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Abstract:
This paper presents the results of a single case study of an EFL teacher’s code switching which involved three languages including English, Indonesian, and Javanese in a young learners’ class. More specifically, this qualitative study aimed to analyze the teacher’s types of code switching and functions of her code switching in the teaching and learning process. Data from classroom observations, teacher’s interview, students’ interview, and students’ questionnaire showed that all of the teacher’s code switching were conversational and based on the structure of her switching; she did intersentential, intra-sentential, and tag switching. Further, those different types of code switching served four positive functions for the EYL teaching. Those included strategy to deliver clear material explanations, strategy to deliver clear task instruction, strategy to give encouragement, and strategy for disciplining the students.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Both English-only and local language-only policies in the EFL classroom are promoted for each of their strength by some theorists who stand with their justifications (See Ferguson, 2012, p. 17). Those justifications comprise the importance of full English exposure and the urge to use most understandable medium of instruction in the EFL class (Ferguson, 2012, p. 17, see also Burden, 2001; Cole, 1998; Cook, 2001; Willis, 1981). In the way to mediate the contradiction, Ferguson (2012, p.17) and Kirkpartrick (2012, p.11) state that
language teachers should focus more on the solution of how to use code switching instead of debating which medium is best, since English and other languages can be used complementary in bilingual or multilingual class to help students master English.

Code Switching is a term used to identify alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation (Myers-Scotton, 1993, p.1, see also Poplack, 2006). It can be used by bilinguals and multilinguals for many functions based on their proficiency levels, needs, and interests (See Appel & Muysken, 1990; Belz, 2003; Cheng & Butler, 2007; Chung, 2006; Eldridge, 1996; Evans, 2009; Ferguson, 2003; Grosjean, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Gwee, 2006; Heredia & Brown, 2004; Hoffmann, 1991; Holmes, 2001; Jochum, 2010; Liebscher & Dailey-O’cain, 2005; Menn, O’connor, Obler, & Holland, 1995; Modupeola, 2013; Montes-Alcala, 2005; Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009; Rinda, 2014; Saville- Troike, 2003; Sert, 2005; Sounkalo, 1995).

Data from pre-study which had been gained by the researcher showed that a tendency of multilingual to switch the codes also happened in one of state elementary schools in Serang, Banten, Indonesia. A multilingual in the aforementioned school is an English teacher who uses three languages including English, Indonesian, and Javanese to teach bilingual students in 5th grade. The investigation of teacher’s code switching which involves three languages is still limited in Indonesia, since most of the studies are concerned with the use of two languages only (See Arumawanti, 2013; Cahyani, 2013; Fitriyah, 2012; Intan, 2013; Murniati, 2004; Ningsih, 2013; Norlaili, 2012; Paramita, 2010; Pradina, Soeriasoemantry, & Heriyanto, 2013; Rahardiyanto, 2011; Sehiling & Setiawan, 2014).

Thus, in order to expand the study about teacher’s code switching in Indonesia, this study was aimed to investigate an EFL teacher’s types of code switching and functions of her code switching which involved the use of English, Indonesian, and Javanese in her teaching process. Those two aforementioned matters were investigated through sociolinguistic approach where this study not only had interest in investigating the use of different languages in the teacher’s code switching, but also different social functions involved in the process of teacher’s code switching (See Backus, 2009; Boztepe, 2005; Callahan, 2004; Gardner-Chloros, 2009; Gumperz, 1982; Holmes, 2001; Nguyen, 2008; Nilep, 2006; Simon, 2001).

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

Research design in this study was chosen to fulfill the need of research purpose. The purpose of this research was to investigate an EFL teacher’s code switching in a young learners’ class; these included types of her code switching and functions of her code switching. Relevant to the aforementioned purpose, this study used qualitative approach with case study design. The overall purposes of qualitative approach are to achieve an understanding of how people make sense out of their lives, delineate the process of meaning-making, and describe how people interpret what they experience (Merriam, 2009, p. 14). The aforementioned purposes were in
line with the purposes of this study where it was used to understand the actions and experiences of an EFL teacher in using code switching. More specifically, this study used single case study because it was eminently justifiable when the case represented a rare circumstance (See Yin, 2003, p. 45). This study only focused on the single case which was an EFL teacher’s code switching and a rare phenomenon where three languages were used in the EYL teacher’s code switching (See background of study in section 1.1).

2.2 Participants
The participants in this study were an English teacher and her 32 students in the fifth grade in one elementary school in Serang, Banten, Indonesia. The teacher had been chosen to be a participant in this study because of two reasons. First, she did the action which was infrequently done by other EFL teachers who taught young learners. Specifically, she was a multilingual who used three languages including English, Indonesian, and Javanese to teach English for the 5th graders. Second, she had willingness to be fully observed and interviewed by the researcher; so that the data could be collected comprehensively. In addition, the 5th graders had been chosen because of their status as bilinguals who were taught by the English teacher using code switching in three languages. With respect to confidentiality of participants’ identities, the anonymity of their names and school was kept (See Silverman, 2010).

2.3 Data Collection Techniques
In order to answer all research questions and establish construct validity appropriately, four data collection techniques were used in this study. There were classroom observation, students’ questionnaire distribution, teacher’s interview, and students’ interview.

2.3.1 Classroom Observations
The researcher did ten semi-structured classroom observations to collect the data about types of teacher’s code switching and the functions of her code switching with two instruments including video recorder and field notes.

2.3.2 Students’ Questionnaire Distribution
The researcher distributed 32 questionnaire sheets which were addressed to all young learners in the classroom of research subjects. The students’ responses in the distributed questionnaires were used to check the findings from teacher’s interview to analyze the functions of her code switching. The responses were used to check the conformity between the students’ description about their own characteristics and the teacher’s way to perceive her students’ characteristics which could affect her use and function of code switching. The collection of the students’ questionnaire responses was conducted on a day before the teacher’s interview for the anticipation if the teacher’s viewpoint of her students’ characteristics had not been comparable with her students’ responses in the questionnaire, the researcher would have asked the inconsistency between teacher’s viewpoint and students’ responses directly to the teacher in the interview session.
2.3.3 Teacher’s Interview
A semi-structured interview with open-ended questions was conducted in this study to get the data that support the findings of classroom observation to analyze the functions of teacher’s code switching.

2.3.4 Students’ Interview
Students’ interview in this study involved five students as the representative respondents from the fifth graders. In this study, those students were interviewed individually through semi-structured interview to double-check the findings from students’ questionnaire and teacher’s interview for analyzing the functions of the teacher’s code switching.

2.4 Qualitative Data Analysis
Data analysis in this study was undertaken descriptively based on the data from classroom observations, students’ questionnaire, teacher’s interview, and students’ interviews. Each stage of analysis of those four data collection techniques of data is presented in following sub-sections.

2.4.1 Steps to Analyze the Data from Classroom Observation
There were two data which had been gotten from the classroom observations. Those included video recordings of English teaching and learning process and field notes in ten classroom observations. Those data were analyzed in five major steps including data transcription, familiarization, categorization, comparison, and interpretation.

2.4.1.1 Data Transcription
The data transcription comprised two steps of action. Firstly, the data from videos of teaching and learning process in ten meetings were transcribed after the researcher watched the videos. Secondly, with respect to the need of neat observation field notes, ten handwritten notes were typed using a word processing program.

2.4.1.2 Data Familiarization
Data familiarization involved the process of reading the data from video transcripts and field notes carefully. It was done to gain an overview of data coverage from those two aforementioned sources of data (See Ritchie et al., 2003, pp- 221-222).

2.4.1.3 Data Categorization
Data categorization involved three specific steps including data coding, data sorting, and data reduction. To begin with, the data was labeled or tagged. In common with some experts (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Cohen et al., 2007; Corbin & Strauss, 2012; Creswell, 1994; Franekel et al., 2012; Lodico, Splauding, & Voegtle, 2006), the researcher referred to this process as coding. In this step, the researcher searched through the data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics which the data covered (See Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 166; Lodico et al., 2006, p. 305). Then, the data were tagged.
After that, the data were categorized by using thematic data analysis. In this step, the coded data were sorted into themes which had become the focus of the study including types of teacher’s code switching and functions of the teacher’s code switching. In the process of coding categorization, the data which did not fulfill the need of research objectives were eliminated from the analysis process. This process is called data reduction.

2.4.1.4 Data Comparison

Data comparison was conducted by comparing the data with the findings of previous studies (See Creswell, 1994, pp. 156-157; Lodico et al., 2006, p. 313; Yin, 2003, pp. 116-120) and other data collection techniques in this study (See Creswell, 1994, pp. 157-158; Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10; Yin, 2003, pp. 97-98). Firstly, all data which had been sorted in thematic categories were compared with the predicated patterns from previous studies which had been conducted by other researcher with the same research concern and the findings from other techniques which were used to collect the additional and/or supportive findings for analyzing the functions of the teacher’s code switching.

2.4.1.5 Data Interpretation

Data interpretation was conducted in the end of data analysis process right before the data in the form of findings and discussion were presented in chapter 4. In this step, the researcher made sense of the “lessons learned” by looking for larger meaning of those lessons (See Lincoln & Guba, 1985, as cited in Lodico et al., 2006, p. 313).

2.4.2 Steps to Analyze the Data from Students’ Questionnaire

The data collected from the students’ questionnaire came in the in the form of students’ written responses. Those responses were analyzed through six major steps. First, the data from students’ questionnaire sheets were read carefully to get the data familiarization. Second, the data were categorized into four thematic categories. Those categories included students’ languages mastery, students’ languages preferences, students’ understanding, and students’ activeness. Third, a simple percentage calculation was conducted. Percentages of questionnaire responses from 32 students were calculated to see domination of students’ characteristics and preferences in dealing with the teacher’s code switching. Fourth, the data were compared with the data founded from previous studies. Fifth, the data were compared with the findings from teacher’s interview and classroom observation. Lastly, the data were interpreted.

2.4.3 Steps to Analyze the Data from Teacher’s Interview

The data collected from teacher’s interview came in the form of teacher’s oral responses in an audio recording. Those responses were analyzed through six major steps. Firstly, the audio of interview was transcribed. Secondly, the transcripts were read carefully in the process of data familiarization. Thirdly, the data were coded. Fourthly, the data were compared with the theories from previous studies. Fifthly, the data were compared with the findings of students’ questionnaire to support the
data needed for the analysis of functions of the teacher’s code switching. Lastly, the data were interpreted.

2.4.4 Steps to Analyze the Data from Students’ Interview

The analysis steps in this sub-section were used to analyze raw data from students’ interviews in the form of five interview audio recordings. The steps consisted of six major steps. The first and second analysis steps of students’ interviews were just the same with the ones done in teachers’ interview analysis. After the researcher got the overview of data set in the students’ interview transcripts, the research coded and categorized the data. Further, the data were compared with the theories from previous studies related to characteristics of young language learners for the need of second research question and criticism of teacher’s code switching in English class for the need analysis of the teacher’s functions of code switching. Then, the data were compared with the ones collected from students’ questionnaire sheets, teacher’s interview, and classroom observations. Finally, the data were interpreted.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Types of an EFL Teacher’s Code Switching in a Young Learners’ Class

Types of the teacher’s code switching in this study were concluded from the analysis of video transcripts of teaching process in the classroom observations which became the main source of data. In addition, the findings from video transcripts were supported by the findings from the observation field notes. The findings showed that the teacher used code switching which involved English, Indonesian, and Javanese. Furthermore, she used different types of code switching in her way to do code switching in those three aforementioned languages.

The teacher’s different types of code switching were analyzed based on the theory of type classifications which had been proposed by Blom & Gumperz (1971), Poplack (1980), and Gumperz (1982). There were six types of code switching proposed by the above-mentioned experts which were used to be the references of data analysis. Those include situational code switching, metaphorical code switching, conversational code switching, inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and tag switching. The first three were classified based on the factors which influence the switching and number of language used in the switching process (See Blom & Gumperz, 1971; Gumperz, 1982). Meanwhile, the last three types were classified based on the structure of the switching process in the utterance (See Poplack, 1980).

In the first data analysis process, the data gained was analyzed based on the first three types. The result showed that among those three types, there was only one type found in the teacher’s code switching. More specifically, all of the teacher’s code switching was conversational. All of her code switching was juxtapositional in conversations between her and her student(s). There were no constrains which bonded her to use one language or another entirely for particular situation or topic like the characteristics of situational and metaphorical code switching.
Further, her conversational code switching was analyzed based on the structure of the switching process. The result showed that she used all types of code switching based on the types classification from Poplack (1980) including inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and tag switching.

3.1.1 Teacher’s Inter-Sentential Switching

Inter-sentential switching is a type of code switching which occurs at a sentence or clause boundary (Poplack, 1980). In this type, each sentence or clause is in one language or another (Poplack, 1980). This type was used by the teacher in nine out of ten meetings. It involved the switching in English, Indonesian, and Javanese.

In addition, among all types of code switching, inter-sentential switching was used dominantly. More specifically, 61% of teacher’s code switching was classified as this type. This finding made the same with previous studies which had been conducted by Rezvani & Rasekh (2011), Rinda, (2014), and Yataganbaba & Yildirim (2015), where they also found that inter-sentential switching was used mostly by EFL teachers who taught EYL in their studies.

Example:

Teacher: **Number four!**  *Nomor empat!**  *Nomor papat!*

(Translation: **number four!**

This code switching was done in a dictation session. The teacher exclaimed “Number four!” when she was about to dictate the fourth question in dictation exercise. A while later, she used Indonesian “Nomor empat!” and Javanese “Nomor papat!” as the translation of English “Number four!” At that moment, English was used to keep the existence of English exposure for all students in that class. Meanwhile, Indonesian and Javanese were used to get the students’ direct attention toward the teacher’s dictation. Both Indonesian and Javanese were used to attract two specified students; they were the ones whose first language was Indonesian and another party whose first language was Javanese.

3.1.2 Teacher’s Intra-Sentential Switching

Intra-sentential switching is a type of code switching which occurs at the clause, phrase, or word level (Poplack, 1980). The findings from classroom observations in this study revealed that the use of intra-sentential switching could be found in eight out of ten classroom meetings. More specifically, 27% of the teacher’s code switching in those aforementioned meetings was classified as intra-sentential switching.

Example:

Teacher: **Wednesday!**

All students: **Wednesday!** *students repeated the teacher’s utterance*

Teacher: **Once more!**
Most students: Once more! *students repeated the teacher’s utterance*
Teacher: **Once more itu sekali lagi.**

(English) (Indonesian)

(Translation: “once more” means once more.)

This code switching was done when the teacher informed the equivalent of “Once more” in Indonesian. In one clause, she used English in advance to say “once more” in quoting her own former English order and Indonesian thereafter to explain the Indonesian translation by presenting the exact equivalent of “Once more” in Indonesia.

### 3.1.3 Teacher’s Tag Switching

Tag switching is a type of code switching which occurs at the tag part of the sentence (Poplack, 1980). It occurs where tag part and main part of sentence are in different languages (Poplack, 1980). This type of switching was used by the teacher in English, Indonesian, and Javanese in eight out of ten meetings. Specifically, 12% of her code switching in all observations was classified as tag switching.

**Example:**

Teacher: **Nah, let’s read together!**

(Indonesian) (English)

(Translation: Well, let’s read together!)

*Mari kita baca sama-sama!*

(Translation: let’s read together!)

This code switching happened when the teacher instructed the students to read the materials together. At that moment, she used informal Indonesian tag as an interjection at the beginning. Further, her Indonesian tag was followed by her English instruction.

All the examples above show that the teacher’s code switching which happened in the conversations came with three different types based on its structure of switching process. Those were switching involving tags, switching involving parts of an utterance, and switching involving whole utterance. Besides, those switching also came with different languages orders in different occasions based on the function of the switching.

### 3.2 Functions of the Teacher’s Code Switching

The teacher’s code switching in this study was used as a teaching strategy which have four functions. Those include a strategy to give clear teaching explanation for the students, strategy to give clear task instruction for the students, strategy to give encouragement for the students and a strategy for disciplining the students.
3.2.1 Code Switching as a Strategy to Give Clear Teaching Explanation for the Students

The findings from the teacher’s interview and classroom observations revealed that she believed each language in her code switching could be useful to scaffold the students who had low understanding in full English instruction and high dependency in Javanese and Indonesian.

More specifically, in the way to deliver clear material explanation, she used her code switching in those three aforementioned languages to teach particular materials. This reason supported the findings from Appel & Muysken (1990), Hoffmann (1991), and Holmes (2001), where multilingual could use code switching to find easier and more comfortable way to talk about particular topic in particular languages(s) rather than another. Those particular topics in this study included the topic discussion of vocabulary teaching and pronunciation teaching.

3.2.1.1 Teacher’s Code Switching in Explaining Vocabulary Material

The teacher’s code switching in English, Indonesian, and Javanese was used since she needed to explain the equivalent and meaning of words and/or expressions in those three languages clearly. She believed that when the students got the clear explanation, they could understand it thoroughly and quickly. In her way to explain the equivalent and/or meaning of the words and/or expressions, she used those aforementioned languages to present exact vocabularies that the students need to know. On the other words, her switching was used to fill linguistic needs where she wanted to present specific vocabularies. Beside that, code switching will make two persons or more understand each other. Her use of code switching to fill the linguistic needs supported the findings from Appel & Muysken (1990), Grosjean (1982), Hoffmann (1991), Saville-Troike (2003), and Rozelin (2010) where code switching can be used to present specific words or phrases from one of languages which are most appropriate for a given concept in particular speech.

Example:

Teacher : Siapa yang tau artinya “Sunday”?
(Translation: Who know the meaning of “Sunday”?)

Students : Minggu!
(Translation: Sunday!)

Teacher : Ia, Minggu.
(Translation: Yes, Monday)

Teacher : Ada yang tau Tuesday?
(Translation: Is there anyone who knows the meaning of “Tuesday”?)

Some students : Kamis!
(Translation: Thursday!)
Selasa!
(Translation: Tuesday!)
Teacher : *Selasa!*
(Translation: Tuesday!)

**Friday hari apa?**
(Translation: What day is “Friday”?)

Some students : *Senin!*
(Translation: Monday!)

*Rabu!*
(Translation: Wednesday!)

Teacher : *Jum’at!*
(Translation: Friday!)

**Thurdsay?**

Students : *Kamís!*
(Translation: Thursday!)

Students : *Kamís*
(Translation: Thursday!)

Teacher : *Monday?*

Students : *Senin!*
(Translation: Monday!)

This code switching happened when the teacher explained the vocabularies about days in English. She used Indonesian and English on that occasion. Both Indonesian and English were used to present equivalent of days in both languages. Indonesian was used dominantly at that time when she did the interaction whether the students knew about days in Indonesian and English or not. She only switched her language to English when she needed to say exact English days in informing the English equivalent of Indonesian days.

### 3.2.1.2 Teacher’s Code Switching in Explaining Pronunciation Materials

The teacher’s code switching which involved the use of English, Indonesian, and Javanese was used by the teacher to deliver clear pronunciation materials. The switching was done based on the teacher’s expectation where every single language involved in her code switching could be useful in pronunciation teaching. Firstly, she believed that English could be used to demonstrate the exact pronunciations of English words and expressions. Further, she believed that Indonesian and Javanese could be used to explain the way to pronounce those English words and expressions.

**Example:**

Teacher : *Third!*

Students : *Third!*

Teacher : *Nih, lidahnya di gigi yang atas.*
(Translation: Look, the tongue is on the top teeth.)

*Third!*
Students : Third!

This code switching happened when the teacher used English and Indonesian alternately to explain practical way to pronounce the English ordinal numbers. More specifically, Indonesian was used to explain the positioning of students’ tongue to pronounce particular words which were kind of difficult to pronounce by the students. In the meantime, English was still used to demonstrate the exact English words and sentences related to ordinal number.

3.2. 2 Code Switching as a Strategy to Give Clear Task Instruction for the Students

The teacher could use her code switching as a strategy to deliver clear task instruction. When she considered that her task instruction was intricate enough to make her students confused, she switched her language into Indonesian and/or Javanese as the students’ understandable languages.

Example:

Teacher : *Ditulis diatasnya “when is your birthday? My birthday is on..”!*  
(Translation: Write “when is your birthday? My birthday is on..” on the top of it!)

*Nah, titik-titiknya ditulis nama bulannya dulu!*  
(Translation: Here, write the name of the month on the dots which have been provided!)

*Ayo ikuti!*  
(Translation: Come on! Follow!)

*Tulis nama bulan yang kamu pilih di atasnya, nih!*  
(Translation: Write the name of the month that you have chosen on the top, here!)

*Ning duhur!*  
(Translation: On the top!)

Some students : Oh! *Ning duhur!*  
(Translation: Oh, on the top!)

This code switching happened when the teacher instructed the students to do an exercise about English months and ordinal numbers in a piece of exercising paper. At that time, her switching involved the use of English, Indonesian, and Javanese. The students’ confusion in doing the task made her switched her language into Indonesian and Javanese more often than English. Indonesian and Javanese were used alternately to explicitly explain the steps that the students needed to follow. At that occasion, some students followed her Indonesian instruction well, but the other students’ understanding was still needed to be enlightened by her use of Javanese.
After she switched her language into Javanese, the students who understood Javanese better than Indonesian became more aware about the teacher’s instruction and showed their understanding by saying “oh!” which was further followed by their correct confirmation of the aforementioned teacher’s instruction, as in “Oh! Ning duhur!”.

3.2.3 Code Switching as a Strategy to Give Encouragement for the Students

The teacher’s code switching could be used as a strategy to give encouragements to the students. The findings from classroom observation and teacher’s interview revealed that those encouragements included the compliment and motivation.

Example 1:

Teacher : Student X, ayo sini, pinter!
(Translation: Student X, come forward, smart girl!)

_**Yang lainnya perhatikan!**_
(Translation: The rest of you, pay attention!)

Student X : June! *Mispronounce it /ˈdʒuːni/*
Teacher : June!

This code switching happened in Indonesian-English order. On that occasion, the teacher motivated a student which wanted to be a volunteer to read the English months vocabulary in front of the class. She used Indonesian to praise student X for her activeness in learning activity since she knew that Indonesian would be well understood by student X. She called her “smart girl” as a compliment and asked the rest of students to pay her their attention. After she had done with her effort to motivate the student, she switched her language into English when she corrected the student’s mispronunciation.

Example 2:

Teacher : Barisan Student X mulai!
(Translation: All students in the row of students X, start to read!)

Students : January!
Teacher : January!
Students : January!
Teacher : Iya!
(Translation: Yes!)

_**Jangan malu-malu, ya!**_
(Translation: Do not be shy, yes!)

_**Aje isin-isin ngomonge!**_
(Translation: Do not be shy to say it!)
This code switching was done in Indonesian-Javanese order. The purpose of the teacher’s use of Indonesian-Javanese switching was same with the one in the first example. It was used to deliver the motivation which was well understood. At that time, she did not motivate one student only, but she motivated all students. The use of Indonesian and Javanese was purposely done to ease two different kinds of addressees; the one who understood Indonesian better than Javanese and another party who understood Javanese better than Indonesian. Her strategy in using code switching to express her clear emotion in giving compliment and motivation made the same with the findings from Hoffmann (1991), Holmes (2001), Qian et al., (2009), Rezvani & Rasekh (2011), Rinda (2014), and Yataganbaba & Yildirim (2015).

3.2. 4 Code Switching as a Strategy for Disciplining the Students

The teacher’s code switching could function to discipline the students in the classroom of research subjects. The findings from classroom observations and teacher’s interview revealed that her alternate use of languages could be used to give admonitions which were well understood by the students when they were not discipline.

Example:

Teacher : Student X, Sini!
(Translation: Student X, come forward!)

*Yang lain dengarkan baik-baik!*
(Translation: The rest of you, listen carefully!)

*Tidak ada yang berbicara lagi!*
(Translation: No more talking!)

*Coba yang lain dengarkan!*
(Translation: Come on, the rest of you, listen!)

*Tidak ada yang bicara lagi!*
(Translation: No more talking!)

*Rungukaken!*
(Translation: Listen!)

*Rungukaken!*
(Translation: Listen!)

This code switching was used to admonish the students who did a lot of unnecessary chat. At that time, the teacher wanted to direct the students’ attention to appreciate their friend’s effort in reading English words in front of the classroom. The switching was done in Indonesian-Javanese order to get immediate attention and response from the students who understood those two languages better than English. Those two languages were used since she believed that the students could be directly aware of her dissatisfaction to hear a lot of unnecessary noise. Her strategy was in line with Li (1998) and Sert (2005) who found that the students were more aware of...
teacher’s explanation when the students’ understandable languages were used. The teacher’s code switching which could function for disciplining the students made the same with the findings from Hoffmann (1991), Holmes (2001), Qian et al., (2009), Rezvani & Rasekh (2011), Rinda (2014), and Yataganbaba & Yildirim (2015).

4. CONCLUSION

The administration of English language teaching for young learners in the EFL context in this study could not be separated from the use of the students’ understandable languages which included their mother tongue. English and students’ understandable language including Indonesian and Javanese were used complementarily in this study by the teacher in her code switching process. The switching of those three languages could happen in word, phrase, clause, or sentence boundary in different types of code switching. Besides, the teacher’s switching in those three aforementioned languages served positive functions in the process of teaching and learning. More specifically, the teachers code switching could be used as a strategy which was useful for the effective transfer of ideas from the teacher to her students. Those ideas included material explanation, task instruction, encouragement statements, and admonition statements.
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