



An Analysis of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in an EFL Classroom: A Case Study at University

Ivia¹, Jufriadi², Devi Ismayanti³, Rusdiansyah⁴, and Nurhayati Usman⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic University of Palopo, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
Received: 2026-09-18 Revised: 2026-09-25 Accepted: 2026-10-13 Keywords: Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, English as a Foreign Language, Classroom Interaction, Language Alternation DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v12i1.12663 Corresponding author: Ivia 2202020008@uinpalopo.ac.id Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic University of Palopo, Indonesia	<i>This study aims to analyze the dominant types of code-switching and code-mixing and identify the reasons for their use by two lecturers and fourth-semester students in an English as a foreign language classroom at UIN Palopo. The study employed a descriptive qualitative method with a case study approach. Data were collected through classroom observations, interviews with two lecturers, open-ended questionnaires administered to fourteen students, and documentation. The data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, with triangulation applied to compare findings from observations, interviews, and questionnaires. The results showed that inter-sentential code-switching was the most dominant type of code-switching, with 10 of 21 occurrences, while intra-sentential code-mixing was the most dominant type of code-mixing, with 46 of 54 occurrences. Three types of code-switching and three types of code-mixing were identified. Five reasons for language alternation were identified: discussing a particular topic, emphasizing a point, interjections and fillers, repetition and clarification, and building group identity. Discussing a particular topic was the most prominent reason, while repetition and clarification was also supported by classroom observations, lecturer interviews, and student questionnaire responses. Overall, the qualitative evidence suggests that code-switching and code-mixing served communicative purposes related to classroom interaction, lesson content, and the communicative needs that arose during classroom activities.</i>

1. Introduction

English is taught as a foreign language in Indonesia, and classroom interaction therefore provides an important context in which lecturers and students use English for teaching, learning, and communication. Although English is expected to be the main language of instruction in EFL classrooms, classroom communication does not always occur exclusively in English. Lecturers and students may alternate between English and Indonesian when explaining learning materials, giving instructions, asking or answering

questions, providing feedback, or clarifying information. Such language alternation can take the form of Code Switching and Code Mixing, which are related but distinct linguistic phenomena. Code Switching generally refers to the alternation between languages during communication, whereas Code Mixing involves the insertion of linguistic elements from one language into another (Gardner-Chloros, 2000; Muysken, 2000).

Previous studies have shown that Code Switching and Code Mixing occur in various educational contexts and can serve different communicative and instructional purposes. Cahyani et al. (2018), for example, found that teachers' Code Switching served pedagogical and socio-cultural functions in bilingual classrooms. Setiawan (2020) reported that Code Switching could function as a teaching strategy in an Indonesian EFL classroom, particularly in supporting students' comprehension and participation. Research conducted in Indonesian educational contexts has also identified Code Switching as a practice used by teachers to facilitate classroom interaction and instructional communication (Kana et al., 2023; Munawaroh et al., 2022; Murtiningsih et al., 2022; Nona et al., 2024). Similarly, research has documented the use of both Code Switching and Code Mixing among students and teachers in EFL-related settings (Fuad et al., 2023; Kurniawati & Setyawan, 2021; Muslihati et al., 2023; Sari, 2022).

More recent studies have continued to examine language alternation in EFL classrooms from different perspectives. Junaid et al. (2025) examined Code Switching practices in English language classrooms and reported its use for instructional clarification, classroom management, affective and interpersonal support, and comprehension repair. Wulandahri et al. (2025) investigated Code Switching and Code Mixing in classroom speaking activities, while Markhamah et al. (2023) examined Code Switching in English teaching and learning processes. Nurpiana and Fithriani (2023) specifically investigated Indonesian EFL teachers' use of Code Mixing in classroom interaction. Other studies have focused on particular types or functions, including Code Switching among university students and lecturers (Putri & Marlina, 2021; Utami et al., 2023), Code Mixing in academic communication (Putri & Santoso, 2022), and the use of Code Switching in EFL classroom interaction (Febriani et al., 2023; Mubarak et al., 2023).

Although these studies provide important evidence concerning language alternation, differences remain in their research settings, participants, and analytical focus. Some studies have focused mainly on Code Switching, while others have examined Code Mixing or particular functions of language alternation. Several studies have also been conducted in secondary schools, non-EFL settings, or contexts involving students only. For example, Fuad et al. (2023) investigated Code Switching and Code Mixing in an Indonesian language classroom at the senior high school level, whereas Junaid et al. (2025) focused primarily on Code Switching and its pedagogical functions in an EFL classroom. Jufriadi (2011) examined Code Switching in a bilingual education program at the senior high school level and found that teachers and students used Code Switching for different communicative purposes. These studies are relevant to understanding language alternation in educational settings, but they do not specifically address the combination of dominant types of both Code Switching and Code Mixing and the reasons for their use in a university EFL classroom at UIN Palopo.

The need for such investigation is particularly relevant to the fourth-semester EFL classroom at the English Language Education Study Program of UIN Palopo. Preliminary observation indicated that lecturers and students used English and Indonesian during classroom interaction, including when explaining learning materials, giving instructions,

asking questions, presenting information, responding to questions, and providing feedback.

However, the occurrence of Code Switching and Code Mixing alone does not indicate which types are dominant or why the participants use them. Therefore, examining the types is necessary to determine the dominant patterns, while examining the reasons provides an understanding of the communicative purposes underlying their use. The present study consequently focuses specifically on the dominant types of Code Switching and Code Mixing and the reasons for their use by lecturers and fourth-semester students in an EFL classroom at UIN Palopo.

Accordingly, this study addresses two research questions: (1) What are the dominant types of Code Switching and Code Mixing used in the fourth-semester EFL classroom at UIN Palopo? and (2) What are the reasons for lecturers and students to use Code Switching and Code Mixing in the classroom? The study aims to analyze the dominant types of Code Switching and Code Mixing and the reasons for their use. Its contribution lies in providing context-specific empirical evidence from a university EFL classroom at UIN Palopo by examining both forms of language alternation together and relating their dominant patterns to the reasons identified from classroom interaction, lecturer interviews, and student questionnaire responses.

2. Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative method with a case study approach. A descriptive qualitative design was appropriate because the study aimed to describe and interpret Code Switching and Code Mixing as they naturally occurred during classroom interaction rather than test hypotheses or measure relationships among variables. The case study approach was used because the research focused on a bounded case, namely the use of Code Switching and Code Mixing in a fourth-semester EFL classroom at UIN Palopo.

The research was conducted from 12 May to 6 June 2026 in the English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic University of Palopo, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The participants consisted of two lecturers who taught the observed classes and seventeen fourth-semester students who participated in the classroom interaction. Fourteen of the seventeen students completed the open-ended questionnaire. The distinction between the seventeen students who participated in the observed classroom interactions and the fourteen students who responded to the questionnaire was maintained throughout the analysis. The participants were included because they were directly involved in the classroom interactions from which the data were collected.

The data were obtained through classroom observation, audio recording, lecturer interviews, an open-ended student questionnaire, and documentation. Classroom observations were conducted during two classroom sessions involving the two lecturers and the seventeen fourth-semester students. The classroom interactions were audio-recorded to support accurate transcription and the identification and classification of language alternation. Interviews were conducted with the two lecturers to obtain information about the reasons for their use of Code Switching and Code Mixing and the classroom situations in which language alternation occurred.

An open-ended questionnaire was completed by fourteen students to obtain their experiences and perspectives concerning Code Switching and Code Mixing during the learning process. The questionnaire served as supporting evidence for interpreting the reasons identified from classroom interaction and lecturer interviews. Thus, classroom interaction served as the primary source for identifying language alternation, while lecturer interviews and student questionnaire responses were used to support the interpretation of the communicative reasons for its use.

The data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles et al. (2014), consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. During data condensation, the classroom recordings were transcribed and examined together with the interview and questionnaire data. Relevant utterances containing Code Switching and Code Mixing were identified and classified according to the operational definitions used in the study. A single occurrence referred to one identifiable instance of language alternation within an utterance. When several English elements occurred as part of the same identifiable mixing event, they were considered as one occurrence unless they functioned as separate, independently identifiable instances of language alternation. The coded occurrences were then reviewed in relation to their immediate classroom context and the instructional activity or topic being discussed.

Code Switching was classified into Intersentential Switching, Intrasentential Switching, and Tag Switching based on Poplack's (1980) classification. Intersentential Switching was operationally defined as switching occurring across sentence boundaries, Intrasentential Switching as switching occurring at the clause level within an utterance, and Tag Switching as the insertion of a detachable tag or short expression. The classification was based on the structural position of the language alternation within the utterance rather than on the frequency or familiarity of the English expression in everyday use.

Code Mixing was classified into Intrasentential Mixing, Intralexical Mixing, and Change of Pronunciation based on Hoffmann (1991). Intrasentential Mixing referred to the insertion of words or phrases from one language into an utterance whose grammatical structure was predominantly formed by another language. Intralexical Mixing referred to the combination of linguistic elements from different languages within a word, including the use of English lexical items with Indonesian affixes. Change of Pronunciation referred to English words whose pronunciation followed an Indonesian pronunciation pattern. In identifying Intrasentential Mixing, English elements were not classified solely because they appeared in English. Their occurrence was considered in relation to the surrounding utterance, the immediate classroom context, and the instructional topic or activity being discussed.

For example, English expressions such as keywords and objectives were considered in the context in which participants were discussing teaching practice, while expressions such as positive sentence and negative sentence occurred during the discussion of grammatical material. These contextual considerations were used to identify language mixing in the recorded classroom interaction rather than automatically counting every English word occurring in the data.

Some English expressions encountered in the classroom, particularly pedagogical terms, may have become relatively conventionalized within the participants' academic or teaching repertoire. The study did not, however, treat lexical borrowing or conventionalization as a separate analytical category because its primary focus was the

types and communicative reasons of Code Switching and Code Mixing in classroom interaction. Therefore, potentially conventionalized expressions were considered according to the same operational criteria applied to the other data, while their possible overlap with lexical borrowing is acknowledged as a limitation of the analysis.

3. Results

Types of Code Switching

The analysis identified three types of Code Switching in the observed EFL classroom: Intersentential Switching, Intrasentential Switching, and Tag Switching. A total of 21 occurrences of Code Switching were identified.

Table 1. Frequency Types of Code Switching

No.	Type	Frequency
1	Intersentential Switching	10
2	Intrasentential Switching	3
3	Tag Switching	8
Total		21

Table 1 shows that Intersentential Switching was the most frequently occurring type of Code Switching, with 10 occurrences, followed by Tag Switching with 8 occurrences and Intrasentential Switching with 3 occurrences. The frequency counts are descriptive and represent the number of coded occurrences identified in the observed classroom interaction.

Intersentential Switching occurred when the speaker changed languages between complete sentences. For example: *"Sekarang teman saya akan menjelaskan. Now my friend is going to explain about daily routine."* Another example was: *"You have to speak to the rules. Janganki yang kayak hari ini tidak di kontrol, tidak ada kontrolingnya sampai selanjutnya."* These examples show that speakers used complete sentences in different languages within the same classroom exchange, particularly when presenting or reinforcing classroom messages.

Intrasentential Switching occurred three times and involved a change between clauses within the same utterance. Two examples were:

"After they guessing, they guess the material, masukkan tujuan pembelajarannya hari ini apa.", "Because you are teacher, jadi pilihan katamu juga perbaiki." In both examples, the English and Indonesian clauses formed parts of the same utterance. The third occurrence, *"Bisa menggunakan simbol yang general seperti tadi, or you may make your simbols,"*

showed the same clause-level alternation.

Tag Switching occurred eight times through short, detachable expressions used in classroom interaction. Two examples were:

"Write down your name and your group team ya.", "Nah, you can choose one of them, or two of them." These expressions were detachable from the main utterance and mainly supported the flow of classroom interaction.

Types of Code Mixing

Three types of Code Mixing were identified: Intrасentential Mixing, Intralexical Mixing, and Change of Pronunciation. A total of 54 occurrences were identified.

Table 2. Frequency Types of Code Mixing

No.	Type	Frequency
1	Intrасentential Mixing	46
2	Intralexical Mixing	6
3	Change of Pronunciation	2
	Total	54

Intrасentential Mixing was clearly the dominant type, with 46 occurrences. Intralexical Mixing occurred 6 times, while Change of Pronunciation occurred only twice. Intrасentential Mixing was therefore not only the dominant type of Code Mixing but also the most frequent category when the 21 Code Switching and 54 Code Mixing occurrences were considered together.

Intrасentential Mixing involved words or phrases from one language inserted into an utterance structured in another language. Two examples were:

"Ada beberapa macam keywords disitu.", *"Pake itu keywords untuk menentukan objectives."* The English terms were inserted into Indonesian utterances and were directly related to the classroom content. The data also contained context-dependent expressions such as *"Apa itu make a line?"* and *"Maksudku saya tadi toh, I mean tiga orang naik kedepan untuk pengenalan diri karena kan first meeting."* Thus, the classification was based on the linguistic structure and contextual use of the expressions rather than simply on their English origin.

Intralexical Mixing occurred six times. It involved English lexical items combined with Indonesian morphological elements. Two examples were:

"Eh tadi miss, yang bagian kegiatan worksheet-nya miss, kan ada beberapa yang disengaja kasi salah kata-katanya.", *"Yang produce-nya itu mereka buat ininya daily routine-nya terus membaca."* The forms *worksheet-nya*, *produce-nya*, and *daily routine-nya* combine English lexical material with the Indonesian suffix *-nya*. Other occurrences included *note taking-nya*, *speech-nya*, *translate-nya*, and *terblocking*.

Change of Pronunciation occurred twice. The two examples were:

"Saya kasih contoh project videonya senior yang semester dulu yah.", *"Content creator ini, coba!"* These occurrences involved the pronunciation of the English words *senior* to *se-ni-or* and *creator* to *krea-tor* according to an Indonesian-oriented pronunciation pattern.

Reasons for Using Code Switching and Code Mixing

Five reasons were identified from the classroom observations, lecturer interviews, and student questionnaire responses: Discussing a Particular Topic, Emphasizing a Point, Interjections and Fillers, Repetition and Clarification, and Building Group Identity. Quoting Famous Figures was not identified. Discussing a Particular Topic emerged as the most prominent reason based on the convergence of the qualitative evidence.

Discussing a Particular Topic occurred when English expressions were directly related to the lesson content being discussed. For example:

"The first one is the students are able to recall daily routine."

"What is simultaneous interpreting?"

In these examples, *daily routine* and *simultaneous interpreting* were directly related to the particular topics discussed during classroom interaction.

Emphasizing a Point occurred when language alternation reinforced an instruction or important message. For example:

"Remember you are senior high school students ya."

"Don't translate one by one, tapi apa intinya itu yang disampaikan, okay."

Interjections and Fillers were represented by short expressions that supported the flow of interaction. Examples included:

"Well, siapa lagi, siapa yang mau?"

"Nah, amm, you have to see at Taxonomy Bloom."

Repetition and Clarification occurred when an expression was repeated or explained in another language. For example:

"Could you hand in your lesson plan please, hand in itu menyerahkan."

"What abbreviation is?" "Singkatan."

This reason was supported by observation, lecturer interviews, and questionnaire responses.

Building Group Identity was reflected in the use of localized expressions shared by lecturers and students. Examples included:

"Search ki sekarang Taxonomy Bloom."

"Hapal i, read and memorize kemudian praktekan."

These expressions reflected the shared local linguistic background of the classroom participants.

4. Discussion

Dominance of Intersentential Switching

Intersentential Switching was the most frequent type of Code Switching, with 10 of the 21 identified occurrences. This finding indicates that switching between complete language units was more common than clause-level switching or detachable tags in the observed classroom. The pattern is consistent with previous studies reporting Code Switching as part of classroom explanation, clarification, classroom management, and interaction (Cahyani et al., 2018; Murtiningsih et al., 2022; Munawaroh et al., 2022; Junaid et al., 2025).

The classroom data suggest that Intersentential Switching was particularly useful when a speaker moved from an English message to an Indonesian explanation, instruction, or reinforcement. For example, the utterance "Okay, any question? Ada pertanyaan?" presents an English question followed by its Indonesian counterpart. Similarly, "Any question for the first project? Ada mau ditanyakan?" combines an English classroom question with an Indonesian continuation. These examples indicate that the switch occurred as part of the ongoing organization of classroom interaction rather than as an isolated change of language.

This interpretation is compatible with Junaid et al. (2025), who reported that Code Switching in EFL classroom interaction was associated with instructional clarification, classroom management, interpersonal support, and comprehension repair. It also complements Jufriadi's (2011) findings concerning the use of Code Switching for explanation, translation, and classroom communication, although the contexts and participants differ. Thus, the present study provides context-specific evidence from a fourth-semester classroom at UIN Palopo that sentence-level switching was a prominent structural pattern in the observed interaction.

Intrasentential Switching occurred only three times, while Tag Switching occurred eight times. The relatively lower occurrence of Intrasentential Switching is consistent with the operational distinction used in this study: it required alternation between clauses within one utterance, whereas Intrasentential Mixing involved individual words or phrases inserted into another language's sentence structure. Therefore, the two categories were not treated as interchangeable simply because both occurred within an utterance.

Dominance of Intrasentential Mixing

Intrasentential Mixing was the dominant type of Code Mixing, accounting for 46 of the 54 identified occurrences. The data show that English words and phrases frequently occurred within Indonesian utterances during classroom explanations, instructions, presentations, questions, and teaching activities.

An important issue in interpreting this finding is whether all 46 occurrences should be regarded as Code Mixing rather than as routine use of established English terminology. The classification in this study was therefore based not only on the English origin of an item but also on its position within the surrounding utterance. For example, "Ada beberapa macam keywords disitu" and "Pake itu keywords untuk menentukan objectives" contain English lexical items within Indonesian sentence structures. Other examples were more clearly context-dependent bilingual insertions, such as "Apa itu make a line?" and "Maksudku saya tadi toh, I mean tiga orang naik kedepan untuk perkenalan diri karena kan first meeting."

This distinction is important because some English expressions found in the data, such as lesson plan, simple present tense, objectives, and checking understanding, are closely associated with classroom and pedagogical discourse. Their frequent occurrence may reflect the subject matter and instructional context rather than language alternation in the same sense as more context-dependent insertions. Nevertheless, within the operational framework of this study, they were classified as Intrasentential Mixing when they occurred as English lexical or phrasal elements within an utterance whose surrounding grammatical structure was in another language.

The finding therefore should not be interpreted as evidence that all 46 occurrences represent independent instances of spontaneous bilingual innovation. Rather, the frequency reflects the combination of English-related terminology and context-dependent lexical or phrasal insertions occurring within the observed classroom interaction. This qualification addresses the possibility of lexical conventionalization while retaining the coding procedure used in the study.

The finding provides context-specific evidence that complements previous research on Code Mixing in Indonesian EFL settings. It also shows why structural classification needs to be considered together with the lexical status and immediate context of the mixed items.

Reasons for Using Code Switching and Code Mixing in EFL Classroom

Five reasons were identified: Discussing a Particular Topic, Emphasizing a Point, Interjections and Fillers, Repetition and Clarification, and Building Group Identity. Discussing a Particular Topic emerged as the most prominent reason from the qualitative evidence. This reason was particularly visible when lecturers and students used English expressions directly related to the concepts, materials, or activities being discussed.

For example, expressions such as “daily routine” and “simultaneous interpreting” occurred in classroom talk in which those concepts were being addressed. This suggests that some language alternation was closely connected to the content of the lesson itself. The finding is consistent with previous research showing that language alternation can be associated with the instructional content and communicative demands of classroom interaction.

Repetition and Clarification was also an important finding because evidence for this reason converged across the three data sources. The classroom example “Could you hand in your lesson plan please, hand in itu menyerahkan” demonstrates how an English expression was followed by an Indonesian explanation. Lecturer interviews indicated that differences in students’ vocabulary competence and possible confusion could lead to additional explanation, while questionnaire responses similarly indicated that language alternation could help students understand unfamiliar vocabulary and material.

Other reasons reflected different interactional purposes. Emphasizing a Point occurred when lecturers reinforced instructions or reminders; Interjections and Fillers helped maintain the flow of classroom interaction; and Building Group Identity was reflected in localized expressions shared by participants. These findings suggest that the reasons for language alternation were not limited to comprehension but were related to instructional, interactional, and social aspects of classroom communication.

The relationship between the dominant type and the prominent reason should, however, be interpreted qualitatively rather than statistically. The frequent occurrence of Intrasentential Mixing and the prominence of Discussing a Particular Topic suggest an interpretive connection: English terminology and expressions were often used while particular lesson concepts and classroom activities were being discussed. This does not establish a statistical relationship between the two categories.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the dominant types of Code Switching and Code Mixing and the reasons for their use by lecturers and fourth-semester students in an EFL classroom at UIN Palopo. The findings identified three types of Code Switching: Intersentential Switching, Intrasentential Switching, and Tag Switching. Intersentential Switching was the dominant type, with 10 of 21 occurrences. Three types of Code Mixing were also identified: Intrasentential Mixing, Intralexical Mixing, and Change of Pronunciation. Intrasentential Mixing was the dominant type, with 46 of 54 occurrences, and represented the highest frequency across the two forms of language alternation.

Five reasons for Code Switching and Code Mixing were identified: Discussing a Particular Topic, Emphasizing a Point, Interjections and Fillers, Repetition and Clarification, and Building Group Identity. Discussing a Particular Topic was the most prominent reason, particularly when lecturers and students discussed lesson concepts, English terminology, learning materials, and classroom activities. Repetition and Clarification was also an important finding because it was supported by classroom observation, lecturer interviews, and student questionnaire responses.

Overall, Code Switching and Code Mixing in the observed classroom were used purposefully according to the communicative needs that emerged during classroom interaction. The qualitative evidence suggests a close interpretative connection between language alternation and the discussion of lesson content, while also indicating interactional and social purposes.

The study is limited to one fourth-semester EFL classroom at UIN Palopo, two lecturers, and fourteen student questionnaire respondents. Therefore, the findings should not be generalized to all EFL classrooms or all students at UIN Palopo. Additional limitations include the researcher-dependent coding process, potential overlap in distinguishing switching from mixing, and the difficulty of distinguishing code-mixing from conventionalized or established English terminology in some classroom expressions. Future research may investigate Code Switching and Code Mixing in a broader EFL setting, particularly the International Class Program (ICP) at UIN Palopo, where English is used more extensively in classroom interaction. Future researchers may also involve students from several classes or semesters to obtain broader evidence concerning dominant types and reasons for language alternation.

6. Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the lecturers and fourth-semester students of the English Language Education Study Program at State Islamic University of Palopo who participated in this study and provided the data necessary for its completion. The authors also acknowledge the support of the English Language Education Study Program and all individuals who contributed to and assisted in the research process.

7. References

- Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: Exploring pedagogical and socio-cultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(4), 465–479.
- Febriani, R. B., Rustandi, A., & Fauziah, S. (2023). Code-switching used by English teachers in teaching EFL students. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 7(4), 1046–1059.
- Fuad, M., Suyanto, E., Mustofa, A., Amala, I. A., & Muhammad, U. A. (2023). Code-switching and code-mixing in Indonesian learning at SMA YP Unila. *AKSARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 24(2), 763–777.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2000). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. Longman.
- Jufriadi. (2011). *Code switching in bilingual education program: A case study at one of senior high schools in Makassar Metropolitan Area*. State University of Makassar.
- Jufriadi. (2026). *The foundation of English*. Deepublish.

- Jufriadi, J., Haryanto, Basri, M., & Weda, S. (2019). Teachers' implementation of pedagogy of multiliteracies in Indonesian context: A case study. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 24(11), 35–42.
- Junaid, R., Santaria, R., Masruddin, M., & Rustan, N. Q. (2025). Code-switching practices in English language classrooms: A classroom discourse analysis and its pedagogical implications for EFL learning. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2).
- Kamaliah, A. M., Amri, M. M., & Laksmi, E. D. (2023). Teacher's code mixing and code switching within EFL environment. *PARADIGM: Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2).
- Kana, I. N., Benu, N. N., Nenotek, S. A., & Beeh, N. (2023). The use of code switching in EFL classroom. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 7(4), 2593–2602.
- Kurniawati, S., & Setyawan, D. (2021). Code switching and code mixing in the Indonesian EFL classroom. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 39(2), 95–104.
- Markhamah, L., Kardena, A., & Bukittinggi, I. (2023). Code switching in English teaching learning processes of English as a foreign language. *PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*, 2(3), 339–347.
- Masruddin, Nasriandi, Ermawati, & Al Hamdany, M. Z. (2022). Code switching as the communication strategy: Indonesian-English code switching between hotel employees. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(2), 517–527.
- Mubarak, M. Z., Dewi, U., & Siregar, D. Y. (2023). The use of code-switching by teacher in classroom interaction at MAN 2 Model Medan. *VISION*, 18(2), 149–165.
- Munawaroh, H., Hartono, R., & Sakhiyya, Z. (2022). The use of code-switching in EFL classroom instruction and interaction. *English Education Journal*, 12(1), 38–46.
- Murtiningsih, S. R., Munawaroh, M., & Hidayatulloh, S. M. M. (2022). Code-switching in EFL classrooms: Factors influencing teachers to use code-switching and its types used in the classrooms. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 12(2), 318–338.
- Muslihati, M., Khusniyah, N. L., & Rahmat, H. (2023). Students code-switching and code-mixing in spoken communication activities at English Language Education Department of UIN Mataram. *Cordova Journal Language and Culture Studies*, 13(1), 54–66.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Code mixing: A typology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nadhifah, T., & Haristiani, N. (2022). Analysis of code-switching and code-mixing of Indonesian Japanese learners. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2022)* (pp. 569–574). Atlantis Press.
- Nona, Y., Aleksi, M., & Toni, E. A. B. (2024). English teacher's employment of code-switching in EFL classroom: Types and functions. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara*, 16(1), 61–70.
- Nurpiana, Z., & Fithriani, R. (2023). Indonesian EFL teachers' use of code mixing in classroom interactions. *Journal of Vocational Education Studies*, 6(1), 25–39.

- Pharamita, G., & Afifah, D. (2021). Analyzing the types of code switching in English learning contexts. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 8(2), 120–135.
- Putri, A. M., & Marlina, L. (2021). The use of code switching by English lecturers in university classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 60–70.
- Putri, A., & Santoso, H. (2022). Code mixing dalam penggunaan Bahasa Indonesia di lingkungan akademik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 6(3), 201–210.
- 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.
- Setiawan, A. (2020). Code switching as a teaching strategy in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 20(1), 45–53.
- Syam, U. K., Saiful, Sangkala, I., & Syarif, I. (2018). Code mixing and code switching in the classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 2 Takalar. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 23(7), 95–99.
- Utami, L. T., Luardini, M. A., & Asi, N. (2023). Code switching analysis in EFL classroom interaction of college student at IAIN Palangka Raya: A sociolinguistic study. *INNOVATIVE: Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(2), 15000–15008.
- Widodo, A., & Nugroho, B. (2023). Code switching in bilingual classrooms: A study in Central Java. *ELT and Linguistics Journal*, 8(1), 45–56.
- Wulandahri, D., Ilma, R., & Desvitasari, D. (2025). Navigating language alteration: A case study on English language teachers' code switching and mixing in classroom speaking activities. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 12(2), 731–746.