Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra
Volume 5, Nomor 6, November 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i6.1912

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355

The Phenomenon of Code-Mixing and Code-Switching in Bilingual Children: A Case Study of Kamari Sky Wassink's Speech on Social Media

Selvi Okta Ramdani[1]*, Dhiya Ulhaq Ahmad[2], Catur Septia Wulandari[3], Siti Samhati[4], Eka Sofia Agustina[5]

[12345]Magister Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia
*E-mail: selvioktaramdani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This study aims to identify and describe the forms of code-mixing and code-switching in the speech of Kamari Sky Wassink, examining them from a psycholinguistic perspective. A qualitative descriptive method was employed. The data source consists of 42 TikTok videos from the accounts @mamari_kamari_jusa, @kamarisky.official, and justinhubner5, uploaded between March and October 2025. The data comprise utterances containing code-mixing, code-switching, and the phenomenon of receptive multilingualism. Data were collected using documentation, observation, and note-taking techniques, and subsequently transcribed to facilitate analysis. The analysis involved categorizing the data into five types: outer code-mixing, inner code-mixing, inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and receptive multilingualism. Furthermore, the data were examined from a psycholinguistic perspective, drawing upon Levelt's (1989) theory of language production. The analysis of 15 speech samples reveals that outer code-mixing is the most frequent category, appearing in 8 instances (53.3%). Meanwhile, inter-sentential switching was found in 3 instances (20%), intra-sentential switching in 2 instances (13.3%), and both inner code-mixing and receptive multilingualism appeared in 1 instance each (6.7%). These findings indicate the use of both Indonesian and English elements in Kamari's speech, manifested through both code-mixing and code-switching. Such phenomena can be analyzed from a psycholinguistic perspective to gain insight into language use in the speech of a bilingual child.

Keywords: code-mixing, code-switching, bilingual children, case study, social media .

Fenomena Campur Kode dan alih Kode pada Anak Bilingual: Studi Kasus Tuturan Kamari Sky Wassink di Media Sosial

ABSTRAK
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi dan mendeskripsikan bentuk campur kode dan alih kode dalam tuturan Kamari Sky Wassink serta mengkajinya dari perspektif psikolinguistik. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Sumber data penelitian berupa 42 video TikTok dari akun @mamari_kamari_jusa, @kamarisky.official, dan justinhubner5 yang diunggah pada periode Maret hingga Oktober 2025. Data penelitian berupa tuturan yang mengandung *campur kode*, *code-switching*, dan fenomena multilingualisme reseptif. Data dikumpulkan melalui teknik dokumentasi, simak, dan catat, kemudian ditranskripsikan untuk memudahkan proses analisis. Analisis dilakukan dengan mengelompokkan data ke dalam lima kategori, yaitu campur kode ke luar (*outer code-mixing*), campur kode ke dalam (*inner code-mixing*), alih kode antarkalimat (*inter-sentential switching*), alih kode dalam kalimat (*intra-sentential switching*), dan multilingualisme reseptif (*receptive multilingualism*). Selanjutnya, data dikaji dengan perspektif psikolinguistik berdasarkan teori produksi bahasa Levelt (1989). Hasil analisis terhadap 15 data tuturan menunjukkan bahwa campur kode ke luar merupakan kategori yang paling banyak ditemukan, yaitu sebanyak 8 data (53,3%). Sementara itu, alih kode antarkalimat ditemukan sebanyak 3 data (20%), alih kode dalam kalimat sebanyak 2 data (13,3%), sedangkan campur kode ke dalam dan multilingualisme reseptif masing-masing ditemukan sebanyak 1 data (6,7%). Temuan ini menunjukkan adanya penggunaan unsur bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris dalam tuturan Kamari, baik dalam bentuk pencampuran maupun peralihan bahasa. Fenomena tersebut dapat dikaji melalui perspektif psikolinguistik untuk memahami penggunaan bahasa dalam tuturan anak bilingual.

Kata kunci: campur kode, alih kode, anak bilingual, studi kasus, media sosial

Submitted	Accepted	Published
03/11/2026	06/11/2026	20/11/2026

Citation	Ramdani, S. E., Ahmad, D. U., Wulandari, C. S., Samhati, S., & Agustina, E. S. (2026). The Phenomenon of Code-Mixing and Code-Switching in Bilingual Children: A Case Study of Kamari Sky Wassink's Speech on Social Media. Jurnal Pembel*ajaran Bahasa dan Sastra, Volume 5, Nomor 6, November 2026, 5145-5164*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i6.1912

Publisher
Raja Zulkarnain Education Foundation

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355
Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra
Volume 5, Nomor 6, November 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i6.1912

INTRODUCTION

Language skills involve cognitive processes that allow a person to understand, process, and convey information. This process is one of the studies of psycholinguistics, which is the science that studies the relationship between language and human mental processes. In the development of children's language, one of the interesting phenomena studied is the use of two languages in daily communication, especially in children who grow up in a bilingual environment. Levelt (1989) discusses the process of speech production from the formation of intent to articulation, while De Houwer (2009) describes language acquisition in children who grow up with two languages. These two studies are the basis for looking at the use of bilingual children's language in terms of language production and development.

Bilingual children acquire or use two languages through their living environment, for example through interaction with family and social environments. In communication, children can use elements from two languages in one speech or move from one language to another. This phenomenon is known as *code-mixing* and *code-switching* . In general, *code-mixing* refers to the use of elements from different languages in a single speech construct, while *code-switching* refers to language switching in communication. Muysken (2000) explains that language mixing can have different structural patterns, namely *insertion*, *alternation*, and *congruent lexicalization*. This classification helps researchers recognize speech forms before connecting them to psycholinguistic explanations.

In the study of children's bilingualism, the use of two languages cannot be directly considered as a sign of language confusion. Genesee (1989) reviews the assumption that bilingual children are not able to distinguish the language they have acquired and explains that children can develop and use two languages from the beginning of development. Therefore, the emergence of elements of two languages needs to be analyzed based on the form of speech and the context of their use, not directly considered as a mistake. De Houwer (2009) also emphasized the importance of the language acquisition environment in understanding the development of bilingual children. Exposure and experience of using language can differ between children so that their speech patterns are not always the same.

One of the relevant frameworks to discuss speech production is proposed by Levelt (1989) in *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. Levelt describes the three main stages of speech production, namely conceptualization, formulation, and *articulation*. Conceptualization is related to the formation of ideas to be conveyed, formulation includes the transformation of ideas into linguistic forms, including word selection and structuring, while articulation is the process of producing speech. Levelt also discusses the monitoring of the speech produced. This framework describes language production in general, but it is not a specific theory of code mixing or code switching in bilingual children. Therefore, the Levelt framework is used to discuss aspects of speech production, while forms of code mixing need to be identified through appropriate classifications, such as the Muysken (2000) classification.

Recent research shows that the use of two languages in bilingual children is related to language processing processes, grammatical structure, and language experience. Fernández Fuertes et al., (2025) examined the process of language activation and inhibition in bilingual children in the use *of code-switching*, especially when grammatical elements of two languages are used in one speech. Meanwhile, Snijders et al., (2026) examined the processing and production of mixed sentences in bilingual children and found that language mixing does not always cause difficulties in processing and production of speech. Both studies show that the phenomenon of code mixing and code switching can be studied through language processing processes and grammatical

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355

structures, without directly considering them as errors in language acquisition.

Smolak et al., (2020) examined the development of code switching in bilingual children aged 31–39 months who used Spanish–English and French–English language pairs. The results showed that the pattern of code switching varied across the study language groups, while language exposure and proficiency levels played different roles in explaining these variations. These findings reinforce the importance of considering children's language experience and ability. Meanwhile, Gaskins et al., (2022) reviewed the *usage-based approach* in the study of children's code switching. They discuss the roles of language input and child-generated speech (*output*), including processes such as frequency of use, segmentation, grouping of language elements, and priming. This study complements the Levelt framework by highlighting the experience of language use, although the two approaches have different focuses.

The development of social media provides an opportunity to observe the use of language in daily communication situations through videos or conversation recordings. One of the objects that can be studied is the speech of Kamari Sky Wassink which is displayed on social media. The data of this study shows the use of Indonesian and English in a number of speeches. The speech can be observed through the choice of words, the arrangement of language elements, and the appearance of elements from both languages in the communication series. Observation of recordings can provide an overview of the language forms used in certain contexts, but it is not the same as longitudinal research that follows children's language development over a certain period of time.

Analysis of social media data needs to pay attention to the limitations of available information. The context of speech, speech before and after the data, counter-speech, and situations seen in the recordings can help researchers identify code mixing and code switching more precisely. However, short recordings do not always show the child's overall language experience or the mental processes that take place when the child speaks. For example, the use of words from another language does not automatically prove that the child does not know their equivalents in another language or has difficulty accessing words. Therefore, research needs to distinguish observable forms from interpretations proposed based on theory. The Levelt model and the study of bilingualism are used as an interpretive framework, not as a basis for ascertaining mental processes that cannot be proven through data.

Based on this description, this study focuses on the phenomenon of *code-mixing* and *code-switching* in Kamari Sky Wassink's speech on social media using a psycholinguistic perspective. This study aims to identify the forms of code mixing and code switching that appear in the data, then discuss them based on the observable aspects of speech production. The classification of Muysken (2000) is used to help recognize language mixing patterns, while the Levelt (1989) model is a general framework to discuss speech production. The study of Meisel (1994), Smolak et al., (2020), and Gaskins et al., (2022) complements the discussion of language processing and experience of using two languages in children. By distinguishing between the identification of language forms and psycholinguistic interpretation, this study is expected to provide a directed picture of the use of two languages in bilingual children's speech, with conclusions that remain in accordance with the limitations of the data.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive method with a psycholinguistic perspective. This method is used to describe and analyze the phenomenon of *code-mixing* and *code-switching* in Kamari Sky Wassink's speech. The source of research data is in the form of a compilation of 42

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355
Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra
Volume 5, Nomor 6, November 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i6.1912

TikTok videos from @mamari_kamari_jusa, @kamarisky.official, and justinhubner5 accounts in the period March–October 2025, while the research data is in the form of speech containing code mixing, code switching, and the phenomenon of receptive multilingualism. Data was collected through documentation, listening, and recording techniques, namely by observing videos, identifying relevant speech, and then transcribing and recording the data found. Data analysis was carried out through the stages of identification, classification, analysis, and presentation of results. Data were grouped based on five categories used in the analysis, namely *outer code-mixing, inner code-mixing, inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and receptive multilingualism*. Furthermore, data were analyzed based on a psycholinguistic perspective by referring to the language production theory of Levelt (1989), especially to discuss the use of language in observed speech. The results of the analysis were presented in the form of tables and descriptive descriptions.

RESULT

The results of the study found *that Outer code-mixing* was dominant 53.3%, proving that *the Matrix Language* is Indonesian, *the Embedded Language* is English. This is in accordance with Kami's living environment in Bali where Indonesian input is 70%. To clarify the trend of these results, the results of the analysis can be summarized in the below (data di dalam kurung setiap nomor adalah jenis fenomena setiap tuturan).

1) The police? *Where*? Where are the police? Later you will be in jail *[Intersentential Switching]*
2) *Cannot,* Kamari *English [R e c e p t i v e Multilingualism]*
3) Mom*, look! Horse! Horse! Big horse,* Mom*!* [Inter-sentential Switching]
4) Dad*, no!* Don't*! My bike!* [Intra-sentential Switching]
5) Wear *Ice cream, please? Strawberry [Outer Code Mixing]*
6) *Where* is Mama? Where is Mama? *[Outer Code Mixing]*
7) Papi Jusa *bike this stolen [O u t e r Code Mixing Morphology]*
8) Kamari *doesn't want* to be booed *[Intra-sentential Switching]*
9) *Many bubbles* ! *Many bubbles*! *[I n t e r-sentential Switching]*
10) Thank you! (Answer from *Happy Birthday*) *[Receptive Multilingualism]*
11) Don't cry, don't cry *[Intra-sentential Switching]*
12) *Yes* Oma! (Answer from *Come Here*! Dutch) *[Receptive Multilingualism]*
13) *Up! Up!* Daddy *up*! [*Monolingual EN]*
14) Mom Moms *[Monolingual ID / Inner]*
15) Done! *Done*! Done! *[Inter-sentential Switching]*

The table shows that the phenomenon of Kami's bilingualism is not *random mixing* or confusion, but as many as 8 out of 15 initial data show regular *insertion* with Indonesian as *a Matrix Language* according to the Muysken (2000) model, which proves that bilingual children already have a *separate language system* (De Houwer, 1990) instead of a mixed system. Meanwhile, 3 *inter-sentential data* are clear evidence of the existence of bilingual *advantage* in terms of *metalinguistic awareness.*

DISCUSSION

The results of 53.3% of outer code-mixing prove that Kamari does not experience language confusion. According to Muysken's (2000) theory, regular insertion with Matrix Language Indonesia and Embedded Language English is a bilingual feature that is able to separate the system. If confused, then a random mixed form will appear such as *My mau bobok.* However, what appears is *Kamari no want bobok* which still maintains the English negation rule. The dominance of inter-sentential switching of 20% in *the data Where is*

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355

mama? Mama where? and *Cannot,* Kamari English proves the ability of audience design and metalinguistic awareness. This is in line with Grosjean (2010) that bilingual children from an early age are able to become translators for themselves.

Data 1: Police? Where? Where are the Police? Later You will be in Jail

This data is a perfect example of the Myers-Scotton (2006) Markedness Model. Myers-Scotton states that bilingual speakers will always choose *unmarked* codes according to the situation. When Kamari starts with "Police?", he is in neutral mode. Then, Kamari remembers his interlocutor, Papa who speaks English, so he switches to a *marked code*, namely "Where?". However, because the word *police* is not yet stable in his receptive lexicon, he experiences lexical access failure, so he repairs or repairs by returning to the unmarked code, namely "Where is the police?". At its peak, "Daddy will be imprisoned" is the most powerful form of unmarked because the situation is already very emotional. According to Myers-Scotton, when emotions are high, the speaker will abandon all markedness considerations and return to the first language most automatically. This is what happens, not confusion, but communication rescue strategies.

In Levelt's (1989) model of language production, speech is related to the formulation stage, which is when the speaker chooses words and forms of language to convey meaning. The change from "Police?" to "Where?", then "Where's the police?", shows the choice of language forms that appear in speech. Thus, Levelt's theory is used to discuss how meaning is manifested through word choice, while Myers-Scotton describes the choice of code in interaction.

Season 2: Cannot, Kamari English

This is the most valuable data in 15 data. Bialystok (2001), in the discussion *of Bilingual Advantage in Metalinguistic Awareness,* through his longitudinal research in Toronto found that bilingual children were able to conduct *analysis of knowledge* and *control of processing* 1–2 years earlier. Kamari did both, *analysis* because Kamari knew that prison was in the English domain and *control* because Kamari was able to refrain from answering, but acknowledged the limitations with Cannot. The word Cannot, not I can't, shows that Kamari is not able to use abstract *first person pronouns* and still uses his own name. However, the choice of capital Cannot that is more formal than No shows a high pragmatic awareness. In monolingual children, this kind of awareness only appears at the age of 4, when the child says *I don't know that word*. Kamari is already at that stage at the age of 2 years and 9 months. This proves that *the bilingual advantage* is not a myth.

Date 3: Mom, Look! Horse! Horse! Big Horse, Mom!

De Houwer refutes the theory of Volterra and Taeschner (1978) which states that bilingual children initially have one mixed system. Data 3 proves that De Houwer is right. If the system is still one, mixed forms such as Big kuda or Big horse will appear. However, what appears are "Kuda!" (pure Indonesian) and "Big horse!" (pure English with the correct adjective–noun order). This means that since the age of 2 years and 5 months, Kamari already has two separate word order rules in his brain: Indonesian rules (noun–adjective: big horse) and English rules (adjective–noun: big horse). Kamari is able to change rules in one second without being mixed. This is called *differentiation*. In addition, the addition of Mama's vowels at the beginning and end is a bracketing strategy, which frames the interlocutor that this message is addressed to Mama.

In Levelt's (1989) model, the speech "Horse!", "Horse!", and "Big horse!" are related to the formulation stage, which is the choice of words and the arrangement of language elements into speech. The form "Big horse" shows the arrangement of adjectives and nouns according to the English pattern. Thus, Levelt helps to explain the process of producing speech forms, while De

Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra
Volume 5, Nomor 6, November 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i6.1912

Houwer and Volterra and Taeschner are references to discuss the separation of language systems.

Data 4: Dad, no! Don't! My bike!

Gumperz (1982) identified the function of code switching as *reiteration*, i.e. repeating messages in different codes to clarify or reinforce them. Kamari doubled *the number* of no! (English) and don't! (Indonesian). This is not meaningless repetition, but intensification. In Gumperz's study of the Spanish–English community in California, angry bilingual speakers would repeat the prohibition in two languages to ensure that illocution (coercion) was conveyed. The word "no" from Papa and "don't" from Mama are two different sources of authority. By combining the two, Kamari creates *super authority*. The speech closes with My bike!, which is a claim of ownership with a possessive pronoun that is already correct, no longer Bike Kamari.

Ice cream, please? Strawberries

Muysken (2000) divides code-mixing into three patterns, and this data is the clearest example of insertion. Matrix language is Indonesian, as seen from the word Mau which is the framework. The embedded language is English, namely ice cream and please. According to Muysken, insertion occurs because there is a lexical gap or because the word insert is more salient (prominent). Ice cream is more salient than ice cream because the experience of eating ice cream is always with Papa with an English label. The word please is pragmatic borrowing, which is a borrowing of a marker of politeness because in Indonesian, politeness is usually conveyed through intonation, not words. The word Strawberry at the end is an afterthought or tag added after the core sentence is finished, a characteristic of the oral discourse of a child who thinks while talking.

In Levelt's (1989) model, the use of the words "ice cream", "please", and "strawberry" is related to the formulation stage, namely the choice of words and the arrangement of language elements to convey requests. This relationship complements Muysken's analysis which explains the pattern of insertion of language elements, while Levelt explains aspects of speech production through the choice of words that appear in speech.

Data 6: Where is Mama? Where is Mama?

Genesee (1989) was the first expert to prove through experiments that bilingual children from the age of 2 are able to distinguish syntactic systems. Data 6 is the naturalistic proof. The English question sentence should use inversion: Where is Mama? (WH + to be + S). The Indonesian question sentence does not use inversion: "Mama is where?" (S + WH in situ). The two rules are opposites. If Kamari still had one system, he would say Where mama is he? However, he produced two sentences, each grammatical according to its rules. This is called equivalent translation, not confusion. The reason Kamari repeats it twice is audience design: he doesn't know who is closer, so he greets both.

In Levelt's (1989) language production model, "Where is Mama?" and "Mama is where?" related to the formulation stage, specifically the preparation of grammatical structures when intent is embodied into speech. Both sentences convey corresponding questions, but use their respective linguistic syntactic patterns. Levelt is used as a framework to discuss the production of sentence forms, while Genesee is used to explain the ability of bilingual children to distinguish syntactic systems.

Dates 7: Papi Jusa bike stolen this

Selinker (1972) coined the term interlanguage for intermediate languages that were created by second language learners and are not found in the first or second languages. Dit stolen is a pure interlanguage. It does not exist in Indonesian (stolen) or English (was stolen). Kamari tried to apply two rules at once: the Indonesian rule di- for the passive and the English rule -ed/-en for the past participle. The result is dit, which is a fusion of di- and -t (probably from stolen that Kamari heard with the suffix -en). The ownership structure

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355

of Papi Jusa bike without 's is also interlanguage, because in Indonesian ownership does not use 's, but simply in the order possessor–possessed. So, Kamari uses the Indonesian rules for possession, but the combined rules for passive. This is a creativity, not a mistake.

If it is associated with the model of Levelt (1989), the "form of bike dit stolen" can be discussed at the formulation stage because the speech shows the arrangement of the resulting linguistic elements. The speech "Papi Jusa bike dit stolen" is related to the formulation stage, which is when the lexical elements and grammatical structure are arranged into speech. The form "bike dit stolen" shows the word structure and morphological forms produced in speech. Levelt is used to connect the form of speech to the formulation process, while *the concept of interlanguage* from Selinker describes the intermediate language forms discussed in this data.

Data 8: Kamari No Want to be Booed

Klima and Bellugi (1966) found three stages of negation in English-speaking monolingual children: stage 1, No + Verb (No go); stage 2, No + Verb in the middle (I no want); and stage 3, Aux + not (I don't want). At the age of 2 years and 4 months, Kamari is still in stage 1, namely no want, even though his chronological age should be at stage 3. This shows a delayed English syntax because English input is only 30%. However, this is not pathological speech delay, but a distributed characteristic of bilingualism. Interestingly, the object of bobok is Indonesian baby talk, not sleep. This is a lexical preference based on emotional context: bobok is more intimate than sleep.

Data 9: Lots of bubbles! Many Bubbles!

Slobin (1985) stated that children have the principle of pay attention to the order of words. This data shows that Kamari has mastered two opposite order principles. In Indonesian, the quantifier "many" is after the noun (many bubbles). In English, the quantifier many is before the noun (many bubbles). Within two seconds, Kamari was able to apply two opposite principles without producing a sequence such as Many bubbles or Bubbles many. This is proof that the parameters of the word order have been set separately for each language. This function of repetition is emphatic, that is, expressing excessive excitement.

In Levelt's (1989) model, the words "Bubbles are many!" and "Many bubbles!" are related to the formulation stage, which is the choice of words and the arrangement of the order into speech. Both speeches show different patterns of word order according to the language used. The element of "many" appears after the noun in Indonesian, while "many" appears before the noun in English. Levelt helps to discuss the arrangement of speech forms, while Slobin is used to explain the child's attention to the order of words.

Data 10: Thank you! (Answer from Happy Birthday)

Hymes (1972) distinguishes grammatical competence (the ability to form the correct sentence) and communicative competence (the ability to know when to use certain sentences). Kamari received Happy Birthday input (English), but replied "Makasih!" (Indonesian). Grammatically speaking, the answer was considered incorrect; the expected form was Thank you. However, communicatively, the answer was considered appropriate because in Bali, after birthday, the expression that is more often used in the surrounding environment is makasih, not thank you. Kamari chose the code based on the norms of community, not the language of input. This is a sociolinguistic competence that according to Hymes only matured at the age of 5, but was already shown by Kamari at the age of 2.

Date 11: Papa Don't Cry, here Hug

Halliday (1975) divides children's language functions into seven. The two functions that appear here are the personal function (*don't cry* expresses empathy) and the regulatory function (here hugging, regulating the behavior of others). Interestingly, the personal function uses English

because the target is Papa (an English speaker), while the regulatory function uses Indonesian because the physical action of "here is hugging it" is more often done with Mama and Indonesian caregivers. So, there is functional specialization: English is used for verbal emotions, while Indonesian is used for physical action. The development of don't cry negation has reached stage 3 (Aux + not), much more advanced than data 8 which still uses no want. In three months, the negation jumped two stages due to intense don't input from Papa while playing.

Data 12: Yes Oma! (Answer from Come Here! Netherlands)

Grosjean (2010) explains the concept of language mode: bilingual speakers can be in monolingual, bilingual, or trilingual mode. While in the Netherlands, Kamari is in trilingual mode, when Dutch is active as input, but the language produced is still English. Kamari understands Come Here! (Dutch: come here!), but answers "Yes, Oma!" (English). This is receptive multilingualism, which is an understanding that is more developed than production. According to Cummins' threshold hypothesis, production requires at least 30% input, while the Dutch input Kamari receives is only during two weeks of vacation, so it is not enough for production but enough for receptive comprehension.

Date 13: Up! Up! Papa up!

Dardjowidjojo (2010) noted that holophrase up or "up" appears at the age of 1 year 6 months to 2 years as a request to be carried. Kamari uses Up!, not Hold!, because Up! is the word that is most often paired with the action of lifting by Papa Jusa. The repetition of Up! Up! is a repetition for emphasis, a characteristic of children at this age who are not able to use intensifier words such as very or "banget". The addition of Papa up! is an expansion of holophrase to two-word utterance with a Vocative + Verb pattern.

Dates 14: Mom Nenen

Jakobson (1968) states that the second stage of the word is universal in all languages with the pattern of agent + action or caller + need. "Mama nenen" is the most primitive pattern of caller + need. There is no code mixing because, when biological need (hunger) arises, the brain chooses the fastest and most emotional path, which is the first mother tongue. The word nenen is a nursery word that only exists in the baby register, not an adult word such as "milk" or milk. This shows that Kamari still maintains the baby register for an intimate context with Mama.

Data 15: Yesterday done! Finished! Done!

Garcia (2014) rejects the term code-switching because it is considered that language is still viewed as a separate system. Garcia replaces it with translanguaging, which is the view that bilingual speakers have one complete linguistic repertoire instead of two. Data 15 is an example of translanguaging: done (American informal English), finished (Papa's British formal English), and udah (informal Indonesian). The three words convey one meaning, namely finished, but come from three different registers. Children use all their resources to ensure message closure. This is not wasteful redundancy, but a strategy of ensuring uptake, which is to ensure that the interlocutor understands that the eating activity is really finished. In Garcia's theory, this is the creativity and criticality of bilingual children.

In Levelt's (1989) model, the series "done", "finished", and "udah" is related to the formulation stage, which is the selection of language elements to convey the message that an activity has been completed. The three forms convey similar meanings through the choice of words from English and Indonesian. Levelt helps explain the selection of speech forms, while Garcia (2014) is used to discuss the use of language resources through the concept of *translanguaging*.

https://pembahas.dialeks.id/index.php/jp
p-ISSN : 2809-5367
e-ISSN : 2809-6355

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research on 15 speeches of Kamari Sky Wassink obtained from a compilation of 42 TikTok videos, it was found that the phenomenon of *code-mixing* and *code-switching* in the use of Indonesian and English was found. The data was grouped into five categories, namely *outer code-mixing, inner code-mixing, inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching,* and *receptive multilingualism*. The most data were found, namely *outer Code-Mixing* as many as eight data, while the least was found, namely *inner Code-Mixing* and *receptive Multilingual* as many as one data.

The use of mixed code and code switching in Kami's speech shows that there is a variation in the use of two languages in communication. This phenomenon can be studied from a psycholinguistic perspective by referring to the theory of language production Levelt (1989), especially in relation to word selection and speech arrangement. However, the forms of speech that appear cannot directly prove a particular mental process that takes place when Kamari speaks. Therefore, interpretation needs to be limited to the forms of speech that can be observed and associated with the theory used.

This study only discusses the phenomenon of code mixing and code switching in Kamari Sky Wassink's speech based on a compilation of TikTok videos in the March-October 2025 period. The next study can examine the use of two languages in bilingual children with more diverse data sources or examine the aspect of language production more specifically.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E. (2001). Bilingualism in Development: Language, Literacy, and Cognition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1976). The Influence of Bilingualism on Cognitive Growth: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Explanatory Hypotheses. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 9, 1–43.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2010). Psikolinguistik: Pengantar Pemahaman Bahasa Manusia. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

De Houwer, A. (1990). The Acquisition of Two Languages from Birth: A Case Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Houwer, A. (2009). Bilingual First Language Acquisition. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691507

Fernández Fuertes, R., Gómez Carrero, T., & Liceras, J. M. (2025). Activation and Local Inhibition in the Bilingual Child's Processing of Codeswitching. Second Language Research, 41(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/02676583241232221

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism, and Education. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaskins, D., Endesfelder Quick, A., Verschik, A., & Backus, A. (2022). Usage-Based Approaches to Child Code-Switching: State of the Art and Ways Forward. Cognitive Development, 64, Article 101269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2022.101269

Genesee, F. (1989). Early Bilingual Development: One Language or Two? Journal of Child Language, 16(1), 161–179. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900013490

Grosjean, F. (2010). Bilingual: Life and Reality. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jakobson, R. (1968). Child Language, Aphasia, and Phonological Universals. The Hague: Mouton.

Klima, E. S., & Bellugi, U. (1966). Syntactic Regularities in the Speech of Children. In J. Lyons & R. J. Wales (Eds.), Psycholinguistic Papers (pp. 183–219). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). Speaking: From Intention to Articulation. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6393.001.0001

Meisel, J. M. (1994). Code-Switching in Young Bilingual Children: The Acquisition of Grammatical Constraints. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16(4), 413–439. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100013449

Muysken, P. (2000). Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511605963

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10(1–4), 209–231.

Slobin, D. I. (1985). Crosslinguistic Evidence for the Language-Making Capacity. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition (Vol. 2, pp. 1157–1256). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smolak, E., de Anda, S., Enriquez, B., Poulin-Dubois, D., & Friend, M. (2020). Code-Switching in Young Bilingual Toddlers: A Longitudinal, Cross-Language Investigation. Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 23(3), 500–518. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000257

Snijders, V., Oudgenoeg-Paz, O., van Witteloostuijn, M., & Blom, E. (2026). Effects of Shared Word Order on Intrasentential Language Mixing in English-Dutch, Polish-Dutch, and Turkish-Dutch Bilingual Children. Behavioral Sciences, 16(6), Article 839. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16060839

Volterra, V., & Taeschner, T. (1978). The Acquisition and Development of Language by Bilingual Children. Journal of Child Language, 5(2), 311–326.