

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Background of the Study

According to Harmer (2001), there is a number of variables which govern our choice of choosing the language forms namely setting, participants, gender, channel, and topics. In line with Harmer (2001), Holmes (1992) argues that sociolinguists are interested in explaining why people speak differently in different social contexts. And the effect of social factors such as social distance, social status, age, gender and class on language varieties such as dialects, registers, genres, etc, and they are concerned with identifying the social functions of language and the way they are used to convey social meanings. In other words, those variables affect someone's language choice.

Since 1990s, numbers of studies started to examine an issue related to the target (second language; hereafter L2) and native (first language; hereafter L1) use in an English as Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. In the past, some studies proposed L1 use contrasted the pedagogy of teaching English through English (Chambers, 1991; Halliwell & Jones, 1991). For those studies, teaching through the target language makes the language authentic and helps learners to be familiar with the whole English environment. This statement supports Krashen (1981)'s comprehensible input and natural order hypothesis. However, recently, this English-only pedagogy has been questioned and some research studies show that L1 is also beneficial in English learning classrooms. Guthrie (1984) has early

questioned that whether the fact that a class is conducted entirely in the target language results in greater intake by those learners.

Code switching is a tool for the acquisition of subject-appropriate vocabulary in first and second language. It is an important instrument in enhancing teaching and learning processes in that it helps students at lower proficiency levels better comprehend ideas and convey their thoughts (Tang, 2002; Greggio & Gil, 2007). Referring to the six functions of code switching including quotation, addressee specification, interjection, repetition, message qualification, personification or objectification, Gumpers (1982) considers it as a special discourse strategy which bilinguals usually use for different purposes during their communication.

In most English as Language Teaching (ELT) classrooms, teachers apply code switching usually automatically and unconsciously (Bilgin, 2013). However, it may be helpful in terms of providing a smooth transition between two languages. According to Mattson and Mattson (1999), this code-switching of teachers function differently in ELT classrooms. One of the functions it serves is topic switching which implies using the native language while giving instructions of grammar rules of the target language. Here, code switching facilitates students' comprehending the rules of L2 by the help of L1. Another function is the affective one which enhances building solidarity and achieving a relaxing learning atmosphere. This may help weaker students since they may need L1 to comprehend the rules of L2.

Ladd (2013) states that experienced teachers are on average more effective in raising student achievement than their less experienced counterparts. As one of the goal in educational program is boosting up the students' achievement, hence the greater effective the teacher teach, the greater development of the students achievement will be. In other words, teaching experience will be one of the important factors in the success of teaching learning process. So lecturers' teaching experience will also be the consideration in this research.

Related to the use of code switching especially by English lecturer, the frequency of using code switching by the more experienced lecturer will not more than the less. Thus, the more experienced lecturer will use English dominantly. But in fact, some students have their own opinion that if the lecturer teaches the lesson only in English especially to the certain terms or some topics that need greater comprehension, sometimes the lecturer needs to switch the language. They think that using only English as the language instruction sometimes makes them frustrated than lead them to be lazier.

However, code switching has been considered by some researcher as an indicator of poor proficiency in one language. Altarriba & Heredia (2001) state that one of the most frequent explanations of why bilinguals switch the language is that they do it to compensate for the lack of language proficiency. The argument is that bilinguals code switch because they do not know either language completely. On the other hand, Ellis (1994), Cook (2001), and Richards and Rodgers (2001) who are specialized in second language acquisition stated that although the exposure to the target language (L2) can help learners to achieve the success, this exposure may not always work effectively in every context. There

are still lots of factors affecting the learning success. For example, English-only classroom would lead to frustration and anxiety because the learners cannot get enough and proper comprehensible input. Hence it might be one of the reasons of the lecturer in switching the language in the teaching process.

Due to the theory of types of code switching, Hoffman (1991) states there are three types of code switching namely emblematic code switching, intra-sentential code switching, and inter-sentential code switching. Emblematic code switching as Poplack (1980) refers it as tag switching is the insertion of tag or exclamation of a certain language to another language, while intra-sentential code switching is due to the insertion of language below a clause level such as a word or a phrase and inter-sentential occurs when the language inserted is at clause level.

Related to the above types of code switching, in switching Bahasa Indonesia to English or vice versa, it was found that some examples of code switching used by some lecturers of State University of Medan who teach English in English Department classes could not be categorized as in the above types. The examples could be seen below.

Data 1

ST : Oh... Leopard
 NR : No leopard but 'leperd'
 NR : OK. See this. Any one ...?? Any one *yang bisa mendescribe gambar ini?*
 Who can directly describe this picture?
 Come on, Rizki. What can you see on this?

Data 2

BS : *Kalian kan ada three groups, jadi kalian harus mempresentkan these three topics.*

Saya yang nentukan. Are you agree?

ST : Yes Sir.

BS : You about this, you about this and you about this. Tell to your group.

Paham?

In data 1, the lecturer firstly spoke in English by saying *OK. See this. Any one ...??Any one*, then she switched her language into Bahasa Indonesia by saying *yang bisa mendescribe gambar ini?* When she switched her language, one word was switched partially in Bahasa Indonesia namely *mendescribe*. Here, a morpheme of Bahasa Indonesia namely *men-* was switched to English word *describe*. Similarly in data 2, a partial switching was also done by the lecturer through the word *mempresentkan*. In this case, prefix *mem-* and suffix *-kan* of Bahasa Indonesia are uttered together with the English word *present*.

As code switching is accepted as a sociolinguistic phenomenon, its usage and function may vary from culture to culture (Bilgin, 2013). Such being the case, EFL teachers' view of code switching from different cultures may be worth examining. Furthermore, related to the above mentioned examples, the words *mendescribe* and *mempresentkan* were the focus in this study. Both of the words showed the occurrence of code switching. These words could not be categorized as emblematic code switching since the insertions were not in the form of tag or exclamation. It also could not be categorized as intra-sentential or inter-sentential code switching because they were not a word or phrase even a clause.

In the light of these considerations, this qualitative study was an attempt to describe the types of code switching uttered by the lecturers of State University of Medan in teaching English in English Department classes and also one more thing

that considered as more important that was to explore their reasons to do code switching in the class. Since the above utterances stated in the examples above were not in the three proposed types, it would be an interesting research to be conducted.

1.2 The Problems of the Study

This study was aimed to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What are the types of code switching uttered by the lecturers of English Department in the teaching process?
2. Why do the lecturers of English Department switch the language for each type of code switching in the teaching process?

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

Based on the above research formulation, this study had some objectives as follows:

1. to describe the types of code switching uttered by the lecturers of English Department in the teaching process.
2. to explain the reasons of the lecturers of English Department using the code switching for each types in the teaching process.

1.4 The Scope of the Study

This study was limited to the use of code switching in language instruction by four English Department lecturers of State University of Medan. Besides, the

observation was limited to 8 meetings because each of the lecturers was observed twice. The lecturers' teaching experience was also one of the aspects that will be taken into account. In this study, the type of code switching was focused based on the theory of Hoffman (1991) and the reasons were based on theory of Selamat (2014)

1.5 The Significance of the Study

This study is intended to be significant both theoretically and practically.

Theoretically, this study was hopefully to be able to:

1. enrich the knowledge or theory about code switching
2. be an inspiration for other researchers to conduct further research related to code switching
3. be guiding information for other researchers who are interested in studying code switching

Practically, this study was also expected to:

1. provide especially the lecturers related to all English matter to appropriately use code switching in the language instruction in the teaching learning process
2. provide readers or other researchers in using code switching in a better way