

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw some conclusions based on my findings after discussing the functions of code switching in the previous chapter. Code switching occurs in Family Planning in Rural West Java. The Serpong Project. The writers write this particular book in two languages, which are English, as the main language, and Indonesian. I believe this happens because in the book the writers tell about the daily life in an area in Indonesia, which of course includes the people's way of life and thinking as well as culture. I think this is an appropriate way as the book tells about the situation and condition of a certain area in Java, in which there are a lot of typical cultural concepts and customs which do not exist in Western culture. For example, the use of the code switched item sarung, which refers to “the traditional cloth with block patterns and usually used by orthodox Muslim men”, occurs because there is no equivalent word for sarung in the English language as the Western culture does not have that thing. Therefore, the writers leave the word in Indonesian.

There are a lot of functions of code switching appearing in the book, such as untranslatability, reiteration, substitutions (appositives), clarification, quotation, emphasis and parenthesis. However, untranslatability and reiteration are the

functions that are most often found in this book. There are ten Untranslatability functions found out of the twenty-seven functions of code switching that I have analyzed. Besides, I find seven functions of Reiteration. Untranslatability is the function which uses the word in the original language, while reiteration is the function which uses the same word in another language. These two ways, in my opinion, are the easiest functions of code switching among the fourteen functions available in Koziol's theory. In Untranslatability, when an equivalent word does not exist in the main language used, a writer can just keep the word in the original language. Or, as in Reiteration, when the word exists in the main language, a writer can use both the word in the main language and the word in the original language so that the readers can also be made aware of the term in the original language.

Untranslatability is usually used for objects that are hard to express in English. In my opinion, in this book, there are a lot of Indonesian words that cannot be replaced by English words. This is caused by the fact that the words are related to Indonesian culture which does not exist in English culture; that is why there are no exact words in English. For instance, the word kebaya is untranslatable because it is one of the traditional clothes in Indonesia and there is no English word that can give an exact illustration of kebaya. I believe that the writers write the words in Indonesia in order that the readers will get an accurate reference of what is being talked about.

Besides the Untranslatability function, I find that Reiteration function is also quite often used. This function is quite easy to find in the book Family Planning in Rural West Java. The Serpong Project. The writers use this function because they

want to be sure that their point is clearly conveyed. For example, in the word musyawarah, the writers write the same word again in English. Therefore, the readers know the meaning of musyawarah because in English musyawarah is known as principle of consensus. I think the word musyawarah must still be kept as it is such a well-known and widely-applied concept in Indonesia that the readers should know this term.

In my opinion, the function of Reiteration is the clearest way of code switching among all the functions available because the readers will get the exact meaning of the word. Compared with the function of substitution (appositives), I think it is more specific. Substitution (appositives) only gives definition and further identifies the noun. Besides, it can make the readers have a different interpretation. For the function of emphasis, it must have a certain implication, which is more difficult for the readers to catch what is being talked about. For the function of untranslatability, the readers themselves must look for the meaning of the words because the writers leave the words in the original language. Besides, not all readers are aware of what is talked about except when they know the culture or customs. Reiteration occurs when a speaker repeats exactly what he has said in another language to reemphasize his point and I think it is more efficient.

After analyzing the functions of code switching, I find some forms which are different from the ones that have been proposed by Koziol, especially because of the use of parenthesis marks. In Koziol's theory, the one between the parenthesis marks should be extra information so that it is called Parenthesis. However, in this book, the ones between the parenthesis marks can be the word in another language (Reiteration) or the word in the original language

(Untranslatability). Therefore, I think, her theory is not absolute, especially about the punctuation forms. This makes me aware that in further studies one may find other different forms of the functions of code switching in their analysis.