CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Design

This research adopts a qualitative framework employing a descriptive-informant strategy. Such a method suits the objective of delving into the nuances of code-mixing specifically its forms and underlying influences from the viewpoints of those involved. The descriptive-informant approach systematically documents the traits and occurrences among English Tadris Department students under examination.

Sugiyono defines a research approach as the overarching method or plan selected to address investigative questions, with qualitative methods prioritizing interpretation, dynamics, and profound insight.[1] Arikunto, meanwhile, characterizes descriptive research as an effort to portray phenomena, occurrences, or events as they manifest during the investigation.[2]

Thus, this inquiry employs a qualitative-descriptive design centered on thorough fieldwork to probe real-world occurrences.[3] It seeks precise, on-site evidence to analyze code-mixing within casual dialogues of the English Tadris community at UIN A.M. Sangadji Ambon's campus. The

[1] Sugiyono, Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2019), p. 9.
[2] Suharsimi Arikunto, Research Procedures: A Practical Approach (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2010), p.
[3] John W. Creswell, Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 5th ed. (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2018), hlm. 41–45.

focus falls on the English Tadris group at UIN A.M. Sangadji Ambon, who routinely blend languages in everyday talk yet often overlook the categories and motivations involved. This underscores the value of exploring code-mixing in their informal campus exchanges to pinpoint its varieties and determinants.

B. Informants

An informant is a person who provides information related to the research. Based on this, informants can be considered respondents. A subject who understands knowledge about the research object as the actor or another individual who understands the research object is called a research informant.[4]

The selected informants are English language teaching students who are actively involved in informal conversations on campus and demonstrate the practice of code-switching (Indonesian–English) in daily interactions within the campus environment. These informants are considered capable of providing a realistic picture of the types and factors of code-switching that occur in informal conversations among students.

In qualitative research, according to Haryana, informants are divided into three categories: key informants, primary informants, and supporting informants.

1. Key information

[4] Suharsimi Arikunto, *Research Procedures: A Practical Approach* (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2013), p. 272.

Key information not only involves understanding the conditions and phenomena being investigated by the researcher, but also includes information that provides a complete picture of the problem being investigated.

2. Primary Informant

   Therefore, the primary source of information is an individual who has a technical and thorough understanding of the research problem to be studied.

3. Supporting Informants

   Supporting informants refer to anyone who can provide information as a means of analysis and discussion in a qualitative study.[5]

Sixteen English Tadris Department from UIN A.M. Sangadji Ambon participated in this study as informants, consisting of:

a) 8 English Tadris Department students from semester 5 (primary informants).
b) 6 English Tadris Department students from semester 7 (key informants)
c) 2 English Tadris Department students, one from semester 5 and the other from semester 7 (supporting informants).

C. Research Location

1. Time

[5] Ade Heryana, *Informants and the Selection of Informants in Qualitative Research* (Jakarta: Universitas Esa Unggul, 2020), pp. 4–6.

This research was conducted over a period of two months, from August to 2025. During this time, various research activities were carried out to collect data and analyze information relevant to the topic being studied. The research team worked intensively to ensure that all aspects of the study could be executed effectively and in accordance with the established plan. With a limited timeframe, every step in the research process was optimized to ensure that the results obtained could make a significant contribution to a deeper understanding of the issues being investigated.

2. Place

This research was conducted or located at UIN A.M Sangadji Ambon of the campus, which was selected purposively because it was considered relevant to the research focus.

D. Data Collection

The data collection techniques used in this research are as follows:

1. **Observation**

Sugiyono describes observation as a data-gathering method involving firsthand scrutiny of subjects in their natural setting.[6] In this study, it enabled direct insight into code-mixing manifestations during routine campus interactions. Observations targeted informal exchanges among English Education students across various campus sites. Broadly, findings revealed code-mixing as commonplace in student dialogues,

[6] Sugiyono. (2019). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. Bandung: Alfabeta.

particularly surrounding scholarly matters, digital tools, and leisure pursuits. Insertions of English terms like “thanks,” “deadline,” “update,” or “meeting” into Indonesian speech proved routine, valued for their brevity and familiarity in the secondary tongue.

Fieldwork spanned key venues, including lecture rooms, lounges, organizational hubs, the library, and communal spaces. At each, notations captured code-mixing variants, contextual patterns, and precipitating elements.

This firsthand monitoring disclosed code-mixing as more than linguistic routine it emerges as a purposeful tactic shaped by scholarly demands, tech influences, communal dynamics, and group affiliations. These insights lay a foundational understanding of the motivations, structures, and roles of code-mixing among English Education students at UIN A.M. Sangadji Ambon.

2. **Interview**

Lexy J. characterizes an interview as a purposeful dialogue between two parties: the interviewer posing queries and the interviewee furnishing responses.[7] Essentially, it constitutes a face-to-face questioning technique to elicit detailed information (data) from participants. Here, participants comprised members of the English Tadris Society at UIN A.M. Sangadji Ambon.

[7] Moleong, LJ (2017). *Qualitative Research Methodology*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Interviews in this inquiry aimed to uncover nuanced details on code-mixing within students' routine campus exchanges. They allowed probing of informants' perspectives, rationales, and firsthand encounters with multilingual communication. Key elements of the interviews conducted include the following:

a. **Interview Data Collection Technique**

The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured format, in which the researcher prepared a list of main questions but still provided space for the informants to freely explain their opinions. This technique was chosen because it is flexible and allows the researcher to explore deeper information regarding students' experiences, language habits, and the reasons they use code-mixing in informal conversations on campus. It also enables the researcher to understand the phenomenon of code-mixing not only from its linguistic forms but also from the social, psychological, and situational aspects that underlie it.

b. Purposes of Interview

This interview was conducted to answer the research problem statements, namely:

1) Identifying the types of code mixing
2) Identifying and anaylize the reason influencing that cause code mixing.

c. Interview Procedure

1) The author contacted the participants and explained the purpose of the study.
2) The author requested the participants' consent to conduct the interview and audio recording.
3) The interview was conducted face-to-face.
4) The duration of each interview was approximately 15–20 minutes.
5) The interview data were recorded, transcribed, and subsequently analyzed using thematic analysis techniques.

Interviews yielded key patterns, including prevalent code-mixing varieties and informants' rationales for its use (e.g., aligning with scholarly terms, cultural norms, or digital influences), alongside their attitudes toward it and its effects on comprehension and interaction. Participants further highlighted contexts where it intensified, notably in scholarly exchanges and everyday chats.

3. **Documentation**

Documentation entails gathering data on topics or variables through records like notes, transcripts, publications, periodicals, meeting logs, schedules, and similar materials. In this study, it served as a supplementary method to enrich findings from observations and interviews on code-mixing within campus settings. It involved compiling textual and visual artifacts that bolstered evidence of code-mixing applications in university life. Collected items encompassed:

a. Field notes, capturing synopses of observational outcomes such as interactional scenarios, speech patterns, and dialogue settings unrecordable via audio or video.
b. Photographs or visuals, documenting code-mixing in communal displays like posters, presentation slides, notice boards, and assorted textual media observed across campus.

E. Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis techniques comprise methodical steps for refining, arranging, and interpreting gathered information, transforming it into coherent, pertinent insights aligned with the study's aims. This encompasses data condensation, display, inference formulation, and validation to uncover latent structures, connections, and implications, thereby bolstering result credibility. The following approaches were applied in this investigation:

1. Data Reduction

This involves sifting, prioritizing, and streamlining data from observations and interviews. Here, the focus narrowed to student casual dialogues featuring code-mixing, sorted by categories like insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Such refinement pinpointed material pertinent to the research queries, advancing only code-mixing-relevant instances for deeper scrutiny.

2. Data Presentation (Data Display)

This step organizes condensed data into accessible formats for straightforward interpretation. In this work, findings appear via tables and textual accounts: tables enumerate code-mixing types with illustrative dialogue snippets, while narratives offer explanatory analysis. This arrangement reveals recurring patterns and drivers of language blending in students' informal campus exchanges.

3. **Conclusion Drawing and Verification**

This culminating phase of analysis derives insights from processed data to address the study's inquiries. It entails interpreting displayed findings to pinpoint dominant code-mixing forms among students and their precipitating factors in casual dialogues. Conclusions undergo validation through cross-checking original data, safeguarding the precision and reliability of outcomes.