



\*Corresponding author: Maemuna Muhayyang, English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

E-mail: [maemarasyyid@unm.ac.id](mailto:maemarasyyid@unm.ac.id)

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# An Analysis of Code Mixing Used by EFL Students in The Classroom Presentation

Riskatul Fadliyah, Syarifuddin Dollah, Maemuna Muhayyang\*

English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia..

**Abstract:** This descriptive qualitative research aims to have a descriptive account of the types of code mixing used by the EFL students in the classroom presentation for the English course provided. The researchers conducted this research at the English Education Faculty of Institut Parahikma Indonesia, Gowa (IPI Gowa) purposely taking 1 lecturer teaching the English course and 1 class of the fourth semester students consisting of 10 students having a classroom presentation as one of the learning activities designed. It employed a classroom observation and open interview to collect the data in which their results were classified based on Musyken's theory (2000) and analyzed using the theory of Miles, Hubberman, and Saldana (2020) coming with three stages of the interactive model data analysis, namely data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. The result of data analysis showed that the code-mixing types utilized by the students when doing the presentation were three, that is (1) insertion (word) taking the most dominant type used with 27 extracts, (2) alternation (clause) taking more dominant type used with 15 extracts, and (3) congruent lexicalization (dialect) taking the least with 12 extracts in the classroom presentation. These findings simply means that the use of code mixing becomes the students' communicative strategy channeling the presenters and the audiences' ways of understanding the points of their discussion during the classroom presentation.

**Keywords:** Analysis, Code Mixing, EFL, Classroom Presentation

## 1. Introduction

Indonesia is one of all multilingual and pluralistic societies in the world, the development of English in this country is evolving hastily in everyday lifestyles. Language is a fundamental device that humans use to interact and communicate in society. Thus, without language human beings cannot communicate and interact with each other. In terms of linguistics, it is called sociolinguistic. According to Holmes as referred in Piantari et al., (2011), sociolinguistics is a technology that suggests the connection between language and society. Sociolinguistics concerns the correlation among linguistic variations and social factors. Nowadays, English has turned into a preferred language thus, the interest of learning and the use of this language has enhanced. English is considered as one of foreign languages that is often used besides mother tongues, with the rapid development of life, English is now taken into consideration as a lingua franca that is extensively discovered as an international language and those generally tend to learn it. Furthermore, English is inserted as one subject into the curriculum in education in Indonesia and is learned from primary into high school students and university.



Thus, many Indonesian teachers and students in this era frequently use English in daily conversation, besides their mother tongue, Bahasa Indonesia. Furthermore, they mostly mix their first language or national or local language and English in their daily communication. This is because students are accustomed to English use in school such as English subjects inserted in curriculum as important language to be learnt, social media which include captions with English or mixed languages, smart phone setting with English language, game application using English instruction, and many others. Consequently, the enlargement of English use cannot be avoided. This phenomenon is known as bilingualism. According to Artini & Nitiasih, (2014), bilingualism is a global phenomenon which recognizes that most of the population in this world use two or more languages to interact in their social life. In addition, Purnamasari et al., (2016) stated that Bilingualism is closely interrelated to the terms called code switching and code mixing. Means that there are two styles of language used in bilingualism, but in this research the researcher only focused on code mixing.

According to Barus et al., (2019), code mixing is two elements of language that have interrelations in their use. Code mixing is the consequent phenomenon of language contact and a notable characteristic of a multilingual society. This research related to the significant linguistic phenomenon takes place not only in the conversation context of the society but also in the education context. Commonly, bilingual people not only do code mixing to interact socially, but it is sometimes deliberately used by educated people. The phenomena of mixing languages are using more than one language within the same utterance or conversation known as code mixing. Code mixing can be analyzed from students generally tend to do code mixing in English and their local languages in their social communication setting. This phenomenon can be seen in using languages to interact and communicate in their daily life with their friends to express their feelings and obtain information from each other. Grosjean, (1982) stated that code mixing offers in moving or transferring the elements or factors from a lexical item to a sentence whereas the alternation of two languages within a single discourse.

Muysken (2000) stated that code mixing occurs when lexical items and grammatical features of two or more languages exist in the same sentence. In this era, people need to speak more than one language, especially English. The Younger generation uses code mixing for prestige and showing off their ability in using a second language. Related to language learning, Khati, (1970) claimed that most students felt that mother tongue should be used in EFL classroom interaction to understand easily. The phenomena of mixing languages can be seen in using languages to interact and communicate, to express ideas, and obtain information from each other. One of the examples from this phenomenon is in the classroom interaction, focused on presentation activity, teachers and students usually used code mixing in explaining the topic, answering the question, etc. According to Noer, (2012), A presentation is a form of communication. Communication in the presentation can be implemented through sound, images, and body language. It comes on the surface that a presentation is a formal talk from someone in giving information, sharing ideas, showing or demonstrating topics to the audience. That is the reason why the use of code mixing comprises one of the most interesting aspects in the scientific field of research. In relation to this point, there were several researchers who had conducted previous studies about code mixing focused on social life and media (Piantari et al., 2011; Samhan, 2017; and Syafaat & Setiawan, 2019). The research on code mixing is not only on social media and in society or community, but also in classroom interaction (Moetia et al., (2018; Rini & Rustandi, 2018; Maulidar et al., 2020; Rahmat, 2020; Rinawati et al., 2020; and Helmie et al., 2020).

Moetia et al., (2018) Code Mixing and Code Switching in the Classroom Interaction. By using theory from Musysken, the result revealed that the English teacher and students used two types of code mixing and three types of code switching in their classroom interaction. From the result of an interview with the teacher it was found that the teacher did these kinds of codes to cover up the lack of target language proficiency of students and to make the process of transferring knowledge run smoothly and effectively in the class. Rini & Rustandi, (2018)

conducted research on Code Mixing Analysis on Teachers and Students Classroom Interaction of Ice Breaking Session. The result of this study showed that insertion was realized in 51 (30.4%) clauses, alternation was realized in 33 (19.6%) clauses, and congruent lexicalization was realized in 1 (0.6%) clause. Based on research conducted by Maulidar et al., (2020) on An Analysis of Code Mixing Used by Students in Learning English, the result showed that there were three types of code mixing used by students in the learning process, namely intra sentential code mixing, intra lexical code mixing and involving change of pronunciation. Both researches showed that the students were doing code mixing in different types.

Furthermore, Rahmat (2020) conducted research on Code Mixing in EFL Classroom: Views from English Teachers Side. The result showed that the English teacher of SMK Negeri 1 Makassar used all of the categories that categorized by Muysken (2000, cited in Liu, 2008: 6) in teaching EFL classroom, they were: Insertion, Alternation and Congruent Lexicalization. In addition, Rinawati et al., (2020) conducted research on A Code-Mixing Analysis on EFL Students' Casual Conversations at School, and the result showed that students did code mixing in their communication with their friends at school, they are frequently use phrase insertion and word insertion in communication, rather than hybrid, repetition word, idioms and clauses insertion. The last previous studies based on Helmie et al., (2020), conducted research on Code Mixing in College Students' Presentation: A Case in an Intercultural Communication Class, based on Hoffman's theory. The result showed that the languages that dominate in the presentation are English and Bahasa Indonesia equally. There are some students' reasons for code mixing in their presentation, that is the difficulties of the English language when they use it to explain the material, to make the material clearly, and too easy to comprehend their presentation. The average response of 20 questions is 56.%. That average is a positive category, that shows most of the audience give a positive response to the presenter's use of code mixing suggesting that code mixing does not always translate the material in presentation.

Referring to the above descriptions and previous related studies, the researchers are getting inspired to address one research question to seek for the answers: What types of code mixing do the IPI Gowa students use in the classroom presentation?.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. How Code Mixing is Defined

There are numerous explanations of code mixing that have been suggested by some scholars. Wari's, (2012) stated that code mixing usually occurs when conversants use both languages together, switch between two languages to the extent that they change from one tongue to the other in the course of a single utterance. Code mixing takes place without a change of topic and can involve various levels of language such as phonology, morphology, grammatical structures or lexical items. According to Sunubi et al., (2013), code mixing refers to the mixing of two or more languages, code-mixing may occur within a multilingual setting where speakers use more than one language. Some scholars use the terms of code mixing interchangeably, especially in studies of syntax, morphology, and other formal aspects of language. We could not avoid that the first language is a big effect in the second language, interaction and mixing between languages result in various languages. Most of the people in the society mix their language with other languages by using pieces of foreign languages even sometimes they are still influenced by their first language. In addition, Wartinah & Wattimury, (2018) stated that code mixing consists of a few words of one language, few words of the other then back to the first for a few words and so on.

In another hand Deuchar, (2005) defined that code-mixing is changing languages within a sentence. In a formal situation, the researcher tends to mix it because there is no exact idiom in that language. Thus, it is necessary to use words or idioms from other languages. Thereby code-mixing caused interrelationship among role of speaker, Language form, and Language reason. Based on the related definitions above, it is concluded that code mixing is using two

or more languages in the same sentence or discourse but one language is more dominant, and it is related with the social context as a function of choosing the code. We can see the reality in the classroom interaction, when students try to explain or say something in English, they mix some language in the sentence that they don't know or to make it clear on how to say in English its meaning combines the language between Indonesia and English.

## 2.2. *Types of Code Mixing*

Muysken (2000) explained that code mixing is typically divided into three main types, namely insertion (word or phrase), alternation (clause), and congruent lexicalization (dialect). Firstly, Insertion of material (word or phrase) from one language into a structure of the other language. Approaches that depart from the notion of insertion view the constraints in terms of the structural properties of some base or matrix structure. The process of code mixing at the insertion of a word or phrasal category into a given structure, the difference is simply the size and type of element inserted such as noun, adjective, verb, and the like.

Example 1: "*jangan2 kamu pengen **ghosting** yab*".

Example 2: "*jangan suka nge-**judge** orang lain, setiap orang kan berbeda*".

(note that "**judge** and **ghosting**" is the English word inserted in the Indonesian utterance).

Secondly, Alternation (clause) between structures from languages. Alternation is the constraint of mixing in terms of compatibility or equivalence of the languages involved at the mix point, and clause. The process of alternation is particularly frequent in stable bilingual communities with a tradition of language separation but occurs in many other communities as well.

Example: "*kamu harus mengekspresikan itu dari internal ke external, **you get my point?***"

(note that when student 1 mixed in English "**you get my point**" with Indonesia's utterance to give a sign to the audience to discuss the next sub-topic).

Thirdly, Congruent lexicalization (dialect) of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure. Congruent lexicalization is akin to language variation and style shifting: switching is grammatically unconstrained and can be characterized in terms of alternative lexical insertions. Linguistic convergence feeds into congruent lexicalization and the two processes may reinforce each other.

Example: "*Apa **benefitnya** apabila kita menggunakan tiga bahasa ini secara specific?*"

(note that when the student inserted lexical words in English "**benefitnya**" and in Indonesia's utterance).

## 2.3. *Reason for Using Code Mixing*

When people applied code mixing there might be motivations and reasons on it. For example, two or more bilinguals mix two languages when speaking or expressing their ideas and they find it difficult to find proper words or expressions or to make it easy to understand. According to Ritchie & Bhatia, (2006), the interlocutors, situations, messages, attitudes, emotions generate code mixing, and some reasons could be participants; their backgrounds and relationships about what is topic and content. Related to the statement of Kim, (2006), reasons of using code-mixing include: situational reasons, some languages are viewed as more suited to particular participant/social groups, settings or topics, class, religion, gender than others. In addition, many traditional societies, where gender roles are clearly demarcated. The participant roles and relationship, remark participant roles and relationships play a very critical role in bilinguals' unconscious agreement and disagreement on language choice. That is, whether bilinguals code mix or not depends on whom they talk to. Language attitudes, dominance, and security. Next is language attitudes, dominance, and security determine the language mixing. For the attitudes, the frequency of code mixing from bilinguals depends on whether a society considers code mixing positively or negatively. Setting and atmosphere of

the conversation situation, which distinguishes between physical place and type of activity. Also, the speech takes place and the situation is participants are often characterized by terms such as caller, receiver, speaker, performer, audience, questioner, answerer, caller, interviewer and interviewee. The instrumentality, including line (verbal, nonverbal, face to face, written) and code (language and/or style used). Interaction and interpretation standards (ground rules that seem to underlie interactions). In addition, there are some reasons which generate code mixing such as quotations, reiteration, topic comment/relative clauses, hedging, interjections, idioms, and deep-rooted cultural wisdom. Direct quotation or reported speech triggers language mixing/switching among bilinguals cross-linguistically.

In addition, Rahmat, (2020) stated that there are six reasons that have an effect on the occurrence of code mixing. The first reason is bilingualism, it shows that the ability to use more than one language is a basic reason for code mixing without understanding another language or monolingual people cannot do code mixing. The second reason is speaker and partner to speak with, the speaker needs a speaking partner to communicate and code mixing could happen if both speakers understand the languages well. The next reason is social community, social community can influence people in using code mixing to interact in daily life. The fourth reason is the situation. Code-mixing often occurs in a relaxed or informal situation, this situation is called habitual communication daily conversation. The last reason is vocabulary, the lack of ability to discover a suitable word or expression in one language makes people change the phrase from one to another language and it also may be combined collectively. In another hand, Sari, (2022), found that there were six reasons that almost all students often used in learning process, namely talking about the particular topic, quoting somebody else, being emphatic about something, interjection, repetition used for clarification, and intention of clarifying the speech interlocutor. It is concluded that there are many reasons why people do code mixing to clarify what they want to express information, ideas, etc. to the listener or audience in relation to the situation. These reasons of using code mixing from some experts enriched the research instrument of interview outline that was used in getting the purpose of this research.

### 3. Research Method and Materials

This research is a descriptive qualitative method focusing on using code mixing types applied by EFL students in the classroom presentation assigned by their lecturer. The researcher conducted her research at Institut Parahikma Indonesia, Gowa (IPI Gowa), which is located at Jl. Mustafa Daeng Bunga, No. 191, Somba Opu, Gowa. It purposely took 1 lecturer teaching the English course and 1 class of the fourth semester students consisting of 10 students having a classroom presentation for the learning activities designed as the sample of this research. An observation checklist and open interview were administered to obtain information for this research purpose. To analyze the data gained Miles et al., (2020) with their interactive model data analysis including data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification was used. The researcher focused on simplifying the raw data of the interview into transcriptions..

### 4. Results and Discussion

#### 4.1. Results

After simplifying the raw data into transcriptions and classifying the result of the observation checklists, it found that there are three types of code mixing used by the students in the classroom presentation, namely insertion (word or phrase), alternation (clause), and congruent lexicalization (dialect). The descriptions of these findings can be seen in following lines with some extracts to strengthen the data gained:

#### 4.2. Insertion (word or phrase)

Insertion is divided into two types, namely word and phrase. Word is a unit of language that carries meaning and consists of one or more morphemes which are linked more or less tightly together, and has a phonetic value, while phrase is a grammatical unit at a level between a

word and a clause. Word and phrase are one of the types of code mixing. According to Muysken (2000), insertion occurs when lexical items from one language are incorporated into another. The examples of insertion (word or phrase) can be seen in the extracts below:

#### Extract 1

RVL: “*Tapi aku takkan melakukannya, **next** yang kelima teknik amplifikasi linguistik*”.

Based on the extract above, the presenter of the group 2 was explaining the material and asking for next slide of the PowerPoint to another participant by saying “*Tapi aku takkan melakukannya, **next** yang kelima teknik amplifikasi linguistik*” and then he continued having the explanation. The extract 1 above simply shows the presenter mixed his language between Indonesian and English, he added his utterance in English, that is “**next**” in the form of a word only called insertion in code mixing.

#### Extract 2

RVL: “*Oke ee materi selanjutnya akan disampaikan oleh **my partner** Karminita*”.

KRM: “*Terima kasih atas kesempatannya*”.

In extract 2, we can see the presenter of the group 2 ended his explanations and invited his partner to continue having the presentation of the material provided by saying “*Oke ee materi selanjutnya akan disampaikan oleh **my partner** Karminita*” and then KRM as a member of the group 2 nicely responded by saying “*Terima kasih atas kesempatannya*”. In extract 2, RVL added his utterance with an English phrase to his Indonesian “**my partner**” called insertion in code mixing.

#### Extract 3

RVL: “*Any questions?*”.

NRN: “*Kenapa seorang penerjemah harus melakukan analisis terlebih dahulu sebelum dia menerjemahkan teks sumbernya? **Thank you** saya kembalikan ke moderator*”.

Based on extract 3 above, RVL, the presenter, was inviting the participants to give questions to his group by saying “*Any questions?*” and one of the participants raised hand and addressed a question by saying “*Kenapa seorang penerjemah harus melakukan analisis terlebih dahulu sebelum dia menerjemahkan teks sumbernya? **Thank you** saya kembalikan ke moderator*”. While asking the question, NRN mixed his language between Indonesian and English phrases and NRN added “**Thank you**” in the middle of his utterance. According to Muysken (2000) when a speaker inserts a phrase from a foreign language into his or her utterance, this is known as word or phrase insertion.

#### Extract 4

AMY: “*Thank you for giving me time, ee on your presentation there are **ini** technique calque halqi what is that?*”.

In the extract 4, AMY as the participant of the presentation was asking a question for group 2 by saying “*Thank you for giving me time, ee on your presentation there are **ini** technique calque halqi what is that?*” which means that AMY was mixing her language from English into Indonesian word “**ini**” called insertion of word in code mixing.

#### Extract 5

NRN: “*Selanjutnya langsung saja pemateri kedua yaitu Ulfha Sabra...*” ...

Students: “*Eehh pemateri pertama bhh...*” ...

NRN: “*Eehh **sorry sorry** pemateri pertama*”.

Based on the extract above, NRN as the moderator of the group 3 was inviting his partner as the first presenter to explain their material by saying “*Selanjutnya langsung saja pemateri kedua*”

yaitu *Ulfha Sabra*” and the participants directly responded “*Eebb pemateri pertama bbb*”. Then, NRN replied by saying “*Eebb **sorry sorry** pemateri pertama*”. In extract 5, it can be seen that the moderator communicated by using code mixing proved in his phrase “**sorry sorry**”.

#### Extract 6

ULS: “**Baik** thanks for the time that was given to me, I wanna explain about translation techniques”.

The extract 6 shows ULS, the presenter of group 3, commenced to explain the material by saying “**Baik** thanks for the time that was given to me, I wanna explain about translation techniques”. From extract 6, the presenter inserted an Indonesian word into her utterance “**baik**” indicating that ULS was using code mixing during classroom presentation.

#### Extract 7

ULS: “selanjutnya **modulation technique**. Modulasi adalah teknik penerjemahan yang mengubah sudut pandang”.

In this extract, ULS, the presenter, was explaining her material by saying “selanjutnya **modulation technique**. Modulasi adalah teknik penerjemahan yang mengubah sudut pandang”. In extract 7, ULS’s statement was classified as an insertion or word in code mixing, because she added English phrase “**modulation technique**” into her Indonesian utterance. From this extract, it can be seen that the members of group 3 utilized code mixing in order to make the presentation go smoothly.

#### Extract 8

ULS: “Kemudian **adaptation technique** merupakan teknik penerjemahan menggantikan unsur budaya BSu dengan unsur budaya yang mempunyai sifat yang sama dalam BSa”.

The extract above shows ULS, the presenter, in the middle of the presentation was explaining the material using two languages by saying “Kemudian **adaptation technique** merupakan Teknik penerjemahan menggantikan unsur budaya BSu dengan unsur budaya yang mempunyai sifat yang sama dalam BSa”. From the extract above, the dominant language that the presenter used was Indonesian, then she put English phrases in the middle of her sentence. It is signed that the presenter applied code mixing in the presentation in the form of phrase insertion.

#### Extract 9

AMY: “Kalo yang sebahamnya Athifah toh **mis**. Kan ini modulasi itu teknik penerjemahan”.

Based on the extract 9 above, AMY, the participant, was clarifying the answer of the other participants’ question to her lecturer by saying “Kalo yang sebahamnya Athifah toh **mis**. Kan ini modulasi itu tehnik penerjemahan”. Based on the extract, the word “**mis**” in the middle of the sentence was the type of insertion.

#### Extract 10

NRN: “penerjemahan yang memperkenalkan unsur-unsur informasi atau ada pengaruh **stylistic**”.

Based on the extract above, the moderator was explaining the materials using Indonesian language and mixing her codes into English by saying “penerjemahan yang memperkenalkan unsur-unsur informasi atau ada pengaruh **stylistic**”. It is clearly seen that the NRN used code mixing in the classroom presentation with the word “**stylistic**” indicating insertion type of code mixing.

#### Extract 11

AMY: “disini saya dari kelompok terakhir yaitu bersama **partner** saya Salsabila yang sampai saat ini juga belum terlibat”.

#### Extract 12

AMY: “yang kelima pepadanan bercatatan. **Next**, nah yang pertama itu penjelasan tentang prosedur penerjemahan”.

In extract 11 and 12, AMY, the member of the group 5, was introducing her group to the audiences and also explaining the material at once. It can be seen in the extracts that the presenter used Indonesian language as the dominant language and put English words in her sentence at once. The words “*partner and next*” signified the presenter used code mixing as insertion in the classroom presentation.

#### *Extract 13*

AMY: “*memulai penerjemahan harus ada tahap-tahap terlebih dahulu yang akan atau rincian yang akan diselesaikan. Next*”.

#### *Extract 14*

AMY: “*sekarang kita membahas perbedaan antara prosedur dengan method*”.

#### *Extract 15*

AMY: “*kenapa kita membandingkan antara prosedur dengan method*”.

In extract 13, 14 and 15, AMY as the presenter of the member of group 5 was presenting her materials using Indonesian utterances then AMY mixed her language into English word “*next and method*”, it signaled that AMY applied code mixing in the classroom presentation. From the presenters` sentence in extract 13, 14 and 15 the researcher found the formation process of code-mixing process was alternation (word or phrase).

#### *Extract 16*

AMY: “*prosedur ini lebih ke makna-makna yang kecil, next! Nah memasuki ke prosedur penerjemahan yang pertama*”.

#### *Extract 17*

AMY: “*Nah yang kedua itu ada pengulangan adjective dalam bahasa Indonesia*”.

#### *Extract 18*

AMY: “*kaya misalnya he she it kata ganti tapi dia mengikut sertakan juga jamak*”.

The extracts above figure out that AMY, the presenter of group 5, was explaining the material, asking for help from another participant to slide the PowerPoint, and continuing describing her point of discussion. The extract 16, 17 and 18 obviously show the presenter mixes her code between Indonesian and English by adding words in English, *next* and *adjective*.

#### *Extract 19*

AMY: “*kalo yang tadi kan sistem adjektiva nomina nah sekarang itu masuki ke struktur*”.

#### *Extract 20*

AMY: “*pergeseran makna rujukan awalnya tidak diganti atau bilang, hanya maknanya saja yang mengalami rekonstruksi*”.

#### *Extract 21*

AMY: “*Next modulasi adalah perubahan yang terjadi pada bahasa sasaran yang berkaitan dengan pergeseran makna*”.

In extract 19, 20 and 21, the presenter of group 5 was still explaining her materials to the audiences by using Indonesian as the dominant language in which she put some English words in the middle of her utterances. From the moderator statement, it is apparent that extracts 19, 20 and 21 indicate as an insertion because they catered two different languages shaping the sentence with words or phrase “*adjektiva nomina, rekonstruksi and next*”.

#### *4.2.1. Alternation (clause)*



Clause is one of the types of code mixing. According to Muysken (2000), alteration occurs when structures of two languages are alternated instinctively both at the grammatical and lexical level. The example of alternation (clause) can be seen in the extracts below:

*Extract 28*

RVL: “Kemudian teknik direct itu ada **borrowing technique, calque, and literal**”.

*Extract 29*

RVL: “Untuk contohnya ee TSu nya itu ee: “**Drink slowly, pet. We’ve a long journey ahead of us.**”

The extracts above reveal that RVL, the moderator of group 2, was presenting his materials in front of the audiences in which he mixed his explanation with Indonesian and English in the form of alternation or clauses in the conversation.

*Extract 30*

KRM: “menerjemahkan kata-per-kata berdasarkan fungsi dan maknanya dalam tataran kalimat. Adapun contohnya ada di halaman delapan, **Well I think that’s all our presentation, so ee any questions so far.**”

*Extract 31*

RVL: “Okay thanks for the questions **jadi mengapa setiap penerjemaahan perlu melakukan analisis Tsu**”.

The extract 30 shows KRM, the presenter, finished having the presentation session and moved to the question-and-answer session. While the extract 31 noted that RVL, the member of group 2, was answering the question from the audience. The utterances in extract 30 and 31 clearly indicated both the presenters mixed two languages in the presentation and questions and answer session in a sentence comprising a constituent from English followed by a constituent from Indonesia and inserting a clause in their utterances as alternation to make their own sessions run effectively.

*Extract 32*

RVL: “**Oke thank you Nazila for your answer** bagaimana saudara Nasrun apakah dapat diterima jawabannya?”.

The extract 32 shows that RVL, the moderator of group 2, was expressing thanks to the participant offering to help answer the question and asking for the audiences’ additional opinions. From the moderator’s conversation above, the researcher found a formation of code mixing in alternation when RVL mixed his utterances in English “**Oke thank you Nazila for your answer**” as to maintain the success of the communication between speakers and listeners.

*Extract 33*

NRN: “Itulah tadi pemaparan materi pertama oleh saudari Ulfha selanjutnya akan dilanjutkan oleh saya. **Technique Description, A translation technique that replaces terms in the source language with its description in the target language**”.

*Extract 34*

NRN: “Yang terakhir yaitu **discursive technique. Translation techniques that use temporary equivalents far from the original context**”.

The extracts 33 and 34 above figure out that NRN, the presenter of group 3, was presenting his material by using code mixing in the classroom presentation in types of alternation exemplified on the clauses above such as **A translation technique that replaces terms in the source language with its description in the target language in**.

#### Extract 35

NRN: “*Kompensation technique yaitu ee penerjemahan yang memperkenalkan unsur-unsur informasi?*”.

In the extract 35, NRN, the presenter of the group 3, was presenting the materials by saying “*Kompensation technique yaitu ee penerjemahan yang memperkenalkan unsur-unsur informasi?*” by mixing two languages, that is clause in a sentence in which it is a constituent from English followed by a constituent from Indonesia in her utterances included as alternation in code mixing.

#### 4.2.2. Alternation Congruent Lexicalization (dialect)

Dialect is one of the types of code mixing. According to Muysken (2000), congruent lexicalization refers to the situation where two languages share grammatical structures which can be filled lexically with elements from either language. The examples of congruent lexicalization (dialect) can be seen in the extracts below:

#### Extract 40

RVL: “*dimana teknik translation itu ee terbagi ee terbagi empat yaitu single, coplet, triplet, and cuadrulet?*”.

#### Extract 41

KRM: “*Kalke termasuk ke dalam jenis loan translation, yaitu teknik penerjemahan yang menerjemahkan morpheme?*”.

#### Extract 42

AMY: “*It's mean like ee apayah ee some technique eee tehnik itu kan menerjemahkan kata. Kenapa technique calque thank you?*”.

The extract 40 and 41 above show that RVL and KRM, the presenters of group 2, were explaining the materials by using two languages in one sentence called congruent lexicalization since they were seemingly interested in placing some English words in Indonesian sentences in which the placement contains the grammatical structure and lexical elements of English. Musken (2000) stated the congruent lexicalization refers to a situation where two languages share a grammatical structure which can be lexically filled from both languages.

#### Extract 43

ULS: “*Jadi pada sample ini terdapat frase nomina yang merupakan bentuk ee dari adjectiva dan nomina?*”.

#### Extract 44

ULS: “*Kemudian yang ketiga compensation techniques Molina dan Albir (2002) mengatakan: “Compensation is used to introduce a Source Text (ST) element of information or stylistic effect in another place in the Target Text (TT) because it cannot be replaced in the same place as in the Source Text?”.*”.

The extracts above reveal that ULS, the presenter, was explaining the materials in the presentation session by using code mixing found in some abovementioned phrases “*Jadi pada*”, “*ini terdapat*” and “*yang merupakan bentuk ee dari*” and derived from the main language, namely Bahasa Indonesia. Then, some other elements were also found in the word “*sample*”, “*frase nomina*” dan “*adjectiva dan nomina*” referring to the terms of the target language, namely English and hose examples are called congruent lexicalization in code mixing.

#### Extract 45

AMY: “*Ndak, sedikit ji to maksudnya ada mungkin preposision-nya berubah, noun-nya yang berubah bukan secara keseluruhan?*”.



#### Extract 46

ULS: *"lebih cocok didengar kalo yang ini, karena disini **doble-ki** lagi kalo misalnya diterjemahkan ki **I-nya**".*

#### Extract 47

RVL: *"Jadi ini eee bentuk ee apa yah ee tehnik harfiahnya dan ini tehnik **transpositions-nya**".*

The extracts 45, 46 and 47 were the congruent lexicalization of code mixing as AMY, ULS and RVL, the presenters, inserted lexical words in English "**preposition-nya**, **noun-nya**, **I-nya** and **doble-ki**" in their Indonesian utterances in which they have no meaning in the dictionary. In addition, those words are called congruent lexicalization or dialect as the English words in Indonesia's sentences share grammatical structure and can be filled lexically with elements from English. In other words, the grammatical structure of Indonesian and English was shared and English words were inserted into Indonesia's structure.

#### Extract 48

AMY: *"yang pertama penerjemah **pronomina** dan penerjemah **nomina***

#### Extract 49

AMY: *"**adverb** yang menerangkan **subject** ber-**pronomina** jamak dalam bahasa Inggris*

The two extracts above signified that AMY, the presenter, was presenting her materials by using code mixing in the classroom presentation with A B A B language method to make her communication run well. It clearly indicates that element A is found in the English phrase while element B is the Indonesian phrase which is called congruent lexicalization since a linear and structure equivalence appear on the syntactic level between the two languages.

To sum up, all of the students felt enjoyed and satisfied learning essay writing using poster sessions. They showed their interest in learning, and they do not only improve their skills in essay writing but also improved their oral skills. Those perceptions line up with what Hennessey (2015), Waquet (2008), and Bayne (2005) found.

## 4.2. Discussions

Based on the findings above, there are 54 extracts that have been analyzed and classified from the observation checklist and 3 audio recordings of the students at the fourth semester of the English education students which consists of group 2, 3, and 5. The data sources of this research are the lecturer and the members of group two, three and five who conducted presentation activity in the classroom. As the session or the part of presentation activity, the group who controls the presentation will lead the process until the end of the presentation. There will be a moderator to make the presentation successful and run effectively. The result of the findings in this research showed that the students of the presentation activity utilized three types of code mixing to communicate in the classroom. The types of code mixing that were utilized by the students or audiences in the classroom include insertion or word/phrase, alternation or clause, and congruent lexicalization or dialect.

### a. Insertion (word or phrase)

Insertion or word/phrase is the dominant type of code mixing that was utilized by the participants in the classroom presentation. There are two examples of insertion categories which insert the target language (English) into Indonesian sentences. While the insertion of chunks there are 27 examples of insertion categories which insert Indonesian into the target language (English). The insertion of Indonesian into English is more than the target language (English) into Indonesian in the sentence used by the students in the classroom presentation. The findings were in line with the Muysken theory (2000) approaches that depart from the notion of insertion view the constraints in terms of the structural properties of some base or matrix structure. When a presenter inserts a word or phrase from a foreign language into his or her utterance, it is called as insertion in code mixing. The findings also were in line with

the previous studies based on Rini & Rustandi, (2018) conducted research on Code Mixing Analysis on Teachers and Students Classroom Interaction of Ice Breaking Session. The result of this study showed that insertion was the dominant type of code mixing that was used by teacher and students in the classroom interaction. However, in this current research, the researcher focused on the context of classroom presentation, insertion also the dominant types that the students used during presentation in the classroom.

Based on the participant's utterance in extract 1 until extract 27, the researchers found the type of code mixing's process was insertion. It can be proved when the participant inserted the phrase "**next, my partner, thank you, sorry, adaptation, modulation, mis, stylistic, method, adjectiva, she he it, rekonstruksi, and nonlinguistic**", in her or his Indonesia's conversation to discuss in the presentation activity. In addition, the insertion can be proved when the participant inserted the phrase "**ini** and **baik**" in her or his English conversation to present in a presentation interaction group discussion. It is called insertion since the English lexical class of word or phrase was inserted in her or his Indonesia's utterance. The utterances are included in types of insertion because insertion of material (lexical item or entire constituents) from one language into a structure of the other language.

#### *b. Alternation (clause)*

Code mixing in type of alternation or clause that were applied by the participants or students in the classroom presentation. From the participant's conversation in the findings, the researcher found a type of code mixing's process was used by the students in the learning process. It can be proved in extract 28 until extract 39, when the participants mixed in English clause with Indonesia's utterance to give an explanation and answer questions to the audience. Based on the utterances in extract 28 until extract 39, the participant mixed two language classes of clause in a sentence. The findings were in line with the previous studies based on Rini & Rustandi, (2018) conducted research on Code Mixing Analysis on Teachers and Students Classroom Interaction of Ice Breaking Session. The result of this study showed that alternation was the second dominant type that was used in classroom interaction. While in this current research in the context of classroom presentation, the alternation type is only used 12 times in three meetings means that this type is the last dominant that the students used in the classroom presentation. In addition, a constituent from English was followed by a constituent from Indonesia or the constituent from Indonesia followed by a constituent from English it is called alternation in code mixing. The findings also supported the code-mixing theory of Muysken (2000), alternation is the constraint of mixing in terms of compatibility or equivalence of the languages involved at the mix point and clause. The process of alternation is particularly frequent in stable bilingual communities with a tradition of language separation, but occurs in many other communities as well. The researcher concluded that when a speaker adds a clause from a foreign language into his or her dominant language, this is called clause insertion.

#### *c. Congruent lexicalization (dialect)*

The last types of code mixing that were utilized by the participants in the classroom presentation was congruent lexicalization. This finding was supported using theory by Muysken (2000), the term congruent lexicalization refers to a situation where the two languages share a grammatical structure which can be filled lexically with elements from either language. The notion of congruent lexicalization underlies the study of style shifting and dialect or standard variation. It can be seen in the last extract of congruent lexicalization "coba bilang ke turis have you eat pisang epe? Pasti turisnya bilang what is pisang peppe". The sentences were shared grammatically with each other to make the presenter easier in saying the sentences and make it clear for the audiences. It also can be proved in the extract 40 until extract 54, it is called congruent lexicalization because the participants were interested in the English words in the Indonesia's sentence or Indonesian word into English` sentence which can share grammatically structure that can be filled lexically with elements from

English. In addition, this type is grammatically unconstrained and can be characterized in terms of alternative lexical insertions.

These three types of code mixing namely insertion (word or phrase), alternation (clause), and congruent lexicalization (dialect) were the strategy that applied by the presenter or speaker to the audiences or the listener to have understanding or to make the communication run smoothly. In this case, classroom presentation interaction.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion above, the researchers draw conclusions that the students utilized three types of code mixing when having the classroom presentation assigned for their course, that is insertion or word/phrase, alternation or clause, and congruent lexicalization or dialect. The use of these code-mixing types alternatively became a communicative strategy applied by the students as the presenter or speaker to lead the audiences or the listeners' understanding to all the materials provided and made the classroom presentation run smoothly.

## References

- Artini, P. L., & Nitiasih, P. K. (2014). *Bilingualisme dan pendidikan bilingual* (Cet. 1). Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Barus, W. S., Pujiono, Mhd., & Fibriasari, H. (2019). Code mixing used by students of the French study program at the State University of Medan. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 3(1), 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v3i1.980>
- Deuchar, M. (2005). *Minority language survival: Code-mixing in Welsh*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass.
- Handayani, R., Sakkir, G., & Kasman, R. (2021). The Influence of Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence on Students Learning Outcomes in English at SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 1(2), 141-148.
- Helmie, J., Halimah, H., & Hasanah, A. (2020). Code mixing in college students' presentation: A case in an intercultural communication class. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 5(2), 403. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v5i2.249>
- Khati, A. R. (1970). When and why of mother tongue use in English classrooms. *Journal of NELTA*, 16(1–2), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v16i1-2.6128>
- Kim, E. (2006). *Reasons and motivations for code-mixing and code-switching*. 4(1), 19. Retrieved from: [https://www.academia.edu/35271736/Reasons\\_and\\_Motivations\\_for\\_Code\\_Mixing\\_and\\_Code\\_Switching](https://www.academia.edu/35271736/Reasons_and_Motivations_for_Code_Mixing_and_Code_Switching)
- Maulidar, E., Daud, B., & Inayah, N. (2020). An analysis of code mixing used by students in learning English. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 5(3), 77–84.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (Third edition). SAGE Publications Inc, United Kingdom: London EC1Y 1SP.
- Moetia, M., Kasim, U., & Fitriani, S. S. (2018). Code mixing and code switching in the classroom interaction. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 9(2), 229-242.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Noer, M. (2012). *Presentasi memukau—Bagaimana menciptakan presentasi luar biasa*. Yodhia Antariksa, 292. Retrieved from [www.presentasi.net](http://www.presentasi.net)
- Piantari, L. L., Muhatta, Z., & Fitriani, D. A. (2011). Alih Kode (Code-Switching) Pada Status Jejaring Sosial Facebook Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Al-azhar Indonesia Seri Humaniora*, 1(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.36722/sh.v1i1.19>

- Purnamasari, N. M. G., Putra, I. N. A., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2016). A descriptive study on the use of code mixing by the English teacher at SMAN Bali Mandara in the academic year 2014/2015. *Lingua Stiencia*, 23(2), 8.
- Rahmat, A. (2020). Code mixing in EFL classroom: Views from English teachers' side. *Al-Lisan: Journal Babasa (e-journal)*, 5(2), 130–147. <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v6i2.1323>
- Rini, D. A. C., & Rustandi, A. (2018). Code mixing analysis on teachers and students classroom interaction of ice breaking sessions. *Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, 1(4), 407–415. <https://doi.org/10.52690/jadila.v1i4.153>
- Ritchie, W. C., & Bhatia, T. K. (2006). *Social and psychological factors in language mixing*. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), (pp. 336–352). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756997.ch13>
- Sahril, S., Rosmini, R., & Sakkir, G. (2022). EFL Students' Anxiety in Oral Presentation in Thesis Examination during Covid-19 Pandemic Era: Factors and Strategies. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2), 144-159.
- Sakkir, G., Muzri, A., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2022). Students' Perception of the Presentation Activities in Online Speaking Class. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(3), 255-260.
- Samhan, A. H. (2017). Social Aspects in Social Media: Code Switching and Code Mixing in Twitter. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(18), 2225-0484.
- Sari, N. F. (2022). Code switching and code mixing in classroom presentations of Indonesian EFL students. *Educasia*, 7(2), 2527-5011.
- Sunubi, A. H., Dalle, H. A., & Magdahalena. (2013). English teacher instruction in giving material by using code switching and code mixing in SMU Neg.2 Parepare. *Kuriositas*, 1, 13.
- Syafaat, P. M. F., & Setiawan, T. (2019). An analysis of code mixing in Twitter. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Interdisciplinary Language, Literature and Education (ICILLE)*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icille-18.2019.57>.
- Waris, A. M. (2012). Code switching and mixing (Communication in learning language). *Jurnal Dakwah Tabligh*, 13(1), 13.
- Wartinah, N. N., & Wattimury, C. N. (2018). Code switching and code mixing in English language studies' speech community: A sociolinguistics approach. *Berumpun JOURNAL*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.33019/berumpun.v1i1.7>