"INDOLISH (INDONESIAN-ENGLISH)" : TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF INDONESIAN-ENGLISH CODE-SWITCHING

"INDOLISH (INDONESIA-INGGRIS)" : SEBUAH TIPE ALIH KODE BAHASA INDONESIA-BAHASA INGGRIS

ABDUL HAKIM YASSI

Abstrak

Penelitian ini sifatnya eksploratif-deskriptif utamanya diperuntukkan menemukan pola umum konfigurasi linguistik alih kode Bahasa Indonesia-Bahasa Inggris terutama pada aspek: fitur sintaktik, kombinabilitas segmen alih kode, linguistik konstrain dan titik alih kode, serta tipe alih kodenya.

Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa alih kode Bahasa Indonesia-Bahasa Inggris umumnya terjadi pada tingkat konstituen yang lebih kecil seperti kata dan paling jauh pada tingkat frasa dimana terlihat bahwa kata benda dan frasa benda mendominasi unsur-unsur lainya, yakni sekitar 40% dari sampel yang ada.

Selanjutnya, sejalan dengan jenis alih kode dimana dominasi jenis intra-sentencial atas inter/extra sentencial sangat signifikan (sekitar 60%) ditemukan pula bahwa kombinabilitas segmen alih kode yang terbanyak terjadi pada tingkat klausa, sekitar 50% dari sampel. Pada kombinasi ini terlihat kombinasi kata kerja yang didahului oleh kata ganti atau frasa benda dan kemudian diikuti oleh frasa preposisi, atau tag atau anak kalimat mendominasi kombinasi lainnya.

Key words : Code-Switching, INDOLISH, intra-clausal / sentencial

INTRODUCTION

In the era of a free trade, the use of English as a global language in Indonesia especially in metropolitan cities such as Jakarta, Medan, Semarang, Surabaya and including Makassar has not only become a must for the settlers but also is getting more and more in frequency. As a result, as reported by Emilia and Widiadana in "The Jakarta Post" (July 2, 2000), "English has penetrated Bahasa Indonesia and it seems there is no stopping it, not a day passes in a metropolitan city like Jakarta in which English is not heard, although it might not be spoken correctly". They further pointed out that Indonesian people starting from the president of Indonesia to business executives, celebrities, housewives, and teenagers are adopting English phrases in their daily linguistic interactions. I termed such a phenomenon as INDOLISH which can be defined as the involvement of some English expressions in Indonesian discourses (oral and written). Although such a term may be associated with

---

* *Faculty member of English Department, Faculty of Letters, Hasanuddin University.*

other related terms such as Chinglish (Chinese-English), Singlish (Singaporean-English), etc. but it is not an English variation at all, giving a similar term like American English, British English, Bostonian English, New Zealand English, Australian English, Indian English, etc.. Rather, it is simply something to do with code-switching or in a softer term, code-mixing.

I believe such a phenomenon has been the logical consequence of a multilingual society, including Indonesia, where many languages are spoken by the society. As a result, they are subject to employ more than one code in their social interaction and even they might juxtapose two different language segments like words, phrases, and clauses within a sentence which is well-known as code-switching. However, the tendency for the settlers to alternate from one code to another is unavoidable and as such has become an unmarked and a natural way of communication (see also Hymes, 1974; Gumperz, 1982).

This paper is an explorative study which is mainly aimed at finding out the typical features of Indonesian-English code-switching in terms of their syntactic categories, combinability of switched segments, and types of code-switching. It is hopefully that this study, as an explorative study will invent general patterns of linguistic configuration of Indonesian-English code-switching which will eventually enrich related previous publications. Moreover, the findings will become a base for other sociolinguists to conduct a more comprehensive study on Indonesian-English bilingual discourses.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Among the diverse configurations of linguistic performance in communities where two or more languages are in contact, the alternating use of different languages within a given situation, or code-switching, is a well documented pattern. I found that much progress has been made in situating code-switching within a micro-sociological framework or that of ethnography of speaking, consistent with the goals of understanding the interactive purpose, communicative function and social implications of this behavior, for instance, Gumperz, 1971, 1976, 1982; Gumperz and Hernandez-Chaves 1970; Sankof, 1972; Valdes-Vallis, 1976; McClure, 1977; Marazigan, 1983; and Li Wei and Milroy, 1995.

Such a progress, however, has been challenged by structuralists including Hasselmo, 1979; Gingras, 1974; Timm, 1979; Poplack, 1980, Sankof and Poplack, 1980 and Myers-Scotton, 1992 doubting that functional factors are the strongest constraints on the occurrence of code-switching. This obviously implies that linguistic factors also play a role.

Although in some of the earlier literature (e.g. Lance 1975:143) it was felt that code-switching was a random phenomenon, most investigators today appear to agree that it is not random but rule-governed. Poplack (1980: 10) pointed out that there is, however, no present agreement on the precise nature of the rules which govern code-switching. It seems clear that some of the constraints on its occurrence are extra-linguistic. Other factors constraining the occurrence of code-switching are linguistic or internal to the discourse.

Code-Switching Defined

I will use the term 'code-switching' in the sense in which Gumperz (1982:59) has defined it, as 'the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems'. The following examples (Taken from Romaine, 1991:1-2) exemplify this.

1. *Kio ke six, seven hours te school de vic spend karde ne, they are speaking English all the time*. (Panjabi/English bilingual in Britain.). "Because they spend six or seven hours a day at school, they are speaking English all the time".

2. *Will you rubim off? Ol man will come.*

(TokPisin/English bilingual child in Papua New Guinea.). "Will you rub [that off the blackboard]? The men will come."

3. *Sano etta tulla tanne etta I'm very sick*. (Finnish/English bilingual recorded by Poplack, Wheeler, Westwood 1987.) "Tell them to come here that I'm very sick"

4. *Kodomotachi liked it*. (Japanese/English bilingual, recorded by Nishimura 1986). "The children liked it"

5. *Have agua, please*. (Spanish/English bilingual child, recorded by Kessler, 1984). "Have water, please."

6. *Won o arrest a single person*. (Yoruba/English bilingual, recorded by Amuda, 1986). "They did not arrest a single person".

7. *This morning I hantar my baby tu dekat babysitter tu lah*. (Malay/English bilingual, recorded by Ozog, 1987) "This morning I took my baby to the babysitter."

It can be seen that all of these utterances draw to differing extents on items which come from more than one language and which are combined in different ways. Moreover, these kinds of utterances are normal everyday instances of language use for the individual concerned. Furthermore, the utterances also indicate that the examples which are drawn from a diverse range of languages show that they probably occur to some degree in the repertoires of most bilingual people and in most bilingual communities, including of course, Indonesia.

However, it is sometimes difficult to give a clear-cut border on the difference between code-switching and code-mixing. Hill and Hill (1980:122) suggested that the only good explanation that can be applied to encounter such a difficulty is by employing the continuum concept, unseparable things. Similarly, Romaine (1991:109) argued that the effort of distinguishing between language switching and language mixing may, however, be technically satisfactory, but it seems to me that it violates common sense of the essence of

a code alternation. She further suggested that it is perhaps better to say that the two phenomena are points on a continuum from the sociolinguistic point of view. Thus, the study has also been designed to stand for this side.

Types of Code Switching

Poplack (1980) has divided code switching into three categories; tag-switching, intrasentential, and intersentential. Tag-switching involves the insertion of a tag in one language into an utterance which is otherwise entirely in the other language, e.g. *you know, I mean* ,etc., to take some English examples. Since tags are subjects to minimal syntactic restriction, they may be inserted easily at a number of points in a monolingual utterance without violating syntactic rules (Romaine, 1991:112). Let us study the following examples taken from various study on code switching.

- A study on Panjabi-English code switching by Poplack (1980).

  I mean, unconciously, subconciously, k∂i jane ∈, you know (English tag) *per I wish, you know* (English tag) *ke me pure Panjabi bol seka*.

- A study on Tagalog-English code switching by Bautista (1980).

  The proceedings went smoothly, ba (Tagalog tag)?. 'The proceedings went smoothly, didn't they?

Another type of code switching is called 'intrasentential' code switching. Romaine (1991) pointed out that intrasentential switching involves, arguably, the greatest syntactic risk, and may be avoided by all but the most fluent bilinguals. Here, switching of different types occurs within the clause or sentence boundary, as in this example from Tok Pisin-English:

What's so funny? Come, be good. Otherwise, yu bai go long kot. 'What's so funny? Come , be good. Otherwise, you'll go to court.'

The last type of code switching can be called 'Intersential switching'. This switching involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary., where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. It may also occur between speaker turns. Intersentential switching can be thought of as requiring greater fluency in both languages than tag-switching since major portions of the utterance must conform to the rules of both languages. An example from the previous Panjabi-English discourse is :

I'm guilty in that sense/ clause boundary / *ke ziada wsi English i bolde fer ode nal eda hwnde ke twhadi jeri zeban e, na?*

Another example from Puerto Rican bilingual Spanish/English speech is given by Poplack (1980):

Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino in espanol. – 'Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English and finish it in Spanish'.

Linguistic Constraints of Code Switching

Apart from the social factors such as setting, topic, degree of competence in both languages, etc., the following illustration deals with linguistic factors which might constraint code switching.

The first attempt to formulate general syntactic constraints can be found in Sankoff and Poplack's (1981) study, where they propose that Spanish-English code switching can be generated by a model of grammar which is governed by two constraints. Firstly, 'free morpheme constraint'. This predicts that a switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the lexical form has been phonologically integrated into the language of the morpheme. Thus, to take an example from Spanish-English bilingual speech, this constraint would predict that *flipeando* – 'flipping' would permissible, but that *catcheando* would not, because *catch* has not been integrated into the phonology of

Spanish, and therefore cannot take the Spanish progressive suffix *-eando*.

Secondly, 'the equivalence constraint'. This constraint predicts that code-switches will tend to occur at points where the juxtaposition of elements from the two languages does not violate a syntactic rule of either language. That is, code switching will tend to occur at points where the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other. This means that a language switch can take place only at boundaries common to both languages, and switching cannot occur between any two sentence elements unless they are normally ordered in the same way.

METHODOLOGY

The research design included recording sessions with 11 members of Sydney University Student Unions who were attending a "pengajian" program, an informal gathering discussing all related aspects of Moslem. The data I will report on here consists of ninety minutes of tape-recorded speech which contains forty-two samples of Indonesian-English code-switching discourses.

Due to the limited numbers of the data, it has been decided that it was not necessary to draw samples from the population of the data. Therefore, all the forty-two switched discourse instances have been regarded to be the samples of the study.

The taped natural speeches were transcribed using the regular English orthography and analyzed in the same way as the written texts. Each piece of conversation was analysed in terms of its syntactic categories and types of code-switching. The following table illustrates how the actual analysis was done. However, the analysis only shows a few selected sample of the data. This is simply intended to share the evaluation and justification of the analysis. The complete version of the analysis can be found in the appendix.

Table 1. Model of Analysis

SAMPLE NO.	TEXTS	SYNTACTIC CATEGORIES	TYPES OF CODE-SWITCHING
A001/sp4	Minggu depan Mas Fahim akan mengORGANISE BARBEQUE	Verb Phrase	Intra-clausal Intra-lexical
A003/sp4	Selanjutnya, mengORGANISE turnamen PPIA	(Single) Verb	Intra-lexical
A006/sp5	Tempatnya itu OPEN	Pred. Adjective	Intra-clausal
A009/sp1	Ada PARK dekat pantai.	Pred. Noun	Intra-clausal
A027/sp1	Jangan tunggu mereka datang, NO WAY	Idiomatic expression	Extra/inter-clausal
A034/1	Saya RELAY sepenuhnya pada informasi. Kalau saya RELAY pada diri saya, susah.	(single) Verb	Intra-clausal

RESULT & DISCUSSION

In this part, our attention will focus on the nature of the switches themselves. The analysis will mainly aim at finding out the answers such as in what point do the switches occur more frequently?, which constituents are switched, and in what ways do they combine with preceding and following segments? Do certain combinations tend to occur more regularly than others?

Syntactic Categories

Eight syntactic categories whose occurrence is totally dependent on sentence-internal constraints were extracted from the data and only one category whose occurrence is dependent on sentence-external constraints or freely distributable categories which seem to be more popular elsewhere in literature. These appear in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Syntactic categories of Indonesian-English code-switching

NO.	SYNTACTIC CATEGORIES	TOKEN NO.	%
A. Intra-sentencial switches			
1.	Noun Phrase	14	22.6
2.	(Single) Verb	13	21
3.	(Single) Noun	11	17.7
4.	Prepositional Phrase	10	16.1
5.	(Single) Adjective	5	8.1
6.	Adverbial Phrase	3	4.8
7.	Verbial Phrase	3	4.8
8.	Adjective Phrase	1	1.6
B. Inter / extra-sentencial switches			
1.	Idiomatic Expression	2	3.2
	TOTAL	62	

As can be seen from the table, the relative frequencies with which constituents may be switched seem completely to oppose the findings of most previous similar studies such as, to name only a few, Gumperz 1976; Wentz 1977; Poplack 1978, 1980 whereby full sentence code switches as well as the other extra sentential code switchings are the most frequently switched constituents found in their studies.

The table shows that most of the switched constituents fall under intra-sentencial switches, making up about 96.8% of the data. Only two tokens (3.2%) which shows extra-sentencial code-switching, i.e. idiomatic expression. Furthermore, among the intra-sentencial switches, we find nouns, both single nouns and noun phrases, to be the most frequently switched category, making up about more than 40%. This seems to be plausible since it confirms the findings of other studies mentioned elsewhere in literature such as to name a few Tim, 1975; Wentz, 1977; and Poplack, 1980. The second position is held by verbs, single verbs and verbial phrases, making up about 30% of the data which also confirm other previous studies like Poplack, 1980.

Combinability of Switched Segments

In order to ascertain points within the sentence at which segments may be switched, the discussion will be divided into three: switched segments at clausal level, phrasal level, and lexical level. The following table illustrates this feature.

Table 3. Combinability of switched segments.

LEVEL	SWITCHED SEGMENTS	PRECEDING SEGMENTS	FOLLOWING SEGMENTS	TOKEN NO.	%
CLAUSAL	1. (Single) Verbs	- Pronouns	- Noun Phrases	**2**	**4.3**
			- Tags	**2**	**4.3**
			- None	**2**	**4.3**
			- Prepositional Phrases	**1**	**2.2**
			- Subordinate Clauses	**1**	**2.2**
	2. Pred.Noun Phrases	- Indonesian Expletive 'ada' (there)	- Prepositional Phrases	**4**	**8.7**
		- Pronouns	- Prepositional Phrases	**1**	**2.2**
		- Personal Names	- None	**1**	**2.2**
	3. Verb Phrases	- Modal Verbs	- None	**2**	**4.3**
			- Obj. Noun Phrases	**1**	**2.2**
			- Prepositional Phrases	**1**	**2.2**
	4. Pred. Adjectives	- Noun Phrases	- None	**3**	**6.5**
	5. Pred. Noun Phrases	- Pronouns	- None	**1**	**2.2**
PHRASAL	1. Prepositional Phrases	- Indonesian Preposition (L1)	English Noun Phrases (L2)	**6**	**13**
	2. NP showing :				
	- Possession	English NP (L2)	Indonesian Possessor (L1)	**5**	**10.9**
	- Non Possession	Ind. Quantifier (L1)	English Noun (L2)	**1**	**2.2**
	3. Adjective Phrases	Ind. Qualifier (L1)	English Adjcetive (L2)	**2**	**4.3**
LEXICAL	1. Verbs	Ind. Bound Morpheme (L1)	English Free Morpheme (L2)	**5**	**10.9**

As can be seen from the table, among the forty-six corpuses, switched segments at the clausal level show the highest occurrence, making up almost half of the data (50%), ie. twenty-two tokens. These are made up by mostly single verbs, making up about 18% that are preceded by pronoun or noun phrases (NP) and are followed by either prepositional phrases such as in the following sample :

Selama ini kita BARBEQUE di PARK. (So far, we've barbequed in a park)

(A007), or by tags as in the following instance :

Tiga lawan tiga, MIX gitu ya, jadi campur putra dan putri. (Three against three, it mixes, you know. So, mixing male and female) (A015), or by no constituent as in sample belows : UNDERGRADUATE kita tidak MIX (Our undergraduate students do not mix)

(A023), or by subordinate clauses as follows : Tidak seperti New South Wales, kalau ada EVENT EVENT olah raga, dia RECRUIT yang UNDERGRADUATE (Unlikely New South Wales, when there are sport events, it will recruit those who are undergraduate (A024)

Then it is followed by switched segment where predicate nouns or noun phrases,

making up about 13% of the data, are mostly preceded by Indonesian expletive, *ada*, and are followed by prepositional phrases as in the following sample :

Ada PARK dekat pantai (There is a park near the beach) (A009).

The predicate noun or noun phrases may also be preceded either by pronouns and followed by prepositional phrase, or preceded by personal names and followed by no constituent as in the following instance :

Tidak seperti waktu Glen, mungkin karena Glen itu UNDERGRADUATE

sehingga kita MIX (It's unlike when Glen ruled, perhaps because he was

undergraduate so we were mixed up (A026).

Another feature of combinability of switched segments at clausal level can be verbial phrases, making up about 9% of the data, which are preceded by modality and followed by a noun phrase as in the following instance :

Selanjutnya, Mas Indra, Mas Jody akan mengORGANISE INTERNATIONAL

SPORT GAMES (Next, Indra, Jody will organize International Sport Games) (A002),

Furthermore, sometimes the verb phrases are followed as well by other constituents like a prepositional phrase as in the following sample :

Bagaimana kalau sebelum pulang Pak Imam mengORGANISE BARBEQUE di pantai (What about?, before leaving, Mr. Imam will organize a barbeque in a beach) (A008).

Another feature of the combinability may also occur in which predicate adjectives are preceded by noun phrases without any following segments as in the following sample: Tempatnya itu OPEN (The venue is open-aired) (A006).

The second most recurring switch points among the 46 tokens are the switched segments at phrasal level, making up more than 30% of the data. This portion was made up by three

types of combinability of switched segments namely noun phrases, prepositional phrases, and adjectival phrases. The highest portion of combinability of switched segments at phrasal level falls under the category of prepositional phrases (Prep. + NP), making up about 13% of the data. The typical feature of this combinability as consistently shown by the data is that the preposition is always in Indonesian (L1) and the NP is in English (L2) as in the following code switch instance:

Selama in kita BARBEQUE <u>di PARK</u>, SOMETHING LIKE THAT, tidak pernah

Di pantai. Kenapa begitu ? (So far we have barbequed in park, something like that. We've never had it in a beach. Why was it?) (A007).

Another feature of combinability of switched segments at phrasal level can be the category of noun phrases (NP). This combinability consists of two types. The first type the NP that denotes possession as in the following instance :

Jadi, rencana <u>BARBAQUE kita</u> akan diadakan di Centennial Park. (So, our barbeque will be conducted in Centennial Par) (A004).

This type shows the most recurring combination, making up about 11% of the data. The typical feature of this type is that the noun (head) is always in L2 (English). Whereas the possessor (possessive markers) is in L1 (Indonesian). The other type of NP category is non-possessive type. This type shows completely different feature with those which are shown by the possessive groups. In the possessive groups the combinability can be written in this formulae, L2^L1, whereas in the non-possessive types show a reversible formulae, ie. L1^L2, as in the following instance :

Jadi., sudah <u>dua STEP</u> ketinggalan di belakang (So, it has been two steps lagged behind) (A017).

The other type of combinability of switched segment at phrasal level can be the adjective phrase category, making up about 5%

of the data. The typical feature of this type is that the qualifier is always in Indonesian while the head is in English and as such suggesting the formulae L1^L2. The following sample may clarify this.

Poin saya barangkali adalah supaya panitia bisa <u>lebih SELECTIVE</u> (Perhaps, my point is that the committees should have been more selective) (A018).

At lexical level, the combinability of switched segments falls under the combination between Indonesian dependent morphemes and English free morpheme, making up 11% of the data which all shows consistently similar feature. Thus, the formulae of this combinability can be written as L1 dependent morphemes^ L2 free morphemes. Such a feature mostly occurs in verbs such as in the following instance.

Minggu depan Mas Fahim akan <u>mengORGANISE</u> BARBEQUE (Next week, Fahim will organise barbeque) (A001).

The sentence above seems to be all written in Indonesian grammatical system. This indicates by the employment of Indonesian bound morpheme*, me-* which undergoes an assimilation process and becomes *meng-* which is combined with an English verb, *organize* to form a lexical entity*, mengorganise* which is more likely to be generated from the Indonesian word*, mengorganisasikan*.

For the sake of scientific developments, regardless of its ill-formedness, such a typical feature of combinability of switched segments cannot be simply neglected because it makes up almost 13% of the data. As such, I believe this typicality even will enrich the world of science especially code-switching.

Similar behavior which is also worthwhile to mention in which grammaticality is questioned has been shown by some features at phrasal level. The data also shows a verb functioning as the head which is accompanied by a possessor as in the following instance.

<u>ORGANISEnya,</u> nanti Pak Imam dan teman-teman lainnya (its management or arrangement will be handled by Mr Imam and other members) (A011).

As a matter of fact, the instance above applies entirely the Indonesian grammatical system. The expression*, organisenya*, has been generated from the Indonesian expression, *organisasinya* (its organization) or in more complete form, *pengorganisasiannya* which can be associated with*, pengelolaannya* (its management or arrangement). I believe that such a feature has been more likely to be motivated by the L1 interference, in this case Indonesian.

Another similar feature has also been signaled by the phenomenon where an adjective functioning as the head of a phrase is combined with a possessor as in the following sample :

<u>PRACTICALnya</u>, ditanyalah satu-satu. (for the sake of its practicality, ask them one by one) (A019).

As can be seen from the sample above, the expression *practicalnya* is made up by the English adjective *practica*l and the Indonesian possessive marker, *-nya*. As such, the sentence can be claimed that it is entirely written in Indonesian grammatical mode since the English adjective *practical* seems to violate the English grammatical system if we compare with its related meaning but different part of speech namely *practicality*. Thus, the correct combination of the expression should be PRACTICALITYnya rather than PRACTICALnya whereby the two language grammars map onto each other, a noun is combined with a possessor.

Another switched segment combinability has been indicated as well by a noun reduplication. This sort of switch occurs where an English word has been reduplicated aiming at denoting plural meanings as applied in Indonesian language. Let's study the following sample :

Tidak seperti New South Wales, kalau ada <u>EVENT EVENT</u> olah raga, dia RECRUIT

yang UNDERGRADUATE. (unlikely New South Wales, when there are sport events, it will recruit the undergraduate students) (A024).

As can be seen from the instance above, the reduplication of the English word, *event*, has been Indonesianized as well by the speaker. This is done by employing a reduplication denoting plural meanings. Whereas, English applies different rule in denoting such function, that is through the employment of –s or –es endings. Regardless of its ill-formedness, I found many Indonesian has been familiar with this sort of switched segment and as such keep using it. As a result, I believe this feature has given as well a great contribution to the colour of Indonesian-English bilingual discourse. Thus, the feature above obviously opposes some previous related studies including Romaine, 1991:112 who argued that code-switching can only be performed by people who have a good command of both languages and likewise those arguing that code-switching may only occur at points where the grammar of the two languages map onto each other (Sankoff and Poplack, 1981).

Constraints and Switched points

In order to linguistically describe the different types of code-switches, we must first define the total population of possible forms : are there elements in discourse which cannot be switched ?, are there environments in discourse where switches cannot occur ?

It terms of at which points the switched segments may occur, there were twenty categories of switched points found in the data:

1. Between Modal Verbs and Verb Phrases:

   Minggu depan Mas Fahim <u>akan mengORGANISE BARBEQUE</u> (Next week,

   Fahim will organize the barbeque) (001)

2. Between L1 Bound Morpheme and L2 Free Morpheme.

   Selanjutnya, Mas Indra, Mas Jody akan <u>mengORGANISE</u> INTERNATIONAL SPORT GAME (Next, Indra and Jody will organize the International Sport Game) (002)

3. Between L1 Possessor and L2 Free Morpheme.

   Jadi rencana <u>BARBEQUE kita</u> akan diadakan di Centennial Park. (Well, the plan of our barbeque will be conducted in Centennial Park) (004)

4. Between Noun Phrases and Predicate Adjective Phrases.

   <u>Tempatnya itu OPEN</u>. (The venue is an open air) (006)

5. Between Noun Phrases and Verb Phrases.

   Bagaimana kalau sebelum pulang <u>Pak Imam mengORGANISE BARBEQUE</u> di pantai. (How about, before leaving, Mr. Imam organizes barbeque in a beach) (008).

6. Between Prepositions and Noun Phrases.

   Selama ini kita BARBEQUE <u>di PARK</u>. (So far, we have barbequed in a park) (007).

7. Idiomatic Expression.

   <u>Jangan tunggu mereka datang. NO WAY</u>. (don't wait them to come by themselves. No way). (027).

8. Between Indonesian Expletive There (ada) and Predicate Noun Phrases.

   <u>Ada PARK</u> dekat pantai. (There is a park near the beach) (009).

9. Between Verb Phrases and tag.

   Tiga lawan tiga<u>, MIX gitu ya</u>. Jadi Campur putra puri dalam satu tim. (Three by three. It mixes up. You know. So it mixes up male and female in one team) (015).

10. Between Quantifiers and Nouns.

    Jadi, sudah <u>dua STEPS</u> ketinggalan di belakang. (So, it has been two steps lagged behind) (017).

11. Between Qualifiers and Adjectives.

Poin saya barangkali adalah supaya panitia bisa <u>lebih SELECTIVE</u>. (Perhaps, my point is the committees should be more selective) (018)

12. Between Verb Phrases and Object Noun Phrases.

Kalau mereka mau, berarti itu mereka <u>punya TALENT, INNER TALENT</u> (When they accept (the offer), that means they have a talent, an inner talent) (020).

13. Between Adverbs and Predicate Nouns.

Dia <u>sebenarnya STUDENT</u> di Macquire tapi ikut pengajiannya dengan kita. (He is actually a student of Macquire University but he joins our 'Pengajian') (022).

14. Between Negations and Verbs.

UNDERGRADUATE kita <u>tidak MIX</u>. (Our undergraduate does not mix up) (023).

15. Between Relative Clause Markers and Nouns.

Tidak seperti New South Wales, kalau ada EVENT EVENT olah raga, dia RECRUIT <u>yang UNDERGRADUATE</u>. (Unlikely New South Wales University, when there are sport events, it will recruit those who are undergraduate students) (024).

16. Between Adverbs and Nouns.

Saya kira kita juga banyak<u>. Cuma LINKAGE</u> antara UNDERGRADUATE dengan POSTGRADUATE tidak jalan. (I think we are big as well. It's simply because the linkages between the undergraduate and postgraduate students do not run well) (025).

17. Between Adverbs and Predicate Adjectives.

Apakah itu <u>masih VALID</u> atau tidak VALID. (Is it still valid or not valid) (028)

18. Between Negations and Predicate Adjectives.

Masih RELIABLE atau <u>tidak RELIABLE</u> (It's still reliable or not) (029)

19. Between Prepositional Phrases and Adverbs.

Kita tidak bisa menerjemahkan suatu makna kata <u>dari bahasa lain LITERALLY</u>. (We should not translate a word of other language literally) (037).

20. Between Adverbs and Verb Phrases.

Dibanding terjemahan, yang sama sekali, yang <u>SIMPLY mengarah</u> kepada TEXTUALnya saja. (Compared with a translation which simply, which simply refers to its textual form) (041).

Among the fifty-nine corpuses, the most recurring switched point is between prepositions and noun phrases, making up about 17% of the data. As data consistently show, the preposition is always in Indonesian while the noun phrases are always in English as in *di PARK; tentang INTERNATIONAL SPORT GAME*; etc. The second position was held by two switched points, each makes up about 12% of the data; they are switched points between a possessor and a free morpheme where it is usually the possessor in Indonesian and the free morpheme in English as in *BARBEQUE kita* (our barbeque)*; TRANSPORTnya* (its transport), etc. and switched point between Noun Phrases and Verb Phrases as in *Mas Imam mengORGANISE BARBEQUE* (Mr. Imam organizes barbeque)*; Mas Indra, Mas Jody akan mengORGANISE INTERNATIONAL SPORT GAME* (Mr Indra, and Mr Jody will organise the international sport game)*,* etc. The third most recurring switched points are between Noun phrases and Predicate Noun Phrases, making up about more than 10% of the data, as in *ada PARK dekat pantai* (there is a park near the beach), etc. and between Indonesian bound morpheme and English free morpheme in a verb as in *mengORGANISE* (organise) *, meREFER* (refer), etc.

A comparison of some of the syntactic constraints on code-switching suggested in the literature with our own data revealed counter-examples, some of which are listed below.

1. Proposed Constraint : Switching is

restricted between pronominal subjects or objects and verbs (Gumperz 1970:158, Timm 1975:477).

Counter-example : Selama ini kita BARBEQUE di PARK SOMETHING LIKE THAT tidak pernah di pantai, kenapa begitu? (So far, we have barbequed in a park, something like that, never in a beach, why?) 007

2. Proposed Constraint :   Switching is blocked between auxiliaries and verbs. (Timm 1975:478).

Counter-example : Minggu depan, Mas Fahim akan mengORGANISE BARBEQUE (Next week, Mr Fahim will organize barbeque) 001.

3. Proposed Constraint : The conjunction must be in the same code as the conjoined sentence. (Gumperz 1976: 34).

Counter-example : Apakah itu masih VALID atau tidak VALID, masih RELIABLE atau tidak RELIABLE (Is it still valid or not valid, still reliable or not reliable) 028.

4. Proposed Constraint : Switching phrases in which the (main) verb is not repeated (gapping) is only marginally acceptable (Gumperz 1976:34).

Counter-example :   Menurut saya, tafsir itu mengarah kepada SETTING, jadi meREFER kepada SETTING pada waktu itu. Itu tafsir (To me, interpreting refers to the setting, so refers to the setting at that time. That is interpreting) 038-9.

The other counter-examples shown by the data may be exemplified in the following samples. These, however, indicate that they do not simply oppose the similar previous literatures but also at the same time they will become the typical feature of Indonesian-English code-switching as well.

1. Predicate Adjective Phrases precede Noun Phrases as in . . . *dan kalau OPEN MINDED kita, kita akan menemukan yang kita cari* (and if <u>we are open minded</u>, we'll

get what we look for) A036.

2. An English verb gets and Indonesian prefixes as in *Minggu depan Mas Fahim akan mengORGANISE BARBEQUE* (Next week, Mr Fahim will <u>organize</u> barbeque) A001.

3. English Noun Phrases precede an Indonesian possessor as in *Jadi rencana BARBEQUE kita akan diadakan di Centennial Park* (So, <u>our barbeque</u> is planned to be conducted at Centennial Park) A004.

4. English verbs had an Indonesian possessor as in *ORGANISEnya* (<u>its organization</u>) A011.

5. English adjectives had an Indonesian possessor as in *PRACTICALnya* (<u>its practicality</u>) A019.

6. English nouns were reduplicated as in *EVENT-EVENT olah raga,* (sport <u>events</u>) A024.

The six figures above have also shown counter-examples to some similar previous studies such as Timm 1975, Gumperz, 1976 and Poplack 1980 especially on the notion of the two linguistic constraints on code-switching namely (1) the free morpheme constraints, and (2) the equivalence constraints which was proposed by Poplack 1980:12.

According to the free morpheme constraint a code switch could take place after any free morpheme and it is also possible to switch any constituent within sentence, providing the constituent consists of at least one free morpheme. This theory was successfully workable to most of the data of this study. However, to some extents, this theory was totally unworkable. The figures no. 2, 4, and 5 show the code switch occur in lexical level i.e. between bound and free morphemes opposing Sankoff and Poplack's (1981) "Free Morpheme Constraints".

On the equivalence constraints, she argues that code-switching tends to occur at points where juxtaposition of the two language elements does not violate a syntactic rule of

either language. Compared with the former constraint, this was the worse. All figures above has proved the violation of English syntactic rule. Figure no. 1, 3 violates the English word order, no.2 violates the English affixation, no. 4 and 5 ruin the English part of speech, and no. 6 violates the English pluralisation.

Types of Code-switching

At the previous section, we have mentioned two major types of Indonesian-English code-switchings ; intra-sentencial and extra or inter-sentencial. In this part I would like to present a more detailed description on the types of the Indonesian-English code-switching. Among sixty-two corpuses, the most recurring type of code switching shown by the data was almost all dominated by intra-

sentencial code-switching making up 96.8% (60 tokens). Only 3.2% (two tokens) of the data belonged to inter / extra-sentencial switched type. This figure as mentioned previously seems to be completely different with those which have been mentioned elsewhere in literature revealing the domination of intersentencial types over the intrasentencial ones (see also Romaine, 1991).

However, in order to accommodate the nature and behavior of the data shown by corpuses of the study, I have made the other two types of code-switching which I called them as intra-lexical, the switches which occur within word boundary, and intra phrasal switched types, the switches within phrasal boundary. The following table shows the complete feature of the types of Indonesian-English code-switching.

Tabel 4. Types of Indonesian-English code switching

NO.	TYPES OF SWITCH	NO. TOKENS	%
1.	Intra-Sentencial / Clausal	36	58.1
2.	Intra-Phrasal	19	30.1
3.	Intra-Lexical	5	8.1
4.	Inter / Extra-Sentencial / Clausal	2	3.2
	TOTAL	62	

As can be seen from the table, the most recurring switched types was intra-clausal, making almost 60% of the data and then was followed by intra-phrasal switched types, making up about 30% of the data. The less frequent switched types were intra-lexical and extra-clausal which both have made up almost 10% of the data.

Such a finding implies that most Indonesians tend to code-switch into English in smaller constituents rather than major ones. This phenomenon is likely to be motivated by among other things are poor intensity of English use in their daily interaction. As a matter of fact, English, as a foreign language, has not been spoken very often in Indonesia

compared with other countries such as Germany, France, Malaysia, Hong Kong, etc. where English is used as their second languages. People in these countries use mostly their first language along with English for their daily interaction. As such, such a relative high frequency of English employment in their daily interaction has formed an internal habit for them and this will eventually form an automatic use of English whenever they communicate with others. That's why, most of the switched constituents employed by them are more likely those which occur at major constituents such as full sentence, tag, idiomatic expressions, rather than at smaller constituent.

In contrast, In Indonesia, English is only used in certain situation like in the English classrooms, or when communicating with foreigners in hotels, tourism objects and the likes. Such a poor use of course will be likely to hinder the formation of the internal habit for them to use English for their daily interaction because there will be no an automatic process of English employment. As such, Instead of switching at major constituents, Indonesians are more likely to switch code mostly into pieces of English words and at most into English phrases rather than full sentences or others that belong to extra-sentential switchs.

Another factor which also plays part in motivating the respondents to alter their code into smaller constituents rather than major ones can be speech situation. Leech, 1983 pointed out that there are at least three important aspects of speech situation; settings or domains, participants, and topics which play an important role to determine the form used by the interactants. As mentioned previously, the data were taken from a more casual situation, i.e. "Pengajian", an informal gathering for Moslem discussing all related aspects of Islam. This gathering was conducted in one of the respondent's home which were attended by 11 Indonesian students residing and studying at Sydney University. Since the status of the participants are equal, all of the interaction seems to be carried out in a more informal way and a very friendly mode (See also Scollon and Scollon, 1990). Such a situation of course has motivated the form of speech chosen by the interactants. As claimed elsewhere in most literature, people tend to feel more at ease and comfortable in conducting their interaction in a language where everybody feel more secure and involved, usually first language or mother tongue. Therefore, the gathering employed Indonesian as the base language because by this language all participants seem to feel more involved and comfortable in getting their message across. Furthermore, it has also been mention elsewhere in literature that the employment of first language in an interaction will create intimacy among the interlocutors. Consequently, in order to maintain such a friendly and intimate situation, all the interactants tried to keep eliminating as many as possible the involvement of other language expressions including English in their interactions. That's why, most of the switched constituents shown by the data were smaller segments such as English words and phrases rather than major ones, like full sentences, idiomatic expressions, etc..

CONCLUSION

In general, the Indonesian-English code-switching tends to occur at smaller constituents rather than major ones where the noun has been found to be the most frequently switched elements and then it is followed by the verb. This obviously confirms other studies (Wentz, 1977, Timm, 1975, and Poplack, 1980). It is argued that this feature might be motivated by the poor exposure and employment of English for Indonesians in their daily interaction as, I believe, the logical consequence of English status as a foreign language in Indonesia.

Along with the types of code-switching where the intra-clausal / sentencial is the most favorite types (about 60%) and then followed by the intra-phrasal ones (about 30%), the combinability of switched segments are mostly found at clausal level, making up about 50% of

the data where single verb are preceded by either pronouns or noun phrases and followed by either prepositional phrases or by tags, or by subordinate clause.

As a supplement to other previous studies, most of the findings seem to confirm other previous findings. However, to some extent, the study has obviously denoted some counter findings to some previous studies, among other things are the aspect of code-switchers' competence and the two linguistic constraints of code-switching; free morpheme constraints and equivalence constraints. As we know, it has been mentioned elsewhere in literature that code-switchers must have a good competence of the two languages to allow them to code switch. Some data have, anyway, performed ill-forms, or ungrammatical forms, and some others violate the English syntactic rule since they actually employ the Indonesian syntactic rule.

REFERENCES

Bautista, M. L. S. 1980. *The Filipino Bilingual's Competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog – English code switching.* Pacific Linguistics, series C-59. Canberra: Australian National University.

Gingras, R. 1974. 'Problems in the Description of Spanish- English Intra sentencial Code switching.' In G. Bills (ed) *Southwest Areal Linguistics*. San Diego : Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Gumperz, J.J. 1971 and Hernandez, E. 'Bilingualism, Bidialectalism, and Classroom Interaction'. In *Language in Social Groups*. Stanford : Stanford University Press.

Gumperz, John. 1977. 'The Sociolinguistic significance of conversational code switching'. *RELC Journal*. 8(2): 1-34

Gumperz, J. John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hasselmo, N. 1979. Code Switching and Modes of Speaking. In G. Gilbert (ed). *Texas Studies in Bilingualism*. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter and Co.

Hill, Jane and Hill, Kenneth. 1980. *Methaporical switching in Modern Nahuatl: change and contradiction.* Papers from the Sixteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 121-133. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Lance, Donald. 1975. 'Spanish-English Code-Switching.' In Hernadez-Chaves et al (eds.) *El Lenguaje de los Chicanos*. Arlington : Center for Applied Linguistics

Marasigan, E. 1983. *Code Switching and Code Mixing in Multilingual Societies*. Singapore : SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

McClure, E. 1977. Aspects of Code-switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican American Cchildren. Washington. D.C. : Georgetown University Rountable on Languages and Linguistics.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social motivation for code-switching : Evidence from Africa*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.

Poplack, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL": Toward a Typology of Code-Switching. *CENTRO working Papers*. New York : CUNY.

Romaine, Suzanne. 1991. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell ltd.

Sankoff, G. 1972. 'Language Use in Multilingual Societies : Some Alternative Approach'. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds*). Sociolinguistics*. Middlesex : Penguin.

Sankoff, D. and Poplack, S. 1981. *A formal grammar for code switching*. Papers in Linguistics. 14, 3-4

Timm, L.A. 1975. 'Spanish – English Code Switching : el porque y How Not-To'. *Romance Philology*. Vol. 28. No. 4.

Valdes-Fallis, G. 1976. 'Social Interaction and Code-Switching Patterns: A Case Study of Spanish/English Alternation. In G. Keller et al (eds.) *Bilingualism in the Bicentennial and Beyond*. New York : Bilingual Press, 53-85

Wentz, J. 1977. *Some Considerations in the Development of a Syntactic Description of Code-Switching*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Wei, L. and Milroy, L. 1995. 'Conversational code switching in a Chinese community in Britain : A sequential analysis.' *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. : 281-299

APPENDIX

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

SAMPLE NO.	TEXTS	SYNTACTIC FEATURES	TYPES OF CODE-SWITCHING
A001/Sp 4	Minggu depan mas Fahim akan mengORGANISE BARBEQUE.	Verb Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Lexical
A002/Sp 4	Selanjutnya, Mas Indra, Mas Jody akan mengORGANISE INTERNATIONAL SPORT GAME,	Verb Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Lexical
A003/Sp 4	Selanjutnya, mengORGANISE turnamen tennis PPIA se NEW SOUTH WALES.	(Single) Verb+ Prep.Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A004/Sp 5	Jadi rencana BARBEQUE kita akan diadakan di CENTENNIAL PARK.	Subj. NP + Prep. Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A005/Sp 5	Jadi TRANSPORTnya dari sentral ambil 378	Subj.NP (Poss)	Intra-Phrasal
A006/Sp 5	Tempatnya itu OPEN.	Pred.Adjective	Intra-Clausal
A007/Sp 1	Selama ini kita {BARBEQUE} di {PARK}, {SOMETHING LIKE THAT}, tidak pernah di pantai, kenapa begitu?	(Single) Verb+ Prep. Phrase + Idiomatic Expression	Intra-Clausal + Prep.Phrase + Extra-Clausal
A008/Sp 6	Bagaimana kalau sebelum pulang Pak Imam mengORGANISE BARBAQUE di pantai	Verb Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Lexical
A009/Sp 1	Ada PARK dekat pantai	Pred.NP	Intra-Clausal
A010/Sp 4	OKEY,	Minor	Intra-Clausal
A011/Sp 4	ORGANISEnya, nanti Pak Imam dan teman-teman lainnya	Subj. NP	Intra-Phrasal
A012/Sp 7	Saya akan mencoba di VOLLEY BALL dan sepak bola	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A013/Sp 8	Sedikit tambahan tentang INTERNATIONAL SPORT GAME.	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A014/Sp 8	Pertandingannya ada BASKET BALL	Pred. NP	Intra-Clausal
A015/Sp 8	Tiga lawan tiga, MIX gitu ya, jadi campur putra putri dalam satu tim.	(Single) Verb	Intra-Clausal
A016/Sp 8	Volley putra, volley putri, sepak bola putra, sepak bola putri, SOFT BALL, MIX, putra campur putri.	Subj.NP + (Single) Verb	Intra-Clausal
A017/Sp 1	Jadi, sudah dua STEP ketinggalan dibelakang	Subj. NP	Intra-Clausal
A018/Sp 1	Poin saya barangkali adalah supaya panitia bisa lebih SELECTIVE.	Pred. Adjective Phrase	Intra- CLausal
A019/Sp 1	PRACTICALnya ditanyalah satu-satu	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A020/Sp 1	Kalau mereka mau berarti itu mereka punya TALENT, INNER TALENT.	Obj. NP	Intra-Clausal
A021/Sp 4	Barangkalai teman-teman yang sudah baca di INTERNET, itu ada anggota pengajian kita yang pulang kemarin pagi	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A022/Sp 4	Dia sebenarnya STUDENTdi MACQUIRE tapi ikut pengajiannya dengan kita.	Pred. NP + Prep. Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal

A023/Sp 1	UNDERGRADUATE kita tidak MIX	Subj.NP + (Single) Verb	Intra-Phrasal + Intra-Clausal
A024/Sp 1	Tidak seperti NEW SOUTH WALES, kalau ada EVENT-EVENT olah raga, dia RECRUIT yang UNDERGRADUATE	Pred. NP + (Single) Verb+ N	Intra-Phrasal + (Single) Verb+ Intra-Clausal
A025/Sp 1	Saya kira kita juga banyak. Cuma LINKAGE antara UNDERGRADUATE dengan POSTGRADUATE tidak jalan.	Subj. NP	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A026/Sp 1	Tidak seperti waktu Glen, mungkin karena Glen itu UNDERGRADUATE sehingga kita MIX.	Pred. NP + (Single) Verb	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Clausal
A027/Sp 1	Jangan tunggu mereka datang, NO WAY	Idiomatic Expression	Extra-Clausal
A028/Sp 1	Apakah itu masih VALID atau tidak VALID	Pred. Adjective	Intra-Clausal
A029/ Sp1	Masih RELIABLE atau tidak RELIABLE pada SETTING yang berbeda	Pred. Adjective + Prep. Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A030/Sp.1	Dengan demikian disimpulkan bahwa ada CULTURAL LOAD yang selalu butuh penafsiran.	Pred. NP	Intra- Clausal
A031/Sp.2	Atau ditinggalkan kalau sedang PERIOD.	Pred. Noun	Intra-Clausal
A032/Sp.3	Pada jaman sebelum seperti sekarang ini al qur'an dihafal oleh orang-orang. Jadi itu adalah MESSAGES.	Pred. Noun	Intra-Clausal
A033/Sp 4	Baru-baru ini saya dapatkan sesuatu yang saya baca di NEW YORK TIME, . . .	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A034/Sp.1	Saya RELAY sepenuhnya pada informasi.	(Single) Verb	Intra-Clausal
A035/Sp.1	Kalau saya RELAY pada diri saya, susah.	(Single) Verb	Intra-Clausal
A036/Sp 5	. . . dan kalau OPEN MINDED kita, kita akan menemukan yang kita cari.	Pred. Adjective Phrase	Intra-Clausal
A037/Sp 3	Kita tidak bisa menerjemahkan suatu makna kata dari bahasa lain LITERALLY.	Adverb	Intra-Clausal
A038/Sp 1	Menurut saya, tafsir itu mengarah kepada SETTING,	Prep. Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A039/Sp 1	jadi meREFER kepada SETTING pada waktu itu, itu tafsir.	(Single) Verb+ Prep. Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A040/Sp 1	Jadi lebih luas dan lebih PRAGMATICAL.	Pred.Adjective Phrase	Intra-Phrasal
A041/Sp 1	dibanding terjemahan yang sama sekali, yang SIMPLY} mengarah kepada TEXTUALnya saja.	Adverb + Prep. Phrase	Intra-Clausal + Intra-Phrasal
A042/Sp 4	Sesuatu yang kontekstual dengan LONGTERM ACHIEVEMENTnya satu saja, LONGTERMnya, tujuan jangka panjangnya adalah itu.	Prep.Phrase + NP (Poss) + NP (Poss)	Intra-Phrasal + Intra-Phrasal + Intra-Phrasal + Intra-Clausal
A043/Sp 5	. . . nggak mungkinkan kalau itu sekedar PLEASURE	Pred. Noun	Intra-Clausal