

---

**A STUDY OF MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS FOR CODE SWITCHING  
IN GLAMOUR DISCOURSE**

---

*Fouzia Rehman Khan  
Ghulam Ali Buriro  
Muhammad Abdullah*

**ABSTRACT**

*Code switching in the conversation takes place in bi/tri/multilingual societies. Factors like context, social distance, values and attitude of the people in a social interaction determine the nature of the code switching. In the context of Pakistani discourse, code switching exists in the use of Urdu (unmarked language) and English (marked language) in general among the educated class mostly in formal interactions. Present research has focused the genre of glamour discourse in a formal gathering for the discovery of social motivational factors behind the code switching in these social interactions through the framework of Mayer Scotton's Markedness Model. The study reveals the nature of switching between marked and unmarked languages in the glamour discourse in the perspective of motivational factors which are controlled by the prevalent circumstances and cultural norms subject to the participants (speaker, listener, audience etc.) of the discourse.*

---

**Keywords:** Motivational Factors, Code Switching, Glamour, Discourse.

**INTRODUCTION**

Bilingual/multilingual interactions involve alternation between two languages. This switch in languages can be an expected and unmarked or unexpected and a marked one according to the situation, mutual relationship of the participants, social distance, values of the society and attitudes of the people beside many other factors. In other words code switching is seldom without an explicit or implicit motivation even if it is the case of borrowing from the other languages in order to fill in the lexical gaps. Code switching is just not a companion of multilingualism but an interaction strategy with functions and effects 'as well as an indicator of larger societal, political and ideological developments' (Meeuwis & Blommaert, 1994:387). In Pakistani context code switching is understood as a combination of Urdu and English. Such an

understanding encompasses the sociolinguistic phenomenon of borrowing in the day-to-day speech.

The present study explores the social motivational factors in a piece of glamour discourse, which is taken from Hum TV awards 2016. The award ceremony was telecasted on Hum TV, a private TV channel of Pakistan. Such events are glamour laden and star studded. The unmarked or the matrix language of these shows is Urdu but it has been observed that the participants alternate their code and switch to the marked language, which is English. This switch is of different kinds ranging from one word to a sequence of sentences in marked language. This phenomenon shall be explored through the symbolic approach to code switching, through the framework of Mayer Scotton's Markedness Model.

#### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The study focuses on the exploration of motivational factors behind code switching by the media celebrities and the anchors during star studded award Shows on private channels in Pakistan through Scotton's Markedness Model. The model derives from Gumperz definition of code switching as an interactional strategy and Elster's Rational Choice Model (1989), who argued that when individuals are encountered with various courses of activities, they code switch. Scotton's markedness model accounts for the socio-psychological motivation behind code switching. According to this model the interpretation of choice of code can be marked or unmarked. Markedness model of Scotton is one of the most significant but controversial sociolinguistic perspective on bilingualism that focuses on the social indexical motivation for code switching.

#### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What are the motivational factors in the selection of marked and unmarked languages in Urdu and English bilingual interactions?
2. How far the use of marked language becomes unavoidable in such interactions?

#### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. To determine the factors which decide for the selection between two languages in a bilingual interaction during a glamour discourse.
2. To find out the significance of marked language during code switching in such interactions.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Code switching is a usual phenomenon in bilingual interaction but the motivational factors and reasons behind alternation between the languages need to be explored in different kinds of interactions. This study is significant as it tries to investigate a newer area of code switching in glamour discourses during Red Carpet Receptions. The code switching in such shows is meaning making and is indicative of negotiation of identities, thus it is an interesting interactional site for exploration of four dimensions of code switching as given by Mayer Scotton in his Markedness Model.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Code switching is an alternative use of two varieties of one language or using two different languages at a single speech event. According to Smith (2000), there are two-research perspectives of code switching. One is the linguistic, the other is the extra-linguistic. The linguistic includes phonology, morphology and syntax i.e. the grammatical factor whereas the extra-linguistic refers to the social meanings as conveyed by code switching i.e. the social factors.

Studies in code switching from a sociolinguistic perspective started with Bloom and Gumperz who tried to find out the social meaning of code switching. Through their initial works they introduced the two basic kinds of code switching i.e. situational and metaphorical. One of the even earlier studies on the subject was by George Barker who worked on Mexican American in Tusson, Arizona, and studied the reason behind the use of ancestral language on one occasion and English on another, among the bilinguals in the community. Barker suggested in the study that the family conversation or the conversation with the other intimates was in Spanish while in formal occasions when the interaction was with Anglo Americans, English became the language of communication even if all the participants knew and understood Spanish. Younger generation was found to be explicitly more multilingual than the elder members of the community. Later, to Barker's findings, Weinreich commented that Barker mentioned only four situations like formal, informal, intimate and intergroup discourse and termed the description as insufficient. Weinreich proposes the possession of two separate language system by the bilinguals that alternate on separate occasions (Nilep, 2006).

Vogot (1954), calls code switching a psychological phenomenon rather than linguistic one, and therefore natural for bi/multilingual which can be called as interference. Ferguson and Fishman concept of diglossia as highly specified and compartmentalized use of two varieties of

language, when there is no switching to the other variety if domain of use need some variety, has a bearing on the situational type of code switching as described by Gumperz. Gumperz's work is considered the most influential in the study of code switching. He worked on Indian languages and their dialects and along with Bloom studied the functionality of Bokmal and Ranamal, the two dialects spoken in Norway. It was the work of these two sociolinguists who differentiated between the situational and metaphorical code switching.

Ethnographic observational studies like the ones done by Heller in Quebec tried to explore the economics of bilingualism and viewed CS as a political strategy –found that dominant groups maintain their symbolic dominance through the choice of the language. Rampton who defined crossing as a way of code switching, to identify oneself as the member of the other ethnic group, has studied the functionality of code switching ethnically. According to Rampton, crossing adds another dimension to the interpretation of code switching (Nilep, 2006).

Cashmen (2008), discusses two approaches for studying any bilingual phenomenon. One is the symbolic approach and the other is the sequential approach. Scotton's markedness model comes under the symbolic approach which holds that the use of certain language carries a specific symbolic meaning, exploited by the speaker in an interaction, whereas the sequential approach sees the choice of language in the sequences of the ongoing conversation which itself becomes meaningful.

Most of the work on motivational factors behind code switching is influenced by Gumperz's pioneering studies in the field. Researchers have exploited both the approaches, symbolic as well as sequential approach to code switching. Bloom and Gumperz (1972), studied a bidialectal community of Norway and observed that the two dialects Ranamal and Bokmal are switched on different occasions. For instance it was observed that the members of the community speak Bokmal with the outsiders like the tourist and the researcher. Most interestingly the teacher teaches in Bokmal but for class discussion switches to Ranamal. People were found to be using Bokmal in the offices as long as they were engaged in some work discussion but for informal talks, they would switch back to Ranamal. The choice between the two codes was regulated socially; they further found that the switching depicted the beliefs, values and attitudes of people.

Gumperz explains 'what was normal usage for some in some situations counted as marked for others. Marked forms moreover tended to be used to convey indirect inferences (Gumperz, 1982, cited in

Cashmen (2008:277). On the basis of this groundwork Gumperz and Bloom suggested the presence of we code and they code or in-group and out-group codes respectively. The community that they studied was bi-dialectal but the findings can be extended to bilingual communities too. From this extension they gave the differentiation between situational and metaphorical code switching, where the situational code switching is a clear change of rights and obligations of the participants as perceived by them, so situational code switching takes place where there are stable norms as for the use of language. On the other hand the metaphorical code switching does not involve the change of situation but the switch is socially significant and meaningful. The meaning is understood on the basis of shared society- its varieties and related identities. Metaphorical code switching is using of an unexpected variety/language in a specific situation where the choice appears to be marked. Besides these Gumperz also referred to contextualization cues through which the communication goes on between the speakers and the listeners as they make meaning of the preceding and the following sentence. Many linguistic features can provide this contextualization cues and switching of language variety is one of them. Such a switch is understood through shared awareness of their function. The social structure of any society can be explored through the conversational behavior of its members, which is reflected in their day-to-day interaction.

Scotton (1993:476), believes that Code Switching is always socially motivated. This may include, but in few of the cases those instances when the switch to the marked code is due to their failure in the complete use of the unmarked code. At an individual level it's a 'creative act' and socially a 'negotiation of public face'.

Mayer Scotton's has based her markedness model on Gumperz use of the term code switching as an interaction strategy and the model also takes insight from Rational Choice model of Elster. Both the models are related to making the choice of language among two or more in a society for specific interaction.

Moradi (2014), comments on the Markedness Model as based on the premise that both the speaker and the analyst are well aware of the marked and the unmarked languages and appropriacy in the choice, this appropriacy is the presence of markedness evaluator that assesses markedness. Two kinds of abilities are needed to conceive markedness, one is to identify that the marked choice of the language is interpreted differently and the other is the ability to recognize that the choice of the

language falls in a continuum from unmarked to more marked depending on a type of discourse. These abilities are acquired through their contact with the codes as they live in the society and they get to know the right setting for the use of marked and unmarked language.

According to Scotton (cited in Moradi, 2014), the speaker's opportunity set consists of his linguistics repertoire, which is constituted by different languages. Minimal responses and turn-taking are part of the opportunity set and the linguistic repertoire. The code choices he makes in the interaction are thus conscious and mindful. Meyer Scotton while using this theory for the analysis of instances of Code Switching in conversation believed that speakers are reasonable in the sense of making choices for the use of particular code, and this choice is based on the assessment of the possible options in particular situation with a consideration about subjective motivations, attitudes, beliefs along with their temporary goals and desires.

Some of the popular works based on Scotton's Markedness Model as cited in Cashmen, 2008, are that of Jorgenson (1998) in which he studied the interactional behavior of Turkish children in Denmark, where their language didn't enjoy prestige and was used in the private domains whereas Danish was marked as the language of dominance and was used in the public and institutional domains. He found that Turkish acted as a we code for the Turkish children and Danish, the they code. Children were also found to be using Danish to exert dominance in the group, therefore using code switching as a tool.

In another study by Yoon (1996), who also applied symbolic approach and explored the code switching phenomenon among Korean English bilingual adults. He compared two groups, one of Korean born bilinguals and the other of Korean English Bilinguals. He found that English is the in-group language and Korean, the language of the out-group among Korean born bilinguals which is opposite for Korean English bilinguals. The analysis of motivational factors show that Korean is thought to be more expressive in terms of linguistic politeness and the use of it shows cultural awareness of social position which is significant for the Koreans and much care is taken of it while talking to the people of out-group which is not equally valued in family or closed group interactions, where English is used which is considered a neutral language. Yoon also observed that the switches were smaller with the out-group and longer with the members of the in-group.

The social identities and varieties of the language of British Caribbeans were examined with the same symbolic approach by Sebba

and Wootton (1998). It was found that British Caribbeans speak two varieties of English, one is the London Jamaican and the other is the London English. After the analysis of interviews, written data and their conversation it was found that Jamaican Creole is used for a global African identity and British English for a local identity. According to the participants all instances of Creole and British English are not significant, but many are indicative of identity associations.

Doley (2013), explored the use of code switching for the purpose of business by the salesmen and traders in the markets of Assam, which is a multilingual region of India.

The salesman switched the code as soon as he recognized the language of the customer. Data for exploring such type of communication was collected from three markets of Assam, which was then analyzed through Scotton's Markedness Model. The study explored the negotiation of identity of self and others and the intention and motivation behind the phenomenon of code switching. The data was collected by observation and recording the transactional conversation between the salesmen and the customers at three different markets of Assam where four languages i.e. Assamese, Hindi, Mising, Sylheti were observed to be in operation. All the three excerpts of such conversations showed the success of these salesmen by the end of the communicative event in the form of convincing the customer and selling the product. In this success code switching has a definite role.

#### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Markedness Model by Mayer Scotton is applied on the data for its analysis. Markedness model is based on the premise that all participants in a particular interaction are bilinguals and know the two languages that are used during code switching. Also the speakers and the analyst know about the marked and the unmarked code or choices. According to Scotton all speakers in interaction have markedness evaluators, which in simpler terms is the cognitive capability to assess markedness.

The markedness and unmarkedness can also be evaluated on the basis of less or more frequency of use of the two languages respectively. However it also depends on the attitudes of the speaker toward the two codes. Markedness model takes into consideration the socio-psychological factors such as language attitudes and social identity. The model holds that the choice of a language in a multilingual setting is driven by the negotiation of identity of self and the relationship with the other participants in accordance with the context and the social setting.

Carol Myer Scotton has described her Markedness model in her book 'Motivation for Code Switching' Evidence from Africa (1993). Scotton believes that in every bilingual society, there is a separate set of rights and obligation (RO). Choosing a language for interaction indicates that the speaker understands the social context and his role in the interaction, which he may negotiate. Each available code or language is associated with a social meaning for the best overall outcome. Moradi (2014:16), argued that 'individuals' activities are filtered by two distinct processes before they happen. During the first filter the speaker's opportunity set is formed. The second filter makes the movement in time where the individual consciously selects between various options'.

Scotton's markedness model is based on Grice's maxims of co-operative principle and is stated as 'Choose the form of your conversational contribution such that it indexes the set of Rights and Obligations which you wish to be in force between the speaker and the addressee for the current exchange' (Scotton, 1993).

The markedness model of Scotton has the following three maxims:

1. Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in talk exchanges when you wish or affirm that RO set.
2. Make a marked code choice when you wish to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange.
3. When an unmarked choice is not clear, use CS to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an RO set, which you favour.

Thus the markedness model defines the social meaning in the choice of the code and the alternation between them in terms of participants' rights and obligations (Nilep, 2006).

Markedness model is one of the most influential models in the symbolic approach to code switching. Myer Scotton's markedness model is based on an understanding that the members in a monolingual or bilingual community are well aware of the expected norms of speech, including the choice of a variety of a language. This 'markedness evaluator' or the knowledge for the appropriate choice is gained by the members of the society through their interactional experiences that gets accepted as conventionalized. The choice of the speakers is either unmarked as expected or marked and unexpected. The Markedness Model actually deals with the marked or unexpected choice of the speaker and tries to understand their social motivation for such choice.

The Markedness model is designed to understand all kinds of code switching during interactions. According to this model code switching occurs for four reasons.

1. Code Switching as a sequence of unmarked choice
2. Code switching itself as an unmarked choice.
3. Code Switching as a marked choice.
4. Code Switching as an exploratory choice.

Code switching as a sequence of unmarked choice takes place due to situational change with the change of the participant or the topic, leads to the change in the RO set, and the interaction continues as an unmarked choice. The second kind of code switching occurs when all the participants know that all of them are bilinguals. In this case code switching is quite expected. The third code switching is alternation to the marked choice, which is unexpected in the RO set. To this kind Scotton believes that a marked choice is made to increase or decrease the distance between the participants and a change is negotiated in the pre-established RO set. The last kind as an exploratory choice takes place when the addressees themselves are not sure which code will help them the most in achievement of their goal. This usually happens when the speaker and the listener are strangers or unknown to each other.

Scotton's markedness model despite being the best socio-cultural model to explain the phenomenon of code switching met several criticisms, especially on its reliance on external knowledge that includes a lot of assumptions on the part of the researcher who interprets the speaker's motivation behind changing the code. The possibility to reason for the change of code without referring to the external factors is traceable the analyst may know about it through ethnographic observations and members of the society know such switching through the process of socialization. Moreover the research does not provide a strong co-relation between language choice and speech activities as predicted by the markedness.

#### **DATA COLLECTION**

The data for the present study is collected in the form of recordings of Hum TV Award show. The collected data is then transcribed to facilitate analysis. The conversational interaction during the ceremony has been analyzed for instances of code switching.

#### **DATA ANALYSIS**

The transcribed data is analyzed qualitatively. Firstly instances of code switching are highlighted and are then interpreted within Mayer Scotton's Markedness Model. The social context of this glamour discourse is a back stage meeting of glamour celebrities who have gathered for pre '2<sup>nd</sup> Hum TV Awards' ceremony. All of them are well

aware of the grand occasion. As such events are rare in Pakistan; a heightened excitement is visible in their conversation. All of them are invited to the ceremony where their role is that of the guest as well as the participant. They are actors and models from the small glamour world of Pakistan. They know each other and most of them are known by the Pakistani audience. Artificiality surrounds the show with gaudy attires and make up laden faces that are trying to look elegant, happy and excited. Most of them are found to be loud in their conversation so as to be a part of the portrayed excitement. All the hype in the costume and conversation is to grab the audience and increase their curiosity for the upcoming awards.

The conversational interaction takes place in two languages, Urdu, the lingua franca in Pakistan and often considered as the unmarked or the expected code. The other language is English, which is considered the language of the educated and the elite class in the country. English acts as a marked language and an unexpected code during this interaction where code switching is being used but this code has a rich social meaning in itself. It associates its speakers to a certain class of people in the society. In other words people who seek words, phrases, clauses and sentences of English in their conversation try to identify themselves with the upper class of people who are rich, educated and followers of the west in thoughts and actions. English has become an integral part of the media discourses specially those related to the world of glamour and the in vogue patterns of conversation are those of code switching in a combination of Urdu and English.

The selected discourse from the world of glamour is a conversation between the two hosts and the arriving celebrities at the Red Carpet Show of 2<sup>nd</sup> Hum TV awards. Initially the second maxim of Scotton's Markedness Model is followed where the marked code English is used during code switching. The conversation starts as "*Assalam-o-Allikum*" this is a greeting in Urdu. An English greeting with the next phrase "Good Evening" and then the marked code English continues "and welcome everyone to Service, powered by Telenor Talkshalk". After naming the sponsors in English, they again switch to the unmarked code Urdu to start with the show and introduce themselves as '*mein hun Anushay aur mein hun Mansha*' (I am Anushay and I am Mansha). This switching indexes unmarked Rights and Obligation set as introduction in unmarked code goes well with eastern greetings in the beginning. The hosts again switches to English following the second maxim which indexes the wish to establish a new Right and Obligation set as unmarked for the current

exchange. This time the switch is with phrases such as “and welcome today” and words within the unmarked code of Urdu as “amazing” “exciting night”. These two phrases in English are uttered after a phrase in Urdu as ‘*ajj bohat hee...*’ and then ‘*aur bohat saray*’ awards. The words in the marked code are used to add excitement and enthusiasm in the conversation.

The interaction then moves to a question that is partially in Urdu and partially in English ‘What do you think?’ ‘*Anooshay ajj kya honay jar aha hey*’. The other host by the name Anooshay answers by following the first maxim using unmarked code with longer sentence in Urdu and with just a very few words that might not be translated in Urdu and are said in English. The rest of the conversation stays in the unmarked code following the established rights and obligation set as she answers ‘well’ ‘*kal bhe hamaree molaqat hoe thee aur hum nay yahee kaha tha k yee jo ‘event’ hey bohat hee ‘amazing’ honay wala hey aur hum log bhe tayar hein aur pohanch chukay hein aur app k samnay hein*’. In these lines only few words of English are used like ‘event’ and ‘amazing’. Using of these words on this particular occasion does not strictly violate the RO set of unmarked code for the reason that immediate alternatives of these words are not available in Urdu. The occasion itself is an event.

The talk continues with the choice of unmarked index of the unmarked RO set to affirm the rights and obligation with only two words in English in each sentence as ‘*umeed hey k ye award ceremony pichalay sal say xiada baRi aur behtereen ho gee*. In this long sentence only a single phrase of English is used as ‘Award ceremony’ and this is a part of the name of the event that could not be translated in Urdu. The next sentence is also in unmarked code with a single word ‘technical’ in English, ‘*jaldee jaldee ap ko thora technical kaam batatay hein*’. Technical is one of the commonest terms used within a conversation in Urdu in bilingual context, which is also found in this particular discourse.

Informing about the technical aspects of the ceremony, the host continues to talk about categories where code switching appears to be an unmarked choice and it is being used with the assumption that the audience and the participants in the conversation have a clear understanding of it. Moreover very little of the marked code is used as ‘28 categories, fashion, music, special awards’ in a longer expression in unmarked code ‘*28 categories hein, jin mein say sola jo hein wo television k lea hein, char jo hein wo fashion k lea hein, aur char jo hein wo special awards hein jo ap k samnay pesh kiye jaein gay*’. Interestingly out of five digits only one is spoken in English i.e. 28, the rest of them are

said in Urdu numerals. Two out of three words from the marked codes have no translation in Urdu such as television and fashion and these can hardly be taken as instances of code switching while the third word 'music' has to be taken as it is because it is one of the names of the award categories. Another word 'special award' of marked code becomes an unmarked one for the present exchange as the event is all about awards and some name or an adjective precedes the word 'award'. Finally moving towards the arriving celebrities at the award ceremony, the host says 'excitement *tou yaqeenun kush ziada honi chay.*' The sentence starts with the marked choice but continues with a sequence of unmarked choice. The single word "excitement" is used to create and maintain the hype of the event.

The talk then starts between the host and the members of the same industry and the second maxim of Scotton's markedness model is followed where the speaker makes a marked code choice when she wishes to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange. The maxim changes as the participants change. Previously she was talking to the television audience now the talk is between the host and the fraternity. In the previous analyzed talk, the switch to the marked code was shorter mostly limited to few words but now it is longer in the form of phrases. The interaction now becomes face to face which was with the camera in the already analyzed talk.

As she talks to the new participant and says '*G Saba, app bataye k you know* 2<sup>nd</sup> Hum Awards *ho rahay hein, jitnay baRay tareekay say ho rahay hein* as an actor as a celebrity, as a person in the fraternity, *kya feel kar rahay ho?*' The speaker starts with the first maxim of markedness model where unmarked addressed form is used and then switches to the marked filler 'you know' and gets back to the unmarked index with unmarked RO set, she talks about the event. The host introduces the newly arrived guest with some almost synonymous words as actor, celebrity, and member of fraternity. In this particular instance the pattern of the code switching is an expected case because the lexemes that made use of marked code are the usual jargons of the glamour register. The host ends her turn on a question choosing the unmarked code with switching at the lexical level only with the use of the word "feel". In the rest of the utterance the first maxim with unmarked matrix language is used along with the established RO set.

The same maxim of code switching as a sequence of unmarked choice is adopted by the listener and she replies as "*bohat accha lag raha hey. Hum Awards nay humein ek baRa platform dia hey. Hr actor*

koappreciation *chayee hotee hey, chahay wo fans k zarye milay, chahay kisee channel k zarye milay, ya chaltay phrtay kahein say bhe mil jae*” Code switching in the reply is at a word level alone. The speaker does not continue the marked code beyond a word and code switching remains a matter of sequence of unmarked choice. Most of the English words inserted in this comment are said probably to fill in the lexical gap since their alternates are not available in Urdu such as words like awards, platform, fan and channel.

Another participant enters the conversation and uses Code Switching as a sequence of unmarked choice. She replies completely in the unmarked code and says “*mujay bohat acha lag raha hey aur mujay fakhar feel ho raha hey. Hum TV ko tou mein apna susral kehTEE hoin.* It can be seen that only a single word “feel” is used in English, which does not look odd but becomes a part of the flow of conversation.

The next three guests by the names of Aisha Omer, Sheroz and Sara use the marked code and establish a new RO set, making the interaction as unmarked for the current exchange. The replies from these participants are completely in English as Ayesha says “I would just like to say congratulations on 2<sup>nd</sup> Hum TV awards. Sheroz then takes up the turn and talks about the performance that evening, “I am very nervous, but let’s see what happens”. The host who has been using the unmarked code makes use of the marked one this time in continuation with the previous utterances in English and puts the question to another participant Sara “Is he a good dancer?” and Sara continues in the marked code without switching and replies “He is a good dancer”. The host and the guest are seen using a single code. This is seldom done in bilingual situations and used to cooperate with each other by taking up one selected code through a marked one. Such supportive conversation aims at decreasing the distance between the participants.

Nida, the next actor chooses the unmarked code except for two words “join and excited”. The code switching in this case remains as a sequence of unmarked choice which according to Scotton can be due to change of participants. Nida, the new participant speaks “*pehlay jo HUM TV Awards thae wo bhe bohat zabardast thae. Dekhnay mein bhe maza aya. Mujay lagta hey k 2<sup>nd</sup> HUM TV Awards uss say bhe ziada achay hoingay. Mein baRee excited hui*”. Again with the entrance and joining of another actor the code changes and this time it’s the unmarked one and *this is chosen following Scotton’s second maxim where the participant wishes to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange.* Code switching as a marked choice is seldom done and this is sometimes

done to show solidarity with the interlocutor. Two new celebrities continue with the marked code one after the other and the *host resumes the same*. The conversation between the three goes as follows:

Actor I “looking forward to this gorgeous event”.

Actor II “this is the second one and I have been here in the first one and being the second one it will be better than the first one”.

Host “How necessary they are?”.

The answer to this query is given in English with Code switching as an exploratory choice, where the addressee does not seem to be sure as to which code may help the most in the achievement of their goals. The participant makes use of both the marked and unmarked languages with intra and inter-sentential code switching, and replies as “very, because, *sub itnee mehnat kartay hein*. They do need appreciation and I think it’s very inspiring and motivating *k app ka dil chahta hey* to work even harder when you know you are going to be recognized for it”. The participant starts and ends up with the marked code, which is picked up by the host to phrase her next question partially in the same code to another actor who had just joined.

Host “How do you feel *k kya honay jar aha hey?*”

The reply to this question in both the codes does not come in whole sentences but in different words of English only with the last one in Urdu as “awards, celebrities, and its glamour, stars and humour, performance, award ceremony, gupshup”. All the lexical items that are used in the reply are in fact jargons of the glamour and show biz register and these are used with the understanding that everyone is a bilingual and can easily comprehend.

In the last dialogue of the selected glamour discourse, the host continues with the question that is partially in the marked and partially in the unmarked code and gets a reply in a similar pattern with alternating of codes after each sentence.

Host “Fahad *app kee nazroin mein kya zarooree hey k network* like HUM should be doing?”

Fahd “I think it is very nice. *Kisee ko award milay na milay* does not really matter but *kisee ko mil raha hey yee bohat acchee baat hey*”. A similarity in pattern of the two speakers reflects group solidarity and shows their belonging from the same fraternity.

## CONCLUSION

Code switching is a comprehensible phenomenon among multilingual societies of the world. There are multiple factors which determine the nature of the code switching in formal, semi-formal and

informal discourse of different genres prevalent in the social settings. Pakistan is a multilingual country where more than seventy five languages are spoken. In the present study, glamour discourse was analyzed through Mayer Scotton's Markedness Model. The discourse was an interplay between two main languages Urdu as an unmarked language and English as a marked language (social recognition) spoken among the educated class in formal interactions at large. The sole objective of the study was to explore the social motivational factors behind the code switching in these social interactions. The nature of switching between marked and unmarked languages in the glamour discourse in the perspective of motivational factors have been discovered. It is also revealed that these factors are influenced by the prevalent circumstances and cultural norms owned by the participants. In accordance with the findings of the present study, the participants of the glamour discourse switch between the marked and unmarked languages in pursuance of the establishment of a new Right and Obligation, for addition of excitement and enthusiasm in the conversation, for creation and maintenance of the hype in the event, for filling the lexical gap of alternative languages (marked or unmarked) and for maintenance of the flow of conversation.

#### REFERENCES

- Cashman, HR. (2008). Conversation and Interaction Analysis. In Wei, L. & Moyer, MG (Eds). *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*: Malden, MA: Blackwell publishing Ltd
- Doley, RK. (2013). Code switching at the market place: A trader's tool. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 2(2), 483-489.
- Meeuwis, M. & Blommaert, J. (1994). Review article The Markedness Model and the absence of society: Remarks on code switching. *Multilingva Journal of Cross Cultural and Interactional Communication*, 13(4), 387-423.
- Moraidi, H. (2014). An overview of markedness model. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 3(10), 16-17.
- Nilep, C. (2006). Code Switching in socio-cultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*: University of Colarado.
- Scotton, CM. (1993). Common and uncommon grounds: Social and structural factors in code switching. *Language in Society*, 22(4), 475-503.
- Smith, DJ. (2000). Patterns of Variation in Spanish/English Bilingualism in Northern Georgia (Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin).