



The Study of Code-Mixing Phenomenon on the Trials Held by Madiun Military Court

Dzakyy Ridha Mufadhhal; Wakit Abdullah; Sri Marmanto

Masters Program in Descriptive Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i10.2139>

Abstract

This current research attempts to describe and explain the phenomenon of a speech event so-called code-mixing with military trials held by Madiun Military Court as the setting. The descriptions are based on (1) types and (2) factors attributing the code-mixing phenomenon. The source of data for this study is the utterances spoken by social components during the trials (juries, auditors, witnesses, victims, and defendants). Meanwhile, the data for this study are the application of code mixing. The data were collected through participative study method with noticing and recording technique. Meanwhile the secondary data of this study are the information related to the trials process obtained by conducting document study on official reports. In maintaining the validity, the current study employs method and data triangulation. The data were analyzed through interlingual and extralingual reference on the basis of Sociolinguistics. There are four lingual forms correlating to the code mixing namely (1) words (2) phrases (3) baster (4) and repetition. Those lingual realizations of code mixing are found to be attributable to four factors namely (1) habit (2) vocabulary mastery (3) humor (4) and interlocutor influence.

Keywords: *Code Mixing; Speech Event; Sociolinguistics; Military Trials*

Introduction

Language is fundamental in man's life in which it becomes an unavoidable element in every single dimension of life especially social dimension. Language, therefore becomes a complex substantial notion in social establishment. It has a vital function in the social dimension since it is the most effective means of interaction.

The substantial notion of language use in social domain is speech situation. It covers the aspects of speaker, interlocutor, context, and communicative objective, speech as the realization of action, and speech as nonverbal activity (Leech 1921: 13-14 in (Simbolon, 2019: 13) Those aspects constitute the speech event realized in dialogue, confirmation, explanation, question, and many other realizations of speech event.

The speech events take place in any social domain including institutional domain. The application of speech event in institutional domain is strongly affected by the affiliation of an institution. For instance, in a military institution, it is by no means influenced by the military circumstance, with no exceptional in the trials held the military court. (Handoko, 2015: 170). In conducting an investigation on the linguistic area concerned with language use in social institution, Sociolinguistics then is the suitable approach to study that phenomenon.

Sociolinguistics is a branch of Linguistics dealing with Sociology and Linguistics. The former one is concerned with society study and the subsequent deals with language study. In other words, Sociolinguistics is a study of language in its relation to the condition of society which is studied under the discipline of Sociology (Sumarsono, 2013: 1). Halliday (1970) stated that Institutional Linguistics refers to such kind of study and Language Sociology by Fishman (1972). The trial conducted by a court is one of the social practices in which the use of language is unavoidably determined the speech situation. The trial process forms such speech situation which directly affects the language use realized in some speech events of its participants. Among the language use phenomena discussed in Sociolinguistics, code mixing and code switching are two of them important to study.

Code Switching and Code Mixing are two similar phenomena but there are several distinctions. For this case, Thelander (1976: 103) elucidates the differences. The distinctive side between them is on the complexity of lingual shifting. Code switching occurs when the clauses from different languages in a speech event. While, code mixing occurs when a speech event consists of mixed hybrid clause or phrase from different language independently exist. In addition, Kachru (1978:28) in Rokhman (2013: 38) elaborates that code mixing is phenomenon of multiple language use for linguistic units transfer from one language to another consistently; it develops a rather language interaction.

Furthermore, there is no specific purpose for mixing code. The motive underlying it is rather personal than pragmatic. It can be attributed to habit or certain pragmatic motive in communication. Both code mixing and code switching generally found in bilingual society. As a result, it is ubiquitously found in any social practice not exceptionally in a trial held by court.

There are several researches investigating this phenomenon. According to a study conducted by Fitrizal (2013) both code mixing and code switching were applied in the trials held by *Pengadilan Negeri Padang Pariaman* (Padanh Pariaman Regional Court). However, that study pays more attention to the phenomenon of code-switching.

In educational institution, Sundoro (2018) conducted a research aiming at describing the phenomenon of code mixing in Bahasa Indonesia class held by a Vocational School in Banyumas. It is found that the code mixing consisted of Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese with Banyumas dialect.

In the area of legal institution, a research conducted by Pakaya (2017) combining the Sociolinguistics and Pragmatics as the approach to reveals the structure of legal language use in the trials processes. It reveals several characteristics of discourse, speech act, language variation, cohesion and coherence in the language use. According to the above researches, it is found that legal institution is the potential setting to reveal the phenomena of Sociolinguistic. Among of them, code mixing and switching are the two to be dominantly found. However, none of the reviewed reports investigate the phenomenon of code-mixing taking place in the legal institution affiliated to the military (i.e Military Court).

The institution under the military affiliation is by all means distinctive compared to the institution under civil affiliation. The strict hierarchical system in military institution gives a certain colour on the people's life aspect of working for the institution by its affiliation. In the aspect of social life, it is a rule for the soldier with lower rank to be more respectful to the higher-ranked soldiers. For that reason, proper

language use in this case matters a lot. The highly formal and strict rules of military culture can also be seen from the language use on the court under the affiliation of military institution. It was mostly found that the people working for the military court (juries, auditors), and the people working in military institution (i.e army) speak formal language (in this case is Bahasa Indonesia). However, in some occasions, the trial's attendants coming from military institution speak rather informally by inserting several lingual elements from multiple languages (mixing code). Meanwhile, for the non-military trial participants found to speak fairly formal. Those phenomena theoretically may be attributable to some factor on the level personal and social. On the personal level, the shifting of formal language to less formal by mixing code is attributable to the individual speech habit, and vocabulary barrier; it is closely related to the education level. Meanwhile, it is attributable to the profession, ethnicity, and social stratification on the social level. With regard to above elaboration, the trial process held by military court is an interesting social practice in term of language use. The military participants with their highly and strictly formal life is contrastive to the civil participants with their egalitarian life. Those contrastive communities on the perspective of Sociolinguistics lead to different language use. It is therefore, the current study attempts to investigate the phenomena of code mixing in the trial process held by military court.

Method

This research applies a qualitative research in its method. It attempts to reveal the less noticeable cultural phenomena. Therefore, the current study is descriptive in its design. (Blaxter, 2006; Moleong, 1989; Strauss and Corbin, 2003 in Santosa, 2017: 31). On the theoretical level, this study employs Sociolinguistics as the approach.

The setting of this research was a military court located in Madiun District on East Java, Indonesia. Meanwhile, the sources of data for this study was the utterances spoken by juries, prosecutor, witnesses, witnesses for the victims, and defendants.

Data collection was carried out through participative observation method with recording and noticing technique. Besides, interview and recording technique were employed to obtain information from the participants of the trial. This study employed two kinds of data namely primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained from the utterance spoken by the participants of the trials and the secondary one was obtained from the official report dealing with the case in the trial. In providing the data, this study employed purposive sampling to collect the data of language variations spoken by a society (Abdullah, 2017: 57).

In maintain the data validity, this study employed triangulation technique. It covered triangulation of source, method, researcher, and theory (Santosa, 2017: 57). However, this study only focused on the source and method triangulation.

Data analysis of this study was conducted by applying intralingual and extralingual reference method. Intralingual reference method was employed to analyze the internal fact in the language such as word, phrase, clauses and discourse. Meanwhile, extralingual reference method was employed to analyze the extranal elements of language potentially influencing the language use such as social context, gender, age, and social class (Mahsun, 2012: 259-260).

Data of this study were presented by following four steps proposed by Mahsun (2012: 270), namely data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusions withdrawal. Those four steps are as follow.

1. Data collection
2. Data reduction
3. Data presentation
4. Conclusion withdrawal

Abbreviation codes in this journal are as follow:

J: Judges	WR: Word Repetition
P: Prosecutor	H: Habit
W: Witness	VK: Vocabulary Knowledge
D: Defendant	HC: Humor Creation
LA: Legal Advisor	II: Interlocutor Influences
Wd: Word	CMT: Code Mixing Types
Pr: Phrase	CMF: Code Mixing Facto
B: Baster	

Results and Discussion

The observation of code mixing on the trials in a military court emerges several results based on the types and factors of code mixing. The explanation of the types and function of code mixing is as follow.

The Types of Code Mixing

Table 1. The Frequency of Code-Mixing Types on the Trials in Madiun Military Court

No	The Types of Code Mixing	Frequency	%
1.	Word	26	57.8%
2.	Phrase	7	15.6%
3.	Baster	10	22.2%
4.	Word Repetition	2	4.4%
Total		45	100%

The Code-Mixing Type of Word

Data (1)

J : Saksi 1! [The Witness 1] Itu mukulnya dengan selang itu keras *opo* (Javaense concessive conjunction indicating alternation) ndak? [Did he hit him hardly with a pipe?] (1)

W : Siap (Indonesian military speech register) tidak! [No!] (2)

J : Tidak? [No?] Saksi 2? [What about the Witness 2?] (3)

W : Siap (Indonesian military speech register) Tidak! [No] (4)

Situation: A trial of seniors' violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning how hard the punishment was

Utterance (1) shows the judge using the word *opo* which is from Javanese language. The word *opo* is uttered in a formal situation which is supposed to use formal Indonesian language. '*Opo*' comes from Javanese language which means '*apa*' in Indonesian Language and 'what' in English. This phenomenon reflects the situation of code mixing.

Data (2)

J : Berarti, sekarang sudah tidak rawat jalan lagi? [So, you are not an outpatient anymore?] (5)

W : Tidak pak [No sir]. (6)

J : Sudah *stop* (English)? [Already stopped the medication?] (7)

W : Iya [Yes]. (8)

Situation: A trial of an accident caused by negligence

Topic: The Judge throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning the outpatient status of the victim witness

The implementation of code mixing from an English word in an Indonesian utterance in utterance (7) happens because the speaker is more familiar with English style. The judge applies uncomplicated utterance as in usual talk to deliver several words, in this case the judge uses the word 'stop' to replace the Indonesian word '*berhenti*'.

The Code-Mixing Type of Phrases

Data (3)

J : *Long weekend* (English) tanggal 9 bulan (*Bahasa Indonesia*)? [The long weekend was on 9?] Berapa? [So what actual date?] Kemudian tanggal 17 suruh kembali memimpin batalion kan? [You were ordered to return to the office on 17 right?] (9)

W : Siap (Indonesia Military Register) (10)

J : November? [November?] Desember? [December?] (11)

W : November (12)

H : *Long weekend* tanggal 9 bulan? Berapa? Kemudian tanggal 17 suruh kembali memimpin batalion kan? (9)

S : Siap (10)

H : November? Desember? (11)

S : November (12)

Situation: A trial of seniors' violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning the witness whether he knows if the defendant is military personnel

The code mixing happens in utterance (9), when the judge uses an English phrase 'long weekend' to replace Indonesian phrase '*liburan panjang*' in the military trial. The phenomenon reflects the use of code mixing in which an English phrase takes place among Indonesian utterances.

Data (4)

P : Tahu kalau dia anggota militer? [Did you know that he was an army?] (13)

W : Nggak tahu, nggak tahu pak [No, Sir]. (14)

- P : Terus semua (*Bahasa Indonesia*) ***podo ngomong*** (Javanese phrase), baru tahu kalau itu anggota militer? (*Bahasa Indonesia*) [Then they just told you that he is an army] (15)
 W : Baru tahu kalau anggota. (16)

Situation: A trial of seniors' violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning the witness whether he knows if the defendant is military personnel

In utterance (15), there is a Javanese phrase in an Indonesian utterance that reflects mixing code. The phrase '*podo ngomong*' comes from Javanese language which means '*pada bicara*' in Indonesian language and 'everyone talks' in English.

The Code-Mixing Type of Baster

Data (5)

- P : ***Startnya*** (Baster as the result of English word morphological modification by attaching Bahasa Indonesia suffix) dari mana? [Where did it start from] Awal *start*? [I mean the point where it started?] (17)
 S : Awal start dari Gangnam. [It started from Gangnam.] (18)
 P : Gangnam. (19)
 S : Ya, Gangnam, lah itu terus berbalik, terus pulang. [I started it at Gangnam then turn back to my home.] (20)

Situation: A trial of an accident caused by negligence

Topic: The prosecutor throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning the starting point of the victim witness before the accident happened

The use of '*startnya*' in utterance (17) from the prosecutor reflects the code-mixing type of baster. Baster is a result of combining of two elements from different languages and it creates one meaning. The reason why it occurs because in this case the prosecutor has English style in expressing the term of starting point of an accommodation. In addition, the way of the speaker tries to simplify his utterance becomes one of reasons why code-mixing happens. An English word has been inserted by Indonesian suffix '*-nya*', then it creates one meaning.

Data (6)

- O : Bisa memberi kronologi kejadian? [Could you please tell the chronology?] ... (21)
 S : Iya, pas itu kan joget-joget sama mabok, itu temen-temen... yang cewek itu, mau hadap sana, mau duduk, ***soale*** (Baster as the result of *Bahasa Indonesia* morphological modification) kan gelap banget, aku sama temen-temen yang lain kan mau apa, duduk. [It was so dark at that time that I hardly see anything. I was dancing while I was drunk at that time. That girl walked to me and she wanted to join our party.] (22)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The prosecutor throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning the chronology of the violent incident against civilians

In utterance (22) reflects one of code-mixing types which is baster insertion to an Indonesian utterance. The term '*soale*' is a combination of an Indonesian word '*soal*' with Javanese suffix '*-e*'. The term means '*soalnya*' in Indonesian language and 'because' in English. In this case, it happens because the witness tries to use simple utterance to explain more clearly regarding the true event of a violence

against civilians by military personnel. The witness is a civilian, it explains why his utterances tends to be inserted by Javanese lexical items since he speaks Javanese language in his daily life. Thus, a baster is formed in his utterances.

The Code-Mixing Type of Words Repetition

Data (7)

J: Terus diketahui ada *njaler-njaler* (Javanese repetition) [Then you just noticed that there was stripped scar?] Garis-garis! [Stripped scar]! (23)

Situation: A trial of seniors' violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the defendant

Aim: Questioning evidence-based scar on the victim

In utterance (23) there is a Javanese word repetition in a Indonesian utterance. The word '*njaler-njaler*' is known as '*garis-garis*' in Indonesian language and 'lines' in English that affects the presence of code mixing.

Data (8)

J : Mabuknya, *nyenggoli* (Javanese word) orang lain nggak, mabuknya itu? [Did you hit anyone when you were drunk] (24)

W : Hanya *jingkrak-jingkrak* [No, I was prancing while dancing] (25)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The judge throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning what usually would happen if someone get drunk

The witness who is a civilian expresses a Javanese word repetition in utterance (25). The repetition is '*jingkrak-jingkrak*' which means '*melompat-lompat*' in Javanese language and 'jumping over and over' in English. The word is occurred in an Indonesian utterance which reflects code mixing.

The factors of code mixing

Table 2. The Frequency of Code-Mixing Factors on the Trials in Madiun Military Court

	The Types of Code Mixing				Σ	%
	Word	Phrase	Baster	Word Repetition		
Habit	18	4	9		31	68.9%
Vocabulary Knowledge	3			2	5	11.1%
Humor Creation	1	1			2	4.4%
Interlocutor Influences	4	2	1		7	15.6%
Jumlah	26	7	10	2	45	100%

Habit

Data (9)

P : Ya *startnya* (English word with *Bahasa Indonesia* suffixation) itu darimana? [Tell us where did it start] *Start* awalnya sebelum berangkat? [I mean the point of the bus departure?] (26)

W : Keluarnya ya? [Where that accident occurred]? (27)

P : Nggak *startnya* darimana? [No, where did the bus depart from?] (28)

Situation: A trial of an accident caused by negligence

Topic: The prosecutor throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning the starting point of the victim witness before the accident happened

Utterance (26) shows the prosecutor tends to use particular English words in speaking. He tends to insert an English word in an Indonesian utterance, in this case the word ‘start’ to replace ‘*mulai*’ makes code mixing exists in the utterance.

Data (10)

P : Berapa orang itu? [How many people were there?] (29)

W : Lima belas. [Fifteen.] (30)

P : Ngumpul di situ? [They were gathering at that place?] (31)

W : Iya, ngumpul *ndek* (Javanese spatial preposition) situ. [Yes they were.] (32)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The prosecutor throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning the chronology of the violent incident against civilians

Utterance (32) shows that the witness has a habit to use the word ‘*ndek*’ to indicate location. It is a Javanese language which means ‘*di*’ in Indonesian language and ‘at’ in English to indicate a place or location. From the data above and the other data, one of the witness has a habit to speak that Javanese word in indicating location, and it happens several times. The social background of the witness who is a civilian plays a huge role affecting this factor.

Data (11)

J : Ada lagi? [Anyone else?] Ada satu lagi, saya lupa, Citra? [If I am not mistaken Citra, wasn't it?] Distracted? [then Distracted right?] (33)

W : Oh, ada [Yes there were..] (34)

J : Terus satu lagi *sopo* (Javanese question word)? [Who are they?] (35)

W : Citra, Arya, sama Putri. [Citra, Arya and Putri] (36)

Situation: A trial of an accident caused by negligence

Topic: The judge throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning witnesses who were at the accident scene

The judge throws a question in utterance (35) by inserting the word ‘*sopo*’ which means ‘*siapa*’ in Indonesian language and ‘who’ in English. The word is spoken by the judge because of habit and it applies simplicity in questioning.

Vocabulary Knowledge

Data (12)

H : Pada saat diobati itu, saksi satu, dua, tiga merintih perih atau biasa saja? [Did he moan in pain severely or not when his wound was cured ?] (37)

T : Siap biasa saja [No]. (38)

H : Masa? biasa aja? [Sure?] Bekas itunya? [The scar is terrible?] (39)

T : Siap.[Indonesian military register] (40)

H : Bekas itu? [What about that bloody scar?](41)

T : Siap (Indonesia military register). (42)

J : Hem? [Well] (43)

D : Siap [Indonesia military register]. (44)

J : Keterangannya tadi kan sudah mendengarkan dari... keterangannya para saksi, terdakwa sendiri yang mengungkapkan. [The witness report that the you (the defendant) admitted it] (45)

D : Siap.(Indonesian military register) (46)

J : Saksi 4, *mulet* (*Javanese word*). [someone said that the victim moaned in pain severely] (47)

D : Siap. (48)

Situation: A trial of seniors' violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the defendant

Aim: Questioning the condition of the victim witness after the incident

Code mixing in data (12) is shown in the utterance (47). The word '*mulet*' is a Javanese word which means '*meredakan*' in Indonesian language and 'relaxing' in English, it is inserted to an Indonesian utterance. In this case, code mixing happens because the judge wants to get a clear description from what the defendant explains regarding the condition of the victim witness after the incident. The word is used to get the same understanding from both speakers in explaining the incident. Moreover, the word '*mulet*' is used because no exact Indonesian word shares the exact meaning as '*mulet*'. Because of this reason, the judge chooses to say '*mulet*' from his vocabulary knowledge to get the exact meaning.

Data (13)

P : Pada saat itu, saksi menonton atau membantu atau...? [What did you when it happened? Did just notice it or help him? (49)

W : Saya keluar. [I went out] (50)

P : Keluar? [Really?] (51)

W : Iya.[Yes] (52)

P : Tapi nggak tahu [Bu you did not know ?]. (53)

W : ... la itu saya udah *ngabani* temen-temen, temen-temen kan terus keluar [Yes, I warn my friends to leave then they went out]. (54)

O : Pada saat itu, saksi menonton atau membantu atau...? (49)

S : Saya keluar. (50)

O : Keluar? (51)

S : Iya. (52)

O : Tapi nggak tahu. (53)

S : ... la itu saya udah *ngabani* temen-temen, temen-temen kan terus keluar. (54)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The prosecutor throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning the chronology of the violent incident against civilians

The witness's utterance in data (13) shows code mixing in utterance (54). The witness is a civilian. The word '*ngabani*' comes from Javanese vocabulary, because it is considered to be more intelligible for both communicators. The speaker uses '*ngabani*' since it is in line with his vocabulary knowledge. The word '*ngabani*' means '*memberi arahan*' in Indonesian language and 'giving direction' in English.

Humor Creation

Data (14)

- J : Saksi 8 gitu juga? (Did The Witness 8 do the same?) Nawarin minum? (I mean, did he give the liquor?) (55)
- W : Ya nawarin sih pak (Indonesia) [Yes he did]... (56)
- J : Atau sambil jongkok gitu? (Indonesia) [Or did he do that while squatting?], ngasih bunga? (Indonesia) [Or did he give her flower too?] (57)
- W : Kalau itu mau nembak, (Indonesia) [I did not do that to propose her] tapi kalau pakai caranya... [but I did my own way] (58)
- W : Saya Al Fatehahi (Arabic word with Indonesia morphological suffixation) [I spell *Al Fateha*]. (59)
- J : Al Fatehah ? (Arabic) [Al-Fateha?] (60)
- W : Hahaha (Laughter) (61)
- J : Salah tempat itu (Bahasa Indonesia) [Gosh, you did it on for the wrong thing]. Minum miras kok (Javanese word signaling intensifier of disagreement) baca Al Fatehah [How come you recite Al Fateha before drinking liquor]. *Opo* (Javanese concessive conjunction indicating alternation) pakek (Bahasa Indonesia word with phonological modification by inserting Javanese sound in the final syllable) [Or did you niat kalau mau minum miras itu? Ada niatnya kalau di muslim itu?] (62)
- W : Ndak ada pak? (63)
- J : Nggak ada ya. Mana ada minum minuman keras bilang *bismillahirrahmanirrahim*? Udah lupa kalau masuk diskotik itu! (64)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The judge throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning the chronology of the violent incident against civilians

In utterance (64) there is an Arabic phrase inserted in it. It is an opening phrase before someone takes a pray. In this case, the judge speaks to the witness with a satire expression by using '*bismillahirrahmanirrahim*' which means '*Dengan menyebut nama Allah yang Maha Pengasih Maha Penyayang*' in Indonesian language and 'In the Name of Allah, the Most Beneficent, the Most Merciful' in English. The phrase should be stated in a good manner, not in a bad one. Thus, the judge tries to remind the witness with a sense of humor so that it would be more acceptable.

Data (15)

- J : Terus pulang gimana, cepet mabuk itu? [How did you drive home while you were drunk ?] Masih bisa nyetir. [Did you drive by yourself?] (62)
- W : Masih bisa. [Yes I did] (63)
- J : Kan kemarin kan control, soalnya *opo* (Javanese question word) ada supirnya yang ikut datang, tapi *driver*, terus nggak boleh minum? [How did you go to the doctor while you were drunk ? Did a drive yourself to the doctor?] (64)
- W : Nggak ada pak [No Sir]. (65)

Situation: A trial of a violence against civilians by military personnel

Topic: The judge throws a question to the witness

Aim: Questioning the chronology after the violent incident against civilians

In attempting to throw a joke, the judge applies two words of code mixing in utterance (64), which are ‘*opo*’ and ‘driver’. ‘*Opo*’ is a Javanese word which means ‘*apa*’ in Indonesian language and ‘what’ in English, while ‘driver’ is an English word which means ‘*supir*’ in Indonesian language. Those words are inserted in a single Indonesian utterance, it makes the utterance consists of three different languages.

Influences of the Interlocutor

Data (16)

J: *Rasanya gimana?* [What did you feel] (65)

W: *Sempil.* (Javanese word) (66)

J: *Sempi* *litu* apa? *Kemeng* (*Javanese*)? (Did you mean painful?) (67)

W: *Iya kemeng* (*Javanese*). (68)

Situation: A trial of an accident caused by negligence

Topic: The judge throws a question to the victim witness

Aim: Questioning a certain Javanese word which is inapprehensible from the answer of the victim witness

Utterance (67) indicates code mixing. The insertion of two Javanese words happens in an Indonesian utterance, those words are ‘*sempil*’ and ‘*kemeng*’. Those words are spoken to share the same understanding from both interlocutors. The judge confirms ‘*sempil*’, a Javanese word, spoken by the witness because it is unfamiliar in Madiun. The judge tries to confirm with another closest Javanese word to ensure that they have the same understanding because they both are able to speak Javanese. It happens to make the judge has the clear explanation from the answer.

Data (17)

J: *Tujuannya untuk opo* (Javanese question word) *ngasih* kabel itu? [Why did you give him a piece of wire] *Emang* dia tukang listrik? [He is not an electrician right?] (69)

D: *Siap* (Indonesian military register) untuk mengingatkan adik-adik yang melakukan pelanggaran (To warn the junior breaking the rules). (70)

J: *Bukannya* mengingatkan itu pakek mulut? [Can not you give a command?] (71)

D: *Siap* untuk menindak. [For giving punishment.] (72)

J: *Menindak?* [Punishment?] (73)

D: *Siap.* (74)

Situation: A trial of seniors’ violence against juniors in military

Topic: The judge throws a question to the defendant

Aim: Questioning the defendant’s reasons why he gave a cable to another defendant which then it was used as a tool to torture the victim

There is a Javanese word, ‘*opo*’, inserted in an Indonesian utterance (69) in data (17). The insertion of a Javanese word is to make easier to say and adding courage for the judge. It is an attempt from the judge to make the defendant answering the question with honest and clear statement. In this case, the judge is influenced by the defendant’s attitude to use certain words because the defendant giving unclear statement during the trial.

Discussion

The data of this research was taken from a military court in Madiun from three different cases. It is known from the data above that there is a code-mixing phenomenon which comes from four different languages that are Indonesian language, Javanese language, Arabic, and English.

The code mixing in this research from the Madiun III-13 military court has a result in the four types of code mixing, that are:

1. Word
2. Phrase
3. Baster
4. Word repetition

The types of code mixing are classified based on the factors of the occurrence. The factors cover four aspects, that are:

1. Habit
2. Vocabulary knowledge
3. Humor Creation
4. Influences of the interlocutor

Based on table 1, the frequency of code-mixing types occurred on the trials in the Madiun military court varies based on the different factors. The word type has occurred in 26 data, the phrase type has occurred in seven data, the baster type has occurred in ten data, and the word-repetition type has occurred in two data. The total number of the data in the trials in the Madiun military court is 45 data.

From all of the classification, it is found several mixing codes from Javanese into formal Indonesian utterances, in total there are 35 data. The mixing code from English into formal Indonesian utterances is eight data, while the Arabic one is two data. The total baster is ten data.

Moreover, in table 2, the four code-mixing types are classified into four factors of code mixing that are habit, vocabulary knowledge, social intimacy, and influences of the interlocutor. Habit has affected the utterances in 31 data, vocabulary knowledge has affected in five data, humor has affected in two data, while influences of the interlocutor has affected in seven data.

In the classification above, the most influencing factor is the habit of the speaker. The habit plays a huge role in determining which words to be the most comprehensive and understandable words to be spoken, especially for the witnesses who usually are nonmilitary people. People, who are less formal in their daily life, tend to speak Javanese and even the traditional one with different dialect. That kind of habit tends to shape the people to speak informally even in a formal circumstance. For instance, in the trial of a violent against civilians by the military personnel, the witness, who is a civilian, almost speak the Javanese word '*ndek*' to indicate a place or location during the whole time in the trial which is a formal circumstance. In the other hand, the habit has also affected the judges and the prosecutors, without any urgent matter. One of the judges has a habit to speak Javanese words, '*opo*' and '*sopo*', into formal Indonesian utterance with the highest frequency. The prosecutor has also inserted several English words, '*start*' and '*stop*', because of habit which he thinks it would be efficient.

The following factor of mixing code is vocabulary knowledge. Social aspect has highly influenced in this factor on the military court, especially for the speakers who has lower chance to get formal educational background and certain level of speech anxiety which makes them difficult to find proper words to describe what they are going to say. In addition, the speakers might have restricted

formal vocabulary, especially for the witnesses or the victim witnesses. For the judges and the prosecutors, they are forced to apply the code mixing of informal vocabulary in order to share the same meaning efficiently with the interlocutors. For instance, in the trial of a violence against civilians by the military personnel, there is an utterance from the civilian witness has inserted a Javanese word ‘*ngabani*’ into a formal Indonesian utterance. It is a common Javanese word spoken, which makes it much more uncomplicated to be spoken. Furthermore, it is quite difficult to find the comprehensive meaning in formal Indonesian word. For that reason, it makes the witness feels rather difficultness in finding words to make his statement remain clear. The code mixing is not found in the witnesses’ utterances who are military personnel, it is because of the strict hierarchical system in the military. They tend to speak formal Indonesian language in formal circumstance because they are trained to do so.

The humor factor plays a minor role in this research since the data of the research was taken place in a formal circumstance. There are two data of the humor factor in code mixing, it becomes minor because humor’s intention it to calm the situation during the trial. The humor is uttered by the judge and the prosecutor to make the interlocutors’ nerves relaxed so that they would be able to make a clear statement by not getting speech anxiety. The judge has inserted two Javanese words in formal Indonesian utterances, ‘*opo*’ and ‘*driver*’. The form of the humor uttered by the judges is a satire to the witness, after that both parties giggle and relaxed for a while. One of the inserted words is a Javanese word, and another one is an English word.

In the factor of influences of the interlocutors, the judge is affected by the previous utterances spoken by the interlocutor. The judge has inserted the Javanese words, ‘*sempil*’ and ‘*kemeng*’, to get a clear definition from the victim witness. In this case, the victim witness is a civilian who finds it difficult to find the exact word to describe the incident, then he chooses more traditional Javanese words. For that reason, the judge asks the term ‘*sempil*’ has the same meaning as ‘*kemeng*’ to the interlocutor. From that phenomenon, code mixing happens from an influence of the interlocutor.

From all of data mentioned above, it is known that code mixing is still able to be found in formal circumstances and even in the military institution with high strict order of formal attitude. It concludes that code mixing phenomenon is inevitable because it has particular intentions in communication even in formal circumstances. The factors also play a role in code mixing occurrence in the formal circumstance. The factors of code mixing in the military trials such as involving civilians who are less often in such formal circumstance, hierarchical system in the military, habit, humor, and other factors in making the communication more casual and flexible. It makes code mixing in people’s pattern of communication becomes inevitable not only in informal circumstances, but also in formal one. It fits sociolinguistics’ field and other branches of linguistic. Language is an arbitrary and flexible thing in communication, so that the formal circumstance might set particular rules, but the need for its phenomena is still needed, one of which is code mixing phenomena in people’s communication.

Conclusion

The code mixing in the trials of Madiun military court is classified into two main categories, the first category is based on (1) types and (2) factors attributing the code-mixing phenomenon. The code-mixing types construct four classifications namely (1) word, (2) phrase, (3) baster, and (4) word repetition. Those four types have several factors namely (1) habit, (2) vocabulary knowledge, (3) humor, and (4) influences of the interlocutor.

As it has been shown above, the highest frequency is the word-type code mixing with 57.8%, then it is followed by the baster-type code mixing with 22.2%, phrase is 15.6%, and the lowest one is word repetition with 4.4%. On the other hand, the highest frequency of code-mixing factor is habit with

68,9%, influences of the interlocutor is 15,6%, vocabulary knowledge is 11,1%, and the lowest one is humor with 4.4%.

The dominant language during the trials in the Madiun military court is Indonesian language since it is the formal language in Indonesia with the highest frequency of code-mixing type is word insertion in the formal utterance. The most prominent reason is the habit of the speaker. In this case, the military court applies strict rules in every aspect of the system and yet code mixing is still able to be found, especially from the witnesses and the victim witnesses who are civilians. To sum up all of the data taken from the military court in Madiun, the code-mixing phenomenon can still occur even in the formal circumstance.

This research is still far from perfection in term of scope from approach of other linguistics' branches. Therefore, further research is needed to be conducted to enhance this issue.

References

- Abdullah, Wakit (2014). *Buku Ajar Etnolinguistik:Teori, Metode, dan Aplikasinya*. Fakultas Ilmu Budaya: Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., dan Thight, M (2006). *How to Research: Seluk Beluk Melakukan Research*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Fishman, J. A (1972). *The Sociology of Language*. Massachussetts: Newburry House Publication.
- Fitrizal, Imam Laili dan Eriza Nelfi. (2013). Analisis Bentuk Campur Kode di Pengadilan Negeri Kabupaten Padang Pariaman. *Abstract of Undergraduate Research, Faculty of Humanities, Bung Hatta University*, 3(1): 1-12.
- Geoffrey, Leech (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Halliday, M.A.K. et. al (1970). *The Users and Uses of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Handoko, Duwi (2015). *Kekuasaan Kehakiman di Indonesia*. Pekanbaru: Penerbit Hawa Dan Ahwa.
- Kachru, Braj. B (1978). *Toward structuring Code Mixing*. Paris: Mouto.
- Mahsun (2012). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Stratehgi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Moleong, L. J (1989). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Remaja Karya.
- Pakaya, Usman. (2017). Bahasa Hukum dalam Putusan Perkara Pidana. *Jurnal Negara Hukum*,8(1): 151-175.
- Rokhman, Fatur (2013). *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Pendekatan Pembelajaran Bahasa dalam Masyarakat Multikultural*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Santosa, Riyadi (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Simbolon, Marlina Eliyanti (2019). *Tuturan dalam Pembelajaran Berbicara dengan Metode Reciprocal Teaching*. Jakarta: Penerbit Media Sahabat Cendekia.

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J (2003). *Dasar-dasar Penelitian Kualitatif: Tatalangkah dan Tehnik-Tehnik Teoritisasi Data*. (M. Shodiq & I. Muttaqien, Trans.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sumarsono (2013). *Sosiolinguistik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sundoro, Bekty Tandaningtyas, Sarwiji Suwandi, dan Budhi Setiawan (2018). Campur Kode Bahasa Jawa Banyumasan dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan. *Retorika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 11(2): 129-139.
- Thelander, Mats (1976). Code Switching and Code Mixing. *International Journal of The Sociology of Language*, 10: 103-124.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).