

The Types and Functions of Switching and Mixing Codes in English Students' Online Discussions

DOI:10.22515/ljbs.v8i2.6161



SRI REJEKI

srirejeki21@mhs.uinjkt.ac.id

NIDA HUSNA

nida.husna@uinjkt.ac.id

ALEK

alek@uinjkt.ac.id

DIDIN NURUDDIN HIDAYAT

didin.nuruddin@uinjkt.ac.id

(corresponding author)

Postgraduate of English Education, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah
Jakarta, Indonesia

submitted: 5/1/2023 revised: 7/8/2023 accepted: 11/8/2023 published: 28/8/2023 pages: 133-147

ABSTRACT

This study aims to discover the switching and mixing code types and their functions that are dominantly used in student online discussions. This research was designed in descriptive-qualitative method by using video recordings and interviews from Pragmatics class of postgraduate degree students as the data sources. The obtained data were then analyzed using Miles and Huberman model of analysis by involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The results showed that students frequently switched and mixed codes during the discussions. In this case, code mixing was dominantly occurred compared to code switching. There were 78 occurrences of code changes in total, with the proportions of 44 mixings and 34 switchings. Dealing with the types, insertion code mixing was found to be the mostly used in the discussions whereas intersentential switching becomes the least. The phenomena of code switching and mixing in the classroom discussions has various functions, i.e.: for communication strategy, for delivering the meaning, for making clarification of the information, for defining specific terms, and for increasing understanding. This study also reflects the students' positive attitudes toward using switching and mixing codes in classroom discussion activities. It is recommended for further research to ensure the appropriate strategies for the teachers in switching and mixing codes for both offline and online classes.

Keywords: code, discussion, mixing, switching

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of multilingual or bilingual in using language is something common in Indonesia (Novianti and Said 2021). English is one of the compulsory subjects for students from the elementary to the college level. Even though the teacher is expected to use English language in English class, sometimes students need help to understand the explanation (Nata 2021). Therefore, the teacher is forced to use both English and Indonesian in delivering the material. It may also happen spontaneously in communication. In this case, the continuance of a conversation relies on the ability of the listener to comprehend the message delivered by the speaker during the conversation and vice versa. In this situation, switching and mixing codes are two phenomena that often occur as communication strategies in bilingual or multilingual interactions (Thao et al. 2021).

Fanani and Ma'u (2018) state that code switching is transferring one language to another based on the context. It can happen when a person is fluent in multiple languages and their variations. Meanwhile, code mixing, according to Ansar (2017), is a strategy used to mix from one language to another without affecting the sense or the meaning of the sentence. Code mixing occurs when words, phrases, and clauses from different languages are employed in the same

sentence. This phenomenon occurs naturally when a user reasonably has proficiency in multiple languages. Switching and mixing codes are spontaneous and unconscious processes of changing languages. In most cases, switching and mixing codes occur in social and classroom settings (Nurhamidah, Fauziati, and Supriyadi 2018). Students may switch and mix some languages when speaking or expressing their thoughts to others to communicate more effectively and prevent from misunderstandings.

Additionally, both code switching and code mixing have become commonplace in language engagement, particularly in the classrooms. In teaching and learning, switching and mixing codes is a common practice. Teachers and students subconsciously change their language while learning (Wang and Wu 2016). EFL students combine languages as the target language in learning. Despite being a natural occurrence, this action puts the teachers in a precarious position. The teachers should evaluate how well the students grasp the English lesson using mixing and switching codes in the classroom. Therefore, it is critical to comprehend the procedures that could result in a poor transmission of message due to switching and mixing codes (Thao et al. 2021).

Several results state that switching and mixing codes can be a communication strategy in learning, especially in the EFL context. For example, Elkins and Hanke (2018) note that the speaker employs switching and mixing codes to connect with the interlocutor and keep a conversation going. Grant and Nguyen (2017) also state that code-switching is helpful in teaching and learning, that students gain a general understanding of the material and understand complex vocabulary in a text (Obaidullah 2016) to attain goals and effective communication (Arlan, Sailan, and Lio 2019), to foster good relationships with students, and inspire students to be more passionate about learning English. In addition, Gulnar et al. (2020) also mention that in classroom interactions, students have several reasons to switch and mix their languages such as to avoid misunderstandings, assist in understanding the explanations conveyed, quote someone's words, describe cultural pride, discuss specifics, make jokes, express personal emotions, and help reduce anxiety when speaking in English.

Besides the positive effects, switching and mixing codes have already drawn criticism, even from academics. Code switching and mixing indicate that the speaker lacks fluency (Bonyadi, Kalvanagh, and Bonyadi 2021), lacks credibility and demonstrates ineptitude (Horasan 2014), and does not reach the desired target language (Wang & Wu 2016). This idea arises because excessive switching and mixing codes can affect students' proficiency in English from classes that always use full English (Helmie, Halimah, and Hasanah, 2020). Switching and mixing codes are feared to have many disadvantages and can affect students' communication. As a result, it is seen as a 'bad practice' with the feature of using illegible language.

Regarding the positive and negative sides of switching and mixing code, it is necessary to know the reasons for using them to determine whether the code is needed to apply. In this case, the level of English student mastery becomes one of the problems in EFL classrooms. Students change languages because their language skills differ from their teacher's ability (Goodman and Tastanbek 2020). Students must find comfortable ways of communicating in the classroom. They do not always use English as a medium for speaking. Sometimes, they use L1 instead. Therefore, using two languages is beneficial because it has various uses, particularly for class discussions. During the learning process, when students convey their ideas or even new words, it often appears that some students may not be familiar with the messages (Nurhamidah, Fauziati, and Supriyadi 2018). In

this situation, switching and mixing codes bridges the gap by providing an opportunity to combine two languages to connect class discussions. This study aimed to determine the types and functions of switching and mixing codes used by the students of master degree in English education, specifically in Pragmatics classroom discussions.

The Pragmatics classes were held online by using Zoom meetings. Hence, the communication in the classroom discussions is considered running very well so that the information from the participants could be appropriately conveyed. However, because in an online classroom the students are in different locations, there are some factors should be considered to potentially hinder student interactions, such as bad internet connection and poor quality of camera and audio (Archibald et al. 2019). Based on the researchers' experience, the students also cannot see the body language that may assist them understanding and decoding what others are saying in online classes. This condition requires students to switch or mix codes in the classroom to keep the discussion running well.

Sometimes, using full English causes a less effective discussion since English is a foreign language to the students in the class. Consequently, switching and mixing codes is necessary to avoid misunderstandings between students during class discussions. In addition, paying attention to the precise function of the code provided is essential so that English remains the primary language students use.

Based on the consideration above, this study was conducted to complete the prior research findings on code switching and code mixing by including the current context problems, that is the education adapted to the post-pandemic era as marked by the transformation from conventional to digital online classrooms. Additionally, this research was purposed to highlight linguistic phenomena that occur in EFL online classes. In a specific term, this research was focused on analyzing the types and the functions of switching and mixing codes performed by EFL students in Pragmatics classroom discussions.

LITERARY REVIEW

There have been several studies on the cases of code switching. The first one was conducted by Afifah, Bahri, and Sari (2020) regarding the use of code switching by the teacher in a classroom. The result of this research shows that the teacher diverts the language in conveying specific grammatical points being taught. Another study was carried out by Fauziati, Widiastuti, and Darussalam (2020) regarding the use of code-switching as a language communication strategy between English learners. The results show that there are three factors contributing to code switching i.e.: bilingualism, limited command of English, and compensation strategy. For EFL learners, code switching is one of the communication strategies to compensate for their low mastery of the target language. It is in line with the research made by Narasuman, Wali, and Sadry (2019) about the function of code switching in EFL classrooms. The result of this study suggests that code switching is used in certain situations that facilitate the teaching and learning process based on student needs.

In addition, some other researchers have also investigated the phenomena of code mixing in English classrooms. From the research conducted by Helmie et al. (2020), it is found that English and Indonesian are used in balance. Students perform code mixing to clarify the explanation and all respond positively to the presenter. Rahmat (2020) also studied code mixing from an English teacher's perspective. English teachers are expected to expand their English vocabulary to reduce code-mixing in EFL classes. Ibrahim et al. (2013) also found that teachers

are the main reason why switching and mixing code happen due to their ability to control classroom engagement dynamics.

Some other studies also reported switching and mixing code in a different setting, such as in offline teaching and learning. Novianti and Said 2021; Arlan, Sailan, and Lio 2019; and Ansar 2017 conducted research to discover the types of switching and code mixing in teaching and learning English. These studies reveal that switching and mixing codes can facilitate a learning activity that effectively directs or conveys some material explanations.

Aside from that, there were also studies conducted for online classes, such from Yuningsih et al. (2021) with the topic code switching used in student-lecturer interactions in WhatsApp-based online learning. This study reveals that code switching is mostly used for changing topics and repeating sentences. In addition, Thao et al. (2021) also investigated the function of code switching in teaching and learning activities by using Zoom. The findings show that code switching in the teaching and learning activities by using Zoom can improve students' learning outcomes and significantly lessen misunderstandings between teachers and students.

The previous studies were focused more on observing codes in the context of offline or face-to-face classrooms. Thus, it needs more studies on the same cases in online learning. At the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, all the teaching and learning activities were transformed from face-to-face to online classrooms which triggered a lot of challenges for the teachers and students in adapting to changes. For the purpose of online learning, Zoom is one of the most popular applications to be utilized. It is because Zoom has a view-sharing capability that enables participants to communicate digitally and share presentation screens (Baron 2020).

UNDERLYING THEORIES

Language is essential for communicating between humans in understanding information (Helmie, Halimah, and Hasanah 2020). Variation or change in a language is a natural consequence when communication is carried out with mutual understanding. Language code is a term that refers to a particular language/variety language used by a person when communicating with another. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015) argue that when two or more people communicate with each other, it is called a code. Thao (2021) further states that code is defined as some dialect or language a person uses as a communication system. In addition, they define code as the language of many speakers who use multiple languages when they speak, whether bilingual or multilingual, and who have a specific purpose when communicating. According to Ansar (2017), code is a phenomenon that occurs in a bilingual or multilingual society. One uses code to help the listener understand what the speaker means.

Code mixing and code switching are consequential phenomena of language contact and a hallmark of multilingual societies. Akhtar, Khan, and Fareed (2016) show that 'code hybridization' is a significant phenomenon and a natural product of language interactions and evolutions. From a sociolinguistic perspective, Gulnar et al. (2020) state that natural switching and mixing codes are used in linguistic phenomena. Several researchers investigated why people switch codes and what social aspects this switch brings (Wang 2019). Enama (2016) reports that sometimes parts of utterances are better expressed and understood in other languages. Speakers may also need to fill in linguistic gaps for an expression or word to exchange information. By considering all the theories, this study focuses on analyzing switching and mixing codes in the EFL classroom context in which students frequently use different codes in class discussions.

Code Switching Murtiningsih et al. (2022) define a speaker who shifts or alters their language from one they previously used into another is said to be code switching. Mahdi and Almalki (2019) claim that code switching is a strategy that speakers with specific goals utilize two or more languages simultaneously in speaking instead of one language only. Fanani and Ma'u (2018) divide code switching into three groups based on grammatical features. The first type is tag switching. Tag switching occurs when the speaker inserts an utterance with a word or phrase (a tag) from a different language. The second is intrasentenential switching. It is a transition within a phrase or sentence to another language in the middle of a sentence (Arlan, Sailan, and Lio 2019). Ansar (2017) asserts that intrasentenential switching commonly happens at a clause or sentence border. The last type is intersentenential switching which occurs between sentences. It iterates at the clause or sentence level, in which each clause or sentence is in a different language (Arlan, Sailan, and Lio 2019).

If viewed from an affirmative point of view, switching codes can help the teaching and learning processes if they can apply the function of the proper code (Gulnar et al. 2020). Enama (2016) stated that target language learning better supports acquiring the first language, so there is no stress in engaging the learning process. To activate prior knowledge of the target language, using L1 is also encouraged because the EFL classroom requires a full-fledged English classroom environment (Nurhamidah, Fauziati, and Supriyadi 2018). In addition, using bilingualism in EFL classrooms provides students with a more comfortable setting where they can speak freely without strict rules. This situation becomes affirmative motivation that teachers and students can benefit from code-switching during learning.

On the other hand, if viewed negatively, using L1 in class signifies laziness, unprofessionalism, and low language competence (Shartiely 2016). Language switching can also lead to long term errors as a standard form of language, and they need to be aware that they are holding on to that standard. It is feared that code-switching distributes much waste and can affect how students communicate in the future (Murtiningsih, Munawaroh, and Hidayatulloh, 2022). Although code-switching is integral to EFL learning, there must be proper instructions. Üstünel (2016) proposed the criteria for code switching instruction in the classroom that the language must be distributed and balanced. Language change must also be unconscious to achieve learning objectives. These criteria are optional for all teachers, but if they do not meet them, it can be referred to as unstructured code switching.

Code Mixing Fanani and Ma'u (2018) define code-mixing as merging two separate codes in a statement to signify uncertainty on which code should be used. The speaker will combine the codes to have the optimal communication effect. Code-mixing frequently occurs in contexts where multiple languages are spoken by one person (Rahmat 2020). Musyken (2000) proposes three code mixing types: insertional, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Insertional code mixing refers to using phrases, grammatical constructions, or lexical components in a sentence (Yuningsih, Amin, and Putera 2021). The parts that can be inserted are nouns, adjectives, or verbs in a sentence. Meanwhile, alternation is mixing languages to match the languages involved in the mixture in the form of clauses (Thao et al. 2021). Lastly, congruent lexicalization is language mixing due to dialect influences on the usage of coherent language lexicalization or when two languages have the same grammatical structure but one of the language parts is added to the lexical one (Fanani and Ma'u 2018).

According to Gulnar et al. (2020), it is rather complex to differentiate between switching and mixing code. Code mixing is a bilingual speaker technique because it is a linguistic reality that monolinguals can use. As shown by lexical items, a lack of proficiency in the base language can be expressed through code mixing. In this situation, code mixing can adequately make up for this shortcoming. However, a bilingual person's code that allows him to convey attitudes, goals, roles, and identification with a particular group can be code switching. Therefore, Rahmat (2020) discovered why bilingualism activates many aspects, including the interlocutor, setting, message, attitude, and emotion toward a particular code. Several universal characteristics can trigger switching and mixing code in all contexts. According to Novianti and Said (2021), the interlocutors' relationship influences switching and mixing codes. It will establish how, when, and why bilinguals will change their codes. In some cases, code switching and mixing serve a specific purpose in the EFL teaching and learning process.

In classroom discussions, it is not impossible that in the teaching and learning process, there will be the use of two or more languages and their variations due to the use of the languages mastered alternatively to communicate. This results in both code mixing and code switching in class discussions. In EFL classes, it is claimed that L1 can be an excellent tool for students to acquire and learn the target language, e.g. English (Puspawati 2018; Muin 2011).

Considering the use of code switching and code mixing in classroom practices, Castillejo, Calizo, and Maguddayao (2018) state that English is the primary language used in language classes, so the use of codes must be kept to a minimum. Language teachers and students are only encouraged to make adequate use of the code in class when explaining complex concepts so that they can actively participate in activities and discussions. Code use should not be excessive because it can slow the learning rate. To sum up, switching and mixing codes are common in EFL teaching and learning practices where English is learned formally. It is used subconsciously by teachers or students during discussions (Wang and Wu, 2016).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study applied the descriptive qualitative method. According to Creswell (2018), qualitative research investigates phenomena deeply to understand how something happens, why, and how participants perceive it. The participants as the objects of this research were master degree students in English education. The data are in the forms of words, phrases, and clauses representing code switching and mixing coming from student discussions in Pragmatics classes which were carried out virtually by using the Zoom application. As the samples, three meetings of the course are taken with the topic pragmatics paradigm in language teaching. This study aimed to find out the types of students' switching and mixing of codes as well as the functions or reasons for using different codes in the discussions. As the instrument for collecting the data, a video camera was used to record the students' discussions. Additionally, semi-structured interviews were also made to obtain the data related to the functions of switching and mixing codes.

The technique of collecting data used in this research was non-participant observation. The researchers collected the data by audiovisually recording the events and interviewing the participants. The video recording was purposed to save the discussion activities for finding out the occurrences of switching and mixing codes in the interactions. After the conversations were transcribed, the texts were then underlined to highlight the key exchanges relevant to this

research. The interviews themselves were aimed at exploring the frequency, reasons, and benefits dealing with the cases of switching and mixing code in the discussions.

For analyzing the data, this research applied the theory of Miles and Huberman (1994) which involves three steps of analysis i.e.: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction refers to selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and converting the data into written forms. Therefore, the data were in the forms of videos of activities and the transcripts of conversations in English discussions of Pragmatics classes.

In more details, the researchers analyzed the data by watching the video and listening to the audio carefully as well as checking the data by reading the transcripts of the conversations to see the context. After that, the researchers selected the sentences or utterances that contain switching or mixing codes. The data obtained were then classified basing on the types and the functions of code switching and code mixing. The researchers also made several notes to relate the theories and the utterances indicating code-switching and code-mixing. These were then summarized to make it easier in the process of analysis. For the data display, the researcher created a tables of data distribution categorizing the types and the numbers of cases found. Lastly, the conclusions were drawn for answering the research questions based on the relevant theories and research findings.

FINDINGS
The Types of Code Switching

From this study, there are found three types of code switching occurring in the online classroom discussions of EFL students in Pragmatic classes as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: The Distribution of Code Switching

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Tag switching	16	47.06 %
Intrasentenential switching	12	35.29 %
Intersentenential switching	6	17.65 %
Total	34	100.00 %

Table 1 illustrates that students performed three different types of code switching in the class discussions, namely tag switching, intrasentenential switching, and intersentenential switching. Based on the findings, tag switching is the most common type of code switching that occur. It is then followed by intrasentenential and intersentenential switching as the less and least frequent types.

Tag Switching

This type occurs most easily because tags usually contain minimal syntax constraints. Therefore, the students do not violate syntactic rules when they insert a foreign word or phrase into a given sentence in a language. Here are some examples taken from the data.

I see that for the last, *ya kan?* (S2)

Nah, in the oral test, this also involves different with a written form. (S1)

(Note: S = Student)

In the example above, the italicized words are cases of switching tag. Tag switching is a short utterance that students use to replace the code in the utterance. The phrase *ya, kan?* is an Indonesian expression that means 'isn't it?' in English. While the word *nah* (that's it) is an Indonesian word that students often

use to emphasize some information. In this study, the students often used this type of code in class discussions by making accents in Indonesian to clarify or confirm information with other friends.

Intrasentential Switching

Intrasentential code switching typically happens when two or more lexical elements from one code are introduced in a sentence shorter than the sentential limit or another grammatical form. The followings are the examples.

If it is not polite like *mereka nggak pakai pertanyaan* but with a direct comment. (S2)

I mean, the student's response *yang berbeda dengan* written may need cognitive. (S4)

In the utterances above, parts of the utterances in italics are cases of intrasentential code switching. This kind of switching occurs within the boundaries of phrases or sentences. This means that students switch to a different language without interruption. The speakers switch to Indonesian at a specific sentence level to highlight some information. The clause *mereka nggak pakai pertanyaan* (they didn't use questions) and *yang berbeda dengan* (which is different from) emphasize the essence of the student's answers, that students want to clarify the difference between the two things being discussed.

Intersentential Switching

Intersentential is a sentence that appears between or outside whole sentences but is still on the same topic. The examples can be seen below.

Tunggu sebentar ya, I will show you; wait. (S1)

Written and orally, many aspects of what we call second language or foreign language, *aspek yang ingin kita capai*. (S3)

The italicized texts above indicate intersentential switching. The speakers use a code at the beginning of the conversation and then changes to another in the next part of utterance and vice versa. In the first utterance, the speaker uses the expression *tunggu sebentar* (wait a minute) in Indonesian to mean that he/she wants to ask for some time to look for a file on his/her laptop. Because the discussion was conducted online via Zoom, the student felt that using Indonesian would further clarify their requests. Meanwhile, the expression *aspek yang ingin dicapai* (the aspects to achieve) was meant to conclude some information. Hence, the other students could catch the meaning that their speaking friend wanted to convey.

The Types Code Mixing

This study also found two types of code mixing occurred in the same discussions whose details can be seen in in Table 2.

Table 2: The Distribution of Code Mixing

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Insertion	23	52.23%
Alternation	21	47.72%
Total	44	100.00%

Table 2 illustrates that students only made two types of code mixing in the class discussions i.e. insertion and alternation with the frequency of former is slightly higher compared to that of the latter. Therefore, it can be said that the levels of use between the two types of code mixing in the class discussions are quite balance. On the other hand, there is no congruent lexicalization used by

students in the discussions because English was still dominantly used by students rather than Indonesian.

Insertion In explaining some information, the students sometimes insert Indonesian words or phrases in English sentences and vice versa. Here are some examples taken from the data.

Tapi kalau roleplay itu sengaja dan sudah disusun. (S5)

I will answer what Kak Dian mention, it is about the *pilihan ganda*. (S6)

In the example above, the regular (S5) and italicized (S6) parts are cases of insertion code mixing for highlighting essential terms often mentioned in a discussion. The insertion in mixing code occurs because the speakers involve two languages (codes) in one sentence. In code mixing, it means that there is a dominant language used. As in the example, students have word inserted from different languages into the dominant languages. In the first utterance, the English word 'roleplay' is inserted into the dominant language, Indonesian. Meanwhile, in the second sentence, it occurs inversely, in which Indonesian phrase, *pilihan ganda* (multiple choice), is inserted into English sentence as the dominant language. Based on the examples, it can be said that insertion is often used for terms that are more familiar to be called by the speaker.

Alternation Alternation is code-mixing in terms of suitability or language equivalence in which words are inserted as alternatives, usually from Indonesian to English sentences and vice versa. Here are some examples taken from the data.

If the student is polite, just say could you help me *atau mereka* could say, can you help me. (S2)

We should consider the picture *karena seperti* as what I see needs some categories. (S4)

Parts of the texts in italics above are examples of alternation in code mixing. The phrase *atau mereka* means 'or they' whereas *karena seperti* equals 'because like' The alternations occurred when the discussion got longer and speakers felt they need to focus more on the information they wanted to convey. Therefore, the language used had begun to mix with Indonesian. The speakers used two languages, English and Indonesian, to build a good atmosphere during the discussion. This alternation is intended to help or encourage the speaker to continue speaking in a discussion.

The Functions of Switching and Mixing Codes This study used interviews to obtain the data about the functions of switching and mixing code performed by the students. Here, the researchers classified the functions based on Hoffman's (in Sari 2022) theory. Five students were selected as interviewees because they actively switched and mixed codes during the discussion activities. From the results of these interviews, the researchers found five functions of the code switching and code mixing made by the students.

As a Communication Strategy The first function of students' switching and mixing codes is as one of the strategies for making communication in the class, especially for maintaining the course of discussions. It can be seen from one of the students' answers regarding his/her reason for actively switching and mixing codes in the discussions.

"...sometimes the presenter perceives something different from what the questioner meant. So, I use code-switching as the communication strategy." (S1)

Based on the student's experience, switching or mixing codes is a strategy for overcoming a bad situation. To exemplify, when the students are blank,

unfocused, and do not find the right English words, they use switching and mixing codes to deal with these situations and conditions. Thus, the discussion goes well and the information can be appropriately conveyed.

To Deliver Meanings

Code switching and mixing can make the information easier to understand as well as accelerate speakers in conveying the meaning. This can be seen from the student's answer as follows:

"Sometimes, it is hard for us to share. Actually, we know the English language, but it seems like the audience cannot understand it, so we switch to Indonesian." (S2)

According to the statement, using changing or inserting code makes it easier for the students to deliver the meaning of the information conveyed since it highlights the core information or central idea of the information obtained when someone is giving opinions, responses, or additional information.

To Make Information Clarification

Another reason for switching and mixing codes is to clarify the learning information so that the spoken sentences do not contain ambiguous and unclear meanings. It can be seen from one of the students' opinion as follows:

"...in explaining using English, we are not satisfied, and we feel that our friends do not understand all the explanations. So, we want to clarify the information using Indonesian." (S4)

From the answers above, it can be concluded that students use switching and mixing codes to clarify information to their interlocutors. In addition, students can clarify something to understand more as well as be more apparent in explaining, and give responses, opinions, and comments. It is supported by the following student's answer:

"We are not native English; to make things easier, we used this code in giving opinions and comments in a discussion." (S5)

To Define Specific Terms

The fourth function of switching and mixing codes is to express specific terms. Even though in the discussions, English was more dominantly used than Indonesian, the use of Indonesian words helped the students convey essential information, so that there was no misunderstanding between the interlocutors. It can be seen from this student's statement:

"I feel my friends will understand better when I use Indonesian for specific terms. I use the term in pictures or picture prompts because sometimes we want to use English, but if the context of a sentence is too heavy to understand, and a sentence can be understood in two directions, I prefer to use Indonesian." (S3)

To Increase the Level of Understanding

The last function, switching and mixing code, is used to make the knowledge or information provided more profound and comprehensive. It can be seen from the answer below.

"The benefit is that we get thorough knowledge; if we use the code, the level of understanding in the discussion is more perfect than using full English." (S4)

Based on the student's opinion, several considerations underlie the phenomena of switching and mixing codes in the class discussions. Even though all of the students were already at the master's level, English remained a foreign language to them. When in English class, students often use their mother tongue due to their habits of speaking Indonesian. In addition, students also possess limited vocabulary. Therefore, when discussions are tough, the use of full English is an obstacle for students to express their opinions clearly. As a result, using

codes is a solution to deepen the understanding of the information or knowledge shared with each other.

DISCUSSION

Based on the percentage of code frequency, it can be concluded that students frequently used switching and mixing codes in the class discussions on Pragmatics subject. However, the use code mixing is more often than that of code switching. The most dominant code mixing performed by students is insertion, which was aimed to help explaining the learning materials, explaining the points of specific materials, as well as primarily clarifying and giving instructions. To avoid the possibility of students' need of help for understanding what is being discussed in a discussion, it is necessary to insert code mixing to avoid misunderstandings during class interactions.

In line with the research of Nata (2021), insertion is the most frequently found type of code mixing. The next type is alternation. Students usually used alternation when they lose their focus while explaining the materials in English. The study conducted by Bonyadi et al. (2021) reveal that students' decisions to mix codes in the classrooms are primarily due to a lack of proficiency in managing classes, for assessing comprehension, for giving more explanations, and for interacting with other students. Helmie et al. (2020) also believe that code-mixing is a communicative strategy in bilingual groups where students can combine several languages during a conversation.

On the other hand, there was no type of congruent lexicalization found in the code mixing analysis. Some previous studies, such from Akhtar et al. 2017 and Novianti and Said 2021 also have similar results in which only two kinds of code mixing were found in their research. In both studies, insertion occurred most frequently in the conversations as well.

Meanwhile, the findings on code switching are compatible with the outcomes from Fanani and Ma'u (2018) research. They claim that code switching is divided into three grammatical groups, each of which has a different characteristic. They are tag switching, intrasentenential switching, and intersentenential switching. Particularly in this study, the dominant type performed by students was tag switching. Because English is not the first language for the students, tag switching to Indonesian often occurred in the class discussions. This phenomenon is supported by Helmie et al. (2020), who state that as bilinguals, EFL students have the potential to stick to using more than one language when interacting with others.

The second type of code switching to occur is intrasentenential. In this type, the speaker inserts a phrase to switch the language in a single sentence (Yuningsih, Amin, and Putera 2021). Lastly, intersentenential switching comes as the minor type because it involves a large amount of syntactic complexity and compliance with the rules of both languages. Therefore, speakers who make this kind of switching must be quite proficient in the participating languages (Novianti and Said 2021).

Regarding the function of the code switching and mixing, it was found that the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of switching and mixing codes in online classroom discussions are positive. Most students agree that switching and mixing codes can make them understand the materials quickly and make the English teaching-learning process more effective (Nata 2021). This contrasts with the perception of Horasan (2014) that any language mixing is a threat to the purity of the language in question and it is due to linguistic difficulties. A lack of lexical treasures causes bilinguals to switch or mix codes.

From this research, there are found five functions of code switching and mixing. The first is as a communication strategy. Learners can maintain communication in English discussion by using code switching or code mixing. Daraini et al. (2021) claim that the utilization of the communication strategy also shows students' English competence. Switching and mixing code are popular strategies to practice in a classroom with multilingual speaker setting. Even now, the effectiveness of the strategy has already been proven through many studies and cases (Nurhamidah et al. 2018; Fachriyah 2017).

Another function of switching and mixing code is to avoid misunderstandings of the intentions delivered by the speakers in English language. The students can clarify or confirm any explanations, information, questions, or statements by switching or mixing codes (Thao et al. 2021).

Then, the third function of code switching and mixing is for information clarification. In this case, the students switch and mix codes to confirm or clarify the meaning of some information. This finding is in line with that of Nurhamidah et al. (2018) research. Even though the teacher has explained a material, he/she tries to explain in Indonesian to make sure that the students understand his/her explanation because the message of material needs to be conveyed appropriately.

The next function of code switching and mixing is for defining specific terms students more familiar with in English than in Indonesian, particularly for saying things such as pictures, activities, listening skills, storytelling, and more (Ansar 2017). In addition, most key terms will become clear or unclear if these critical terms are translated into Indonesian.

The last function of switching and mixing codes is to increase the level of understanding in teaching the target language as long as the code frequency is minimized and adapted to the needs (Üstünel 2016; Nurhamidah et al. 2018).

Switching and mixing codes in language teaching and learning allows classroom interactions to flow through continuous communication and negotiation of language issues. As such, it also enables students with lower abilities to develop target language proficiency more quickly. Although code-switching and mixing are advantageous when these are utilized strategically, the main objective of EFL lessons remains to increase target language input. In various occasions and circumstances, students may adjust or change the use of language as needed. However, the participants did not deny that switching and mixing codes could affect students' ability to speak English effectively. Therefore, English competence is required to perform switching and mixing codes properly and to ensure their use has clear functions in the learning process (Fanani and Ma'u 2018).

CONCLUSION Based on the result of the research, it can be concluded that English Master's students perform all types of code switching in classroom discussions namely: tag switching, intrasentenential switching, and intersentenential switching. Meanwhile, for code mixing, there are only insertion and alternation found. Therefore, congruent lexicalization is a type that does not appear in discussion activities.

There are five functions of switching and mixing code found in the discussions, i.e.: for a communication strategy, to deliver the meaning clearly, to clarify information, to define specific English terms, and to increase the level of understanding.

Some of the findings are in line with the study conducted by Fanani and Ma'u (2018) that switching and mixing codes can be beneficial if they are used

appropriately. In contrast, both can also have a negative effect if they are used excessively and not adapted to the functions and needs of code usage in English classes. This is supported by Nata (2021) who claims that a good attitude towards switching and mixing codes can make the English teaching and learning process more effective, in which students can understand the conveyed information more quickly without eliminating the purpose of using English for increasing the target language input.

Based on the data obtained related to the phenomena of switching and mixing codes in students' discussions, it can be concluded that students agree with the use of code switching and mixing as long as these can help them maintain the discussion activities. However, the action of switching and mixing codes must be adjusted to the needs and situations in the classroom. Therefore, it is recommended for the future research to formulate the appropriate strategy for the teachers for taking benefits from switching and mixing code in both offline and online classes.

REFERENCES

- Afifah, Nur, Syamsul Bahri, and Diana Fauzia Sari. 2020. "An Analysis of Code Switching Used by an English Teacher in Teaching Process". *Research in English and Education (READ)* 5 (1): 33–35. <http://jim.unsyiah.ac.id/READ/article/view/14910>.
- Akhtar, Huma, Asim Khan, and Muhammad Fareed. 2016. "Code-Mixing and Code Switching in EFL/ESL Context: A Sociolinguistic Approach". *Balochistan Journal of Linguistics* 4: 29–42. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315782612>.
- Ansar, Aulia Fitrah. 2017. "Code Switching and Code Mixing in Teaching-Learning Process". *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris* 10 (1): 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.24042/EE-JTBI.V10I1.873>.
- Archibald, Mandy M., Rachel C. Ambagtsheer, Mavourneen G. Casey, and Michael Lawless. 2019. "Using Zoom Videoconferencing for Qualitative Data Collection: Perceptions and Experiences of Researchers and Participants". *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 18: 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919874596>.
- Arlan, Zalili Sailan and Asrun Lio. 2019. "Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in English Language Teaching and Learning at SMA Negeri 2 Kendari". *Journal of Language Education and Educational Technology* 4 (1). <http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/JLEET/article>.
- Baron, Rifari. 2020. "Students' Perception on Online Application in Speaking Skill". *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society* 4 (2): 213–21.
- Bonyadi, Alireza, Mehdi Kheyrollahi Kalvanagh and Minoo Bonyadi. 2021. "Teachers' Perceptions on Code-Switching in EFL Classroom Discourse". *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education* 12 (2): 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.2478/dcse-2021-0015>.
- Castillejo, Franklin, Maricon Calizo, and Ruth Maguddayao. 2018. "Code-Switching and Students' Performance in English". *International Journal of English and Education* 7 (October): 406–21.
- Creswell, John W. 2018. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Fifth Edit. Vol. 4. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.
- Daraini, Amira Muficha, Endang Fauziyati, and Dewi Rochsantiningih. 2021. "Students' Perception of The Implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at Senior High School". *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan* 13 (1): 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i1.404>.
- Elkins, Becki and Eran Hanke. 2018. "Code-Switching to Navigate Social Class in Higher Education and Student Affairs". *New Directions for Student Services* 2018 (162): 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20260>.
- Enama, Patrick R. Belibi. 2016. "The Impact of English-Only and Bilingual Approaches to EFL Instruction on Low-Achieving Bilinguals in Cameroon: An Empirical Study". *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 7 (1): 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0701.03>.
- Fachriyah, Eva. 2017. "The Functions of Code Switching in an English Language Classroom". *Studies in English Language and Education* 4 (2): 148.
- Farani, Ahmad and Jean Antunes Rudolf Zico Ma'u. 2018. "Code Switching and Code Mixing in English Learning Process". *LingTera* 5 (1): 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v5i1.14438>.

- Fauziati, Endang, Hartati Widiastuti, and Hanif Maghfur Darussalam. 2020. "Code Switching as Interlanguage Communication Strategy by Indonesian EFL Learners". *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa* 9 (2): 301. doi:10.26499/rmh.v9i2.2950.
- Goodman, Bridget and Serikbolsyn Tastanbek. 2020. "Making the Shift From a Codeswitching to a Translanguaging Lens in English Language Teacher Education". *TESOL Quarterly* 0 (0): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571>.
- Grant, Lynn E. and Thi Hang Nguyen. 2017. "Code-Switching in Vietnamese University EFL Teachers' Classroom Instruction: A Pedagogical Focus". *Language Awareness* 26 (3). Taylor & Francis: 244–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2017.1402915>.
- Gulnar, Orynbek, Akmetbek Gulzhan, Erik Gulnur, Koshirbayeva Gaziza, and Baltabayeva Gauhar. 2020. "Students Reasons and Attitudes for Code-Switching in Language Classroom". *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation* 24 (7). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340732645>.
- Helmie, Jauhar, Halimah Halimah, and Aan Hasanah. 2020. "Code Mixing in College Students' Presentation: A Case in an Intercultural Communication Class". *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics* 5 (2): 403. doi:10.21462/ijefl.v5i2.249.
- Horasan, Seçil. 2014. "Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms and the Perceptions of the Students and Teachers". *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 10 (1): 31–45. <http://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/159>.
- Ibrahim, Engku Haliza Engku, Mohamed Ismail Ahamad Shah, and Najwa Tgk Armia. 2013. "Code-Switching in English as a Foreign Language Classroom: Teachers' Attitudes". *English Language Teaching* 6 (7): 139–50.
- Mahdi, Abdulghani and Mansoor S Almalki. 2019. "Teachers' Perceptions towards Pedagogical Implications of Code Switching: Saudi EFL Classroom Context in Focus". *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature* 7 (3): 1–9. doi:10.20431/2347-3134.0703001.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis* (Second Edition). London: SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.
- Murfingsih, Sri Rejeki, Munawaroh, and Sibakhul Milad Malik Hidayatulloh. 2022. "Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms: Factors Influencing Teachers to Use Code-Switching and Its Types Used in the Classrooms". *Journal on English as a Foreign Language* 12 (2): 318–38. doi:10.23971/jefl.v12i2.3941.
- Musyken, Pieter. 2000. "Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing". *Language* 78 (2): 330–33. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2002.0114>.
- Narasuman, Suthagar, Ahmad Zahir Wali, and Zahra Sadry. 2019. "The Functions of Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms". *Social and Management Research Journal* 16 (2): 137–51.
- Nata, Ipan Dwi. 2021. "Code-Switching And Code-Mixing Used By English Teachers At Homy School Palangka Raya". *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia* 2 (3): 398–415. doi:10.36418/japendi.v2i3.106.
- Novianti, Rika and Mashadi Said. 2021. "The Use of Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in English Teaching-Learning Process". *DEIKSIS* 13 (1): 82. doi:10.30998/deiksis.v13i1.8491.
- Nurhamidah, N., Endang Fauziati, and Slamet Supriyadi. 2018. "Code-Switching in EFL Classroom: Is It Good or Bad?". *Journal of English Education* 3 (2): 78–88.
- Obaidullah, Md. 2016. "Code Switching in EFL Classrooms: A Bangladeshi Perspective". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 6 (5): 924. doi:10.17507/tpls.0605.03.
- Putera, Lalu Jaswadi, Nona Arlita Yuningsih, and Muhammad Amin. 2021. "Analysis of Code Switching Used in Student-Lecturer Interactions in Online Learning Using Whatsapp". *Palapa: Jurnal Studi Keislaman dan Ilmu Pendidikan* 9 (2): 233–50. doi:10.36088/palapa.v9i2.1095.
- Rahmat, Agus. 2020. "Code Mixing in EFL Classroom: Views from English Teachers Side". *Al-Lisan* 5 (2): 130–47. <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v6i2.1323>.
- Sari, Nur Fitamala. 2022. "Code Switching and Code Mixing in Classroom Presentation of Indonesian EFL Students". *Educasia* 7 (2): 91–120. www.educasia.or.id.
- Shartiely, Nikuigize Erick. 2016. "Code-Switching in University Classroom Interaction: A Case Study of the University of Dar Es Salaam". *Stellenbosch Paper in Linguistics Plus* 49 (0): 215–31. doi:10.5842/49-0-663.
- Thao, Nguyen Van, Herman, Eliza Rorezs Napitupulu, Nguyen Thi Hien, and Hilman Pardede. 2021. "Code-Switching in Learning via Zoom Application: A Study in an EFL Context". *Asian ESP Journal* 17 (3): 91–111.
- Üstünel, Eda. 2016. *EFL Classroom Code-Switching*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-55844-2.
- Wang, Junqing and Junli Wu. 2016. "Conversation Code-Switching in Class with Chinese as Foreign Language". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 6 (4): 894. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0604.30>.

Wang, Wenxia. 2019. "Code-Switching and Its Role in Language Socialization". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22 (7): 787–800. doi:10.1080/13670050.2017.1313809.

Wardhaugh, Ronald and Janet M. Fuller. 2015. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Seventh Edition). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

ARTICLE CITATION IN *THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE 16*

In-text Citation

Rejeki, Husna, Alek, and Hidayat (2023, 140)

..... (Rejeki, Husna, Alek, and Hidayat 2023, 140)

Reference List Entry

Rejeki, Sri, Nida Husna, Alek, and Didin Nuruddin Hidayat. 2023. "The Types and Functions of Switching and Mixing Codes in English Students' Online Discussions". *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 8 (2): 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v8i2.6161>.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright ©2023 *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*