4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer presents the data analysis results to answer the research questions as presented in Chapter 1. The writer analyzed the data based on the types of code-mixing theory by Muysken (2000) and the factors influencing code-mixing theory by Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) which were explained in Chapter 2. This chapter is divided into three sections in which the writer explains the findings in more detail.

The first section discusses the types of code-mixing utilized by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2.* The second section discusses factors that influence Edwin to use the specific types of code-mixing. The last section explains the writer's discussion of the findings.

The table below presents the types and influencing factors of code-mixing employed by Edwin in the web series *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2.*

Table 4.1

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

Types	Factors										Multiple Factors			
	Participant Roles and Relationships	Situational	Message-Intrinsic							Language Attitudes, Dominance, and Security	Participant Roles and Relationships + Situational	Participant Roles and Relationships + Message-Intrinsic (Interjections) + Language Attitudes, Dominance, and Security	Situational + Message-Intrinsic (Reiteration and Message Qualification)	Participant Roles and Relationships + Situational + Message-Intrinsic (Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses)
			Quotations	Reiteration	Message Qualification	Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses	Hedging	Interjections	Idioms and Deep-Rooted Cultural Wisdom					
Insertion	✓	✓			✓	✓					✓	✓		
Alternation														
Congruent Lexicalization													✓	✓

Table 4.1 shows that Edwin employed two specific types of code-mixing in his interactions within this web series: insertion and congruent lexicalization. The alternation type did not feature in his communication. Table 4.1 also indicates that the insertion type exhibited by Edwin was shaped by a range of factors, including participant roles and relationships, situational, and various message-intrinsic aspects namely message qualification, topic-comment/relative clauses, and interjections, in addition to language attitudes, dominance, and security. Moreover, Edwin's use of the congruent lexicalization type was influenced by factors namely participant roles and relationships, situational, and selected message-intrinsic elements, namely reiteration, message qualification, and topic-comment/relative clauses. Additionally, some factors did not influence his code-mixing namely quotations, hedging, and idioms and deep-rooted cultural wisdom.

In the following sections, the writer presents detailed explanations regarding the findings revealed in Table 4.1.

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

This section describes the types of code-mixing utilized by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*. The analysis in this study uses the theory of code-mixing types by Muysken (2000).

Muysken (2000) defines code-mixing as the occurrence of grammatical features and lexical objects from two different languages within a single sentence. Muysken (2000) classifies three distinct forms of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Additionally, Muysken (2000) provides further clarification by stating that four diagnostic characteristics namely constituency, element switched, switch site, and properties are used to identify each form of code-mixing.

4.1.1 Insertion

Muysken (2000) defines insertion as the incorporation of lexical items or entire constituents from one language into the structure of another. This phenomenon is characterized by integrating elements, such as nouns or phrases from a secondary language, into the main language's sentence structure. To identify instances of insertion, Muysken (2000) outlines four diagnostic features: constituency, the elements switched, switch site, and properties.

Constituency refers to sentences containing a single constituent or demonstrating a nested a b a structure, indicating insertion. The elements switched often include content words like nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, or selected elements that involve complements or objects. Additionally, the presence of a dummy word can signal insertion. Lastly, telegraphic mixing and morphological integration may accompany instances of insertion.

The writer presents some examples below of Edwin's sentences in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* that exhibit characteristics of insertion. The examples of this type are described below:

4.1.1.1 Data 1.3

Biasanya kita kalau mau *brainstorming*, santai di sini.

(Usually when we want to brainstorm, we relax here.)

In this example, the sentence (data 1.3) employs Indonesian words "Biasanya" (usually), "kita" (we), "kalau" (when), "mau" (want to), "santai" (relax), and "di sini" (here) as verified by KBBI Daring (n.d.). Thus, "Biasanya kita kalau mau *brainstorming, santai di sini*" which means "Usually when we want to brainstorm, we relax here" is an example of insertion type. Here, Edwin inserted the English word *brainstorming* into an otherwise Indonesian sentence.

Regarding constituency, the inserted English word *brainstorming* functions as a single constituent that conveys a distinct meaning. The word *brainstorming* in this sentence is classified as a constituent, specifically a noun (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). Moreover, the word *brainstorming* also demonstrates a nested a b a structure in this sentence. In nested a b a structure, *a* signifies Indonesian and *b* signifies English. The English word *brainstorming* as *b* is inserted between the Indonesian elements *Biasanya kita kalau mau* as the first *a* and the other *a* is *santai di sini.*

In terms of element switched, the word *brainstorming* in this sentence is categorized as an English noun which means an activity or business strategy in which a group of individuals interact to suggest a large number of new ideas for potential development (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). Therefore, the English noun *brainstorming*

Petra Christian University

here is categorized as a content word because a noun is an example of content words in English.

There are no dummy words indicating insertion in this sentence concerning the switch site.

In terms of properties, this sentence does not exhibit properties associated with insertion.

In conclusion, the sentence "Biasanya kita kalau mau *brainstorming,* santai di sini" (Usually when we want to brainstorm, we relax here) represents an insertion type because the sentence has an English noun *brainstorming* which shows a single constituent and represents the second language or *b* in nested a b a form. Additionally, the element switched in the sentence above is a noun which is categorized as a content word. In terms of switch site, the sentence above does not have a dummy word that can identify the occurrence of insertion. Finally, regarding the properties, there are no specific properties of insertion which can be seen in the sentence above.

4.1.1.2 Data 3.2

==Ya *simple*nya sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha.==

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

The sentence (data 3.2) incorporates the words "Ya" (Yes), "bikin" (making), "aplikasi" (app), "buat" (for), and "para pelaku usaha" (business operators), which are all listed as Indonesian words in KBBI Daring (n.d.). Hence, "Ya *simple*nya sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha" which means "Yes, the simple thing is, that it is making an app for business operators" is an example of insertion type. In this case, Edwin integrates the English adjective *simple* into an otherwise Indonesian sentence.

In terms of the constituency, the English word *simple* which is inserted in the sentence above is considered as a single constituent that conveys one clear meaning. The word *simple* in this sentence is classified as a constituent, specifically an English adjective (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). Then, the word *simple* also indicates a nested a b a structure in this sentence. In nested a b a structure, *a* signifies Indonesian and *b*

signifies English. The English word *simple* or *b* is inserted between the Indonesian components *Ya* as the first *a* and the other *a* is *-nya sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha.*

Concerning element switched, the word *simple* in this sentence is classified as an English adjective which means easy or not difficult or not complicated to comprehend (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). Thus, the word *simple* as an adjective qualifies as a content word.

In this sentence, there is no insertion of a dummy word that indicates insertion regarding the switch site.

Lastly, concerning properties, this sentence shows morphological integration. The English adjective *simple* is integrated with the Indonesian suffix *-nya*. The Indonesian suffix *-nya* can be added to word classes other than nouns such as to adjectives to give an emphasis (Sneddon, 2006). Thus, in this sentence it is attached to the adjective *simple* and it becomes *simplenya* which means the same as *mudahnya* in Indonesian*.*

To conclude, the sentence "Ya *simple*nya sih bikin aplikasi buat para pelaku usaha" (Yes, the simple thing is, that it is making an app for business operators) demonstrates an insertion type because the sentence has an English adjective *simple* that represents a single constituent and at the same time represents the second language or *b* in nested a b a form. Furthermore, the element switched in the data above is an adjective which is categorized as a content word in English. In relation to the switch site, the sentence above does not show a dummy word insertion that can indicate the emergence of insertion. In terms of properties, there is a morphological integration which can be seen from the integration of Indonesian suffix *-nya* after the English adjective *simple* which eventually forms the final form *simplenya.*

4.1.2 Congruent Lexicalization

Muysken (2000) describes congruent lexicalization as the integration of lexical items from two languages into a unified grammatical structure, allowing for elements from either language to be inserted due to a shared grammatical framework. When there is an occurrence of back-and-forth switches of elements from different languages it can be indicated as

41

congruent lexicalization. To identify instances of congruent lexicalization, Muysken (2000) outlines four key characteristics: constituency, involving multi-constituent code-mixing without a nested a b a pattern; the switching of function words (e.g., pronouns, conjunctions) or selected elements such as complements, objects; bidirectional mixing indicating frequent alternation between languages; and properties such as linear and equivalence in structure, homophonous forms, morphological blending, and the combination of idioms and collocations.

The writer presents below some instances of Edwin's sentences that exhibit features of congruent lexicalization. All data of this type are discussed below:

4.1.2.1 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.)

In this example, the sentence (data 1.5) incorporates the Indonesian words "kita" (we), "di sini" (here), "jadi" (so), "bisa" (can), "masuk" (come in), "agak siang" (in a little later), "cuma" (but), "tetap" (still), "harus" (have to), "delapan" (eight), "jam" (hours), all of which are Indonesian words as listed in the KBBI Daring (n.d.). Thus, "*By the way* kita di sini *flexitime*, jadi bisa kita masuk agak siangan cuma tetap harus delapan jam" which means "By the way we have flexitime here, so we can come in a little later but we still have to complete eight hours" is an example of congruent lexicalization type. This data demonstrates Edwin's fluid switching between English and Indonesian within the same sentence.

Regarding constituency, Data 1.5 features multiple constituents that are switched, including the phrase *by the way* (Merriam-Webster, n.d.) and the noun *flexitime* (Oxford English Dictionary, n.d.). Moreover, the sentence above shows non-nested a b a form that is found in congruent lexicalization because the sentence begins with English and then switches to Indonesian and back to English again and finally ends with Indonesian.

In terms of element switched, the sentence above has function words which are represented using pronouns that connect the English and Indonesian elements in the

sentence which can be seen from the pronouns *kita* and *di sini* that are located between English words *by the way* and *flexitime*. Moreover, the word *flexitime* that is located after Indonesian elements *kita* and *di sini* can be identified as a selected element specifically a complement. The word *flexitime* in the sentence above is a complement because it adds information about *kita* or we. *Kita* or we in the context of the sentence above refers to the working time from Edwin and his interlocutors who are IT interns in the same division as him. *Flexitime* is necessary to be used to make the sentence above has a complete and clear meaning. Thus, it is considered as a selected element specifically a complement.

In terms of switch site, the sentence above demonstrates a bidirectional code-mixing which refers to the back-and-forth switches of two languages in a sentence. *By the way* as the English language precedes the sentence and then the language switches to the Indonesian language which can be seen from *kita di sini* and then back to the English language again which can be indicated from *flexitime* then it switches to Indonesian again until the end of the sentence.

Finally, this sentence does not show specific properties traditionally associated with congruent lexicalization.

In summary, *"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) shows a congruent lexicalization by featuring multiple constituents, demonstrating a non-nested a b a form, and showcasing bidirectional switching between English and Indonesian. The switching elements include function words and complements, pivotal for conveying the intended meaning, although no distinct properties of congruent lexicalization are identified.

4.1.2.2 Data 3.5

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

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

The sentence (data 3.5) employs Indonesian words "Jadi" (therefore), "kita" (we), "bisa" (can), "tau" (know), "juga" (also), "yang" (which), "lebih tinggi" (higher) as

Petra Christian University

verified by KBBI Daring (n.d.). Hence, "Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana *project* yang *urgency*nya lebih tinggi" which means "Therefore, we can also know which projects have higher urgency" is an example of congruent lexicalization type. This instance highlights Edwin's seamless switching between English and Indonesian within the same sentence.

Regarding constituency, the data above includes multiple constituents that are switched, notably the English nouns with their respective meanings, namely *project* and *urgency* (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). In addition, the sentence above exhibits non-nested a b a form that is found in congruent lexicalization type because the sentence begins with Indonesian and then switches to English and back to Indonesian again and then switches to English again and ends with Indonesian.

In terms of element switched, the sentence above has a function word that connects the switches of English and Indonesian words which can be seen from the conjunction *yang* that is located after the English words *project* and before *urgency*. After *yang* appears the language is back again to English and then changed to Indonesian again. Furthermore, there is also a selected element that is shown by the word *project* that plays a role as an object. Objects usually take place after the verb (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). In the sentence above, the word project is located after the Indonesian verb *tau* or know in English.

In terms of switch site, the sentence above demonstrates a bidirectional code-mixing which refers to the back-and-forth switches of two languages in a sentence. *Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana* as the Indonesian language begins the sentence and then the language switches to the English language which can be seen from *project* and then back to the Indonesian language again which can be indicated from *yang* then it switches to English which is shown from *urgency* and then back to Indonesian until the end of the sentence.

Lastly, in terms of properties, the data above shows the occurrence of morphological integration when there is an Indonesian suffix *-nya* integrated to the English noun *urgency*. Suffix *-nya* usually attached to a noun to give definiteness, frequently translatable as 'the' and followed by nouns (Sneddon, 2006). Hence, in this sentence it becomes *urgencynya*. Moreover, the English word *urgency* also indicates

one of the properties of this type called homophonous diamorphs feature since it has a similar pronunciation to its Indonesian meaning *urgensi*.

In conclusion, the sentence *"Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana project yang urgencynya lebih tinggi"* (Therefore, we can also know which projects have higher urgency) shows a congruent lexicalization type through its use of multiple constituents, non-nested a b a form, and bidirectional language switches. The integration of function words and objects as switched elements, alongside properties such as morphological integration and homophonous diamorphs, further categorizes it within this type of code-mixing.

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

This section explains the factors that influence two types of code-mixing in Edwin's communication to his interlocutors in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, namely insertion and congruent lexicalization. The analysis in this study applied the code-mixing factors theory by Bhatia and Ritchie (2013).

According to Bhatia and Ritchie (2013), people who are bilingual or multilingual can employ a variety of styles in different languages that are not always mutually understandable, in contrast to monolinguals. Their ability to speak in multiple languages allows them to use several languages in a particular setting. Bilinguals' decisions about language choice and mixing are influenced by four primary factors: "participant roles and relationships, situational factors, message-intrinsic factors, and language attitudes, dominance, and security" (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013, pp. 378-386).

The following subsections detail how these factors manifest in Edwin's code-mixing behavior within the series.

4.2.1 Participant Roles and Relationships

The roles of the participants and the nature of their relationships are significant factors that influence whether bilinguals unconsciously agree or disagree regarding language choice.

Furthermore, individuals' linguistic shifts between languages during communication can represent a genuine form of repair or a way to become more compatible in communication when there is a language mismatching. Dual or plural identities, speech accommodation, and social distance of conversation participants may influence the probability of language mixing or switching in relation to participant roles and relationships (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). In this case, the participant roles and relationships factor only influence the insertion type.

The insertion type utilized by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* is motivated by participant roles and relationship factors. Below are some examples of this factor:

4.2.1.1 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.)

In the sentence above, Edwin's code-mixing occurred when he communicated with his colleague, Karin, who knew about a project that Edwin and his team in the IT division were proposing, namely a project to create a merchant application for customers. Karin asked Edwin about the merchant application project with two questions, "Eh iya, gimana-gimana?" (Oh yeah, how is it going?) and "Kalian tuh jadi ngajuin Merchant apps?" (Did you guys apply for the merchant application?) Then, Edwin responded to his colleague's question by confirming that he and his team in the IT division were ready to submit the merchant application scheme they were talking about. In addition, Edwin made it clear that the scheme of the application would be presented at an upcoming scrum meeting.

The code-mixing in Edwin's sentence above happened because of the dual identities of the communication participants. The English noun *scrum meeting* that is integrated to his Indonesian sentence as the primary language happens because previously his colleague also mixed her Indonesian dialogue with English language. This shows that Edwin's colleague is bilingual who has dual identities. Dual identities here refer to Edwin's and Karin's ability to fluently communicate in both Indonesian and English, which facilitates smoother interactions between them.

46

In addition, Edwin's ability to adapt to Karin's bilingual communication style by including English in his response shows a mirroring strategy that strengthens their mutual understanding and connection. His incorporation of English noun *scrum meeting*, seamlessly blended into an Indonesian sentence, not only demonstrates his understanding of the professional context but also caters to Karin's linguistic preferences. Karin's supportive response to Edwin's update about the project's approval at the scrum meeting highlights the effective communication between them, which is influenced by their respective roles and established relationship.

4.2.1.2 Data 2.2

Ada *meeting* gue.

(I have a meeting.)

The code-mixing instance in the data above occurred as Edwin was preparing to leave for a meeting with his division at the office. He used the sentence above because one of his colleagues, Karin, wanted to know why Edwin was leaving first. Then, Edwin responded to Karin by using the sentence above.

This instance of code-mixing may be related to Edwin's familiarity and relationship with Karin, as they both share dual language identities. This familiarity likely facilitates the seamless integration of English and Indonesian in their interaction. The consistent use of an English word such as *meeting* in conversations predominantly in Indonesian could be influenced by their professional role and the comfort level in their communication. In short, the presence of dual language identities and the ease of linguistic switching underscore the role of participant roles and relationships in shaping code-mixing patterns within interactions of Edwin and his interlocutor.

4.2.2 Situational

Regarding the situational factor, certain languages are considered more appropriate than others for specific social groups, participants, topics, settings, or circumstances. Language mixing or shifting may be influenced by situational factors, including changes in personality, ideas, audience, and subject matter (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). Based on the data, the situational factor only affects the insertion type data.

Below are some examples of insertion type utilized by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* that demonstrate the situational factor identified in the data:

4.2.2.1 Data 1.4

Nah ini dia nih, ini *recharge room.*

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

The instance of code-mixing mentioned above occurred when Edwin was introducing the recharge room to IT interns, Tia and Wijaya, on their first day at BCA office. During the introduction, Edwin was in the room itself, explaining its purpose and showing the room to the interns who were unfamiliar with it.

Data 1.4 above is influenced by the situational factor in which a particular language seems well suited to the communication context. The English noun *recharge room* integrated in an otherwise Indonesian sentence used by Edwin above fits the circumstances in which he introduced the room to the IT interns who were unfamiliar with it. The use of the term *recharge room* is appropriate for the setting, as Edwin and the interns were physically present in the room being discussed at that time. The inclusion of this English term helps familiarize the interns with its commonly used name, thereby enhancing their understanding of the workspace within the IT division. This use of English ensures clarity and relevance, aligning the language choice with the participants' needs and the situational context.

4.2.2.2 Data 1.2

Ini *breakout room.*

(This is the breakout room.)

In this example, Edwin employs code-mixing while showing Tia and Wijaya, the IT interns, around their office for the first time, particularly when introducing them to the breakout room. This room, usually used by the IT division workers, was explained by Edwin at that time in terms of its layout and usage.

Petra Christian University

Data 1.2 above is motivated by the situational factor because the English language is used appropriately for that context. The choice of using the English *breakout room* aligns with the situational factor, as it accurately describes the function and designation of the room in a language that may capture the essence of its purpose more effectively than its Indonesian equivalent. This use of English is appropriate for the setting and helps in introducing the interns to their new environment. The use of this term in English aligns with the official terminology used within the company, which makes it a suitable choice for the context in which Edwin was communicating to the interns.

4.2.3 Message-Intrinsic

Language mixing or switching is impacted by several pragmatic and linguistic factors. These include quotations, reiteration, message qualification, topic-comment/relative clauses, hedging, interjections, idioms, and deep-rooted cultural wisdom. Below, the writer presents data regarding insertion type exemplifying the message-intrinsic factors, specifically focusing on message qualification and topic-comment/relative clauses identified in the study:

4.2.3.1 Data 1.9 (Message Qualification)

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

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

In the sentence above, Edwin engaged in code-mixing while discussing his plan to invite IT interns namely Tia and Wijaya to join a project group. He introduced his suggestion by incorporating the English abbreviation *Btw* (by the way) into his predominantly Indonesian sentence.

Edwin's use of code-mixing in data 1.9 serves a specific rhetorical purpose. It qualifies the message that follows by signaling a shift in the conversation to a new but related topic. Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) note that language mixing often occurs appears in the form of a complement, where an additional phrase provides clarity or emphasis to the sentence. In this context, *Btw* (by the way) functions as a discourse marker that introduces and sets the stage for Edwin's suggestion. The use of *Btw* (by the way)

Petra Christian University

improves the clarity of Edwin's communication, making sure that the suggestion about inviting the interns is introduced clearly.

4.2.3.2 Data 1.6 (Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses)

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

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

The code-mixing occurrence above happened when Edwin spoke to his colleagues regarding his idea to create a new application aimed at addressing the concerns of BCA customers, specifically referencing a customer named Mrs. Tika, whose daughter owned a business and was disabled.

The insertion of the English verb *manage* within an otherwise Indonesian sentence shows the use of message-intrinsic factors, specifically topic-comment/relative clauses. According to Bhatia and Ritchie (2013), language mixing can occur when a topic is stated in one language and is followed by comments expressed in another language. In this case, the part of the sentence "yang bisa *manage* kekhawatirannya Ibu Tika" (that can manage Mrs. Tika's worries) serves as a comment expanding on the initial topic about creating a new application, initially introduced in Indonesian. This use of bilingual expression helps Edwin clearly convey the specific functionality of the proposed application, emphasizing its potential impact on Mrs. Tika's situation and linking it to broader benefits for similar cases.

4.2.4 Multiple Factors

Usually, a code-mixing type in a sentence is influenced by one factor. However, there are also instances where more than one factor may affect code-mixing occurrences in this web series. This is exhibited in sentences utilized by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2,* where some examples of insertion type and all data of congruent lexicalization type are motivated by multiple factors, as detailed below:

50

A. Participant Roles and Relationships + Situational

These factors influence one type namely insertion. Below is an example where Edwin's use of insertion code-mixing is influenced by both participant roles and relationships and situational factors:

Example: Data 3.1

<mark>Iya kan, jadi lebih gampang buat ngajuin mesin *EDC*.</mark>

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

The mixture of English in the Indonesian sentence in the data above occurred when Edwin responded to a question from his colleague, Maya, who is part of the same division. Maya's initial question to Edwin was, "Kalau misalnya kita bikin aplikasi yang waktu itu lo ajuin di BCA Innovation Award gimana?" (What if for example we make the application that you submitted to the BCA Innovation Award?) Following this, Edwin replied, "Iya kan, jadi lebih gampang buat ngajuin mesin *EDC*," (Yes, it will be easier to apply for EDC machines) to which Maya agrees with "Iya," (Yes) showing their mutual understanding of the proposal to simplify the application process for EDC machines.

Data 3.1 suggests that Edwin's use of insertion code-mixing is motivated by participant roles and relationships. Edwin incorporates the English term *EDC* in response to Maya, who had previously used English in her dialogue when asked to Edwin, reflecting her bilingual capability. This interaction reflects the dual language identities and the speech accommodation that Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) note can influence language mixing. Edwin, being bilingual, matches Maya's language use, demonstrating his flexibility and adaptability as a bilingual speaker.

Additionally, situational factors also contribute to Edwin's language choice. The term *EDC* is particularly relevant to the specific context of discussing an application creation idea that facilitates EDC applications. The use of English for the term *EDC* aligns with the topic and is directed at Maya, who clearly understands the term, as evidenced by her confirming response. This appropriateness and understanding highlight how situational factors, along with participant roles and relationships, influence Edwin's code-mixing in his professional interaction.

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

These factors influence one type of code-mixing, namely insertion. Below, the writer presents an example of insertion code-mixing by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, influenced by a combination of factors, specifically participant roles and relationships, interjections from message-intrinsic factors and language attitudes, dominance, and security:

Example: Data 3.7

Ya *happy* lah.

(Yes, I am happy.)

This instance occurred when Edwin responded to his colleague Karin, who inquired about his feelings regarding the potential approval of a merchant application project he developed. Edwin's colleague asked Edwin with a question, "Kalau disetujuin gimana?" (What if it's approved?) to which Edwin answered by saying, "Ya *happy* lah," (Yes, I am happy.)

Edwin's incorporation of the English word *happy* reflects the participant roles and relationships factor, highlighting the dual identities of Edwin and Karin as bilingual speakers who frequently use both Indonesian and English in their communication. This adaptation aligns with Karin's bilingual communication style, showcasing Edwin's flexibility and his effort to adjust the linguistic preferences of his colleague as his interlocutor.

The use of *happy* also illustrates a message-intrinsic factor, specifically serving as an interjection. As stated by Bhatia and Ritchie (2013), language mixing can be used to serve as an interjection. Interjection can be defined as "a word that is used to show a short sudden expression of emotion" (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). In this context, Edwin employs the word *happy* to express his positive emotions or excitement about the possible approval of his project.

Furthermore, Edwin's choice of English reflects issues of language attitudes, dominance, and security. According to Genesee et al. (1995) language dominance can describe a person's preference for a language which is influenced by certain reasons

that are not related to proficiency. In this context, Edwin's preference for expressing excitement in English rather than Indonesian underscores his linguistic dominance in this emotional context.

Additionally, code-mixing can also occur when someone feels secure when communicating with the person they are talking to in line with the explanation by Kim (2006). This feeling of security could be supported by the positive attitude of Edwin's interlocutor. Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) state that individuals will tend to mix languages when others also mix their languages or have a positive attitude towards language mixing. In this context, Edwin's ease in using English to express his happy feelings reflects both his comfort with Karin as his interlocutor and her supportive attitude towards language mixing, thus fostering a conducive environment for bilingual conversation.

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

The writer shows the data below of congruent lexicalization code-mixing used by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* that is influenced by multiple factors namely situational combined with reiteration and message qualification from message-intrinsic factors. The data is described below:

Example: 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 data above occurred when Edwin spoke to the two IT interns, Tia and Wijaya, who had just started their first day as BCA interns. Initially, Edwin discussed the recharge room, a facility available for BCA employees and interns. Subsequently, he shifted the conversation to discuss the IT division's flexitime policy. He explained about the working time policy of the IT division to the interns, which was expressed in the sentence above.

Petra Christian University

The code-mixing observed here, particularly the use of the English words *by the way* and *flexitime* are influenced by situational factors. In this sentence, the English element *by the way,* serves to transition the topic from the function of the recharge room to the flexitime policy, marking a change in both language and subject matter. The English term *flexitime* further highlights situational because it suited the topic of his conversation. This aligns with Bhatia and Ritchie's (2013) theory that language shifts can be motivated by changes in conversation topics, where specific languages or terms are suited for particular contexts.

Furthermore, Edwin's use of the term *flexitime* directly relates to the topic of flexible working hours, a relevant term for explaining the working conditions at BCA office. He elaborates on this concept by repeating in Indonesian that employees can start work later, provided they complete the mandatory eight hours, thereby clarifying the term for the interns. This reiteration of *flexitime* in Indonesian helps to ensure clarity and emphasizes the message, illustrating reiteration as described by Bhatia and Ritchie (2013). Reiteration in code-mixing occurs when a message initially presented in one language is repeated or elaborated in another to reinforce or clarify the intended meaning of a speaker.

Additionally, the phrase *by the way* (Merriam-Webster, n.d.) functions as a message qualification, enhancing the structure of Edwin's explanation thus the message sounds clear and comprehensive. This use of language mixing, where a phrase serves to complement the overall message, is typical in bilingual communication (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013).

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

The writer presents the data below of congruent lexicalization code-mixing used by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* that is motivated by multiple factors namely participant roles and relationships, situational, and topic-comment/relative clauses from message-intrinsic factors. The data is described below:

Example: Data 3.5

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

54

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

This instance of code-mixing occurred during a discussion about the prioritization of projects within the IT division. Edwin's response followed a series of comments from his superior, who praised the idea of a merchant application project but also reminded the team of their busy schedule. Edwin's colleague, Maya, then posed a question about whether to discuss the merchant application project in the upcoming scrum meeting. Edwin responded affirmatively, suggesting that this would help identify which projects required more immediate attention. Edwin said, "Jadi kita bisa tau juga mana *project* yang *urgency*nya lebih tinggi," (Therefore, we can also know which projects have higher urgency.)

The instance of code-mixing above is influenced by participant roles and relationships. Bhatia and Ritchie (2013) propose that dual identities, speech accommodation, and the relationships of the participants can affect language mixing to happen. In the data above, Edwin mixed his Indonesian sentence with several English words such as *project* and *urgency* because previously his interlocutors also incorporated their dialogues with English elements. Their capability in communicating with two different languages back and forth represents that they are bilinguals who have more than one language identity. Their dual identities as bilinguals made them easily integrate two languages within their communication which also reflects their agreement to adapt toward each other's communication style that use those languages.

The situational context further motivates the use of code-mixing. Edwin's choice to use English words such as *project* and *urgency* aligns with the professional and specific nature of the discussion, which revolves around project management within the IT division. These English words are particularly relevant to the topic of being discussed at that time and are likely better suited or more effective to describe certain technical aspects of their work than their Indonesian counterparts.

Moreover, the structure of Edwin's statement demonstrates the message-intrinsic factor of topic-comment/relative clauses. In this case, Edwin uses the statement "yang *urgency*nya lebih tinggi" (which projects have higher urgency) to provide a comment about the projects under discussion. This usage exemplifies how bilingual speakers often use code-mixing to elaborate on or clarify a topic introduced in

one language with a comment in another, thereby enhancing understanding among all participants (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013).

4.3 Discussions

This discussion section explores the use of code-mixing by Edwin in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, focusing on his preference for insertion and congruent lexicalization over alternation. It also examines the specific factors that influence Edwin's choice of these code-mixing types.

4.3.1 Predominance of Insertion and Congruent Lexicalization in Edwin's Communication

Edwin's preference for insertion and congruent lexicalization over alternation might reflect a linguistic choice to optimize clarity. Insertion and congruent lexicalization allow people to seamlessly integrate two languages or codes without causing any confusion (Hartawan & Hikmaharyanti, 2023). In the context of the present study, insertion and congruent lexicalization allow Edwin to seamlessly integrate English into his Indonesian sentences. This strategy is especially useful for explaining complex ideas or specific information that may not have direct translations in Indonesian or that have specific meanings in English, which are important and relevant in the professional situations shown in the series.

Insertion enables Edwin to seamlessly integrate English terminology and specialized expressions into his predominantly Indonesian conversations, thus maintaining coherence and flow. This type of code mixing, which involves embedding English within Indonesian sentences, proves especially beneficial when discussing technical or specialized knowledge (Riantini, 2023).

Similarly, congruent lexicalization facilitates the merging of language elements—such as words—into a single grammatical structure, enhancing the connection of complex ideas. This method of code mixing allows for the integration of familiar Indonesian expressions with specialized English terminology within the same grammatical framework. Congruent lexicalization works especially well in professional settings, where it helps people clearly communicate complicated ideas (Fadliyah et al., 2023).

4.3.2 Absence of Alternation in Edwin's Code-Mixing

One interesting finding from the data analysis of Edwin's communication in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* is the absence of the alternation type. The absence of this type of code-mixing in Edwin's communication might be caused by the need to maintain a clear and consistent communication flow in the professional settings depicted in the series.

The web series mostly shows Edwin in business contexts where he has to solve problems and run projects. To make sure that communication works, the language used must be clear and consistent. The use of alternation type of code mixing might lead to confusion. This risk is particularly high if the context is not explicitly clear or if the speaker lacks proficiency in both languages. According to Stroud (1992), the sudden shift in language can cause difficulties in following the conversation and grasping the intended meaning of the messages that may lead to ambiguity. Such disruption is undesirable in professional settings where precise details are crucial.

Moreover, Edwin's primarily national professional background and his level of English proficiency, given that he has not worked abroad or in highly international contexts, may also limit his ability to effectively utilize alternation. Cárdenas-Claros and Isharyanti (2009) suggest that effective alternation requires a high degree of linguistic competence in both languages involved, which may not be the case with Edwin.

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

The analysis of Edwin's communication in *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* highlights how the use of insertion and congruent lexicalization types are influenced by participant roles and relationships, situational, message qualification, and topic-comment/relative clauses.

Participant Roles and Relationships: In *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, Edwin's position as an IT analyst and supervisor heavily influences how he chooses to communicate. His professional role requires him to use technical language accurately, and he achieves this through insertion and congruent lexicalization. These types of code-mixing methods allow him to incorporate necessary English technical terms into his primarily Indonesian interactions, ensuring that his statements are clear and that complex concepts are easily understood by his interlocutors. The relationship between Edwin and his colleagues also plays a crucial role. His status as a supervisor means he must maintain professional authority and manage team relationships effectively. By integrating English and Indonesian, Edwin not only conveys

57

Petra Christian University

technical information effectively but also strengthens his leadership role, which is essential for managing a diverse, multilingual team. Holmes (1999) notes that such linguistic choices are strategic in professional environments where clear communication serves as the key to performance and relationship within the team.

Situational: The context or setting of an interaction often influences linguistic choices, including the choice to mix languages, made by the speakers (Kushartanti, 2020). In Edwin's situation, working within the IT division of a bank often involves specialized terminology and effective communication style. This setting may require specific types of code-mixing to convey complex technical information accurately and effectively. Insertion could be used to introduce specific terms that suit the setting, while congruent lexicalization could facilitate the seamless integration of these terms into the conversation clearly.

Message Qualification: This factor refers to how Edwin uses code-mixing to make his points sound clearer. Edwin's use of both insertion and congruent lexicalization ensures that his interlocutors grasp his main idea clearly. This approach is especially important in his work environment, where clear communication is essential for correctly understanding the notion of his communication.

Topic-Comment/Relative Clauses: This factor involves starting a topic in one language and then discussing it in another (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). By using this approach in both insertion and congruent lexicalization, Edwin utilizes his ability to speak two different languages to structure his conversations. This ensures that important points are emphasized and that everyone understands the details. This technique is particularly useful in making sure key information stands out in discussions.

4.3.4 Factors Influencing Insertion in Edwin's Communication

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

Interjections: Interjections are important for expressing spontaneous emotions or reactions during conversations (Ollennu, 2017). In settings where more than one language is spoken, such as in Edwin's case, using interjections can quickly convey emotional responses without interrupting the grammatical flow of the conversation. 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. This technique enhances the expressiveness of his speech, also adding necessary clarity and emphasis of his emotions to his interlocutors.

Language Attitudes, Dominance, and Security: Edwin's use of English terms 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. Additionally, speaking English might make Edwin feel more confident or assured in explaining certain ideas or feelings. 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. This approach also ensures that complex communications are conveyed effectively and understood clearly by his colleagues.

4.3.5 Factor Influencing Congruent Lexicalization in Edwin's Communication

In *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, Edwin's use of the congruent lexicalization type of code-mixing is influenced by the factor of reiteration. Reiteration in code-mixing involves repeating information in different languages to strengthen messages or provide further clarification (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). 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 communication. This helps to make the message clearer and more easily understood.

In this context, Edwin can effectively communicate specific terms and key points to his interlocutors by using reiteration. Precise and accurate communication is crucial in professional settings such as Edwin's, as it can facilitate the understanding of information. Moreover, 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. Hence, it supports Edwin to communicate effectively and accurately.

4.3.6 Absence of Some Factors in Edwin's Code-Mixing

59

In *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2*, 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: Quotations typically involve repeating someone's words exactly as they were originally spoken or written, maintaining the original language used (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). In Edwin's context, as an IT analyst and supervisor, there is less emphasis on quoting others. Instead, conversations 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 not effective. This could explain why this factor does not influence the use of code-mixing in Edwin's communication.

Hedging: Hedging is a linguistic strategy used to soften the impact or certainty of a statement, making it less direct (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013). However, in Edwin's role as an IT analyst and supervisor within a bank, there is a strong preference for clear, certain, and direct communication. In environments, where clarity and precision are critical, hedging might be less useful because it can make messages less clear and confusing (Varttala, 2001). In Edwin's professional context, the focus is on conveying information clearly and accurately, particularly when discussing complex technical matters or giving specific instructions. Additionally, the absence of hedging in Edwin's communication indicates that he 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: Expressions and phrases that carry cultural wisdom are usually unique to one language and have meanings that are strongly tied to a particular culture. In a professional environment such as the one portrayed in the series, 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. As Marek (2019) notes, the diversity of cultural backgrounds can complicate the use of idioms or culturally specific expressions that might not be understood by everyone.

4.3.7 Multiple Factors Motivate Code-Mixing Occurrences in Single Sentences

The analysis of Edwin's communication within *Rumah Biru The Series Season 2* shows the occurrence of multiple factors influencing code-mixing. This complexity is particularly evident in professional settings like Edwin's, where communication is not limited to sharing information but also involves building relationships and maintaining a professional image. These conditions are challenging and require skillful use of language.

In this professional environment, Edwin also must ensure that all team members clearly understand the point of discussions or grasp the importance of certain information, especially when it involves technical details. To achieve this, Edwin strategically employs code-mixing, tailoring 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 intelligible information.

The presence of multiple factors in code-mixing within single sentences highlights Edwin's skillful use of language in multilingual professional settings. His ability in code-mixing is crucial for effectively managing a diverse team to achieve common goals. His language skill also shows the importance of code-mixing as a strategy to address the complex communication needs in today's workplaces.