CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Regarding to the following inquiry of this present study, this chapter presents the introduction of this study such as background of the study, statement of problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation, and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Social networking websites are virtual communities which allow people to connect and interact with each other on a particular subject or to just “hang out” together online (Murray and Waller, 2007). Social media websites are about connecting with friends, family and acquaintances you already have in real life. The most well-known social media sites are Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and LinkedIn. These sites allow you to share photos, videos and information, organize events, chat, and play online games.

a) Social Networks. These sites allow people to build personal web pages and then connect with friends to share content and communication. The biggest social networks are MySpace, Facebook and Bebo.
b) Blogs. Perhaps the best known forms of social media, blogs are online journals, with entries appearing with the most recent first.

c) Wikis. These websites allow people to add content to or edit the information on them, acting as a communal document or database. The best-known wiki is Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia which has over 2 million English language articles.

d) Podcasts. It is audio and video files that are available by subscription, through services like Apple iTunes.

e) Forums. It is areas for online discussion, often around specific topics and interests. Forums came about before the term “social media” and are a powerful and popular element of online communities.

f) Content communities. It is communities which organize and share particular kinds of content. The most popular content communities tend to form around photos (Flickr), bookmarked links (del.icio.us) and videos (YouTube).

g) Microblogging. It is a social networking combined with bite-sized blogging, where small amounts of content (‘updates’) are distributed online and through the mobile phone network. Twitter is the clear leader in this field.

Facebook is one of Social Network which provides multiple add-in functions (e.g., virtual pets, online games, the wall, virtual
gifts) that facilitate users to customize their own interface on Facebook. In addition, Facebook provides a special function called ‘‘News Feed” that allows users to browse their friends’ movement on Facebook. Furthermore, Facebook is one of social media which is really popular in Thailand. Thus, it causes some of Thai Facebook users do code-mixing when they interact with others or and update their status on Facebook. According to Bunloet et al. (2010), in Thailand Facebook has become the most popular social networking site and the number of the Facebook users with age of 18-24 is approximately 1,350,320.

Furthermore, Das and Gamback (2013) state that the increased use of the Internet enables many Thais to have more chances to interact in English with others in verbal and textual forms. In social media, non-English speakers do not always use Unicode to write in their own language, they use phonetic typing, frequently insert English elements (through code-mixing and Anglicisms), and often mix multiple languages to express their thoughts, making automatic language detection in social media texts a very challenging task. It means that in social media, especially Facebook, Thais not only use Thai language but also frequently insert English.
Concerning the issue above, code-mixing on Facebook which is done by Thais is an essential issue to be discussed. In this study, the researcher focuses on the types of code-mixing which is frequently used by Thais for their status update on Facebook. The researcher chooses Thais as the subject because Facebook is really popular in Thai, so that the social media which is mostly used in Thai is Facebook.

1.2. Statement of Problem

Based on the explanation about, the researcher has two things that will be discussed farther through the research, they are:

1. What types of code mixing are used by Thai students to update status on Facebook?

2. What is the type of code mixing most frequently used by users to status update writing on Facebook?

1.3. Purpose of Study

Referring to formulation of the problems mentioned above, the purpose of study can be stated as follows:

- To identify the types of code mixing used by Thai students to update status on face book.
- To know type of code mixing most frequently used by face book users to status update writing on face book

1.4. Significance of the study

The result of this study is expected to give contribution in two ways:

1. Theoretically, it is expected to give more knowledge to Thai students in university Muhammadiyah Malang about code mixing sociolinguistic subject.

2. Practically, it is expected to the Thai students have more information about code mixing, and then they can make an update status with more educational value and have variation in their sentence or quick text. Furthermore, their status update should be more interesting.

1.5. Scope and limitation

There are two scopes in this studies, the first is social networking called Facebook. Then, the users who update status with involve code mixing in their sentence. The participants whose support this study are from the researcher’s Facebook friend list. After that, the researcher watches Facebook ‘s home to see users whose update status with
combine two or more languages in their sentence from 08:00 pm to 11:00 pm in a week.

1.6. Definition of key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding, the key terms in this study are defined as follows:

1. Thai Students: Thai students refer to the Thai students who get scholarship in study at English Department at University of Muhammadiyah Malang.

2. Facebook: Facebook is one social media which provides multiple add-in functions (e.g., virtual pets, online games, the wall, virtual gifts) that facilitate users to customize their own interface on Facebook.

3. Code mixing: code-mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity where the participants, in order to infer what is intended, must reconcile what they hear with what they understand. (Aeyomoni, 2006; Wardhaugh, 2006).