

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter further elaborated the result within the research and with throughout analysis for the research. This chapter presented the findings of the research that are collected and conducted with students as active Instagram users and then explore how the comment section give any vocabulary gaining for students based on the students experience. The discussion's objectives were given explanations regarding the problem definition and the interpretation of the results according to the relevant theoretical review.

A. Research Findings

The sources regarding to the data that used in this research in order to analyze the findings were the utmost important. Five participant, in which regarded as P1 (participant 1), P2 (participant 2), P3 (participant 3), P4 (participant 4), and P5 (participant 5), were participated in this research in order to build the dataset that further be analyzed in this research. The students' for this research were selected thoroughly to fit the aimed participant that mentioned in chapter III (three) of this research. The data were thoroughly collected to have better understanding regarding to students experience toward the comment section interaction in Instagram in order to acquire more vocabulary.

All of the participants were given each set of eight specific question as part of the research design aimed to reach the goal of reaching the in-depth

answers that further explain their point of view regarding to the research discussed topic. Each participant answered eight narrative questions, producing rich accounts of their experiences related to this research.

By the aim regarding to this research, two research questions were required to be answered. The first research question were to find which kind of code mixing that the students' use in Instagram and the second question is to explore the reason behind the students' vocabulary gaining through interaction using code mixing within the Instagram comment section.

1. The Type of Code Mixing Used in Instagram

Participants' understandings of code-mixing and their examples of mixed comments were examined using the code-mixing framework described in Chapter II in which referred to insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization.

By using the interview question of: *"What do you understand about the term code mixing in the use of language on social media, especially Instagram?"* and the question of *"Can you give an example of a comment you replied to or someone replied to that used code mixing?"* that were given to the participant by the researcher, this section discussed of how the students view code mixing and the implementation of it.

To discuss the underlying subject, this section divided into two section.

a. The Scoop of Code Mixing in Regard of Students Understanding

This section analyzes interview responses which sought participants' understandings of the term code mixing as it operates

within language use on social media, with a focus on Instagram. The aim were to establish a baseline understanding of how participants conceptualize code mixing, which informed subsequent explorations of its effects on engagement and vocabulary learning in social-media contexts.

To establish a foundation for analyzing structural patterns, participants were first asked to articulate their understanding of the term "code-mixing" as it pertains to social media communication. Their responses revealed varying degrees of metalinguistic awareness, ranging from tacit familiarity to explicit theoretical knowledge, which collectively illuminate the conceptual frameworks that guide their bilingual language practices.

P1 demonstrated minimal explicit metalinguistic knowledge, stating:

"as far as i know, i quite understand what code mixing are."

This response, while affirming comprehension, provides no definition elaboration, suggesting that P1's understanding operates at an implicit, procedural level rather than explicit conceptualization. Such tacit knowledge was characteristic of fluent bilinguals who engage in code-mixing as a natural communicative practice without conscious reflection on its structural properties or sociolinguistic functions. The absence of definition detail indicates that P1's code-mixing behavior likely follows intuitive patterns

rather than strategic application, which may influence the structural types of mixing observed in their actual Instagram comments.

P2 articulated a more explicit definition of

"code-mixing is a way of speaking in which one language is combined with another but it should follow some kind of rules, yet many people still don't really understand. Code-mixing is common on social media since there is a lot of different language interaction every day."

This response reveals several key conceptual elements which recognition of code-mixing as a rule-governed linguistic system rather than random alternation, awareness of widespread misunderstanding among users, and attribution of prevalence to high-frequency language contact in digital environments.

The reference to *"some kind of rules"* suggests P2 possesses implicit knowledge of grammatical constraints governing code-mixing, potentially aligning with Muysken's (2000) typological distinctions between insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. The acknowledgment that *"many people still don't really understand"* indicates metalinguistic awareness of code-mixing as a specialized competence, distinguishing proficient users from novices. This conceptualization implies that P2's code-mixing practices may be more structurally systematic and strategically deployed than those of less aware participants.

P3 defined code-mixing through its functional application,

"In my understanding, using term code mixing in social media.

Specially in Instagram,. used for talking with the strangers when I discuss something with them about some topic or maybe just to tell internet jokes."

This definition frames code-mixing as a pragmatic tool for managing intercultural communication and humor, rather than a structural phenomenon. The emphasis on *"talking with the strangers"* and *"internet jokes"* reveals that P3 conceptualizes code-mixing primarily as a social strategy for bridging linguistic differences and enhancing affective engagement in informal digital contexts. This interactional perspective suggests that P3's code-mixing patterns may prioritize communicative effectiveness over structural purity, potentially favoring lexical insertions that facilitate cross-cultural understanding (e.g., English terms for internet culture phenomena) over grammatically integrated alternations. The functional orientation implies that vocabulary enrichment through P3's code-mixing would likely target pragmatically salient lexical items such as slang, humor markers, and topic-specific terminology, rather than structurally embedded grammatical elements.

P4 provided the most structurally precise definition:

"Code mixing on social media, especially Instagram, is when a person uses two or more languages or language varieties within a

single sentence or utterance. It's a very common linguistic phenomenon, particularly in multilingual communities. The common use of code mixing in the Instagram apps, for example 'holiday with my istri', for phrase 'my istri' is also common phrase that use by a lot of people in the internet"

This response demonstrates explicit awareness of code-mixing as intra-sentential language alternation, distinguishing it from inter-sentential code-switching. The reference to "*multilingual communities*" situates the practice within established sociolinguistic theory, indicating sophisticated metalinguistic knowledge.

P4's example of "*holiday with my istri*" exemplifies insertional code-mixing, where the Indonesian noun "*istri*" (wife) is embedded within an English matrix sentence. This concrete illustration reveals that P4 conceptualizes code-mixing as lexical-level insertion rather than phrasal or sentential alternation. The observation that this phrase is "a common phrase that use by a lot people in the internet" further demonstrates awareness of code-mixing as a community norm rather than idiosyncratic behavior. This formal-linguistic conceptualization suggests P4's actual code-mixing practices can likely follow insertional patterns consistent with Muysken's typology, where English provides the grammatical framework and Indonesian supplies culturally specific lexical items.

P5 articulated the most theoretically sophisticated understanding,

"the term of code mixing is a theory part of socio linguistic. Code mixing is a part of speech which happened when you mix two or more language into one sentence. Just like the mixing of Indonesian language and English. The change happens in 1 sentence in which the mixing happens in words, unlike code switching. In social media, it's frequently happened because it's becoming a trend and become an easier access for people to accept or to exposed to a new language."

This response demonstrates explicit differentiation between code-mixing (intra-sentential, lexical-level) and code-switching (inter-sentential), aligning with foundational sociolinguistic theory. P5 attributed prevalence to trend diffusion and accessibility of foreign language exposure, framing code-mixing as both a sociolinguistic phenomenon and a pedagogical affordance for language learning. The emphasis on "easier access for people to accept or to be exposed to a new language" directly connects code-mixing to vocabulary acquisition, suggesting that P5 conceptualizes it as a learning tool rather than merely a communicative practice.

The conceptual diversity reveals that students' understandings of code-mixing directly shape their deployment patterns. Those conceptualizing it as lexical insertion (P4) likely produce insertional code-mixing. Those viewing it as pragmatic strategy (P3) may prioritize functional appropriateness over structural consistency.

Those with theoretical knowledge (P5) may exhibit more systematic patterns aligned with established typologies. This finding is crucial because it establishes that observed code-mixing types are not random but reflect underlying conceptual frameworks that vary across individuals. The prevalence of insertional conceptualizations (explicit in P4, implicit in P2's "rules" and P5's "words") suggests that insertion likely dominate the structural patterns observed in actual Instagram comments.

A hypothesis confirmed by the examples provided in the next section for more of in-depth answer.

b. The Types of Code Mixing Encountered

To address this inquiry, participants provided authentic examples from their Instagram engagements through Interview which solicited concrete instances of code-mixed comments they had either produced or encountered.

Due to the participants refusal to gave the screenshots of the interaction, the researcher only attached the participants interaction that given to the researcher via quotation of the interaction that have occurred. Despite the participants refusal of giving the interaction that have occurred in Instagram comment section, the participants agree to give the testimony directly of how the interaction occurred in the Instagram. The participants also agree to write the interactions

willingly.

The analysis applies Muysken's (2000) typological framework, which distinguishes three primary code-mixing patterns of insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. This framework enables systematic classification of the linguistic structures underlying bilingual digital communication practices.

The analysis of participant-provided examples revealed that insertion emerged as the predominant code-mixing type in Instagram comment sections. P1 reported encountering a comment reply stating,

"apa yang kamu komentar di atas sudah masuk ranah logical fallacy sehingga sudah tidak masuk ke dalam ranah komentar si pengirim."

This exemplifies insertion, where the English technical term "*logical fallacy*" is embedded within an Indonesian grammatical matrix. The Indonesian sentence structure remains intact while accommodating the English lexical item, demonstrating how students insert specialized English vocabulary into their native language framework.

Similarly, P3 described receiving the comment

"game gamble berkedok shooter,"

Which also demonstrates insertion patterns. The utterance maintains Indonesian as the matrix language through the use of the Indonesian verb "*berkedok*" (disguised as), while English gaming terminology

"game gamble" and "shooter" are inserted as content words.

P2 provided another insertion example:

"Betul dia cuman self-claim expert, aslinya tidak."

The English phrase *"self-claim expert"* is nested within the Indonesian sentence structure, with Indonesian function words and grammatical elements framing the English insertion.

In contrast, P4's example revealed a different pattern:

"ikr, he more like jawa menurutku."

This utterance exhibits characteristics of alternation, wherein English and Indonesian elements are distributed throughout a shared grammatical structure. *"Ikr, he more like jawa menurutku"* exemplifies alternation in code-mixing. This clause/phrase-level switch between languages at boundaries, without one dominating the frame, fits alternation per Muysken's model, unlike congruent lexicalization's free lexical swaps in a shared structure.

P5's example, In *"Bawang putih is so over powered,"* the Indonesian term *"bawang putih"* (which means garlic) is inserted into an English sentence structure. The matrix language (the language providing the grammatical framework), is English, while the embedded element *"bawang putih"* comes from Indonesian. This demonstrates insertion because the Indonesian noun phrase is incorporated into an otherwise English grammatical structure, with English providing the copula *"is"* and the predicate adjective phrase *"so over powered"*.

Insertion dominated by four, followed by one alternation but none of congruent lexicalization type, indicating structured rather than random bilingual practices on Instagram. These patterns align with sociolinguistic norms in Indonesian digital spaces, where English lends precision to informal exchanges. These findings indicate that Indonesian-English bilingual students employ diverse code-mixing strategies in Instagram comment sections, with insertion being the most frequently observed type, followed by instances of alternation and then congruent lexicalization.

Across all of the five examples, English lexical items consistently function as content words (nouns, noun phrases, predicates, and discourse markers) embedded into Indonesian matrix clauses, fitting Muysken's insertion type of code-mixing. The recurrent insertion of English terminology, especially evaluative and domain-specific expressions such as logical fallacy, self-claim expert, and over powered, suggests that students draw on English resources to achieve greater precision, stance expression, and alignment with online discourse norms in Instagram interactions.

Comment	Types of code mixing
p1: Apa yang kamu komentar di atas sudah masuk ranah logical fallacy sehingga sudah tidak masuk ke dalam	insertion

ranah komentar si pengirim	
p2: Game gamble berkedok shooter	Insertion
p3: Betul dia cuman self-claim expert, aslinya tidak	Insertion
p4: Ikr, he more like jawa menurutku.	Alternation
p5: Bawang putih is so over powered	Insertion

Table 2. The types of code Mixing encountered

2. Students' Engagement in Instagram Comment Section to Enrich Vocabulary

The participants' were the objective of this research to have better understanding regarding to how the code mixing engagement in Instagram comment section has involved in vocabulary acquisition.

To discuss the underlying subject, this section divided into six section.

a. Code Mixing Influence Factor

This section specifically probed participants' perceptions regarding the influences that drive code-mixing practices. Thematic analysis identifies three primary influences which consist social media trends and virality, peer networks and interpersonal dynamics, and communicative goals or pragmatic needs. Understanding these motivational factors provides crucial insight into the mechanisms through which vocabulary expansion occurs, as the sources and contexts of code-mixing exposure directly correlate with opportunities for lexical learning.

By using the question of "In your opinion, is the use of code mixing

influenced by trends, friends, or certain goals?" The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview.

This section presents participants' perspectives on the sociolinguistic forces that precipitate code-mixing behavior in Instagram comment sections.

The participants' responses reveal significant convergence regarding the primary influences on code-mixing engagement, while also demonstrating contextual variation that illuminates the multidimensional nature of this linguistic phenomenon.

All five participants explicitly identified trends or social media phenomena as primary drivers of code-mixing behavior. This unanimous recognition suggests that viral linguistic content functions as a consistent exposure mechanism for new English vocabulary. P1 referenced "*tren atau bahkan quote yang relatable*" (trends or even relatable quotes), while P3 noted "*trends or influencer*," P4 mentioned "*internet/trends*," and P5 provided extensive elaboration on how terms like 'brainrot' and 'ragebait' circulate virally. This convergence indicates that trend-mediated code-mixing creates repeated encounters with specific lexical items across participants' social networks, facilitating incidental vocabulary acquisition through frequency and salience.

Four participants explicitly mentioned peer influence, social

interaction, or friend networks as catalysts for code-mixing adoption. P2 emphasized "*social interaction*," P4 noted "*friend, in real life*," and P5 detailed the peer-to-peer transmission process, "*when one person shares it with another, and the other person shares it with another, it becomes more widely used*".

This high convergence demonstrates that code-mixing operates within communities of practice where linguistic innovations diffuse through interpersonal networks, reinforcing vocabulary retention through social validation and communicative necessity.

Three participants identified specific communicative goals or functional contexts driving code-mixing. P2 specified hobby and online game contexts requiring code-mixing, P4 mentioned advertising and daily life narration, and P5 explicitly described goal-oriented usage:

"they mix languages because they can't or forget the word they want to convey in their first language, so they take it in English".

This moderate convergence reveals that code-mixing serves pragmatic functions in which lexical gap-filling and domain-specific communication that directly enhance productive vocabulary by necessitating English term retrieval and application.

Responses varied considerably in analytical depth. P3 and P4 provided relatively brief acknowledgments of trends and peers, while P5 offered systematic elaboration distinguishing three distinct

mechanisms of social media dissemination, peer reinforcement, and compensatory language use. This divergence suggests differential metalinguistic awareness among participants, with P5 demonstrating explicit understanding of how multiple influences interact synergistically to promote vocabulary expansion through both passive exposure and active gap-filling strategies.

On the other side, P2 uniquely emphasized hobby-related contexts, specifically online gaming, as requiring code-mixing, stating:

"someone like me who tend to play online game that require code mixing in it".

This contrasts with other participants' more generalized references to social media trends, highlighting that domain-specific communities (gaming, professional discourse) may intensify code-mixing engagement and accelerate specialized vocabulary acquisition within particular lexical fields.

In contrasts, P1 uniquely distinguished between contemporary trend influence and code-mixing's deeper origins: *"kalau untuk asal-muasalnya bahasa code mixing ini mungkin akan jauh dari tren dan perkiraan"* (but for the origins of this code-mixing language, it might be far from trends and expectations).

This temporal perspective suggests recognition that while trends accelerate current vocabulary diffusion, code-mixing as a phenomenon predates social media, reflecting broader

sociolinguistic contact dynamics.

The correlations reveal a multi-layered influence model where trends initiate exposure, peers reinforce and normalize usage, and functional needs consolidate retention. P5's detailed account synthesizes these layers: viral terms emerge online, peers adopt and disseminate them offline, and individuals deploy them to address lexical gaps, creating a complete cycle from receptive exposure to productive mastery. The convergence on trends and peers indicates these are primary pathways through which Instagram code-mixing engagement enriches vocabulary, while the moderate goal-orientation agreement suggests individual variation in conscious vocabulary-learning strategies versus naturalistic acquisition.

Collectively, participants' responses demonstrate that code-mixing influence operates at ecological (platform trends), social (peer networks), and individual (communicative goals) levels, with each level contributing cumulatively to vocabulary expansion through different psychological mechanisms then leads to exposure of frequency, social reinforcement, and pragmatic application.

This finding aligns with extensive research demonstrating that bilingual speakers consistently produce structurally systematic code-mixing even when unable to describe governing principles, as linguistic competence operates largely below conscious awareness. The gradient from P1's tacit recognition to P5's theoretical

sophistication therefore enhances rather than undermines data quality by capturing diverse participant profiles representative of the broader Indonesian Instagram user population, which encompasses both casual users with intuitive bilingual competence and linguistically-aware users with explicit metalinguistic knowledge.

b. Code Mixing Motivational Role To Enhance English Vocabulary

By using the question of "*Are you motivated to learn or use more English vocabulary because you frequently interact in the Instagram comment section?*" The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview.

The majority of participants reported direct motivational linkages between Instagram comment interactions and their desire to expand English vocabulary repertoires.

P1, P3, P2, and P4 exhibit unified recognition that comment section participation necessitates and incentivizes English vocabulary acquisition, correlating through shared emphasis on functional communication benefits. This alignment mirrors empirical findings indicating that most of social media language learners report communication improvements through platform interactions. The quantitative convergence suggests that comment section

engagement functions as a consistent motivational driver across diverse learner profiles, supporting claims that social media increases students' motivation and engagement in second language learning through familiar and interactive platforms.

P1 and P3 correlate through recognition of practical communicative benefits from sustained interaction. P1 identifies necessity-driven learning: "kita perlu menambah pemberdayaan kosakata apabila kita sudah mulai masuk ke akun berita atau bahkan meme dari manca negara" (we need to empower vocabulary when entering international news/meme accounts), linking frequency to domain expansion. P3 echoes this pragmatics: "It's make me feel more flexible when I express my thought in internet," where repeated engagement yields expressive fluency. Together, they illustrate how interaction frequency creates competency thresholds initial exposure reveals gaps, motivating vocabulary acquisition to sustain participation.

P2 and P4 converge on relational incentives. P2 stated:

"I really want to interact more with Other people who share the same hobbies and interests," framing frequency as enabling deeper community ties.

P4 complements: *"I really motivated to learn English more especially in the slangs,"* targeting interaction-specific lexicon (slang) for authentic belonging.

This dyad shows how frequent commenting fosters social capital, where vocabulary growth becomes instrumental for maintaining hobby-based networks, amplifying motivation through reciprocity. The responses collectively suggest a positive linear correlation between interaction frequency and vocabulary learning motivation, operating through cumulative exposure effects.

P1's phrase "*kadang ada kalanya kita perlu*" (sometimes there are times we need) implies episodic awareness during interactions, while P2's "*because of that, I really want to*" and P4's "*Yes, I really motivated*" indicate sustained motivational states resulting from habitual engagement. This progression suggests that initial sporadic interactions create lexical gap awareness, while repeated engagement consolidates this awareness into stable motivational orientations toward vocabulary expansion.

On the other hand, P5's attribution of motivation primarily to "*watching the content more instead of the comment section*" represents the sole divergent view, introducing a hierarchical distinction between passive content consumption and active comment interaction.

This perspective does not contradict the frequency-motivation correlation but rather specifies a two-stage model: content exposure generates initial vocabulary interest and partial acquisition, while comment interaction provides motivational reinforcement through

authentic usage demands. P5's response thus complements rather than contradicts the majority, suggesting that comment section motivation may be contingent upon prior content engagement establishing foundational vocabulary.

The responses demonstrate convergent-complementary correlation in which all participants recognize Instagram engagement's motivational impact, but identify different facets of how interaction frequency activates vocabulary learning commitment. This multidimensionality indicates that comment section interactions motivate vocabulary expansion through multiple simultaneous pathways in which are exposure necessity, expressive functionality, social instrumentality, and stylistic appropriateness, with each pathway reinforcing others to create cumulative motivational effects. The affirmative convergence, combined with varied motivational mechanisms, suggests that interaction frequency operated as a universal catalyst while individual learner characteristics (interests, social goals, linguistic backgrounds) determine which motivational dimension predominates.

The correlational analysis reveals that frequent Instagram comment interaction engenders vocabulary learning motivation through both deficiency awareness (recognizing lexical gaps impeding participation) and growth opportunities (encountering novel vocabulary in authentic contexts). The convergence mirroring

empirical literature on social media language learning, substantiates that comment section engagement constitutes a significant motivational variable in vocabulary enrichment processes. Critically, the differentiated motivational pathways indicate that Instagram's affordances (content diversity, informal registers, community structures, and interactive features) collectively address multiple motivational needs, explaining why the platform effectively drives sustained vocabulary acquisition efforts across diverse learner populations.

c. Vocabulary Enrichment by Using Code Mixing

By using the question of "*Do you think that using code mixing helps you add or enrich your vocabulary, especially in English? Explain why?*" The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview.

This section directly examined participants' perceptions of code-mixing's efficacy in enriching English vocabulary. This inquiry elicited divergent perspectives ranging from skepticism to strong affirmation, revealing nuanced understandings of how bilingual language practices facilitate or constrain lexical development.

Three participants expressed unequivocal agreement that code-mixing facilitates English vocabulary enrichment through contextualized learning and memory reinforcement.

P2 articulated a clear pedagogical advantage:

"Yes, it does help me to enrich my English vocabulary, it much more easier to learn by context using code mixing rather than learn from textbook." This response positions code-mixing as superior to formal instructional methods, emphasizing authentic contextual acquisition over decontextualized memorization. The preference for situated learning aligns with naturalistic vocabulary acquisition theories, wherein lexical items embedded in communicative contexts achieve deeper encoding and retention than isolated word lists.

P4 corroborated this view with dual emphasis: *"Yes, I think by using a code mixing really help me to enrich and memorize my vocabulary."*

The explicit mention of memorization highlights cognitive benefits, suggesting that active code-mixing practice, requiring real-time lexical retrieval and application, strengthens memory traces more effectively than passive exposure. This dual function of enrichment and memorization which indicates that productive engagement with code-mixed discourse consolidates both receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge.

P3 provided pragmatic validation:

"yeah, Sometimes I find it a little difficult to express what I want to say. Maybe it's because I feel that using English is more concise or comfortable, and doesn't feel exaggerated." While acknowledging

initial difficulty, P3 identifies code-mixing as enabling more precise expression, implying that engagement with English vocabulary through code-mixing expands nuanced communicative resources unavailable in Indonesian alone. The reference to "*concise*" expression suggests vocabulary acquisition driven by semantic gaps where English terms offer lexical efficiency.

P2, P3, and P4 were aligned in terms of agreement, while P1, on the other hand, provide skeptical Perspective regarding to technical language and limited utility.

P1 offered a dissenting view:

"tidak terlalu, untuk beberapa orang bahkan tidak cukup membantu dalam memperkaya kosakata baru. karena biasanya bahasa code mixing ini menggunakan bahasa yang lumayan teknis atau mungkin bahasa yang jarang digunakan dalam percakapan sehari-hari" (not really, for some people it doesn't help enough in enriching new vocabulary because code-mixing language usually uses quite technical language or perhaps language rarely used in daily conversation). This critique highlights a potential limitation that by code-mixed vocabulary consists predominantly of specialized or low-frequency terms, its practical utility for general communicative competence may be constrained. P1's response suggests that vocabulary enrichment depends on lexical transferability, technical jargon acquired through code-mixing may not enhance everyday

conversational proficiency.

Furthermore, P5 provided the most analytically sophisticated response, acknowledging bidirectional (two-way) effects: "*pertama, code mixing ini tujuannya apa dulu? Misalnya tadi untuk mengisi kalimat yang digunakan untuk menjelaskan idenya, misalnya secara lebih nyaman, ini bisa jadi memperkuat vocabulary bahasa inggris, bisa juga ni malah membatasi kemampuan berbahasa first languagenya. jadi karena dia terbiasa menggunakan bahasa/istilah tertentu, dia jadi lupa atau jadi kurang terbiasa menggunakan first languagenya. tapi positifnya, karena dia sering menggunakan atau mencampurkan bahasa, itu bisa membuatnya lebih ingat dengan bahasa inggris, di situ dia bisa menambah vocabulary-nya*" (first, what is the purpose of code-mixing? For example, to fill sentences used to explain ideas, more comfortably for example, this can strengthen English vocabulary, but it can also limit first language proficiency. So because they are accustomed to using certain languages or terms, they forget or become less accustomed to using their first language. But positively, because they often use or mix languages, it can make them remember English better, there they can increase their vocabulary).

P5's response introduces critical nuance that while acknowledging code-mixing's vocabulary-enhancing potential through repeated use and cognitive reinforcement, it simultaneously warns of first

language attrition risks. This bidirectional perspective reveals that vocabulary enrichment occurs not in isolation but within a dynamic bilingual system where second language gains may correlate with the first language maintenance costs. The emphasis on "*purpose*" suggests that intentional, strategic code-mixing yields vocabulary benefits, whereas habitual substitution may produce unbalanced bilingual development.

P2 and P4 strongly correlate through emphasis on situated learning and retention benefits, establishing code-mixing as superior to formal methods for vocabulary acquisition.

P2 states: "*it much more easier to learn by context using code mixing rather than learn from textbook,*"

While P4 affirms: "*by using a code mixing really help me to enrich and memorize my vocabulary.*" This dyad illustrates the core mechanism, lexical items gain meaning and durability when embedded in authentic bilingual discourse rather than decontextualized lists, directly evidencing how code-mixing operationalizes incidental learning theory, where repeated exposure in meaningful contexts fosters both comprehension and recall.

P3 and P5 converge on functional drivers, linking code-mixing to expressive needs that necessitate English vocabulary expansion.

P3 notes: "*using English is more concise or comfortable,*" *identifying semantic efficiency as motivation for lexical borrowing.*

P5 elaborates: "karena dia sering menggunakan... itu bisa membuatnya lebih ingat dengan bahasa inggris, di situ dia bisa menambah vocabulary-nya" (frequent use makes them remember English better, increasing vocabulary). Together, they demonstrate a reinforcement cycle: communicative gaps prompt code-mixing leads to English terms fill gaps then it leads to repeated application strengthens second language lexical access, creating self-sustaining vocabulary growth independent of formal instruction.

P1's skepticism diverges from the affirmative cluster but correlates inversely with their claims, creating a conditional validity framework. P1's critique *"menggunakan bahasa yang lumayan teknis atau mungkin bahasa yang jarang digunakan dalam percakapan sehari-hari"* (uses quite technical language rarely used in daily conversation) challenges whether code-mixing enriches usable vocabulary versus merely specialized jargon. This correlates negatively with P3's "concise/comfortable".

While P3 values vocabulary enabling precise expression, P1 questions whether technical terms acquired through code-mixing transfer to general communicative competence.

However, P1's divergence correlates complementarily with the affirmative cluster by introducing a domain specificity variable: vocabulary enrichment may vary based on lexical type (technical vs. general) and usage context (specialized discourse vs. everyday

conversation). This suggests the affirmative correlation between P2, P3, and P4 may apply primarily to domain-relevant vocabulary (gaming terms for P2, slang for P4, expressive vocabulary for P3), while P1's skepticism flags limitations when technical code-mixing vocabulary lacks broader applicability.

P4's explicit mention of memorization in "help me to enrich and memorize my vocabulary", correlates with P2's contextual learning through the depth-of-processing framework which is contextual learning (P2) naturally produces deeper semantic processing, which P4 experiences as enhanced memorization. This correlation quantifies the affirmative position in which convergence on context-memory pathways indicates that the majority perceive code-mixing as activating cognitive mechanisms (semantic integration, retrieval practice, usage-based reinforcement) that traditional vocabulary study may underutilize.

On the contrary, P5's balanced response correlates synergistically with both the affirmative cluster and P1's skepticism, creating a dual-process model which further leads to P5 affirms:

"karena dia sering menggunakan atau mencampurkan bahasa, itu bisa membuatnya lebih ingat dengan bahasa inggris, di situ dia bisa menambah vocabulary-nya" (because they often use or mix languages, it can make them remember English better, there they can increase their vocabulary).

The mechanics (frequency-driven retention) directly correlates with P4's memorization claim and P2's contextual learning in which repeated code-mixing practice that leads to contextualized usage resulting memory strengthening. This three-way correlation validates frequency as a critical mediator, with P5 making explicit what P2 and P4 imply that leads to sustained engagement that drives vocabulary gains.

The divergent responses indicate that code-mixing's vocabulary-enriching effects are perceived as conditional rather than universal. Affirmative participants emphasize contextual learning, mnemonic strengthening, and expressive precision as mechanisms through which code-mixing facilitates lexical growth. The skeptical view cautions that technical vocabulary may have limited transferability to general usage contexts. The balanced perspective integrates both positions, recognizing vocabulary gains while acknowledging potential first language trade-offs and emphasizing purposeful engagement as critical for optimal outcomes. Collectively, these perspectives suggest that code-mixing enriches English vocabulary most effectively when embedded in authentic communicative contexts, actively produced rather than passively encountered, addressing genuine expressive needs, and employed strategically rather than habitually, while remaining mindful of domain-specific versus general vocabulary utility .

Taken together, the answers show that participants largely converge on the idea that code mixing can help enrich English vocabulary, particularly when English items are used repeatedly in meaningful, comfortable expression. On the contrary, vocabulary were encountered in authentic context rather than isolation. At the same time, the data also indicate that this enrichment is not automatic or uniform; it is perceived as more effective when code mixing is purposeful and contextually relevant, and less so when it involves narrow, technical terms or leads to over-reliance on English at the expense of first language. This pattern directly supports the research claim that code-mixing engagement can help enrich students' English vocabulary, but under certain sociolinguistics and pedagogical conditions.

d. Contextual Usage Pattern of Using Code Mixing in Instagram Comment Section

By using the question of "*Can you explain situations where you would typically use code mixing in comments, and when you would prefer to stick to just one language?*" The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview.

The language usage in the comment section may vary in each individual comment by the user. This section present of how the

participants reveals overlapping yet complementary frameworks for language choice decisions, collectively illuminating the pragmatic contexts that trigger code-mixing engagement versus monolingual usage on Instagram comment section. These correlations directly address how participants typically employ bilingual versus monolingual strategies in comment interactions.

All participants demonstrated strategic, context-dependent language choices rather than habitual or indiscriminate code-mixing. Each respondent articulated clear situational criteria governing when to mix versus maintain monolingualism, contradicting assumptions of random bilingual practice. This unanimous pattern indicates that code-mixing engagement emerges through conscious pragmatic calculation aligned with communicative goals, audience characteristics, and linguistic resources, supporting the view that Instagram comment interactions provide structured rather than chaotic vocabulary learning environments.

P1 explained:

"biasanya aku menggunakan code mixing disaat aku ingin menggunakan kata yang lumayan spesifik akan tetapi aku tiba-tiba lupa atau bahkan kurang tahu kata yang tepat dalam bahasa Indonesianya sehingga mencampurkan kata yang spesifik dari bahasa lain" (I usually use code-mixing when I want to use quite specific words but suddenly forget or don't know the right word in

Indonesian language, so I mix in specific words from another language). This response underscores code-mixing as a compensatory strategy for domain-specific vocabulary deficits, where English provide precise lexical alternatives unavailable or inaccessible in the first language.

Then, P2 elaborated:

"I often use mixing when I need to explain something that was a bit tricky to explain in my own language because of lacks in vocabulary so that using English was the best decision." The explicit reference to 'tricky' concepts highlights code-mixing's role in conceptual clarification, positioning it as an adaptive mechanism that simultaneously exposes users to new English vocabulary during problem-solving discourse.

Furthermore, P3 concurred:

"I use code mixing in comments when I feel it's more suitable to said the topic or the opinion in another language than my native language."

This pragmatic orientation emphasizes perceived topical suitability, suggesting that code-mixing emerges when English aligns better with subject matter register, thereby enriching topic-specific lexical repertoires through contextual necessity.

Three participants explicitly identified lexical insufficiency as the primary situational trigger for code-mixing, demonstrating

remarkable thematic alignment. P1 stated, "*aku tiba-tiba lupa atau bahkan kurang tahu kata yang tepat dalam bahasa Indonesianya*" (I suddenly forget or don't know the right word in Indonesian language), P2 noted "*because of lacks in vocabulary*," and P3 explained "*when I feel it's more suitable to said the topic*" in another language. This convergence reveals a shared compensatory mechanism that leads to code-mixing that is deployed precisely when Indonesian vocabulary proves inadequate for conceptual precision, creating vocabulary-enriching moments where English lexical items are retrieved under communicative pressure. The correlation demonstrates that code-mixing is not arbitrary but response-driven, targeting semantic gaps that motivate active second language vocabulary retrieval and consolidation through necessity-based usage.

Two participants (P4 and P5) emphasized audience comprehension and content context as determinants of language choice, demonstrating strategic code-mixing calibrated to interlocutor linguistic competence.

P4 described: "*I would use a code mixing in the comments section when the video is from our country like Indonesia and seeing someone from another country asking about something that they don't know so I have to explain it using code mixing. like for example 'oh, so this is nasi padang and you have to eat it with you hand.'* I

will also stick to the one language if the content is from Indonesia and a lot of people in the comments are from Indonesia." This example illustrates cross-cultural accommodation, where code-mixing bridges first language cultural references with second language accessibility, facilitating vocabulary enrichment through explanatory bilingualism.

P5 provided the most analytically sophisticated response, acknowledging bidirectional effects of "*pertama, code mixing ini tujuannya apa dulu? Misalnya tadi untuk mengisi kalimat yang digunakan untuk menjelaskan idenya (secara lebih nyaman), ini bisa jadi memperkuat vocabulary bahasa inggris, bisa juga ni malah membatasi kemampuan berbahasa first languagenya. jadi karena dia terbiasa menggunakan bahasa atau istilah tertentu, dia jadi lupa atau jadi kurang terbiasa menggunakan first languagenya. tapi positifnya, karena dia sering menggunakan atau mencampurkan bahasa, itu bisa membuatnya lebih ingat dengan bahasa inggris, di situ dia bisa menambah vocabulary-nya*" (first, what is the purpose of code-mixing? For example, to fill sentences used to explain ideas [more comfortably], this can strengthen English vocabulary, but it can also limit first language proficiency. So because they are accustomed to using certain language terms, they forget or become less accustomed to using their first language. But positively, because they often use or mix languages, it can make them remember English

better, there they can increase their vocabulary).

P5's response introduces critical nuance that while acknowledging code-mixing's vocabulary-enhancing potential through repeated use and cognitive reinforcement, it simultaneously warns of first language attrition risks. This bidirectional perspective reveals that vocabulary enrichment occurs not in isolation but within a dynamic bilingual system where second language gains may correlate with the first language maintenance costs. The emphasis on 'purpose' suggests that intentional, strategic code-mixing yields vocabulary benefits, whereas habitual substitution may produce unbalanced bilingual development.

P2 practiced reciprocal adaptation "*if they only speak in English, so do I*", P4 employed bridging code-mixing when "*seeing someone from another country asking about something*", and P5 provided systematic audience profiling, checking whether Facebook groups contain "*orang-orang tua yang jarang terpapar dengan bahasa inggris*" (older people rarely exposed to English) versus Instagram/Twitter audiences. This convergence, though expressing different audience scenarios, reveals shared sociolinguistic competence which is when participants assess interlocutor bilingualism and adjust accordingly. The correlation indicates that code-mixing occurs in bilingual-competent contexts, ensuring vocabulary exposure happens within communicative and supportive

environments where mixed usage is mutually intelligible.

Another convergent were from P4 and P5 that uniquely considered content linguistic features when deciding language use. P4 distinguished Indonesian-origin content with Indonesian-dominant audiences (monolingual Indonesian) from intercultural scenarios requiring mediation. P5 systematically assessed whether the language is mixed in the original post before deploying code-mixing. This correlation introduces a third decision variable beyond individual lexical need and audience which code-mixing mirrors existing linguistic norms in the comment thread that leads to demonstrated genre awareness. For vocabulary enrichment, this suggests exposure amplification in which when content already mixes languages, participants' responsive code-mixing increases cumulative bilingual input through iterative interaction.

P4 uniquely specialized in cross-cultural explanation "*oh, so this is nasi padang and you have to eat it with your hand.*" While others mentioned general expressivity or audience, only P4 framed code-mixing as cultural translation for international interlocutors. This divergence complements the majority by identifying a specific high-value scenario which explaining first language cultural concepts in second language creates vocabulary-rich pedagogical moments where domain-specific terms like food, customs are explicitly taught, maximizing mnemonic consolidation through explanatory

elaboration.

All five participants identified situations warranting monolingual Indonesian, P1's "*forum resmi*" (formal forums), P2's English-only interlocutors (reciprocal English), P4's Indonesian-dominant threads, and P5's uncertain audience comprehension or elder demographics. This universal convergence establishes clear boundaries which is, code-mixing occurs in informal, bilingual-competent, heterogeneous contexts, while monolingualism prevails in formal or linguistically homogeneous settings. This demarcation clarifies that vocabulary enrichment through code-mixing depends on participatory contexts permitting linguistic flexibility in which Instagram comment sections qualify as low-formality, heterogeneous spaces enabling experimental bilingual practice.

Overall, the convergence across all participants on audience awareness combined with substantial recognition of lexical gaps and topic suitability reveals that code-mixing in Instagram comments is predominantly strategic rather than arbitrary. Participants deploy code-mixing when Indonesian vocabulary is insufficient for precise expression, necessitating English lexical retrieval, audiences are bilingual or require cross-cultural explanation, demanding productive English use, contexts are informal, permitting stylistic flexibility, and topics align with English semantic domains. Conversely, monolingual Indonesian is preferred when audiences

are monolingual Indonesian speakers, contexts are formal, or content is locally-oriented. These strategic patterns create systematic vocabulary learning opportunities specifically in high-engagement, authentic communication scenarios where lexical retrieval is functionally motivated rather than pedagogically imposed. The situational specificity suggests that vocabulary enrichment through code-mixing is most effective in informal, cross-cultural, or specialized discourse domains where English terminology provides communicative advantages that Indonesian alone cannot supply.

e. Preferability of Vocabulary Acquisition by Code Mixing Comment

Comment section may trigger one's interest. Instagram comment section engagement may be in one way only or be chained conversation which leads to broader use of vocabulary to express one's expression. Thus, commenting on Instagram comment section can be seen as an interesting activity or the comment section itself is already interesting without having to contribute to the section.

By using the question of *"In your experience, is it easier to get new vocabulary when you only read comments from people who contain code mixing, or is it easier to get new vocabulary from comments (which contain code mixing) from people who reply directly to your comments?"* The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview.

This section discussed how participants perceived greater vocabulary acquisition benefits from passive reading of code-mixed comments versus active engagement through receiving direct replies containing code-mixing. This distinction addresses a fundamental pedagogical question within the research question that whether observational exposure or interactive participation constitutes for the more effective vocabulary enrichment mechanism in social media contexts.

Two participants expressed preference for or equivalent efficacy of passive comment reading as a vocabulary acquisition strategy, emphasizing breadth of exposure and autonomous learning orientations.

P1 and P3 both favor passive reading but through distinct mechanisms that collectively validate observational learning's vocabulary-building potential. P1 emphasizes autonomous agency: *"sudah dirasa cukup untuk hanya membaca dan mencari tahu secara mandiri kosakata yang disebut"* (its enough to just read and independently find out about the vocabulary), positioning passive exposure as sufficient when coupled with self-directed follow-up research. P3 provides complementary reasoning focused on input quality of general comments contain *"pembicaraan yang lebih luas dan membutuhkan lebih banyak kosakata"* (broader conversations requiring more vocabulary) compared to simplified replies.

This convergence reveals two distinct advantages of passive reading which learner autonomy in processing pace and depth and exposure to lexically richer, unfiltered discourse. Together, they suggest that passive observation optimizes vocabulary breadth through extensive input, particularly for self-motivated learners who proactively engage with encountered vocabulary. The correlation directly addresses to the research by demonstrating that mere reading of code-mixed comments, without direct interaction, can enrich vocabulary when learners possess sufficient curiosity and when comments contain complex rather than simplified language.

On the contrary to P1 and P3 answers, P2 stands alone in explicitly favoring interactive replies: *"new vocabulary is easier to acquire when interacting."* This singular position diverges from the passive majority but introduces critical nuance in which interactive engagement may facilitate easier (not necessarily greater) acquisition through personalized, contextually-anchored input. While P2 lacks supporting voices among co-participants, this perspective aligns with social learning research demonstrating that direct replies create stronger memory traces through personal relevance and potential negotiation of meaning.

The divergence from P1 and P3 suggests that "easier" acquisition regarding to P2's criteria versus "sufficient" or "richer" acquisition refereed to P1 and P3's criteria represent different optimization

goals: interactive learning may reduce cognitive load through tailored input, while observational learning may maximize lexical variety despite requiring greater inferential effort.

Regarding to convergence on conditional factors, P4 and P5 correlate by refusing to prioritize either modality, instead identifying contingent variables. P4 emphasizes comprehensibility, "both of it really help me to increase a vocabulary, as long as i can understand," positioning intelligibility above participatory mode. P5 emphasizes novelty: "*apabila itu sudah sering muncul... maka tidak menambah kosakata, apabila baru maka saya akan mencari artinya*" (if it already appears frequently... then it doesn't add vocabulary; if new, I will search its meaning), subordinating modality to lexical unfamiliarity.

This reveals that neither passive nor interactive modes inherently guarantee vocabulary gains, rather, effectiveness depends on input characteristics (comprehensibility, novelty) that can occur in either modality. P4 and P5 implicitly correlate by suggesting that the passive-versus-interactive debate is secondary to whether encountered vocabulary is sufficiently contextualized for meaning inference and genuinely novel rather than redundant.

Notably, P5 also revealed practical constraints: "*saya sangat jarang menggunakan komentar di instagram*" (I very rarely use comments on Instagram), explaining limited experience with interactive

replies. This correlates inversely with P2's pro-interactive stance, suggesting that interactive learning effectiveness may depend on actual participatory behavior by those who comment frequently (implied for P2) encounter more reply-based vocabulary, while passive observers P1 and P5 must rely on reading general threads.

The lack of majority consensus indicates that code-mixing engagement enriches vocabulary through multiple valid pathways rather than a singular optimal mechanism.

The diverse perspectives indicate that vocabulary acquisition through code-mixed Instagram comments operates throughout multiple complementary mechanisms rather than a single optimal pathway. Passive observational learning statement provides advantages of lexical breadth, exposure to complex linguistic constructions, and suitability for autonomous learners, supporting receptive vocabulary development through extensive input. Interactive engagement learning offers advantages of personalized input, immediate relevance, and deeper processing through output demands, facilitating productive vocabulary consolidation. The comprehensibility criterion and novelty dependency suggest that effective vocabulary enrichment requires both sufficient contextual support for meaning inference and encounter with previously unknown lexical items.

f. Communication Affectiveness of Code Mixing in The Comment Section

Code mixing in the comment can be a weapon to pique other interesting or make the topics rather uninteresting due to the lack of one's interest.

By using the question of *"In your opinion, does the use of code-mixing in social media comments make communication more engaging or confusing? Why?"* The researcher yielded the data that acquired by each of the participant answer throughout the interview. This section discuss participants' perceptions of whether code-mixing in social media (especially in Instagram) comments enhances engagement or creates confusion, addressing the affective and pragmatic dimensions. This inquiry is theoretically significant to the study because affective responses, including interest, motivation, and comprehension anxiety, substantially influence vocabulary learning outcomes. If code-mixing generates confusion rather than engagement, its vocabulary-enriching potential may be undermined by negative affective responses that impede lexical processing.

Three participants explicitly characterized code-mixing as producing both engagement and confusion, representing the strongest thematic convergence in this data set.

P2 stated *"it's both, because it can be more engaging if the topic was*

interesting... and it can be confusing too if we are not really understand the context." P4 echoed: *"using code mixing will make you both confusing and engaging."* P5 paralleled: *"i'm fine with code mixing. it's still engaging, but it must be confusing if the person doesn't know what the english words meaning."*

P4 and P5 establishes that code-mixing's affective impact is inherently bifurcated rather than singular, with outcomes determined by contingent variables. However, the three participants diverge on which contingencies matter most, P2 emphasizes topic familiarity and contextual clarity, P4 foregrounds interlocutor bilingual proficiency, and P5 highlights individual lexical knowledge. This distributed specification collectively constructs a multi-factorial model where code-mixing engages when topics are inherently interesting with adequate contextual scaffolding, conversational partners share sufficient English competence, and individuals possess requisite vocabulary to process mixed discourse.

Vocabulary enrichment through code-mixing succeeds only within a 'Goldilocks zone' where all three conditions align of engaging topics maintain attention, bilingual-competent interlocutors normalize mixed usage, and learners possess intermediate vocabulary enabling partial comprehension that motivates gap-filling. When any condition fails, boring topics, monolingual audience, or excessive lexical unfamiliarity, confusion overrides

engagement, creating affective barriers that impede vocabulary acquisition.

Meanwhile, P1 correlated obliquely with the dual-function majority by adopting a perspectival stance of "*tergantung bagaimana kita dalam menanggapi. karena tiap orang memiliki kepentingan dan tujuannya masing-masing*" (it depends on how we respond to it. Because each person has their own interests and goals).

While P2, P4, and P5 identify objective situational factors (topic, audience, vocabulary), P1 emphasizes subjective interpretive agency, the same code-mixed comment may engage learners with vocabulary development goals while confusing those seeking only immediate comprehension.

P1's perspective complements the majority by adding a metacognitive layer even when P2's, P4's, and P5's favorable conditions exist (interesting topic, bilingual audience, adequate vocabulary), learners must also possess intentional learning orientations to transform code-mixing exposure into vocabulary gains. This correlation reveals that affective responses (engagement vs. confusion) are not purely stimulus-driven but mediated by learner dispositions, explaining why identical code-mixed discourse produces differential vocabulary enrichment across individuals.

P3 stands isolated in asserting unqualified positive effects: "*Of course it will be more engaging & interesting... opens up many*

things that can be discussed more broadly." This diverges sharply from the acknowledging confusion potential (P1, P2, P4, and P5). P3's exclusive focus on engagement benefits (topical breadth, conversational interest) omits comprehensibility challenges entirely. However, this divergence may be complementary rather than contradictory. P3 likely represents an optimal learner profile (high proficiency, strong motivation, vocabulary-development goals) for whom code-mixing indeed produces predominantly positive effects because P2's, P4's, and P5's confusing conditions rarely apply. P3's experience thus validates that code-mixing can be purely engaging for advanced bilinguals, while P2, P4 and P5's dual perspectives capture intermediate learners who navigate both benefits and barriers.

Implicitly, P4 and P5 specifically correlate through shared emphasis on English vocabulary knowledge as the confusion determinant. P4 stated *"sometimes you'll find someone confused and make you stick to only one language."* furthermore, P5 stated that *"it must be confusing if the person doesn't know what the english words meaning."* This pinpoints lexical comprehension as the critical gating factor distinguishing engagement from confusion.

This correlation directly addresses vocabulary enrichment mechanisms of code-mixing enrichment vocabulary only for learners above a minimum proficiency threshold where English

lexical knowledge suffices to maintain comprehension despite encountering unfamiliar terms. Below this threshold (P5's "person who doesn't know"), confusion dominates, impeding learning, above it (P3's implicit position), engagement facilitates acquisition. The P4-P5 correlation thus suggests that Instagram code-mixing environments optimally enrich vocabulary for intermediate-proficiency learners positioned between prohibitive confusion and redundant familiarity.

The convergence on conditional/dual perspectives of P1, P2, P4, and P5 versus unconditional endorsement of P3 establishes that code-mixing's affective impact (and thus vocabulary-enriching capacity) is overwhelmingly context-dependent rather than inherent. The distributed specifications across participants collectively answer the interview question that code-mixing is engaging when learners possess adequate proficiency (P4, P5), encounter interesting and contextualized topics (P2), interact with bilingual-competent partners (P4), and adopt intentional learning stances (P1), it becomes confusing when these conditions fail.

This conditional model directly connected to the one of the main research of this study by revealing that vocabulary enrichment through code-mixed Instagram engagement is not automatic but requires alignment of multiple factors such as, affective engagement (interesting content maintaining attention), cognitive scaffolding

(sufficient context enabling meaning inference), social support (bilingual community normalizing mixed usage), and learner intentionality (vocabulary development goals). The high convergence on conditionality suggests Instagram's code-mixed comment sections function as differentiated learning environments where vocabulary enrichment outcomes vary systematically based on learner proficiency levels, topic engagement, audience composition, and metacognitive orientations.

B. Discussion

In this section, the information that acquired throughout the findings are utilized to answer the research question regarding to the types of code mixing that the students' use in instagram and how code mixing engagement can enrich students vocabulary.

1. The Type of Code Mixing Used by The Students'

The findings shows that all participants recognized code-mixing as a common and meaningful practice on Instagram, though their understanding ranged from intuitive to theoretical. Most described it as intra-sentential language mixing, aligning with Muysken's (2000) typology and showing awareness of Instagram's informal, multilingual environment that encourages bilingual expression. This finding supported Androutsopoulos (2015), who noted that social media

promotes code-mixing as both an identity marker and a communicative tool.

Analysis of participants' examples showed a clear structural pattern which leads to insertion as the dominant type, followed by alternation and congruent lexicalization. This confirmed that code-mixing on Instagram followed consistent linguistic structures rather than random alternations. The predominance of insertion echoed Wahyuningsih et al. (2024), while the presence of all three types indicated diverse strategies motivated by lexical precision and social informality. Through such usage, English vocabulary was naturally integrated into Indonesian discourse, supporting authentic and context-based vocabulary enrichment.

2. Students' Engagement in Instagram Comment Section to Enrich Vocabulary

The findings of this study demonstrated that code-mixing on Instagram enriched students' English vocabulary through interconnected sociolinguistic, motivational, and cognitive processes. Participants reported that their code-mixing practices were shaped by online trends, peer networks, and communicative needs, which collectively generated frequent, contextualised exposure to English vocabulary in authentic digital interactions. However, vocabulary enrichment was conditional rather than universal, it occurred most effectively when learners

possessed intermediate proficiency, encountered comprehensible and contextually supported input, and engaged actively with code-mixed content. Participants strategically deployed code-mixing in informal, peer-oriented contexts to fill lexical gaps or achieve expressive precision, while reverting to monolingual use in formal settings or with less proficient audiences. This strategic behaviour created dual learning pathways which passive reading of diverse comment threads built receptive vocabulary breadth, while active participation in reply-based exchanges strengthened productive vocabulary depth through retrieval practice and social interaction.

Code-mixing enriches vocabulary most effectively when intermediate-proficiency students strategically engage in bilingual-competent Instagram communities where trending terms provide input, peer interaction offers scaffolding, communicative needs drive retrieval, contextual embedding supports inference, dual modalities maximize exposure and processing, and affective engagement sustains motivation that transform incidental exposure into purposeful lexical development. This discovery align with previous study of Guimong et al., (2025) and other study from Mubarak & Febriyanti (2024) which discover THAT using code mixing can make student's gain more vocabulary.

Despite its potential benefits, code-mixing also presented challenges that moderated its effectiveness. Participants recognised it as simultaneously engaging and confusing, with its impact dependent on

audience proficiency and contextual clarity. For bilingual-competent users, code-mixing sustained motivation and facilitated vocabulary acquisition through repeated exposure and communicative necessity. For less proficient learners, however, it risked creating comprehension barriers that hindered understanding and limited learning opportunities. Overall, code-mixing emerged as a pedagogically valuable yet context-dependent resource for vocabulary development, yielding optimal outcomes when learners exercised strategic awareness, maintained intentional learning orientations, and participated in supportive bilingual communities where English use was both meaningful and comprehensible.