LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 23, No. 1, April 2020

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

LANGUAGE AWARENESS: LANGUAGE USE AND REASONS FOR CODE-SWITCHING

Cresensiana Widi Astuti
STIKS Tarakanita Jakarta, Indonesia
correspondence: kresentiawidi@starki.id
DOI: doi.org/10.24071/llt.2020.230109
received 4 January 2020; accepted 26 March 2020

Abstract
The co-existence of languages in a speech community prompts language users to do code-switching in communication. They do it for certain reasons. This paper is to report language awareness among language users and the reasons why people do code-switching in their speech communities. Using an open-ended questionnaire, this research involved 50 participants. They were asked to identify the languages they had in their repertoire, the language they used when they communicate with certain people, and the reasons why they did code-switching in communication. The results showed that, first, the participants had awareness of languages in their repertoire, namely Indonesian, a local language, and English. Second, they admitted that they did code-switching in communication. Thirdly, the reasons for code-switching were to discuss a particular topic, to signal a change of dimension, to signal group membership, and to show affective functions.

Keywords: language awareness, language use, code-switching reasons

Introduction

It is common nowadays to find several languages used in a speech community. When people communicate in a speech community, they are usually aware of the language they should use in communication with other people. Indonesians, for example, are commonly bilinguals. They were raised in a local language and thus, they have at least their first language – Javanese, Sundanese, Batak language, Manado language, Balinese, or one of the other 700 local languages – and the national language, Bahasa Indonesia or Indonesian. Some generations might be raised in Indonesian and were introduced to foreign languages, such as English, Mandarin, or, the now-hype language, Korean language.

In communication, people usually just use the language they share with their interlocutors. Sociolinguists believe that the way someone speaks signals his/her social status and construct their social identity. It may also reflect the social relations between the speaker and the interlocutor (Holmes, 2008). This leads to the idea that one's speech is controlled by specific norms in society. In a multilingual speech community where people speak more than one language, this social rule or norm can be seen from the choice of language used when they communicate with other people. This choice of language includes code-switching between languages in one's repertoire because when two or more languages are in interaction in a certain community, code-switching is unavoidable.

Many research works focused on language use and code-switching in society as well in classroom settings, such as Romaine (1992), Auer (1998), Febiyaska and Ardi (2019), Holmes (2008), Bin, Xin, and Mimi (2014). Some terms need to be defined and explained for the sake of clarity and to set up the boundaries of discussion.

Language varieties

Bilingual Indonesians generally speak one local language and Indonesian, or Indonesian and one foreign language, such as English, Mandarin, or Japanese, with English as the most learned foreign language in Indonesia even though English is introduced and used as a foreign language. Even so, English has gained popularity among Indonesian, especially young people living in urban areas.

Young people are usually highly motivated to learn English considering English mastery has a functional benefit, such as 'to pass an examination, to get a better job, or to get a place at a university' (Ellis, 2003). This 'instrumental motivation' is the major determining factor in the second language (L2) learning. Ellis (2003, p. 75) further stated that 'in countries where English is a foreign language, learners are highly motivated to learn an L2 because it opens up educational and economic opportunities for them'. Job ads often post 'fluency in English orally and in writing' as English is the *lingua franca* of business communication in the world. Indonesian people have been identified as 'highly motivated to learn English' (see Astriningsih & Mbato, 2019; Juniar, 2016; Nichols, 2014).

Thus, Indonesia is a multilingual community where at least two languages are used in communication in speech communities. Therefore, it is very common to hear young people speak in a mixed language of Indonesian, Mandarin, and English. The older generation might still use their local regional language to communicate with their childhood friends or family members sharing the same language. Simply put, Indonesian is the *lingua franca* of communication in Indonesia – in schools, campuses, for media, business, and social life. Undeniably, the number of languages used in communities makes them bilingual or multilingual communities and this phenomenon usually prompts code-switching.

It has been noted worldwide in the last two decades that developments such as massive population shifts through migration, the expansion of educational provision to many more levels of society, and technical advances in large communities have emphasized the existence of a visibly and audibly multilingual modern world (Milroy & Muysken, 1995). The world gradually becomes smaller where people are more connected than ever. English has been the common language of communication and at the same time, a recognition of other languages becomes more common. Oxford English Dictionary decided to include 29 Nigerian words into the dictionary (Spary, 2020), for example.

Language awareness

Research work, such as Bolitho et al. (2003), Carter (2003), Lin (2011), discussed the term 'language awareness' related to the Language Awareness Approach to language teaching as to enhance learners' noticing which, in its turn,

would manifest in the learners' ability to use the language. Richards & Schmidt (2002) defined language awareness as

> "a movement that developed in Britain in the 1980s which sought to stimulate curiosity about language and to provide links among the different kinds of language experiences children typically encountered in school, e.g. in science, in literature, and in foreign language classes. Language awareness courses seek to develop knowledge about language and languages as an important element in the education of all children" (Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R., 2002, pp. 286-287).

This research was built on the framework that language is used in communication and that language awareness is linked more to the language users' awareness of their repertoire. This framework was built on a definition of language awareness proposed by Van Lier (1995, p. xi), i.e. 'an understanding of the human faculty of language and its role in thinking, learning, and social life'. Based on this definition, language awareness is noted to have an influence not only on the thinking and learning process but also on the way language users interact with each other socially. The development of language awareness takes place in social interaction which requires language users' knowledge about which language (code) is used with certain people for a certain function. This is in line with Carter (2003, p. 64) who stated that language awareness refers to the development of learners and enhanced consciousness of and sensitivity to the form and function of language. Language awareness is closely related to 'social factors' (Holmes, 2008) which governs the use of language.

Most people might not of the notion of social factors, but generally, they understand that they have to use different languages when they talk to other people. Holmes (2008, p. 21) termed this as social factors – who you are talking to, the social context of the talk, the function, and the topic of the discussion. And they know in which 'domain of language use', they use certain code or variety. Fishman (1999) categorized language use into five domains, i.e. family, friendship, religion, education, and employment.

Using Fishman's five domains, these are the codes Bagus (not his real name) uses in his communication. Bagus is a young Javanese Catholic man who lives and works in Jakarta. He is a master's student at a private university in Jakarta. Like other young men in Jakarta, he enjoys hanging out in cafes and of course, soccer games. This year, he plans to marry his fiancée. Table 1 shows Bagus' language awareness of the languages in his repertoire and his awareness of social factors that govern the way and how he uses the languages in communication.

Table 1. Fishman's five domains of the codes used by Bagus

Domain	Addressee	Setting	Topic	Code
Family	Parents, Sibling, and Fiancée	Home	Planning a wedding	Javanese, Indonesian
Friendship	Friend	Cafe	Hanging out	Jakarta Indonesian

Domain	Addressee	Setting	Topic	Code
Religion	Priest	Church	Deciding the wedding day	Indonesian
Education	Teacher	Campus	Negotiating a submission day	English
Employment	Employer	Workplace	Requesting for a promotion	Indonesian

Bagus speaks in Fine Javanese to his parents to show that he belongs to a Javanese community (social identity) and that he knows how to use it properly (social status). But sometimes, the components of a domain do not always fit with each other, thus individual interactions may not be typical (Holmes, 2008, p. 25). Bagus talks in Indonesian to both his parents and fiancée when they talk about the wedding plan. Holmes (2008) stated that people may select a particular variety of code because it makes it easier to discuss a particular topic, regardless of where they are speaking. This is what is termed as 'leakage' – the code associated with one domain is 'leaking' into another (Holmes, 2008, p. 25). And that is normal and occurs regularly, especially when both participants share more than one variety. This leakage is sometimes acknowledged as code-switching.

Bagus also talks in Jakartan Indonesian (a mixture of Indonesian and native Jakarta, Betawi language, with the typical *loe* (you), *gue* (I), *kagak* (no), combined with the *yuppies* language which mixes Indonesian with English. He uses this variety when he is with his friends hanging out at the café. He uses this code to show that he belongs to this group (social identity) and this shows his social relationship with his close friends. To negotiate a submission date of an assignment he speaks in English to his teacher. This usage is governed by the social dimension: there is a degree of formality, status or role, and function of the interaction, i.e. to negotiate a submission date (Holmes, 2008, p. 27).

Bagus uses the formal type of Indonesian when interacting with the priest in his church and with his employer. Both interactions show the social distance with the interlocutor and are usually done with a certain degree of formality, aiming at different goals: deciding the wedding day (in interaction with the priest) and getting a promotion (in interaction with his employer).

Code-switching

Code-switching, a common practice of communication in the multilingual speech community, has been the topic of many research work in the shrinking world where people from all over the world are enabled to communicate with each other as a result of technological advancement and a more connected world. Gumperz (1982, pp. 60-61) classified code-switching into two types:

1. Situational code-switching: caused by situation change, such as settings (class, work, home, etc.), kinds of activities (ceremonies, public speaking, formal negotiations, verbal games, etc.), and categories of speakers (family members, friends, government officials, social inferiors, strangers, etc.). The users of this type of code-switching are usually more aware of the situation change and the required language appropriate to the situation.

2. Metaphorical code-switching: motivated by the main concern of communication, i.e. the communicative effect of what they are saying. The switch is usually automatic, not consciously recalled. This code-switching occurs in the same minimal speech act, thus the change or switch seamlessly glides from one language to another. Most of the users are not aware of which language is used, especially when the two languages are used in communication in the communities.

Romaine (1992) defined code-switching as "the use of more than one language, variety, or style by a speaker within an utterance or discourse, or between different interlocutors or situations" (p. 110). Then, code-switching is seen as an action to address certain situational changes in an utterance or discourse. In line with this, Dornyei (1995, p. 58) suggested seeing code-switching in communication as one of the communication strategies, i.e. strategies to minimize or overcome potential communication breakdowns. Thus, code-switching serves as a kind of 'way out' in a difficult situation where communication flow is at stake. In EFL classes in Indonesia, code-switching between Indonesian and English is often used to foster better understanding between learners and teachers as well as to simplify new and complex ideas.

Skiba (1997) concluded that 'code-switching may be viewed as an extension to language for bilingual speakers rather than interference and from other perspectives it may be viewed as interference, depending on the situation and context in which it occurs'. This conclusion was made based on the notion proposed by Crystal (1987) that 'switching occurs when a speaker: needs to compensate for some difficulty, express solidarity, convey an attitude or show social respect'.

Holmes (2008, p. 35) identified that code-switching usually occurs within a domain or social situation and indicates a change in the social situation, oftentimes in a situation where there is a new participant in the exchange or communication. Holmes (2008, pp. 35-39) also managed to identify some reasons and functions of code-switching. They are summarized as follows:

1. Code-switching within a domain or social situation: as an expression of solidarity, as a signal of group membership and shared ethnicity with the addressee, and a change in the other dimensions, such as status relation between two people or the formality of their interaction.
2. Code-switching within a speech event: to discuss a particular topic – technical terms, quotes – for an affective (on purpose) as well as a referential function.

Auer (1998, p. 1) reiterated the necessity to look code-switching as 'a verbal action, the 'alternating use of two or more codes within one conversational episode'. Auer (1998, pp. 1-2) shed a light on the necessity to focus on the 'conversational event' of code-switching. It is clear then that code-switching largely occurs in the context of certain real-time social interactions of two or more people.

Code-switching occurs mostly in bilingual communities where speakers share more than one language employ their ability to code-switch or mix their language during their communication. Code-switching has been identified as a useful tool in the Indonesian EFL context. English in Indonesia is usually learned in an

environment where most of the learners share the same first language, i.e. Indonesian. Not only the learners but also the teachers, whose first language is also Indonesian, usually speak in Indonesian as well to bridge communication flow, particularly in low-proficient classes. The learners in these classes usually need more scaffolding in the learning process. Indonesian English teachers are generally willing to use Indonesian as the language of instruction in most English classroom settings in Indonesian. This situation, consequently, leads to a stronger tendency for the Indonesian EFL learners to do code-switching in communication.

Kachru (1990) offered a perspective by embracing the fact that when English is in contact with other languages, it will be influenced by some features of the language, especially vocabulary and the way people use the languages, precisely code-mixing or code-switching. He categorized countries into the concept of Three-Model of World Englishes, acknowledging English usage all over the world as follows:

1. Inner Circle countries: the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand
2. Outer Circle countries: Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, and Zambia
3. Expanding Circle countries: China, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, Russia, Zimbabwe...

In countries categorized as Outer and Expanding Circle, code-switching is a common phenomenon as those countries usually have more than one language in use. For example, Pariona (2018) reported that the Philippines has many regional languages, Filipino, and English. The regional languages are spoken in specific regions; Filipino is the official and serves as the national language used in public schools, televised media, and cinema; and English is the official language primarily used in printed publications. The code-switching in the Philippines gained a great recognition of Taglish, a mix of Tagalog and English. Taglish has been viewed as a mode of discourse and a linguistic resource in the bilingual's repertoire (Bautista, 2004). Sawe (2017) reported that South Korea is home to Korean, English, and Japanese. Korean is the official language, while English is promoted as a second language and used in trade, academics, and business. Japanese is spoken by the older generation of South Korea particularly in Busan.

More and more research works in the Outer- and Expanding-Circle countries show that the use of code-switching in communication is more and more commonly understood and accepted as a common phenomenon in contemporary settings, such as in China (Bin & Mimi, 2014), in Israel (Shay, 2015), in Iraq (Al-Ani & Ibrahim, 2015).

There seem, at this point, to be more and more evidence that a language is universal in the behavior of multilingual speakers, or – to employ a shorthand definition of code-switching – using several languages or language varieties in the course of a conversation is based on conversation-internal mechanisms observable in various social contexts all over the world. Code-switching is then seen as one of the ways people use their language repertoire. Following Gumperz (1982), identifying code-switching in communication assumes that the language users have

at least two languages they use in interaction and that in situational events, they are aware of the existence of the languages and the purpose of code-switching.

Methods

This mini-research involved 50 young female Indonesian aged 18 – 20 years old. Hailed from places in Indonesia, they lived in Jakarta, doing their study at STIKS Tarakanita Jakarta, Indonesia. They were selected purposively based on accessibility and availability at the time of data collection.

The data were collected using a questionnaire administered to the participants. It was an adapted version of an open-ended interview protocol developed by Martinez (2013) consisting of ten interview questions: the first six questions were used to identify the languages used by the participants in their personal and social lives, while the last four questions were used to identify whether they were aware of code-switching in communication. They were asked to give reasons for their answers as well, especially the reasons for doing code-switching.

This mini-research was conducted to identify, first, the participants' language awareness of their language use in communication, including code-switching, and second, the reasons for their code-switching. The data were tabulated and presented in percentages. They were then analyzed and explained. The reasons for code-switching were categorized following Holmes (2008). The open-question questionnaire was posed to prompt the participants to give some explanations to their answers. The complete set of the questionnaire was available in the Appendix.

Findings and Discussion

The results of the questionnaire are presented below in two parts. The first part presents the participants' language awareness of their language use, including code-switching, and the second part presents the participants' reasons for doing code-switching.

Language Awareness of Language Use

The participants showed language awareness of languages they use in communication. They were aware that they had a variety of languages in their repertoire. The majority, 92% of the participants claimed that their first language was Bahasa Indonesia or Indonesian. This is an undeniable fact as Indonesian is the national and official language in Indonesia used in almost all aspects of life, from children's upbringing to education at all levels, from daily communication to business communication to media and politics. It seems that just like other Indonesian children in general, the participants were raised in Indonesian. Only a very small percentage, 8% of the participants, claimed that they were raised in both Indonesian and their respective local languages, namely Sundanese, Javanese, Bataknese, and Manadonese, to name some.

When the participants communicate with their immediate family members, parents and siblings, 74% of them claimed that they used Indonesian. Some 16% claimed to use both Indonesian and a local language at home. Ten percent of the participants claimed that they used both Indonesian and English at home. It is not surprising though because more and more people are acquiring and actively using

English in communication. This confirms Lauder (2008), Crystal (2018), Kachru (1990).

Ninety-two percent of the participants claimed that Indonesian was their best-spoken language, a not surprising finding due to its function as a national language and the official language of Indonesia. Around 6% of them claimed both Indonesian and English as their best-spoken languages. Again, this confirms what Kachru (1990), Lauder (2008), and Crystal (2018) put forward. A very small percentage (2%) claimed a certain local language as their best-spoken language, but it seems that they used it in their limited circle only. The finding showed that the participants relied on their best-spoken language, Indonesian, to communicate with their friends in their family and social settings: family members, teachers, friends, and even strangers.

Indonesian was also the language the participants used when they communicate with friends outside the classrooms. 84% of them used Indonesian with reasons as follows:

1. It's a familiar language.
2. It's easy to use.
3. All of my friends use Indonesian every day.
4. It's more comfortable to talk in Indonesian than in English.
5. I don't like talking in English with my friends; many of them don't understand English.
6. When I started talking in English, my friends gave me a nasty look.

A few participants (4%) claimed that they used both a local language and Indonesian to communicate with their close friends outside classroom settings sharing the same local language; thus, the goal was to show that they belong to certain cultures and communities, according to Holmes (2008). It was the same reason when some of them (4%) did code-switching between Indonesian and Mandarin.

Some participants who were more capable of English used both Indonesian and English to communicate with their friends (8%). They did code-switching between Indonesian and English citing the following reasons:

1. Just want to try it with some friends.
2. Preparing a talk for speaking class.
3. I don't want to be judged by others as snobbish.
4. I don't want to be misunderstood by other people.

Most of the participants did code-switching by using Indonesian as the main language and English words were inserted in the utterance or sentence. This phenomenon confirms Auer (1998) who stated that the most common form of code-switching is discourse-related insertions.

In their education domain, the participants were identified to do code-switching from English to Indonesian and vice versa. More than half of the participants (54%) did code-switching between Indonesian and English when they spoke to their teachers in the classroom and it was limited in English classes only. They did this

for the sake of clarity and understanding. Only 8% of them used English only in English classes and 38% used Indonesian, particularly in non-English subjects.

It seems that the classroom was a safe place where most of the participants used English and did code-switching between Indonesian and English to bridge a communication gap. This is in line with Sert (2005) stating that Eldridge's (1996) concept of 'equivalence' functions as a defensive mechanism for students as it allows the students to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence. This type of code-switching is only possible when the two interlocutors share the same language. In the Indonesian EFL context, both teachers and students share the same first language (L1), Indonesian. This prompted the students to codeswitch between English and Indonesian.

First language (L1) is very dominant in language use. 92% of the participants admitted that they talked to their teacher in his/her office in Indonesian, even if this particular teacher was an English teacher. English was used only when they talked to English teachers in classrooms. Code-switching between Indonesian and English was used for clarification. Only 8% of them admitted that they did code-switching between Indonesian and English when they talked to their teacher on her/his office, stating the following reasons:

1. Indonesian is easy to use.
2. Indonesian is more effective in communication.
3. My English teachers also speak Indonesian.
4. I don't know some words in English.

To facilitate communication, people tend to suit their languages to the situation they face by using their most familiar language and sometimes, by code-switching. For example, there is a tendency for Indonesian to greet English teachers in English, saying, "Good morning, Sir" or 'Good morning, Mam", but they greet non-English teachers in Indonesian, saying, "*Pagi, Pak*" or "*Pagi, Bu*". This is in line with Holmes (2008) who stated that

> "code-switching is used to show that they belong to a certain group and share ethnicity with an addressee, even though they are not really capable of using the language, they are willing to utter brief and simple phrase" (Holmes, 2008, p. 25)

Holmes (2008, p. 38) stated further that a switch may also reflect a change in the formality of interaction. This is obvious in the different languages they used when the participants spoke to their English teachers in the classroom (i.e. formal interaction) and in their offices (i.e. informal interaction).

Table 2 summarized the findings of the participants' language awareness of their language use.

Table 2. The participants' language awareness of their language use

No	Settings	Indonesian	Indonesian & Local Language	English	Indonesian & English	Indonesian & Other*
1	First Language	92%	8%	-	-	-
2	Language Spoken at Home	74%	16%	-	10%	-
3	Best-spoken Language	92%	2%	-	6%	-
4	Language Used with Friends Outside Classroom	84%	4%	-	8%	4%
5	Language Used with Teacher in Classroom	38%	-	8%	54%	-
6	Language Used with Teacher in his/her office	92%	-	-	8%	

Note: *Some students mentioned Mandarin*

Reasons for Code-switching

Being young people in the metropolitan city of Jakarta in this era, the participants were exposed to English usage in communication. This condition was amplified by technological advancement which supports more platforms of communication and opportunities to communicate in English and other languages, as well as the opportunity to communicate with people from all over the world. All of these formed a fertile ground for code-switching.

The last four questions in the questionnaire inquired about the participants' awareness of code-switching and their reaction to this phenomenon. Table 3 below shows the participants' awareness of code-switching.

Table 3. The participants' awareness of code-switching

	Questions	Yes	No
7	Do you switch between Indonesian and English?	92%	8%
8	Do you notice when you switch between Indonesian and English?	75%	25%
9	Do you notice when other people switch between Indonesian and English?	96%	4%
10	Do you like being able to switch between Indonesian and English?	86%	14%

Using a language in communication, including code-switching, implies an awareness of languages and language use. Ninety-two percent of the participants were aware of their code-switching and admitted that they switched between Indonesian and English with reasons as follows:

1. Code-switching helps me clarify certain ideas or intentions.
2. I have the words just on the tip of their tongues, but I can't let it out.
3. I don't have a lot of vocabulary to express what I am thinking.
4. Some English words sound good to express some words in Indonesian.
5. I can use both languages well.

On one side, because of their lack of vocabulary to express their thought, the participants inserted the words in Indonesian into their English utterances. On the other side, proficiency in both Indonesian and English triggered code-switching. This, once again, confirm Auer (1998) on one of his categorization of code-switching, i.e. discourse-related insertions.

8% of them claimed they did not do code-switching between Indonesian and English, stating some reasons (some wrote their reasons in Indonesian) as follows:

1. *Saya tidak bisa berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris* (I cannot speak in English).
2. *Kalau gonta-ganti bahasa, malah pusing* (Code switching gave me headache).
3. I don't like mixing languages in communication.

Seventy-five percent of the participants claimed that they noticed their code-switching. This showed that they were aware of their doing code-switching between these two languages. They did it consciously because of its function, i.e. to convey their messages in communication. It seems that they inserted Indonesian words into their English as a communication strategy, most likely to overcome a lack of vocabulary or grammatical problems they had.

Twenty-five percent of the participants did not notice that they were code-switching, claiming that they just did it spontaneously. It is likely because both languages were in their language repertoire and, both languages were used seamlessly. Spontaneity happens and is usually triggered by the need of code-witching in communication. This is exactly what was pointed by Verschueren (1999, p. 119) when he stated that 'code-switching, a cover term for language or code alternation, is an extremely common occurrence and a flavored strategy, especially in oral discourse. It may serve many different functions'.

In social settings, it was identified that 96% of the participants claimed that they noticed other people's code-switching between Indonesian and English: their teachers, people on TVs, their friends, their family members. The participants agreed that people did code-switching to bridge the communication gap. This confirms Holmes (2008) on one of the functions code-switching, i.e. to discuss a particular topic for an affective and referential function. 4% of them did not even notice other people's code-switching.

When asked whether they liked being able to switch between Indonesian and English, 86% of the participants answered "Yes". It seems that they were positive towards this ability, citing reasons such as

1. It (being able to do code-switching)'s cool.
2. It (being able to do code-switching)'s fun.

3. I'm proud of it (being able to do code-switching).
4. It (code-switching) helps me practice English.
5. I can show off a bit about my ability.
6. I want to be able to speak like native speakers, so I try my best.
7. I'm proud of my achievement.

It seems that these young girls considered themselves using English mixed with Indonesian as something to be proud of. According to Holmes (2008), this is what is called code-switching for affective function and at the same time, signaling that they are members of a kind of English-speaking community in the making. Meanwhile, 14% of them disliked code-switching citing some reasons as follows:

1. It is confusing.
2. I don't know English much.
3. I don't want other people to misunderstand me.
4. I want to speak English well, not mixing it with Indonesian.

Table 4 summarized the findings of the participants' reasons for code-switching.

Table 4. The participants' reasons of code-switching

No	Reasons
To discuss a particular topic	
1	Code-switching helps me clarify certain ideas or intentions.
2	Some English words sound good to express some words in Indonesian.
3	Preparing a talk for speaking class.
4	Indonesian is more effective for communication.
5	Indonesian is easy to use.
6	It (code-switching) helps me practice English.
To signal a change of dimension	
7	My English teachers also speak Indonesian.
8	I can use both languages well.
To show affective function	
9	Just want to try it with some friends.
10	It (being able to do code-switching)'s cool.
11	It (being able to do code-switching) 's fun.
12	I'm proud of it (being able to do code-switching).
13	I don't want to be judged by others as snobbish.
14	I don't want to be misunderstood by other people.
To signal a group membership	
15	I want to be able to speak like native speakers, so I try my best.
16	I have the words just on the tip of their tongues, but I can't let it out.
17	I don't have a lot of vocabulary to express what I am thinking.
18	I don't know some words in English.
19	I can show off a bit about my ability.
20	I'm proud of my achievement.

Conclusion

The participants were identified to have an awareness of the language in their repertoire and the language they used in communication in their domains. The majority of them claimed Indonesian as their first language, and therefore, they were very keen on using it at home with their family members as well as with their close-knit such as classmates and friends outside the classroom, with their teachers in the classroom and their offices. This is not a surprising finding as Indonesian is the national and official language in Indonesia.

A small number of them claimed to be raised in one of the many local languages in Indonesia and to have an ability to use it in their close-knit sharing the same local language. A few participants claimed to use both Indonesian and English in communication with family members and some friends signaling that their interlocutors shared English. Some participants even claimed English as their best-spoken language.

In the education domain, most of the participants were identified to tend to use English as a means of communication with their English teachers but limited to the use in the classroom only. When the participants talked to the teachers in their office, they tended to switch into Indonesian considering that they shared the same language with their teachers. It seems that the participants were aware of their code-switching between Indonesian and English.

The participants were identified to do code-switching for some purposes: to discuss a particular topic, to signal a change of dimension, to signal a group membership or shared ethnicity, to show affective functions, and to express solidarity.

Code-switching is a growing and expanding research field, especially because of the recent development where languages co-exist and intertwine in a more complicated context than ever. This phenomenon surely invites researchers to look deeper and further, embracing the concept of World Englishes proposed by Kachru (1990). This study only touches a tiny part of the big idea of code-switching. Therefore, more and deeper research work on this area is welcome, especially the work using corpus and other kinds of data obtained from the way people use languages (English, Indonesian, and local languages) in communication in many settings.

References

Al-Ani, A., & Ibrahim, H.A. (2015). *A study of code-switching among EFL learners.* Retrieved from Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309419008_A_Study_of_Code_Switching_among_EFL_Learners

Astriningsih, N., & Mbato, C.L. (2019). Motivation to learn English: Why Indonesian adult learners join a community of interest. *ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal, 34*(2). https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v34i2.2202

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in Cconversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Bautista, M. (2004). Tagalog-English codewitching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific education Review, 5*(2), 226-233. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ720543.pdf

Bin, X., & Mimi, L. (2014). A sociopragmatic analysis of Chinese-English code-switching in advertising discourse. doi:10.24308/iass-2014-156

Bolitho, R., Carter, N., Hughes, R., Ivanic, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlison, B. (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal, 57*(3), 251-259. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.3.251

Carter, R. (2003). Language awareness. *ELT Journal, 57*(1), 64-65. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ661136

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 55-85. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587805 .

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303-311. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Febiyaska, A.E., & Ardi, P. (2019). Indonesian-English code-switching in GoGirl! Magazine: Types and features. *JELTL (Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics), 4*(3), 289-303.

Fishman, J. (1999). *Handbook of language and identity.* Oxford: oxford University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.pdfdrive.com/discourse-strategies-studies-in-interactional-sociolinguistics-e184499274.html

Holmes, J. (2008). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (3rd ed). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Juniar, R. (2016). The role of motivation in learning Engglish for Indonesian students. *Proceedings of 22nd IASTEM International Conference, Tokyo, Japan, 20th June 2016, ISBN: 978-93-86083-39-5.* Tokyo: IASTEM. Retrieved from www.worldresearchlibrary.org/up_proc/pdf/348-146726190210-13.pdf

Kachru, B. (1990). World englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes , 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00683.x

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *MAKARA, Sosial Humaniora, 12*(1), 9-20. Retrieved from http://journal.ui.ac.id/humanities/article/view/128

Lin, Y. (2011). A Language awareness approach to English language teaching in joint programs in China. *he 16th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, (pp. 123-129). Retrieved from http://www.paaljapan.org/conference2011/ProcNewest2011/pdf/oral/2A-1.pdf

Martinez, R. (2013). Reading the world in Spanglish: Hybrid language practices and ideological contestation in a sixth-grade English language arts classroom. . *Linguistics and Education, 24*(3), 276-288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.03.007

Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspective on code switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/14512/RR14512.pdf?sequence=1

Nichols, R. (2014). *Motivating English language learners: An Indonesian case study*. Master Theses. Retrieved from Digital Colelction @Dort: digitalcollections.dordt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1051&context=med_theses

Pariona, A. (2018). *What language do they speak in the Philippines?* Retrieved from WorldAtlas.com: https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/what-language-do-they-speak-in-the-philippines.html

Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* London: Pearson Education Limited.

Romaine, S. (1992). *Bilingualism.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Sawe, B. E. (2017). *What languages are spoken in Korea?* Retrieved from WorldAtlas.com: https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/what-languages-are-spoken-in-south-korea.html

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, XI*(8). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-Code switching.html

Shay, O. (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code switching in amultilingual country. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science, 209*, 462-469. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The internet TESL Journal, III*(10). Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-Code switching

Spary, S. (2020, January 29). From 'Kannywood' to 'rubbing minds' - Oxford English Dictionary adds 29 Nigerian words and phrases. *CNN World*. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/29/africa/nigerian-words-added-to-english-dictionary-scli-intl-gbr/index.html

van Lier, L. (1995). *Introducing language awareness.* London: Penguin.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics.* London: Edward Arnold. Retrieved from https://www.pdfdrive.com/understanding-pragmatics-d186951878.html