

FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES OF CODE SWITCHING BY BAJO STUDENTS IN ENGLISH FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

KATEGORI FUNGSI ALIH KODE SISWA BAJO DALAM KELAS PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA INGGRIS SEBAGAI BAHASA ASING

Lalu Erwan Husnan

Kantor Bahasa Nusa Tenggara Barat
Jalan Lingkar Selatan, Karang Pule, Ampenan, NTB, Indonesia
Telepon (0370) 623354, Faksimile (0370) 626297
Pos-el: lalu.erwan@kemdikbud.go.id

Naskah diterima: 15 Juli 2016; direvisi: 3 November 2016; disetujui: 18 November 2016

Abstract

This research discusses functional categories of codeswitching in English Foreign Language (EFL) classroom by Bajo students at MTs NW Nurul Ihsan Tanjung Luar village. Bajo students use Bajo, Sasak, and Indonesian (multilingual) in their daily communication. They bring their languages into their English classroom when they meet other students who come from other ethnic backgrounds and are only able to speak Sasak and Indonesian. This study is aimed at finding out the functional categories of codeswitching in Bajo's EFL classroom. Data are collected using observation, interview, and recording method. Method used to analyze the data is descriptive-qualitative by labeling, transcription, classification, and simple descriptive statistic. Result of this research shows that the highest functional categories of codeswitching in the form of pupils' comment as much as 44% with 129 instances, categorized into less dominant. Grammar explanation is 20% with 58 instances, categorized into not dominant. The other categories are categorized into not dominant. Most of the functional categories of codeswitching use Indonesian as much as 50,68% with 148 instances, categorized into dominant, while English is about 34,59% with 101 instances, categorized into less dominant. The other two languages, Bajo is about 8,22% and Sasak is about 6,51%, are not dominant.

Keywords: functional categories, codeswitching, Bajo, EFL classroom

Abstrak

Penelitian ini membahas masalah kategori fungsi alih kode siswa Bajo MTs NW Nurul Ihsan dalam kelas bahasa Inggris di Desa Tanjung Luar. Siswa Bajo menggunakan bahasa Bajo, Sasak, dan Indonesia (multilingual) dalam komunikasi sehari-hari. Siswa membawa kemampuan berbahasanya ke dalam kelas bahasa Inggris ketika bertemu dengan siswa lain dengan latar belakang etnik lain yang hanya mampu berbahasa Sasak dan Indonesia. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan kategori fungsi alih kode siswa Bajo di kelas bahasa Inggris. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan metode observasi dan interviu dengan teknik rekam. Metode yang digunakan dalam analisis adalah deskriptif-kualitatif dengan teknik pelabelan, pentranskripsian, pengklasifikasian, dan penghitungan dengan hitungan sederhana. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan kategori fungsi alih kode sebagian besar dalam bentuk komentar siswa (pupils comment) sebanyak 44% dengan 129 bukti, tergolong kurang dominan. Kategori penjelasan tata bahasa (grammar explanation) sebanyak 20% dengan 58 bukti, tergolong tidak dominan. Kategori lainnya tergolong tidak dominan. Sebagian besar kategori fungsi alih kode menggunakan bahasa Indonesia sebesar 50,68% dengan 148 bukti, tergolong dominan, sedangkan bahasa Inggris sebesar 34,59%

dengan 101 bukti, tergolong kurang dominan. Dua bahasa yang lain, Bajo sebanyak 8,22% dan Sasak sebanyak 6,51%, termasuk tidak dominan.

Kata kunci: kategori fungsi, alih kode, Bajo, kelas EFL

BACKGROUND

This writing is about functional categories of codeswitching by Bajo students in EFL classroom. The setting was in Tanjung Luar village. Bajo students are multilingual so that they are able to speak using more than one language for their daily communication. They speak their first language (Bajo), their neighbor language (Sasak), and national language (Indonesian).

As the first (native) language, Bajo is used to communicate with their friends and families at home. Bajo is also used at the mosque, wedding party, sport, trading, and meeting. Bajo is acquired by Bajo students since their early age. Their second and third languages are Sasak and Indonesian. Both of them are learned from their environment.

Being multilingual makes Bajo students bring their languages into their English Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. In EFL classroom, they use codeswitching to address other students. Codeswitching used encompasses its functions in teaching and learning process. In this case, they have to select different codes to fulfill in educational functions. The functions of codeswitching by students are to achieve a better understanding on English.

During English teaching and learning process, codeswitching often occurs in terms of the use of two or more codes or languages. Codeswitching by Bajo students is due to the influence of some factors, such as age, social status, participant, context, topic, and setting of the conversation which have educational functions (Bullock and Toribio, 2009, p. 99). One or more of the functions must be used more intent than others. Certain functional categories may serve more of the students' need in EFL classroom.

The problem in this research which would like to answer was what were the functional categories of codeswitching used by Bajo's student in their EFL classroom. Study on these educational functions of codeswitching has not been done in community which has three languages with different status (e.g. Bajo community). On the other hand, Bajo students have to study English at school as a compulsory subject. In accordance with those phenomena, the objective of this research was to find out the functional categories of codeswitching in EFL classroom of multilingual community. This study needs to be done for it is significant as one of considerations in planning and designing English course in one hand, and how to manage Bajo students in EFL classroom on the other hand. It is important to know what to give and in what ways the course given. Bajo students must be managed wisely so that their different codes could help them studying and learning English. To know the clear cut of the functional categories of codeswitching in Bajo's EFL classroom, it was a need to do such study. So, it is an interesting study of knowing the functional categories of codeswitching, and which of them are dominantly used by the students in English teaching and learning process.

Doing such study on functional categories of codeswitching in Bajo's EFL classroom, this research has to consider and use certain studies which have been done and theories which are related to. Having those two important things would make this research easier in analyzing and discussing the data.

Researches on Bajo's language contacts in West Nusa Tenggara were done by some researchers. They were Yudiastini (2007, p. 1), Kasman (2007, p. 2), and Husnan (2007,

p. 2). They did the research on linguistic adaptation of Bajo toward local or indigene languages used in West Nusa Tenggara; they are Sasak, Samawa, and Mbojo. Yudiastini (2007, p. 122) said that linguistic adaptation of Bajo was in phonological, morphological, and lexical level. Category of linguistic adaptation of Bajo toward Sasak in Tanjung Luar village was on the middle, while Medana Dusun Jambi Anom was less dominant. The second research, Kasman (2007, p. 166) said that language adaptation of Bajo toward Samawa were in phonological and lexical level. He reported the same finding in Pulau Bungin and Pulau Kaung. Husnan (2007, p. 142) said that language adaptation of Bajo toward Mbojo occurred in phonology, lexicon, and morphological level. Phonological adaptation was dominant (79%), followed by lexicon (16%), and morphology (5%). Bajo people in Bima followed vocalic system of Mbojo. For instances, they adapted consonants at the middle of words, adopted vocal [i] and [a] at the beginning of word, and adapted dental stop consonants at the beginning of word. They also followed vowel system by omitting consonants at ultimate position so that the word would be vowel or opened. Of the three villages, Bugis village had the highest language adaptation (53%) than Soro village (25%) and Bajo Village (22%).

There were also many researches on codeswitching in EFL classroom. Some of them are research done by Agneta and Bogunic (2010, p. 7) about 'A Study of Teachers' Codeswitching in Six Swedish EFL Classrooms'; research done by Zarei and Arasteh (2011, p. 96) about the effect of code-mixing and contextualization on L2 vocabulary; and research done by Li (2008, p. 76) about the study of mixed code and classroom codeswitching. Agneta and Bogunic (2010, p. 22) studied on codeswitching between L1 and L2 in Swedish EFL classroom. The teachers' codeswitching occurred when they translated difficult words and phrases.

Codeswitching was used in order to get students' attention and to make an order in the EFL classroom. Codeswitching was also used to express their feeling (for example, irritation). Zarei and Arasteh (2011, p. 100) reported two main findings; there was not any effect of code mixing, thematic clustering and contextualization toward L2 vocabulary recognition, and there was a significant effect of code mixing, thematic clustering, and contextualization toward L2 vocabulary production. Furthermore, thematic clustering's students performed better than code mixings' group on production test. At the end, thematic group did better than contextualization group. Li (2008, p. 77) did research on code mixing and codeswitching which is ban in the classroom in Hongkong. The teachers who were being observed tried to use Cantonese or English according to instruction policy. Li said that code mixing or codeswitching was difficult to avoid both inside and outside EFL classroom. Chinese Hongkongers found that it was difficult to maintain using English in formal interaction with other in Cantonese. As a result, they used code mixing or codeswitching (Li, 2008, p. 85). Li suggested some points; a need to have better understanding in which domain code mixing or codeswitching is necessary; a need to identify pedagogically sound and productive code mixing or codeswitching practices; and disseminate or giving demonstration, workshop, and teacher training to have a good code mixing or codeswitching practices.

Theoretically, codeswitching is the use of more than one language or dialect by the speakers who share particular codes (Grosjean, 2008, p. 48). The choices of code are determined by social and linguistic factors. In EFL classroom, codeswitching is said to be a strategy (Grosjean, 2008, p. 52) to teach a second language. It could help students to learn a second language. Teacher uses codeswitching to begin a lesson in one language and, then,

switch to other languages. Teacher could also use codeswitching to have his/her students to listen carefully and comprehend the lesson. It could also be used by students to have other students to do something or to have attention from his/her teacher. Codeswitching is not merely a shift from one language to another, it has some functions in EFL classroom. Ferguson defined the functions of codeswitching into three categories (Ferguson in Uys, 2010, p. 14): (1) to help students understand the subject matter of the lesson, (2) codeswitching is used for classroom management, and (3) to be used as interpersonal relations. In this case, Canagarajah (1995, p. 186 in Yletyinen, 2004, p. 53) proposed fifteen functional categories of codeswitching. The fifteenth functions of codeswitching are (1) explanation, (2) requesting help, (3) pupils helping each other, (4) self-corrections, (5) moving from one activity to another, (6) codes switching in clearing misunderstandings, (7) not knowing the English counterpart, (8) checking for understanding, (9) unofficial interactions, (10) pupils' comments, (11) pupil initiation, (12) teacher admonitions, (13) grammar translation, (14) grammar explanation, and (15) lapses. In this writing, the fifteen functional categories of codeswitching are used. Of the fifteen functional categories of codeswitching one or more must be dominant. This function is dominantly used to compare with others.

Codeswitching is the use of two or more linguistic varieties in bilingual or multilingual societies and communities (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p. 4). Several languages or dialects are used in the same conversation or sentence by bilingual people. It practically could affect everyone who is in contact with more than one language or dialect. Contact in various manifestations is included into language interaction. In addition, there are some sociolinguistic terms which are involved in Bajo's repertoire. They are polite (high/V) and impolite form (Low/T) since Bajo

speakers live among Sasak with strong cultural values (Mahyuni, 2007, p. 84). The two terms are affected by power and social distance of the speakers of Bajo. Etymologically, the V (vous) refers to polite form, and the term T (tu) refers to impolite. In this case, it is a need to answer question what kinds of strategies would be polite or impolite in Bajo's situation involving the evaluation of a number of different factors. There are two main strategies which are used in the process of attunement. They are convergence and divergence (Labov, 2010, p. 4). Convergence refers to speakers alternate the way they talk so that it approaches the norms of their interlocutor and accentuates commonality between the interlocutors. Convergence can approach the actual norms of the addressee, or it can involve approximating norms that the speaker believes (incorrectly) are characteristic of their addressee.

In EFL classroom, learning and practicing English is the primary goal (Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher, 2009, p. 139). Students are guided and situated to use English in the classroom. However, it is hard to ban the use of L1 and L2 in EFL classroom as reported by Li (2008, p. 77). Further, Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2009, p. 135) used discourse-related and participant-related in analyzing the use of L1 in English classroom. He said that discourse-related switches used to structure and organize conversation. It is done by presenting sign which is different to the utterances that preceded them. In this case, teachers and students used the L1 in discourse-related ways. Participant-related used to correspond to preferences of the listener or other participant. They pointed out instances of participant-related, such as momentarily forgetting a word or phrase. Codeswitching is not a simultaneously choice of codes, it has some roles and functions in a conversation. Codeswitching could be said to be the roles as an explanation of language change (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p. 30). Moreover,

the roles of codeswitching are as a means of comprehension; the use of contrasts, framing/footing, showing cooperativeness or the lack of it (preference organization). Codeswitching also has functions (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p. 172) within speech. It allows various mixtures of different codes. Further, bilingual speakers often switch varieties to communicate something beyond the superficial meaning of the words. It can also involve switching between dialects, registers, levels of formality, intonations etc. In addition, codeswitching tends to cover speakers' expression of repetition, translation, explanation, change interlocutors, a turn boundary, and false start.

This research focused on the functions of codeswitching by Bajo students in EFL classroom. They are about fifteen functional categories of codeswitching. (1) *Explanation* is used when a speaker realizes that his/her listener does not comprehend the message. The speaker wants to repeat what s/he has said in other languages (it can be in Bajo, Sasak, or Indonesian). It is done in order to help the listener to understand the message. Even though the explanation usually employed in L1 (Bajo for Bajo students), the explanation may also be employed in her/his neighbor languages (Sasak or Indonesian). It is due to the community consists of variety students' background. They are Bajo, Sasak, and the national language used (Indonesian). Bajo students usually know Sasak and Indonesian. To explain the lesson, there are some different strategies: repetition, reformulation, clarification, and exemplification. Explanation is the most popular codeswitching used by students. It is usually done during teaching and learning when a teacher is checking students' exercises. (2) *Requesting help* is used when they find a problem or question. Students use codeswitching to find the answer of their problem. Students ask a help from teacher or their classmates when they do not know about their task, which line their

task is, how work on the task, the topic of the task. (3) *Pupils helping each other* is usually used when students are working in a group or asking to do something by the teacher which involves the whole class. During discussing and working out with the task, students ask a help from his teacher or others about the task they do not understand. They ask others to explain, for example, teacher's question may be in Bajo's L1 (Bajo) or L2 (Sasak and Indonesian). It means that explaining by translating is not only done by a teacher but also by the students. (4) *Self-corrections* are used by students when their utterances are incorrect. They may switch to L1 or L2 at the middle of the utterances. The utterances in L1 and L2 are addressed to the teacher. After the insertion to L1 and L2, they continue to the correct answer in English. (5) *Moving from one activity to another* is used by a teacher during teaching and learning process. It is used to know a shift in the lesson, it is a move from one activity to another. It is useful to have students' attention. It is used when a teaching using English, and there is a shift to the students' L1 or L2. English as a foreign language is only used for interaction required by the materials and the lesson. On the other hand, L1 and L2 are used for all other interactions. So, teacher's codeswitching is a sign to start a new activity. (6) *Codeswitching in clearing misunderstandings* is used when a teacher find her/his students misunderstand the material s/he gave. When there is a need for her/him to clear a misunderstanding, it is usually done using students' L1 or L2. English is the base language. It means that codeswitching is used to clear misunderstanding. For example, teacher misspelled the students' name. So, both teacher and students can use this type of functional codeswitching during teaching and learning process. (7) *Not knowing the English counterpart* is used when English counterpart is unknown. When it happens, the students insert L1 or L2 in their utterances. The teacher corrects

by translating into English. (8) *Checking for understanding* is used during teaching and learning process, a teacher makes sure that every single word in the lesson is understood. Teacher uses codeswitching by asking the students what is the meaning of certain word is in their L1 and L2. It is useful so that a teacher will not always translate every word. She/he lets the students to participate by telling the meaning of the word. This is usually used since in every new chapter there are some vocabularies required to be comprehended by the students. (9) *Unofficial interactions* are included into an interaction which is not required. It should not occur during teaching and learning process. Further, L1 is usually used for this function. It is often between the students' interaction. It can be in group discussion. Yet, teacher can also use this type of codeswitching when s/he discussing extra matters which is not strictly related to the lesson. (10) *Pupils' comments* are used when students gave comments to her/his teacher or classmates on the activities or events related to their tasks. This functional category is not the same with unofficial interaction since the comment gave is related to the task or subject in teaching and learning process. (11) *Pupil initiation* is used when students initiate to employ switching to their L1 during teaching and learning. Teacher usually responds this in English. (12) *Teacher admonitions* is used when the teacher is angry or disappointed to her/his students during teaching and learning process. The teacher expresses his feeling by using L1 or L2. (13) *Grammar translation* is used when teacher code switches using students L1 or L2. Codeswitching is employed because of necessity to transfer the grammar into students L1 or L2. So, both teacher and students use L1 or L2 codeswitching. (14) *Grammar explanation* is used when teacher is going to emphasize some important point on the subject. For example, a teacher is going to tell her/his students on how nouns are inflected. S/

he uses switching to explain the students about the point. (15) *Lapses* is used when teacher insert English word in students L1 or L2. The base language is usually in students L1 or L2. The embedded language is English. It happens accidentally. When s/he speaks in L1 or L2, s/he slips an English word. These fifteen types of functional categories of codeswitching in EFL classroom proposed by Canagarajah (1995, p. 186 in Yletyinen, 2004, p. 53) are useful for teaching English. They are used as the frame work of this study in observing the use of codeswitching in EFL classroom.

METHODS

This study was conducted at Bajo's EFL classroom. It was at Tanjung Luar village. The participants were students of the second-year students of MTs Nurul Ihsan NW, Tanjung Luar, East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. There were 72 students which were divided into three classes, each class had 24 students. One class or 24 students was taken as the participants. The class was chosen purposively. More heterogeneous of the class would produce more codeswitching. So, IIA was chosen for there are six (6) students whose ethnic backgrounds were Sasak, and the rest were Bajo. Other two classes did not have this kind of composition of the students. Thus, participants of this study were the second-year students of IIA of MTs. Nurul Ihsan NW Tanjung Luar. They were Bajo and non Bajo students.

There were two methods used to collect the data: observation and interview (Agneta and Bogunic, 2010, p. 10). Observation was used to know when the students codeswitch in EFL classroom (Nunan and Choi, 2010, p. 257). Observation was done in a formal setting. It was at Bajo's EFL classroom. Technique used for observation was complete participant. By using complete participant, I did not participate in the students' interaction and classroom situation. This technique was helped by recording. The

second method used was interview. It was done after the data has been transcribed. This method was used to know their comment on the codeswitching they used. Technique used was semi-structured interview. So, methods used to collect the data were observation and interview. These two methods were helped by the use of recording and semi-structured interview.

In analyzing the data, there were some methods used. They are diachronic, labeling, transcription, classification, and simple statistic. Diachronic method was used to know whether one code belongs to a language or others. In this case, diachronic used was *padan* (comparative) method (Mahsun, 2010, p.81—82). Techniques used were comparative technique (*hubung banding menyamakan*) and contrasting technique (*hubung banding membedakan*). This technique used to compare and contrast data gathered. By using this technique, it was easy to determine whether a shift was codeswitching or not. The data was labeled, transcribed, and classified into functional categories of codeswitching. The code in Indonesian is *italic*, in Sasak is underlined, in Bajo is **bold**, and in English is regular. The abbreviations used are

T (teacher), S (student), Ss (students), and 1.4 (the column and the row of student’s seat). One or more functional category must be dominant than others. To do that, classified data were counted using simple statistic. The formula is

$$\frac{S}{N} \times 100\% = d\%$$

S : number of similarity
 N : comparative number
 d : percentage.

The result is conversed into three categories: dominant, less dominant, not dominant. The conversion is

- Dominant : > 50 %
- Less dominant : between 30—49%
- Not dominant : < 30 %

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This subheading presents 2 tables of functional categories of codeswitching by Bajo students in EFL classroom. Table 1 is the sum of functional categories of codeswitching. Table 2 is the sum functional categories of codeswitching combined by the language used employed by students.

Table 1 Functional categories of codeswitching by Bajo students in EFL classroom at MTs. Nurul Ihsan NW Tanjung Luar, East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara

No.	Functional Categories	Languages				Total	%
		Bajo	Sasak	Indonesian	English		
1	Explanation	1	3	3	3	10	3
2	Requesting Help	4	0	8	3	15	5
3	Pupils Help Each Other	7	4	16	1	28	10
4	Clearing Misunderstanding	0	0	2	0	2	1
5	Unofficial Interaction	3	3	12	3	21	7
6	Pupils’ Comments	6	7	38	78	129	44
7	Pupils’ Initiation	1	2	8	1	12	4
8	Grammar Translation	1	0	8	8	17	6
9	Grammar Explanation	1	0	53	4	58	20
	Total	24	19	148	101	292	100
	%	8.22	6.51	50.68	34.59	100	

The total number of functional categories of codeswitching by Bajo students is 292 instances. They are divided into nine categories. There is not any dominant category. Nevertheless, pupils' comments have the highest percentage. It is about 44% (129 instances). This category is included into less dominant. Others categories are included into not dominant as they have percentage of codeswitching under 30%. At the second place is grammar explanation. It is about 20% with 58 instances. At the third place is pupils help each other. It is about 10% with 28 instances. The other categories are 7% (unofficial interaction) with 21 instances, 6% (grammar translation) with 17 instances, 5% (requesting help) with 15 instances, 4% (pupils' initiation) with 12 instances, 3% (explanation) with 10 instances, and 1% (clearing misunderstanding) with 2

instances. It means that most of the functional categories applied by the students of Bajo is pupils' comments.

In addition, codeswitching is mostly done in Indonesian. It is about 50.68% with 148 instances. This percentage which is more than 50% is categorized into dominant. The second codeswitching is done in English as the subject of the class. It is about 34.59% with 101 instances. This percentage is categorized into less dominant, that is between 30—49%. The percentages of the two local languages with different status in Bajos' community are only 8.22% with 24 instances for Bajo and 6.51% with 19 instances for Sasak. Thus, Indonesian as the national and united language in Indonesia is the main choice of language to communicate to others students with different local language background.

Table 2 Functional categories of codeswitching and languages used by Bajo students in EFL classroom at MTs. Nurul Ihsan NW Tanjung Luar, East Lombok West Nusa Tenggara

Base Language \ Embedded Language	Embedded Language				Total	%
	Bajo	Sasak	Indonesian	English		
Bajo	0	14	4	6	24	8%
Explanation	0	1	0	0	1	4
Requesting Help	0	2	0	2	4	17
Pupils Help EA	0	3	2	2	7	29
Unofficial Interaction	0	3	0	0	3	13
Pupils Comments	0	4	1	1	6	25
Pupils Initiation	0	1	0	0	1	4
Grammar Translation	0	0	1	0	1	4
Grammar Explanation	0	0	0	1	1	4
Sasak	7	0	10	2	19	7%
Explanation	0	0	1	2	3	16
Pupils Help EA	2	0	2	0	4	21
Unofficial Interaction	2	0	1	0	3	16
Pupils Comments	3	0	4	0	7	37
Pupils Initiation	0	0	2	0	2	11

Grammar Translation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grammar Explanation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesian	39	25	0	84	148	51%
Explanation	1	0	0	2	3	2
Requesting Help	5	2	0	1	8	5
Pupils Help EA	8	5	0	3	16	11
Clearing Misunderstanding	0	0	0	2	2	1
Unofficial Interaction	8	3	0	1	12	8
Pupils Comments	16	12	0	10	38	26
Pupils Initiation	1	3	0	4	8	5
Grammar Translation	0	0	0	8	8	5
Grammar Explanation	0	0	0	53	53	36
English	10	1	90	0	101	35%
Explanation	0	0	3	0	3	3
Requesting Help	1	0	2	0	3	3
Pupils Help EA	0	0	1	0	1	1
Unofficial Interaction	2	1	0	0	3	3
Pupils Comments	7	0	71	0	78	77
Pupils Initiation	0	0	1	0	1	1
Grammar Translation	0	0	8	0	8	8
Grammar Explanation	0	0	4	0	4	4
Total	56	40	104	92	292	
%	19.24	13.75	35.74	31.27	100	

Table 2 shows that there are about nine (9) functional categories of codeswitching employed by students in EFL classroom. They are explanation, requesting help, pupils help each other, clearing misunderstanding, unofficial interaction, pupils' comments, pupils' initiation, grammar translation, and grammar explanation. They are combined with the languages used to convey the messages.

In general, as the base language, Indonesian is the most dominant functional category of codeswitching (about 51%). The second great base language is English which is categorized into less dominant (about 35%). The percentage of Bajo language is higher than Sasak, but both are included into not dominant.

They are about 8% and 7% respectively. So, as the base language, Indonesian is mainly chosen by students to communicate his/her feeling to other students or teacher. Indonesian is chosen since it is the only language that is mostly understood by all of students with different ethnic backgrounds. So, the messages that they wanted to express would easily achieved by the listeners.

In contrast, there is not any of the languages could be categorized into dominant in embedded language. However, percentage of both Indonesian and English is still higher than Bajo and Sasak. The percentage of Indonesian and English as the embedded languages is 35.74% with 104 instances (second instance

of pupils' comments and the instance of grammar explanation) and 31.27% with 92 instances respectively (the instance of grammar explanation). Both are categorized into less dominant. Even though Bajo and Sasak are categorized into not dominant as the embedded languages, Bajo is still higher than Sasak. The percentage is 19.24% with 56 instances for Bajo and 13.75% with 40 instances for Sasak. It can be said that as the embedded languages, Indonesian and English would be chosen by the students in responding to other students or the teacher during teaching and learning process in their EFL classroom.

When Bajo is the base language, there are about eight functional categories of codeswitching employed by Bajo students in EFL classroom. They are (1) explanation, (2) requesting help, (3) pupils' help each other, (4) unofficial interaction, (5) pupils' comment, (6) pupils' initiation, (7) grammar translation, and (8) grammar explanation. Bajo as the base language is about 8% of the total codes. Using explanation, there is only one instance of Bajo-Sasak codeswitching with 4%. There are two embedded languages using requesting help with 17%: Bajo-Sasak with 2 instances and Bajo-English with 2 instances. There are about three embedded languages using pupils help each other with 29%: Bajo-Sasak with 3 instances, Bajo-Indonesian with 2 instances, and Bajo-English with 2 instances. There is only one embedded language using unofficial interaction with 13%, Bajo-Sasak with 3 instances. There are three embedded languages using pupils comments with 25%: Bajo-Sasak with 4 instances, Bajo-Indonesian with 1 instance, and Bajo-English with 1 instance. Using pupils' initiation, there is one embedded language with 4%, Bajo-Sasak with 1 instance. There is also one embedded language for grammar translation with 4% (Bajo-Indonesian with 1 instance). The last, using grammar explanation, there is only one embedded language with 4% (Bajo-

English with 1 instance). All of the functional categories are included into not dominant. The highest percentage for functional categories of codeswitching employed by Bajo students in EFL classroom is pupils' help each other with 29%. The second highest percentage is pupils' comment with 25 %. The third and fourth are requesting help and unofficial interaction with 17% and 13% respectively. The other four functions (explanation, pupils' initiation, grammar translation, and grammar explanation) have the same percentage, 4%.

When Sasak is the base language, there are five functional categories of codeswitching employed by the students. They are (1) explanation, (2) pupils' help each other, (3) unofficial interaction, (4) pupils' comment, and (5) pupils' initiation. Sasak as the base language is about 7% of the total codes. Using explanation, there is two embedded languages with 16%: Sasak-Indonesian with 1 instance and Sasak-English with 2 instances. There are about two embedded languages using pupils help each other with 21%: Sasak-Bajo with 2 instances, Sasak-Indonesian with 2 instances. There are two embedded languages using unofficial interaction with 16%: Sasak-Bajo with 2 instances and Sasak-Indonesian with 1 instance. There are two embedded languages using pupils' comments with 37%: Sasak-Bajo with 3 instances and Sasak-Indonesian with 4 instances. Using pupils' initiation, there is one embedded language with 4%: Sasak-Indonesian with 2 instances. Only one functional category of codeswitching could be categorized into less dominant, pupils' comment with 37%. The second highest percentage is pupils' help each other with 21%. There are two functional categories (explanation and unofficial interaction) of codeswitching with the same percentage (16%). The last function is pupil's initiation with 11%.

When the base language is Indonesian, there are about nine functional categories

of codeswitching employed by the students. They are (1) explanation, (2) requesting help, (3) pupils' help each other, (4) clearing misunderstanding, (5) unofficial interaction, (6) pupils' comment, (7) pupils' initiation, (8) grammar translation, and (9) grammar explanation. Indonesian as the base language is about 51% of the total codes. Using explanation, there are two embedded languages with 2%: Indonesian-Bajo with 1 instance and Indonesian-English with 2 instances. There are three embedded languages using requesting help with 5%: Indonesian-Bajo with 5 instances, Indonesian-Sasak with 2 instances and Indonesian-English with 1 instance. There are about three embedded languages using pupils help each other with 11%: Indonesian-Bajo with 8 instances, Indonesian-Sasak with 5 instances and Indonesian-English with 3 instances. There is only one embedded language using clearing misunderstanding with 1%: Indonesian-English with 2 instances. There are three embedded languages using unofficial interaction with 8%: Indonesian-Bajo with 8 instances, Indonesian-Sasak with 3 instances and Indonesian-English with 1 instance. There are three embedded languages using pupils comments with 26%: Indonesian-Bajo with 16 instances, Indonesian-Sasak with 12 instances and Indonesian-English with 10 instances. Using pupils' initiation, there are three embedded languages with 5%: Indonesian-Bajo with 1 instance, Indonesian-Sasak with 3 instances, and Indonesian-English with 4 instances. There is one embedded language for grammar translation with 5% (Indonesian-English with 8 instances). The last, using grammar explanation, there is only one embedded language with 36% (Indonesian-English with 53 instances). The highest percentage is grammar explanation (36%) which is included into less dominant. The second highest percentage is pupils' comment (26%). At the third is pupils help each other (11%). The fourth is unofficial interaction (8%).

At the fifth, there are three functions (requesting help, pupils' initiation, and grammar translation) which have the same percentages (5%).

The last but not least, when the base language is English, there are about eight Functional categories of codeswitching employed by the students. They are (1) explanation, (2) requesting help, (3) pupils' help each other, (4) unofficial interaction, (5) pupils' comment, (6) pupils' initiation, (7) grammar translation, and (8) grammar explanation. English as the base language is about 35% of the total codes. Using explanation, there is one embedded language with 3%: English-Indonesian with 3 instances. There are two embedded languages using requesting help with 3%: English-Bajo with 1 instance and English-Indonesian with 2 instances. There is one embedded language using pupils help each other with 1%: English-Indonesian with 1 instance. There are two embedded languages using unofficial interaction with 3%: English-Bajo with 2 instances and English-Sasak with 1 instance. There are two embedded languages using pupils' comments with 77%: English-Bajo with 7 instances and English-Indonesian with 71 instances. Using pupils' initiation, there is one embedded language with 1%: English-Indonesian with 1 instance. There is one embedded language for grammar translation with 8% (English-Indonesian with 8 instances). The last, using grammar explanation, there is only one embedded language with 4% (English-Indonesian with 4 instances). The most dominant functional category of codeswitching is pupils' comment (77%) which is included into dominant. The other functional categories of codeswitching are categorized into not dominant. The second highest percentage is grammar translation (8%). The fourth highest percentage is grammar explanation (4%). There are three functions (explanation, requesting help, and unofficial interaction) of codeswitching which have the

same percentage (3%). The last, there are two functions (pupils help each other and pupils' initiation) with the same percentage (1%).

The number of functional categories of codeswitching in table 1 tells that of the fifteen functional categories of codeswitching which were proposed by Canagarajah (1995, p. 186 in Yletyinen, 2004, p. 53), only nine found in Bajo's EFL classroom. They are (1) explanation, (2) requesting help, (3) pupils help each other, (4) unofficial interaction, (5) pupils' comments, (6) pupil's initiation, grammar translation, and (7) grammar explanation. Two of them are the highest than others: pupils' comments and grammar explanation. The nine functional categories of codeswitching used Indonesian and English. Both were mostly used by students. English as the subject being taught assumed, of course, to appear often than other languages. However, in accordance with the data, Indonesia is apparently dominant. It suits to what Zarei and Arasteh (2011, p. 100) said that there was a significant effect of code mixing, thematic clustering, and contextualization toward L2 vocabulary production. It means that when students of Bajo code switched to Indonesian, it will increase their vocabulary in English and help them studying second language (Grosjean, 2008, p. 52).

In contrast, two other local languages, Bajo and Sasak did not used by Bajo students most of the time to respond to the subject being taught for they have other students with different ethnic backgrounds. The only language that could be understood by all of the students is Indonesian. So, they chose Indonesian when they would like to respond to their teacher or other students.

This research would not like to say anything about the competence of the student in English, but the two languages (English and Indonesian) were used to transferring English. Students try to respond in Indonesia and English for the same purpose, understanding the subject

(Ferguson in Uys, 2010, p. 14). This result, in general, means that codeswitching cannot be banned as reported by Li (2008, p. 77). It is impossible to force the students of Bajo to stick in English for about 2 hours of class a day since they will respond their teacher in Indonesian, even in their two local languages. Consequently, students code switched to national language (Indonesian) and to two local languages (Bajo and Sasak).

Moreover, students were able to use varieties of functional categories of codeswitching during English class (table 2). They employed all of them using different languages for different purposes which is in line with what Gardner-Chloros (2009, p. 4) said that several languages are used by multilingual. Indonesian was mostly used for grammar explanation, while English was mostly used for pupils' comments. Both are interchangeable. When grammar explanation was employed by students using Indonesia as the base language, the embedded language was in English. When pupils' comments were employed by Bajo's students using English as the base language, the embedded language was in Indonesian. So, it can be said that one of the functional category of codeswitching (grammar explanation) helped student understanding the fundamental knowledge of English using Indonesian-English codeswitching in one hand, and another functional category of codeswitching (pupils' comments) motivated the students to learn and practice their English using English-Indonesia codeswitching.

Indeed, Bajo students approach the norm of dominant local language in Lombok by respond in Sasak (Labov, 2010, p. 4). Even though the number of functional categories of codeswitching using Sasak was few, but the codes employed implicitly indicated that they showing solidarity to Sasak ethnic background.

Most of the students used codeswitching

to give comments to the subject being taught or to other students related to the lesson they were discussing (instances of pupils' comments presented at different paragraphs). Further, codeswitching used to emphasize the topic by having explanation of the lesson in Indonesian as Grosjean (2008, p. 52) said that codeswitching helps students to study the second language. Their main goal in EFL classroom was to learn and practice their English. They were guided by the teacher to use English (Dailey-O'Cain and Leibscher, 2009, p. 139). As a result, they code switched to English by using pupils' comments and grammar explanation. Dailey-O'Cain and Leibscher said that in EFL classroom L1 (Indonesian and two local languages of Bajo) discourse-related switches used to structure and organize students' conversation in English. It means that when Bajo's students find their L1 share particular codes with English, they would give respond in English.

Of the nine functional categories identified in this study, two of them would be presented respectively based on the percentage gathered. They are pupils' comment and grammar explanation. Both are commonly used by Bajo students in EFL classroom.

Pupils' Comments

This type of functional category of codeswitching occurred when students gave comments during teaching and learning process. Specifically, this type of functional category of codeswitching was used during the activities or events related to their tasks (Grosjean, 2008, p. 52). This type of codeswitching is different to unofficial interaction. Comments were made and directed related to the situation in teaching and learning process, while unofficial interaction was not. Below are two instances of pupils' comments which are taken from video 3.

The first instance was occurred at the beginning of the lesson of IIA class. The teacher called all of her students one by one.

One student made a comment on homework he had. He asked another student whether he should use “will” or not using Indonesian-Sasak codeswitching. Unfortunately, his comment was heard by other students, so Riyan felt annoy and suggest (1.4) to be quite using Indonesian-Sasak codeswitching. Both of the codeswitching made by (1.4) and Riyan are included into functional categories called pupils' comments.

- T : are you fine, yes?
aux pr adj adv
Are you fine?
- Ss : Yes, I'm fine.
adv n adj
Yes, I'm fine.
- 1.4 : Riyan *Akan ke*
Riyan will-aux clpr
Riyan, it uses 'will', will not it?
Riyan: *Tenang ke*
calm-adj clpr
Calm down, please.
- T : Eee ...how are you today?
n rp aux pr adv
How are you today?

The first instance presented was started in English initiated by teacher. It got respond in English too by almost all of the students, except some students, (1.4) was one of them, who were busy corrected their tasks. (1.4) did not follow the class well. He still confused and tried to find the correct answer of certain number in his task. (1.4) did it to have the correct one before the teacher check his/her. Being confused, he asked his classmate if 'will' was the correct one by translated the word into Indonesian and switched to Sasak in term of tag (It is the only instance of tag switching found). By using Indonesian-Sasak codeswitching, (1.4) hoped that s/he would get attention from her/his classmate (Grosjean, 2008, p. 52). This situation realized by Riyan since he reminded (1.4) to stop being noising using Indonesian-Sasak codeswitching, but this conversation disturbed the class which was refreshed by the

teacher who turned the code in English.

The second instance of codeswitching is also taken from video 3. This type of pupils' comment of codeswitching is occurred at the middle of teaching and learning process. The topic of the lesson was about description. Teacher encouraged students to tell other students about their description. She used Indonesian to do that. One student (3.1) was laughing and added his description using Sasak/Indonesian codeswitching. This functional category of codeswitching is included into pupils' comment since the additional information given is still related to the description of the student. The next utterance is also included into pupils' comment. After students telling the type of hair, many of the students added information about the hair.

- T : *Terus.*
then-adv
Then.
- 3.1 : *Idungn mancung* (laugh). *Mancung ke*
Hidung-nose-n sharp-adj sharp-adj
dalem.
deepens-v
He has sharp nose.
- T : *Apa lagi?*
what-pr again-adv
What else?
- S : *Ekor panjang. Maten*
tail-n long-adj. eye-nclpr
His tail is long. His eyes.
- T : *Apa lagi? Terus rambutnya?*
what-pr again-adv then-adv hair-nclpr
What else? How about his hair?
- Ss : *Kriting*
curly-adj
Curly.
- T : *Nah, ya*
yes-adv
Yes.
- Ss : *Keriting kayak mi goreng.*
curly-adj like-v noodles-n fried-n
Kayak mi goreng
like-v mie-n fried-n
Curly is just like noodles, fried noodle.
- T : *Terus?*
then-adv
Then.

- S : *Hitam manis,*
Black-adj sweet-adj
Black sweet.

This instance shows how teacher started the lesson using Indonesia. She used this code to guide and organize the class. (1.3) respond in Sasak-Indonesian codeswitching telling that (1.3) understood what his/her teacher wanted even though using Sasak-Indonesian codeswitching. This codeswitching in line to what Gardner-Chloros (2009, p. 172) said that codeswitching did by students tended to express speaker's translation and explanation. It was not blamed by the teacher since she encouraged them to go on as well as they knew the structure of description. Consequently, another student gave a comment in Indonesian-Sasak codeswitching.

Grammar Explanation

This type of functional category of codeswitching is occurred when a student needs to emphasize some important point on the language. Student can tell his partner how nouns are inflected. She/he uses grammar explanation type of codeswitching to explain other students this issue. Below is one instance of grammar explanation codeswitching.

This instance of grammar explanation of codeswitching is taken from video 1. It was at the middle of teaching and learning process. The teacher was explaining about the present tense. She tried to tell her student about present tense using scaffolding. Students responded their teacher by repeating some points. Apparently, some of them understood about the present tense and explained it to others by switch their code to Indonesian. They say the changes are due to the type of words, noun and verb.

- T : And you see in your test, *ya.*
conpr v pre pos n (tag)
Mana-mana saja di sini
which-pr only-adj at-d this-d

- Spot is a regular house cat.
 n aux art adjn n
 You can see in your test, can't you?
 Which one of these. Spot is a regular house cat.
Di situ, ya to be-nya dia memakai[...]
 at-d that-d (tag) aux-clpr he-pr use-v
 In this case, the auxiliary used is ...
- Ss : [is]
 Is.
- T : *Is itu masih termasuk dalam[...]*
 auxtha-d still-adv include-v in-pre
Is is included into...
- Ss : to be [identification]
 aux n
 To be. Identification.
- T : *Nah lihat lagi. ...likes to chase likes to chase*
 look-v again-adv v pre v v pre-v
 everyone.
 n
 Look again. The cat likes to chase everyone.
Ketemu likes kenapa dia pakai likes
 meet-v v v why-rp he-pr use-v v
 s at-pre behind-adv
 (adding s) *di belakang.*
 You see. Why like has adding s?
- Ss : *Karena kata benda, kata kerja*
 because-con word-n thing-n word-n work-v
 Because of noun, verb.
- T : *Ini (pointing to the verb)*
 this-d
 This one.
- Ss : *benda, kerja*
 thing-n work-v
 Noun, verb.
- T : *Ini kata kerja tunggal otomatis*
 his-d word-n work-v single-n automatic-n
ini kata kerjanya akan hadir
 this-d word-n work-vclpr will mdaxist-v
 This one verb with the third singular
 person, so the verb will be added by s.
Karena ini merupakan
 because-con this-d is-aux
orang [ketiga tunggal]
 person-n third-num single-n
 Because the subject is the third singular
 person.

This conversation tells that grammar explanation type of functional category of codeswitching is useful in EFL classroom. When teacher tried to explain, the structure using English-Indonesian codeswitching, students responded in Indonesian. Moreover, some of the students told others by turning their

code to Indonesian explaining the structure. It means that the turn made by the students was functioned explaining the material as stated by Grosjean (2009, p. 30).

CONCLUSION

Having discussion of the functional categories of codeswitching in Bajo's EFL classroom, there are only nine types found of the total fifteen being studied. Of the nine types, there are only two functional categories which are mostly used by Bajo's students. They are pupils' comments (less dominant) and grammar explanation (not dominant). Students give comments related to the task or subject being taught. Students give comments which suit to the situation of teaching and learning process. Students use grammar explanation to emphasize some important points of the materials to her/his classmates. Students give comments using Indonesian-English codeswitching, but they explain grammar to her/his classmates using English English-Indonesian codeswitching.

REFERENCES

- Agneta, A. and Ana B. 2010. "A Study of Teachers' Code Switching in Six Swedish EFL Classrooms". Malmö: Malmö Hogskola University Press.
- Bullock, B. E., and Almeida J. T. (Eds.). 2009. *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dailey-O'Cain, J. and Grit L. 2009. "Teacher and Students Use of the First Language in Foreign Language Classroom Interaction: Functions and Applications". in Turnbull, Mile and Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer (Ed.). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 2009. *Code-Switching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Grosjean, F. 2008. *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Husnan, L. E. 2007. "Kontak Bahasa antara Masyarakat Tuter Bahasa Bajo dan Mbojo di Kabupaten Bima dan Dompu". Laporan Penelitian. Mataram: Kantor Bahasa Provinsi NTB.
- Kasman. 2007. 'Kontak Bahasa antara Komunitas Tuter Bahasa Bajo dengan Komunitas Tuter Bahasa Samawa di Kabupaten Sumbawa dan Sumbawa Barat'. Laporan Penelitian. Mataram: Kantor Bahasa Provinsi NTB.
- Labov, W. 2010. *Principles of Language Change: Volume 3, Cognitive and Cultural Factors*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Li, David C.S. 2008. 'Understanding Mixed Code and Classroom Code-Switching Myths and Realities'. *New Horizon in Education* Vo. 56 No.3 December.
- Mahsun. 2010. *Genolinguistik: Kolaborasi Linguistik dengan Genetika dalam Pengelompokan Bahasa dan Populasi Penuturnya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Mahyuni. 2007. "Valuing Language and Culture: An Example from Sasak". *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, Vol. 11 No. 2, Desember pp.79—86.
- Nunan, D. and Julia C. 2010. *Language and Culture: Reflectives Narratives and the Emergency of Identity*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Uys, D. 2010. "The Functions of Teachers' Code Switching in Multilingual and Multicultural High School Classrooms in the Siyanda of the Northern Cape Province". Unpublished Dissertation: Stellenbosch University.
- Yletyinen, H. 2004. "The Functions of Codeswitching in EFL Classroom Discourse". Unpublished Thesis. Irelandia: University of Jyvaskyla.
- Yudiastini, N. M. 2007. "Kontak Bahasa antara Komunitas Tuter Bahasa Bajo dengan Komunitas Tuter Bahasa Sasak di Pulau Lombok". Laporan Penelitian. Mataram: Kantor Bahasa Provinsi NTB.
- Zarei, A. A. and Samira T. A. 2011. "The Effect of Code Mixing, Thematic Clustering, and Contextualization on L2 Vocabulary Recognition and Production". *Journal of Language and Culture* Vol. 2(6) pp.96—102.