



EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka) :
Culture, Language, and Teaching of English

Journal homepage: <http://jurnal.unmer.ac.id/index.php/enjourme/index>

An analysis of syntactic code mixing used by male and female students in speaking fluency

¹Ike Dian Puspita Sari, ²Hernina Dewi Lestari

¹IKIP Budi Utomo Malang, Jl. Simpang Arjuno No. 14B, 65119, Malang, Indonesia

²IKIP Budi Utomo Malang, Jl. Simpang Arjuno No. 14B, 65119, Malang, Indonesia

¹ikedianpuspitasari@buduutomomalang.ac.id , ²herninadewilestari@buduutomomalang.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 May 2018

Received in revised form 04 June 2018

Accepted 16 July 2018

Available online 14 August 2018

Keywords:

Code mixing, communication, foreign language learning, speaking skills.

ABSTRACT

Acquiring speaking skill does not only consider the accuracy, but also the fluency. Hence, in doing conversation, somehow people mix the L2 with their L1. This research focuses on analyzing code mixing used by 12 male students and 35 female students as the sample. The data were taken from their presentation. The data classified based on lexical units and code mixing categories. The result shows that there were quite different frequencies of code mixing used by male and female students. Female students tend to mix their L2 with L1 modifier. Based on the categorization of the code mixing data, alternation is mostly used by female students. However, male students prefer to use insertion.

© 2018 EnJourMe. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Speaking is one of English skills that students learn. As foreign language, learning speaking as productive skill acquires high intention. Bueno et al. (2006) assume that students are accustomed to the old method in teaching and learning process, in which it focuses on grammar. Thus, they have difficulties in fluency of speaking.

Besides, Harmer (2007) strengthens that students have to arrange words, phrases and sentences in speaking. Moreover, intonation and tone should be considered because it causes different meaning. Therefore, fluency in speaking is an important thing to consider.

There are some classifications of communication including spoken and written communication, verbal and nonverbal communication, horizontal communication, literal communication, formal and informal communication, and one way or two ways communication (Masmuh, 2008). All those classification has different meanings and purposes depending on object involved and the way used by the speaker

An observation was conducted by Alharbi (2015). He found that the problem of acquiring speaking skill was caused by ignoring the authentic language learning situation. Moreover, it becomes more difficult for students to acquire this skill because of another factor, for example the use of mother language during teaching and learning process. In Kenyan University, students tend to switch or mix their English and make grammatical mistakes (Gudu et. al, 2010).

Myusken (2010) assumes that code mixing occurs in one sentence, that speaker mixes lexical items and grammatical features of two languages, in which the code mixing is divided into insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. In the insertion pattern, one language determines the overall structure into which constituent from the other language are inserted. Hence, alternation occurs when two languages are alternated indistinctively both at the grammatical and lexical level. A standard language is mixed with regional or social dialect in a continuously variable fashion. Such cases involve languages that are both lexically and structurally similar, presenting the most favorable environment for congruent lexicalization. The lexical

units, such as morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses and sentences mixed by the speaker are involving the grammatical rules of two languages used (Bathia and Ritchie, 2004). Eunhee (2006) defines some reasons of using code mixing or code switching in speaking. The main reason is because speaker cannot define proper words or expression that can be used. Other reasons are caused by language attitudes, dominance, and security.

Using code mixing or code switching depends on community perspective, in which code mixing or code switching is considered as negative or positive attitude. Hence, the dominance proficiency is a reason why the speaker mixes or switches the language. It is also caused by security, in which speaker is more comfort to deliver their messages or opinions correctly by mixing and switching the languages.

In this research, researcher focuses on spoken communication which was done in one-way-communication. Researcher analyzes students' speech as the researcher found many students used code mixing to support their fluency in speaking. Therefore, the researcher felt the urge of conducting this research.

2. Method

This research was conducted in IKIP Budi Utomo Malang in 2017. The data were taken in English for Specific Purposes class A, in which there were 47 students. The class consisted of 12 male students and 35 female students. The students present their materials in front of the class with certain topics given in previous meeting. The topic is related to hotel management involving front office department, food and beverage department, house keeping department, and marketing. Each students should choose one topic. They should prepare the material of presentation. Each student has 5 minutes to deliver their ideas.

Furthermore, the researcher describes type of code mixing and the example of code mixing used by students. The researcher took the data by recording students' presentation and taking notes. The amounts of code mixing items were classified based on the lexical units, such as morpheme, word, modifier, phrase, clause, and sentence. The data were analyzed qualitatively by listing the code mixing showed in the students' speaking and classified into alternation, insertion, and congruent lexicalization. Hence, the researcher drawing conclusion based on the classification.

3. Results and discussion

From the research instrument, the researcher found that there were 466 code mixing items done by male students and 639 code mixing items done by female students. Before classifying the code mixing used by the students into insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization, the researcher define the data based on the lexical unit. The lexical units include morpheme, word, modifier, phrase, clause, and sentence. The data were shown in the Table 1.

Table 1. Code Mixing Classified by the Lexical Units

Lexical Units	Code Mixing	
	Male	Female
Morpheme	183	175
Modifier	96	185
Phrase	36	108
Clause	55	66
Total	370	534

From the data appeared in the table, there were 183 code mixing used by male students, and 175 code mixing used by female students. Based on the lexical units, those code mixing were involved as morpheme. However, there were not any bound morphemes used by both male and female students. They used free morpheme which included lexical morphemes (ordinary nouns, adjectives, and verbs) and functional morpheme. The examples of each lexical morpheme were shown below.

(a) Lexical fields that has studied in *Bahasa Inggris* include the following.

(b) We can say that the predicates has two meaning *berbeda*.

(c) A preposition *terdiri dari* predicates and arguments.

Sentence (a) showed lexical morpheme of ordinary noun, in which student mixed '*bahasa Inggris*' within sentence. The example (b) was lexical morpheme which mixed adjective (*berbeda*). Hence, the

sentence (c) was also lexical morpheme which mixed ‘*terdiri dari*’ as verb in the sentence.

Another free morpheme used by the students was functional morpheme including conjunction (a), preposition (b), article (c), and pronoun (d). The example for each functional morpheme can be seen below.

(a) The next presentation will be continued Paulin *dan* Vincent

(b) The complete description you can see *di* power point slide.

(c) You will speak with accent *itu*.

(d) Meaningnya is different.

Modifier code mixing was also found in students’ presentation. There were 96 modifiers used by male students and 185 modifiers used by female students. For example, ‘We have explained the definition of argument in our slide *yang halaman keenam*’. From the example, the student used ‘*yang halaman keenam*’ as the modifier of ‘our slide’.

Another code mixing used by the students was phrase. They also mixed their sentence by using another language phrase. There were 36 phrases used by male students and 108 phrases used by female students. For example, ‘kinship is related to *ikatan darah* or *ikatan pernikahan*’. The two phrases in the example used by students, in which ‘*ikatan darah*’ should be ‘blood ties’ and ‘*ikatan pernikahan*’ should be ‘marriage’.

Hence, the researcher found 55 code mixing clauses used by male students and 66 code mixing clauses used by female students. It was the most few lexical units mixed by students during their presentation. For example, ‘the lexemes seaman and sailor are synonyms *dan contoh lainnya bisa dilihat di depan*’.

After the researcher divided code mixing done by the students based on the lexical unit, the researcher classified those items into three categories: insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Based on the classification of 904 code-mixings done by students in their presentation, the next classification was shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Code Mixing Categories

Code Mixing	Male	Female	Total
Insertion	183	175	358
Alternation	132	293	425
Congruent Lexicalization	55	66	121

The table showed that alternation was mostly used by female students. They tended to mix L2 with L1 in the form of phrase or clause. Here two examples of alternation:

a. Emm, I show you the example of speech act *yang tadi dijelaskan oleh teman saya*.

b. Accent is influenced by emm... *bahasa daerah*.

The first example (a) is the alternation used by students, in which the L2 was mixed with a clause of L1. Hence, they can also mix L2 with phrase in L1 in the example (b).

Moreover, male students prefer to use insertion rather than the other categories of code mixing. The data shows that there were 182 insertion items used by them. They mixed their L2 with L1 word. Here the examples of insertion:

a. Thank you for the time. I will present *definisi* language use.

b. We can say that the predicates has two meaning *berbeda*.

Hence, congruent lexicalization was rarely used by both male and female students. Congruent lexicalization emphasizes word and phrase or clause mixing in one sentence. Thus, students mixed insertion and alternation categories in the sentence. For example:

a. *Sepertinya* I give a chance for *dua penanya* in this section.

b. *Pengertian* semantics *dan* pragmatics are different, while, emm... semantics *lebih mengacu pada makna logis dari bahasa yang kita pakai*.

The example (a) was mixed by word ‘*sepertinya*’ and phrase ‘*dua penanya*’. Compared with example (a), the example (b) used word and clause. There were ‘*pengertian*’ as word and ‘*lebih mengacu pada makna logis dari bahasa yang kita pakai*’ as clause.

From the data discovered, there was different amount of code mixing used by male and female students. There were 370 code mixing items used by male students and 534 items used by female students. The result opposes the previous research, that there is not any influence of gender in using code mixing and code switching for undergraduate students (Rabbani and Mushtaq, 2012). The 42 students were taken randomly as sample from 974 students as population in Foundation University. They examined code mixing

and code switching frequency in both male and female students' text message. However, the result showed that the data were normally distributed, which means that there was not any significance different frequency of using code mixing and code switching for both male and female students.

Moreover, Ali and Aslam (2012) also found the insignificance difference of code mixing used by male and female students in Pakistan. There were 1000 SMS from 25 female and 25 male university students in Lahore city. They have equal statistics regarding to English code mixing they used in sending text message.

From the findings of this study supported by the mentioned research findings above, it can be concluded that either male or female students equally used code mixing and code switching to enhance their fluency in speaking. Therefore, teachers may suggest their students to implement code mixing or code switching to help their problem in improving the speaking fluency.

4. Conclusion and Suggestions

Analyzing from lexical units, mixing L1 morphemes are mostly used by male students. Compared to male students, the data shows that female students mostly mix their L2 with L1 modifier. The lowest lexical units as code mixing are phrase used by male students and clause used by female students. Based on the categorization of the code mixing data, alternation is mostly used by students. They mix L2 with L1 phrase or clause. All at once, the alternation is mostly used by female students. However, male students prefer to use insertion. They mix L2 with L1 word.

5. References

- Alharbi, A. Heba. (2015). Improving Students' English Speaking Proficiency in Saudi Public Schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(1).
- Ali, I. & Aslam, T. M. (2012). Frequency of Learned Words of English as a Marker of Gender Identity in SMS Language in Pakistan. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 22 (2), 45-55.
- Bhatia, T. K. & Ritchie, W. C. (2004). Social and Psychological Factors in Language Mixing. In W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp.336-352). Blackwell Publishing.
- Bueno, A., Madrid, D., & McLaren, N. (2006). *TEFL in Secondary Education*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Eunhee, Kim. (2006). Reasons and Motivation for Code-Mixing and Code-Switching. *Spring 2006 Issues in EFL*, 4 (1), 43-61.
- Gudu, O. Benter. (2010). *A study of The 2002 Integrated Approach to Instruction of Speaking Skills in English: A Case of Secondary Schools in Eldoret Municipality- Kenya*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Moi University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching: 4th Edition*. London: Longman.
- Masmuh, Abdullah. (2008). *Komunikasi Organisasi Dalam Perspektif Teori dan Praktek*. Malang: UMM Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rabbani, R. & Mushtaq, H. (2012). Gender Difference in Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in