Teachers' Perceptions about the Use of Code-Mixing in Teaching English

Sri Wahyuni[1], Nur Aeni[2*], Hasriani G[3]

[1,2,3]English Education Department, State University of Makassar, Indonesia
*Corresponding E-mail: nur.aeni@unm.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine the perceptions of the teachers about the use of code-mixing in teaching English. The researchers used a mixed-method triangulation research design (quantitative-qualitative). To achieve the research objectives, the data collected is the result of observation, interview and questionnaire. The sample in this research was the teacher who taught in a third-year English class in SMP 4 Bantimurung. The results of data analysis showed that the perceptions of teachers had positive perceptions about the use of code-mixing in teaching English as evidenced by the results of observations and interviews which showed positive responses to the use of code-mixing and also supported by accurate data from a questionnaire where there was mean score 68 for teacher. The reason why a teacher had a positive perception of code mixing in teaching English is that the teacher considers that code-mixing can help teachers to make students more actively participate in taking English lessons. The use of L1 or Indonesian by the teacher can help students understand teacher instructions, subject matter, assignments, and even exams. In addition, students can also improve their vocabulary and how to pronounce new vocabulary acquired during the teaching-learning process.

Keywords: *Teachers, Perceptions, Code-Mixing.*

1. Introduction

Communication is closely related to language and society. It can be seen in everyday life that every communication made in social life cannot be separated from the use of language. This is discussed in sociolinguistics itself. According to Amin (2020) in sociolinguistics, language is part of the social and communication systems and is also part of society and culture.

Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that explores the relationship of language in society. Sociolinguistics can be seen from how language is used in social contexts, such as how people interact on an interpersonal level or a broader group level, such as cultural, national, and international levels. In this sociolinguistic study, there are three types of language acquisition in people from various groups; monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual. Bilingual and multilingual phenomena are often found among people in Indonesia. This phenomenon is caused by the influence of globalization and cultural openness itself.

Along with the openness of modernization in Indonesia, people began to learn various languages. In various schools, English is a foreign language that must be studied and included in the education curriculum in Indonesia. This is because English is an international language that is very important to learn. Those who master English language skills can help them in having brilliant careers.

English in Indonesia in the context of formal education has been studied from elementary school to university level. Beginner-level English learners only learn about basic English introduction, such as vocabulary used in everyday life. Then at a higher level will get additional material and additional lesson time. In learning English, the language of instruction can affect students' skills in language acquisition. In Indonesia, they have learned English since the elementary school level. However, the students still cannot master English well and apply it in their daily life. This is because students are less exposed to English. They use English or learn English only in the English classroom. Besides that, they don't even fully use English directly to the maximum in class; this is one of the reasons why they are not motivated and have less knowledge.

The result of students' lack of understanding of English is why teachers mix English and Indonesian in teaching students; teachers sometimes use local languages to explain or translate words into English so that students can easily understand them. This phenomenon also occurs in schools that were the target of research, namely SMP 4 Bantimurung. In the initial observations made by the researcher, the researcher saw that the interaction during the teaching and learning process used code-mixing between Indonesian and the regional language, namely the Makassar language. This also happens in learning English in the classroom, where the teacher uses code-mixing between English and Indonesian.

According to Al-Ahdal (2020), code-mixing is a linguistic communication phenomenon. Code-blending is the utilization of one language in another. Where the lexical things and syntactic highlights in two dialects become a similar sentence in discourse. Two speculations make sense of the sorts of code-blending: the principal hypothesis comes from Hoffman (1991) which expresses that there are three kinds of code-blending, specifically intra-sentential code-blending, and interlexical code-blending, including a difference in elocution.

Several previous studies became the basis for researchers to conduct research with the title of teachers' and students' perceptions about the use of code-mixing in teaching English classrooms, namely: Nuraini (2022), Ramadhaniarti (2017), Novianti & Said (2021), and Hasai (2021). Their research investigated the use of code-mixing among English teachers/lecturers when teaching in the classroom. To find the research results, they used a qualitative descriptive research method with the data source coming from the language of instruction spoken by the English teacher when teaching in class. The findings of this study are that teachers/lecturers have a positive view of the use of code-mixing when teaching in the classroom and they find the type of code-mixing that teachers/lecturers use is the type of code-mixing classified by Muysken (2000) and Hoffman (1991).

From the findings of several researchers above, they found several types of code-mixing used by teachers/lecturers in the classroom. However, this study differs from theirs; In this study, the researchers focused on teachers' perceptions of using code-mixing in teaching English.

2. Literature Review

2. 1. Definition of Perception

Perception is a complex cognitive action that can recognize a picture of sensory information about a condition in the environment. Mussen (1973) in Nursanti (2016) defines perception as information processed through sensory receptors, which are then processed into what we think, see, hear, smell, taste, or even touch. it might be deduced that knowledge is the commitment of the fervor cycle given what is gotten by the receptors from various events or experiences experienced to transform into an idea or picture.

2. 2. Sociolinguistics

According to Holmes (2013), sociolinguistics concentrates on the connection between language and society. This study makes sense of why individuals talk diversely in various social settings, which will then provide broader information about how language works with social relations in the community context.

2. 3. Code-mixing

According to Wardaugh (1987), code-blending happens when speakers utilize the two dialects they ace together as long as they change starting with one language and then onto the next in one expression. The fact of the matter is that while talking, speakers just change a few components of the language they talk. There are 3 kinds of code-blending, specifically intra-sentential code-blending, intra-lexical code-blending and change of articulation.

3. Research Methodology

3. 1. Research Design

This research uses a mixed method (qualitative-quantitative). According to McKim (2017), mixed methods are used to analyze the strength of qualitative and quantitative research. This study means to depict the view of educators about the utilization of code-blending in teaching English in the classroom. According to Wardaugh (1987), code-blending happens when speakers utilize the two dialects they ace together as long as they change starting with one language and then onto the next in one expression. The point is that when speaking, speakers only change some elements of the language they speak. There are 3 kinds of code-blending, in particular intra-sentential code-blending, intra-lexical code-blending and change of articulation.

3. 2. Research Variable

This research had a single variable which is teachers' perceptions. Teachers' perceptions in this study were how she perceives the use of code-mixing in teaching English.

3. 3. Population and Sample

The population in this study were teachers who taught in third-year English class.

3. 4. Instrument of the Research

In gathering information, the specialist utilized three instruments, to be specific:

a. Observation
   Discernment in this study was finished to know the usage of code-mixing used by teachers while teaching English. Researchers used a recording device and an observation sheet adapted from Khairunnisa (2016).

b. Questionnaire
   In this review, the scientist utilized a poll to decide the view of educators about the utilization of code-blending in instructing English. The educator poll was adjusted and changed from the Afriani survey (2019).

c. Interview
   The use of interviews as a research instrument was used to obtain data or strong arguments about the perceptions of teachers about the use of code-mixing in teaching English. The type of interview used is a semi-structured interview. For the teacher adapted from Ivana (2018).

3. 5. Procedure of Collecting data

a. Observation
   The researchers asked permission from the teacher to make observations. Insight was made by clearly seeing the code mixing used by the teacher during the training and learning. In the observation activity, the researchers record the entire course of learning English and write a small note that is adjusted to the observation sheet to achieve the desired goal.

b. Questionnaire
   The second instrument was a questionnaire. At this stage, the researchers asked permission from the teacher to fill out the questionnaire that the researchers had prepared using the Google form. However, before she filled out the questionnaire, the researchers provided

instructions or some information on how to fill out the questionnaire.

c. Interview

The researchers asked permission from the teacher to take the time to be interviewed. After that, the researchers provided interview guides and explanations. The interview guide consists of a list of questions. Finally, the researchers interviewed the teacher to get a strong argument about her perceptions of the use of code-mixing in teaching English.

3. 6. Technique of Data Analysis

a. Observation and Interview

The information got from perception and interview were then handled utilizing a proposed model comprising of information assortment, information decrease, information show, and check.

1) Data Collection

In collecting data, for observation, the researchers observed the teaching and learning process in English class by paying attention to the code-mixing used by the teacher, in the observation process the researchers focused on the points on the observation sheet. As for the interview, researchers interviewed the teacher in which the information

was used to obtain more supportive data.

2) Data Reduction

The next stage was to reduce irrelevant data by selecting the data obtained during the study by focusing only on the research objective, namely to determine the perceptions of teachers about the use of code-mixing in teaching English.

3) Data Display

In this step, for observation, the researchers identify the use of code-mixing by the English teacher during the learning activities by writing down some examples of speech used by the teacher on the observation sheet. While the results of the interview will be conducted in the form of a narrative.

4) Conclusion and verification

The researchers interpret the content of the data to display analysis with the result that through data verification, the research can establish conclusions and verify the perceptions of teachers about the use of code-mixing in teaching English classrooms.

b. Questionnaire

The questionnaire used the Likert scale, which consists of five-point scales as follows:

Table 1. Likert Scale

Series of statement	Score	
	Positive	**Negative**
1. Strongly agree	5	1
2. Agree	4	2
3. undecided/no answer	3	3
4. Disagree	2	4
5. Strongly disagree	1	5

(Gay, 2006)

1) Analyzing the Data by Using the Formula Below:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

(Gay, 2006)

Where:

P   : Percentage

F   : Frequently

N   : Amount of sample

2) Calculating the Mean Score by using the Formula Below:

$$X=\Sigma X/N$$

Where:

X   : Mean Score
ΣX   : Total row score
N   : The total number of participants

(Gay,2006)

3) Measuring the Teachers' and Students' Perception

The questionnaires consist of 20 items and had positive and negative statements. If the respondents chose all statements with strongly agree (SA), he/she got 100 and if all the respondents chose all the statements with strongly disagree (SD), he/she got 20. So, 100-20=80. Since the questionnaire uses 5 scales. So, the interval will be 80:5=16. The classification of the perception will be:

Table 2. Perception Classification

84-100	Strongly Positive
67-83	Positive
50-66	Moderate
33-49	Negative
16-32	Strongly Negative

Lestari (2017) in Aeni (2022)

4. Findings

The discoveries of the examination show the aftereffect of perception, poll, and interview to respond to the exploration inquiries in the main part. The exploration question is "What are the educators' discernments about the utilization of code-blending in instructing English? The researchers collected data through observation, interviews, and questionnaires.

4. 1. Observation

In light of the perception that has been made during four gatherings, the specialist found that the showing style brought out by the educator was through a bunch of conversations. During the teaching and learning process took place four meetings the teacher used the dominant language of English rather than Indonesian. During the observation, the teacher used English and she translated it into Indonesian. In addition, the teacher also did several repetitions of words/phrases/sentences and used them to provide opportunities for students to repeat the words mentioned by the teacher. During four meetings the researchers found two types of code-mixing from three types of code-mixing classified by Hoffman (1991:112) in Ivana (2018). The two types of code-mixing

were Intra-sentential code-mixing and Involving change of pronunciation.

a.   Intra-sentential code-mixing
Intra-sentential code-mixing occurs at a phrase, clause, or sentence boundary. Based on observations made during four meetings, it was found that the teacher mixed phrases, clauses, and sentences in English and Indonesian. In this observation, it was found that there were 61 times the teacher used this type of code-mixing in her utterances when teaching in the classroom. Here are some examples of the utterances:
   "Yah jangan ragu-ragu coba ngomong have a nice trip"
   "Yah good luck coba semua good luck"
   "Untuk number ten apa disitu"

b.   Involving change in pronunciation
Involving change in pronunciation occurs at the phonological level. Based on observations made during four meetings, it was found that the teacher when teaching mentioned English words several times but modified them into Indonesian phonological structure. In this observation, it was found that there were 27 times the teacher used this type of code-mixing in her speech when teaching in the classroom. Here are some examples of the utterances:

"Ok nah dibaca diatas"
"Ok grup one situation two"

4. 2. Questionnaire

There was only one teacher who taught in the third year of SMPN 4 Bantimurung, and she was the respondent in this research. Based on the data analysis from the questionnaire, it was found that teacher's perceptions about the use of code-mixing in teaching English were positive. It can be seen from the result of the mean score in the questionnaire that was calculated below:

Table 3. Teachers' Perceptions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Score	Classification
Hamsinah S.Pd	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	68	Positive

Table 4. Teachers' Perceptions Classification

Range of Scale	Frequency	Percentage	Teachers' Perception
84-100	-	-	Strongly Positive
67-83	1	100%	Positive
50-66	-	-	Moderate
33-49	-	-	Negative
16-32	-	-	Strongly Negative
Total	1	100%	

From the two tables above (Table 3 and Table 4), we can see that the total score from the questionnaire for the teacher was 68 with a total sampling was 1. The results of the mean score were supported by frequency and the percentage of the questionnaire which showed that 100% of teachers had a positive perception of the use of code-mixing in teaching English.

4. 3. Interview

The data from the questionnaire are supported by the results of the interview with the teacher as follows:
a. Teacher's perceptions
Only one teacher is teaching English in the third year of SMPN 4 Bantimurung and the teacher had positive perceptions about the use of code-mixing in teaching English. She said that this code-mixing was effective for use when teaching in giving instructions and explaining the subject matter.

Extract 1
(Teacher,28/7/2022/No.1-7)

... Yes, I do. Yah code mixing yaitu ada apa Namanya eeee setelah berbahasa inggris di selingi dengan bahasa Indonesia, yah itu maksudnya, maksud saya begitu. I mean in English and Indonesian ok. (Yes, I do. Yeah code-mixing is eeee after speaking English interspersed with Indonesian, well that's what it means, I mean that. I mean in English and Indonesian ok.)

.....Yeah, sometimes I realize, kadang-kadang saya menyadari bahwa saya menggunakan dua bahasa ini, mencampur bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa inggris, yeah kadang-kadang saya gunakan, saya pakai. (Yeah, sometimes I realize, sometimes I realize that what is it, eee using these two languages, mixing Indonesian and English, yeah sometimes I use, I use.)

.....Yah tentunya disini saya berusaha menggunakan lebih banyak bahasa inggris yah, supaya anak-anak terbiasa mendengar kata-kata dalam bahasa inggris. Jadi sedikit apa. Namanya sedikit penjelasan saja untuk bahasa Indonesia dan tentu lebih banyak bahasa

inggris. Tapi saya juga menyesuaikan dengan kondisi para siswa. (Well of course here I try to use more English, well, so that students get used to hearing words in English. So a little what the name is eeeeee just a little explanation for Indonesian and of course more English. But I also adjust to the conditions of the students.)

....Iyah, saya gunakan dua bahasa ini untuk memberi petunjuk, supaya anak-anak lebih paham, karena kadang-kadang anak-anak tidak paham kalau hanya disebut sekali. Maksudnya dalam bahasa inggris mereka belum paham jadi supaya lebih mengerti harus diulang menggunakan bahasa indonesia. (Yes, I use these two languages to give instructions, so that students understand better because sometimes students don't understand if just mentioned once. It means that in English they do not understand, so to understand better, they must use Indonesian.)

....Itu tadi, code mixing ini saya kira, karena kadang anak-anak apa Namanya langsung bilang tidak tahuki bu artinya, jadi harus diperjelas. Dengan di ulang pake bahasa Indonesia. Jadi code-mixing ini sangat membatu menurut saya. (That was, I think code-mixing because sometimes students, what is it? immediately say they don't know what it means, so it must be clarified. By repeating in Indonesian. So code-mixing is very petrified in my opinion.)

....Dengan menggunakan code-mixing ini tentu anak-anak lebih paham dan bisa meningkatkan pemahamannya. (By using code-mixing, of course, students understand better and can improve their understanding.)

....Iya sangat efektif, misalnya kalau petunjuk-petunjuk kapan tidak diberi apa Namanya, missal tidak diberikan penjelasan dengan bahasa Indonesia kadang mereka masih bingung, dan dalam bahasa Indonesia saja diberi satu kali masih ada yang belum paham. Apalagi kalau bahasa inggris terus. (Indeed, it is exceptionally convincing, for example "course" when not given, what is call, for example, not being given an explanation in Indonesian, sometimes they are at this point

jumbled, and in Indonesian only one time, there are at this point individuals who can't really understand. Especially if it's in English)

From the findings of the interviews above, it can be seen that the teacher realized that she used code-mixing in teaching English. Code-mixing is very effectively used as a tool to explain learning material to students. The use of code-mixing in delivering learning materials is based on the student's lack of vocabulary in English. The teacher realized that improving English language skills also need to be followed by students' understanding of the learning material. Therefore, the teacher uses a mix of English and Indonesian by always trying to keep putting forward using more English. So that students still feel that they are learning English. in addition, the material taught to third-year junior high school students is the material of expressions used in everyday life. So, students need to be able to understand the material and understand how to pronounce these expressions so that students can apply them in their lives.

5. Discussions

This part manages the understanding of the discoveries and the clarification of the information examination gathered through perception, interview, and poll. By the aftereffect of perception, interview, and poll, the analyst found that the educator had positive discernments about the utilization of code-blending in educating English. It was given by the consequence of dissected information through perception, interview, and survey.

As we know that everyone has a different perception because perception is the cycle by which individuals arrange and understand their tangible impressions to give them natural importance. It was associated with the significance of wisdom by Walgito (2010) that knowledge is significant for an unmistakable connection that starts when an individual helps a lift through the receptors, which is taken care of into a view imaged. This is in line with what Mussen (1973) in Nursanti (2016) defines perceptions as information processed through

sensory receptors, which are then processed into our thought process, see, hear, smell, taste, or even touch. It is connected to how educators and understudies see the utilization of code-blending in educating English. This is related to how teachers and students perceive the use of code-mixing in teaching English during learning.

Regarding the result of the data from findings which showed that teachers had positive perceptions about the use of code-mixing in teaching English. This is inseparable from the purpose of using code-mixing itself which is used to confirm or provide certainty about something or it can be said that code-mixing is used to provide good communication between speakers and listeners. This is in line with Spice's (2018) research which says that code-mixing is very effective in communication because speakers will find the best way to be able to convey their messages to the intended listeners, for those who have bilingual skills, using code-mixing is very helpful for speakers to provide a wider range of vocabulary to choose from to find the right words to say.

The practice of using code-mixing carried out by teachers also aims at how teachers can communicate well with students so that the material being taught can be conveyed and also students' English skills can develop. This is maintained by a declaration from the teacher during the gathering that code-mixing is uncommonly feasible, especially at some point that requires more explanation using L1. However, even though the teacher said that L1 was very helpful when teaching English, the use of more English as the target language being studied became a priority for the teacher. This is also supported by the result of observation, which showed that during the teaching-learning process, the teacher always used code-mixing when opening, taking attendance, giving instructions, explaining the material, providing feedback, assessing, and closing. Where the teacher uses the objective language and is followed by repeating the very same thing in L1 for help or mixing the code in both including words in L1 that students have

not learned in the objective language, specifically English. Code mixing is also used to measure students' understanding of the target language, especially at lower proficiency levels where students do not have sufficient knowledge of the target language. Nguyen et al., (2016) agree that code-mixing can positively affect language acquisition. Code-mixing is particularly useful in improving multilingual societies where translation and interpretation are very useful, and therefore should not be dismissed as poor language use (Nguyen et al., 2016). Lu (2014) contends that code-blending reflects low language ability. He finishes up his review that moderate utilization of code-blending is not the slightest bit inconvenient to L2 students.

Related to the previous research findings conducted by Nuraini (2022) Ramadhaniarti, (2017), Novianti & Said (2021), and Hasai (2021) in their exploration discoveries by what was found by a specialist, specifically code-mixing had a positive discernment for the educator. This is because the educators need their instructing and learning would be see effectively by the understudies and the educator found that their understudies have restricted jargon so they think it is important to utilize code-mixing in their educating and educational experience. They typically utilized code-mixing while moving into educating. The educator needed the illustration would be justifiable by the understudies. Code-mixing truly assists the understudies with understanding and fathoming the importance of words, sentences and expressions. Code-mixing is one of the educator systems to assist them with building communication with the understudies in the study hall. Educators think it is important to utilize code-blending in showing in English classes since code-mixing likewise could contribute to a superior instructor understudies homeroom collaboration and correspondence. Code-mixing helped them in giving guidance, deciphering the new English words and explaining the illustration to the understudies.

However, in this study, which is different from previous research, the researchers found that code-mixing can increase the level of students' confidence in learning English. By using L1 or Indonesian in teaching English, students are not intimidated and feel burdened because they are confused about what the teacher says, especially junior high school students who still have low English skills. This confidence can motivate students to participate actively the in teaching-learning process such as students can confidently do assignments, answer questions from the teacher and can boldly convey their ideas. According to Benabou & Tirole (2002) in Akbari & Sahibzada (2020) self-confidence is very effective in motivating humans and in education self-confidence is a factor in learning that can have an impact on student participation and progress. In addition, in this study, the researchers found that in addition to code-mixing, it can provide some new.

6. Conclusion

The educator's discernment about the utilization of code-blending in showing English is positive. This is maintained by observational data which found that while learning happened and the teacher used code-blending, learning in the homeroom was impressively more powerful since students got a handle on the learning material and the rules from the teacher. When students understand what the teacher is saying or understand the material in the teaching-learning process this is what makes their level of confidence to learn English increase so that they will continue to be motivated to develop their English skills. This is upheld by the consequences of meetings where as per the educator this code-mixing is exceptionally successful to utilize since, in such a case that the educator just purposes the objective language or English then understudies might feel threatened in the study hall. Therefore, the teacher needs to intersperse with Indonesian. However, keep in mind that the teachers on improving students' English skills, so teachers should keep trying to use more English so that students can find new vocabulary and know how to pronounce and use English vocabulary. In addition, the

statement of positive wisdom about the use of code-blending is maintained by review data which shows a key score of 68 for the educators' experiences.

References

Aeni, N. (2022). Reflections of Teachers and Students on the Effectiveness of Virtual Learning Systems. *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, *2*(1), 107–116.

Afriani, V. (2019). THE INFLUENCE OF SURVEY, QUESTION, READ, RECITE AND REVIEW (SQ3R) METHOD AND READING INTEREST TOWARDS READING COMPREHENSION OF THE NINTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP N 13 OF PALEMBANG. *ELTE Journal (English Language Teaching and Education)*, *7*(1), 84-98.

Akbari, O., & Sahibzada, J. (2020). Students' self-confidence and its impacts on their learning process. *American International Journal of Social Science Research*, *5*(1), 1-15.

Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2020). Code Mixing in Arabic Conversations of College Students: A Sociolinguistic Study of Attitudes to Switching to English. *Asian ESP Journal*, *16*(11), 6–19.

Amin, A. (2020). Attitude Towards Language in Sociolinguistics Settings: A Brief Overview. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, *2*(1), 27–30. https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v2i1.3758

Hasai, Y. (2021). *Teacher Candidates' Beliefs About Crosslinguistic Pedagogy, Code-Switching, and Code-Mixing: A Snapshot from University of Hamburg*. *3*, 106–118. https://doi.org/10.36074/d-oblippo.monograph-2021.05

Holmes, J. (2013). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. In *Paper Knowledge. Toward a Media History of Documents* (Fourth Edi). Routledge.

Ivana, D. (2018). *An Analysis of Code Mixing Used by English Teachers in Teaching Learning Process at MAS PAB 2 Helvetia*. State Islamic University of North Sumatera.

Khairunnisa. (2016). *Code Mixing Analysis in English Teaching Learning Process at Senior High School 1 Takalar*. Alauddin State Islamic University of Makassar.

Kim, E. (2006). Reasons and Motivations for Code-Mixing and Code-Switching. *Efl*, *4*(1).

Kusumoputro, B., Irwanto, P., & Jatmiko, W. (2002). Optimization of Fuzzy-neural Structure through Genetic Algorithms and Its Application in Artificial Odor Recognition-system. *IEEE Asia-Pacific Conference on Circuits and Systems, Proceedings, APCCAS*, *2*, 47–51. https://doi.org/10.1109/APCCAS.2002.1115117

Lu, D. (2014). Code-mixing and its impact on language competence. *International Journal of Language Studies*, *8*(2).

Muysken, P. (2000). Code-mixing, Bilingual Speech and Language Change. In *Bilingual Speech_ A Typology of Code-Mixing*. The Press Syndicate of The University of Cambridge.

Nguyen, N. T., Grainger, P., & Carey, M. (2016). Code-switching in English Language Education: Voices from Vietnam Code-switching in English Language Education: Voices from Vietnam. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(7), 133–1340. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0607.01

Novianti, R., & Said, M. (2021a). The Use of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in English Teaching-Learning Process. *Deiksis*, *13*(1), 82–92. https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v13i1.8491

Novianti, R., & Said, M. (2021b). The Use of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in English Teaching-Learning Process. *Deiksis*, *13*(1), 82. https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v13i1.8491

Nuraini. (2022). *Students' Perception on The Use of Code Mixing in English Teaching Process at Second Grade Junior High School 2 Enrekang*. Faculty of teacher Training and Education.

Nursanti, Y. (2016). Students' Perception of Teacher's Bilingual Language Use in an English Classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, *4*(1), 159–176.

Ramadhaniarti, T. (2017). *Code – Mixing in English Classes of SMPN 14 Kota Bengkulu: Views from The Teachers*. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Bengkulu University. triramadhaniarti@gmail.com Abstract:

Spice, A. (2018). The Effects of Code-Mixing on Second Language Development. *Linguistics Senior Research Projects*, *3*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.15385/jch.2018.3.1.1

Üstünel, E. (2010). EFL classroom. In *Language Testing*. Springer Nature.

Walgito B (2010) *Introduction to General Psychology*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.

Wardaugh, R. (1987). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. In *the British Journal of Sociology* (fifth edit, Vol. 38, Issue 3). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.2307/5907