

Code Switching and Code Mixing Uttered by Thai Students in Indonesia: Types and Contributing Factors

Tanzil Huda¹⁾, Yayah Ikhda Nevia²⁾, Nurhayatee Mushoma³⁾

¹⁾²⁾ Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, Indonesia

³⁾ Saeng Prathip Withya Mulnithi School, Thailand

SUBMISSION TRACK

Submitted : 15 April 2025
Accepted : 25 May 2025
Published : 30 May 2025

KEYWORDS

code-switching, code-mixing, Thai international students, multilingualism, translanguaging

CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail:
tanzilhuda@unmuhjember.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

This study investigates code switching and code mixing among Thai students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, Indonesia, within the broader context of bilingualism, multilingualism, and translanguaging. Conducted from September 2024 to February 2025 using a qualitative descriptive method, data were collected through audio recordings, interviews, and observations. The findings identify three types of code switching—tag-switching (50%), intra-sentential (40%), and inter-sentential (10%)—and three types of code mixing—alternation (52%), insertion (41.5%), and congruent lexicalization (6%). Influencing factors include language proficiency, academic year, social environment, communicative intent, and emotions. Older students used more Indonesian and English, while newer ones preferred Thai and Malay. The study concludes that code switching and mixing function as adaptive strategies that enhance communication and identity expression, supporting the need for translanguaging pedagogies in multicultural education.

Copyright © 2025 All right reserved

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](#) license



Introduction

Language serves not only as a tool for communication but also as a medium through which individuals express identity, negotiate social relationships, and participate in cultural exchange. In multilingual and multicultural settings, the interplay between languages often leads to the phenomena of code switching and code mixing, which are integral aspects of bilingual and multilingual. Code switching generally refers to the alternation between two or more languages or dialects within a single conversation or discourse, while code mixing involves the blending of elements from different languages within the same utterance or sentence (Muysken, 2000). These linguistic practices are not random or indicative of linguistic incompetence; rather, they are rule-governed, purposeful, and context-dependent behaviors employed by speakers to achieve specific communicative goals.

In recent decades, a growing number of sociolinguistic studies have explored how code switching and code mixing manifest in various social domains, including education, media, workplaces, and online communication (Myers-Scotton, 2020). In educational settings, particularly where students come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, these practices are increasingly common and often serve as strategies to manage communication barriers, express solidarity, or accommodate interlocutors (Canagarajah, 2011a; Sert, 2001).

Southeast Asia, as a region marked by linguistic richness and cultural heterogeneity, presents a unique context in which multilingual communication flourishes. Countries such as Thailand and Indonesia are home to a variety of regional languages and dialects, in addition to official or national languages like Thai, Indonesian, and English. English, in particular, has gained prominence as a medium of instruction and international

communication across ASEAN countries, further encouraging language contact and multilingual interactions (Baker, 2011).

Within this regional context, student mobility has significantly increased due to regional cooperation in education, such as the ASEAN International Mobility for Students (AIMS) program and various scholarship opportunities. As a result, Thai students are now more frequently enrolling in universities in neighboring countries, including Indonesia, where they encounter new languages, cultural practices, and academic norms.

These Thai students, typically fluent in Thai and English, are often exposed to Indonesian through daily interaction with local students and faculty members. In navigating this trilingual environment—Thai, English, and Indonesian—students may engage in frequent code switching and mixing as they attempt to communicate effectively in academic, social, and personal contexts. This linguistic behavior is not only a reflection of their multilingual competencies but also of their adaptation strategies to new cultural and social norms (Wei & García, 2016).

Despite the abundant research on code switching and code mixing across various populations and regions, relatively little attention has been paid to international students from Southeast Asia, especially Thai students studying in Indonesia. Much of the existing literature has concentrated on bilingual communities involving dominant global languages such as English-Spanish (Sánchez et al., 2018) often within Western contexts. In the Southeast Asian context, several studies have examined code switching among Malaysian or Indonesian bilinguals (Low, 2016; Setiawan, 2016; Sumarsih et al., 2014), yet few have investigated the experiences of non-native Indonesian speakers, such as Thai students, learning to communicate in Indonesian while also maintaining their use of English and Thai.

Even more scarce are studies that address the specific types of code switching and mixing (e.g., inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and tag-switching) and how these manifest in everyday communication among international students (Romaine, 2007). Understanding these types is important for analyzing how linguistic knowledge and social intent interact during communication. Furthermore, little research has been conducted on the underlying factors that drive code switching and mixing among this population. Such factors may include linguistic competence, social identity, peer influence, academic requirements, situational context, and even psychological comfort (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Without such insight, our understanding of how multilingual students manage communication across multiple languages in foreign academic environments remains incomplete.

In addition, the role of institutional context—such as language policies, teaching practices, and campus culture—has been underexamined in shaping students' language use patterns. As (Meier, 2017) points out, language practices are deeply embedded in the socio-political structures of institutions, and thus, multilingual behavior should be examined not just from a linguistic perspective, but also from a sociocultural and educational one.

Given these gaps in the existing literature, this study seeks to explore the multilingual communication practices of Thai students at the Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, with a focus on code switching and code mixing. It is particularly interested in understanding the types of code switching and code mixing used in their daily interactions, and the factors that influence their use of these linguistic strategies. These research questions are stated as follows, (1) What types of code switching and code mixing in communication are used by Thai students at the Universitas Muhammadiyah

Jember?; (2) What factors do cause the Thai students to use code switching and code mixing in communication?

This research is theoretically grounded in sociolinguistic models of bilingualism and multilingualism as the recent frameworks emphasizing the fluid and dynamic nature of multilingual communication (Canagarajah, 2011b; Wei & García, 2016). By situating the study within these frameworks, it acknowledges that code switching and mixing are not just linguistic phenomena, but are also deeply connected to identity, culture, and power relations in educational and social contexts.

Furthermore, the findings of this study are expected to have practical implications for language educators, university administrators, and policy-makers. Understanding how and why Thai students switch and mix languages can help educators design more linguistically responsive curricula, create inclusive classroom environments, and support students' linguistic and cultural transitions. For institutions aiming to attract and retain international students, such research offers important perspectives on how language policies and campus culture can support or hinder effective communication and learning.

In sum, this study aims to fill a significant gap in the literature by investigating the complex linguistic behaviors of Thai students in Indonesia, and by providing a nuanced understanding of the role of code switching and code mixing in multilingual, multicultural academic settings.

Literature Review

Understanding Code Switching and Code Mixing

Code switching and code mixing are common phenomena in multilingual communities and have been the focus of extensive sociolinguistic inquiry. Code switching refers to the alternation between two or more languages or language varieties within a single conversation or discourse, often at sentence or clause boundaries (Myers-Scotton, 1989). Meanwhile, code mixing typically refers to the blending of linguistic elements—words, phrases, or morphemes—from different languages within a single utterance or sentence (Muysken, 2000).

These phenomena are often used interchangeably in casual discourse, but researchers make important distinctions. (Myers-Scotton, 1989) categorizes code switching into three main types: inter-sentential switching, which occurs at sentence boundaries; intra-sentential switching, which happens within the same sentence; and tag-switching, where tags or fillers from one language are inserted into an utterance in another. (Muysken, 2000), meanwhile, offers a typology of code mixing that includes insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. These classifications provide useful analytical frameworks for understanding how speakers switch and mix languages in actual communication.

Functions and Motivations Behind Code Switching and Code Mixing

The use of code switching and mixing serves multiple communicative functions. These practices are not random but rather socially and contextually driven. Speakers may switch codes to emphasize a point, mark identity, signal group membership, or accommodate their interlocutors. Codeswitching may be used to express solidarity, anger, familiarity, or emotional nuance that may not be easily conveyed in a single language.

(Myers-Scotton, 1989) offers the Markedness Model, suggesting that speakers switch codes based on social expectations and to manage interpersonal relationships. If a speaker selects an unexpected or “unmarked” code, it may carry social meaning or imply

a shift in power dynamics or intimacy levels. It means that code switching should be understood as an interactional resource, shaped by discourse and context.

In educational settings, (Sert, 2001) found that teachers and students often switch codes to clarify content, manage classroom interaction, or relieve tension. In multilingual peer communication, students switch codes to ease expression, avoid misunderstandings, or retain cultural references (Canagarajah, 2011a).

Code Switching and Code Mixing Among Students in Multilingual Contexts

Student populations are especially prone to code switching and mixing due to their frequent engagement in both academic and informal communication. (Wei, 2018) notes that young bilinguals often develop a flexible linguistic repertoire that allows them to fluidly navigate between languages. In multicultural educational contexts, code switching and mixing are not merely linguistic tools, but part of identity construction, particularly for international students who must adapt to new linguistic and cultural environments.

Numerous studies have examined code switching among bilingual students. For instance, (Low, 2016) investigated Malaysian bilinguals and observed that English-Malay code switching was influenced by topic shifts, emotional intensity, and domain-specific vocabulary gaps. Similarly, (Setiawan, 2016) and (Sumarsih et al., 2014) found that Indonesian students switch to English in the classroom for technical terms and to align with perceived academic prestige.

However, few studies have explored how non-native speakers of the host language engage in code switching, particularly in trilingual environments. Thai students studying in Indonesia, for example, must navigate not only their native Thai and the widely used English, but also Indonesian, the local language of instruction and communication. This creates a unique sociolinguistic situation in which multiple switching and mixing patterns may emerge based on linguistic proficiency, peer influence, and institutional language norms.

Thai Students and Language Use in Foreign Contexts

Although limited, a few studies have shed light on the language behaviors of Thai students studying abroad. (Baker, 2011) argues that ASEAN students increasingly use English as a lingua franca, yet they often incorporate their native language and the local language into their interactions. When abroad, Thai students tend to rely on a combination of English and the host country's language for academic survival, while Thai remains a code for intimacy and cultural bonding Darling, C. (2024)

These dynamics are especially relevant in Indonesian academic institutions, where students are expected to engage with both Indonesian and English, depending on the subject and context. Thai students in this setting may experience varying degrees of language anxiety, accommodation, and code negotiation, leading to diverse switching and mixing patterns. However, systematic research exploring this group in Indonesia remains scarce.

Theoretical Frameworks in Analyzing Code Switching and Code Mixing

Several theoretical frameworks inform the study of code switching and code mixing. Based Muysken's (Muysken, 2000), sociolinguists often draw on omain theory, which explains language choice based on the setting and participants. (Wei & García, 2016) propose a translanguaging perspective, viewing bilingual practices as holistic and fluid rather than fragmented between distinct linguistic systems.

In analyzing the factors that influence code switching, the Ecological Approach (Hornberger, 2004) can also be useful, as it considers how environmental, institutional, and interpersonal factors shape language behavior. These frameworks collectively help to explain not just how students switch and mix codes, but why they do so in particular contexts.

Research Method

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the types of code switching and code mixing used by Thai students and to identify the factors influencing their use in communication. A qualitative approach is appropriate for this study as it enables the researcher to gain in-depth insights into participants' linguistic behaviors, social interactions, and underlying motivations in natural settings (Flick, 2022). The descriptive nature of the study allows for the systematic identification, observation, and interpretation of language use without manipulating variables or testing hypotheses.

Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, a private higher education institution in East Java, Indonesia, that hosts international students, including those from Thailand. The participants consisted of eight Thai students (4 males and 4 females) currently enrolled in undergraduate programs at Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember. Participants were selected through purposive sampling, as they met specific criteria relevant to the study: (1) being native speakers of Thai, (2) having studied in Indonesia for at least one academic year, and (3) being capable of using English and Indonesian in addition to Thai.

This sample size was deemed sufficient for a qualitative inquiry aimed at capturing a range of experiences, and it allowed for rich, contextual data to emerge from multiple language interaction scenarios.

Data Collection Technique

To ensure triangulation and depth of understanding, two primary data collection methods were used:

a. Audio Recording

With participants' consent, selected conversations were audio-recorded during informal interactions and small group settings. These recordings captured spontaneous language use and provided a reliable source for identifying code-switching patterns, types, and frequencies.

b. Semi-Structured Interviews

In-depth interviews were conducted individually with each participant. These interviews explored students' language backgrounds, self-perceived language proficiencies, reasons for switching or mixing codes, emotional or social triggers, and their perceptions of language use in academic and social life. Interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes and were conducted in a mix of English and Indonesian, based on participant comfort. Interviews were recorded and later transcribed for analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using content analysis and thematic coding, based on the frameworks provided by (Muysken, 2000). The process involved:

1. Transcribing all recorded audio data and interview sessions.

2. Identifying instances of code switching and code mixing in the transcripts.
3. Classifying the types of switching and mixing using established categories (inter-sentential, intra-sentential, tag switching; insertion, alternation, congruent lexicalization).
4. Coding for themes based on factors influencing language behavior, such as linguistic competence, social context, emotional expression, peer pressure, and academic necessity.

Coding technique was used to organize and group thematic data for interpretation. Themes were then triangulated across interviews, observations, and recorded conversations to ensure credibility and validity.

Trustworthiness of the Study

To ensure the trustworthiness and credibility of the findings, several qualitative strategies were employed:

- Triangulation: Using multiple data sources (observation, recordings, interviews) to confirm patterns.
- Member checking: Participants were given the opportunity to review and verify their interview transcripts and summarized interpretations.
- Peer debriefing: Findings and interpretations were discussed with academic peers and supervisors to reduce researcher bias.
- Thick description: Detailed contextual accounts were provided to enable transferability of findings to similar educational or cultural settings.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance was obtained from the appropriate academic authority at the Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study, their rights, and the voluntary nature of participation. Informed consent was obtained in writing. All data were anonymized to ensure participants' privacy and confidentiality, and pseudonyms were used in reporting findings.

Result and Discussion

Result

Data from Audio Recordings

Types of Code Switching

Analysis of recorded daily conversations among Thai students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember revealed the use of three major types of Code Switching based on (Myers-Scotton, 1989) classification is described as follows:

Table 1. Type of Code Switching Uttered by Thai Students

No	Type of Code Switching	Number of Utterances	Percentage (%)
1	Tag-switching	5	50%
2	Inter-sentential switching	1	10%
3	Intra-sentential switching	4	40%
Total		10	100 %

Meanwhile, the samples of Tag-switching (e.g., “สวัสดีค่ะ Nuri speaking”): English phrases inserted into Thai discourse are as follows:

- Inter-sentential switching (e.g., “Congratulations my sis. นางสาวเขาและ”): switching between complete sentences in English and Thai.

- Intra-sentential switching (e.g., “Tak leh, scan gi tak leh”): blended use of Malay and English within a single clause.

Types of Code Mixing

The analysis of data of daily conversations among Thai students also revealed the three types of Code Mixing categorized based on Muysken’s (2000) typology is described as follows:

Table 2. Type of Code Mixing Uttered by Thai Students

No.	Type of Code Mixing	Number of Utterances	Percentage (%)
1	Insertion	47	41.5%
2	Alternation	59	52%
3	Congruent Lexicalization	7	6%
Total		113	100%

Meanwhile the sample of each type of Code Mixing is presented as follows.

- Insertion (e.g., “นี่คือ example ของวันนี้”): embedding lexical items into a dominant language structure.
- Alternation (e.g., “เรามากิน Watermelon”): switching between full constituents.
- Congruent Lexicalization (e.g., “สี ning doh สีม่วงมั่งคุด aku tengok hok Hana hata”): use of shared grammatical structures with integrated vocabulary.

Data from Interview

Interview data highlighted several influencing factors:

- Language Proficiency: Earlier cohorts used more Indonesian/English; recent cohorts favored Thai/Malay.
- Social Environment: Peer preferences led to reduced English use in informal contexts.
- Cultural Integration: Language choice reflected group identity and local norms.
- Emotional/Practical Factors: Students reported greater fluency, confidence, and expressiveness when mixing languages.

Discussion

Code Switching as a Sociolinguistic Strategy

The predominance of tag-switching (50%) among Thai students reflects its function as a low-risk, discourse-oriented strategy. Tag-switching typically involves set phrases (e.g., “you know,” “I mean”) that do not violate grammatical rules of either language, making it the least syntactically disruptive. Its high frequency among participants suggests that students rely on these formulaic expressions to maintain conversational flow, convey emotions, or assert identity—particularly in multilingual peer interactions. This is consistent with recent findings by (Liu, 2023), who emphasizes that tag-switching serves as a pragmatic and affective resource in intercultural communication.

Intra-sentential switching (40%), the integration of lexical items and syntactic elements from two languages within a single sentence, is often considered the most complex form of code switching. Its use indicates high bilingual or multilingual proficiency which is marked by the cognitive and linguistic flexibility required to switch seamlessly within a clause. This type of switching not only signals language mastery but also reflects an ingrained practice in linguistically diverse environments, where boundaries between languages are permeable and fluid (Canagarajah, 2011b). In these

contexts, students actively co-construct meaning by drawing on all their linguistic resources, especially in peer talk.

Inter-sentential switching (10%)—switching between complete sentences or clauses—tends to occur in more formal or rhetorical settings, including storytelling or clarification. According to Myers-Scotton’s (1998) Markedness Model, such switching can be a deliberate choice to indicate a change in discourse context, audience alignment, or power dynamics. For example, students may use English to express academic knowledge or authority and Thai/Malay for solidarity and emotional resonance. Recent studies (Rojas, 2025) shows that such switching patterns are socially embedded acts of identity negotiation, shaped by institutional language hierarchies and interpersonal relationships.

Code Mixing as a Reflection of Multilingual Competence

The dominant presence of alternation (52%) in code mixing suggests that students strategically exploit their multilingual repertoires to enhance communication. (Muysken, 2000) described alternation as the insertion of entire phrases or clauses from one language into the syntax of another. This is common in informal, spontaneous speech and has been observed in multicultural settings where interlocutors share multiple languages (Lantto, 2023). In this study, alternation enabled students to express themselves with greater nuance and emotional range, particularly when discussing culturally specific topics or peer humor.

Insertion (41.5%)—the embedding of single lexical items or short phrases from one language into another—was most prevalent in academic or technical conversations. (Sert, 2001) argues that this practice reflects content-based language learning, where students appropriate domain-specific vocabulary from the language of instruction (often English) while maintaining the grammatical structure of their native language. This aligns with the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), which suggests that repeated exposure to target vocabulary in context promotes acquisition through conscious attention.

The presence of congruent lexicalization (6%)—in which both grammatical structures and vocabulary from two or more languages (Yani et al., 2023) are blended within the same utterance—suggests advanced multilingual competence. (Wei, 2018) argues that this form of mixing reflects the emergence of hybrid grammars in multilingual speakers, especially in contact zones where linguistic boundaries are fluid. Though less frequent, congruent lexicalization in this study demonstrates that some students are not simply code-switching but are engaging in translingual practice, drawing on a shared semiotic repertoire to express layered meanings (Canagarajah, 2018).

Factors Influencing Code Choice

Differences in language proficiency across student cohorts mirror Cummins’ Threshold Hypothesis (Cummins, 2001), which proposes that cognitive and linguistic benefits of bilingualism manifest once a certain level of proficiency in both languages is achieved. Earlier cohorts, with more exposure to Indonesian and English, exhibited more diverse switching patterns, whereas newer cohorts leaned toward Thai/Malay, reflecting shifts in input frequency, peer norms, and institutional language policies.

Contextual and social factors were equally important. According to (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015), code choice is both a reflection of individual identity and a response to situational demands. Students often adjusted their language use to align with group expectations, academic contexts, or affective needs. Code switching thus becomes a

performative act—a way to negotiate relationships, assert group belonging, or soften linguistic boundaries (Rojas, 2025).

Furthermore, the data revealed frequent translinguaging—the dynamic and flexible use of all linguistic resources to construct meaning (Vogel & García, 2024; Wei & García, 2016). Rather than viewing languages as separate systems, students employed a unified linguistic repertoire, integrating multiple codes in fluid, intentional ways.

Conclusion

This study examined the types and causes of code switching and code mixing among Thai students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember. The findings revealed the use of all three types of code switching—tag-switching (50%), intra-sentential (40%), and inter-sentential (10%)—as well as the three forms of code mixing i.e., alternation (52%), insertion (41.5%), and congruent lexicalization (6%). These patterns reflect the students' multilingual competence and their ability to navigate fluid language boundaries in everyday communication.

Several factors influenced these language practices, including students' language proficiency, social dynamics, cultural integration, and emotional or practical motivations. The data also indicated frequent translinguaging, demonstrating students' strategic use of their entire linguistic repertoire to construct meaning and assert identity.

Rather than signaling confusion or deficiency, these multilingual practices reflect adaptive strategies that enhance communication, foster peer solidarity, and support academic and social integration. The findings call for a rethinking of language education policies to embrace multilingualism as a resource, not a barrier, particularly in international and culturally diverse learning environments.

Implications

The findings of this study carry several important implications for language education, sociolinguistic research, and institutional policy, particularly in multilingual academic contexts:

Recognition of Multilingual Competence

The use of various types of code switching and code mixing among Thai students indicates not linguistic deficiency, but rather a high degree of multilingual proficiency. Educators should view these practices as evidence of communicative adaptability and cognitive flexibility, rather than as interference or error.

Support for Translinguaging Pedagogy

The fluid integration of Thai, Malay, Indonesian, and English observed in students' discourse supports the adoption of translinguaging frameworks in instructional settings. Classrooms should be designed to leverage students' full linguistic repertoires to enhance learning and meaning-making.

Curricular Inclusivity

Academic programs must reflect the linguistic and cultural realities of international students. This includes validating students' home languages and creating opportunities for multilingual expression within academic and social spaces. Such inclusivity fosters identity affirmation and academic engagement.

Language Policy Reform

The influence of language proficiency and peer norms on students' language choices suggests that institutional policies should promote balanced exposure to Indonesian, English, and students' native languages. This includes support systems such as language mentoring, multilingual signage, and culturally responsive academic advising.

Sociolinguistic Awareness and Teacher Training

Language educators should receive training to understand and respond to students' multilingual practices. Developing teachers' sociolinguistic awareness will enable them to support multilingual learners more effectively and avoid enforcing restrictive monolingual norms.

Future Research Directions

These findings open pathways for further investigation into how code switching and mixing affect academic performance, identity construction, and cross-cultural communication. Longitudinal and comparative studies could explore similar patterns in other student populations or institutional contexts.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Indah Rakhmawati Afrida for her invaluable support in organizing and managing the references for this article through the use of Mendeley.

References

- Baker, W. (2011). Intercultural awareness: Modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2011.577779>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Applied Linguistics Review 2 2011. In *Zhurnal Eksperimental'noi i Teoreticheskoi Fiziki*. <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:No+Title#0>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Canagarajah, S. (2018). Translingual Practice as Spatial Repertoires: Expanding the Paradigm beyond Structuralist Orientations. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx041>
- Cummins, J. (2001). Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire, by J. Cummins. *The CATESOL Journal*, 13(1), 201–203.
- Flick, U. (2022). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research Design* (Flick (ed.)). SAGE Publications.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2004). The continua of biliteracy and the bilingual educator: Educational linguistics in practice. *Bilingualism and Language Pedagogy*, 7, 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853597565-004>
- Lantto, H. (2023). Language contact: Bridging the gap between individual interactions and areal patterns. In R. van Gijn, H. Ruch, M. Wahlström, & A. Hasse (Eds.), *Language contact: Bridging the gap between individual interactions and areal patterns*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8269092>
- Liu, Y. (2023). *Exploring the relationship between code-switching and emotions*. A

- systematic review. University of Oxford.
- Low, S. M. (2016). *The Effectiveness of Classroom Code-Switching in Malaysian Science Classrooms*. University of Sheffield.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dornyei, Z., Clement, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545. <https://doi.org/10.2307/330224>
- Meier, G. S. (2017). The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: Assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 8(1), 131–161. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-2010>
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1989). Codeswitching With English: Types of Switching, Types of Communities. *Word Englishes*, 8(3), 333–346.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2020). Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In *The Bilingualism Reader, Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003060406-13>
- Rojas, B. G. (2025). *Code-Switching Communities as Identity Negotiation in Multilingual*. 2(1), 13–23.
- Romaine, S. (2007). The Handbook of Linguistics. In M. Aronoff & J. Rees-miller (Eds.), *The Handbook of Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405102520.2002.00021.x>
- Sánchez, M. T. (Maite), García, O., & Solorza, C. (2018). Reframing language allocation policy in dual language bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(1), 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1405098>
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Sert, O. (2001). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 1–6.
- Setiawan, D. (2016). English Code Switching in Indonesian Language. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 1545–1552. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040707>
- Sumarsih, S., Siregar, M., Bahri, S., & Sanjaya, D. (2014). Code Switching and Code Mixing in Indonesia: Study in Sociolinguistics? *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v4n1p77>
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2024). Translanguaging. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Race and Education*, 1, 292–306. <https://doi.org/10.7146/spr.v25i68.128425>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley Blackwell. http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM_P_EMBETUNGAN_TERPUSAT_STRATEGI_MELESTARI
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Wei, L., & García, O. (2016). Form Researching Translanguaging to Translanguaging Reserach. In K. King (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 1–14). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02329-8>
- Yani, K. N. H., Budasi, I. G., Ramendra, D. P., Artini, L. P., & Ana, I. K. T. A. (2023).

Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual Education: What Can We Learn from the Previous Studies? *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 6(3), 554–565. <https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v6i3.3362>