

Language Variation: Code-Mixing Done by Yahukimo Students

Pradnya Paramita Dewi^{1*}, Suyarmanto¹, Melky Dapla¹

¹Universitas Gajayana

^{1*}Email: paramita@unigamalang.ac.id

***Abstract.** Multilingual individuals, who possess proficiency in multiple languages and an understanding of their structures, often engage in code-mixing as a means of communication. This study aims to explore the code-mixing patterns exhibited by Yahukimo students residing in Malang, as well as the underlying motivations for their code-mixing practices. Employing a descriptive qualitative research design, the study identifies two predominant types of code-mixing: insertion and congruent lexicalization, which are influenced by the linguistic structures of the languages involved. Additionally, the variation in code-mixing is classified into inner and outer code-mixing. The findings indicate that Yahukimo students employ code-mixing as a means of fostering solidarity and navigating social and cultural distances. This research provides valuable insights into the intricate dynamics of language use and contributes to our understanding of the phenomenon of code-mixing.*

Keywords: code mixing; language variation; yahukimo

A. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, as one of the countries with a lingua franca, exhibits a unique linguistic landscape where its citizens master multiple languages, including Indonesian and their regional languages. Indonesian serves as a unifying language, representing the identity of the Indonesian nation and functioning as the official language for science, technology, and the country as a whole. However, it is not the primary language used by the people in their everyday interactions within local communities. Regional languages take precedence in daily communication due to the varying levels of understanding and proficiency in standard Indonesian. As

Holmes (2013) suggests, language choice within a speech community is influenced by specific social factors, such as the recipient of the communication, the social context, and the purpose and topic of the discussion. This phenomenon highlights the dynamic nature of language use in Indonesia, where Indonesian language is often intertwined with regional languages in terms of pronunciation and meaning, particularly in daily activities.

Indonesian people are known for their ability to switch between languages based on the situation and the interlocutors they are speaking with. In many communities, both locals and newcomers utilize a combination of two languages to establish understanding between speakers. College students, who often come from diverse regions, frequently adapt their language use to fit into the local society. While they primarily communicate in Indonesian, their regional language also finds its way into daily conversations. This language mixing, as observed by Novianti (2021), serves to reinforce ideas expressed and minimize potential miscommunication.

Based on the aforementioned phenomena, Papuan students have the same participation. During their study time, they are staying in Malang and blending with the local society. Most of them are living in boardinghouses or renting houses special for Papuan students. They are using Indonesian to communicate with the local people, but they are using their regional language to speak with Papuan students. However, sometimes code-mixing is being used when they are communicating with other Papuan students.

Yahukimo is one of the regencies located in the eastern end of Papua and has 51 districts and 510 villages. There are twelve tribes in Yahukimo, namely Yali, Hupla, Kimyal, Momuna, Una-Ukam, Mek, Yalimek, Ngalik, Tokuni, Obini, Korowai, Duwe, Obukain, Kopkaka, and Bese. Each tribe speaks a regional language. During their stay in Malang, they speak several languages. Indonesian is used at college or school or when they talk to other friends outside Papua. They rarely use the regional

language for daily conversation even though they all come from Yahukimo. They speak the regional language only with students from the same tribe. However, they speak English in a particular context of a conversation.

Given the social interaction dynamics mentioned earlier, the present study holds significant interest. Its primary aim is to investigate the intra-sentential code mixing employed by Yahukimo students who have relocated to Malang for further studies. Distinguishing itself from previous research, this study adopts a unique data source by examining language usage in Indonesia, rather than relying on talk shows or movies. The objective of this study is to identify the types of code mixing utilized and explore the potential factors influencing their language choices. To support this investigation, the study employs the code-mixing classification proposed by Muysken (2000), which categorizes code mixing into three types: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. However, it is worth noting that Suwito (1985) provides an alternative perspective on code mixing, differentiating between inner and outer code mixing.

Sociolinguistics

Variation or language diversity is the main subject of discussion in Sociolinguistics. Holmes (2013) defines sociolinguistics as a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between language and society. A similar point of view by Fishman (1971) says that Sociolinguistics is the study of language variation and the function of that variation as well. Hudson (2011) states variety as a set of linguistics items with the similar social distribution. In other words, sociolinguistics discusses language problems related to social, situational, and cultural factors (Wijana, 2006).

Bilingualism and multilingualism

The original language a person grows up speaking is their first language or mother tongue. Someone raised with two first languages or mother tongues is called a

simultaneous bilingual. If they learn a second language later, they are called sequential bilingual. In short, bilingual is the ability to use two languages. Multilingualism refers to two or more languages. According to Jendra (2010), multilingual people use more than two languages. In addition, the term multilingual can refer to an individual speaker who uses two or more languages, a community of speakers who uses two or more languages, or a speaker of different languages. Crystal (1992) cites that multilingual situations develop for some reasons, such as their historical origin, people's choices, or the circumstances forced upon them in politics, religion, culture, education, economy, and natural disaster.

Code switching

A code is a language, variety, or style. Wardhaugh (2006) defines code as any system that two or more people employed for communication. Alternating two codes in conversation is called code-switching. Gal in Wardhaugh (2006) states code-switching is a communication strategy to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries. It also evokes, creates, or changes interpersonal relations with their rights or obligations. Poplack (2004) classifies code-switching into three types, Tag-switching, inter-sentential, and intra-sentential code-switching. Tag-switching is an independent element that usually appears at the beginning or end of the statement or question. Inter-sentential switching occurs outside the sentence and the clause level. Intra-sentential switching occurs within the sentence or clause.

Code Mixing

Code mixing is another alternative strategy in conversation. Hudson (2011) states that code-mixing is a situation where two fluent bilingual talks to each other and change the language without changing any topic. A similar conception proposed by Bonvillain (2008), code-mixing as a linguistic process incorporates material from a second language into a first language by adding morphological markers of the first to introduce elements.

Muysken (2000) says that code-mixing is intra-sentential code-switching. Code mixing classifies into three types. They are insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Insertion is the inserting of a word from one language into a structure of another language. Alternation occurs between the structure of two languages, and congruent lexicalization is of material from different lexicons into a shared grammatical structure.

In a different view, Suwito (1983) classifies code mixing based on language variation and language structure. Code mixing classifies into two types based on language variation, inner and outer code-mixing. Inner code-mixing occurs when elements are insertions from an original language with all its variation. However, outer code-mixing occurs when element insertion stems from a foreign language. Based on language structure, there are five types of code-mixing, word insertion, phrase insertion, idiom or expression insertion, hybrid insertion, and reduplication insertion. Assumed from the theory mentioned earlier, the writer uses the code-mixing proposed by Muysken and Suwito in this study.

The reason why people employ code-mixing

The use of code-mixing turns to the issue of what makes the speakers choose codes. Wardhaugh (2006) provides four reasons for code-mixing. The first reason is to express solidarity with the listeners. The second reason is accommodation to listeners, and the third is the choice of topic in a conversation. The last reason is perceiving the social and cultural distance.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopted a descriptive qualitative design with a sociolinguistics approach. According to Bogdan (2007), qualitative research is characterized by five key features. Firstly, it draws data from natural settings, allowing for an authentic representation of the phenomena under investigation. Secondly, data are analyzed

and described using words rather than numerical measurements. Thirdly, the focus is on understanding the process rather than solely emphasizing the outcomes. Fourthly, theory and existing research knowledge are employed to interpret the findings. Lastly, qualitative research aims to explore meaning and gain insights from the participants' perspectives. In line with Bogdan's (2007) assertion, when researchers collect data in the form of recordings, they seek to understand the context, conditions, and circumstances in which the data were produced.

Cropley (2021) states that data collection in a study with participants is an interview. It may be an open, semi-structured, or structured interview. Other ways of collecting data are case studies or shadowing. The data in this study is in the form of video recording via G-meet. This study uses shadowing data collection. During the data collection, the writer involves in the conversation between Yahukimo students who live in Malang. The writer is involved in the conversation recessively and records the conversation.

Cropley (2021) cites that qualitative data analysis aims to discover the general meaning underlying a group of related specific statements and to achieve reliability and validity. Besides, it is needed an existing theory is the starting point for setting up a research study. This study investigates the classification of code mixing done by Yahukimo students based on language structure and language variation proposed by Muysken and Suwito, and the reasons for using code-mixing proposed by Wardhaugh.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Considering the results of this study, it concludes that multilingual speakers switch and mix the codes based on the interlocutor, topic of the conversation, and situation.

Code mixing based on language structure, and language variation occur in the data analysis.

The Types Of Code-mixing In Language Structure Used By Yahukimo Students

According to the data, 15 code-mixing used by Yahukimo students in Malang. The following are the number and the percentage of each code-mixing based on language structure.

Table 1. Type of code-mixing in language structure

No	Type of code-mixing	Number of Case	Percentage
1	Insertion	13	86,7%
2	Alternation	-	-
3	Congruent Lexicalization	2	13,3%
Total		15	100%

Insertion Code-mixing

The data indicates that there are some types of insertion code-mixing used by Yahukimo students in Malang. The types are word insertion, phrase insertion, and reduplication insertion.

“*Kalau tidak ada pertanyaan ini, **closing** saja atau tutup.*”
“If there is no more question, let’s have closing.”

It is classified into word insertion. The word **closing** is an insertion in the form of a word. In detail, the inserted word is a noun. The speaker mixes the code since he assures that the interlocutors are understood the word even though after saying the word the speaker switches to Indonesian.

“Dengan adanya pembangunan **food estate** ini mungkin ada manfaatnya tapi bagi kami sangat menghawatirkan.”
“The development of food estate may have benefits, but for us, it is worrying.”

The insertion is in the form of a noun phrase. Food estate becomes the topic of the discussion, so the community has familiar with the meaning. Moreover, during the conversation, they mention food estate instead of “perkebunan makanan”.

“**Mute-mute**, belum aktif saudara Balow.”
“Mute-mute, you are not active yet, bother Balow.”

The utterance classifies in the reduplication insertion. The word mute is said twice to inform the interlocutor that his zoom speaker is in mute mode, so his voice cannot be heard by the other participants in the meeting.

Congruent Lexicalization Code-mixing

“**Slide** bisa kita tampilkan atau bagaimana?”
“Slide can be shared or how?”

The utterance above identifies as congruent lexicalization. It is a type of code-mixing at the phonological level. The speaker says an English word but modifies it into an Indonesian phonological structure. Yahukimo students say the word “slide” with the same phonological “slide” in English.

The Types Of Code-mixing In Language Variation Used By Yahukimo Students

Yahukimo students use three different varieties in a conversation. Below is the number and the percentage of code-mixing based on language variation.

Table 2. Type of code-mixing in language variation

No	Type of code-mixing	Number of Case	Percentage
1	Inner	6	40%
2	Outer	9	60%
Total		15	100%

Inner code mixing

“**Nare**, itu saya tanya lagi ini, hormat.”
“Friend, I want to ask again, respect”

As the first language, some regional words are mixed during the conversation. It shows a close relationship in the community. Even though the meeting uses standard Indonesian, sometimes they use the local words unconsciously.

Outer Code-mixing

“Jadi dampak dari industri food estate, kemudian juga **illegal logging**, kemudian tentang hutan, kemudian kayu-kayu itu diambil untuk diekspor...”

“The effect of food estate industry, and illegal login, and the forest, the wood is taken for eksport...”

Yahukimo students tend to use illegal logging rather than “penebangan liar”. All the meeting participants have known the term. Moreover, mixing English words in the conversation shows that they are educated.

The Reasons for using code-mixing.

Two reasons motivate Yahukimo students in using code-mixing are solidarity and perceiving social and cultural distance. All the community members come from the same regency. The relation is much closer than the other students outside the regency. They have a strong sense of brotherhood. When they chose inner code-mixing, the rest of the participants could understand the meaning. However, the uses of outer code-mixing are some terms related to the topic of conversation.

The second reason is perceiving social and cultural distance. This reason interprets inner code-mixing used where the speakers only use general terms in their local language.

Discussion

Yahukimo students who live in Malang choose inner and outer code-mixing in the formal meeting. Based on their background, all of them are college students with different departments. Generally they have familiar with English, even though they do not speak English in daily conversation. However, they have been associating with students outside of Papua. It influences the way of thinking and choosing a word. After some time, they used to mix the codes. It builds self-confidence when they use outer code-mixing. Finally, they use the outer code to show that they are educated.

It states that Yahukimo regency consists of 12 diverse tribes with each local language. The distance between each tribe is miles away. This condition makes each tribe has a similar language structure but different word pronunciation and spelling. Yahukimo students who live in Malang rarely speak their local language to minimize misunderstanding. They prefer to use Indonesian for formal and informal conversations. It notices from the use of inner code-mixing. They use local words to address friends, themselves, and some general terms that are familiar by the other tribes. They use inner code-mixing to show solidarity.

The finding is in line with the code-mixing theory proposed by Muysken and Suwito. Yahukimo students prefer to mix the code in words and word phrases. However, the data do not show the occurrence of alternation code-mixing. This study has similarities with the previous studies. The used of outer code-mixing is more than inner code-mixing.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

The finding of this study becomes a small part of the language variety that Yahukimo students used. Since the scope of the study is Yahukimo people who live in Malang, it is possible to find code mixing alternation for Yahukimo students who studied outside Malang. Moreover, code-mixing is found in the original place. In conclusion, the environment in which a person lives and the community they associate with influence the variety of code-mixing.

Suggestion

Code-mixing is an interesting topic to be discussed. Further researchers are encouraged to conduct similar research with more data. Another option is to have a direct interview, so it is hoped Yahukimo students can produce more variety of code mixing use.

E. REFERENCES

- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bonvillain, N. (2008). *Language, Culture, and Communication*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Chaer, A. & Leonia, A. (2004). *Sociolinguistik Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta.
- Cropley, A. (2021). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methode: A practice Oriented Introduction for Students of Psychology and Education*. Open access- doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.3095. 6888/1
- Crystal, D. (1992). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.
- Fishman, J. (1970). *Sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Newburry House.
- Holmes, J. 2013. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Hudson, R.A. (2011). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press University.
- Hutauruk, B.S. 2016. Code switching in Bilingual Classes: A Case Study of Three Lectures at Bunda Mulia University. *Journal of English Teaching as a Foreign Language*. Vol 11, No. 1, 69-86.
- Jendra, M.I.I. (2012). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Societies' Languages*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Mileh, I. N. 2020. Campur Kode Pemakaian Bahasa Indonesia pada Wacana Iklan. *KULTURISTIK: Jurnal Bahasa dan Budaya*. Vol 5, no. 1, 35-43
- Muysken, P. (2000) *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge Universiti Press
- Novianti, R. & Said, M. 2021. The Use of Code Switching and Code-Mixing in English Teaching-Learning Process. *DEIKSIS*. Vol 13, No. 1, 82 – 92
- Poplack, S. 2004. Code-Switching Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik: *An International handbook of the Science of Language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 589-596

- Pratama, R.M.D. & Hastuti, D.P. 2020. Code Mixing and Code Switching in Twivortiare 2 Novel by Ika Natassa: *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*. Vol 2. No. 2, 288-295
- Suwito (1985). *Pengantar Awal Sociolinguistik, Teori dan Problema*. Surakarta: Henry Offset.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Victoria: Blackwell.
- Wibowo, A.I. 2017. Analysis of Types Code Switching and Code Mixing by the Sixth President of republic Indonesia's speech at the National of Independence Day. *Progressive*. Vol.XII, No.2, 13-22
- Wijana, I.D.P. & Rohmadi, M. (2006). *Sociolinguistik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.