

Code-Mixing Analysis Used by Edwin in The Web Series *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*

Evelyn Patricia

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Creative Industries, Petra Christian University,
Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya 60236, INDONESIA
Email: evelynptrc11@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the code-mixing types and factors used by Edwin in the web series *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*. The writer employed a qualitative approach using Muysken's (2000) and Bhatia and Ritchie's (2013) theories to analyze Edwin's sentences that contain code-mixing. The findings revealed that Edwin utilized two types of code-mixing, namely insertion and congruent lexicalization. The alternation type was absent. Those types were motivated by factors, namely participant roles and relationships, situational, reiteration, message qualification, topic-comment/relative clauses, interjections and language attitudes, dominance, and security. Furthermore, some message-intrinsic factors, specifically quotations, hedging, idioms and deep-rooted cultural wisdom were absent. These findings underscore how Edwin's code-mixing meets the demands of his workplace, enhancing clarity and efficiency in professional communication.

Keywords: code-mixing, code-mixing factors, code-mixing types, web series

INTRODUCTION

This study aimed to examine the types and factors of code-mixing as used by Edwin, a character in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*. This choice is influenced by Edwin's code-mixing in his communications within the web series, which demonstrates a suitable context to comprehend code-mixing occurrences within the professional communication setting. In the web series, Edwin is depicted as an IT analyst and supervisor who often communicates in both Indonesian and English in his professional interactions. This bilingual interaction is not restricted to Edwin because it is a practice that is also implemented by his colleagues, superiors, and interns who are shown engaged in multilingual talks in the workplace (Solusi BCA, n.d.). This communication, which includes code-mixing practice, provides a complete understanding of bilingual communication in the workplace which can create effective communication. Therefore, Edwin's communications which involve code-mixing in his workplace interactions allow this study to analyze the types and factors influencing code-mixing in a professional context.

METHODS

The writer utilized a qualitative approach in conducting this study. The source of the data was all sentences used by Edwin in the four episodes of the web series *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*. The data were all sentences that demonstrate code-mixing or contain more than one language utilized by Edwin from the four episodes of the web series *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, which was taken from YouTube (Solusi BCA, n.d.). The data were analyzed utilizing theories proposed by Muysken (2000) regarding the types of code-mixing and Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) regarding the factors influencing code-mixing. The writer applied a two-digit numbering system to indicate the specific occurrence of code-mixing in Edwin's sentences within the web series.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The writer found out that the following code-mixing types were utilized by Edwin in the web series: insertion and congruent lexicalization. One type of code-mixing was absent, namely alternation. Moreover, the insertion type was influenced by factors: participant roles and relationships, situational, and various message-intrinsic factors namely message qualification, topic-comment/relative clauses, and interjections, and the last factor namely language attitudes, dominance, and security. In addition, the congruent lexicalization type was motivated by factors: participant roles and relationships, situational, and message-intrinsic factors namely reiteration, message qualification, and topic-comment/relative clauses. Furthermore, quotations, hedging, and idioms and deep-rooted cultural wisdom did not motivate Edwin's code-mixing.

Types of Code-Mixing Used by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*

A. Insertion

Muysken (2000) explains insertion as the blending of lexical elements or whole constituents from a particular language to the structure of different languages. According to Muysken (2000), in terms of constituency, insertion involving a single constituent or showing a nested a b a form. Regarding the element switched, insertion involves content words or selected elements. Furthermore, a dummy word insertion can indicate insertion in relation to the switch site. In terms of properties, morphological integration and telegraphic mixing may occur.

Some sentences utilized by Edwin in the web series are categorized as the insertion type. An example of this type is described as follows. Data 3.2:

Ya *simplenya* sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha.

(Yes, the simple thing is, that it is making an app for business operators.)

Regarding the constituency, the sentence above has an English adjective *simple* that demonstrates a single constituent. The word *simple* also refers to the nested a b a form. In nested a b a form, the English word *simple* as the *b* is added between the Indonesian elements as the *a* which can be seen from *Ya* and *-nya sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha*. In terms of element switched, the word *simple* is an English adjective, and an adjective is categorized as a content word. Concerning the switch site, the presence of a dummy word that marks insertion is absent. Finally, regarding properties, there is a morphological integration which can be seen from the integration of the English adjective *simple* with the Indonesian suffix *-nya*.

B. Congruent Lexicalization

According to Muysken (2000), congruent lexicalization combines elements from two distinct languages into a single grammatical framework that allows the incorporation of elements from either language since the two languages exhibit a common grammatical structure. Muysken (2000) notes that in terms of constituency, congruent lexicalization has several constituents and non-nested a b a structure. Regarding the element switched, there are switching of function elements or the inclusion of selected elements that cover objects or complements. Concerning the switch site, bidirectional mixing occurs in this type. Lastly, linear and equivalence in structure, homophonous diamorphs, morphological integration, and mixed collocations and idioms may present as the properties of congruent lexicalization.

Some sentences utilized by Edwin in the web series are categorized as the congruent lexicalization type. An example of this type is presented below. Data 3.5:

Patricia: Code-Mixing Analysis Used by Edwin in The Web Series
Rumah Biru The Series Season 2

Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana *project* yang *urgencynya* lebih tinggi.

(Therefore, we can also know which projects have higher urgency.)

In terms of constituency, there are several constituents that are switched which refer to the English nouns, namely *project* and *urgency*. Additionally, the sentence starts with Indonesian and then changes to English and switches to Indonesian and changes to English again and switches to Indonesian until the end which demonstrates non-nested a b a structure. Regarding the element switched, the Indonesian conjunction *yang* plays a role as a function word that links the mixing of English and Indonesian. Moreover, there is an object as a selected element which can be seen through the word *project* after the Indonesian verb *tau* or know in English. Concerning the switch site, there is a bidirectional code-mixing in which two languages switch back-and-forth within a sentence. Finally, the presence of morphological integration when there is an Indonesian suffix *-nya* attached to the English noun *urgency* and the occurrence of homophonous diamorphs which refers to the similar pronunciation of the English word *urgency* to its Indonesian *urgensi* highlight the properties of congruent lexicalization.

Factors Influencing Specific Types of Code-Mixing Used by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*

A. Participant Roles and Relationships

According to Bhatia and Ritchie (2013), the participants' responsibilities and the nuances of their relationships have a considerable impact on whether bilinguals agree or disagree about language choice. Moreover, linguistic changes between languages can be a genuine process of repair or a means to become more compatible in communication when there is a language mismatch. Dual or multiple identities, speech accommodation, and social distance among communication participants may increase the potential of language mixing or switching. This factor influences the insertion type. An example of this factor is presented below. Data 3.6:

Skemanya udah siap, tinggal gue bawa aja nanti ke *scrum meeting*.

(The scheme is ready, I just need to bring it to the scrum meeting later.)

The insertion of the English noun *scrum meeting* to Edwin's Indonesian sentence occurs because of the dual identities of the dialogue participants. Before Edwin stated the sentence above, his colleague, Karin inserted English language in her Indonesian dialogue. Dual identities can be seen in their interactions because Edwin and Karin can communicate in both Indonesian and English without difficulty. Additionally, Edwin's ability to accommodate Karin's bilingual style of speech by integrating English into his answer demonstrates a mirroring process that enhances their mutual understanding and connection. Karin's encouraging answer to Edwin's update on the project's acceptance at the scrum meeting demonstrates their successful communication, affected by their respective roles and established connections.

B. Situational

Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) state that in terms of situational factors, particular languages are regarded to be more suited than others for certain social groups, individuals, subjects, settings, or situations. Furthermore, some situational aspects which cover changes in personality, ideas, audience, and topic matter can impact on language mixing or switching. This factor influences the insertion type. Below is an example of this factor. Data 1.4:

Nah ini dia nih, ini *recharge room*.

(So here it is, this is the recharge room.)

The English noun *recharge room* embedded in an otherwise Indonesian sentence used by Edwin suits the situation in which he explained the room to the IT interns who were not familiar with it. The English noun *recharge room* is suitable for the situation because Edwin and the interns were physically present in the room where the discussion was taking place. The use of this English term introduces interns to its generally used name, improving their familiarity with the workplace inside the IT division. Therefore, the inclusion of the English term in Edwin's communication above fits well with the specific context and participants at that time.

C. Message-Intrinsic

Language mixing or switching is impacted by several pragmatic and linguistic factors. The writer shows data below regarding insertion type exemplifying the message-intrinsic factors, focusing on message qualification and topic-comment/relative clauses.

a. Message Qualification

Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) note that language mixing often appears in the form of a complement, where an additional phrase provides clarity or emphasis to the sentence. The data of this factor is explained below. Data 1.9:

Btw, Tia dan Wijaya gue ajak ke grup ini ya?

(By the way, I will invite Tia and Wijaya to this group, okay?)

The insertion of *Btw* in the Indonesian sentence above has a particular rhetorical function. It qualifies the message that follows by indicating that the discussion is going to move to a different but connected subject. *Btw* (by the way) in this case introduces and establishes Edwin's suggestion. Edwin's usage of *Btw* (by the way) guarantees that the idea of inviting the interns, Tia and Wijaya, is communicated with clarity.

b. Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses

Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) suggest that language mixing can happen when a topic is presented in a language and is subsequently followed by comments stated in a different language. Below is the data on this factor. Data 1.6:

Kalau kita bikin aplikasi, yang bisa *manage* kekhawatirannya Ibu Tika, artinya kita bisa nolong situasi banyak orang kayak Rara loh.

(If we make an application that can manage Mrs. Tika's worries, it means we can help a lot of people like Rara.)

The inclusion of the English verb *manage* in an otherwise Indonesian sentence demonstrates the usage of message-intrinsic variables, notably topic-comment/relative clauses. The section of the sentence "yang bisa *manage* kekhawatirannya Ibu Tika" (that can manage Mrs. Tika's worries) is a comment that expands on the initial topic of developing a new application, which was introduced in Indonesian. This usage of bilingual language allows Edwin to properly describe the precise functions of the proposed application on Mrs. Tika's situation.

D. Multiple Factors

a. Participant Roles and Relationships + Situational

These factors motivate one type, which is insertion. In the following example, Edwin's usage of insertion code-mixing is influenced by both participant roles and relationships, as well as situational factors. Data 3.1:

Iya kan, jadi lebih gampang buat ngajuin mesin *EDC*.

Patricia: Code-Mixing Analysis Used by Edwin in The Web Series
Rumah Biru The Series Season 2

(Yes, it will be easier to apply for EDC machines.)

The English term *EDC* inserted in the data above is influenced by participant roles and relationships because Edwin used *EDC* to answer his colleague, Maya, who had previously used English when talking to Edwin. Moreover, Edwin's effort in matching to Maya's language use, showing his adaptability and flexibility as a bilingual. Furthermore, the term *EDC* is relevant to the particular context of talking about an application creation idea that facilitates EDC applications. The use of the term *EDC* also suits with the discussion topic and is directed at Maya, who clearly knows the term further emphasizing situational factors.

b. Participant Roles and Relationships + Message-Intrinsic (Interjections) + Language Attitudes, Dominance, and Security

These factors motivate one type of code-mixing, namely insertion. The writer provides an example of Edwin's insertion code-mixing, which is shaped by several factors, including participant roles and relationships, interjections, language attitudes, dominance, and security. Data 3.7:

Ya *happy* lah.

(Yes, I am happy.)

Edwin's incorporation of the English word *happy* reflects the participant roles and relationships, emphasizing the dual identities of Edwin and Karin as bilingual speakers and demonstrates Edwin's flexibility and his effort to adjust the linguistic preferences of his colleague, Karin, as his interlocutor. In this context, Edwin uses *happy* to express his positive feelings or excitement about the possible approval of his project which represents interjection from message-intrinsic. Additionally, Edwin's preference for conveying excitement in English rather than Indonesian highlights his language dominance in this emotional context. In this context, Edwin's use of *happy* also reflects both his secure feeling with Karin and Karin's positive attitude towards language mixing, hence fostering the occurrence of code-mixing.

c. Situational + Message-Intrinsic (Reiteration and Message Qualification)

The writer presents the data on Edwin's congruent lexicalization code-mixing, which is affected by several factors, including situational paired with reiteration and message qualification from message-intrinsic. The data is described as follows. Data 1.5:

By the way kita di sini *flexitime*, jadi bisa kita masuk agak siangan cuma tetap harus delapan jam.

(By the way we have *flexitime* here, so we can come in a little later but we still have to complete eight hours.)

The use of *by the way* and *flexitime* are motivated by situational factors because in this case, *by the way*, gives signals that there is a change in both topic and language. The term *flexitime* also emphasizes situational because it fits with the discussion contexts regarding the IT division's *flexitime* policy. Moreover, Edwin describes the concept of the term *flexitime* by repeating it in Indonesian to clarify the meaning of the term to the interns that represents reiteration. In this context, the phrase *by the way* also functions as a message qualification, improving the structure of his explanation so that the message sounds complete and clear.

d. Participant Roles and Relationships + Situational + Message-Intrinsic
(Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses)

The writer gives the following data on Edwin's congruent lexicalization code-mixing, which is motivated by some factors, including participant roles and relationships, situational, and topic-comment/relative clauses from message-intrinsic. The data is described as follows. Data 3.5:

Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana *project* yang *urgencynya* lebih tinggi.

(Therefore, we can also know which projects have higher urgency.)

Edwin's code-mixing above is motivated by participant roles and relationships. He integrated his sentence with English words such as *project* and *urgency* because his interlocutors combined their conversations with English which shows their dual identities. Their dual identities also encourage Edwin to adapt to each other's speaking style to use both Indonesian and English. Edwin's use of those English elements also shows situational because those English words are relevant to the discussion topic and are likely better suited or more effective to explain specific technical aspects of their work rather than Indonesian. Furthermore, the statement he used "yang *urgencynya* lebih tinggi" (which projects have higher urgency) functioned as a comment about the projects under discussion that is stated in different languages.

DISCUSSIONS

A. Predominance of Insertion and Congruent Lexicalization in Edwin's Communication

Edwin's preference for insertion and congruent lexicalization over alternation could represent his desire to communicate clearly. Insertion and congruent lexicalization allow people to seamlessly integrate two languages or codes without causing any confusion (Hartawan & Hikmaharyanti, 2023). Edwin uses insertion to effortlessly mix English terms and specialized words into his main Indonesian talks, ensuring coherence and flow. Similarly, congruent lexicalization enables the use of familiar Indonesian words alongside sophisticated English terminology within the same grammatical framework.

B. Absence of Alternation in Edwin's Code-Mixing

The absence of this form of code-mixing in Edwin's interaction could be caused by the necessity to maintain a consistent and unambiguous interaction flow in professional situations. The employment of the alternation form of code-mixing may cause confusion. Furthermore, Edwin's predominantly national employment history and level of English proficiency, combined with the lack of experience working overseas or in highly international circumstances, may limit his capacity to employ alternation successfully.

C. Factors Influencing Insertion and Congruent Lexicalization in Edwin's Code-Mixing

Participant Roles and Relationships: Edwin's professional role as an IT analyst and supervisor demands him to utilize technical language accurately, and he fulfills it with insertion and congruent lexicalization. Those types help him to communicate important English terms with clarity and make sure that complex concepts are well understandable. The relationship between Edwin and his colleagues also plays a crucial role. Edwin not only delivers technical information effectively but also reinforces his leadership role by using insertion and congruent lexicalization, which is important in managing a diverse team.

Situational: In Edwin's working situation within the IT department, it is very important to deliver complex technical information accurately and effectively. Insertion could be utilized for introducing specific words that are appropriate for the context, whereas congruent lexicalization could help to integrate specific words into the communication intelligibly.

Patricia: Code-Mixing Analysis Used by Edwin in The Web Series
Rumah Biru The Series Season 2

Message Qualification: This factor refers to how Edwin utilizes code-mixing to make his points sound clearer. Edwin's use of both insertion and congruent lexicalization ensures that his interlocutors can understand his main idea clearly.

Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses: The application of this factor in both insertion and congruent lexicalization helps Edwin to use two different languages to structure his conversations. This ensures that important points are emphasized and that everyone understands the details.

D. Factors Influencing Insertion in Edwin's Communication

In *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, Edwin's use of the insertion type is notably influenced by interjections and factors related to language attitudes, dominance, and security.

Interjections: In settings where more than one language is spoken, such as in Edwin's situation, using interjections can directly convey emotional responses without interrupting the grammatical flow of the communication. Edwin's use of English interjections specifically in the insertion type is likely aimed at clearly expressing and highlighting emotions, while keeping the conversation smooth and uninterrupted.

Language Attitudes, Dominance, and Security: Edwin's use of English words in his conversations in Indonesian might be influenced by his view of English as a prestigious language or a symbol of professional status within the industry. This factor in the insertion type also helps Edwin to emphasize certain preferences or feelings with different language in his conversation thus Edwin could feel more connected to his interlocutors.

E. Factors Influencing Congruent Lexicalization in Edwin's Communication

In the web series, Edwin's use of the congruent lexicalization type is especially motivated by the factor of reiteration. In congruent lexicalization, when elements from two languages are combined in a shared grammatical structure, reiteration plays a key role in highlighting important meanings of the interaction. Additionally, reiteration particularly appears in congruent lexicalization because there is bidirectional code-mixing in this type, which refers to the back-and-forth switches of different languages, and it allows the repetition of explanations of other language elements that have been mentioned previously. Thus, Edwin could deliver his meaning precisely and effectively.

F. Absence of Some Factors in Edwin's Code-Mixing

The use of insertion and congruent lexicalization by Edwin does not appear to be influenced by factors namely quotations, hedging, idioms and deep-rooted cultural wisdom.

Quotations: In Edwin's context, communications in his role are likely to focus more on practical issues such as solving occurring problems or discussing projects. Due to its practical focus, quoting past conversations is not particularly useful and relevant. Moreover, using quotations could make Edwin's communication sound wordy.

Hedging: In Edwin's professional context, the focus is on delivering information clearly and accurately, particularly when discussing complex technical topics or giving specific instructions. Moreover, the absence of hedging indicates that Edwin needs to master everything related to his roles and project tasks with certainty. Therefore, hedging may not be the best way, as it could make it harder to understand information or to carry out the tasks.

Idioms and Deep-Rooted Cultural Wisdom: In a professional environment such as Edwin's work environment, where effective communication is crucial, it is important to

minimize the use of idioms or culturally specific references to prevent any potential confusion. It is also crucial to consider the cultural diversity in environments like Edwin's.

G. Multiple Factors Motivate Code-Mixing Occurrences in Single Sentences

It is evident in Edwin's context that communication is not restricted to sharing information but also includes creating a good relationship and a professional image. Edwin also must ensure that all group members clearly understand the point of discussions or grasp the importance of certain information. Therefore, Edwin strategically employs code-mixing, organizing his language use to fit the roles of the people he is addressing, the context of the discussions, and the specific ways in which he needs to present clear information. The presence of multiple factors in code-mixing within single sentences highlights Edwin's skillful use of language that is needed to address the complex communication needs in today's workplaces.

CONCLUSION

The data analysis results showed that Edwin utilized two code-mixing types, namely insertion and congruent lexicalization. These choices enhance clarity and coherence. The absence of alternation highlights the need for maintaining a consistent and straightforward communication flow. Additionally, Edwin's code-mixing choices are influenced by his professional role, the need for conveying clear messages, and the situational context of his communications. The exclusion of quotations, hedging, and idioms and deep-rooted cultural wisdom factors highlight the importance of direct and precise communication in his work environment. Furthermore, the use of interjections and the impact of language attitudes, dominance and security in insertion type of code-mixing show how emotional expressiveness and perceived linguistic prestige contribute to his communication style. The occurrence of multiple factors in Edwin's code-mixing shows how he uses language effectively for both technical discussions and social interactions. Finally, this study shows that Edwin's use of code-mixing is strategically adapted to meet the demands of his professional environment and the contexts of his interactions and create clear communication.

REFERENCES

- Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Hartawan, N. P. I. A., & Hikmaharyanti, P. D. A. (2023). Types of code-mixing found in Natasha Surya's TikTok. *Elysian Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 3(3), 147-156.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Solusi BCA. (n.d.). *Playlists* [YouTube channel]. YouTube.
<https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLklgHGGuwABMKZmHMIFvW2nkP8fOBKQ0k&si=GssMG74j04zqeXMn>