Code Mix Analysis on Buying and Selling Interactions at Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant

Ayu Puspita Indah Sari[1], Lela Sartika[2]

Indonesian Education, Teacher Training, Education and Language Sciences, Bina Darma University Palembang

lelasartika2907@gmail.com

Abstract- This study aims to describe the form of code-mixing in the interaction of buying and selling at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant, as well as the factors causing the mixing of code codes in the exchange of buying and selling at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant. This type of research is qualitative research through a case study approach. Data collection techniques use listening, tapping, note-taking, and recording techniques. Data analysis techniques use descriptive methods. From the results of these findings, it was identified that there were findings of code mixing in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and word loops. Factors causing code-mixing include linguistic elements such as *low word frequency, Pernicious humanity, Oversight, and End (purpose and goal).*

Keywords : Mixed Code, Buying And Selling Transactions

I   INTRODUCTION

Human daily life is never separated from language; when we read exciting stories, watch movies, listen to melodious songs and talk to family and friends are some human activities that can be enjoyed through language. Therefore, language plays an essential role in everyday life. However, many people ignore the language. Language is a fundamental need that plays a vital role in communication. Language is to have more than one meaning or sense (Chaer, 2014).

A language is a tool for interacting between one individual and another that can convey specific intentions and goals to others (Aisyah & Sari, 2019) . Language has an essential role in interacting. In addition to functioning as the primary communication tool, language is also a skill that only humans have; this is what distinguishes human interaction from the interaction of other creatures on earth.

Language has three functions, namely the ideal function, the textual function, and the interpersonal function. These three functions (Wiratno & Santosa, 2014) re called superfunctions, and the three functions represent different realities.   The ideal function of language is used to express physical-biological truth and involves interpreting and representing experience. The function of text language is to describe the reality of symbols or semiotics about how the text is produced in context. The interpersonal communication function of

language serves to reveal social truth and involves the interaction between speakers or interlocutors.

The state of Indonesia is a country with a

variety of people, especially in terms of the use of language because the use of language is very plural found in Indonesia. Indonesian is extensive in use, and the variety of speakers is diverse. In communicating using only one language. What Indonesians use when interacting has expertise in conducting citizen relations, expertise in literacy, and at least knowing two languages. The ability to dominate more based on one language is claimed to use the word bilingualism.

Kedwibahasaan is the ability of speakers to use two languages (Wilian, 2010). His fluency in the language is different. Indeed, the process of acquiring the language of each individual is different. In this context, language is essential in communication, functioning as a unitary multilingual society.

Using language in a multilingual society does not rule out the possibility of using language that is not by the applicable rules due to mixing codes. Code mixing is a phenomenon carried out by people who use one language for another to carry out their interactions.

The phenomenon of code mixing in the context of language research is in the field of sociolinguistic research. Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between language and social factors. Daily communication in society often occurs in code-mixing. For example, in the interaction carried out between sellers and buyers at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant. Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant is a Padang Restaurant located at Jalan Jenderal Ahmad Yani No. 6, 13 Ulu, Kecamatan. Sebrang Ulu II, Palembang City, South Sumatra 30116.

Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant is the right picture to see how the situation of using mixed codes is because Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant is a place that is crowded with buyers. For example, the author has seen firsthand the activities during the buying and selling transaction at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant, carried out by a buyer from Pagar Alam to buy food menus there using the Palembang language every day the following sentence. Example: Here is apo bae food? (Here there is food) is an Indonesian (apo bae) of the Palembang language. From the example above, it can be seen that the use of mixed codes occurs in Indonesian and Palembang languages. Thus it can be known that code-mixing can be carried out by heterogeneous societies of different ethnicities, ages, genders, and levels of education.

Therefore, in the description above, the author is interested in conducting a study titled Code Mix Analysis on Buying and Selling Interactions at Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant.

II. METHODS

This research is qualitative. Because qualitative research is considered to provide a more detailed picture of the research object. Qualitative research is based on existing facts or phenomena that live empirically on its speakers (Fitriani & Nurlaili, 2021)

Bogdan in saying that qualitative is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written and spoken words from people and observed behaviors. Qualitative research is carried out on natural conditions and is discovery-based. In qualitative research, the researcher is a crucial instrument (Murdiyanto, 2020)

This study examines the mixing of codes in the interaction of buying and selling at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant through a case study approach based on the reality in the field.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The following is recorded data regarding the form of code mixing and the factors causing code mixing found in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant. The data is presented in the following table.

Transcription data 1

Table 1.
Transcription Results 1.

Utterance/ Sentence	Code Mix Form			
	Words	Waived	Clause	Word Iteration
T1.Pb1.Pj 1	5	2	-	-
T1. Pj2	1	1	-	-
T1.Pb3.Pj 3	2	-	1	-

T : Transcription
Pb : Buyer
Pj : Seller

From the table above, it can be seen that many code mixtures are found in the form of words as many as 8 (eight) words, phrases as many as 3 (three) phrases, clauses as many as 1 (one) clause, while word loops are not found.

Transcription data 2

Table 2.
Transcription Results 2

Utterance / Sentence	Code Mix Form			
	Words	Waived	Clause	Word Iteration
T2.Pb1.Pb1	3	2	-	-
T2.Pb2.Pj2	3	-	4	1
T3.Pb3.Pj3	5	2	-	-

T : Transcription
Pb : Buyer
Pj : Seller

From the table above, it can be seen that many code mixtures are found in the form of words as many as 11 (eleven) words, phrases as many as 4 (four) phrases, clauses as many as 4 (four) clauses, while word loops as many as 1 (one) word loop.

Transcription data 3

Table 3.
Transcription Results 3

Utterances/Sentences	Code Mix Form			
	Words	Waived	Clause	Word Iteration
T3. Pj1.Pb1	5	3	-	-
T3. Pb2.Pj2	4	1	1	1
T3. Pb3.Pj3	3	2	-	-

T : Transcription
Pb : Buyer
Pj : Seller

From the table above, it can be seen that many code mixtures are found in the form of words as many as 12 (twelve) words, phrases as many as 6 (six) phrases, clauses as many as 1 (one) clause, while word loops as many as 1 (one) word loop.

Table 4.
Code Mix Form

No	Code Mix Form	Amount	Percentage
1.	Word	31	59,6%
2.	Phrases	13	25%
3.	Clause	6	11,5%
4.	Word Iteration	2	3,8%

Based on the table above, The form of code mixing on buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant, there are 31 (thirty-one) words, 13 (thirteen) phrases, 6 (six) clauses, and 2 (two) word loops. In this case, the use of the word is more dominantly used, namely as many as 31 (thirty-one) words with a percentage of as much as (59.6%).

The factors causing the code mix carried out at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant consist of non-linguistic factors and happiness factors. However, non-linguistic factors were not found in this study, because the language used by individuals in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant was still using the local regional language. As for the linguistic factor, researchers found 1) *Low frequency of word*, 2) *Pernicios humanity*, 3) *Oversight*, 4) *End (purpose and goal)*.

Table 5.
Factors Causing Code Mix

No	Factors Causing Code Mix	Sum	Percentage
1.	*Low frequency of word*	17	39,5%
2.	*Pernicios humanity*	2	4,7%
3.	*Oversight*	21	48,8%
4.	*End (purpose and goal*	3	7%
	Grand Total	**43**	**100%**

Based on the table above, the factors causing code mixing in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant, there is *a Low frequency of words,* as many as 17 (seventeen), *Pernicious humanity* as much as 2 (two), *Oversight* as many as 21 (twenty-one), *End (purpose and goal* as much as 3 (three). In this case, the word is more dominantly used, namely as many as 31 (thirty-one) words with a percentage result of as much as (59.6%).

In this discussion, the researcher showed the form of code mixing and the factors causing code mixing based on data analyzed with relevant theories and research carried out previously. The following is a discussion of the form of code mixing and the factors causing code mixing in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Restaurant from June 6 to June 8, 2022.

Code Mix Form
Insertion of elements that are tangible words

Om mau *pesen*, jingok menunyo?
The example above is a mixture of code in the form of words. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for conversation. The example of mixing the code above is in the

form of *the word pesen*—the message in Indonesian, pesen in Palembang.

> Nasi *apo* dek??
> Bungkus *apo* makan disini?
> Minumnya *apo* buk?

The example above is a mixture of code in the form of words. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for conversation. The example of mixing the code above is in the form of *the word apo*. What in Indonesian, apo in Palembang.

> Makan disini *iyo* buk?

The example above is a mixture of code in the form of words. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for conversation. The example of mixing the code above is in the form of *the word iyo*. Yes in Indonesian, iyo in Palembang.

> oh iya, nasi perkedel *sikok*

The example above is a mixture of code in the form of words. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for conversation. The example of mixing the code above is in the form of *the word sikok*. One in Indonesian, sikok in Palembang.

2. **Insertion of elements that are in the form of word loops**

Om mau pesen, *jingok menunyo*?

The example above is a mix of phrase-tangible codes. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for the conversation. The code in the example above is *the phrase jingok menunyo*. See the menu in Indonesian, *jingok menunyo* in Palembang.

Kalau lele *berapo hargonyo*?
oh iya, nasi perkedel *berapo hargonyo*?

The example above is a mix of phrase-tangible codes. Indonesian such as (B1) and Palembang (B2) are suitable for the conversation. The code in the example above is *the phrase berapo hargonyo*. How much does it cost in Indonesian, *berapo hargonyo* in Palembang.

3. **Insertion of elements that are in the form of word loops**

Mas, Ayamnyo pesen banyak ya
The example above is a mix of clause-tangible code. Palembang languages such as (B1) and Indonesian (B2) were inserted into the conversation. Mix the code in the form of clauses

Mas, Ayamnyo pesen banyak ya

Limo belas porsi, saya dan keluargo mau makan-makannyo disini soalnya
The example above is a mix of clause-tangible code. Palembang languages such as (B1) and Indonesian (B2) were inserted into the conversation. Mix the code in the form of *Limo belas porsi, saya dan keluargo mau makan-makannyo disini soalnya*.

Pak, pesen ikan gulai kuningnyo yang banyak
The example above is a mix of clause-tangible code. Palembang languages (B1) and Indonesian (B2) were inserted into the conversation. Mix the code in the form of *Pak, pesen ikan gulai kuningnyo yang banyak*.

4. **Insertion of elements that are in the form of word loops**
Limo belas porsi, saya dan keluargo mau *makan-makannyo* disini soalnya
The example above is a mixture of code in the form of word iteration. Palembang languages such as (B1) and Indonesian (B2) were inserted into the conversation. The code mix in the example above is a phrase in the form of a word loop *makan-makan*.

iyo pak, makan disini bersama *anak-anak* pak
The example above is a mixture of code in the form of word iteration. Palembang languages such as (B1) and Indonesian (B2) were inserted into the conversation. The code mix in the example above is a iteration tangible phrase *anak-anak*.

Code mixing forms on buying and selling interactions at the Morning Star Restaurant. Based on the analysis results, researchers found mixed forms of word codes, phrases, clauses, and word loops.

The factors causing the code mix in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant from June 6 to June 8, 2022. Code mixing can occur due to several things, namely non-linguistic factors and linguistic factors.

a. **Non-linguistic factors**
Non-linguistic factors were not found in this study because the language used by individuals in buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant still uses the local, regional language.

b. Linguistic factors

1) *Pesen*: Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors. Because in speech, speakers only use the word *pesen* because of the limitation of the words possessed by the speaker's language.

2) *Samo, iyo, bae, iyo, apo, apo, iyo* : Researchers classify *the low frequency of word factors because* the words in the language are easier to remember and have a stable meaning.

3) *Jingok menunyo, sambel ijo, pake galo* : Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors due to the limitations of the words possessed by the language of the speakers.

4) *Mas, minta nasi rendang tigo, ayam bakar duo sama pepes* : Researchers classify into End language factors *(purpose and goal)* because the speaker explains and convinces the buyer more to persuade the seller to buy the order.

5) *Apo, iyo, apo, iyo* : Researchers classify *the low frequency of word factors because* the words in the language are easier to remember and have a stable meaning.

6) *Duo, idak, berapo, idak, berapo, berapo, sikok* : Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors due to the limitations of the words possessed by the language of the speakers.

7) *Berapo hargonyo, limo belas, tigo belas, duo belas* : Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors due to the limitations of the words possessed by the language of the speakers.

8) *Mas, Ayamnyo pesen banyak ya* : Researchers classify *pernicious human* linguistic factors because such speakers use words whose own language can give rise to ambiguous meanings.

9) *Limo belas porsi, saya dan keluargo mau makan-makannyo disini* : Researchers classified into End language factors *(purpose and goal)* because the speaker explained that fifteen people wanted to eat there.

10) *Oh iya, es jeruk limo belas jugo* : Researchers classify into End language factors *(purpose and goal)*. Because the speaker explained that he wanted to buy fifteen iced oranges

11) *Apo, iyo, iyo, apo, iyo, bae* : Researchers classify the low frequency of word factors because the words in the language are easier to remember and have a stable meaning.

12) *Jingok, berapo, sikok, berapo, limo, galo*: Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors due to the limitations of the words possessed by the language of the speakers.

13) *Berapo hargonyo, duo belas ribu, duo puluh duo ribu, tigo puluh ribu* : Researchers classify into *oversight* linguistic factors due to the limitations of the words possessed by the language of the speakers.

14) *Pak, pesen ikan gulai kuningnyo yang banyak* : Researchers classify into *pernicious humanity* linguistic factors. Because such speakers use words whose own language can give rise to ambiguous meanings.

Based on the results of recordings on buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant, researchers found several factors causing code-mixing, such as *Low frequency of the word*, *Pernicious humanity*, *and Oversight*, *End (purpose and goal)*.

IV. CONCLUSION

Mix codes on buying and selling interactions at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant totaling 52 data. The results of this finding, it was identified that there were 31 findings of mixed codes in the form of words (59.6%), hybrid principles in the form of phrases, as many as 13 findings (25%), mixed code clauses as many as six findings (11.5%), word repeating as many as two results (3.8%). The factors causing the code mix in buying and selling at the Bintang Kejora Jaya Restaurant are non-linguistic and linguistic. Still, linguistic aspects were not found in this study. Meanwhile, the linguistic factor researchers found several factors that caused the mixing of codes, such as *Low frequency of words* 17 findings (39.5%), *Pernicious humanity* as many as two findings (4.7%), *Oversight* of as many as 21 results (48.8%), *End (purpose and goal)* as many as three findings (7%).

Suggested future research to developers of studies in sociolinguistics, especially in code-mixing research, to expand the range of research

objects. Such as taking objects with broader community interaction, such as tourist attractions, markets, schools, rural areas, etc. It is expected to re-develop this research.

REFERENCES

Aisyah, N., & Sari, A. P. I. (2019). *PEMERTAHANAN BAHASA BUGIS SEBAGAI PELESTARIAN BAHASA DAERAH DI DESA DAYA MURNI*.

Chaer, A. (2014). *Linguistik Umum*. Rineka Cipta.

Fitriani, S., & Nurlaili, Y. (2021). *Aliterasi : Jurnal Pendidikan , Bahasa dan Sastra Analisis Campur Kode dalam Interaksi Masyarakat di Pasar Kota Juang Kabupaten Bireuen*. 2(01), 59–65.

Murdiyanto, E. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif (Sistematika Penelitian Kualitatif)* (p. 158).

Wilian, S. (2010). *PEMERTAHANAN BAHASA DAN KESTABILAN KEDWIBAHASAAN PADA PENUTUR BAHASA SASAK DI LOMBOK*. 28(1), 23–39.

Wiratno, T., & Santosa, R. (2014). Bahasa, Fungsi Bahasa, dan Konteks Sosial. *Modul Pengantar Linguistik Umum*, 1–19.