

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IN THE PRODUCTION OF CODE-SWITCHING IN PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN: A CASE STUDY OF THREE INDONESIAN CHILDREN

Puji Siswanto^{1*}, Arief Styo Nugroho¹, Usmaedi¹, Ade Eka Anggraini²

¹STKIP Setiabudi Rangkasbitung

²Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Malang

puji_stkip@gmail.com*

*Corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 07/07/2021

Approved 4/2/2022

Keywords:

Children
code-switching
environmental
pre-school;

ABSTRACT

Abstract: The study investigates code-switching performed by three pre-school children in Indonesia. The study employs a qualitative research methodology with an exploratory case study. The participants of the study are three pre-school children who live in a small village in Banten Province in which two languages are exposed and spoken by the majority of people in that area namely Bahasa Indonesia as the national language and Sundanese as a vernacular language. The study reveals that the code-switching utterances performed by preschool children are classified into intra and inter sentential switches.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini menyelidiki alih kode bahasa yang dilakukan oleh tiga anak prasekolah di Indonesia. Penelitian ini menggunakan metodologi penelitian kualitatif dengan studi kasus eksploratif. Partisipan penelitian ini adalah tiga anak prasekolah yang tinggal di sebuah desa kecil di Provinsi Banten di mana dua bahasa dituturkan oleh mayoritas masyarakat di daerah tersebut yaitu Bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa nasional dan bahasa Sunda sebagai bahasa daerah. Hasil penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa tuturan alih kode bahasa yang dilakukan oleh anak prasekolah diklasifikasikan menjadi dua alih kode bahasa yaitu: *intra* dan *inter sentensial*.

INTRODUCTION

The study on Language Acquisition (LA) and production are always challenging to be investigated to get more comprehensive knowledge of how the language doers acquire their L1 and L2 in monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual contexts. For many years, a plethora of studies deals with language fields is conducted in many countries. Indonesia as multi-ethnicity and multi-languages country creates people with more than one language they use in daily communication. This condition potentially makes people who speak and use two languages at the same time or change from one language to another language. At the very beginning level, the children acquire and learn their L1 by nature, especially the local language. Some factors are affecting children language productions viewed from environmental factors (sociolinguistics and culture) such as family, friends surrounding, and neighbour language exposures.

Language studies are often investigated in multidiscipline studies to get a much deeper understanding of the discipline being studied. One of which new advances in research methods and multiple theoretical perspectives—psychological, linguistic, social, cognitive, anthropological, neurobiological—cover on a new understanding of how the young children learn to communicate based on the inputs or exposures they got from the surrounding (Chapman, 2019). One influential account of word learning in young children is the mutual exclusivity (ME) hypothesis (Markman, 1989; Markman & Wachtel, 1988 as cited in (Bialystok, Barac, Blaye, & Poulin-Dubois, 2010). Moreover, he says that although its developmental origins and interpretation are controversial, the assumption is that ME is a natural constraint that restricts pre-schoolers assumptions about word meanings and word extensions (Bialystok et al., 2010). Further, the assumption seems to make an impact on children's naming behaviour improvement during the preschool years. Therefore, children start on word-specific construction that they generalize to more general frames as a function of more input (Tomasello, 2003 as cited in Blom, 2010).

In the context of sociolinguistics study, the children's language has been noted for its intensive, longitudinal study of free speech samples from individual children, a method particularly suited to revealing developmental trajectories and individual differences. That work, mainly in English, has yielded the outlines of developmental sequence in children's language production in pragmatics, semantics, syntax, and morphosyntax identified dimensions of individual variability and their potential sources and identified characteristics associated with specific language impairment (Chapman, 2019). More and more children who being raised and grew up in the bilingual environment and home, however, the course of language development in children from bilingual homes is not well described or understood (McCardle & Hoff, 2006 as cited in Hoff et al., 2012).

The advances in methodology, however, have allowed us to examine the contributions of varied genetic and *environmental inputs or exposures* in unprecedented scope, directness, and detail. These advances are reviewed here, provide them with the evidence for a strong interactionist position, with multiple genetic and environmental factors contributing to variation in language learning; and a lot of the same scholars who originally proposed universal content for, and constraints on, children's language learning have modified their views with the subsequent evidence (e.g. Markson & Bloom, 1997; Mervis & Bertrand, 1995 in Chapman, 2019). Meanwhile, regarding the terms used in the study, there is no convention of the use of terms related to children's interaction with the environment. Some scholars describe it as *exposure* to others called *experience* and at last switch that term as *exposure* and *input* (Carroll, 2017). However, those terms mentioned refer to the same thing.

One of the first studies to investigate the question of exposure and bilingual acquisition claimed that children who have a 'weaker language' are behaving like second language (L2) learners. For example, thus, Schlyter (1993) claimed that bilingual Swedish–French children living in Sweden, whose French was weaker than their Swedish, made errors similar to those produced by adult L2 learners of French, e.g., placing weak or clitic personal pronouns (which can only occur in a pre-verbal position) in a post-verbal position (**Je donne le versus Je le donne* 'I give it' (Carroll, 2017). Therefore, Schlyter makes it as findings argue that these bilinguals had grammars that are substantially different from those of monolingual learners of French and simultaneous bilinguals (2L1) whose French was 'strong' or 'balanced'. For Schlyter and others engaged in the 'weak language and strong language' discussion (La Morgia, 2011; Yip & Matthews, 2006), the argument is that differences in the quality and quantity of exposure are the causal factors (Carroll, 2017). Moreover, she claims that maturational changes start from age 3 until 3;6 that subsequently change the way children in processing language. All bilingual children should process the language they hear in the same way as monolinguals. After this age, children may process the language that they hear using the mechanisms that late L2 learners use.

Also, as Bonnesen's (2009 as cited in Carroll, 2017) study reveals that when bilingual children choose to switch to the *stronger language* or refuse outright to speak the *weaker language*, parents may use this change in the *child's behaviour* as a pretext to stop speaking the minority language with their child altogether. In these cases, it can be predicted that the child will cease to learn phenomena not yet acquired in the absence of relevant input and may even attrite. According to Fantini, 1985; Genishi, 1981; Huerta, 1980 as cited in Huerta-Macías & Quintero, 1992) the phenomena of code-switching is the existing subject in the literature on bilingualism since the early nineteen hundreds when Espinosa (1917) wrote of a "speech mixture" in the speech of New Mexicans. Since then, the research in this area has focused on different aspects of code-switching. Within the last two decades, studies have evolved which focus on the role of code-switching in young children developing their bilingualism.

Moreover, to fulfil the complexity in communicative demands, the speakers who live in a community in which two or more languages coexists frequently switch from one language to another, either between utterances. This kind of phenomenon is known as code-switching (Chung, 2006). Moreover, (Gutiérrez-Clellen, Simon-Cerejido, & Leone, 2009) Code-switching is considered as a rule-governed system with social and grammatical constraints. Meanwhile, the reason why the speakers make code behaviour is stated by Crystal (1987 in Chung, 2006) presents many possible reasons for switching from one language to another. One reason presented by Crystal for the switching behaviour is the notion that when speakers may not be able to express themselves in one language, they switch to the other to compensate for the deficiency. Another use of code-switching is that it may be used to build intimate interpersonal relationships among members of a bilingual community. In this respect, it may be claimed that it is a tool for creating linguistic solidarity especially between individuals who share the same ethnocultural identity (Sert, 2005).

Three main factors have been identified to explain why some children become bilingual whereas others become predominantly monolingual speakers of the majority language: the age of acquisition of each language, the amount of input for each language, and the language status of each language (majority or minority) (for review, see Pearson, 2007). For preschool-aged children, the amount of input for each language is strongly tied to the language environment found within the home and the language status of the two languages outside of the home (Hoff et al., 2012). Among children, sociolinguistic factors, such as living in a bilingual community, may influence whether a child becomes bilingual (Gathercole and Thomas, 2009) and, if so, what level of proficiency will be attained in each language (Oller et al., 2007; Paradis, 2009). Therefore, although preschool-aged children may not have a strong sense of sociolinguistic identity, they are sensitive to what language is being used in their environment by mirroring the frequency of code-switching (i.e. switching from one language to the other) of the adult speakers (Comeau et al., 2007; Juan Garau and Perez-Vidal, 2001 as cited in Hoff et al., 2012). Besides, the status of each language can influence the attitudes and opportunities that children have to use both of their languages. The sociocognitive approach in L2 acquisition is more than just a theoretical proposal but is shown that L2 development occurring in, for, and by the integrated mind, body, and world ecologies (Atkinson, Churchill, Nishino, & Okada, 2007).

Regarding receptive vocabulary, it shows that receptive vocabulary is sensitive to differences in the amount of exposure (Kohnert and Bates, 2002; Thordardottir, 2011). In her study of bilingual 4-year-olds learning English and French, Thordardottir found that when children received 40–60% exposure to a language, they were not different from monolingual children with regards to their receptive vocabulary. Lower exposure rates, however, did result in significantly lower receptive vocabulary scores for the given language (MacLeod, Fabiano-Smith, Boegner-Pagé, & Fontolliet, 2013). So, taken together, receptive vocabulary appears to be a strong candidate to observe the effects of language exposure on the majority and minority languages being acquired by bilingual children (MacLeod et al., 2013). Besides, most studies on child bilingualism, confirm that mixing is more common during the very early phases

of bilingual language development. This has repeatedly been interpreted as evidence in favour of the claim that early mixing is code-mixing and not yet code-switching. The reasoning here is true that switching, defined as rule-governed linguistic behaviour, requires elaborate grammatical knowledge about both languages; and since young children still lack this kind of grammatical competence, their mixes cannot be classified as instances of code-switching (Meisel, 1994).

The high frequency of mixing due to limited competence in both languages should be expected to decrease as the child acquires knowledge about the two lexicons and the two grammars; but it may increase again, once the child has acquired enough knowledge to use adult-like code-switching. Vihman (1985). In fact, did find a pattern of this kind. The Estonian-English child she studied slowly gave up mixing English words into Estonian after age 2;0, but the frequency increased again after age 3;0. Vihman interprets this as indicating that mixing during later phases represents code-switching whereas earlier instances are different. A further prediction of the deficiency hypothesis is that mixing is expected to be related to whether the competence in using both languages is well balanced or not (Meisel, 1994).

A lot of studies have observed that early mixing consists mostly of inserting elements from the stronger language (dominant language) into the weaker one (cf. Kielhofer, 1987, and Petersen, 1988) even though mixing into the stronger language is also possible. As for adult bilingual language use, Poplack (1980) reports that speakers who are dominant in one language do switch to the weaker language, but that these are typically not intra-sentential switches. On the other hand, she also found that balanced bilingualism favours code-switching. The greater or higher the competence in both languages, the more frequently the adult speakers use code-switching. Moreover, it is used more frequently by individuals who learned the L2 early, at age 2;0-6;0, that is, by bilinguals who acquired both languages simultaneously (Meisel, 1994).

Grammatical Constraints on Code-Switching

According to Meisel (1994) during their third year of life, the children begin to use code-switching, even though it may still differ in some respects from adult usage. This leads to the question of whether early code-switching is already subject to structural constraints. The discovery that seemingly random linguistic behaviour is indeed constrained by, among other things, grammatical principles has been a major step toward a better understanding of adult code-switching.

Moreover, Meisel (1994) proposes the three classifications of the structural constraints, they are: the first two constraints are the *free morpheme constraint* and the *equivalence constraint* as formulated by Poplack (1980) and the third is the *government constraint* put forth by di Sciullo et al. (1986). Then, there are some empirical and theoretical shortcomings of these three constraints, leading, most importantly, to a revision of the government constraint. The first important result is that grammatical constraints on code-switching apply to the surface structure properties of the languages involved. Secondly, this point concerns what has been called the *grammatical coherence* of constructions.

Neighbourhood context and children language input

The children when they interact with their neighbours and friends are the factors that are assumed to give exposure or language input to the children. The condition of the neighbourhood can impact residents' well-being across domains, including child development (Brody et al., 2001 in de Marco & Vernon-Feagans, 2013). Moreover, Burke, O'Campo, & Peak (2006) as cited in (de Marco & Vernon-Feagans, 2013) state that the condition of the neighbourhood might exert unique effects on children and families in rural communities, yet this relationship has received little attention.

The bioecological can be used in the study. The model had been used by Bronfenbrenner, 1989; Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000. This model claims that human development is produced by reciprocal interaction between one person and another person, object, and symbols in the immediate external environment. The frequency of exposure and intensity determine the strength of this interaction (Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000 as cited in de Marco & Vernon-Feagans, 2013). Moreover, some previous studies revealed that both parental language input and the quality of childcare experiences are related to children's early language (e.g., Dearing, McCartney, & Taylor, 2009; Vernon-Feagans, Hurley, Yont, Wamboldt, & Kolak, 2007). Further, neighbourhood factors can influence children's development and ability to learn and succeed in school, and also neighbourhood characteristics play an important role in shaping children's development (N. E. Hill & Herman-Stahl, 2002; Ingoldsby et al., 2006 in de Marco & Vernon-Feagans, 2013).

Children's language dominance and language choice

Most bilingual preschool children display greater proficiency, or more advanced development, in one of their two languages, and this is commonly referred to as their dominant language. Children's dominant language is typically the language they receive more exposure to, moreover, young bilingual children tend to codemix more when they use their less proficient than their more proficient language (Pearson et al., 1997, Genesee et al., 1995a; Lanvers, 2001 in Paradis & Nicoladis, 2007). According to Pearson (2007 as cited in Zhang, 2009), children invite more input of a certain language by using this language themselves. This suggests that the language environment of the child outside the family can indirectly influence the mother's language use with her child. Moreover, Zhang proposes three elements in second language acquisition, namely: input, interaction, and output. Input is a very essential factor in language acquisition. Input is accepted that interaction plays a very important role in the process of second language learning.

According to Ellis 1985 (as cited in Zhang, 2009) mentioned that input is language data that is exposed to. There are three views regarding the issue of input in second language acquisition. They are behaviourist, mentalist, and interactionist views and each of them

holds a different emphasis in explaining SLA. Firstly, behaviourist views that language learning as environmentally determined, controlled from outside by the stimuli learners are exposed to and the reinforcement they receive. Unlike behaviourists, mentalist ideas concern the importance of the learners' black box, and the human brain is equipped to learn the language and to trigger acquisition (Elis, 1997 in Zhang, 2009). Meanwhile, the interactionist theories see that both input and internal language processing emphasizing the joint contribution between the linguistic environment and inner mechanism in interactive activities.

Code-switching is a mundane phenomenon in our daily conversation in bilingual or multilingual society conducted by adults and children. Code-switching is a common phenomenon that bilingual speakers regularly engage in including bilingual children (Yow, Tan, & Flynn, 2018). There are some motivations why people make code-switching. For adults the code-switching, the produce in conversation is one of the communication strategies and to show their solidarity to their interlocutors. In this condition, the use of code-switching in communication shows linguistics competence. Moreover, code-switching can also indicate that the speakers feel confused in using the linguistics code they have.

Regarding the functions of code-switching Chen, 1996 as cited in Hei (2015) in her studies of Chinese or English code-switching among speakers in a teachers' college in Taiwan identified five functions of code-switching and they are the expressive function, the directive function, the metalinguistic function, the poetic function, and the referential function. Moreover, other studies have been identified code-switching as a necessary vehicle to convey power, solidarity, secrecy, intimacy, emotions, glory, status, ideology, neutrality, religion, kinship, and many more. Meanwhile, for the children code-switching they do is common and happened naturally. Most of the children make this language alteration in a form of linguistic competence they have. The environment factor is central in affecting code-switching produced by children. The inputs and exposures they got from surrounding greatly affected their language acquisition and code-switching respectively, as the results of two linguistics code inputs become their language repertoire.

However, there has been heated debate deals with children's code-switching behaviour suggest about their linguistic competency. Early studies on children's language alternation behaviours postulated that bilingual children mix or switch language for some evidence a) the children are confused or b) they are linguistically incompetent. Proponents of the position that bilingual children mix languages because they are confused and cannot differentiate between the two languages (e.g the Unitary Language System Hypothesis in young children aged 3 years and below (Genesee, 1989 as cited in Yow et al., 2018).

In other studies, researchers claim that bilingual children code-switch not due to the inability to differentiate two language systems, however, it because they lack the lexical, grammatical, and or pragmatic competence in one or both of the languages known. Some studies reveal that bilingual children aged between 2 to 6 years codeswitch to fill in their lexical gapes-they tend to insert words from one language into another language when they do not have the translation equivalents (e.g., Deuchar & Quay, 2000; Cantone, 2007; Lindholm & Padilla, 1978; see Nicoladis & Genesee, 1997 as cited in Yow et al., 2018). Further, Bernardini and Schlyter (2004), who examined code-mixing patterns of five Swedish–French or Italian children aged 2 to 4 years, posited that children code-switch because they are not yet competent in structuring grammatical sentences in their “weaker” language.

In contrast to, the recent studies conducted by Mac Swan, 1999; Meisel, 1994; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1997; Paradis, Nicoladis & Genesee, 2000; van Gelderen & MacSwan, 2008). Genesee (1989) argued that, contrary to the *Unitary Language System Hypothesis*, young bilingual children can use their developing language systems differentially in contextually sensitive ways. Second, case studies have found that children's code-switching behaviour illustrates a good understanding of the grammatical systems of both languages.

To wrap up for this review above, the language that the children get, and use is the impact of their interactional with the environmental context or sociolinguistics factors. In a bilingual setting, the children commonly acquire more than one language exposure. Firstly, the younger children got exposure from the family members such as parents, siblings, or even nanny or childcare. Then, another different language exposure or input they got from neighbours or friends. As a result, they speak two different languages (linguistic codes) which sometimes make code-switching in the conversation using their languages (stronger language or weaker language).

A plethora of studies on sociolinguistics was conducted by a lot of scholars, however, few of the studies deal with code-switching performed by preschool children in Indonesian were explored. Therefore, the current study investigates code-switching production performed by three pre-school children who live and interact in a rural where two different languages are used, they are: Bahasa Indonesia as their national language (stronger language) and Sundanese as local or vernacular language (weaker language).

METHOD

The study employed a qualitative research method with an exploratory case study to investigate the code-switching performed by pre-school children. The participants of the study were the three preschool children. They are Khaira 6. years old, Talita 5 years old and Akhdan 4 years old who live in a small village in Banten Province, Indonesia in which two languages are exposed and spoken by the majority of people in that area namely Bahasa Indonesia as the national language and Sundanese as a vernacular language. The data were collected in two ways, the first is from notes written by the researcher when the participants make code-switching, audio recorded for enriching the data needed in the study. The data were collected throughout time and classified based on the number of participants of this study. The observation is almost conducted every day in which the children make interact and communication. There was no intervention along the process of observation from the researcher. The children made code-switching naturally when they

communicate with their interlocutors. The utterances of the children when they made code-switching were transcribed along with the observation. The writer was helped by the members of the adult family member and as well as a nanny who carrying the children. The transcriptions were also confirmed to validate the utterances (code-switching) and avoid discrepancies made by the children to those who heard the children's utterances at the very beginning. After the data from observation were transcribed, then the data were coded and classified based on the observation participants of the study. The code-switching utterances were classified into Intra and inter sentential switches.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Code-switching analysis

In this study, code-switching utterances were classified into intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches and the type of sentences or phrases produced by the participants. See the following table.

Types of code-switching, words, phrases or sentence types.

The code-switching produced by the three children are classified as follow:

Table 1. Type of codeswitching performed by participant 1

Type of code-switching	
Intra sentential	Inter sentential
Khaira: Ayah, tadi Tita nyubit kecil ke kaka, tapi <i>nyeur</i> . Meaning: Dad, Tita pinched me, but <i>painful</i> . Ema: Kaka habis makan jangan dulu tiduran Meaning: Kaka don't lay, you just have eaten. Khaira: Kakannya <i>cangkeul</i> ma, <i>nyeri tonggong</i> makanya kaka tiduran. Meaning: Kaka is <i>fatigue</i> ma, <i>backache</i> , so Kaka lay down but did not sleep. Khaira: Bunda tu tadi si Titanya <i>nyiwit</i> Meaning: Mom, Tita <i>pinched</i> me just now, Khaira: Itu laki laki sama perempuan ganteng ganteng <i>teuing</i> . Meaning: the man together with the woman is <i>very</i> handsome.	Khaira Ma, <i>aya sireum</i> di tangan kaka. Meaning: Ma, <i>there is an ant</i> on my hand. Khaira: <i>Ma kadiuken piringna!</i> kakanya mau makan. Ma gorengin telur dong...! Meaning: <i>Ma, bring me a plate!</i> Kaka wants to eat. Ma, fry an egg, please. Khaira: Ayah <i>bukuna kadiuken geurakeun</i> Meaning: Ded, <i>bring me a book right soon.</i>

Table 2. Type of codeswitching performed by participant 2

Type of code-switching	
Intra sentential	Inter sentential
Talita: Ma tita mau makan ma telur, ma <i>pang nyokotkeun</i> kecap di atas rak Tita gak nyampai. Meaning: Ma, Tita want to eat egg. Ma, <i>please take</i> ketchup on the rack, Tita can't reach it. Talita: Pin jangan naik kena pagar ntar dibagi tahu sama ayah, <i>bisi labuh</i> . Meaning: Pin don't climb on the fence or I will tell my father. <i>Being afraid of falling down.</i>	Talita: <i>Ma kadiuken origamina, si Akhdan menta</i> . Meaning: <i>Ma, take the origami, Akhdan asks it.</i> Talita: Ma <i>kadiukeun itu bajuna</i> , Tita mau pakai. Meaning: <i>Ma take me the cloth</i> , Tita want to wear it. Talita: Ma <i>kadiu!</i> itu si Hani naik naik <i>kana</i> pintu pagar ma. Meaning: Ma, <i>come here!</i> Hani climbs <i>on</i> the fence door ma.

Table 3. Type of codeswitching performed by participant 3

Type of code-switching	
Intra sentential	Inter sentential
Akhdan: Ma baseuh , ada sireum di tempat nasinya Meaning: Ma, it is wet , there is an ant on the rice.	Ema: Akhdan udah makan? Meaning: Akhdan, have you eaten? Akhdan: Dede enggues dahar ma . Meaning: Dede has already eaten ma .

This study investigates code-switching production made by pre-school children as the effect of environmental factors in which there is two language exposure acquired by the children. Three children who were raised and grew up in a bilingual society were involved in the study. The data were gotten from spontaneous utterances made by the participants and then transcribed by the writers. The process of observation in collecting the data is almost done every day. Having collected and transcribed the data, then the data were classified or coded. The data were classified based on the type of code-switching made by the participants. They were classified into intra sentential and inter sentential code-switching.

In these findings, the code-switching made by the participants is the effect of their environment factors. According to Meisel (1994) during their third year of life, the children begin to use code-switching, even though it may still differ in some respects from adult usage. The code-switching produced by the participants could be classified into intra-sentential and inter-sentential. Based on the data findings and analysis all the participants produced code-switching for both *intra-sentential* and *inter-sentential*. These productions are not merely dominated by the factor of age, but the exposure and input which become intake take that the children make code-switching from strong language into weaker language respectively.

P#1: Khaira

Firstly, Khaira (6 years old) makes code-switching in the level of both *intra-sentential* and *inter-sentential*.

Excerpt 1

Khaira : Ayah, tadi Tita nyubit kecil ke kaka, tapi **nyeuiri**.
Meaning: Dad, Tita pinched me, but **painful**.

Excerpt 2

Ema: Kaka habis makan jangan dulu tiduran
Meaning: Kaka don't lay, you just have eaten.
Khaira: Kakannya **cangkeul** ma, **nyeri tonggong** makanya kaka tiduran.
Meaning: Kaka is **tired** Ma, **backache**. Therefore, I lay down.

Excerpt 3

Khaira: Bunda tu tadi si Titanya **nyiwit**
Meaning: Mom, Tita **pinched** me just now.

Excerpt 4

Khaira: Itu laki laki sama perempuan ganteng ganteng **teuing**.
Meaning: the man together with the woman is **so** handsome.

Khaira Ma, **aya sireum** di tangan kaka.
Meaning: Ma, **there is an ant** on my hand.

Khaira : **Ma kadieuken piringna!** kakanya mau makan. Ma gorengin telur dong...!
Meaning: **Ma, bring me a plate!** Kaka want to eat. Ma, fry an egg please.

Khaira spoke “Ayah, tadi Tita nyubit kecil ke kaka, tapi **nyeuiri**”. in this sentence she made code-switching from her stronger language (bahasa Indonesia), into her weaker language (Sundanese). In this sense, she tried to show that she is able to speak in both languages. When she spoke “**nyeri**” Sundanese word (adj), actually she also knows the word in Bahasa Indonesia.

Meanwhile, in the level of inter sentential, Khaira produced code-switching in the level of sentences. Like on the excerpt 5 and 6. Ma **aya sireum** (Sundanese), di tangan kaka (Indonesia). In this case, the speaker (Khaira) knows what *sireum* means in Indonesian, but

she wants to be intimate with her partner (Ema) whose mother tongue is Sundanese. Moreover, in excerpt 6, she produced longer code-switching **Ma kadieuken piringna! (Sundanese) kakanya mau makan. Ma gorengin telur dong...** (Indonesian).

P# 2: Talita

Secondly, Talita (5 years old) also makes code-switching in the level of both *intra-sentential and inter-sentential*.

Excerpt 1

Talita: Ma tita mau makan ma telur, ma **pang-nyokotkeun** kecap di atas rak Tita gak nyampai.
Meaning: Ma, Tita want to eat egg. Ma, **please take** ketchup on the rack, Tita can't reach it.

Excerpt 2

Talita: Pin jangan naik kena pagar ntar dibagi tahu sama ayah, **bisi labuh**.
Meaning: Pin don't climb on the fence, or I will tell my father. **Being afraid of falling**.

In the level of inter-sentential

Excerpt 3

Talita: **Ma kadieuken origamina, si Akhdan menta.**
Meaning: **Ma, take the origami, Akhdan asks it.**

Excerpt 4

Talita: Ma **kadieukeun itu bajuna**, Tita mau pakai.
Meaning: **Ma take me the cloth**, Tita want to wear it.

Excerpt 5

Talita: Ma **kadieu!** itu si Hani naik naik **kana** pintu pagar Ma.
Meaning: Ma, **come here!** Hani climbs **on** the fence door Ma.

The excerpts above show that Talita produced code-switching in imperative sentences for both intra and inter sentential. In excerpt 1, she switched from Indonesian into Sundanese (*pang nyokotkuen*) which means *please take* (in English). Moreover, in excerpt 2, she warned her friend not to climb on the fence door. She used Sundanese words as a strategy and try to be intimate with her friend who is familiar with the Sundanese. In excerpt 3 and 4, she made longer code-switching (inter-sentential) that is used to convey the message to 'Ema or Ma as her childcare who are very familiar with Sundanese. Further, in excerpt 6, she made code-switching as the information conveyed to Ema.

P# 3: Akhdan

The third, Akhdan (4 years old) also makes code-switching in the level of both *intra-sentential and inter-sentential*.

Intra sentential

Akhdan: Ma **baseuh, ada sireum** di tempat nasinya
Meaning: Ma, **it is wet**, there is an **ant** on the rice.

Inter sentential

Ema: Akhdan udah makan?
Meaning: Akhdan, have you eaten?
Akhdan : **Dede gues dahar Ma.**
Meaning: **Dede has already eaten Ma.**

In line with Khaira and Talita, Akhdan also tends to use code-switching in intra sentential and inter sentential. In intra sentential and inter sentential, he produced code-switching in affirmative sentences. He used Sundanese to his interlocutors who are familiar with Sundanese. In this context, Akhdan tends to use Sundanese actively than both his elder sisters.

This finding is in line with Mac Swan, 1999; Meisel, 1994; Nicoladis & Genesee, 1997; Paradis, Nicoladis & Genesee, 2000; van Gelderen & MacSwan, 2008). Genesee (1989) that claim that young bilingual children can use their developing language systems differentially in contextually sensitive ways and case studies have found that children's code-switching behaviour illustrates a good

understanding of the grammatical systems of both languages. Moreover, code-switching she made in intra sentential on the words. Code-switching is that it may be used to build intimate interpersonal relationships among members of a bilingual community. In this respect, it may be claimed that it is a tool for creating linguistic solidarity especially between individuals who share the same ethnocultural identity (Sert, 2005). At last, code-switching is natural in early childhood language development compared with strict one parent – one language (OPOL) compartmentalisation strategies (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The present study investigates the code-switching production made by three pre-school children. The study employed a qualitative method with an exploratory case study. The data got from the field notes made by the researcher. Then, the data were coded, transcribed, and analyzed. Based on the data analysis and findings after the writer made serial steps in doing this project, the study reveals that the environmental factors contribute to the pre-school children's language acquisition named Khaira, Talita, and Akhdan. The language exposures that the children got become inputs that enrich their language repertoire. From the research findings, code-switching performed by three preschool children are classified into intra sentential and inter sentential. Moreover, in the context of sentence type, the children tend to use code-switching in imperative sentences rather than other types of sentences. The children produced codeswitching in communication with their interlocuter are seen from their intentions. Firstly, they use code-switching from their stronger language (Bahasa Indonesia) into Sundanese (weaker language) due to their closeness with their speaking partners. Secondly, they use code-switching to show that they can speak two languages. Third, code-switching is mundane in the bilingual society which is often performed by children age under 6 years old. Code-switching is a common phenomenon that bilingual speakers regularly engage in including bilingual children (Yow et al., 2018). Among children, sociolinguistic factors, such as living in a bilingual community, may influence whether a child becomes bilingual (Gathercole and Thomas, 2009). Therefore, although preschool-aged children may not have a strong sense of sociolinguistic identity, they are sensitive to what language is being used in their environment by mirroring the frequency of code-switching (i.e. switching from one language to the other) of the adult speakers (Comeau et al., 2007; Juan Garau and Perez-Vidal, 2001 as cited in Hoff et al., 2012).

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D., Churchill, E., Nishino, T., & Okada, H. (2007). Alignment and interaction in a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 169–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00539.x>
- Bialystok, E., Barac, R., Blaye, A., & Poulin-Dubois, D. (2010). Word mapping and executive functioning in young monolingual and bilingual children. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 11(4), 485–508. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2010.516420>
- Blom, E. (2010). Effects of input on the early grammatical development of bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(4), 422–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006910370917>
- Carroll, S. E. (2017). Exposure and input in bilingual development. *Bilingualism*, 20(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728915000863>
- Chapman, R. S. (2019). *Children's Language Learning: An Interactionist Perspective*. 41(1), 33–54.
- Chung, H. H. (2006). Code switching as a communicative strategy: A case study of korean–english bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 293–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162878>
- de Marco, A., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2013). Rural Neighborhood Context, Child Care Quality, and Relationship to Early Language Development. *Early Education and Development*, 24(6), 792–812. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2013.736036>
- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F., Simon-Cerejido, G., & Leone, A. E. (2009). Code-switching in bilingual children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13(1), 91–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006909103530>
- Hei, K. C. (2015). Factors Affecting code-Switching: A Case Study of an Urban Family in Petaling Jaya. *Journal of Modern Languages*, 12(1), 34–156.
- Hoff, E., Core, C., Place, S., Rumiche, R., Señor, M., & Parra, M. (2012). Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, 39(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000759>
- Huerta-Macias, A., & Quintero, E. (1992). Code-Switching, Bilingualism, And Biliteracy: A Case Study. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(3–4), 69–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1992.10162638>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- MacLeod, A. A. N., Fabiano-Smith, L., Boegner-Pagé, S., & Fontolliet, S. (2013). Simultaneous bilingual language acquisition: The role of parental input on receptive vocabulary development. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 29(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659012466862>

- Meisel, J. M. (1994). Code-Switching in Young Bilingual Children. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(4), 413–439. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100013449>
- Paradis, J., & Nicoladis, E. (2007). The influence of dominance and sociolinguistic context on bilingual preschoolers' language choice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(3), 277–297. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb444.0>
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms of Sindh University. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8), 101–106. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.htm>
- Yow, W. Q., Tan, J. S. H., & Flynn, S. (2018). Code-switching as a marker of linguistic competence in bilingual children. *Bilingualism*, 21(5), 1075–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728917000335>
- Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n4p91>