can also be a strategy to capture attention. For example, some Indian newspapers add non-English words to English articles to make headlines more noticeable. In spoken communication, teachers may similarly switch languages or even use the word 'attention' in L2 to refocus students' concentration.

5. Findings

The word *Banglish* (a mix of Bangla and English) appeared in Binary Barman's article 'I am not ashamed of speaking Banglish,' published in *The Daily Star's Campus* on 28 October 2007 (Uddin & Tabassum, 2022).

The prestige and social status associated with English can encourage Bangla speakers to incorporate English expressions into their speech by adding English phrases into their conversation. In the example below, it is clear that the interlocutor in his speech added the English words *student* and *ensured quality education* to his sentence in Bangla through insertional code-switching and creation of a hybrid sentence. It clearly demonstrates that the final product – hybrid linguistic units emerges from switches between languages.

(1) Student dhora rakhar pechone jeta beshi ensure korte hob eta holo quality education.
(Uddin & Tabassum, 2022)

The English equivalent is: 'To retain students, what needs to be ensured most is quality education.' The insertion of English lexical items into Bangla is a common feature of Banglish, with such items often integrated into Bangla morphological and syntactic structures (Tahereen, 2016a). Also, at higher education institutions, students may switch

spontaneously between codes, depending on the level of English language proficiency. Some examples provided by Alam (2018) are presented below:

(2) Eta korle apnara victimized hoben.- If you do this, you will be victimized.

Eta amader controller saheber jonno subidhajanak hobe- This will be convenient for our controller, sir.

Ei bishoyti simplified korte hobe - This matter needs simplification.

Amra ekta certain time diye dibo. -We will give a specific amount of time”. (Talukder, 2016)

What are the reasons for the prevalence of English vocabulary in Bangla, and particularly in academic communities? Suchana (2014, p. 88) argues that a major reason is that English expressions may make information, particularly difficult concepts, clearer to students. As a result, this method seems to assist students in understanding and memorizing the information in a more efficient manner. The sentences above are obvious examples of the frequent use of English vocabulary, which is the main reason for the hybridization of the Bangla language in the academic circle. Below are some other examples at a variety of levels for a better understanding of the development of hybrid Banglish.

5.2. Word-level hybridization

The sentence contains a single English word – ‘publish’ – inserted into a Bangla sentence. In this example, the word ‘publish’ is widely used in Bangla academic contexts. Original alternatives like ‘prokash kora’ are more or less common in institutional speech. Such frequent use can contribute to the integration of the item into Bangla. According to Poplack (1980, pp. 581–618), this type of single-word inclusion should be considered borrowing rather than code-switching.

(3)“Amader exam routine publish hoyese.” (Talukder, 2016) (Exam routine published — Bangla grammatical frame + English lexical items)

5.3. Sentence-level switching

Sentence-level switching differs from word-level switching because the switched units are complete sentences rather than individual lexical items. As Gumperz (1982, pp. 75–84) notes in *Discourse Strategies*, the first sentences are generally command-type sentences, and the second ones are generally used either to explain or to give a reason for the previously mentioned command. In the example below, two languages are used to increase clarity with a strict instruction, further reinforcing it with a Bangla sentence.

(4)“Stop writing. Somoy sesh.” (Talukder, 2016) (English clause + Bangla clause)

5.3 Clause-level switching. In this kind of switching, the speaker switches between the two languages at the level of clauses in the same discourse unit. In contrast to other types of switching, here the two parts are closely connected. Moreover, this type of switching requires good bilingual skills since the speaker has to handle two grammatical structures

at the same time and switch languages without violating syntax, while maintaining syntactic coherence.

(5) “I do not know. Ata kivabe korbo.” (Talukder, 2016) (English clause + Bangla clause)

5.4. Morphologically integrated hybrid structures

In this type of mixing, English words are not merely inserted into the sentence structure of Bangla but morphologically adapted. The example below shows hybridization where English lexical items are inserted into Bangla but controlled by Bangla grammar. In this example, Bangla functions as the matrix language, while English supplies lexical content.

(6) “Tomar barir interior ta onek sundor decorate and design koreso.” (Talukder, 2016)
Bangla grammar + English content words (interior, decorate, design)

Another important feature of Banglish is morphological integration and case marking. As English does not have morphological case markers, Banglish integrates English nouns into Bangla’s system of case marking, like genitive (–er / –r): class-er, dative (–ke / –r jonno): amake, accusative (–ke): friend-ke, locative (–e): bari-te. For example: class-er – genitive, amake – dative. Although English lacks such case forms, Banglish applies Bangla morphology to English stems.

(7) “Tomar friend ke dako.” (“Call your friend.”) shows the English noun friend taking the Bangla accusative marker ke. In Bangla, the marker ke follows animate nouns and other markers after inanimate nouns to indicate case. (Roberts, 1939, p. 153)

In some cases, sentences that are classified as Banglish are not identified only by borrowed lexicon, but also by code-switching. For example, the mixed English–Bangla sentence *Ami wish korte chai tinjon keamar mom*, Farhad’s mom and my baby’s mom *illustrates code-switching rather than borrowing* (Tahereen, 2016a, p. 153) and can be translated into Azerbaijani as:

(8) “Mən üç nəfəri görməyi arzu edirəm — öz anamı, Fərhadın anasını və körpəmin anasını”. (Soltanova, 2023).

For example, a structural comparison of Bangla and English shows that Bangla follows a Subject + Object + Verb pattern, while English follows a Subject + Verb + Object pattern. In Banglish, in addition to inter-sentential code-switching, every English-origin word adapts to Bangla grammatical structure and appears alongside markers specifying Bangla case categories. For another example:

(9) Then, from which mobile did he send us a text message?

The example illustrates the interaction of Bangla word order with English-origin lexical items. Its English counterpart is: ‘Then, from which mobile did he send us a text message?’ In Azerbaijani: ‘O zaman o kimin mobil telefonundan bizə sms göndərdi?’ (TermCoord, 2019). In both cases, mobile and sms are English words, but –ke is the dative case in Bangla. In plural formation, hybridization is also quite common. English words can be accompanied by English plural markers –s, –es and Bangla plural suffixes –

ra, -der. The way borrowed nouns form plurals can be an important checkpoint to see if borrowed nouns are borrowed from code-switching.

There are three strategies to pluralize borrowed words: oikomorphological, xenomorphological, and allomorphological. -- In the oikomorphological approach, no matter what language the noun is borrowed from, it takes the plural marker of its recipient language. For instance, the English word *koala*, borrowed from the Dharuk language, takes the English plural marker +s.

- Xenomorphological pluralization, on the other hand, puts the source language plural marker on the borrowed word and creates a new morphological category. For example, the Greek word *phenomenon* comes to English as *phenomena*, because the Greek +a ending is used (Roseano, 2013, p. 6).
- Allomorphological pluralization is different from the other two: nouns take neither the donor nor the recipient language marker. Instead, there is a new morphological form that reflects the features of both systems. This only happens when long-term intense contact leads to deep integration. These are observed in Balkan, Bolivian, and Yiddish languages. Oikomorphological pluralization is the most integrated form of language, while xenomorphological is the least. The example below shows xenomorphological pluralization in Banglish.

(a) *Ami apnader janabo amar ki plans ki hopes*

Its English version is: ‘I will let you know how many plans, hopes, and dreams I have.’ Closer examination shows that *plans* and *hopes* have their English plural forms (Tahereen, 2016b, p. 156). In the second example below, the words *student* and *awkward* are still the same, and in the mixed English-Bangla context, the English-originated noun *student* is integrated with Bangla plural morphology.

(b) *Awkward situation a porto her student der*

English equivalent: Students are pushed into an awkward situation. A few features can be seen in the verb structure in Banglish. In Bangla, simple, compound, and derived verb types are found in two parts: the lexical root and the auxiliary element. Both parts work together to express a single meaning (Roseano, 2013, p. 77). Words like *kora* (‘do’), *hova* (‘be’ / ‘occur’), and *deva* (‘give’) are used in Banglish with English verbs to produce fixed expressions mentioned below.

- c) – *EksiDenT kOra* (accident-do) – ‘to cause an accident’
- *EksiDenT hOwa* (accident-be) – ‘to have an accident’
- *ribhEnj newa* (revenge-take) – ‘to take revenge’
- *grup kOra* (group-do) – ‘to put persons/things into a group’
- *Ofish kOra* (office-do) – ‘to work in an office’
- *slow kOra* (slow-do) – ‘to slow down’
- *kOmpaTibOl hOwa* (compatible-be) – ‘to be compatible’
- *in kOra* (in-do) – ‘to put inside’
- *kOnfuz kOra* (confuse-do) – ‘to confuse’

– jasTify kOra (justify-do) – ‘to justify’ (Bhattacharja, 2010, p. 76)

In all these examples, the first element comes from English with a Bangla-adapted pronunciation, and the second element is a Bangla light verb, forming Banglish verbal compounds.

At the clause level, Banglish frequently reflects Bangla’s verb-final syntactic pattern. For instance, the English sentence ‘Abdullah had an accident’ follows a Subject + Verb + Object (SVO) structure. A key point is that not every Banglish verb can be replaced by a Bangla equivalent light verb. In many cases, the English element cannot be substituted by a Bangla verb without changing the meaning. For example, Bangla uses obhijog kora (‘to complain’), while Banglish also uses kOmplein kora (‘to complain’) (Bhattacharja, 2010, p. 76).

Similarly, although accident and durghOTona are near-synonyms, the expression durghOTona kora cannot replace EksiDenT kora (Bhattacharja, 2010, p. 76).

Another example is:

Fahim Riker kOmpleinTa kOnsiDar korbe (Fahim-Rik-Gen-complaint-Cl-consider-will do) – ‘Fahim will consider Rik’s complaint.’ (Bhattacharja, 2010, p. 78)

Here, kOmpleinTa and kOnsiDar originate from English. The English noun complaint appears as kOmpleinTa in Banglish, while consider appears as kOnsiDar. Both are fully adapted to Bangla phonology and morphology.

5.5. Phonological variation and social-educational factors

Phonological adaptation is an important aspect of Banglish. English-origin lexical items may not always retain their source-language pronunciation when they are embedded in Bangla speech. Tahereen (2016b) also points out that established and less established English-origin items can be nativized in Banglish through processes such as the realization of English diphthongs as Bangla monophthongs and the substitution of sounds that are not part of the Bangla phonological inventory. Such patterns suggest that phonological integration can be understood as a continuum in which some items are well adapted to Bangla phonology while others remain closer to an English model depending on the speaker and context.

Variation is also associated with speakers’ linguistic and educational backgrounds. For Bangladeshi tertiary students, Hoque (2012) found that local varieties and regional background influenced English sound patterns and that differences in exposure to English and familiarity with pronunciation norms contributed to variation. In Banglish, this means that pronunciation should not be considered a single fixed system. The degree of English-language contact, educational experience, communicative setting, and social environment may influence whether an English-origin form is pronounced in a more nativized Bangla-like form or in a form closer to English pronunciation. The reviewer’s observation that the pronunciation of the label Banglish might vary illustrates the broader issue: its pronunciation may vary according to Bangla phonology and actual speech practice. The present article does not present a categorical pronunciation rule for Banglish, because it does not contain acoustic or recorded speech data. Determining the distribution of such variants would require phonological data from recorded speakers from different educational, regional, and social backgrounds.

6. Hybrid verb constructions

Banglish frequently creates hybrid verb constructions by combining an English lexical base with Bangla light verbs like *kora* (to do), *howa* (to become), *newa* (to take) with English lexical bases, forming stable hybrid expressions:

- (10) a) accident *kora* – “to cause an accident”
- (b) revenge *newa* – “to take revenge”
- (c) slow *kora* – “to slow down”
- (d) justify *kora* – “to justify”

In the examples above, Bangla provides the syntactic structure and English content morphemes because Bangla grammar requires a full word in a predicate position, and speakers add Bangla light verbs to the English root because English lexical roots cannot function as verbs in Bangla grammar without getting adapted to Bangla verbal morphology.

These constructions mirror typical Bangla compound verb patterns even when the lexical base is English.

However, not all English verbs can be paired with Bangla light verbs, and some hybrid forms do not allow for full substitution with native Bangla equivalents. Bhattacharja (2010, pp. 76–78) illustrates these restrictions through constructions involving *kOmplein kora* (‘to complain’) and its Bangla counterpart *obhijog kora*. Both mean ‘to complain’, but they are not fully interchangeable due to structural constraints.

6.1. Limitations and directions for empirical research

A major limitation of this study is that it is largely analytical and literature-based. The linguistic examples in this paper are derived from published sources and are used to demonstrate structural tendencies rather than to estimate the frequency of phonological variation across the Bangladeshi population. So we cannot statistically test the relationship between phonological variation and social position, regional background, educational level, educational policy, teaching method, and intensity of English use. Future research should collect original data through recorded speech, interviews, structured pronunciation tasks, and larger corpora. A mixed-methods approach might be used to compare speakers across educational levels and social or regional backgrounds to investigate how patterns change over time. Such work would allow the phonological observations discussed in this article to be tested and would clarify which features are stable characteristics of Banglish and which remain speaker- or context-dependent.

7. Conclusion

The analysis presented in this study demonstrates that Banglish has emerged through sustained and multifaceted contact between Bangla and English, resulting in a hybrid linguistic system shaped by historical, social, and communicative forces. The comparative investigation of Bangla and English structures shows that although the two languages belong to distinct linguistic families, prolonged interaction – intensified

during and after colonial rule – has produced a wide range of mixed forms at lexical, morphological, and syntactic levels. These hybrid structures are not accidental or random; rather, they reflect patterned linguistic behavior that is grounded in speakers' communicative needs, identity construction, and the sociocultural environment in which bilingualism develops.

The paper highlights that code-switching plays a central role in the formation of Banglish. Drawing on foundational frameworks such as Poplack's typology, Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model, and Malik's communicative functions, the analysis shows that language alternation is driven by both structural and social motivations. Speakers switch languages to fill lexical gaps, express emotional nuance, emphasize key points, mark group identity, or accommodate specific communicative contexts. These functions work together to explain why Bangla-English bilinguals consistently alternate between linguistic codes, producing hybrid utterances that are intelligible, meaningful, and socially functional within their communities.

Borrowing further contributes to the stabilization of Banglish. Words of English origin increasingly undergo phonological and morphological integration into Bangla, take case markers and plural suffixes, and interact with Bangla verblight verb constructions. This demonstrates that certain English items have become fully naturalized within Bangla's grammatical system, blurring the boundary between temporary code-switches and permanent lexical borrowings. The existence of hybrid verb compounds, mixed noun phrases, and structurally fused sentence patterns illustrates the depth of integration and shows that Banglish operates as a coherent linguistic variety rather than an inconsistent mixture.

The socio-historical backdrop also plays a key role in shaping Banglish. British colonial rule, migration to the United Kingdom, global cultural flows, and the prestige attached to English have all created environments in which Bangla-English mixing became socially meaningful and increasingly normalized. As bilingualism expanded – especially among urban youth – Banglish evolved from a casual communicative strategy to a recognizable hybrid system used across social, educational, and technological domains. Its presence in media, advertisements, digital communication, and daily speech reflects its growing acceptance, not only among bilingual speakers but also among monolingual communities who have become familiar with its mixed forms.

This study shows that Banglish is a dynamic product of language contact: structural processes of code-switching and borrowing are combined with sociolinguistic factors related to identity, globalization, education, social background, and communicative efficiency. The hybridization of Bangla and English demonstrates the ways in which languages change in response to social circumstances and the ways in which bilingual speakers use linguistic resources to navigate complex cultural landscapes. Rather than viewing Banglish in terms of linguistic decay or corruption, this paper presents it as an integrated and culturally meaningful outcome of multilingual interaction. The present literature-based study cannot establish the frequency or social distribution of phonological variants. In the future, interviews, recorded speech, corpus data, and sociolinguistic variables such as educational level, regional background, social position, and intensity of English use

should be examined to investigate how Banglish pronunciation and other structural features vary across speakers and over time.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Aysel Soltanova  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2292-8569>

References

- Alam, F. (2018). English in Bangladesh and the issue of identity. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh (Humanities)*, 63(1), 67–84.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, C. Emerson & M. Holquist, ed.). University of Texas Press.
- Banu, R., & Sussex, R. (2001). English in Bangladesh after independence: Dynamics of policy and practice. In B. Moore (Ed.), *Who's centric now? The present state of post-colonial englishes* (pp. 122–147). South Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bhattacharj, S. (2010). Benglish verbs: A case of code-mixing in Bengali. In Ryo Otoguro, Kiyoshi Ishikawa, Hiroshi Umemoto, Kei Yoshimoto, & Yasunari Harada (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation (PACLIC 24)* (pp. 75–84). Sendai, Japan: Institute of Digital Enhancement of Cognitive Processing, Waseda University, Tohoku University.
- Choy, W. F. (2011). *Functions and reasons for code-switching on Facebook by UTAR English-mandarin Chinese bilingual undergraduates [Final year project]*. Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman].
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook* (pp. 35–54). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1515/9783110218442.35
- Hoque, M. A. (2012). The influence of the local varieties on the sound patterns of English: A case study of Bangladeshi tertiary students. *IIUC Studies*, 7, 197–220. doi:10.3329/iiucs.v7i0.12268
- Literariness. (2016). *Homi Bhabha's concept of hybridity*. Literariness. <https://literariness.org/2016/04/08/homi-bhabhas-concept-of-hybridity/>.
- Malik, L. (1994). *Socio-linguistics: A study of code-switching*. Anmol Publications.
- Meechan, M., & Poplack, S. (1995). Orphan categories in bilingual discourse: Adjectivization strategies in wolof-french and fongbe-french. *Language Variation and Change*, 7(2), 169–194. doi:10.1017/S0954394500000971
- Muthusamy, P. (2009). Communicative functions and reasons for code switching: A Malaysian perspective.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, S. (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. doi:10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581
- Roberts, M. H. (1939). The problem of the hybrid language. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 38, 23–41.

- Roseano, P. (2013). Can morphological borrowing be an effect of codeswitching? Evidence from the inflectional morphology of borrowed nouns in Friulian. *Probus*, 26(1), 1–57. doi:10.1515/probus-2013-0007
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code-switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(10).
- Soltanova, A. (2023). On analysis of language units in linguistic system of Banglish language. *Journal of Baku Engineering University - Philology and Pedagogy*, 7(1), 62–68.
- Stockhammer, P. W. (Ed.). (2012). *Conceptualizing cultural hybridization: A transdisciplinary approach*. Springer.
- Suchana, A. A. (2014). Code switching of bilinguals in content area classrooms at tertiary level. *Journal of SUB*, 5(1), 77–89.
- Taha, T. A. (2008). Language alternation in university classrooms. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35, 336–346.
- Tahereen, T. (2016a). Banglish: Code-switching and contact induced language change in a spoken variety of bangla. *Spectrum: Journal of the Department of English*, 12, 143–164.
- Tahereen, T. (2016b). Banglish: Contact-induced changes in a spoken variety of Bangla. *Spectrum: Journal of the Department of English, University of Dhaka*, 12, 143–165.
- Talukder, A. A. L. A. (2016). Code switching - pragmatic aspect in everyday life in Bangladesh. *Prime University Journal*, 10(1), 133–155.
- TermCoord. (2019). Banglish: A new hybrid language. *TermCoord*. Retrieved from <https://termcoord.eu/2019/03/banglish-a-new-hybrid-language/>.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. University of California Press.
- Uddin, M. F., & Tabassum, M. (2022). Code switching in joint venture Bangla movies: Why movie characters switch codes? *Asian Journal of Social Science and Management Technology*, 4(2). <https://www.ajssmt.com/Papers/4298109.pdf>.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Young, R. J. C. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race*. Routledge.