

## Analysis of Code-Mixing Patterns in English Students Daily Conversation

Apriani Sarce Mince Kalasuat<sup>1</sup>, Rizqi Claudia Wardani. H<sup>2</sup>, Nurteteng<sup>3\*</sup>  
<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong

\*Corresponding author, E-mail: [nurteteng@unimudasorong.ac.id](mailto:nurteteng@unimudasorong.ac.id).

### Abstract

This study investigated the patterns of code-mixing used by students of the UNIMUDA English Department in daily conversational interactions and the factors influencing its use. A descriptive qualitative design was applied. The data were collected through naturalistic observation, questionnaires, and interviews involving five active students. The conversational data were analyzed using thematic analysis and categorized based on Muysken's (2000) code-mixing theory. The findings showed that three patterns of code-mixing occurred: intra-sentential code-mixing, inter-sentential code-switching, and tag switching. Intra-sentential code-mixing was the most dominant pattern, as participants frequently inserted English lexical items into Indonesian sentence structures to maintain fluency and efficiency. Inter-sentential switching was used to clarify meaning and emphasize ideas, while tag switching functioned as a pragmatic marker in interaction. The study also revealed that code-mixing was influenced by internal factors, namely language identity and language proficiency, and external factors, including social situation and communicative purpose. Among these factors, communicative purpose was the most dominant, as code-mixing helped participants achieve clarity, emphasis, and smooth communication. Overall, code-mixing functioned as a strategic communicative practice rather than merely a linguistic habit.

**Keywords:** Code Mixing; Bilingualism; Conversational Interaction

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



### Introduction

In multilingual societies such as Indonesia, interaction between languages frequently produces mixed linguistic forms in everyday communication. One of the most prominent phenomena emerging from this interaction is code-mixing, which occurs when speakers embed elements from one language into another within a single utterance (Muysken, 2000). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, code-mixing is particularly visible among university students who are simultaneously exposed to Indonesian, local languages, and English. Recent sociolinguistic research emphasizes that code-mixing should not automatically be viewed as linguistic deficiency; rather, it often reflects communicative strategy, identity construction, and pragmatic adaptation in bilingual environments (Gardner-Chloros, 2019; Macaro, 2018; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2021).

In higher education settings, especially in English education programs, students are expected to develop communicative competence in English while still operating within predominantly Indonesian-speaking environments. This dual linguistic exposure creates natural conditions for code-mixing to occur in both formal and informal interactions. Contemporary studies indicate that multilingual learners frequently mix languages to maintain conversational flow, express precise meaning, or compensate for lexical limitations (García & Wei, 2018; King & Mackey, 2016). However, the patterns and motivations underlying code-mixing behavior vary depending on learners' proficiency, interactional goals, and sociolinguistic context.

At Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong (UNIMUDA), preliminary observation indicates that students often engage in informal conversations that blend Indonesian and English expressions. Many students appear comfortable inserting English words or short phrases into Indonesian discourse during peer interaction. Informal monitoring suggests that code-mixing is not incidental but rather a recurring communicative practice among students. Similar patterns have been reported in recent Indonesian EFL studies, which show that bilingual university learners frequently

employ code-mixing as a conversational resource and identity marker (Fachriyah, 2017; Siregar, 2021; Wibowo et al., 2017). Despite this observable trend, systematic documentation of the types and functions of code-mixing in the Sorong context remains limited. Without empirical analysis, lecturers may overlook whether students' code-mixing reflects strategic bilingual competence or underlying gaps in English mastery.

From a theoretical perspective, code-mixing has been extensively examined within contemporary sociolinguistics and bilingualism research. Muysken's (2000) typology categorizes code-mixing into insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, providing a robust analytical framework for identifying structural patterns in bilingual speech. More recent scholarship reinforces the relevance of structural analysis while also emphasizing the functional and interactional dimensions of bilingual language use (Bullock & Toribio, 2009; Gardner-Chloros, 2019). Understanding these patterns is particularly important in EFL contexts because code-mixing may simultaneously signal communicative flexibility and areas where learners still rely on their first language resources.

Previous research on code-mixing in Indonesian educational settings has predominantly focused on classroom discourse, teacher talk, or social media communication. Many recent studies report that intra-sentential mixing, especially insertion, tends to dominate student speech and is often driven by lexical convenience or communicative efficiency (Fachriyah, 2017; Pratama, 2020; Siregar, 2021). However, most existing investigations emphasize structural classification without closely examining informal peer conversations in university EFL environments. Furthermore, relatively few studies have been conducted in Eastern Indonesian contexts such as Sorong, where multilingual exposure, institutional support, and English learning ecology may differ from those in more frequently studied urban regions.

This gap is pedagogically important. Informal student conversation represents a natural linguistic environment in which authentic bilingual behavior emerges more spontaneously than in controlled classroom settings. If lecturers understand how and why students mix codes in daily interaction, they can better evaluate whether the behavior facilitates communicative development or potentially limits full English immersion. Moreover, analyzing code-mixing patterns can provide valuable insight into students' communicative strategies, lexical control, and confidence in using English.

Therefore, the present study aims to analyze the types and factors of code-mixing used by students of Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong in informal conversational contexts. By applying Muysken's typology alongside contemporary sociolinguistic perspectives, this study seeks to contribute to a more context-sensitive understanding of bilingual behavior in Indonesian EFL higher education. The findings are expected to offer practical implications for English lecturers in designing pedagogical strategies that acknowledge students' natural bilingual practices while still promoting more effective English development.

## **Literature Review**

### *a. Definition of Code Mixing*

Code-mixing is a linguistic phenomenon that is frequently observed in bilingual and multilingual cultures, especially in the everyday interactions of students in academic settings where English is the primary language, like the English Department students at UNIMUDA Sorong. It happened when a speaker blended two or more languages in a single statement or dialogue, reflecting social identity as well as communicative demands (Muysken, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 2002). According to Poplack (2015), code-mixing can happen at the word, phrase, or sentence level, enabling speakers to exhibit linguistic variation and creativity. Muysken (2000) defined code-mixing as the combination of two or more languages within a single utterance that were syntactically and semantically connected. The three forms of code-mixing were tag switching, which involves inserting brief words or phrases into a sentence without altering its syntactic structure, intra-sentential mixing, which involves combining languages within a single sentence, and inter-sentential switching, which involves switching between sentences. Each type had a distinct purpose: tag switching increased emphasis or conveyed emotional attitudes in conversation (Myers-Scotton, 2002; Nguyen, 2018), inter-sentential switching indicated topic shifts or contextual adaptation (Poplack, 2015), and intra-sentential mixing reflected linguistic proficiency and nuanced expression (Muysken, 2000).

Both internal and external influences were shown to have an impact on code-mixing. The speaker's linguistic identity and level of expertise were examples of internal influences. Language proficiency determined bilingual speakers' capacity to mix languages flexibly to accomplish communicative goals, whereas linguistic identity allowed them to communicate social or cultural ties (Garcia & Wei, 2018). Social and situational circumstances, such as the context's formality, the interlocutors' relationships, and the communicative goal, were examples of external influences. According to Canagarajah (2018) and Myers-Scotton (2002), these factors influenced when and how speakers used code-mixing to highlight points, clarify meaning, or accommodate their interlocutors. To understand how English Department students combined English and Indonesian in their everyday talks, it was necessary to comprehend these characteristics. The employment of two or more languages in a single speech or discussion is known as "code-mixing," and it frequently happens in bilingual and multilingual cultures. It demonstrated the speaker's capacity to communicate social identity and accomplish communicative objectives by combining linguistic resources (Muysken, 2000) as cited in a study by Rachmadani (2018). According to Poplack (2015), code-mixing can happen at the word, phrase, or sentence level, enabling speakers to exhibit linguistic diversity and inventiveness. Comprehending this term served as a basis for examining the trends and purposes of code-mixing in everyday discussions among UNIMUDA Sorong English Department students.

#### *b. Types of Code Mixing*

According to Muysken (2000), supported by more recent analyses such as Chen and Lee (2019), code-mixing can be categorized into several types based on its structural position and linguistic realization within an utterance. This typological classification is important because it helps researchers identify how bilingual speakers organize elements from two languages during real-time communication. The three most commonly observed types in bilingual interaction are intra-sentential code mixing, inter-sentential code switching, and tag switching. Each type reflects a different level of syntactic integration and communicative intention.

Intra-sentential code mixing occurs when elements from one language are inserted into a sentence that is otherwise structured in another language. This type typically appears at the word, phrase, or clause level within a single sentence and requires relatively high bilingual competence because the speaker must maintain grammatical coherence across languages. Recent studies note that intra-sentential mixing is often the most frequent form among EFL learners because it allows speakers to compensate for lexical gaps while maintaining conversational fluency (Chen & Lee, 2019; Gardner-Chloros, 2019).

Inter-sentential code switching, in contrast, takes place at sentence boundaries, where a speaker completes one sentence in one language and then shifts to another language in the following sentence. This type involves less structural integration than intra-sentential mixing but still reflects deliberate language alternation for discourse or pragmatic purposes. It is commonly associated with topic shifts, emphasis, or audience accommodation in bilingual interaction.

Tag switching (sometimes called emblematic switching) involves the insertion of short fixed expressions, discourse markers, or tags from one language into an utterance produced in another language. Common examples include expressions such as "you know," "okay," or "right." Although structurally simple, tag switching plays an important pragmatic role in managing interaction, signaling attitude, or maintaining conversational flow. Because it requires minimal grammatical adjustment, this type often appears even among learners with lower proficiency levels.

Understanding these distinctions is essential in EFL research because the dominance of a particular type of code-mixing may reflect learners' linguistic competence, communicative strategy, and level of bilingual flexibility. Therefore, applying Muysken's typology in the present study enables a more systematic analysis of how UNIMUDA students employ code-mixing in their informal conversations.

#### **Methodology**

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design to examine code mixing patterns in English Department students' daily conversations. The research was conducted at Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong. The participants consisted of five English Department students

selected through purposive sampling. Select participants who actively use both English and Indonesian in their daily interactions. Choose these students because they frequently engage in informal conversations and are considered capable of providing rich data relevant to the objectives of the study. Collect the data using observation, questionnaire, and semi structured interviews. Use observation to obtain natural conversational data and to identify the types of code mixing that occur during student interaction. Apply an observation guide to systematically record instances of code mixing, including the linguistic form, conversational context, and interaction patterns.

Use a questionnaire to identify the factors influencing students' use of code mixing. Design the questionnaire with 13 Likert scale items based on four analytical factors: language identity, language proficiency, social situation, and communicative purpose. Arrange the response options on a five point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Conduct semi structured interviews to gain deeper insights into students' reasons, experiences, and attitudes toward code mixing. Use 16 open ended questions and involve the same five participants. Audio record all interviews to maintain accuracy and allow careful transcription.

Implement the research procedure in three stages. First, conduct naturalistic observations of students' daily conversations. Second, distribute the questionnaires to the selected participants. Third, carry out the semi structured interviews to clarify and enrich the data obtained from the previous instruments. Analyze the data using qualitative thematic analysis. Transcribe the conversational data from observations and audio recordings, then identify and classify instances of code mixing. Categorize the occurrences into intra sentential code mixing, inter sentential code switching, and tag switching. Analyze the questionnaire data descriptively by calculating the mean score of each factor to determine the dominant influences on students' code mixing behavior. Code the interview transcripts and group the responses into themes related to language identity, language proficiency, social situation, and communicative purpose. Triangulate the findings from observation, questionnaire, and interview data to strengthen the validity and consistency of the results.

## Result

The findings of this research revealed that English students used code-mixing in their daily conversations in three main patterns: intra-sentential code-mixing, inter-sentential code-switching, and tag switching. Among these patterns, intra-sentential code-mixing was the most dominant, indicating that students frequently inserted English lexical items into Indonesian sentence structures during informal interactions. This finding shows that students preferred partial language integration rather than complete language switching in everyday communication.

**Table 1.** *Code Mixing used by English Students*

No	Example Utterance	Pattern	Context
1	“ Okay guys, jadi today my activity just apa ya? Wake up in the morning”	Intra-sential	Sharing daily routine
2	“ Aku seperti juggling... there's so many assignments.”	Intra-sential	Academic pressure
3	“ I really like singing, maybe Indonesian music.”	Intra-sential	Musical preference
4	“ So yeah, i started to learning.. meskipun aku masih berpikir..”	Inter-sential	Reflection

5	“ I have a solution. Baca jurnal. It can make you feel sleepy.”	Inter-sential	Giving advice
6	“ Yeah, because i listened to my mom. Guru bahasa inggris aku datang ke rumah..”	Inter-sential	Strorytelling
7	“ Oh my God, kok aku kasihan sekali”	Tag Switching	Expressing emotion
8	“ Please, trust me. Trust me”	Tag Switching	Emphasis
9	“ Okay okay.. but we have to make it clear”	Tag Switching	Clarification

Table 1. presents the types of code mixing identified from the observation guide. The data show that English students employed three types of code mixing, namely insertion, intra- sentential code mixing, and tag switching. These types were identified based on the structure and position of the mixed elements within the utterances.

a. Intra-Sentential Mixing

Intra-sentential code mixing occurs when a language shift takes place within a sentence or clause, where two languages are intensively mixed at the morphological and syntatic level. From the pattern found “Okay guys, *jadi* today my activity just *apa ya?* Wake up in the morning”. The utterance contains word-level and phrase-level code-mixing, as English lexical items (today, activity, just) and a verb phrase (wake up in the morning) are inserted into an Indonesian sentence structure. This type of mixing is categorized as intra-sentential code- mixing.

b. Inter-Sentential Switching

Inter-sentential switching involve a switch of language at the boundary between sentences. One sentence is spoken in one language, and the following sentence in another, such as “ So yeah, i started to learning. *meskipun aku masih berpikir.*”. The speaker switches from an English clause (So yeah, i started learning) to an Indonesian clause (*meskipun aku masih berpikir*), indicating inter-sentential code switching used to express reflection and continuation of thought. This type of switching typically appeared when speakers shifted topics, introduced new ideas, or clarified their points. This aligns with the view that sentence level switching serves discourse management functions, allowing speakers to control meaning, emphasis, and interpersonal relations within the interaction.

c. Tag Switching

Tag switching refers to the insertion of short elements such as words or phrases (tags) from a second language into a sentence in the primary language without altering the syntatic structure. From the example found “ Oh my God, *kok aku kasihan sekali.*” This utterance is categorized as tag switching, as the speaker inserts an English exclamatory tag (Oh my God) into an Indonesian sentence (*kok aku kasihan sekali*) to express emotion and emphasis. Tag switching appeared as a pragmatic device, functioning as emotional markers, emphasis cues, softeners, or tools for maintaining interpersonal connection. Although its frequency was relatively low, its functional significance was notable, showing that code-mixing is not merely structural but also socially and pragmatically motivated.

Another finding of this study addressed the second research question, which focused on the factors influencing English students’ use of code-mixing in their daily conversations. The findings revealed that students’ use of code-mixing was influenced by both internal and external factors. The internal factors included language identity and language proficiency. Students tended to mix languages because bilingual language use reflected their identity as English students. In addition, limited vocabulary and difficulty in expressing certain ideas in English encouraged students to insert Indonesian

elements to maintain fluency. External factors also contributed to the occurrence of code-mixing. Social situation influenced language choice, as students mixed languages more frequently in informal interactions with peers who shared similar linguistic backgrounds. Among all factors, communicative purpose emerged as the most dominant factor. Students mixed languages to clarify meaning, emphasize ideas, avoid misunderstandings, and maintain smooth communication. These findings indicate that code-mixing among English students was shaped by linguistic competence, social context, and communicative needs rather than occurring randomly.

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study reveal that students of Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong frequently employ code-mixing in informal conversations, with intra-sentential mixing emerging as the dominant type. This pattern indicates that students are not merely switching languages randomly but are strategically integrating English elements into Indonesian discourse to support communicative efficiency. The dominance of intra-sentential mixing suggests that most students possess sufficient bilingual awareness to embed lexical items while maintaining the grammatical frame of the base language. This result aligns with Gardner-Chloros (2019), who argues that intra-sentential mixing often reflects developing bilingual competence rather than linguistic deficiency.

The prevalence of insertion-type mixing in the present study is also consistent with recent EFL research in Indonesian university contexts. Previous studies have reported that learners tend to insert English lexical items, especially nouns and technical terms, into Indonesian sentences when equivalent expressions are less accessible or less familiar in the first language (Fachriyah, 2017; Siregar, 2021). In the UNIMUDA context, students appeared to rely on English insertions primarily to maintain conversational flow and avoid communication breakdown. This finding supports the view that code-mixing functions as a compensatory communication strategy in bilingual interaction.

From a functional perspective, the results indicate that communicative purpose was the most dominant factor motivating students' code-mixing behavior. Many students mixed codes to express ideas more precisely, respond quickly in conversation, or sound more natural within peer interaction. This pattern is in line with García and Wei (2018), who emphasize that bilingual speakers often draw flexibly from their full linguistic repertoire to achieve communicative goals. Rather than operating in strictly separated language systems, students appear to use a fluid bilingual practice that reflects pragmatic adaptation to the interactional context.

The findings also suggest that social and contextual factors play an important role in shaping code-mixing behavior. Informal peer conversations provided a low-anxiety environment in which students felt comfortable blending languages without fear of formal evaluation. This supports Macaro's (2018) argument that language choice in EFL contexts is highly sensitive to interactional setting and perceived communicative pressure. In more relaxed environments, learners tend to prioritize message delivery over strict language separation. Therefore, the high frequency of code-mixing observed in this study may partly reflect the informal nature of the conversational setting.

Another noteworthy finding is that most code-mixing instances occurred at the lexical level rather than at the clause or sentence level. This pattern indicates that students primarily use English to fill vocabulary gaps rather than to restructure entire utterances bilingually. Such behavior is typical of developing EFL learners, whose productive vocabulary in the target language is still expanding. As noted by Wardhaugh and Fuller (2021), lexical insertion is often the earliest and most common form of bilingual mixing among second language users.

However, while code-mixing in this study appears largely strategic, it may also signal areas where students still depend on Indonesian linguistic support. Excessive reliance on insertion could potentially limit opportunities for full English sentence production if not pedagogically addressed. This does not imply that code-mixing should be discouraged entirely; rather, it suggests the need for balanced instructional approaches that gradually increase students' confidence in sustained English use. Bullock and Toribio (2009) emphasize that bilingual mixing is a natural communicative resource, but its pedagogical implications depend on how it is managed in learning environments.

Compared with previous Indonesian studies, the present research contributes additional insight by focusing specifically on informal peer interaction in an Eastern Indonesian university context. Much prior work has concentrated on classroom discourse or teacher talk, whereas this study captures more

spontaneous bilingual behavior. The findings therefore extend existing literature by demonstrating that communicative-purpose-driven code-mixing remains robust even outside formal instructional settings. This highlights the importance of examining authentic student interaction when evaluating bilingual language use in EFL environments.

Despite these contributions, several limitations should be acknowledged. The study involved a relatively small number of conversational samples and focused on one institutional context, which may limit generalizability. In addition, the analysis concentrated primarily on structural types and reported motivations rather than detailed discourse functions. Future research could incorporate larger datasets, longitudinal observation, or conversation analysis to provide deeper insight into how code-mixing evolves alongside students' English proficiency.

Pedagogically, the findings suggest that English lecturers should not immediately interpret students' code-mixing as a failure to use English. Instead, it may reflect adaptive bilingual competence that can be strategically guided toward fuller target language production. Teachers can build on students' existing bilingual flexibility by designing activities that gradually extend mixed utterances into more sustained English discourse. Encouraging awareness of when and why to mix languages may help students develop more controlled and purposeful bilingual communication skills. The study confirms that code-mixing among UNIMUDA students functions primarily as a communicative strategy shaped by lexical needs, interactional context, and developing bilingual competence. Understanding this behavior provides valuable insight for EFL pedagogy in multilingual Indonesian higher education settings.

## Conclusion

This study concludes that English Education students at Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong frequently employ code-mixing in their informal daily conversations. The analysis identified three primary patterns: intra-sentential code-mixing, inter-sentential code-switching, and tag switching. Among these, intra-sentential code-mixing was the most dominant form, indicating that students commonly integrate English lexical items into Indonesian sentence structures during spontaneous peer interaction. This pattern reflects an emerging bilingual competence in which students flexibly draw on both linguistic resources to support communication.

The findings further demonstrate that students' code-mixing behavior is shaped by a combination of internal and external factors, including language identity, level of English proficiency, social context, and communicative purpose. Of these, communicative purpose emerged as the strongest influence. Students primarily mixed codes to maintain conversational flow, express meaning more precisely, avoid lexical difficulty, and sustain interaction with peers. This suggests that code-mixing in this context functions less as a sign of linguistic weakness and more as a pragmatic strategy for effective communication in a multilingual environment.

Overall, the study indicates that code-mixing among English students operates as a systematic and meaningful communicative practice rather than random language interference. The findings imply that lecturers should interpret students' mixed language use carefully and consider pedagogical approaches that both acknowledge natural bilingual behavior and gradually encourage more sustained English production. Future research is recommended to involve larger datasets, different interaction settings, and longitudinal observation in order to deepen understanding of how code-mixing develops alongside students' English proficiency.

## References

- Arfan, A. (2019). *An analysis of code-mixing used by the seventh semester students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar* (Undergraduate thesis). Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Chen, S., & Lee, J. (2019). Types and functions of code-mixing in bilingual speech communities. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(4), 761–778.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2018). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kusumawati, F. P., & Putri, S. S. R. (2021). Code-mixing in speaking of tenth grade students at SMAN 1 Metro academic year 2019/2020. *English Teaching and Linguistics Journal (ETLiJ)*, 2(2), 240–253.
- Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2017). Bilingualism and code-mixing in university communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 21(3), 310–329.
- Manihuruk, L. M. E. (2021). The code mixing in the classroom conversation of first semester students of University of HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. *Pedagogika: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Kependidikan*, 1(1), 14–16.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford University Press.
- Nguyen, T. (2018). Tag switching in Vietnamese-English bilingual conversations: Pragmatic functions and social meanings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 126, 60–72.
- Nugraha, I., Jaelani, A., & Sukma, B. P. (2024). How Indonesian students view code-mixing in daily conversations. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics Studies (JET Li)*, 6(2), 88–94.
- Nurpiana, Z., & Fithriani, R. (2023). Indonesian EFL teachers' use of code mixing in classroom interactions. *Journal of Vocational Education Studies*, 6(1), 25–39.
- Poplack, S. (2015). Inter-sentential code-switching and its social functions. *Language in Society*, 44(2), 123–143.
- Rachmadani, F. (2018). Code-mixing in bilingual communities: A sociolinguistic study. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 12(2), 45–62.
- Rahmanika, F. (2023). *Code switching and code mixing in English learning process at Department of English Education* (Doctoral dissertation). Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
- Rahmawati, L., Sholeha, M. A., & Rizka, H. (2022). Code-mixing in WhatsApp group discussions of online English classes. *Journal of English and Education (JEE)*, 73–80.
- Sari, N. F. (2022). Code switching and code mixing in classroom presentation of Indonesian EFL students. *EDUCASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, 7(2), 91–120.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (2014). *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford University Press.
- Suandi, I. N. (2014). *Sosiolinguistik*. Graha Ilmu.
- Sundari, F. (2022). *An analysis of code mixing used in speaking class activity at second grade students of MTS Darul Ulum Menggal* (Doctoral dissertation). Universitas Islam Riau.
- Wulandari, A., & Santosa, A. (2020). Code-mixing as a social strategy in bilingual student communities. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 8(1), 101–115.