

ABSTRACT

INDRAYANI SIMPURUH, 2019. *The Indicators of Code-Crossing Phenomena in EFL Classroom Interaction*

(Supervised by Murni Mahmud and Kisman Salija)

Email: cencenindrayani@gmail.com

This research focused on investigating the indicators of code-crossing phenomena in EFL classroom interaction. The researcher collected the data by conducting classroom observations and interview and analyzing the data by adopting a qualitative research design. The research was conducted at the first semester of Postgraduate Program State University of Makassar. The data was taken in classroom interaction use audio recording. The data from audio recording would be transcribed and analyzed. The result of the research showed that the lecturer and students used code crossing in learning process. Code-crossing which occurred in EFL classroom interaction consist of eight indicators. They were; (1) address term, (2) emphasize the important point, (3) local language, (4) checking for students understanding, (5) self correction, (6) reinforce a request, (7) ease of expression and (8) lapses. The result shows that the indicators of code crossing were the use of low and high code by the lecturer and students in classroom. In context of classroom interaction, the lecturer and students not only use English language when communicating, but also use Indonesian and Buginese language. The lecturer and students in speaking low and high code use English, Indonesian and Buginese language.

Keywords: code-crossing, indicators, classroom interaction.

INTRODUCTION

In teaching and learning process, communication between the lecturer and students is regarded as the important element to perform an effective learning. Talk between lecturer and students are important in teaching and learning process. Through the talk of the lecturer, students are able to understand the material. It can be assumed that the lecturer holds main role in the success of teaching and learning process. They talk to make the whole learning successful, starting from opening the class, delivering teaching material, asking questions and managing behaviors in the classroom. Andersen (1986) defines communication is a process that occur whenever one person stimulates meaning in the mind of a receiver or change the behavior of receiver. They communicate to express their ideas, needs, thought, feelings, and knowledge.

The interaction that occurs between lecturer and students and among the students in classroom interaction becomes the most significant part in teaching and learning process. When they are communicate they use code-crossing. Interaction in classroom context is a medium for a student to learn how to use a code. The

interaction that occurs between lecturer-students and among the students in classroom interaction becomes the most significant part in teaching and learning process. In case of classroom interaction, the interaction between lecturer and students is more dominant. Lecturer is talking actively.

The address term that should be used in classroom interaction is high code language expression. In other words, the situation when the students speak which is classroom interaction indicates politeness situation so that the language should be adjust to the situation. It means that the students should be used high code expression. In fact, sometimes students do not understand about using low and high code language in classroom interaction. As Brown and Gilman (1960) said that the use of address terms is driven by two meanings (semantics), called power and solidarity. The meaning of semantic power pronoun like power relations, non-reciprocal. A person has power over others at his level can control the behavior of others. This relationship is non-reciprocal because the two people cannot have mutual power over others in the same area .

In the same way, the meaning of power bring the use of two non-reciprocal address terms. People whose lower queries say V (vous) - in Bugis *kita* 'You' – to the person who has the power and he receives the greeting T (tu) - in Bugis *kamu* 'you'. In order to find the use of code-crossing, the first thing that should be determined is indicators of code-crossing phenomena. Based on those issues, the researcher is interested to conduct research about the indicators of code-crossing phenomena in EFL classroom interaction.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

In this study, the researcher employed discourse analysis as an approach that was appropriate with the purpose of this research in order to get the description about the indicators of code crossing phenomena in classroom, the factor influencing the use of code crossing in classroom and students perception on the use of code crossing in classroom interaction. This research, qualitative design was applied. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), qualitative research involves an interpretive and naturalistic method. Qualitative researchers concern on analyzing natural setting, interpreted them in terms to seek the meaning people bring to them.

The subjects of this research were two lecturers and fifty five students from two classes in postgraduate program specifically English education department of State University of Makassar academic year 2018/2019. To get the data the researcher use two instruments; audio recording and interview in the classroom interaction context. The duration o recording was about 60 minutes each meeting. The numbers of students were five students as the subjects in interview section.

In analyzing the data, the researcher use Miles and Huberman (2014) interactive models. Those are; transcribing, analyzing, categorizing or classifying and interpreting data.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A research entitled “Hierarchical Politeness in Javanese” conducted by Wajdi (2009) found that Javanese is well known for its speech levels called *ngoko* and *krama* which enable its speakers to show intimacy, deference, and hierarchy among the society members. This research applied Brown and Gilman (1960)’s theory of terms of address to analyze the asymmetrical, factors which influence, and politeness of the use of speech levels in Javanese. The use of speech levels shows asymmetric communication where two speakers use two different codes, i.e. *ngoko* and *krama* because of power (+P) and with/without distance (+/-D), and it is the reflection of hierarchical politeness. The finding of the research shows that the use of *ngoko* and *krama* could present the phenomena of code-switching, code-mixing, and the fundamental phenomenon is ‘code-crossing’. It is concluded that hierarchical politeness in Javanese is ‘social contract’ i.e. the acknowledgment of the existence of high class (superior) and low class (inferior) implemented in ‘communications contract’ using speech levels of the Javanese language in line with status scale. Asymmetrical use of *ngoko* and *krama* indexed inequality, hierarchy, and harmony.

Code-Crossing

Asymmetrical communication in stratified society and using language stratification, seen from the use of the code, is called code-crossing. When two unequal participants: superior-inferior, senior-junior, boss-employee, lecturer-student have to communicate to each other using language code, i.e. superior uses *ngoko* and inferior employs *krama* is called code-crossing. If it is contrasted, the use of term of address *kowe* ‘you’ by an elder sister (brother) and *sampeyan* ‘you’ by a younger sister (brother) as seen in Wajdi’s research, it is best called “code-crossing” (Wajdi, 2009). The phenomenon of code-crossing is not merely communication strategy, but it is a kind of “social contract”, i.e. an acknowledgment of the existence of low and high class which is implemented in communication contract using their own language stratification. As it is normally a contract, there is right and obligation which have been agreed by the participants. Social contract that has been made: superior (e.g. elder sister/brother, father) uses low term of address *kowe* ‘tu’ and inferior (younger sister/brother, children) employs *sampeyan* or *panjenengan* ‘vous’. The use of term of address *kowe* ‘you’ and *sampeyan* by two participants shows “crossing” phenomenon; that is why it is called “code- crossing”. The use of T vs. V by two participants also presents “crossing” phenomenon that is why it is called “code-crossing”.

FINDINGS

The indicators of code crossing phenomena in EFL classroom interaction were found through the lecturer and students expression on the use of code crossing were identified by their utterances in classroom. This study applied Wajdi (2009)'s theory of code crossing where the speech levels shows *ngoko* (low code) and *krama* (high code). The indicators show the use of low and high code by the lecturer and students in classroom by some extracts. Therefore, the researcher found that the most dominant indicator that lecturer and students use is address term and emphasize the important point.

Extract 1: Address Term

- T : Ok the class, say out this word, oh because of you find in a craps. How do you read this word?
- Ss : jinuen
- T : sorry?
- Ss : genun
- T : sorry
- Ss : genin
- T : sorry?
- Ss : **geniin mam**
- T : Sorry?
- Ss : @@ geniinn
- T : Not genin but genuine ya! You may go with American and I go with British.

Based on extract 1 above, it shows the phenomena that the student uses code crossing in the classroom interaction by saying "**geniin mam**". In this case, the lecturer asked the students to say the pronunciation of the word 'genuine' then the students said '**geniin mam**'. The students used high code to the lecturer by the word **mam**'. The word 'mam' as the high code in code crossing and show the identity.

Extract 2: Emphasize the Important Point

- T : Emm... I'd like to see you three weeks or two weeks?
- SS : Two weeks
- T : Two weeks?
- SS : Yes mam
- T : **Ok two weeks**. Ee last two weeks I got sick and last week I was some way in malang and surabaya and... next week Insyaallah I'm living again (smiling)

Based on extract 2 above, it shows that the lecturer was using code crossing in classroom interaction by saying '**Ok two weeks**'. The word '**Ok**' here indicated as the

low code. Here the other ways to show the use of code crossing to emphasize the important point is by stressing or repeating the important one.

Extract 3: Local Language

- T : *Oh god mallakudeh, dualagi.*
(Oh god I'm afraid. There are two)
- Ss : @@
- S : *Iye mam,* disinisarangnya mam
(Yes mam, Here the nest mam)
- T : Berarti adaa sesuatu disini.

Based on extract 3 above, it shows that the student used high code when the lecturer used her local language in teaching process to created an enjoyable or relax circumstance. It can be seen when the lecturer used Buginese in her utterance by saying '*Oh god mallakudeh, dualagi*' and all of the student laughed when they heard it because the students understood their lecture's utterance. The use of code crossing to change of attitude relationship was showed by using high code by saying '*iye mam, disinisarangnya mam*'. The word '*iye*' in buginese show politeness.

Extract 4: Checking for Students Understanding

- T : *Nomor hp mu berapa digitkah?*
(How many digit your phone number?)
- S : Twelve mam
- T : Twelve. Nomor yang dulu 9.
(The old number was nine)

Based on extract 4 above, it shows the lecturer used code crossing in classroom. The lecturer employed code crossing when she said "*nomor hp mu berapadigitkah?*". The use of code crossing here is checking for students' understanding. In this situation, the lecturer uses low code when asked to the students with the word '**mu**'. The word 'mu' shows that the lecturer has high status.

Extract 5: Self Correction

- S : A branch of...
- T : In Australia school, school kids raise hand I'm sir, angkat tanganmu.
- S : I'm sir
- T : Yes
- S : *A branch of psychology that ee people learn*
- T : Concern how?
- S : *Concern how human learn sir.*

Based on extract 5 above, it shows that the students used high code to do self correction when she realize that she was wrong by saying '*a branch of psychology*

that ee people learn' and changed her answer when she realize that the lecturer was giving clue by saying '**concern how human learn sir**'.It can be seen by the word '**sir**' that indicated as high code to the lecturer. Self correction here when she know that she has answered and wish to correct it by clue. When self correction occurs, a lecturer is usually producing a sentence and when he realize that a mistake has occurred in his sentence, he corrected it by inserting a L1 word and then continuing in the TL, but now with a more correct answer.

Extract 6: Reinforce a Request

S : A branch of...
T : **In Australia school, school kids Raise hand " I'm sir", angkattanganmu!**
S : I'm sir.
T : Yes.
S : A branch of psychology that ee people learn
T : Concern how?
S : Concern how human learn sir.

Based on extract 6 above, it shows the lecturer used low code to reinforce a request used by the student. In this case, the lecturer used low code to make instruction comprehensible for the students by saying '**raise hand "I'm sir", angkattanganmu**'. Thus, the student was expected to be able to understand the instruction better, and then she was also expected to be able do the instruction correctly.

Extract 7: Ease of Expression

T : Semua bisa menuliskan?
(Everybody can write?)
S : Yes.
T : Semua bisa menuliskan? **Hello!**
(Everybody can write? **Hello!**)
Ss : Bisa mem.
(Yes mam)

Based on extract 7 above, it can be seen that the lecturer employed low code in code crossing to the students by using the word '**hello**' after her Indonesian utterance. The lecturer wanted to asked the students whether everyone can write or not. The word '**hello**' was an English Interjection. It is used by the lecturer to get the students attention by expressing her tension.

Extract 8: Lapses

T :Ok metodenya apa, *tapi ini nanti yang dikurikulum sorry di material developmentmu you tidak perlu membuat yang seperti ini.*

(Ok what is the method, but in curriculum later sorry in your material development you did need to make like this)

Based on extract 8 above, it shows that the lecturer employed code crossing by saying '*tapi ini nanti yang dikurikulum sorry di material developmentmu you tidak perlu membuat yang seperti ini.*' She gave instruction in Indonesian but she inserted an English word '**sorry**' and '**you**' in her explanation. The reason the lecturer used an English word in this situation because she presumed that the student have been familiar with this word. Here code crossing is treated as lapses because the word '**you**' as low code in code crossing. Lapses are instances where the lecturer is speaking Indonesian but says a word or a couple of words in English. These English words can be spoken almost accidentally or not purely accidental but the lecturer partly knows she is using English. The lecturer in the present data have a few lapses during the classroom interaction.

DISCUSSION

The indicators in dyadic asymmetric communication by Brown and Gilman (1960) of the two different codes, low and high codes by two unequal speakers (lecturer and students) that appeared in classroom interaction. The phenomena of the use code crossing were employed by both lecturer and students. The lecturer and students code crossing expression emerged in some extract. In this sense, some extracts of lecturer's code crossing were expressed in low code form. The lecturer used those low code utterances to the students directly in order to make a clear and direct meaning in her instruction, and the meaning was unambiguous. The presence of lecturer can influence the use of the language of students because the lecturer is superior to the students. Susanto (2014) and Mahmud (2010) claims that the age and social status are two very important things in shaping the pattern of communication and strategies.

The indicators the use of low code in classroom interaction. The expression of students' utterances indicated as low code can be found in some extract. The expressions of unsympathetic, disinterested and derogatory remarks were identified as low code. *Duduk meko* (just sit down), *Kenapa saya mutanya ih* (*Why you ask me*) were expressions unsympathetic and disinterested. While word *alismuweh* (your eyebrow) was categorized as taboo and derogatory remarks. Those utterances identified as low code, because it has negative meaning and causing disharmony among students.

Next, the indicators of the use high code in classroom interaction. In English classroom interaction, the lecturer and students not only use English when interacting. The lecturer and students also use Indonesian and Buginese language

because of the students' vocabulary is limited, so the lecturer often combine all three languages to facilitate communication in the English language classroom. Not surprisingly, the lecturer and students in speaking low and high code also use English, Indonesian and Buginese language.

In brief, the researcher found that the lecturer students use low and high code in formal context. The setting of the interaction among students in this research refers to classroom interaction which is a formal context (Straker, 1980). High code is appropriate to be used in classroom interaction while low code is not appropriate to use in classroom interaction.

CONCLUSION

The use of code crossing in the classroom interaction is appropriate to use. In fact, sometime students used low code. The lecturer and students use two different codes, low and high codes. The lecturer-student have to communicate to each other by using language code where superior uses low code and inferior employs high code. It means, the use of term of address '*kamu*' (you) by the lecturer and '*anda*' (you) by the students is the use of code-crossing and known as a social contract. The use of low and high codes shows hierarchical politeness and functions as hierarchical markers, and inequality means.

The research findings show that in asymmetric dyadic communication, namely the first participant (lecturer) uses the vertically downhill low code to students and vice versa the second participant (students) uses upward vertical code to lecturer. This also happened among the students (senior-junior).

To make people understand and determined about code crossing, this research provide the indicators of code crossing phenomena used by the lecturer and students in classroom interaction. This research hopefully can help the reader to determined the use of code crossing then, it is useful as a reference to communicate either in low and high code based on the context.

REFERENCE

- Andersen, J. F. (1986). Instructor Nonverbal Communication: Listening to Our Silent Messages. In J. M. Civikly (Ed), *Communication in College Classroom: New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Fransiso: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960).The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In P. Giglioli (1972) (Ed), *Language and Social Context*, 252-282. Harmonsworth: Penguin.
- Denzin N. & Lincoln Y. (Eds.) (2000).*Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication Inc.
- Miles & Huberman. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: UI Press.

- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. California; SAGE publications Inc.
- Mahmud, Murni. 2010. *Politeness in Bugis: A Study in Linguistic Anthropology*. Vol. 1, Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Straker, D. (1980). Situational variables in language use. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1980(26), 101-122.
- Susanto, D. (2014). The Pragmatic Meanings of Address Terms *Sampeyan* and *Anda*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 140-155.
- Wajdi, M. 2009. "Alih Kode dan Silang Kode: Strategi Komunikasi dalam Bahasa Jawa", Dalam Sukyadi, Didi (Ed.). 2009. *Proceeding of the 2 nd International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2)*, UPI Bandung, 3—4 Augustus 2009. Bandung: CV Andira and UPI Press.
- Wajdi, M. 2010. "Code-crossing: Hierarchical Politeness in Javanese", *Proceeding of International Seminar on Austronesia Languages*. Denpasar: Udayana University Press.