



ISBN 978-602-14018-1-1

English reading vocabulary language writing vocabulary English writing reading language speaking learning writing speaking.

# The 61<sup>st</sup> TEFLIN



## International Conference 2014

Solo, 7 - 9 October 2014



### PROCEEDINGS

*English Language Curriculum Development:  
Implications for Innovations in Language Policy and Planning,  
Pedagogical Practices, and Teacher Professional Development*



ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY  
SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY

**BOOK 3**



ISBN 978-602-14018-1-1

The **61<sup>st</sup>** **TEFLIN**



Solo, 7 - 9 October 2014

**PROCEEDINGS**

*English Language Curriculum Development:  
Implications for Innovations in Language Policy and Planning,  
Pedagogical Practices, and Teacher Professional Development*



ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY  
SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY

## FOREWORD

These proceedings feature 335 papers out of 531 papers presented at the The 61<sup>st</sup> TEFLIN International Conference. Enmeshed in the theme, “*English Language Curriculum Development: Implications for Innovations in Language Policy and Planning, Pedagogical Practices, and Teacher Professional Development*”, the papers present different lines of scholarship which address such topics as (1) language policy, (2) language planning, (3) needs analysis, (4) language syllabus and lesson planning, (5) language materials evaluation and development, (6) instructional design and language teaching methodology, (7) instructional media and technology, (8) language classroom management, (9) language testing and assessment, (10) language program evaluation, and (11) teacher professional development. The proceedings are alphabetically organized based on authors’ names.

All the papers in these proceedings were not peer-reviewed, but the papers published in these proceedings met the basic requirements set out by the committee. All the papers do not exceed a total of five pages (including tables, figures, and references). In the editing process, the editors extended the maximum page limit up to six pages in order to include more papers.

Neither the Conference Committee nor the Editors are responsible for the content, outlook, opinions, and arguments made in the papers. The sole responsibility concerning the ethical aspect, validity of methodology, and political views in the papers rests with the individual authors.

Finally, we would like to extend our sincere gratitude to all of the paper presenters who have shared their bright and inspiring ideas at the conference, and to the board of reviewers and editors who have worked hard in screening all the submitted abstracts. We do hope that readers enjoy reading the papers in the proceedings and find them enlightening and useful.

Surakarta, 7 October 2014  
The Committee

**A List of Internal and External Reviewers for Abstracts Submitted  
for The 61<sup>st</sup> International TEFLIN Conference**

The organizing committee of the 61<sup>st</sup> International TEFLIN Conference would like to acknowledge the following colleagues who served as anonymous reviewers for abstract/proposal submissions.

**Internal Reviewers**

**Chair**

Joko Nurkamto (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)

**Members**

Muhammad Asrori (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Abdul Asib (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Dewi Cahyaningrum (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Djarmiko (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Endang Fauziati (Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, INDONESIA)  
Dwi Harjanti (Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, INDONESIA)  
Diah Kristina (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Kristiyandi (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Martono (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Muammaroh (Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, INDONESIA)  
Ngadiso (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Handoko Pujobroto (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Dahlan Rais (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Zita Rarastesa (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Dewi Rochsantiningih (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Riyadi Santosa (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Teguh Sarosa (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Endang Setyaningsih (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Gunarso Susilohadi (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Hefy Sulistowati (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Sumardi (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Anam Sutopo (Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, INDONESIA)  
Dewi Sri Wahyuni (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)  
Agus Wijayanto (Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, INDONESIA)  
Tri Wiratno (Sebelas Maret University, INDONESIA)

**External Reviewers (Referees)**

**Chair**

Handoyo Puji Widodo (The University of Adelaide, AUSTRALIA)

**Members**

Helena I. R. Agustien (Universitas Negeri Semarang, INDONESIA)  
Adcharawan Buripakdi (Walailak University, THAILAND)  
Pisarn Chamcharatsri (University of New Mexico, USA) Patrisius  
Istiarto Djwandono (Universitas Ma Chung, INDONESIA)  
Christine Manara (Payap University-Chiang Mai, THAILAND)  
Julius C. Martinez (Ateneo de Manila University, THE PHILIPPINES)  
Selim Ben Said (Chinese University of Hong Kong, HONG KONG)  
Nugrahenny T. Zacharias (Satya Wacana Christian University-Salatiga, INDONESIA)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover .....	i
Foreword .....	v
Table Of Contents .....	vi
<b>I. Language Policy and Language Planning</b>	
1. Exploring Innovative Framework to Observe ESP Curriculum in Higher Education Context <i>Adriadi Novawan</i> .....	1
2. Which One is Better; <i>KTSP</i> (School-based Curriculum) or 2013 English Curriculum? <i>Alma Prisilya</i> .....	6
3. Teachers' Responses toward 2013 Curriculum: After a Year of Implementation <i>Arina Shofiya</i> .....	10
4. Standardizing Core Competence in the Curriculum of Academic Education for Prospective English Teachers in Indonesia <i>Budi Setyono</i> .....	14
5. English as Medium of Instruction and Students' Language Attitude (A Case of Ex-RSBI Senior Secondary Schools in Pekanbaru) <i>Bukhori</i> .....	19
6. Implementing KKNi in Developing English Curriculum for Shipbuilding Polytechnic <i>Desi Tri Cahyaningati</i> .....	23
7. The Emergence of Interference in Students Foreign Language Acquisition <i>Dyah Kusumastuti</i> .....	27
8. Sole Use of English in EFL Classroom: Pragmatism or Belief <i>Eka Afrida Ermawati and Wahyu Kartika Wienanda</i> .....	29
9. Teachers' Beliefs in Teaching Reading towards National Examination Challenge in Indonesia <i>Intan Kusumawardhani and Erwin Suhendra</i> .....	33
10. The Impacts of Integrated Curriculum <i>Maya Defianty and Ummi Kultsum</i> .....	37
11. Nuclear Stress: A Candidate of Factors Determining Global Intelligibility of EFL Speakers' Speech <i>Moedjito</i> .....	41
12. Back to Basics: Improving Pre-service Teachers' Quality by Designing Sound Curriculum for Teaching Practicum Program <i>Nurrahma Sutisna Putri</i> .....	45
13. Restructuring English Curriculum: The Implementation of English Corner (EC) in SD Muhammadiyah 8 DAU Malang <i>Puji Sumarsono</i> .....	48
14. The Relevance of the Competence Based Curriculum with the Units of Standard Competencies for the ESP Courses of Tourism Students <i>Ratnah and Faradillah Saputri</i> .....	52
15. Media Literacy: A Salient Concept for English Language Curricula Planning <i>Riani Inkirawang Winter, Laksmi Mayesti Wijayanti, Sandra Sembel, and Alfred Inkirawang</i> .....	56
16. The Contributions of Anthropological Studies to the Usage of Genres in TEFL <i>Saiful Anwar Matondang</i> .....	60
17. The English Teachers' Perceptions toward School-based Curriculum (SBC) and 2013 Curriculum; Complaints, Comparisons and Contrasts (An Investigation on English Teachers' Perceptions in Pekalongan) <i>Sarita Dewi Matra</i> .....	63
18. The 2013 English Curriculum: Prospects and Challenges <i>Shirly Rizki Kusumaningrum</i> .....	67
19. Challenges and Recommendations on the Implementation of 2013 Curriculum <i>Siti Muniroh</i> .....	71
20. A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of "Dream" Metaphors in Basic Reading I Course <i>Truly Almendo Pasaribu</i> .....	76
<b>II. Needs Analysis</b>	
21. Needs Analysis for Developing Supplementary Reading Materials of Automotive Students of Vocational High School <i>Alfiyati, Tety Mariana</i> .....	80

327. Students' Noticing of Corrective Feedback on Writing (Case Study for Low Learners) <i>Restu Mufanti</i> .....	1332
328. Indonesian Argument Style: An Analysis on the Ways Indonesian Writers Argue for Their Research Project in Their Research Article Introductions <i>Safnil Arsyad and Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana</i> .....	1336
329. The Learning of English as a Foreign Language: What EFL Teachers Should Know <i>Santi Chairani Djonhar</i> .....	1341
330. A Vignette on Reflective Teaching: Potential Challenges Faced by Future ESP Practitioners <i>Sari Hidayati</i> .....	1344
331. A Study of the English Reading Habits of EFL Students of Baturaja University <i>Silfi Sanda</i> .....	1347
332. Professional Development in Integrating Technology into Teaching and Learning: EFL Teachers' Perspectives and Experiences <i>Siti Kustini and Evidoyanti</i> .....	1351
333. Professional Teacher: What, Who and How <i>Siti Mafulah</i> .....	1355
334. Presenting ESP Using Authentic Materials <i>Slamet Wiyono</i> .....	1358
335. The Relationships among Teacher Effectiveness, Self-Efficacy and Academic Achievement of English Education Study Program Students in Three Universities in Palembang <i>Sri Endah Kusmartini</i> .....	1360
336. An Inappropriate Use of Linguistic Components Found in the Composition of the Students at the Master Level <i>Susanto</i> .....	1364
337. Teachers' Cognitive Coaching on Students' Reading Comprehension <i>Yayu Heryatun</i> .....	1368
338. The Roles of English Teacher Working Group (MGMP) to Support Teacher Professional Development <i>Yusawinur Barella</i> .....	1371
339. Exploring Professional Development of English Teachers on Writing and Its Instruction <i>Eun-Ju Kim</i> .....	1374
340. Improving Reading Comprehension of XI Social Science 2 Students of SMAN 7 Malang through Two Stay Two Stray Technique <i>Nur Henik Sukriowati</i> .....	1377
341. Listening Strategies for 'Authentic Input/Materials' English on Television <i>Bayu H Wicaksono</i> .....	1380
342. Zero, and Progressive Aspects: Which To Teach First? <i>Hendra Tedjasuksmana</i> .....	1383
343. Prospects and Challenges in Promoting Quality ELT Services in Rural Indonesian Areas Seen from Student Factors: A Case Study of Bima, Kota Bima and Dompu <i>Kamaludin Yusra and Yuni Budi Lestari</i> .....	1388
344. Application of Quantum Learning Method to Promote Student's Speaking Skill and Motivation at the Students of Grace EnglishHome in Supercamp Program <i>Muhammad Zuhri Dj and Fatmawati</i> .....	1393
345. Writing Rubric Construction Used by Teachers In Assessing Students' Achievement in English Subject in State Senior High Schools Pekanbaru <i>Syahdan and Husna Haiaty</i> .....	1397
346. Extensive Reading for the Context of Language Learning Policy in Indonesia <i>Syofia Delfi and Hamidah Yamat</i> .....	1401
347. The Nature of Learner Error: A Case Study of Indonesian Learners Learning English as A Foreign Language <i>Endang Fauziati</i> .....	1405
348. Code-Switching in English Language Teaching : From Theory to Practice <i>Margana</i> .....	1413

## CODE-SWITCHING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING : FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Margana

*English Education Department  
Faculty of Languages and Arts  
Yogyakarta State University  
[margana@uny.ac.id](mailto:margana@uny.ac.id)*

**Abstract:** In English language teaching and learning in expanding English speaking countries such as Indonesia, teachers of English at any level of education should not be worried about the utilisation of code-switching practices from English to Indonesian or vice versa on the grounds that code-switching (CS) practices serve a lot of functions. Such practices are supported by some convincing theories, which claim that CS could be applied as a strategy to sustain the classroom communication between English teachers and their students. In other words, code-switching is of great use for both English teachers and students to cope with language barriers when they are involved in communicative events on the grounds that CS practices are initiated by some reasons and functions. This suggests that CS should be flexibly conducted in English language teaching and learning as CS could be a means of enriching the lexical items of the target language and reinforcing the lexical items of the home language as one of the functions of CS practices. Such a language enrichment facilitates students to deal with a language mediation activated in the communication practices. In reference to the issue, this paper attempts to theoretically justify the application of CS practices in terms of the reasons for and functions of CS and to clearly give examples of how to utilise CS in English language teaching and learning.

**Keywords:** *Code-switching, English Language Teaching*

### Introduction

In the context of a bilingual society, for example, the Indonesian society, the utilisation of two or more codes in communication practices becomes a common trend as the interlocutors tend to perform two codes when they are involved in some communicative events. This relies on the theory that activating two codes in communication practices cannot be avoided when the interlocutors have more than one code, which exists in their mind (Wardhaugh, 2010 and Margana, 2012). This suggests that use of two codes in a series of communication practices becomes common behaviours among bilingual including English-Indonesian bilinguals. Such practices are labelled with the term *code-switching*. This statement is supported by some scholars one of whom is Grosjean (2001:145) who claims that code-switching serves a striking aspect in bilingual societies in which the interlocutors alternate one code with another code in the same conversational events.

Use of two codes in some communicative events by bilinguals occurs not only in some natural settings but also in formal ones (Margana, 2013). This implies that CS is not only utilised in daily life conversational practices as found in social communication practices but also employed in educational ones. More specifically, code-switching practices are widely utilised by English teachers or even English lecturers when they are involved in classroom communications. This relies on the convincing theories that CS serves multi functions in instructional practices. Cook (2001) advocates that CS can be a strategy to sustain the communication practices in classroom when they face a stagnancy in a particular code due to psychological or non-psychological factors. For example, when an English teacher finds a difficulty to express a particular technical term, she/he may code-switch from English to her/his first language or vice versa in order to sustain the communication.

As a matter of fact, use of code-switching in educational contexts becomes a controversial issue among scholars. According to Nation (1997), the target language, for instance English, has to be exclusively used in classroom communications by English teachers as the exclusive use of English could provide students with a good model of English so that they would be accustomed to using English as a means of communication practices depending upon the contexts of communication. Added to this, the exclusive use of English in classroom communication inspires students to willingly practice their English. It also facilitates students to acquire the linguistic components such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and others on the grounds that students are always stimulated with the English expressions. The exclusive use of the second language (L2) without re-course to the first language (L1) in the English teaching and learning process is believed to provide students with real L2 utterances, enabling them to achieve maximum L2 proficiency (Nation, 1997). This statement refers to an unconvincing assumption, which claims that students should get a comprehensive input in the target language as it would accelerate students to acquire English language proficiency.

The above statements are questioned by a great number of scholars since the exclusive use of English does not guarantee the success of acquiring the target language. Guthrie (1984), for example, argues that the exclusive use of the target language in English language teaching and learning would not guarantee greater intake in the target language. In support of this, Dickson (1992) also questions whether the quantity of the input of the target language would be as beneficial as the quality of the input of the target language. In line with the statement, Skinner (1985) strongly claims that the exclusive use of the target language is believed only to hinder the process of developing concepts and to block students' thoughts and ideas which have been developed in their first language. Further, Phillipson (1992) asserts a strong argument to the exclusive utilization of English in English language teaching and learning. He urges that the exclusive use of target language only exemplifies linguistic colonization when it is imposed on second language teaching and learning all around the world. Other scholars such as Macaro (1995), Coste (1998), Simon (1998) and Levine (2003) argue that the exclusion of students' first language in second/foreign language teaching is likely to be unreasonable on the grounds that it may only divest students' strategies to learn the target language. In support of the statement, Pillay and Wha (1997) assert that since second/foreign language learners are in the process of becoming bilinguals, they attempt to expand their skills and strategies (i.e. code-switching) when they are involved in second/foreign language teaching and learning.

With regard to the second argument, it is obvious that switching from one language to another language is believed to be effective and efficient in continuously establishing classroom communication practices. To some extent, the inclusion of students' first language can be utilized to clarify points of grammars, to arrange tasks, to give instructions, to check comprehension, to sustain discipline, and to conduct classroom activities (Cook, 2001). Added to this, CS can be employed in classroom communication when English teachers attempt to focus on form (Robinson and Long, 1998). To sum up, use of CS in second/foreign language teaching is believed to be beneficial on the grounds that CS serves to explain new concepts, to engage and maintain students' concentration & interest levels which encourage them to learn more, to lower stress levels, and to provide an atmosphere more conducive to language acquisition (Margana, 2005).

In reference to the above arguments, this paper deals with theoretical justifications of the use of CS in English language teaching and learning followed by the examples of CS in classroom communication practices as performed by English teachers. This is of great importance for English teachers to really know the concept of CS as used in classroom communication practices.

### **Theoretical Justifications of CS in Educational Contexts**

As previously explored, use of CS in classroom communication confers some convincing benefits which are theoretically justified. This suggests that CS practices are not randomly conducted but they are constrained by some reasons and functions. In terms of reasons, Auer in Margana (2013) proposes two main reasons for CS in a classroom communication setting: discourse-related and participant-related switching. The former serves as a supply for marking off different kinds of discourse utterances within a communication sequence while the latter deals with participant linguistic preferences or proficiency. This implies that English teachers do code-switching practices from English to Indonesian or vice versa because they want to get their message across to their students without disregarding student language preferences or competencies. In relation to reasons for CS, Margana (2013) documents nine reasons for the application of CS by English teachers in classroom communications at senior high schools in Yogyakarta. They include (1) insufficiency of students' English mastery, (2) inadequate knowledge of code-switchers (English teachers), (3) unavailability of particular lexical items of the activated languages, (4) language stagnancy, (5) the coverage of the semantic features of the code-switched language, (6) the emotional conditions of the participants, (7) the closeness of the language and culture, (8) the tiredness of language, and (9) class situations.

In reference to the functions of CS, Brice and Brice in Margana (2013) 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 humour and expressing emotions (anger, like, dislike, etc). In addition to those functions, Merrit 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. With regard to the function of CS in educational contexts, Margana (2013) proposes two main functions of CS which include academic and non-academic functions. The former is concerned with the use of CS in instructional practices while the latter is concerned with discourse makers. The instructional practices deal with classroom management and material presentation.

### Examples of CS in Classroom Communication Practices

In reference to the explanation above, it is evident that CS can be one of the strategies to deal with the process of English language teaching and learning at any level of education on the grounds that CS confers some convincing justification. In line with the issues, the following provides some examples of use of CS as employed by English teachers when they are involved in classroom communication practices. The following only deals with some functions of CS for the content-orientation.

#### a. Making a clarification

In classroom communication practices, CS is employed by English teachers to make a clarification of a particular message as exemplified below.

- (01) Teacher : You may add your elaboration sentences. For this group, this group argument paragraph. And for the last, recommendation. You may elaborate of the main idea from the draft. Any question from you? *Okay, paham belum maksudnya* ('okay, do you understand the point')? *Sini mengembangkan thesis* ('here develops thesis') (Margana, 2012)

#### b. Reiterating particular message

CS practices are commonly done to reiterate particular message as found in the texts presented. The examples of reiteration are presented below.

- (02) Teacher : Do you understand about these situations? Okay, now, suppose you are a radio announcer, **choose one from these situations. Jadi pilih satu dari tiga situasi ini** ('so choose one of these three situations'). Do you understand what I mean? Do you understand? Okay, now, I will give time for 10 minutes. (Margana, 2013)

#### c. Enriching students' vocabulary

In classroom communication, English teachers use CS to enrich students' vocabulary. This is usually conducted by alternating English with Indonesian for the sake of finding the equivalent meaning of particular lexical items.

- (03) Teacher : You know this word. **Invade..invade**. Have you heard **invasi**?  
 Student : Ya.  
 Teacher : Yes. This is the noun of invade. What is **invade**? *Invasi itu* ('that') the noun of invade. *Kalau* ('if') **invade kata kerjanya apa** (What is the verb)? *Apa* to invade *itu* ('What is the Indonesian word of invade')? (Margana (2013)

#### d. Explaining grammar

To some extent, students find difficulties in coping with the grammar of the target language as it deals with systemic knowledge, which requires a serious and clear explanation from their English teacher. Therefore, to minimise the misconception of the grammar, the English teacher code-switches from English to Indonesian as exemplified in the following constructions.

- (04) Teacher : *Noun kalau dalam satu kalimat itu fungsinya sebagai subjek atau objek* ('What is the function of noun in a sentence as a subject or object'). And then how about noun phrase? You know phrase? *Phrase kalau dalam bahasa Indonesianya* ('What is the Indonesian word of phrase'). *A phrase di sini adalah* (A phrase here means ...'). A phrase is a group of words *sebagai subyek* ('as subject') or *object* ('object'). *Sekelompok kata, tidak ada verbnya* ('There is no verb in a group of words'). (Margana (2013)

#### e. Making an inference

In the process of English language teaching and learning, very often the English teacher makes an inference of the materials. In order to facilitate students to keep the memory in long-term space, the English teacher uses Indonesian to make an inference. He/she usually alternates English with Indonesian as exemplified below.

- (07) Teacher : A beautiful girl sitting under the tree is..... *Gadis cantik yang duduk di bawah pohon itu adalah...* ('A beautiful girl sitting under the tree..') Any question so far? You get the point of noun phrase? *Intinya tahu ya. Dari satu kata dikembangkan menjadi noun phrase* ('You know the point'). *Jadi inti katanya adalah kata benda itu sendiri* ('So, the point is the noun itself'), **the noun itself. A group of words which functions as a noun. Kata bendanya ..** ('The noun is..'). (Margana (2013))

### Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

In reference to the above explanation, it is evident that switching from one language to another language becomes general trends by bilinguals including English-Indonesian bilinguals as what English teachers of any level of education do. This suggests that CS should be positively viewed on the grounds that CS practices are not randomly utilised by English teachers when they are involved in classroom communications. This relies on the convincing theories as explored by great number of scholars who urge that CS serve many functions. In other words, CS practices confer some benefits of the part of English teachers and students as CS practices could facilitate them to sustain the communication practices. Added to this, CS can be a strategy to do with the language stagnancy or language dis-fluency due to insufficient lexical items of in a particularly domain.

Realising that CS confers some functions in the English language teaching and learning, English teachers and students should not be worried about use of CS in classroom communication practices. In other words, CS practices should be tolerated as it can be one of the strategies for English teachers and students to successfully manage classroom communications. Added to this, English teachers are encouraged not to exclusively use English as a means of classroom communications when they observe that students perform insufficient English fluency and have insufficient English mastery. The exclusive use of English without recouring use of their first language is believed to hinder students' acquisition of the target language. To sum up, CS is still applicable for English language teaching and learning at any level of Education provided that CS is not randomly conducted. When the students perform the excellent English mastery enabling them to exclusively use of English as a means of classroom communication practices, English teachers may gradually minimise use of CS in classroom communication.

### 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
- 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>.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402-423.
- Coste, D. (1998). Alternances didactiques. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquee*, 108, 393-400.
- Dickson, P. (1992). *Using the target language in modern foreign language classroom*. Slough, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*, 47, 59-72.
- Grosjean, F. (2001). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guthrie, E. (1984). Intake, communication and second language learning. In J. Sauvignon & M. Berns (Ed.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching* (pp.35-54). Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Levine, G.S. (2003). Students and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 343-364.
- Macaro, E. (1995). Target language use in Italy. *Language Learning Journal*, 11, 52-54.
- 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.
- Margana, (2005). Functions of Codeswitching in English Language Teaching and Learning at Junior High School in Yogyakarta. *Proceeding on International Conference* at National University of Singapore.
- Margana, (2013). Alih Kode dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di SMA di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Litera*, Edisi April 2013. FBS UNY.
- Nation, P. (1997). L1 and L2 use in the classroom: A systematic approach. *TESL Reporter*, 30, 19-27.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 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).
- Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code-switching in schoolchildren's conversation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28 (1), 77-98.
- Robinson, P. & Long, M. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on Form in the Classroom* (pp.15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Skinner, D. (1985). Access to meaning: The anatomy of the language/learning connection. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6 (5), 369-389.
- Simon, D.L. (1998). Alternance codique en classe de langue: Rupture du contrat ou survie? [Code-switching in the language classroom: The breaking of a contact or survival?]. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquee*, 108, 445-455.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.



➔ [www.teflin2014.org](http://www.teflin2014.org)

English Education Department  
Teacher Training And Education Faculty :  
Sebelas Maret University

Jalan Ir. Sutami 36 A Ketingan, Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia 57126  
Email: [committee@teflin2014.org](mailto:committee@teflin2014.org)



ISBN 978-602-14018-1-1