ANALYSIS OF CODE-MIXING TYPES AND MOTIVATIONS ON @IDEXTRATIME TWITTER ACCOUNT (SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROACH)

Fransiscus Xaverius Bintang Krisna Haryadi [1], Arini Hidayah [2]
English Literary Program, Surakarta University, Indonesia
fransiscusxaveriusbintang148@gmail.com , ariniunsa@gmail.com

Submitted: 2026-04-16
Accepted: 2026-06-25
Published: 2026-06-30
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70210/amrj.v4i2.207

Abstract
This study aims to examine the types and reasons for code mixing used in the @idextratime (Extra Time Indonesia) Twitter account. This research employs a descriptive qualitative approach within a case study design, focusing on a football-related social media account. Twitter was selected as the data source due to its high engagement in sports discourse and its tendency to encourage informal bilingual language use. The data consist of 50 utterances containing code-mixing elements, collected through documentation techniques in the form of screenshots. The data were analyzed using data reduction, classification, and interpretation based on Muysken's (2000) framework of code-mixing types and Hoffman's (1991) framework of code-mixing motivations. The findings reveal three types of code mixing: insertion (40 occurrences), alternation (3 occurrences), and congruent lexicalization (7 occurrences), with insertion as the dominant type. In terms of reasons, talking about a particular topic is the most frequent (24 occurrences), followed by real lexical need (13 occurrences). The findings indicate that code mixing is primarily used to facilitate effective communication in football discourse, where English terminology is widely recognized.

Keywords: code mixing, sociolinguistics, occurrence, Twitter

Introduction

Language plays a central role in human communication, particularly in increasingly digitalized environments where interaction occurs across diverse linguistic backgrounds. In such contexts, bilingual and multilingual speakers frequently engage in code mixing, defined as the embedding of elements from one language into another within a single utterance (Hoffman, 1991). This phenomenon has become more visible in social media, where informal communication encourages flexible and hybrid language use.

In Indonesia, code mixing between Indonesian and English is widely observed, especially in domain-specific discussions such as sports, technology, and entertainment. Twitter, as a microblogging platform, facilitates rapid and concise communication, often leading users to combine languages for efficiency, clarity, and stylistic purposes. In football discourse in particular, English terminology dominates due to its global status, making code mixing a common linguistic strategy.

Previous studies have examined code mixing across various platforms and contexts. For instance, Raksang (2019) and Zhahira and Indhiarti (2023) found that insertion is the most dominant type of code mixing in social media interactions. Similarly, Sari (2019) and Saqib and Anindita (2025) identified topic-related communication as a primary motivation for code mixing. Although these studies provide valuable insights, they

mainly focus on general social media interactions and do not specifically examine discourse within a particular community or thematic domain. In addition, previous studies tend to analyze either the types or the motivations of code mixing separately, rather than investigating both aspects simultaneously within a specialized discourse context.

This study differs from previous research because it focuses specifically on code mixing in football discourse presented through a verified social media account. Football discourse is sociolinguistically significant because football has developed into a global cultural phenomenon that connects multilingual communities and encourages the frequent use of mixed linguistic expressions, especially English football terminology within local language communication. The interaction between global football vocabulary and local language practices reflects identity construction, community affiliation, and contemporary digital communication patterns. Furthermore, analyzing a verified football account contributes both theoretically and practically to sociolinguistic scholarship. Theoretically, it expands the understanding of code mixing in specialized digital discourse and demonstrates how language choice operates in structured and influential online content. Practically, the study provides insight into how verified content creators shape language trends and influence audience communication styles in social media environments.

Therefore, this study addresses this gap by analyzing both the types and the reasons for code mixing in a football-focused Twitter account, namely @idextratime. By combining structural and functional analysis, this research aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how code mixing operates in digital sports communication.

Method

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design to analyze code mixing in a specific social media context, namely the @idextratime (Extra Time Indonesia) Twitter account. The data consist of 50 utterances containing code-mixing elements, collected from posts and comments published between January and July 2025. The sample size was determined based on data saturation, meaning that no new patterns of code mixing types or reasons were identified after analyzing the selected data. Therefore, 50 data points were considered sufficient to represent the phenomenon under investigation.

This study uses purposive sampling, which involves selecting data based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives (Arikunto, 2010). The criteria for data selection are as follows:

(1) the posts must contain a combination of Indonesian and English (code mixing),
(2) the content must be related to football discourse, and
(3) the posts must originate from the @idextratime account.

This technique ensures that only relevant and information-rich data are included in the analysis. The data were collected using a documentation method (Arikunto, 2002), in the form of screenshots of tweets and comments. This method allows the researcher to capture authentic language use in its natural digital context.

The data were analyzed using a qualitative descriptive technique following three stages adapted from Siyoto and Sodik (2015): (1) Data Reduction: the researcher

selected and filtered the data by excluding posts that did not contain code mixing or were irrelevant to the research focus. This step ensured that only valid and relevant utterances were analyzed; (2) Data Display: the selected data were categorized into types of code mixing based on Muysken's (2000) framework, namely insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Muysken's typology was considered appropriate for Twitter discourse because social media communication is characterized by brief, dynamic, and multilingual interactions in which users frequently combine lexical items, phrases, and syntactic patterns from different languages within a single utterance. This framework enables the researcher to identify the structural patterns of mixed language use commonly found in digital communication. In this study, code mixing refers to the embedding of linguistic elements from one language into another language within a sentence or utterance, whereas code switching refers to a shift from one language to another across clauses or conversational turns. The study focuses specifically on code mixing because the analyzed posts predominantly involve the insertion and integration of English football-related terms into Indonesian discourse rather than complete language shifts. The data were also classified according to the reasons for code mixing using Hoffman's (1991) framework; (3) Conclusion Drawing and Verification: the researcher interpreted the patterns and calculated the frequency of each type and reason of code mixing to draw conclusions. Beyond identifying frequencies, the analysis also explored the sociolinguistic meanings of code mixing in football discourse, including identity construction among football fans, the influence of globalization on language use, the prestige associated with English football terminology, fandom culture in online communities, and the emergence of digital bilingualism in social media interactions. The findings were then verified by re-checking the data classification to ensure consistency.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, this study applies triangulation techniques based on Denzin (1978), including: Theory triangulation, by using two theoretical frameworks (Muysken for types and Hoffman for reasons) to strengthen the analysis; Methodological triangulation, by supporting the analysis with multiple academic sources such as books and journal articles; Investigator validation, conducted through systematic and consistent coding procedures, where each datum was carefully analyzed and categorized based on clear criteria. Additionally, the researcher applied data rechecking (intra-rater reliability) by reviewing the classification multiple times to ensure consistency and minimize subjective bias.

Result and Discussion

This chapter shows the findings of code mixing and the reasons of code mixing used in @idextratime (EXTRA TIME INDONESIA) Twitter account. This study's classification of code mixing is taken from Muysken's theory which are Insertion, Alternation, Congruent Lexicalization and the reasons of code mixing is taken from Hoffman's theory which are Talking About a Particular Topic, Quoting Somebody Else, Interjection, Expressing Group Identity, Being Emphatic About Something, Repetition Used for Clarification, To Soften and Strengthen Request or Command, Because of Real Lexical Need, To Exclude Other People.

Table 1. Types of Code Mixing

No	Types of Code Mixing	Data

1	Insertion	40
2	Alternation	3
3	Congruent Lexicalization	7

These are three examples of the most frequently used type of code mixing, insertion.

03/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"Perbandingan jumlah **passing** hingga menit ke-16"*

Insertion code mixing is an act of inserting words and short phrases from language B into language A. Nouns, adjectives, verbs are embedded inside sentences which have dominant grammar and structure of main language, put simply, inserting non-native words from foreign language into a base language. This type of code-mixing shows speaker's linguistic proficiency while also reflect speaker's familiarity with certain terms that may lack equivalent in base language and not commonly used in base language.

11/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"**Line Up** Timnas Belanda untuk menghadapi Finlandia dini hari ini*
Sepak mula 01.45 WIB – RCTI"

The phrase "Line Up" is an English compound noun inserted at the beginning of the sentence. The remaining structure is entirely Indonesian. "RCTI" is a local proper noun and does not count as code-mixing. *"Sepak mula"* is used instead of "kick-off," which shows the speaker's choice to stay with the native equivalent. Code-mixed phrase "Line Up" is commonly used in football contexts to announce team formations. The speaker opts for the English term for convenience and familiarity, particularly in sports media. This indicates that the reason for code-mixing is Talking about Particular Topic / TAPT. Since "Line Up" does not alter the grammatical structure and fits smoothly into the sentence, it is classified under insertion type of code mixing.

22/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"Ekspresi seram **skill** suram"*

This sentence features the English word "skill" embedded within an Indonesian sentence structure, which categorizes it as insertion type of code mixing. However, the use of the word "skill" is not merely a structural insertion, but also reflects the influence of global football culture on Indonesian sports discourse. English football terminology dominates online football discussions because most football content, including match commentary, player analysis, international broadcasts, and social media updates, is produced and circulated globally in English. As a result, terms such as "skill," "line up," "goal," and "clean sheet" have become widely familiar among Indonesian football audiences and are often perceived as more natural and expressive than their Indonesian equivalents. Although the word *"kemampuan"* could replace "skill," the English term is

preferred because it carries stronger stylistic and cultural associations within football communities.

In addition, audience familiarity strongly influences lexical choice in the Twitter posts of @Extra Time Indonesia. The account targets football fans who are already accustomed to bilingual football terminology through international leagues, gaming culture, sports journalism, and digital media consumption. Therefore, the use of English lexical items functions not only to communicate information efficiently, but also to create solidarity with audiences who share similar football knowledge and online communication styles. The rhyme between *"seram"* and *"suram"* further strengthens the humorous and expressive tone of the post, showing how code mixing is integrated creatively into digital interaction.

Furthermore, the frequent use of insertion indicates that code mixing also functions as an identity performance and a marker of globalization. By mixing English football vocabulary into Indonesian sentences, the account presents itself as part of a modern, globally connected football community. The use of English terms symbolizes familiarity with international football culture and reflects digital bilingualism among Indonesian social media users. In this context, code mixing is not simply a linguistic phenomenon, but also a sociolinguistic strategy that constructs group identity, modernity, and community membership among football fans on Twitter.

The reason why insertion becomes the most commonly used type of code mixing on @Extra Time Indonesia's Twitter account is because it is the simplest and most practical form of mixing. Insertion allows English words or short phrases to be integrated into Indonesian sentence structures without requiring major grammatical changes. This strategy is highly effective in fast-paced social media communication, where messages must remain concise, engaging, and easily understood. The dominance of insertion also reflects the normalization of English football vocabulary in Indonesian digital discourse. Meanwhile, congruent lexicalization appears less frequently because it requires a higher level of bilingual competence and deeper integration of two linguistic systems within the same utterance. Alternation becomes the least used type because full shifts between languages are more difficult to maintain in short Twitter posts and may reduce readability for broader audiences. Therefore, insertion is preferred not only for linguistic simplicity, but also because it supports audience engagement, reflects global football culture, and reinforces the bilingual identity of online football communities.

Tabel 2. Reasons of Code Mixing

No	Reasons of Code Mixing	Total Data
1.	Talking About a Particular Topic	24
2.	Quoting Somebody Else	0
3.	Interjection	2
4.	Expressing Group Identity	4
5.	Being Emphatic About Something	1
6.	Repetition Used for Clarification	3
7.	To Soften and Strengthen Request or Command	3
8.	Because of Real Lexical Need	13
9.	To Exclude Other People	0

	Total	50

These are examples of the most frequent reason for code mixing, talking about a particular topic.

47/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"Kemungkinan formasi di atas lapangan. Optimis **clean-sheet**?*

Here, the speaker inserted foreign words "clean sheet" into an Indonesian sentence, equal rule applies with the reason from datum written above. Even though clean sheet has an equivalent in Indonesian, which is "*Nirbobol*", the speaker still opts to use an English term because it is widely understood on football conversations. Therefore, the word "clean-sheet" is used due to the topic being about football.

48/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"Susunan pemain World Cup Qualifiers Jepang vs Indonesia. Sepak Mula 17.35 WIB - RCTI. Patrick Kluivert membuat 5 perubahan dari **line-up** vs China kemarin."*

@Extra Time Indonesia uses "line-up" because the topic is about football, it refers to full squad players or "*susunan pemain*", the reason behind the usage of this code mixing is talking about particular topic because the speaker is making a conversation about football topic, in which technical terms such as line-up is kept as it is commonly used worldwide. Thus, the word "line-up" is used since the topic is specific to football.

40/POST/INSERT/TAPT
*"Juara Liga 1 bertukar **jersey** dengan Juara **Premier League**"*

This sentence contains both "jersey" and "Premier League" as lexical items borrowed from English, embedded within Indonesian grammatical structure. "Premier League" is a fixed proper noun referring to England's top football division, and "jersey" is an English term frequently used in Indonesian football contexts to refer to a uniform. Both are treated as insertions into the sentence. The sentence is about football, a topic area that frequently incorporates English terms which fulfills the reason of discussing a particular topic.

Based on the analysis, the most frequent reason for code mixing in @idextratime (EXTRA TIME INDONESIA)'s Twitter account is talking about a particular topic (24 occurrences). This shows that the account often switches to English when discussing football-related content, especially when certain terms are more familiar or accurate in English. The second most common reason is real lexical need (13 occurrences), where the speaker uses English because there is no exact word in Indonesian to express the intended meaning. Another reason found is expressing group identity (4 times), where the account uses certain English terms to show alignment with a football community or fan culture. Interjection appears 2 times and is used to express strong emotions like excitement or surprise. There are also 3 occurrences each of repetition for clarification and to strengthen or soften a request, which suggest that code mixing also helps in emphasizing a message or making it sound more polite. Only one example was found for

being empathetic about something. Meanwhile, no data were found for quoting someone else or to exclude others, meaning the account does not use code mixing for quoting people or keeping certain messages exclusive to specific groups.

Discussion

The most frequent type of code mixing found is insertion. It is commonly used as this type of code mixing is simple, borrowing words from foreign language, without changing grammar and sentence structure, it also shows that the account often mixes English words into Indonesian sentences, especially to mention football terms. Very helpful for majority of people in Indonesia where not all are fluent in English but still picks up some familiar and popular English words. Congruent lexicalization appears less often. This type shows a deeper level of mixing where both languages are combined more freely. However, it needs better fluency and is less practical for short posts like tweets, which may explain why it is used less. Alternation is the rarest type found. Since this type switches between full sentences in different languages, it is more complex and not often used in short, fast-paced social media content. As for the reasons, the most common one is talking about a particular topic. In football, many terms are better expressed in English, making code mixing helpful and even necessary.

The second reason is real lexical need, meaning the speaker uses English because there is no exact word in Indonesian that fits or there is available word but feels taboo when used. Other reasons like expressing group identity, interjections, and emphasis or politeness show that code mixing is also used to show emotion, excitement, or build connection with readers. No examples were found for quoting someone or excluding others, which suggests that the account uses code mixing mainly for open communication, not for private references.

One strength of this study is that its findings are in line with several previous studies. For example, Study by Zhahira & Indhiarti (2023) and Study by Alisa Raksang (2019) both found that Insertion was the most frequently used type of code mixing, which is also supported by this research. This consistency shows that the dominance of Insertion is not limited to one context but occurs across various platforms and user backgrounds. However, this research also has some limitations. Since the data only comes from one football-focused Twitter account, the code mixing found here may only reflect language use in that specific context. Other studies used different platforms or covered wider topics, so the results of this study might not apply to conversations outside of football or on other social media.

Conclusion

based on analysis, the researcher found a total of 50 posts containing code mixing, and the research result in 40 utterances which fell into the insertion type. Insertion code mixing happens when word or short phrase from foreign language is inserted into the main language. Second most common type found is Congruent Lexicalization, which the researcher found 7 of them. Congruent Lexicalization happens when speakers mixed two grammatical elements from language A and language B, which resulting in natural flow of sentence even when both languages are mixed into one. The least common type found is alternation type, the researcher managed to found 3 of them. Alternation happens when speakers switch sentences from language A to language B, this is usually done by people who grew up and live in a diverse country. Along with type of code

mixing, the researcher also analyzed the reasons behind the usage of code mixing on @Extra Time Indonesia. The analysis found that there are 24 utterances using talking about a particular topic (TAPT) as the reason, implying that @Extra Time Indonesia used code mixing to explain something more effectively within a particular context. Second most frequent reason is because of real lexical need (BORLN), which the researcher found 13 of them. This happen when there is lack of diction in main language and may be, there is a diction for that, however, it is taboo when used and majority of people are not familiar with the word. The other reasons are less frequent, with expressing group identity (EGI), repetition used for clarification (RUFC), and to soften and to strengthen request or command (TSASRC), each with 4, 3, and 2 utterances, respectively. The last frequent reason is being empathetic about something (BEAS) with 1 utterance. Quoting somebody else (QSE) and to exclude other (TOE) are not found in the data.

Reference

Angraini, M. U. (2022). *Intra Lexical Code Mix in the Tweet of Anak Jaksel.* Universitas Islam Negri Maulana Malik Ibrahim.

Arikunto, S. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

BP, A. R., Munandar, S. A., Fitriani, A., Karlina, Y., & Yumriani. (2022). Pengertian Pendidikan, Ilmu Pendidikan dan Unsur-Unsur Pendidikan. *Jurnal Universitas Muhammadiyah Makasar*, Vol 2, No 1.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hanafi, W., & Hamidah, N. (2023). Code-Mixing on Twitter Account Convomf: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Tamaddun: Jurnal Kebudayaan dan Sastra Islam* .

Hoffman, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism.* London: Longman.

Hoffman, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism.* London: Longman.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Indonesia, E. T. (2024-2025). *Extra Time Indonesia Twitter Account*. Retrieved from https://x.com/idextratime

Lumintang, A. N. (2023). *The Use of South Jakarta Language Code Mixing in the TikTok Application.* Surakarta: UMS Thesis.

Lumintang, A. N. (2023). *The Use of South Jakarta Language Code Mixing in the TikTok Application.* Surakarta: UMS Thesis.

Manly, J. T., Lynch, M., Oshri, A., Herzog, M., & Wortel, S. N. (2013). The Impact of Neglect on Initial Adaptation to School.

Meliani, P. E. (2021). Code Mixing as Language Style in Communication Through Social Media Twitter. *Yavana Bhāshā: Journal of English Language Education*.

Mewengkang, C., & Fansury, A. (2021). Writing Daily Status on Social Media: Code-Mixing and Code-Switching Phenomena: A Literature Review. *KLASIKAL: Journal of Education, Language Teaching and Science*, 80-87.

Moleong, L. J. (2001). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Moleong, L. J. (2007). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Moleong, L. J. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Munthe, I. S., & Raharjo, S. T. (2024). Pemenuhan Kebutuhan Afeksi pada Anak. *Jurnal Pekerjaan Sosial*, Vol 7 No 1.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raksang, A. (2019). *The Analysis of Code Mixing in Social Media Produced by The Students of English Department at IAIN Palopo.* Palopo: IAIN Palopo Thesis.

Sandelowski, M. (2004). Using Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 893–915.

Saqib, M. N., & Anindita, W. K. (2025). An Analysis of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing on Deddy Corbuzier's Podcast Episode Agnez Monica. *ACCELERATION Multidisciplinary Research Journal* .

Sari, R. P. (2019). *English Code Mixing Used in Naila. Farhana's YouTube Channel.* IAIN Thesis.

Siyoto, S., & Sodik, A. (2015). *Dasar Metodologi Penelitian.* Yogyakarta: Literasi Media Publishing.

Zhahira, A., & Indhiarti, T. (2023). *Indonesian–English Code Mixing of Bahasa Jakarta Selatan in Online Chatting Used by Indonesian Young Adults.* Malang: Universitas Brawijaya Thesis.