

Title
Analysis of Indonesian-English Code Switching Performed by the English
Lecturers in PNUP (Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang)

Author
Shanty Halim

Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang, Makassar-Indonesia

Bioprofiles:

Shanty Halim is an English lecturer at Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang, Makassar-Indonesia. Her research interests include English Teaching and Sociolinguistics. She has a master degree in English Language Studies at Hasanuddin University, Makassar-Indonesia and currently teaching English Skills. She can be reached at shantynurul@yahoo.com.

Abstract

This research is intended to find out the characteristics of Indonesian-English Code Switching used by the English lecturers in PNUP (Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang) in two aspects; the switched segments and types of code switching. The researcher uses both qualitative and quantitative methods. The data are taken from the conversations of the English lecturers when they were chitchatting at SPUP (State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang). Population of the data is the conversations among the lecturers, consisting of 10 hours recording. Of 50 dialogs, the researcher gets 20 dialogs. In terms of the switched segments, it is found noun phrase, single noun, and clauses as the most switched segments occurred. Concerning with the switch points, it is found the combination of Indonesian preposition and English noun phrase as the most occurring combination used by the teachers. Finally relating to the types of code switching, it is found intra-sentential switching as the most type occurred in the teachers' conversation.

Key words: Code switching, switched segments , types of code switching

Comment [RMJ1]: If this is the source of corpus then it is already given that the interlocutors will switch codes as chitchatting is an informal kind of communication. How did the author justify the appropriacy of the given situation (chitchatting) as the source of data (corpus) for this study?

Comment [RMJ2]: More appropriate to use Sources of corpus

Comment [RMJ3]: Author needs to check grammar of the abstract.

Introduction

Language as a communication medium plays a very important role in human activities to communicate meaning, to exchange ideas, feeling or wishes. Using language human can convey ideas to other person, also as one aspect of total communication behavior by which a number of societies can interact to each other. Language is always changing. It is flexible. There are many thousands languages in this world. People used many of them to communicate among others. Of those languages, a person may acquire one or more. The acquisition of various languages, two or three or four brings out language choices to be used in a community.

In the era of globalization nowadays, English is used as one of the most important languages as well as an international language which is used to communicate with people around the world to share knowledge, opinions and ideas through the medium of internet which provide social networking system. The acquisition of two or more languages may make a community become bilingual and multilingual.

One of the phenomena which happens in a bilingual community is code switching, that is the way of speaking that combines two languages in the same sentence or discourse. It is a natural process that often occurs between multilingual speakers who share two or more languages in common. Code switching is not a strange thing for Indonesian people now, especially in big cities. This phenomenon can be much found in electronic medium such as in television, radios, some people like leaders or politician, entertainers, business executives, teenagers or even housewives frequently combine Indonesian and English when they are talking.

In natural conversation among English lecturers at SPUP (State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang), the writer has observed this phenomenon. The lecturers frequently switch their codes in chitchatting, without being aware of it. This seems to happen naturally because the teachers habitually speak English in teaching. That habit could be influencing their way of speaking in conversation. Possible reasons that some lecturers use code switching include marking emphasis and simplifying the message they intend to convey. The following example is taken from one of the teachers' conversation observed by the writer.

1. Lecturer 1: Sis A, besok jadikah kita *visit* Pak M?

Lecturer 2: Jadi, mungkin kita bisa berangkat *after the class* yah at 12 .

Lecturer 1: Ok, nanti kita saling *contact* saja yah.

2. Lecturer 1: Laparma! *I'm so starrving.*

Lecturer 2: *Let's eat then.* Kantin Bu Acha kayanya enak disitu.

Based on the background explained previously, the researcher proposes to identify and evaluate: 1) The switched segments the lecturers code switch, 2) The point where the switch occurs and 3) The types of code switching used by the lecturers in conversation.

In order to observe the code-switching which happens around the lecturers, the researcher listened and recorded tentatively to the conversations carried especially when they have finished teaching, chitchatting, in their daily conversations with others.

The significances of the research are; 1) The findings will give some information for Indonesian people, especially for teachers and sociolinguists in concerning the phenomenon of code switching. 2). The findings will provide a description of pattern of Indonesian-English code switching, especially those who switch their code from Indonesian to English. 3). The study will reveal a natural phenomenon of language development in the society.

Literature Review

There have been several studies on bilingualism and code switching. Arifin (2018) states that although most of studies now have shown the bi/multilingual advantage over their monolingual counterparts, there are also studies that find no coherent evidence of this advantage. Yassi (2003) found 20 patterns of socio-pragmatic functions of Indonesian-English code switching, such as: message repetition, desire to play with a well known English expression, quotation, lack of a set Indonesian word, message neutralization etc. Yassi (2003) also found 5 strategies, which mainly function to harmonize the sentences and utterances whenever the speakers code switch such as: to naturalize the utterances, to avoid repetition, to transform the syntactic function, etc. Zirker (2007) conducted a research on Intrasentential Vs Intersentential Code Switching in early and late bilingual. The result shows that 26 early and late Spanish-English bilingual speakers made acceptability judgments on intra- and intersentential switches. The results also indicate that there is no statistical difference between early and late bilinguals when responding to whether a mix was good or bad, and how good or bad a mix was. There were, however, trends in the results which indicate that early bilinguals may respond faster to

code switches than late bilinguals, suggesting that early and late bilinguals may process language differently.

Meanwhile, Iqbal (2011) shows the findings from Urdu/English code-switching corpus, collected from universities of Lahore city, are presented and analyzed. It is investigated that while making use of code-switching, there is a frequent use of different linguistic features of code-switching between Urdu and English by university teachers. It is found that intra-sentential codeswitching (37.15%) is the leading code-switched area, and code-switching at word (31.21%), clause (21.54%), and phrase (6.42%) level, being a part of inter-sentential code-switching, are the successive areas. On the other hand, inter-sentential code-switching (3.66%) makes the least of it.

A basic concept in sociolinguistics is the speech community. It can be defined as a group of people who habitually interact with each other linguistically (Hudson 1987:25). Further explanation is given by Shridar in McKay and Hornberger (1996:49) speech community is a community sharing knowledge of the rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech. Such sharing consist of knowledge of at least form of speech and knowledge of its patterns of use.

State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang (SPUP) is one of the famous vocational campus in Makassar. In this institution, there are a lot of people get along together. They are coming from different backgrounds. For the English lecturers in SPUP also come from different backgrounds. They are university graduates. They also come from different areas. Some are from Bugis, Toraja, Makassar, and the others are from areas outside South Sulawesi. These different origins give impact to their interaction through language. For instance when they are talking, sometimes they use vernaculars.

Outside the classroom, the lecturers always meet and chat each other. At SPUP, there is no strict rule that all English Lecturers must speak English all the time. However the lecturers possess an awareness that they teach English and it means they have to always use the language. Therefore, when they are in a conversation, they never forget to use English. They mix it with Indonesian or even vernaculars. It happens very often. Beside this awareness, this phenomenon probably can be happened because of the frequent use of English in the classroom. When the lecturers are outside the classroom, consciously or unconsciously they use some expressions from the lesson in their classroom in their conversations.

Code switching may be defined as follows: the use of more than one language by two people engaged in a speech act (Poplack, 1980; Lipski, 1985; Gonzales-Velásquez, 1995; Myusken, 2000 in Zirker, 2007). It can occur between the speakers involved in a conversation or within a speech turn of a single speaker. Code switching can appear on several language levels including syntactic, phonological and morphological levels. Code switching and code mixing as language switch, as one of the communication strategies (Selinker, 1972) cited in Syahri (2001:13). Code switching occurs when bilingual speakers switch from one language to another in the same discourse, sometimes within the same utterances (Myer-Scottort, 1997; cited in Silberstein,2007:103). It involves the alternate use of two languages or linguistic varieties within the same utterance or during the same conversation (Hoffmann, 1991:110). Holmes (1992:51) says, "People who are rapidly code switching tend to switch completely between two linguistic systems - sound, grammar, and vocabulary." Redlinger and Park (1980:339; cited in Hoffmann, 1991:105) say "Language mixing refers to the combining of elements from two languages in a single utterances." Code- mixing occurs when conversant uses both languages together to the extent that they change from one language to the other in the course of a single utterances (Wardhaugh, 1990:103). One criterion that is sometimes offered to distinguish switching from mixing is the grammar of the clause determining the language (Fasold,1984:182). If one uses a word or a phrase from another language, he mixes, not switches. However, if one clause has the grammatical structure of one language and the next is constructed according to the grammar of another, a switch has occurred.

In code switching, one language may be more dominant than the other. It happens when a speaker uses one language mostly than the other in a discourse. The dominant language is termed as "matrix language" while the subdominant one is "embedded language". Thus, for example the speakers of Indonesian-English code switching use Indonesian more than English, then Indonesian is the matrix language (ML) while English is the embedded language (EL). Myers Scotton as found in Bentahila and Davies (1998:30) define the matrix language as "the higher frequency of morphemes in a discourse".

In terms of grammar of code switching, Poplack's study in Jacobson (1998:54) proposed that a model of grammar, which is governed by two constraints, could generate Spanish/English code switching. Firstly, the free morpheme constraint, where the switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the lexical form has been phonologically integrated.

Into the morpheme. Secondly, the equivalence constraint. This constraint predicts that code switches will tend to occur at points where the juxtaposition of elements from the two languages does not violate a syntactic rule of their language. In addition to grammatical constraints of code switching, Gumperz (1998:87:89) proposed permissible switch points, syntactic relationship (Spanish-English code switching) as in the following examples (the segments under consideration are in italics) :

1. Switching is blocked between subject-predicate construction:
 - My uncle sam *is the most Americanized*
2. Switching is blocked between noun complement construction:
 - That's the book *the one that was lost*
3. Switching is blocked between verb-verb complement constructions:
 - You should *go to the field*
4. Conjoined phrases
 - Jhon stayed at home *because his wife was at work*
5. Switching is blocked between verbs of proportional attitude
 - I think he went to the field

From various studies of code switching in the world, Shoji Azuma (1998:117) concluded, the words that can be easily code switched are those that can meaningfully stand-alone. Among them are open class words or content words such as noun, verb, and adjective.

Other segments that easily switched are conjunctions, tags and various phrasal categories (Azuma ; 114-6) as shown in the following examples:

1. Conjunction (Lingala /French)
 - A-li-tu-ambia, THEN tu-ka-enda
 - (he told us, THEN we left)
2. Adverb (Malay/English)
 - Where did you go PETANG INI, Zam?
 - (where did you go this afternoon, Zam?)
3. Adverb and tag (Japanese/English)

Soredakara, ANYWAY, asokode smoked salmon, katta no yo

(so, anyway we bought smoked salmon there)

For Indonesian, English language is a foreign language. Therefore, English is not widely and daily used among the community. The people still have the Indonesian language and vernaculars to be used every day. English is just used in certain situations and by certain personalities.

According to Poplack (2003) and Esen (2016) classified types of code switching into three categories, they are: Inter-Sentential code switching, which the language switch is done at sentence boundaries. This is seen most often between fluent bilingual speakers. For example: *If you are late for the job interview, işe alınmazsın..* the second is intra-sentential code switching, the shift is done in the middle of a sentence, with no interruptions, hesitations or pauses indicating a shift. The speaker is usually unaware of the shift. Different types of switch occur within the clause level including within the word level. Some researchers call it also code mixing. For example: *You are sleepy çoğu zaman, because you spend a lot of saat in your bed..* The last type is extra-sentential, that is there is an insertion of a tag from one language into an utterance that is in another language. For example: Turkish students use some boundary words like *ama* (but) or *yani* (I mean) while speaking English.

Methodology

This research is qualitative as well as a case study. In this research, the writer provides a description on Indonesian-English code switching phenomenon in order to disclose the patterns in terms of grammatical categories use, the switch segments of switching takes place, the switch points where they occurred, and the types of code switching used in the conversations among the English lecturers at SPUP (State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang). The conversations were in various topics such as daily life and career.

The subjects of this research are English Lecturers of SPUP (State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang). There are 10 (ten) English lecturers elected randomly. The population of this research is the conversations which are taken from various topics. Of 50 samples of dialogue that contain switches, the writer randomly draws 20 switches as the sample of the data.

The data were collected through observation, questionnaire, and recording. In observation, the researcher writes down directly the code switching produced by the lecturers in conversation, where the researcher is present. Most of the data are collected through recording, consisting of 10 hours recording session the natural speech of the subject. Consequently, the data obtained in one long recording session were sometimes too small because some teachers switch their codes more frequently while others hardly ever. The questionnaire is needed to support the finding which is analyzed textually. There are twenty respondents who has filled out and returned the questionnaires. The questionnaires have been designed to get the answers of functions for the respondents to switch their codes.

In analyzing data, researcher presents the illustration of the general patterns of syntactic features namely switched segments, switch points and types of Indonesian-English code switching found in the lecturee's conversation at State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang (SPUP). Switched segments of Indonesian-English Code Switching among the Lecturers in Conversation. The data were analyzed by transcribing and sorting out the code switching discourse, then putting them in a tabulated form, consisting of switch segments, switch points and types of code switching. The frequency of occurrences then counted and described.

Findings and Discussion

After analyzing the data, it is found 42 switched segments employed by the lecturers in conversation. It is found ten types of switched segments indicated by the data in lectures's conversation. See table 1, the table details this feature.

No.	Switched Segmnets	Samples Code										Total	%
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	Single N	3	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	28,57
2	NP	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	15	35,71
3	Indep Cl	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	9,52
4	Verb P	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4,76
5	Dep Cl	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2,38
6	Conjunction	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2,38
7	Minor Cl	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4,76
8	Adj P	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4,76
9	Idiomatic	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2,38

	Exp												
10	Prep. P	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4,76
Total												42	100

As can be seen from the table above, the data show that single Noun and Noun Phrase as the most frequent switched segment comprising 64,28% of the data.

1. A: Posisi HEADSTAND itu berat sekali, kak. (Headstand position is quite difficult, sis.)

B: Iya yah..... (No 1, Sp 2-9)

In this example above lecturer A is talking about a kind of sport that is yoga. The word HEADSTAND is one of the pose which becomes famous and widely known, since they became the exercise used in yoga, breakdancing and acrobatics. Even the people who have a very limited English or not at all have used and known the word. The word is rather awkward if it is translated to Indonesian “kepala diatas”, so people prefer to use the former than use the translation.

2. A: Saya orangnya “SIMPLE” dan tidak suka menyusahkan orang lain”. (I’m a simple person and don’t like to make troubles with others)

B: AWESOME (No 2, Sp 3-4)

Here, the conversation is taking in a meeting of English Lecturer. Lecturer “A” is talking about herself to lecturer B. In example no 2 the word SIMPLE has been integrated into Indonesian. This word is written and pronounced “simple”, a little bit different from the English word. The lecturer switch their codes into English when they come to such an expression because the subjects have been familiar enough with those integrated words. The word “awesome” is then mentioned by lecturer B indicates that she feels amazed and as compliment to her friend’s personality.

3. A: Saya suka SELF CONFIDENCEnya, mau tampil ke depan kelas (I like his self confidence for coming in front of the class) (No 3, Sp 1)

In the example above lecturer A is talking about one of the student in her class, switching occurs in Noun Phrase as SELF CONFIDENCE since it is known that English is more practical rather than explain them in long word (Weinrich in Tjalla, 2003:59), therefore she probably prefers to switch them.

4. A: Ke Jepang saja (Just go to Japan)

B: Tapi kayanya mahal itu Kak, I'M AFRAID WE CAN'T AFFORD IT. (but it seems quite expensive, sis) (No 15, Sp 2-1)

5. A: JUST IN CASE dikau lupa kunci lab, ada di lemari saya simpan. (Just in case you forget the lab key, I put it in the cupboard) (No 16, Sp 5).

Code switching then occurs in the form of clauses, i.e independent Cl, dependent Cl, and minor Cl comprising 4,76 % of the data. It is exemplified in 4 (indep Cl), and 5 (minor Cl).

In example no 4, the speakers are talking about general topic; taking vacation. Switching occurs in the form of independent clause, then followed by minor clause in example no 5. It is understandable that they are English lecturers they always use English, they sometimes forget the Indonesian version. It might be happen since they rarely use the language.

The other switched segments which also show a high of occurrences are adjective, prepositional P, and verb P. It is exemplified in sentence 6 (adj), 7 (prep P) and 8 (Verb P).

6. A: Mereka ENTHUSIASTIC banget ikut lomba,.... (They are very enthusiastic in joining the competition). (No 5, Sp 7)

7. A: Kalo saya begitu metodenya, DURING THE CLASS mereka tidak hanya speaking, tapi ada listeningnya juga. (I use the kind of method, during the class they're not only speaking but also listening) (No 6, Sp 3)

8. A: Jangan makan kuenya, SMELLS BAD..... (don't eat the cake, it smells bad).(No 9, Sp 9).

The data found support the previous researchers in which single noun and noun phrase are the most popular switches segment (Tjalla, 2003, Halim 2004). In addition to single noun and noun phrase it is also found clauses. The tendency of the speaker to switch in larger constituents such as clauses is probably caused by their habits. Since the subjects of the research are the English lecturers, they have good ability of English. It is proper when they switch to clauses. Another reason for the lecturer to switch their code in smaller constituents such as noun, noun phrase, adjective, adverb and verb phrase because they found it more convenient, much easier and freely to switch rather than in large

constituent like sentence. It also shows that noun, adjective, adverb and verb are the easiest parts to be switched since they are the basics lessons in English vocabularies. Therefore, the lecturers probably also have good ability in those word classes above.

It is also found the switch of an English idiom which is shown in the following example:

9. A: Ahhh, YOU DON'T BEAT AROUND THE BUSS lha, tak usah bertele-tele. Ada gosip apakah? (you don't beat around the buss, okay? what's the news?) (No 10, Sp 1)
B: Ada deh! Sabar yah, nanti saya cerita detailsnya.

In this example above the conversation occurs between the two lecturers which ask about the news. She is curious about what happened so here the the code switching occurs by using idiom, then it is translated to bahasa Indonesia, for clarifying and emphasizing on the important point she wanted to focus on.

- Switch Points of Indonesian-English Code Swiching among the Lecturers in Conversation

The study has found six combinations of Indonesian-English Code Switching used by the respondents (table 2). In this combination the switch occured between Indonesian preposition and noun phrase is the most frequent switch point, comprising 40% of the data. It is shown in 10 (the segments under consideration are underlined).

10. A: Di Malino bagus UNTUK OUTDOOR (It's better to have outdoor in Malino,....)
B: Tadi kakak bilang (No 5, Sp 2-1)

In the example above, the speaker tends to code switch only the noun rather than preposition "untuk" because it belongs to closed class items, eg determiners, quantifiers, helping verbs, auxiliaries, and tense, cannot be switched.

The other combination of switch point is between English free morpheme and Indonesian bound morpheme, and between preposition and verb, comprising 20% and 13,33 %. It is shown in 11, 12, and 13.

11. A: Itu bapak SENSE OF HUMOURnya tinggi sekali, hahahhaa, saya ketawa terus dengar ceritanya. (that man has a high sense of humour, hahahha, I kept laughing after listening his stories). (No 7, Sp 5)
12. A: Apa ENGLISHnya ini perkedel jagung, yah? (What do you call perkedel jagung in English?)

B: Ohh itu kalo tidak salah corn patty, namanya. (ohh If I'm not mistaken, it's called corn patty). (No 16, Sp 5-10).

13. B: Kayanya susah kalau suruh orang lain yang handle itu. (It's rather difficult if we asked the other person to handle it).

C: Kenapa tidak DIORGANIZE sendiri saja, Kak. (No 14, Sp 8-9)

As can be seen from the example above the switching occurs between English free morpheme humour and Indonesian bound morpheme –nya, which functions as possessor. According to Yassi in (Halim, 2004:17) this is called naturalizing strategy. The suffix –nya plays a crucial role in the sentence in terms of both meaningfulness and naturalness of the sentence. It is arguable that the exclusion of such a suffix from the sentence of the noun phrase will risk the meaning and the naturalness of the sentence.

There are also examples which are similar to Gumperz's study found in the data they are proposed constraint; conjunction must be in the same language as the conjoined sentence and the other proposed constraint; switching is blocked between auxiliary and verb. Gumperz in (Yassi, 2003:198-199). They are exemplified in 14 and 15 below.

14. A: Kenapa itu Jalil sudah dua hari absent dan tidak ada kabar?

B: oh iya, ibu S wali kelasnya toh?

C: Sebaiknya perhatikan kembali RULEnya, WHENEVER A STUDENT DOESN'T COME TO CLASS, HE SHOULD INFORM TO THE CHAIRMAN OR AT LEAST TEXT THE LECTURER. (No 20, Sp 1,3,7)

In the example above the switching WHENEVER functions as the subordinator conjunction. It is support Gumperz' view who states that the conjunction must be in the same code as the conjoined sentence, which means after the subordinator conjunction must be followed by the same language.

15. A: Harusnya kau bilang dulu kalau mau datang, biar kita bisa PREPARE-PREPARE makanan gitu deh...

(You should tell me first if you want to come, so that we can prepare the food) (No 19, Sp 9).

In example no 15 the switching occurs in the form of verb, the English verb is pluralized in the code switching. This also means the matrix language is dominant in Indonesian – English code switching. In communication strategy, this is called compromising strategy (Yassi adapting

Sebba 1998: 12). In order to achieve the goal of communication, the switching occur although the structure is ungrammatical according to the rules of grammar of one of the languages involve in the case of Indonesian – English code switching. Yassi (2003:230) states that the speakers to compromise the Indonesian grammatical system used in the English words regardless of the fact they infringe the grammatical system. This is because the speakers do not have many alternatives to avoid such a violation. The speakers would not switch the code of the plural marker because it belongs to segment that cannot stand alone. As Azuma in Halim(2004: 67) explains, the segment that stand alone cannot be switched.

Table 2 Swich Points

No.	Switch Points	Samples Code										Total	%
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	Prep+NP	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	40,00
2	Eng Free Morp+Indo	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	20,00
3	Prep+V	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	13,33
4	Verb+NP	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	13,33
5	Aux+verb	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6,67
6	Tag+Interrogative Cl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6,67
Total												15	100

-Types of Code Switching

The data also shows the types of code switching used by the lecturers at SPUP (State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang). The English lecturers mostly prefer to make intrasentential switching since it is the most dominant of other types. It comprises of 43,75% of the data. The second larger is intersentential code switching consists of 25% of the data. It is then followed by intralexical 18,75% and tag 12,50%. The intrasentential switching is the most dominant probably because the lecturers found this is easier and more practical also they have at least good knowledge in English.

The examples of both intrasentential and intersentential code switching can be seen below in 16 and 17. (The segments under consideration are underlined).

16. A: Ayomi kita SAVE MONEY TO MAKE OUR DREAMS COME TRUE.... ayo nabung yuk yuk...(Let's save money then, to make our dream comes true). (No 18, Sp 1)
17. A: Itu di Pancious enakny es krimnya. IT'S VERY TEMPTING. (At Pancious the ice cream is so delicious. It's very tempting)

Here the switchings occurs in the form of independent clause. According to Gumperz (1988:78) code switching repetition is used to clarify what is said or to emphasize a point. to make it clear also to avoid misunderstanding, so she repeats the English expression in the Indonesian's equivalences.

The followings are intralexical in no 18, while tag switching are exemplified in 19 and 20.

18. A: Ehh ada PRINCESSnya Kak S datang! Sama siapa nak? (Ehh here comes the princess of Kak S! With whom do you come, dear? (No 17, Sp 10)

Here the speaker uses switching in the form of Noun. In Indonesian the word princess sometimes is used for calling the daughter. The speaker tends to qualify the message and specified it by addressing her friend's daughter.

19. A: Barusan datang ke pesta makanannya habis. Pestanya petinggi di sini lagi. (I've just come to a party and they ran out of the food.

B: Ahh REALLY? ARE YOU KIDDING ME? (No 23, Sp 2-3)

The conversation in no 19 is about going to party, here the speaker seemed to be annoyed because she came to the party and did not have some meals there, the lecturer B then replied by switching at the form of idiom which referred to surprising that she could not believe the situation happened at the party.

20. A: YOU KNOW, mereka sebenarnya tahu kondisinya begitu, tapi mereka diam saja. (You know, they actually realize the condition, but they just keep silent) (No 25, Sp 10).

Here the switch occurs in the form of simple clause. You know is as filler which also means that the speaker has some kind of shared knowledge with his/her interlocutor.

Table 3 Types of Code Switching

No.	Types of Code Switching	Samples Code										Total	%
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	Intrasentential	3	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	14	43,75

2	Intersentential	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	8	25,00
3	Tag	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	12,50
4	Intralexical	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	18,75
Total												32	100

Conclusions

First, in the discussion of the switched segments, it is found noun phrase, single noun and clauses as the most frequent switched segments. The clauses are independent clause, dependent clause, and interrogative clause. This led to the conclusion that since the subjects of this research are English lecturers, they have good ability of the language. English is their environment, they always use to teach to the students. It is proper for them to switch to the larger constituent like clause. The more frequent the use of English will form a habitual use of English. Therefore, the speakers tend to switch words in phrases and clauses.

Second, in terms of the switch points, it is found between Indonesian preposition and English Noun Phrase and between English free morpheme and Indonesian bound morpheme.

Third, in terms of types of code switching, it is found four types that are used by the speakers: intrasentential, intersentential, tag and intralexical switching. This led to the conclusion that probably the lecturers found this is easier and more practical.

In the discussion of the function of code switching by the speakers, it is found; to use English words in general/daily life, to repeat message, to neutralize expressions, to show tendency to use the integrated words, and to qualify message. This led to the conclusions that in delivering their message, the lecturers have certain purposes during the interaction. To sum up the concluding points above, the writer synthesized that the teachers employed Indonesian-English code switching; they have certain grammatical features which denote certain social meaning during their interaction.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, Muhammad Ahkam. 2018. Bilingualism: The Beneficial and Contradictory Findings. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20 (5): 264-275
- Auer, pater 1998. *Code switching in Conversation*. Routledge: New York
- Azuma, Shoji, 1998. *Meaning and form of code switching*. In Rodolfo Jacobson (ed) code switching. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The sociolinguistics of Language*. Basil Blackwell Inc: New York.
- Gumpers, J. J. 1988. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Halim, Shanty 2004. *Conversational Functions of Indonesian-English Code Switching among the Teachers in MANELS English Course*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar. Postragraduated Studies Program. Hasanuddin University.
- Huddleston , Rodney. 1988. *English Grammar : An Outline*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, R.A 1980: *Sociolinguistics* . Cambridge, London, New York Melbourne, Sydney : Cambridge University press.
- Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1998. *Conveying a Broader Message Through Bilingual Discourse. An Attempt at Contrastive Code Switching Research*. In Rodolfo Jacobson (Ed). Code Switching Worldwide. Berlin: Mounon de Gruyter
- 1998. *Code Switching World Wide*. Berlin: Luderitz and Beur.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1996. *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge university Press .
- Mc Kay, Sandra Lee and Hornberger, Nancy H. 1996. *Sociolinguistic and Language teaching Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.

- Nishimura, Maiwa. 1993. *A Functional Analysis of Japanese/English code Switching*. Journal Of Pragmatics.
- Rusdiah, 2003. *Conversational Code Switching among Teachers and students*. Unpublished Proposal. Makassar : Program Pascasarjana.
- Seliger, Herbert and Shohamy, Elana, 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suganda, Lingga A. 2012. Code Switching and Code Mixing Done by the Teachers of SMA Kusuma Bangsa Palembang. *Jurna Holistics* Vol 4 No 7 Juni 2012
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1993. *Common and Uncommon ground : Social and Structural factors in code Switching*. A journal. Cambridge University Press.
- _____, and Ury W. 1977. *Bilingual Strategies: The Social Function of code Switching*. Linguistics Journal.
- Skiba, Richard. 1997. Code Switching as a Language Countenance Interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. III, No. 10. Accessed on 12 Maret 2017
- Tjalla, Maghdalena, 2003. *An Analysis of Indonesian-English Code Switching of Radio Broadcasters*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar. Postgraduated Studies Program. Hasanuddin University.
- Wei, Li 1998. *The Why and How Questions in the Analysis of Conversational Code Switching*. In Peter Auer (Ed) *Code Switching in Conversation language, Interaction and Identity*. London :Routledge
- Yassi, A.Hakim. 2000. *Code switching as a Communication strategy in Indonesia-English Bilingual Discourse; A Discourse Analysis*. Unpublised Proposal: Makassar: Postgraduate Studies Program. Hasanuddin University.
- _____. 2003. *Code Switching as A Communication Strategy in Indonesian-English Bilingual Discourse*. Unpublished Dissertation. Makassar. Postgraduate Studies Program. Hasanuddin University.

Zirker, Kelly Ann Hill, "Intrasentential vs. Intersentential Code Switching in Early and Late Bilinguals" (2007). *All Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 927.
scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article...etd accessed on 10 Juli 2017