**NUSRA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Ilmu Pendidikan**
Volume 7, Issue 3, August 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55681/nusra.v7i3.6359
Homepage: ejournal.nusantaraglobal.ac.id/index.php/nusra

p-ISSN: 2715-114X
e-ISSN: 2723-4649
pp. 1368-1383

# INDOGLISH IN NATURALLY OCCURRING POST CLASS PEER TALK: STRUCTURAL PATTERNING AND INTERACTIONAL FUNCTIONS AMONG EFL LEARNERS

Ahmad Yugita Ishaq*, Evynurul Laily Zen, Nurenzia Yannuar
Program Studi S2 Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Negeri Malang
**Corresponding author email: ahmad.yugita.2402218@students.um.ac.id*

**Article History**

**Received: 11 May 2026**
**Revised: 12 June 2026**
**Published: 19 June 2026**

**ABSTRACT**

*Research on Indoglish has largely concentrated on social media discourse, written language practices, and broad educational setting, remaining spontaneous peer interaction comparatively underexplored. Addressing this gap, this study examines Indoglish as natural peer talk in post class discussion among master's students. By applying a qualitative sociolinguistic design, the study draws on naturally occurring spoken interaction recorded after class amd transcribed using Turboscribe. The dataset consists of nine audio recordings, involving 20 EFL master students , with each recording lasting approximately 20-30 minutes. The data were investigated to identify recurrent structural patterns in bilingual utterances and to define their sociolinguistic sig in context The findings reveal three fundamental patterns: Indonesian Matrix with English insertion, Hybrid or mixed framed structures, and English Matrix with Indonesian insertion. These patterns prove that Indoglish in post class peer discussion is not a random alternation of linguistic elements, but systematic and interactionally meaningful practice. The analysis further reveals that such bilingual patterning allows learners to negotiate meaning, express stance, maintain interactional flow, and strengthen peer solidarity in informal academic discourse. By shifting attention from predominantly written and digitally mediated indoglish to naturally occurring spoken discourse, this study contributes to the sociolinguistic comprehending of bilingual language practice among EFL learners and highlight post class peer discussion as a productive site for investigating multilingual meaning making.*

***Keywords:*** *Indoglish, natural peer talk, post class discussion; Efl learners, sociolinguistic*

**ABSTRACT**

*Penelitian tentang Indoglish sebagian besar terkonsentrasi pada wacana media sosial, praktik bahasa tulis, dan lingkungan pendidikan yang luas, sementara interaksi antar teman sebaya yang spontan masih relatif kurang dieksplorasi. Untuk mengatasi kesenjangan ini, studi ini meneliti Indoglish sebagai percakapan antar teman sebaya yang alami dalam diskusi pasca-kelas di antara mahasiswa magister. Dengan*

*menerapkan desain sosiolinguistik kualitatif, studi ini menggunakan interaksi lisan yang terjadi secara alami yang direkam setelah kelas dan ditranskripsikan menggunakan Turboscribe. Dataset terdiri dari sembilan rekaman audio, yang melibatkan 20 mahasiswa magister EFL, dengan setiap rekaman berdurasi sekitar 20-30 menit. Data tersebut dianalisis untuk mengidentifikasi pola struktural yang berulang dalam ujaran bilingual dan untuk mendefinisikan signifikansi sosiolinguistiknya dalam konteks. Temuan mengungkapkan tiga pola mendasar: Matriks Bahasa Indonesia dengan sisipan Bahasa Inggris, Struktur kerangka hibrida atau campuran, dan Matriks Bahasa Inggris dengan sisipan Bahasa Indonesia. Pola-pola ini membuktikan bahwa Indoglish dalam diskusi antar teman sebaya pasca-kelas bukanlah pergantian unsur linguistik secara acak, tetapi praktik yang sistematis dan bermakna secara interaksional. Analisis lebih lanjut mengungkapkan bahwa pola bilingual semacam itu memungkinkan pembelajar untuk menegosiasikan makna, mengekspresikan pendirian, mempertahankan alur interaksi, dan memperkuat solidaritas antar teman sebaya dalam wacana akademik informal. Dengan mengalihkan perhatian dari indoglish yang didominasi tulisan dan media digital ke wacana lisan yang terjadi secara alami, studi ini berkontribusi pada pemahaman sosiolinguistik praktik bahasa bilingual di kalangan pembelajar EFL dan menyoroti diskusi antar teman sebaya setelah kelas sebagai tempat yang produktif untuk menyelidiki pembuatan makna multibahasa.*

***Kata Kunci:*** *Indoglish, percakapan antar teman sebaya yang alami, diskusi setelah kelas; pembelajar EFL, sosiolinguistik*

*Copyright © 2026, The Author(s).*

***How to cite:*** Ishaq, A.Y., Zen, E.L., & Yannuar, N. (2026). Indoglish in Naturally Occurring Post Class Peer Talk: Structural Patterning and Interactional Functions among EFL Learners. *NUSRA: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, *7* (3), 1368–1383. https://doi.org/10.55681/nusra.v7i3.6359

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

## INTRODUCTION

The increasing contact between Indonesian and English in contemporary communication has led to the emergence of hybrid language practices, one of which is largely recognized as Indoglish. As part of broader bilingual and multilingual phenomena, Indoglish reflects how speakers draw on linguistic resources from both languages within a single communicative event. This phenomenon is closely associated with globalization, technological development, and the expanding role of English as an international language in Indonesian society. Sadhono and Sulaksono (2018) argue that indoglish emerges as part of social transformation in urban and educational contexts, whereas Sudewi et al. (2023) emphasizes its growing prominence among younger generations as English increasingly circulates through digital platforms and everyday interactions. In this sense, Indoglish is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but a socially situated practice shaped by speakers' communicative needs and sociocultural context.

A considerable number of studies have examined Indoglish across different domains, especially in digital and educational context. Khotimah et al. (2020) investigated Indoglish in social media platforms such Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp, spotlighting its role in declaring identity and fulfilling communicative needs. Likewise, Kristanti et al. (2024) centered on Instagram captions and identified both linguistic forms and sociolinguistic factors underlying Indoglish usage. In online discourse, Wijaya and Bram (2021) investigated the "Anak Jaksel" phenomenon on twitter, indicating how Indoglish functions as a marker of youth identity and social positioning. In educational contexts, Sedeng and Indrawati (2019) examined authentic campus communication and identified linguistic level and motives of Indoglish usage, whereas Handayani and Amelia (2022) and Riadil (2021) investigated Indoglish among university students emphasizing vocabulary use, language levels, and underlying motivations. Collectively, these studies prove that Indoglish has been broadly documented as a sociolinguistic phenomenon across digital communication and academic settings.

Despite these contributions, existing studies show several limitations that indicate the need for further investigation. First, many Indoglish studies rely heavily on written data derived from social media platforms, such as captions, tweets, and online posts, which indicate mediated and frequently performative forms of language use. Second, studies conducted in educational settings tend to examine Indoglish at the level of words, phrases, or sentences, or focus on motives such prestige, familiarity, and communicative efficiency rather than investigating how bilingual utterances are structurally organized in real time interaction. As a result, whereas previous studies have successfully investigated where Indoglish occurs and why it is used, less attention has been given to the recurrent structural patterning of Indoglish in spontaneous peer talk. This indicates a gap in the literature concerning how Indonesian and English are organized in real time bilingual interaction, particularly in informal academic communication among EFL learners. This issue is fundamental because Indoglish may simultaneously facilitate communicative fluency and

constraint the development of target language accuracy. Whereas bilingual mixing can support meaning negotiation and interactional ease, sustenance reliance on hybrid forms my limit exposure to English structural patterns, thereby positioning this study to clarify the role of Indoglish as both a communicative resource and a factor in learners' language development.

This gap is especially fundamental when considering post class peer discussion as a site of language. Unlike social media discourse, which is written, editable, and frequently audience oriented, post class interaction captures language as it unfolds in real time. It also differs from teacher led interaction, as students are no longer constrained by instructional roles but remain within academic context. From the translanguaging landscape, such spontaneous interaction is critical because multilingual competence emerges through the local negotiation of linguistic resource in communication rather than through separate language system (Bailey et al., 2025). Therefore peer interaction provides direct access to how learners mobilize the repertoire to build meaning, align with other, and participate in discourse (Kirsch & Mortini, 2021). Nevertheless, despite this potential, post class peer discussion remains underexplored as a distinct analytycal domain, especially in relation to how EFL learners organize Indonesian and English in everyday academic communication.

In response to this gap, the present study investigates Indoglish in naturally occurring post class peer discussion among master's EFL students. This study aims to identify and describe the recurrent structural patterns through which Indonesian and English are blended in peer interaction and to interpret how these patterns function as interactional resources in informal academic interactions and how these patterns function as interactional resources in informal academic interactions. The analysis focuses on three recurring patterns that appeared from the data: Indonesian matrix structures with English insertion' hybrid or mixed framed structures, and English matrix structures with local insertion. By shifting attention from predominantly written and digitally mediated Indoglish to spontaneous spoken discourse, this study contributes to the sociolinguistic understanding of bilingual language practice and highlights post class peer discussion as a productive site for examining multilingual meaning making among EFL learners.

## METHODOLOGY

This study applied a qualitative discourse oriented design to examine the syntatic patterning of Indoglish in naturally occurring post class peer discussion among EFL learners. A qualitative approach was selected because the study proposed to investigate language as it emerged in authentic interaction rather than to quantify it statistically. In qualitative inquiry, language is comprehended as socially situated practice shaped by context, interpretation and interaction as Craswell and Poth (2018) demonstrate, more particularly, this study adopted a discourse oriented approach because it focused on how bilingual utterances were structurally organized in real peer talk. This orientation aligns with interactional sociolinguistics, which emphsizes the relationship between linguistic forms and social meaning in discourse as Gumperz (1982) argues.

The participants consisted of 20 EFL learners who were involved in nine naturally

occurring peer discussions held after class over a two week period. These participants were selected because they represented original interactional settings in which Indoglish was likely to occur. Rather than organizing artificial discussion settings, the study focused on ordinary post class interaction to maintain the naturalness of communication. This approach follows a key principle of sociolinguistic research that language should be studied in the contexts where it is habitually used, as Labov (1972) and Wardhaugh and Fuller (2021) pointed out. In this sense, the participants were not treated as respondents performing language for the researcher, but as speakers engaged in existing social practice.

From a theoretical perspective, this study integrates interactional and structural accounts of bilingual language use. Within interactional sociolinguistic, meaning emerges through context sensitive interpretation, where speakers strategically dploy linguistic resources to negotiate alignment and participation (Gumperz, 1982; Tanen, 2005). In this sense, Indoglish reflects socially meaningful language choice shaped by communicative goals and participants' roles (Holmes, 2013; Wardhaugh, 2006). At the same time, bilingual utterances are structurally organized rather than random. Drawing code switching and code mixing research (Gumperz, 1982; Musyken, 2000) and the Matrix language frame model (Myers-scotton, 1993) one language typically provides the grammatical frame while the other contributes embedded elements. Accordingly, Indoglish in peer interaction can be realized through recurrent configurations, including Indonesian based clauses with English insertion, hybrid constructions, and English based clauses with local elements, Indicating a rule governed bilingual system shaped by both linguistic competence and interactional demands.

The data collected in this study consisted of qualitative data derived from audio recorder spontaneous peer discussion. The recording captured utterances containing Indoglish features, including code switching, lexical mixing, and hybrid sentence constructions. Spoken discourse was chosen because it enables researchers to observe language as it unfolds in real interaction, maintaining both structural and contextual dimensions of meaning making, as Gee (2014) notes. The data were collected over a two week period, during which participants were informed that recording would be accepted; however, the exact timing of each recording session was not disclosed.

All recordings were transcribed using the TurboScribe tool and subsequently reviewed manually to ensure accuracy, especially in capturing bilingual utterances. The transcription followed an orthographic, discourse oriented approach, focusing on preserving lexical choices, code switching patterns, and clause level structures rather than detailed phonetic features, as the study aims to analyze structural patterning in bilingual interaction. Ethical procedures were observed throughout the study: participants provided informed consent prior to data collection and all data were anonymized to protect participants' identities.

The data were analyzed using a discourse oriented analytical framework supported by qualitative content analysis procedures. While the study is theoretically grounded in interactional sociolinguistic, qualitative content analysis was employed as

a systematic technique to identify recurring structural patterns in the data (Bengston, 2016). The analysis proceded through four stages: (1) decontextualization, in which the data were segmented into meaningful units containing Indoglish features; (2) recontextualization, where the units were examined within the original conversational context to preserve interactional meaning; (3) categorization, in which the data were classified into three recurring structural patterns, Indonesian matrix with English insertion, hybrid or mixed framed structures, and English matrix with Indonesian Insertion; and (4) compilation, where the categorization were synthesized to identify consistent structural tendencies and their interactional functions. This procedure allowed for systematic pattern identification while maintaining the contextual sensitivity required in discourse analysis (Miles et al., 2014).

To enhance the credibility and reliability of the analysis, the data were repeatedly reviewed throughout the coding and categorization process. Representative excerpts were selected from multiple recordings to ensure that the identified patterns reflect recurring tendencies rather than isolated instances. In addition, all data were anonymized, and informed consent was obtained from participants prior to data collection, ensuring compliance with ethical research standards.

## Findings and Discussion

The analysis reveals that Indoglish in post class peer discussion is not an unsystematic mixture of Indonesian Matrix with English insertion, Hybrid or mixed framed structures, and English Matrix with Indonesian insertion. These patterns show that bilingual utterances in peer talk are organized in sytematic ways rather than produced through random alternation (Zen & Hidayati, 2016). As Gumperz (1982) argues, bilingual discourse should be comprehended in relation to its interactional organization, not only as the coexistence of two linguistic codes. This perspective is aligned to the current data because the three patterns identified reflect different ways in which speakers combine Indonesian and English to organize meaning, stance, and interpersonal alignment in informal academic interaction.

To provide an overview of these patterns, Table 1 presents the distribution across the dataset. Out of 103 identified bilingual utterances, Indonesian matrix with English insertion emerged as the most dominant pattern ( N = 58), followed by hybrid or mixed framed structures (N = 15). This uneven distribution indicate that bilingual language use in peer interaction is not equally distributed across patterns, but indicates a clear structural preferences toward Indonesian based construction. The predominance of Indonesian matrix structures suggest that speakers tend to rely on Indonesian as the primary grammatical framework, while English is selectively integrated to fulfill specific lexical and interactional functions.

*Tabel 1. Distribution of Indoglish structural patterns*

| Indoglish Pattern | Description | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Indonesian matrix with English insertion | Noun and adjective (n = 31), verb (n = 15), and English root with local morphology ( 12) | N = 58 |
| Hybrid or mixed framed structure | Clause by clause alternation within one excerpt (n = 14), and Internally mixed frame within one excerpt (n = 16) | N = 30 |
| English Matrix with Indonesian insertion | English clause with local marker (n = 9), and English led evaluative expression (n = 6) | N = 15 |

In this sense, bilingual language use in peer discussion can be seen as communicative resource rather than a failure to maintain target language norms. The systematic variation across the three patterns indicates that learners strategically mobilize their bilingual repertoires to support interaction. This interpretation is consistent with Cahyani et al. (2020), who argue that bilingual practices in educational contexts function as resources for meaning making rather than deficiencies. Similarly, Tina and Jiang (2021) demonstrate that first language use in peer interaction can facilitate negotiation of meaning and task progression. Taken together, these findings position post class peer discussion as a productive site for investigating how EFL learners organize their bilingual repertoires in socially and interactionally meaningful ways

### 1. Indonesian Matrix Structures with English Insertion

Table 2. Indonesian matrix structures with English insertion

| Subpattern | Structural Description | Data ID | Transcript excerpt |
|---|---|---|---|
| English adjective insertion | Indonesian supplies the clause frame, while **simple** fills the predicate adjective slot. | REC 01 | Ya konteksnya **simple** |
| English verb insertion | The Indonesian modal arrangement **aku harus** X is keeping, whereas upload functions are the main verb | REC 07 | Aku harus **upload** ke G-drive |
| English predicate insertion | The indonesian skelton yang disini harus X stays dominant, while **invite them** fills the verbal slot | REC 07 | Yang disini harus **invite them** |
| English root with indonesian morphology | The English noun **background** is integrated Indonesian | REC 08 | Karena **background-nya** orang miskin |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | colloquial prefix **nge-**, indicating local morphological integration | | |
| English root with indonesian morphology | The English root **chat** is adjusted through the Indonesian colloquial prefix **nge-,** showing local morphological integration | REC 08 | Aku tuh **nge-chat** di group malah nggk di-bales |

The first and most dominant finding is Indonesian Matrix Structure with English Insertion, accounting for 58 of 103 utterances. As shown in Table 1, this pattern included noun/ajective insertion (n = 31), verb insertion (n = 15), and English roots with Indonesian affixation (n = 12). Indonesian functions as the grammatical scaffold. That is the language providing clause structure, word order, and functional frame, while English fills specific lexical slots. This the evident in *"ya konteksnya simple"* where Indonesian supplies the clause frame and "*simple*" occupies the adjective position, and in "*Aku harus upload ke G-drive"* where Indonesian provide the subject modal structure and *"upload"* function as the main verb. These examples indicate that speaker retain Indonesian syntax while inserting English elements for Lexical precision and interactional nuance (Azzahrah et al., 2022). This pattern aligns with Muysken's (2013) account of bilingual optimization, in which speakers combine linguistic resources while maintaining the grammatical organization of the dominant language.

This finding is sociolinguistically fundamental because it suggests that Indoglishin post class peer discussion is not a random accumulation of English words inside Indonesian speech. Rather, it is patterned bilingual practice in which English is systematically embedded into Indonesian clause organization. This interpretation is in line with Boloyani (2022) who argues that code switching study needs careful structural distinction rather than wide and undifferentiated labels of mixing. In the current data , English does not operate independently of local syntax. Instead, it is inserted into Indonesian modal, predicate, complement, and descriptive positions in regular and recognizable ways.

The morphological subpatterns further reinforce this interpretation. Forms such as background-nya and nge-chat show that English items are not merely borrowed in their original form, but are merged into Indonesian grammatical habits. This suggest a deeper level of bilingual integration than simple lexical insertion. In this sense, the finding supports Deuchar's (2022) view that bilingual speech must be distinguished according to degrees of structural integration, particularly between plain insertion and more locally adapted forms. It also resonates with Bhatt and Bolonyai's (2022) argument that multilingual practices are influenced by socially organized and community specific grammatical principles. Therefore, Indonesian matrix structures with English insertion reflect a locally meaningful bilingual strategy in which Indonesian stays interactionally dominant while English functions as a productive Linguistic resource.

## 2. Hybrid or mixed framed structures

Table 3 hybrid or mixed framed structures

| Subpattern | Structural Description | Data ID | Transcript excerpt |
|---|---|---|---|
| Clause by clause alternation | The conditional clause in Indonesian frame, whereas the primary clause is English framed | REC 01 | Kalau kita ga isi **our supervisor will send text to us** |
| Clause by clause alternation | The first clause is English-framed joined by and Indonesian framed clause | REC 01 | **My brother came here,** dia jalan-jalan |
| Internally mixed framing | Indonesian and English equally shape one clause, with make it as the verbal core inside a mixed frame | REC 03 | Tapi aku **make it** sussah |
| Internally mixed framing | The English subject phrase is followed by an Indonesian predicative structure, creating one integrated bilingual clasue | REC 05 | **Our life goals** itu beda bro |
| Internally mixed framing | The utterance combines an English discourse opener, Indonesian evaluative framing, and an English predicate phrase in one integrate structure. | REC 07 | **In a way** itu memang betul **solo journey** |

The second primary pattern identified in the data is hybrid or mixed framed structures, accounting 30 out of 103 bilingual utterances. This category cannot be adequately clarified through a single dominant matrix language. Unlike Indonesian matrix structures with English insertion, in which English is inserted into an already established grammatical frame, this pattern indicates that Indonesian and English may jointly contribute to the organization of the same utterance. As Bhatt and Bolonyai (2011) and Deuchar (2020) argue, bilingual discourse cannot always be reduced to a simple distinction between base language and inserted elements, because multilingual speakers frequently draw on more than one linguistic system in socially constructed ways. That perspective is particularly relevant to the current data, where hybridity emerges in two related forms; clause by clause alternation, in which Indonesian and English shows in sequential but structurally distinct clause and internally mixing framing, in which both languages participate

more tightly with the same clause or integrated utterance. The importance of this category lies in indicating that Indoglish in peer discussion is not limited to insertional mixing, but also involves more distributed and jointly constructed bilingual organization.

The first subpattern, clause by clause alternation, appears when one clause is organized through Indonesian grammar and the following clause shifts into English, or vice versa. Excerpts such as *kalau kita gak isi, our supervisor will send text to us, my brother came her, dia jalan-jalan, and he knows, mereka terlalu jauh* illustrate this pattern clearly because the bilingual shifts takes place across clause boundaries rather than inside a single grammatical frame. In these excerpts, each clause remains internally coherent according to it's own structural system, but the utterance as a whole is built through the juxtaposition of two different clause organization. This patterns is interactionally fundamental because, as Gumperz (1982) and Cadden et al. (2024) suggests, code switching frequently helps speakers structure discourse, manage contrast, and highlight particular meanings in conversations. That isight helps explain the current data: Indonesian framed clauses often provide context, background, or conditional setup, whereas English framed clauses tend to carry focal, explanatory, or evaluative content. Clause by clause alternation therefore functions not as random switching, but as discourse organizing resource that enables speaker to distribute communicative work across languages within same turn.

The second subpattern, internally mixed framing, reflects a tighter form of bilingual integration because indonesian and English are combined within the same clause or closely connected utterance. Examples such as *Tapi aku make it susah, our life goals itu beda bro, and in away memang betul solo journey* show that neither language fully determines the overall grammatical organization of the utterance. Instead, English may contribute the discourse opener, subject phrase, or predicate elements whereas Indonesian shapes topical framing, evaluation, complement structure, or local reinforcement. This patterns support Szcepek Reed et al.'s (2022) and Kootstra (2020) argument that multilingual discourse is frequently motivated by discourse management, conversational alignment, lexical need, and interactional emphasis rather than by simple alternation between separate language systems. In the current data, hybrid structures permit speakers to combine informational content, evaluative stance, and interpersonal alignment in a single compact utterance (khafosh et al., 2025). For that reason this category occupies a central place in the findings; it indicates that some Indoglish utterances are best understood not as insertion into one dominant language, but as jointly framed bilingual discourse through which speakers coordinate meaning and manage interaction in real time (Damayanti et al., 2025)

### 3. English Matrix with Indonesian insertion

Table 4. English matrix with Indonesian insertion

| Subpattern | Structural Description | Data | Transcript excerpt |
|---|---|---|---|
| English clause with local marker | The key clause is fully English framed, while | REC 08 | Ayok-ayok, **you have to finish** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **ayok-ayok** functions only as a local discourse prompt | | **your paper** |
| English clause with local marker | The Indonesian section introduces the utterance, but the structural center lies in the English clause **don't relate** | REC 08 | Aku kayak, **I don't relate** |
| English marker with local marker | The proposition **it's in his brains** English framed, whereas gitu serves as local pragmatic reinforcement | REC 09 | **It is in his brain** gitu? |
| English led evaluative expression | The evaluative core **looks good** is English led, while emang strengthen the speaker's stance | REC 04 | Emang **it looks good** |
| English led evaluative expression | The structural center is the English evakuative expression **makes sense** with **juga** added as local reinforcement | REC 05 | **It makes sense** jugak |

The third major pattern identified in the data is the English matrix with Indonesian insertation accounting for 15 out of 103 bilingual utterances. In this configuration, English provides the main structural frame of the utterance whereas Indonesian contributes particles, stance markers, discourse prompts, or pragmatic reinforcement. This pattern differs from Indonesian matrix with English insertation structures because English is no longer inserted into an Indonesian grammatical based; instead, it functions as the structural center of the utterance. At the same time, the presence of local elements such as *ayok-ayok, aku kaya, gitu, emang, and juga* indicates that these excerpts do not operate as isolated or fully monolingual English clauses. Rather, they remain interactionally grounded in the speakers' bilingual environment. This interpretation is consistent with Fang et al. (2022), who argue that multilingual speakers frequently draw on multiple linguistic resources simultaneously, even when one language appears to dominate the propositional structure of the utterance (Cenoz & Gorter, 2019, Jia 2023). That perspective is useful here because the English led excerpts in the present data still retain local pragmatic coloring anchoring.

One important feature of this pattern is that English matrix with Indonesian insertation often appear either as full clauses with local markers or as compact evaluative expression reinforced by Indonesian elements. Excerpts such as *you have to finish your paper, I don't relate, and it's in his brain, gitu*, show that English carries the main propositional or clause level meaning, whereas Indonesian contributes framing or pragmatic emphasis. Shorter expression such as *looks good and*

*make sense juga* suggest a similar organization at the evaluate level, where English serves as the core carrier of judgment and Indonesian adds stance reinforcement or local familiarity. This supports Marlina's (2013) critique of English only assumptions in multilingual educational context, since the data indicate that English use in peer interaction does not necessarily involve a complete shift away from local linguistic resources (Weston, 2013; Tai 2022, Koostra et al., 2020). Instead, English and Indonesian remain functionally connected, even when English takes the structural lead. In this sense, English anchored structures are best understood not as pure English embedded in Indonesian discourse, but bilingual utterances in which English dominates structurally whereas Indonesian maintains pragmatic and interpersonal relevance.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, this pattern is especially important because it indicates that English in peer discussion is used not only for propositional content, but also for stance taking, evaluation, and expressive positioning. Wang (2022) argues that translanguaging challenges the assumptions that meaningful language use in EFL settings must conform to English only norms, since multilingual learners routinely draw on their full repertoires as communicative resources (Zhou & Mann, 2021; Martinez et al,. 2020). That argument helps clarify the current findings. When speakers say *you have to finish your paper, I don't relate, or make sense jugak*, the are not abandoning Indonesian altogether; rather they are using English as the structural base whereas retaining indonesian practicals or markers that preserve local tone, solidarity, and conversational familiarity. English anchored structures with local additions therefore represent the English led end of the bilingual continuum identified in this study, whereas still demonstrating that peer interaction remains shaped by locally meaningful multilingual practices.

Taken together, the three patterns reveal a continuum of bilingual structuring in post class peer talk. In Indonesian anchored structures, Indonesian remains the main grammatical base while English is inserted lexically or morphologically. In hybrid or jointly framed structures, Indonesian and English participate more equally in shaping the same utterance. In English anchored structures, English becomes the main structural frame, while Indonesia continues to contribute local pragmatic reinforcement. This continuum demonstrates that Indoglisg is not a single undifferentiated form of language mixing, but a set patterned bilingual resources that speakers mobilize in different ways depending on interactional needs. In line with Gumperz (1982) interactional perspective, the findings suggest that bilingual discourse in peer communication is best understood as an organized communicative practice rather than as in imperfect departure from monolingual norms. Specifically, the current data show that EFL learners use Indoglish to coordinate meaning, express evaluation, and sustain peer alignment in naturally occurring informal discussion. Based on that perspective, post class peer interaction emerges as a productive site for understanding how bilingual speakers manage structure and social meaning simultaneously in everyday academic communication.

## CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how Indoglish is structurally patterned in naturally occurring post class peer discussion among EFL learners and how those patterns function in informal academic interaction. The findings show that Indoglish in this setting is not an unsystematic mixture of Indonesian and English, but a patterned bilingual practice realized through three recurring structural configurations: Indonesian Matrix with English insertion, Hybrid or mixed framed structures, and English Matrix with Indonesian insertion. Across these configurations, learners draw on Indonesian and English in different but systematic ways to organize meaning, express stance, and maintain interpersonal alignment. These results strengthen the argument that bilingual language use in peer discussion should be understood as a meaningful communicative resource rather than simply as deviation from target language norms.

More broadly this study contributes to Indoglish scholarship by shifting attention away from predominantly written and digitally mediated discourse toward spontaneous spoken interaction in peer talk. In doing so it highlights post class discussion as a fundamental site for understanding how EFL learners manage bilingual repertoires in real time and how structural variation in mixed utterances reflect socially grounded meaning making. Although this study is limited to one interactional setting, it demonstrates that Indoglish in everyday academic communication is structurally organized, interactionally purposeful, and sociolinguistically significant. Future research may extend this line of inquiry by critically examining whether and how the use of Indoglish in peer interaction facilitates or constrains the development of students' English language proficiency, particularly in terms of fluency, accuracy, and communicative effectiveness.

## REFERENCES

Azzahrah, F., Febrianti, Y., Yannuar, N., & Zen, E. L. (2022). Multilingualism in social media: Indonesian K-pop fans language choices on Twitter. KLAUSA (Kajian Linguistik, Pembelajaran Bahasa, dan Sastra), 6(1), 1-20.

Bani-Shoraka, H., & Jansson, G. (2007). Bilingual practices in the process of initiating and resolving lexical problems in students' collaborative writing sessions. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 11*(2), 261–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069070110020201

Beatty-Martínez, A. L., Navarro-Torres, C. A., & Dussias, P. E. (2020). Codeswitching: A bilingual toolkit for opportunistic speech planning. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 1699. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01699

Bhatt, R. M., & Bolonyai, A. (2022). Multilingualism as an object of sociolinguistic description. Languages, 7(4), Article 277. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7040277

Cahyani, H., Tursini, U., & Yannuar, N. *(2020). Mixing and Switching in Social Media: Denoting the Indonesian "Keminggris" Language.*

*International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 10(11), 133-150.*

Cedden, G., Meyer, P., Özkara, B., & von Stutterheim, C. (2024). The code-switching issue: Transition from (socio)linguistic to cognitive research. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728924000737

Cedden, G., Meyer, P., Özkara, B., & von Stutterheim, C. (2024). The "code-switching issue": Transition from (socio)linguistic to cognitive research. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728924000737.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogies and English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching, 52*(3), 300–311. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000246

Damayanti, S. A., Yannuar, N., Zubaidi, N., & Khaerani, N. S. (2026). Exploring Translanguaging and Trans-semiotizing for Students with Intellectual Disabilities. Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture, 11(1), 146-161.

Deuchar, M. (2020). Code-switching in linguistics: A position paper. *Languages, 5*(2), Article 22. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages5020022

Fang, F., Zhang, L. J., & Sah, P. K. (2022). Translanguaging in language teaching and learning: Current practices and future directions. *RELC Journal, 53*(2), 305–312. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211114478

Hambali, A. (2022). Analisis bahasa Indoglish dalam Instagram pada generasi Z di Kabupaten Sragen. *Riksa Bahasa, 16*, 15–24.

Handayani, F., & Amelia, M. (2021). Indoglish as a sociolinguistic phenomenon: A case study at English departments UMMY Solok. *Journal of English Language Learning (JELL), 6*(1), 53–61.

Hlavac, J. (2006). Bilingual discourse markers: Evidence from Croatian-English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(11), 1870–1900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.05.005

Jia, W. (2023). How do EMI lecturers' translanguaging perceptions impact their pedagogical practices? *Sustainability, 15*(6), Article 4895. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064895

Juwintan, & Ikram, R. W. (2022). An analysis of sociolect language variation of social interaction in Surau Lauik society. *Language, Education, and Development (LEAD) Journal, 2*(1), 28–36.

Kartika-Ningsih, H., & Rose, D. (2018). Language shift: Analysing language use in multilingual classroom interactions. *Functional Linguistics, 5*, Article 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0061-0

*Khafshoh, A. L., Anugerahwati, M., Yannuar, N., & Basthomi, Y. (2025). Translanguaging practices and teacher perspectives in a CLIL program: A case study at a national plus school in Indonesia. Journal on*

*English as a Foreign Language, 15(2), 679-701.*

Khotimah, K., Pribadi, F., Mintowati, M., & Ahmadi, A. (2020). Indoglish in social media platforms and its significance as a national language planning material. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 491*, 998–1005. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201201.167

Kootstra, G. J., van Hell, J. G., & Dijkstra, T. (2020). Interactive alignment and lexical triggering of code-switching in bilingual dialogue. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 1747. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01747

Kristanti, I. P., Seli, S., & Fiani, A. (2024). A sociolinguistic analysis of Indoglish used on Instagram captions. *LIED (Linguistic, Literature, and English Education), 4*(1), 17–33.

Long, Y., Wang, X., Xue, J., Hu, Y., Xie, J., & Qian, Y. (2021). Pronunciation augmentation for Mandarin-English code-switching speech recognition. *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing, 2021*, Article 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13636-021-00222-7

Marlina, R. (2013). Globalisation, internationalisation, and language education: An academic program for global citizens. *Multilingual Education, 3*, Article 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/2191-5059-3-5

Muysken, P. (2013). Language contact outcomes as the result of bilingual optimization strategies. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 16*(4), 709–730. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000727

Putra, N. B. A. (2022). Exploring Indoglish as a language variation phenomenon on Twitter at MLBB Fess account. In *Current Issues and Opportunities in Linguistics, Literature, Culture and Arts Studies in the New Normal* (pp. 8–15).

Rakhmawati, A., Saddhono, K., Hastuti, S., & Devilito, R. (2016). A phenomenon of Indoglish usage at universities in Indonesia: Breaking down the motives from sociolinguistics perspective.

Riadil, I. G. (2021). Investigating EFL learners' "Indonglish" usage by English department students: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Humanity Studies, 5*(1), 47–56. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v5i1.1943

Ruiz-Dolz, R., Ferrández, Ó., Mora, E., Vázquez, M., & Cano, A. (2021). VivesDebate: A new annotated multilingual corpus of parliamentary debates. *Applied Sciences, 11*(15), Article 7160. https://doi.org/10.3390/app11157160

Saddhono, K., & Sulaksono, D. (2018). Indoglish as adaptation of English to Indonesian: Change of society in big cities of Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 126*, 012092. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/126/1/012092

Setiawan, D. (2016). English code switching in Indonesian language. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(7), 1545–1552.

Sudewi, N. K. P. N., Muhlisin, & Ardiyati, S. M. (2023). Indoglish as a

sociolinguistic phenomenon: The power of language in the 4.0 era. *JISHUM (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora), 1*(3), 407–416.

Tai, K. W. H. (2022). Translanguaging as inclusive pedagogical practices in English-medium instruction science and mathematics classrooms for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Research in Science Education, 52*, 975–1012. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-021-10018-6

Vanhaverbeke, M., Enghels, R., Parafita Couto, M. del C., & Ivanova, I. (2025). Enhancing code-switching research through comparable corpora: Introducing the El Paso Bilingual Corpus. *Languages, 10*(7), Article 174. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10070174

Wang, D. (2022). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: Students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 25*(4), 1381–1395. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1740160

Weston, D. (2013). Functional markers in Llanito code-switching: Regular patterns in Gibraltar's bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(5), 579–607. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912438304

Wijaya, A. D., & Bram, B. (2021). A sociolinguistic analysis of Indoglish phenomenon in South Jakarta. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education), 4*(4), 672–684.

*Zen, L. E., & Hidayati, M. (2016). Cultural Negotiation: Evidence from Language Switching and Mixing Practices in Classroom Discourse.*

Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2020). Dialogic discussion as a platform for constructing knowledge: Student-teachers' interaction patterns and strategies in learning to teach English. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5*, Article 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00101-2

Zhou, X., & Mann, S. (2021). Towards a sustainable classroom ecology: Translanguaging in English as a medium of instruction EMI in a finance classroom. *Sustainability, 13*(19), Article 10719. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910719