

## Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata in the *Jerome Goes to School* Vlogs

### Spania Refira

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Creative Industries, Petra Christian University,  
Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya 60236, INDONESIA  
Email: a11200057@john.petra.ac.id

### ABSTRACT

This study analyzes Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's use of code-mixing in a *Jerome Goes to School* vlog. Muysken's (2000) code-mixing theory is used as the primary framework, supported by Holmes' (2013) social factors theory. A qualitative approach is employed, complemented by numerical data. The findings reveal six similarities and five differences in Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's code-mixing practices. Similarities include the use of all three types of code-mixing (insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization), with insertion being the most common and congruent lexicalization the least common. Both speakers also exhibit high consistency in their use of constituency indicators and the uniform application of alternation's and insertion's four indicators. Differences include Jerome Polin's higher use of insertion and lower use of congruent lexicalization, contrasted with Livy Renata's higher use of congruent lexicalization and specific elements switched. The study highlights how participants' roles (host and guest), the setting (educational and entertaining vlog), topic (school tour), and function (informing and engaging viewers) influence their code-mixing practices. Future research should analyze multiple episodes and content types or should focus on audience reception and comprehension related to the use of code-mixing in digital media.

**Keywords:** code-mixing, school, social factors, vlog

### INTRODUCTION

When a person has a background that enables them to speak more than one language, code-mixing can occur in a sentence. Hence, the writer strives to observe Jerome Polin's sentences when talking to Livy Renata and vice versa in a YouTube vlog video. Livy Renata's multilingual capabilities are interesting to analyze. She attended an International School called Bina Bangsa School (BBS) from elementary until junior high school (Aditya, 2024) and graduated from Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia (Zakawali, 2023). Although Jerome Polin graduated from a university in Japan and his ability to speak Japanese has a high probability, he most likely will not speak to Livy Renata in Japanese because Livy Renata is more fluent in English. Looking at their sociolinguistic background, this study attempted to analyze the code-mixing in Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's sentences. Therefore, the research questions of this study are: (1) What types of code-mixing are used by Jerome Polin when talking to Livy Renata in the vlog? (2) What types of code-mixing are used by Livy Renata when talking to Jerome Polin in the vlog? (3) What are the similarities and differences between Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's use of code-mixing?

The main theory of this study is the code-mixing theory by Muysken (2000). Muysken (2000) employs three types of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Muysken (2000) explains, each type of code-mixing exhibits contradictory structural forms. Additionally, every type of code-mixing is characterized by four indicators: constituency, switch site, element switched, and properties (Muysken, 2000). This study is supported by social factors theory by Holmes (2013). Holmes (2013) identifies four key social factors influencing code-mixing: participants, setting, topic, and function.

### METHOD

**Refira: Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata in  
the *Jerome Goes to School Vlogs***

This study employs Creswell and Creswell's (2018) qualitative method. This study also incorporates Maxwell's (2010) quantitative method as a supporting method. According to Maxwell (2010), simple counting can be very helpful in research findings. The data source was the sentences of Jerome Polin and Livy Renata, which contain code-mixing elements as shown in the YouTube video *Sekolah Sultan!? Ada Salmon, Trampolin, Kolam Renang 🤪 Ft. Livy Renata | Goes to School BBS PIK* (Nihongo Mantappu, 2023). The data has three limitations: it only analyzes Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's verbal interactions, focuses on school-related topics, and the languages are not classified by the writer as standard or non-standard variants.

Collecting the data involved several steps. First, the writer watched the YouTube vlog video and used an online transcript called Good Tape (<https://goodtape.io/>). Then, the current writer highlighted Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's sentences that contain code-mixing elements when observing the video and the transcript. After that, the current writer used a two-digit numbering system. The first number in this system showed who was speaking. For example, 1 means that sentences were said by Jerome Polin to Livy Renata, and 2 means that sentences were said by Livy Renata to Jerome Polin. The second digit was used for each sentence in the dialogue to number it in order.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section elaborates on the findings of the writers' study. There are three main parts, which are divided into further sections to provide an in-depth discussion of the analysis: (1) types of code-mixing used by Jerome Polin (2) types of code-mixing used by Livy Renata (3) similarities and differences between the types of code-mixing used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata. The table below (Table 4.1) shows the general summary of every type of code-mixing as well as its four indicators applied by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata.

Table 4.1  
Summary of Types of Code-Mixing Findings

Code-Mixing by Jerome Polin												Code-Mixing by Livy Renata															
Types of Code-Mixing & Four Indicators																											
I				A				CL				I				A				CL							
C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P	C	S	E	P
Total Percentages of the Data's Four Indicators																											
100%	5.6%	100%	16.6%	100%	100%	100%	62.5%	100%	100%	0%	66.6%	100%	5.6%	56.8%	4.5%	100%	100%	100%	48%	100%	100%	87.5%	16.6%				
Total Percentages of the Data's Types of Code-Mixing																											
62.07%				27,59%				10,34%				47.31%				26.88%				25.81%							

Abbreviations:

I : Insertion                      A : Alternation                      CL: Congruent Lexicalization  
 C : Constituency                SS: Switch Site                      ES: Element Switched  
 P : Properties

### Types of Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin

Jerome Polin's analysis revealed that he employs all forms of code-mixing, including insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Examples of each type of code-mixing are provided below.

### A. Insertion

Example: Data 1.1

Oke, dari pintu masuknya udah keliatan kayak mall ya?  
(Okay, from the entrance, it already looks like a mall, right?)

Nested in a-b-a form, the sentence highlights the insertion's constituency by having 'a' represent the sections "Oke, dari pintu masuknya udah keliatan kayak" and "ya?" from Indonesian, and 'b' indicate the added word "mall" from English. This arrangement guarantees that "mall" functions as a single constituent.

Moreover, based on the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), "mall" in this context is categorized as a noun that fits the requirements for the element switched in insertion. Still, the sentence (or data 1.1) lacks unique elements pertaining to the switch site's and properties' characteristics.

### B. Alternation

Example: Data 1.12

Iya, swimming pool is surprising.  
(Yes, swimming pool is surprising.)

Data 1.12 shows alternation's constituency. Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) clarify the sentence consists of three parts: "swimming pool" was a noun; "is" was the verb; and "surprising" was the adjective. This indicates Jerome Polin's speech had multiple constituencies for the alternation. Regarding the switch site, it was shown that the added words were placed at the sentence's periphery, which was the words "swimming pool is surprising".

Moreover, the element switched in this sentence was tag-switching where It started in Indonesian and ended in English. Furthermore, the constituents were long and complex. The study also found that data 1.24 showed linear equivalence in the alternation properties. It was due to the similarity in sentence structures between Indonesian and English languages.

### C. Congruent Lexicalization

Example: Data 1.19

Pas di sekolah negeri, yang English cuma Bahasa English doang.  
(In public school, English was only used during English class.)

Based on the findings of Data 1.19, it was discovered that the constituent of the congruent lexicalization was non nested in a-b-a form. According to the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), the word "English" is a noun. In terms of switch site, data 1.19 revealed bidirectional switching. Data 1.19 contained a sentence that switched back and forth between Indonesian and English. However, there was no indication of an element switched and properties in data 1.19.

## Types of Code-Mixing Used by Livy Renata

The YouTube video analysis revealed that Livy Renata's sentences contained code-mixing. Her dialogues contained all three types of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. The following sections provide examples for each type.

### A. Insertion

**Refira:** Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata in  
the *Jerome Goes to School Vlogs*

Example: Data 2.76

Kalau secondary itu tiga belas.  
(It was thirteen for secondary.)

Data 2.76 showed the constituency of the insertion where the sentence is in a-b-a form. ‘a’ stands for Indonesian words, and ‘b’ for English words. Moreover, the word “secondary” was a single constituent. According to the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), “secondary” was classified as an adjective.

The word “secondary” was the element switched from data 2.76. According to Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), “secondary” is a content word and classified as an adjective. However, Data 2.76 did not reveal any signs about the switch site and properties.

### **B. Alternation**

Example: Data 2.42

Ini, uh, we are required to have one of these.  
(This, uh, we are required to have one of these.)

Data 2.42 revealed that there was an alternation constituency in the sentence. Data 2.42 contained multiple constituencies in non-nested a-b-a form. According to the Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), “we” was the pronoun, “are” was the auxiliary verb, “required” was the verb, “to have” was the infinitive phrase, “one” was the determiner, “of” was the preposition, and “these” was the pronoun. Furthermore, the switch site of the words “we are required to have one of these” was placed at the peripheral of the sentence.

Moreover, data 2.42 contained an alternation’s element switched. The element switched was the tag-switching, which changed the language from Indonesian to English. The constituents were also long and complex. The alternation’s properties in data 2.42 were self-correction. The word “uh” was a sign of self-correction because it changed into another language later.

### **C. Congruent Lexicalization**

Example: Data 2.51

Tapi is your Indonesian lancar or not?  
(But is your Indonesian fluent or not?)

Data 2.51 revealed the sentence had congruent lexicalization’s constituency. The sentence in data 2.51 contained multiple constituents and was in non a-b-a form. Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) classified the words “is” was the auxiliary verb; “your” was the pronoun; “Indonesian” was the adjective; “or” was the conjunction; “not” was the adverb. In addition, Data 2.51 showed the congruent lexicalization switch site. Data 2.51 used bidirectional switching where the Indonesian and English languages switched back and forth in a sentence.

Additionally, the element switched was used in congruent lexicalization. Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) classified “is” from data 2.51 as an auxiliary verb and “or” as a conjunction. Thus, function words included “is” and “or”. Nevertheless, data 2.51 showed no congruent lexicalization properties.

### **Similarities and Differences Between the Types of Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata**

This section discusses the similarities and differences between Jerome Polin and Livy Renata's use of code-mixing. The current writer identified several similarities and differences in how they use code-mixing in their communication with one another.

### **Similarities**

This study found six code-mixing similarities between Jerome Polin and Livy Renata. It encompasses all types of code-mixing used, the most and least common types, constituency indicator usage, three alternation indicators, and both speakers applying all four indicators from insertion and alternation.

#### **A. Use of All Three Types of Code-Mixing**

There are several reasons why both Jerome Polin and Livy Renata employ all three types of code-mixing. First, their bilingualism plays a huge role. Both speakers are fluent in multiple languages, allowing them to switch between various types of code-mixing seamlessly. Furthermore, the engagement with the audience holds a significant importance. Jerome Polin and Livy Renata use code-mixing to match their listeners' linguistic preferences and proficiencies, making their content more engaging. Finally, Jerome Polin and Livy Renata's use of all three code-mixing types reflects bilingual and multilingual people's language use. Jerome Polin and Livy Renata switch their code-mixing styles depending on the topic and participants in natural conversations.

#### **B. Most Common Type of Code-Mixing Used**

The second similarity between Jerome Polin and Livy Renata was the use of insertion as the most common used type of code-mixing. Jerome Polin and Livy Renata may use insertion as code-mixing due to their roles in vlog. Holmes (2013) emphasizes that conversational participants' identities and relationships greatly affect their practices. Jerome Polin acted as the host and Livy Renata acted as the guest in the vlog. Due to her familiarity with Bina Bangsa School (BBS), which she attended, Livy Renata also acted as a tour guide. During the vlog video, Jerome Polin mostly asked questions, while Livy Renata answered in detail. Insertion could help Livy Renata to avoid giving the wrong information. Jerome Polin helped viewers to understand by translating Livy Renata's English responses into Indonesian.

#### **C. Least Common Type of Code-Mixing Used**

Congruent lexicalization was the least used type of code-mixing for Jerome Polin and Livy Renata. Due to the complexity of blending two languages in one sentence, congruent lexicalization requires fluency in both languages' vocabulary and grammar. This type of code-mixing is complicated and may confuse listeners who are not fluent in both languages. Thus, congruent lexicalization's constant switching may disrupt conversation, making it unsuitable for vlogs' spontaneous dialogues. The format of their vlog requires Jerome Polin and Livy Renata to communicate effectively and make their conversation accessible and engaging to viewers of varying language proficiency. Simpler code-mixing types like insertion, where single words or phrases are mixed into the dominant language, and alternation, where switches occur less often, improve understanding and viewer interest without the complexity and confusion of congruent lexicalization. Thus, Jerome Polin and Livy Renata may prefer simpler code-mixing that allows bilingual communication without misunderstanding.

#### **D. The Use of Constituency Indicator**

Jerome Polin and Livy Renata show 100% use of insertion's constituency. This high consistency suggests that they follow the base language's grammatical rules when inserting words. There are two possible causes. First, both speakers typically speak well in the languages they mix, allowing them to add words without disrupting syntactic structures. Second, constituency helps

**Refira:** Code-Mixing Used by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata in  
the *Jerome Goes to School Vlogs*

Jerome Polin and Livy Renata's speech to be understood by their audience, which is essential for effective communication.

### **E. The Use of Three Indicators of Alternation**

In their alternations, Jerome Polin and Livy Renata have 100% for their constituency, switch sites, and element switched. They use alternation to switch phrases or clauses between languages while maintaining grammatical integrity, indicating high structural integration.

### **F. The Use of the Four Indicators of Insertion and Alternation**

Based on the analysis, Jerome Polin and Livy Renata used all four code-mixing indicators for insertions and alternations: consistency, switch site, element switched, and properties. Their multilingualism allows them to blend language structures. Jerome Polin and Livy Renata's code-mixing may be influenced by their linguistic background. Due to their international study, Jerome Polin and Renata naturally implement various types of code-mixing into their communication. Their consistent use of these indicators shows they can manage language mixing structure.

## **Differences**

This analysis revealed several differences in Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's use of code mixing. Five key differences were identified: the use of insertion, congruent lexicalization, properties, element switched, and the absence of the congruent lexicalization's element switched in Jerome Polin's analysis, which was present in Livy Renata's.

### **A. The Use of Insertion**

Jerome Polin (62.07%) used more insertion than Livy Renata (47.31%). Their insertion methods might be different for several reasons. The first reason is the differing language comfort and proficiency. Jerome Polin's foreign language education and international exposure may help him with frequent insertions. Livy Renata is also proficient, but she may use insertion less due to her different language acquisition process or comfort with language integration. Communication roles and contexts are also important. Jerome Polin, the YouTube vlog host, likely knows his audience's demographics and language skills. In order to be more engaging, the use of insertions help to communicate and relate to Jerome Polin's audience. Meanwhile, Livy Renata who acts as a guest or tour guide in the vlog, may not know the audience's language. Due to her unfamiliarity and role, she may prefer longer monolingual conversations to avoid misunderstandings.

### **B. The Use of Congruent Lexicalization**

According to this study, Livy Renata used congruent lexicalization more frequently, with a total of 25.81%, than Jerome Polin, who had a percentage of 10.34%. Livy Renata, who speaks English better, can use more congruent lexicalization, switching languages within sentences. Her ability to seamlessly blend languages shows that she can handle both languages' syntactic and semantic demands. Livy Renata may be good at code-mixing because she speaks English well and had studied abroad. Jerome Polin used less congruent lexicalization (10.34%) than Livy Renata (25.81%) which suggests that they communicate in different ways. To avoid confusion, Jerome Polin prioritized viewer comprehension. Therefore, he used insertion more often, a type of code-mixing that lets him introduce foreign language elements without disrupting the base language's syntactic structure.

### **C. The Use of Properties Indicator**

The analysis showed significant differences in insertion and congruent lexicalization between Jerome Polin and Livy Renata. Jerome Polin used 16.6% and 66.6% properties in insertion and congruent lexicalization, compared to Livy Renata's 4.5% and 16.6%. Jerome Polin's extensive use of morphological integration—blending a suffix from one language into a word from another—contributes to these differences. Jerome Polin often adds “-nya” to English nouns like “map” to form “map-nya” instead of “peta.” This shows high linguistic blending and increases the complexity and frequency of his code-mixing properties. This strategic morphological integration is crucial to Jerome Polin's role as a host. It ensures bilingual audiences find content engaging and relatable. Livy Renata, a guest and tour guide, used these properties less often. Livy Renata's job requires precise and clear explanations of familiar settings. Thus, she used less morphological integration and other complex code-mixing properties to simplify information.

#### **D. The Use of Element Switched Indicator**

Jerome Polin and Livy Renata have different percentages of elements switched in code-mixing for insertion and congruent lexicalization. The element switched of Livy Renata was 56.8% in insertion and 87.5% in congruent lexicalization, while Jerome Polin had 100% for the element switched in insertion but there was no indication of the element switched in congruent lexicalization. Livy Renata's linguistic background in international school had shown her how to use function words and incorporate English vocabulary into her Indonesian dialogues. However, Jerome Polin's upbringing in Surabaya, a city known for its casual communication, had influenced his preference for content words.

#### **E. The Use of Element Switched in Congruent Lexicalization**

Jerome Polin and Livy Renata used element switched within congruent lexicalization differently. Livy Renata's 87.5% function words caused her to use element switched's congruent lexicalization, while Jerome Polin did not. Livy Renata, whose role was as a tour guide, uses function words extensively to explain and clarify. Jerome Polin, the host, elicits information, which may not require or benefit from function words that congruent lexicalization requires. Each speaker uses different linguistic strategies and has different conversational roles. Function words in Livy Renata's code-mixing help her explain complex information clearly and engagingly. Meanwhile, Jerome Polin's lack of function word usage in congruent lexicalization suggests a more straightforward, question-focused interaction style, consistent with his role of gathering information rather than providing it.

### **CONCLUSION**

The writers' findings lead to the conclusion that the overall findings support Holmes' (2013) theory by illustrating how participants' roles, the setting of the vlog, the topic being discussed, and the function of communication influence Jerome Polin's and Livy Renata's code-mixing practices. The writer found that Jerome Polin used all three types of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Also, Jerome Polin appeared to use all four indicators: properties, constituency, switch site, and element switched. However, in congruent lexicalization, Jerome Polin only used three of the four indicators: constituency, switch site, and properties. In addition, Livy Renata also used all types of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Livy Renata also used all four indicators—constituency, switch site, element switched, and properties—in all types of code-mixing.

This study has limitations; hence, it is recommended that other researchers conduct an analysis across multiple episodes and different types of content created by Jerome Polin and Livy Renata. This would provide a more holistic understanding of their code-mixing practices. Future researchers can also study how the use of code-mixing affects audience reception and comprehension. Surveys or interviews with viewers could reveal their preferences and understanding.

## REFERENCES

- Aditya, R. (2024, March 25). Sekolah Livy Renata dimana? Dituding beli mobil mewah dari donasi padahal kuat bayar ratusan juta biaya pendidikan. *Suara.com*. <https://www.suara.com/lifestyle/2024/03/25/192447/sekolah-livy-renata-dimana-dituding-beli-mobil-mewah-dari-donasi-padaahal-kuat-bayar-ratusan-juta-biaya-pendidikan>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Are. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/are>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). English. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/english>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Have. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/have>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Indonesian. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/indonesian>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Is. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/is>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Mall. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/mall>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Not. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/not>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Of. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/of>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). One. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/one>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Or. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/or>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Required. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/required>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Secondary. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/secondary>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Surprising. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/surprising>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Swimming Pool. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/swimming-pool>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). These. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/these>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). To. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/to>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). We. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/we>
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d). Your. In *Cambridge Free English Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Retrieved June 10, 2024 from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/your>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publication.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). Routledge.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2010). Qualitative inquiry: Using numbers in qualitative research. *Sage*, 16(6).
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nihongo Mantappu. (2023, March 21). Sekolah sultan!? Ada salmon, trampolin, kolam renang 🤔 Ft. Livy Renata | Goes to school BBS PIK [Video]. YouTube. [https://youtu.be/dZRpE9xMMns?si=ycqINaehW-Kvs\\_ya](https://youtu.be/dZRpE9xMMns?si=ycqINaehW-Kvs_ya)
- Zakawali, G. (2023, August 29). Profil Livy Renata lengkap, dari karier hingga kekayaan. *Orami*. <https://www.orami.co.id/magazine/profil-livy-renata?page=all>