## **CHAPTER FOUR**

## CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw some conclusion based on the discussion of the function of code switching in the previous chapter. Code switching occurs in <u>Inside Indonesian Society (Cultural Change in Java)</u>. The author writes this particular book in two languages, which are English, as the main language, and Indonesian. I believe this code switching happens because the writer discussed about some cultures in Java, Indonesia.

In my opinion, the use of code switching in the book is a significant way as the book tells about the life and condition of a certain area in Java, in which there are many cultural concepts and costumes, which do not exist in western culture. For example, the use of the word <u>kejawen</u>, which refers to the way of life of Javanese people, occurs because there is no appropriate word for <u>kejawen</u> in the English language as the western culture does not have that particular culture. Therefore, the author writes the word in Indonesian to keep the meaning of the word <u>kejawen</u>. After analyzing the data, I found some functions of code switching, such as untranslatability, reiteration, clarification, emphasis, quotation, parenthesis, designation (endearment & name calling), and substitution (appositives). Out of the 28 functions of code switching, there are seven data of emphatic functions, seven data of reiteration functions, and seven data of untranslatability functions.

In **emphasis**, when the word is closely related to the culture, the writer can just keep the word in the original language. In **reiteration**, when the word exists in the main language, the writer uses both the word in the main language and the word in the original language to reemphasize the point he describes. **Reiteration** can make the readers aware of the original term. **Emphasis** is usually used for the words that are typically of Indonesian culture. Therefore, it does not exist in the English culture. Hence, if the English word is used, it will lose its value.

**Untranslatability** is usually used for words which cannot be replaced by any words in another language. In this book, there are a lot of Indonesian words that cannot be replaced by English words, for instance, the use of the word <u>kraton</u>. The word <u>kraton</u> is untranslatable because it is a certain noun which is closely related with Indonesian culture and there is no English word that can really reflect the word <u>kraton</u>. The use of the word <u>kraton</u> can keep the essence of the words.

In <u>Inside Indonesian Society (Cultural Change in Java)</u>, I find the function of reiteration is quite often to be used. The use of **reiteration** can make the point clearly conveyed. For example, in the words <u>kota budaya</u>, the author writes the same words in English, <u>the city of culture</u>. I think the use of the word <u>kota budaya</u> is important because it can imply the idea meant by the writer.

In my opinion, the function of **reiteration** is the clearest way of code switching among all the available functions because it can keep the exact meaning of the word. The function of reiteration can be compared with the function of **substitutions (appositives)** that gives the definition of the word or a noun being talked about and further identifies the noun. I think, the use of **substitutions** (**Appositives**) is not effective for the code switching because it can make different interpretation of the words mentioned. Besides, I only found one data which has the function of **substitutions (appositives)**.

The function of **emphasis** is actually quite difficult for me because it must have a certain implication and can make the readers more difficult to find what is being talked about. For **untranslatability**, the readers must understand the meaning of the words themselves because the author writes the word in the original language, while not all the readers are familiar with the culture. Comparing the three functions above, I think **reiteration** is the most efficient function because the writer repeats exactly what he has said in another language that can reemphasize his point.

In my opinion, the use of code switching in <u>Inside Indonesian Society</u> (<u>Cultural Change in Java</u>) can give a significant effect on the words. The code switching is an effective way to describe the words which belong to the culture and customs in one particular area in Indonesia. By using the Indonesian language, it can keep the meaning of the words and it will make the idea easier to be understood.

In this analysis, I find some different forms of code switching function that have been proposed by Koziol. It is the use of **parenthesis**. Koziol's theory explains that the utterance between the brackets should contain extra information to give more explanation of the previous utterance or word. However, I found that the word mentioned between parentheses could be the word in another language, which has the same meaning. For example, in data 11, there is the utterance lu lu, gue gue followed by the English words which have the same meaning, you you, I I and they are put in brackets.

After doing the analysis, I also found that one switched word or utterance may have more than one function of code switching. As an example, the word <u>jilbab</u> functions as **substitutions (appositives)** and **untranslatability**. These two functions occur because <u>jilbab</u> is a more familiar term for the Moslem women's headgear for Indonesian.

Based on what I have mentioned above, I think that Koziol's theory is not absolute. This makes me understand that in the code-switching phenomenon we may find different forms of the functions of code switching. As an example, in parenthesis function, the words or phrases in the brackets may not always contain extra information. They can be the words or phrases which have the same meaning with the previous words or phrases. They can also be the words or phrases that clarify the previous ideas or words. For example in data eight, the words <u>sepuh</u>, <u>wong tuwa</u>, <u>kiai</u> and <u>guru</u> are put in the parenthesis; yet, they are used to clarify the respected elders and religious leaders.

(1010 words)

29