CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

This chapter presents the theoretical foundation that is suitable for the research. It provides theories of pragmatics, presupposition triggers, code-mixing, and previous study.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies meaning analysis. When people communicate with one another, the aim and context of their utterances must be understood. "Pragmatics is the study of meaning and language use aspects that depend on the speaker and other features of the context of utterance." (Levinson, 1983, p. 5). Pragmatics is used in daily life, although many people are unaware of it since they are unfamiliar with linguistics theory. Therefore, pragmatics is related to the use of language in communication as well as the explicit and implicit meaning of human utterances.

Still on the same wave length, Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 3) defines pragmatics as the study of the meaning that a speaker or reader would communicate. Therefore, pragmatics deals with the use of language in communication. In addition, Yule claims that pragmatics is a study that involves not only the speaker's meaning but also contextual meaning and an expression of relative distance. Besides that, these types of studies have to entail the interpretation of what the speakers assumed.

Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 128) defines pragmatics as the study of invisible meaning, whereas the meaning that exists inside the context is the actual meaning that the speakers or the writers refer to, but not in spoken or written language. Yule (Yule, 1996, P. 3) states four pragmatic meanings:

1.) Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning

This approach focuses on what the speaker says to comprehend the meaning of the utterances and connect with others while communicating, as well as the meaning that the speaker expresses and how the hearer interprets it. The context in communication is not the literal meaning, but rather an interpretation of what someone intends in a certain situation and the effect that interpretation has on the hearer and speaker. It will be able to understand what the speaker says if such an interpretation is used.

Understanding what the speaker says allows the hearer to communicate in the intended context, and communication will happen. The most important aspect of communication is precise meaning within the context of the discourse. The context of the conversation was communicated by the speakers.

Speakers also need to provide appropriate utterances for the situation and make the meaning clear, thus the hearers have no difficulty in understanding and communicating. The context will ultimately change and become the conclusion of communication.

2.) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning

Context is important to understanding a conversation. Context is often used to achieve the purpose of each other's conversations. An unspoken utterance is always part of communication, and it is frequently related to the context of the conversation. It is common when we need to speak with others. Besides that, the context being spoken is either something familiar to the hearer or speaker.

This research entails interpreting what people mean by utterance context, which influences and affects what is spoken. This type refers to how listeners might draw their conclusions about what the speaker assumes in that context. With the conclusion of the hearer, the conversation seems to be shaping up for the best and will have a positive impact.

3.) Pragmatics is the study of how more meaning is communicated that what is said.

What is not spoken in conversation is known as an interpretation of the spoken meaning and is spoken by the speaker or writer, begging the issue of what we choose between spoken and unspoken to be interpreted. That interpretation will be the basis for communication.

Communication occurs when both parties understand the meaning and context of what they say in an utterance. Pragmatics requires the hearer to relate to what has previously been spoken to understand the speaker's understanding of meaning, even though this must be interpreted as the hidden meaning of the surrounding state concerning the prediction of the context. That context utterance must have an effective communication base to make predictions.

The correlation of meaning between the hearer and the speaker is important to successful communication. The hearer's reference to what the speaker had previously stated was extremely useful. Even more, the speaker should consider the context that will be understood and relevant to the hearer's knowledge.

4.) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning

This approach aims to examine the issue of how to choose between unspoken and spoken utterances that are both related to the concept of distance. This contextual meaning is related to the unspoken or spoken utterance, and it will serve as a conclusion in communication between the speaker and hearer to provide an utterance.

The speaker can estimate the topics. In terms of communication and information delivery, this means that the speaker must be able to think about and evaluate the abilities and relationships of the hearers to convey understandable information.

11

According to Yule's explanation, linguistic structure and the people who use it are related. An utterance can have multiple meanings depending on the listener's background, including occupation, status, gender, and so on. Because it can be proven by different interpretations depending on the background, and the context of meaning is most important in a pragmatic approach.

Based on that explanation, it is possible to conclude that context is the best source of meaning in an utterance. This can be learned from pragmatics, a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between the outside context of language and the intent of tutelage through the interpretation of its spelling situation. Pragmatics covers a lot of topics, including context, reference, speech acts, and politeness. This research will continue to focus on presuppositions, types of presuppositions, and presupposition triggers, among other topics.

2.2. Presupposition

Presupposition, implicature, and entailment all have close relations in the linguistics branch. Three of them equally examine the interpretation of the speaker's utterance in equal measure. A spoken utterance is an unwritten or unspoken thought, and the meaning is unspoken in the utterance. The research will examine presuppositions to avoid misinterpretation, specifically types of presupposition and presupposition triggers.

A presupposition is a handle to avoid ambiguity in an utterance. Based on Frage's argument, the perfect language can refer to its objects well. On this occasion, it is possible to conclude that a correct utterance is one that refers to the direction of the object under discussion. To reduce the possibility of ambiguity in speaker utterance presupposition by considering the hearer's or the reader's background, wrapped in language that matches the background and what the hearers and readers understand.

Furthermore, Levinson (Levinson, 1983, p. 179-180) defines a presupposition as a preexisting idea about an utterance that:

1. Statements must be mutually known by the speaker's assumption and addressee to be appropriate in the context.

2. In general, that will remain a necessary assumption, whether the utterances are in the form of a statement, denial, or query.

3. In most circumstances, it will be related to a specific lexical word or grammatical element (presupposition trigger) in the utterance.

Presupposition is important for understanding the meaning of an utterance. To make the presupposition even more accurate in interpreting the meaning of an utterance, the presupposition incorporates predictions that fit the hearer's background. As a result of the assumption, the meaning of the utterance will be proven in light of the context. It is also important to note that there is a connection between presupposition and context, as follows:

1. Presuppositions related to the generic context

   Generic context refers to the common world and culture, as a reasonably comprehensive category, and in this research the researcher chooses to focus on human needs that apply to people from diverse cultural backgrounds.

2. Presuppositions related to the situational context

   Text producers or translators believe that listeners or text recipients should obtain more benefits for less cost, more praise, less criticism, less dispute, and more sympathy.

3. Presuppositions related to discourse context

   The structure of the texts is one of the presuppositions related to the discourse context. Four essential principles regulate textual rhetoric: the possibility principle, the clarity principle, the economy principle, and the expressibility principle.

According to the exposure, Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 133) says that a presupposition is something that speakers assume to be true before making an utterance. In this case, presupposition is the result of the thinking process of categorizing the visible meaning in the speaker's utterance. The hearer demands that they extract additional information from what they interpret. Furthermore, Hudson (Hudson, 2000, p. 173) defines a presupposition as something that can be assumed to be true in an utterance that clarifies other utterances, thus implying that two utterances are interrelated. The presupposition related one utterance to another.

It is possible to conclude that presuppositions become the main idea concerning other presuppositions that are thought to result from the analysis of a meaning that can have a relationship with other utterances in demonstrating the truth of the utterance, and thus the hearer demands that additional information not visible in the utterance be understood. Because the truth of a presupposition results in the truth or untruth of an utterance, the utterance is said to presuppose another utterance. Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 6) defines presupposition as connecting two perceptions that allow the pra-condition to be presupposed, although the utterance was negated. Two perceptions result in one idea, one of which is the negated utterance.

It is clear from that explanation that a presupposition is a relationship between two presuppositions. According to Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 26), the sentence in [2a] contains a presupposition p and the sentence in [2b] contains a presupposition q, the >> is a symbol used to explain the presuppose, and the relationship in [2c]

[2] a. Mary's cat is cute. (=p)

b. Mary has a cat.   (=q)

c. p >> q

2.1.1. Types of Presupposition

Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 27) encourages an explanation of the example that divides the presupposition into six types, such as:

1. Existential presupposition

   Presupposition denotes the existence of someone or something. According to Yule (Yule, 1996, p. 27), existential presupposition not only signifies possession and existence but also expresses a noun phrase in all forms of expression. Finally, the speaker states that the existence or entities will be added.

   Possession is an existential presupposition that denotes the existence of two parties in a sentence are subject and object. The utterance is an existential presupposition given the presence of these two parties. Because it represents possession, the sentence "Syifa's sister is a teacher" is categorized as an existential presupposition.

   Furthermore, existential presupposition denotes the presence of anything, whether it is a person, object, or something else that bears proof of its existence in the utterance. An existential presupposition is an utterance that incorporates evidence of the presence of something or concepts that suggest the existence of something. An example of the utterance would be "there is a car."

   In conclusion, the subject of linguistics will analyze existential and all the presuppositions that use noun phrases. Noun phrases have the same syntax as other nouns and a modifier frequently explains other nouns by combining a verb with a pronoun or a number to generate a more specific sentence to create a word.

2. Lexical Presupposition

A lexical Presupposition is can have different meaning interpretations that are conventionally understood. One word that can be a sign of another meaning and not expressly spoken in those words, by the majority interpretation of the different meaning or something that has already happened in the past.

A word that signifies a prior occurrence or other speech and gives additional meaning to an utterance that is not recorded or unheard. That word usually refers to behavior or actions that were once done or became a habit but are no longer done or repeated by that person. An example is, "Carla was late again."

The conclusion is "late is Carla's habit," which she repeats. This can be another presupposition that might refer to a continuous new utterance based on an existing utterance when the habits are repeated.

Lexical makes presuppositions about things that used to happen in the past but are no longer done presently, in addition to signaling habits. He quit smoking, which the word meaning in Indonesia is "dia sudah berhenti merokok," and the interpretation is "he used to be a smoker."

The word contains the past tense, implying that "he used to be a smoker" without requiring it to be in the written or spoken utterance. People can grasp what happened or what someone did in the past by using these words. The past tense might also indicate a change in circumstances that may result in something unexpected. The utterance is analogous to demonstrating a development in an utterance through an event or person.

3. Structural Presupposition

The structure relies on conventional and regular presuppositions, and part of that structure is meant to be an accurate structure. The speaker can use the structure correctly because it is already true and also use a wh-question to ensure more data is available.

This type of presupposition is used to determine and obtain further information about an event using utterances with the wh-question structure. Structural presupposition also discusses previous occurrences and wishes to learn more about them. Thus, structural presupposition finds new presuppositions by extracting information from previous ones.

Structural presupposition can use "when" to investigate new information about time in an utterance. For example, "when did Syifa leave?" In other words, it may be deduced that Syifa was previously in that location and that Syifa had already left that location. The speaker wants further information regarding Syifa's departure time.

"Where" to know more about the location of an utterance. Another example is "where did Syifa go?" After being at the location, the speaker wonders about Syifa's future location and needs more information regarding Syifa's next location is necessary.

"Why" is also used to elicit new information regarding the reasons behind an utterance. Another example is "why did Syifa leave?" which asks why Syifa left. Further information concerning the motivation behind Syifa's conduct is necessary. In addition to the one mentioned above, many additional WH-questions are symptoms and part of the framework of this structural presupposition.

4. Factive Presupposition

A presupposition denotes the truth is more complex sentences with verbs. By complex words that aim to explain facts in an utterance that is supported by other facts. Factive presuppositions have a higher probability than counter-factual and non-factive presuppositions because they both use strong data and facts.

Assumptions about anything are complicated because they contain implicit assumptions that rely on implicit meaning and assume the presence of something or an idea. In this case, it signifies that the assumption is not in the utterance, and therefore, another meaning is implied but not expressed in the utterance. Thus, factive presupposition can generate presumptions that are consistent with the facts as stated in the utterance. An example is "he didn't realize he was ill." That might also mean "he is ill."

By employing the word "knows" in the conventional sense, factive presupposition suggests that the speaker was previously aware of the implicit meaning. For example, "he knows that he is ill," which means "he is ill," and everyone knows that.

Based on common assumptions, it is obvious that a factive presupposition must demonstrate one element that is consistent with current facts and can be proven. Another example is "we regret telling him," which has meaning since "they actually told him."

Factive presupposition is particularly accurate since substantial factual facts support the factive presupposition. Factive presupposition has the highest accuracy in comparison to counter-factual and non-factive presuppositions since many people already know the facts and because factive presupposition always says utterances that fit the facts.

5. Counter Factual Presupposition

A presupposition that indicates something contrary to the facts is also known as "contrary to the facts." By using preponderance, which indicates something contrary to the fact at the time, the utterance of uncallable facts is achieved. However, over time, this can become a fact, and it is still reasonable if made factual and by a preponderance of the evidence.

Counter-factual presuppositions often use presuppositions whose facts still make sense and are understandable to the majority of people, but the presuppositions are not labeled as facts since they are not in conformity with the actual situation. The utterance is a type of presupposition that analyzes the facts that occur when the utterance is spoken but may change in the future. For example, "if I become rich, I will give you some money." The utterance demonstrates that "rich" is not a fact that can be proven since it has not happened yet, but it may in the future.

Counter-factual presupposition is known as "contrary to the facts." The utterance comprises facts that are contradictory to the facts at the moment, therefore it cannot be proven as a fact, yet it still makes sense if the utterance becomes a fact one day. For example, "if you were my friend, you would help me," implies that they are not true friends, and that person will not help.

Accuracy according to the facts but not as accurate as factive presuppositions might nonetheless be accurate. All of this is since fact the statements made are presuppositions that can become facts. However, the counter-factual may still be able to become fact, and the level of fact remains higher than the non-factive presupposition.

6. Non-factive Presupposition

Presuppositions that indicate something impossible becomes real and simply becomes a dream are also difficult to establish as facts. In comparison to counter-factual, this possibility of non-factive is much less likely to become a fact in the future because the sentences are absurd and there is no other evidence of the truth.

Non-factive presuppositions usually include phrases related to wishful thinking, which do not make sense and are difficult for most people to understand. This indicates that wishful thinking is not true since it is contrary to reality and does not make sense. The utterance is wishful thinking and will never become an actuality. For example, "I dreamed I was Superman." The statement demonstrates that "I was Superman" is not a fact and will never be a fact.

Non-factive presupposition also uses imagination, which is devoid of facts. These utterances include information that will never be confirmed or treated as fact, it cannot be proven or handled. For example, "imagine this is a fairytale," which indicates it isn't a fairytale and also that a fairytale is never founded on reality.

Non-factive presupposition is incorrect since it contradicts the facts and is only wishful thinking. In contrast, counter-factual and factive presuppositions are might happen in real life, but non-factive presuppositions are only wishful thinking and do not correspond to the facts, because non-factive presuppositions are not in agreement with facts and cannot be proven to exist in the real world and be a fact.

2.1.2. The Presuppositions Generated Meaning in Each Own Type

The following will show how the presuppositions generate meaning by knowing the trigger in each own type proposed by Yule (1996, p. 27).

1. Existential presupposition

Euren (Euren, 1994) states that existential presuppositions are the main starting point for presupposition theory in philosophy (Lamarque, 1997, p. 359). The existential presupposition is considered to be present not just in possessive constructions but also in any definite noun phrase, such as a definite description, in which the addresser is thought to the existence of the entities.

[1] Syifa's sister is a teacher

[2] Carla's car is broken

The trigger in an existential presupposition is typically a noun phrase. The presupposition trigger in sentence [1] is "Syifa's sister," which uses noun phrases. Possessive construction as a presupposition trigger in "Syifa's sister," which explains that Syifa has a sister. Possessive construction is relevant to existential presuppositions because it confirms the existence of Syifa's sister.

In sentence [2], it proves that "Carla's car" also uses noun phrases. Both examples indicate that the existential presupposition employs noun phrases. Possessive construction is also in "Carla's car," which describes Carla's possession of the car. This existential presupposition may be found in the posse construction since it proves Carla's ownership of a car. Existence and possession are closely related in this utterance as part of the type of existential presupposition.

2. Lexical Presupposition

Yule (Yule, 1996, p.28) defines lexical presupposition as the verb "managed," carrying both asserted and presupposed meaning when someone manages to achieve something. The meaning of an utterance is that the person was successful in achieving something. Therefore, when someone says they did not manage to accomplish something, the meaning is that they did not succeed, although the presumptive meaning is that they try to do that action. So, "managed" is commonly read as stating 'success' and presuming 'tried'. Levinson (1983, p. 181) labels this type of verb as 'implicative verbs' providing the following examples:

[1] He stopped smoking

[2] Carla was late again

Lexical use of the past tense as a presupposition triggers. The presupposition trigger in sentence [1] is "stopped," which uses the past word "stop." According to the description above, lexical presuppositions use implicative verbs in addition to the past tense, which explains the –ed at the end of the words about the things that have been done before.

The presupposition trigger in sentence [2] is "again," the use of which indicates someone's habit. "Again," indicates that Carla's habit has always been late, and Carla is doing it again. In addition to implicative verbs, there are terms related to the habit that frequently.

According to the two examples above, samples [1] and [2] explain the other meanings in both sentences well. The interpretation is "he used to smoke," and the word "stopped," is derived from "stop," which is in the past tense because it happened in the past. It is assume that there is a person named Carla who is frequently late.

3. Structural Presupposition

Certain sentence forms are analyzed routinely, often presuming things that are already true in structural presupposition. In English, the 'WH-Question structure' is often evaluate with the premise that the information following the 'wh-form' is already known to be accurate (Yule, 1996, p. 28-29). This conclusion agrees with Khaleel's (2010) observation that structural presupposition triggers are less prevalent in journalistic texts since they limit certain structures. Consider the following examples as illustrations:

[1] When did Syifa left?
[2] Where did you buy the bike?

Wh-questions are used as presupposition triggers. In sentence [1], the presupposition trigger is "when," which uses wh-questions to determine the timing of something that is happening correctly. This utterance uses "when" to obtain more information, indicating that the speaker needs more information concerning the time of Syifa's departure, and it may be assumed that Syifa was previously there.

In sentence [2], it indicates that "where," also establishes the location of an event. This utterance employs "where" to inquire about the nature of an occurrence, and it can conclude that "you bought the bike," and the speaker requires further information about that bike.

According to the two examples above, samples [1] and [2] are already present in both sentences. It can presuppose that wh-questions needs to explain something that actually happens as well as to elicit additional information to ascertain something, deepen perceptions, and draw conclusions in a conversation.

4. Factive Presupposition

Factive presupposition is activated by using a verb such as 'know' and it is considered a fact. Other verbs with factive presuppositions include 'realize' and 'regret' as well as phrases combining 'be' with 'aware', 'odd', and 'glad' (Yule, 1996, p. 27). This is most likely due to the writers' avoidance of imposing factual propositions on their opinions (Khaleel, 2010).

[1] He didn't realize he was ill

[2] We regret telling him

Factive use of verb phrases as presupposition triggers. In sentence [1], the presupposition trigger is "realize," which presupposes "that he is ill," according to the fact. All of this demonstrates the factual possibility that is said with the intent to communicate his opinion. Thus "realize," is like emphasizing that it is a fact, saying that the fact is "he is unwell."

In sentence [2], the presupposition trigger is "regret," which implies "we are telling him," according to the fact. All of these are true possibilities to express their opinions, and thus "regret," is like an emphasis that "we actually told him," and everything can be proven according to the facts.

According to the three examples above, samples [1], [2], and [2] are defines when the verb explains the fact. In sentence [1], the presupposition can be used to indicate that he is ill, proving that it can also presuppose other utterances; in sentence [2] the presuppose is that we told him; and in sentence [3] the presupposition can indicate that he left early. All three sentences are well-known or have become habitual for many people, which could indicate that they are all facts.

5. Counter Factual Presupposition

A counter-factual presupposition is one in which the assumption is not only "not true," but also the inverse of what is "true" or "contrary to facts." Certain conditional structures, known as counterfactual conditionals, for example, presume that the information in the If-clause is untrue at the time of utterance (Yule, 1996, p. 29). This pattern is recurrent in other studies (Bonyadi & Samuel, 2011; Fadhly & Kurnia, 2015). The following are some sample utterances:

[1] If you were my friend, you would help me.

[2] If I become rich, I will give you some money.

In the example phrase [1], the presupposition trigger is "if you were my friend," which employs the "if" word. That assumes a predominance of "you were my friend." The truth is that "if you are not my friend, you will not help me." As a key, the word "if" denotes a speech that is contractual to the fact.

Sentence [2], describes "if I become rich," which also employs the word "if" as a predominance in an utterance. Consider the prevalence of "I have become rich." The truth is."I am not wealthy, therefore I will not offer you money."

According to the two examples above, samples [1] and [2] prove how "if," predominates at the beginning of a sentence. In sentence [1], it is possible to assume that "you are not my friend," whereas "friend" is simply a preponderance that uses "if" and indicates that it is a presupposition that could presuppose other utterances; in sentence [2], it is possible to assume that "I am not rich," whereas "rich," is simply a preponderance that uses "if," and indicates that it is a presupposition that could presuppose other utterances.

6. Non-factive Presupposition

A non-factive presupposition is one in which the assumption is not to be true. Based on the semantics of truth-condition, a non-factive presupposition is retrieved regarding the semantic properties of certain verbs produced by a speaker or writer. The use of non-factive verbs like 'dream', 'imagine', and 'pretend' implies that the following propositions are 'untrue'. Consider the following example that the researcher found in the data of the study:

[1] Imagine this is a fairytale

[2] I dreamed I was Superman

Non-factive use "dream," "imagine," and "pretend," as a presupposition trigger. The presupposition trigger in sentence [1] is "imagine," indicating that a fairytale is unreal and can only be inferred. "Imagine," as a presupposition trigger of non-factive presupposition, because no data is indicating that a fairytale is actually real, becomes the key and an indication that the utterance is wishful thinking that will never come true.

In sentence [2] it indicates that "dreamed," which indicates that Superman is unreal and can only be inferred. "Dreamed," as a presupposition trigger of non-factive presupposition, is the key indicator that the statement is only a fantasy that cannot come true because no facts are declaring that Superman is genuinely real or facts demonstrating that the individual has truly become Superman.

According to the two examples above, samples [1] and [2] explain that "dream," and "imagine," can be a presupposition trigger in both sentences. In sentence [1], it is possible to presuppose "it is not a fairytale," and in sentence [2], that "I was not Superman."

2.2. Code-mixing

The study of language in the social realm is known as sociolinguistics. According to Chaer and Agustina (Chaer & Agustina, 2004, p. 2), sociolinguistics is the study that investigates social and language interaction since language and social life are intrinsically linked.In sociolinguistics, everything that is related to what humans do will always influences by the surrounding settings and conditions that relate to language, social, situational, and cultural aspects (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2012, p.7).

Sociolinguistics can explain variations of language with a social context background and also the correlation of social structure to the form of language explained by sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics is also related to a variety of topics, such as languages, accents, code-switching, and code-mixing (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2012, p.6).

Code-mixing is also related to bilingualism; one of the reasons for this is that the globalization era has a significant impact on one language on another language. Nowadays, society is well aware of this language issue. The usage of language is also obvious, particularly in Bahasa, which frequently engages with English (Wijana & Rohmadi, 2012, p.71).

Bussmann (Bussmann, 1996, p. 130) defines bilingualism as the ability of a speaker to communicate in one or two languages and uses them as communication tools in daily life. Nowadays, bilingualism is becoming more popular and widely used in society as a source of inspiration for interacting and communicating within society. It is becoming an intrinsic aspect of society and is widely used. The interactions in society are informal interactions, formal interactions, and social media interactions. This ability leads to the phenomena known as code-switching and code-mixing.

This research is related to code-mixing, which occurs when speakers employ one dominating language to support a discourse in another language (Chaer & Agustina, 2010, p. 115). An insertion, which mixes one word or phrase from borrowing; an alternation, which mixes the whole sentence from borrowing; and congruent lexicalization, which impacts code-mixing, are the three types of code-mixing.

When it comes to code-mixing, there are two sides to the argument: pro and con. Supporters of code-mixing argue that it is meant to help people improve their English skills. Opponents believe it is excessively difficult and leads many people to misinterpret the statement.

Appel and Muysken (Apple & Muysken, p. 19) describe code-mixing as the employment of two languages in the same statement. When two phrases are combined, a new language is generated and must be translated. Findlay (Findlay, 1998, p. 32) describes code-mixing as "a language in which a second language is mixed with the base language." The example of code-mixing is as follows:

[1] "*Jadi pengen lanjutin baca Eragon* since most people are disappointed that the movie doesn't look like what is written in the novel."

[2] *"Tergantung. Mau temenan berapa orang, ganjil atau genap. Kalo lu udah ngerasa* left out *dari* circle *tersebut ya susah."*

Because of the increased use of science and technology that emphasizes English as an international language, many people have become bilingual in Indonesian-English. All of this facilitates humans' adaptation and eases the use of technology and communication with many people, whether directly or via social media. Many people nowadays already use code-mixing to deliver utterances on social media. Thus, some social media users should be aware that an utterance can be communicated via social media.

2.3. Twitter

Social media is the term that is frequently used to describe new forms of media that entail interactive engagement. The evolution of the media is divides into two different eras: the broadcast era and the interactive era. During the broadcast era, the media were almost exclusively central, with one entity—such as a radio or television station, a newspaper company, or a movie production studio—distributing messages to many people. Feedback to media outlets was often indirect, delayed, and impersonal. Individuals communicate with one another on a much smaller scale, through personal letters, phone conversations, or on a somewhat larger scale, through means such as photocopied family newsletters.

Social media aims to bring together friends who are already separated but still want to communicate with each other. However, it turns out to be a self-existing event. It's common on some social media that the friends they have on their social networks aren't always friends they've met before, but they're friends from social media. Even though some individuals prefer to make friends on social media, they are still alone in the world without having to meet and communicate with other people in real life.

One example is Twitter, which is a social media platform that is part of new media or alternative media. It is a social media platform consisting of 140-character messages known as tweets. It's a simple new approach to finding out what's new or what's going on, especially if it's relevant to what you're looking at. Twitter was founded in March 2006 by Jack Dorsey, and its social networking site debuted in July. "Twitter" literally means "chirping." This site employs the micro-blog concept.

Twitter users themselves can be made up of a diverse group of people who can engage with friends, family, co-workers, or others with similar interests from all over the world. Twitter users may communicate more by sending messages about what they are thinking, current events, breaking news, topics of similar interest, and other things via Twitter.

The most common use of Twitter for research objectives in the literature is in tweeting about new publications. Mollett et al. (Mollet, 2011) suggest that researchers should tweet about new developments when the researcher's project work informs them, such as changes in relevant government policy, think-tank reports, or newly published research. Furthermore, Mollett et al. (Mollett, 2011) states that the brevity, accessibility, and immediacy of Twitter appeal to both research partners and non-academics.

Twitter now provides a variety of previously unavailable options. The ability to use Twitter as a critical evaluation tool for assessing research is also a chance to further distribute ideas and views about research. The opportunity to review academic work does not have to be limited to conference presentations, but can also include reviews of publications, although Mandavilli (Mandavili, 2011) points out some of the drawbacks, stating that the pace and tone of online reviews can be intimidating, and it is unclear how authors should respond to these critiques.