Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Analyzing Grammatical Categorization of English Code Mixing in TV Talk Shows: A Study of Political Discourse

[1]Amna Chachar and [2]Dr. Zohaib Zahid

1. MPhil Scholar, Department of English Linguistics, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Sub Campus Rahim Yar Khan, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. 2. Assistant Professor, Department of English Linguistics, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Sub Campus Rahim Yar Khan, Punjab, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author** | zohaib.zahid@iub.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

This study examines the grammatical distribution of the English lexical insertions in Urdu political talk programmes in Pakistan. A descriptive qualitative design was used to carefully select, transcribe and screen 31 public talk show episodes with English words incorporated into Urdu. The items collected were divided into nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and phrases to illustrate the distributional relationships. Ten tables were then used for frequency reporting. In general, verbs and nouns dominate the data set, indicating a preference for describing English behaviors, attitudes, and institutional ideas. Adverbs and adjectives are less common, but they support assessment and emphasis, as opposed to phrases, which are rarely used and imply a preference for technical or political terminology.

| **KEYWORDS** | English Code-Mixing, Political Talk Shows, Grammatical Categorization, Media Discourse |

Introduction

Pakistan's media environment reflects everyday multilingual realities, where Urdu is typically the main code while English is frequently inserted to mark institutional language, professional register, and political terminology. Political talk shows provide a particularly visible setting for this mixing: hosts and guests move between Urdu and English to explain policy issues, frame arguments, and project authority. English holds symbolic and practical value in Pakistan because of its association with education, governance, and socio-economic mobility (Rahman, 2010). While prior research has documented motivations and social meanings of code-mixing in Pakistani media, comparatively fewer studies focus on the grammatical shape of English insertionsi.e., which parts of speech appear most often and how that pattern aligns with political talk-show communication (Jabeen, Mahmood, & Rasheed, 2011). To address this gap, the present study classifies English items embedded in Urdu talk-show discourse into grammatical categories and reports their distribution. By concentrating on grammatical categorization, the study complements functional accounts of code-mixing and helps clarify what types of English items are most productive in televised political interaction.

Literature Review

Code-mixing is widely studied in sociolinguistics as a patterned practice in bilingual communication. Rather than being random, mixing often follows structural constraints and also indexes social meanings such as prestige, identity, and audience design (Myers-Scotton, 1993).

Code-Mixing in Bilingual and Multilingual Contexts

Structural approaches argue that bilingual speakers mix languages in rulegoverned ways. Poplack (1980) highlights that switches are typically constrained by syntactic compatibility, while Myers-Scotton's (1993) Matrix Language Frame model explains how a dominant "matrix" language provides the grammatical frame into which elements from an "embedded" language are inserted. Muysken (2000) further differentiates types of bilingual mixing and shows that insertional patterns are especially relevant where a dominant code shapes sentence structure.

Code-Mixing in the Pakistani Sociolinguistic Context

Urdu is the national language of Pakistan, while English has official and institutional status; English has become a marker of authority and of elite access in the bureaucracy, in education, and in the media, where it is used in public discussion of issues (Rahman 2010). Given the historical and global pressures on the presence of English in elite and institutions, it is reflected in public communications, as is evident in English use in Pakistani media reports about governance, politics, and international issues, which appear to combine functional need and symbolic value (Jabeen et al. 2011).

Code-Mixing, Power, and Institutional Discourse

In political discourse, language choice is associated with credibility and institutional consistency. English may serve as a symbolic capital in post-colonial contexts, especially when speakers are talking about governing systems or globally circulating political concepts.In televised talk shows, such insertions may therefore work as resources for precision, positioning, and authority rather than mere stylistic variation.

Media Discourse and the Normalization of Code-Mixing

Language practices are both reflected in and stabilized by media through repetition. English insertions may seem commonplace and expected if one is regularly exposed to mixed talk-show discourse. According to earlier research, anchors usually use English when moderating intricate discussions or using technical terms (Kamran, 2017). Similar results from other multilingual media contexts demonstrate that English insertions are frequently linked to professionalism and modernity and have the potential to gradually alter audience expectations (Mukenge, 2012; Al-Mulhim, 2014). However, studies warn that an over-reliance on English may make content less accessible to audiences who speak the language less well (Tehseem, 2014).

Code-Mixing as a Resource for Identity and Social Positioning

Code-mixing does identity work in addition to institutional meanings. Language decisions can convey social positioning, stance, and group membership (Wardhaugh, 1992; Myers-Scotton, 1993). In Pakistani public discourse, Urdu implies national accessibility, whereas English may imply education and fluency (Rahman, 2010). Other scholars argue that blending enables speakers to negotiate identity through the hybrid, or third, space of the linguistic interaction between local and global resources (Casielles-Suarez, 2017), as is common in political media, for example, where presenters balance the need for audience reach with authority.

Grammatical Categorization in Code-Mixing

While the motivations for mixing are well-documented, grammatical categorization is more concerned with the *what* (types of elements inserted: nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, phrases) and the *how often* (frequency of insertion). Structural models explain that these insertions are not arbitrary: integration and distribution are usually limited by the

matrix language (Poplack, 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Muysken, 2000). The grammatical profile of the inserted English items provides a concrete way to describe the structure of mixing in televised political discourse.

Material and Methods

To examine natural language practices in media discourse, this study uses a descriptive qualitative design (Creswell, 2009; Leavy, 2017). The dataset consists of 31 publicly available recordings of political talk shows in Pakistan. These recordings were selected through purposive sampling to ensure clear examples of code-mixing between English and Urdu. We extracted English words used in Urdu speech from the transcriptions of these episodes. These items were classified into nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and multi-word phrases using content analysis. We summarized the distribution patterns by calculating frequencies (Creswell, 2014). There were no direct human participants in the study. All sources were taken from broadcasts that were accessible to the public. By using the content responsibly and giving proper credit to the sources, we upheld ethical practices.

Data Analysis

In order to identify English words used in Urdu discourse, transcripts were analyzed. To establish which parts of speech were most common in the data set, items were first coded according to grammatical category and then quantified. Ten tables show the results of the categorized data.

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives

Sr. No.		NOUNS		VERBS			ADJECTIVES		
		F	%	Word	F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Ability	1	0.02	Abandon	1	0.02	Absolute	2	0.04
2.	Absconder	1	0.02	Absorb	1	0.02	Academic	3	0.06
3.	Abuse	2	0.04	Abstain	1	0.02	Acceptable	3	0.06
4.	Academy	1	0.02	Accept	10	0.21	Accessible	1	0.02
5.	Acceptability	1	0.02	Accepted	1	0.02	Accountable	1	0.02

Table 1 shows that among the listed English nouns, verbs, and adjectives, the verb "Accept" is the most frequent item (10; 0.21%). The adjective "Academic" appears the most among adjectives (3; 0.06%), while "Abuse" leads the noun list in this table (2; 0.04%). Most remaining items occur only once, indicating a scattered distribution for this set.

Table 2
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Adverbs and Phrases

Sr. No.		ADVERB		PHRASES		
		F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Absolutely	5	0.10	About turn	1	0.02
2.	Academically	1	0.02	Accidental incidents	1	0.02
3.	According	1	0.02	Accountability court	1	0.02
4.	Accordingly	1	0.02	Accumulated losses	1	0.02
5.	Accurately	1	0.02	Across the board	1	0.02

Table 2 shows that in the category of adverbs and phrases, the adverb "Absolutely" occurs most frequently (5; 0.10%). The rest of the adverbs appear only once each, and all phrases listed in this table occur one time (0.02%), suggesting that phrase-level insertions are comparatively less repeated in this portion of the data.

Table 3
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives

Sr. No.		NOUNS		VERBS			ADJECTIVES		
		F	%	Word	F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Access	6	0.12	Accommodate	1	0.02	Accurate	2	0.04
2.	Account	9	0.19	Accuse	1	0.02	Active	4	0.08

3.	Accountability	3	0.06	Achieve	12	0.25	Actual	2	0.04
4.	Accounts	3	0.06	Acknowledge	1	0.02	Additional	3	0.06
5.	Accusation	1	0.02	Activate	1	0.02	Administrative	7	0.15

Table 3 shows that within this set of English nouns, verbs, and adjectives, the verb "Achieve" has the highest frequency (12; 0.25%). Among nouns, "Account" is most frequent (9; 0.19%), and "Administrative" is the leading adjective (7; 0.15%). Overall, this table reflects more repetition than Table 1, especially for institutional and action-related items.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Adverbs and Phrases

Sr. No.	ADVERB			PHRASES		
		F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Actually	12	0.25	Act of war	6	0.12
2.	Administratively	1	0.02	Action plan	2	0.04
3.	Again	5	0.10	Active politics	1	0.02
4.	Almost	3	0.06	Acts of Parliament	1	0.02
5.	Already	12	0.25	Actual integrity	1	0.02

Table 4 shows that the adverb "Actually" is highly prominent (12; 0.25%) compared to the other adverbs listed. In phrases, "Act of war" appears most often (6; 0.12%), while the remaining phrases occur less frequently. This indicates stronger repetition patterns for discourse markers and selected policy-related phrases.

Table 5
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives

Sr. No.	NOUNS			VERBS			ADJECTIVES		
		F	%	Word	F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Accusations	1	0.02	Add	13	0.28	Affective	2	0.04
2.	Achievement	3	0.06	Address	10	0.21	Aggressive	2	0.04
3.	Achievements	2	0.04	Adjust	1	0.02	Agreed	4	0.08
4.	Acknowledgement	3	0.06	Admit	2	0.04	Alien	1	0.02
5.	Act	3	0.06	Admitted	2	0.04	Alleged	1	0.02

Table 5 demonstrates a clear preference for English action verbs, with the verb "Add" appearing most frequently among the items listed (13; 0–28 percent). The most common noun in the category is "Achievement" (3; 0.06 percent), and the most common adjective is "Agreed" (4; 0.08 percent). A few items appear more than once, according to the overall distribution.

Table 6
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Adverbs and Phrases

Sr. No.	ADVERB			PHRASES		
		F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Analytically	1	0.02	Economic advisors	1	0.02
2.	Annually	1	0.02	Economic advisory	1	0.02
3.	Anyhow	2	0.04	Economic affairs	1	0.02
4.	Anyway	1	0.02	Economic collapse	1	0.02
5.	Apparently	2	0.04	Economic condition	1	0.02

Table 6 demonstrates that this group of adverbs and phrases continues to have comparatively low frequencies. The majority of other adverbs only appear once, while the most common item is the adverb "Anyhow" (2; 0.04%). The fact that every phrase in this table appears just once (0.02 percent) indicates that phrase-level insertions in this section of the dataset are not frequently repeated.

Table 7
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives

Sr. No.	NOUNS			VERBS			ADJECTIVES		
		F	%	Word	F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Action	18	0.38	Adopt	1	0.02	Alternate	5	0.10
2.	Actions	1	0.02	Advance	2	0.04	American	5	0.10
3.	Actives	1	0.02	Advise	7	0.15	Angry	1	0.02
4.	Activities	4	0.08	Advocate	1	0.02	Annual	1	0.02
5.	Activity	1	0.02	Affect	7	0.15	Anti	1	0.02

The noun–verb–adjective category has a more pronounced concentration of repeated items in Table 7. The most prevalent noun in this set is "Action," which occurs the most frequently overall (18; 0.38 percent). The most common verb is advise (7; 0.15 percent) and the most common adjective is alternative (5; 0.10 percent). A stronger concentration around the governance and procedural vocabulary is seen in this table.

Table 8
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Adverbs and Phrases

Sr. No.	ADVERB		PHRASES		
		F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Artificially	1	0.02	Economic crisis	3	0.06
2.	Aside	1	0.02	Economic health	1	0.02
3.	Automatically	1	0.02	Economic imperatives	1	0.02
4.	Basically	13	0.28	Economic indicator	2	0.04
5.	Better	1	0.02	Economic instability	1	0.02

Table 8 shows that the most frequently used adjective is essentially (13; 0.28 percent), which indicates its function as a typical explanatory or framing adjective in talk show discourse. The most common phrase is economic crisis (3; 0.06 percent), while most other phrases appear only once or twice. In this table, adjectives are generally more repeated than phrases.

Table 9
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Nouns, Verbs, and Adjectives

Sr. No.	NOUNS		VERBS			ADJECTIVES		
		F	%	Word	F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Actualization	1	0.02	Afford	2	0.04	Anxious	1	0.02
2.	Addition	5	0.10	Agree	31	0.67	Apolitical	3	0.06
3.	Adjustment	3	0.06	Allege	2	0.04	Appreciable	1	0.02
4.	Adjustments	1	0.02	Allow	3	0.06	Appropriate	1	0.02
5.	Administration	5	0.10	Allowed	2	0.04	Armed	1	0.02

Table 9 shows one of the strongest high-frequency patterns in the dataset: the verb Agree appears most often (31; 0.67 percent), followed by apolitical (3; 0.06 percent), the most frequent adjective, and Addition and Administration, the most frequent nouns (both 5; 0.10 percent). The English insertions shown here are heavily influenced by verbs related to stance and formal institutional nouns, as this table illustrates.

Table 10
Frequency and Percentage of English Code-Mixed Adverbs and Phrases

Sr. No.	ADVERB		PHRASES		
		F	%	Word	F	%
1.	Blatantly	1	0.02	Economic issues	1	0.02
2.	Briefly	1	0.02	Economic performance	1	0.02
3.	Carefully	1	0.02	Economic policy	1	0.02
4.	Categorically	3	0.06	Economic reform package	1	0.02
5.	Cautiously	2	0.04	Economic revival	2	0.04

Table 10 shows that the most common adverb is Categorically (3; 0.06 percent), which suggests the strongest position. The most common phrase is Economic revival (2; 0.04 percent), whereas most of the others occur only once. While Table 9 shows a higher instance of verb repetition, this table shows generally selective phrase insertion with minimal repetition.

Discussion

When looking at high frequency items, verbs involving agreement and stance (e.g. The g. agree, accept) are frequently found, while nouns related to institutional discourse and governance (e.g. appear, indicating that formal political concepts used in official and media registers are readily summarized in English. Adjectives and adverbs are less common but still play an important role; adverbs such as basically, actually, and categorically are stance markers, intensifiers, or discourse management tools, whereas adjectives often evaluate policies or actors. Phrases are still relatively rare and often connected to technical or policy

topics (e.g. The g. economic expressions), suggesting selective insertion where the intended institutional meaning cannot be expressed with a single word. In summary, the findings show that English code mixing in Urdu political talk shows is systematic and planned, that the predominance of verbs and nouns indicates that Urdu retains the grammatical framework of interaction while English is used for propositional content actions, processes, and institutional references, which is in accordance with structural accounts of insertional mixing that emphasize matrix language control (Myers Scotton 1993; Muysken 2000), and that evaluative adjectives and stance-marking adverbs indicate that English is used for rhetorical positioning, which is in accordance with the communicative functions of arguing, qualifying, and intensifying in political talk show settings, as well as professional authority indexed by institutional English in Pakistan (Rahman 2010).

Conclusion

The results of this study show that English code is mixed into Urdu political talk shows in Pakistan, with English items being grouped by grammatical categories that support political discourse, with verbs and nouns predominating, while adverbs, adjectives, and phrases are used in supporting roles for evaluation, emphasis, and technical reference.

Recommendations

Media professionals and talk show hosts may take audience-sensitive language choices Media professionals and talk show hosts may consider audience-sensitive language choices, omitting superfluous insertions when Urdu equivalents exist and using English where it provides precision. Future research could expand the dataset and compare channels, program genres, or speaker roles to study how grammatical patterns vary across context.

References

Al-Mulhim, A. A. (2014). The role of media in promoting code-switching and code-mixing among Saudi speakers. *International Journal of Linguistics, 6(4), 128–145.*

Casielles-Suarez, E. (2017). Functions of code-mixing in bilingual discourse. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 38(6), 1–15.*

Creswell, J. W. (2009*). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Jabeen, F., Mahmood, K., & Rasheed, A. (2011). Code-switching in Pakistani media discourse: *A sociolinguistic analysis. Journal of Media Studies*, *26(2), 45–62.*

Kachru, B. B. (1986). The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models for Non-Native Englishes. *Oxford: Oxford University Press. 17(1)*

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes 2000: Resources for research and teaching. *English World-Wide, 18(2), 209–251.*

Kamran, M. (2017). English-Urdu code-switching in Pakistani television talk shows. *Pakistan Journal of Applied Linguistics, 20(1), 89–102.*

Leavy, P. (2017). Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches. *Nw York NY: Guilford Publications. 47(1)*

Mukenge, S. (2012). Code-switching and code-mixing in African media discourse. *Journal of African Cultural Studies*, *24(1), 45–59.*

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing.* Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa.* Oxford University Press.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y terminoenespañol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18(7-8), 581–618.*

Rahman, T. (2010). *Language and politics in Pakistan.* Oxford University Press.

Rasul, S. (2009). Language shift in Pakistan: English as a dominant language. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences, 29(1), 1–15.*

Tehseem, T. (2014). Impact of English code-mixing on comprehension of political discourse. *Journal of Language and Communication, 8(2), 33–47.*

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.