



Code-Switching in a University EMI Classroom: Patterns and Implications

Susilowaty^{*1}, R.A. Angelica Sherly Rosa²

^{1,2}English Language Education Department, Sampoerna University, Indonesia

e-mail: ^{*1}susilowaty@sampoernauniversity.ac.id, ²Angelicasherly12@gmail.com

Abstract The study on code-switching (CS) in an English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) context at a private university in Indonesia highlights the lecturer's frequent use of situational switching over metaphorical switching during Public Speaking classes. Through observations and a semi-structured interview, it was found that the CS employed by the lecturer not only facilitated better understanding among students but also served specific functions, such as providing emphasis, offering examples, and demonstrating empathy, which were positively received by the learners.

Keywords: Code-Switching, English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI), EFL College Students

Abstrak Sebagai kesimpulan, penelitian tentang alih kode (code-switching) dalam konteks Bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Pengantar (EMI) di sebuah universitas swasta di Indonesia menyoroti penggunaan alih kode (code-switching) situasional yang sering dilakukan oleh dosen dibandingkan alih kode metaforis selama kelas Public Speaking. Melalui pengamatan dan wawancara semi-terstruktur, ditemukan bahwa CS yang digunakan oleh dosen tidak hanya memfasilitasi pemahaman yang lebih baik di antara para siswa tetapi juga melayani fungsi-fungsi tertentu, seperti memberikan penekanan, memberikan contoh, dan menunjukkan empati, yang diterima secara positif oleh para siswa.

Kata Kunci: Alih Kode, Bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa Pengantar, Mahasiswa EFL.

INTRODUCTION

The growth of globalization and worldwide communication has urged many countries to expand the use of English as an international language for various purposes, including academic settings in higher education (Dearden, 2014; Zare-ee & Hejazi, 2017). This has positioned English as the language of instruction in higher education institutions, known as English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI). Macaro (2018) defines EMI as "the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English" (p. 1). EMI offers students opportunities to develop strong English language skills that benefit their personal and professional lives (Breeze, 2021; Szeder, 2020).

In Indonesia, the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education (RISTEKDIKTI) has recognized EMI as a crucial component of the bilingual curriculum (Jakarta Post, 2015; Lamb, et al, 2020). As a result, universities have adopted EMI in their international classes (Bolton, 2023; Simbolon, 2018; 2021), and efforts to expand EMI programs are ongoing (Lamb et al., 2021). However, these developments often face challenges such as insufficient vocabulary knowledge, low self-esteem in communicating in English, and heightened anxiety when speaking in English (Nopriya, 2016). To address these issues, lecturers frequently resort to using students' first language, Bahasa Indonesia (BI), in specific situations. This practice, known as code-switching (CS), involves alternating between languages within or across sentences (Wardhaugh, 2010).

While existing research has examined the phenomenon of CS in various contexts, significant gaps remain. For instance, studies have extensively documented the reasons for CS, such as easing communication, explaining unfamiliar terms, and creating rapport in classrooms (Chowdhury, 2012; Shabani et al., 2016). Additionally, typologies of CS, including intersentential, intrasentential, and tag switching, have been well established (Poplack, 1980). However, few studies have focused specifically on CS practices within EMI classrooms in Indonesian higher education settings, particularly in courses such

as Public Speaking, where students are expected to demonstrate advanced oral communication skills in English. Moreover, there is a limited exploration of how lecturers' CS contributes to addressing students' linguistic and emotional challenges in such contexts. This gap necessitates further investigation to understand how CS operates and its potential pedagogical implications in EMI classrooms.

To address these gaps, this study explores the use of CS in a Public Speaking class at an Indonesian university that employs EMI. Public Speaking courses are crucial for first-year students, as they often encounter difficulties in using English in an academic context for the first time. This study specifically investigates the types and functions of CS employed by lecturers to facilitate learning and create a supportive classroom environment. The study adopts Wardhaugh's (2010) typology of situational and metaphorical CS and Hoffman's (1991) framework of CS functions, including discussing particular topics, quoting, emphasizing, clarifying, and expressing group identity.

Code-switching (CS) refers to the practice of alternating between two or more languages or language varieties within a single conversation or discourse (Poplack, 2001). Wardhaugh (2010) categorizes CS into two main types: situational switching and metaphorical switching. Situational switching occurs when a speaker changes languages based on the context or circumstances, such as switching to a native language during informal interactions to facilitate participation. Metaphorical switching, on the other hand, is guided by thematic considerations, with speakers altering their language to emphasize a particular topic or subject matter. Wardhaugh's (2010) typology of situational and metaphorical switching provides a foundation for understanding the contexts in which CS occurs. Therefore, this study used types of CS from Wardhaugh (2010) since the setting was a Public Speaking class focusing on improving the oral communication of college students. They were introduced to the use of English in different situations and metaphors. A public speaking class was chosen to be the setting of this study since this course is offered to first-year college students who enroll in a university that applies English as a medium of instruction. Based on the empirical data, the students frequently struggled in this class as they were expected to use English in the class. This was challenging for them since they had

not been exposed to the use of English in an academic setting as much as they did in college

Poplack's (1980) typology further classifies CS into intersentential, intrasentential, and tag switching. These frameworks provide insights into the structural and functional dynamics of CS (Al Heeti and Al Abdely, 2016).

Hoffman (1991) outlines several functions of CS, offering a comprehensive understanding of its practical applications. The following functions are adopted in this study:

- a. Discussing a specific topic: Speakers may switch languages when addressing certain topics, opting for the language that best facilitates communication.
- b. Quoting others: CS presents well-known expressions or quotes in their original language, preserving their authenticity and impact.
- c. Emphasizing a point: Switching between languages can highlight a speaker's emphasis on a particular idea, whether intentional or spontaneous.
- d. Using interjections: CS includes the insertion of interjections or sentence fillers from another language, which can occur either deliberately or unintentionally.
- e. Clarifying through repetition: A speaker may repeat a statement in another language to ensure the listener's understanding.
- f. Explaining speech content: Instead of simple repetition, speakers use CS to rephrase or elaborate on points for better comprehension during bilingual communication.
- g. Expressing group identity: CS can reflect group affiliations, with different languages symbolizing membership in specific social or cultural groups.

Hoffman's (1991) functions of CS offer a detailed framework for analyzing the practical applications of CS in classroom interactions. By combining Wardhaugh's and Hofman's perspectives, this study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of CS practices in EMI classrooms.

English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) refers to the use of English to teach academic subjects in contexts where English is not the first language of the majority population (Macaro, 2018). EMI has become increasingly prevalent in higher education institutions worldwide, driven by globalization and the demand for English proficiency in academic and professional settings (Breeze, 2021; Rose & McKinley, 2018).

In Indonesia, English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) has emerged as a cornerstone of bilingual education, supported by initiatives from the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education (RISTEKDIKTI) to enhance its implementation (Jakarta Post, 2015; Lamb et al., 2020). Private universities, in particular, have integrated EMI into their international programs (Bolton, 2021; Simbolon, 2018; 2021). However, its adoption has not been without challenges. Students often face obstacles such as inadequate vocabulary, heightened anxiety, and diminished confidence when using English, which impede their learning experience (Chou, 2018; Nopriya, 2016). To address these issues, lecturers frequently turn to code-switching as a practical strategy to bridge language barriers and create a more engaging learning environment (Agustina and Widagsa, 2024; Sahan and Rose, 2021).

Research on code-switching (CS) in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) classrooms highlights its critical role in addressing both linguistic and emotional barriers. For instance, Chowdhury (2012) observed multiple motivations for CS in Bangladeshi universities, such as managing large classes, accommodating diverse student backgrounds and abilities, simplifying communication, explaining unfamiliar terms, and expressing solidarity. In the context of Iranian EMI classrooms, Shabani et al. (2016) highlighted the advantages of CS in building rapport and enhancing students' affective experiences. For example, lecturers' use of CS to share jokes, exchange ideas, or discuss personal experiences created a more inclusive and friendly learning environment. Iranian students, often from modest educational backgrounds, reported feeling restricted when instruction was entirely in English. The strategic use of CS allowed lecturers to foster solidarity and alleviate students' discomfort, thereby enhancing their overall engagement and participation. Several challenges characterize the practice of EMI, including students' limited vocabulary knowledge, low self-esteem in communicating in English, and heightened anxiety when speaking in the language (Nopriya, 2016). To address these issues, lecturers frequently resort to using students' first language, in this case, Bahasa Indonesia (BI), in specific situations. Agustina and Widagsa (2024) identified three types of code-switching: tag-switching, inter-sentential switching, and intra-sentential switching appeared in an English speaking class. They also

outlined six functions: quotation, addressee specification, interjection, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization or objectification. Lecturers used code-switching to clarify challenging material, support understanding in the target language, reinforce vocabulary, translate, inform, and build rapport with students. Additionally, code-switching improved students' pronunciation of difficult words and helped them retain previously studied material.

This study builds on these findings by investigating how CS is utilized to address linguistic and emotional challenges in Indonesian EMI classrooms, with a particular focus on its implications for courses emphasizing oral communication skills, particularly in a Public Speaking course. Through this exploration, the study seeks to provide insights into how CS can be strategically employed to support students' learning experiences and emotional well-being.

Public Speaking courses present unique challenges for first-year students in EMI programs. These students often struggle with fluency and confidence in using English in academic settings, having had limited exposure to such contexts prior to university. Lecturers in these courses may use CS strategically to clarify concepts, reduce performance anxiety, and create a supportive learning environment.

METHOD

This qualitative study employed a case study method, which Creswell (2012) defines as an "in-depth analysis of a bounded system" (p. 465), such as an event, activity, process, or individual. Case studies are particularly effective for exploring significant phenomena through comprehensive data collection. This study used a case study approach to investigate the lecturer's use of code-switching (CS) in a higher education EMI classroom. The participants included 27 first-year college students whose insights provided a deeper understanding of how CS functions within the classroom context.

Data were collected through voice recordings and field notes during four observation sessions of a short-semester Public Speaking class. These instruments documented dialogues between the lecturer and students engaging in code-switching (Emerson et al., 1995). A passive observation method, where observers

focus solely on data collection without participating in classroom activities, was employed (Gay et al., 2009). Semi-structured interviews were conducted to supplement the observation data. The first interview gathered insights into the lecturer's code-switching (CS) practices and underlying functions, while the second interview, conducted as part of triangulation, involved purposively sampled students who attended all four sessions (Gay et al., 2009).

Data analysis followed Stake's (1995) steps. Raw data, including speech recordings from observations, were examined for patterns and interpretations. Dialogue between the lecturer and students was transcribed, and relevant excerpts illustrating CS practices were selected. The data were categorized based on Wardhaugh's (2010) CS theories, distinguishing situational and metaphorical switching. After categorization, the first interview provided further insights into the lecturer's CS functions (Hoffman, 1991). The second interview, conducted with students, triangulated findings to identify connections between the lecturer's practices and students' experiences. Data from both interviews were transcribed and analyzed to highlight the role of CS in the classroom.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings on the types and functions of code-switching (CS) employed by the lecturer in the Public Speaking class, as observed during the study. The classification of CS types is based on Wardhaugh's (2010) framework, while the functions are analyzed using Hoffman's (1991) categorization. The results are further contextualized and discussed with reference to interview data, relevant theories, and insights from previous studies.

Types of Code-Switching Observed in the Classroom

The data collected from the observations and field notes revealed that the lecturer utilized code-switching (CS) as part of her instructional practices during a Public Speaking class. While English was the primary medium of instruction, the lecturer switched to Bahasa Indonesia (BI) in specific circumstances. Across the four observation sessions, which lasted 480 minutes, 50 instances of CS were documented. The analysis employed Wardhaugh's (2010) framework, which

identifies two types of CS: situational switching and metaphorical switching. Situational Switching occurs when the speaker shifts from one language to another based on changes in the situation, such as moving between formal and informal contexts or addressing different audiences. On the other hand, Metaphorical Switching focuses on the speaker's intention to redefine the situation, such as transitioning from formal to informal tones, introducing humor, or emphasizing solidarity.

Out of the 50 instances, situational switching was observed 28 times, while metaphorical switching occurred 22 times. This suggests that the lecturer predominantly employed CS in response to situational demands rather than to redefine the classroom context. A detailed explanation of the findings across the four observation sessions is supported by data excerpts below. The excerpts were transcribed from the original language and then translated to English using Gumperz and Berenz's (2014) suggestion in code-switching transcription using a format with a direct Tr using brackets "()".

Day 1: Dominance of Metaphorical Switching

On the first day of observation, the lecturer employed CS 16 times, the highest frequency among all sessions. Of these, 10 instances were metaphorical switching, while 6 instances were situational switching. During this session, the students practiced reading an article aloud using techniques previously introduced by the lecturer. Metaphorical switching was primarily used to clarify reading techniques or to express encouragement, such as:

L: "You should focus on intonation when reading. Supaya lebih jelas, coba ulangi dengan penekanan yang tepat." (To make it clearer, try repeating it with the correct emphasis.) [Excerpt 2.3]

In this case, the lecturer shifted to BI to emphasize key points and ensure student comprehension, redefining the formal activity into a more approachable and supportive interaction.

Day 2: Dominance of Situational Switching

During the second observation session, 9 instances of CS were recorded, with 6 classified as situational switching and 3 as metaphorical switching. The students were tasked with practicing arguments in pairs. The lecturer

predominantly used situational switching as a response to the students' BI utterances:

S6: "Miss, apa ini argumen saya sudah benar? (Is my argument correct?)"

L: "Yes, it's good. Tapi coba perjelas lagi alasan utamanya. (But try to clarify the main reason.)" [Excerpt 4.1 and 4.2]

Here, the lecturer's CS responded to the students' use of BI, reflecting a situational adjustment to facilitate effective communication and maintain engagement.

Day 3: Increased Use of Situational Switching

On the third day, CS occurred 12 times, with 9 instances of situational switching and 3 instances of metaphorical switching. Similar to the second day, students were engaged in reading activities. The lecturer frequently switched to BI to respond to students' questions or comments, which were often posed in BI:

(1) S3: "Miss, saya nggak ngerti cara baca ini. (I don't understand how to read this.)"

(2) L: "Let's break it down together. Kita mulai dari kalimat pertama, ya." (Let's start with the first sentence.)" [Excerpt 10.1 and 10.2]

This pattern highlights the lecturer's situational use of CS to address immediate challenges faced by students in understanding instructions or content.

Day 4: Balanced Use of Situational and Metaphorical Switching

The final observation session recorded 13 instances of CS, with 7 classified as situational switching and 6 as metaphorical switching. During this session, students delivered closing speeches in front of the class. Situational switching was frequently observed when the lecturer addressed logistical or procedural matters, while metaphorical switching occurred during moments of encouragement or clarification of tips for speech delivery:

L: "Remember to maintain eye contact. Jangan terlalu tegang, santai saja." (Don't be too tense, just relax.) [Excerpt 12.3]

Here, metaphorical switching was used to redefine the formal setting into a more supportive and empathetic one, fostering a positive learning environment.

Over the four observation sessions, the lecturer employed both types of CS almost evenly, with 28 instances of situational switching and 22 instances of metaphorical switching. The frequency of CS varied slightly across the sessions,

with the first day showing the highest frequency (16 instances) and the second day the lowest (9 instances). Situational switching was predominantly influenced by students' use of BI in their interactions, prompting the lecturer to adjust her language accordingly. Meanwhile, metaphorical switching was often employed to clarify, encourage, or redefine the classroom atmosphere.

The detailed findings highlight the lecturer's adaptive use of CS to address situational demands and foster a supportive learning environment, demonstrating the dual role of CS in managing classroom interactions and enhancing student comprehension.

Function of Code-Switching in Each Type of Code-Switching

The function of code-switching refers to the type of CS that occurs when the speaker switches from one language to another language according to the situation; the speaker uses one language in a particular situation and switches to the other language in a different situation (Wardhaugh, 2010). In this respect, situational switching occurred 28 times by the lecturer in different circumstances. There were five different circumstances: explanation, instruction, asking questions, stating expression, and giving feedback. The lecturer employed five circumstances in situational switching during the learning and teaching process. Explanation was divided into three sub-circumstances: clarifying, giving examples, and confirming information.

The findings showed that explanation became the most dominant circumstance in situational switching with a total of ten times occurrences: four times clarifying information, three times giving examples, and three times confirming information. Giving instruction occupied the second place among the other circumstances, which appeared eight times. Furthermore, the occurrence of stating expression was revealed four times. Meanwhile, giving feedback and asking questions were the least frequently used circumstances, with a total of three times occurrences in each circumstance. To give some sense of the form of this situational switching, the following excerpts of the lecturer's CS practiced in Public Speaking class are presented. The function of CS proposed by Hoffman (1991) was also analyzed in each of the circumstances.

a. Explanation

In the first circumstance, situational switching occurred when the lecturer explained information to the students. During the observation, it was found that the lecturer performed CS in explaining information, which was delivered by clarifying the information, giving an example, and also confirming the information. Excerpt 18.3 is an example of situational switching in explaining information.

L: The protocol makes it one way. *Pak Presiden, 5 menit aja ya pak, 5 menit aja.* (Mr. President, just 5 minutes, all right, sir, just 5 minutes.)
[Excerpt 18.3]

In Excerpt 18.3, CS was found on the second day of observation. The topic being discussed in the class was the protocol for political speech. The lecturer explained the political speech protocol in the context of Indonesia. She began her explanation in English by saying, "The protocol makes it one way." She then switched to BI to give an example by saying, "*Pak Presiden, 5 menit aja ya pak, 5 menit aja.*" At that time, the example was given by quoting someone else's expression. The lecturer was exemplifying and placing herself as if she was the one who said it directly to the President. In addition, she also changed her voice as she tried to be heard by someone else; therefore, the students would know that the statement was meant to be quoting someone else's expression.

In this situation, the lecturer chose the usage of BI because she was giving an example in the Indonesia context. Someone who is on duty to give instructions to the President of Indonesia would probably say something like the lecturer said. In this respect, the CS done by the lecturer is categorized as situational switching. As Wardhaugh (2010) has stated, situational switching is when one switches from one language to another according to the situation, one language in one situation and another in another. There is no topic change, and the speaker does not try to redefine or change the situation when delivering the example. The atmosphere remained serious and formal, yet the use of BI was necessary

in this situation in order to give a real-life example in the Indonesian context.

Furthermore, Excerpt 18.3, as shown above, did not serve any CS function proposed by Hoffman's theory. However, the CS performed by the lecturer has the function of giving an example to the students. As she said in the interview:

"Oh itu giving example, situational berarti itu ya, kaya misalnya if I gave the student the example of the situation in the context, gitu, jadi kaya, miss ingin menjelaskan protokol tuh kaya gini loh "5 menit lagi ya pak 5 menit lagi"

(Tr)

"Oh, that is giving an example; it means that it is situational, right? For example, if I gave the student the example of the situation in the context like that, so it's like, I want to explain the protocol like this: "5 more minutes, all right sir, 5 more minutes."

From the data interview, the lecturer said that the function of CS in Excerpt 18.3 is to give examples to the students. The lecturer mentioned that she wanted to give the student an example based on the context. Evidently, this function of CS was also confirmed by the students; four of them (Student 3, Student 4, Student 5, and Student 6) felt that it was for giving a real example. Student 6 gave an opinion about this function, as she said:

"Karena kita kan adanya di Indonesia, jadi si Miss A ini mencontohkannya itu pake presiden Indonesia, konteksnya di Indonesia. Dan biasanya mungkin yang memang kejadian itu memang mereka ngomongnya gitu, '5 menit aja ya pak 5 menit aja', jadi gak ngomong '5 minutes ya, sir'. Jadi ga masuk kalo gitu, contohnya kurang gimana gitu"

(Tr)

"Because we are in Indonesia, Miss A gave an example using the context of the President of Indonesia, which is in Indonesia. And usually, maybe it presents the real situation from what actually happened by saying so, 'Only 5 minutes all right sir, only 5 minutes', so they don't say it like '5 minutes ya, sir'. So, it just doesn't suit well; the example just doesn't feel right."

From the data interview above, Student 6 said that since they are in Indonesia, therefore, Miss A will use BI to give examples for them. It just does not present the real example if the lecturer had been using English to give an example. The usage of BI, in this case, seems suitable to give a real or live example for them; as Student 3 said, "...it's giving a more live example". Followed by Student 5 opinion who similarly said "*Ini Miss A mau ngasih contoh dan mengucapkan contohnya itu dengan real, nyata gitu...*" (Tr: Miss A wants to give example and saying the example in real example...)

However, in the contrary, Student 2 has different view as she said "*Mungkin kan kak kalo lagi buru-buru itu lebih simple ngomong di Bahasa Indonesia dan lebih tegas gitu kan.*" (Tr: Maybe, if one is in such a hurry, it would be simpler talking in BI and feels firmer.) It can be inferred from the statement that she feels the function of CS in this case was not to give the real example, instead, it more into the efficiency. She assumed that the usage of BI at that time can help the lecturer to have a simpler yet firmer example to the students in a rush or hurry situation.

Furthermore, another example of situational switching in explanation is exemplified below:

Excerpt 24.1 and Excerpt 24.3

- (1) L : "Shuffle their feet, gaze at the clock, shuffle their feet."
- (2) S1 : [student 1 shuffle her feet]
- (3) L : *Itu namanya* (that is called) shuffle feet.

The Excerpts exemplified above were found on the second day of observation. At that time, the CS occurred when the lecturer was explaining about audiences' feedback in public speech. At first, she explained that one of the types of feedback from the audience that might show during the speech is shuffling feet. The explanation was delivered in English as she said " Shuffle their feet, gaze at the clock, shuffle their feet." After that, one of her students shuffled her feet, and the lecturer said something in BI to confirm what the student just did by saying, "*Itu namanya...*" (Tr: that is called..) and continued by using the English term "...shuffle feet." The utterance above shows that, at first, the lecturer used

English when she was explaining the material. However, she switched to BI as her response to the student. The CS occurred right after she noticed there was one of the students who shuffled her feet. Thus, since the lecturer was explaining about the shuffling feet at the same time, she attempted to confirm what the student had just done by using BI. In this respect, the CS performed by the lecturer is categorized as situational switching. At that time, the lecturer switched from English to BI according to the situation. This is in line with Wardhaugh's (2010) theory, which states that situational switching happens when a speaker changes from one language to another language according to the situation. The spontaneous reaction from the student affected the lecturer to perform CS in order to confirm the information.

Additionally, no function of CS proposed by Hoffman's theory was found in this excerpt. However, the CS in Excerpt 24.1 and Excerpt 24.3 have a function to confirm the information. This function is supported by the lecturer's response in the interview session, as she said, "*Kalau yang ini untuk confirm aja kalau itu shuffle feet.*" (Tr: This one is only to confirm if it is shuffle feet). From the response, it can be clearly inferred that the lecturer attempted to confirm the information. She confirmed that the thing her student was doing was shuffling feet.

Similarly, based on the interview with the students, it is found that three of them (Student 1, Student 2, and Student 4) assumed that the CS performed by the lecturer in this excerpt is to confirm the information, as what Student 1 said, "To point out the example, to confirm." The same statement was also shared by Student 4, who said, "Untuk memperjelas lagi, to confirm it." (Tr: to clarify again, to confirm). The function of CS found in this excerpt is also in line with one of the previous studies conducted by Rinda (2012) about CS performed by the trainee teacher. The findings of the research reported that one of the functions of CS served by the teacher is to give confirmation for certain cases. For instance, her study revealed that the teacher attempted to give confirmation to the students related to the task given in the classroom.

However, different opinions came from Student 3 and Student 6. Both felt that the function of CS in Excerpt 24.1 and Excerpt 24.3 is to emphasize. Student 3 said that “*Mungkin Miss A mau emphasize sih, itu namanya shuffle feet, gitu, kaya mumpung dipraktikin sama studentsnya...*” (Tr: Perhaps Miss A wanted to emphasize that it is called by shuffle feet, while it was performed by one of her students). Another different opinion also came from Student 5, who said that the function of CS in this excerpt was only a spontaneous reaction due to the student’s action. As Student 5 said, “*Spontan, karena ada student yang langsung shuffle gitu. Sebenarnya bisa sih pake Bahasa Inggris, ‘yes that is shuffle feet’, gitu. Jadi ya spontan berarti*” (Tr: Spontaneous, because there was a student who directly shuffle. Actually, it can be delivered using English, ‘yes that is shuffle feet’, like that. So, it means it’s spontaneous). At this point, it can be said that the function of CS served by the lecturer in Excerpt 24.1 and Excerpt 24.3 was viewed differently by some of the students, yet some of them also perceived the similar function as what the lecturer attempted to give in the excerpt above.

b. Giving Instruction

Next, situational switching was also found when the lecturer was giving instructions to the students. The following excerpt was found on the first day of observation.

Excerpt 5.1 and Excerpt 5.2

(1) L : “*Yuk, sudah lewat nih 10 menit, yuk.*” (Come on, it’s already 10 minutes passed).

(2) “*Devi nih, yuk.*” (Come on, Devi).

The data exemplified in Excerpt 5.1 and Excerpt 5.2 were taken when the lecturer gave instructions to the students. At first, the lecturer gave an article to each of the students; they were asked to find out the correct pronunciation and the meaning of the words, and they were supposed to find out where to make some pauses in reading the article. Then, after the practice session, all of the students need to perform to read at least one to two paragraphs in front of the class to read the

article. At that time, when the students were having the reading practice for around 10 minutes, the lecturer noticed the time on the laptop screen and directly gave an instruction to the students to perform in front of the class by saying the following utterances in BI, “*Yuk, sudah lewat nih 10 menit, yuk*”. (Tr: Come on, it’s already 10 minutes passed). After that, she also encouraged one of the students to perform first by saying the utterance in BI, as she said “*Devi nih yuk*”. (Tr: Come on, Devi). In this respect, the lecturer did not use any English term to give the instruction, instead, she fully used BI in this situation.

The example above shows that the lecturer used BI as a response to the situation that occurred at that time. Previously, the lecturer had explained to the students about the duration for practicing in English. The students were given 10 minutes to practice their reading article. However, at this point, no students seemed to have done the practicing session when the lecturer noticed the time was up. Thus, she gave the instruction to the students as she attempted to notify them that it was time for the students to stop the practice and begin to perform in front of the class. She also encouraged one of the students to begin the reading performance. In this respect, it can be said that the lecturer performed a situational switching in the classroom. As Wardhaugh (2010) said, situational switching occurs when a speaker speaks one language in a situation and another language in different situations. She directly switched to BI as a response to the situation, which influenced the language the lecturer used.

Furthermore, no CS function was proposed by Hoffman in Excerpt 5.1 and Excerpt 5.2. Instead, the function of CS found in the excerpt was to give instruction to the students. This result finding is similar to the previous research conducted by Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), who stated that one of the functions of CS used by teachers in the classroom is giving instruction to complete tasks. He also added that future use of CS in the classroom would help the students to understand the teachers’ instruction better.

c. Asking Question

Besides giving instruction, another CS was done by the lecturer when she was asking questions to the students. The example below was taken on the third day of observation.

Excerpt 31.1 – 31.11

- (1) L : “*Bisa* (Can you) Alya?”
- (2) S5 : “*Ga bisa nih*, (I can’t) miss.
- (3) L : “*Oh mungkin ini, kaya* (Oh maybe this, it’s like the) duplicate *terus apa gitu?*” (and then what else?)
- (4) S5 : “*Oh ya*, I don’t know where.”
- (5) L : “*Waduh.*” (Ouch)
- (6) S5 : “Does anyone have experience with Mac?”
- (7) L : “*Yang punya Mac gatau?*” (The one who got Mac, don’t you know?)
- (8) S5 : “*Duh mana ya*” (Where is it?) [Searching in the laptop]
- (9) L : “*Mana ya, itu lho yang* (Where is it) extend, this is screen only, view Coba” (just try.)
- (10) S5 : “Can I contact the owner for a second?”
- (11) L : “Sure. Alya contact *dulu pemiliknya*. (Just contact the owner first) Miss, *lanjutin closing dulu ya.*” (I will continue to the closing first, alright).

In Excerpt 31.1 until Excerpt 31.11, the lecturer performed CS when she asked her students questions. At that time, one student was about to deliver a speech in front of the class. However, there was a technical problem, which caused the student's laptop to not connect to the screen projector.

After that, the lecturer directly asked the student using BI whether she was able to do it or not. At this point, the lecturer asked the student almost fully in BI, except only for several terms such as “duplicate,” “extend,” “screen only,” “view,” “contact,” and “closing.”

The excerpts above indicate that the types of CS performed by the lecturer in this situation are categorized as situational switching. This is because the lecturer performed CS when the class was outside the lecture

process. Instead, the CS occurred when her student was preparing to present her speech in front of the class. This result finding is in line with Wardhaugh's (2010) statement regarding situational switching. He said that situational switching occurs when one language is used in a particular situation and another language is also used in another situation.

Blom and Gumperz in Wardhaugh (2010) also exemplified how situational switching occurred in a classroom context, which is similar to the result in the current study. In Hemnesberget, a small Norwegian town, people there use a local dialect of Norwegian, namely, Ranamål, and one of the standard varieties, namely, Bokmål, which is only reserved for school and church use or any other formal occasions. In the classroom context, it was revealed that the situational switching occurred when the teacher gave a formal lecture in Bokmål. However, they switched to using Ranamål when they were doing a discussion in the classroom. It can be said that even though most locals thought that the school would use Bokmål as a whole, that was not the case. Instead, the use of Ranamål is still preferred in some of the situations in the classroom context; in this respect, it is used in a discussion session.

In addition, regarding the function of the CS employed by the lecturer in Excerpt 31.1 until Excerpt 31.11, no function of CS purposed by Hoffman was found. However, in the interview session, the lecturer said that the usage of BI in this context is for the efficiency of the utterances. As she said:

“Nah ini coba liat kata-kata yang miss ga code-switch, kaya misalnya duplicate, itu kan kaya terminology yang udah ada di laptopnya, ‘duplicate’, ‘extend’, ‘screen only’. Jadi, maybe because I was lazy to, engga maksudnya kalau misalnya pengen konsisten pake Bahasa Indonesia, how do you translate that? Malah lupa jadinya. Karena term termnya pake Bahasa Inggris dalam computer, jadinya yaudah digabungin aja gitu. Dan itu diluar context pembelajaran dan itu just the first thing that comes to your mind aja. Misalnya kaya kita menggunakan copy-paste itu ga mungkin kamu mendengar

orang ngomong salin dan tempel, itu jarang banget deh say. Kalau ngomong pasti 'entar tinggal di copy-paste'..."

(Tr)

"Well, try this to look at those terms that I did not code-switch, such as 'duplicate'; it is like terminology that already exists in the laptop, 'duplicate,' 'extend,' 'screen only.' So, maybe because I was lazy too; I mean, if you want to use Indonesian consistently, how do you translate that? In fact, you can just forget later. Because those terms are already used in English on the computer, so I just combined those words together then. Moreover, it happened outside of learning context, also it's just the first thing that come up to your mind. For example, it is like when we use 'copy-paste,' it is impossible if you hear someone say 'salin' (copy) and 'temple' (paste); it's so rarely happens. People will just say it as 'okay, I'll just copy-paste later'..."

Data from the lecturer interview above can be inferred that the usage of BI and specific terms in English was due to language efficiency in the classroom. In this respect, the lecturer switched from BI to English because certain English terms mentioned above, such as "duplicate," "extend," and "screen only," already existed in the computer or were regarded as computer terminology. The lecturer also pointed out an interesting view in her answer as she said that certain words that are derived from computer terminology, including "copy" and "paste," are commonly used in BI. The answer from the lecturer's interview was also followed by another example of computer terminology usage in BI, as she said:

"...walaupun dalam Bahasa Indonesia mulai miss biasakan itu ya. Tapi, untuk kaya regular conversation, misalnya, ntar tinggal download aja, upload aja gitu, di copy-paste. Yakan gitu kan ya. Jadi kita ga perlu mikir dua kali kalau untuk conversation. Kaya gitu sih menurutku. Unintentionally code switch."

(Tr)

"...Although in Bahasa Indonesia, I am starting to get used to it. However, in regular conversation, for example, 'just download it later, 'just upload,' and 'copy-paste.' It is like that, right? So, we do not need to

think twice in a conversation. That is my opinion. Unintentionally code switch.”

From the statement above, it can be said that even though the lecturer attempted to consistently use BI without inserting any terms in English, it was found that such a case cannot be avoided in regular or informal conversations. This finding is in line with the previous research conducted by Da Silva (2013), who conducted research about English borrowings and Indonesian-English CS in two short blog stories. The research found that English borrowings and Indonesian English CS are frequently used in the story. A certain term such as ‘game,’ ‘expert,’ ‘shock,’ and ‘chatting’ can be easily found in Indonesian sentences. Furthermore, a current study about CS and English language variations among Indonesian Facebook users conducted by Setiawan (2016) also shared the same results. The study shows a common use of CS and English borrowing words among Indonesian Facebook users. Some borrowing words such as ‘share,’ ‘fashion show,’ ‘designer,’ and ‘open house’ were found among Indonesian Facebook users’ posts to be inserted in the sentence using BI. The following sentence is an example of how an English borrowing words is used in a sentence using BI “... Open house *nya seminggu lho, dari tanggal 1 – 8 April ...*”. (Tr: ... The open house will be held for a week from April 1 – 8...). At this point, it can be concluded that some English words are very common to be used in BI sentences. Even though certain terms are the ones that has Indonesian equivalents or have the Indonesian translation, English-borrowing words are still preferred to be used in BI.

Another interesting view also came from the data of students’ interviews. Although the lecturer pointed out that the use of CS in this excerpt is a language efficiency, the students felt different functions in Excerpt 31.1 until Excerpt 31.11. Three of the students, including Student 2, Student 3, and Student 6, stated that the lecturer was performing CS to show her empathy to the student who was going to present. Student 2, the one who was going to present in front of the class, said the following answers:

“Aku merasakan simpati sebenarnya, cuma kaya cepetan-cepetan gitu, kaya bisa ga? Kalau gabisa kaya disuruh ganti yang lain gitu. Dan kadang-kadang juga gitu kan, misalnya kalau gak konteks lagi ngasih penjelasan, kadang-kadang ada guru yang kaya suka kelupaan juga pake Bahasa Indonesia.”

(Tr)

“I was actually feeling sympathy, but it’s like we were in a rush, so she was asking, like, can you do it? If you cannot, just replace it with the other one, like that. And sometimes the case is like that, right. Sometimes there are these teachers who forget and use Bahasa Indonesia when we are out of lecturing context.”

From the data interview above, Student 2 felt empathy from the lecturer, even though she also mentioned that it was due to the situation, which has already become a habit or routine for some of the teachers to use BI when the class was not in a lecturing session. Furthermore, the other two students, who are Student 3 and Student 6, also shared the same opinion regarding the function in the excerpt above. This function of CS is in line with one of Hoffman’s functions of CS. Hoffman (1991) stated that one of the functions of CS is to be emphatic about something. Some people who are talking using a language that is not regarded as their mother tongue will directly switch to their first language, intentionally or unintentionally, when they want to show empathy to others.

On the contrary, one of the students argued that the utterances in Excerpt 31.1 until Excerpt 31.11 did not imply any function. In other words, Student 5 felt that the lecturer’s CS at that time was only a part of a spontaneous reaction and did not serve any function of CS, as she said:

Excerpt 3.1

“...Kayanya beliau lupa deh terus ngomong pake Bahasa Indonesia. Menurut aku itu kondisinya bukan disaat beliau harus mengemphasize makanya pake Bahasa Indonesia atau kaya yang tadi untuk mencontohkan gitu. Nah ini ga kaya gitu, ini cuma common question yang seharusnya pake aja Bahasa Inggris gitu, jadi ketika beliau ini the main reason sih kayanya keceplosan sih gaada tujuan tertentu, karena dia bisa menggunakan Bahasa Inggris.”

(Tr)

"...Maybe she forgot and then used Bahasa Indonesia. I think it's not the condition when she must emphasize her utterances, so she used Bahasa Indonesia or not to give examples, too, like the previous one. This was not like that; this was just a common question that should be just in English, so I think the main reason why she switched was just because she slipped out; there were no certain objectives because she could have just used English."

From the data interview above, it can be inferred that Student 5 felt that the usage of BI in Excerpt 31.1 until Excerpt 31.11 had no function intended by the lecturer. Instead, she argued that the CS occurred at that time only because the lecturer had just slipped out, or in other words, it was due to unintentional CS. Furthermore, she also mentioned that even though the situation that occurred at that time was not in the lecturing session, she suggested that the usage of English remains. The lecturer should have just asked in English because, in her opinion, it was just a common question that could be answered using English. Thus, it can be concluded from the students' interview that they felt different functions in the excerpt; some felt that the lecturer intended to give empathy, while other did not feel any function served in the lecturer's CS.

d. Stating Expression

Another circumstance in which the lecturer performed CS in the classroom was when she was expressing herself. The following excerpt was found on the fourth day of observation.

Excerpt 46.1

L : Student 2 (.) wah cakep nih backgroundnya. (Wow, the background is beautiful).

In the datum exemplified above, the lecturer performed CS in order to express her feeling of surprise. At first, she was about to give an instruction to one of the students, Student 2, to start performing the speech. The lecturer called her name. However, the lecturer paused for a second because she noticed the background scenery behind Student 2's back. The background scenery behind the student was the view of

buildings which was visible through the glass wall behind the student. The lecturer, who first focused on the camera phone she prepared to record the student, was surprised when she noticed the scenery behind the student; then she expressed her feelings in BI by saying, "*Wah cakep nih background nya.*" The utterance in Excerpt 46.1 shows that, at first, she only intended to give the instruction to one of the students to be prepared by calling her name. The lecturer seemed about to tell that she needed to be ready since the camera phone that the lecturer held was already facing the student. However, at this point, the lecturer looked at the student's background and noticed the beautiful scenery by stating her expression in BI. In this respect, the utterance above can be categorized as situational switching. As Wardhaugh (2010) said situational switching occurred when a speaker changes one language to another language due to the situation. The lecturer spontaneously used BI as a result of her surprised reaction to the background scenery. This circumstance caused the lecturer to use BI instead of English, which acts as the medium of instruction in the classroom.

Furthermore, the situational switching exemplified above did not serve any function of CS as Hoffman had proposed. In addition, the data from the interview also revealed that the lecturer admitted the utterance in Excerpt 46.1 was only a spontaneous reaction, as she said: "*Itu juga spontaneous reaction itu, I don't really intend to, karena beneran cakep beneran itu dibelakangnya.*" (Tr: That's also a spontaneous reaction, I do not really intend to, because that was really beautiful the background behind her). It can be inferred that at that time, the lecturer only stated her spontaneous reaction and did not intend to serve any function when performing the above CS. This result is also in line with a previous study conducted by Chowdhury (2012), who found that in Bangladesh, CS in the classroom context is viewed as an everyday phenomenon. Even though there are specific rules that state the usage of English should be the only language in the classroom. However, the CS between Bangla and English performed by the teacher in a tertiary education often occurred spontaneously and subconsciously.

In addition, the statement from the lecturer is also in line with most of the students' responses in the interview session. Five students, including Student 1, Student 2, Student 4, Student 5, and Student 6, stated that they felt the CS performed by the lecturer in Excerpt 46.1 was merely a spontaneous reaction. As what Student 5 said, "*Spontan, kaya 'aduh bagus nih', gaada fungsi lain.*" (Tr: Spontaneous, it is like 'wow beautiful', there is no other function).

However, Student 1 and Student 2 pointed out other similarities between the answers. Student 1 said, "It could be spontaneous, but it also could be to make the students less nervous. *Karena kan mau record kan*". (Tr: it could be spontaneous, but it could be to make the students less nervous because the student is going to be recorded, right). Similarly, Student 2 said that "*Mungkin emang Miss A kaya apa ya, spontaneous comment sama kaya dia tuh pengen ice breaking gitu aja. Anak- anak kan udah pada tegang gitu kan udah mau di record gitu kan.*" (Tr: Maybe, Miss A is like, to give spontaneous comment and then she just wants to do the ice-breaking since the students were already so tense because they are going to be recorded, right). It can be said that both of the students pointed out other functions on the lecturer's CS in Excerpt 46.1. The other function of the lecturer's CS at that time was to calm the situation since all the students seemed nervous. Thus, this function of CS is similar to one of the CS functions found in the previous study conducted by Muthuuri-Gitonga (2007), who noted that the CS is able to act as an ice-breaking strategy in the classroom, which also indicated rapport among the group members who shared the same codes or languages.

CONCLUSION

This study explores the types and functions of code-switching (CS) in a university EMI classroom. It identifies two types of CS: situational switching (56%) and metaphorical switching (44%). Situational switching was primarily used for clarification, feedback, and instructions, while metaphorical switching was less frequent but helped explain material and emphasize key points. The

study also finds that CS serves various functions, including emphasizing ideas, providing emotional support, and fostering student engagement.

The findings highlight the importance of CS as a pedagogical tool for enhancing student comprehension, emotional well-being, and participation in EMI classrooms. Future research should examine CS in diverse contexts, its evolution over time, and its impact on academic performance. This study underscores the potential of CS to create an inclusive and effective learning environment.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, M., & Widagsa, R. (2024). Exploring the practice of code-switching by lecturer in English speaking class . *Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 9(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.upy.ac.id/index.php/eltics/article/view/5789>
- Al Heeti, N. H., & Al Abdely, A. A. (2016). Types and functions of codeswitching in the English language used by Iraqi doctors in formal settings. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Review*, 1(8), 10-18.
- Aeyonomi, M. O. (2006). Code-switching and code-mixing: Style of language use in childhood in yoruba speech community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(1), 90-99.
- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Bensen, H., & Çavusoglu, C. (2013). Reasons for the teachers's uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 69-82. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iuayefd/article/view/1023022102>
- Bista, K. (2010). *Factors of code switching among bilingual English students in the university classroom: A survey*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2649532/Why_do_People_Code-switch_A_Sociolinguistic_Approach

- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes, *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Breeze, R. (2021). Teaching English-medium instruction courses in higher education: a guide for non-native speakers. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic
- Bolton, K., Hill, C., Bacon-Shone, J., & Peyronnin, K. (2023). EMI (English-medium instruction) in Indonesian higher education. *World Englishes*, 42, 424-446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12622>
- Cambridge, D. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english> Chahayani, Y. N. (2015). *The Analysis of Lecturers' Code Switching in Teaching Learning Process (A Case Study in the English Department Teaching Learning Process Faculty of Cultural Sciences Sebelas Maret University)*. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.fib.uns.ac.id/index.php/jbssa/article/download/208/104>
- Chou, M.H. (2018). Speaking anxiety and strategy use for learning English as a Foreign Language in full and partial English-Medium Instruction contexts. *TESOL Quarterly* 52(3):611-633. DOI:10.1002/tesq.455
- Chowdhury, N. (2012). Classroom code switching of English language teachers at tertiary level: A Bangladeshi perspective. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 40-61. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3329/sje.v7i0.14462>
- Chowdury, N. (2012). Classroom Code Switching of English Language Teachers at Tertiary Level: A Bangladeshi Perspective . *Stamford Journal of English*, 40-61.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Da Silva, A. M. (2013). The English borrowings and the Indonesian-English code-switching in two collections of blogs short-stories. *K@TA PETRA*. doi:10.9744/kata.15.1.9-18
- Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction - a growing global phenomenon. British Council.
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Floris, F. D. (2014). *Learning Subject Matter through the Medium of English: Perspectives from the Field*. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/11852164.pdf>

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications (9th edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code-switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10(2), 371- 393.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. Gumperz, J. J., & Berenz, N. (2014). Transcribing Conversational Exchanges. In J. A. Edwards, & Lampert, M. D., *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Psychology Press.

Haagen-Schützenhöfer, C., & Mathelitsch, L. (2001). *English as a medium of instruction in science-teaching*. Retrieved from http://www.fisica.uniud.it/girepseminar2001/CS06/HAAGEN_03_FI_NAL.pdf

Heredia, R. R., & Altaribba, J. (2001). Bilingual language mixing: Why do bilinguals code-switch? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(5), 164-172.

Herniti, E., Budiman, A., & Kusumawati, A. A. (2016). Kesantunan berbahasa dalam dakwahmultikultural. *Adabiyāt*, 15(1), 38-62.

Hoffman, Charlotte. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Inc: Longman.

Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 31-45.

Ibrahim, J. (2001). The implementation of EMI (English Medium Instruction) in Indonesian universities: Its opportunities, its threats, its problems, and its possible solutions. *A Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature*, 3(2), 121-138.

Ja'afar, N. S., & Maarof, N. (2016). Teachers' beliefs of code switching in the ESL classroom. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 4, 212-222. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.44030>

Josefsson, R. (2010). *Code-switching in the English Classroom, Six Teachers'*

theory and Practice. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:411891/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

K Herlina, C. (2007). Teacher's use of code switching in the classroom and its implications on students' score. *Binus University Journal*, 1(2), 117-131. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21512/lc.v1i2.318>

Lamb, M., Waskita, D., Kuchah, K., Hadisantosa, N., Ahmad, N.F. (2020). The state of English as Medium of Instruction (EMI) in Higher Education Institutions in Indonesia. British Council.

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, 12(1), 9-20.

Ling, L. Y., Jin, N. Y., Tong, C. S., Tarmizi, M. A., & Sahiddan, N. (2013). Influence of an English lecturer's code-switching practice on students' confidence in the subject. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 4(2), 226-233.

Macaro, E. (2018). English medium instruction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mattsson, A. F., & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers, Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics*, 47, 1-13.

Modupeola, O. R. (2013). Code-switching as a teaching strategy: Implication for English Language teaching and learning in multilingual society. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 14(3), 92-94.

Muthuuri-Gitonga, D. (2007). Functions of code-switching in a multilingual classroom. *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa*, 1(1). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jolte.v1i1.41752>

Palinkas, L. A., Wisdom, J. P., Green, C. A., & Hoagwood, K. E. (2013). *Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research*. doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol: 'Toward a typology of code switching'. *Linguistics*, 18: 581-616.

Poplack, S. (2001). Code-switching (Linguistic). In S. Niel & B. Paul (eds). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier Science Ltd.

Riegelhaupt, F. (2000). *Codeswitching and Language Use in the Classroom*. Retrieved from http://faculty.kutztown.edu/nunez/riegelhaupt_1.pdf

- Rinda, R. K. (2012). A study of code-switching of teacher talk on trainee teacher in PPL II program of State University Surabaya. *Jurnal Mahasiswa UNESA*, 01(01), 1-10.
- Sahan, K., & Rose, H. (2021). Translanguaging or code-switching? Re-examining the functions of language in EMI classrooms. In B. Di Sabato & B. Hughes (Eds.). *Multilingual Perspectives from Europe and Beyond on Language Policy and Practice* (pp. 348-356). Abingdon: Routledge
- Sari, D. M. (2015). *An Analysis Of Code Switching And Code Mixing Used In A Talk Show Hitam Putih*. Retrieved from <http://repository.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/53005?show=full>
- Sehiling, Y., & Setiawan, S. (2014). The students' attitudes toward the instructor's code-switching in the EFL classroom. *Language Horizon*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Setiawan, B. N. (2016). Code-switching and English language variations among Indonesian Facebookers. *Indonesian Studies Journal*, 1-17.
- Shabani, G., Jamnani, R. , & Heidar, D. (2016). A study of Iranian EFL university lecturers' practice of code-switching in English as a foreign language instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 6(2), 95-118. doi:10.5296/jse.v6i2.9247
- Simbolon, N. (2018). EMI in Indonesia Higher Education: Stakeholders' Perspective. *TEFLIN Journal*, 29(1), 108-128. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v29i1/108-128>
- Simbolon, N. E. (2021). English Medium Instruction (EMI) practice: Higher education internationalization in Indonesia. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 8(2), 72-83. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v8i2.8961>
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. California: Sage.
- Sukyadi, D., Wirza, Y., & Hasiani, M. U. (2015). *Code-switching on Facebook Wall: A Case Study in the English Department at Indonesia University of Education*.
- Tariq, A. R., Bilal, H. A. , Abbas, N. , & Mahmood, A. (2013). Function of code-switching in bilingual classrooms. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(14), 29-34.

- Then, D. C., & Ting, S. (2011). Code-switching in English and science classrooms: more than translation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*. doi:10.1080/14790718.2011.577777
- Ustunel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom Code-Switching*. London: Springer Nature.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Whitehead, T. L. (2005). *Basic Classical Ethnographic Research Methods*.
- Wurm, S. A., Mühlhausen, P., & Tryon, D. T. (1996). *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*. Berlin, New York: Mouton deGruyter.
- Zare-ee, A. and Hejazi, Y. (2017). University teachers' views on English as the medium of instruction in an Iranian higher education institution. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* 8 (4), 467- 485
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3094548>