LiNGUA Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra

LiNGUA Vol. 20, No. 2, December 2025 • ISSN 1693-4725 • e-ISSN 2442-3823

Streaming Selves: Vulgar Language, Code-Mixing, and Hybrid Communal Identity of an Indonesian Live-Streamer

Fariq Shiddiq Tasaufy [1], **Cicilia Deandra Maya Putri** [2], **Slamet Setiawan** [3], **Ayunita Leliana**[4], **Lina Purwaning Hartanti** [5], **Imam Hanafi** [6], **Noerhayati Ika Putri** [7]

[2] ciciliaputri@unesa.ac.id
[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
[7] Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

First Received: 15/08/2025; Final Proof Received: 02/12/2025; Accepted: 08/12/2025

Abstract

This paper examines how an Indonesian live-streamer and his audiences create a hybrid communal identity by using vulgar language and code-mixing with reference to the popular YouTube livestream @deandeankt. With the digital medium transforming the world into a global village, the streaming culture in Indonesia provides a distinct perspective into how localized linguistic practices interact with global trends in the internet. The interpretivist-constructivist paradigm applied in the current case study research was aimed at understanding the way language and interaction produced hybrid identities. It gathered linguistic and paralinguistic data of @deadndeakt's livestream for 90 minutes with netnography and thematic analyses. According to the study, abusive swearing (e.g., "*kontol* [dick]", "goblok [stupid]") represents 89.3 percent of the vulgar language and serves as playful insults, which enhance group cohesion. Emphatic swearing ("Anjing! Gua kalah! [Bitch! I lost!]") and cathartic swearing ("*Ngentot*, mic-nya rusak! [Fuck, the microphone is broken!]") increase the emotional involvement. Intra-sentential blends, especially code-mixing ("Brightness-*nya kita bikin tiga kali* [We increase the brightness threefold]"), prevails in 85 percent. Other examples combine English gaming slang (template, unarchive) with Indonesian structure and local dialects, like a Javanese swear word ("*Cok* [Damn]"). Pronunciations, such as BTW [read in Indonesian: *be te we*] are even more localized global terms. It is analyzed that the vulgar language usage assists in persona creation and building of relationships with the audience, creating a tight-knit, exclusive community in which such language represents belonging and emotional release, despite its offensiveness in the larger society. Moreover, streamers combine Indonesian and English with gaming jargon to successfully appeal to their bilingual audience, so that they could be technically accurate and still fit into the global gaming cultures. These activities form a hybrid identity, where speakers possess a strong sense of Indonesian culture but are consistent with international trends, which strengthens group exclusivity. The results draw attention to live-streaming as a contact zone in which language negotiates belonging, which disrupts strict cultural boundaries. The study highlights the sociolinguistic innovativeness of online communities and recommends future research on offline effects of these online linguistic norms and the effects of the hybrid identities and communicative practices used in live-streaming communities on daily language, social interaction, and identity formation in the real world. The authors also suggest cross-cultural comparative research to find out whether the phenomena are specific to the Indonesian situation or have they become a global trend.

Keywords: code-mixing; digital discourse; hybrid identity, Indonesian streamer; vulgar language.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of online platforms has altered the practice of language, creating new forms of identity in online communities. This paper will discuss how the concept of code-mixing interacts with the use of vulgar language (profanity/swearing) and how it influences the development of hybrid identity in the digital streaming environment of Indonesia. Being one of the most visited social media in Indonesia, YouTube is a dynamic platform of hybrid interaction, as streamers and viewers interact in real time (synchronous communication) and through comments (asynchronous communication) (Susilo & Sugihartati, 2021). Live streaming, such is that which the @deandeankt account often does, is a form of synchronous interaction, where content creators and viewers engage in a real-time, unplanned interaction that can result in the use of unfiltered, vernacular language. On the other hand, asynchronous interactions enable delayed and more thoughtful responses, but both forms add to a common linguistic repertoire that strengthens in-group identity (Wohn & Freeman, 2020). In these spaces, language not only serves as a means of communication, but as a sign of belonging, with exclusive codes, like the use of gaming slang (e.g., AFK, OP, KS), intimate address pronouns, and local slang, establishing a sense of belonging.

Hybrid communal identity is the result of the fusion of cultural and linguistic resources, which is formed due to the dynamic circulation of codes, symbols and multilingual practices (Belgrade et al., 2021; Gonçalves, 2013; Oesterheld, 2016; Schiff et al., 2012; Szpunar, 2024). This hybridity is an extension of the larger process of multicultural identity formation (Appadurai, 2014; Bhabha, 2012), in which digital platforms serve as contact zones (Pratt, 2012) and a space of identity exchange (Kljun, 2015; Pujiati et al., 2025), i.e., multilingual spaces in which identities are negotiated and performed (Androutsopoulos, 2013; Jenkins, 2006). This negotiation of identity is especially apparent in the strategic application of vulgar language, code-mixing, and local adaptations of the global internet slang, which are both social bonding practices (Fatkhiyati, et al., 2024; Setiawan and Lestyarini, 2024; Cachola et al., 2018; Cameron, 2020; Holgate et al., 2018; Stapleton, 2010) and identity markers (Setiawan, Suhardi, and Lestyarini, 2024).

The language use in Indonesian live-streaming sessions has unique characteristics of the virtual register, such as: vulgar language and intimate addressing pronouns (to establish camaraderie), domain-specific terms (e.g., gaming abbreviations), code-mixing between regional language and global language (e.g., mixing Bahasa Indonesia, English, and local dialects), and phonological adaptation (e.g., vowel lengthening imitating colloquial Indonesian speech). These characteristics add to a hybrid linguistic identity that is both locally-based and globally-shaped, strengthening the persona of the streamer (Hsieh et al., 2018), as well as creating a sense of exclusivity among viewers (Guarin & Cardoso, 2023; Maseko & Siziba, 2023; McGlashan, 2020). Through these practices, this paper provides an insight into the ways in which digital spaces are facilitating new modes of linguistic hybridity and communal identity formation in the changing media space in Indonesia.

Vulgar language is used to express strong emotions, such as anger, frustration, or surprise (Cachola et al., 2018; Holgate et al., 2018). In the micro-contextual situation, the use of vulgar language is considered taboo, functioning as a sign of contempt and criticism, and is deployed sarcastically. On the other hand, within a specific social group, this kind of profanity can indicate identity and solidarity (Gupta & Dwivedi, 2023; Stankevičiūtė, 2018). Vulgar language is often associated with swearing, profanity, or cursing. Trudgill categorizes swearing words based on their sociolinguistic aspects, including social class, gender, and group identity. These words are not explicitly categorized in the abstract, but rather focus on social factors. On the contrary, Pinker (2007) categorizes swearing into its functional, emotional, and contextual factors. There are five types of swearing, including descriptive swearing, idiomatic swearing, cathartic swearing, abusive swearing, and emphatic swearing.

Descriptive swearing is used to describe something vividly, that is, expressing a literal description using swear words. Next, idiomatic swearing is used casually without a direct reference to the literal meaning of the words, expressing non-literal words that fit with the group. Cathartic swearing is used to release emotions in response to pain and frustration, such as using taboo words to release the stress of pain. Abusive swearing is used directly to interlocutors to insult or demean. It includes any swearing that is intended to cause harm or offense to others and is often used in an

aggressive context, such as "*asu"* (dog) and *"kontol"* (penis). Emphatic swearing is used to emphasize a point or add intensity to a statement, i.e., any form of swearing that is characterized by intensifying. This type of swearing may be similar to the previous types, but the differences lie in the tone reflected by the suprasegmental feature during the live interaction.

Beyond the affective and relational functions of vulgar language, hybrid communal identity is also sustained through the systematic blending of linguistic resources from different languages within the same communicative event. Through such multilingual practices, streamers are able to align themselves simultaneously with local cultural norms and global digital cultures, thereby extending the semiotic work of vulgar language into broader processes of identity negotiation. Such blending of different languages in a communicative vent is known as code-mixing.

Code-mixing refers to the practice of alternating between two or more languages within a single conversation, sentence, clause, or even phrase (Muysken, 2007; Poplack, 1988). This phenomenon is common in bilingual or multilingual environments, including online media (Rahmawati & Nur'aini, 2020). Although Deuchar and Stammers (2016) questioned the terms by addressing donor-language versus host-language in the context of Welsh, this study does not approach the code in the same manner. Indonesian people mostly use their national language and vernacular during conversation. It can be assumed that Deuchar's case may not be equalized to this study. The phenomena of bilingual speech production include code-mixing and code-switching. Depending on the interlocutor and the communication domain, bilinguals frequently use their languages in conversation. Both phenomena similarly use two or more languages. Thus, the present study will use the term *code-mixing* throughout this investigation, following Clyne (in Myers-Scotton, 2006), who integrates code-mixing and code-switching into a concept of transference.

According to Hoffman (1991), there are three types of code-mixing: 1) intra-sentential code-mixing, 2) intra-lexical code-mixing, and 3) involving a change of pronunciation. Intra-sentential code-mixing occurs when two languages are mixed within a single sentence. For instance, the sentence "*Aku* literally *main* game *tiap hari,"* comes from an English sentence, "I literally play games every day" but some Indonesian words are inserted within the sentence. Intra-lexical code-mixing happens when components from two different languages are combined to create a single word. For example, the word "*jujurly"* is a combination of an Indonesian word "*jujur"* [honest] and an English morpheme "-ly", creating a new word which means "honestly" in English. The third type of code-mixing involves a change in pronunciation, where a speaker changes how they pronounce a word or phrase, usually to match the pronunciation of another language being used. For example, a speaker may use an Indonesian accent when pronouncing an English word to sound clearer to interlocutors.

Previous studies have demonstrated that both vulgar language and multilingual practices play important roles in shaping social relations and identity in digital communication. Research on online swearing shows that profanity is not merely a marker of aggression or taboo but functions as a resource for emotional expression, humor, social bonding, and in-group alignment (Cachola et al., 2018; Holgate et al., 2018; Cameron, 2020; Setiawan et al., 2024). In parallel, scholarship on code-mixing and multilingual discourse highlights how speakers strategically draw on multiple linguistic resources to manage audience design, signal affiliation, and negotiate identity in online environments (Androutsopoulos, 2013; Muysken, 2007; Rahmawati & Nur'aini, 2020; Dubravac & Skopljak, 2020). Studies of hybridity and multicultural identity further emphasize that identities are produced through the interaction of cultural and linguistic resources in contexts shaped by mobility and digital connectivity (Bhabha, 2012; Szpunar, 2024; Belgrade et al., 2021). More recently, research on digital communities and live-streaming platforms has shown how linguistic practices contribute to persona construction, community cohesion, and collective belonging (Wohn & Freeman, 2020; Guarin & Cardoso, 2023; McGlashan, 2020). Together, these studies establish a strong foundation for understanding language in online interaction while pointing to the need for closer examination of how multiple linguistic strategies interact within live, performative digital spaces.

Despite this growing body of scholarship, existing research tends to examine vulgar language and multilingual practices as analytically separate phenomena. Profanity is often investigated in terms of emotion, power, or social alignment, while code-mixing is typically approached as a structural feature of bilingual communication. As a result, limited attention has been paid to how

these two resources operate together in real-time digital interaction to construct hybrid communal identity, particularly in non-Western live-streaming contexts. Moreover, much of the literature on hybridity focuses on offline multicultural settings, leaving the micro-level linguistic processes of identity negotiation in live online performance underexplored. To address this gap, the present study investigates how vulgar language and multilingual practices intertwine in Indonesian YouTube live-streaming. Accordingly, this study is guided by the following research questions: (1) What types of vulgar language are used in Indonesian live-streaming interactions, and what social functions do they perform? (2) What patterns of multilingual practice characterize these interactions? (3) How do vulgar language and multilingual practices operate together in constructing hybrid communal identity in Indonesian live-streaming communities? Taken together, these findings confirm that vulgar language and multilingual practices operate as an integrated semiotic system through which Indonesian streamers and their audiences construct hybrid communal identity in real-time digital interaction.

METHOD

This research was a case study that adopted an interpretivist-constructivist paradigm, emphasizing how hybrid identity was constructed through language and interaction. It employed online ethnography to gather linguistic and paralinguistic data from 90 minutes of *@deandeankt*'s livestream. This method was used because the data from the internet space was embedded in the innate online context, not in an artificial setting (Kozinets, 2010). Thus, new communication norms may be discovered (Varis & Blommaert, 2015). Primary data included transcriptions of stream content, focusing on instances of vulgar language and code-mixing (Indonesian-Javanese-English blends), supplemented by time-stamped notes (passive observation) on contextual cues (e.g., humor, audience, live-chat, and reactions). Manual transcription was employed to capture the tone, intent, and accuracy of the hybrid language used during the stream, including abbreviations and vernacular items that are not recognized by automatic transcription tools.

To analyze communal hybrid identity constructed through vulgar language and code mixing, this study employed the latest model (Naeem et al., 2023) of Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Clarke & Braun, 2013). The thematic analysis offered flexibility to capture the emergence of hybrid identity themes. It fits the interpretivist paradigm (put extra information and details). To categorize the vulgar language, Pinker's typology (2007) was used to refine broader themes represented by the collected data. To analyze code-mixing, this study adopted Muysken's (2007) sociolinguistic framework, which categorizes mixed-language utterances based on structural and functional patterns. Unlike the well-known Poplack typology (1988), Muysken accommodates rule-breaking mixes that reflect identity through the structural precision of the mixed hybrid language.

ANALYSIS

The findings of swear words (vulgar language) in *@deandeankt*'s streaming video revealed a dynamic interplay of swearing strategies and code-mixing practices, reflecting both global gaming culture and linguistic creativity. Drawing on Pinker's (2007) typology, the data showcase a prevalence of cathartic swearing (e.g., "What the fuck is that?") for in-game reactions, idiomatic swearing (e.g., "*anjay* [dog]," "good game,") as normalized slang, and abusive swearing (e.g., "*goblok*," [stupid] ,"*anjing,*" [dog]) in competitive taunts. Emphatic and descriptive swearing further highlight how language evolves in digital communities, blending global gaming jargon with Indonesian and vernacular expressions. Simultaneously, Hoffman's (1991) framework illuminates pervasive code-mixing, including intra-sentential blends (e.g., "brightness-*nya* kita bikin tiga kali [We increase the brightness threefold]", morphological hybrids (e.g., "*nge*-lag" [lagging], "*di*-request" [requested]) and pronunciation adaptations (e.g., "BTW" [by the way, read: be te we], "*merit*" [married]). Together, these practices demonstrate how language evolves in digital communities—serving emotional release, in-group identity, and performative entertainment, while bridging English gaming jargon with Indonesian colloquialism.

Table 1. Data Tabulation of Vulgar Language and Code-Mixing

Category	Subcategory	Frequency	Percentage	Examples
Vulgar Language	Abusive Swearing (AS)	207	89.3%	"*Kontol,*" (Penis), "*Babi,*" (Pig), "*Goblok,*" (Stupid).
	Emphatic Swearing (ES)	9	6%	"*Anjing! Gua kalah!*" (Damn! I lost!)
	Cathartic Swearing (CS)	8	4.7%	"*Ngentot, mic-nya rusak!*" (Fuck, the mic is broken!)
	Descriptive Swearing (DS)	0	0%	Not observed
	Idiomatic Swearing (ISw)	0	0%	Not observed
Total Vulgar Language		**224**	**100%**	
Code-Mixing	Intra-sentential Mixing (IS)	77	85%	"*Terima kasih sudah bekerja* shift *malam,*" (Thank you for working the night shift).
	Intra-lexical Mixing (IL)	8	9%	"*mood-nya*" (the mood), "*di-*request" (requested).
	Pronunciation Change (P)	5	6%	"BTW" pronounced as [be te we], "mic" as [mık]
Total Code-Mixing		**90**	**100%**	

Table 1 shows that specific linguistic units are dominantly used during live streaming. Based on Pinker's research (2007), abusive swearing is the most frequently used (89,3%), followed by emphatic swearing (6%) and cathartic swearing (4,7%). For the code-mixing categorization based on Hoffman's research (1991), it has been found that the streamer @*deandeankt*'s live streaming employed mostly intra-sentential code-mixing (85%), followed by intra-lexical code-mixing (9%), and pronunciation changes (6%).

This pattern confirms and extends earlier findings on the social functions of swearing in digital environments; vulgar language in social media is not solely associated with aggression, but also serves expressive and relational purposes, such as humor, emotional release, and in-group bonding (Cachola et al., 2018; Holgate et al., 2018). The present findings also align with this argument, particularly in the frequent use of abusive terms (e.g., *anjing* [dog], *goblok* [stupid], and *cok* [damn]) in playful and non-offensive interactions. However, this study further demonstrates that within Indonesian live-streaming culture, abusive swearing is normalized to such an extent that it functions less as an act of verbal violence and more as a marker of intimacy and shared identity, which is less explicitly emphasized in other prior studies in vulgar language or online ethnography.

In contrast to Cameron's (2020) findings, where the use of vulgar language is ascribed as the performance of masculinity and power, Indonesian livestreaming accounts or Indonesian gaming streams employ the swearing as a mechanism of communal alignment rather than ideological positioning. This study shows that during the stream, the role of swearing is to construct social relationships. It also shows that vulgarity is less about dominance and more about solidarity, humor, and emotional attachment between the streamer and the viewers. This claim is also supported by the use of cathartic and empathic swearing that frequently accompanies moments of frustration or surprise in online interaction, such as in the expressions of "*Ngentot, mic-nya rusak!* [Fuck, the microphone is broken!]*"* and "*Bangsat, nggak kena!* [Damn, I missed]". Those examples illustrate how swearing operates as an immediate emotional outlet (Holgate, et al., 2018). However, unlike Western streamers/platforms where cathartic swearing often escalates into conflict, this study shows that such utterances rarely disrupt social harmony, and are rapidly absorbed into ongoing humorous interaction. This highlights a culturally specific pattern in which emotional expressivity through profanity is socially tolerated within the streaming community.

The Use of Vulgar Language: Abusive vs Emphatic

One of the most commonly used expletives in the live streaming of @deandeankt's show is the word *anjing* (meaning dog). The application of this term can be divided into three types in terms of functionality, which are abusive, cathartic and emphatic. In expressions like: "*Lu anjing!"* ("You

dog!"), "*Anjing lu mas*!" ("You are a dog, Bro!") and "Viewer *anjing ini ribut mulu*!" ("These damn viewers will not hush up!"), *anjing* is a provocative or derisive use, generally aimed at a second person (in this case, it can be viewers and in-game partners or opponents). It is not always hostile, although it expresses great emotion. In English, this would be something like "You bastard!" The other most common and most intense words are abusive functions that are mostly directed to opponents, viewers, or in-game characters, which are very offensive. The words are: *kontol* ("penis", 17 instances), *babi* ("pig", 15 instances), *memek* ("vagina", 4 instances), and *ngentot* ("fuck"). These examples can be compared to "cunt" or "mother fucker" in English. In the meantime, less offensive words, such as *goblok* ("stupid", 25 instances) and *tolol* ("dumb", 5 instances) are more playful, similar to "dumbass" or "idiot" in English. "*Cok*" (21 occurrences), a Javanese-based slur which was a more common occurrence, is an indication of linguistic regionalism, used as a mock-insult rather than as a direct attack.

The other use of *anjay/anjing* (meaning "dog") is as a show of sympathy (emphatic swearing). The intention of this statement is nothing but to enhance meaning and emotional stress. An instance of its application may be found in the expression "*Anjing! Gua kalah!*" ("Damn! I lost!"). Here, the word *anjing* is used to make a statement more emotional or expressive, as opposed to insulting or showing frustration. The stress that the word *anjing* provides tends to strengthen the attitude or response of the speaker towards a situation in which the gameplay was thrilling, or the mechanics of the opponents were superior to those of the streamer. This word intensifies the speaker's excitement and involvement. In this case, the vulgar language does not address an individual, nor shows anger or distress, as it acts only as an intensifier. In addition, the humorous exaggeration can also be enhanced by this amplification, as demonstrated in the sentence, "*Anjing, lama banget nih loading!* (Damn, it's taking such a long time to load this)". It may also intensify a praise, like in the sentence, "*Anjing, keren banget nih!* (Damn, this is so cool!)". These applications explain the way in which swear words may be used rhetorically and expressively in a given situation.

The Use of Cathartic Swearing

Vulgar words also serve as cathartic outlets for frustration. This form of swearing was less commonly found within the live stream. The terms "*Ngentot*" and "*Bangsat*" were employed to express the streamer's frustration. The first is shown in the sentence, "*Ngentot, mic-nya rusak!* (Fuck, the microphone is broken!)". The second is shown in "*Bangsat, nggak kena!* (Damn, I missed it!)". Those utterances serve as a channel for frustration, particularly in response to in-game failures or technical issues. This shows that the function of swear words can be shifted from abusive to cathartic, depending on the context. These swear words can be identified by the tone difference. In other words, when used in a phrase like "*Anjing, gua kalah*! (Damn, I lost!)", the term functions primarily as a channel of frustration, reflecting a self-directed emotional response. In this context, the expletive is more cathartic, aimed at expressing internal emotional states rather than targeting others.

The Use of Code-Mixing

In the analyzed livestream, the authors observed intra-sentential code-mixing within sentences following the syntax of a certain language, in this case, in English or Indonesian. As can be seen from the data, most of the sentences uttered by the live streamers followed the Indonesian syntax. For instance, the sentence, "*Terima kasih sudah bekerja* shift *malam"* (Thank you for working the night shift), followed the Indonesian grammar with an insertion of one English word, "shift", in the noun phrase "shift *malam* (night shift)". Indonesian noun phrases typically follow a pattern of head noun + adjective; in this case, it is "shift" (N) + "*malam*" (Adj). Meanwhile, English noun phrases follow the pattern of adjective + noun; in this case, "night" (Adj) + "shift" (N). A plausible explanation for streamers mixing their languages is to reach a broader audience (Setiawan, Putra, & Fitriyah, 2025). While English words or phrases are used to keep up with gaming terminology, which is often in English, Indonesian syntax might be preferred in this instance, because it resonates more closely with the target audience.

Another instance of intra-sentential code-mixing happened when speakers had to use streaming jargon in their utterances. Many English streaming jargon terms do not have direct translations in Indonesian; thus, it may be easier to use the original English term. For example, in the

sentence "Template *mulu*, (Always using a template,)", the word "template" comes from English language and the word "*mulu* (always)," is from Indonesian language. The word "template" is commonly used in Indonesia to refer to a model or a prototype. In Indonesian, the word *template* has been borrowed and translated to "*templat*." However, "*templat*" is not commonly used by Indonesian speakers.

Other English technical terms are also inserted within a sentence during the conversation between the live streamers, for instance, "Live unarchive *dua kali*, (Live unarchive twice,)" and "Mediashare *hidup,* (Mediashare is active,)". The use of English streaming jargon allows streamers to indicate participation in the global trends without leaving their local identity. Moreover, it allows them to remain engaged with global advancements, such as the gaming industry and online media consumption.

Unlike intra-sentential code-mixing, which exhibits irregular patterns, most intra-lexical code-mixing found in the data follows a consistent pattern of an EN noun + ID possessive marker. For instance, the word "mood-*nya,* (the mood,)" which is a combination of an English word "mood" and the Indonesian possessive marker "*-nya.*" Other similar instances include "next level-*nya,*" "motel-*nya,*" and "credit scene-*nya."* The word "task-*mu,* (your task,)*"* also follows the same pattern, but instead of "*-nya"* (the), the Indonesian morpheme used is "*-mu*" (your/yours). Some English terms are also mixed with Indonesian prefixes, such as "*di*-request" (requested) and "*me*-request" (to request). Streamers can preserve meaning while maintaining a natural and fluid sentence structure by combining English terms with Indonesian morphemes, such as possessive markers like "*-nya*" or "*-mu*" or prefixes like "*di-"* or "*me-."* This method is quicker and more practical, particularly when some English words, such as "mood," "level,", and "credit scene," are more accurate or well-known than their Indonesian equivalents.

Furthermore, the morphological integration of English lexemes with Indonesian affixes (e.g., mood-*nya, di*-request, and *nge*-lag) extends Muysken's (2007) notion of mixed codes by showing how structural hybridity is locally constrained by Indonesian morphosyntax. Unlike the Welsh–English context discussed by Deuchar and Stammers (2016), where donor and host language boundaries are more sharply contested, the Indonesian case illustrates a highly flexible borrowing system. It shows how English items are rapidly naturalized without triggering conflicts of language loyalty. This suggests that the Indonesian digital linguistic ecosystem is characterized by pragmatic multilingualism rather than ideological bilingualism.

The least common type of code-mixing observed in live streaming is changes in pronunciation. The change in pronunciation often happens when a speaker would like to match the other languages being used. The present research found that the pattern of pronunciation change happened when speakers uttered English terms using Indonesian pronunciation. For instance, the initialism "BTW" is not pronounced as [biː tiː ˈdʌbᵊl juː] but [be te we], following an Indonesian way of pronunciation. Compared to English, Indonesian has a more regular vowel system and fewer diphthongs. In the case of the initialism "BTW," an Indonesian speaker may find the English pronunciation of the multiple vowels complicated, so they simplify the pronunciation, which is more in line with the simple Indonesian consonant-vowel patterns. The pronunciation adaptation findings (e.g., BTW → [be te we], mic → [mɪk]) further reinforce Androutsopoulos's (2013) argument that online multilingualism is not merely lexical but also phonological. However, this study adds a new dimension by showing that phonological localization is not only a marker of accent but also a strategy of accessibility and audience alignment, ensuring that borrowed English terms remain intelligible to monolingual Indonesian viewers. This supports Guarin and Cardoso's (2023) observation that virtual linguistic landscapes are shaped by audience design. Further, it is demonstrated how phonological simplification functions as an identity-bridging strategy in live interaction.

Based on these findings, it was discovered that streamers employed various types of code-mixing, primarily to facilitate communication with their viewers. In this case, their viewers are mostly Indonesians watching from YouTube. Thus, the use of Indonesian syntactical structures and pronunciation was employed to attract more Indonesian viewers and help Indonesian audiences better understand the contents of the livestream. Additionally, a type of cultural integration was also demonstrated by these phonological adaptations, such as the use of Indonesian accents when pronouncing English words. This linguistic feature ensured that the content remained appealing and

intelligible for the Indonesian audience while maintaining a connection to the global digital culture by bridging the gap between local language norms and global gaming terminology.

Strategic Language Use and Identity Formation

Streamers in the Indonesian digital spaces employ language strategically to establish and sustain their hybrid identity in communication. There is a combination of code-mixing and vulgar language to negotiate between different cultural identities, which manages to blend local and international elements (Hsieh et al., 2018).

One of the most important features of this hybrid identity formation is the use of vulgar language. To create a close connection with their audience, the persona of the streamer may frequently contain words such as *anjing* (dog), *kontol* (penis), or *goblok* (stupid). These words are applied in the live-streaming community to refer to familiarity, affinity, and emotional release, although they may be viewed as offensive in a more general social context. This identity also leads to exclusivity in the community (Guarin & Cardoso, 2023; Maseko & Siziba, 2023), where the members speak the same style, thus forming a sense of belonging between them. YouTube and other online sources are used as a medium of social interaction, establishing a common identity and providing entertainment.

The second important feature of strategic language use is the code-mixing strategy, which forms a hybrid cultural identity. Code-mixing has helped streamers to communicate better with their bilingual audience with the presence of regional Indonesian dialects, international English, and gaming jargon. Words like *template, unarchive,* and *lag* are common in the global gaming culture, although they might not have the precise or generally known counterparts in Indonesian. By using English gaming language, these streamers have become relevant and technically correct, fitting into the global gaming culture. However, the use of Indonesian morphemes in English words, e.g., *nge*-lag (lagging) or the use of Indonesian syntax, creates a setting that depicts both local and global identities.

In terms of identity, the results of this research show are rather close to the idea of hybrid identity formation introduced by Bhabha (2012), Appadurai (2014), and Szpunar (2024), in which identities are formed as a result of the collision of local and global cultural flows. Nevertheless, most of the past research papers explores the concept of hybridity in offline multicultural contexts (Goncalves, 2013; Oesterheld, 2016), whereas the given study offers micro-level linguistic insights into how the concept of hybridity is enacted in real-time digital communication through profanity and code-mixing. The strategic application of vulgar language and English gaming terms demonstrate how the streamers themselves build a persona, which is both locally based on Indonesian street language and globally oriented towards the gaming culture.

Moreover, in line with Guarin and Cardoso (2023) and McGlashan (2020), the given study proves that the shared linguistic style promotes community exclusivity and collective identity. Nevertheless, unlike the earlier works, which primarily revolved around the use of address pronouns or political speech, this study proves that in the gaming livestreams, vulgar language itself is a prominent semiotic asset to be included that indicates who is part of the in-group and who is not. The role of language as a boundary-making tool is supported by the fact that newcomers who are not familiar with this style might feel symbolically excluded. Combined, these results not only support previous studies on swearing, code-mixing, and digital identity, but also extend the sociolinguistic theory by demonstrating how these phenomena are mutually reinforcing in a live, performative, and highly interactive Indonesian streaming environment. In contrast to most of the earlier research, which considers the phenomena of vulgarity and code-mixing as two distinct entities, this paper shows that their intertwining is the key to the formation of hybrid communal identity in the context of live-streaming.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that the hybrid communal identity of Indonesian live-streaming communities is fundamentally constructed through the combined use of vulgar language and multilingual practices, which together function as central resources for performing belonging, emotional engagement, and social cohesion in digital interaction. To sum up, the formation of the

hybrid identity in Indonesian live-streaming communities is not limited to language; the performance of belonging is one more aspect of this phenomenon, where streamers and viewers form a locally-based and globally-connected identity. These societies flourish in their cultural hybridity through the fusion of vulgar language and code-mixing, which offers them social interaction and emotional discharge in the digital global world.

Furthermore, the active interaction of the language and performance is an even greater manifestation of the cultural transformation in the virtual worlds, where strict lines between the local and the global are becoming more blurred. A clear example of how virtual spaces are transformed into cultural negotiation spaces where streamers and viewers interact is Indonesian live-streaming communities, where the virtual space is transformed into a localized context and, it is even redesigned to suit local requirements. This situation, in turn, forms an interactive, flowing identity. This procedure underlines internet communities' agency to oppose homogenization as they cement their distinct hybridity in linguistic creativity and collective practice. These interactions are not simply entertainment, but an indication of a new identity in the digital era, one that is multi-faceted and flexible, reflecting the strength of belonging to a group in a globalized world.

By providing the empirical evidence from Indonesian live-streaming discourse, this study extends current sociolinguistic theories of hybridity and digital identity by demonstrating how identity is negotiated through every day linguistic practice in live, performative online environments. According to the results of the current research, the authors suggest that future research may investigate the more general implications of streamers' language use. Future research must consider how these digital linguistic norms are applied offline; how these hybrid identities and communicative styles used in online communities affect the daily language; and social interaction and identity construction in the physical world. The authors also suggest future research regarding cross-cultural comparative studies to reveal whether these phenomena are specific to the Indonesian setting or has it become a global trend. The comparison of the application of code-mixing and vernacular in similar platforms within various cultural and linguistic areas could reveal whether this practice is platform-based or culturally-oriented.

REFERENCES

Androutsopoulos, J. (2013). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook and their implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *19*(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913489198

Appadurai, A. (2014). Arjun Appadurai. *Globalizations*, *11*(4), 481–490. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2014.951209

Astriani, A. S., Fauzan, L. A., & Al-Arief, Y. (2022). Langue des jeunes: The use of greetings by E-sports players. *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra, 17*(2), 155 - 166. https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v17i2.17732

Belgrade, A., Kira, M., Sadaghiyani, S., & Lee, F. (2021). What makes us complete: Hybrid multicultural identity and its social contextual origins. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *50*(5), 2290 – 2313. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22776

Bhabha, H. K. (2012). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cachola, I., Holgate, E., Preotiuc-Pietro, D., & Li, J. J. (2018). Expressively vulgar: The socio-dynamics of vulgarity and its effects on sentiment analysis in social media. *Association for Computational Linguistics*, 29272938. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85081401165&partnerID=40&md5=67c82bbb34ea52c72cf63be00605f281

Cameron, D. (2020). 10 - *Banter, male bonding, and the language of Donald Trump*. In D. Cameron (Ed.), Language in the Trump Era: Scandals and Emergencies (pp. 209–231). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108887410.011

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist*, *26*(2). https://uwe-repository.worktribe.com/preview/937606/Teaching%20

Deuchar, M., & Stammers, J. R. (2016). English-Origin Verbs in Welsh: Adjudicating between Two Theoretical Approaches. *Languages*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages1010007

Dubravac, V., & Skopljak, N. (2020). Foreign and multilingual language play on social sites as an identity marker. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *15*(1), 61 – 79. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2019.1701678

Fatkhiyati, N., Mardiana, R., Azyyati, N., Barus, K. R. N. G., & Ratri, Z. W. C. (2024). Children's language in the digital era: Analysis of children's spoken language variety through artificial intelligent and Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics, 11*(2), 387-404. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i2.37797

Gonçalves, K. (2013). Cooking lunch, that's Swiss: Constructing hybrid identities based on socio-cultural practices. *Multilingua*, *32*(4), 527 – 547. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2013-0026

Guarin, D., & Cardoso, L. O. (2023). A virtual linguistic landscape analysis of higher education institutions and their use of pronouns of address in the Hispanic and lusophone world. In M. T. Ketsman (Ed.), *Transformation of Higher Education Through Institutional Online Spaces* (pp. 1–20). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8122-6.ch001

Gupta, H., & Dwivedi, A. V. (2023). Four letter word in Hindi: A study of taboo in sacred games; [Paraula de quatre letres en hindi: Un estudi del tabú en jocs sagrats]. *Dialectologia*, *30*, 71 – 101. https://doi.org/10.1344/DIALECTOLOGIA2023.30.4

Hoffman, C. (1991). *Introduction to Bilingualism (1st ed.)*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842035

Holgate, E., Cachola, I., Preotiuc-Pietro, D., & Li, J. J. (2018). Why swear? Analyzing and inferring the intentions of vulgar expressions. *Association for Computational Linguistics,* 4405–4414. 10.18653/v1/D18-1471

Hsieh, Y. C., Weng, J., & Lin, T. (2018). How social enterprises manage their organizational identification: A theoretical framework of identity management approach through attraction, selection, and socialization. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*(20), 2880–2904. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1328610

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Fans, bloggers, and gamers: Exploring participatory culture*. NYU Press.

Kljun, J. U. (2015). Perceptions of mixed identities and codeswitching within the Italian national minority in Slovenia | Dojemanje mešane identitete in kodnega preklapljanja med pripadniki italijanske narodne skupnosti v Slovenski istri. *Annales-Anali Za Istrske in Mediteranske Studije - Series Historia et Sociologia*, *25*(1), 223–234.

Kozinets, R. (2010). *Netnography. doing ethnographic research online*. SAGE Publications

Maseko, B. & Siziba, L. (2023). On the dialectics of policy and practice: Multilingualism and the virtual linguistic landscape of a South African university. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2268395

McGlashan, M. (2020). Collective identity and discourse practice in the followership of the Football Lads Alliance on Twitter. *Discourse and Society*, *31*(3), 307–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519889128

Muysken, P. (2007). Mixed codes. In P. Auer & L. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication* (pp. 315–340). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/9783110198553.3.315

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Michael Clyne, Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages. *Language in Society*, *35*(1), 129–155. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506210054

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*, 16094069231205788. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789

Oesterheld, C. (2016). (Un)becoming Dayak: Intermarriage and the dynamics of identity and belonging in East Kalimantan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, *17*(2), 138 – 156. https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2016.1144780

Pinker, S. (2007). *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature.* HarperCollins.

Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 215–244). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110849615.215

Pratt, M. L. (2012). Arts of the contact zone. In M. Scott & T. Lillis (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 171–185). Routledge.

Pujiati, Lundeto, A., & Trianto, I. (2025). Representing Arab-Indonesian identity: Language and cultural narratives on social media. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 653 – 666. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i3.78286

Rahmawati, L. E., & Nur'aini, R. (2020). Code-mixing in Korean Reomitvlog. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *12*(1), 466–479. https://www.ijicc.net/images/vol12/iss1/12148_Rahmawati_2020_E_R.pdf

Schiff, B., Toulemonde, M., & Porto, C. (2012). Identities in the First Person Plural: Muslim-Jewish Couples in France. *Navigating Multiple Identities: Race, Gender, Culture, Nationality, and Roles*, 167-186. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199732074.003.0010

Setiawan, T., Suhardi, & Lestyarini, B. (2024). Swearing in online commenting discourse: Investigating netizens' involvement in virtual discussion arena. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(3), 588-599. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i3.66950

Stankevičiūtė, K. (2018). Vulgarity journalism in Lithuania: A cultural review of the genre. *Logos (Lithuania)*, *94*, 167–178. https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2018.17

Stapleton, K. (2010). Swearing. In M. A. Locher & S. L. Graham (Eds.), *Interpersonal Pragmatics* (pp. 289–306). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214338.2.289

Susilo, D., & Sugihartati, R. (2021). Indonesian nationalism discourse on YouTube video produced by young Chinese-Indonesians. *Plaridel*, *18*(2), 141 – 161. https://doi.org/10.52518/2020-02rahma

Szabó, Á., & Ward, C. (2020). The relationship between intercultural abilities and cultural identity styles: A longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, *55*(3), 465–471. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12592

Szpunar, M. (2024). Constructing a hybrid identity. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, *70*(7), 53–69. https://doi.org/10.18290/rh247207.4

Varis, P., & Blommaert, J. (2015). Conviviality and collectives on social media: Virality, memes, and new social structures. *Multilingual Margins: A Journal of Multilingualism from the Periphery*, *2*(1), 31-45. https://epubs.ac.za/index.php/mm/article/view/50/48

Wohn, D. Y., & Freeman, G. (2020). Audience management practices of live streamers on Twitch. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM International Conference on Interactive Media Experiences (IMX 2020)* (pp. 106–116). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3391614.3393653