2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides the theories about code, code mixing, and gender differences. In addition, the writer presents some previous studies that are related to the topic of this present study.

2.1. Review of Related Theories

This section presents the theories that would be used to help the writer to analyze the data. The theories presented are code, bilingualism, code mixing, and gender differences and code mixing.

2.1.1. Code

According to Finch (2000, pp. 209-210), "code is a system of rules that allows people to give information in symbolic form. Human language is a code. It consists of words that represent ideas, events, and objects. When it is put together in certain circumstances, it will help people to communicate. In other words, code is basically used to convey people's idea or message".

Wardhaugh (1986, pp. 99-100) also states that "code is generally used to communicate. When people are about to speak, they have to choose a particular code to express their minds of feeling. The particular code in this case can be a particular language, dialect, style, register, or variety. Therefore, in daily situation, people may use different code in different situations. When people think that they need to use a certain code to communicate with certain people, they will adjust the type of code depending on the need". This leads to another linguistic phenomenon called bilingualism.

2.1.2. Bilingualism

Spolsky (1998, p. 45) defines bilingual as "a person who has some functional ability in second language". This ability may vary from one bilingual to another. Related to speech community, Hamers and Blanc (1987, p. 6) define bilingualism as "the state of a linguistic community in which two languages are in contact with the result that codes can be used in the same interaction and that a

Petra Christian University

number of individuals are bilinguals". In short, bilinguals can choose what language they are going to use. In this line, Spolsky (1998, p. 46) says "The bilinguals have a repertoire of domain-relate rules of language choice". In other words, bilinguals can vary their choice of language to suit the existing situation and condition in order to communicate effectively. This leads them to alternate two codes within the same sentence or commonly called, code mixing.

2.1.3. Code Mixing

According to Nababan (1978, p.125), "code mixing is a linguistic phenomenon and very often seen among bilingual speakers in multilingual society. It is defined as the use of elements of one language within a sentence in another language". In line with this, Wardhaugh (1992, p. 106) also defines "code mixing as a mix of code that occurs when conversants use two codes together that changes from one code to the others in the course of a single utterance. Thus if someone mixes two codes in one sentence by inserting other elements of language, it means that he uses code mixing".

"Most of the time, code mixing happens in informal situation. If it happens in formal situation, it is because there is no suitable word or utterance to say it in a language which is being used" (Nababan, 1984, p. 32).

According to Holmes (1992, p. 50), "the speaker is mixing up codes indiscriminately or perhaps because of incompetence. Moreover their mixing language may also be caused by some factors such as the lack of vocabulary in a language, the lack of knowledge of the vocabulary if there is no concept to describe an object".

Kachru (1982, p. 34) identifies three criteria of code mixing namely (1) it entails transfer of the units of code *a* into code *b* at intersentential and intrasentential levels, (2) there is an 'absorbing' code and an 'absorbed' code, (3) the transferred units may be morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and what are traditionally called 'idioms'.

Furthermore, Kachru (p. 39) proposes that there are five types of code mixing namely unit insertion, unit hybridization, sentence insertion, idiom and collocation insertion, and reduplication.

6

2.1.3.1. Unit insertion

Related to Kachru's first type of code mixing, Gumperz (1982, P. 60) states that unit insertion refers to the introduction of a grammatical unit, such as word, phrase and dependent clause from another language. The examples are:

- <u>Tank</u> *va redar prapt karne ki bhi yojna.*

  'Tank and radar procure do of also scheme' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker mixes the English and Hindi codes. The main code used is Hindi, and the English code (tank) which is in the word level is inserted (Kachru, 1982, p. 39).

- Go and get my coat <u>*aus dem Schrank da.*</u>

  'Go and get my coat out of the closet there' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker mixes the English and Germany codes. The main code used is English, and the Germany code which is in the phrase level is inserted (Gumperz, 1982, p. 60).

2.1.3.2. Unit hybridization

Hybrid is a word made up of elements (or morphemes) from different languages, such as *television* (Greed *tele* "far" plus Latin *visto* "seeing") (Nordquist, 2009, p. 1). It is also sometimes called as the morphological adaptation (Murniarti, 2004, p.130). Some examples of unit hybridization are:

- *yeenna parents <u>full-lah</u> irukkapooRadilla.*

  'Because parents are not going to be with us always' (English translation)

  In this example, the speaker mixes the English and Tamil codes. The main code used is Tamil, and the Malaysian suffix '-lah' combined with the English code (full) is inserted into the main code (Paramasivam & Lal, 2007, p. 9).

- *Aku beli HP pavilion mx50, walau <u>processor-nya</u> celeron 766 tapi spesifikasinya bagus.*

  'I bought HP pavilion mx50, eventhough the processor is Celeron 766, the specification is good.' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker mixes the English and Indonesian codes. The main code used is Indonesia, and the Indonesia suffix *-nya* combined with the

7

English code (processor) is inserted into the main code used (Murniarti, 2004, p.130).

2.1.3.3.Sentence insertion

This refers to an insertion of a sentence from another language into the language base of the discourse (Kachru 1982, p. 39). Some examples are:

- *purani hai to kya hua phain to ha*, <u>but I do not like Rajesh Khanna</u>.

  'Old is what happened fine however is, but I do not like Rajesh Khanna.' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker inserted the English sentence into the Hindi. The main code used is Hindi, and the English code which is in the sentence level is inserted (p.39).

- <u>It'll go into the same column</u> *a lei ming m ming ngo ji si a?*

  'It'll go into the same column, do you understand what I mean? (English translation)

  In this example, the speaker inserted the English sentence into the Cantonese. The main language used is Cantonese, and the English code which is in the sentence level is inserted (Chen, 2008, p. 100).

2.1.3.4. Idiom and collocation insertion

Idiom is a term used in grammar and lexicology to refer to a sequence of words which is semantically and often syntactically restricted, so that they function as a single unit. From a semantic viewpoint, the meanings of the individual words cannot be summed to produce the meaning of the 'idiomatic' expression as a whole (Crystal, 1997, p. 189). Collocation is the way that two or more words are associated, for examples "bread and butter, get away with murder, salt and pepper" (Brown & Attardo, 2000, p.30). Some examples of idiom and collocation insertion are:

- *aur mai parivartan ghar se suru karuga kyuki* <u>charity begins at home</u>.

  'And I change home from begin will do because charity begins at home.' (English translation)

In this example, the speaker inserted the English idiom into the Hindi sentence. The main code used is Hindi (Kachru, 1982, p.39).

- <u>No doubt</u> *pestanya rame*.

  'No doubt the party is merry' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker inserted the English collocation into the Indonesian sentence. The main code used is Indonesian (Gunawan, 2007, p. 3).

2.1.3.5. Reduplication

The process of reduplication is the process of repeating the same meaning in two codes (Kachru 1982, p. 39). Some examples are:

- <u>acting</u> *vekting mai kya janu re.*

  'Acting and the like I what should know hey.' (English translation).

  In this example, the speaker reduplicates the English code and Hindi code, acting (English) and *vecting* (Hindi). Both words actually have the same meaning. The main code used is Hindi, and the English codes is inserted (p. 39).

- *Parov,* <u>sorry</u>.

  'Sorry, sorry'. (English translation)

  In this example, the speaker reduplicates the English code and Bislama code, sorry (English) and *parov* (Bislama). Both words actually have the same meaning. The main code used is Bislama, and the English codes are inserted (Lindstrom, 2007, p. 226).

2.1.4. Gender Differences and Code Mixing

According to Holmes (1992, pp. 164-167), women and men do not speak in exactly the same way as each other in any community. Particular linguistic features occur only in the women's speech or only in the men's speech. These features are usually small differences in pronunciation or word-shape (morphology). Holmes (pp. 167-177) also said that women tend to use more of the standard forms, while men tend to use more of the vernacular forms.

Several studies have been conducted to find out the use of code mixing related to the gender differences. Wong (2004), for example, investigated the use of code mixing among male and female in Hong Kong. In doing this research, he took twenty Cantonese-English bilingual speakers as his subjects. Ten of them were female and ten of them were male. They were all Hong Kong ethnic Chinese who were born and grown up in Hong Kong. These subjects were observed when they worked or had job interviews. It was found that the women tended to use code mixing. The frequency was 2.0%-6.0%. Men seldom use code mixing. The frequency was only 1.5%-4.0%.

From the theories presented in section 2.1., it can be concluded that the phenomenon of code-mixing can happen in the society because nowadays many people master more than one language. There are five types of code-mixing: unit insertion, unit hybridization, sentence insertion, idiom and collocation insertion and reduplication. The types of code-mixing can be found in the level of word, phrase, clause, and sentence. The theories presented in section 2.1 would be used to analyze the types of code-mixing used by the interviewees in *Popular* magazine. Next, in section 2.2., the writer presents two previous studies that are used to give him more knowledge about code-mixing.

2.2. Review of Related Studies

As his related studies, the writer used two studies from previous researchers in the same field as this study. The previous studies were conducted by Wilfred (2000) and Soesanti (2003).

2.2.1. Code Mixing in Interview Articles on *FHM* Magazine (Wilfred, 2000)

Wilfred's study aimed to find out (1) the code mixing used and (2) the reasons why the code mixing is used in the interview articles published in *FHM* magazine. In order to answer his research questions, Wilfred used code mixing theory proposed by Suwito (1984) and Nababan (1991).

In his study, Wilfred observed seven interview articles which were published in *FHM* magazine (January 2006 edition). The length of each interview

article is about five-hundred words. The approach of his study was both quantitative and qualitative.

The findings of Wilfred's study showed that there were four reasons of the use of code mixing in the interview articles. First, the speaker would like to show prestige. Second he/she wished to show solidarity or familiarity. Third, the speaker found no exact idiom that suitable for a certain word. Fourth, he/she had no competence to translate a certain word.

There is a similarity and some differences between the present writer's and Wilfred's studies. The similarity is that both writers observed the interview articles published in an adult male magazine. However, different from Wilfred's study which analyzed four interview articles, the present writer focused on seven interview articles. Another difference is on the focus of the study. The present writer focused on the types of code mixing used and whether there are gender differences in expressing the code mixing, while Wilfred focused on the reasons of using code mixing.

Wilfred's study gives an insight for the writer's present study. After reading Wilfred's study, the present writer learned that code mixing occurred for some reasons. Thus he was inspired to find out whether code mixing would also occur in other Indonesian magazines.

2.2.2. Code Mixing in the Article *'Blue Sauna Eropa Timur' of Jakarta Undercover 2: Karnaval Malam* (Soesanti, 2003)

Soesanti's study aimed to find out (1) the code mixing expressions and (2) the types of code mixing that occur in the article *'Blue Sauna Eropa Timur of Jakarta undercover 2: Karnaval Malam'*. In order to answer her research questions, Soesanti used code mixing theory proposed by Kachru (1982) and Holmes (1992). The approach of her study was qualitative.

The findings of her study showed that there were four code mixing expressions and four types of code mixing used in the article. The code mixing expressions used were the mixture of Indonesian and English, Indonesian and Jakartanese, Indonesian and Javanese, and Indonesian, English and Jakartanese codes. There were four types of code mixing found in *'Blue Sauna Eropa Timur*

Petra Christian University

of Jakarta Undercover 2: Karnaval Malam' namely unit insertion, unit hybridization, sentence insertion and idiom and collocation insertion.

There are some similarities and differences between the present writer's study and Soesanti's study. The first similarity is that both writers observed a written text. Another similarity is that both writers investigated the types of code mixing proposed by Kachru (1982). However, different from Soesanti's study which analyzed the types of code mixing in report articles, the present writer focused on interview articles. Another difference is that the present writer also examined gender differences in the use of code mixing, while Soesanti did not conduct such study.

Soesanti's study gives an insight for the writer's present study. After reading Soesanti's study, the present writer was curious to find out whether the types of code mixing proposed by Kachru (1982) that occurred in Soesanti's study would also occur in other type of articles, i.e. interview articles.