



---

# An Analysis of Code-switching and Code-mixing in Indah G and Andovi Da Lopez's "Indah G Show on YouTube"

Luthfiatunnisa\*, Dzakiah, Zulfikri

UIN Datokarama Palu

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v2i4.1964>

\*Correspondence: Luthfiatunnisa

Email: [luthfiatunnisa05@gmail.com](mailto:luthfiatunnisa05@gmail.com)

Received: 10-05-2025

Accepted: 21-06-2025

Published: 29-07-2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract:** This study investigates the forms and functions of code-switching and code-mixing in a bilingual podcast episode of The Indah G Show on YouTube, featuring Indah Gunawan and Andovi Da Lopez. Using a qualitative research design, discourse analysis was applied to examine 132 instances of code-switching and 187 of code-mixing. Poplack's (1980) and Muysken's (2000) typologies were used to classify structural forms, while Hoffman's (1991) framework was employed to identify their communicative functions. The analysis revealed that intra-sentential switching and insertion were the most frequently used types, indicating a high degree of bilingual fluency and integration. The most dominant function was clarifying speech for the listener, followed by discussing specific topics and expressing group identity. These findings demonstrate that language alternation in digital media is both strategic and context-sensitive, allowing bilingual speakers to engage audiences, convey meaning more effectively, and construct fluid linguistic identities. The study offers empirical insights into bilingual language use in online entertainment and contributes to a broader understanding of multilingual practices in digital communication.

**Keywords:** Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, Bilingualism

---

## Introduction

The rapid development of digital communication platforms has significantly transformed how individuals interact and express themselves across multiple languages. In Indonesia, a linguistically diverse country where Bahasa Indonesia coexists with regional languages and global English, the use of code-switching and code-mixing has become increasingly prominent—particularly among younger generations and online content creators (Grosjean, 2010; Myers-Scotton, 1993). On platforms such as YouTube, bilingual speakers often alternate or blend languages to convey humor, build rapport with audiences, and reflect social affiliations (Androutsopoulos, 2013; Lee, 2017).

Code-switching refers to the use of two or more languages within a single discourse, often influenced by topic, interlocutor, or setting (Auer, 1998). Meanwhile, code-mixing involves a more fluid integration of elements from different languages, including lexical items, phrases, or grammatical structures, within one utterance (Bullock & Toribio, 2009). These bilingual practices not only serve communicative needs but also function as tools for negotiating identity, managing interpersonal relationships, and adapting to shifting discursive contexts (Hoffman, 1991; Gumperz, 1982; Zentella, 1997).

Previous studies have largely examined code-switching and code-mixing in formal settings such as classrooms, workplaces, or political discourse (Setiawan, 2021; Maulida & Rahman, 2020). Even in digital contexts, research has tended to focus on short-form content like TikTok videos, Instagram captions, or microblogging, which provide limited scope for complex language alternation (Sultana et al., 2013; Lee, 2017). However, long-form YouTube podcast videos—such as The Indah G Show episode analyzed in this study, which lasts 2 hours, 48 minutes, and 22 seconds—provide a distinctive discursive environment for bilingual interaction. Unlike short-form content, these extended formats enable sustained, in-depth conversations that allow bilingual speakers to alternate languages flexibly, spontaneously, and in response to nuanced shifts in topic, emotion, and audience engagement.

Such a format is ideal for exploring natural bilingual practices that evolve across a range of topics, tones, and interpersonal dynamics. This prolonged duration creates a rich linguistic landscape in which multiple types and functions of code-switching and code-mixing can emerge naturally, including patterns that may remain undetected in shorter or more scripted digital content.

This study aims to examine the structural forms and communicative functions of code-switching and code-mixing in a bilingual episode of The Indah G Show on YouTube, featuring Indah Gunawan and Andovi Da Lopez. By applying Auer's (1998) and Bullock and Toribio's (2009) typological frameworks, along with Hoffman's (1991) model of language function, the research seeks to identify how language alternation is used both structurally and socially in online entertainment discourse.

The findings are expected to offer valuable insights into how bilingual speakers in digital environments use language not only as a communicative tool but also as a means of performing identity and engaging audiences. This study contributes to the growing body of sociolinguistic literature on bilingualism in digital contexts, highlighting the significance of long-form informal media as a space for linguistic innovation, audience connection, and identity performance.

## Methodology

This study is conducted using a qualitative approach with discourse analysis as the research design. Discourse analysis was selected to explore language use within its social context, focusing particularly on the functional aspects of code-switching and code-mixing in spoken interaction (Gee, 2011). The research data consist of language samples in the form of utterances featuring code-switching and code-mixing, spoken by two bilingual speakers, Indah Gunawan and Andovi Da Lopez, in a selected episode of The Indah G Show, a podcast published on YouTube. The episode, titled "Life in the Indonesian Diaspora as a TCK & Dealing with Political Differences ft. Andovi Da Lopez", was chosen due to its rich bilingual content and its spontaneous, informal conversational style.

The data were collected through a non-participant observation technique, in which the researcher did not directly engage with the subjects but observed and recorded the interaction from a publicly accessible YouTube video (Creswell, 2014). The spoken utterances were transcribed using Turbo Scribe AI and then manually reviewed to ensure

accuracy. Additionally, nonverbal elements—such as intonation, emphasis, and pauses—were noted to support the analysis of communicative functions.

The analytical framework employed in this study integrates three core theoretical models. The first is Poplack's (1980) classification of code-switching, which categorizes instances into inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and tag switching. The second is Muysken's (2000) framework of code-mixing, which was utilized to identify linguistic patterns such as insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Third, Hoffman's (1991) functional framework was employed to determine the communicative purposes of the language alternation, including clarifying speech, expressing solidarity or group identity, quoting someone's words, and discussing specific topics.

The data were analyzed thematically. Each utterance was examined in terms of its structural form and communicative function, with manual coding used to enable close and context-sensitive interpretation. Since all data were obtained from a publicly available platform and did not involve direct interaction with human participants, the study did not require ethical clearance. All materials, including the transcript and coding sheet, are available from the researcher upon request.

## Result and Discussion

This study analyzed a bilingual podcast episode entitled "*Life in Indonesian Diaspora as TCK & Dealing with Political Differences ft. Andovi Da Lopez*" from *The Indah G Show*. The podcast episode featured spontaneous alternation between English and Indonesian throughout the conversation. By utilizing discourse analysis and drawing upon the theoretical frameworks proposed by Poplack (1980), Muysken (2000), and Hoffman (1991), this research identified a total of 132 code-switching occurrences and 187 code-mixing occurrences, each performing one or more communicative functions as outlined in the analytical model. This section presents the types and functions of these language alternations and discusses their sociolinguistic significance.

### Types of Code-switching

Following the framework proposed by Poplack, the observed code-switching was sorted into three categories: intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag switching.

**Table 1.** frequency and percentage of code switching

Type of code-switching	Indah G	Andovi Da Lopez	Frequency	Percentage %
Intra-sentential	10	82	92	69,7%
Inter-sentential	3	22	25	18,9%
Tag switching	2	13	15	11,4%
Total	15	117	132	100%

As presented in Table 1, intra-sentential switching was the most dominant form for both speakers, accounting for approximately 69.7% of the total code-switching instances. This form refers to language alternation within a single sentence or clause, where grammatical rules from both languages are preserved. Its frequent use reflects a high level

of bilingual proficiency and the ability to shift codes fluidly without syntactic disruption (Poplack, 1980).

Examples of intra-sentential switching include:

"It's our homework collectively, untuk membuat kita semua bisa lebih critical thinking."

(Andovi – Data 77, 0:41:15)

"Aku kalo harus kayak bener-bener jujur with myself I think I'm at, like, a fifth-grade level."

(Indah – Data 222, 2:22:03)

These examples illustrate how the speakers blend languages not only for stylistic variation but to convey nuance, strengthen expressiveness, and reflect bilingual identity. This finding aligns with previous studies. Siregar (2021) reported similar patterns in Indonesian-English bilingual vlogs, where intra-sentential switching was dominant (62%), particularly for cultural and affective expressions. Likewise, Ghyfari et al. (2022) observed the prevalence of this type in online classroom discourse, highlighting its function in maintaining flow and fluency.

In contrast, inter-sentential switching appeared less frequently (18.9%), typically marking topic shifts, emphasis, or contrast between statements. The alternation happens at clause or sentence boundaries, and sometimes between turns in a conversation. For instance:

"Bahasa Indonesia itu kayak gitu. Bahasa Indonesia is an amalgamation of all of the foreign influences that we have had throughout time."

(Indah – Data 256, 2:28:06)

"Beda kalo gua kyk gua begini ni krn gua mau ngerusak orang. I know in the deepest down of my heart I'm not doing this to hurt people."

(Andovi – Data 172, 1:58:32)

These cases suggest that the speakers employ inter-sentential switching to manage transitions in discourse, reflecting what Holmes (2013) describes as a rhetorical strategy to guide the audience or adjust emphasis. Lastly, tag switching, though least frequent (11.4%), played a noticeable role in managing tone and social rapport. Tag switching involves inserting short fixed elements such as discourse particles or interjections from one language into an utterance from the other.

Examples:

"To put it crassly, brainwash you lah."

(Indah – Data 51, 32:55)

"Yeah you know kan?"

(Andovi – Data 305, 2:41:29)

Although these tags are brief, they perform powerful pragmatic functions—expressing emotion, seeking affirmation, or reinforcing solidarity. Afifah (2020) similarly

noted that tag switching is used sparingly in student speech but serves crucial interpersonal roles, particularly in informal and affective contexts.

In sum, the speakers' preference for intra-sentential switching reflects not only bilingual fluency but also the sociolinguistic norms of their context—digital, informal, expressive, and often performative. The occasional use of inter-sentential and tag switching further enriches their discourse, allowing flexibility in framing messages, managing tone, and signaling cultural positioning. These patterns are consistent with earlier studies across digital and educational contexts and reinforce the view that code-switching is a strategic, meaningful, and identity-driven practice in bilingual interaction.

As shown in the table, intra-sentential switching was the most dominant type for both speakers, comprising approximately 69.7% of the total code-switching instances. This type of switching involves the insertion of a second language within the boundaries of a single sentence or clause, with both grammatical systems remaining intact. Such seamless blending is generally regarded as a sign of high bilingual proficiency, as it demands an understanding of both linguistic structures (Poplack, 1980).

For example, Indah stated:

"Aku kalo harus kayak bener-bener jujur with myself I think I'm at, like, a fifth-grade level."  
(Data 222, 2:22:03)

Similarly, Andovi said:

"It's our homework collectively, untuk membuat kita semua bisa lebih critical thinking."  
(Data 77, 0:41:15)

These utterances show how the speakers alternate languages within a single sentence to express ideas more fluently, blending their bilingual identities into casual, yet structured speech. This mirrors findings from Siregar (2021) and Ghyfari et al. (2022), who both identified intra-sentential switching as the most prevalent in digital media contexts, particularly in vlogs and online classrooms.

Recent research by Nurhabibah and Suhendar (2023) further confirms that intra-sentential switching dominates in podcast discourse due to its fluidity and minimal syntactic disruption, allowing speakers to maintain rhythm and engagement. Likewise, Hamdani and Fitriani (2022) argue that this switching type reflects bilingual speakers' adaptive competence in merging expressive and referential functions simultaneously. In comparison, inter-sentential switching occurred less frequently (18.9%). This type involves complete shifts between sentences or clauses. It often marks changes in tone, topic, or communicative intent.

### **Types of Code-mixing**

Muysken's (2000) model was employed to categorize code-mixing into three types: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization.

**Table 2.** frequency and percentage of code-mixing

Type of code-switching	Indah G	Andovi Da Lopez	Frequency	Percentage %
Insertion	38	124	162	86,6%
Alternation	2	6	8	4,3%
Congruent Lexicalization	0	17	17	9,1%
Total	40	147	187	100%

As shown in Table 2, insertion was by far the most frequently used type of code-mixing, accounting for 86.6% of all occurrences across both speakers. This finding strongly supports Muysken's (2000) proposition that insertion reflects asymmetrical bilingual influence, where one language—typically the dominant or matrix language—hosts lexical items from the other. In this case, English often served as the matrix language, with Indonesian lexical elements embedded into the syntactic frame of English.

This insertional mixing is evident in utterances such as:

“And I haven't been vocal enough in encouraging people to not golput.”

(Indah – Data 124, 1:29:59)

“In Indonesia, you still eat that permen.”

(Andovi – Data 312, 2:41:39)

“Bro, it's not lebay at all.”

(Indah – Data 36, 14:17)

These examples reflect how culturally specific or emotionally expressive terms from Indonesian were seamlessly integrated into English sentences. Such insertions allow bilingual speakers to convey nuanced meaning, emotional color, and cultural resonance, often more effectively than a single-language equivalent could.

The dominance of insertion also aligns with findings from Siregar (2021), who analyzed code-mixing in Indonesian-English YouTube beauty vlogs and found that 88% of mixing cases involved insertion. Similarly, Putri and Zulaikha (2023) observed that young bilinguals frequently embedded Indonesian slang into English on Instagram stories. These studies, together with the present findings, reinforce the idea that insertion is the most accessible and spontaneous form of bilingual language alternation in informal, digital media contexts.

Interestingly, congruent lexicalization appeared only in Andovi's speech (11.5%). This type involves a deeper level of grammatical blending between two languages and often occurs when both languages share similar syntactic structures, allowing for simultaneous lexical insertions from both.

Examples include:

“Formal Indonesian has that baku-ness.”

(Data 310, 2:42:21)

“It’s a fictional musical about me being a calon president and Kak Jo being a calon president.”

(Data 40, 22:43)

These utterances show a creative fusion where English and Indonesian lexical items are merged within a common syntactic frame. In “baku-ness,” for instance, an Indonesian root word is affixed with an English morpheme (-ness), demonstrating morphological integration. This suggests that Andovi’s code-mixing style reflects a higher level of bilingual experimentation, possibly influenced by his exposure to bicultural environments and public communication experience. His blending of both language systems may also point to identity expression, a stylistic choice that reflects his Indonesian roots and global perspective simultaneously.

In contrast, alternation was relatively rare, occurring in only 4.3% of all code-mixing instances. This type of mixing involves switching between longer constituents from each language, such as phrases or clauses, without necessarily using a stable matrix language.

For example:

“Even I used to be kind of like apaan cuman kyk gitu doang.”

(Indah – Data 155, 1:45:04)

“Fenomena is an Indonesian word it is, tapi kata serapan.”

(Andovi – Data 236, 2:42:16)

Alternation requires speakers to shift between two different grammatical systems within a single utterance, making it more cognitively demanding and less frequent in informal speech. Wulandari (2020) found similar trends in student peer conversations, where alternation only occurred when the speaker paused and reformulated ideas across languages. In the current study, its low frequency may reflect the conversational flow of podcast dialogue, where speakers prefer smoother transitions through insertion or congruent elements rather than abrupt structural shifts.

Overall, the dominance of insertion and the selective use of congruent lexicalization and alternation highlight the bilingual flexibility of the speakers in The Indah G Show. Indah’s speech is more structured and reliant on word-level insertions, while Andovi displays a broader repertoire, including morphological creativity and deeper blending. These findings align with existing research and suggest that code-mixing, much like code-switching, is not a random or deficient use of language, but a strategic, expressive, and context-dependent practice used to convey meaning, emotion, and cultural identity in bilingual discourse.

Insertion was the dominant type of code-mixing (86.6%), involving the embedding of lexical items such as *golput*, *lebay*, or *permen* into English utterances. This supports Muysken’s (2000) notion that insertion reflects asymmetrical bilingual influence, where one language provides the matrix for the inserted elements. Interestingly, congruent

lexicalization was found only in Andovi's utterances (9.1%), such as in *baku-ness* and *calon president*, indicating a higher degree of structural blending between languages. Alternation (4.3%) occurred less frequently, reflecting fewer syntactic shifts between language systems.

### Functions of Code-switching and Code-mixing

Each instance of code-switching or mixing was evaluated through Hoffman's (1991) lens to determine its pragmatic function within the dialogue.

**Table 3.** frequency and percentage of code-mixing

Type of code-switching	Frequency	Percentage%
Clarifying speech for the listener	96	30,0%
Discussing a specific topic	84	26,3%
Expressing emphasis or solidarity	47	14,7%
Expressing group identity	45	14,1%%
Quoting someone's word	34	10,6%
Using interjection	9	2,8%
Repetition for clarification	4	1,2%
Total	319	100%

The most dominant function observed was Clarifying Speech for the Listener (30.09%). In many cases, the speakers restated or rephrased an idea in another language to enhance understanding, especially when explaining abstract or context-specific concepts. For example:

"Situasi dan keadaan, context."

(Indah – Data 130)

"That's what I mean by pemahaman – understanding the why behind the what."

(Andovi – Data 221)

These utterances demonstrate how bilingual alternation serves not just as a stylistic choice, but as a pedagogical strategy to ensure the message is received accurately by a potentially multilingual audience. This is consistent with Bista's (2010) findings that bilingual speakers in academic or semi-formal discourse frequently switch codes to clarify meaning, especially when addressing mixed audiences.

The second most frequent function was Discussing a Specific Topic (26.33%), often involving culturally specific terms or phenomena—such as pemilu, golput, or Bubur Diaduk—that lacked direct English equivalents. By switching to Indonesian in these moments, speakers maintained the cultural authenticity and semantic richness of the subject matter.

“You know what’s wild? Some people don’t even know what golput means.”

(Andovi – Data 198)

“Kayak topik-topik yang sensitif seperti pemilu — it gets tricky.”

(Indah – Data 141)

This function supports the view presented by Auer (1999) and Bullock & Toribio (2009) that bilingual speakers use language alternation to index cultural context and authenticate discussion of local or national realities, especially when such topics are rooted in sociopolitical or historical significance. Another significant function was Expressing Emphasis or Solidarity (14.73%), where code-switching was used to show alignment with the audience, stress sincerity, or emotionally reinforce the speaker’s point.

“Karena jujur, I’ve struggled with that too.”

(Indah – Data 113)

“I love Indonesia, beneran.”

(Andovi – Data 180)

This strategic use of language echoes Bhatti, Shamsudin, & Said (2015) who argue that switching to the L1 (in this case, Indonesian) is often employed to express emotional honesty and build solidarity with the listener—particularly when addressing complex or identity-related topics in public discourse. Closely related was the function of Expressing Group Identity (14.11%), which appeared in references to shared cultural norms, foods, and local humor.

“Lu tim bubur diaduk apa enggak?”

(Andovi – Data 100)

“That’s so Indo, you know?”

(Indah – Data 192)

These utterances reflect not only the speaker’s bilingual ability but also their cultural embeddedness, functioning as in-group markers. This resonates with Albirini (2016), who highlights that bilinguals use code-switching to construct and perform group identity, particularly in spaces where community belonging is implied, such as digital media or social storytelling.

Other notable functions included Quoting Someone’s Words (10.66%), such as direct repetition of Indonesian phrases for effect:

“Katanya sih, ‘Kita gak butuh perubahan.’ Gila gak sih?”

(Andovi – Data 158)

This aligns with García & Wei (2014) who noted that quoting others in bilingual contexts often involves preserving the original language to maintain voice and authenticity.

Though less frequent, the function Using Interjection (2.82%) still played an expressive role in conveying reactions such as shock, affirmation, or disbelief:

“No, no, no, bukan itu maksud gue!”

(Indah – Data 176)

Finally, the function Repetition for Clarification (1.25%) occurred when the same idea was repeated bilingually for emphasis or to reach both English- and Indonesian-speaking audiences.

“We need to vote, harus milih.”

(Andovi – Data 99)

These functional patterns emphasize that the speakers' language alternation was not random, but highly strategic. Whether clarifying meaning, engaging the audience, expressing identity, or managing discourse flow, their use of both English and Indonesian reveals a deep competence in bilingual pragmatics. This supports Myers-Scotton's (2006) Matrix Language Frame model, which argues that bilinguals actively choose when and how to alternate codes based on context, purpose, and interlocutor.

In addition, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2005) found that in informal bilingual discourse, speakers use code-switching not only to navigate meaning but to negotiate discourse roles and indicate subtle shifts in alignment with listeners. Similarly, Jaspal and Coyle (2010) highlighted that in digital interactions, code alternation can serve as a resource for constructing identity positions and stance, particularly in settings that require managing multiple audience expectations.

Furthermore, Canagarajah (2011) proposed that multilingual communicators in online spaces exhibit what he calls “translingual competence”, the ability to shuttle strategically across languages to co-construct meaning with a heterogeneous audience.

## Conclusion

This study reveals that code-switching and code-mixing in bilingual podcast discourse are deliberate, strategic, and contextually motivated. The speakers used language alternation to clarify meaning, express cultural identity, and maintain audience engagement. These findings demonstrate the communicative value of bilingual practices in digital media and highlight the need to recognize them as effective tools rather than language interference. Future research may extend these insights by examining similar strategies across different digital platforms and bilingual communities.

## References

- Afifah, S. N. (2020). An analysis of code switching used by students in English speaking performance. *English Language Teaching and Research Journal*, 3(1), 50–60.
- Albirini, A. (2016). *Modern Arabic sociolinguistics: Diglossia, variation, codeswitching, attitudes and identity*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/978131575524>

- Auer, P. (1999). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2004). Social and psychological factors in language mixing. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 336–352). Blackwell Publishing.
- Bhatti, A., Shamsudin, S., & Said, S. B. (2015). Code-switching: A useful foreign language teaching tool in EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 8(8), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n8p1>
- Bista, K. (2010). Factors of code switching among bilingual English students in the university classroom: A survey. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 9(29), 1–19.
- Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511576331>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Routledge.
- Ghyfari, A., Asyhar, A., & Kurniawan, D. (2022). Code-switching patterns in online language learning interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 7(2), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v7i2.2022>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hamdani, A. R., & Fitriani, S. S. (2022). Code-switching in Indonesian podcast conversations: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of Language and Discourse Studies*, 4(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.33369/langdis.4.1.3>
- Hoffman, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838250>

- Jaspal, R., & Coyle, A. (2010). Language and identity among British South Asians: Exploring discourse in online environments. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 29*(4), 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X10385899>
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00277.x>
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO978051161128>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nurhabibah, S., & Suhendar, D. (2023). An analysis of intra-sentential code-switching in bilingual podcast content. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(2), 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i2.51321>
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18*(7–8), 581–618. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>
- Putri, S. K., & Zulaikha, S. (2023). Code-mixing in students’ Instagram stories: A sociolinguistic study. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching, 10*(2), 110–121.
- Siregar, R. A. (2021). A study of Indonesian-English code-mixing in YouTube beauty vlogs. *Journal of Language and Literature, 21*(1), 55–64.
- Wulandari, N. (2020). Congruent lexicalization in bilingual students’ peer conversation. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 8*(1), 45–53.
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Blackwell.