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Abstract

This paper reports the types of code-switching patterns used by students of early years in one of international schools in Bali while they had online classes. This study involved ten students who were chosen based on a purposive random sampling. The research design used in this study was a qualitative case study. The data were collected through observation and in-depth interview. The data were analyzed by implementing two layers of data analysis: Interactive qualitative analysis of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) and categorization of Muysken’s code-switching theory (2000). The results show that insertion and alternation were mostly used by students during Bahasa Indonesia and Indonesian culture courses. It was followed by the reason of teachers in applying code-switching in the class interaction because of students’ deficiency of Bahasa. Thus, by using code-switching, it could encourage them to have good communication skill in Bahasa and develop their Bahasa continuously in practice. This research was expected to give pedagogical implications for early years’ teachers and parents in understanding the importance of bilingualism for students’ language development.
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INTRODUCTION

Code-switching becomes a valuable academic concern in the field of linguistics with the appearance of bilingual and multilingual community (Wang, 2014). According to Hoffman (1991), code-switching is defined as the changing of two languages possessed by a person or shifting the linguistic differences in the same utterance uttered or within conversation. Moreover, it refers to the alternation process of people’s two language or more used in the form of discourse specifically in sentence or clause level (Li, 2008). This code-switching is used by bilingual people in the bilingual societies where people could use it for communication with others (Johansson, 2013). One example is in a bilingual school.

In the context of a bilingual school in Indonesia, code-switching may happen in the classroom for the purpose of class instructions. For example, when a local teacher, teaches Bahasa Indonesia and needs to explain Indonesian culture and other good values in the Indonesian culture, the teacher can switch from English to Bahasa Indonesia, and vice versa. The teacher’s code switching can be done by switching phrases and even clauses in English to the ones in Bahasa Indonesia, or the other way around.

In response to types of codes that are commonly switched, Muysken (2000) proposed three types of code-switching: insertion (intra-sentential code-switching), alternation (inter-sentential code-switching), and congruent lexicalization. Insertion is the incorporation of lexical items of whole units from one language into a structure of another language (Moyer, 2002). In addition, it is a
simple type of code-switching which switches a phrase, including a single word, and not change the base of the language for instance, “Tampangnya yang sok innocent saat ospek membuatku dan Bima sangat hobi menjahilinya” (innocent means no guilty). Muysken (2000) identified alternation (inter-sentential code-switching) is the switching between structures from separate languages in the example of “Or I should say, kehidupan seksual kami” (Rismawati, 2016). Congruent lexicalisation is the code-switching which occurred if the two languages shared similar grammatical patterns like English-Dutch, English-Spanish, Indonesia-English as example, “Baca pas bagian diagnosis,” ujarku in which the single word of diagnosis has same phonological with Bahasa Indonesia. Furthermore, many studies investigated deeper about how and why speakers do code switching related with the factors, reasons, functions of code switching for getting better comprehension of study. Crystal (1997) stated that speakers use code switching for several reasons as deficiency, expressing solidarity, and conveying attitude.

Several studies had been conducted to investigate the code-switching used in some different contexts. Purniawati, Artini & Adnyani (2019) did a research about code-switching in an Indonesian-French married family who spoke Bahasa Indonesia, French, English, and Javanese. The result showed that inter- and intra-sentential code switching did exist in their interaction between and among the family members.

The second study was conducted by Pollard (2002) in a public elementary school in Evanston, Illinois. It involved a group of five Spanish students in the fifth-grade class. The finding showed that students who were allowed to switch codes in the classroom better in the classroom in terms of expressing ideas and information in front of their teachers and classmates.

The third study was conducted by Promnant and Tayjasanant (2016) It involved Thai students in ESP (English for Special Purposes) classes. The findings demonstrated that code-switching from English to Thai could benefit the students to help them obtain clear ideas on the subject matter explained by their teacher. In addition, it also revealed that code switching made the students more secured, comfortable, and confident in listening the teacher’s explanation than when listening in English only explanation. Thus, using code-switching could help students with lower performance to be able to follow the lessons better than using only English through the learning periods. Lastly, code-switching could reduce the students’ stress and make them feel free to speak English when they could not think of what to say.

Another study related with motivations of students using code switching was from Rauf’s study (2017). The International bilingual students were as the participants and the result showed that 80% of students used code switching because of deficiency of target language. They could not find the suitable vocabularies in expressing their ideas. As well as Meisel’s research (1994), bilingual children from French and German were involved in the study. It revealed that they tended to apply code switching since they did not yet hold relevant grammatical relation of target language. Then, it was a good way applied in early while slowly learning language that was still working on specifically in the grammar.

The previous studies investigated types of code switching and how it is used in some contexts like in a mixed-marriage family.
and in monolingual classrooms. The present study enriches the study of code switching by examining the use of code switching by early years students in a bilingual school. The objectives of the study are to investigate types of code switching used by early years students in a bilingual school, and to find out the reasons why they used particular types of code switching from teachers’ point of view.

**METHOD**

The present study involved ten students purposively selected as the research participants from early years classes aged 4-6 in Sunrise School Bali as an International School in Bali. They were coming from different countries and nationalities and dominantly from mixed-marriage families. Thus, their every day’s language used was mixed English, Indonesia, and French. Yet, this school used English for teaching and learning.

The local subjects provided here are Bahasa Indonesia, Religion/Agama, Living Value/Budi Pekerti, Citizenship/PKn, and Indonesia Culture/ Budaya Indonesia. These are taught from Small World (lower than playgroup class) until Junior High School. Local teachers must use Bahasa Indonesia dominantly here and English as the tool to make them understand meaning of words. Specifically in early years, all teachers are local as well. In this recent situation, the virtual classroom has been implemented through Zoom conference meeting to learn from home. The research design used in the present study is a qualitative case study. The data were collected through observation and interview. Data analysis used Miles, Huberman, and Saldana’s theory of analyzing data (2014) The first step was data condensation. It involved selecting essential data from the field. The second step was focusing selected data for pre-analysis through limiting data related with research problems only. The third step was abstracting them which were connected with quality and data proficiency. The fourth step was categorizing into types of code-switching proposed by Muysken (2000). The fifth step was displaying the data descriptively. The last step was verifying the data by connecting them with previous research and related theories. These stages were interactive and iterative process for achieving data saturation and maintaining data validity.

**TRUSTWORTHINESS**

The trustworthiness of the data in this research was done through triangulation. There were three types of triangulation: triangulation of data collection technique, triangulation of source of data, and triangulation of time. This research used triangulation of data collection techniques by using research instruments, i.e. interview and observation of the virtual class.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

According to Muysken (2000), there were three types of code-switching; insertion (intra-sentential code-switching), alternation (inter-sentential code-switching), and congruent lexicalization.

![Figure 1. Chart of code switching by early students](image-url)
It could be seen from the chart above that insertion and alternation were the only found in the students’ interaction with teachers in online learning in Sunrise International School Bali. The percentage of insertion and alternation consecutively were 68.2% and 31.8%. Unfortunately, there was no congruent lexicalisation found.

Insertion

Muysken (2000) explained insertion (intra-sentential code-switching) as a simple type of code switching which switch phrases (including a single word) and not change the base of the language. There are some examples of insertion type used by the students

1. “Ya I eat nasi and sate. My friend and Bapak make it at home. They make it here, not in Kampung.”
2. “Mantap bang bro!”
3. “Mama Nina, Mama Irena, Om Tong-tong, with all, sama semuanya.”
4. “Yes, me too with Kakak George.”
5. “Ibu Tini, I want play the ceng-ceng.”

It could be seen from the utterance 1-5, children switched some phrases from English to Bahasa Indonesia such as eat nasi, and sate, my friend and Bapak, in Kampung, bang bro, Om Tong-tong, with all sama semuanya, with Kakak, Ibu Tini and the ceng-ceng.

The utterances were uttered by students in the different classes and different topic of discussion. Example 1 was uttered by student in the beginning of the class. It happened when he told the teachers what he did yesterday during weekends with his family. Example 2 is about a student who used a slang in Bahasa Indonesia mixed with English for expressing great. Example 3 is to show the student’s family members who stayed with him at home recently. Example 4 was uttered to tell daily activities at home. The student used to call her brother “kakak” used for respecting older brother. Example 5 happened in the middle of lesson of Bahasa Indonesia from Playgroup class. One of the students did not focus on the lesson because he wanted to play the Balinese music instrument called cengceng.

Other examples of insertion were explained below.

6. “Ya I like it, suka, enak.”
7. “Yesterday, Poppy and Mia play bola, basketball in the yard.”
8. “Ya, I know only pedas, and do not know bubur.”
9. “Because my mom likes to eat pedas.”
10. “That kue putu looks so enak.”

The italic words and phrase as like it suka, play bola, only pedas, know bubur, eat pedas, and that kue, so enak were as their switching language from Bahasa Indonesia which were inserted by children in their English sentences. Those were called simple words and phrase as their trying to apply Bahasa that they had listened from teachers’ instructions.

Example 6, 8, 9, 10 happened when students discussed about local food in Indonesia called bubur pedas and kue putu. They talked whether they or their families have tried and liked them through showed picture in the share screen. Meanwhile, the utterance in example 7 was told to inform about her activities with her nanny during weekends. All of the data could be sum up in the form of table as follows.
According to data obtained and explained in Table 1, it can be summed up that insertion is frequently applied by replacing one simple word or phrase in a sentence in the communication between students and teacher. Based on the observations during in the classroom, this insertion (intrasentential code-switching) in the field happened from English to Indonesia language for practicing Indonesia language in the local subjects. From repetition and drill as it had been done, it could make students remember the simple word of Bahasa Indonesia. The teachers and students were uttering utterances by using insertion in the forms of statements and questions in classroom interactions. Besides, there was no imperative sentence found for using insertion in the utterances found in the field.

Through interview of teachers, this strategy was stated the only way to memorize the words through help of pictures, videos, or other visual stuffs for children. They still could not read and write either specifically for playgroup students. Therefore, it needed communication actively between students and teacher during the local subjects and inserting some Bahasa words for replacing the common words that they usually heard as complements, greetings, or another expression. This finding was similar with Promnant and Tayjasanant's study (2016) that code switching helped students for being able to follow the lessons by using their every day’s language and inserting some words during the learning periods and make them feel free to speak.

This insertion was also found commonly used by early years’ students when answering teachers’ question as Pollard’s study (2002) that switch codes in the classroom was found better done in classroom context for

Table 1. Insertion data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Switching/word class</th>
<th>Playgroup Class</th>
<th>Prep Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insertion word (Noun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat nasi → eat rice</td>
<td></td>
<td>with Kakak → with my brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and sate → and satay</td>
<td></td>
<td>play bola → play ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my friend and Bapak → my</td>
<td></td>
<td>know bubur → know porridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend and daddy</td>
<td></td>
<td>that kue → that cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibu Tini → Ms Tini</td>
<td></td>
<td>like it, suka → I like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the cengceng → the music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument in Kampung →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in hometown bang bro →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother Om Tong-tong →</td>
<td>Uncle Tong-tong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insertion by phrase</td>
<td>sama semuanya → with all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase (Preposition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only pedas, → only spicy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat pedas → eat spicy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so enak → so delicious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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expressing ideas and information in front of teachers and classmates. It was also based on Muysken (1981), constituents that represent food, furniture, or other nouns around children environment could be often switched by teachers to children due to its simplicity. Besides, this result was similar with Prasad and Rao’s study (2011) that studied code-switching of Kannada children’s lexical corpora on their speech. Their study revealed that they tended to switch languages in several aspects as nouns category, verb, category, and colors’ identification. The insertion type was good since students had limitation of Bahasa words and not their habit language used at home and school. Yet, they tried to memorize and differentiate another language. Thus, by teaching these local subjects, they could develop their potency of Bahasa language in the daily communication through implementing code-switching

**Alternation**

Muysken (2000) also stated that another pattern of code-switching namely alternation (inter-sentential code-switching) is the switching between structures from separate languages. There were also some utterances which indicated alternation by students in terms of sentences. There were only some data included this category explained as follows.

11. “I’m good. *kabar saya baik.*”
12. “I’m Rafael. *Nama saya Rafael.*”
13. “It is a tree daddy and mommy. *Ini pohon keluarga.*”
14. “Mama, om, dan saya di rumah. At home, mama, om tong-tong, and me, myself.”
15. “Yes, di sekolah *ada Kyron, Bapak,* Mommy *di sekolah.* Owen is at home, not in the school.”
16. “The shape of earth is circle, Ms. *Earth itu bumi, bulat*”
17. “Yes, *Rio tau bulat.* It’s like this and not oval”

All of the the data can be sum up in the form of table as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Code Switching</th>
<th>Playgroup Class</th>
<th>Prep Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alteration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m good. <em>kabar saya baik.</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m Rafael. <em>Nama saya Rafael.</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a tree daddy and mommy. <em>Ini pohon keluarga.</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mama, om, dan saya di rumah. At home, mama, om tong-tong, and me, myself.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yes, di sekolah <em>ada Kyron, Bapak,</em> Mommy <em>di sekolah.</em> Owen is at home, not in the school.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The shape of earth is circle, Ms. <em>Earth itu bumi, bulat</em>”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Yes, <em>Rio tau bulat.</em> It’s like this and not oval”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the gathered data in table 2, alternation only occurred in the form of simple utterances specifically one or two full sentences of Bahasa Indonesia by students. These were as the students’ replies from teachers’ instructions of drilling some simple sentences according to the topic discussed. The repetition strategy was the most frequently used by early teachers in this school with the help of pictures and videos. So, teachers put the simple sentences of Bahasa
Indonesia to be able to repeat but still switched to English sentence to avoid confusion. This strategy was conducted slowly and step by step by teachers in finishing the worksheets. It could be seen that they attempted to encourage students to be bilingual within class interaction. As the findings above, some students could follow and repeat in a sentence fully with different materials of local subjects.

Playgroup students did some repetitions and responded while discussing about introducing self and family. The sentences of “I’m good. Kabar saya baik (I am good)” ; “It is a tree daddy and mommy. Ini pohon keluarga” (this is a family tree) were uttered altogether by students at the beginning of class and also as their repetition of teacher while discussing about family. When introducing self, one of the students answered it completely by using English switched to Bahasa Indonesia, “I’m Rafael. Nama saya Rafael.” This student also replied “Di rumah ada mama, om, dan saya.” At home, mama, om tong-tong, and me, myself.” when being asked “siapa saja keluargamu?“ (who are your family members?). It became the example of answering the question with another student’s reply through suddenly talking about their activity of fishing yesterday at school, “Yes, kemarin di sekolah ada Kyron, Bapak, Mommy di sekolah. Owen is at home, not in the school.” (Yes, there were Kyron, Bapak, Mommy at school yesterday. Owen is at home, not in the school). While other students who did not answer tried to understand by looking at the pictures shared by teachers. In the prep class, the online discussion was related with saving earth. A student stated their idea by saying “The shape of earth is circle, Ms. Earth itu bumi, bulat.” (Earth is earth, circle), “Yes, Rio tau bulat. It’s like this and not oval.” (Yes, Rio knows circle).

This finding was similar with the previous studies conducted by Purniawati, Artini & Adnyani (2019) regarding code-switching in Indonesian-French married family and inter and intra sentential types (insertion and alternation) existed in the mixed married of Indonesian-French wife husband in their interaction between and among the family members using the family languages: Bahasa Indonesia, French, English, and Javanese. In addition, code-switching is a good way to encourage students as early as possible to be bilingual brought out in the teaching and learning process as Gulzar’s research (2010). In the society as well, the terms of code-switching and code mixing achieved response positively as the developed style on today’s language. It will not be ‘taboo’ anymore to do (Hasan and Akhand, 2015).

This alternation pattern runs effectively during the local subjects meeting. In this school, teachers permit students to do code-switching for communication. It is assumed by teachers as their beginning to recognize some words before being able to make a good sentence with good grammar in Bahasa. This finding was similar with Rauf’s research (2017) who studied about the motivations of students in applying code-switching mostly because of deficiency of target language. They were still thinking proper words in stating idea. Meisel’s research (1994) also supported that the earlier children in using code-switching in the classroom was a helpful way for building grammar relation of target language. In addition, teachers stated that it impacts to students’ language development cognitively, based on the examples above, few students are able to state full sentences in Bahasa in the few sections of meeting. This pattern of code switching is a level above than insertion since it involves clauses of another language in a single
conversation. It means that those children successfully do switching language more than clauses; in the sentence of Bahasa. Besides it is good for their habitual expressions and linguistic advantages, it could be for showing Indonesian identity. In other words, bilingual people in way of code-switching within communication are acceptable in the today’s community. Thus, the earlier is better for teaching students to be bilingual person as their preparation skill for their future career too.

**CONCLUSION**

In sum up, only insertion and alteration only occurred in early years students’ interaction with their teachers. Insertion is used by students mostly by words in the word class of nouns and adjectives such as eat *nasi*, in *Kampung*, and so *enak*. Insertion by phrase was also found here as with all, *sama semuanya*. Meanwhile, the alternation pattern was used in the simple sentences mostly from teachers’ repetitions of topic discussed followed by students as “It is a tree daddy and mommy. *Ini pohon keluarga*” and some were from students’ replies by using their Bahasa without instruction as “I’m Rafael. *Nama saya Rafael*.” The words uttered are common in the daily communication. From teachers, students tended to use code-switching because of their deficiency of language that was learnt. Therefore, code-switching is permitted by teachers as their start in mastering another language (Bahasa Indonesia). It is as the means to increase their linguistic benefits as their habitual in communication. By teaching them local subjects, their Bahasa would be developed by continuously applying it in practice. Consequently, it also would lead them up to be bilingual who master two languages.
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