

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw some conclusions based on the analysis that I have carried out in the previous chapter. After recording, interviewing and doing the analysis of the lecturer's utterances, I find out that the lecturer has performed code-switching, which according to the theory belongs to several types of function. Moreover, the code-switching in the lecturer's utterances has different purposes.

From the 23 data that have been analyzed, I find that most of the data (18 data) show that the code-switching happens because the lecturer wants to deliver her explanation well to the students so that the students will understand better what she has said before. According to Liu's theory of the functions of code-switching, 21 code-switching utterances in the data can be said to have the **Repetitive function**. In addition, there are also one data showing **For translation of new and unfamiliar words or expression function** and three data showing **Socializing function**.

The findings demonstrate that the code-switching that most frequently happens in the lecturer's utterances belongs to the **Repetitive function**. In my opinion, this is due to the fact that the lecturer wants very much that the students understand her explanation. Also, it has become habitual for the lecturer to repeat her explanation by code-switching to make the students understand the subject better. In addition, she uses code-switching to avoid the students' misunderstanding. In this case, I would like to give an example taken from data number 1 when the lecturer is explaining the different placements of an inversion by using not until, only when, only after and hardly or no sooner. She repeats her explanation by code-switching from English to Indonesian to convey the same idea or message.

I would also like to point out that there is one data showing the code-switching using **For translation of new and unfamiliar words or expression function**, which occurs when the lecturer introduces new vocabulary or unfamiliar words. In this case, the code-switching utterances happen because the lecturer is afraid that the students do not understand her explanation of the new words or the unfamiliar words. So, the lecturer translates the English word into Indonesian as a quick method to explain the subject. As mentioned in the analysis of Data 18, this function can be recognized when the lecturer translates the English word for into Indonesian. The lecturer has to translate the English word for because there are different meanings of for in English and in Indonesian. The code-switching occurs in the utterance because the lecturer tries to avoid the students' misunderstanding.

Meanwhile, there are also three data showing **Socializing function**, which is used by the lecturer to get the rapport-building purpose, to make the lecturer have a closer relationship with the students; therefore, the solidarity or relationship between the lecturer and the students can be developed or maintained. This type of code-switching happens because the lecturer wants to approach the students so her explanation can be delivered well and the students will understand the subject better. This function can be seen in the analysis of Data 8, when the lecturer asks her students about the meaning of a clause. In addition, she asks about the difference between a clause and a phrase. She uses code-switching type of **Socializing function** because she wants to show her concern for the students or to show her understanding of her students' problem in answering her question. So, by using code-switching, she wants to show her attention when she has not received the expected response from the students.

Besides those three functions that I have found in the analysis, according to Liu's theory, there are two other functions that I do not use in this analysis. The first is **For compensating the teacher's linguistic incompetence and insecurity function**, which happens when the lecturer is unable to remember the required English word at the moment of uttering or when she is uncertain about which English words she should use. In my opinion, this kind of code-switching function is not found because the lecturer is fluent in English. Therefore, she never feels uncertain about which English words she should use and she always remembers or knows the words that she wants to convey to the students. So, this function of code-switching never occurs in the classes.

The other function that the lecturer does not use is **For ease of expression function**. This function can be recognized when a speaker switches from English to Indonesian because there is no equivalent expression of an Indonesian specific term in English or the English equivalent expression of the term is not easy to retrieve. In my opinion, this function is not used by the lecturer because in English grammar classes specific terms in Indonesian are not used in the class. For example, the word verb in English has an equivalent in Indonesian, which is kata kerja. So, the lecturer does not need to use code-switching in her explanation because the students know exactly what is meant by verb in Indonesian. The case will be different if she teaches Indonesian culture, in which **For ease of expression function** is likely used by the lecturer, for example when teaching the words batik and canting.

From the analysis I know that according to Liu's theory, the lecturer has used three types of code-switching function. The types are **For translation of new and unfamiliar words and expressions**, **Repetitive function**, and **Socializing function**. In my opinion, the lecturer's code-switching utterances can be classified into the effective and ineffective ones. I would like to give an example taken from the analysis of Data 18, when the lecturer is explaining the different meanings of for in English and Indonesian. I think this code-switching is effective to be used because most of the students do not know that the word for can have different meanings in English and in Indonesian. So, this code-switching is very useful to make the students understand and to avoid the students' misunderstanding.

The ineffective code-switching can be seen from the analysis of Data 23, when the lecturer translates the English sentence he didn't feel mad at all into Indonesian. I think this code-switch is not effective because it is a grammar class which is given in the sixth semester. This is the ultimate subject of grammar in the English Department so the students in the sixth semester have obtained sufficient skills to communicate in English. In my opinion, the students will understand the meaning of the English sentence even if the lecturer does not translate it into Indonesian. This code-switching is not influential for the students. It will not give a new knowledge to them.

As a closing remark, I would like to say that when a lecturer, especially in the English Department, performs code-switching, the act is not only useful for helping the students to understand the message better but it is also worth analyzing to reveal the types of the code-switching and the lecturer's purposes in doing the code-switching.