Proceeding

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON TEACHING ENGLISH
AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

BINA CITRA
PUSTAKA

FACULTY OF LETTERS
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY
PURWOKERTO

BINA CITRA PUSTAKA

PROCEEDING
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TEACHING ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE
2ND COTEFL

PUBLISHED IN A COLLABORATION BETWEEN

FOREWORD

The first International Conference of Teaching English as a Foreign Language last year got exciting responses from its participants. Most of the participants felt great and asked the committee to run the similar conference. Thus, Faculty of Letters, Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto proudly presents the second International Conference precisely a year after the first. This year International conference focuses on "Building up Linguistic Competence and Global Communication Skills in Diverse Culture".

This proceeding consists of some abstracts to present at the conference. They are sent from some areas of Indonesia and foreign countries, and are written some lecturers, teachers, and students. The writings give interesting pictures to discuss about the importance of English as a communication media in this globally merged world.

As an illustration Mr. Amporn Sa-ngiamwibool (Thailand) discusses the effects of CRI (Consciousness-Raising Instructions) and CAI (Computer-Assisted Instructions) on Thai students' proficiency at international communication levels, with three specific purposes: (1) to examine the effects of the CRI and CAI on Thai students' English proficiency, (2) to explore the students' communicative proficiency, and (3) to determine how to enhance English for communication in an EFL classroom.

As such, this book is a valuable guide to understanding any issues dealing with how the communicative skills, the linguistic competences and the multicultural understanding are planted and enhanced to the learners in each grade, the best practices to achieve the objective, and benefits we can take out of the IT for it. We wish that the compilation of writings will offer enthusiasts and incredible opportunity to learn from the experts.

Finally, we cordially welcome you for the fruitful conference and enjoyable stay in Purwokerto!!!

Thank you.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb

Titik Wahyuningsih, S.S.,M.Hum.
Dean, Faculty of Letter

Promoting Code-switching Practices to Teach Other Subjects through English

Margana

State University of Yogyakarta

Nowadays, the Indonesian government has been promoting the use of English as a means of instructions in all education levels called bilingual programs as one of the national policies. To realize it, the Indonesian government has decided to establish the pilot international standard schools in every province in Indonesia implemented from the elementary school level to senior high school level. Added to this, some universities such as Indonesian Islamic University of Yogyakarta, State University of Yogyakarta, and others offer international classes for some study programs to respond to the national policy. One of the aims of the establishment of the pilot international standard program and international class is to make the Indonesian education achieve qualified graduates to internationally compete with other graduates from other countries.

To implement the bilingual program, the Indonesian government encourages bilingual teachers and lecturers to dominantly use English as a means of communication, particularly when they are involved in classroom communications. To do so, bilingual teachers and lecturers have to struggle hard to achieve sufficient English proficiency. Based on some interviews with bilingual teachers and lecturers in Yogyakarta, however, they still have difficulties in speaking English. With regard to this problem, switching from English to Indonesian or vice versa called code-switching can be one of the alternatives to minimize the problem faced by bilingual teachers and lecturers on the grounds that they have limited English proficiency. The application of code-switching can be used to minimize burden and stress on the part of bilingual teachers and lecturers when they teach other subjects through English. In addition, the use of English alternated with Indonesian conducted by bilingual teachers and lecturers in classroom communication is an interesting issue as switching from one language to the other language, for example, from English to Indonesian language or vice versa cannot be avoided for some reasonable functions. Those functions include (1) maintaining the sustainability of the communication between bilingual teachers and their students, (2) coping with their language barriers; (3) explaining the difficult concept of certain issues, (4) managing the teaching and learning process, and (5) encouraging students to learn the subjects concerned. To sum up, code-switching practices are encouraged and tolerated for bilingual teachers and lecturers.

Key words: *Code-switching, Bilingual Education*

A. Introduction

Nowadays, the primary education level to the tertiary education level have been establishing a bilingual program - the practice of teaching non-English core subjects such as sciences, social studies, and mathematics through English. This program is aimed at facilitating students to be closely engaged with the subjects concerned as English is the language for the development of science and technology. This implies that students in all levels should have high English skills both written and spoken in order that they could maximally gain the content and the application of the core subjects offered by the schools or universities concerned. In addition, the bilingual program targets to gain qualified and competitive graduates who are able to compete with other graduates from other countries in many aspects.

In lieu with the bilingual program, the Indonesian government via the ministry of national education has been struggling for the establishment of the bilingual program. The policy refers to the Act of National Education System Number 20 Year 2003 Article 50 Verse 3 which states that the Indonesian government in collaboration with local governments holds

at least one international standard school in every level of education. This triggers the establishment of the bilingual school programs in the whole Indonesian regions. As a result, a number of international school programs have been blooming from the elementary school level to the university one.

To successfully implement the bilingual programs, teachers and lecturers of sciences, mathematics, and social sciences are demanded to be able to speak English when they are involved in teaching and learning process as English is one of the required devices used in classroom communication. Ideally, teachers and lecturers of those subjects mentioned should use English exclusively as a means of communication. However, this seems to be hard for bilingual teachers and lecturers as they have not been purposively and intensely prepared as bilingual teachers and lecturers. In shorts, their English language skills have not been sufficient enough to administer such a bilingual program policy. To cope with this problem, the minister of the national education via the department of the primary and secondary education has provided local, regional, or national in-service training for bilingual teachers to update their knowledge of the subjects concerned and English skills. Also, some lecturers have been facilitated to go abroad and to continue their study. Those efforts, however, cannot figure out the English insufficiency problem faced by bilingual teachers and lecturers as utilizing English exclusively takes a long process and needs strenuous efforts and regular practices.

In reference to the above problem, this paper attempts to promote use of code-switching - alternating one a language with another language in a series of communication events - to bilingual teachers and lecturers when they teach non-English subjects through English. The use of code-switching (abbreviated CS) can be one of the alternative solutions to cope with language barriers and to minimize psychological burdens on the part of bilingual teachers and lecturers. In addition, code-switching practices are believed to be advantageous in nature as it is not randomly conducted. In other words, code-switching practices serve many functions which are believed to directly or indirectly influence to the success of teaching non-English subjects through English.

To easily understand the main point of this paper, the writer systematizes his writing into three main discussions which include (1) the notion of code-switching, (2) types of code-switching, and (3) functions of code-switching practices. To end the discussion, some final remarks are made. Each is presented below.

B. The Notion of Code-switching

Before having a further discussion of the notion of code-switching, the term *code* should be well understood. *Code* is used not only to refer to different languages but also to deal with language varieties in the same language which includes dialects and styles within the language itself. Boztepe (2003) states that the term *code* embodies a language or a dialect as it is a relatively impartial conceptualization of linguistic diversity. For example, in Javanese there are some types of language variations which include *Ngoko, Kromo,* and *Kromo Inggil.* In addition, Javanese consists of some types of dialects such a Yogyakartanese dialect, a Solonese dialect, and others. Those are also called code. Gardner-Chloros (1991) reemphasizes that code-switching emerges not only between languages, but also dialects in the same activated language. For the purpose of this writing, the writer applies the term *code* to refer to any language used by bilingual teachers or lecturers excluding the language variations that possibly exist within the activated language. There are three types of language that are applied by bilingual teachers or lecturers. They include English (target language), Indonesian (first language), and Javanese (local language). When bilingual teachers or lecturers alternate one of the languages with another language, for example, Indonesian with English or vice versa, this is called code-switching.

In lieu with *code-switching*, many terms have been proposed by some experts. The terms include language mixing, code-mixing, and language alternation. Butler and Gutierrez (2003) define language mixing as the behaviour of bilinguals to code-alternate one language with another language. Further, they assert that language mixing includes *code-switching, code-mixing,* and *borrowing*. Different from such a term, David (2003) distinguishes between code-mixing and code-switching. *Code-mixing* refers to the employment of two languages in turn, but it is only concerned with limited token use of the target language. *Code-switching* deals with the use of more than one code, which can appear within a turn or within an utterance. Auer (1995) prefers to use the term *code alternation* and *code insertion*. The former refers to the replacement of one language with another that usually occurs in longer stretches. The latter means the insertion of single word from one language to the structure of another language. Both terms appear to be two different processes but they have the same work of CS language models (Muysken, 1995, 2000). Kamwangamalu (1992) also uses language alternation for code-switching and code-mixing. The former refers to alternating one language with another language across sentence boundaries, while the latter is within a sentence (Grosjean, 1982; Toress, 1989; and Brice, 2000). In addition to code-mixing the forms of language alternation can be single words (nouns, pronouns, adjective, and verbs), phrases (noun phrases, preposition phrases, and alike), or sentences.

With regard to the different terms, the writer uses the term code-switching which is commonly used to refer alternating one language with another language in any communication including in classroom communication conducted by bilingual teachers or lecturers. Such alternation is a normal, common, and significant aspect of bilingual nature (Grosjean, 1982; Kamwangamalu, 1992; Pennington, 1995). Poplack (1980) adds that the alternation of two or more languages in discourse often with no change of participant or topic. In a more detailed sense, Gumperz (1982:59) defines CS as 'the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems'. The code-switched items are prosodically, semantically, and grammatically tied in a single communication activity (Romaine, 1995).

Another definition is offered by Richards et al. (1992), stating that it is a switch by a speaker from one language to another language. The switch can be in the middle of discourse or even within one sentence. In support of this definition, Omar (1993) defines code-switching as alternating one code with another 'in the speech of a particular speaker in a particular situation'. Jariah (2003) adds code-switching from one language to another is not merely engaged with equal proficiency which a bilingual has, but a bilingual speaker often code-switches from one language to another to resolve the language difficulty. In other words, a bilingual speaker who has limited proficiency tends to use of code-switching by repeating and reformulating utterances from of one language to another (see David, 2001). Further, David (2002) claims that code-switching employed by Malaysian Sindhi families is used as a communicative strategy to compensate insufficient linguistic mastery.

As previously discussed, a myriad of terms are proposed to describe the use of two or more languages alternated one with another such as *language switching, language insertion, language alternation, language mixing, code-mixing, code-alternation, code changing,* and *code-switching*. Given that such terms have not been standardized in the literature, this study, therefore, reserves the term *code-switching* because it embodies code-mixing which is equivalent to intra-sentential CS (Romaine, 1995; Baker, 2001; May et al., 2004). Milroy and Muysken (1995) also prefer to use the term CS which embodies inter-sentential and intra-sentential switches. This position taken here is that the term code-switching is both adequate and appropriate to the description of CS practices for bilingual teachers and lecturers. In

addition, this paper does not differentiate code-switching and code-mixing since the term code-switching is also to encompass code-mixing (see May et al., 2004; Baker, 2001).

The term *code-switching* used in this paper is defined in a much broader sense of its conventional definition. The alternation of English with Indonesian or vice versa by bilingual teachers and lecturers who do not have equal proficiency in both English and Indonesian is called code-switching. Bilingual teachers and lecturers may switch at any point of sentences, and between sentences or within sentences. In other words, when they activate more than one language no matter what they repeat, reformulate or literally translate utterances from one language to another, it is called code-switching.

C. Types of Code-switching

As previously discussed, the term *code-switching* refers to switches between sentences or within a sentence. In terms of its type, Romaine (1995) divides CS into three: (1) inter-sentential, (2) intra-sentential and (3) tag switching. The term *inter-sentential code-switching* is defined as alternating some linguistic elements from one language to another language across sentence boundaries. The following presents the example of inter-sentential code-switching.

(1) Teacher : Today we will continue our lesson about fungi. Do you still remember two characteristics of fungi? *Siapa yang masih ingat karakteristik jamur* ('Who remembers the characteristics of fungi')? *Coba siapa yang mau jawab pertanyaan saya* ('Who wants to answer my question')?

(2) Teacher : *Jadi jamur mendapatkan makanan dari inangnya* ('So fungi gets food from its core'). Okay, next we will study the classification of fungi. *Silahkan isi tabel mengenai klasifikasi jamur* (Fill in the table dealing with the classification of fungi').

The italicized forms perform some examples of inter-sentential code-switching. Bilingual teachers or lecturers sometimes do code-switching from English to Indonesian or vice versa across sentence boundaries.

Intra-sentential CS occurs when the linguistic items are alternated within a clause or sentence from one language to another (Poplack, 1980; Berk-Seligson, 1986; Romaine, 1995; Bhatia and Ritchie, 1996; MacSwan, 1997, 1999). The linguistic items can be in the form of nouns, noun phrases, verbs, verb phrases, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, adverbial phrases, subordinate conjunctions, coordinate conjunctions, prepositional phrases, interrogatives, subordinate clauses, coordinate clauses, and clause markers. Some examples of intra-sentential code-switching are presented below.

(3) Teacher : If you see such a problem, *kamu bisa menggunakan aturan pertama* ('you may use the first rule').

(4) Teacher : The Pythagorean theorem *sangat penting untuk dipelajari* ('is very important to be studied').

(6) Teacher : Okay, finish *belum* ('yet')? Hartati, please write your discussion result, *hasil diskusi* (the result of your discussion') on the whiteboard.

In relation to intra-sentential CS, Brice and Brice (2000) conducted research on language use in a classroom for Spanish and English bilinguals. The results of their study reveal seven forms of grammatical elements in the intra-sentential type of code-switching.

The grammatical elements include (1) noun, (2) verb phrase, (3) verb, (4) preposition phrase, (5) adjective, (6) adverb, and (7) interjection. Of the seven grammatical elements, the noun was the most common element in intra-sentential code-switching. Other scholars also documented the order of syntactic functions of CS across studies. The results show that the syntactic classes: noun, verb, preposition, adjective, and adverbs, tend to always occur in the intra-sentential code-switching across studies. Of the five grammatical elements, the noun is the most common in the intra-sentential type as shown in the following table.

Rank	Pfaff (1977)	Poplack (1980)	Zentella (1997)	Brice (2000)
1	Noun-	Single Noun	Object/Subject Noun	Object/Subject Noun
2	Verb	Interjection	Adverb	Verb Phrase
3	Adjectiv	Noun Phr	Preposition Phrase	Prepositional Phrases /Verb

	e	a s e		
4.	Preposition	Adverb	Verb Phrase/Adjective	Adjective/Adverb
5.	Verb Phrase	Verb Phrase	Verb	Interjection
6.		Verb		
7.		Adjective		

(Source: Brice & Brice, 2002:6)

Table 1 The order of Syntactic Functions of Intra-sentential CS

Tag switching refers to the insertion of a tag or parenthetical in one language into an expression in the other language (Romaine, 1995). Poplack (1980) names such a code-switching type as emblematic switching since it functions as a trademark of the bilingual character of an otherwise monolingual sentence. The following presents the examples of tag switching.

(5) Teacher : Now, you know the Pythagorean theorem, *khan*?

(6) Teacher : Don't make any noise, *ya*?

In reference to the types of code-switching, bilingual teachers and lecturers may apply those types of code-switching depending on their English language proficiency and topics that they deal with. Also, they can utilize any type of code-switching regarding students' English proficiency and the context of situation of teaching and learning process.

D. The Functions of Code-switching

In terms of function, Gysels (1992) outlines two general functions of CS practices in natural discourse, namely to fulfill linguistic/conceptual gaps among participants and other multiple purposes, such as solidarity, identity, formality. Crystals (1987) proposes three functions: (1) to compensate for participant language deficiency, (2) to show solidarity among participants within a particular social group, and (3) to express participant attitudes toward other participant(s).

More specific functions of CS are proposed by Gumperz (1982:73), who divide six functions in the speech community: (1) quotations, (2) addressee specification, (3) interjections, (4) reiteration, (5) message qualification, and (6) personalization versus objectivization. Quotation function refers to reporting someone's utterance either in direct or indirect speech forms. Addressee specification is defined as directing a certain message to a particular participant among other participants involved in the communication. Interjection means inserting certain forms to mark sentence fillers, for example, the insertion of the English form *you know* in an otherwise entirely Indonesian utterance. Reiteration refers to repeating a statement in the other language to clarify the message. Message qualification is defined as elaborating the preceding sentences in the other language. Personalization versus objectivization refers to the degree of speaker participation in the communication. For example, English teachers switch from English to Indonesian to personalize the message since this switching can create comfortable and closed atmosphere, then they control communication by activating English to remain objective and distanced.

In reference to functions of CS as proposed by Gumperz (1982), Romaine (1995) classifies functions of CS in the speech community into: pragmatic and socio-psychological perspectives. In terms of pragmatic, CS practices function (1) to make direct quotations, (2) to direct a message to one of several addressees, (3) to express interjections, (4) to paraphrase propositions, (5) to qualify messages, and (6) to signify topic-comments. From a socio-psychological perspective, CS can be used (1) to show solidarity, power, personalization, and objectification; (2) to reflect the addressers' language proficiency and language dominance, and (3) to meet suitable discourse domains. Myers-Scotton (1976) adds a strategy of neutrality.

Further, Koziol (2000) has eight additional functions of CS practices by Spanish and English bilinguals in American Society. The functions include (1) designation, (2) substitution (appositive), (3) emphasis, (4) clarification, (5) un-translatability, (6) parenthesis, (7) message aggravation, and (8) topic shift. Designation means using endearment or a particular name to designate someone. Substitution (appositive) is defined as a word or a group of words used to refer to the same thing. Emphasis means highlighting a certain segment of a sentence. Clarification refers to specifying what a speaker is talking about. Un-translatability means relegating concepts or issues, which have no equivalents in the activated languages. Parenthesis means any extra additional information on a certain subject. Aggravating messages is the opposite of mitigating messages. It is defined as giving emphasis on demand without giving further explanation. Topic shift means alternating one topic with another topic. Koziol (2000) claims that personalization – alternating one language with another language to include the other speaker in communication, is the most common function practised by Spanish-English bilinguals in the American society.

In relation to the functions of CS, many scholars have endeavoured to conduct research on the functions of CS in classroom communication. Brice and Brice (2002), for example, document ten functions of CS practices by Spanish-English bilingual teachers in classroom communication. The functions include (1) to respond to students' questions, (2) to give tasks to students, (3) to ask factual questions, (4) to check vocabulary, (5) to reiterate a statement, (6) to give further information, (7) to check comprehension, (8) to provide feedback to students, (9) to give indirect task requests, and (10) to review content of the lesson.

In relation to those functions, Rollin-Ianziti & Brownlie (2002) classify three communicative functions of CS practices by French-English bilingual teachers: (1) organizing the class, (2) responding to students' requests, and (3) expressing state of mind. The first communicative function includes giving instructions, motivating students, planning activities, delivering the lesson, giving feedback, checking comprehension, and dealing with classroom equipment. The second function is classified into answering student questions in their first language about the second language and translating upon student request. The third function comprises creating humor and expressing emotions (anger, like, dislike, etc). In addition to those functions, Merritt et al. (1992) offer a linguistic insecurity function. This refers to the teachers' strategy to control utterances by employing CS in order to effectively maintain classroom communication. Fly-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) offer another function of CS, which is topic switch. This means teachers utilize CS to switch from one topic to another topic. In addition, they suggest that second language teachers may switch from the target language to the first language when they explain grammar/structure. Reyes (2004) also found CS functioned as a discourse marker, where certain linguistic items were inserted in the other language without adding to the content of utterances. More specific functions are proposed by Margana (2008) who documents at least seven functions of code-switching practices by English teachers when they are involved in teaching English for beginning learners. The functions include (1) getting work done, (2) attention getting, (3) conversational devices, (4) getting along with others, (5) language building, and (6) mitigating a message, and (7) reinforcing learners' memory.

For bilingual teachers and lecturers who have insufficient English proficiency, code-switching practices can be used for some particular functions. Bilingual teachers or lecturers can use code-switching as a strategy for coping with their linguistic barriers, sustaining the continuity of classroom communication, explaining the difficult concept of certain issues, managing the teaching and learning process, and encouraging students to learn the subjects concerned. Kasper (1997) contends that CS can be applied as a strategy for compensating inadequate knowledge of linguistic items. In support of this statement, Pillay and Wha (1997) assert that since bilingual teachers are in the process of becoming bilinguals, they attempt to expand their skills and strategies (i.e. code-switching) when they are involved in teaching and learning process. To sum up, code-switching practices should be promoted to bilingual teachers and lecturers on the grounds that such practices serve a great number of functions. When bilingual teachers and lecturers have gained high English proficiency, code-switching practices have to be minimized depending on the students' characteristics and other related factors that constrain the use of code-switching.

E. Conclusions

With regard to the above discussions, it is obvious that code-switching practices should be tolerated for beginning bilingual teachers in particular when they are involved in teaching non-English subjects through English. Code-switching practices can be in the form of inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-switching. Tolerating the use of code-switching in teaching non-English subjects through English is believed to confer some functions which

include (1) maintaining the sustainability of the communication between bilingual teachers and their students, (2) coping with their language barriers, (3) explaining the difficult concept of certain issues, (4) managing the teaching and learning process, and (5) encouraging students to learn the subjects concerned. Also, it can be used to minimize the psychological burdens on the part of bilingual teachers and lecturers due to their insufficient language barriers. Imposing them to use English exclusively in teaching non-English subjects does not guarantee the success for achieving the targeted subjects.

References

Auer, J. C. P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (Ed.) *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115-135). Cambridge: University Press

Berk-Seligson, S. (1986). Linguistic constraints on intra-sentential code-switching: A study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *Language in Society, 15* (3), 313-348.

Bhatia, T.K., & Ritchie, W.C. (1996). Bilingual language mixing, universal grammar, and second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie and Tej K. Bhatia (Ed), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp.627-688). San Diego: Academic Press.

Boztepe, E. (2003). Issues in code-switching: Competing theories and model. Teachers college, Columbia University.

Brice, A. (2000). Code-switching and code mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. *Journal of the Speech Pathology Association of Australia, 20* (1), 19-28.

Brice, A., & Brice, R. (2002). Language in the classroom: Comparisons of four bilingual environments. Retrieved on October 16, 2004 from http://www.asha.ucf.edu/Southafrica2000.html.

Butler, Y. G., & Gutierrez, M. B. (2003). Learning climates: A case of 4th grade students in an English-only district in California. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27* (2), 207-224.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

David, M. K. (2001). *The Sindhis of Malaysia: A sociolinguistic study.* London: Asean.

David, M. K. (2002). Communicative strategies in Malaysian Sindhi homes. In David, M. K. (ed.), *Methodological Issues in Language Maintenance and Language Shift Studies.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 59-70.

David, M.K. (2003). Role and functions of code-switching in Malaysian courtrooms. *Multilingua, 22,* 5-20.

Flyman-Mattsson, A & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers, 47,* 59-72.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Conversational code-switching. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Jariah, M. J. (2003). Code-switching for power wielding: Inter-gender discourse at the workplace. *Multilingua, 22*, 41-57.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. (1992). Mixers and mixing. English across cultures. *World Englishes, 1i* (2/3), 173- 181.

Kasper, G. (1977). Towards a characterization of the strategies of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 2*, 58-145.

Koziol, J. M. (2000). Code-switching between Spanish and English in contemporary American society. Retrieved on August 30, 2004 from http://www.smcm.edu/aldiv/ilc/pdfdocs/koziol.pdf.

MacSwan, J. (1997). A minimalist approach to intra-sentential code switching: Spanish-Nahuatl bilingualism in central Mexico. *Doctorial Dissertation*. University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved on August 30, 2004 from http://www.publica.asu.edu/~macswan/bilingualism.pdf.

MacSwan, J. (1999). *A Minimalist Approach to Intra-sentential Code Switching*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Margana. (2008). Functions of Code-switching for Beginning Learners. Presented on the International Conference in Soegiapranata University of Semarang.

May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingual/immersion education: Indicators of good practice*. Final Report to the Ministry of Education, New Zealand.

Merritt, M., A. et al. (1992). Socializing multilingualism: determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. M. Eastman (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp.103-21). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken, (Ed.), *One speaker, two languages, cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 177-198). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C.. (1976). Strategies of neutrality: Language choice in uncertain situations. *Language, 52* (4), 919-941.

Omar, Asmah Haji. (1993). *Language and society in Malaysia.* Kuala Lumpur: *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.*

Pennington, M. C. (1995). Eight case studies of classroom discourse in the Hong Kong secondary English class. *Research Report Number 42.* Hong Kong Department of English. City University of Hong Kong.

Pillay, H., & Wha, Y.P. (1997). Language and empowerment: the role of first language (L1) in the teaching of English. *Third International conference on Language in Development*, Langkawi, Malaysia, National Institute of Public Administration (INTAN).

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

Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic Structures and Social Functions of Code-switching. In R.P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behaviour* (pp. 169-84). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Poplack, S. (1985). Contrasting pattern of code-switching in two communities. In Wrkentyne, Hj, (Ed). *Methods V: Proceedings of the V International Conference on Methods in Dialectology.* Victoria: University of Victoria Press.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code-switching in schoolchildren's conversation. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28* (1), 77-98.

Richards, et al. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* London and New York: Longman.

Rolin-Ianziti, J. and Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, (3), 1-23.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (Second edition). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Tores, L. (1989). Code mixing and borrowing in a New York Puerto Rican community: a cross-generational study. *World Englishes, 8* (3), 419-432.

Undang-Undang Nomor 20 tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional

Proceeding

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE