

SPEECH VARIETY OF ELITE PEOPLE IN MAKASSAR:  
FORMS AND SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF  
INDONESIAN-ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING

Abdul Hakim Yassi\*

**Abstrak**

Fenomena alih kode *code switching* dan campur kode *code mixing* merupakan suatu perilaku bertutur yang wajar dan tak terhindarkan bagi masyarakat multilingual. Di Indonesia, fenomena ini hidup dan bertumbuh subur dan umumnya digunakan atau dilakukan oleh kelompok *speech community* tertentu yakni kaum elit. Penelitian ini dirancang khususnya untuk menemukan alasan atau motivasi para kaum elit dalam melakukan alihkode yang diawali oleh pembahasan pola umum fitur linguistik dari alihkode antara Bahasa Indonesia dengan Bahasa Inggris.

Data penelitian ini berbentuk tuturan alami alih kode antara Bahasa Indonesia dengan Bahasa Inggris yang diambil dari 40 kaum elit dari berbagai profesi di Makassar pada empat sadegan tutur; seminar, rapat, dialog di TV dan ngobrol dengan rekan sejawat. Dari 15 jam rekaman tuturan, diambil secara acak sebanyak 500 diskursus tuturan. Data kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan *analytical framework* dari Yassi's (2003) *integrated functional approach* yang diadaptasi dari beberapa kerangka teori yang ada khususnya Gumperz's (1982) *contextualization theory*.

Menyangkut aspek fitur linguistik alihkode antara Bhs.Indonesia dengan Bhs.Inggris, penelitian ini menemukan kata benda mendominasi unsur kata yang dialihkodekan (68,72%), dan kombinasi antara kata kerja Bhs. Indonesia dengan frasa benda Bhs.Inggris mendominasi titik alihkode (25,58%), serta intraclausal switching, alihkode yang terjadi dalam batas klausa (53,06%) mendominasi jenis alihkode. Ini menunjukkan bahwa alihkode antara Bhs.Indonesia dengan Bhs.Inggris

---

\* Dosen Jurusan Sastra Inggris Fakultas Sastra UNHAS

umumnya terjadi pada level konstituen yang lebih kecil seperti frasa atau bahkan kata yang lazim disebut *intrasentencial code switching* (bandingkan dengan : *intersentencial code switching*, alih kode yang terjadi pada konstituen yang lebih besar, yakni antar kalimat, atau antar klausa). Menyangkut fungsi alihkodenya, didapatkan tiga fungsi yang paling dominan, yakni (1) mengutip peribahasa Bhs Inggris atau statemen orang lain (31.97%), (2) mengulangi pesan (13,60), dan (3) kecendrungan menggunakan istilah-istilah atau ungkapan-ungkapan Bhs Inggris yang populer (12,58%). Menyangkut motivasi atau alasan responden melakukan alihkode, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa responden beralihkode ke Bhs Inggris karena umumnya (1) ingin membuat pesan lebih jelas atau memberikan penekanan pada pesan yang ingin disampaikan (26.22%), dan (2) ingin menunjukkan sosial status mereka, yakni berpendidikan atau modern (9.83%). Sedangkan motivasi atau alasan responden beralihkode ke Bhs.Indonesia sewaktu berkomunikasi dalam Bhs.Inggris umumnya dipicu oleh hal-hal yang sifatnya personal, seperti (1) keinginan mengakrabkan diri dengan lawan bicara (23.80%), (2) merasa lebih nyaman (19,04%), menunjukkan hormat kepada yang lebih tua (14,28%), dan menunjukkan simpati kepada lawan bicara (14,28%). Dengan demikian disimpulkan bahwa alihkode yang dilakukan oleh kaum elit di Makassar mempunyai spektrum dimensi sosio-pragmatik yang sangat luas.

Code switching or mixing has become an unmarked phenomenon for a multilingual society. It seems to be almost no single country in the world may escape from this phenomenon.

In Indonesia, this speech behaviour has nowadays become trendy among Indonesian people especially the elite ones. It is quite easy to find them to switch from Indonesian to English whenever they communicate with others. The following examples clarify this.

- *Saya tentu saja melihat dari dimensi pemerintah GOVERNANCE yang menjadi sebuah BODY OF STATE tubuh dari sebuah negara atau daerah (a government officer)*

- *Lalu perbankan beralih MOSTLY dari CORPORATE BANKING ke RETAIL BANKING (a bank director)*
- *Tragedi yang mengenaskan dan mengejukan bangsa ini dengan terjadinya BOMB EXPLOTION di Bali (a legislative)*
- *Kita bisa mengORGANIZE mereka, ini negara kita, kita mengORGANIZE dia, bukan dia yang mengORGANIZE kita (a doctor)*
- *Nggak apa-apa, WHAT IS WRONG WITH cerita kancil? (a proferssor)*
- *Ibu saya juga kan SINGLE PARENTS (a celebrity)*

As can be seen from the examples above, switching phenomena provide abundant issues for a scientific studies ranging from the linguistic configuration of switching such as switched segments, switched points, grammatical constraints, etc. up to the social dimension of code switching such as functions and reasons for a switch.

However, the present study has been designed to find out the general patterns of linguistic configuration and socio-pragmatic functions of Indonesian-English code switching.

#### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS, AND METHODOLOGY

The theoretical framework used in this study is adapted from various existing literature on code switching in the world such as ‘situational and metaphorical switchings’ by Gumperz (1977), ‘Contextualization’ theory by Gumperz (1982). This theory is then developed by Marazigan (1982) and Romaine (1991); theory of ‘social function and social motivation of code switching’ by Myerz-Scotton and Ury (1977), theory of ‘social arena’ by Myerz-Scotton (1988, 1993) which is then developed by Mc Convell (1988). These are all the frameworks used for the socio-pragmatic functions of code switching whereas the frameworks for the syntactic categories of code switching are adapted from theory of ‘two grammatical constraints’ by Poplack (1980), ‘formal grammar’ by Sankoff and Poplack (1981), and ‘congruence’ theory by Sebba (1998) which is then developed by Lorente (2000).

The present study is descriptive qualitative and quantitative in nature. It relies much on a content-based analysis. Data were collected from 40 elites of different professions in four different types of interactions; seminars, meetings, dialogues on TV, and chitchats employing a direct observation method including recording techniques,

and questionnaires. From 15 hours of recorded natural speech produced by the subjects, it has been drawn 500 switching discourses as the samples of the study. The research design has been assigned the linguistic features including switched segments, switched points, and switched types and socio-pragmatic functions of code switching to be the dependent variables of the present study.

**Results**

1. Recorded speech

The following is the result of the analysis of the data taken from the recorded speech of the respondents.

a. Switched segments

It is found N to be the most dominant switched segments (68.72%) serving as an Object of V or Prep. (38.09%) as in (1), (part of) an NP (26,53%) as in (2), or a subject (5.10%) as in (3).

- (1) *Kita selalu mendorong mengupayakan adanya FURTHER CONTACT (J001)*
- (2) *Mereka juga mempunyai LANDSCAPE atau BLUE PRINT yang mereka sebut FINACIAL MASTER PLAN (M002)*
- (3) *Nah, kemudian dari BOARD OF DIRECTOR harus memikirkan kira-kira TARGET berapa (I008)*

NO	SWITCHED SEGMENTS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Obj. NP	112	38.09
2.	NP	78	26.53
3.	Subj. NP	15	5.10
4.	V	37	12.58
5.	Adj	25	8.50
6.	Clauses	24	8.16
7.	Adverb	2	0.68
8.	Prep.P	1	0.34
	TOTAL	294	

b. Switched points

It is found the switch between V & Obj NP to be the most dominant switched points (25.58) as in (4) . It is then followed by the switch between NP & NP (17.00) as in (5), between Prep &

Obj.NP (9.86) as in (4) and Indonesian bound morpheme & English free morpheme (9.86) as in (6).

- (4) Kita mendapatkan *BACKGROUND INFORMATION* tentang *CULTURAL INDEXES* atau kata yang mengandung muatan budaya (A011)
- (5) Ini perumahan *BETTER SHELTER* yang ditanggung oleh Sulsel di Aceh (C004).
- (6) Saya tidak setuju perawat saya di*CANCEL* (C019)

NO	SWITCHED POINTS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Btw V & Obj. NP	76	25.85
2.	Btw NP & NP	50	17.00
3.	Btw Prep & Obj. NP	29	9.86
4.	Btw Ind bound morp & Engl free morpheme	29	9.86
5.	Btw Clause & Clause	24	8.16
6.	Btw N & V	13	4.42
7.	Btw Conj & NP	13	4.42
8.	Others (under 10 corpora)	60	20.40
	TOTAL	294	

c. Switching types

It is found Intraclausal switch to be the most dominant switch types (53.06) as in (7), then it is followed by Intraprasal switch (28,91) as in (8), Intralexical (9.86) as in (9) and then Interclausal switch (8.16) as in (10).

- (7) Tidak mungkin satu persatu dari mereka bisa mengakses *RESOURCES RESOURCES* dari teknologi (L001)
- (8) Semua *STAKEHOLDER* berperan serta, jadi tidak ada yang bekerja sendiri-sendiri (C008)
- (9) Kita mencoba meng*ACKNOWLEDGE*, meng apa namanya, menghargai atau merujuk (J003)
- (10) Yang pertama *HOW TO FIND THE REAL PROBLEM OF THE PEOPLE* bagaimana menemukanli apa sih yang menjadi problem (K007)

NO	SWITCHING TYPES	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Intraclausal	156	53.06
2.	Intraphrasal	85	28.91
3.	Intralexical	29	9.86
4.	Interclausal	24	8.16

	TOTAL	294	
--	-------	-----	--

## d. Functions of code switching

It is found quoting such as technical terms, and one's statement to be the most dominant functions of switching (31.97) as in (11). Then, it is followed by repeating messages (13.60) as in (12), playing wit a well-known English expressions (12.58) as in (13).

(11) *Tapi dia menjawab RECEIVED PRONUNCIATION IS SOMETHING IDEAL (E002)*

(12) *Dalam beberapa hal kita sangat berbeda dengan mereka VERY DIFFERENT (O001)*

(13) *Ada tiga hal yang harus berjalan dalam nuansa CHECK AND BALANCE (K012)*

Others : English is simpler and more explicit (9.86) as in (14), lack of good equivalence of meaning (4.08) as in (15), and anglicizing (3.40) as in (16).

*Maka SMALL HOLDER FARMER ini mampu mengelola sumber daya dengan baik (L007)*

(14) *MULTILEVEL MARKETING itu harus mempunyai ribuan DOWN LINE (I012)*

(15) *Yang ketiga HOW TO MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT BY THE PEOPLE (K010)*

NO	FUNCTIONS	FREQUENCY	
		Token	%
1.	Unidentified	94	31.97
2.	Quoting : name, technical terms, one's statement, or proverb	58	19.72
3.	Repeating	40	13.60
4.	Playing with well-known/popular English expression	37	12.58
5.	English is much simpler and more explicit	29	9,86
6.	Lack of good equivalence of meaning in Indonesian	12	4.08
7.	Anglicizing	10	3.40
8.	Clarifying	9	3.06
9.	Neutralizing	5	1.70
	TOTAL	294	

2. Questionnaire

The following is the result of the analysis of the data taken from the distribution of questionnaires to respondents

a. Respondent's use of English in their daily interaction

NO	FREQUENCY OF USE	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Always		
2.	Frequently	8	53.3
3.	Sometime	7	46.7
4.	Rarely		
5.	Never		
	TOTAL	15	

As can be seen from the table, respondents use English in their daily interaction ranging from most of their time up to frequent use of English. I believe that such a frequent use of English in their daily interaction indicates that the respondents can be classified as competent bilinguals. In order word, they have a relatively good command of the embedded language, in this sense, English, enabling them to switch back and forth without fearing of violating either language rule.

b. Switching as a conscious or unconscious process

NO	CONSCIOUSNESS	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Done consciously	8	47.05
2.	Done unconsciously	9	52.94
	TOTAL	17	

As can be seen from the table, respondents doing the switches could be done consciously and unconsciously, comprising almost the same amount of the data, i.e. 50%. This figure confirms Yassi's (2003) study which found that people codeswitch sometimes consciously sometimes unconsciously. This indicates that switching phenomena are both cognitive-processing phenomena and habitual action phenomena.

c. Respondent's objectives for switching to English

NO	OBJECTIVES	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	Make the message much clearer	9	14.75
2.	Keep the interaction going on	8	13.11
3.	Emphasize the message	7	11.47
4.	Clarify the message	7	11.47
5.	Convince the addressee	7	11.47
6.	Quote something	6	9.83
7.	Involve another party	6	9.83
8.	Show a respect	6	9.83
9.	Show a social status	6	9.83
	TOTAL	61	

As can be seen from the table, the most significant functions of code switching is to make the message much clearer, comprising about one fifth of the data. This is then followed by the purpose of keeping the interaction going on. Moreover, it is worthy to mention that to some extent function of code switching can be used to identify an exclusive social status of the switchers as let say an elite educated people or modern people (see also Myerz-Scotton, 1993; and Gibbon, 1987).

d. Respondent's reason or motivation for switching to English

NO	REASONS OR MOTIVATION	FREQUENCY	
		TOKEN	%
1.	None, it's just as a habit	8	22.85
2.	English is more simple	8	22.85
3.	English is more complete	7	20.00
4.	Lack of a good equivalence of meaning in Indonesian or even no equivalent meaning in Indonesian	6	17.14
5.	It sounds more educated or modern	6	17.14
	TOTAL	35	

As can be seen from the table, the most significant respondent's motivation or reasons to switchcode is that because English is more

complete and simpler. As such, it is an effective medium to be used in expressing certain expressions which tend to be longer when it is expressed in Indonesian, such as *multilevel marketing*, *down line*, *small holder farmers*, etc. Moreover, people switchcode without attempting at any particular interactional goals or intention. They simply do it because of habitual action. This phenomenon as I believe explains that some people do swithcode unconsciously. Other significant motivation of people in performing a codeswitch can be caused by the absence of equivalent meaning in Indonesian. Another one is again in order to sound more educated and modern.

e. Respondent's reason or motivation for switching to Indonesian

NO	REASON OR MOTIVATION		
		TOKEN	%
1.	Feel much closer to the addressee	10	23.80
2.	Feel much easier and more convenient	8	19.04
3.	Show a respect	6	14.28
4.	Expressing a sympathy	6	14.28
5.	Seeking for a help	6	14.28
6.	Expressing a disappointment	6	14.28
	TOTAL	42	

In contrast, the study identified six reasons or motivation for people to switchcode to Indonesian when they are speaking English. The two most significant ones are because they feel much closer to the addressee and feel much easier and more convenient. The rest ones are in order to express a symphaty, disappointment, asking for a help. This findings are in line with Gumperz (1982) who pointed out that the 'we' code in this respect, Indonesian, was a good tool to deliver personal aspects such as intimacy, anger, happiness and the likes rather than the 'they' code in this respect, English.

**Discussion**

The domination of N or NP comprising about ¾ of the data realized as an object, subject and part of NPs result in the switch is mostly to occur between V & Obj.NP, Prep & Obj.NP and NP & NP. This indicates that the switch is mostly to occur in small constituents such as within a clause boundary which is also commonly known as intraclausal switching including 'intraphrasal switching' (Yassi, 2001), a switch that occurs within a phrasal boundaries and 'intralexical

switching' (ibid), a switch which occurs within a word boundaries, comprising more than 90% of the data (91.83%).

As such, the findings have lent strong support to previous studies on code switching such as to name only a few Poplack (1980), McClure (1998), Nishimura (1998), Lorente (2000), and Yassi (2001, 2003) which found N to be the most dominant switched segments in their data. However, at the same time, the findings have provided some counter findings to some previous studies such as to name only a few :

- Poplack's two grammatical constraints theory; free morpheme and equivalence constraints as in *Niatmu mau pergi, mau bantu atau supaya diSHOOTING televisi* (C018).
- Plaff and Poplack (1980) " switching is most likely to occur only in major constituents, intersententially rather than in minor constituent, intrasententially.
- Gumperz (1976), 'the conjunction must be in the same code as the conjoined sentences' as in *Kalau seandainya SMALL HOLDER FARMER ini dan LOW TECHNOLOGY ini bisa diberdayakan maka . . .* (L007).

I believe that at least there are three important factors motivating this noun domination. Firstly, the natural portion of noun in the structure of English sentences. Noun occupies about 2/3 of syntactic roles i.e. subjects, and objects of both verbs and prepositions. Secondly, low intensity of use. As a foreign language, English is only used occasionally and by certain people such as in classrooms and in a very small number, only about 0.30 switch to English per minute (Yassi, 2003) as compared with Gumperz's data (1982) on switching between Spanish and English by Spanish people residing in New York concluding one switch per minute. Finally, speaker's English competence. Due to their lack of English competence, subjects tend to switch only in small constituent levels rather than in major ones. Otherwise, they will risk at ruining the syntactic categories of both English grammar and structure. This is in line with Romaine (1991). She pointed out that switchers tend to switch nouns because they were free from syntactic restriction so that switchers felt free to switch without fearing of violating the form of embedded language. Other theories supporting this phenomenon can be 'chunk' theory by Azuma (1988) advocating that words that can meaningfully stand alone can be switched. Similarly, this is in line with 'open and closed class item' theory by Joshi (1985) pointing out that content words such as nouns,

adjectives, and verbs are more likely to be switchable compared to those belong to structural words such as bound morphemes, tense markers, etc.

In terms of the socio-pragmatic functions of code switching, the present study has demonstrated that switching possesses a very wide spectrum of social dimensions ranging from self-identity and dignity, service provision, social relation, up to the social norms and value of the given society.

I believe that switching to English by playing with well-known or popular English expressions, or quoting certain English expressions, or anglicizing certain English expressions is the embodiment of self-identity expressions or announcements as an educated elite, or modern people. The implicit goal of such an expression is to have a self-recognition and respect from others for the sake of their own dignity as Brown and Levinson (1987) called it 'positive face'.

Another social dimension of switching can be found in the speakers' willingness to provide good service for other people. Such a social dimension is embodied through the provision and making of clearer messages. The implicit gain of such a provision is to speed up addressee's comprehension by repeating the messages, or translating messages into Indonesian.

Furthermore, another significant socio-pragmatic functions of switching can be the switcher's willingness to keep in line with the norms and value applied in the society. Such a social function is embodied through the speaker's effort in neutralizing certain expressions especially in the area of sex, money, taboo, or politeness which will appear to be socially unacceptable when it is delivered in Indonesian.

Finally, the other crucial social function of switching has been the switcher's willingness to keep a good relation to other people. This is realized through various forms of interactional goals ranging from willingness to put themselves much closer to their addressees, showing a sympathy, showing a respect, to expressing disappointment. This is in line with Gumperz (1982) who claims that switch to the 'we' code is an appropriate medium in delivering personal feeling and emotion.

## **Conclusion**

The present study has successfully demonstrated that code switching is a crucial phenomenon for a multilingual society. It plays a significant role in governing the social interaction of the community because it has a very wide spectrum of socio-pragmatic implication

which significantly contribute to the lives of man whether as an individual being or as a social one.

Above all, code switching is a rich-issue phenomenon, both linguistic configuration and social dimension of switching, which calls for further and more comprehensive studies. As such, it provides sociolinguists with abundant and more challenging issues to be investigated.

## References

- Azuma, S. 1998. Meaning and Form in Code-switching. In R. Jacobson. (ed.) *Code-Switching Worldwide*: Mouton deGruyser: Berlin, New York : 109-124
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness : Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Gibbons, John. 1987. *Code Mixing and Code Choice : A Hong Kong case study*. Multilingual matters: Clevedon
- Gumperz, J.J. 1977. 'The Sociolinguistic significance of conversational code switching'. *RELC Journal*. 8(2): 1-34
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Lorente, B. P. 2000. Revisiting Taglish Na Naman : A Congruence Approach to Tagalog-English Code-switching. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 31. 1, 25-37.
- Marasigan, E. 1983. *Code Switching and Code Mixing in Multilingual Societies*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre : Singapore.
- McConvell, P. 1988. 'Mix-IM-UP : Aboriginalcode-switching, old and new'. In M.Hedler (ed) *Code switching : Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin : Mouter de Gruyter, Berlin.

- Myers-Scotton, C. and Ury, W. 1977. 'Bilingual Strategies : The Social Functions of Code-switching'. *Linguistics*. 193, 5-20.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1988. Code-switching as indexical of social negotiation. In Heller, M (ed). 1988. *Code-Switching : Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Mouton de Gruyter : Berlin.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social motivation for code-switching : Evidence from Africa*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. In C. Myers-Scotton. (ed.) 1993. *Language in Society*. 22:475-503
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. 'Common and uncommon ground : Social and structural factors in code switching'. *Language in Society*. 22, 3, 475-503.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometime I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol: Toward a typology of code switching'. *Linguistics*, 18 : 581-616.
- Romaine, S. 1991 [1989]. *Bilingualism*. Basil Blackwell ltd. : Oxford.
- Sankoff, G. and Poplack, S. 1981. *A formal grammar for code switching*. *Papers in Linguistics*. 14, 3-46
- Sebba, M. 1998. A Congruence Approach to the Syntax of Code-switching. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*. 2,1 : 1-19.
- Yassi, A. H. 2001. Indolish (Indonesian-English): Toward a Typology of Indonesian-English Code-switching. *Analisis*. 4:235-252.
- Yassi, A.H. 2003. *Code switching as a communication strategy in Indonesian-English bilingual discourses: A congruence-functional approach to Indonesian-English code switching*. Disertasi. Universitas Hasanuddin.