CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter concludes of the presents study. It consists of two parts. The first part presents the conclusion, which is derived from the findings presented in the previous chapter. The second part provides suggestion and recommendation, which addressed to the teacher and the next researcher.

5.1 Conclusions

The present study concerns the phenomena of code switching (CS) in EFL classrooms. It examine the types of CS that occurs during classroom interaction and different functions of CS employed by teacher and students.

The finding reveals that both teachers and students employed three types of CS: inter-sentential, tag-switching, and intra-sentential switching. It is also found that, inter-sentential switching is the most frequent type of CS which occurred in both EFL classrooms. It seems that the participants in Regular class is little less fluent in bilinguals than the students in RSBI class. This is in line with the assumption of Ene (2007; see also Gregio & Gil, 2006) who states that CS will be more often occurrs in the speech of less fluent bilinguals. This phenomena happened during the interaction and might facilitate the classroom teaching and learning process (Gregio: 2007).

The finding also shows that the occurances of CS appears to serve several

functions, i.e. *explanation* occurred 7 times (11,86%) of total CS functions occurrence, *checking for understanding* occurred 3 times (5,26%), *grammar translation* occurred 7 times (11,86%), *admonition* occurred 6 (10,52%), *requesting help* occurred 4 times (7,02%), *helping each other* occurred 4 times (7,02%), *self-repair* occurred 8 times (14, 3%), *unoficial interaction* occurred 9 times (15, 8%), *clearing misundestanding* occurred 4 times (7,02%) and students' *interaction* occures 3 times (5,26%) of total CS functions occurrence. In this respect, the function of CS with the most frequent occurence is *unoficial interaction (student function)*, while the least frequently occurred functions are *checking for understanding (teacher function)*and *student initiation* (*student function*). Furthermore, the data shows that the function of CS occurred more often in Regular than in RSBI class. This seems to give support to the assumption of Ene (2007; see also Gregio & Gil, 2006), CS would be found more often in the speech of less fluent bilinguals. This study seems to suggest that the participants in Regular class are less fluent in English than those in RSBI class since the number of CS functions in student function is much bigger in Regular class than that in RSBI class.

It can be futher said that the teacher and students switched code during the lesson in both classrooms for two reasons: for social functions, and pedagogical functions. Sociallly, CS in this study served as (1) conveying's teacher admonition, that is to express disappointment or upset when the students did not obey to the teachers' expectation, (2) request help when there is a problem during the classroom activity, (3) helping the students in understanding the teachers'

questions by explaining and translating the question into Indonesian, (3) commenting on the students' unsatisfied answers, and (5) building unofficial interaction among the students when they talked about unrelated issues to the lesson being discussed (see Winford, 2003).

Pedagogically, CS served as to (1) translate sentence when students learn about grammatical features (2) explain or repeat ununderstandable utterances which has been said previously in order to help students understand it, (3) check the students' understanding to the new words or expression introduced in the lesson, (4) repair self which were made when answering the teachers' question by resorting self-correction, (5) clarify teachers' misunderstanding, and (6) initiate a question when the teacher clarifies his/her explanation which lead to misunderstanding. The finding also shows that English is usually used in *materials-dependent talk* (Hanna, 2004) whereas Indonesian is reserved for students to students interaction, disciplinary talk or students' initiation. This is in line with the finding of Canagarajah (2001) who says that English is used as *Material-Base Communication*, while L1 is used for other activity (e.g. serve as functions of CS) (see Winford, 2003).

Although it is believed that the result of this study has brought new insight to the field of CS research, it is not exhaustive. Due to a relatively small sample of data, the results cannot be generalized to apply to all foreign language classrooms. In this case, this research focuses only on two teachers and two groups of students; different settings may result in different result. Different places and participants may offer different other types and functions of CS.

5.2 Suggestions

Considering the findings of this study, it is suggested that the use of Indonesian is sometimes needed during the use of English for pedagogical purpose, i.e. the students can attain certain degree of understanding. Beside, by allowing the students to switch language, it is expected that the students can build their confidence with this strategy for communicating meaning in interaction. Furthermore, in the use of CS teachers should not use it randomly since it will make the students confused in understanding the message. Teachers should introduce to students how CS is used in communication. Therefore, the use of CS as one of among other strategies can facilitate the teacher and students interaction in English.

For further investigation in the same of inquiry (code switching), another aspects of CS functions are awaiting to be investigated. In this case, if the present study how and the participants employed CS and what function the participants used for, it is important to know the student's perception towards the used of CS in EFL classrooms. The result of the investigation will explain how important CS is in facilitating the students' learning. In addition, it is hopefully that the result of this study would help other researchers better understand the CS phenomenon.