

CODE MIXING ANALYSIS OF @SKIPBERAT X-ACCOUNTS' TWEETS**¹Naura Izza Zahro', ²Fika Ar-Rizqi Naf'ihima****Universitas Islam Kadiri****¹nauraizzaza@gmail.com, ²fikaa.nafihima@gmail.com****ABSTRACT**

Numerous studies in the field of discourse analysis (DA) have utilized X application as their primary data source. This study examines code-mixing in tweets from the '@skipberat' X account between May 18, 2024, and June 18, 2024. Using descriptive qualitative with focus on discourse analysis, it explores the types of code mixing used by the X user '@skipberat' in his tweets. The research identifies and categorized the tweets into three types of code mixing namely insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Findings highlight that insertion emerging as the most frequent form followed by alternation and congruent lexicalization. Insertion code-mixing occurs when the speakers insert lexical items into another language. The example from the '@skipberat' tweet is '*Panjang umur aespaa karir kalian bakal longlasting*'. The English word 'long lasting' is inserted in the last and it does not change the grammatical so it is categorized into insertion code mixing. There is still a lot of tweets can be analysed by code mixing or others issues in Discourse Analysis so the next researcher can explore more.

Keywords: code-mixing, discourse analysis, X application, @skipberat user account

INTRODUCTION

In today's digital age, the internet has revolutionized the way we communicate, bringing about significant changes in social media and language. Social media platforms, as a subset of the internet, have become ubiquitous, serving as primary venues for interaction, information sharing, and cultural exchange. These platforms have not only broadened our communication horizons but also reshaped the patterns and norms of language use. The majority of young people today use social media to share what they like, their activities, and to communicate with others. They are particularly used in social media to interpret particular ideals or frames (Ayomi, 2021).

Language on social media is dynamic and adaptive, influenced by trends, hashtags, and the rapid spread of information. This interplay between the internet, social media, and language highlights the transformative impact of digital technologies on our everyday lives, redefining how we connect, express ourselves, and engage with the world around us. This research conducted on language development in the younger generation in the digital era shows many gaps in research (Budiasa et al., 2021).

Twitter, also known as X, is a potent communication tool that enables people to build online communities and networks and exchange knowledge and concepts. According to Kwak et al. (2010), the public profile comprises the user's full name, location, website, brief biography, and the quantity of tweets they have posted. Users can engage with the content through the X application by liking, commenting, or retweeting the tweets. According to McGregor et al. (2017), the X application facilitates communication between the public, political actors, and the media while also providing a platform for other users to communicate. The X application is a well-known resource for knowledge and data analysis for different machine learning-based stance analysis methods (Khan et al., 2017). Nonetheless, the language used is a crucial component in the application of X (Michael, 2020).

In the realm of digital communication, X application has emerged as a dominant platform, facilitating a vast array of interactions through short, impactful messages known as tweets. Message elements such as whether the utterance is questioning or declarative, as well as social dynamics and the social dynamics and discourse conditions involved, are often reflected in the prosodic structure of the utterance. The nature of these tweets, characterized by their brevity and immediacy, makes them rich subjects for discourse analysis. The content of the X app itself is derived from everyday human conversations and labels each sentence with a different emotion (neutral, angry, disgusted, scared, happy, sad, or surprised) (Babich et al., 2022). By examining the language, themes, and patterns present in tweets, discourse analysis can uncover deeper insights into the social, cultural, and political dynamics at play within the X application community. Analysing tweets through this method is essential for understanding how users construct their

identities, express opinions, and influence public discourse. Consequently, the need for such analysis is paramount, as it helps to decipher the complex web of communication that shapes contemporary digital landscapes.

Numerous studies in the field of discourse analysis (DA) have utilized X application as their primary data source. One notable area of focus has been the study of politeness in discourse. Researchers such as Murti (2020), Sili Tonga and Paraiba (2021), and Maros and Rosli (2022) have conducted extensive studies examining how politeness is conveyed and perceived in tweets. Another significant area of research has been speech style, with Mukhin et al. (2021) exploring various stylistic features in user communication on X application. In order to contribute novel insights to the field, the current researcher has turned attention to bilingual issues, specifically analysing code-mixing practices within tweets on X application. This research aims to shed light on how users blend languages in their tweets, enriching the understanding of linguistic diversity and code-switching behaviours in digital communication.

In sociolinguistic, bilingualism is one thing will be learnt. Bilingualism is simply about two languages. Originally, multilingual societies that speak two or more languages are the ones who use code mixing and code switching the most (Chaer & Agustina, 2004). Combining a word or phrase from one language with another is known as "code-mixing" (Safitri, Harida, & Hamka, 2017). In multilingual cultures, code-mixing is frequently found during oral and written communication (Hidayatullah et al., 2022). (Aboh, 2020) states that Code-mixing is an innate capacity that arises spontaneously from recombination. According to (Sabrina, 2021) The language of Indonesia's millennial generation is influenced by globalization as a tech-savvy generation. Therefore, the majority of them have mastered two or more languages from family, school, and neighborhood environments, the speakers can blend various languages into one sentence (Krauska & Lau, 2023). The phenomenon where people communicate, they decide for themselves which code is appropriate because members of society develop new codes by adopting and combining parts of two or more language (Permata Sari et al., 2022). From written or spoken interactions, it can be deduced that code-mixing

refers to the process by which individuals switch between their native tongue and another language in everyday conversation. Therefore, (Siska & Yelliza, 2023) code-mixing is a very natural incident for bilinguals.

A number of academics have discussed the various forms of code mixing. Two main types of code mixing were identified by Sumarsono & Pratana (2004): inner code mixing and outer code mixing. Moreover, three categories of code mixing are outlined by Musyken (2000) and Safitri, Harida, & Hamka (2017): 1) insertion, 2) alternation, and 3) congruent lexicalization. Musyken's (2000) types of code-mixing are highlighted in this study. The act of speakers inserting lexical items into a different language is known as insertion code-mixing. When there is an imbalance in the relationship between the languages, the process occurs. According to (Muliadi & Haristiani, 2020) the mixing process with insertion was similar to borrowing, namely the insertion of lexical categories and foreign phrases into a particular structure. The process of alternation code-mixing happens when speakers combine one grammatical structure with a different linguistic pattern. Here, the speaker switches between two different linguistic systems in one sentence. In general, alternation processes differ from insertions in that the former do not take precedence over another grammatical structure. When two languages are close to one another linguistically, congruent lexicalization happens. The speakers can freely move the lexical items within a sentence because their grammatical structures are similar.

In this study, we conduct a discourse analysis of code-mixing in the tweets of the X account '@skipberat'. X, as a microblogging platform, offers a rich corpus of spontaneous and conversational text, making it an ideal source for investigating code-mixing practices. The analysis aims to identify the types and frequencies of code-mixing, explore the syntactic and pragmatic contexts in which code-mixing occurs, and understand the sociolinguistic implications of such practices. By focusing on '@skipberat,' a prominent user known for engaging in bilingual or multilingual communication, this research seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of how digital platforms influence language use and how individuals navigate their linguistic repertoires in online spaces. The results of this research

should clarify the relationship between language, identity, and digital communication as well as offer insights into the linguistic techniques used by bilingual people.

METHOD

The accomplish to achieve the research goal of understanding how a community or person accepts particular concerns, qualitative approaches have been chosen (Murtadho & Refli, 2023). The researcher will be interpreting the data, it is crucial in this instance for researchers who employ qualitative approaches to guarantee the research process quality.

This study employed a qualitative discourse analysis approach to examine code-mixing practices in tweets from the '@skipberat' X account over a one-month period from May 18, 2024, to June 18, 2024. The data collection process focused on text-based tweets, which were subsequently analyzed and categorized according to Muysken (2000, p. 1), three major areas for code mixing analysis: insertion (word or phrase), alternation (clause), and congruent lexicalization (dialect). The analytical framework involved identifying the language pairs engaged in code-mixing, predominantly Indonesian and English, and scrutinizing the syntactic and pragmatic contexts in which code-mixing occurred. Message elements such as whether the utterance is questioning or declarative, as well as social dynamics and the social dynamics and discourse conditions involved, are often reflected in the prosodic structure of the utterance. Furthermore, the research assessed the frequency and patterns of different code-mixing types to discern prevalent trends.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Types of code-mixing

a. Insertion



Insertion is one of the types of code-mixing. Insertion pertains to the incorporation of lexical or

phrasal elements from one language into the syntactic structure of another language.



This tweet demonstrates insertion code-mixing. The base language is Indonesian: "Panjang umur aespa karir kalian bakal" (May aespa's career be long-lasting). The English word "longlasting" is inserted at the end, replacing its Indonesian equivalent. This insertion doesn't change the grammatical structure of the sentence but adds a bilingual element.



This tweet uses insertion code-mixing. The base language is Indonesian: "Inimah kudunya dibayar 1M tiap perform" (This should be paid 1M for each performance). The English phrase "music show" is inserted at the end. This insertion adds specificity to the type of performance being discussed.

This tweet primarily uses Indonesian, but incorporates two English words: "debut" - an insertion of an English verb and "weverse" - an insertion of an English proper noun (likely referring to a social media platform). The sentence structure remains Indonesian, with these English words inserted into it. This is a clear example of insertion, where single lexical items from one language are incorporated into the structure of another language.



This tweet also primarily uses Indonesian, with one English insertion. The English word "stage" - an English noun inserted into the Indonesian sentence structure. This is an example of insertion, where a single English word is used within an otherwise Indonesian sentence.

The definition of "insertion concept" itself alludes to the term's "translation" or "transmission," as used by Clyne, and "embedding," as used by Myer-Scotton (Syafaat & Setiawan, 2019). This type of code-mixing typically involves the integration of nouns, verbs, adjectives, or entire phrases from the embedded language while maintaining the grammatical framework of the base language. This phenomenon demonstrates the speaker's linguistic dexterity, enabling the seamless integration of foreign elements without disrupting the grammatical integrity of the base language. The practice of insertion reflects the dynamic and adaptive nature of language use among bilingual individuals, highlighting the process of linguistic borrowing and the fluid boundaries between languages.

b. Alternation

The combination of the structural components of two languages can result in a variety of mixing patterns, as evidenced by the sort of code mixing known as



alternation (Sinamo & Ivone, 2024).

This shows alternation code-mixing. The tweet begins with the English phrase "Beauty and the beast," then switches to Indonesian: "waktu Gw masih jd beast" (when I was still a beast). This is a clear example of inter-sentential switching, where the language changes at a clause boundary. The use of "Gw" (informal

Indonesian for "I") and "jd" (abbreviation for "jadi" meaning "become") also shows informal Indonesian language use.

This tweet demonstrates alternation code-mixing. The first part "Inget prinsip asik sendiri" is fully in Indonesian. The second part "til u make it" is a complete English phrase. This shows a clear switch from Indonesian to English mid-sentence, which is characteristic of alternation. The grammatical structure changes from



This form of code-mixing is characterized by the alternation of segments from different languages, often occurring at natural syntactic boundaries. For instance, an Indonesian-English bilingual speaker might state, "Saya akan pergi sekarang, but I will be back soon," where the shift from Indonesian to English occurs between two clauses. This type of code-mixing underscores the speaker's proficiency in both languages and their ability to navigate between them with ease. Alternation often serves pragmatic functions, such as emphasizing certain points, accommodating the linguistic preferences of the interlocutors, or achieving rhetorical effects within a multilingual context.

c. Congruent Lexicalization

Congruent lexicalization occurs when the languages involved share similar grammatical structures, facilitating the seamless mixing of lexical items from both languages within the same syntactic framework.



have two language between Indonesian and English. It can be seen from ("Asian value", "cant afford to be sick") with Indonesian connectors and structure, "adalah" (Indonesian) links two English phrases, "karena" (Indonesian) introduces a reason in a mix of Indonesian and English.

Therefore, L1 and L2 share a shared grammatical structure in congruent lexicalization sentences (Samola et al., 2023) and words from both languages are inserted somewhat at random in congruent lexicalization code mixing. This type of code-mixing leverages the structural congruence between languages, resulting in utterances where elements from both languages are interwoven naturally. For example, in Indonesian-English code-mixing, a sentence such as "Meeting itu diadakan di office baru" demonstrates how both Indonesian and English words can coexist within a unified grammatical structure. Congruent lexicalization highlights the syntactic compatibility between the languages and showcases the linguistic creativity of bilingual speakers (Iniesta et al., 2021). It enables them to produce integrated and coherent expressions that draw on their entire linguistic repertoire, thereby enriching their communicative practices.

CONCLUSION

This study examined code-mixing practices in tweets from the '@skipberat' X account, focusing on the interplay between Indonesian and English languages. The study identified three primary types of code-mixing: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. The result showed that insertion emerging as the most frequent form followed by alternation and congruent lexicalization. This pattern suggests a complex interplay between the base language (predominantly Indonesian) and the embedded language (English), reflecting the user's bilingual competence and the linguistic landscape of their digital environment.

The observed code-mixing practices demonstrate not only linguistic flexibility but also serve various pragmatic functions, including emphasis, precision, and cultural resonance. This linguistic behaviour aligns with broader sociolinguistic trends, particularly the increasing influence of English in Indonesian digital discourse. The study thus provides insight into the evolving nature of language contact phenomena in the context of computer-mediated communication.

REFERENCES

- Aboh, E. O. (2020). Lessons From Neuro-(a)-Typical Brains: Universal Multilingualism, Code-Mixing, Recombination, and Executive Functions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(April), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00488>
- Ayomi, P. N. (2021). Managing Interpersonal Meaning in Social Media: a Case Study of Indonesian Language Use. *Academic Journal Perspective : Education, Language, and Literature*, *9*(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.33603/perspective.v9i1.4544>
- Babich, O., Vyshnyvskiy, V., Mukhin, V., Zamaruyeva, I., Sheleg, M., & Kornaga, Y. (2022). The Technique of Key Text Characteristics Analysis for Mass Media Text Nature Assessment. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, *14*(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.5815/ijmeecs.2022.01.01>
- Budiasa, I. G., Savitri, P. W., Shanti, A. A. S., & Dewi, S. (2021). Slang language in Indonesian social media. *Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture*, *11*(1), 30.
- Hidayatullah, A. F., Qazi, A., Lai, D. T. C., & Apong, R. A. (2022). A Systematic Review on Language Identification of Code-Mixed Text: Techniques, Data Availability, Challenges, and Framework Development. *IEEE Access*, *10*(October), 122812–122831. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3223703>
- Iniesta, A., Paolieri, D., Serrano, F., & Bajo, M. T. (2021). Bilingual writing coactivation: Lexical and sublexical processing in a word dictation task. *Bilingualism*, *24*(5), 902–917. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728921000274>
- Krauska, A., & Lau, E. (2023). Moving away from lexicalism in psycho- and neuro-linguistics. *Frontiers in Language Sciences*, *2*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/flang.2023.1125127>
- Muliadi, & Haristiani, N. (2020). *Code-Mixing in Japanese Language Beginner Level Classroom*. *509(Icollite)*, 469–474.

<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201215.074>

Murtadho, F., & Refli, Z. (2023). *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* Code Mixing of Supervisors ' Oral Feedback on Students ' Thesis Writing. 232–241.

Permata Sari, I., Jyotisha Gangga Dara Gamaya, D., & Wayan Ana, I. (2022). Code Mixing Found in Antologi Rasa Novel by Ika Natassa. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2022, 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i10.11272>

Sabrina, A. N. (2021). INTERNET SLANG CONTAINING CODE-MIXING OF ENGLISH AND INDONESIAN USED BY MILLENNIALS ON TWITTER (Slang Internet Mengandung Campur-Kode Bahasa Inggris dan Indonesia yang Digunakan oleh Milenial di Twitter). *Kandai*, 17(2), 153–165.

Samola, N. F., Mamentu, A. C., & Kemur, V. C. (2023). *An Analysis of English-Indonesian Code-Mixing Used by Marion Jola*. Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-35-0_176

Sinamo, C. B., & Ivone, F. M. (2024). *Code Switching and Code Mixing : An Analysis in Boy William ' s Reality Show ' The Family . ' 10(2)*, 1506–1516.

Siska, S., & Yelliza, Y. (2023). Code Mixing Analysis in Group Discussion Activitiy in Speaking Class. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, 7(1), 332–340. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v7i1.4178>

Syafaat, P. M. F., & Setiawan, T. (2019). *An Analysis of Code Mixing in Twitter*. 297(Icille 2018), 276–281. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icille-18.2019.57>