

## ***Code Switching And Code Mixing In Classroom Interaction Among Fifth-Semester English Education Student***

### **Peralihan Kode dan Pencampuran Kode dalam Interaksi Kelas di Kalangan Mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Semester Lima**

**Apriani Silviani Sitingjak<sup>1</sup>, Carolina Pakpahan<sup>2</sup>, Christina Natalina Saragi<sup>3</sup>**

English Education Study Program, HKBP Nommensen University Universitas HKBP Nommensen<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Email: <sup>1</sup>[apriani.silvianisitingjak@student.uhn.ac.id](mailto:apriani.silvianisitingjak@student.uhn.ac.id), <sup>2</sup>[carolina.pakpahan@uhn.ac.id](mailto:carolina.pakpahan@uhn.ac.id),  
<sup>3</sup>[christina.saragi@uhn.ac.id](mailto:christina.saragi@uhn.ac.id)

\*Corresponding Author

---

Received : 11 March 2026 : 30 March 2026, Accepted : 30 March 2026.

---

#### **ABSTRACT**

*Code-switching and code-mixing frequently occur in bilingual or multilingual communities, including in classroom interactions. In the teaching and learning process, lecturers and students often switch or mix languages to make communication easier and more effective. This phenomenon is commonly found in English classes where both Indonesian and English are used during discussions. This research aims to identify the types of code-switching and code-mixing used in classroom interaction and to determine the most dominant type used by the lecturer and students. This study applied a descriptive qualitative method. The data were obtained through classroom observation of fifth semester students of the English Education Study Program. The researcher recorded the classroom interaction and transcribed the utterances containing code-switching and code-mixing. The total data found in this research were 80 utterances. The findings show that there are three types of code-switching and three types of code-mixing used in the classroom interaction. The types of code-switching include inter-sentential switching (4 data or 5%), intra-sentential switching (19 data or 23.75%), and tag switching (13 data or 16.25%). Meanwhile, the types of code-mixing consist of insertion (33 data or 41.25%), alternation (6 data or 7.5%), and congruent lexicalization (5 data or 6.25%). The most dominant type found in this study is insertion. In conclusion, code-switching and code-mixing play an important role in classroom communication. The lecturer and students use both languages to clarify explanations, express ideas more easily, and maintain interaction during the learning process.*

**Keywords:** Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, Classroom Interaction, Sociolinguistics.

#### **ABSTRAK**

Pengalihan kode (code-switching) dan pencampuran kode (code-mixing) sering terjadi dalam komunitas bilingual atau multilingual, termasuk dalam interaksi di kelas. Dalam proses pengajaran dan pembelajaran, dosen dan mahasiswa sering beralih atau mencampur bahasa untuk membuat komunikasi lebih mudah dan efektif. Fenomena ini umum ditemukan di kelas bahasa Inggris di mana bahasa Indonesia dan Inggris digunakan selama diskusi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis pengalihan kode dan pencampuran kode yang digunakan dalam interaksi di kelas dan untuk menentukan jenis yang paling dominan yang digunakan oleh dosen dan mahasiswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif deskriptif. Data diperoleh melalui observasi kelas terhadap mahasiswa semester lima Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Peneliti merekam interaksi di kelas dan mentranskripsikan ujaran yang mengandung pengalihan kode dan pencampuran kode. Total data yang ditemukan dalam penelitian ini adalah 80 ujaran. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat tiga jenis pengalihan kode dan tiga jenis pencampuran kode yang digunakan dalam interaksi di kelas. Jenis-jenis peralihan kode meliputi peralihan antar kalimat (4 data atau 5%), peralihan intra kalimat (19 data atau 23,75%), dan peralihan tag (13 data atau 16,25%). Sementara itu, jenis-jenis pencampuran kode terdiri dari penyisipan (33 data atau 41,25%), pergantian (6 data atau 7,5%), dan leksikalisasi kongruen (5 data atau 6,25%). Jenis yang paling dominan ditemukan dalam penelitian ini adalah penyisipan. Kesimpulannya, peralihan kode dan pencampuran

kode memainkan peran penting dalam komunikasi di kelas. Dosen dan mahasiswa menggunakan kedua bahasa untuk memperjelas penjelasan, mengekspresikan ide dengan lebih mudah, dan menjaga interaksi selama proses pembelajaran.

**Kata Kunci:** Peralihan Kode, Pencampuran Kode, Interaksi Kelas, Sociolinguistik.

## 1. Introduction

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is ideally used as much as possible in higher-education settings to enhance students' linguistic competence. However, in practice, the use of **code switching** and **code mixing** remains a common communication strategy among university students. This phenomenon emerges due to several factors, such as limited vocabulary, lack of confidence, peer influence, pragmatic needs, or efforts to maintain smooth communication during class activities.

Previous studies mostly focused on code-switching practices among secondary school students or in informal contexts, leaving limited research on how university students particularly fifth-semester students employ *code switching* and *code mixing* in classroom interactions. Yet, understanding the forms, functions, and motivations behind these linguistic practices is crucial to identifying students' communication patterns and evaluating whether such practices support or hinder their English proficiency development.

By examining this phenomenon, the study is expected to provide deeper insights into the role of code switching and code mixing in the learning process at the university level and contribute to the development of more effective, communicative, and student-centered teaching strategies. According to Brown (2007), the process of language learning reaches its optimal effectiveness when learners actively engage in using the target language for genuine communication, both within the classroom environment and in real-life contexts beyond it. However, observations in the field indicate that the full use of English has not yet been implemented as expected. In classroom communication practices, students frequently mix English with Indonesian when engaging in discussions, responding to questions, or interacting with lecturers and peers.

Although students learn and actively practice the use of English, in reality, many of them still frequently shift between English and Indonesian, and even local languages, when engaging in classroom discussions, posing questions, or responding to lecturers. According to (Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 101) emphasizes, code switching is a linguistic phenomenon in which speakers alternate between different languages or language varieties during a single interaction or communicative event. This phenomenon indicates a gap between the ideal linguistic proficiency expected in academic contexts and the actual communicative practices observed in classroom settings. This issue is significant because excessive implementation of code-switching and code-mixing may hinder fluent English communication, thereby preventing the achievement of the primary objective of language learning which is the development of communicative competence. On the other hand, this phenomenon may also reflect a natural linguistic strategy that enables students to adapt to social contexts, levels of comprehension, and communicative needs. However, there remains a lack of comprehensive research that examines the functions, motivations, and social pragmatic implications of code-switching and code-mixing within classroom interactions within higher education contexts, particularly among fifth-semester students who are expected to have reached a stage of linguistic maturity. Without further investigation, this phenomenon may perpetuate an imbalance between students' formal academic competence and their everyday language use. Moreover, lecturers and educational institutions may lack the empirical foundation necessary to design effective language learning strategies that foster consistent English usage while still recognizing the social and cultural functions of students' first languages.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the development of sociolinguistics and pragmatics studies, particularly in understanding the role of social context, identity, and

communicative functions in students' bilingual practices. According to Holmes (2013, p. 44), in bilingual interactions, speakers' language choices signify both their linguistic competence and their understanding of the social and communicative dimensions of discourse. This study also enriches academic references related to the patterns and motivations of these phenomena within the Indonesian formal education system. Practically, the findings of this research may serve as a reference for lecturers and curriculum developers in adapting more contextual and communicative language teaching methods. Students, in turn, may gain a deeper understanding of when and why they engage in code-switching, enabling them to exercise greater control over their language use in academic discourse. Thus, this research holds strategic value in supporting the enhancement of communication quality and English language learning in higher education settings. Although numerous studies on phenomena have been conducted, most have primarily focused on secondary school contexts, informal conversations, or social media interactions. These studies generally discuss the basic forms and functions of code-switching, such as overcoming vocabulary limitations or adjusting to the interlocutor.

There has been limited research exploring code-switching and code-mixing in higher education, particularly among English Education students who already possess relatively advanced language proficiency. Previous studies rarely examine the pragmatic functions and social contexts underlying these phenomena in classroom interactions. Among fifth-semester students, code-switching may not result from linguistic limitations but rather serve as a communicative strategy to clarify meaning, build rapport, or maintain a comfortable discussion atmosphere. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by investigating how and why students use code-switching and code-mixing in their classroom conversations, as well as the social and pragmatic functions behind their language use. The findings are expected to provide new insights into the linguistic behaviour of prospective English teachers and offer practical implications for more effective and contextually relevant language teaching.

This phenomenon can be observed in various learning contexts. For instance, when a lecturer poses a question in English, students often respond by mixing the two languages, as in, *"I think it's about the topic we learned yesterday, tapi saya kurang yakin, Miss,"* or *"It's easier to understand kalau dijelaskan pakai Indonesian."*, *"Miss, what does this sentence mean? Saya gak ngerti."* Or *"Miss, jadi tugasnya dikumpul hari ini atau next meeting?"* Such expressions indicate that students alternate or combine two languages to facilitate the delivery of their ideas. This phenomenon is known as **code-switching** and **code-mixing**, referring to the alternation or blending of languages by bilingual speakers within the same conversation.

From a pragmatic perspective, the use of code-switching and code-mixing can be understood as a communicative strategy that serves specific contextual functions. Students do not switch languages merely due to linguistic limitations, but also to achieve particular interactional goals, such as emphasizing meaning, softening utterances, adjusting levels of politeness, or building rapport with interlocutors. As Gumperz (1982, p. 67) explains, *code-switching is a conversational strategy that speakers use to mark emphasis, mitigate messages, or express social relationships*. For instance, students may switch to Indonesian to show solidarity with their classmates or use English to convey politeness and professionalism when addressing their lecturers. This illustrates that code-switching and code-mixing are not purely linguistic phenomena but are also rich in pragmatic meaning, closely linked to context, speaker intention, and the social relationships among participants in the interaction.

From a social perspective, the practice of these phenomena also reflects the social identity of students as prospective English teachers living within a bilingual society. In classroom interactions, language alternation serves as a symbol of linguistic flexibility as well as a representation of their social and academic positioning. Social factors such as solidarity, status, and relational closeness may influence students' decisions to use one language or to blend two languages. For instance, the use of Indonesian within predominantly English discourse may serve as an expression of familiarity among peers, whereas the exclusive use of English may be employed to demonstrate competence and confidence in formal contexts. Thus, the use of two

languages not only indicates linguistic competence but also mirrors the social dynamics within the academic community.

The challenge arising from this phenomenon lies in its potential impact on the effectiveness of language learning and students' mastery of English. On one hand, the use of both languages can facilitate better comprehension of learning materials and minimize misunderstandings in communication. On the other hand, this habit may impede the development of students' ability to communicate fully in English. Moreover, existing research provides insufficient insight into the particular patterns of code-switching and code-mixing within classroom settings, as well as the linguistic, pragmatic, and social motivations that drive students to engage in such practices in their daily academic interactions.

Therefore, this study is essential in addressing this research gap by examining the forms and underlying motivations of code-switching and code-mixing in the daily classroom conversations of fifth-semester students in the English Education Study Program. Through pragmatic and sociolinguistic approaches, this research aims to uncover the communicative functions and social factors that underlie students' bilingual language use.

## **2. Metodology**

This research will use a **qualitative descriptive design**. The purpose of qualitative descriptive research is to describe and interpret naturally occurring phenomena based on real-life situations without manipulation (Creswell, 2014). The researcher aims to analyse and explain how and why **code switching** and **code mixing** occur in classroom interactions among fifth-semester English Education students.

A qualitative approach will be selected because it allows the researcher to explore **linguistic behaviour, social meaning, and pragmatic functions** in depth. The descriptive method provides a detailed picture of the communicative strategies used by both students and lecturers during teaching and learning processes. The focus is on understanding the natural occurrence of code switching and code mixing, rather than quantifying them statistically.

## **3. Literature Review**

Sociolinguistics views language as a social practice that reflects the relationship between language and society. It explains how language choice is influenced by factors such as participants, setting, topic, and social norms (Holmes, 2013).

Pragmatics, in contrast, examines how language is strategically employed to realize communicative intentions, with consideration of speaker meaning, contextual factors, and interactional objectives. (Leech, 1983).

According to Poplack (1980), code switching occurs when bilingual speakers shift from one language to another at sentence or clause boundaries, or even within the same sentence.

Wardhaugh (2010) describes code switching as a natural and systematic linguistic behavior in which bilingual or multilingual speakers alternate between two or more linguistic codes within a single interaction.

Appel and Muysken (1987) conceptualize code switching not merely as a structural phenomenon or lexical habit, but as a form of **linguistic alternation** that carries significant social and pragmatic functions.

Bullock and Toribio (2009) conceptualize code switching as an inherent and natural component of bilingual competence rather than a sign of linguistic deficiency or confusion.

Bullock and Toribio (2009) present code switching as a hallmark of bilingual competence that embodies both **cognitive flexibility** and **social flexibility**. It illustrates how bilingual speakers skilfully navigate linguistic and social worlds, making deliberate choices that reflect both mental control and social intelligence.

**Muysken (2000)** divided *code mixing* into three main types: *insertion*, *alternation*, and *congruent lexicalization*. These frameworks explain the processes by which linguistic elements from two languages co-occur within a single communicative unit.

## 4. Results And Discussion

### 1.1 Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the data obtained from classroom observations of fifth-semester students in the English Education Study Program at HKBP Nommensen University. The data consisted of the lecturer's and students' utterances collected during three classroom meetings and transcribed for analysis.

The analysis was conducted by identifying the types of code switching and code mixing that occurred in classroom interactions based on the theories proposed by Poplack (1980) and Muysken (2000). Each utterance containing language alternation was classified into specific categories, namely intra-sentential switching, inter-sentential switching, and tag switching. In addition, the researcher examined the underlying factors as well as the social and pragmatic functions of language alternation within the instructional context.

The finding indicated that language alternation occurs naturally in classroom interaction. Both students and the lecturer employed code switching as a communicative strategy to clarify meaning, emphasize important points, establish social rapport, and ensure comprehension of the learning materials. Therefore, this phenomenon not only reflected the students' bilingual competence but also demonstrated its pedagogical and social functions in the teaching and learning process.

After analyzing all the data, the researcher identified all six types code switching and code mixing in the classroom interactions:

#### 1.1.1 Types of Code Switching

##### 1.1.1.2. Intra-sentential Switching

Intra-sentential switching occurs when two languages are mixed within a single sentence or clause without a clear boundary separating them. According to Poplack (1980), this type of switching requires a relatively high level of bilingual competence because the speaker must manage two grammatical systems simultaneously within one syntactic structure. Unlike inter-sentential switching, the alternation does not occur at sentence boundaries but within the same clause, resulting in structural integration between the two languages.

Based on the revised data consisting of 80 utterances produced by fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, intra-sentential switching frequently appears in classroom interaction. For example, in *Jadi I think aku gak akan mau nya because this is not my fault*, the speaker begins with the Indonesian discourse marker "Jadi," shifts to the English clause "I think," returns to Indonesian in "aku gak akan mau nya," and ends again with the English subordinate clause "because this is not my fault." The switching occurs multiple times within a single sentence without any sentence boundary, demonstrating grammatical integration rather than separation.

Similarly, in *I feel like insecure tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya*, the clause begins in English and immediately shifts to Indonesian within the same syntactic unit, connected by the conjunction "tapi." Another example can be seen in *Christmas itu tidak hanya tentang kebahagiaan but also about the sadness*, where the Indonesian sentence structure continues with an English phrase in the same clause. In *Jadi kita harus make sure dulu mana dia yang salah*, the English verb phrase "make sure" is embedded directly into an Indonesian syntactic frame. Likewise, *Happy new year juga mam* shows how an English greeting is integrated into an Indonesian sentence without forming a separate clause.

In all these examples, the grammatical structures of English and Indonesian coexist within one sentence, fulfilling the criteria of intra-sentential switching. In the classroom context at HKBP Nommensen University, this type of switching typically occurs in spontaneous speech, especially when students express opinions, emotions, arguments, or academic explanations. Functionally, intra-sentential switching reflects linguistic flexibility and bilingual fluency, as students simultaneously draw from both language systems to convey meaning more effectively and naturally.

**1.1.1.3. Tag Switching**

Tag switching refers to the insertion of a short expression, discourse marker, or tag from one language into an utterance that is otherwise structured in another language. According to Poplack (1980), tag switching is considered the simplest type of code-switching because tags are syntactically independent and can be inserted without affecting the grammatical structure of the main clause. Since tags do not need to conform strictly to the syntactic rules of the sentence in which they appear, they can move freely between languages without disrupting grammatical integrity.

Based on the classroom data of fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, several examples of tag switching were identified. One example is *That’s right, ya*, where the main clause “That’s right” follows English syntax, and the Indonesian tag “ya” is added at the end to seek agreement or emphasize confirmation. The insertion of “ya” does not alter the grammatical structure of the English sentence. Another example is *Iya, me too*, in which the Indonesian agreement marker “iya” precedes the English phrase “me too.” Here, “iya” functions as an interpersonal reinforcement rather than a structural shift, and both elements remain syntactically independent.

A similar pattern appears in *Ngerti nya ci, do you get it?* where the English tag “do you get it?” is attached to an Indonesian utterance to confirm understanding. The English expression functions as a detachable confirmation tag rather than forming part of the Indonesian clause. Additional examples from the data include *Yes, seperti itu* and *Oke thank you*, where short English discourse markers are inserted into predominantly Indonesian utterances. In each case, the inserted element operates at the discourse level and does not interfere with clause formation.

In the classroom interaction observed at HKBP Nommensen University, tag switching primarily functions to express agreement, seek confirmation, maintain conversational flow, signal politeness, and strengthen interpersonal connection. Because the alternation involves only short, syntactically detachable elements, these utterances clearly demonstrate tag switching. The grammatical structure of the main clause remains intact, confirming that the switching occurs at the discourse level rather than within the core syntactic framework of the sentence.

**Table 1. The Analysis of Data of Code Switching**

Intersentential	Intrasentential	Tag
Biasa aja mam nothing special	How was your holiday? Oh iya sebelumnya mam mau ucapkan happy new year to us.	That’s right ya.
<i>Di sana I don’t care my happiness because I always just focus on her health but from that place</i>	Happy new year juga mam	lyalah, anyone else?
Nah, sebelum kita membuat claim letter before we write a claim	Christtmas itu tidak hanya tentang kebahagiaan but also about the sadness.	Thank you

letter we should make sure that all the information about the problem.	Jadi teman-teman sekalian Iya, me too. I spent my holiday di rumat sakit because my sister is sick
Kenapa gak pakai sunscreen kau.	Well, I wanna ask you cia.

### 1.1.2 Types of Code Mixing

#### 1.1.2.1 Insertion

Insertion refers to the embedding of lexical items or short phrases from one language into the grammatical structure of another language. According to Muysken (2000), insertion occurs when one language functions as the matrix language (the dominant grammatical framework), while elements from another language are inserted as embedded language items. These inserted elements typically appear in the form of nouns, noun phrases, verbs, or short expressions, while the overall syntactic structure remains controlled by the matrix language.

Based on the classroom data consisting of 80 utterances produced by fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, insertion appears as the most dominant type. Several examples clearly illustrate this pattern. In */Saya mau share sedikit experienceku/*, the grammatical structure follows Indonesian syntax, but the verbs and nouns “share” and “experience” are taken from English. Similarly, in */Skincare gue affordable semua/*, the adjective “affordable” is inserted into an Indonesian sentence pattern. Another example can be seen in */Disuruh submit video nya kan ke google drive?/*, where the verbs and noun phrases “submit,” “video,” and “google drive” function as embedded English elements within an Indonesian syntactic frame.

Additional examples further confirm this classification. In */Kapan deadline nya?/*, the noun “deadline” is inserted into an Indonesian interrogative structure. In */Kenapa gak pake sunscreen kau?/*, the noun “sunscreen” functions as an English lexical item embedded within Indonesian grammar. Likewise, in */Christmas itu tidak hanya tentang kebahagiaan/* and */Make sure dulu mana dia yang salah/*, English lexical items (“Christmas” and “make sure”) are integrated into Indonesian clauses without altering the overall grammatical system.

In all these examples, Indonesian clearly serves as the matrix language because the sentence structure, word order, and grammatical markers follow Indonesian rules. English functions as the embedded language supplying lexical resources. There is no clause-level grammatical shift; instead, only particular vocabulary items are inserted. This confirms that the switching does not occur at the structural level but at the lexical level.

In the classroom interaction at HKBP Nommensen University, insertion becomes the most dominant pattern because students frequently incorporate English academic terms, technological vocabulary, and popular expressions into Indonesian sentences. This pattern indicates that English primarily functions as a lexical resource rather than replacing Indonesian as the base grammatical system. Therefore, the dominance of insertion reflects habitual bilingual vocabulary integration rather than full structural code-switching.

#### 1.1.2.2. Alternation

Alternation refers to the switching between two grammatical systems within a single utterance, where each language contributes its own clause or structural pattern. According to Muysken (2000), alternation differs from insertion because it does not merely involve embedding lexical items into a base language. Instead, it reflects a shift from one syntactic structure to another, meaning that each segment follows the grammatical rules of its respective

language. The alternation typically occurs at clause boundaries within the same overall discourse unit.

Based on the classroom data of fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, several examples demonstrate this pattern. One clear example is */I feel like insecure tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya/*. In this utterance, the speaker begins with a complete English clause (“I feel like insecure”) and then alternates to an Indonesian clause (“tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya”), which follows Indonesian syntactic rules. The switching does not involve isolated lexical borrowing but rather a shift from one grammatical system to another within the same utterance.

Another example can be seen in */Maybe bisa aja sih Himalaya ini memberikan discount or maybe gift, but I just wanna ordering only four skincare because this is claim letter/*. In this case, the speaker alternates between Indonesian and English clause structures. The Indonesian segment (“bisa aja sih Himalaya ini memberikan discount”) follows Indonesian syntax, while the English clauses (“but I just wanna ordering only four skincare because this is claim letter”) follow English syntactic patterns. Each segment maintains its own grammatical framework, indicating structural alternation rather than simple insertion.

A further example appears in */So, if you return the product today ketika mereka bilang nanti ongkos kirimnya darimu/*. The first clause (“So, if you return the product today”) is fully constructed in English, then alternates to an Indonesian clause (“ketika mereka bilang nanti ongkos kirimnya darimu”) within the same discourse unit. The alternation occurs at clause level, demonstrating a shift in syntactic structure rather than lexical embedding.

In all these examples, the switching involves entire grammatical segments rather than isolated words. Each language segment preserves its own syntactic integrity, confirming that the pattern fits the category of alternation as proposed by Muysken (2000). In the classroom interaction at HKBP Nommensen University, alternation typically appears in longer explanations, argumentative responses, or reflective statements. This suggests a higher level of bilingual flexibility, as students are able to navigate between two linguistic systems at the structural level rather than merely borrowing vocabulary items.

### 1.1.2.3. Congruent Lexicalization

Congruent lexicalization occurs when elements from two languages are combined within a shared grammatical structure, and both languages contribute lexical items relatively freely. According to Muysken (2000), this type differs from insertion and alternation because neither language clearly functions as the sole matrix language. Instead, the two languages share a common syntactic frame that allows extensive and flexible mixing. In this pattern, the grammatical structure appears hybrid, and the boundaries between the two language systems become less distinct.

Based on the classroom data of fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, several utterances reflect this blended structure. One example is */So, in writing claim letter ini I want to order skincare Himalaya 3 boxes facewash karena produknya damaged/*. In this utterance, English provides part of the structural frame (“So, in writing claim letter... I want to order...”), while Indonesian elements such as “ini” and “karena produknya damaged” are integrated smoothly within the same syntactic flow. The sentence does not strictly follow purely English or purely Indonesian grammar; rather, both languages interact dynamically within a shared structure.

Another example appears in */Actually kalau kita lihat dari segi kualitas the product is good tapi packaging-nya kurang safety/*. Here, Indonesian and English lexical items are distributed throughout the sentence without a clear dominant grammatical base. The utterance blends Indonesian clause patterns (“kalau kita lihat dari segi kualitas”) with English predicate structure (“the product is good”), followed again by a mixed segment (“tapi packaging-nya kurang safety”). The structure reflects overlapping grammatical contributions rather than a clear shift or simple insertion.

A further example can be observed in */Maybe nanti kita bisa discuss lagi about the refund process supaya tidak misunderstanding/*. In this case, English and Indonesian lexical items coexist within a shared conversational structure. The sentence moves fluidly between the two languages, and both contribute to the overall grammatical organization. The mixing is not limited to isolated lexical borrowing, nor does it involve a clear alternation between independent clauses; instead, the grammatical pattern is blended.

In the classroom interaction at HKBP Nommensen University, congruent lexicalization tends to appear in spontaneous explanations, negotiations, and argumentative discussions. This pattern reflects a high degree of bilingual integration, as students draw from both English and Indonesian within a shared grammatical framework. The data indicate that speakers do not perceive strict structural boundaries between the two languages, but rather utilize them as compatible linguistic resources for constructing meaning in academic interaction.

**Table 2. The Analysis of Data of Code Mixing**

Insertion	Alternation	Congruent Lexicalization
Saya mau <i>share</i> sedikit <i>experience</i> ku.	I feel like insecure tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya	So, in writing claim letter ini I want to order skincare Himalaya 3 boxes facewash karena produknya damaged
<i>Skincare</i> gue <i>affordable</i> semua.	Maybe bisa ajasih Himalaya ini memberikan discount or maybe gift, but I just wanna ordering only four skincare	Actually kalua kita lihat dari segi kualitas the product is good tapi packagingnya kurang safety.
Kapan <i>deadline</i> nya?	So, if you return the product today Ketika mereka bilang nanti ongkos kirimnya darimu.	Maybe nanti kitab isa disscuss lagi about the refund process supaya tidak misunderstanding
Disuruh <i>submit</i> videonya ke <i>google drive</i> .		
Kenapa gak pakai <i>sunscreen</i> kau.		

**1.2 Research Findings**

The data were obtained from three classroom meetings of fifth-semester students of the English Education Study Program at HKBP Nommensen University. The researcher recorded and transcribed all classroom interactions during presentations, discussions, and question-answer sessions.

This section presented the findings of the study on the types of code-switching and code-mixing used by the fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University. The classification is based on Poplack’s (1980) theory of code-switching (inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and tag switching) and Muysken’s (2000) typology of code-mixing (insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization).

From 80 utterances analyzed, six types were identified. However, several utterances did not contain any switching because they were produced entirely in one language.

**Table 3. Frequency of Code-Switching**

No	Type	Frequency	Percentage
1	Inter-sentential	4	5%
2	Intra-sentential	19	23.75%
3	Tag switching	13	16.25%

<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>
--------------	-----------	-------------

  

**Table 4. Frequency of Code-Mixing**

No	Type	Frequency	Percentage
1	Insertion	33	41.25%
2	Alternation	6	7.5%
3	Congruent Lexicalization	5	6.25%
<b>Total</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The findings revealed that the utilization of code switching and code mixing among fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University is predominantly charact. The findings revealed that the utilization of code switching and code mixing among fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University is predominantly characterized by the type of **insertion**, which accounts for **41.25%** of instances observed. This finding indicated that almost half of all classroom interactions include the integration of English elements into the grammatical structure of Indonesian sentences.

Supporting this observation is **Muysken's (2000) theory of code mixing**, which categorized *insertion* as a linguistic phenomenon where components from a second language were embedded within the framework of the first language. Within the context of English as a foreign language education, the employment of English elements as a lexical resource significantly enhances the precision and efficiency of idea expression.

Students tend to favor the *insertion* type during classroom interactions for several underlying reasons. Primarily, they often encounter challenges in locating appropriate vocabulary in Indonesian for academic or technical terminology. Consequently, students may resort to utilizing English lexicon that they perceive as more familiar, particularly when engaging with topics pertinent to their fields of study. Moreover, the use of *insertion* facilitated enhanced clarity in communication, thus allowing students to articulate their thoughts with greater specificity.

The employment of the *insertion* type by students during classroom interactions emerged as an effective communicative strategy that is reflective of their linguistic and pedagogical needs. The prevailing theories substantiate this understanding, highlighting the significance of recognizing the roles of code switching and mixing within multilingual educational contexts.

This pattern was further supported by the Matrix Language Frame Model introduced by Carol Myers-Scotton (1993), which explained that bilingual speakers typically maintain one dominant grammatical structure while incorporating lexical items from another language. Therefore, the dominance of insertion in this study reflected a structurally economical and linguistically stable bilingual practice.

Several factors may explain why insertion is more dominant than other types. First, from a linguistic perspective, insertion requires less structural adjustment than alternation or inter-sentential switching. Students did not need to reorganize the grammatical system of the sentence; instead, they simply replace or insert particular lexical items. This made insertion cognitively less demanding and more spontaneous in classroom interaction.

Second, from an academic perspective, students in an English Education program were frequently exposed to English terminology, especially in academic and technological contexts. Certain terms such as *assignment*, *submit*, and *deadline* are more commonly used in English and may not have equally practical or frequently used equivalents in Indonesian. Thus, English functions as a lexical resource rather than as a full structural system.

Third, from a sociolinguistic perspective, the use of English lexical items may signal academic identity and group solidarity. As suggested by Rene Appel and Pieter Muysken (1987), code-mixing can serve symbolic functions, including identity marking and social alignment. In

this context, the insertion of English terms reflects the students' identity as English-major students and members of an academic community.

A comparison with existing literature further illustrated that this phenomenon is not confined to the Indonesian context but is also prevalent in diverse multilingual settings. For instance, in the research conducted by **Adjei (2010)** in Ghana, it was observed that students frequently employed code switching to express solidarity and group identity. This aligned with findings at HKBP Nommensen University, where students leverage *insertion* and code switching to foster connections with their peers and lecturers.

Furthermore, **Sert and Seedhouse's (2006) study** demonstrated that the application of code switching in English language instruction in Turkey served as an effective pedagogical strategy to facilitate comprehension. This corroborated the relevancy of the current findings, indicating that students within academic environments similarly employ such techniques to elucidate instructions and enhance classroom interactions.

For instance, Sumarsih (2014) found that insertion was the most frequent type of code-mixing among university students, particularly in academic discussions. Similarly, Kumarsih (2015) reported that EFL learners tended to insert English lexical items to facilitate communication and express concepts more efficiently. These studies support the argument that insertion is commonly dominant in bilingual classroom settings, especially in higher education contexts.

However, unlike studies conducted in secondary school settings, the dominance of insertion in this research does not indicate limited English proficiency. Instead, it reflects strategic bilingual competence. The students demonstrate the ability to maintain Indonesian grammatical structure while selectively employing English lexical items to enhance clarity, precision, and efficiency.

In conclusion, the dominance of insertion (48.4%) suggests that bilingual classroom interaction in this study is characterized by lexical-level mixing rather than structural switching. English functions primarily as a lexical and symbolic resource within an Indonesian grammatical framework. This finding reinforces Muysken's (2000) classification of insertion as a common and structurally economical form of code-mixing in bilingual discourse.

### 1.3 Pragmatic Functions of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing

Based on the observation conducted in three classroom meetings, it was found that the practice of code-switching and code-mixing did not merely function as a linguistic phenomenon, but also served significant social and pragmatic functions in classroom interaction.

The researcher analyzed the pragmatic functions of code-switching and code-mixing based on the speech act classification proposed by George Yule (1996). According to Yule, speech acts can be categorized into declaratives, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives. In the classroom interaction of fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University, four major functions were identified: representative, expressive, directive, and commissive. Declarative acts were not found because classroom interaction did not involve institutional authority that changes status or situation formally.

#### 1.3.1 Representative

Representative acts were found to be the most dominant pragmatic function in the data. Representatives occur when speakers commit to the truth of a proposition by stating, explaining, describing, or informing. In classroom interaction, this function is particularly dominant because the academic setting requires students to present ideas, explanations, and arguments.

No	Utterances	Types of Switching	Context	Pragmatic Function
----	------------	--------------------	---------	--------------------

1	“When you receive a reminder letter you must reply quickly. Jadi dianjurkan supaya kita membalas dengan cepat.”	Inter-sentential	Explaining academic procedure	Representative
2	“Saya mau share sedikit experienceku tentang customer complaint.”	Insertion	Sharing personal experience in discussion	Representative
3	“Actually kalau kita lihat dari segi kualitas the product is good.”	Congruent Lexicalization	Giving evaluation during presentation	Representative
4	“Before we send the email kita harus cek dulu formatnya.”	Alternation	Explaining procedural steps	Representative
5	“Before we send the email kita harus cek dulu formatnya.”	Insertion	Describing product characteristics	Representative

The dominance of representative acts indicates that students primarily use bilingual resources to transmit knowledge and academic content. Code-switching functions as a clarification strategy rather than as identity marking alone. This finding aligns with the academic nature of classroom discourse, where information exchange is central.

**1.3.2 Expressive**

Expressive acts were identified when students used language alternation to express feelings, evaluations, agreement, or disagreement. Expressives reflect the speaker’s psychological state rather than objective facts.

No	Utterances	Types of Switching	Context	Pragmatic Function
1	“I feel like insecure tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya.”	Intra-sentential	Expressing personal emotion	Expressive
2	“Actually menurutku itu kurang fair.”	Intra-sentential	Expressing disagreement	Expressive
3	“That’s really annoying sih.”	Tag / Intra	Showing frustration	Expressive
4	“Packaging-nya kurang safety menurut saya.”	Congruent Lexicalization	Evaluating product	Expressive
5	“I’m so happy karena akhirnya selesai juga.”	Intra-sentential	Expressing happiness	Expressive

Expressive functions frequently appeared during spontaneous discussion and argumentative exchanges. This suggests that bilingual competence enables students to select emotionally appropriate expressions from either language to articulate nuanced attitudes.

**1.3.3 Directive**

Directive acts occur when the speaker attempts to influence the listener’s behavior. In the classroom data, directives appeared in instructional explanations and confirmation checks.

No	Utterance	Type of Switching	Context	Pragmatic Function
----	-----------	-------------------	---------	--------------------

1	“Ngerti nya ci, do you get it?”	Tag Switching	Checking classmates’ understanding	Directive
2	“Jadi kita harus make sure dulu mana dia yang salah.”	Alternation	Giving instruction	Directive
3	“Please submit tugasnya sebelum jam 12.”	Insertion	Giving reminder	Directive
4	“Can you explain lagi maksudnya?”	Intra-sentential	Asking clarification	Directive
5	“Don’t forget ya kirim videonya ke Google Drive.”	Tag / Insertion	Reminding peers	Directive

Directive functions demonstrate that code-switching supports pedagogical interaction. Students use bilingual strategies to maintain clarity, participation, and collaborative learning.

### 1.3.4 Commissive

Commissive acts were less frequent but still present. Commissives involve commitment to future actions.

No	Utterance	Type of Switching	Context	Pragmatic Function
1	“Maybe nanti kita bisa discuss lagi about the refund process.”	Congruent Lexicalization	Planning further discussion	Commissive
2	“I will try jelaskan lagi minggu depan.”	Intra-sentential	Promising explanation	Commissive
3	“Nanti saya submit tugasnya tonight.”	Insertion	Promising task completion	Commissive
4	“We will fix the mistake besok.”	Alternation	Committing to correction	Commissive
5	“Okay, I’ll send the file nanti.”	Intra-sentential	Offering action	Commissive

This utterance signals intention for future discussion. The mixing reflects informal negotiation and collaborative planning.

Although not dominant, commissive acts indicate that language alternation also plays a role in organizing future academic interaction.

### 1.4 Social Function of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing

The use of code-switching and code-mixing in bilingual communication is closely related to social interaction. In sociolinguistics, language choice not only conveys meaning but also reflects relationships between speakers, social identity, and communicative purposes. According to Janet Holmes, speakers may switch languages to express solidarity, reduce social distance, and show group membership. Similarly, John J. Gumperz explains that code-switching in conversation serves interactional purposes such as emphasizing messages, clarifying meaning, and managing communication in social contexts. By combining these perspectives, code-switching and code-mixing can be understood as strategies that function both socially and interactionally in communication.

Based on these theories, several social functions of code-switching and code-mixing can be identified.

#### 1.4.1 Building Solidarity

Code-switching can be used to create closeness between speakers. When participants use a familiar language shared by the group, it signals friendliness and mutual understanding. Holmes states that language choice often reflects solidarity within a community. In classroom interaction, switching from English to Indonesian may help lecturers and students build a more comfortable relationship.

*“Morning class... how was your holiday? Oh iya sebelumnya mam mau ucapkan happy new year to us.”*

The lecturer began the interaction in English and then switched to Indonesian. This language shift indicates an effort to create a friendly and comfortable atmosphere with the students. According to Janet Holmes, language choice can signal solidarity and closeness between speakers in social interaction.

#### 1.4.2 Reducing Social Distance

Language alternation can also reduce the perceived distance between speakers of different statuses. According to Holmes, speakers often adjust their language to make interaction feel more equal. In educational settings, lecturers may switch languages so students feel more confident participating in discussions.

*“Okay, anyone else?”*

*“Ayo nang satu-satu cerita dulu hari ini kita cerita-cerita lah dulu.”*

The lecturer used English and then switched to Indonesian to encourage students to speak more comfortably. This language alternation reduces the level of formality and minimizes the social distance between lecturer and students.

#### 1.4.3 Showing Group Identity

Code-mixing often reflects membership in a particular social or academic group. The use of English terms in Indonesian sentences can signal that the speakers belong to an English-speaking academic community. This aligns with Holmes' view that language is an important marker of social identity.

*“Excuse me mam, I will try to answer. Jadi, masalahnya dalam surat itu adalah they ordered the book...”*

The student mixed English and Indonesian in one utterance. This reflected their identity as English Education students who are accustomed to using English academic terms in classroom discussions. The mixing of languages indicated membership in an academic community.

#### 1.4.4. Emphasizing or Clarifying Meaning

From Gumperz's perspective, code-switching functions as a conversational strategy to highlight important information or clarify meaning. When a speaker switches language, it may draw attention to key ideas or help listeners better understand the message.

*“Before we write a claim letter we should make sure that all the information about the problem.”*

followed by

*“Jadi kita harus make sure dulu mana dia yang salah.”*

The lecturer switched languages to highlight an important point in the explanation. According to John J. Gumperz, code-switching can function as a conversational strategy to emphasize key information and help listeners understand the message more clearly.

#### 1.4.5 Facilitating Communication

Gumperz also explains that bilingual speakers switch languages to maintain the flow of conversation. When a concept is difficult to express in one language, switching to another language helps ensure that communication remains effective.

“So, how about your opinion? Jadi pertanyaanku aku gak tau jenis produk apa yang kau pesan.”

Students used both languages to make their ideas easier to understand. Switching languages helped maintain the flow of communication and allowed speakers to express their thoughts more effectively during the discussion.

### 1.5 Data Triangulation

The researcher conducted interviews with six students of the English Education Study Program who participated in the class. The interviews were carried out to identify the reasons and factors underlying the use of code-switching and code-mixing in classroom interaction. To ensure the credibility and validity of the data, this research applied source triangulation. Source triangulation is a technique used to check the trustworthiness of qualitative data by comparing information obtained from different sources related to the same phenomenon. By examining data from several sources, the researcher can confirm the consistency of the findings and reduce potential bias in interpreting the data.

In this study, the researcher collected data from classroom interactions during the English learning process. The primary data consisted of utterances produced by the teacher and students in the classroom that contained code-switching and code-mixing. These utterances were obtained through classroom observation and were recorded and transcribed by the researcher.

The researcher applied source triangulation by comparing several data sources related to the classroom interaction. First, the researcher analyzed the transcriptions of the classroom conversation to identify utterances that contained code switching and code mixing. From these transcriptions, the researcher selected 80 utterances that were relevant to the research focus.

Second, the researcher compared the identified occurrences with the original classroom observation notes and recordings. This step was conducted to ensure that the transcription accurately represented the actual classroom interaction and that the identified data truly reflected the use of code switching and code mixing during the teaching and learning process.

Third, the researcher compared the utterances produced by different participants in the classroom, namely the teacher and the students. By examining these different sources of speech, the researcher was able to verify whether the patterns of code-switching and code mixing occurred consistently across different speakers and classroom situations.

Through this process, the researcher ensured that the data were not derived from a single perspective but were supported by multiple sources of information within the classroom context. The comparison among classroom recordings, observation notes, and utterances from different speakers helped strengthen the credibility and reliability of the findings.

Therefore, the use of source triangulation in this research contributed to validating the data and ensuring that the analysis of code switching and code-mixing in classroom interaction was accurate and trustworthy.

### 1.6 Discussion

#### 1.6.1 Type of Code Switching

##### 1.6.1.1 Inter-sentential Switching

Inter-sentential switching was found less frequently compared to intra-sentential switching. This type occurs when language switching happens between sentences, for example, one complete sentence in Indonesian followed by another complete sentence in English.

*"Oh iya sebelumnya mam mau ucapkan happy new year to us."*

*"Enjoy your moment aja masih muda kok."*

*"I can't catch what kind of product did you buy from the shop?"*

*"Jadi pertanyaanku, aku gak tau jenis produk apa yang kau pesan dari toko tersebut."*

The lower frequency of this type can be explained by the fact that it requires greater control over two separate grammatical systems. In spontaneous classroom discussions, students

tend to choose more practical forms rather than switching languages fully between sentences. Therefore, inter-sentential switching is not dominant in this study.

### 1.6.1.2 Intra-sentential Switching

Intra-sentential switching is the most dominant type found in this study. This type occurs when students insert English words, phrases, or clauses into Indonesian sentence structures without changing the overall grammatical system. The dominance of this type indicates that students tend to use the most flexible form of switching that does not disrupt the flow of communication.

*"Jadi teman-teman sekalian my holiday I spent my holiday di rumah sakit because my sister is sick."*

*"Di sana I don't care my happiness because I always just focus on her health."*

*"Jadi claim letter itu adalah complain letter surat yang mengungkapkan bahwa to complain sebuah product."*

According to the classification proposed by Shana Poplack, intra-sentential switching frequently appears in natural bilingual situations because it does not require a complete shift between grammatical systems. In the classroom context, students often insert academic terms such as *assignment*, *discussion*, or *theory* into Indonesian sentences. This suggests that switching occurs due to academic habits and lexical accessibility.

### 1.6.1.3 Tag Switching

Tag switching was also identified in the data, although its frequency is lower than intra-sentential switching. This type occurs when students insert short tags or expressions such as *okay*, *right*, or *you know* into Indonesian utterances.

*"That's right ya."*

*"Well, kita bahas lah chapter 12 dulu ya practice 2."*

*"Okay boleh dikerjakan. Any question?"*

Tag switching is relatively easy to perform because it does not affect the main sentence structure. Its use often serves interactional functions, such as maintaining engagement, attracting attention, or checking understanding. Thus, the occurrence of this type is closely related to the interactive function of classroom communication.

## 1.6.2 Type of Code Mixing

### 1.6.2.1 Insertion

Insertion is the most dominant type of code-mixing in this study. This type occurs when English lexical elements are inserted into Indonesian structures without changing the main syntactic pattern.

According to the theory proposed by Pieter Muysken, insertion is the most common form of code-mixing in bilingual communities because it only involves the insertion of lexical items. In the classroom context, students frequently insert English academic terms that are considered more precise or more familiar than their Indonesian equivalents. This indicates that insertion functions as a practical strategy to maintain both accuracy of meaning and communication fluency.

For examples: *"Biasa aja mam, nothing special."*, *"Keknya karna gak pake skincare aku pas di kampung."*, *"Jadi sunburn gitu ga pake sunscreen."*

### 1.6.2.2 Alternation

Alternation was found to be the least frequent type in the code-mixing category. This type occurs when speakers alternate between two grammatical systems within the same utterance. For example: *"I feel like insecure tapi aku kek stecu aja sebenarnya."*, *"Maybe bisa ajasih Himalaya ini memberikan discount or maybe gift, but I just wanna ordering only four skincare because this is claim letter."*

The low frequency of alternation can be understood because this type requires a full structural shift between languages. In spontaneous and communicative classroom interactions, students rarely engage in complex structural switching. Therefore, insertion appears more dominant than alternation.

### 1.6.2.3. Congruent Lexicalization

Congruent lexicalization appeared in limited instances in this study. This type occurs when two languages share similar grammatical structures, allowing lexical items from both languages to appear within a single sentence structure. The presence of this type reflects students' bilingual flexibility; however, it is not dominant because classroom interaction tends to involve lexical insertion rather than full lexical system blending.

This indicates that students tend to select simpler and more practical forms of language switching that do not require a full grammatical shift. The phenomenon reflects a functional use of language within the learning context. For example : *"Jadi kalau misalnya mereka mau ngasih something atau nambahin barangnya so the Perusahaan nya itu ngasih tahu samak", "So, if you return the product today Ketika mereka bilang nanti ongkos kirimnya darimu."* So, in writing claim letter ini I want to order skincare Himalaya 3 boxes facewash, exfoliating face, and purifying neem mask."

In general, the findings of this study demonstrated that code-mixing and code-switching frequently occurred in classroom interaction among fifth-semester students at HKBP Nommensen University. Among the six identified types, insertion emerged as the most dominant pattern, accounting for **41.25%** of the total occurrences. This indicates that students predominantly embed English lexical items into Indonesian grammatical structures rather than switching entire sentence structures.

In addition, intra-sentential switching appeared as the second most frequent type (**23.75%**), followed by tag switching (**16.25%**). Alternation accounted for **7.5%**, while congruent lexicalization represented **6.25%**, and inter-sentential switching showed the lowest percentage at **5%**. This distribution suggests that bilingual language use in the classroom is primarily characterized by lexical-level mixing rather than full structural shifts between languages.

In general, the significant pattern shows that Indonesian remains the dominant grammatical framework, with English functioning mainly as a lexical resource in academic interaction. The predominance of insertion reflects structural stability in classroom discourse, while the relatively high presence of intra-sentential and tag switching indicates dynamic bilingual flexibility in spontaneous interaction.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study entitled *"Code Switching and Code Mixing in Classroom Interactions among Fifth-Semester English Education Students"* provides meaningful insights into students' bilingual practices in academic classroom settings. Based on the analysis of 80 occurrences, the findings reveal that **insertion** is the most dominant type, accounting for **41.25% (33 occurrences)** of the total data. This dominance indicates that students primarily embed English lexical items into Indonesian grammatical structures. Such a pattern reflects a practical and efficient communication strategy that allows students to maintain fluency while expressing academic concepts accurately.

The second most frequent type is **intra-sentential switching**, comprising **23.75% (19 occurrences)**. This finding shows that students frequently insert English elements within Indonesian sentences without changing the overall grammatical structure. Meanwhile, **tag switching** accounts for **16.25% (13 occurrences)**, suggesting that students often use short English expressions such as discourse markers to maintain interaction and engagement during classroom discussions.

In contrast, the less frequent types include **alternation** at **7.5% (6 occurrences)**, **congruent lexicalization** at **6.25% (5 occurrences)**, and **inter-sentential switching** as the least dominant type at **5% (4 occurrences)**. The relatively low percentage of inter-sentential switching and alternation indicates that students rarely perform complete structural shifts between languages. Instead, they prefer simpler and more flexible forms of bilingual expression that do not require full grammatical transitions.

In general, these findings demonstrate that code switching and code mixing in classroom interaction are systematic and purposeful rather than random. Students tend to select forms that support communicative efficiency, academic clarity, and interactive engagement. The dominance of insertion and intra-sentential switching highlights the functional role of bilingual practices in facilitating learning and maintaining effective classroom communication.

This study contributes to the broader understanding of bilingual behavior in higher education contexts and emphasizes that code switching and code mixing should be recognized as legitimate communicative strategies. Future research may explore similar phenomena in different academic levels or institutional contexts to further deepen insights into multilingual classroom dynamics.

## References

- Adjei, A. (2010). *Code switching and code mixing among Ghanaian university students in academic communication*. Accra: University of Ghana Press.
- Alenezi, A. A. (2020). Code-switching in EFL classrooms: A tool for comprehension or a hindrance in fluency? *Arab World English Journal*, 11(2), 181–195.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2005). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110239331.1>
- Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (2010). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dewi, N. (2020). Teachers' and students' perceptions of code switching in EFL classrooms in Indonesia. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(3), 321–335.

- Ezeh, C., Okoro, A., & Nwosu, J. (2022). The role of code switching and code mixing in the teaching of English as a second language in rural Nigeria. *International Journal of Language Education*, 6(2), 112–125.
- Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA Review*, 16(1), 38–51.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Newbury House.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ho, J. W. Y. (2007). Code-mixing: Linguistic forms and socio-cultural meanings. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 10(3), 211–230.
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35–71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Indrawan, R., & Yaniawati, P. (2014). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan campuran untuk manajemen, pembangunan, dan pendidikan*. Refika Aditama.
- Jacobson, R. (1998). *Code-switching worldwide*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Köylü, Z. (2018). The use of L1 in tertiary level EFL classrooms: Code-switching functions, factors and attitudes. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(2), 44–60.
- Kumari, S. (2024). Code switching and code mixing in multilingual classrooms: A theoretical exploration. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 13(1), 45–59.
- Kumarsih, T. (2015). Code switching and code mixing in classroom interaction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(3), 487–493.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance, and code switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 49–84.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. *Educational Research*, 47(1), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188042000337574>
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2014). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nababan, P. W. J. (1993). *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu pengantar*. Gramedia.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 1–6.
- Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2006). Classroom interaction and the organization of learning. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(2), 1–20.
- Sert, O., & Seedhouse, P. (2006). *Code-switching in the classroom: A conversation analytic perspective*. Newcastle University.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sumarsih, E. (2014). Code switching and code mixing in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 1(2), 69–81.
- Sumarsih, S. (2014). Code-switching and code-mixing in EFL teaching and learning process. *Journal of English and Education*, 2(1), 77–85.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Mouton.
- Yao, T. (2011). Code-switching in EFL classroom discourse: A systematic study. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13(2), 1–24.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian pendidikan (Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Alfabeta.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.