Code-Crossing in Indonesian EFL Classroom Interaction

Indrayani Simpuruh
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: cencenindrayani@gmail.com

Murni Mahmud
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: murnimahmud@unm.ac.id

Kisman Salija
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: kismansalija@unm.ac.id

Abdul Halim
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: abdulhalimmhum@yahoo.com

Abstract
The phenomena of language use in the class still become the object of study ever since the languages are essential aspects in classroom interaction. It cannot be denied that in the classroom interaction, the communicative styles of the lecturers and students will be influenced by many aspects. One of them is the social status differences which lead to the occurrence of code-crossing in the class. For that purpose, the study in this paper is directed to explore the occurrence of code-crossing in the class and the factors influencing it. This research applied a qualitative research design taking two English classes and their students at one university in Makassar as the subject. The data of this research were collected by employing classroom observation and audio recording. The data were analyzed descriptively by adopting Discourse Analysis approach which relies on data recording, data transcription, data selection, and data interpretation. The result of the research shows that the lecturers and the students employed code-crossing in EFL classroom interaction which can be seen from the use of low and high code. This study also found that the use of that high and low code in the form of code-crossing of the lecturers and the students is influenced by the power of social status, age differences, the social distance or familiarity, and intimacy between the lecturers and the students. Findings from this study are worthy of reading for English language teaching practitioners in their effort to create effective classroom interaction.

Keywords**:** Code-Crossing, Power, Social Distance, Familiarity, Intimacy, Classroom Interaction

Introduction

The use of language to communicate in a certain community still becomes the crucial areas of investigation, especially in the field of sociolinguistics and anthropolinguistics. Studies were directed to promote the effective strategies of communication in order to overcome the problems of communication (Lenhart, Ling, Campbell, & Purcell, 2010; Somsai & Intaraprasert, 2011; Aladdin, 2012; Hua, Nor, & Jaradat, 2012; Golob, Elving, Nielsen, Thomsen, Schultz, Podnar, & Colleoni, 2013; Floreddu, & Cabiddu, 2016; Mahmud, 2017; Pavón Vázquez, & Ramos Ordóñez, 2019).

Studies in these areas were also directed to explore the use of language by a particular community influenced by many different factors such as cultural values, the sociocultural context, language ideology, power relations, the politics of language, and some individual differences such as social status, motivation, attitude, age, intelligence, aptitude, cognitive style, and personality (Kim, 2003; Saville & Troike, 2003; & Haryono, 2011; 2018; Khasinah, 2014; Mashudi, Rahmat, Sanudin, Suliman, & Musanif, 2017). A study conducted by Mashudi, et. al. (2017), for example, show that interactions through the use of spoken language in formal settings and understanding the cultural background of participants contribute to the effectiveness of communicating in a social relationship. These studies show that the use of communication in a sociolinguistic perspective is worth exploring and can contribute to building effective communication strategies.

The area of teaching English is one area that will be affected by this issue. Lecturers and students who interact and communicate in class also need effective communication strategies to achieve a successful English teaching process. In today's society, there are many phenomena that affect the success of interaction in the classroom. One of them is the practice of power and dominance in relation to aspects of communication culture. A study by Milal (2011) shows that lecturers possessed power in dominantly in the class in the forms of the amount of speech, frequency of directive acts, initiative of interaction, control of topic, lecturer being questioner, use of closed questions, lecturer's use of modeled extraction, and lecturer's answering own questions. Another study was conducted by Abdullah and Hosseini (2012) in terms of power and dominance of lecturers in Iranian High School. It was found that the lecturers' domination was mainly manifested in asymmetrical distribution of talk time, turn-taking and elicitation strategies which were appropriated discursively (p. 388). A study by Hikmah (2019) confirms that language has power and dominating power especially in learning and therefore teachers use dominating power through language as a strategy to transfer the learning materials and to encourage students to understand the learning materials delivered through teaching and learning activities. These studies show that lecturer and student communication in the class will automatically be influenced by the strength and dominance of the lecturer and the cultural context of the class.

The above issues encourage the researchers to explore the emergence of cross-crossing in the classroom. The factors that influence the use of the language of speakers such as individual differences (differences in social status and differences in age) can also be found in the teacher and student interaction. Ahmed and Maros (2017) had discussed the problem of high code (high code) used by students to communicate with supervisors. The study conducted by Haryono (2018), also explained that the teacher-student relationship and the context of the conversation can create communication formalities.

Recent studies in term of code or language crossing had been conducted in many different contexts of communities (Dovchin, 2019; Makoni, 2019; Masters & Makoni, 2019; Sultana, 2019). Specific study on this area had been conducted by Wajdi (2009, 2011) and Wajdi, Laksana, Suastra, & Budiarsa, (2010) on Javanese society. However, there are still few studies about the phenomena of code crossing in the area of classroom interaction. Therefore, this

paper is directed to explore the occurrence of code-crossing in the class and to examine the influencing factors in the occurrence of that code-crossing. It is expected that from this study, lecturers and educators can get broader insights about the practice of power which may be asymmetrical in the classroom interaction. The findings from this study are expected to contribute to the innovation and creation of more enjoyment and reduction of oppression in the classroom interaction in a country like in Indonesia, whose students come from different languages, cultures, and sociological dimensions. It is expected that good understanding and application of this code-crossing phenomena can contribute to successful communication and interaction between the lecturers and students in the class

Review of literature

In defining code-crossing, the term "code" is worth exploring. Code is a term that refers to a variety. Poedjosoedarmo (1979) states that code can be defined as "a speech system and the application of language elements that have specific characteristics in line with the speaker's background, the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor and the situation". He also added that the code can be said not only as a language, but also as a variety of languages including dialects and styles. Code can be defined as a system used to communicate between two or more parties used at every opportunity. People are usually asked to choose a particular code every time they choose to speak, and they can also decide to switch from one code to another or to mix codes and choose codes, sometimes in very short speeches. This situation has the potential to create code-crossing.

The issue regarding code-crossing had been observed by some researchers. Rampton (1995) who has first observed that code-crossing is basically a strategy used by the speaker to navigate gaps in communication caused by differences in the speaker's conditions. Rampton (1995) states that language crossing involves "code alternation by people who are not accepted members of the group associated with the second language that they are using (code switching into varieties that are not generally thought to belong to them)". Rampton (1998) furthermore states that language crossing involves "a sense of movement across quite sharply felt social or ethnic boundaries, and it raises issues of legitimacy that participants need to reckon with in the course of their encounter". Rampton (2001) defined language crossing as "the use of language that is not normally though to belong to the speaker". In a recent study on language crossing, Rampton, Charalambous, & Charalambous (2019) show that the study of language crossing moves away from the scenes of multi-ethnic heteroglossia that have dominated the research, and turns instead to a different setting where the language has been introduced as part of a reconciliation initiative.

Other scholars had also investigated the mechanism of language crossing in different communities. Kamwangamalu. (2001), in his study in the new South Africa, found that the multilingual speakers use to construct, maintain, manage, or negotiate their social identities with a focus of on its language crossing and its derivatives, refusal, and passing. Pooley, & Mostefai-Hampshire (2012), in their study, investigated code-crossing and multilingualism among 13–14 year olds in three schools (five classes) in the northern French city of Lille while Chuchu and Noorashid (2015) linked the use of code-crossing as a neutral term from a language, dialect or even a register that is related to the wishes of the speaker in practicing certain codes in a communication situation. Banda (2019) linked the use of the rural languages and traditional music styles to the new ways of languaging and that music styles find connections with the transnational/global world of music.

In Indonesian context, a study of code-crossing in Javanese society had been conducted by Wajdi (2009; 2011. The phenomenon of cross-crossing is not just a communication strategy, but is a "social contract", namely the recognition of the existence of low and high classes implemented in contracts of communication using the stratification of their own language. Wajdi (2009) states that code-crossing, in a society with social stratification, is a social contract made and agreed by the members of society as an acknowledgment of the existence of two social groups or classes: superior and inferior. In asymmetrical communication, the participants use low and high code utterances to each other. Seen from the communication point of view, code-crossing could be stated as communication contract between superior (who has rights and obligation to use *low code*) and inferior (has rights and obligation to employ *high code*). It could be concluded that superior has to use low code *(ngoko)* and inferior has to employ high code (*karma)* every time they communicate to each other.

Research method

This study employed a descriptive-qualitative research design. Denzin and Lincoln state that qualitative research involves interpretive and naturalistic approaches (2000). In this study, the researchers described naturalistic settings as classroom interactions involving the teachers and students during the teaching and learning process. The data obtained were interpreted to answer the research questions.

This qualitative research was conducted at one university in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia in 2019. The subject of the research is two English lecturers and two classes of students of English Department. The two English lecturers were chosen because of their competence and working experience in teaching. In this study, the researchers observed two classes in which all of the students in these classes are also taught by both of the lecturers. To collect data, the researchers observed the teaching and learning process of the lecturers and students who use code-crossing in classroom interactions. Classroom observations were conducted six meetings and to aid the process of observation, a video recorder was employed and a field note was taken.

The collected videos from the teaching process were reviewed several times to assist in the analysis of the notes taken during the observation. The videos were also transcribed. To ensure the trustworthiness of the data analysis, both the lecturers and some of the students in both classrooms were consulted after the recording through unstructured interviews (informal conversations). The main purpose was to reconfirm the researcher's interpretation of the discursive strategies that they employed during the classroom interactions. The researchers discussed with the subject about the data that had been recorded from the video.

The transcribed data were then analyzed based on the framework of discourse analysis which relies on data recording, data transcription, data selection, and data interpretation. The classroom interactions were transcribed. The transcripts were next analyzed to describe, interpret, and explain the classroom processes adopting the three-dimensional framework of Fairclough (1992; 2001; 2003) which includes text analysis, discourse practice analysis, and social practice analysis. In text analysis, which is a description of the text's linguistic features, Fairclough (2003) adopts a relational approach to maintain that "textual analysis can focus on just a selected few features of texts [in qualitative research] or many features simultaneously by 'quantitative analysis'…" (p. 6). Discourse practice analysis, which concerns interpreting the discursive strategies used in producing and interpreting text, links the other two layers, text and social practice. Finally, social practice analysis involves the explanation of the relationship between the text and its context of situation, context of institution, and context of society. In this research, the findings resulted from the text analysis and those of the discursive practice analysis were explained

in relation to the social context in which the text is embedded, including the socio-cultural and institutional forces which shape the discourse. In this case, the text analysis and those of the discursive practice analysis related to the use of code crossing were explored in relation to factors influencing it in the form of extracts followed by analysis in each section.

Findings

This part illustrated some extracts of the conversation obtained from the lecturers (L) and the students (SS) by using classroom observation and audio recording. The extracts explain the indicators of code-crossing occurring in the conversations and the factors influencing that code-crossing. The indicators of code-crossing are categorized in the form high and low code between the lecturers and students and among the students themselves.

Lecturers and students' code-crossing

Extract 1: Showing the pronunciation of one word

L:	***okey, the class! say out this word! how do you read this word?***
Ss	*jinuen*
L:	*sorry?*
Ss:	*genun*
L:	*sorry*
Ss:	*genin*
L:	*sorry?*
Ss:	***geniin, Ma'am***

In extract 1 above, the lecturer was explaining the way to pronounce the English word "***genuine***". She gave instruction to the class by saying, "***okey, the class! say out this word! how do you read this word?***" She said it directly and did not apply any polite markers. This indicated that the lecturer applied low code influenced by her position as a lecturer who needed to hold the floor in the teaching process. After repeating for many times, one of the students said "***geniin, Ma'am***". Different from the lecturer, the student's answer in this case was categorized as high code, which can be seen in the use of address term "***Ma'am***", showing the high status of the lecturer which need to be respected by the students. Therefore, in this conversation, the lecturer applied low code whereas the students applied high code. This was influenced by the social status and the age differences of the interlocutors. It was also influenced by the dominant power of the lecturer and the class condition, in which the lecturer needs to hold the floor in the teaching process. The same case can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 2: Showing an example of activity in the class

L:	*in Australia school, school kids raise hand, **I'm, Sir! angkat tanganmu!.***
	*in Australian Schools, kids raise hands by saying "I'm, Sir!" raise your hand**!***
S:	***I'm, Sir!***
L:	*yes…*

In extract 2 above, the lecturer was explaining the habit in Australian schools as an example in the class. He said, "***I'm, Sir! angkat tanganmu***" (I'm, Sir! raise your hand!). This is the example of how the students should do in the class. Later the students imitated by saying "***I'm, Sir!***". The

use of "***Sir***" by the student indicated high code to the lecturer. Conversely, the lecturer just applied low code which can be seen in the use of direct pronoun "***mu***" in the instruction "***angkat tanganmu***" (raise your hand!). The use of direct instruction without any polite markers was categorized as low code. Therefore, it can be seen that the lecturer was applying low code whereas the students applied high code influenced by the social status between the interlocutors, in which the lecturer dominated the conversation in the class, as a part of his instruction in the teaching process. Another example can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 3: Asking the students' phone number

L: ***nomor hp mu berapa digitkah?***
         how many digits is your phone number?
S: *twelve,* ***Ma'am***

In extract 3 above, the lecturer was asking about the phone number of the student. She asked, "***nomor hp mu berapa digitkah***?" (how many digits is your phone number?). The lecturer in that case applied direct pronoun "***mu***", categorized as low code. The word "***mu***" was also applied by the lecturer to address his student. This was categorized as a direct way of addressing, showing that the lecturer dominated the conversation in the class due to his social status possession as a lecturer. Conversely, the high code using address term "***Ma'am***" was applied by the student when he was answering the questions of the lecturer. Based on extract 3 above, it shows that the lecturer and the students used code-crossing in classroom interaction. Like extract 1 and 2 above, the use of low code of the lecturer and the high code of the students was influenced by the dominant status of the lecturer in the class.

Extract 4: Asking the students to write

L: ***semua bisa menulis kan?***
         all of you can write, can't you?
S: *yes.*
L: *s****emua bisa menulis kan? hello!***
         all of you can write, can't you? hello!
Ss: ***bisa, Ma'am.***
         [we] can, Ma'am

In extract 4 above, the lecturer asked all of the students whether they all can write or not. She said, "***semua bisa menulis kan?***" (all of you can write, can't you?). But, in fact, not all of the students paid attention to his question. She repeated the question by saying, "***semua bisa menulis kan?***" (all of you can write, can't you***?).*** He also said, "***hello!***", which was very direct and therefore functioned to stress his questions and ask more attention from the students. By using the word "***hello***"***,*** he was implying that the students need to do what he instructed in the class. This indicated the use of low code of the lecturer in the class. Conversely, the students said "***bisa, Ma'am***" ([we] can, Ma'am). This answer was categorized as high code, which was very polite showing the students' high respect to the lecturer. The use of low code and high code in this extract was influenced by the social status and dominant power of the lecturer in the class.

Extract 5: Informing about the materials in the class

L: ***please*** *let me give you something ee.. something I don't know whether it is new or not but let me give you something not inside up classroom management.*

S1:   ***saya nyalakan LCDnya, Ma'am?***
        should I turn on the LCD, Ma'am?

In extract 5 above, the lecturer was giving an instruction in the first turn. As a matter of fact, the lecturer had been trying to explain it clearly but the students showed less attention. At last, she said, "***please*** *let me give you something ee..*". She was applying a low code by inserting the word "***please***" in order to stress her point so that the students could understand her instruction. The student then responded, "***saya nyalakan LCDnya, Ma'am?***" (Should I turn on the LCD, Ma'am?)***.*** The student's answer was categorized as high code, seen from the address term "***Ma'am***". The quick response of the students to the request of the lecturer showed the high code of the students to the lecturer. Therefore, it can be seen that the lecturer applied low code whereas the student applied high code. This was influenced by the social status and dominant power of the lecturer in the class.

Extract 6: Asking the student to explain himself

L: *you can understand easily, faster and comprehensible. well, Irsyam? [name of the student]* ***tell me about you!***

S: *yes,* ***Sir***

L: *yes.* ***now evaluate yourself.***

S: *I prefer to speaking..*

L: *you prefer speaking, you love to speaking..* ***why, why do you think speaking is very strong?***

In extract 6 above, the lecturer instructed the student to explain himself. He said, "***tell me about you!***". This kind of instruction was formed in the most direct way without modification or addition. This showed the low level of politeness of the lecturer and therefore, it was categorized as low code of the lecturer. Conversely, the students applied high code by using the address term "***yes, Sir***". The conversation was then followed by another instruction by the lecturer "***now evaluate yourself***" and the direct question "***why, why do you think speaking very strong?***". The instruction and the question were expressed directly without any polite markers, showing the low code of the lecturer in the class. Therefore, it can be seen from the conversation that the lecturer and the student applied code-crossing in the class. The lecturer applied low code due to his high social status and his dominant power of the lecturer in the class, whereas the students applied the high code showing their less power in the class as students.

Extract 7: Explaining about classroom management

L: ***yah you see what I mean?***

S: ***yes, Ma'am***

L: *iya, karena keseringannya tidak mampu mengontrol emosi. kenapa itu terjadi? lack of classroom management understanding.* ***karena kamu tidak paham yang namanya classroom management.***

yes, because they usually can't control their emotion. why is it happened? lack of classroom management understanding. because you don't understand about classroom management

In extract 7 above, the lecturer was explaining about what the students should do in the classroom management. However, the lecturer got impression that the students did not understand her whole explanation. Then she asked, "***yah you see what I mean?***". In this case, she showed her low code to the students. She was showing her direct question which turned to be low level of politeness. Later, she continued her explanation by saying, "***karena kamu tidak paham yang namanya classroom management***" (Because you don't understand about classroom management). This occurred when the lecturer was upset to feel that her students did not understand her explanation for many times about the same thing and the students always did it. So, to express her anger or disappointment to her students, she said her reasons in a more direct way. The word "***kamu***" (you) indicated as low code used by the lecturer to the students. Seen the lecturer's expression, one of the students was trying to minimize the situation by showing confirmation to what the lecturer said. The student said, "***yes, Ma'am***". In this way, the student applied a high code to the lecturer, prompted by the student's inferior status which should always confirm the lecturer's instruction in the class, which always dominant in such kind of classroom interaction.

Extract 8: Explaining about the curriculum material

L: *okey, metodenya apa,* ***tapi ini nanti yang dikurikulum, sorry, di material developmentmu, you tidak perlu membuat yang seperti ini,.***
         okey. what kind of method? ***But later in the curriculum, sorry, in your material development, you do not need to make like this***

In extract 8 above, the lecturer was explaining about the material on curriculum. She said, "***tapi ini nanti yang dikurikulum, sorry, di material developmentmu you tidak perlu membuat yang seperti ini***" (But later in the curriculum, sorry, in your material development, you do not need to make like this). She instructed the students by using a direct way; however, she inserted an apology, "***sorry***" as a way to polite and therefore it was categorized as high code. Later, she said "***developmentmu***" in which the use of direct pronoun "***mu***" indicated his low code of the lecturer. Based on this extract, it shows that the lecturer employed high and low code due to the social status of the lecturer in the class.

Extract 9: Giving an advice about health

L: *dia tidak bisa kenapa? he has getting older. usia yang sudah berumur. so* ***kamu, kamu yang perempuan, kalau sudah 40 tahun ke atas hati-hati.***
         he can't, why? he has getting older. the older age. so you are girl if [already] 40 [years old], be careful
Ss: *@@ (laughing)*

In extract 9, the lecturer was giving an advice to students saying "***so kamu kamu yang sudah perempuan kalau sudah 40 tahun ke atas hati-hati***" (so you are girl if [already] 40 [years old], be careful). The use of pronoun, "***kamu***" (you) repeated for twice showed the

lecturer as superior and used low code. Compare with the following extracts in which the lecturers might also apply high code in the class due to some reasons.

Extract 10: Opening the class

L: ***okey, well the class, assalamu alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh***
        ok, well the class, peace be upon you all
SS: ***waalaikumsalam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh***
        peace be upon you all too
L: *emm… I'd like to see you three weeks or two weeks?*
SS: *two weeks*
L: *two weeks?*
SS: ***yes, Ma'am***

In extract 10 above, the lecturer started the class by saying, "***assalamu alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh***" (ok, well the class, peace be upon you all). This is a kind of greeting which was intended by the lecturer to express his gratitude to the class. Greeting in this case showed that he was showing his high appreciation to the class and therefore, tend to be polite in the class. This was categorized as the high code of the lecturer in the class. Later the students also answered the greeting by saying, "***waalaikumsalam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh***" (peace be upon you all too), which also showed the students' appreciation to the lecturer's greeting. This also showed the high code of the students. Therefore, it can be seen that both of the lecturer and student applied high code, which was intended to show polite interaction in the class. Although the lecturer had high social status and possessed dominant power over the class and the student, the lecturer still applied high code influenced by the need to maintain intimacy and familiarity for them so that their social distance due to their social status was reduced. The same case can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 11: Starting the class interaction

L: *well, the class assalamu alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*
        well, the class, peace be upon you
Ss: *waalaikumsalam warahmatullahi wabarakatuh*
        Peace be upon you too
L: ***first that I'd like to say I miss you so much***

Extract 11 above shows the situation of an interaction between the lecturer and the students when the lecturer was starting the class by greeting to the students. Like in extract 10, the lecturer and the students started the class by greeting to each other showing the use of high code by both parts. The lecturer then said, "***first that I'd like to say I miss you so much***". The expression "***I miss you so much***" shows the familiarity between the students and the lecturer, and therefore created intimacy among them. This showed that the lecturer also employed low code as a part of code-crossing to show her closeness to the students. Another example can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 12: Asking for break

L: ***sorry yah kita break sebentar, tidak apa-apa?*** [I'am]
        sorry, let's take a minute, is it okay?

S8:   ***iye, Ma'am***
        Yes, Ma'am

In extract 12 above, the lecturer said, "***sorry yah, kita break sebentar, tidak apa-apa?***" ([I'm] sorry, let's take a minute, is it okay?). This was said after long explanation about the topic in the class. In this case, the use of apology "***sorry yah***" ([I'am] sorry) showed the low code of the lecturer which was polite and acted less formal to the class. The use of "***yah***" marked the closeness and reduced the familiarity among them. Later she also said "***kita***", which is the inclusive pronoun to include both of them as lecturer and student in the situation. This made the conversation more intimate but then created low code situation. She also said, "***tidak apa apa?***" (is it okay?), showing his willingness to negotiate the situation which reduced the tension during the teaching process. This expression again showed her low code. Therefore, it can be seen that the lecturer applied low code in the class due to the teaching situation in the class. That expression created intimacy between the lecturer and the students and therefore, created low code in the conversation. Conversely, the student used high code to the lecturer, which can be seen when the student said, "***iye, Ma'am***" in Bugis language. The use of "***iye***" derived from Bugis language which means "***yes***" followed by the address term "***Ma'am***" indicated the high code of the student to the lecturer. Therefore, although in the conversation, the lecturer may exercise a dominant power as a lecturer, the need to maintain intimacy in the class made both the lecturer and the student applied high code to each other.

Students and students code-crossing

The following extracts show that the students among themselves also applied code-crossing in their conversations. The examples are as follows:

Extract 13: Asking about the difference

S1:   *bisanya itu. beda-beda semua ya.*
        how could be. All is different
S2:   ***Kak, beda-beda penyusunannya?***
        Older Sister/Brother, is the arrangement different?

Extract 13 above shows that two students are talking to each other in the class. One of them (S1) is older that the other (S2). S1, the older one said in a simple way, "***bisanya itu. beda-beda semua ya***" (how could be. all is different). This was categorized as simple statement uttered familiarly by the older student (S1) showing that he was free to express his ideas. This was influenced by the age differences, and therefore, he applied low code. Later S2, the younger one responded, "***Kak, beda-beda penyusunannya***" (Older Sister/Brother, is the arrangement different?). It can be seen that the younger students (S2) applied high code to older student (S1) by using respected address term "***Kak***". Therefore, it can be seen that even among the students themselves, the use of high and low code can be practiced among them. One might use low code such as expressed by S1 and high code expressed by S2, although they have the same status as students. Due to different age in the class, regardless of the same grade, the use of code-crossing cannot be avoided. Another example can be seen in the following extract:

Extract 14: Asking about the attendance

S2:   *eh, number two.* ***Kak Ros, why I got absent in the first meeting?***

S3:   **yang mana, Dek?**
        which one, younger sister/brother?
S2:   *In the first meeting.*

Extract14 above showed that one of the students questioned about her attendance in the first meeting. She noticed the mistakes about the attendance. She was in the class but the absence said she was not present at the time. The chairman is **Kak Ros** who is older than the other students in the class. The use of "**Kak**" to respect senior in this extract showed the high code of the speaker (S2). Kak Ros, the older student also said, "**yang mana, Dek?**". The address term "**Dek**" to respect the junior indicated the low code in code-crossing. Therefore, it can be seen that in the conversation, the students of the same age and the same social status applied high code to each other. It created politeness and intimacy among them. A different example can be seen in the following extract of conversation:

Extract 15: Refusing to answer a question

S2:   **mau ka bertanya**
        I want to ask
S1:   **kenapa bertanya sama saya ih**
        Why did you ask me?

In extract 15 above, one of the students wanted to ask a question. She said, "**mau ka bertanya**" (I want to ask). This was categorized as low code since it did not apply polite markers. Indeed it was very direct. The use of pronoun "**ka**" in "**mauka bertanya**" (I want to ask) was derived from Bugis pronoun which was usually expressed toward similar age and status people and in very informal condition. Another student also responded in a direct way too by saying, "**kenapa bertanya sama saya ih**" (Why did you ask me). The use of the word "**ih**" shows a very direct expression and tend to be very easy going and informal. This was also categorized as low code. Therefore, it can be seen that the use of low code in this extract shows close relationship or familiarity between the two students. Another example can be seen in the following extracts of conversation:

Extract 16: Expressing jokes

T: *Yah gitu karena kita ternyata selalu memotret, sosok yang selalu kita anggap favorite, yang kita anggap ideal yang bisa kita tiru. So let's see, she should design classroom activities, which promote students motivation, dan ternyata psychal Appereance itu bisa memicu dan memacu motivasi belajar siswa kita, maaf yah mahasiswi yang make upnya jangan terlalu over karena nanti yang diperhatikan alisnya bu guru e,*
        Well, that's because we are always photographing, a figure that we always favorite, that we think is ideal that we can emulate. So let 's see, she should design classroom activities, which promotes students' motivation, and turns out that physical appearance can trigger and stimulate the learning motivation of our students, sorry the female students do not over your make up because the 's eyebrows are noticed later
Ss: *@@*
S5:   **alismu weh**
        your eyebrow heh
S6:   **kau lipstikmu perbaiki**

> *fix your lipstick*
S5:   ***biarkanmi weh***
          leave it like that

In extract 16 above, the lecturer explained the trending way of physical appearance, such as the decoration of eyebrows which tended to be too much. The students laughed at it. One of the students said, "***alismu weh***" (your eyebrow heh). Another student replied "***kau lipstikmu perbaiki***" (fix your lipstick). Another student responded "***biarkanmi weh***" (leave it like that). Those are direct responses from the students towards the explanation of the lecturer, which tended to become a joke among them. The researchers argued that they had already been familiar with their friends, so they spoke familiarly or even use low code. All of the students also applied low code in their conversation due to their familiarity among themselves. The presence of the lecturer in the class who had already talked in low code too made the situation in the classroom more familiar and more informal.

Extract 17: Expression from local language

S1:   *she, she have been*
S2:   *She has been in hospital.* ***semuanya di'?***
          She has been in hospital. Are they all?
S1:   ***ndak. saya menulis begini. Duduk meko.***
          no. I write like this. [you] just sit down
S2:   *She has been in hospital eh, three weeks ago*

In extract 17 above, the students had a chat to each other. They had a joke about how to make a sentence about someone in the hospital. One of them said in Indonesian language combined with Bugis language, one of the local languages in South Sulawesi Indonesia, "***She has been in hospital. semuanya di'?***" (She has been in hospital. Are they all?). Another student also said "***Ndak. Saya menulis begini. Duduk meko***" (No. I write like this. Just sit down). The expression "***duduk meko***" ([you] just sit down) is derived from Bugis dialect. In terms of code-crossing, the way the students in this extract communicated can be categorized as using low code since those expressions did not apply polite markers and therefore tended to be informal rather than formal. The use of low code in this case was influenced by the familiarity and the intimate relations among the students in the class.

Discussion

Seventeen extracts above had been discussed as examples of the use of code-crossing in the classroom interaction. The first finding shows that the conversations either between the lecturers and students or among the students themselves applied code-crossing which can be seen in the use of low code and high code.

In most of the conversations between lecturers and students (extract 1-7, 9), high code was mostly applied by the students which can be seen in the use of respected and polite markers such as the use of "***Ma'am***", "***Sir***" to address the lecturers**.** Conversely, the lecturers always applied low code in those conversations in the form of direct pronoun, "***mu***" (you) and "***kamu***" (you). High code can also be seen in the use of direct instruction in most of the extracts. In extract 8, 10, and 11, the lecturers were shown to apply high and low code interchangeably. Extract 12 is the

only extract in which the lecturer applied low code due to the intimacy and the closeness created in the conversation.

In the conversation among the students themselves (extract 13-14), it can be seen that the students also applied high code by using address terms "***Kak***" (older brother/sister). However, low code by the use of address term "***Dek***" (younger brother/sister) was also used. In other extracts (extract 15-17), low code was mostly applied due to the familiarity among the students themselves and the same level of status and age differences. There were expressions identified as low code such as "***duduk meko***" ([you] just sit down), "***kenapa saya mutanya ih***" (Why did you ask me?), and "***alismu weh***" (your eyebrow heh). In addition, the students applied direct pronoun "***mu***" (you) and "***kau***" (you) which indicated the low code by the students in addressing each other.

The researchers also found some factors influencing those code choices. They are power differences which include social status and age differences. The lecturers who applied low code were influenced by the power dominance they have in the class. This is in line with the study conducted by Wajdi (2009), Wajdi, Laksana, Suastra, & Budiarsa, (2010), and Wajdi, 2011), which found that code-crossing is more likely to occur when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee. In this study, the social status of the lecturer was used to give instruction to students directly. A study by Milal (2011), Abdullah and Hosseini (2012), and Hikmah (2019) have also shown that teachers/lecturers possessed power dominantly in the class, which were used to maintain the progress of the classroom interaction.

This study also shows that another aspect influencing the use of high and low code is social distance/familiarity and intimacy. Finding of this study is also in line with the idea of Brown & Gilman (1960) which highlights the functions of distance or social closeness between individuals in the use of language. The social distance in this study is lecturer's closeness with her/his students. Therefore, the lecturers employed low code verbally to their students because they are familiar, and therefore, they felt intimate and close to each other.

Findings from this study show that in the conversations between the lecturers and students and among the students themselves, different code choices are applied due to the influence of power differences and social distance, which caused the emergence of code-crossing. According to Brown and Gilman (1960), these phenomena remarked the existence of "dyadic asymmetric communication" by of the two different codes, low and high codes by two unequal speakers (teachers/lecturers and students). In relation to Rampton (1995; 1998; 2014), the emergence of those different codes was in line with the speaker's background, the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor and the situation". Another study by Wajdi and Subiyanto (2018) also reveals the influence of many aspects in the way to communicate in Bali. It was found that "low and high speech levels of the language of Bali are language codes that could be used to show and express social relationship between or among its speakers" (p. 1).

Findings from this study also show that code crossing can become alternatives to create communication strategy among various background of community. Several studies had proved this phenomenon in different contexts of communication, for example in Javanese society (Wajdi, 2009; Wajdi, Laksana, Suastra, & Budiarsa, 2010; Wajdi, 2011). In terms of code choice in the educational setting, a study by Valentina & Elena (2020) had revealed the use of different codes by Cypriot Greek students in the class due to different forms of power and legitimacy which reflects the social value of solidarity and membership in the dominant community. Dovchin (2019) found the use of language crossing as resistance and passing strategy among Mongolian women who encounter linguistic homogeneity, discrimination, and alienation and enable them to resist dominant linguistic norms and standards in the dominant culture.   Sultana's study reveals

that language crossing is in a complex relationship with the societal ideologies and existing stark realities of young adults of Bangladesh (2019). Makoni (2019) in the study among black African immigrants (BAIs) self-styling which enables them to disarticulates the close relationship between language and ethnicity, allowing BAIs to claim an ethnic identity even in instances where they have limited or no proficiency in the relevant language.

All of the above studies show that the use of language crossing can be used for various reasons in different contexts of communication. In this study, it can be seen that code crossing exist in the interaction between teachers and students in the class due to the various individual and social differences. This code crossing functions to bridge the gap of communication between the teachers and the students in order to create effective classroom interaction.

Conclusion

This study had discussed the use of code-crossing in lecturers and students in classroom interaction. There are two different codes which exist, namely low and high code. High code was mostly applied the students whereas low code was employed mostly by the lecturers. This was influenced by the power of social status and age differences which mostly possessed by the lecturers. However, due to the persistence of social distance, familiarity, and intimacy, the lecturers applied high code in the class. In the conversation among the students, high and low code can also be employed, in which the students applied mostly low code whereas the use of high code was influenced by the age differences among the students. It can be seen that the power of social status and age differences, and social distance or familiarity became the most important factors influencing the lecturers and students in applying the code-crossing.

Still very few of study on it, however, and therefore, findings from this study is worthy of reading for English language teaching practitioners in their effort to create effective classroom interaction. It is important to note that the language aspect in terms of code-crossing in the classroom interaction is an important factor in creating effective classroom interaction. Furthermore, findings from this study contributed significantly on the use of code-crossing in other educational contexts. Based on this study, the phenomena of code-crossing are also evident in the class. Classroom interaction is the place where the use of high code and low code by teachers/lecturers and students are exercised and therefore, causes the emergence of code-crossing. More studies in this case need to be further conducted in order to explore other aspects of language choices in the classroom interaction

References
Abdullah, F. S., & Hosseini, K. (2012). Discursive enactment of power in Iranian high school EFL classrooms. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *12*(2), 375-392.

Ahmed, W. K., & Maros, M. (2017). Using hedges as relational work by Arab EFL students in student-supervisor consultations. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *17*(1), 89-105.

Aladdin, A. (2012). An analysis of the usage of communication strategies in Arabic oral communication. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 12*(2), 645-666.

Banda, F. (2019). Beyond language crossing: exploring multilingualism and multicultural identities through popular music lyrics. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *14*(4), 373-389.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In P. Giglioli (1972) (Ed). *Language and Social Context*, (pp. 252-282). Harmonsworth: Penguin.

Chuchu, F., & Noorashid, N. (2015). Code choice within intercultural communication among ethnic minority in Brunei. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 86-94.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.).(2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publication Inc.

Dovchin, S. (2019). Language crossing and linguistic racism: Mongolian immigrant women in Australia. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *14*(4), 334-351.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power (2nd Ed.).* Harlow: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Floreddu, P. B., & Cabiddu, F. (2016). Social media communication strategies. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *30*(5), 490-503.

Golob, U., Elving, W. J., Nielsen, A. E., Thomsen, C., Schultz, F., Podnar, K., & Colleoni, E. (2013). CSR communication strategies for organizational legitimacy in social media. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, *18*(2), 176-192.

Haryono, A. (2011). Pola komunikasi warna nu etnis madura sebagai refleksi budaya paternalistik. *Humaniora: Jurnal Budaya, Sastra dan Bahasa, 23*(2).175-184

Haryono, A. (2018). Communication patterns among *Kiais* of *Nahdlatul Ulama* in the M adurese ethnic group. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(3), 714-726.

Hikmah, S. N. A. (2019). The dominance of discourse in class. *ISLLAC: Journal of Intensive Studies on Language, Literature, Art, and Culture*, *3*(1), 69-74.

Hua, T. K., Nor, N. F. M., & Jaradat, M. N. (2012). Communication strategies among EFL students: An examination of frequency of use and types of strategies used. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *12*(3), 831-848.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2001). *Ethnicity and language crossing in post-apartheid South Africa*. Walter de Gruyter.

Khasinah, S. (2014). *Factors influencing second language acquisition.* Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Ranity Banda Aceh.

Kim, L. S. (2003). Exploring the relationship between language, culture and identity. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *3*(2), 1-13.

Lenhart, A., Ling, R., Campbell, S., & Purcell, K. (2010). Teens and mobile phones: Text messaging explodes as teens embrace it as the centerpiece of their communication strategies with friends. *Pew Internet & American Life Project*.

Mahmud, M. (2017). Communicative styles of English students at the State University of Makassar. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *17*(1), 223-238.

Makoni, B. (2019). Strategic language crossing as self-styling: The case of black African immigrants in South Africa. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *14*(4), 301-318.

Mashudi, R., Rahmat, H., Sanudin, S. R., Suliman, S., & Musanif, A. M. (2017). Peraturan interaksi peristiwa komunikatif wawancara dalam akhbar (Rule of interaction in the press' communicative events interview). *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *17*(3), 70-85.

Masters, K., & Makoni, S. (2019). Gazing at language crossing in the global north but doing crossing in the global south.

Milal, A. D. U. (2011). Indicators of the practice of power in language classrooms. *Teflin Journal*, *22*(1), 01-15.

Pavón Vázquez, V., & Ramos Ordóñez, M. D. C. (2019). Describing the use of the L1 in CLIL: An analysis of L1 communication strategies in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(1), 35-48.

Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1979). *Tingkat tutur bahasa Jawa. Jakarta*: DEPDIKBUD

Pooley, T., & Mostefai-Hampshire, Z. (2012). Code-crossing and multilingualism among adolescents in Lille. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *22*(3), 371-394.

Rampton, B. (1995). Language crossing and the problematiation of ethnicity and socialisation. *Pragmatics*, *5*(4), 485-513.

Rampton, B. (1998). Language crossing and the redefinition of reality. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 290-317.

Rampton, B. (2001). Language crossing, cross-talk, and cross-disciplinarity in sociolinguistics. *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, 261-296.

Rampton, B. (2014). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New york: Longman.

Rampton, B., Charalambous, C., & Charalambous, P. (2019). Crossing of a different kind. *Language in Society*, *48*(5), 629-655.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sultana, S. (2019) Language crossing of young adults in Bangladesh. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(4), 352-372, DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2019.1657123

Somsai, S. & Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 11*(3), 83-96.

Valentina, C., & Elena, I. (2020). Classroom communities, language choices and accessibility to discourse: the case of a multi-ethnic/multilingual class of a private school in Cyprus. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *14*(1), 58-75.

Wajdi, M. (2009). Alih kode dan silang kode: strategi komunikasi dalam bahasa Jawa. *Proceeding of the 2nd International Conference on Applied Linguistics* (pp. 3-4).

Wajdi, M. (2011). Code choice and politeness systems in Javanese. *Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology at Universitas Islam Negeri Malang*, *23*, 24.

Wajdi, M., & Subiyanto, P. (2018). Equality marker in the language of Bali. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 953(1), p. 012065). IOP Publishing.

Wajdi, M., Laksana, I. K. D., Suastra, I. M., & Budiarsa, I. M. (2010). Code-crossing: hierarchical politeness in Javanese. *e-Journal of Linguistics*