Furthermore, Kachru (in Soewito, 1985, p.76) define code-mixing as the use of two languages or more by means of inserting the elements of one language to another. In the codemixing, there is a main code or the basic code in use and the code has the function of autonomy. On the other hand, the other codes that might have been involved in the conversation will be mere fragments without any function of autonomy. Thelander in Chaer (1994, pp.151-152) state that code-mixing will occur if phrases or clauses that have been involved in a conversation consists of mixed phrases or clauses and each phrase or clause does not support their own function. For example, a speaker of Bahasa Indonesia inserts most fragments from his or her vernacular in a conversation. Thus, it might be considered that the speaker has performed codemixing. The apparent characteristic of code-mixing from the grammatical aspect is the mixture between two language systems into one sentence or phrase. In other words, the apparent characteristic of code-mixing is the intra-sentential code-switching. This statement is in line with the argument by Appel & Musyken (2006, p.118), who state that intra-sentential switches occur in the middle of a sentence; this type of switching is often called code-switching. Muysken, Díaz, & Muysken (2000, p.3) proposes three types of code-mixing. The three types of code-mixing are defined by different structural requirements. In addition, the three types of code-mixing play their role in different levels and with different manners on specific bilingual background. Then, the three types of code-mixing are insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. Each type will be elaborated further in the following sections.

Numan and Carter (2001:275) briefly define the term as “a phenomenon of switching from one language to another in the same discourse”. From this definition, “discourse” will be handled as the students’ and teachers’ naturally occurring language use in classroom. Additionally, the languages between which alternation is performed are the native language of the students, and the foreign language that students are expected to gain competence in.

Terms in sociolinguistics for language and especially speech that draws to differing extents on at least two languages combined in different ways, as when the students in the class (Indonesian/English bilingual) says: Ms I want to pergi to the toilet (pergi = go). A code may be a language or a variety or style of a language; the term code mixing emphasizes hybridisation, and the term code-switching emphasizes movement from one language to another. Mixing and switching probably occur to some extent in the speech of all bilinguals, so that there is a sense in which a person capable of using two languages.

While putting the phenomenon of code switching in context, the functions of code switching will be introduced in various aspects.

1. Its function in bilingual community settings will briefly be explained by giving a sample authentic conversation which will help the reader deduce ideas about its possible applications in educational contexts.

2. The functionality of code switching in teachers’ classroom discourse will be introduced with its aspects as: topic switch, affective functions, and repetitive functions.

3. The focus will shift to students’ code switching by introducing some basic functional perspectives as: equivalence, floor holding, reiteration, and conflict control.

From the function above, generally, code switching occur not only in social community but also it always occurs in the class situation. And it has the big advantages especially for the teacher in order to give the knowledge of foreign language for the students, through this alternative way the students is required to use target language while speaking or discussing to develop their skill in learning foreign language.

On the other hand, code-mixing is the other phenomenon closely related to code switching. Code mixing takes place without a change of topic and can involve various levels of language such as phonology, morphology, grammatical structures or lexical items.We could not avoid that the first language is a big effect in second language. Interaction and mixing between languages result in various languages. Most of the people in the society mix their language with other language by borrowing or using pieces of foreign languages even sometimes they are still influenced by first language.

Kachru in Nusjam (2004) defines code mixing as the use of one or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language into another, and by such a language mixture developing a new restricted or not so restricted code of linguistic interaction. Related to Kachru’s definition, we can see the reality in the class, when students say something in English, they mix some language in the sentence that they don’t know how to say in English means combine the language between Indonesia and English.

* + 1. **Code switching and code-mixing differences**

When discussions are usually made about the differences between code switching and code mixing, both of them have the strong similarities, making it difficult to identify the differences. The similarities between the two is the function when we employ two or more languages as a variant language in speech community. But the differences are in code switching, switch language event or variety of languages by the bilingual because of a certain reason and selected consciously. While code mixing, the use of fregments of another language to one language that is needed probably, has the function and it is not considered wrong or a deviation. Like in our country, a bilingual sometimes slipped fregments of a language in conversation: it can be said he or she practiced code mixing.

Thelander quoted by Chaer and Leony (2004:115) tried to differ between code switching and code mixing. He said that code switching is speech event where there is a switch from one clause of language to another clause of other language. When speech event occurs, the clauses or phrases consist of hybrid clauses and hybrid phrases is called Code mixing. From the previous study of experts to identify between code mixing and code switching, it is difficult to differentiate between the two, this is due to some concepts of rule to be observe in making it clear.

* 1. **Code switching in Malay song**

Malay composers basically have specific patterns of code-switching in their songs. Many rap songs for instance, contained a blend of English and Malay languages in chorus and verses. Languages used in modern Malay songs come in various styles, forms and patterns due to songwriters’ creativity and individuality. Code-switching is seen as a normal phenomenon in language classrooms (Rido et al. 2015). Some scholars, however, perceive code switching as a negative habit because it affects one’s proficiency. Cook (2002) for instance, believes that code switching in multilingual classrooms create problems, confusion and misunderstanding because not all participants or learners come from the same linguistic background. Therefore, even though the use of code-switching in Malay songs enhances students’ participation in class, it does not develop their proficiency and confidence in speaking (Mokgwathi & Webb 2013). Some educators perceive code-switching as an indication of users’ low proficiency. When students combine two or more languages in a single utterance, language teachers normally see it as an inappropriate linguistic behavior that leads to multiple language errors (Palmer 2009).

Many previous studies have found that intersentential code-switching is more common in song lyrics as compared to intrasentential code-switching and tag switching. Daoh’s (2016) study for instance, focuses on code-switching in the lyrics of ‘Bird Thongchai Mcintyre’. According to Daoh (2016), intersentential code-switching was the most frequently used in the song, followed by intrasentential code-switching and tag switching. Codeswitching was used as interjection, indicate personality and objectification, simplify a message, identify the addressee, reiterate, and perform a referential function.

Another study conducted by Ria (2016) examined the code-switching phenomenon in the lyrics of ‘Bondan Prokoso’, featuring Fade 2 Black as one of the singers. Ria (2016) found that intersentential code-switching was more popular than intrasentential codeswitching. According to Ria (2016), code-switching was used to clarify speech, quote somebody’s words, attract audience, and highlight some information. Widaya’s (2015) study focuses on English-Indonesian code-switching in some modern Indonesian song-lyrics. Widaya (2015) also found that intersentential code-switching was more popular than intrasentential code-switching and tag switching. There were six reasons behind the use of code-switching given by Widaya (2015), which are the lack of vocabulary, mood expression, emphasis, semantic significance, addressing different audience, and prompting the audience’s attention.

* 1. **Code switching in You Tube vlog videos**

YouTube exists since 2005. YouTube provides a lot of features along with its development. In YouTube, people, from kid to adult, can find everything they want to explore supported by audio and visualization. People are able to share or upload everything, anywhere, and anytime. Those who love to share their videos through their channel are named a YouTuber. The more viewers they get the more famous they are. By having a YouTube channel, YouTubers can upload everything they want to convey to the viewers. While, the viewers can choose selectively what they want to watch and what information they want to get.

While the code switching occurred, the motivation or reasons became background of why the speaker switched language with interlocutor. Hoffman cited in Wiruma (2017; 43) said that some reasons for bilingual switch their language were as follow:

a. Talking about particular topic People sometimes prefer to talk about particular topic in one language rather than in another. Sometimes, a speaker feels free or comfortable to express their emotional feeling in different language. The case can be found in Singapore, in which English used to discuss about trade or business, Mandarin for international “Chinese” language, Malay as the language of the region and Tamil as the language of the important ethnic groups in the republic.

b. Quoting somebody else. A speaker switches code to express a famous expression, proverb, or saying of some well-known figures. The switch involves just the words that the speaker is claiming the quoted person said. The switch like a set of quotation marks. In Indonesia, those well-known figures are mostly from some English-speaking countries. Then, because many of the Indonesian people nowdays are good at English. Those famous expressions or sayings can be quoted in their original language.

c. Being emphatic about something (Express solidarity) Usually, when someone who is talking using a language that is not his native language suddenly wants to be emphatic about something, the speaker either intentionally or unintentionally will switch from his/her second language to first language. on the other hand, the speaker switches from second to first language because he/she feels more convenient to be emphatic in his second language rather than in his/her first language.

d. Interjection (Inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors) Interjections are words or expressions which are inserted into a sentence to convey surprise, strong emotion, or to gain attention. Interjection is a short exclamation like: Damn!, Hey! Well! Look! Etc. they have grammatical value but the speaker uses them quite often in speaking than in writing. Language switching among bilingual or multilingual people can sometimes mark an interjection or sentence connector. It may happen unintentionally or intentionally.

e. Repetition used for clarification When a bilingualist wants to clarify his/her speech to the interlocutor, the speaker can use both the language (codes) that he masters to tell the same message. Frequently, a message in one code is repeated in the other code literally. A repetition is not only used for clarifying the speech, but also for amplifying or emphasizing a message.

f. Intention for clarifying the speech content for interlocutor When bilingual or multilingual talks to each other, there will be lots of code switching occur. It means to make the content of his speech runs smoothly and can be understood by the interlocutor. A message in one code is repeated in the other code in somewhat modified form.

g. Expressing group identity Code switching can also be used to express group identity. The way of communication of academic people in their disciplinary groupings, are obviously different from other groups. In the other word, the way of communication of one community is different from people who are outside the community.

Language attitudes spread through our everyday lives: people often judge our social status, group membership, intelligence, competence by the way we use language (Garrett 2010). People hold attitudes to language at all its levels, e.g. accent, choice of words, speed of speech, grammar, language variety. The vast majority of the existing studies on language attitudes are done on particular languages, language varieties, or certain aspects, such as pronunciation or spelling, of particular languages, usually in sociolinguistic situations where there is a troubled history of language contact and a sharp differentiation of the symbolic values of the languages involved. For example, there are studies of language attitudes towards English and other local languages in Hong Kong, India, sub-Saharan Africa and Wales (Garrett 2010). Systematic studies of attitudes towards code-switching – the alternation and mixing of languages within a conversational utterance – are, as Gardner-Chloros (2009, 81–82) points out, few and far between, and most of the existing studies are done in contexts where code switching is restricted or forbidden, such as in many language classrooms (Moodley 2007). In this article, we focus on attitudes towards code switching by multilinguals in a variety of everyday situations.

A large number of studies have reported pejorative terms for code switching such as ‘verbal salad’ (in Nigeria), ‘still colonized’ (Morocco) and ‘very irritating’ (Hong Kong) (see citations in Lawson and Sachdev 2000). Some monolinguals are inclined to dismiss code switching as ‘gibberish’ (Edwards 2004, 78). Even neutral sounding terms such as Tex-Mex, Franglais, Japlish often have negative connotations (78). These terms reflect ideologies of monolingualism and linguistic purism, or one language only (OLON) and one language at a time (OLAT), which lie behind attitudes against code switching (Wei and Wu 2009). Languages are best kept separate and well-formed according to tightly defined monolingual rules. Even bilinguals who code-switch themselves sometimes believe that code switching is an indication of laziness or poor linguistic proficiency. Chana and Romaine (1984), for example, reported negative attitudes towards code switching among Punjabi–English bilinguals in Birmingham, in spite of their almost exclusively using a code switching mode. Experimental studies of attitudes towards code switching using matched guise techniques largely confirm the negative findings from questionnaires and interviews. Bentahila (1983) found that the majority of the 109 Arabic–French bilinguals in Morocco who took part in the experiment reacted negatively to the code switching guise, and their attitudes ranged from pity to disgust. Lawson and Sachdev’s (2000) own study of 169 Tunisians found code switching to be rated the lowest of all the guises. A similar pattern was uncovered by Berthele (2012) who investigated the influence of different ethnically marked names (Serbian) and code-switches on Swiss teachers’ evaluations of pupils’ oral proficiency in French as a foreign language. Without code switching, texts with a Balkan name were perceived as being superior, but with code switching this superiority was lost and the samples got significantly lower assessment scores.

* 1. **Variables that affect the use of code switching**

In the present study, we focus on the variables that have been found to be significant in the self-reported frequency of use of code switching, e.g. prior and current linguistic practices, age, gender and education. Our overall research question is whether the same variables also affect attitudes towards code switching? We add personality traits which have not been extensively investigated in relation to code switching, but have been found to be significant in our parallel study (2013b).

* + 1. **Personality traits**

Personality traits are hierarchically organised with five broad, independent dimensions at the summit and a larger number of more specific lower-order traits (Pervin, Cervone, and John 2005). We will focus on the first two dimensions out of the so-called ‘Big Five’ (Pervin, Cervone, and John 2005) which may be linked with attitudes towards code switching: Extraversion versus Introversion and Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability. We will also discuss two ‘lower-order’ traits, namely Tolerance of Ambiguity cognitive empathy.

* + 1. **Extraversion – Introversion**

Variation on the Extraversion – Introversion dimension is linked to the amount of cortical arousal, which leads to different behaviour and also different communicative behaviour (Dewaele 2012). Extraverts are sociable, gregarious, talkative, impulsive and risk-taking individuals. Introverts are quiet, introspective, reserved individuals who plan ahead and avoid excitement. The extraverts’ inclination to take risks seems to extend to their linguistic behaviour. They swear more frequently than introverts (Dewaele 2013) and are more willing to use stigmatised speech styles (Dewaele 2012). Dewaele and Li (2013b) using the database on which the present study is based, found that extraverts reported more frequent code switching. We thus assume that extraversion is linked to more positive attitudes towards code switching.

* + 1. **Neuroticism – Emotional stability**

High scorers on Neuroticism (high-N) tend to be ruminators, ‘emotionally labile and frequently complain of worry and anxiety, as well as bodily aches’ (Pervin, Cervone, and John 2005, 238). Those who score low on Neuroticism can be described as emotionally stable, calm, and contented. Dewaele (2013) found that high-N individuals (both English L1 users and English foreign language users) reported swearing significantly more in interactions with friends and strangers. Neuroticism has been linked to activity in the limbic system, with high-N individuals being more responsive to threat or stress, and showing slower reaction times in response to negative words in emotional Stroop tests (Pervin, Cervone, and John 2005, 316). It might be possible that high-N individuals may be more anxious in dealing with code switching.

* + 1. **Tolerance of Ambiguity**

Tolerance of ambiguity has been defined as: the way an individual (or group) perceives and processes information about ambiguous situations when they are confronted by an array of unfamiliar, complex or incongruent cues. The person with low tolerance of ambiguity experiences stress, reacts prematurely, and avoids ambiguous stimuli. At the other extreme of the scale, however, a person with high tolerance of ambiguity perceived ambiguous situations/stimuli as desirable, challenging, and interesting and neither denies nor distorts their complexity of incongruity. (Furnham and Ribchester 1995, 179) Dewaele and Li (2013a) found that mono- and bilinguals scored significantly lower on tolerance of ambiguity compared to multilinguals. Moreover, participants with higher levels of multilingualism and those who has lived abroad also scored significantly higher on tolerance of ambiguity. A regression analysis showed that both variables contributed significantly to explaining the variance in tolerance of ambiguity. We concluded that tolerance of ambiguity is determined by individuals’ social-linguistic cultural environment and especially by the experience of having to survive in a foreign cultural and linguistic environment. A prolonged stay in a new environment requires a sustained and conscious effort to acquire the new local rules governing communication and social interaction. Tolerance of ambiguity was not linked to more frequent self-reported code switching (Dewaele and Li 2013b).

* + 1. **Cognitive Empathy**

Empathy has been defined as ‘the “glue” of the social world’ (Baron-Cohen and Wheelwright 2004, 193). It refers to the ability to empathise, to understanding what other people might be thinking or how they might be feeling. People with high levels of empathy are better at understanding the intentions of others, are more accurate in predicting their behaviour, and are better able to recognise the emotion of their interlocutor. Dewaele and Li (2012) investigated the relationship between multilingualism and cognitive empathy among mono- and multilinguals. A significant positive correlation emerged between multilingualism and cognitive empathy. Intense multilingual practice seems to make multilinguals more skilful in conversations as they learn to see the world from their interlocutor’s point of view. It is possible that the ability to empathise with a multilingual interlocutor might be linked to more positive views of code switching, as this is a way of highlighting the specific links between the speaker and the interlocutor. Cognitive empathy was linked with higher self-reported frequency of code switching in Dewaele and Li (2013b).