

## Code-Mixing by Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta in the Podcast *Daniel Tetangga Kamu*

**Marcelino Albertus Sukamto<sup>1</sup>, Samuel Gunawan<sup>2</sup>**

English Department, Faculty of Humanities and Creative Industries, Petra Christian University,  
Siwalankerto 121-131. Surabaya 60236, INDONESIA  
E-mail: a11210036@john.petra.ac.id<sup>1</sup>, samgun@petra.ac.id<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

This study examines code-mixing as used by Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta in the podcast *Daniel Tetangga Kamu* (Your Neighbor Daniel), specifically in the episode *Go International, Agnez Mo Selalu Bangga Mewakili Indonesia* (Go International, Agnez Mo is Always Proud to Represent Indonesia). The analysis is based on Muysken's (2000) theory of types of code-mixing. The research was conducted qualitatively, supported by simple quantitative calculations. The findings show that both speakers employed all three types of code-mixing. Moreover, congruent lexicalization, as the most complex type, was dominantly used by both, indicating strong language skills in both Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta. However, Agnez Mo used code-mixing more frequently than Daniel Mananta in the video. This difference is more likely due to unequal speaking opportunities, as one served as the host and the other as the guest. Overall, this study provides useful findings and discussions on the significant patterns of code-mixing used in the podcast *Daniel Tetangga Kamu* (Your Neighbor Daniel). Future researchers are encouraged to explore code-mixing on newer digital platforms that are increasingly popular among youth, such as TikTok. Lastly, they are advised to complement Muysken's (2000) structural framework with additional theories that examine social relationship or interactional functions.

**Keywords:** code-mixing, patterns, podcast, types of code-mixing

### INTRODUCTION

Language use is highly dynamic and context-dependent. People naturally adjust how they speak based on social settings, resulting in variations in style and even language choice. According to Joos (1977), casual style is the most commonly used form in informal situations, and in multilingual societies like Indonesia, it often involves combining multiple language codes in a conversation. One example of this is code-mixing, which Muysken (2000) defines as the use of lexical items and grammatical features of two languages within a single sentence.

This study examines the code-mixing used by Agnez Mo as the guest and Daniel Mananta as the host in the podcast *Daniel Tetangga Kamu* (Your Neighbor Daniel), specifically the episode *Go International, Agnez Mo Selalu Bangga Mewakili Indonesia* (Go International, Agnez Mo is Always Proud to Represent Indonesia). The podcast provides a rich source of casual language use, making it ideal for code-mixing analysis. Grounded in Muysken's (2000) theoretical framework, this study aims to identify the types of code-mixing, namely insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, and to reveal significant patterns found in both speakers' code-mixing. Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta were chosen as the subjects of this study because both are well-known public figures with broad linguistic repertoire, shaped by their domestic and international careers in the entertainment industry. In doing so, it contributes to a deeper understanding of how code-mixing works in digital media from a sociolinguistic perspective.

## METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach as outlined by Dörnyei (2007), which emphasizes understanding social phenomena in their natural contexts. The data were taken from a one-hour-and-seventeen-minute podcast episode of *Daniel Tetangga Kamu* (Your Neighbor Daniel), titled *Go International, Agnez Mo Selalu Bangga Mewakili Indonesia* (Go International, Agnez Mo is Always Proud to Represent Indonesia) (Daniel Mananta Network, 2021). Non-dialogue parts of the video such as the teaser and closing monologue were excluded from analysis.

The conversation between Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta was transcribed using Good Tape (<https://goodtape.io/>), an online transcript generator, and was then manually reviewed for accuracy. Sentences that contain code-mixing, based on Muysken's (2000) definition, were highlighted and coded using a speaker-based numbering system (e.g., A.122 for Agnez Mo's 122nd code-mixing sentence). While the analysis was primarily qualitative and interpretative, simple quantitative elements were used to calculate the frequency and distribution of code-mixing types from each speaker.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis of code-mixing found in the selected podcast episode. The discussion is divided into three parts: types of code-mixing used by Agnez Mo, types of code-mixing used by Daniel Mananta, and significant existing patterns of code-mixing by both speakers. The table below (Table 4.1) summarizes the findings.

Table 4.1

Comparison of Code-Mixing Use Between Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta

Comparison of Code-Mixing Use Between Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta					
Agnez Mo			Daniel Mananta		
Total Code-Mixing Sentences by Speaker					
337 (76.94%)			101 (23.06%)		
Number of Code-Mixing Sentences by Type (% of each speaker's total code-mixing)					
I	A	CL	I	A	CL
102 (30.27%)	82 (24.33%)	153 (45.40%)	25 (24.75%)	28 (27.72%)	48 (47.52%)
Number of Code-Mixing Sentences by Speaker (% of total code-mixing in the video)					
337 (76.94%)			101 (23.06%)		
Total Code-Mixing Sentences in the Video					
438 (100%)					

Abbreviations:

I: Insertion

A: Alternation

CL: Congruent Lexicalization

Further explanation is discussed in the following sections.

### Types of Code-Mixing Used by Agnez Mo

This section discusses the types of code-mixing used by Agnez Mo, based on Muysken's (2000) theoretical framework. One example is provided for each type.

#### A. Insertion

Example: Data A.122

Mereka pengen gua untuk isi acara *charity* di sana.  
(They wanted me to perform at a charity event there)

The word "charity" is a single constituent, inserted into an Indonesian sentence structure. This creates a nested a-b-a pattern, reflecting the constituency indicator of insertion. As a switched element, the word "charity" is a content word, as it is categorized as a noun (Oxford University Press, n.d.), and nouns are commonly classified as content words. This supports Muysken's (2000) explanation that, in insertion, the inserted element is typically a content word.

#### B. Alternation

Example: Data A.10

*It's funny*, karena gua tuh selalu ngerasa kalau hidup gua di dunia itu bukan punya gua.  
(It's funny, because I always feel like my life in this world does not belong to me)

The sentence begins with an English clause, "It's funny", followed by a longer Indonesian clause. This structure illustrates the constituency indicator of alternation, as it contains multiple constituents from two different languages without a nested grammatical relationship. The switch site occurs at the boundary between two clauses, forming what Muysken (2000) describes as a major clause boundary switch. In addition, the switch is also peripheral, because it takes place at the edge of the sentence rather than within a single clause. The two clauses are connected by the conjunction "karena", with each maintaining its own grammatical structure. This also reflects embedding in discourse, where one language begins the sentence and another ends it, another typical feature of alternational code-mixing.

#### C. Congruent Lexicalization

Example: Data A.83

*My life is so much bigger than just karier gua, my life, tapi me as a woman, me as a mother someday.*  
(My life is so much bigger than just my career, my life, but me as a woman, me as a mother someday.)

The sentence contains multiple constituents from both languages and adopts a non-nested a-b-a pattern, which reflects the constituency indicator of congruent lexicalization. The switch site is bidirectional, meaning there is back-and-forth switching between English and Indonesian without fixed structural restrictions. In line with Muysken's (2000) characteristics of congruent lexicalization, the switched elements in this sentence are not limited to content words but also include function words. For example, the Indonesian conjunction "tapi" is surrounded by the English expressions "my life" and "me as a woman ...". Finally, the property of homophonous diamorph is evident in "karier", which is an

Indonesian word homophonous with the English word “career” (Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, n.d.; Oxford University Press, n.d.).

### Types of Code-Mixing Used by Daniel Mananta

This section discusses the types of code-mixing used by Daniel Mananta, based on Muysken’s (2000) theory. One example is given for each type.

#### A. Insertion

Example: Data D.81

Nah, cuman kenapa nggak kita fokus ke *love-based*-nya?  
(But why don’t we focus on the love-based instead?)

In the sentence, the English phrase “love-based” functions as the ‘b’ element inserted into the Indonesian structure as the ‘a’ element. From the constituency indicator, this structure reflects a nested a-b-a pattern. Although “love-based” is not inherently a noun, it functions as a noun phrase in this context for some reasons. First, it appears as the object of the Indonesian verb “fokus”. Second, it is followed by the Indonesian suffix “-nya”, which, according to Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa (n.d.), is a clitic that refers to a specific thing or concept previously mentioned. The clitic normally attaches to nouns or noun phrases (Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, n.d.). This strengthens the argument that “love-based” in the sentence indeed acts as a noun. As a noun, it counts as a single constituent and automatically a content word too. Last but not least, that combination of an English word with an Indonesian suffix performs the property that Muysken (2000) called morphological integration.

#### B. Alternation

Example: Data D.9

*Actually*, tahun ini gua ulang tahun ke-21, ya.  
(Actually, this year I’m turning 21, right.)

This sentence consists of the English adverb “actually” and a full Indonesian clause. Although the English word is one constituent, it is not a case of insertion because it is not simply inserted into the Indonesian structure. Instead, “actually” is syntactically independent and functions as a discourse marker that does not affect the grammatical structure of the Indonesian clause. Muysken (2000) describes this type of switched element as emblematic or tag switching. Regarding the switch site, this sentence demonstrates peripheral switch, as “actually” and the Indonesian clause are located at the periphery of the sentence. Finally, embedding in discourse is also evident, as the sentence begins in English and ends in Indonesian.

#### C. Congruent Lexicalization

Example: Data D.48

*Now let’s talk about that, that controversy, which* gua support lu banget saat itu, *when you said, I don’t have any blood of Indonesian in me.*  
(But it is such an honor for her to be in my living room, right)

In this sentence, Daniel Mananta mixes multiple constituents in both English and Indonesian. The pattern is a non-nested a-b-a form, as the mixing occurs without structural restrictions. The switch site is bidirectional, as shown by the back-and-forth switches between the two languages. Besides content

words, function words are also switched, such as the Indonesian pronoun “gua” which appears between the English elements “which” and “support” in “... which gua support ...” Additionally, there is the property of homophonous diamorph. The English word “controversy” has a similar pronunciation to its Indonesian equivalent “kontroversi”, as confirmed by Oxford University Press (n.d.) and Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa (n.d.).

### **Significant Existing Patterns of Code-Mixing by Both Speakers**

This section discusses some significant patterns in the code-mixing used by Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta. The discussion is based on the data that have been collected and analyzed, and remains within the framework of Muysken (2000).

#### **A. The Use of All Types in Both Speaker’s Speech**

All three types of code-mixing proposed by Muysken (2000), which are insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, were present in the speech of both Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta. Agnez Mo used congruent lexicalization in 45.40% of her code-mixing, insertion in 30.27%, and alternation in 24.33%. Meanwhile, Daniel Mananta used congruent lexicalization in 47.52% of his code-mixing, alternation in 27.72%, and insertion in 24.75% (see Table 4.1).

These findings support the earlier claim that both speakers have a broad and flexible linguistic repertoire. In the podcast, Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta fluently switched between Indonesian and English. They did not limit themselves to insertion, the simplest form of code-mixing, but frequently used alternation and especially congruent lexicalization, which Muysken (2000) describes as the most complex.

#### **B. More Code-Mixing Sentences by Agnez Mo**

Quantitatively, 76.94% of the code-mixing sentences in the video were spoken by Agnez Mo, while only 23.06% came from Daniel Mananta. At first glance, it looks like Agnez Mo did code-mixing more frequently than Daniel Mananta. However, it is actually not the case if we look further into their conversational roles in the podcast.

As the guest, Agnez Mo had more speaking time to respond to questions and share long stories. In contrast, Daniel Mananta, as the host, mainly guided the conversation, introduced topics, and asked questions. Automatically, he produced fewer code-mixing utterances, but not necessarily less complex ones.

This interpretation is supported by early moments in the video (00:53–02:50), where Daniel Mananta takes a long time to open the podcast (Daniel Mananta Network, 2021). In that part alone, he produced eight code-mixing sentences, while Agnez Mo contributed only one. In conclusion, the fact that Daniel Mananta used fewer code-mixing sentences does not weaken the earlier interpretation in Sub-section A that both of the speakers have a broad linguistic repertoire.

#### **C. Congruent Lexicalization as the Dominant Code-Mixing Type**

Among the three code-mixing types, congruent lexicalization was the most dominant for both speakers. Its dominance is not only reflected in the highest percentage, but also in the significant gap between this type and the others. For instance, in Daniel Mananta’s case, congruent lexicalization makes

up 47.52% of his total code-mixing, while alternation accounts for 27.72% and insertion 24.75%. The gap between congruent lexicalization and alternation is very big, whereas the difference between alternation and insertion is relatively small.

The dominance strengthens further the interpretation that both speakers possess strong linguistic competence. As Muysken (2000) explains, congruent lexicalization is the most complex type, involving multiple bidirectional switches between languages without structural restriction. Its consistent use suggests that both Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta are very good at integrating two different languages fluently.

This finding also aligns with their backgrounds. Both speakers have international experience. Agnez Mo, for example, has built a career in the U.S. music industry (Daniel Mananta Network, 2021), while Daniel Mananta gained similar experience by hosting events like Miss World 2013 (Kumparan.com, 2020). Their international exposure has contributed to their familiarity with switching languages interchangeably, as reflected in their frequent use of congruent lexicalization.

#### **D. Different Second-Dominant Type**

While congruent lexicalization was the dominant code-mixing type for both speakers, their second-dominant types differed. For Agnez Mo, it was insertion; while for Daniel Mananta, it was alternation (see Table 4.1).

The reason why Agnez Mo used insertion a lot might be related to the topics she talked about. In the conversation, she discussed her career in the U.S., including song releases, collaborations with other artists, sales of songs, conflicts with her team, and more (Daniel Mananta Network, 2021). These discussions naturally led her to insert English technical terms that are difficult to translate, such as promotion, charting, walkthrough, hosting, and haters. For instance, in the sentence “Itu namanya walkthrough” (A.67), she referred to a specific promotional practice in the American music industry. Most of these technical terms are nouns, which aligns with Muysken’s (2000) explanation that insertion usually involves content words.

On the other hand, Daniel Mananta’s second-dominant type was alternation. His alternational code-mixing often involved two juxtaposed clauses in different languages, or a clause in one language accompanied by discourse tags from another. These patterns align with Muysken’s (2000, p. 96) explanation that in alternation, “... the two languages present in the clause remain relatively separate.” Due to his role as the host, this type of code-mixing may have helped him structure his ideas clearly and ensure that both his messages and the context of his questions were communicated accurately to the guest.

### **CONCLUSION**

This study found that Agnez Mo and Daniel Mananta used all three types of code-mixing proposed by Muysken (2000): insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. The quantitative data revealed that Agnez Mo produced 76.94% of the total code-mixing, while Daniel Mananta contributed 23.06%. This difference is not due to language ability, but rather reflects their different speaking roles in the podcast. Congruent lexicalization was the dominant type for both speakers. Since this type is considered the most complex among the three (Muysken, 2000), its consistent use supports the interpretation that they possess a broad and flexible linguistic repertoire. However, they showed differences in the second-dominant type, as Agnez Mo used more insertion and Daniel Mananta used more alternation.

This study has presented useful findings on the code-mixing patterns used in the podcast *Daniel Tetangga Kamu* (Your Neighbor Daniel). However, the analysis was limited to one podcast episode and focused only on the structural aspects of code-mixing within Muysken's (2000) framework. Future research is encouraged to explore code-mixing on newer digital platforms like TikTok, which may better reflect current language use. Structural analysis may also be complemented with theories on social relationships or interactional functions to better understand the motivations behind code-mixing choices.

## REFERENCES

- Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. (n.d.-a). Kontroversi. In *KBBI VI daring*. Retrieved May 14, 2025, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/kontroversi>
- Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. (n.d.-b). Nya. In *KBBI VI daring*. Retrieved May 14, 2025, from <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/nya>
- Daniel Mananta Network. (2021, January 9). *Go International, Agnez Mo Selalu Bangga Mewakili Indonesia - Daniel Tetangga Kamu* [Go International, Agnez Mo is Always Proud to Represent Indonesia - Your Neighbor Daniel] [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/uRUBKtVjHjg?si=dx2Bk8yAXp5Wmi-t>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Joos, M. (1977). The isolation of styles. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language*. Mouton.
- Kumparan.com. (2020, November 17). *Perjalanan karier Daniel Mananta, dari VJ MTV sampai panggung Indonesian Idol* [Daniel Mananta's Career Journey: From MTV VJ to the Indonesian Idol Stage]. <https://kumparan.com/berita-hari-ini/perjalanan-karier-daniel-mananta-dari-vj-mtv-sampai-panggung-indonesian-idol-lubcMsSRV75/full>
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-a). Charity. In *Oxford learner's dictionaries*. Retrieved May 14, 2025, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/charity?q=charity>
- Oxford University Press. (n.d.-b). Controversy. In *Oxford learner's dictionaries*. Retrieved May 14, 2025, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/controversy?q=controversy>