

## Forms and Functions of Indonesian-English Code Switching: A Case Study of Elites in Makassar City

Wa Ode Hanafiah<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia

\*Correspondence: [waodehanafiah@yahoo.com](mailto:waodehanafiah@yahoo.com)

### ABSTRACT

*The phenomenon of code switching is one of the many social contexts that can help any interaction with the transition from one language to another. The aims of this research are to find out the general patterns of linguistic configuration and socio-pragmatic functions of Indonesian-English code switching. This research used descriptive qualitative and quantitative and the data were collected from 40 elites of different professions in four different types of interactions; seminars, meetings, dialogues on TV, and chitchats employing a direct observation technique including recording and jotting down, and questionnaires. The result of this research is demonstrated that code switching is a crucial phenomenon for a multilingual society. It plays a significant role in governing the social interaction of the community because it has a very wide spectrum of socio-pragmatic implication which significantly contribute to the lives of man whether as an individual being or as a social one*

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Published September 24<sup>th</sup> 2022



### KEYWORDS

Code Switching; Elites in Makassar; Indonesian-English; Linguistic Studies

### ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2022 Universitas Hasanuddin Under the license CC BY-SA 4.0



### 1. Introduction

Sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society. According to Hudson (1996:4) sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society, while the sociology of language is the study of society in relation to language. Furthermore, sociolinguistics studies language and society to know how many kinds of language it is. Sociolinguistics is concerned with the relationship between language and the context in which it is used and everyone uses language to ask and give information to others. Everyone uses it to express anger and annoyance, as well as admiration and respect (Sukmawaty, et al., 2022). Often one utterance will simultaneously convey information and express feelings.

When a bilingual switches in to two languages, there are many reasons from the speaker which are important considerations in the process. According to Hoffman (1991: 116) there are seven reasons for bilingual or multilingual people to switch or mix their languages that are talking about a particular topic, quoting somebody else, being empathic about something, interjection, repetition used for clarification, intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor and expressing group identity.

Code switching or mixing has become an unmarked phenomenon for a multilingual society. It seems to be almost no single country in the world may escape from this phenomenon (Rahman & Weda, 2019).

In Indonesia, this speech behaviour has nowadays become trendy among Indonesian people especially the elite ones. It is quite easy to find them to switch from Indonesian to English whenever they communicate with others. The following examples clarify this.

- Saya tentu saja melihat dari dimensi pemerintah GOVERNANCE yang menjadi sebuah BODY OF STATE tubuh dari sebuah negara atau daerah (a government officer)
- Lalu perbankan beralih MOSTLY dari CORPORATE BANKING ke RETAIL BANKING (a bank director)
- Tragedi yang mengesankan dan mengejutkan bangsa ini dengan terjadinya BOMB EXPLOSION di Bali (a legislative)

- Kita bisa mengORGANIZE mereka, ini negara kita, kita mengORGANIZE dia, bukan dia yang mengORGANIZE kita (a doctor)
- Nggak apa-apa, WHAT IS WRONG WITH cerita kancil? (a proferssor)
- Ibu saya juga kan SINGLE PARENTS (a celebrity)

As can be seen from the examples above, switching phenomena provide abundant issues for a scientific studies ranging from the linguistic configuration of switching such as switched segments, switched points, grammatical constraints, etc. up to the social dimension of code switching such as functions and reasons for a switch.

However, the present study has been designed to find out the general patterns of linguistic configuration and socio-pragmatic functions of Indonesian-English code switching.

According to Wardhaugh (2006:11) sociolinguistics is the study of the use of social language, and the most productive study in the four decades of sociolinguistic research have emanated from the determination of social evaluations of linguistic variants. This is also an area most susceptible to scientific methods such as hypothesis formation, logical inference, and statistical testing.

Code Switching occurs when the language used, changes based on the situation in which the user finds himself. The speakers here change one code to another language (Weda, et al., 2021). Wardhaugh (2006: 98) based on this theory, code switching occurs in a bilingual society. Code switching also occurs when people use a certain code and suddenly change to another code.

According to Hoffman (1991: 112) shows many types of codes and code combinations based on point or the scope in which language occurs. Example: intra sentential switching, inter sentential switching, emblematic switch, and establishing continuity with the previous speaker.

The theoretical framework used in this study is adapted from various existing literature on code switching in the world such as 'situational and metaphorical switchings' by Gumperz (1977), 'Contextualization' theory by Gumperz (1982). This theory is then developed by Marazigan (1982) and Romaine (1991); theory of 'social function and social motivation of code switching' by Myerz-Scotton and Ury (1977), theory of 'social arena' by Myerz-Scotton (1988, 1993) which is then developed by Mc Convell (1988). These are all the frameworks used for the socio-pragmatic functions of code switching whereas the frameworks for the syntactic categories of code switching are adapted from theory of 'two grammatical constraints' by Poplack (1980), 'formal grammar' by Sankoff and Poplack (1981), and 'congruence' theory by Sebba (1998) which is then developed by Lorente (2000; Bachriani, et al., 2018).

## **2. Method**

The present study is descriptive qualitative and quantitative in nature. It relies much on a content-based analysis assisted by two statistic tests; Anova Friedman, testing the sameness of patterns of both syntactic categories and socio-pragmatic functions; Coefficient of Contingency, testing degree of interdependency of the two variables. Data were collected from 40 elites of different professions in four different types of interactions; seminars, meetings, dialogues on TV, and chitchats employing a direct observation technique including recording and jotting down, and questionnaires. From 15 hours of recorded natural speech produced by the subjects, it has been drawn 500 switching discourses as the samples of the study. The research design has been assigned discourses taken from seminars, meetings, dialog on TV and chitchats to be the independent variables of the study while the linguistic features including switched segments, switched points, and switched types and socio-pragmatic functions of code switching to be the dependent variables of the present study.

## **3. Result and Discussion**

In the story of Sura and Baya, there lived a Baya (crocodile) and a Sura (shark) who fought over each other for prey. The two of them fought for days, but neither one lost nor won. Sura then wants to end his feud with Baya and proposes an agreement to divide the prey hunting area. Sura proposes himself ruling in the water and must seek prey in the water, while Baya reigns on land and must seek prey on land. Both agreed and there was no fight between them anymore. But one day Baya saw Sura secretly looking for prey in the river. Baya was very angry and accused Sura of violating the agreement because he had been looking for prey in a river whose bottom was land. Sura felt that he had not violated the agreement because the river had water and water was his territory. Feeling cheated, Baya cancels the

agreement, and a fierce battle takes place again without a winner. Sura then Returns to his territory in the ocean and Baya maintains his territory on land. However, the dispute again occurred.

### 3.1. Recorded Speech

The following is the result of the analysis of the data taken from the recorded speech of the respondents.

#### a. Switched segments

It is found N to be the most dominant switched segments (68.72%) serving as an Object of V or Prep. (38.09%) as in (1), (part of) an NP (26.53%) as in (2), or a subject (5.10%) as in (3).

- (1) Kita selalu mendorong mengupayakan adanya FURTHER CONTACT (J001)
- (2) Mereka juga mempunyai LANDSCAPE atau BLUE PRINT yang mereka sebut FINACIAL MASTER PLAN (M002)
- (3) Nah, kemudian dari BOARD OF DIRECTOR harus memikirkan kira-kira TARGET berapa (I008)

**Table 1.** Switched segments

NO	SWITCHED SEGMENTS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Obj. NP	112	38.09
2.	NP	78	26.53
3.	Subj. NP	15	5.10
4.	V	37	12.58
5.	Adj	25	8.50
6.	Clauses	24	8.16
7.	Adverb	2	0.68
8.	Prep.P	1	0.34
	TOTAL	294	

#### b. Switched points

It is found the switch between V & Obj NP to be the most dominant switched points (25.58) as in (4) . It is then followed by the switch between NP & NP (17.00) as in (5), between Prep & Obj.NP (9.86) as in (4) and Ind bound morpheme & Eng free morpheme (9.86) as in (6).

- (1) Kita mendapatkan BACKGROUND INFORMATION tentang CULTURAL INDEXES atau kata yang mengandung muatan budaya (A011)
- (2) Ini perumahan BETTER SHELTER yang ditanggung oleh Sulsel di Aceh (C004).
- (3) Saya tidak setuju perawat saya diCANCEL (C019)

**Table 2.** Switch points

NO	SWITCHED POINTS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Btw V & Obj. NP	76	25.85
2.	Btw NP & NP	50	17.00
3.	Btw Prep & Obj. NP	29	9.86
4.	Btw Ind bound morp & Engl free morpheme	29	9.86
5.	Btw Clause & Clause	24	8.16
6.	Btw N & V	13	4.42
7.	Btw Conj & NP	13	4.42
8.	Others (under 10 corpora)	60	20.40
	TOTAL	294	

c. Switching types

It is found Intraclausal switch to be the most dominant switch types (53.06) as in (7), then it is followed by Intraprasal switch (28,91) as in (8), Intralexical (9.86) as in (9) and then Interclausal switch (8.16) as in (10).

- (1) Tidak mungkin satu persatu dari mereka bisa mengakses RESOURCES RESOURCES dari teknologi (L001)
- (2) Semua STAKEHOLDER berperan serta, jadi tidak ada yang bekerja sendiri-sendiri (C008)
- (3) Kita mencoba mengACKNOWLEDGE, meng apa namanya, menghargai atau merujuk (J003)
- (4) Yang pertama HOW TO FIND THE REAL PROBLEM OF THE PEOPLE bagaimana menemukan apa sih yang menjadi problem (K007)

**Table 3.** Switching types

NO	SWITCHING TYPES	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Intraclausal	156	53.06
2.	Intraphrasal	85	28.91
3.	Intralexical	29	9.86
4.	Interclausal	24	8.16
	TOTAL	294	

d. Functions of switch

It is found quoting such as technical terms, and one's statement to be the most dominant functions of switching (31.97) as in (11). Then, it is followed by repeating messages (13.60) as in (12), playing wit a well-known English expressions (12.58) as in (13).

- (1) Tapi dia menjawab RECEIVED PRONUNCIATION IS SOMETHING IDEAL (E002)
- (2) Dalam beberapa hal kita sangat berbeda dengan mereka VERY DIFFERENT (O001)
- (3) Ada tiga hal yang harus berjalan dalam nuansa CHECK AND BALANCE (K012)

Others : English is simpler and more explicit (9.86) as in (14), lack of good equivalence of meaning (4.08) as in (15), and anglicizing (3.40) as in (16).

- (1) Maka SMALL HOLDER FARMER ini mampu mengelola sumber daya dengan baik (L007)
- (2) MULTILEVEL MARKETING itu harus mempunyai ribuan DOWN LINE (I012)
- (3) Yang ketiga HOW TO MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT BY THE PEOPLE (K010)

**Table 4.** Switching functions

NO	FUNCTIONS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Unidentified	94	31.97
2.	Quoting : name, technical terms, one's statement, or proverb	58	19.72
3.	Repeating	40	13.60
4.	Playing with well-known/popular English expression	37	12.58
5.	English is much simpler and more explicit	29	9.86
6.	Lack of good equivalence of meaning in Indonesian	12	4.08
7.	Anglicizing	10	3.40
8.	Clarifying	9	3.06
9.	Neutralizing	5	1.70
	TOTAL	294	

**3.2. Questionnaire**

The following is the result of the analysis of the data taken from the distribution of questionnaires to respondents

a. Respondent's use of English in their daily interaction

**Table 5.** Frequency of use

NO	FREQUENCY OF USE	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Always		
2.	Frequently	8	53.3
3.	Sometime	7	46.7
4.	Rarely		
5.	Never		
	TOTAL	15	

As can be seen from the table, respondents use English in their daily interaction ranging from most of their time up to frequent use of English. I believe that such a frequent use of English in their daily interaction indicates that the respondents can be classified as competent bilinguals. In other words, they have a relatively good command of the embedded language, in this sense. English enabling them to switch back and forth without fearing of violating either language rule.

b. Switching as a conscious or unconscious process

**Table 6.** Consciousness

NO	CONSCIOUSNESS	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Done consciously	8	47.05
2.	Done unconsciously	9	52.94
	TOTAL	17	

As can be seen from the table, respondents doing the switches could be done consciously and unconsciously, comprising almost the same amount of the data, i.e. 50%. This figure confirms Yassi's (2003) study which found that people codeswitch sometimes consciously sometimes unconsciously. This indicates that switching phenomena are both cognitive-processing phenomena and habitual action phenomena.

c. Respondent's objectives for switching to English

**Table 7. Objectives**

NO	OBJECTIVES	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Make the message much clearer	9	14.75
2.	Keep the interaction going on	8	13.11
3.	Emphasize the message	7	11.47
4.	Clarify the message	7	11.47
5.	Convince the addressee	7	11.47
6.	Quote something	6	9.83
7.	Involve another party	6	9.83
8.	Show a respect	6	9.83
9.	Show a social status	6	9.83
	TOTAL	61	

As can be seen from the table, the most significant functions of code switching is to make the message much clearer, comprising about one fifth of the data. This is then followed by the purpose of keeping the interaction going on. Moreover, it is worthy to mention that to some extent function of code switching can be used to identify an exclusive social status of the switchers as let say an elite educated people or modern people (see also Myerz-Scotton, 1993; and Gibbon, 1987).

d. Respondent's reason or motivation for switching to English

**Table 8. Reasons or motivation**

NO	REASONS OR MOTIVATION	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	None, it's just as a habit	8	22.85
2.	English is more simple	8	22.85
3.	English is more complete	7	20.00
4.	Lack of a good equivalence of meaning in Indonesian or even no equivalent meaning in Indonesian	6	17.14
5.	It sounds more educated or modern	6	17.14
	TOTAL	35	

As can be seen from the table, the most significant respondent's motivation or reasons to switchcode is that because English is more complete and simpler. As such, it is an effective medium to be used in expressing certain expressions which tend to be longer when it is expressed in Indonesian, such as multilevel marketing, down line, small holder farmers, etc. Moreover, people switchcode without attempting at any particular interactional goals or intention. They simply do it because of habitual action. This phenomenon as I believe explains that some people do swithcode unconsciously. Other significant motivation of people in performing a codeswitch can be caused by the absence of equivalent meaning in Indonesian. Another one is again in order to sound more educated and modern.

e. Respondent's reason or motivation for switching to Indonesian

**Table 9. Reson or motivation**

NO	REASON OR MOTIVATION	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Feel much closer to the addressee	10	23.80
2.	Feel much easier and more convenient	8	19.04
3.	Show a respect	6	14.28
4.	Expressing a sympathy	6	14.28
5.	Seeking for a help	6	14.28
6.	Expressing a disappointment	6	14.28
	TOTAL	42	

In contrast, the study identified six reasons or motivation for people to switchcode to Indonesian when they are speaking English. The two most significant ones are because they feel much closer to the addressee and feel much easier and more convenient. The rest ones are in order to express a symphaty, disappointment, asking for a help. This findings are in line with Gumperz (1982) who pointed out that the 'we' code in this respect, Indonesian, was a good tool to deliver personal aspects such as intimacy, anger, happiness and the likes rather than the 'they' code in this respect, English.

The domination of N or NP comprising about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the data realized as an object, subject and part of NPs result in the switch is mostly to occur between V & Obj.NP, Prep & Obj.NP and NP & NP. This indicates that the switch is mostly to occur in small constituents such as within a clause boundary which is also commonly known as intraclausal switching including 'intraphrasal switching' (Yassi, 2001), a switch that occurs within a phrasal boundaries and 'intralexical switching' (ibid), a switch which occurs within a word boundaries, comprising more than 90% of the data (91.83%).

As such, the findings have lent strong support to previous studies on code switching such as to name only a few Poplack (1980), McClure (1998), Nishimura (1998), Lorente (2000), and Yassi (2001, 2003) which found N to be the most dominant switched segments in their data. However, at the same time, the findings have provided some counter findings to some previous studies such as to name only a few.

- Poplack's two grammatical constraints theory; free morpheme and equivalence constraints as in *Niatmu mau pergi, mau bantu atau supaya diSHOOTING televisi* (C018).
- Plaff and Poplack (1980) " switching is most likely to occur only in major constituents, intersentencially rather than in minor constituent, intrasentencially.
- Gumperz (1976), 'the conjunction must be in the same code as the conjoined sentences' as in *Kalau seandainya SMALL HOLDER FARMER ini dan LOW TECHNOLOGY ini bisa diberdayakan maka . . .* (L007).

I believe that at least there are three important factors motivating this noun domination. Firstly, the natural portion of noun in the structure of English sentences. Noun occupies about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of syntactic roles i.e. subjects, and objects of both verbs and prepositions. Secondly, low intensity of use. As a foreign language, English is only used occasionally and by certain people such as in classrooms and in a very small number, only about 0.30 switch to English per minute (Yassi, 2003) as compared with Gumperz's data (1982) on switching between Spanish and English by Spanish people residing in New York concluding one switch per minute. Finally, speaker's English competence. Due to their lack of English competence, subjects tend to switch only in small constituent levels rather than in major ones. Otherwise, they will risk at ruining the syntactic categories of both English grammar and structure. This is in line with Romaine (1991). She pointed out that switchers tend to switch nouns because they were free from syntactic restriction so that switchers felt free to switch without fearing of violating the form of embedded language. Other theories supporting this phenomenon can be 'chunk' theory by Azuma (1988) advocating that words that can meaningfully stand alone can be switched. Similarly, this is in line with 'open and closed class item' theory by Joshi (1985) pointing out that content words such as nouns, adjectives, and verbs are more likely to be switchable compared to those belong to structural words such as bound morphemes, tense markers, etc.

In terms of the socio-pragmatic functions of code switching, the present study has demonstrated that switching possesses a very wide spectrum of social dimensions ranging from self-identity and dignity, service provision, social relation, up to the social norms and value of the given society.

I believe that switching to English by playing with well-known or popular English expressions, or quoting certain English expressions, or anglicizing certain English expressions is the embodiment of self-identity expressions or announcements as an educated elite, or modern people. The implicit goal of such an expression is to have a self-recognition and respect from others for the sake of their own dignity as Brown and Levinson (1987) called it 'positive face'.

Another social dimension of switching can be found in the speakers' willingness to provide good service for other people. Such a social dimension is embodied through the provision and making of clearer messages. The implicit gain of such a provision is to speed up addressee's comprehension by repeating the messages, or translating messages into Indonesian.

Furthermore, another significant socio-pragmatic functions of switching can be the switcher's willingness to keep in line with the norms and value applied in the society. Such a social function is embodied through the speaker's effort in neutralizing certain expressions especially in the area of sex, money, taboo, or politeness which will appear to be socially unacceptable when it is delivered in Indonesian.

Finally, the other crucial social function of switching has been the switcher's willingness to keep a good relation to other people. This is realized through various forms of interactional goals ranging from willingness to put themselves much closer to their addressees, showing a sympathy, showing a respect, to expressing disappointment. This is in line with Gumperz (1982) who claims that switch to the 'we' code is an appropriate medium in delivering personal feeling and emotion.

#### 4. Conclusion

The present study has successfully demonstrated that code switching is a crucial phenomenon for a multilingual society. It plays a significant role in governing the social interaction of the community because it has a very wide spectrum of socio-pragmatic implication which significantly contribute to the lives of man whether as an individual being or as a social one.

Above all, code switching is a rich-issue phenomenon, both linguistic configuration and social dimension of switching, which calls for further and more comprehensive studies. As such, it provides sociolinguists with abundant and more challenging issues to be investigated.

#### References

- Azuma, S. (1997). Meaning and form in code-switching. *Trends In Linguistics Studies And Monographs*, 106, 109-124.
- Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(4), 429-440.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Research design pendekatan kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan mixed*. Yogyakarta: pustaka pelajar.
- GUMPERZ, J. J. (1976) *The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching*. In Cook-Gumperz, J and Gumperz, J. J. (Eds), *Papers on Language and Context* (Working Paper 46), pp. 1-46. University of California Language Behavior Research Laboratory, Berkeley.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1977). The Sociolinguistic significance of conversational code switching. *RELC Journal*. 8(2): 1-34.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (No. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbons, J. (1987). *Code-mixing and code choice: A Hong Kong case study* (Vol. 27). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- JOSHI Aravind (1985), *Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching*, in: David R. DOWTY, Lauri KATTUNEN, & Arnold M. ZWICKY (eds.), *Natural language parsing: Psychological, computational and theoretical perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Lorente, B. P. (2000). Revisiting Taglish na naman: A congruence approach to Tagalog-English code-switching. *Philippine journal of linguistics*, 31(1), 25-37.
- Marasigan, E. (1983). *Code-switching and code-mixing in multilingual societies* (Vol. 7). Singapore University press.
- McClure, E. (1997). The relationship between form and function in written national language-English codeswitching: Evidence from Mexico, Spain and Bulgaria. *Trends In Linguistics Studies And Monographs*, 106, 125-152.
- McConvell, P. (1988). Mix-im-up: Aboriginal code-switching, old and new. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 48, 97-149.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a [1997]). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in society*, 22(4), 475-503.



- Nishimura, M., & Yoon, K. K. (1998). Head directionality and intrasentential code-switching: A study of Japanese Canadians and Korean Americans' bilingual speech. *Japanese/Korean linguistics*, 8, 121-130.
- Poplack, S. (1980). *Sometimes i'll start a sentence in spanish y termino en espanol: toward a typology of code-switching*<sup>1</sup>.
- Rahman, F., & Weda, S. (2019). Linguistic deviation and the rhetoric figures in Shakespeare's selected plays. *XLanguage" European Scientific Language Journal"*, 12(1), 37-52.
- Romaine, S. (1991). Last tango in Paris. *Language & Communication*, 11(1-2), 83-84.
- Sankoff, D., & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 14(1), 3-45.
- Sebba, M. (1998). *A congruence approach to the syntax of codeswitching*. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(1), 1-19.
- Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). *Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching*.
- Scotton, C. M. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Clarendon Press.
- Sukmawaty, Rahman, F.F., & Andini, C. (2022). Covid-19 Pandemic and Axiology of Communication: A Study of Linguistic Phenomena. *IJSRT*, 7(4).
- Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Linguistic aspects in intercultural communication (IC) practices at a higher education institution in Indonesia. *Eroupean Language Scientific Journal*, 14, 2-6.
- Yassi, A. H. (2001). Indolish (Indonesian-English): toward a typology of Indonesian-English code-switching. *Journal of Language and Society*, 1, 235-25212.
- Yassi, A. H. (2003). *Code Switching as a Communication Strategy in Indonesia-English Bilingual Discourse: A Congruence-Functional Approach to Indonesia-English Code-Switching*. Makassar: PPSUnhas.