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| **ABSTRACT** English as Foreign Language (EFL) teaching and learning process, it is inevitable for teachers and students to be engaged in various cases involving L1 use. Code-switching has arisen debatable notion of what it brings, good or bad, in educational milieu. To some extent, it is believed that code-switching is such a help for both teachers and students in achieving the learning target while to some party the use of code-switching is no more than a hurdles. In the classroom context in Indonesia where teachers and students share the same first language showed that CS was used by teachers in EFL the classrooms. The research indicated that teachers used CS in teaching and learning process for various reasons. The main reason would be to facilitate students’ learning because by using CS teachers believed that they increase students’ under standing of the teaching materials and provide students with comprehensible input, especially for lower level students. and this research study found that code-switching give contribute the L1 of students especially in vocabulary acquisition.  |
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**INTRODUCTION**

In the teaching process of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), teachers and students inevitably have to participate in various situations involving the use of L1. The debate about the good and bad of code conversion in the educational environment has caused controversy. To a certain extent, people believe that code conversion is helpful for teachers and students to achieve learning goals, while for some people, the use of code conversion is only an obstacle.

Lin (2013: 195) defines code-switching as the code used by teachers or students in two languages ​​in a classroom environment. Code switching is usually found during the teaching process. The communication established between the teacher and the student or otherwise is carried out through language, because at the same time an interruption occurs, and code switching becomes the only solution (Nordin, Ali, Zubir and Sadjirin, 2012: 483). In Indonesia, in a classroom environment where teachers and students share the same first language, studies (Kustati, 2014; Nurhayati, 2014; Widia, 2015; Fatimah 2016; Fhitri, 2017) have shown that in EFL classrooms, teachers use CS. Studies have shown that teachers use CS in the teaching process for various reasons. The main reason is to promote the learning of students, because by using CS teachers believe that they can improve students’ understanding of teaching materials (Widia, 2015: 16) and provide students with comprehensible input, especially for lower level students (Fatima, 2016 : 73). The research by Kustati (2014 : 181) also showed that when teachers used CS the classroom engagement was improved because the students understand the instruction better.

In addition, research on the use of CS in EFL classes in the Indonesian language environment also shows that people are worried that excessive use of CS in the classroom may have a negative impact on the teaching process. Teachers also worry that students may become accustomed to CS, which will reduce students' willingness to speak English (Kustati, 2014: 174). A study by Fhitri (2017: 3) also shows that the use of CS by teachers is not a strategy that teachers consciously use to promote learning. On the contrary, teachers use CS because they are influenced by students who use their first language, which is considered a disturbance when teachers use English (Fhitri, 2017: 9). Sakaria and Priyana (2018: 176) also pointed out that excessive use of CS in EFL classrooms may make students overly dependent. They encourage teachers to use CS carefully to promote learning. Therefore, although the use of CS is beneficial to the EFL classroom, it should be considered whether teachers use CS as a strategy to promote learning, or only use CS as a sign of teacher L2 insufficient ability, and should be cautious.

Although code-switching is an integral part of foreign language teaching, there must be instructions for code-switching. The standard of code-switching teaching in the classroom: (a) the language distribution must be 50/50; (b) the change must be unconscious; and (c) the rotation is for learning purposes (Jacobson 1983). Regarding the positive and negative aspects of transcoding, you should know the reasons behind it to understand whether transcoding is applicable. The mastery level of students has become a problematic cause. Students tend to switch languages ​​because their language ability is not equal to another language, nor is it equal to the proficiency of their teacher (Üstunel, 2016: 45). Students should find a convenient way to communicate with classmates. They do not use English as a spoken language, otherwise they use L1. On the other hand, teachers can also take the same actions to overcome the gaps in the dialogue. Like code-switching, an unprecedented level of teachers and students should be filled in some way. This is an obstacle.

The decision to choose vocabulary as the goal of language learning is mainly based on previous research on teacher CS. According to the understanding of Nation (2011) and others, the acquisition of vocabulary is essential to the successful use of a second language and plays an important role in the formation of complete oral and written texts. Vocabulary becomes the basis for acquiring or learning the target language.

**METHOD (Tahoma 11pt, Bold, Capitalized)**

The chosen subject is focused on one class. Those students participated in this study from the beginning to the end. The study uses cluster sampling in doing this study. It is conducted in MAN 2 LEBAK, Xl of IPA 2 class which consist of 25 students.

There are three types of instruments used to collect the data that should be accurate. In this study, the researcher conduct eight meetings by online using whatsapp application.

* + - 1. **Pre-test**

Pre-Test is conducted to measure how understand the students about vocabulary acquisition and used google docs before giving the treatment.

* + - 1. **Treatment**

The researcher create materials which were closely in line with participants’ school curricula in terms of the difficulty of language and content so that they could be incorporated into their regular english classes.

* + - 1. **Post-test**

Post-test is conducted to measure and find out the significant after the treatment of teacher’ code-switching. The post-test is held by using google docs.

**Data Analysis**

1. **Determining t-test**

$$t=\frac{X1-X2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS1+SS2}{N1+N2-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N1}+\frac{1}{N2 }\right)}}$$

Where:

t : Test of Significance

2 : The number of test involved

1 : Constant number

1. **Determining degree of freedom**

Df = N – 2

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

 The data of this study was collected from XI IPA 2 students of MAN 2 LEBAK in academic year of 2020/2021. The total of this study is 25 students.

 The data needed in this study was collected by three instruments. They were pre-test, treatment, post-test. The pre-test was conducted on February 9th 2021 in order to get their existing linguistic knowledge about vocabulary. The treatment was conducted on February 12th – 20th 2021 in order to review or improve their linguistic knowledge about vocabulary through code-switching. The post-test was conducted on February 23rd 2021 in order to find out the significance progress after the treatment.

The result of the data were described in the following :

 **Table 1.2**

 **Pre-test and post-test analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Name**  | **Post-test****(X1)** | **X1****Kuadrat** | **Pre-test****(X2)** | **X2****Kuadrat** |
| **1** | Ahmad Solihin  | 85 | 7255 | 50 | 2500 |
| **2** | Almira Tiara Putri | 90 | 8100 | 65 | 4225 |
| **3** | Anita Aramanda  | 90 | 8100 | 70 | 4900 |
| **4** | Bulan Sri Rahayu | 90 | 8100 | 60 | 3600 |
| **5** | Fairus Sulhah | 95 | 9025 | 70 | 4900 |
| **6** | Ferdi Yansah | 75 | 5625 | 55 | 3025 |
| **2** | Hisyam Abdu Rahman | 95 | 9025 | 75 | 5625 |
| **8** | Iin Indriyani  | 90 | 8100 | 50 | 2500 |
| **9** | Indi Alfitriyani | 55 | 3025 | 50 | 2500 |
| **10** | Isah Susanti | 95 | 9025 | 40 | 1600 |
| **11** | khaerunisa | 95 | 9025 | 50 | 2500 |
| **12** | Linda Oktaviani | 90 | 8100 | 45 | 2025 |
| **13** | Maula Z | 95 | 9025 | 60 | 3600 |
| **14** | Mesi Anita Hamidah | 75 | 5625 | 65 | 4225 |
| **15** | Merih Yulianti | 90 | 8100 | 55 | 3025 |
| **16** | Mila Mustika | 70 | 4900 | 25 | 625 |
| **17** | Nazwa Chasanah | 70 | 4900 | 45 | 2025 |
| **18** | Nisa Nurul Hasanah | 95 | 9025 | 50 | 2500 |
| **19** | Reni Febriani | 75 | 5625 | 60 | 3600 |
| **20** | Rita Herawati | 65 | 4225 | 30 | 900 |
| **21** | Selfa Yuliana | 80 | 6400 | 65 | 4225 |
| **22** | Siti Nurfadilah | 90 | 8100 | 75 | 5625 |
| **23** | Surtini  | 85 | 7225 | 45 | 2025 |
| **24** | Tina Lestari | 80 | 6400 | 55 | 3025 |
| **25** | Wina  | 55 | 3025 | 30 | 900 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **∑X1=****2065** | **∑X12=****175080** | **∑X2=****1330** | **∑X22=****76200** |

From the table 1.2, it can be seen that the result is **∑X1= 2065,**

**∑X12= 175080 and ∑X2= 1330, ∑X22= 76200.**

The analysis of the post-test (X1) and pre-test (X2) variable as follows:

* 1. Determining mean of
	2. X1 variables

 $M1=\frac{∑X1}{N1}$ = $\frac{2065}{25}$ = 82,6

1. Determining of standard deviation score of X1 variables

$SD\_{1}= \sqrt{\frac{SS\_{1}}{N\_{1}-1}}$ where $ SS\_{1}=∑X1^{2}- \frac{(∑X1)^{2}}{N1}$

*SS1 =* 175080 - $\frac{\left(2065\right)^{2}}{25}$

*SS1* = 175080 - 170569

SS1 = 4511

*SD*1 = $\frac{\sqrt{4511}}{24}$

*SD*1 = $\sqrt{187},9$

*SD1 =* 13,7

1. Determining mean of X2 variables

 $M2=\frac{∑X2}{N1}$ = $\frac{1330}{25}$ = 53,2

1. Determining of standard deviation score of X2 variables

$SD\_{2}= \sqrt{\frac{SS\_{2}}{N\_{2}-1}}$ where $ SS\_{2}=∑X2^{2}- \frac{(∑X2)^{2}}{N2}$

*SS2*  = 76200 - $\frac{\left(1330\right)^{2}}{25}$

*SS2* = 76200 – 70756

*SS2* = 5444

*SD2* = $\frac{\sqrt{544}4}{24}$

*SD*2 = $\sqrt{22,68}$

*SD2* = 4,77

1. Determining t-test

$$t=\frac{X1-X2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS1+SS2}{N1+N2-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N1}+\frac{1}{N2 }\right)}}$$

 t = $\frac{82,6-53,2}{\sqrt{\frac{\left(4511+5444\right)}{25+25}}}\left(\frac{1+}{25}\frac{1}{25}\right)$

 t = $\frac{29,4}{\frac{\sqrt{9955}}{48}}\left(\frac{2}{25}\right)$

 t = $\frac{29,4}{\sqrt{2074x}0,08}$

 t = $\frac{29,4}{\sqrt{16,5}}$

 t = $\frac{29,4}{4,1}$

 t = 7,2

1. Determining degree of freedom

df = N – 2

df = 25-2 = 23

df = 23

1. Determining t-table in signifikan level 5% with degree of freedom.

The value of df is 23 at degres of significance 5 % or t-table is 1,71387. The result of the data analysis showed that Teachers’ Code-Switching On Students’ Vocabulary Acquisiton is effective.

**Table 1.2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| t-calculation | t-table | Significant  |
| 7,2 | 1,71387 | Significant  |

***Discussion***

 After calculating the data to the T score, the T test was found to be greater than the T table. This means that teachers’ code-switching has a significant impact on students’ vocabulary acquisition. Therefore, the research hypothesis (H1) is accepted, and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected.

In the previous subtitle, the author has used statistical formulas to analyze the data of this study. Through statistical analysis and analysis of the data of Class XI IPA 2 students from Lebak, Department 2 in Banten City, it is found that the mean scores before and after the test are different. Mean before the test was 53.2, and mean after the test was 82.3. In fact, it is obvious that MAN 2 LEBAK's XI IPA category 2 has different performance between pre-test and post-test. As mentioned earlier, the average score before the test was 53.2, and the average score after the test was 82.3. Mean score after the test is higher than the mean score before the test. It shows that the performance of students after treatment is better than before treatment.

However, the author needs to use statistical procedures to prove the hypothesis to see if there is any significant impact. In this case, the author uses the t-test formula to get 7,2 points. In this study, the author wants to know whether the T count is greater than the T table in 23 degrees of freedom, with a significance level of 0,05, which is 1,7138. Therefore, based on the above calculation results, the author finds that T-count≥T-table (7,2≥1,71387).

The author statistically proves that teachers’ code conversion has a significant impact on students’ vocabulary acquisition.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the study that was conducted in XI IPA 2 of students at MAN 2 LEBAK, Banten. Altough this study was conducted by online and used whatsapp application to collect the data, the study was running well. First impression of students while the teacher using code-switching they were amazed because the teacher usually using almost Indonesian language while teaching.

The first thing the researcher did was determine the target word, and adjust to the lesson plan from the English book, it is about analytical exposition text. Then the researcher select the theme *Global Warming, is it an end to our world ?,* the text were intended to be both enjoyable to read and age appropriate for the participant. And a vocabulary pre-test which was administered at the outset of the study to measure the degree of learners’ vocabulary knowledge of the target words.Then because this study was being held during pandemic covid-19 the researcher use the audio as the media, and lastly immediate post-test which measure the acquisition of vocabulary knowledge.

It can be seen and concluded that there are significant differences result between pre-test and post-test, it is proven from the result that is obtained. Pre-test is obtaining 53,2 and post-test is 82,6. From the explanation above, there is a significant result by using Teacher’s Code-Switching.
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