Code-Switching in Lecturer-Students' Interaction in Thesis Examination: A Case Study in Indonesia

Ridwan Hanafiah
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia, *ridwances@yahoo.com*

Umar Mono
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia, *umar.mono@yahoo.co.id*

Muhammad Yusuf
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia, *yusuf_my@usu.ac.id*

Being bilingual provides opportunity to choose the code used in interaction. Code-switching (CS) is also the result of bilingualism and contact among languages. This study attempts to discover the types of CS (English-Bahasa Indonesia) and how the function of code-switching is in lecturer-student's interaction in thesis examination. This study employed qualitative content analysis as the research design. The data were in the form of utterances obtained from recorded interaction of two thesis examination sessions in the graduate program of English at Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia. The data were analysed through some processes including data condensation, data display (identifying, labelling, grouping), and inference making. The utterances were analysed by using Poplack's classification of CS. From the analysis, it was found that there are three types of CS namely intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag switching. Then, the dominant type is intra-sentential switching. The functions of CS utilized by the participants in the interaction are as entertaining, translating, emphasizing, making an inference, clarifying, explaining, asking, checking understanding, giving feedback, giving discussion, and repetition. Lecturers and students in the interaction utilized CS in order to keep the continuity and smoothness of the interaction as well as to ensure that the messages could be comprehended well.

Keywords: code-switching, intra-sentential, inter-sentential, tag, lecturer-student's interaction

INTRODUCTION

Code-switching (CS) is a result of a bilingual situation. Bilingualism is the habit of using two languages in the interaction with others (Hanafiah et al., 2018). Bilinguals can code-switch and use their languages as resources to discover other ways in delivering the meaning (Johansson, 2013). Conversely, CS is seen as a sign of lack of mastery of

either or both languages (Mabule, 2015). Then, CS is simply part of the ordinary linguistic practices of these bilinguals, and not necessarily utilized to switch between social identities (Mushin, 2010).

Code-switching (CS) is also a language phenomenon resulting from language contact. One of the fundamental things is this is under the discussion of bilingualism. Bilingual people own their choice to use a certain code in the communication. But, there is still a debate on the difference code switching and another term in sociolinguistics, code mixing (Tajudin, 2013). He adds that code-switching and code-mixing could be differentiated based on the place where the changing occurs. Other expert, Shay (2015) believes that there are common terms related to CS, and sometimes are even used alternatively, relating to the same phenomenon. Some of these are transfer, borrowing and code-mixing. The phenomenon of CS could be easily found in any sector of life such as marketing, education, business, entertainment, joking, and even praying. CS in the educational interaction such as teacher-student interaction is used to help students in elucidating misunderstandings in performing their target language (Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013). Fachriyah (2017) investigates how CS plays its role in English language classroom in Banten, Indonesia. She argues that the utilization of CS in ESL classroom is positioned as a tool to facilitate interactions during learning process and it has various functions.

Code-switching, an action of jumping from one language to another language in communication, is one of bilingualism phenomenon has some types namely intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag switching (Poplack, 1980). Inter-sentential switching happens during a conversation from sentence to sentence. This type involves switching at sentential boundaries in which one clause or sentence is in one language and the next clause or sentence is in the other. Intra-sentential involves the grammar of each language. The speaker knows how these two languages interact and thus, is able to avoid ungrammatical utterances (Shay, 2015). Meanwhile, tag switching involves attaching a tag from one language to an utterance entirely in the other language (Mohammed et al., 2015). In relation to the function of CS, Fachriyah (2017) states that there are14 types of code-switching functions. They are (1) clarification, (2) reiteration or repetition, (3) explanation, (4) asking, (5) translation, (6) checking for understanding, (7) emphasizing of a language element, (8) making inferences, (9) developing vocabulary, (10) class discussions of student' tasks, (11) giving feedback, (12) aiding memorization, (13) class management, and (14) entertainment and general communications.

Many scholars conducted multiple of research in the area of code-switching around the globe. In the context of EFL/ESL, there are some studies done such as Mushin (2010) which observes the bilingual talk in Aboriginal societies, Amorim (2012) dealing with how CS is employed in student-student interaction, Rathert (2012) exploring employment of CS by teacher and student in EFL classroom, Hasan & Akhand (2015) observing the connection of language use to the language user's socioeconomic class in Bangladesh, Mohammed et al. (2015) describing the use of code-switching among Iraqi Arab speakers of English, Zanoni (2016) dealing with the use of students' CS in CLIL class. In Indonesia, there are some works such as Syam, Sangkala, & Syarif (2018)

describing the use of CS in classroom interaction in senior high school in Indonesia, and Hanafiah et al. (2018) dealing with the use of bilingualism in boarding school in Indonesia.

The interaction among lecturers and students in thesis examination is part of educational discourse. The interaction during the thesis seminar or thesis examination session in English studies department of Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU) is ideally conducted fully by using English as the medium of communication among the interactants in the thesis examination. But, in fact, code-switching (English-Bahasa Indonesia) still occurred during the interaction. For example, the examiner used CS because the examinee (student) does not give a response when questioned. This condition is understandable by the examiners (lecturers) so that they employ CS to maintain the smoothness of the interaction. In this case, the lecturer is aware in performing CS. Of course, in performing it, they have the reasons. This phenomenon is critical to be investigated since it is important to improve the quality of the thesis examination in English department specifically in Universitas Sumatera Utara, and generally in Indonesia.

Research Questions

Considering the condition presented in the previous part, the research questions are formulated as the followings:

1. What types of code-switching are found in lecturer-student's interaction in thesis examination?

2. How is the function of code-switching in lecturer-student's interaction in thesis examination?

Research Significance

The findings of this research are expected to be beneficial to enrich the horizon in the application of CS in communication specifically educational discourse. Practically, it is hoped that the findings can be a reference for further researches dealing with bilingualism in educational discourse and language contact in various discourses.

METHOD

Design

This study employed qualitative content analysis as the research design. Ezzy (2012) states that this design is beneficial to be employed as it permits the relevance of pre-existing theory to be tested, and as a way of assessing the applicability of a theory. The data were in the form of utterances obtained from recorded interaction of two thesis examination sessions in graduate program of English at Universitas Sumatera Utara (USU), Indonesia. The procedures of this research including data collection and data analysis explained as the followings.

Data Collection

Due to the limited time and schedule available for thesis examination, the researchers attended two sessions of thesis examination which was conducted in April 2019. The topics presented by the students are about politeness strategies and conversation analysis. The researcher got permission from the head of the department and the examiners to record the examination process by using video-recorder in order to record all the utterances performed by the participants (students and lecturers). In each session, there are two supervisors (main and co-supervisor), and two examiners. The session is led by the main supervisor and the medium of communication is English. The session was opened by the chair (main supervisor), then the student (examinee) presented the result of the research for 15 minutes. After the students had finished their presentation, the chair opened question and answer (Q&A) session. Every examiner (lecturer) was given 15 minutes to give any comments, suggestions, or questions related to the content of the thesis.

Data Analysis

In analysing the data, following there are some procedures based on Ezzy (2012) done as the followings:

- Transcribing the utterances performed by lecturers and students.

- Data condensation. It involves a process of reducing the unnecessary utterances such as local languages used in the interaction.

- Identifying, labeling, and grouping the types of code-switching. This process includes the employment of codes used such as TE (thesis examiner), TA (thesis adviser), and S (student).

- Displaying data in the form of table and the last one is inference making.

FINDINGS

Types of Code-switching

Based on the data analysis, it was found that three types of code-switching as stated by Poplack (1980) were realized in the data namely intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag switching. The details of the occurrences are presented in the following table.

Table 1
Code-Switching Occurrences

Number	Code Switching Types	Occurrences		Total	Total in Percent (%)
		First Presentation	Second Presentation		
1	Intra-sentential	71	16	87	66
2	Inter-sentential	38	13	51	32
3	Tag	2	1	3	2
		111	30	141	100

Table 1 explicitly shows that the number of Intra-sentential code-switching occurrences reached 87 occurrences or 66% of the total 141 utterances found in the two presentation sessions. Then, it is followed by inter-sentential code-switching as the second most common type of code-switching totaling to 51 occurrences or 32%. The last type was tag code-switching. The occurrences of tag code-switching were relatively few or rare. Tag code-switching only reaches 2%; 2 occurrences in the first percentage and 1 occurrence in the second percentage.

Intra-sentential code-switching

TE2   : …. so what is Levinson say about politeness? …. politeness?

S   : Politeness

TE2   : ……… "So, if a Javanese said or Malay said, *ya, sila masuk kita duduk sama makan sama*"….. (So, if Javanese or Malay Said, yes, please come in, have a seat, and have a meal together with us)

         Data from the first presentation (17:49)

The conversation between the speaker S and TE2 above shows that TE2 used Indonesian language when attempting to explain an example of politeness phenomenon. Beforehand, the situation or the context of they interacted each other should be in English. So the utterance "*Sila masuk kita duduk sama makan sama*" should be communicated as "Please come in, have a seat, and have a meal together." This was why the researcher categorized this utterance as code-switching. Moreover, it has been categorized as intra-sentential code switching due to the level of language switch has reached the clause level. This utterance is used by TE2 in order to examine the students' understanding about the phenomenon of politeness theory written in the students' thesis.

Inter-sentential code-switching

Inter-sentential code switching occurred in the data as the following example.

S   : ….Sir, why I choose two speeches because …. I worried about.

TE3   : No, no you don't talk about that …. *Padahal di sana juga (even though, there are)* … also studies about

S   : … ?

TE3   : Are you okay?

         Data from the first presentation (49:04)

The data above indicated the TE3 speaker used inter-sentential code-switching in clause "…*padahal di sana juga*…" which in English was "… whereas there too …".

Tag code-switching

S   : … to face of … *untuk menjaga (to keep)*

TE2   : … *jaga apa*? (to keep what)

S   : *Perasaan* (feelings)

    Data from the first presentation (30:49)

In the utterances above, tag code-switching was found in TE2 utterance. TE2 speaker began to switch his language from English to Indonesian after the S speakers suddenly switched the language. This phenomenon actually happened accidentally due to the TE2 speaker also suddenly tag his language based on his interlocutor language.

The Functions of CS in the Interaction

In the analysis of this CS function, the researcher also found that at each presentation session there were differences in the amount of code switching function used. The difference lies in the function that does not appear in certain presentation sessions. In the first presentation session, there were 11 code-switching functions namely *entertainment, translating, emphasizing, making an inference, clarifying, explaining, asking, checking understanding, giving feedback, giving discussion, and repetition*. On the other hand, in the second session, there were only 9 functions with the absences of discussion and repetition function.

Table 2
Code-Switching Functions

Number	Code Switching Functions	Occurrences		Total	Percentage
		First Presentation	Second Presentation		
1	Asking	54	3	57	40.4%
2	Emphasizing	18	8	26	18.4%
3	Explanation	17	4	21	14.9%
4	Making an Inference	9	3	12	8.5%
5	Entertaining	1	8	9	6.4%
6	Clarification	4	1	5	3.5%
7	Checking understanding	4	1	5	3.5%
8	Translating	1	1	2	1.4%
9	Giving feedback	1	1	2	1.4%
10	Discussion	1	0	1	0.7%
11	Repetition	1	0	1	0.7%
Total		111	30	141	100%

Table 2 showed that in the second presentation there were no *discussion* and *repetition* functions. Meanwhile, from the whole data, the function of *discussion* and *repetition* were the lowest function after *translating* and *giving feedback* functions. The percentage of the occurrences of the *discussion* and *repetition* functions only reached 0.7%. Not much different from translating and giving feedback functions which reached 1.4% occurrence. Similar to the *making an inference, entertainment, clarification and checking understanding functions*, the percentage of the occurrences of these functions were not even reached ten percent. Furthermore, there were three functions that have a high occurrence frequency; asking (40.4%); emphasizing (18.4%); and explanation,

(14.9%). Here, *asking* function was the most frequent function even three times higher than *emphasizing* and *explanation* which are less than 20% from total occurrences.

Asking

S　　: Yes Sir.

TE2　: … his utterance was well maintained and save his face to …. *Bagaimana kita tahu*? (How do we know?)

S　　: From the utterance Sir.

TE2　: *Ya (yes)* from the utterances.

　　　Data from the first presentation (37:08)

During the conversation, the previous TE2 speaker used English but suddenly, at the end of the conversation, he asked the speaker S in Indonesian, which means in English then he mentioned again "How do we know?" In that situation, there was actually a slight emphasis on the question, but the emphasis is clearer in the last English sentence than in the previous Indonesian sentence. This led the researcher to conclude that the TE2 speaker deliberately switches his language to Indonesian for asking specific thing because the question really needed an answer. Different from the next question, the same question but in English "How do we know?" which further shows the reaffirmation of the previous Indonesian question. So, based on that explanation, the question "*Bagaimana kita tahu*?" classified as CS which the functions as an asking function.

Emphasizing

TA2　: … past happen.

TE1　: So …. Read this thesis so you have benefit from this … *Langsung dapat manfaat (*directly got the benefit*)*.

S　　: This research is, spontaneous giving the benefits for the students that … research, can make a better political speech.

Data from the second presentation (28:00)

In this section, there was a discussion between TA2, TE1, and S about the benefits of research conducted by speaker S. Until in the middle of the discussion, the TE1 speaker closed his conclusion by emphasizing "*Langsung dapat manfaat*" or in English "Get benefits right away". This CS happened here is regarded as *emphasizing*. At a glance, the data indicated the make inference function, but by paying attention to the previous sentence, the speaker actually has made an inference in English "read this thesis so you have benefits from this." In short, the essence of the sentence is "the thesis has benefit" and the TE1 speaker has concluded the benefits and emphasized it with an Indonesian language clause, neither repeated nor translated because the sentence "read this thesis so you have benefits from this" and clause "*Langsung dapat manfaat*" have different meaning.

Explanation

S   : Yes Sir.

TE2   : …. *Ini tak ada riset. Hanya mendata, tak ada analisis, karena datanya anda ambil, anda sebutkan dua ada, ya*. How are the strategy used by Ellen ….

S   : From the utterance Sir.

       Data from the first presentation (36:41)

In the conversation above, CS has an explanation function which is lied in "*hanya mendata, tak ada analisis, karena datanya anda ambil, anda sebutkan dua ada, ya*." or in English "just data, there is no analysis, because you take two data, you mention two there, yes." The TE2 speaker continued using Indonesian after he made the conclusion that the student fails to present the analysis of the data. The student only provided raw data without presenting the analysis and the in-depth discussion based on the data. The TE then said "*ini tak ada research*" or in English "There is no research." Therefore, the appearance of the sentence "*hanya mendata, tak ada analisis, karena datanya anda ambil, anda sebutkan dua ada, ya*" was aimed *to explain* the reason for the conclusion that has been said by the previous TE2 speaker.

Making an Inference

S   : To

TE2   : …when communicated with the guest of the talk show. *Berarti anda, research anda gak betul*. (it means that you did your research wrongly)

S   : Yes Sir.

       Data from the first presentation (34:10)

Here the TE2 speaker made a conclusion after he explained some of the parts of the research conducted by S namely "*berarti anda, research anda gak betul*" which meant "Means you, your research is not correct." Based on this analysis the researchers classified the data as CS which has the make inference function. The TE made his inference after questioning the student since the student failed to explain what she has done during the research.

Entertaining

TE1   : So you analyze Donald Trump speaking, ya? *....sudah gila sakit kita kata Mahatir ya*? (crazy, sick, like Mahatir said)

TA2   : ….

TE2   : *Dia mau sakit jadi* …(He wants to get sick, so...)

TA1   : *Emang gila*. (really crazy)

Data from the second presentation (00:36)

In the early part of the conversation, the TE1 showed interest in the research conducted by speaker S. The research related to one of the world's major figures, Donald Trump. Incidentally, the issues about Donald Trump that were currently being rife by the world were making the TE1 speaker interested in bringing up the opinions of other figures such as Mahathir who taught Donald Trump has a strange mentality. Therefore, TE1 began the conversation with a tickling tickle from Mahatir about Donald Trump "*Sudah gila sakit kita ...kata Mahatir ya*?" or in English "We are already crazy sick ... said Mahatir isn't it?"In the midst of the conversation, all the speakers laughed and replied to the tweet by switching the language with Indonesian as stated by the TE2 speaker "*Dia mau sakit jadi ...*" meant "He wants to be sick so…". The CS, both of which were used by TE1 at the beginning of the conversation and what TE2 said was classified into the entertainment function. It was due to the researchers' observations, the speakers have deliberately changed their language to Indonesian in order to make the joke sound more fun.

Clarification

TE2 : … how many data?

S : Twelve Sir.

TE2 : *Tapi anda sebutkan tadi dua puluh satu.* (but you said twenty one before)

S : Ow, the data, *dua puluh (twenty)*, oh iya Sir.

Data from the first presentation (30:05)

In this case, the TE2 speaker wanted to confirm or clarify the S speaker's answer that previously sounded inappropriate. TE2 speaker switched the language to "*tapi anda sebutkan tadi dua puluh satu*" which means "but you mentioned twenty-one." The sentence sounds like asking or affirming in response to the S speaker but his name is not a question or affirmation but rather a sentence that aims to clarify whether the speaker S was sure of the answer before. Conversely, it was not a question or affirmation but rather a sentence that aimed to clarify whether the S speaker is sure of the answer.

Checking Understanding

S : Because they looks happy and …

TA2 : …?

TE2 : So if this sentence you use here is mean, I think no need to put the strong statement like this one right? …Modality. *Gunakan modalitas kayak tidak ada keraguankan*? (use modality like there is no doubt)

Data from the second presentation (39:46)

In the last part, the TE2 speaker switched his language to Indonesian, "*Gunakan modalitas kayak tidak ada keraguankan*?" or in English "use modality like there is no doubt right?" Based on the researcher observation, that CS served as checking understanding. The TE2 speaker had previously explained "modality" to the S speaker.

Therefore, after the TE2 speaker explained, he then ascertained whether the speaker S understood or captured his explanation by giving questions that were switched into Indonesian.

Translating

TE3   : What is your major?

TE2   : What is your major?

S   : … Sir?

TE3   : Major

TE1   : *Jurusannya apa*? (what major?)

Data from the first presentation (39:22)

In this section, the sentence function that the speaker TE1 switched—"*jurusan apa*?" was very clearly categorized as translating function. As the conversation data above, there were two speakers, TE3 and TE2, asked the same question to the S speaker. The question "What is your major?" was firstly asked by TE3 speaker then the TE2 speaker repeated it. At that time, the S speaker did not seem to understand what the TE3 speaker was asking so TE2 repeated the question with the same sentence but the S speaker still did not understand the meaning of the question. Then TE3 emphasized the important point of the question "Major" with the intention that the S speaker would understand the purpose of the question. Seeing the incident, the TE1 speaker then repeated the TE3 question by translating it into Bahasa Indonesia, "*Jurusan apa*?". That is why the researchers concluded that this time was code switching which functioned for translating.

Giving Feedback

S   : … stress of the utterances

TE2   : *Ngarang ngarang* (unclear, unclear)

TE3   : …*ngarang. Di sini ada gak*? (unclear, is this presented?)

S   : *Gak ada* sir. (nothing, sir)

TE3   : …. So your mind should be written here *apa pun hasilnya* (whatever it is).

Data from the first presentation (46:38)

The CS employed by the TE3 speaker at the end of the conversation above served as giving feedback. "So your mind should be written here *apa pun hasilnya*" or which means "So your mind should be written here whatever the result" was conveyed by TE3 as feedback on some answers given by the S speaker. The sentence was delivered by TE3 with the intention of giving advice in response to the S speaker's answer that was not as it should be.

Discussing

S   : … the meaning ….

TE2 : Bald and Record?

S   : Yes Sir.

TE2 : *Oke kita tulis dengan a ini, ada politeness strategy, a, b*. (okay, we mark this as

      *a,*there is politeness strategu, a, b.)

      Data from the first presentation (22:01)

Here, after TE2 asked a number of questions to the S speaker, TE2 began to continue discussions related to research conducted by S. As at the end of the conversation, TE2 switched the language "*Oke kita tulis dengan a ini, ada politeness strategy, a, b."* which meant "okay we write with this a, there is a politeness strategy, a, b." The language change was carried out by the TE2 speaker right when he discussed his idea with the S speaker about to write something in S's research. Therefore the function CS here is discussion.

Repetition

TE2 : … What kind of politeness strategy are used by Ellen ….

S   : I used the positive politeness and negative politeness… Sir.

TE2 : … *Ni dipake gak yang dua yang lain*? (this does not use the other two) That is this talk show…. *Yang dua yang lain, yang anda buang yang tadi pake apa tidak*? (the other two that you throw away before, do they use it or not?)

      Data from the first presentation (33:49)

The repetition function here was in the form of the question "*Yang dua yang lain, yang anda buang yang tadi pake apa tidak*?" or in English "the other two, that you throw away before, is it used or not?" The TE2 speaker had actually asked that question before but in a shorter question "is it used the other two?" But he repeated the question after his explanation to speaker S.

DISCUSSION

The phenomenon of many occurrences of CS (English and Bahasa Indonesia) found in the data is a common thing. But, it seems to be interesting since it happens in the situation that ideally should be run by using English fully. The use of CS in educational context is not forbidden. It could be as strategy as stated by Songxaba, Coetzer, & Molepo (2017) that CS could be one of strategies performed by teacher in classroom interaction. They further argue that the switch from English to indigenous language in South Africa. The use of CS by students indicates that students have difficulty in English fluency and linguistic competence. The example is presented in the following:

S : … to face of … *untuk menjaga* (to keep) (Data from the first presentation (30:49))

The example above clearly shows us that the student used the phrase "*untuk menjaga*". She did not know the phrase in English "to keep". So, she used Bahasa Indonesia instead of the English one. It means that the student had a problem in linguistic competence. This is in line with the statement of Cook (2013) stating that the speaker switch the language due to his or her inability to detect words or terms as the narration of specific thing in a certain language.

During the data collection, the writers observed that the use of CS by the examiners was triggered because the students were silent when being questioned. It means that the examiners are aware in using CS and it may be their strategy to keep the communication. Apart from it, realize it or not, either conscious or subconscious, CS provides some fundamental functions that may be beneficial in language learning situation Qing (2010) including examination. Additionally, the writers also found that there are 11 code switching functions used by both students and examiners based. It is quite different from the research conducted by Bensen & Çavuşoğlu (2013) mentioning that there were 14 types of code-switching functions. In this research, it is found that the eleven (11) functions of CS in thesis examination were entertainment, translating, emphasizing, making an inference, clarifying, explaining, asking, checking understanding, giving feedback, giving discussion, and repetition.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, it is concluded that in terms of the types, intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag switching are realized in the data. Then, the dominant type is intra-sentential switching. In terms of the function of CS utilized by interactants, there are eleven (11) function realized namely as entertainment, translating, emphasizing, making an inference, clarifying, explaining, asking, checking understanding, giving feedback, giving discussion, and repetition. It can be inferred that in graduate program of English at Universitas Sumatera Utara, lecturers and students in thesis examination are hard to avoid the employment of CS during interaction. Even though the rule is to use full English, but in order to keep the continuity and smoothness of the interaction as well as to ensure that the messages could be comprehended well, CS is still used.

Based on the fact above, it is suggested that the graduate students of English at Universitas Sumatera Utara improve their ability in speaking English and understanding the content of their thesis. It is also known that one of the factors of CS employment in this research is due to the students' lack of understanding. For further research, it is also suggested to explore the areas such as the use of politeness and language style in thesis examination.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Amorim, R. (2012). Code switching in student-student interaction; functions and reasons! *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos Da Univerdade Do Porto*, *7*, 177–195.

Bensen, H., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Sayi*, *20*(2), 69–82.

Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.

Ezzy, D. (2012). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. National Library of Australia.

Fachriyah, E. (2017). The functions of code switching in an English language classroom. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *4*(2), 148–156. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v4i2.6327.

Hanafiah, R., Rantika, A., & Yusuf, M. (2018). The levels of English Arabic code-mixing in islamic boarding school students' daily conversation. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *9*(6), 78. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.6p.78.

Johansson, S. (2013). *Code-switching in the English classroom: What teachers do and what their students wish they did* (Degree Project). Karlstads Universitet.

Mabule, D. R. (2015). What is this? Is it code switching, Code mixing or language alternating? *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *5*(1), 339–350. https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2015.v5n1p339.

Mohammed, M. Q., Hameed, F. W., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2015). *Code-switching between informal Iraqi dialect and English language among Iraqi undergraduate students at Baghdad university*. *3*(6), 193–208.

Mushin, I. (2010). Code-switching as an interactional resource in Garrwa/Kriol talk-in-interaction. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *30*(4), 471–496. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2010.518556.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, *18*(7–8), 581–618.

Qing, X. (2010). To switch or not to switch: Examine the code-switching practices of teachers of non-English majors. *Canadian Social Science*, *6*(4), 109–113.

Rathert, S. (2012). Functions of teacher and student code-switching in an efl classroom and pedagogical focus: Observations and implications. *Educational Process: International Journal*, *1*(1–2), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.12973/edupij.2012.112.1.

Shay, O. (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country. *Pro.-Soc. and Beh. Sci.*, *209*, 462–469. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253.

Songxaba, S. L., Coetzer, A., & Molepo, J. M. (2017). Perceptions of teachers on creating space for code switching as a teaching strategy in second language teaching in the Eastern Cape province, South Africa. *Reading & Writing*, *8*(1), 1–7.

Syam, U. K., Sangkala, I., & Syarif, I. (2018). Code mixing and code switching in the classroom interaction at SMA Negeri 2 Takalar. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, *23*(7), 95–99. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2307079599.

Tajudin. (2013). The occurrence of code switching on personal message of Blackberry messenger. *Journal of English and Education*, *1*(2), 103–114.

Zanoni, F. (2016). Code-switching in CLIL classes: A Case study. *EL.LE*, *5*(2), 279–295. https://doi.org/10.14277/2280-6792/ELLE-5-2-6.