DAFTAR ISI

THE USE OF CODE-SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AT STATE POLYTECHNIC OF SRIWIJAYA

Muhammad Nadjmuddin

English Department State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya
Email: mnadjmuddin@yahoo.co.id

Abstarct : This article discusses the usage of Bahasa Indonesia (BI) in EFL classrooms of State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya (Polsri). The first objective of this study was to examine the language use in the classroom instruction, in particular, the use code-switching (CS) and code-mixing (CM) and linguistic factors of the utterances as well as the functions of using CS and CM by the lecturers. Another purpose was investigating the subjects' perception on the use of CS and CM. This case study collected data from four lecturers and their students in English Department, Polsri. The analysis of the classroom corpus identified seven communication functions in the lecturers' speeches. The findings of this study also revealed that there were different levels of agreement and disagreement on whether a lecturer should use of CS and CM in the EFL classes. Based on the data collected from the subjects' responses to the questionnaire, this study concluded that CS and CM were aimed at increasing the efficiency of information conveyed. CS and CM are necessary communicative strategies for lecturers to achieve teaching goals, in particular, involving the students who lack English proficiency.

Key words: code switch, mix, linguistic factors, functions

INTRODUCTION

Interaction between learners and teachers is one of determinant aspects affecting learning success. Nunan (1991:37) preserves that a teacher's ability to plan and manage the interaction is necessary to achieve learning goals. The failure in interaction may cause misconception and failure in accomplishing studying objectives. One of the important classroom interaction is lecturers' talks. Regarding this issue, Marzulina (2010) states that in a language class, verbal communication is the most obvious. As the main resource and model, students expect that their lecturers know everything and must provide perfect models.

To deliver their ideas or knowledge, lecturers must be able to communicate effectively. The communication is effective if it can create comprehension between lecturers and students. However, many students have too low English proficiency to understand the lectures. As responsible lecturers, they must have appropriate strategies to help students understand the idea or concept. When the students find it difficult to understand the explanation in English, the lecturers resort to the use of Indonesian words and expressions. Translation technique is normally used to clarify foreign language items in an utterance by providing clarification in CS and CM. Although the presence of this language form in the explanation is partial, it helps clarify the meaning of difficult English words.

Indonesia is multilingual nation in which its people speak several vernaculars and BI. BI is used as a national language, and English is used as a foreign language. Like other English classes with multilingual students, English classes in Indonesia often use CS and CM in the instructional communication. The most common form of CS and CM used by the lecturers was that between Bahasa Indonesian and English language.

Students at Polsri learn English in most semesters of the total six semesters. The use of English as a medium of instruction is expected to be the main exposure to the target language. In some brief interviews with several lecturers of English Department at Polsri, the writers found that CS and CM are common phenomena in the English classrooms. These language forms, as parts of communication media, need to be investigated due to their important role as learning inputs.

All of the lecturers of English at Polsri have been trained and graduated from their graduate study in English education. It is assumed that the lecturers do not have any problem

to use English as an instructional medium in their classrooms. However, in their factual communication with students, the lecturers frequently use CS and CM. The use of BI in the utterances raised questions about the motivation of the lecturers in using CM and CS as well as linguistics factors in the utterances. In the light of this, the problem of this study was formulated in the following questions: (1) What linguistic factors can be found in the lecturers' utterances?; (2) What are the functions of CS and CM in English classes?; (3) What are the students' perception towards the use of CS and CM?; What are the teachers' perception towards the use of these language forms?

So far relatively little has been done to study CS and CM in Bahasa Indonesia-English contexts with a qualitative approach. The present case study was aimed at filling this gap by using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

The findings can contribute to answer linguistic phenomena regarding the use of switched and mixed codes by students and teachers. The findings can be of paramount significance to the lecturers of English in terms of the role of English, in particular, in State Polytechnic of Sriwijaya and in tertiary instructional settings in general.

Language is a main media of communication and people will find it difficult to communicate without language (Cakrawati, 2011). The character, dynamic of language and how people interact in society as well as the role of language within a society is explored through sociolinguistic studies (Fishman, 1980). Furthermore, Holmes (1992) emphasizes that linguistics is concerned with the social aspects of language in a community in which people interact using the language. Linguistics are interested in "the relationship between language and society" (Holmes, 1992:1), including the study of different ways of speaking and language alteration such as CS and CM (Holmes, 1992:34-50).

Code Switch and Code Mixing

CS is the combination of words, phrases and sentences from two languages simultaneously or interchangeably in a single unitary interaction (Bokamba, 1989). Gumperz (1982) defines CS as the use of two or more codes or languages within a single speech event. CS can take some forms such as words, phrases, clauses and complete sentences (Hudson,1996 & Holmes, 1991). Wardhough (1990: 104) and Poplack (1980) point out that Hymes (1971) states that CS is an alternative use of two or more languages in one communication event. (Hymes, 1971; Milroy & Muysken, 1995). Similarly, Bokamba (1989) holds that CS is the combination of words, phrases and sentences from two languages simultaneously or interchangeably in a single speech.

Bokamba (1989) states that CM is fixations of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphem), words (unbound morphems), phrase and clauses. It happens because the speakers try to match what they hear with what they understand. Wardhough (1990:104) supports this opinion suggesting that CM is a phenomena in which an expression from one language is used based on the structure from another language. Furthermore, Leung (2010) defines CM as a combination of two or more linguistic units from two different languages in a sentence. This concept is supported by Heller (1988:1) who contends that CM is the use of two or more languages in one episode of communication.

Indonesia is the country in which multi ethnicities and many tribes live together harmoniously that allows dynamic interactions and communications between people who speak different languages. The effects of this type of communication, among others, are language alteration such as CS and CM. A bilingual or multilingual community tends to use the languages simultaneously in one communication event.

Many empirical studies showed that in language learning classes with bilinguals and multilingual students the interactions between students and teachers were rarely in monolingual. Several studies have revealed that CS and CM occurred in bilinguals and multilingual speakers (Nababan, 1993:13). Thus, CS and CM are common practices

(Flowerdew & Miller, 1992; Martin, 2005; Arthur & Martin, 2006; Mahadhir & Then, 2007; Warsiti, 2011). Burden (2001) reported the result from his study on the use of L1 in English classrooms that the Japanese students needed an explanation in L1 on some occasions. Furhermore, he concluded that teachers need to know when they should use L1in their teaching.

The occurrences of CS and CM should be regarded as a natural learning process. When fluent bilingual speakers of various languages make conversation, they often include words, phrases, clauses and sentences from different languages in a single discourse.

Communication among the speakers of English as a foreign language is a complex process and to communicate effectively people require strategies. This study assumed that CS and CM done by the lecturers were strategies for the purpose of effective communication. Taron (1983) (cited in Syahri, 2001) asserts that language switch is one communication strategies frequently employed by bilingual speakers. The use of CS enhanced instruction in ESL setting not only by insuring understanding and two-way communication between teachers and students, but also by building rapport with the students so that they could communicate in the class and let them speak in whatever language(s) they could express.

Some studies have suggested the effect of social environments on the use of CS and CM. Shin (2010) investigated the functions of CS at a Korean Sunday school in the United States. The study showed that some social interactions could lead the use of CS. A study conducted by Ugot (2010) suggested that language choice, CS and CM in multilingual Biase in Cross River State, Nigeria were influenced by social situations and environments. Redouane (2005) and Ayeomoni (2006) examined the effects of social environment in Canada affected CS and CM used by Morocco immigrants. Redouane (2005) reported switch patterns and syntactic aspects in the bilingual utterances of French-Arabian speakers, Moroccan descents living in Canada. Other study (Arifin & Husin, 2011) revealed some differences in the students' perceptions on the use of CS and CM.

Berlinawati (2009). implied that to some degree miscommunication between teachers and learners occurred due to the lack of understanding about what the teachers are explaining. As a consequence the teachers use CS and CM during their interactions or teaching activities. The teachers switch the language or mix the target language and their first language so that the word the students find it difficult to understand can be explained in the first language.

Language Alteration as a Strategy

Taron (1983) (cited in Syahri, 2001:17-210) holds that CS is a communication strategy. Unlike traditional perspective which considered CS as a defected language form resulted from interference processes and should be avoided, today's experts and educators believe that this language form should be accepted in English teaching and it is considered as a communication strategy (Corder, 1981).

CM may be used to gain both a linguistic/conceptual purpose and other multiple communicative purposes (Gysels, 1992). In many bilingual communication occasions, in which a speaker combine two or more languages in one communication event without any demanding situation, CM is unavoidable.

The success of using CS and CM as a communicative strategy or a teaching methodology remains debatable. Tarone (1983) (cited in Syahri, 2011: 9) holds that CS is a communication strategy. Gabusi (2007) states that CS is one of useful communication strategies in class interactions and similarly, Kachru (1978) holds that CM is use tool for effective communication. Cole (1998) asserts that the teacher's use of L1 in FL class can help explain complex instructional materials. An investigation of learners' code-switching conducted by Arnfast and Jorgensen (2003) shows how a bilingual competence among learners within the first year of intensive training could be developed through code-switching.

Unlike the aforementioned studies, Watson (2005) reported her research findings suggesting that the use of code-switching was not always a wholly successful communication strategy.

METHODOLOGY

The subjects of this study were lecturers of English and their students in English Department, Polsri. All of them were vernacular-Indonesian bilinguals. The students, had qualifications equivalent to the fifth University semester, were between 18 and 20 years.

A case study was used in this study because it could yield wholly and deep data Tellis (1997). Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to achieve the aims of the study. Qualitative data were collected in an attempt to understand a range of different utterances, language contacts and communicative functions, and such data are diverse and laborious to classify. A questionnaire in BI using Likert Scale was designed to collect quantitative data finding out from the students the perceptions on the use of CS and CM. In addition, CS and CM used by the lecturers in English classes were also investigated by asking all subjects to answer open ended questions in interviews after the classes. The semi-structured interviews with four lecturers were used to confirm what the lecturers actually did in the classes regarding CS and CM.

This study employed both qualitative and quantitative data analyses methods comprising not only frequency counts of the instances of idea units in the speeches but also questionnaire tabulations. For instance, to count the frequency of the functions in the utterances, first the transcribed utterances were analyzed qualitatively by inferring the markers in each instance of these markers in the corpora. Secondly, the instances were counted. Then, the function of each CS or CM was described qualitatively. The same procedure was followed in analyzing the linguistic factors. The analyses focused on the identification of morphemic and lexicogrammatical features of the corpus.

The first set of data processing activities involved a variety of primary qualitative data collected through recordings and observations. The data set consisted of verbatim typed transcripts of recordings and field notes made by the writer during class observations.

After the qualitative data collection activities, several processing steps were conducted to organize and understand them. The first of these processing steps was to fragment the whole transcripts into idea units to search the idea units for functions, to develop analytical categories, and to classify the idea units accordingly. The function of CS and CM use in each utterance were then interpreted adopting the classification of communicative functions developed by Gumperz (1982). The descriptive categories were simply a list of functions and the excerpts which were retrieved from long lectures by three lecturers. The transcripts were gained from approximately four hours of audio recording taken in four classrooms by the two researchers. Some examples of excerpts were provided in Table 1 to help explain what each function is. Finally, two sets of analytical categories for language aspects were devised to help classify the data into vocabulary and grammar aspects.

The second data processing step was a set of activities in which data on students and teachers' perception regarding the use of CM and CS in the questionnaire were quantified. The quantitative data consist of the percentages of questionnaire responses presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

DISCUSSION

There are seven functions identified in this study. The functions are, repetition, translation, ease of expressions, socializing and linguistic competence and insecurity, presented here only for the purpose of illustrating that CM and CS conveys information

which enhances communication within a classroom context. The instances of the functions were counted to find the percentages of each function in the utterances. The function of each CS or CM is described qualitatively below after the following table.

Table 1. The Functions of CM and CS

Function	Lecturer	Examples (Excerpts from three lectures)	%
1. Repetition	1	*-Number five Agung ya?* *-So, read the strategy, strategy C ya?* *-You have to look at the location, ya the location.*	15.50
2. Elaboration	2	*-And then your less favourite yang kurang disenangi jadi kalo favorite you like the subject very much but you hate the subject your less favorite.* *-May be the place where you were born, mungkin kamu masukkan tempat lahir, it is the name of the city.* *-Kata pertama dalam kalimat, the person I, jadi eventhough I in the middle of the sentence should be in the capital letter walau di tengah kalimat itu I selalu huruf besar.*	17.20
3. Translation	1	*-We have chronological order kan? And we have special order disana.* *-Anything that happen, terus apa, kejadian atau peristiwa?*	14.60
	2	*-Subject is your pelajaran.* *-But not title with a name jadi ada exception ada pengecualian*	
	3	*-From this perspective, we can see that animal communication is not a language. Jadi dari definisi ini bisa kita simpulkan bahwa komunikasi binatang tidak menggunakan bahasa.*	
4. Ease	1	*-Object is quite difficult kan?* *-At the end of your presentation, ya kan?*	20.22
	2	*-Tanda baca mechanicitu, punctuation kapan when you should use your capital letter, comma, colon, semi colon, titik dua apa titik koma?* *-Mau di print sekarang itu ke perpustakaan silahkan.*	
	3	*-Dia hanya menggunakan sign, menggunakan tongue without communication.* *-Jadi, animal communication is very simple.*	
5. Socializing	1	*-Keep… maksudnya apa itu?* *-Ya, you have to discuss point per point, ya kan, itu ya?*	19.10
	2	*-Jadi buat pertanyaan sendiri datanya yang ada di diri kamuand then you answer them the questions?* *-Capitalization has so many rules in English, dalam Bahasa Inggris?*	
	3	*-Jadi buat pertanyaan sendiri datanya yang ada di diri kamu and then you answer them the questions?* *-Capitalization has so many rules in English, dalam*	

		Bahasa Inggris?	
6. Owing to teacher's linguistic competence and insecurity	1	*Terus…okey. So we in ini apa in structuring*	5.61
	2	*First, after this you can continue your work liat dulu ini penjelasannya*	
	3	*Jadi dia tidak bisa membicarakan kondisi sekarang, tidak bisa berbicara di luar konteksyang dia bicarakan.. karena membicarakan future*	
7. Others	1	*So, ini apa?*	6.74
	2	*And then don't forget about the mechanic, ibu Tiur sudah jelaskan mungkin.*	
	3	*Jadi kalau bahasa itu bukan jadi kebiasaan Anda berarti belum menjadi bahasa and then language is subconsciously.*	

Functions

Repetitive function was used when the lecturer wanted to emphasize or underscored an idea in the alternate language. Elaboration function occurred when details or additional information were given in the alternate language. Translation function was utilized when an English utterance was translated into BI. Ease function was used to overcome the language barrier or make an expression more meaningful. Socializing function was aimed at establishing goodwill and rapport. A function related to teacher's linguistic competence and insecurity is filling in the gap of the utterances with words in native language in order to maintain the fluency.

Ease was most frequently used to clarify foreign language items in an utterance. The expressions of ease such as "*ya kan?*" and "*Jadi…*" were added in the sentences. The next dominant functions found in the expressions were elaboration, repetition and translation functions amounting to 17.20%, 15.50% and 14.60 % consecutively. Although the alternate codes regarding the lecturers' linguistic competence and insecurity in the utterances were minimal, they helped manage the flow of communication.

Individual use of CM and CS

The percentages of the occurrences of CS and CM from the total lectures in the classroom amount to 21.3 % and 33.10 % consecutively. The analysis of the idea units suggests the relative high percentage of BI words have been inserted into the English utterances by the first lecturer. The second lecturer used less CS and CM than the first lecturer. The third lecturer used the least while the fourth lecturer did not use any CM and CS at all. Table 2 shows that CM (78.04%) is used significantly more than CS by the first lecturer.

Table 2. The Use of CS and CM

Lecturer (L)	Code Switch (%)	Code Mixing (%)
L1	17.07	78.04
L2	35.48	14.51
L3	4.76	16.66
L4	-	-

Linguistic factors

The next analyses focused on the identification of morphemic and lexicogrammatical features of the corpus. The analysis process found two main linguistic factors namely vocabulary and grammar.

Aspect of Vocabulary

L1: *Object is quite difficult kan*?

The lecturer did code mixing by saying *Bahasa Indonesia kan*? The English sentence should be "Object is quite difficult isn't it?"

L3: *Jadi animal communication is very simple*.

The word jadi is code mixing which was intended to substitute so.

Aspect of Grammar

L2: *Try out, we skip them and then also you should learn by yourself dipelajari sendiri page 10, sentence structure may be just read.*

In this code-mixed sentence, the active voice "you should learn by yourself" was changed into a passive voice "dengan dipelajari sendiri".

Answers to Questionnaire

Additional data were collected from the lecturers who, in a questionnaire and during interviews, gave their perspectives on several questions relating to the use of CS and CM. The questionnaire asked the four lecturers, for example, about their teachings, students' level of English proficiency, comprehension difficulty, reason and purpose of using CS and CM.

Table 3. The Use of CS and CM

Description	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Teaching English is difficult	1	1	1	1	1
2. English is important for your teachings				2	2
3. Teaching English is enjoyable				4	
4. Your students' English is fluent		1	3		
5. You can speak English well			1	3	
6. Your pronunciation is clear				4	
7. English is used as a medium of instruction				4	
8. You speak BI in the class			2	2	
9. Your students have difficulty in understanding your English teaching			1	1	2
10. Your students can understand the materials better if you switch English into BI			2	2	
11. You switch English into BI			2	2	
12. You mix English and BI				2	
13. Code switch and code mixing help your students understand the learning materials			1	3	

N=4

When asked about their difficulty in teaching, the four lecturers gave different levels of agreement and disagreement. Most lecturers believed that CS and CM were needed by low proficient students for understanding complex ideas. However, one of the lecturers disagreed with the use of CS and CM in relation to students' access to English inputs. The data also indicate, for example, that the lecturers switched and mixed languages in different frequencies to help their students understand the learning materials. The students reported their uses of CS and CM in the classrooms with their lecturers by saying that CS and CM in their utterances were helpful. This study found that the functions of CS and CM identified in the classrooms were similar to what had been previously reported in other previous studies.

Table 4. The Percentage of Responses to Questionnaire
by the Students

Description	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. English is difficult		17.7 %	22.2%	40%	20%
2. English is important for your career		-	11.1%	26.6%	62.2%
3. English is enjoyable.		-	15.5%	71.1%	13.3%
4. Your lecturers' English is fluent		8.8%	26.6%	48.8%	15.5%
5. You can speak English well			8.8%	66.6%	24.44%
6.Your lecturers' pronunciation is clear			28.8%	57.7%	13.3%
7. English is used as a medium of instruction	-	-	22%	64.4%	13.3%
8. You lecturers' speak BI in the class	-	4.44%	26.6%	64.4%	4.44%
9. You have difficulty in understanding your lecturers' English teaching.	--	11.1%	31.1%	42.2%	15.5%
10. You can understand the materials if your lecturers switch English into BI.	-	17.7%	15.5%	44.4%	22%
11. You lecturers switch English into BI.	-	17.7%	35.5%	35.5%	11.11%
12. You lecturers' mix English and BI.	-	8.8%	13.3%	53.3%	24.44%
13. CS and CM help you understand the learning materials	-	13.3%	26.6%	31.1%	28.8%
14. You agree with the use of CS and CM.	11.1	20%	44.4%	24.44%	-

N=45

Table 4 compares the data collected from questionnaire presenting 14 items under study in percentages. A first major trend was that English was enjoyable. Another trend shows that 66.6% respondents agreed that their English was fluent. It is followed by the percentage of the respondents who agreed that their lecturers used both BI and English in the English classes amounting to 64 % of the total respondents. The same trend to emerge from this study was that the students claimed that their English was fluent which accounted for 64.4% of the total respondents. The percentages of the students who agreed with the use of CS and CM were between 20% and 44 %. The students gave different levels of agreement on the statement whether CS and CM helped them understand the learning materials which accounted for 13.3%, 26.6%,31.1% and 28.8% of the total data respectively

CONCLUSION

The CS and CM forms used by the lecturers were between BI and English. When the students found it difficult to understand the explanation in English adequately, the lecturers resorted to the use of CS and CM. In the interview, most lecturers believed that CS and CM were needed by low proficient students for understanding complex ideas. However, the use of CS and CM may cause a problem. One of the lecturers disagreed with the use of CS and CM in relation to students' access to English inputs. Main exposure to English input is via the lecturers of English. This condition demanded that lecturers used English as much as possible in the classrooms and they must be aware of the disadvantage of overuse of first language in English classes.

This study indicates that lecturers faced a dilemma in using CS and CM and it also shows how complex language learning is in Polsri. Finally, it is suggested that L1 is used in the right way so that CS and CM will help lecturers reach their instructional objectives.

REFERENCES

Arnfast, J.S. and Jorgensen, J.N. (2003). Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 23-53.

Arifin, K & Husin, M.S. (2011). Code Switching and Code Mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in Content-Based Classrooms: Frequency and Attitudes. *The Linguistics Journal,* 5(1), 220-247 (Online), accessed on December 10[th,] 2012 [http://www.linguitics-journal .com/june-2011-ka.pdf on 10]

Arthur, J. & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing Lessons in Postcolonial Classrooms: Comparative Perspectives from Botswanaand Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, *42*(2), 177-202.

Ayeomoni, M.O. (2006). Code-Switching and Code-Mixing: Style of Language Use in Childhood in Yoruba Speech Community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 15*(1), 90-99.

Berlinawati, L. D. (2009). *Pengaruh kemampuan Logika dan Komunikasi antara Guru dengan Siswa terhadap presentasi belajar Akuntansi kelasX SMK Muhammadyah 2 Surakarta Tahuan Ajaran 2007/2008*. Skripsi. Universitas Surakarta.

Bokamba, E. (1989). Are Syntatic Constraints on Code Mixing? *World Englishes 8(3).*

Brown. H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles. Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Burden, P. (2000). The use of the students' mother tongue in monolingual English "Conversation" classes at Japanese universities. *The Language Teacher, 24*(6), 5-11.

Cakrawarti, Dias Astuti. (2011). *Analysis of Code Switching and Code Mixing in the Teenlit Canting Cantiq by Dyan Nuranyndya*.Unpublished Thesis. Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University. Semarang.

Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 25 (4):5-9.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. London: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. 1980. "Prefatory Notes". *Languages in Contact and Conflict XI*. Ed. P. H. Nelde. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1992). Approaches to research on second language lecture comprehension. *RELC Journal, 23*(2), 61-79.

Gabusi, V. (2007). *Code-Switching Uses: The Focus on the Teacher-Applied Analysis in a High School Context.* (Online), accessed on September 12th 2010. [http://www.facli.unibo.it/NR/rdonlyres/..A2 FB../Tesinadi Valentina-Gabusi.pdf]

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

Gysels, M. (1992). French in Urban Lubumbashi Swahile: Code-switching, borrowing or both? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13, 41-56.

Heller, M. (1988). *Code Switching*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmes, J. (1992). *Introduction to Linguistics*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1971).*Introduction to [[part III] in Pidginisation and Creolization of languages*. Edited by D Hymes: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. (1978). Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In J. Alatis (ed.). *International dimension of bilingual education*. pp. 25-52. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Leung, C. (2010). Code-Mixing in Print Advertisement and its Cultural Implications in Hongkong. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 12(3)*, 417-429.

Mahadhir, M., & Then, C. O. (2007). Code-switching in the English language classrooms in Kuching secondary schools. *Sarawak Museum Journal*, Special Issue No. 7 on Social Sciences and Humanities, LXTV(85), 197-219.

Martin, P. (2005). Safe language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia. Tensions between policy and practice. In A.M. Lin and P.W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalization: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 74-97), Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters

Marzulina, L. (2010). Lecturer's Roles and Communicative Functions in English Education Study Program Classroom of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. Thesis. English Study Program. Graduate School. Sriwijaya University.

Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (1995). Introduction: code switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspective on code switching* (pp. 1-14). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nababan. (1983). *Sosiolinguistik: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Nunan, D. (1991). Methodological issues in classroom research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 2.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol Towards a Typology of Codeswitching. *Linguistics 18(7/8), 581-618.*

Rahmat, J (1999). *Psikologi Komunikasi*. Bamdung: Remaja Rosda Karya

Redouane, R (2005) Linguistic Constraints on Codeswitching and Codemixing of

Bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French Speakers in Canada Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism. Somerville: Cascadilla Press. (Online), accessed on December 10th, 2012 [http://www.lingref.com/isb/4/149ISB4.PDF]

Syahri, I (2011). *Conversational Communicational Strategies in Teacher-Trainee Interactions in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*. Thesis English Study Program. Graduate School. Sriwijaya University.

Tarone, E. (1983) "Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy'." In Færch, C. & G. Kasper (eds) (1983). 61-74.

Tellis. W. (1997, September). Application of a case study methodology [81 paragraphs]. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], *3*(3). (Online), accessed on December 10th, 2012 [http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html]

Ugot, M. (2010). Language choice, code-switching and code-mixing in Biase. Global Journal of Humanities, 8 (2), 27-35.

Watson, G. (2005). A Model for the Functional Interpretation of Code-Switching in NNS-NS Contact Situations. Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism. Cascadilla Press: Somerville, MA.

Wardhaugh, R. 1990. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, New York: Blackwell.

Warsiti, S. (2011). *Alih Kode pada Wacana Iklan Komersil Media Massa Cetak Terbitan Palembang*. Thesis. Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa. Program Pasca Sarjana. Universitas Sriwijaya.