Code-Mixing by Muna Language Speakers Residing in Yogyakarta

CrossMark
click for updates

Haerun Ana [a]
La Yani Konisi [b]
Maulid Taembo [c]
Sahlan [d]
Yunus [e]

Abstract

This study is concerned with the code-mixing phenomenon on Muna language speakers at Wisma Pahlevi, Pogung Dalangan, Yogyakarta. The objective of the study is to find out and describe the types of code mixing in Muna language speakers' utterances. The data of this study were collected through participation, recording, and noting, and then analyzed by using morphological, semantic, and syntactic analysis. The writer used these three kinds of analysis because Muna language is a unique one. It means that one word in Muna language sometimes can be one word or one morpheme only, a phrase, a clause or a simple sentence. Based on the writer's interpretation, the result of the study shows that the types of code-mixing found on Muna language speakers' utterances residing in Yogyakarta are only code mixing on word insertion, phrase insertion, clause insertion, and reduplication insertion.

Corresponding author:
Haerun Ana,
Department of Indonesian language and literature education, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia.
Email address: haerun.ana@uho.ac.id

---

[a] Department of Indonesian language and literature education, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia

[b] Department of Indonesian language and literature education, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia

[c] Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Trunjoyo University Madura, Bangkalan, Indonesia

[d] Department of Indonesian language and literature education, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia

[e] Department of Indonesian language and literature education, Halu Oleo University, Kendari, Indonesia

1 Introduction

Indonesia, an archipelago country has many ethnic groups spread out from Sabang to Merauke. Therefore, besides the Indonesian language as the national language, it also has many regional languages which still have been kept and used by every speech community. It should be realized that regional languages have a very important role, especially in the development of the Indonesian language because many Indonesian language vocabularies or words are derived from regional language vocabulary. It is clear that there are many regional languages in Indonesian.

Relating to the importance of language, Brown et al. (1983), divide the function of language based on two views, namely; the transactional view and the interactional view. The first view, the transactional one, means that language used to perform many communication functions; they nonetheless make the general assumption that the most important is the communication of information. The second, the interactional view means that it is used to establish and maintain social interaction. For example, the language is used to negotiate role-relationship, peer solidarity, and the exchange of turn in the conversation, the saving of face of both the speaker and hearer. It is clear that the purpose the use of language on the interactional view is to conduct interpersonal interaction rather than to convey factual or proportional information (Bokamba, 1988; Bentahila & Davies, 1995; Jisa, 2000). Relating to the explanation, the writer concludes that language function as a transactional view focuses on the use of language to convey factual information, while interactional one focuses on the use of language primarily to perform interpersonal communication which indicates the speaker's readiness to be friendly.

The Muna language is one of the hundreds of local languages in Indonesia. It exists in Muna regency. However, the speech community of the language spread out around Yogyakarta, particularly at Wisma Pahevi, Pogung Dalangan. Like other local languages, the Muna language is still maintained and used effectively by the Muna people as their mother tongue. It is clear that the Muna people who live in Yogyakarta also still use their mother tongue productively in their daily communication with each other (Hao, 2012; Jing, 2017; Sarniwati et al., 2022).

In addition, daily verbal interaction in the different speech community creates bilingual or multilingual. So, people are able to use or change more than one language and language combination in their communications. They may use their native languages and a second language means any language other than their native language. They also can combine both of native language and second language in their speaking in one utterance. It is called as code-mixing or code choice (Ralph, 1984). As Suwito (1985), states that code-mixing is language variation which is happened in one utterance. Indeed, the phenomenon of code-mixing is found in the speech community that uses more than one language. Bilingual or multilingual speakers are people who master two or more languages (Auer, 2013).

The phenomenon encourages some researchers to investigate code-mixing aspects in bilingual or multilingual societies. Septiana (2012), conducted a study of code-mixing in transmigration societies who live in Lambuya district of Konawe regency. This study elaborated on the kinds of code mixing and the factors affecting it. He only focused his study on three languages, namely Sundanese, Javanese, and Indonesian languages. Likewise, Amijayanti (2001), investigated Code-Mixing in Keren Beken Tabloid in Yogyakarta. In brief, there have been a number of studies about code-mixing in bilingual or multilingual societies in Indonesian.

There are two considerations of choosing the title in the study. Firstly, there is an indication that shows us about use of code-mixing in Muna language speakers who live in Yogyakarta, particularly at Wisma Pahlevi, Pogung Dalangan. The phenomenon of code-mixing and the lack of study about code-mixing in Muna language speakers in Yogyakarta is another reason to choose the title. In connection with the above description, the writer is interested in carrying out an investigation in the sociolinguistics analysis of code-mixing. The title of this study is "Code-mixing by Muna Language Speakers Residing in Yogyakarta''. In this case, the writer has ever heard someone use code-mixing between Muna language and the Indonesian language as follows:

1) *Saya ingin beli laptop tapi **dhoiku** tidak cukup.*
   I want to buy laptop but ***money-my*** not enough
   "I want to buy laptop but my money is not enough".
2) *Nakumala we daoa negholi **ikan**.*
   3rdSP go to market 3rdSP buy **fish**
   "She/he will go to the market to buy fish".

Looking at the examples above, it is clear that those two sentences indicate code-mixing in both Muna language and the Indonesian language. The first sentence shows that *dhoiku* is Muna word means "my money", and the others are

Saya ingin beli laptop tapi and *tidak cukup* are Indonesian words mean "I want to buy laptop but" and "not enough". Furthermore, the second sentence shows that *Nakumala we daoa negholi* are Muna words mean "she/he will go to market to buy", and the other is *ikan* is an Indonesian word means "fish". You can see that Muna language speakers do code-mixing in their daily communication.

Based on those two simple examples above, the writer intends to find out more data concerning the code-mixing happened in Muna language speakers who live in around Yogyakarta. There are two considerations of choosing the title in the study, as follows. First, there is an indication that shows us about using of code-mixing in Muna language speakers who live in Yogyakarta. The second consideration of choosing this title is that the code-mixing in Muna language and Indonesian language has never been conducted by previous researchers. Therefore, this is preliminary research in terms of code-mixing by Muna language speakers. It means that the phenomenon of code-mixing and there is not study yet about code-mixing in Muna language speakers in Yogyakarta are reasons to choose the title. To conclude, in this paper, the writer would like to find out and describe the types of code-mixing in Muna language speakers' utterances. Finally, the writer wishes this study can be useful for further study on the sociolinguistic area, particularly on the use of Muna language by its speech community and as a beginning study that can be used as an additional source, particularly to other future researchers who are interested in carrying out a similar investigation (Creese & Blackledge, 2011; Heller, 1996; Silva, 2000).

2   Results and Discussions

Language contact happens when speakers have a mastery of two or more languages. Therefore, people who master more than one language usually combine those languages in one utterance which is called a code-mixing phenomenon. It means that code-mixing can be found in bilingual or multilingual speech communities. Code-mixing is one aspect of language dependency in the bilingual or multilingual community. Relating to this matter, Aitchison (1987), states that code-mixing occurs when the speaker uses of both languages to a certain extent and changes from one language to the other in the course of a single utterance. Likewise, Suwito (1985), says that the combination of different language variations in one or the same certain sentence or clause is categorized as code-mixing. It is also supported by Thelander (1976); Fasold (1987), cited by Chaer & Agustina (1995), that it is categorized as a code-mixing if a speaker uses a word or phrase in another language. It means that code-mixing occurs when someone speaks more than one language in one utterance. Furthermore, Suwito (1985), distinguishes five types of code-mixing based on the language elements. Therefore, here are some examples of code-mixing in Muna language speakers' utterances to be analyzed based on Suwito's claim. However, this study found only four types of code-mixing as follows.

Word insertion

The classification of code-mixing in word insertion means that someone speaks in a certain language but he/she inserts a word separately in another language. The code-mixing data of word insertion can be found on the examples below:

1) *Saya kasihkan kau* **bhalobu**
   I   give   you   **glassware**
   "I give you glassware".

The data on sentence (1) *Saya kasihkan kau* **bhalobu** "I give you glassware" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *saya kasihkan kau* are Indonesian words means "I give you", and *bhalobu* is Muna word means "glassware". The writer concludes that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on word insertion of Muna word *bhalobu* "glassware" into Indonesian words.

2) *Tiga   ikat   dua ribu,* **naembali***?*
   Three bunch two hundred,   **can**?
   "Three bunches are two hundred, is it ok/can be?

The data on sentence (2) *Tiga ikat dua ribu*, **naembali***?* "Three bunches are two hundred, is it ok?" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *Tiga ikat dua ribu* are Indonesian words means "Three bunches are two hundred" and *nembali* is Muna word means "ok". It is clear that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on word insertion of Muna word *naembali* "can" into Indonesian words.

Phrase insertion

The classification of code-mixing in phrase insertion means that someone speaks in a certain language but he/she inserts a phrase or a number of phrases separately in another language. The code-mixing data on phrase insertion can be found in the examples below:

3) **Uumbe daano***, tetanggaku   idolaku.*
   Yes correct,   neighbor-my   favorite-my
   "Yes, it is correct, my neighbor is my favorite".

The data on sentence (3) **uumbe daano***, tetanggaku idolaku* "Yes, it is correct, my neighbor is my favorite" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *tetanggaku idolaku* are Indonesian words means "My neighbor is my favorite" and *uumbe daano* is Muna words means "Yes, it is correct". You can see that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on phrase insertion of Muna words into Indonesian words since *uumbe daano* is a phrase that consists of two morphemes or two words, they are *uumbe* means "yes" and *daano* means "correct".

4) **N***oafa gara*?*,   bicara,   apa   yang   kamu mau!*
   Why part.?   Speak,   what   that   you   want!
   "What is it? Say what do you want!"

The data on sentence (4) **noafa gara***, bicara, apa yang kamu mau?* "What is it? Say what do you want?" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *Bicara, apa yang kamu mau* are Indonesian words means "say what do you want", and *noafa gara* is Muna word means "What is it?". It is clear that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on phrase insertion of Muna words into Indonesian words because *noafa gara* is a phrase that consists of two morphemes or two words, they are *noafa* is as question word in Muna language means "why" and *gara* is as an affirmation such "kah" as particle in Indonesian language.

Reduplication insertion

The classification of code-mixing in reduplication insertion means that someone speaks in a certain language but he/she inserts reduplication or a number of reduplications separately in other language. The code-mixing data on reduplication insertion can be found in the example below:

5) *Waktu saya   makan tadi   siang*, **nokatembe-tembe**.
   Time   I   eat   just   day,   it rather tasteless
   "When I had lunch, I felt rather tasteless".

The data on sentence (5) *Waktu saya makan tadi siang*, **nokatembe-tembe** "When I had lunch, I felt rather tasteless" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *waktu saya makan tadi siang* are Indonesian words means "When I had lunch", and *nokatembe-tembe* are Muna words means "I felt rather tasteless". Morphologically, the words *nokatembe-tembe* is reduplication from *tembe* "tasteless". This word is reduplicated through attaching prefix *ka-* before the base. Therefore, after being reduplicated, the word becomes *katembe-tembe* means "rather tasteless". Furthermore, the reduplicated words attached by prefix *no-* as a subject marker, which indicates third singular person or thing. In this case, *no-* refers to something to eat. Semantically, the word *nokatembe-tembe* means "it is rather tasteless". Based on the result of morphological and semantic analysis, the writer concludes that syntactically, the words *nokatembe-tembe* (reduplication word) can be categorized as a clause or simple sentence in Muna language because it can fulfill a minimal aspect of a sentence. Therefore, the writer

concludes that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on clause reduplication insertion of Muna words into Indonesian words.

6) **Badhu-badhu aini**, *kotornya*.
   These clothes,   are dirty
   "These clothes are dirty".

The data on sentence (6) **Badhu-badhu aini**, *kotornya* "These clothes are dirty" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *kotornya* is Indonesian word means "dirty", and *badhu-badhu aini* are Muna words means "these clothes". Morphologically, the words *badhu-badhu* is reduplication from *badhu* "a cloth". This word is categorized as completed reduplication or symmetric reduplication. Therefore, after being reduplicated, the word becomes *badhu-badhu* means "clothes". Based on the result of morphological and semantic analysis, the writer concludes that syntactically, the words *badhu-badhu aini* can be categorized as a phrase reduplication. Therefore, the writer concludes that code-mixing happened on that sentence is code-mixing on phrase reduplication insertion of Muna words into Indonesian words.

Clause insertion

The classification of code-mixing in clause insertion means that someone speaks in a certain language but he/she inserts a clause in other language. The code-mixing data on clause insertion can be found in the example below:

7) **Amepeko**,   *sunyi sekali kita, kamu ada laptopmu*.
   I- hit-you, lonely very we. You be laptop you
   "I hit you. We feel lonely. You have a laptop"

The data on sentence above, **Amepeko**, *sunyi sekali kita, kamu ada laptopmu* "I hit you, we feel lonely, you have a laptop" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *sunyi sekali kita. kamu ada laptopmu* are Indonesian words means "We feel lonely, you have a laptop", and the word *amepeko* is Muna word means "I hit you". Morphologically, the word *amepeko* consists of one word but actually syntactically it consists of three morphemes, they are prefix *a-* as subject marker means "I", *mepe* as verb derived from a base *pepe* mean "hit" and suffix *ko* as object marker means "you". Therefore, semantically the words mean "I hit you". Based on the result of morphological and semantic analysis, the writer concludes that syntactically, the word *amepeko* can be categorized as a clause or simple sentence in Muna language because it can fulfill a minimal aspect of a sentence. Indeed, the sentence above as code-mixing on clause insertion of Muna word "Amepeko" into Indonesian words "sunyi sekali kita, kamu ada laptopmu".

8) *Iwan dimana kita?* **asuli kadeki**.
   Iwan-where are you, I-go back now
   "Where are you, Iwan? I am going to back now"

The data on sentence above, *Iwan dimana kita?* **asuli kadeki** "Where are you, Iwan? I am going to back now" indicates that sentence is derived from Indonesian and Muna words. The words *Iwan dimana kita?* are Indonesian words means "Where are you, Iwan?", and the word **asuli kadeki** is Muna word means "I am going to back now". Morphologically, the word *asuli* actually consists of two morphemes, they are prefix *a-* as subject marker means "I" and *suli* as verb means "go back". Therefore, semantically the words mean "I go back". Based on the result of morphological and semantic analysis, the writer concludes that syntactically, the word *asuli kadeki* can be categorized as a clause or simple sentence in Muna language because it can fulfill a minimal aspect of a sentence. Indeed, the sentence above as code-mixing on clause insertion of Muna word "*asuli kadeki*" into Indonesian words "I am going to back now".

   Based on the discussion above, it can be clearly seen that the native speakers of Muna language who live in Yogyakarta usually use combination language which is called code-mixing in their utterances. The code-mixing used by the Muna language speakers in this study was focused only on both of Indonesian and Muna languages. Further, the data found in this study were analyzed based on the types of code-mixing. The types of code-mixing that refers to Suwito's claim of code-mixing are word, phrase, clause, idiom, and reduplication insertions. Nevertheless, the data

found in this study were only code-mixing on word insertion, phrase insertion, clause insertion, and reduplication insertion (Halsband, 2006; Chen, 1992; Abutalebi et al., 2013).

3 Conclusion

Bilingual and multilingual communities and language contact are reasons for the existence of code-mixing. Based on the discussion above, the writer concludes that the native speakers of Muna language who live in Yogyakarta usually use combination language which is called code-mixing on their utterances. The code-mixing used by the Muna language speakers in this study was focused only on both of Indonesian and Muna languages. Besides that, the data found in this study were analyzed on the types of code-mixing only. The types of code-mixing in this study refer to Suwito's opinion, they are code-mixing of word insertion, phrase insertion, clause insertion, idiom insertion, and reduplication insertion. Nevertheless, the data found in this study were only code-mixing on word insertion, phrase insertion, clause insertion, and reduplication insertion. The writer did not find the code-mixing on idiom insertion.

This study was limited on the types of code-mixing that occurred on Muna native speakers in both Indonesian and Muna languages. When we talk about code-mixing, it will be better for us to talk also about factors affecting code-mixing. Nevertheless, because of the time limitation, the data of code-mixings in this study were analyzed only based on the classifications of code-mixing. Therefore, the writer recommends or suggests to further researchers to analyze the data of code-mixing based on the factors that affect it. Even more, they can conduct a study on other languages either about code-mixing or code-switching in the speech communities.

Conflict of interest statement
The authors declared that they have no competing interests.

Statement of authorship
The authors have a responsibility for the conception and design of the study. The authors have approved the final article.

References

Abutalebi, J., Della Rosa, P. A., Gonzaga, A. K. C., Keim, R., Costa, A., & Perani, D. (2013). The role of the left putamen in multilingual language production. *Brain and language*, *125*(3), 307-315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2012.03.009

Aitchison, J. (1987). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.

Amijayanti, R. (2001). *Code-Mixing in Keren Beken Tabloid*. Gadjah Mada University. Unpublished Thesis.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (2013). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.

Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1995). Patterns of code-switching and patterns of language contact. *Lingua*, *96*(2-3), 75-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(94)00035-K

Bokamba, E. G. (1988). Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory:: Evidence from bantu languages. *Lingua*, *76*(1), 21-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(88)90017-4

Brown, G., Brown, G. D., Brown, G. R., Yule, G., & Gillian, B. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge university press.

Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (1995). Sosiolinguistik Perkenalan Awal cet pertama.

Chen, H. C. (1992). Lexical processing in bilingual or multilingual speakers. In *Advances in psychology* (Vol. 83, pp. 253-264). North-Holland. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)61499-5

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of pragmatics*, *43*(5), 1196-1208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006

Fasold, R. (1987). Language policy and change: Sexist language in the periodical news media. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (GURT)*, 187-206.

Halsband, U. (2006). Bilingual and multilingual language processing. *Journal of physiology-Paris*, *99*(4-6), 355-369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphysparis.2006.03.016

Hao, Y. C. (2012). Second language acquisition of Mandarin Chinese tones by tonal and non-tonal language speakers. *Journal of phonetics*, *40*(2), 269-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2011.11.001

Heller, M. (1996). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and education*, *8*(2), 139-157. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0898-5898(96)90011-X

Jing, F. (2017). Investigating intentionality of linguistic landscapes from the multilingual commercial signs. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *3*(5), 46-52. Retrieved from https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/article/view/222

Jisa, H. (2000). Language mixing in the weak language: Evidence from two children. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(9), 1363-1386. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00104-6

Ralph, F. (1984). The sociolinguistics of society. *New York: BasilBlackwell*.

Sarniwati, N., Hanafi, N., & Nuriadi, N. (2022). The pattern and representation of linguistic landscape in multilingual context in Selong. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *8*(4), 138-144. https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v8n4.2111

Septiana, H. (2012). Alih kode dan campur kode dalam pemakaian bahasa indonesia pada aktivitas diskusi siswa smp di kawasan pedesaan (studi kasus dalam pembelajaran bahasa indonesia di Smp Negeri 2 Kepil Kabupaten Wonosobo).

Silva, R. S. (2000). Pragmatics, bilingualism, and the native speaker. *Language & Communication*, *20*(2), 161-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(99)00019-1

Suwito, (1985). Sosiolinguistik. Surakarta: Fakultas Sastra Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Thelander, M. (1976). Code-switching or Code-mixing?.