

CODE MIXING IN DEDDY CORBUZIER'S PODCAST: A CASE STUDY OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Maimunah Ritonga^{1*}, Amron Zarkasih Ritonga²

¹²Universitas Islam Labuhan Batu, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

*Correspondence Author Email: maimunahritonga89@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian metode campuran ini menyelidiki fenomena percampuran bahasa pada Podcast Deddy Corbuzier yang berjudul "Agnéz Mo... Mantantku Ter....". Podcast tersebut diperoleh dari informasi video Channel YouTube Deddy Corbuzier yang selanjutnya ditranskripsikan menjadi percakapan tertulis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa video podcast Deddy Corbuzier terdapat 124 kejadian campur kode. Ada 5 jenis campur kode dengan variasi tampilan yang berbeda-beda. Begitu pula dengan penelusuran fungsi campur kode, terdapat 6 fungsi dengan persentase berbeda pada setiap kategori. WEI merupakan jenis campur kode yang paling banyak ditemukan. Sedangkan F1 merupakan fungsi terbanyak mengapa dilakukan campur kode oleh penutur.

Kata kunci: Sociolinguistik, Bilingual, Campur Kode

Abstract

This mixed-method research investigated the phenomenon of language mixing on Deddy Corbuzier Podcast entitled "Agnéz Mo ... Mantantku Ter". The podcast was obtained from Deddy Corbuzier's YouTube Channel inform of video that further transcribed into the written conversation. The results showed that Deddy Corbuzier's video podcast contained 124 occurrences of code-mixing. There were 5 types of code-mixing with different variations of appearance. Likewise, with the investigation of code-mixing functions, there are 6 functions with different percentages in each category. WEI was the most common type of code-mixing found. While F1 was the most function of why code-mixing was used by the speaker.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, Bilingualism, Code-Mixing

Article History:

Submitted: August 6, 2024

Revised: August 9, 2024

Accepted: August 9, 2024

INTRODUCTION

The development of the digital era has had a big influence in all aspects including aspects of the language used in communication. Nowadays, communicating does not have to be face to face because there are so many online media that give everyone space to do a long-distance communication. However, it cannot be denied that these fast-digital media have brought various people with diverse cultural backgrounds into one social arena and causing cultural friction. This has been confirmed by (Wardhaugh, 2002) that when two different cultures meet in one social situation, there will be cultural friction. This incident then caused languages contact, resulting in the phenomenon of Multilingualism (Chaer, 2007) or what is often referred to as the ability to use more than two languages (Holmes, 2013). What is interesting about this phenomenon is that this event did not end there. This matter still continues and arise to another phenomena such as code mixing or code switching in which many linguistic experts argued that these two terms are a

natural occurrence since the existence of different cultures or languages in the same social situation is possible.

Code mixing (mixing languages) and code switching (switching languages) are events that occur when there is communication between multilingual or bilingual occurred (Romaine, 1995). For example, an utterance from Dedy Corbuzier's podcast on his YouTube channel, "...seberapa gak beruntungnya orang-orang yang ada under my microscope....". The speaker was actually using Indonesian but at the middle of her speech, she suddenly inserts an English phrase. Indeed, this is not a new issue for linguist, especially in sociolinguistic studies. However, this code mixing or code-switching event is a phenomenon that has always been sticking out till now. Especially with the widespread of the use of online media or social media that not only bring together the local people but also all citizens around the world with variant cultural or language backgrounds as well. Some of these media include YouTube, Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, and TikTok.

In addition to being considered as a natural phenomenon, mixing or switching language also has several reasons: as entertainment, discussing certain topics, or just as an element of style (trend) (Smith, 2023). One of the most well-known podcasts in Indonesia is Dedy Corbuzier's podcast which is his YouTube channel is subscribed by 13.6 million people. Based on preliminary research data, the podcast content uploaded by Dedy on his YouTube channel contains elements of mixing or switching languages. The content that he uploaded has also been watched by millions of people, which means that the phenomenon of code mixing and code switching has been witnessed by many people regardless of whether they are aware of it or not.

Therefore, the researcher is interested in analyzing the type and function of code mixing on podcasts on Dedy Corbuzier's YouTube channel. Apart from being a well-known figure in Indonesia, Dedy Corbuzier is also multilingual and he often creates podcasts by collaborating with multilingual people such as Fiki Naki or Agnez Monica.

METHOD

This research used descriptive qualitative method based on Cohen, et.al. (2007) that on its perspective focus on describing, comparing, contrasting, classifying, and analyzing the subject or object that being researched. Qualitative method is not involved into statistic or measurement (Best & Khan, 2006). In addition, qualitative research is generally plunge naturally into the phenomenon situation so as may avoid manipulation and control behaviors. The researcher also used sociolinguistics theoretical approach which is the research approach related to the language used in society (Chaer, 2004).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The researcher used Hoffman (1991) theory of code-mixing in classifying the types of code-mixing. There are many types were found of this research.

Word Element Inserted (WEI)

WEI is a type of code-mixing that occurs in the word area. Thus, the researchers found a lot of language mixing that occurs at the word level. Regardless of whether it is intentional or not, the researcher still includes all kinds of words that are classified as language mixing phenomena. The following is an explanation of some utterances that very clearly represent WEI. These utterances are data obtained from the results of the analysis of the video "*Agnez Mo ... My Ex Ter*",

Agnez :Jadi, engga cuman sebenarnya mungkin juga gara-gara

Deddy : Iyaa kan, dulu gua , iyaa

Deddy :Exactly padahal kan, sebenarnya waktu itu kan lu masih 21,20.

From this it can be observed that regardless of the position of a word, if words from different languages are used in the same utterance, then the speaker who expresses the utterance has mixed his language. This also happened to Agnez just like in the podcast on Deddy Corbuzier's YouTube channel.

Phrase Inserted (PI)

PI is the third most common language mixing phenomenon in this research. There were 28 PI occurrences or 22% of the total language-mixing occurrences. Here are some factual examples obtained from the results of video analysis.

*Deddy : iya, **my character** pada saat itu bikin gua emang tua. (Yes, my character at that time really turned me old.)*

Agnez :Jadinya, makanya yang sebenarnya aslinya cuman beda berapa tahun, ya kan 5,6 tahun (So, that's why the actual difference is only 5-6 years right?)

Deddy : Hmm, disitu memang berdua tuh di depan kaya orang bodoh di trotoar ampe malam, ngobrol-ngobrol, terus setelah itu gua, ahh masa-masa itu. (We were there, like idiots on the sidewalk until the night, chatting, then after that, I was, ahh those times).

At the beginning of Deddy and Agnez's conversation above, Deddy inserted an English phrase into his Indonesian speech. The phrase is formed from the words '**my**' and '**character**' which then refers to the character possessed by Deddy when he was dating Agnez. Here, Deddy admits that he did look old. He made this confession by inserting the phrase '**My character**' in the middle of his utterance.

Baster Form Inserted (BFI)

Based on the results of data analysis, BFI was the least common type of all types of language mixing found. There are only 2 BFI occurrences or 2% of the whole occurrence. This was what made BFI the least common in terms of its occurrence. This was also different from RWI that even was not exist. So that RWI could not be called the least frequent type. As already explained, BFI was a language mixture that can simply be concluded as the involvement of different phonological elements in an utterance with a different language too (Fishman, 1977). For instance, the pronunciation of English words by using Indonesian phonology found in Agnez and Deddy's conversation below.

*Deddy : **Sepplit** lah (Of course split)*

Agnez : Untung ada nyokap gua, gua ama nyokap gua ... (Lucky, I am going with my mom)

*Deddy : Loh kita kalo di acara TV aja kita **sepplit** kok (Indeed we split when on TV show)*

These two occurrences from BFI are actually found in the same word, namely the two words in bold above. The word in bold above was actually the word '**split**' which was mentioned twice by Deddy. Initially, Agnez pronounced the word as well as the English pronunciation. However, in the next turn, Deddy pronounced the word a little differently and with the addition of a vowel sound, 'e' sound and doubled the consonant 'p'. It should be pronounced as 'split' instead of '**sepplit**', this was the reason why this phenomenon was categorized language mixing as BFI type.

Clause Inserted (CI)

CI was the second most common type of language mixing found in data analysis. There were 38 utterances containing CI with a percentage of 30% of the total types of utterances that were categorized as code-mixing. Similar to WEI and PI, CI also requires careful analysis. This accuracy was not because it was difficult to distinguish between phrases and clauses, but to clarify the boundaries between code-switching and code-mixing. Because the clause was the highest limit of code-mixing syntactically (Li & Garcia, 2022). According to the conversation between Agnez and Deddy, here were some examples of CI and their explanations.

*Agnez : Jadinya, makanya yang sebenarnya aslinya cuman beda berapa tahun, ya kan? 5-6 tahun, **people think that**, ow iya ini 15 tahun ni bedanya gitu. (So, that's why, the thing that you really want is to make a difference of how many years, right? 5-6 years, people think that, oh yeah, it's 15 years, that is the difference)*

Deddy: Hmm, di situ memang berdua tuh di depan kaya orang bodoh di trotoar ampe malam, ngobrol-ngobrol, trus setelah itu gua, ahh masa-masa itu. (We were there, like idiots on the sidewalk until the night, chatting, then after that, I was, ahh those times) Deddy dan Agnez tertawa Bersama (Deddy and Agnez laughing together)

The bolded utterance above was categorized as CI. Indeed, it was an English clause that inserted by Agnez in her Indonesian utterance. This was called a clause because there was a subject and a predicate but it was still incomplete since that English utterance was followed by Indonesian. If Agnez changed the next utterance into English until at the end she finished the clause, then this was no longer a code-mixing but code-switching. Here, we could observe that Indonesian was still more dominant in Agnez's sentence above. While in mixing theory, there was a dominant language between the language mixture (Gumperz, 1982). This means that the clause above was included in the category of mixing language in the CI type.

Expression or Idiom Inserted (EII)

The types of code-mixing that have been described previously can be said to be types from a syntactic perspective, this time EII is quite different. EII deals with expressions and idioms that can ignore syntactic contexts such as WEI, PI, or CI. That was, this EII can be the insertion of words, phrases, or clauses. The reason was simple, because to express something or communicate using idioms can be done by using words, phrases, or even clauses. This was proofed by the results of conversational data analysis on Agnez and Deddy's video podcast which can be observed as follows.

Deddy : Kenapa jadi cuman lu doang yang muda?(Why the young is only you?)

*Agnez : Karena muka lo tua **bro** (Because your face looks old)*

Deddy : Makasih loh, makasih loh (Thank you, thank you).

If we pay close attention to the conversation between Agnez and Deddy, the word 'bro' is an inserted English word. However, this was not a WEI category even though 'bro' was syntactically a word. 'Bro' was an idiom used to address male friends. In Indonesia, this was often used as informal and maybe most Indonesians know it. Another thing that supports this as EII is, although 'bro' can be said to be a common language among Indonesian people, still, 'bro' was a foreign language that was not included in the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI). So the word 'bro' in Agnez's utterance above was clearly an insertion of an English idiom into Indonesian speech or hereinafter referred to as EII (Martin & Rubdy, 2023).

The Function of Code-Mixing

In analyzing the function of code-mixing, the researcher examined the code-mixing functions that were conveyed by speakers in Deddy Corbuzier's podcast. In the analysis, the researcher used the theory of Hoffman (1991) that there were 7 functions of code-mixing. From the 7 functions, 6 functions were found. While one of the seven functions was not found in Deddy Corbuzier's podcast at all. In more detail, the researcher has distributed the function calculation data from the code-mixing found here. The data were distributed into the form of a table as follows.

Table 4.2. The Function of Code-Mixing Table

No.	Reasons	Occurrence	Percentage
1	F1	78	63%
2	F2	0	0%
3	F3	1	1%
4	F4	29	24%
5	F5	4	3%
6	F6	8	7%
7	F7	4	3%
Total Occurrences		124	

Note:

F1 = Talking about particular topic

F2 = Quoting somebody else

F3 = Being emphatic about something (Express solidarity)

F4 = Interjection (Inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors)

F5 = Repetition used for clarification

F6 = Intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor

F7 = Expressing group identity

Here, the researcher deliberately put some initials to the seven types of code-mixing functions. Researchers changed each category of code-mixing function names to facilitate the process of marking the transcribed speech. It also helps to simplify the recapitulation and presentation of code-mixing function data that have been found through transcript analysis and review of the compatibility with the video.

Based on the table 4.2, it can be observed that of the 124 occurrences of code-mixing, F1 and F4 are the more conspicuous functions than the others. F1 is the most frequently used function with a total of 78 occurrences or 63% of the total and F4 is in the second position with 29 occurrences or 24%. While the other 4 functions, namely F3, F5, F6, F7 did not touch the 10% figure at all. Moreover, F2 is not found at all. Here, the researcher also attaches an explanation and example of each code-mixing function found in Deddy Corbuzier's video podcast entitled 'Agnéz Mo ... My Ex-Ter'.

Talking about particular topic (F1), F1 is the most commonly found function. This function was related to habits that bilingual or multilingual speakers can realize or not at all. For instance, just as Agnez utterance in a conversation on Deddy Corbuzier's podcast.

*Agnez : Waktu itu lu **play a tract** pokoknya waktu itu lu bilang ... dan itu kita lagi break kan? (At that time, you played attract, basically, at that time you said ... and then we were on a break, right?)*

Deddy : Hmm (Hmm)

Agnez : karna yang waktu itu ... sampai pagi kan? (Because that time... until morning, right?)

The conversation above showed that there were two parts bolded in Agnez's utterance. The first was the clause 'Play attracts' and the second was the word 'break'. Based on the perspective of the type of code-mixing, the two utterances were not the same kind of code-mixing. The first was categorized as CI and the second as WEI. The interesting thing was both types of code-mixing were actually shared the same function. Both utterances were used by Agnez in talking about particular topics.

Based on the investigation on Agnez and Deddy video podcast, the researcher concluded that Agnez was deliberately turned the clause and word into English. She turned the utterances in purpose to remind Deddy of a particular topic. She wanted Deddy to remember that at the time Deddy started playing attracts. Then, Agnez also added another explanation that she thought could support her previous utterance by mentioning the word 'break'. So then, Deddy began to remember the topics which were Agnez tried to explain. It was not about whether Deddy remembered it or not, but the main point was, here Agnes was mixed her language just for talking a particular topic to Deddy. This analysis made CI and WEI above were categorized as F1.

Being emphatic about something (Express solidarity) (F3), F3 was a function where mixing language was used to express a certain empathy or feeling. This function also applies to utterances that were conveyed in expressing solidarity. Based on the transcription analysis and video review, there was only one mixing phenomenon which was considered as the F3 function (Hudson, 1996). Here was the code-mixing which was determined as an F3 function,

*Agnez : Habis itu, nah **back to your question**, gua waktu itu belum pernah pacaran, jadi gue pada saat waktu itu dideketin sama seorang penyanyi. (After that, back to your question, I had never been in a relationship at that time, so I was approached by a singer at that time).*

Deddy : Sama orang itu, oh iya iya betul. (By that person, oh yeah, right)

*Agnez: Ya ya ya,ingat kan? Dideketin tapi gua waktu itu **I was too young**.
(Yes, remember right? He Approached, but at that time I was too young).*

To find this F3 function, researchers have investigated the matching between the transcript and the original video. Here it was found that Agnez conveyed the clause "I was too young" in a different tone which implies that it was her expression of empathy. Why was that? This was because Agnez delivered the clause as an illustration of her empathy that the man who approached her at that time came at the wrong time. Instead of saying it clearly, Agnez actually described it with empathy that she actually felt a little sorry for the man by "I was too young".

Interjection (Inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors) (F4). F4 was the second most common function found, although in terms of number it was still relatively small or only about 29% of the total. F4 found from the results of data analysis consists of interjection and sentence fillers. Examples can be observed such as the conversation below

Deddy: Iyaa kan, dulu gua, iyaa (Yeah right, I used to be, yeah)

*Deddy: **Exactly** padahal kan sebenarnya waktu itu kan lu masih 21, 20.
(Exactly. Even though at that time you were actually 21, 20).*

Deddy: 20 lah. (Sure, 20).

The word in bold in the above conversation was WEI. Meanwhile, the WEI function above was an interjection. The reason was, Agnez used the word 'exactly' to express strong emotions. That was, here Agnez expressed her expression that she was of the same mind as Deddy.

*Agnez: ... **anyways** pada saat waktu itu hmm apayah*

*Deddy: Hmmm, tapi **with the problem**, tapi **with that thing**.*

*Agnez: **And**, tapi ada cewe lain (And, but there is another girl).*

The code-mixing above (WEI) is categorized as F4 because it functions as a sentence filler. Basically, sentence filler is unnecessary in a sentence. It's the same with the word 'anyways' above which actually doesn't matter if it's omitted. That's because the sentence filler is just like pleasantries used by Agnez. Unlike the interjection which aims to show a strong expression. Repetition used for clarification (F5). Based on the data analysis, F5 only consist of 4 occurrences or 3% from the whole function. That was why F5 as the least function found in this research. As the name of this function suggests, F5 is a repetition of the speech spoken by the speaker. This repetition usually aims to clarify previous utterances or certain topics. Maybe this touches on F1 a bit because repetition does focus on a topic. The difference is that here the speaker does repeat his utterance or mixes his language specifically to clarify something (Fasold,1984). Examples can be seen as the conversation below.

*Agnez: Yo, **stupid**.*

Deddy: Oh, makasih loh

*Agnez: Bukan **you are stupid** tapi yo **stupid**.*

This was an example of code-mixing that can be said to be intentionally used by Agnez. The reason was that Deddy misunderstood Agnez's expression 'Yo stupid' at the beginning of the conversation above. Deddy felt that Agnez called him stupid. While, here Agnez clarified the meaning of her words. As a result, Agnez repeated

the utterance with a little explanation that differentiated her meaning from "*Not you are stupid, but yo stupid*". It was the phrase conveyed by Agnez to describe how she felt at that time.

Intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor (F6). There were 6 occurrences of F6 or only 7%. F6 has similarities with F5. The difference lied in the repetition of the same speech. F6 is not a repetition but was more purely used to clarify or confirm something. The example can be seen as follows.

*Agnez : Ya karna, maksud gua kan secara umur memang **I was young**. (Yes, because I mean by age, I was young)*

*Deddy : **Well because I'm also young right?***

Agnez : Cuman kan (But).

The CI in bold in the conversation above is Agnez's speech which is included in the F6 category. Agnez on that occasion clarified that he was indeed still young in terms of age. Also, there was no element of repetition of words or clauses. The clause was purely inserted by Agnez as a clause that clarified and strengthened his previous utterance. Another example was also found on WEI as below.

Agnez : Kita pacaran hampir tiga tahun right? (We were almost three years in relationship, right?)

Deddy : Empat! (Four!)

Agnez : Ya ya (Yeah)

Here Agnez clearly wanted to confirm whether what she said was true or not. This was indicated by the WEI "Right?" at the end of her utterance. This showed that Agnez was actually not too sure that they were dating for almost three years. Then Deddy confirmed that Agnez was slightly mistaken. Deddy clarified it by one word "four" which means not nearly three years as Agnez stated. Expressing group identity (F7).

Just like F5, F7 was the smallest function with the same total occurrence and percentage. There were only 4 code-mixing categorized as F7 or 3% of the total. Here was an example of F7's findings on Agnez and Deddy's video podcast.

Agnez : Karena muka lo tua broo (Because your face looks old)

Deddy : Makasih loh, makasih loh (Thank you)

Agnez : Muka lo tua bro (Your face looks old bro).

This was a simple and easy example to realize. WEI 'bro' that Agnez said there was an idiom used to call a male friend. That was, there was already an element of closeness between them. This was a symbol that they have a close relationship. If Agnez does not have a close relationship with Deddy, then this time she was considered rude. But they actually have a closeness. It is proven that Deddy is not angry at being called 'bro'. This was proved by Agnez by mixing her language at that time. She mixed it to show her solidarity or express that they actually have the same closeness and identity, namely as friends and ex-boyfriends.

CONCLUSION

Referring to the previous research question, here the researcher presented the following discussion. On the types of Code-mixing investigation, there were 124 code-mixing events. Of the 6 types of code-mixing, only 5 types of code-mixing were found, namely: WEI (37%), PI (22%), BFI (2%), EII (8%), and CI (30%). WEI is the

most dominant type of code-mixing and is followed by CI, PI, EII, and BFI. In the analysis of code-mixing functions, researchers found 6 types of functions out of a total of 7 functions. The functions are F1 (63%), F4 (24%), F6 (7%), F5 (3%), F7 (3%), and F3 (3%). F1 is the most frequently found function while F3 is the least frequent function..

REFERENCES

- Best, J.W., & Kahn, J. (2006). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt.
- Chaer, A. (2007). *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Method in Education* (6th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffmann, C. (1991). *Introduction to Bilingualism* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Fishman, J.A. (1977). *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hudson, R.A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, W., & Garcia, O. (2022). Translanguaging in education: Theoretical perspectives and practical applications. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 12(1), 25-40.
- Martin, P., & Rubdy, R. (2023). Multilingualism and identity: Exploring the dynamics of language use in globalized contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 27(3), 301-320.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, J. (2023). Language maintenance and shift among indigenous communities: A case study of the Sami. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 27(2), 111-130.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.