Code-Mixing Practices of EFL Lecturers in Classroom Settings

Victor[1], Nehru P. Pongsapan[2], Markus Deli Girik Allo[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja

E-Mail: victorhikarikyuketsuki@gmail.com

Abstract: *The objevtive of research is to find out what type of code mixing used by EFL lecturers in Classroom Contex and what the impact are use code mixing used by EFL lecturers in classroom context. The researcher conducted this investigation used qualitative methodologies. Purposive sampling technique for the participant lecturers and snowball sampling for the students at campus 1 UKI Toraja. Observation and interview are the instruments of this research. The findings show that there are four types of code mixing used, namely insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization, and involving a change in pronunciation. The impact of using code mixing is incredibly positive, with students reporting increased understanding, motivation, and engagement in the learning process. However, there are also concerns that dependence on code mixing may reduce students' motivation to learn English independently. This research emphasizes the importance of a balanced teaching strategy to effectively support students' language development. In conclusion, the research shows four types of code-mixing insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization, and involving a change in pronunciation. Each contributing positively to students' understanding, motivation, and engagement in learning. However, reliance on code mixing may hinder students' independent learning of English. Therefore, a balanced teaching strategy is essential to effectively support students' language development.*

Keywords: *Sociolinguistics, Code Mixing, EFL Lecturers, Impact, Multilingualism*

INTRODUCTION

Language plays a crucial role in human communication, serving as the primary medium for expressing thoughts, feelings, and information. It fosters relationships and eases knowledge exchange, reflecting the culture and identity of its speakers (Kejiwaan & Kresna, 2020). A society's ideals, customs, and beliefs are often reflected in its language (Cong, 2023). In multicultural and multilingual contexts, language not only preserves cultural heritage but also aids in adapting to diverse interactions. In Indonesia, English is a core subject across educational tiers, motivating both students and educators to engage effectively with the language (Henry, 2023).

Multilingualism, the ability to use multiple languages in daily interactions, is prevalent in diverse societies like Indonesia. It enhances communication and identity formation while significantly affecting educational settings (Fisher et al., 2020; Rutgers et al., 2024). Code mixing, the integration of two or more languages

within a single dialogue, is common in bilingual or multilingual environments. In educational contexts, it can clarify meaning and deepen comprehension among students (Situmorang et al., 2023). While code mixing can help address language barriers and reduce anxiety in learning English, over-reliance on this practice may limit students' exposure to the language itself (Nurpiana & Fithriani, 2023).

The use of code-mixing by lecturers has appeared as a commonly used approach to enhance the teaching and learning experience. Code mixing refers to the integration of two or more languages within a single sentence or dialogue, which in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context typically includes English and Indonesian. For lecturers, code mixing serves as a valuable mechanism to address language barriers, particularly when students meet difficulties with English vocabulary or grammatical structures. Additionally, this practice can aid students in understanding the subject matter more effectively (Nurpiana & Fithriani, 2023). The use of code-mixing can help faster comprehension of material for students and reduce the anxiety associated with learning English. However, it is important to note that over- reliance on this practice can reduce students' opportunities to engage with the English language itself.

The use of code mixing by lecturers has appeared as a commonly used approach to enhance the teaching and learning experience. For lecturers, code mixing serves as a valuable mechanism to address language barriers, particularly when students meet difficulties with English vocabulary or grammatical structures. This practice can aid students in understanding the subject matter more effectively and help faster comprehension of material, while also reducing the anxiety associated with learning English (Nurpiana & Fithriani, 2023). However, it is important to note that over-reliance on this practice may limit students' opportunities to engage with the English language itself.

At the Indonesian Christian University of Toraja, lecturers often employ code mixing to elucidate learning materials. However, some students still struggle to engage and understand the content, leading to a lack of interaction in class. This observation raises questions about the effectiveness of code mixing as a pedagogical tool and its implications for student learning. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the types of code mixing used by lecturers and the impact of these practices on student comprehension and engagement.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Code-Mixing Practices of EFL Lecturers in Classroom Settings

Code-mixing refers to the blending of two or more languages within a single discourse, often within the same sentence or conversation (Muysken, 2000). In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), lecturers often mix languages, such as using the students' first language (L1) with English (L2), to facilitate comprehension, manage the classroom, or build rapport.

Code-mixing, the blending of elements from two or more languages within a single utterance or discourse, is a common linguistic phenomenon in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. In such contexts, lecturers often switch between English (L2) and the students' first language (L1), either intentionally or

unconsciously, to facilitate understanding and foster communication. According to Muysken (2000), code-mixing serves as a linguistic strategy that enables multilingual speakers to navigate between languages more flexibly. In classroom settings, this practice has pedagogical implications, especially when used as a tool to scaffold learners' comprehension and engagement.

Several theoretical perspectives underpin the use of code-mixing in educational contexts. Sociolinguistic frameworks such as those proposed by Fishman (1972) and Gumperz (1982) emphasize that language choice reflects social factors, identity, and domains of interaction. Hymes' (1972) concept of communicative competence further highlights the importance of selecting appropriate language codes to achieve effective communication. More recently, García and Wei's (2014) theory of translanguaging reframes code-mixing not as interference but as a legitimate and dynamic strategy through which bilingual individuals make meaning, learn, and express themselves.

Empirical studies have consistently shown that EFL lecturers use code-mixing to fulfill various pedagogical functions. Sert (2005) notes that switching to the students' L1 is often used to clarify difficult concepts, manage classroom behavior, or support learners emotionally. Bista (2010) finds that such strategies can help improve classroom management and facilitate student comprehension. Similarly, Levine (2011) suggests that code-mixing can lower student anxiety and enhance classroom participation. In Malaysian university contexts, Ahmed and Jusoff (2009) observed that code-mixing helped create a more interactive and inclusive learning environment.

In the Indonesian context, Manara (2007) found that EFL lecturers strategically used Bahasa Indonesia to explain culturally nuanced ideas and promote student understanding. Gulzar (2010), in a study in Pakistan, revealed that teachers employed code-mixing to bridge lexical gaps and enhance clarity. These studies support the idea that code-mixing is a pragmatic and context-sensitive practice that aligns with the communicative needs of both teachers and students.

Despite its advantages, code-mixing has also drawn criticism. Scholars such as Macaro (2001) warn that excessive reliance on the students' L1 may hinder their exposure to and acquisition of the target language. Ellis (2008) argues that frequent code-mixing can undermine the authenticity of an English-immersive environment and raise questions about instructional professionalism. Additionally, the practice presents challenges for assessment and consistency with institutional policies that mandate English-only instruction.

While numerous studies have examined student perceptions and the functions of code-mixing, fewer have focused specifically on lecturers' deliberate strategies in employing this practice, particularly in higher education. There is a noticeable research gap concerning how lecturers perceive and adapt their code-mixing practices in response to institutional language policies and the diverse linguistic profiles of their students. Addressing this gap through in-depth, qualitative investigations would offer a more nuanced understanding of code-mixing as a reflective and pedagogically motivated decision in EFL classrooms.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative method to explore the phenomenon of code mixing used by EFL lecturers in classroom environments. A case study approach was adopted because it allows for an in-depth exploration of complex language behaviors within specific, real-world settings. This method helped the collection of rich, real-time data through observations and interviews, capturing the dynamics of interactions between lecturers and students. The primary aim was to understand the experiences of the participants, focusing on their behaviors, perceptions, and motivations in relation to code mixing during instruction.

The participants included two EFL lecturers from the UKI Toraja English Education Study Program, both of whom frequently employed code mixing during their instructional sessions. Additionally, three students were selected from each lecturer's class, resulting in a total of eight student participants. Purposive sampling was used for the lecturers, while snowball sampling was employed for the students. Observations were conducted to directly assess the use of code mixing in real-time classroom interactions, while semi-structured interviews offered deeper insights into the lecturers' and students' perspectives on the effectiveness and challenges of code mixing.

To analyze the data, thematic analysis was employed. This technique involved transcribing the interview and observation data, followed by coding and categorizing key themes related to the forms, functions, and underlying motivations of code mixing. Codes were generated inductively from the data, then grouped into categories to show emerging themes. This approach ensured a comprehensive understanding of the types and functions of code mixing, including insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization, and pronunciation changes within the context of English language education. Ethical clearance was obtained, and informed consent was secured from all participants prior to data collection.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results of a study conducted through observations and interviews with two EFL lecturers at the Christian University of Indonesia Toraja. The primary focus of this research was to explore the types of code mixing used in classrooms and the impact of these practices on student engagement and understanding. Observations were conducted from December 7, 2024, to December 21, 2024, while interviews with eight seventh- semester students were conducted from December 21, 2024, to February 12, 2025.

Types of Code Mixing Used by Lecturers

The findings reveal that both lecturers employed distinct types of code-mixing strategies, including:

Insertion

Both lecturers often used insertion as a strategy to integrate English vocabulary into Indonesian sentences. For example, Mr. C often inserted English verbs and nouns to clarify concepts, such as saying, "Kita itu di anggap appreciate, kita menghargai bahasa mereka." This approach helps students bridge linguistic gaps and enhances their understanding of the material.

Alternation

Alternation was also seen, where lecturers switched between languages within a single sentence. For instance, Mr. C said, "Kan kita belajar bahasa Inggris kan to fluently and then similar with native speaker," proving how this strategy can effectively convey ideas and engage students.

Congruent Lexicalization

This type of code mixing involves using English and Indonesian within the same grammatical structure. An example from Mr. C includes the phrase, "Students tidak punya percaya diri," which illustrates how congruent lexicalization can facilitate comprehension by supporting grammatical consistency while integrating both languages.

Involving Pronunciation Changes

Both lecturers also employed changes in pronunciation to aid understanding. For example, Mr. C pronounced English terms according to their English pronunciation while adjusting Indonesian terms to fit local pronunciation norms. This strategy helps students who may be more familiar with English terms to better grasp the context being discussed.

Impact of Code Mixing

The impact of code mixing on student engagement and understanding was significant, categorized into several areas:

On Learning

The use of code mixing was found to enhance students' comprehension of the material. Many students reported that they found it easier to understand lessons when both languages were used, as it provided a familiar context for learning. This approach also helped the delivery of complex concepts, making them more accessible.

On Student Behavior

Code mixing positively influenced student participation and interaction. Students felt more comfortable asking questions and engaging in discussions when they could use both languages. However, some students expressed that they occasionally felt confused, showing that while code mixing can enhance engagement, it may also require students to adapt to new vocabulary.

On Cognitive Ability

Both lecturers and students agreed that code mixing significantly aids in understanding the learning material. Students reported that they could grasp concepts more quickly when explanations were given in both English and Indonesian, proving that this practice accelerates the learning process.

On Affective Aspects

The use of code mixing positively impacted students' motivation and emotional responses. Lecturers noted that students appeared happier and more engaged when code mixing was employed, as it created a supportive learning environment. However, some students expressed feelings of discomfort or confusion, highlighting the need for sensitivity to individual preferences and emotional responses in teaching.

This section presents a discussion based on the findings of this study. The research reveals that code mixing is a customary practice among EFL lecturers at the Christian University of Indonesia Toraja, serving as a valuable strategy to enhance the teaching and learning experience. Based on the data analysis, several types of code mixing and their impacts were shown.

The findings of the study identified four primary types of code mixing used by EFL lecturers: insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization, and pronunciation changes. Insertion emerged as the most dominant type, where English vocabulary is embedded into Indonesian sentences. This result aligns with the study by Nurpiana and Fithriani (2023), which showed insertion as the most common code-mixing practice among EFL teachers. In this study, insertion was used to bridge linguistic gaps, making abstract or unfamiliar English terms more accessible to students. Students reported that this strategy helped them better understand new vocabulary and increased their engagement with the learning material.

Alternation, another frequently observed form, involves switching between two languages within a sentence. The lecturers employed this type to clarify complex concepts or provide emphasis. This finding is supported by Upa et al. (2022), who suggest that alternation allows instructors to adapt their language to meet the needs of learners, particularly when explaining difficult topics. Students in this study appreciated this technique as it helped them grasp the content more effectively.

Congruent lexicalization, as observed in the classroom interactions, refers to the blending of elements from both languages that share similar lexical forms and grammatical structures. This practice, in line with Hardianto (2017), highlights

the lecturers' linguistic flexibility and encourages an inclusive classroom environment. By integrating familiar structures and terms, lecturers created a more accessible and relatable learning context.

The final form, involving pronunciation changes, was less frequent but still significant. In this strategy, lecturers adapted the pronunciation of English words to better align with Indonesian phonological patterns. Hoffmann (2020) argues that such adaptation aids students in processing information more easily. The findings of this study support this view, as pronunciation changes helped students with varying language abilities follow lessons more clearly.

The study also explored the effects of code mixing on various aspects of the teaching and learning process, including learning comprehension, student behavior, cognitive development, and affective factors.

In terms of learning, the findings support Rahmat's (2020) assertion that code mixing helps understanding in EFL classrooms by providing linguistic support. Students in this study stated that explanations involving both languages enabled them to absorb updated content more quickly and confidently. This dual-language approach served as an effective tool for clarifying abstract or difficult material.

On student behavior, the study found that code mixing encouraged more active classroom participation. Rini (2021) noted that students are more inclined to engage in discussions when allowed to use both English and their native language. This study confirms that students felt more comfortable expressing ideas and asking questions when code mixing was used, leading to more dynamic and inclusive class interactions.

Cognitively, the findings are consistent with Gayatri (2023), who emphasized the role of code mixing in helping learners process complex ideas. Participants showed improved comprehension and analytical thinking when lessons included both languages. However, the study also uncovered a potential drawback—some students became overly reliant on translations provided by the lecturers, which might inhibit their motivation to explore and understand English independently.

From an affective perspective, the results align with Sulistiyo's (2016) view that effective language strategies can enhance student motivation. Code mixing was shown to foster a supportive learning atmosphere, especially for students who struggled with full-English instruction. Many participants expressed that they felt more encouraged to learn and less anxious about making mistakes. Nevertheless, the findings also highlighted a cautionary note: if overused, code mixing may lead to reduced student effort in mastering English, as reliance on native language support could diminish the drive for language acquisition.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to investigate the types of code mixing employed by EFL lecturers at the Christian University of Indonesia Toraja and to assess its impact on various aspects of student learning, behavior, cognitive abilities, and emotional

responses. The findings revealed that lecturers primarily used four types of code mixing: insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization, and changes in pronunciation. While the study highlights the benefits of code mixing in enriching students' learning experiences, it also raises concerns about students' reliance on lecturers for translations. This dependency may hinder their motivation to engage with the language independently, which is crucial for their growth and confidence in using English.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching, 2*(2), 49–55. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n2p49

Bista, K. (2010). Factors of code switching among bilingual English students in the university classroom: A survey. *English for Specific Purposes World, 9*(29), 1–19.

Cong, R. (2023). The Application of Sociolinguistic Theory in College English Teaching: A Brief Discussion. *SHS Web of Conferences, 168.* https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202316803026

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society.* Newbury House.

Fisher, L., Evans, M., Forbes, K., Gayton, A., & Liu, Y. (2020). Participative multilingual identity construction in the languages classroom: a multi-theoretical conceptualisation. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 17*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1524896

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gayatri, P., Sit, H., Chen, S., & Li, H. (2023). Sustainable EFL Blended Education in Indonesia: Practical Recommendations. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 15*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032254

Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 32*(2), 23–44.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge University Press.

Hardianto, A. (2017). Code Mixing Employed by the English Lecturers in EFL Classroom. *Edukasi Lingua Sastra, 15*(2). https://doi.org/10.47637/elsa.v15i2.62

Henry, A. (2023). Learner–environment adaptations in multiple language learning: casing the ideal multilingual self as a system functioning in context. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 20*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1798969

Hoffmann, C. (2020). Sociocultural aspects of bilingualism. In *Introduction to Bilingualism.* https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842035-15

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

Kejiwaan, M., & Kresna, I. (2020). Program Studi Ilmu Komunikasi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta. *Jurnalkommas.Com.*

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom.* Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 10, pp. 273–286). Springer.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531–548. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124

Manara, C. (2007). The use of L1 in English language teaching in Indonesia: A portrait of a primary classroom. *Language Education in Asia, 1*(1), 55–66.

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

Madehang, M., Masruddin, M., & Iksan, M. (2024). Reflecting on the Implementation of Online English Learning in Islamic Higher Education: Lecturers and Students' Perspectives. International Journal of Asian Education, 5(3), 183-197.

Nurpiana, Z., & Fithriani, R. (2023). Indonesian EFL Teachers' Use of Code Mixing in Classroom Interactions. *Journal of Vocational Education Studies, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.12928/joves.v6i1.8049

Rahmat, A. (2020). Code Mixing in EFL Classroom: Views from English Teachers Side. *Al-Lisan, 5*(2). https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v6i2.1323

Rini, D. A. C. (2021). Code Mixing Analysis on Teacher's and Students Classroom Interaction of Ice Breaking Session. *Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education, 1*(4), 407–415. https://doi.org/10.52690/jadila.v1i4.153

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(8). http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Situmorang, M. K. T., Mono, U., & Perangin-angin, A. B. (2023). Language Production among Multilingual Children: Insights on Code Mixing. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.24036/jbs.v11i1.117784

Sulistiyo, U. (2016). English Language Teaching and EFL Teacher Competence in Indonesia. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar On English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4).*

Upa, R., Yunus, R. Y. I., Marthen, D., & Rahayu, S. (2022). An Analysis of Code-Mixing Used by the Lecturer at Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo. *DEIKTIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra, 2*(3), 356–365. https://doi.org/10.53769/deiktis.v2i3.321