

---

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Code Choices of English Language Teachers in Social Interactions at SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus

Riajeng Woro Megaswari<sup>1</sup> ✉ Djatmika<sup>2</sup> and Henry Yustanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Magister of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Riajeng Woro Megaswari, **E-mail:** [riajengmegaswari@gmail.com](mailto:riajengmegaswari@gmail.com)

---

| ABSTRACT

This study is a qualitative descriptive research that employs a sociolinguistic approach. This research aims to describe the code-switching patterns employed by English language teachers in social interactions at SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus. This school is located in Semarang regency, Central Java, Indonesia, which is part of the Javanese-speaking community. The data for this study consists of oral utterances made by English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus and their interlocutors during the process of code-choice, including single language use, code-switching, and code-mixing. The researcher employed various methods and techniques for data collection: 1) observation method using basic techniques such as tapping and advanced techniques including recording and note-taking; 2) interview method using in-depth interview techniques; 3) document method with documentation study techniques. Data analysis was conducted through the equivalent method. Data validity was ensured through triangulation techniques, including source triangulation, method triangulation, and expert judgment. The social interactions carried out by the English language teachers of SMK N 1 Pringapus involve the usage of code choice, including single-language variations, code-switching, and code-mixing. The patterns of code-choice are examined based on domains (work and friendship), situations (formal and informal), the age of the interlocutor (younger, same age, and older), and the interlocutor's position (lower, equal, and higher). Additionally, the roles and functions of the emerging languages used are also identified.

| KEYWORDS

Code-choice, code-mixing, English teacher, school environment

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

**ACCEPTED:** 01 September 2023

**PUBLISHED:** 10 September 2023

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.9.3

---

### 1. Introduction

In contemporary communication activities, language users often employ multiple languages interchangeably or simultaneously, which is often referred to as bilingualism. Chaer and Agustina (2010: 84) define bilingualism as the ability of language users to utilize two languages alternately or concurrently to communicate with their interlocutors. Those who possess bilingualism are referred to as bilingual speakers. With their bilingual proficiency, language users often make choices in terms of language or code selection, encompassing single language usage, code-switching, and code-mixing. According to Saville-Troike (2003), as cited in Muhid (2011: 88), the diverse linguistic landscape of Indonesia, characterized by language diversity, variations, and dialects, results in a communication style that extends beyond just a single code or language. Different communities choose and use languages or codes according to contextual strategies. Fasold (1984), as cited in Wardhani, Mulyani, and Rokhman (2018), explains that the phenomenon of code choice is a situation in which speakers must choose a language to communicate with their interlocutors for specific purposes, intentions, or reasons. Sumarsono and Partana (2004) distinguish three categories of language choice: the first is single language choice (intra-language variation), where speakers use only one variation of the same language. Then, there is code-switching, where speakers switch from one language code to another, and lastly, code-mixing, which refers to the phenomenon of mixing several languages within the main language. Suwito (as cited in Rahardi, 2010: 23–24) defines code-

switching as the conscious or deliberate switching from one language code to another or from one language variant to another (with specific reasons or goals). On the other hand, code-mixing occurs when speakers do not have specific intentions, and it happens naturally based on the speaker's habitual use of multiple languages. These selections of code are closely tied to social situations, such as age, educational level, and societal status. The influence of these social and situational factors gives rise to various code choices made by language users. Consequently, these factors contribute to the emergence of different code variations. Mutmainnah (2008) states that participants, situations, discourse content, and interaction functions are factors underlying language code choices. Cultural norms, habits, traditions, and communication tools play pivotal roles within a culture. Suandi (2014: 8), in his book, notes that language functions as a tool for social interaction within a community, necessitating language behavior that respects the sociocultural aspects of the local culture by adhering to cultural norms. Social and cultural aspects require considering factors like age, social status, situation, familiarity, gender, tone of speech, etc.

The discussion related to bilingual speakers within the speech community is inseparable from the use of various variations of a language side by side, each of which has its own roles and functions; this is commonly referred to as diglossia. A diglossic society has two variations of a language, namely the high dialect or high register (H) and the low dialect or low register (L). The high register (H) variation is typically used only in formal situations and is considered prestigious, superior, esteemed (more educated), a logical language, and is typically associated with literary traditions. In terms of acquisition, the high register is usually learned through formal education. On the other hand, the low register (L) is used in informal and relaxed situations, considered less prestigious, and some even reject its existence; it is typically acquired through daily interactions. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2010: 1) explain that the Javanese society, with its social hierarchy, gives rise to "*undha-usuk*" or levels of speech in the Javanese language, widely known and still used today, consisting of three levels: *ngoko*, *madya*, and *krama*. These levels of speech, or *undha-usuk*, are language variations that differentiate each level based on the speaker's politeness towards their interlocutor to show differences in respect. Another important aspect when speakers communicate with their interlocutors is the frequent consideration of the social relationship between them, reflected in power dynamics and solidarity. This aims to express the speaker's role and create a representation of oneself in relation to the interlocutor. Brown and Gilman (1960) analyzed honorific pronouns and found connections between pronoun usage and the objective relationship of the participants. In every conversation that occurs between participants, one of them is considered to have the power to control the discourse or behavior of other speakers. Thus, power can be said to indicate an asymmetrical relationship among the participants, where one of the speakers is considered subordinate or a minority, while another is superior or a majority. Furthermore, solidarity indicates a symmetrical relationship in which there is a social similarity among the participants. Social similarity influenced by solidarity can create interactions filled with an atmosphere of familiarity, usually characterized by the use of just first names or personal names.

Previous research in language code choices varied in focus from this study. For instance, Tuah, Shin, Gedat, and Mis (2021) described language choices among the Kedayan ethnic community in Bekenu Sarawak and analyzed the survival of the Kedayan language in minority ethnic communication. Jumaida and Rokhman (2020) analyzed language choices among Indonesian language and literature students at Universitas Negeri Semarang and the factors influencing these choices. Amaliani, Triana, and Riyanto (2020) investigated code-switching and code-mixing during learning processes in Pertiwi Longkeyang Preschool, Bodeh, Pemalang, and their implications on language learning at the high-school level. Julia, Rijal, and Purwanti (2020) described code-mixing and interference among students of the Faculty of Cultural Sciences at Mulawarman University, along with the factors causing these phenomena. Handayani (2019) analyzed code-switching and interference during teachers' discourse in the Ibnu Qoyyim Putri Yogyakarta Islamic boarding school, identifying strategies to minimize them in Arabic language learning. Maszein, Suwandi, and Sumarwati (2019) analyzed code-switching and code-mixing among teachers and students during Indonesian language learning at SMA Negeri 7 Surakarta. Nurlianiati, Hadi, and Meikayanti (2019) studied code-mixing and code-switching in Bayu Skak's YouTube videos.

After reviewing the explanation of the focus of analysis in previous studies, a novelty can be found in this research. In previous studies, the focus of the analysis is related only to the forms of code or language choice (single language, code-switching, and code-mixing) and the factors influencing the occurrence of these code choices. We have not found a study that also analyzes the patterns of code selection by respondents. Therefore, this paper will present the research findings regarding the case of code selection patterns used by English language teachers in social interactions at SMK N 1 Pringapus. In the analysis of code selection patterns conducted by English language teachers in social interactions during their work at SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus, the analysis is carried out within the domains of work, friendship, formal and informal situations, and is observed based on the age of the interlocutor (younger, same age, older) and based on the position of the interlocutor (lower, equal, higher). In the analysis of code selection patterns in this study, we discovered the roles and functions of the languages used by respondents, which serves as the novelty aspect in the discussion of code choice in this research.

This research was conducted in SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus (Pringapus State Vocational High School 1), which is situated at Harjuna Raya Street, Pringapus sub-district, Semarang regency, Central Java. In this location, the code variations used by the participants

(members of the SMK N 1 Pringapus school community) for social interactions within the workplace can be described as diverse and rich. This is due to the influence of the participants' bilingual abilities and other backgrounds, such as social status based on positions and ages, that are usually observed in the work environment. Several of the previously mentioned background influences are likely to significantly impact the code choices used by the English language teachers at SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus. Another reason is the frequent occurrence of phenomena related to code choice, code-switching, and code-mixing, particularly among the English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus. The respondents in this study are English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus with diverse linguistic, age, and position backgrounds. Based on the language usage backgrounds of the English language teachers, their usage is more varied compared to other interlocutors who are not English teachers, as non-English teachers only use two languages, the first being the regional language and Indonesian as the second language. The respondents in this study (the English teachers) often incorporate the use of a third language, namely English, in addition to using Javanese and Indonesian.

An initial assumption is that when making code choices, the respondents also need to consider politeness and manners when communicating with their interlocutors. As English language teachers at SMK Negeri 1 Pringapus are situated within the Javanese society, the language selection should also consider the social-cultural aspects and norms prevailing in the Javanese society to foster mutual respect among participants. Moreover, the respondents should also pay attention to the nature of the language prevailing in the speech community, which is a diglossic society when speech occurs, such as the usage of *undhak-usuk* in Javanese. In the book by Suandi (2014: 27–28), it is mentioned that Indonesian society positions the Indonesian language as the official language, regional languages function as communication tools within regions to build familiarity, and foreign languages serve as international communication languages. Considering the previously explained reasons, this will generate data related to the code choices made by English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus during communication with their interlocutors, which, according to the researcher, is worthy of further research analysis. Additionally, the researcher notes the accessibility and potential for direct observation at the location, facilitating effective timing and distance for conducting the research.

## **2. Methodology**

This study is qualitative descriptive research using a sociolinguistic approach, analyzing the original data progressively and examining each part separately. The primary data source in this research consists of oral speech events that occur between English language teachers (respondents) and their interlocutors during social interactions at SMK N 1 Pringapus. The primary data of this study includes the spoken language from English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus, encompassing instances of single-language choices, code-switching, and code-mixing during their social interactions within the school environment. The secondary data sources for this study are the respondents and documents. The secondary data consists of supportive information derived from documents and interview outcomes with the respondents.

The data collection methods employed in this research encompass observation, interviews, and document analysis. The observation method includes basic techniques such as passive observation or tapping, while advanced techniques involve recording and note-taking. The research employs an in-depth interview technique for conducting interviews, and for document analysis, the study employs documentation study techniques. The validation of the research data is ensured through triangulation techniques involving source triangulation, method triangulation, and expert judgment. The analysis of the data in this study is conducted using the method of correlation or correspondence analysis.

## **3. Results and Discussions**

### **3.1 Results**

In the pattern of code selection in this research, the use of language by the English language teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus was identified when making language choices based on domains (work and friendship), situations (formal and informal), age of the interlocutor (younger, same age, older), and position of the interlocutor (lower, equal, higher). Additionally, the researcher also discovered the functions and roles of the languages that emerged.

Table 1: The usage of languages within the code-choice process

Language	As the Main Language / Not as the Main Language	Work Domain		Friendship Domain		Σ	%	Age of Interlocutor			Position/rank of Interlocutor			
		Formal	Informal	Formal	Informal			Younger	Same age	Older	Lower	Equal	Higher	
Javanese	Krama	Main Language	1	-	-	2	3	1.6%	-	-	3	-	3	-
		Not Main Language	6	-	1	9	16		8	4	10	7	8	1
	<b>Instances</b>		7	-	1	11	19	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	
	Madya	Main Language	3	-	-	8	11	4.0%	2	-	9	1	9	-
		Not Main Language	30	-	1	6	37		27	5	28	22	25	9
	<b>Instances</b>		33	-	1	14	48	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>9</b>	
	Ngoko	Main Language	11	16	-	102	129	28.4%	102	1	33	14	64	33
Not Main Language		73	43	3	96	215	162		9	101	64	131	84	
<b>Instances</b>		84	59	3	198	344	<b>264</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>117</b>		
Indonesian	Formal Variation	Main Language	10	-	-	-	10	0.9%	9	6	9	8	3	1
		Not Main Language	1	-	-	-	1		1	1	1	1	-	-
	<b>Instances</b>		11	-	-	-	11	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	
	Casual Variation	Main Language	191	100	11	136	438	46.0%	345	49	203	216	231	136
		Not Main Language	19	16	3	80	118		81	5	39	22	92	25
<b>Instances</b>		210	116	14	216	556	<b>426</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>161</b>		
English	Main Language	7	2	3	1	13	17.0%	8	5	3	11	3	2	
	Not Main Language	90	54	6	43	193		160	35	73	125	106	45	
<b>Instances</b>		97	56	9	44	206	<b>168</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>47</b>		
Arabic	Main Language	4	1	2	1	8	1.7%	4	2	6	4	3	1	
	Not Main Language	5	-	2	6	13		13	4	7	4	11	3	
<b>Instances</b>		9	1	4	7	21	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>		
Latin	Main Language	-	-	-	-	-	0.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Not Main Language	-	-	-	5	5		5	-	-	-	-	5	
<b>Instances</b>		-	-	-	5	5	<b>5</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Σ</b>						<b>1210</b>	<b>100%</b>							

As seen from the table above, it is evident that several languages are used by the English teachers of SMK N 1 Pringapus, and their patterns of usage vary, including primary languages, transitional languages, or languages mixed with other primary languages.

Among the eight languages used by the English teachers of SMK N 1 Pringapus are Javanese: *krama*, *madya*, *ngoko*; Indonesian: formal/business style, casual style; Foreign languages: English, Arabic, and Latin.

- a) Indonesian – casual variation is the most frequently used language by the respondents, both as a primary language and as a mixed or transitional language with different primary languages. This is evident from its high usage percentage of 46.0%. Casual Indonesian is more commonly used as a primary language (438 instances) compared to being used as a language that transitions or mixes with primary languages other than casual Indonesian (118 instances).
- b) Javanese – *ngoko* variation is the second most frequently used language by the respondents, both as a primary language and as a mixed or transitional language with different primary languages. Its usage percentage is 28.4%. *Ngoko* Javanese is predominantly used as a language that transitions or mixes with primary languages other than *ngoko* Javanese (215 instances), compared to being used as a primary language (129 instances).
- c) English emerges as the predominant foreign language chosen by the respondents, serving as both a primary language and a mixed or transitional language alongside different primary languages. The dominance of English stands at a significant 17.0% in usage. It is predominantly employed for transitioning or blending with primary languages other than English (193 instances), in contrast to its use as a primary language (13 instances).
- d) Javanese – *madya* variation is employed by the respondents both as a primary language and as a mixed or transitional language with different primary languages. The percentage of its usage is 4.0%. *Madya* Javanese is predominantly utilized as a language that blends or transitions into primary languages other than *madya* Javanese (37 instances), compared to its use as a primary language (11 instances).
- e) Arabic is employed by the respondents both as a primary language and as a mixed or transitional language with different primary languages. The percentage of its usage is 1.7%. Arabic is primarily used as a language that transitions or mixes with primary languages other than Arabic (13 instances), compared to being used as a primary language (8 instances).
- f) Javanese – *krama* variation becomes the sixth most frequently used language, both as a primary language or as a transitional language with a different primary language, with a percentage of 1.6%. It is observed that *krama* Javanese is more commonly employed by the respondents as a language transitioning to primary languages other than *krama* Javanese (16 instances), compared to being used as a primary language (3 instances).
- g) Indonesian – formal variation is rarely used by the respondents, both as a primary language and as a transitional language with a different primary language. This is evident from the relatively small percentage of its usage, which is 0.9%. The formal variety of Indonesian is used more frequently as a primary language (10 instances) compared to being used as a language transitioning to primary languages other than the formal variety of Indonesian language (1 instance).
- h) Latin is very rarely used by the respondents, both as a transitional language with a different primary language, with a percentage of only 0.4%. Latin is never used as a primary language. It is found that the Latin language is used solely as a language transitioning to primary languages other than Latin.

In the code-switching patterns exhibited by the respondents using these eight languages, there is a pattern of their usage as primary languages (based on domains, situations, age of interlocutors, and positions of interlocutors).

a) Language Use Based on Domain

In the domain of work, discussions typically revolve around work-related topics, often accompanied by serious and formal discourse situations. During conversations between participants, who still consider their respective roles and positions, respondents demonstrate their choice of using vocabulary from languages that are formal or official in nature. In the work domain, respondents use several languages as primary languages, namely: *krama* Javanese (1 instance), *madya* Javanese (3 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (26 instances), formal Indonesian (10 instances), informal Indonesian (291 instances), English (9 instances), and Arabic (5 instances). Respondents predominantly employ informal Indonesian (Arum, Farida, Zulfa) and *ngoko* Javanese (Samsul, Mansur) as their primary languages in their discourse within the work domain. The most frequent language choice patterns in the work domain with informal Indonesian as the primary code are as follows: switching to *madya* Javanese, switching to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, switching to English, and mixing with English. The most common language choice pattern in the work domain with *ngoko* Javanese as the primary code is mixing with informal Indonesian.

Conversely, in the domain of friendship, the topics discussed in conversations outside of work are generally light and casual. Therefore, the relationship between participants positions them as friends with equal social status without the need to emphasize formality. Discourse in this domain tends to be relaxed and informal. In the domain of friendship,

respondents use several languages as their primary means of communication, including *krama* Javanese (2 instances), *madya* Javanese (8 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (102 instances), informal Indonesian (147 instances), English (4 instances), and Arabic (3 instances). Among these, respondents primarily favor the use of informal Indonesian (Arum, Samsul, Farida, Mansur) and *ngoko* Javanese (Zulfa) as the main languages in their conversations within the domain of friendship. The most common language choices observed in the domain of friendship with the primary code of informal Indonesian include switching to *krama* Javanese, transitioning to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, and mixing with English. Similarly, in the domain of friendship with the primary code of *ngoko* Javanese, the most common language choices include switching to English and mixing with informal Indonesian.

b) Language Use Based on Situation

Conversations in formal situations within this study tend to be more formal and official compared to informal situations, although not overly rigid, as there is still significant use of *ngoko* Javanese within the more formal languages. In formal situations, respondents primarily use several languages as their means of communication, including *krama* Javanese (1 instance), *madya* Javanese (3 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (11 instances), formal Indonesian (10 instances), informal Indonesian (202 instances), English (10 instances), and Arabic (6 instances). However, among these five respondents, informal Indonesian is predominantly favored as the primary language in their discourse during formal situations. The most frequent language choices observed in formal situations with the primary code of informal Indonesian include switching to *krama* Javanese, transitioning to *madya* Javanese, transitioning to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, and mixing with English.

Conversations in informal situations within this study tend to be more relaxed compared to formal situations. In informal situations, respondents primarily use several languages as their means of communication, including *krama* Javanese (2 instances), *madya* Javanese (8 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (118 instances), informal Indonesian (236 instances), English (3 instances), and Arabic (2 instances). However, among the five respondents, informal Indonesian is predominantly favored as the primary language in their discourse during informal situations. Respondent Zulfa, in addition to using informal Indonesian, also uses *ngoko* Javanese as the primary language with equal frequency. The most frequent language choices observed in informal situations with the primary code of informal Indonesian include switching to Javanese Ngoko, mixing with Javanese Ngoko, transitioning to English, and mixing with English. The most frequent language choice observed in informal situations with the primary code of Javanese Ngoko is transitioning to English.

c) Language Use Based on the Age of Interlocutor

When conversing with younger interlocutors, respondents use several languages as their primary language, including *madya* Javanese (2 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (102 instances), formal Indonesian (9 instances), informal Indonesian (345 instances), English (8 instances), and Arabic (4 instances). However, for respondents Arum, Samsul, Farida, and Zulfa, informal Indonesian is predominantly favored as the primary language in their discourse when interacting with younger interlocutors. Conversely, for the respondent, Mansur, *ngoko* Javanese is favored as the primary language in his discourse when interacting with younger interlocutors. The most frequent language choices observed when interacting with younger interlocutors with the primary code of informal Indonesian include switching to *madya* Javanese, switching to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, transitioning to English, and mixing with English. The most frequent language choices observed when interacting with younger interlocutors, with the primary code of *ngoko* Javanese, include switching to informal Indonesian mixing with informal Indonesian.

In interactions with same-age interlocutors, respondents use several languages as their primary language, namely *ngoko* Javanese (1 instance), formal Indonesian (6 instances), informal Indonesian (49 instances), English (5 instances), and Arabic (2 instances). However, respondents Arum and Farida predominantly use informal Indonesian as their primary language in their conversations with same-age interlocutors. For respondent Zulfa, they predominantly use *ngoko* Javanese as their primary language in their conversations with same-age interlocutors. The most common language choice that occur with same-age interlocutors with the primary code of *ngoko* Javanese is switching to informal Indonesian. The most common language choices that occur with same-age interlocutors with the primary code of informal Indonesian are switching to *madya* Javanese, mixing with English.

When conversing with older interlocutors, respondents use several languages as their primary language, namely *krama* Javanese (3 instances), *madya* Javanese (9 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (33 instances), formal Indonesian (9 instances), informal Indonesian (203 instances), English (3 instances), and Arabic (6 instances). However, all five respondents predominantly use informal Indonesian as their primary language in their conversations with older interlocutors. The most common language choices that occur with older interlocutors with the primary code of informal Indonesian are switching

to *krama* Javanese, switching to *madya* Javanese, switching to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, and mixing with English.

d) Language Use Based on Position/Rank of Interlocutor

When interacting with interlocutors of lower positions, respondents use several languages as their primary language, namely *madya* Javanese (1 instance), *ngoko* Javanese (14 instances), *formal* Indonesian (8 instances), informal Indonesian (216 instances), English (11 instances), and Arabic (4 instances). However, respondents Arum, Samsul, Farida, and Zulfa predominantly use informal Indonesian as their primary language in their conversations with interlocutors of lower positions. Respondent Mansur predominantly uses *ngoko* Javanese as his primary language in his conversations with interlocutors of lower positions. The most common language choices that occur with interlocutors of lower positions with the primary code of informal Indonesian are switching to *madya* Javanese, switching to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, switching to English, mixing with English. The most common language choice that occurs with interlocutors of lower positions with the primary code of *ngoko* Javanese is switching to informal Indonesian.

When interacting with interlocutors of equivalent positions, respondents use several languages as their primary language, namely: *krama* Javanese (3 instances), *madya* Javanese (9 instances), *ngoko* Javanese (64 instances), formal Indonesian (3 instances), informal Indonesian (231 instances), English (3 instances), and Arabic (3 instances). Respondents predominantly use informal Indonesian as their primary language in conversations with interlocutors of equivalent positions. The most common language choices that occur with interlocutors of equivalent positions with the primary code of informal Indonesian are switching to *madya* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, and mixing with English.

When interacting with interlocutors of higher positions, respondents use several languages as their primary language, namely *ngoko* Javanese (33 instances), formal Indonesian (1 instance), informal Indonesian (136 instances), English (2 instances), and Arabic (2 instances). However, all respondents predominantly use informal Indonesian as their primary language in conversations with interlocutors of higher positions. The most common language choices that occur with interlocutors of higher positions with the primary code of informal Indonesian are switching to *ngoko* Javanese, mixing with *ngoko* Javanese, and mixing with English.

### **3.2 Discussion**

Respondents tend to pay more attention to the situation, nature, and function of the language when choosing their code during speech. They do not focus much on the age and position of their conversation partners, as they consistently show respect towards them. This is particularly evident when addressing their conversation partners using honorific pronouns from languages with higher levels of politeness or refinement. However, when communicating with their interlocutors, respondents often take into account the social relationship between them, as reflected in power dynamics and solidarity. The researcher found two forms of power and solidarity observed among respondents: 1) Superiority and Non-Solidarity, and 2) Superiority and Solidarity.

Respondents use conversation patterns with the form of "Superiority and Non-Solidarity" when their interlocutors are students of SMK N 1 Pringapus. Respondents, as educators (English teachers), consistently receive greetings using pronouns like "*bapak*" (sir) or "*ibu*" (ma'am) from their student conversation partners in the same school. Meanwhile, when addressing their students, respondents frequently use pronouns commonly used in Javanese speech like "*cah ayu*" (girl), "*le*" (boy), or a short name like "San" (for Sandi), and the pronoun "*kamu*" (you). This implies that the relationship between these speakers positions them in their respective roles as teacher and student, indicating a relationship of superiority without evident closeness (Non-Solidarity).

Furthermore, respondents utilize the form of "Superiority and Solidarity" when interacting with fellow colleagues who are also teachers and staff at SMK N 1 Pringapus. For English teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus, respondents consistently receive greetings using pronouns "*bapak*," "*ibu*," and the polite versions of "you" in Javanese, such as "*panjenengan*," "*njenengan*," "*sampeyan*," from their colleagues. Similarly, when addressing their colleagues, respondents more often use the pronouns "*bapak*," "*ibu*," and the polite versions of "you" in Javanese, such as "*panjenengan*," "*njenengan*," "*sampeyan*." Occasionally, respondents are also found to address their colleagues using pronouns like "*mas*" (brother, older), "*mbak*" (sister), "*dek*" (sibling, younger), their colleagues' names such as "Ali," and the pronoun "*kamu*" (you). This indicates that the relationship between the two speakers (respondents and fellow teachers or staff) is defined by their respective positions and ages, showing a relationship of superiority (Superiority). To observe the familiarity between respondents and their conversation partners, one can examine their communication style. It is not uncommon to find that despite differences in age and hierarchical positions, both speakers are not concerned when using the informal *ngoko* Javanese, demonstrating a sense of camaraderie (Solidarity).

Based on data analysis, it is known that for each language variation used by the English teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus, there are specific roles and functions. The use of regional languages by respondents in this study is primarily for communicating with

interlocutors who share the same regional language (Javanese). This is because respondents aim to signify solidarity through the use of the same regional language (Javanese) to foster familiarity with their conversation partners. *Krama* Javanese (polite/formal Javanese) and *madya* Jawa (moderate) are regarded as formal languages by respondents due to their high level of politeness. Consequently, most respondents use them to refine or formalize speech, with the intention of showing respect to their conversation partners. Additionally, there's *ngoko* Javanese (casual), which serves as a low-level, informal, and casual language.

Furthermore, respondents perceive Indonesian as a higher-politeness language compared to local languages. The researcher concludes that most respondents prefer to use Indonesian to avoid misunderstandings caused by the limited proficiency in Javanese politeness levels (*undhak-usuk*). Formal Indonesian is characterized as a high, formal, and official language. Respondents only use it in discussions during work meetings that are mainly focused on achieving some outcome (result oriented). Informal Indonesian, on the other hand, is flexible as it can be both formal and informal, allowing it to be used in various situations. When formal Indonesian is used alongside informal Indonesian, the latter becomes a low-level language. However, when informal Indonesian is used alongside *ngoko* Javanese (informal Javanese), it takes on a high-level language role.

Foreign languages used by respondents include English, Arabic, and Latin. All three foreign languages are considered high-politeness languages by the respondents. English terms and phrases are frequently integrated into speech patterns, as evident from the prevalence of code-mixing compared to code-switching. Respondents naturally use English terms like conjunctions, responses, agreements, and other popular vocabulary. Outside of educational contexts, English is rarely employed, except for the occasional, inadvertent use of familiar terms, as mentioned earlier. One reason cited during interviews is that most of the respondents' colleagues at SMK N 1 Pringapus have limited English proficiency. Hence, Javanese and Indonesian are more commonly used. However, sometimes, the respondents will use English when communicating with interlocutors who understand English or to respond to them. When using Arabic and Latin, respondents only know a few vocabulary words that are commonly used or popular. Latin is used by respondents, but it is the least frequently used language. The use of Latin, for example, is limited to mentioning the names of ornamental plants, while the use of Arabic is usually a way to indicate religiosity.

#### 4. Conclusion

When selecting a language code, respondents pay closer attention to the situation, nature, and function of the language. When communicating with their conversation partners, respondents often take into account the social relationship between them, which is reflected in power dynamics and solidarity. In this study, respondents predominantly use conversational sentences in the form of "Superiority" (dominant) and "Solidaritas" (solidarity) in social interactions within the working environment of SMK N 1 Pringapus. Respondents use conversational sentences in the form of "Unggul" and "Bukan Solidaritas" (non-solidarity) when their conversation partners are students, whereas they use sentences in the form of "Unggul" and "Solidaritas" when their conversation partners are fellow colleagues, teachers, and employees who also work at SMK N 1 Pringapus.

In the work domain, respondents commonly opt for casual Indonesian as their main language, even in formal settings. For language use based on domain among friends, they prefer a language that feels more relaxed and informal, favoring casual Indonesian, along with a significant presence of *ngoko* Javanese as their main language. For language use based on situations, in formal situations, respondents most often choose a primary language that is formal. Casual Indonesian language is mostly selected as the primary language in this situation. In informal situations, respondents most frequently opt for a primary language that is more relaxed than in formal situations. However, it seems that respondents lean towards using casual Indonesian language more, even though the usage of *ngoko* Javanese as a primary language is also high. When conversing with interlocutors who are younger, the same age, or even older, respondents prefer casual Indonesian as the primary language. Similarly, when considering the position or relation of the interlocutor, whether lower, equal, or higher, respondents most frequently use casual Indonesian as the primary language.

From the languages that were used by the English language teachers of SMK N 1 Pringapus, their roles and functions were identified. *Krama* Javanese and *madya* Javanese are considered high register (H) due to their high level of politeness; respondents use them to soften or formalize discourse with the intention of showing respect to their interlocutors. Then there is *ngoko* Javanese, which is considered low register (L) and feels more unofficial and casual. Furthermore, the respondents view Indonesian as a more formal language (H) compared to the local Javanese language (L). Respondents use Indonesian to avoid selecting words with ambiguous meanings, as they are not very proficient in the different levels of politeness or *undha-usuk* in Javanese. Indonesian – formal/business variation is considered a high register (H) language, and respondents only use it in speech during work meetings that are productive and focus more on the outcomes. On the other hand, according to respondents, Indonesian – informal variation is more flexible as it can be used in both formal and casual settings, allowing its use in various situations. In situations where respondents use both formal Indonesian and casual Indonesian concurrently, the latter becomes the low register (L). However, when casual Indonesian is used in conjunction with *ngoko* Javanese, it assumes a high-register (H) role. Furthermore, according to the respondents, English, Arabic, and Latin are considered high-register languages seen as superior. Outside of learning situations,



respondents rarely use English, except for a few popular English words that are familiar or commonly used. Moreover, it's only used to respond to interlocutors who have previously used English. Respondents use Arabic and Latin languages only to the extent of knowing a few commonly used words or popular vocabulary. The use of Arabic by respondents signifies religiosity, while Latin is only employed to mention the names of ornamental plants.

This study only discusses the patterns of code switching (usage, roles, and functions of the languages used) conducted by English teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus. The researcher feels that there are still aspects not yet explored in this study, considering that the English teachers at SMK N 1 Pringapus often engage in code switching and code mixing, resulting in numerous instances of interference. Therefore, further research or similar studies are needed to delve into this code-switching topic. These studies could include discussions on language interference, phatic functions, or other discussions concerning the events during code selection. Furthermore, future researchers could examine the relationship between code-switching strategies and the perceptions of conversation partners to assess the effectiveness of communication that takes place.

**Acknowledgments:** A special thanks to my amazing lecturers, Prof. Dr Djatmika, M.A, and Dr Henry Yustanto, M.A., for helping and guiding me to conduct this research.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

## References

- [1] Amaliani, S., Triana, L., & Riyanto, A. (2020). Alih Kode dan Campur Kode pada Proses Belajar di TK Pertiwi Longkeyang dan Implikasinya. *Jurnal Skripta*, 6(2), 64–71.
- [2] Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. *In: Style Language*. Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Press, 253-276.
- [3] Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (2010). *Sociolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [4] Handayani, S. (2019). *Alih kode, campur kode, dan interferensi bahasa Arab pada peristiwa tutur guru di pondok pesantren Ibnul Qoyyim Putri Yogyakarta*. UIN Sunan Kalijaga.
- [5] Julia, A., Rijal, S., & Purwanti. (2020). Campur Kode dan Interferensi pada Percakapan Mahasiswa Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Mulawarman: Kajian Sociolinguistik. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 4(3), 315–330.
- [6] Jumaida, N., & Rokhman, F. (2020). Pilihan Bahasa Mahasiswa Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia di Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 9(3), 192–197.
- [7] Maszein, H., Suwandi, S., & Sumarwati. (2019). Alih Kode dan Campur Kode dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di SMA Negeri 7 Surakarta. *BASASTRA Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 7(2), 62–71.
- [8] Muhid, A. (2011). Tingkat Tutur Bahasa Jawa Masyarakat Samin Desa Klopoduwur Kabupaten Blora. *Majalah Ilmiah Informatika*, 2(1), 82–103.
- [9] Mutmainnah, Y. (2008). *Pemilihan Kode dalam Masyarakat Dwi Bahasa: Kajian Sociolinguistik pada Masyarakat Jawa di Kota Bontang Kalimantan Timur* (Universitas Diponegoro).
- [10] Nurlianiati, M. S., Hadi, P. K., & Meikayanti, E. A. (2019). Campur Kode dan Alih Kode dalam Video Youtube Bayu Skak. *Widyabastra*, 7(1), 1–8.
- [11] Rahardi, K. (2010). *Kajian Sociolinguistik Ihwal Kode dan Alih Kode*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [12] Suandi, I. N. (2014). *Sociolinguistik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- [13] Sumarsono, & Partana. (2004). *Sociolinguistik*. Jakarta: Sabda Pustaka Pelajar.
- [14] Tuah, D., Shin, C., Gedat, R., & Mis, M. A. (2021). Language Choices among the Kedayan Ethnic Minority in Bekenu, Sarawak: A preliminary study. *Gema: Journal of Language Studies*, 21(2), 177–194.
- [15] Wardhani, P., Mulyani, M., & Rokhman, F. (2018). Wujud Pilihan Bahasa dalam Ranah Keluarga pada Masyarakat Perumahan di Kota Purbalingga. *KREDO: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 1(2), 91–105.
- [16] Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (seventh). West Sussex: Wiley blackwell.