

# CODE MIXING FOUND IN DEBATES OF INDONESIAN PRESIDENT CANDIDATES 2014

Fadhila

## Abstrak

*Penelitian ini menjelaskan tentang campur kode dalam debat calon presiden Indonesia 2014. Penelitian ini dirancang secara kualitatif dan dianalisis secara deskriptif untuk mengumpulkan datanya dan dianalisis secara deskriptif menggunakan perhitungan sederhana. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa diantara ketiga jenis campur kode menunjukkan penyisipan cenderung menjadi jenis utama campur kode yang terjadi dalam debat calon presiden (87,6%), diikuti oleh leksikal kongruen (10,1%), dan terakhir adalah selang-seling (2,2%). Fungsi campur kode paling sering digunakan adalah membicarakan tentang topik tertentu (33,3%). Ada dua fenomena campur kode dengan bahasa lain: Pertama, kebutuhan, jika tidak ada kalimat yang tepat dalam bahasa Indonesia yang dapat mewakili bahasa Indonesia, Kedua adalah karena pembicara ingin menunjukkan status sosialnya.*

**Kata Kunci:** *Campur kode, analisa dan debat calon*

Sociolinguistics is the study of all aspects of linguistics applied towards the connections between language and society, and the way use it in different language situations. Language is seen as a unifying force and a common ground among various people through which effective communication is carried out. In the globalization era, worldwide interaction happens; it is quite common for people to use two or more languages as a communication. Among all the means of communication language is the most complicated and unique. Language also stands distinct in its nature from other communication system used by human beings or animals because of the magnitude of its resources. Society impinges on language and language impinges on the society. Hence, there must be a relationship existing between language and society.

Bilingual and multilingual are normal in many parts of the world and that people in those parts would view any other situation as strange and limiting. In multilingual society, in which the people know more than language, they usually require selecting particular code. In fact, a

person who speak one or two more languages will decide to switch from one code to another or mix the nation, we certainly have something to codes. Using English cannot be avoided in Indonesia. The reality is so many people mix Indonesian to English language for their communication or the other way. Even, English is used when they know the Indonesian vocabulary. However, there are some people who have ability in speaking foreign languages especially English and they often insert some words from English in their Bahasa Indonesia. It is because they use it as their prestige or to show that they have good knowledge about English. The low understanding of English makes people unaware that they have damaged the construction of Indonesian language.

There are some English borrowing words which have synonyms in Bahasa Indonesia but it seems people would rather use words which are derived from English to Bahasa Indonesia. Indonesian people prefer to use foreign words rather than the words of the original Indonesian. They prefer to use the words of the approach rather than the approach, rather than applause, complex rather than complicated definitive than sure,

etc. The reasons of the researcher to choose this topic because the phenomenon of code mixing does not only occur in daily life situations. It is also used by some program media such as television, radio, and newspaper.

Based on the background above, the problem statement are Indonesian people preferred to use another language in conversation and mixed it with Indonesian language and the Indonesian people did not know whether it was an Indonesian language or borrowing words from another language. By the research conducted the researcher proposes a research question as follows: What types and functions of code mixing are dominantly used in debate of Presidential election? The question was the entry point to do the research. By doing the research, the researcher expected give scientific information about code mixing as sociolinguistics phenomena for the readers and other researchers also to be beneficial for improving an understanding and using language especially for the English teacher in teaching learning process.

### **Review of Related Literature**

When people interact with others in society at anytime and anywhere they must use a language. Without a language, people will find some troubles when they do their activities and toward the others. There are no people or society without a language. The role of a language among the people in this life is very crucial. The study of linguistics reveals that language and society cannot be separated to investigate. It develops into sociolinguistics or the sociology of language. Chaer and Agustina (2004) state that sociolinguistics is the study of the characteristics of language varieties, the characteristics of their functions, and the characteristics of the speaker as these three constantly interact, change and change one another within a speech community. In addition, Holmes

(2001) states that sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and the context in which it is used by the speaker.

Phenomenon of people having more than one code (language) is called bilingualism or multilingualism (Wardhaugh, 1998). This may vary from a limited ability in one or more domains, to very strong command of both languages. According to Bloomfield (1933), bilingualism is a situation where a speaker can use two languages as well. In addition, Gumperz (1982) also explains that bilingual people usually use their own idioms for in-group communication and the common language for their interaction and communication with outsiders. In this case, the bilinguals have a repertoire of domain-related rules of language choice.

Bilinguals are able to choose which language that he is going to use. There are three reasons why someone becomes bilingual, namely membership, education, and administration. Hammers and Blanc (2000) express that being bilingual equals being able to speak two languages perfectly. Romaine (1995) informs that bilingualism has often been defined in terms of categories, scales and dichotomies which are related to factors such as proficiency function, etc. Mastery of language by an individual who is more than one is called bilingualism. In other words, since the members of a bilingual community vary in the capacity of mastering the languages used in the community, they have to be able to set a condition where they can communicate effectively. This condition leads them to do code switching and code mixing.

People usually choose different codes in different situation. They may choose a particular code or variety because it makes them easier to discuss a particular topic, regardless where they are speaking. When talking about work or school at home, for

instance, they may use the language that is related to those fields rather than the language used in daily language communication at home. A code is a system that is used by people to communicate with each other. When people want to talk each other, they have to choose a particular code to express their feeling. Wardhaugh (1998) maintains that a code can be defined as a system used for communication between two or more parties used on any occasions. Holmes (2001) expresses that three important social factors in code choice are participant, setting and topic. Holmes (2001) also state that there are other factors that contributed to the appropriate choice of code; they are social distance, status formality, and function or goal of the interaction. Wahid (1996) clarifies that code can be defined as a speech system and the application of the language element which has specific characteristic in line with the speaker's background, the relationship between the speaker and interlocutor and the situation.

Code mixing is an important linguistic phenomenon in many countries in the world where more than one language is used. Generally, we can say that code mixing means mixing the words, phrases or smaller units of one language in the structure of other language. Sometimes more than two languages are mixed up and code mixing becomes a regular feature of language usage. In linguistic the term 'code mixing' is often used interchangeably with code switching that creates confusion. Musyken (2000) informs that code mixing refers to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence. Chaer and Agustina (2004) define that code mixing is using pieces of another language, maybe needed unconsciously, so that is not accepted as a mistake. According to Nababan (1984), a prominent feature in the event of code mixing is the relaxation or informal situations. So, combine the code generally

occurs when speaking casually, while in informal situations this is rarely the case.

Formal situation occurs code mixing, this due to the absence of a sulk on the concept of the term in question. According to Hoffman (1991) there are a number of reasons for bilingual or multilingual person to switch or mix their languages. Those are: **1). Talking about a particular topic:** People sometimes prefer to talk about a particular topic in one language rather than in another. Sometimes, a speaker feels free and more comfortable to express his/her emotional feelings in a language that is not his/her everyday language. **2). Quoting somebody else:** A speaker switches code to quote a famous expression, proverb, or saying of some well- person said. **3).Being emphatic about something (express solidarity):** As usual, when someone who is talking using a language that is not his native language suddenly wants to be emphatic about something, he either intentionally or unintentionally, will switch from his second language to his first language. **4). Interjection (inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors):** Interjection is words or expressions, which are inserted into a sentence to convey surprise, strong emotion, or to gain attention

Language switching and language mixing among bilingual or multilingual people can sometimes mark an interjection or sentence connector.**5). Repetition used for clarification:** When a bilingual or multilingual person wants to clarify his speech so that it will be understood better by listener, he can sometimes use both of the languages (codes) that he masters to say the same message. **6). Intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor :** When bilingual or multilingual person talks to another bilingual/multilingual, there will be lots of code switching and code mixing occurs. **7). Expressing group identity:** Code switching and code mixing can also be used to express group identity. **8). To soften or**

**strengthen request or command:** For Indonesian people, mixing and switching Indonesian into English can also function as a request because English is not their native tongue, so it does not sound as direct as Indonesian.**9). Because of real lexical need:** The most common reason for bilingual/multilingual person to switch or mix their languages is due to the lack of equivalent lexicon in the languages.**10). To exclude other people when a comment is intended for only a limited audience:** Sometimes people want to communicate only to certain people or community they belong to. To avoid the other community or interference objected to their communication by people, they may try to exclude those people by using the language that no everybody knows. Musyken (2000) informs that Code mixing also called intra-sentential code switching or intra-sentential code alternation occurs when speakers use two or more languages below clause level within one social situation. He expresses three types of code mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization.

Insertion occurs when lexicalization items from one language are incorporated into another. Alternation occurs when structures of two languages are alternated indistinctively both at the grammatical and lexical level. Congruent lexicalization which refers to the situation where two languages share grammatical structures which can be filled lexically with elements from either language. Debate is a broader form of argument than deductive reasoning, which only examines whether a conclusion is a consequence of premises, and factual argument, which only examines what is or isn't the case, or rhetoric, which is a technique of persuasion. Coulmas (1998) states that media is related to the observation mode above that impact of small and or socially disadvantaged language is on the increase in media. A common urban person usually wakes up in the morning checks the

TV news or newspaper, goes to work, makes a few phone calls, eats with their family or peers when possible and makes his decisions based on the information that he has either from their co workers, TV news, friends, family, financial reports, etc. Debating is commonly carried out in many assemblies of various types to discuss matters and to make resolutions about action to be taken, often by a vote. Deliberative bodies such as parliaments, legislative assemblies, and meetings of all sorts engage in debates.

### Method

This research used a descriptive qualitative method. It was qualitative because it deals with the natural phenomena such as the code mixing in debate used by candidate of president of Indonesia. This research was conducted to find out the types and functions of code mixing performed by candidates of president of Indonesia in debate show. The data were collected through internet which we can found a full recorded of the debate shows. In this research, the instrument used was video recording.

The data of the research were analyzed through three stages. They were the identification of the occurrences, classification into types and the functions, and quantification for making an interpretation of presidential debate election related to the use of code-mixing. To find the occurrences of code-mixing the researcher firstly identified the 5 sections of the presidential debate election 2014. Each debate consists of 2 hours for each section. The researcher watched the record of debate thoroughly to get deeper understanding of issues in the debate, especially about the code-mixing exercised by the presidential candidates.

The second stage was classification. The main purpose in this stage was based on types and functions. For the functions of code mixing, the researcher used ten function of code mixing as proposed by

Hoffman (1991). They are talking about a particular topic, quoting somebody else, being emphatic about something (express solidarity), interjection (inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors), repetition used for clarification, intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor, expressing group identity, to soften or strengthen request or command, because of real lexical need, and to exclude other people when a comment is intended for only a limited audience. Last, to find out the frequency and the percentages of the occurrences code mixing in debate of presidential election, the researcher conducted the present research in quantification. Although this research was carried out in a descriptive qualitative method but this research also needs an accurate quantification to complete the research study. This stage was conducted to discover the most frequent constituents mixed into other languages by using formula stated by Sudjana (2005). The formula is:

$$P = x 100\% \frac{f}{n}$$

- P: Percentage
- F: Frequency
- N: Total of code mixing

**Findings and Discussion**

To analyze the code mixing, the researcher tried to find some types and functions of code mixing used by the

candidates of presidential election debate. After that, there was an explanation by using tables about the code mixings were used in presidential debate. The researcher analyzed the types and functions of code mixing found in candidates debates of the 2014 Indonesian presidential election which are shown in spoken and written text. This code mixings were found in these candidates debate of presidential election 2014 are classified and analyzed based on the types and functions of code mixing. There were 89 sentences contains of code mixing found in the debate. It was divided into 3 types of code mixing; insertion, alternation and congruent lexicalization. The writer also found several functions of code mixing that used in the debate. There were: talking about particular topic, to soften or strengthen command, Interjection (Inserting Sentence Fillers or Sentence Connectors), repetition used for clarification, Intention of Clarifying the Speech Content for Interlocutor, and because of real lexical need. It means not all of functions of code mixing have been used in that situation.

Bahasa Indonesia is indeed changing in this debate, and English language lays an important role. Moreover, English has a great influence on other languages in the world including Indonesian language because it is the biggest International language and most of the people in the world understand English. The data will be shown in the following table:

**Table 1. Types of Code Mixing**

No	Type of Code Mixing	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1,	Insertion	78	87.6%
2,	Alternation	2	2.2%
3,	Congruent Lexicalization	9	10.1%
	TOTAL	89	100%

From the data above, the insertion becomes the highest frequency 87.6%

because the speaker always inserting their sentences in Indonesian language to English

and most of the speaker unconscious to inserting the language into another language. It was always happen in bilingual language such as in Indonesia which inserting from many languages. The second type was congruent lexicalization with 10.1%

frequency because two languages share grammatical structures which can be filled lexically with elements from either language. The lowest was alternation with 2.2% because Alternation occurs when structures of two languages

**Table 2. Functions of Code Mixing**

No.	Function	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1,	Talking about a particular topic	30	33.7 %
2,	Quoting About Somebody Else	-	-
3,	Being Emphatic about Something (Express Solidarity)	-	-
4,	Interjection (Inserting Sentence Fillers or Sentence Connectors)	1	1.1 %
5,	Repetition Used for Clarification	18	20.2 %
6,	Intention of Clarifying the Speech Content for Interlocutor	5	5.6 %
7,	Expressing Group Identity	-	-
8,	To Soften or Strengthen Request or Command	6	6.7 %
9,	Because of Real Lexical Need	29	32.5 %
10,	To Exclude Other People When Comment is Intended for Only a Limited Audience	-	-
	TOTAL	89	100 %

The table above indicates that first function of code mixing that was talking about particular topic have been used 30 times (33.7%). The second, the third and the forth of functions of code mixing: quoting somebody else and being emphatic about something were none used by the speaker of the debate. Next, the forth function of code mixing was Interjection (Inserting Sentence Fillers or Sentence Connectors) with 1 times (1.1%) the fifth, repetition used for clarification have been used 18 times (20.2%). The sixth function was Intention of Clarifying the Speech Content for Interlocutor with 5 times (5.6%). The seventh functions of code mixing expressing group identity were none used in the debate. The eighth functions of code mixing was to soften

or strengthen request or command have been used 6 times (6.7%) in the debate. The ninth functions of code mixing that was because of real lexical need have been used 29 times (32.5%). The last function was To Exclude Other People When Comment is Intended for Only a Limited Audience was none used in the debate of candidates of presidential election 2014.

The highest function of code mixing used by the candidates of presidential election was talking about particular topic. It was happen because the speaker in the debate talking about some particular topic for each sections of the debate and the speaker feels free and more comfortable to express his/her emotional feelings in a language that is not his/her everyday language. The second

function was because of real lexical need. It could be because the lack of equivalent lexicon in the first language, so that the speakers tend to use the real lexical in other language. The lowest function was Interjection (Inserting Sentence Fillers or Sentence Connectors) because it used to mark an interjection or sentence connector and rarely used by the speakers in the debate.

## Conclusions and Suggestions

### Conclusions

Code mixing is the use of two or more languages by transferring from one language into others. After analyzing the data, it comes to the conclusion that the candidates of presidential election debate mostly used code mixing. The data presents that all the three types suggested such as insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization appeared in the debate session. Data suggested that among all the three types of code mixing, it appears that insertion tends to be the main type of mixing that occurred in the debate of presidential election (87.6%), followed by congruent lexicalization (10.1%) and the last, alternation (2.2%). According to the analysis, talking about particular topic choose as their main function of using code mixing in the debate of presidential election (33.3%). The phenomena of code mixing with other language there were two reasons; need, if there was no Indonesian language that can represent the idea of the speakers, he/she will used another language especially English. The second reasons were the speaker want to show their social status.

### Suggestions

1. English education students are hoped that by knowing the results of this research, they will know types and functions of code mixing between English and Indonesian used in presidential election

debate 2014 so they can improve their knowledge of Sociolinguistics.

2. Future researchers can include all aspects of code mixing. They have to analyze code mixing in the other point of view. People should use it appropriately because language is flexible since they can adapt the new situation.
3. This research can be additional information for increasing knowledge about code mixing.

## REFERENCES

- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chaer, A, & Agustina, L. 2004. *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Perkenalan Awal*. Cetakan kedua-Edisi Revisi. Jakarta:PT. Rineka Cipta
- Coulmas, F.1998. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Reference Online.
- Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hammers, J. F & Blanc, M, H, A. 2000. *Bilingual and Bilinguality-Second Edition*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, C. 1991. *An introduction to Bilingualism*. New York.: Longman. Jovanovich, Inc.
- Holmes, J. 2001. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Musyken, P. 2000. *Bilingual Speech : A Typology of Code Mixing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Nababan, P, W, J. 1984. *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta. PT. Gramedia
- Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism-Second Edition*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell
- Sudjana. 2005. *Metoda Statistika*. Bandung. Tarsito
- Wahid, S. 1996. *Analisis Wacana*. Ujung Pandang. Proyek Pengadaan Buku

kuliah yang Dibiayai Oleh Proyek Peningkatan SLTP Swasta Sulawesi Selatan dengan Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan.

Wardhaugh, R. 1998. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York. Basil Blackwell