

A STUDY OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS' *CODE SWITCHING* IN EFL CLASSROOMS SETTING

Muslim⁽¹⁾, H Sukiyah⁽²⁾, Arif Rahman⁽³⁾

¹Student of Postgraduate FPBS IKIP Mataram

²Student of Postgraduate FPBS IKIP Mataram

³Lecturer of Postgraduate FPBS IKIP Mataram

Muslim08@gmail.com⁽¹⁾, hajisukiyah@gmail.com⁽²⁾, Arifrahman058020@gmail.com⁽³⁾

Abstract

This study aims to investigate a phenomenon of bilingualism in which the use of Target language (English) is switched to target Indonesia, known as *code switching* (CS). More specifically, the study focuses on the types of CS and the functions of CS in EFL classrooms setting. The data were obtained from classroom observations through audio recording and field notes from two different English classes. The finding reveals that both the teachers and the students employed three types of CS: inter-sentential, tag-switching, and inter-sentential switching in different contexts. Furthermore, the different frequency of CS functions employed by teachers and students' occurs both in two classes for two reasons: for social and pedagogical functions. Socially, CS in this study served as (1) conveying teacher's admonition, (2) requesting for help, (3) helping other students, (4) commenting on the students' unsatisfactory answers, and (5) building unofficial interaction among the students. Pedagogically, CS served to (1) explain or repeat understandable utterances which has been said previously in order to help students understand it, (2) check the students' understanding to the new words or expression introduced in the lesson, (3) translate sentence when students learn about grammatical features (4) repair self mistakes, (5) clarify teachers' misunderstanding, and (6) initiate a question.

Keywords: *Teacher and Students, Code Switching, EFL Classroom Setting*

INTRODUCTION

English is treated differently in two different types of secondary schools for several private schools in Indonesia. In most schools in Indonesia, English is only used as an instructional language for English subject. However, in other schools, it is used as an instructional language across all school subjects. In this regard, the first mentioned schools are categorized as Regular program school while the second refers to international class that serves Cambridge program as an internationally-standardized for its English Curriculum.

Despite of their differences, the two types of school shows similarity in case of bilingualism while they performs an English in EFL classroom interaction. In

this condition, although both teachers and the students' expected that to used English in classroom, the use of Indonesian as an alternation language during classroom interaction is unavoidable in particular situations. This phenomenon wherein the teacher or the student switch language is defined as *code switching* (CS).

CS has become an interesting phenomenon to study especially in the field of classroom interactions since it is one of the major aspects of bilingual's development process. Therefore, this phenomenon is considered as useful strategy in classroom interaction, especially if the aims of CS are to make meaning clear and to transfer knowledge efficiently to the other members of classroom community (Flyman-Mattsson

and Burehult, 1999; see also Hurtado, 200; and Gregio & Gil, 2007).

Generally, CS occurs because of two reasons; because of the speaker deficiency in target language and because of some multiple communicative purposes (Gysels 1992 cited in Duran, 1994). The speaker deficiency in the target language, as mentioned by Polplack (1980), results from linguistics constrains. Similarly, Cristal (1992 cited in Duran, 1994) says that CS occurs because a speaker cannot express his/herself in one language to compensate to the deficiency. In line with communicative purpose and strategy, it is stated that CS occurs because of some social, and discourse/pedagogical functions (Canagarajah, 2001; Winford, 2003 Hanna, 2004; see also Adrerdooff, (1966, as cited in Han Chug, 2006; Gregio & Gil, 2007).

Nowadays, CS is seen as having certain functions in the communication done by bilinguals. Different purposes of CS are identified by different scholars. Hanna (2004: 49-80) identifies the varied functions of CS that she found in two different level of EFL classrooms program : teacher's explanation/clarification, requesting help, students helping each other, students self-repair, teacher's language slip (lapses), unknown English counterpart, checking for understanding, students clearing misunderstandings, students initiation, and students comment.

While Canagarajah (1995: 179) reports that CS in EFL classroom discourse serves as classroom management which includes opening the class, negotiating directions, requesting help, managing discipline, teacher encouragement, teacher compliments, teacher's commands, teacher admonitions, mitigation, pleading and unofficial interactions. Besides,

Canagarajah (1995) states that CS also serves as content transmission which involves review, definition, explanation, negotiating, parallel translation and unofficial student collaboration. From all functions of CS mentioned by the experts above, the fuctions of CS purposed by Canagarajah (1995) and Hanna (2004) are used in this study.

Studies about CS in classroom setting have been focused on the nature and the purpose of CS (e.g. Coogan, 2003; Deckrow, 2005, Lewis, 1999), patterns of CS depending on the sociological or ethnographical factors (e.g. Jung Lee, 2005; Gamal, 2007, Sahdan, 1996), the context in which CS may occur in classroom activity (Hurtado, 2002), syntactic and morphosyntactic constraints on CS (Alenezi, 2006), the use of CS in computer-mediated communication (Cui, 2006), and factors that influence CS (Ying, 1993).

Most of those studies have been done in a bilingual setting with the focus on using English as a second language. Particularly focused on the nature of CS in EFL classroom settings based on its social and pedagogical functions (i.e. Canagarajah, 2001; Hanna 2004; Sundelin 2001; Haryati, 2007; see Nieken, 2007, Araya, 2013). In most cases of those studies, the status of English is a daily language of social encounters. Furthermore, English is often used as a language of instruction in other school subjects as well. Thus, more studies are needed in investigating CS which occurs in EFL classroom settings.

Based on the overview, this study is intended to explore the teacher's and students' CS, i.e. the types and functions of CS in EFL classrooms. This issues is

conducted with the assumption that the result not only to identify and answer about CS phenomenon but also, it can significantly broaden the understanding of current process of the language spoken. Furthermore, the present study, hopefully, will help raise awareness on the issue of CS in the EFL classrooms context. Regarding the issues raised, the purpose of this study, therefore, is to seek answer to the questions about the types of code switching are found in EFL classrooms and the functions do teacher and students' code switching serve in EFL Classrooms.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study conducted a qualitative methodology because it allows the researcher to capture naturally occurring interactions among the participants. In this case, this study attempts to see natural phenomena of classroom interaction. Detailed observations and descriptions of context and what people said or did formed the basis for inductive rather than deductive analysis. In this respect, a theory is used to explain the data, rather than data collected to test pre-established hypotheses (Locke and Silverman, 1993).

This study was undertaken at MA Plus Mataram in Lembang. It was located in the city of Mataram West Java Province. Compared with the other schools, this school was the more popular in terms of its extra-lesson activities. The participants involved in this study were fifty-seven students and two teachers from two bilingual MA Plus Mataram classrooms, i.e. Regular class and English Program class. The age of the participants ranged from 14 to 16 years old. In Regular class, there were thirty-two students of which 18 girls and 14 boys. In English Program

class, there were twenty-five students, in this classroom, there were fourteen girls and twelve boys.

The aim of the data analysis is to discover pattern, ideas, explanations, and understanding (McMillan, 1992: 221). He also argues that data analysis of qualitative studies are interwoven, influencing each other; therefore, in this study, the analysis was carried out as the data has been collection was going on as well as after the data collected.

The data collected from observations, i.e. audio recorder and field notes taking were converted into written form (transcripts). The Audio recording and field notes transcripts were then read many times and notation were also made in the margins to look for events related to the research problems, and then they were coded. The codes were then categorized according to initials. In the first step, the recorded data of classroom interaction was listened to and transcribed.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Types of Code Switching

To classify the types of CS used by the teachers and the students in this study, the categorization of CS proposed by Poplack (1980 in Hanna; see also Ene, 2007; Chaiwician, 2007; Nieken, 2007) is used. Those categories are inter-sentential switching, tag switching (emblematic switching), and intra-sentential switching.

Inter-sentential Switching

Inter-sentential switching, as defined by Polplack (1980 in Hanna, 2004), occurs between sentences or clauses. It was found from the data that this type of CS occurred 60 times both in Regular class and in English Program class. In Regular class, intra-sentential switching occurred 33

times while in English Program class, inter-sentential switching occurred 27 times. This types of switching was employed by the teacher when translating or explaining grammar and by the students when doing exercise in classroom activities.

Extract 1 shows how ‘inter-sentential’ switching occurred between sentences or clauses. In this point, the teacher employed an inter-sentential switching when he asked students whether they could translate the sentence in simple past tense into Indonesian. He used Indonesian when asking question and used English when reading sentences from the book afterwards, as observed at moves1 of extract 1. At move 3 shown that an English was also used for asking a question while Indonesian was used for instructing the students to do exercise.

Extract I: (Observation I, Regular Class)

(1) T : *okay*, siapa yang bisa menterjemahkan kalimat tersebut? dalam

bentuk lampau, lihat kalimat di situ. **“one hundred years ago people drove a horse and cart”** (okey, who could translate that sentence? in the past

form, look at the sentence “one hundred years ago people drove a horse and cart”)

(2) S : *yes sir*, bagaimana dengan kalimat di paragraf dua baris tiga?

(3) T : **translate, what does it mean in Indonesian?**, kerjakan juga di halaman

belakang (translate, what does it mean in Indonesian, do also the next

page)

Based on the definition given by Poplack (1980 in Hanna, 2004) the instances of CS that occurred at moves 1

and 3 above were classified as inter-sentential switching. At move 1, inter-sentential switching occurred between sentences which can be identified by full stop. At move 3, inter-sentential switching occurred between clauses which can also be identified by pauses.

Extract 2 exemplifies ‘inter-sentential’ switching between sentences that took place in English Program class. The data shows how inter-sentential switching was employed when students and their teachers discussed newspapers in Indonesian. It can be seen at moves1 and 8 that the teacher employed inter-sentential switching at sentence level.

Extract 2: (Observation 3, English Program Class)

(1) T : mm which one is the best news of both Risky!. **Mana yang terbaik seperti**

apa yang kamu lihat kemarin

(mm which one is the best new of both Risky!.

Which is the best as what seen yesterday)

(2) S6? : I think pilkada is hot news in PR sir

(3) T : umm are you sure his the one?

(4) S6 : **yes**, pikiran rakyat lebih menarik untuk di baca (yes, pikiran rakyat is

more interesting for reading)

(5) T : {demonstrate both news paper}okay, so that's so here, is there any difference

between kompas news and pikiran rakyat newspaper? and how to distinguish them?

(6) S7 : I think, I think no difference sir

(7) T : **kalo sama ataupun beda mesti ada indikasinya**. Are you really that one?

as I said it has, has different each other (if the same it should be indicated. Are

you sure that one? as I said it has, has different each other)

At move1, the teacher used an Indonesian sentence to emphasize his question by asking Risky to choose the best answer, while at move 8, he used English in order to reinforce his statement to students about the difference between newspapers. In this case, the teachers' base language was Indonesian and then he switched into English.

In the present data, the instances of inter-sentential switching were quite easy to identify. This is in line with what Ene (2007: 8) states that inter-sentential switching is the easiest to recognize because it occurs at the sentence level, where syntactical boundaries are clearly not interfering. It has become a consecrated assumption that this type of CS is mostly encountered in the speech of less fluent bilinguals, as it involves the least syntactic difficulty (Ene, 2007: 8).

Tag-switching

The second type of CS is tag-switching or "emblematic switching" (Ene, 2007), i.e. inserting a tag in one language into another language in an utterance or vice versa (Poplack, 1980 in Hanna, 2004 & Nieken, 2008). For example, an English tag may be inserted into an Indonesian when the base language is Indonesian. On the contrary, an Indonesian tag may be inserted into English when the base language is English. In this case, a tag can be moved freely in a sentence since they do not have syntactic constraints (Romaine, 2001 in Hann, 2004).

As previously discussed in chapter two, according to Dumitrescu (1993, in Ene, 2006), tag switching or Emblematic switching, defined as switching at the level of tags, and covers at least two types of tags. Tag or emblematic switching can be single nouns (for instance, high frequency,

habitual speech, culture-specific terms such as, *honey, well, okay, yes, and alright*), or, most often, short sentential formulas (for instance, *are you kidding, give me a break, you know, and I mean*).

In the data, this type of CS was found in both Regular class and English Program class as much as 50 times. In Regular class, tag-switching occurred 32 times while in English Program class tag-switching occurred 18 times. Extract 3 demonstrates how the 'tag-switching' or 'emblematic' occurrence in the data, particular in Regular class.

Extract 3: (Observation 2, Regular Class)

- (1) T : **okey**, lihat kosa kata dipapan, berikutnya disebutkan (okay, look the vocab at blackboard, the next to be mentioned)
- (2) S4 : **yes** sir, dilanjutkan! (ye sir, to be continued!)
- (3) T : how about you Heri..., can you?
- (4) Ss : {inaudible}
- (5) S4 : **all right**, saya akan mencobanya (allright, I will try it)
- (6) S5 : *good*..lihat pekerjaan saya (good..look at my work)
- (7) S4 : mm..punya saya lebih bagus, **you know** (mm..mine is better, *you know*)

In extract 3, the class was discussing vocabulary. While writing on the blackboard, the teacher asked students in Indonesian to read the words. Here, the teacher used the word 'okey' in the beginning of his Indonesian sentence. In this case, the tag-switching took place at the beginning of an utterance. This kind of CS was also used by a student (S4) as seen at moves 2, 5, and 7. At moves 2 and 5, tag-switching occurred at the beginning of the student's utterance while at move 7 the tag occurred at the end of the student's

utterance. This evidence demonstrates the fact that tag can move freely in a sentence because it does not have 'syntactic constraints' (Romaine, 2001 in Alenezi, 2006).

In extract 4, it was found that the teacher and the students employed tag switching of different languages. At move 3, the teacher used English words 'you know' at the beginning of his Indonesian utterance. And then, at move 6, the student used Indonesian words 'bukan' at the end of English sentence.

Extract 4: (Observation 2, English Program Class)

- (1) T : let's continue then see this how about persons a and b, what are they?
- (2) T : okey, none of them are interesting in repairing cars, fixing cars, or nobody interested in machinery, or not even you
- (3) T : **you know?** maksud-ny tidak seorang pun yang tertarik pada mesin
(you know? I mean nobody interested in machinery)
- (4) S6 : *ndak* I don't think I am (no I don't think I am)
- (5) T : you have
- (6) S6 : I think we are better than others, **bukan?**
(I think we are in better than others, do I?)

Extract 4 shows that after the students had listened to the tape about different types of persons, the teacher asked whether there were those types of persons in the classroom interesting in machine or not. At moves 1 to 3, the teacher invited students to continue their lesson. At move 3, the teacher wanted to know the student's answer about the topic. At move 4, the student replied the teacher's question using Indonesian word in his English utterance. At move 7, the student used an Indonesian word at the end

of his utterance.

Intra-sentential Switching

Intra-sentential switching, the third type defined by Poplack (2002 in Chaiwichian, 2006), is a type of CS that occurs within a clause or sentence boundary. It is argued that this type of CS is mostly used by fluent bilinguals since it requires a lot of integration in a sentence (Romaine 1991 in Nieken, 2008). Romaine further argues that this types of switching concerns the greatest syntactic risk and may be done by the most fluent bilinguals. Intra-sentential switching is also used naturally by EFL teacher and students in classroom discourse (Hanna, 2004).

In the present data, 'intra-sentential' switching occurred 51 times a little less than the occurrence of inter-sentential. In Regular class intra-sentential switching occurred 28 times while in English Program class 23 times. In extract 5 and 6, this type of CS occurred when students were doing grammar exercises. In those situation the base language that the students usually used was Indonesian while the grammar exercise was in English. Extract 5 shows that to employ intra-sentential switching, teachers, and students have to know the grammar of the two languages used in the utterance. In the extract, the teacher gave instructions in English to the students and gave them a puzzle. He employed intra-sentential switching by inserting Indonesian word '*dalam bentuk*' (in form of) when he instructed students to read the sentences as seen move 1.

Extract 5: (Observation 2, Regular Class)

- (1) T : you want to just, try to form some sentences **dalam bentuk** past tense
here's for you (you want to just,

- try to form some sentences form of past tense
here's for you here's for you)
- (2) S4 : can I get a **teka-teki** again? (can I get a puzzle again?)
- (3) S2 : kita mulai dengan **exercise 3**, tapi bagian kedua sir (we start with *exercise* three but part two sir)
- (4) T : so there is no start and no finish I can guess, but it doesn't matter you can start wherever you want
- (5) Ss : {laughs}
- (6) T : you want just, try to form the sentence in the past tense, here's for you
here's for you:
- (7) S4 : can I get a **teka-teki** again (can I get a puzzle again)

At moves 2 and 7, intra-sentential switching was employed by student (S4). S4 switched the word 'teka-teki' in his English question as he did not know what 'teka-teki' in English was. By placing 'teka-teki' in the position of noun, S4 assumed to know the concept of English article 'a'. On the other turns, S2 employed intra-sentential switching in English by inserting the word 'exercise 3' in his Indonesian utterance as seen at move 3.

Another example of intra-sentential was observed in extract 6. This type of CS was used when teacher taught the students adjectives. The teacher inserted into his English utterance an Indonesian word in one time and inserted English into his Indonesian word in another time. Observe the following extract.

Extract 6: (Observation 3, English Program Class)

- (1) T : okey, for example is word narrow, this is familiar to you, **ditandai aja**, understand? (okey, for example is word narrow, this is familiar to you, just mark it, understand?)
- (2) Ss : once again sir?
- (3) T : saya ndak akan menulis

semua kata **such narrow** anda bisa

menyebutnya langsung (I won't write all of these words narrow you can say them directly)

- (4) T : mana yang ingin anda gunakan **narrower or narrowest** tergantung context-nya (which one you use more narrow or the most narrow based on...

At move1, the teacher inserted the words '*ditandai aja*' (just marked it) into his English sentence to instruct the students to identify the comparative and superlative degree of each adjective. He also employed intra-sentential switching by inserting the word 'narrow' into his Indonesian utterance, at seen move 3 and by inserting the words 'narrower or narrowest' into his last Indonesian sentence, as observed at move 4.

In extract 7, there were three occasions where intra-sentential switchings occurred. In the first and the third occasions, teacher inserted Indonesian words into his English utterance while in the second occasion, he inserted an English words into Indonesian sentence. However, there was an occasion, besides the three, where another kinds of switching occurred. This switching happens when an English word is embedded by an Indonesian inflection or which is called 'affix word' forms since there is a mix of two languages in the level of word (Hanna: 2004), As observed in extract 7.

Extract 7: (Observation 3, English Program Class)

- (1) T : how would you say 'quite easy going' **terdiri dari kata** 'quite and easy', what does it mean? Do you know what is it? (how would you say 'quite easy going',

- these consists of words 'easy' and 'quite' what does it mean? Do you know what is easy going?)
- (2) S1 : kuit izi guoing, it means take it easy, is it sir?
- (4) T : yes,it can be also for example, jangan dipaksa **slow-lah easy going** saja
 make'nya (yes, it can be also for example, take slow in dressing just *easy going*, don't be forced)
- (5) T : how would you say it?
- (7) S4 : quite quite easyto use even it's old fashioned
- (8) T : that's right you **bisa juga katakan** a pice of cake (that's right you can also say a pice of ake)

At move 1 of extract 7, the teacher inserted Indonesian words '*terdiri dari kata*' (consists of words) into his English sentence and the word '*bisa juga katakan*' (can also say) at move 8. In other ocussion, besides the teacher inserted an English words 'easy going' into his Indonesian utterance. Interestingly, he also embedded an Indonesian inflection '*lah*' into the English word 'slow'. In this respect, this kind of inflection is intended to give an emphasizing on the word 'slow', which has similar meaning as 'just' in English.

From extract 5, 6, and 7, it can be concluded that intra-sentential switching occurred in three different cases. First, it occurred when a speaker inserted an Indonsesian word into his/her English utterance (i.e. extract 5). Second, it occurred when a speaker inserted English word into Indonsian utterance (i.e. extract 6). The last, beside ocurred when speaker inserted Indonesian clause in English language, it also inserted suffix into English word (i.e. extract 7).

Functions of Teacher and Students' Code Switching

This section presents the findings of this study dealing with the functions of CS. This study identifies different functions of CS employed both by teachers and students in the two classrooms, i.e. Regular class and English Program class. The functions of CS employed by the teacher include *explanation, checking for understanding, grammar translation, and admonition*. The functions of CS employed by the students involve *students helping each other, self-repair, clearing misunderstandings, and students' initiation*. The categorization of CS functions used in this study derives from the work of Hanna (2004) and Canagarajah (1995).

The Occurences of Code Switching Functions

There are exactly ten functions of CS found from the observation with various occurrences. In this section, the ten functions of CS will be presented by the number of their occurrences in both classes: Regular class and English Program class. The following table shows the frequency of their occurrences with their percentage.

Table 4.2 the Occurrences of Code Switching Functions in two EFL Classrooms

No	Funci ons of Code Switc hing	Regu lar Class	Englis h Progra m	Freq uenc y	Pecent age (100)
1	Teach er: <i>Explan ation</i>	6	1	7	11, 86
2	Teach er: <i>Checki ng for unders tandin g</i>	2	1	3	5,26
3	Teach	6	1	7	11, 86

	er: Gram mar Transl ation				
4	Teach er: Admon itions	6	-	6	10,52
5	Stude nts: Reque sting help	4	1	4	7,02
6	Stude nts: Helpin g Each Other	4	-	4	7,02
7	Stude nts: Self- repair	7	2	8	14,03
8	Stude nts: Unoffi cial interac tion	7	2	9	15,8
9	Stude nts: Cleari ng Misun dersta ndings	4	-	4	7,02
10	Stude nts: Studen ts' Initiati on	3	-	3	5,26
Total number of Occurences		49	8	57	100%
Percentage (100%)		85,5 %	14,5%		

Summary of Findings

From the presentation and discussion of the CS types and functions, it can be summarized that the three types of CS have different frequency of occurrence. In this respect, the type of CS with the most frequent occurrences is *inter-sentential* switching. In this case, inter-sentential was

usually occurred in situations when grammar was being taught and served many functions i.e. explanation, requesting help or unofficial interaction. This phenomena happened during the interaction and might facilitate the classroom teaching and learning process (Gregio: 2007).

The findings furthermore show that *inter-sentential* switching was naturally occurred in a single turn (switch within a sentence or clause) i.e. when a student initiated CS to Indonesian in a situation while the others speaking in English, to request help. Inter-sentential switching could be a natural choice for a student since then he/she did not have to know both English and Indonesian grammar to be able to produce a grammatically correct utterance.

Intra-sentential was employed in situation when teaching and learning grammar which demonstrated the nature of that situation i.e. mode of studying is Indonesian but the examples are in English or vice versa. Interestingly, in the data was found that the teacher and some of the students in both classes developed what so called 'affixed words' mixing English and Indonesian in the same word.

Tag-switching was a less common feature of classroom CS as the findings suggested. This might be because the classroom activity was structured, which means that there were not much space for free speaking because the teacher usually controlled the turns when students have turn to speak. Furthermore, in teacher-led activities, the discussion did not flow naturally, although the teacher controlled it. In such situations, the students focused only on the production of a correct sentence. They did not have more attention

on the discussion being present.

This study reveals that four CS functions were employed by the teacher in Regular class. These functions involve *explaining/clarification*, *checking for understanding*, *grammar translation*, and *admonition*, while, in English Program class the teacher employed three functions of CS, which involve *explaining/clarification*, *checking for understanding*, and *grammar translation*. In the student function, six functions were found among the students in Regular class, which involve *requesting help*, *helping each other*, *self-repair*, *unofficial interaction*, *clearing misunderstanding*, and *student's initiation*. Meanwhile, in English Program class three functions of CS were found among the students, i.e. *requesting for help*, *clearing misunderstanding*, *self-repair*, and *unofficial interaction* (Hanna, 2004).

Apart from that, CS took place in different contexts of learning. First, CS occurred when the focus of the lesson is on discussing grammar point. Second, CS occurred when the students were working through a chapter. Third, CS occurred when the students were doing exercises. Fourth, CS occurred when the students were having a discussion.

Furthermore, this study also identifies that the students used English mostly in *materials-dependent talk*, i.e. the use of English by students as it is demanded by the learning task or the textbook (Hanna 2004; 20). This is in line with the study of Canagarajah (1995) which reported that English was only used for *material-based communication* while the first language (L1) was reserved for other activities. In this study, the material facilitates the students' interactions during

the lessons, or for commenting on the exercise. This is in line with finding of Tonbury (2005) when he says that CS is one of communication strategy that the member of classroom community use to be better understand the lesson or concept.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The present study concerns the phenomena of code switching (CS) in EFL classrooms. It examines the types of CS that occurs during classroom interaction and different functions of CS employed by teacher and students.

The finding reveals that both teachers and students employed three types of CS: inter-sentential, tag-switching, and intra-sentential switching. It is also found that inter-sentential switching is the most frequent type of CS which occurred in both EFL classrooms. It seems that the participants in Regular class is little less fluent in bilinguals than the students in English Program class. This is in line with the assumption of Ene (2007; see also Gregio & Gil, 2006) who states that CS will be more often occurs in the speech of less fluent bilinguals. This phenomena happened during the interaction and might facilitate the classroom teaching and learning process (Gregio: 2007).

The finding also shows that the occurrence of CS appears to serve several functions, i.e. *explanation* occurred 7 times (11,86%) of total CS functions occurrence, *checking for understanding* occurred 3 times (5,26%), *grammar translation* occurred 7 times (11,86%), *admonition* occurred 6 (10,52%), *requesting help* occurred 4 times (7,02%), *helping each other* occurred 4 times (7,02%), *self-repair* occurred 8 times (14, 3%), *unofficial interaction* occurred 9 times (15,

8%), *clearing misunderstanding* occurred 4 times (7,02%) and students' *interaction* occurs 3 times (5,26%) of total CS functions occurrence. In this respect, the function of CS with the most frequent occurrence is *unofficial interaction (student function)*, while the least frequently occurred functions are *checking for understanding (teacher function)* and *student initiation (student function)*. Furthermore, the data shows that the function of CS occurred more often in Regular than in English program class. This seems to give support to the assumption of Ene (2007; see also Gregio & Gil, 2006), CS would be found more often in the speech of less fluent bilinguals. This study seems to suggest that the participants in Regular class are less fluent in English than those in English Program class since the number of CS functions in student function is much bigger in Regular class than that in English Program class.

Considering the findings of this study, it is suggested that the use of Indonesian is sometimes needed during the use of English for pedagogical purpose, i.e. the students can attain certain degree of understanding. Besides, by allowing the students to switch language, it is expected that the students can build their confidence with this strategy for communicating meaning in interaction. Furthermore, in the use of CS teachers should not use it randomly since it will make the students confused in understanding the message. The teachers should introduce to students how CS is used in communication because the use of CS as one of among other strategies can facilitate the teacher and students interaction in English.

For further investigation in the same of inquiry (code switching), another

aspects of CS functions are awaiting to be investigated. In this case, if the present study how and the participants employed CS and what function the participants used for, it is important to know the student's perception towards the used of CS in EFL classrooms. The result of the investigation will explain how important CS is in facilitating the students' learning. In addition, it is hopefully that the result of this study would help other researchers better understand the CS phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching: between Italian and dialect in Sicily. *Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, pp. 180-211.
- Alwasilah, A Chaedar. (2002). *Pokoknya Kualitatif: Dasa-dasar Merancang dan Melakukan Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT. Jakarta: Dunia Pustaka Jaya.
- Araya, Jacqueline. (2013). Code-Switching in the EFL Classroom: Friend or Foe?. *Revista de Linguas Modernas Journal*. 19/13. pp 375-391.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in The Classroom: A Neglected Resource? *English Language Teaching Journal* 41/4. pp.20-43.
- Auer, Peter. (1998). *Code switching in conversation; Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Botztepe, Erman. (2003). Issues in code-switching: competing theories and models. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguisticode switching*. Vol 3, No 2. 1-27. Retrived October 1st, 2008 from the

- <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/academic/tesol/Webjournal/>.
- Brice, A. (2000). Code Switching and code mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. *Advances in speech language pathology. Journal of the Speech Pathology Association of Australia*, 20/1, pp. 19-28.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. (1995). Functions of code switching in esl classrooms: socialising bilingualism in jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 16, No. 3, 173-195. Retrived Agust 4th, 2008 from [www http://www.sosiojournals.edu/mult.173-195/canag-sur.pro.html](http://www.sosiojournals.edu/mult.173-195/canag-sur.pro.html).
- Chaudron, Craig. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cipriani, Fabiana. (2001). Oral participation strategies in the foreign language classroom: an ethnographic account. (2001). *Disertasi (Mestrado em Inglês)*. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Clark, Herbert. H., & Eve V. Clark. (1977). *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cook, Vivian. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. Vol. 57, No 3. Retrived December 11th, 2008 from <http://www.utpjournals.com/jour.ihtml?lp=product/cmlr/573/573Cook.html>.
- Duran, Luis. Toward Better Understanding of Code Switching and Interlanguage in Bilingualism. *Bilinguals Article*. Retrived May 27th, 2008 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/jeilm/vol14/duran.html>.
- Faltis, C. J. (1989). Code-switching and bilingual schooling: An examination of jacobson's new concurrent approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10/2, pp.117-27.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of french. *Working Papers*, 47/2, pp. 59-72.
- Grosjean, François. (1982). *Life With Two Languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, John J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanna Yletinen. (2004). The fuction of code switching in EFL classroom discourse. *Unprinted thesis*. Retrived February 20th, 2009 from [www html version of file http://thesis.jyu.fi/v04/G0000707.pdf](http://thesis.jyu.fi/v04/G0000707.pdf).
- Hymes (eds.) Directions in sociolinguistic code switching: The ethnography of communication. *Journal of Sociolinguistic*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc, 8/2, pp. 407-434.
- Jacobson, R. (1983). *Inter-sentential Codeswitching: an Educationally Justifiable Strategy*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED231/ 221.
- Jorgensen, J.N. (1998). Children's acquisition of code-switching for power-wielding. In Auer, Peter

- (ed) *Code-switching in Conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge, 5/1 pp. 237-258.
- Kovács, Magdolna. (2001). *Code-switching and language shift in Australian Indonesian in comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Lasley., & Kaperzyk. (2006). The implementation of code switching in classrooms. *Journal of sociolinguistic*. Retrived May 17th, 2008 from [www http://www.beiwaionline.com/tutor/2003.collection/liuaichun.html](http://www.beiwaionline.com/tutor/2003.collection/liuaichun.html).
- Lipski, Jhon. (1985). *Linguistic aspect of Spanish-English Language Switching*. Arizona; Center for Latin American Studies.
- Lynch, Brian K. (1996). *Language program Evaluation: theory and Practice*. Oakleigh, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang. (1986). Conversational Structures in the Foreign Language Classroom. In Gabriele Kasper (ed.). *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*. *ELT Journal*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 27/5, pp.11-22.
- Macaro, Ernesto. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84/4, pp.531-548.
- Merritt, Marilyn., Ailie Cleghorn., Jared. Abagi., & grace bunyi. (1992). Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of code switching in kenyan primary classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13/1&2, pp. 103-121.
- Mirja Pietikinen. (1988). Teacher input and the use of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom. *Unprinted Post Graduate Thesis*. University of Jyväskylä. Spain.
- Muysken, Pieter. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. *Sociolinguistic Article*. In L. Milroy, P. Muysken (eds.), pp.177-198.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code Switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Polio, Charlene G. and Patricia A. Duff. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of english and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Teaching*.
- Poplack, Shana. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino Spanol: Toward a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics Journal*, 18, pp.581-618.
- Romaine, Suzanne. (1995). *Bilingualism*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Simon, Diana-lee. 2001. Towards a new understanding of cs in the foreign language classroom. *Bilingualism Journal*. Code switching worldwide II. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 28/3, pp. 311-342.