CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the findings of the present study show that both the teacher and the students employ code switching in EFL classrooms. However, there are differences in their uses of code switching. The students' behavior is understandable as they are not so confident users of English yet; when a problem arises they often resort to Indonesian rather than trying to, for example, rephrase their English utterance (e.g. when clearing a misunderstanding). There is, however, one instance in the data when a student switches from Indonesian to English.

When students employ code switching it is not, however, always because they lack the vocabulary in English to say what they want to say. They may also employ code switching when, for instance, they want to catch the teacher's mean. When English is the mode of instruction, Indonesian jumps out in the context, which suggests that there is perhaps some other reason besides answering the teacher's question, for using Indonesian. In addition, students in Islamic Senior High School want to help the less competent students by codes witching to Indonesian to translate what the teacher has asked a less competent student. These instances reveal that the students are not switching to Indonesian only when they do not know the English words. This suggests that the students know that it is acceptable to use Indonesian in English classrooms. As mentioned above, teachers employ code switching both from English to Indonesian and from Indonesian to

English. When the teacher switches from English to Indonesian her reasons may be to make sure everyone understands what she is saying to them (i.e. explaining) or to check that everyone understands the words in a chapter or in an activity. This is understandable since the teacher's duty is to teach the students an d a part of this teaching is making sure everyone knows what they are supposed to do or understand the chapter they are about to listen to.

Code switching in the EFL classroom can be known from the types of code switching, the types indicate that code switching have some features, the features will make the other understand that code switching is revealed unconsciously. Based on the Saville and Troike theory (2003) stated that code switching divided into two types, (1) inter-sentential which mean that code switching consists of language switches at phrasal, sentence, or discourse boundaries and (2) intra-sentential which mean that code switching involves a shift in language in the middle of a sentence, usually performed without pause, interruption or hesitation. Different from Saville and Troike, Poplack (1980) has different concept of type code switching, Poplack stated that code switching divided into three types (1) inter-sentential, (2) intra-sentential and (3) tag-switching which mean that the code switching including tag, like yes, you know, I like, etc.

When applying Poplack's and Saville-Troike types of codeswitching to EFL classrooms, the findings show that although the categories have originally been used to describe naturally occurring discourse, they can also be found in classrooms. Inter-sentential used by the teacher when explain the material of English, make the students understand what teacher want, in students side inter-

sentential used to clarify what teacher want. Inter-sentential occurs both within a turn and between turns, the latter being the more common situation. Meanwhile, intra-sentential also was used, but it rarely to use. The finding shown that intra-sentential was used by the teacher to make a correction to the students, in students side intra-sentential did not arise. Poplack theory stated that tag-switching is one of the types of code switching, the finding shown that tag-switching often arise when the teacher give assessment from what students done, sometimes it could be an praise word even the notice. Whereas, in students side tag-switching was used to the teacher to say thank about the assessment. In this finding, writer gave the features of the type code switching, (1) inter-sentential, it's a must to finish the sentence and then begin the new one with different language (sentences should have full stop [.]), (2) intra-sentential, it's the switching of language in the middle of sentences and in the same topic, (3) tag-switching all of the switching where the switching was included the tag word.

The findings of the present study have similarities to other studies done on functions of code switching. Canagarajah (1995) found that English is only used for material–based communication, while the mother tongue is reserved for other activities. The findings of the present study support this idea. However, the present study also found that English is sometimes also used for other activities in Indonesian EFL classrooms, for instance, in unofficial interactions or in student initiation, which is contrary to Canagarajah's findings. There was only one instance of both of these functions, still it is noteworthy to discover that English is used in such situations sometimes. This would suggest that the limitations for

using English and the mother tongue in English foreign language are not as strict as they appear to be Jaffna where Canagarajah conducted his study. Merritt et al. (1992) found in their study of the types of codeswitching that codeswitching often functions as an attention getting devicewhich is supported by the present study as well. Both these previous studies also found that English is the formal code while the mother tongue is the informal code. This applies to the present study as well to an extent, since using English has a clear pedagogical function meant that code switching supported teacher-students and students-teacher communication in English classroom whereas Indonesian can also serve a social function (e.g. when comment in Indonesian on an exercise to form a bond between them). Interestingly, even though Canagarajah and Merritt et al. studies have been conducted in an ESL context, there are similarities to EFL classrooms but also differences in the occurrences of code switching. The findings of the current study suggest that code switching is not thought as a forbidden practice or bad behavior. The teachers allow the students to use code switching; they do not indicate verbally that they want the students to use English in certain situations. However, by their own language choices they demonstrate to the students that, for instance, English is the only language in some situations. This is shown by the way the teachers respond in English to a student's Indonesian question or the way they quickly go back to speaking English if they switch to Indonesian.

The findings in this study also to find the features of teacher talk that occurs in code switching, Ur (2009) stated that teacher talk has two features, Teacher' explanation and teacher' feedback. The finding shown that the form of code

switching in teacher' explanation and teacher' feedback indicated that code switching actually was used to make the teacher' communication more fluent to the student by giving some word of assessment (such as good job, well done, yes it's right) and the teacher give the explanation in explaining the material to make the student easiest to understand (e.g. teacher repeat the explanation, ensure that the students give attention, being brief by asking question "understand).

Furthermore, the findings suggest that it is more common to switch from English to Indonesian than the other way around. This would indicate that English is the mode of instruction over half of the time during lessons, both the teachers and the pupils use English in activities, but Indonesian is employed to help facilitate the communication or to make a distinction between the exercise at hand and the other activity (e.g. requesting help). To conclude, Indonesian and English go side by side in EFL classrooms in Finland, both languages seem to have their own functions in the classroom although some functions overlap