ATTITUDES TOWARD THE USE OF CODE SWITCHING AMONG TECHNICAL LECTURERS IN UNIKL MSI

ZURAIDAH MD NOOR

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

2009

ZURAIDAH MD NOOR

THIS MASTERS PROJECT SUBMITTED TO UUM COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION
(INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY)

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
2009

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in fulfillment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may ne granted by my supervisor or, in absence by the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood taht any copying or publication or use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due regoinition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Request for permission to copy or make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Research and Postgraduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman.

ABSTRACT

This descriptive study investigates the acceptance and perceptions of UniKL MSI Technical lecturers on the use of code switching in the classroom. Data was gathered by distributing 35 questionnaire using convenient sampling among Technical lecturers. The questionnaires were divided into three parts using Likert Scale. The first part was to access the frequency of using code switching in the classroom, the second part was the attitude towards the use of code switching among Technical lecturers, and the final part was the implications of using code switching in teaching Technical subjects. Apart from the questionnaire, interview sessions with 4 selected respondents were conducted to further substantiate the findings in the questionnaire. The findings suggest that The Technical lecturers consider code switching as an acceptable linguistic behaviour in the classroom. Besides facilitating learning, code switch is also used for giving instruction, to gain feedback, to establish relationship as well as classroom management. Nevertheless, they feel that code switching should be the last resort when teaching and only use it when the situation demands. Code switching is considered as a teaching tool to help the low proficient students to understand the subject matter. At the same time, code switching is seen as hindrance in English language acquisition both to the Technical lecturers as well as the students. All ia all, code switching is acknowledged and acceptable in the context of teaching Technical subjects in UniKL MSI.

ABSTRAK

Kaji selidik ini bertujuan untuk menentukan tahap penerimaan dan pandangan tenaga pengajar teknikal di UniKL MSI terhadap *code switching* di dalam bilik darjah. Data dikumpul dengan mengedar 35 set soalan kaji selidik kepada tenaga pengajar teknikal. Soalan kaji selidik dibahagikan kepada 3 bahagian dan menggunakan Pengukur Likert. Bahagian pertama adalah untuk mengetahui kekerapan penggunaan code switching di dalam bilik darjah, bahagian kedua adalah untuk menilai pandangan tenaga pengajar mengenai penggunaan *code switching* di dalam bilik darjah. Manakala bahagian terakhir pula untuk mengetahui kesan penggunaan *code switching* terhadap pengajaran dan pembelajaran subjek teknikal. Selain daripada soalan kaji selidik, temu duga juga dilakukan bersama 4 tenaga pengajar teknikal untuk mengesahkan lagi data yang diperoleh daripada kaji selidik yang dijalankan. Keputusan kaji selidik dan temu duga mengesahkan bahawa tenaga pengajar teknikal menerima penggunaan *code switching* di dalam bilik darjah mereka. Selain dari penggunaannya sebagai bantuan mengajar, *code switching* juga digunakan semasa memberi arahan, untuk memperoleh respon, membina hubungan di antara pengajar dan pelajar dan untuk pengurusan bilik darjah. Walau bagaimanapun, mereka berpendapat, *code switching* adalah pilihan terakhir apabila mengajar dan hanya digunakan apabila keadaan memerlukannya. *Code switching* juga dianggap sebagai bantuan mengajar untuk pelajar yang mempunyai tahap pemahaman yang rendah. Pada masa yang sama, *code switching* juga dilihat sebagai penghalang bagi pelajar dan juga tenaga pengajar dalam menguasai Bahasa Inggeris. Keseluruhannya,

code switching diiktiraf dan diterima di dalam context pengajaran subjek teknikal di UniKL MSI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost I would like to thank ALLAh s.w.t. for giving me the strength and will to complete this project paper.

Secondly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Aizan Yaacob for her comments, guidance and advice in the preparation of this project paper.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to all UniKL MSI Technical lecturers for providing me information as well as co-operation in collecting the data for my project paper. My gratitude also goes to Nurul Ain and Safura of UniKL MIAT for letting me to adopt their research instrument for this project paper.

Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family and friends for their in sustaining support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 Background of Study

Code switching is generally defined as the phenomenon when a bi- or multilingual speaker shifts from one language to another language in the course of a conversation. Bilinguals, who can speak at least two languages, have the ability to code-switch or mix their languages during communication by substituting a word or phrase from one language with a phrase or word from another language. Bilinguals, who can speak at least two languages, have the ability to use elements of both languages when conversing with another bilingual.

Code switching can occur between sentences (intersentential) or within a single sentence (intrasentential). In intersentential code switching, the language switch is done at sentence boundaries. This is seem most often between fluent bilingual speakers. In intrasentential code switching, the shift is done in the middle of a sentence, with no interruption, hesitations, or pauses indicating a shift. The speaker is usually unaware of the switch (Lipski, 1985). If the latter is considered, the phenomenon is called code-mixing. Contrary to this, if the switch is across sentence boundaries, the phenomenon is considered as code switching (Poplack, 1980).

Code switching is an everyday reality in every place where more than one language is spoken in everyday communications. Traditionally, code switching has been viewed as a strategy to compensate for diminished language proficiency. The premise behind this theory is that bilinguals code switch because they do not know either language completely. This argument is also known as semi-lingualism, which underscores the notion that bilinguals "almost" speak both languages correctly (Heredia & Brown, 1997). Halliday (1975) views code switching as fulfilling the interpersonal function of communication. Here the mixed language spoken plays the role of a mediator. In other words, it is the use of language to act as a mediator between self and participants in the communication event. Turdgill (2000) suggested that code switching can be used for self expression and is a way of modifying language for the sake of personal intentions. Another function of code switching is that it may be used in order to build intimate interpersonal relationships among members of a bilingual community. Holmes (1992) in his research found that the subjects in his research switch from English to Maori during their conversation reflects their ethnic identity and this language shift functions as a bridge that builds solidarity among them.

Code switching in conversation and public discourse attracted a great deal of attention over the years, most likely because it supports a strong expectation that the communication is made intelligible whatever the language.

Code switching is not only an acceptable form of communication in society but may also occur in classroom where the learners are bilingual or multilingual. Being a

multilingual and multicultural communities, the use of code switching in Malaysian classroom is inevitable. Although it is not favoured by many educators, one should have at least an understanding of the functions of switching the native language and the foreign language and its underlying reasons. This understanding will provide teachers with a heightened awareness of its use in classroom discourse and will obviously lead to better instruction by either eliminating it or dominating its use.

Second language medium teaching is different from second language teaching, in a way that a learner is taught other subject through the medium of a second language. For example, in the European schools, children in the middle years of secondary education may learn history, Geography and social studies through a second language. In Canadian Immersion schools, children in elementary years learn much of the curriculum through their second language (Cummins, 1992). Similarly, in Malaysian schools, students learn Mathematics and Science through the medium of second language, English.

Learning content-area subjects through the medium of a second language has become increasingly popular in many countries. In some cases a foreign language is used as the medium of instruction in non-language subjects, at the secondary school level when students have acquired sufficient proficiency in the foreign language. In Luxembourg, for example, both German and French are used as a medium of instruction throughout student's school careers to support simultaneous learning of both languages (Pufahl, Rhodes and Christian, 2001).

In most cases, bilingual teachers use two languages to teach the academic content. Within the context of lessons, they switch between the languages in at least three ways: (a) spontaneously, (b) for direct translation, or (c) intentionally. Teachers may decide on the spot when L1 should be used and when a switching to L2 is appropriate in order to enable comprehension and meaningful involvement of students (Cook, 2001). More often, however, teachers are unaware of the fact that they are switching; i.e., switches are made unconsciously (Tikunoof, 1985; Ovando & Collier, 1985; Mattson & Burenhult, 1999). Rodolpho Jacobson (1981) has proposed and tested a model which incorporates the use of code switching in the teaching of content courses in bilingual courses. There are pros and cons to the application of the concurrent approach that is using two or more languages in the same context.

This research is conducted to identify the opinion of bilingual lecturers of privately run English medium university in Kulim towards the use of code switching in their classroom. The study will look at the use of English (L2) in teaching content (technical subjects) to students of Engineering Technology (L2 learners). It will assess the technical lecturers knowledge and views of code switching in classroom environment. Their opinion will reflect the level of acceptance of code switching in the much acclaim “English Only” policy of the institute.

1.2 Problem Statement

Code switching is naturally occurring sociolinguistics phenomena occurring in bilingual environments. According to Cook (1991), "Code switching is found all over the world where bilingual speakers talk to each other…… Bilingual code switching is neither unusual nor abnormal; it is an ordinary fact of life in many multilingual society". Thus being multilingual, code switching is one of the linguistic behaviour of Malaysian.

Malay is the most important language, being the national and only official language and lingua franca. English is the second most important language and according to Asmah Omar, it is widely used in the domain of public life. By 1983, with the national education policy and the National Language Act of 1967, all English schools and the universities turned to using Malay as the medium of instruction. In 1995 education Bill, the position of Malay is strengthened through making it compulsory subject in all schools including private schools (Ho & Wong, 1997).

There are series of attempts to find a balance between teaching and using Malay, the national language to promote unity and solidarity, and meeting ethnic group interests through allowing the continuation of minority language (Chinese and Tamil) schools. The teaching of two languages, Malay and English in Malaysian schools – one for nation building and the other largely for economic reasons has resulted in an imbalance in linguistic achievement probably of unequal emphasis on the teaching of the two languages. On the other hand, there is less need and less opportunity in the school and

outside of it to use English, especially when a pass in English paper was not required for the award of a certificate or diploma (Asmah Omar, 1994). This leads to a decline in the standard of spoken and written English over the years. Because spoken and written English is extensively used in private sector and international relations, the concern has been that this decline in English proficiency particularly in speaking and writing, is a disadvantage to the country's economy as it takes a more global trend.

In the current education system of Malaysia, English language is considered as the second language as it meets the criteria as stated by Wilkins (1972) as a language that is not the mother tongue of any group within the country but has some internal social functions which can encompass part or all of government administration, politics, law, medicine, industry, internal trade, newspapers, general publishing and can even have a role as a medium of instruction.

Previously, most universities or institute of higher learning in Malaysia were using Malay or Bahasa Melayu as the medium of instruction. Only for the past decade, most universities is in the process of changing the medium of instruction from Malay into English in most of their curriculum. This move was taken to address the declining standard of English and to ensure Malaysia's future economic competitiveness and its industrial and technical progress.

In most private universities in Malaysia, English is widely used as medium of instruction. This is due to the role of English that is recognized as the global language. In

order to produce a competitive graduate to the work field, many private universities have adopted this approach to be an added value besides the curriculum that they are offering.

Established in response to the rapidly increasing demand of the industry and incorporating the most advanced technology in Automotive Engineering, Universiti Kuala Lumpur Malaysian Spanish Institute (UniKL MSI) commenced its operation in August 2002 in Kulim Hi-Tech Park in Kulim. A collaborative effort between the Malaysian and Spanish government, UniKL MSI offers automotive engineering programmes with a combination of theoretical and practical application.

UniKL MSI is one of the many private universities in Malaysia that offers its students with the experience of learning the subject content through the use of English as the medium of instruction. Not only all of the courses offered in the curriculum are delivered in English, the assessment is also conducted in English. However, problems arise when almost all of the students are struggling with the content knowledge due to the functional linguistic. This due to the fact that most of the students' level of proficiency is considered quite low as the entry requirement for English is only a pass in Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM). This is quite contradictory as the "English Only" instruction requires the learner to have mastered the target language in order the ensure that these students would be able to cope with the linguistic demand. Based on the data gathered from the July Intake 2008, UniKL MSI Academic Affairs Department reported that a total of 69 out of 200 students who registered in UniKL MSI obtained 7D and 8E for their English subject in their SPM results. Thus, approximately 30% of the Diploma students in UniKL

MSI are considered as low intermediate L2 learners. In addition, there is also another factor to consider that UniKL MSI Diploma students admission qualification is divided into two categories. In the first category, the candidates use their SPM results to enrol in UniKL MSI Diploma programs, while in the other category, candidates uses their certificate results form other institutions such as Institute Kemahiran MARA (IKM), Giat MARA, Politeknik and such as their admission qualification. Rationally, students that come from these educational backgrounds usually failed their SPM English subject.

In multilingual communities, code switching is a widespread phenomenon that extends from daily life and workplace to classroom in which specific languages have been identified as the official languages of instruction. Teachers code switch when teaching content subjects such as history, linguistics and science. Martin's (1996) earlier study in primary level 4 and 5 classrooms in Brunei Darulssalam revealed that code switching is the most frequent in history lessons, followed by science and geography, with the least use in Mathematics. As English is one of the main languages in Automotive Engineering, UniKL MSI is using English as a medium of instruction for teaching purposes. The fact that after eleven years of learning English in primary and secondary schools, most Malaysian students are still not proficient in this language. Code switching is employed to facilitate students comprehension and alternatively as a strategy for teachers to adapt to students' English proficiency, teaching goals and teacher roles in a university (Yang, 2004). For this reason, the Technical lecturers in UniKL MSI have to code switch in order to teach technical subjects in English. Furthermore, they think that the use of code switching in class is a tool in teaching as argued by a line of researcher

that code switching can be applicable and effective tool in the ESL classroom (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 1991; Duran, 1994; Harbord, 1992; Littlewood, 1981).

Generally, based on empirical evidence, it can be perceived that Malaysians do code switch. This is proven as Romaine (1995) and Cook (1991) used their observations on Malaysians as example in their discussions about code switching in sociocultural linguistics. Thus it can be expected that code switching is accepted in both the society and classroom. However, to what extend this is true cannot be determined. This study seeks to clarify whether code switching is identified, accepted and used by UniKL MSI technical lecturers in teaching content subjects to students of Automotive Engineering.

This study was guided by a number of theoretical assumptions related to bilingualism and the use of code switching in classroom. Code switching can be defined as the use of more than one code or language in the course of a single speech event (Gumperz, 1982). There is substantial body of literature on code switching, in particular, code switching in the classroom. For example, research on bilingualism and code switching in classroom has focused on linguistic minority students' academic performance (Zazkis 2000: Kearsey and Turner 1999) or teacher-student interaction (or teacher-led classroom discourse) in a bilingual classroom or code switching as a marker of identity (Cleghorn 2000: Arthur 2001; Heller 2000; Zentella 1997). Thus, few studies have paid attention to code switching as a tool to construct knowledge through classroom discourse functions.

The 1990s saw a growing body of classroom-based research on the use of code switching as a contextualization cue (Martin-Jones 2000). This term was developed by Gumperz (1982) which refers to any choices of verbal and non verbal forms with a communicative encounter.

Many researches have been focusing on the use of code switching by bilingual learners in learning a second language simultaneously either among younger or adult learners. However, with a new direction of becoming a global language, especially in education, English is now commonly used in content-based lessons. The need to be proficient in the use of English among non-native speakers has become a global phenomenon. Today, educators are faced with the challenge of addressing the needs of mastering other skills and content in other subjects areas. In Malaysia particularly, English is not only used in tertiary level but also is secondary level where English has been implemented as the language of instruction for Science and Mathematics.

Code switching can be exploited as part of actual teaching in the classroom context. When a teacher knows the language of the students, the classroom itself is a setting that potentially elicits code switching. Code switching is inevitable in the classroom if the teacher and students share the same languages and should be regarded as a natural component of a bilingual's behaviour. Command of only one language has become a rare phenomenon these days. Teaching in English medium schools or higher institutions is an important area of research. It helped the researcher to find out various forms of assimilated, non-assimilated and switched sentences that are used by speakers.

Although there are rich sources of data for English as a Second Language across the curriculum, there is a dearth in literature concerning the use of English in content-based lessons. The need to answer the challenge of both attaining mastery of the content and the English language is an issue that educators should address. Thus, this study will look at code switching as a necessary tool for Technical lecturers in UniKL MSI to achieve teaching goals in content-based lessons involving students who lack of proficiency in the instructional language.

1.3 Research Purpose

This study seeks to clarify whether code-switching is identified, accepted and used by UniKL MSI technical lecturers in teaching content subjects to students of Automotive Engineering and investigate to what extent does code-switching help students significantly in improving both content knowledge and functional linguistic abilities.

1.4 Research Objectives

i. To identify the frequency of code switching used by the Technical lecturers in the classroom.

ii. To determine the reasons of using code switching by the Technical lecturers in the classroom.

iii. To evaluate the Technical lecturers' attitude on the use of code switching in the classroom.

iv. To identify the classroom implications of using code switching in teaching Technical subjects.

1.5 Research Questions

i. How frequent does code switching is used by the Technical lecturers in the classroom?

ii. What are the reasons of the use of code switching in the classroom?

iii. What are the Technical lecturers' opinions about the use of code switching in the classroom?

iv. What are the classroom implications of using code switching in teaching technical subjects?

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at the definition of code switching by different proponents of researchers. It also looks at the types of code switching and previous studies conducted that investigate the functions of code switching in the society as well as in the classroom.

2.2 What is Code Switching

Code switching is a term in linguistics referring to alternation between two codes (languages and/or dialects), between people who share those particular codes. Choices about how code switching manifest itself are determined by a number of social and linguistic factors. It is quite typical in multicultural population. Code switching can take several forms including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages, and switching in a long narrative. In normal conversations between two bilinguals, code switching consists of eighty-four percent single word switches, ten percent phrase switches, and six percent clause switching (Skiba 1997).

Wardaugh (1998) defined code switching as a situation where bilingual or multilingual is required to select a particular code to use and at times switch or mix one

another according to suitability of a situation. It is done usually during conversation subconsciously but is useful for purposes such as develop or eliminate group boundaries, alter interpersonal relations and ensure effective communication.

Gumperz (1982) coined the term conversational code switching and refers to it as, "the juxtaposition of passages speech belong to two grammatical system or subsystems within the exchange. Most frequently the alternation takes the forms of subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses a second language either to reiterate his message or to reply someone else's statement" (p. 59).

Richard (1985) defines it as, "A change by a speaker (writer) from one language variety to another. Code switching can take place in conversation when one speaker uses one language and another speaker answers in different languages. A person may start speaking one language and then change to another one in the middle of their speech or sometimes even in a middle of the sentences" (p. 43).

As for the sake of this study, code switching is defined as alternating between the target language to the first language, i.e the lecturer will first start the lesson in English and later alternating to Bahasa Melayu when situation demands.

Languages in contact influence one another as in the case with English and Bahasa Malaysia. One of the ways in which contact with English modifies Bahasa Malaysia is code switching, a process by which bilinguals in Malaysia especially Malays

alternate their native language (L1) and their second language (L2) at the word, phrase, clauses or sentence level. Linguists feel that these bilinguals who code switch demonstrate high level of competence manipulating two linguistic systems in a sentence without breaking the grammatical rules of either language. Prescriptivists, on the other hand, apply negative connotation to this linguistic behaviour arguing that code switchers are not fluent in either L1 or L2 and therefore, need both languages to express themselves. Have critics convinced bilingual community that code switching is a language flaw? It is important that L2 speakers know that code switching is a positive linguistic ability? Before we work towards this goal we need to know their perspective about code switching. Accordingly, my research deals with the opinions and acceptance of code switching among educators in a private higher learning institution in Malaysia.

2.3 Types of Code Switching

Poplack (1980) has identified the following three types of code switching:

i) Tag switching

ii) Intersentential Switching

iii) Intrasentential Switching

In Tag switching, a tag is one language is inserted into utterance which is otherwise entirely in the other language, for example – “You know”, “I mean” (English tags) ‘lah” (Malay tag). It is the most common type of code switching.

In intersentential code switching, a switch takes place outside the sentence or clause level, where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. It requires greater fluency in both languages than tag switching since major position of the language must confirm to the rules of both languages.

In intrasentential code switching, switching of different types occur within the clause or sentence boundary. Intrasentential switches take place within sentence / clause / word boundaries with no apparent change in topic, setting etc.

2.4 Reasons for Code Switching

Code switching can be more convenient than waiting for one's mind to think of an appropriate word in sentences. Likewise, code switching can help an ethnic minority community retain a sense of cultural identity, in much the same way that slang is used to give a group of people a sense of identity and belonging, and to differentiate them from society.

Mattson and Burenhult (1999) listed topic switch, affective functions and repetitive functions as functions of teacher's code switching. In topic switch cases, the teacher alters his/her language according to the topic that is under discussion. In these cases, the students' attention is directed to the new knowledge by making use of code switching and accordingly making use of native tongue. At this point it may be suggested

that a bridge from known (native language) to unknown (new foreign language content) is constructed in order to transfer the new content and meaning is made clear in this way.

In addition to topic switch, code switching phenomenon also carries affective functions that serve for expression of emotions. In this respect, code switching is used by the teacher in order to build solidarity and intimate relations with the students. In this sense, one may speak off the contribution of code switching for creating a supportive language environment in the classroom.

Another explanation for the functionality of code switching in classroom settings is its repetitive function. In this case, the teacher uses code switching in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students to clarify. Following the instruction in target language, the teacher code switches to native language in order to clarify meaning. However, the tendency to repeat the instruction in native language may lead to some undesired student behaviours. A learner who is sure that the instruction in foreign language will be followed by a native language translation may loose interest in listening to the former instruction which will have negative academic consequences; as the student is exposed to foreign language discourse limitedly.

Studies offering linguistic evidence based on naturally occurring classroom data provide better insight into the functions and forms of code switching. Studies using Gumprez's semantic model find the use of code switching by students and teachers for a variety of conversational functions. Choi and Kuipers (2003) studied the interaction of

two bilingual Hispanic students and two monolingual English students in middle school during a unit of hands-on and inquiry-based chemistry lessons. The bilingual Hispanic students frequently co-constructed or re-constructed their knowledge from the curriculum in Spanish, particularly in clarification of procedures rather than concepts. The students were found to code switch for calling attention, revoicing, clarification (message qualification) and objectivisation versus personalisation. Choi and Kuipers argue that the students made sense of schooling when interacting with peers, curriculum and the teacher by using two linguistic resources. Zheng (2000) examines the switching between Mandarin Chinese and English of 30 Chinese-Australian bilingual children in Melbourne, aged six to seven, attending school language programme. The interviewer only spoke Mandarin Chinese while students switched between Chinese to English. It was found situational switching was prompted by changes in the setting and topic presented in the visual stimuli. There was no addressee specification as there was only one interviewer. Zheng found direct quotation drew listener's attention to another speaker's comment, reiteration clarified and emphasised a message, message qualification distinguished topic and comment of a discourse, and personalisation versus objectivisation distinguished between talk and action.

While Choi and Kuipers (2003) and Zheng (2000) focus on student code switching, other researchers show more interest in the phenomenon of teacher code switching. By adopting approaches of Choi and Kuipers (2003) and Richards and Rogers (1986), Mahadhir and Then (2007) analyse the code switching of nine pre-service English teachers in Malaysia in relation to teacher roles. The teacher switched to other

languages for revoicing, calling attention and personalisation, and in the process they acted as resources, need analyst, and communication facilitator for their students. The primary function of switching to languages familiar to students was to facilitate their understanding and build their vocabulary knowledge.

In another study on teachers of second year university German classes, Seidlitz (2003) finds that, on average, the five American teachers of German performed more situational switching than the three German native speakers. As for metaphorical code switching functions, Seidlitz finds that the German native speakers' reiteration was slightly more frequent while the American speakers' reiteration was typically lengthier. The American teachers tended to speak German first, followed by English, while the order of the languages for the Germans was the reverse. Moreover "the American teachers tended to switch in response to perceived student misunderstandings while the Germans' use of English was typically motivated by students language choice" (Seidlitz, 2003, p.82). Message qualification was observed infrequently among the teachers studied. There was a difference between the two groups of teachers pertaining to personalisation versus objectivisation with native American teachers using English overall much more often for humour, praise, encouragement, and chastising than German native speakers did. Addressee specification and direct quotations were not found. While these studies affirm that the code switching functions identified by Gumprez (1982) were used by the students and teachers, there is less understanding of the relationship between code switching for different discourse functions in good instructional practice.

2.5 Studies on Attitude Toward Code Switching

Studies regarding attitudes towards a certain language are quite numerous. Swain (1986) ranks mother tongue (MT) use as one of the three hallmarks of good practice in bilingual education. She gives two reasons: first, that MT uses signals to the child the value of self, home and community, and second, that if MT is used as medium of instruction, comprehension is observed. Garret et al. (1994) reports an experimental study (The Bangor Study) in which MT Welsh and MT Punjabi primary school children were taught L2 English writing in their respective MTs. Specifically, the children's MTs were the medium in which they were taken through the pre-writing activities including brainstorming, discussion, definition, sequencing, formulation of ideas relevant to the topic of composition, in fact all those activities that are meant to activate relevant schemata in the child's mind antecedent to the writing proper, in L2 English. For each population (Welsh and Punjabi) an experimental group's performance was compared with that of a control group which did not receive MT pre-writing activation. The result, supporting Swain's claim, was a definite improvement in attitude. On the other hand, there was no measurable improvement in the writing of the experimental groups. Possibly the time-span of the experiment was too short for any discernible improvement in their EL2 writing to emerge. It was significant; however, that L2 writing did not deteriorate as a result of MT preparation, which might have been expected.

In the field of reading, a study by Kamhhi-Stein (2003) suggests that the reader's view of their home language and beliefs about reading may play an important role in

reading. In her study of college readers in Spanish and English, findings show that attitudes seem to affect the reading behaviour of the participants. In a third study conducted by Barromeo-Samonte (1981) on the attitudes of Filipino college students towards English, results show that the students favour English. The student attitudes were influenced by their integrative motivation as they can easily identify themselves with the culture. Students' performance and attitudes were influenced by motivation. The study also showed that the attitudes were conditioned by the choice of profesion/vocation, age, teacher influence and peer group influence.

Similar studies in the Philippines conducted by Amino (2000) on attitudes of students, teachers and parents toward English and Filipino as media of instruction provided an interesting comparison. Students and teachers prefer the use of English as the medium of instruction with the teachers finding English as a more comfortable language for explaining ideas and concepts. Teachers further noted that English is intellectualized language and a valuable too to source information technology. However, the parents preferred Filipino because "it is a language in which they can think and express themselves" and it is a language that they understand and through which they themselves are better understood.

From the empirical evidence above, it can be noted that the language preferred in teaching technology is English. However, do all teachers or students agree on the use of 'English only' in the classroom? Vizconde (2006) in her research on the attitudes of students and teachers towards the use of English as the language of instruction for science

and Mathematics in the Philippines, found that even though English is the preferred language in teaching Science and Mathematics, the respondents suggested that both languages, i.e English and Filipino, to be allowed as media of instruction for teaching these subjects.

A research conducted in Malta by Camilleri (1996) looks at language practices in secondary classrooms. The study investigates how teachers and learners employ code switching between Maltese and English as a communicative resource in constructing knowledge across the curriculum, in interacting with monolingual English texts, and in building relationships with one another. Another significance issue that arise from the study was the preference for English as a spoken medium of instruction among older teacher and the preference of Maltese, often mixed with English among younger teachers. This pattern of linguistic preference reflected the changing nature of language values and communicative practices in Malta. With that evidence, it is becoming more clear that code switching is not only being an acceptable behaviour among bilinguals in every day communication but also in the classroom.

Chen & Su (2008) conducted a study to examine the functions of code switching in secondary school English and science classrooms in Malaysia, where English has recently been implemented as the language of instruction for science. The study shows that the content knowledge focus on science and English lessons necessitates use of code switching to convey the message to students. In teacher-fronted content lessons, frequent alternation between reiteration of key points and message qualification from English to

Bahasa Malaysia is targeted at ensuring student comprehension. In teacher facilitated language lessons, code switching is used for explanation but not for personalization, and may be a quotation of students' use of other languages which is resourcefully incorporated into the lesson. The study has gone beyond affirming the use of code switching for discourse functions identified by Gumperz (1982) to identifying the co-occurrence of reiteration and message qualification as useful strategies to enhance teacher explanations of referential content for the student's benefit. While some may view code switching is language lessons to be invalidating the second language of students rather than helping them to learn (e.g., Lin, 1996; Montague & Meza-Zaragosa, 1999), this study suggest that in circumstances where students' proficiency in the instructional language is lacking, code switching is a necessary tool for teachers to make their messages more comprehensible to students.

As mentioned earlier in the introduction, code switching is inevitable in a bilingual or a multilingual classroom. According to Willis (1981), the use of code switching in a classroom is preferable and economical when the teachers wanted to explained the meaning of new words in order to make the students to understand better. Much of the researches conducted so far are on the use of code switching in a language classroom (ESL) or the use of English as the medium of instruction in a content-based lesson. However, research on the teachers' attitudes on the use of code switching in their content-based lessons has yet been explored. Thus, this paper will look at the attitudes of Technical lecturers in UniKL MSI in using code switching in their classroom.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains on the research design adopted for this study. The research instrument, research sample and the administration of data collection are also described in this chapter.

3.2 Research Design

This study used a quantitative approach and a descriptive survey research. The survey is used to describe behaviours and to gather respondents' perception, attitudes, frequency used, reasons and teaching implication on code switching. The study used across-sectioned designs which involved the collection of data at one point in time from a random sample representing some given population at one time. Interview sessions were also conducted to help ensure that the information gained from the questionnaire is authentic opinion of the respondents.

3.3 Research Instruments

The study made use of questionnaire and actual interviews as main tools for gathering information on attitudes of using code switching among Technical lecturers in UniKL MSI. The questionnaire is deemed appropriate due to its objective nature. Information gained from a questionnaire shows uniformity and accuracy. The interview sessions were conducted to substantiate the results gathered from the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was constructed based on the findings of the use of code switching among bilingual educators in Rawang in teaching Science and Mathematics which was obtained and modified from Gan Kheng Leng (2000) as cited in Malarvizhi (2006). The format and the items constructed in the questionnaire were also adapted from a research done in University Kuala Lumpur Malaysian Institute of Aviation Technology (UniKL MIAT) by Safura & Nurul Ain (2008) on the attitude towards the use of code switching among Technical instructors in UniKL MIAT. The questionnaire was divided into 2 sections. Section A gathered the Technical lecturers' personal backgrounds such as gender, age group and the amount of respondents' teaching experience. Sections B consists of three parts which addressed questions about code switching according to Likert scale numbered 1 through 5 (5 being the most positive), probing how much the respondents agreed or disagreed with positive and negative opinions about code switching. The first part was the frequency of using code switching in the classroom, the second part was the attitude towards the use of code switching among Technical

lecturers, and the final part was the implications of using code switching in teaching technical subjects.

In addition, two semi-structured interview sessions were conducted to further deliberate on the frequency used, reasons, attitudes and teaching implications on the use of code switching by the Technical lecturers in their classroom. The interview was also conducted to find out if there are other problems that they face when teaching technical subjects that lead to the use of code switching in their classroom. Each interview session was recorded.

3.4 Research Sample

The questionnaires were distributed to 35 Technical lecturers who were selected using convenient sampling. This is approximately 65% out of the total number of Technical lecturer population in UniKL MSI. The Technical lecturers belong to 3 different sections; Mechanical section, Manufacturing Section and Electrical Electronics & Automation Section. Currently, there are 54 Technical lecturers teaching various Technical subjects in UniKL MSI. This is not including part-time lecturers and lecturers who are currently on study leave.

As for the interview, 4 Technical lecturers; 2 males and 2 females, were invited to participate in the interview sessions. All respondents has at least a minimum qualification

of Bachelor Degree in Engineering, Sciences or Engineering Technology. Below is the summary of the interviewees' background profile

Table 3.1:
The Interviewees' Background Profile

Personal Information	**Interviewees**			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Gender	F	M	F	M
Age	30	25	25	27
Mother tongue	BM	BM	BM	BM
Highest Qualification	Bachelor of Engineering	Bachelor of Technology Engineering	Bachelor of Engineering	Bachelor of Engineering
Teaching Experience	6 yrs.	4 yrs.	1.5 yrs.	2 yrs.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The 40 set questionnaires were distributed to the respondents in a determine session by the researcher as it is crucial for the researcher to be there in person to explains to the respondents regarding the subject at hand. The respondents understanding of the matter is necessary in order to obtain valid and reliable responses. As most of the respondents share the same room, i.e. 4 people in a room, it is easier for the researchers to handle the session. However, there were also some questionnaires that were left for the Technical lecturers to answer without any explanation form the researcher.

The interview sessions were conducted after the distribution of the questionnaire. The 4 Technical lecturers agreed to participate in the session upon invitation by the researcher. The semi-structured interview was conducted in two sessions. Each session involved 2 respondents; a male and a female. As the interview sessions were recorded, it is easier to identify the speaker when a male and a female respondent were interviewed simultaneously. Both interview sessions took about 30 – 45 minutes. Due to time constraint, the recorded interviews were not transcribed however a summary of the significant and relevant points were made for further analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data were analysed by using SPSS. The results were analyzed using one-way ANOVA to see any significant difference between variables and descriptive statistic were also used. The data will be presented by statistical analysis as well as item analysis.

CHAPTER IV

Results and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter attempts to analyze the acceptance and perceptions of the Technical lecturers on code switching in their teaching. The reasons of using code switching among Technical lecturers were also analyzed. Finally, the implications of using code switching in teaching the Technical subjects are also analyzed and discussed.

4.2 Frequency of Code Switching in the Classroom

Table 4.1:
Analysis of Variance between frequency with age, gender, education level and teaching experience.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	6.329	5	1.266	.891	.500
	Within Groups	41.214	29	1.421		
	Total	47.543	34			
Gender	Between Groups	.540	5	.108	.427	.826
	Within Groups	7.345	29	.253		
	Total	7.886	34			
Education	Between Groups	3.814	5	.763	.822	.544
	Within Groups	26.929	29	.929		
	Total	30.743	34			

Experience	Between Groups	3.279	5	.656	.493	.779
	Within Groups	38.607	29	1.331		
	Total	41.886	34			

Based on the table above, *p>.05* shows that there is no significant difference between the respondents' frequency of using code switching in the classroom when compared to the respondents' age, gender, education level as well as teaching experience. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed these important findings. The test results indicate there is no significant difference in frequency of code switching according to age, gender, education level and teaching experience. That is, all respondents code switched with the same frequency for each situation. Thus, it shows that the technical lecturers sometimes do code switch in their teaching regardless of their personal background. In this context, the Technical lecturers normally will start their classes in English and switch to Bahasa Malaysia according to situation.

However, the respondents' ethnicity and first language results were not analyzed as all of the respondents are of Malay origins and their first language is Bahasa Melayu. As majority of the students in the institute are also Malay, code switching would be inevitable as both the lecturers and the students share the same mother tongue. At one point or another, the lecturer will resort to code switching in their classroom.

Furthermore, this study did not gather the respondents' English level of proficiency nor their language acquisition data. The results might be otherwise if these items were tested and we might see the significant difference. Most studies found that

code switching is frequently used due to poor mastery of the target language. However, in this study, it is inconclusive.

4.3 Reasons of Using Code Switching in the Classroom

Table 4.2:
Item Analysis of Reasons of Using Code switching in the Classroom (Questionnaire)

		Extremely Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Extremely Disagree
a.	I only use English when using technical terms.	**28.6%**	**42.9%**	**11.4%**	**11.4%**	**2.9%**
b.	I only use English when introducing new technical terms.	**25.7%**	**42.9%**	**11.4%**	**14.3%**	**2.9%**
c.	I only use English when I feel I'm being observed.	**5.7%**	**17.1%**	**20.0%**	**31.4%**	**22.9%**
d.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when using technical terms.	**0%**	**0%**	**20.0%**	**57.1%**	**20.1%**
e.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when introducing new technical terms.	**0%**	**11.4%**	**22.9%**	**40.0%**	**22.9%**
f.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when my students are confused.	**31.4%**	**54.3%**	**8.6%**	**2.9%**	**0%**

*2.9% for no response for each item

Based on the results in the table above, it shows that most of the respondents do code switch in their classroom. 42.9% of the respondents agreed that they use English and not Bahasa Melayu when using and introducing technical terms. 54.3% of them also agreed that they only use Bahasa Melayu when their students are confused. The findings show that the Technical lecturers only use Bahasa Melayu in English medium classes for the

students' understanding in content matter. In most technical lessons, code switching from English to Bahasa Melayu is sometimes necessary to explain new technical terms, which helps learning and makes the learners more familiar with the meanings in two languages. It is used to facilitate learning. With that, it is consistent with 31.4% of the respondents disagreed and 22.9% extremely disagreed with the statement that they only use English when being observed. This shows that the main purpose of the use of code switching is to achieve teaching goal regardless of the institute policy of using "English only" in the classroom.

Table 4.3:
Excerpt of Reasons of Using Code Switching in the Classroom (Interview)

"For instruction … we also need to code switching because it is important for the students to understand. It is also for their safety" (To make students understand instruction)
"Students are afraid to ask question… If we use English 100%... they won't ask any question" (To encourage students to participate in lessons)
"It is hard for the students to speak English. So, if we speak English in class, they will not ask any question. So, when we code switch, they are more open to ask question" (To establish relationship, humor and to have conducive environment for teaching and learning)
"I usually code switch when I want to introduce new technical terms and of course when I change from 1 topic to another topic" (To emphasis and to explain scientific terminology/topic)

"I also sometimes code switch when to check if my students already understand the lesson especially in lecture" (To confirm that the students have understood the subject matter)
"Usually to explain to the students because their proficiency is too low… If you don't code switch it's difficult for students to understand" (To accommodate students' poor level of English proficiency)
"For me code switch save time for the students to understand the lecture that I gave" (To save time)

Based on the interview data, the respondents not only use code switch to facilitate learning, it is also used to give instruction in the classroom. As most technical lessons are conducted in the lab or workshop, students deal with highly advanced and expensive machines. It is imperative that the students are cautions when handling these machines. Careful and thorough instructions are given to ensure safety in the workshop. This is achieved by code switching. Similarly, Simon (2000) points out that in classroom interaction, the code choice are very frequently closely associated with the type of task or activity for methodological reasons (native language for grammatical explanations, cultural information and sometimes instruction about what to do). Besides used to give instruction, code switching is also used to establish relationship between the Technical lecturers and the students. The respondents reported that the students feel that the Technical lecturers are more approachable we they code switch in the classroom compared to when they use English all the time. The students feel less intimidated when the Technical lecturers accept code switching when they have questions or come for

consultation. This definitely establishes a positive environment for teaching and learning. In a study conducted by Chen & Su (2008) in teacher code switching in Secondary English and Science, it is found that when code switching is used as personalisation, the teacher closed the distance with the students and the students were more responsive.

Furthermore with the students' low level of English proficiency, code switching is necessary to check whether the students have understood the subject matter and it also promote students' participation in the lesson. In code switching, the lecturer always seek oral feedback from the students. By requiring and obtaining such feedback, the lecturer learns if the students have understood what had been said, and thus, she can repeat and clarify words, expressions and concepts where necessary. Finally, code switching is used to save time as the lecturers do not have to translate the lessons that she has given in English to Bahasa Melayu.

In summary, the use of code switching among Technical lecturers is mainly to facilitate learning and not otherwise. Skiba (1997) suggests that in the circumstances where code switching is used due to an inability of expression, it serves for continuity in speech instead of presenting interference in language. In this respect, code switching stands to be a supporting element in communication of information and in social interaction; therefore serves for communicative purposes in the way that it is used as a tool for transference of meaning.

4.4 Technical Lecturers' Attitudes Toward the Use of Code Switching

Table 4.4:

Analysis of Variance of Attitude Toward the Use of Code Switching

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	18.281	12	1.523	1.145	.376
	Within Groups	29.262	22	1.330		
	Total	47.543	34			
Gender	Between Groups	2.457	12	.205	.830	.621
	Within Groups	5.429	22	.247		
	Total	7.886	34			
Education	Between Groups	9.302	12	.775	.795	.651
	Within Groups	21.440	22	.975		
	Total	30.743	34			
Experience	Between Groups	11.088	12	.924	.660	.770
	Within Groups	30.798	22	1.400		
	Total	41.886	34			

The analysis of variance above shows that there is no significant difference of the attitude of the Technical lecturers when compared to age, gender, education level and teaching experience with $p>.05$.

By comparing level of proficiency of the respondents, there might be a significant difference when compared to the respondents' attitude. Researches have indicated that more fluent speakers of the target language would less favour code switching in their

teaching as compared to less fluent speaker. However, it is inconclusive in this study as the respondents' level of proficiency or their language acquisition data has been left out.

Table 4.5:
Descriptive Statistics of Technical Lecturers' Attitudes Toward the Use of Code Switching

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
a4	35	2.00	5.00	3.6571	.83817
b4	35	2.00	5.00	3.9714	.85700
c4	35	2.00	5.00	3.6571	.90563
d4	35	.00	5.00	3.0857	1.19734
e4	35	.00	5.00	3.6286	1.08697
f4	35	1.00	5.00	2.4857	1.14716
g4	35	1.00	5.00	2.6000	1.09006
h4	35	1.00	5.00	3.3143	1.18251
i4	35	1.00	5.00	2.4286	1.19523
Valid N (listwise)	35				

Based on the descriptive statistics above, the results indicate that most respondents' attitude is positive when asked whether code switching is important in their teaching and most of them disagreed that code switching is considered as interference while teaching technical subjects. The attitude of the respondents towards code switching can be taken positively. Though generally, the respondents adhere to the use of English in teaching technical subjects, the findings suggest that they do not necessarily agree with the sole use of English as the medium of instruction in their classroom. Thus it shows that code

switching is considered as a teaching tool by the Technical lecturers when teaching technical subjects in UniKL MSI.

4.5 The Implications of Using Code Switching in Teaching Technical Subjects

Table 4.6:
Item Analysis of The Implications of Using Code Switching in Teaching Technical Subjects (Questionnaire)

		Extremely Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Extremely Disagree
a.	I teach better when I code switch.	**17.1%**	**51.4%**	**11.4%**	**11.4%**	**2.9%**
b.	Code switch saves time in teaching.	**17.1%**	**31.4%**	**20.0%**	**22.9%**	**2.9%**
c.	Code switch simplifies teaching.	**8.6%**	**60.0%**	**11.4%**	**14.3%**	**0%**
d.	Students understand better when I code switch.	**34.3%**	**54.3%**	**2.9%**	**2.9%**	**0%**
e.	Students give positive feedback (participation, results, etc.) when I code switch.	**31.4%**	**45.3%**	**11.4%**	**5.7%**	**0%**
f.	Students still get confused when I code switch.	**0%**	**8.6%**	**34.3%**	**31.4%**	**20.0%**
g.	Code switching does not promote English speaking environment in UniKL MSI.	**22.9%**	**25.7%**	**22.9%**	**17.1%**	**5.7%**
h.	I'm being asked to code switch by my students.	**11.4%**	**48.6%**	**14.3%**	**11.4%**	**8.6%**
i.	Students become fully depending on code switching for better understanding.	**22.9%**	**42.9%**	**20.0%**	**5.7%**	**2.9%**

* 5.7% for no response for each item

Based on the item analysis above, the respondents feel that code switching brings positive implications in their teaching. In terms of teaching methodology, they feel that they teach better when they code switch, code switch saves time in teaching and code switching simplifies teaching with 51.4%, 31.4% and 60% respectively. 54.3% of the respondents also agree that students understand better when they code switch. Although 48.6% of the respondents succumb to their students' request for them to code switch in the classroom, they do admit that the more they code switch, the more dependent the students become on code switching for better understanding. As code switching being commonly used in the classroom, the respondents have mixed opinion as to whether code switching promote English speaking environment in UniKL MSI.

Table 4.7:
Excerpt of The Implications of the Use of Code Switching in Teaching Technical Subjects (Interview)

"The implication is only on the students English not content" (Code switching does not help improve students' English language discourse)
"The other implication is that we as lecturer seem not to be competent because we code switch. So, students might feel that we are not competent in speaking English" (Students feel that the lecturers are incompetent because they are unable to master the language)
"The implication that I can see is that the students having problem in the final exam because it is conducted in English but the class is conducted with code switch. They have problem to answer in English. So, it is a big problem" (Students face problem when answering exam questions)

For the lecturer… so the spoken part… no practical for the lecturer to speak English" (The lecturers' English language is also deteriorating when frequently code switch in their teaching)
Because they always ask question in BM not English. So if we ask in English, they will not answer. If the lecturer code switch, student will code switch also" (Encourage participation and feedback from students)

The same responses on the implications of using code switching in teaching Technical subjects were also gain during the interview sessions. The respondents admitted that by using code switching they save time in their teaching. Instead explaining the lessons in English only, they find that code switching helps the students understand faster and easier. On the other hand, they reported that although code switching helps to save time and ensure students' understanding, it does not do justice in helping the students' to improve their English language discourse. They feel that if they always use Bahasa Melayu in English medium classroom, it hinders the learning of the target language.

Moreover, based on their teaching experience in the institute, they found that students usually have difficulty in answering final exam questions as in the finals they students are required to answer questions in English. The students are unable to explain the theoretical aspect of the subject matter because they are lacking of the language to describe specialized and complex content. They are so used of code switching; it is difficult for them to write in "English only" sentences. This definitely affects the students' academic performance.

Surprisingly, even though a great amount of the respondents reported that their students asked them to code switch in class, and the students themselves code switch when communication with their lecturers, many students in their course evaluation form which are distributed at the end of the semester commented that their lecturers are incompetent in English language. They feel that the technical lecturers should be able to master the content subject as well as the target language. Because of that, they feel it affects the teaching and learning not only in the subject content but also affecting their performance in English language acquisition.

Similarly, the lecturers also feel that by using code switching in their teaching, they also feel that their own English language proficiency is deteriorating. Even though they realized that they code switch because they wanted the students to understand better, it is necessary for them to encourage the students to speak the target language. Most of the time, they try to minimize the use of code switching in the classroom and only use Bahasa Melayu when the situation demands.

In conclusion, there is positive evidence that code switching is identified, used and acceptable by the Technical lecturers in teaching Technical Subjects in UniKL MSI.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher will summarize the findings based on the data given in chapter four. Later, based on the findings, the researcher will make practical recommendations on how to make use of code switching positively in the teaching of Technical subjects.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the results, it is found that the Technical lecturers more often than not do code switch in their classroom. Even though as to whether when they code switching, i.e. semantic code switching, code switching in clause and sentence level, code switching in phrase level or code switching in word level in not determined, it is evidence that they accepted the bilingual method in their teaching.

The reasons for the Technical lecturers to code switch are more concern to facilitate learning. This study shows that the content knowledge focus of Technical subjects lessons necessitates use of code switching to convey the message to students.

Besides facilitating learning, code switch is also used for giving instruction, to gain feedback, to establish relationship as well as classroom management.

Generally, the Technical lecturers' perceptions on the use of code switching in the classroom are positive. They acknowledged that code switching is necessary in Malaysian context due to the multicultural background of our country. However, they feel that code switching should be the last resort when teaching and only use it when the situation demands. They feel they are obliged to promote the use of the target language in the classroom.

There are two sides of the implications of using code switching in teaching the Technical subjects; positive and negative. Positively, code switching is considered as a teaching tool to help the low proficient students to understand the subject matter. At the same time, code switching is seen as hindrance in English language acquisition both to the Technical lecturers as well as the students.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Research

Language is a tool for all teachers. Its use should be guided by actual observations and practice of the classroom teacher. In the case of Technical lecturers in UniKL MSI, code switching is considered as a teaching tool in teaching Technical subjects. Although, this seen as a short cut to achieve teaching goals, this matter should seriously be addressed.

This study looks at the acceptance and perceptions of Technical lecturers of using code switching in teaching Technical subjects.

As this study only investigates the Technical lecturers' attitude and perception towards the use of code switching as a language tool, it is recommended that in future research, code switching which naturally occurs in the classroom should be observed. The pattern of the lecturers' code switching practices which emerged should be interpreted within the scope of study. This will give clear understanding on when and why the lecturers code switch in the Not only that, students' attitude and opinions towards the use of code switching as a language tool should also be investigated.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resources?. ELT Journal Vol. 41/4

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. TESOL Quartely, vol.27, p1-19.

Brown, H.D. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching. U.S.A: Prentice Hall Regents.

Camilleri, A. (1996). Language values and identities: Code switching in secondary classrooms in Malta. Linguistic and Education V.8 p. 85-103.

Choi, J., & Kuipers, J. (2003). Bilingual practices in a science classroom: Bilingual Hispanic students' ways of constructing school science. Retrieved October 10, 2009, from http://www.gwu.edu/~scale-up/EQRE.doc

Chen, O. T., & Su, H. T. (2009) A Preliminary study of teacher code-switching in secondary English and Science in Malaysia. The online TESL Journal [online], v13 Number 13. Available: http://tesl-ej.org/ej49/a3.html

Cook, V. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. Great Britain: Edward Arnold.

Duran, L (1994). Towards a better understanding of code switching and interlanguage in bilinguality: Implications for bilingual instructions. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students [online], v14 p69-88. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/jeilms/vil14/duran.htm.

Ellis, R. (2003). Second language acquisition. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Eldridge, J. (1996). An introduction to sociolinguistic. London: Longman.

Flyman-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. Working Papers 47, 59-72.

Gumprez, J. J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). Learning how to mean: Explorations in the Development of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. ELT Journal Vol. 46/4.

Heredia, Roberto R. & B. Jeffery M. (1997). Code-switching. Reterived October, 28, 2008 from http://www.tamiu.edu/~rheredia/switch.htm

Holmes, J. (1992). An introduction to sociolinguistics. London: Longman.

Jacobson, R. (1981). The implementation of a bilingual instructional model: The new concurrent approach. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.) Ethnoperspectives in Bilingual Education Research, Vol. 3 Bilingual Education Technology, pp 14-29. Ypsilanti, MI: eastern Michigan University.

Kearsey, John & Sheila Turner. (1999). The value of bilingualism in pupils' understanding of scientific language. International Journal of Science Education. 21(10): 1037-1050.

Larsen, D. (1986). Techniques and principles in English language teaching. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1990). Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms. Research Report No. 3. City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Department of English.

Lipski, John. (1985). Linguistic Aspects of Spanish-English Language Switching. Arizona: Centre for Latin American Studies.

Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Mahadhir, M., & Then, C. O. (2007). Code-switching in the English language classrooms in Kuching secondary schools. Sarawak Museum Journal, Special Issue No. 7 on Social Sciences and Humanities, LXIV(85), 197-219.

Martin, P. W. (1996). Code-switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and unplanned language environment in Brunei. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17(2-4), 128-144.

Martin, P. W. (1999). Encounters of a bilingual kind: Interactional practices in primary classroom in Brunei. International Journal of Education Development, 19, 127-140.

Mattsson, A. & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. Working papers 47:59-72.

Muthusamy, P. (2005). Communicative functions and reasons for code switching: A Malaysian perspective. Retrieved: November 2009 from http://www.crisaps.org/newsletter/summer2009/Muthusamy.doc.

Nilep, C. (2006). "Code Switching" in sociocultural linguistics. Colorado Research in Linguistic. June 2006. Vol.19, 1-22.

Omar, Asmah Haji. (1993). Language and society in Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Pascasio, E. (2002). The Filipino bilingual from a sociolinguistic perspective. A paper presented at the International Conference on Applied Linguistics and Language Education: Theory and Practice, Manila, December 9-11, 2002.

Poplack, S. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol: Towards a typology code-switcching": Linguistic, 18, 581-616.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. R. (1986). Approaches and methods in language teaching: a descriptive and analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Romaine, S. (1995). Bilingualism. Great Britain: Blackwell.

Seidlitz, L. M. (2003). Functions of code switching in classes of German as a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. The Internet TESL Journal [online]. Available:http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html.

Shohamy, E and Selinger, H.W. (1989). Second language research methods. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. The online TESL Journal [online]. Available: http://www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/Articles/Skiba-codeswitching.html

Trudgill, P. (2000). Sociolinguistics. London: Penguin.

Vizconde, C. J. (2006). Attitudes of student teachers towards the use of English as Language of Instruction for science and Mathematics in the Philippines. The Internet TESL Journal, 1(3). Retrieved: July 2009 from http://iteslj.org/

Yang, M. (2004). A study of code-switching in Chinese EFL classrooms: A pragmatic approach. Sino-US English Teaching, 1(10), 43-49.

Zabrodskaja, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian code-switching in the university. Arizona Working papers in SLA & Teaching, 14, 123-139.

Zazkis, Rina. (2000). Using code switching as a tool for learning Mathematical language. For the learning of mathematics: an international journal of mathematical education. 20(3): 38-43.

Zentella, Ana Celia. (1997). Growing up bilingual. Maiden, MA: Blackwell.

Zheng, L. (2009). Living in two worlds code-switching amongst bilingual Chinese-Australian children. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 32(1), 5.1-5.18. DOI: 10.2104/aral0905.

RESEARCH ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF CODE SWITCHING AMONG TECHNICAL LECTURERS/INSTRUCTORS IN UniKL MSI

Dear Lecturers/Instructors,

Thank you in advance for participating in this questionnaire.

Before proceeding, the definition below will be helpful:

Code switching refers to alternating between one or more languages such as from English to Bahasa Malaysia during teaching.

Section A: Personal Information

1. Age: _____

2. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

3. Race: ☐ Malay ☐ Chinese ☐ Indian
   ☐ Others: _____

4. First Language: ☐ Bahasa Malaysia ☐ English

5. Education: ☐ SPM ☐ STPM ☐ Certificate ☐ Diploma
   ☐ Bachelor ☐ Master ☐ PHD

6. Subject(s) taught
   1. _____
   2. _____
   3. _____

7. Teaching experience ☐ 1-2 years ☐ 3-4 years ☐ 5-7 years ☐ More than 7 years.

Section B: The use of code switching in the classroom

2. Frequency of code switching in the classroom.

Please indicate the scale of the following statements. (Circle the number)

		Always	**Often**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Never**
a.	I use English for teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
b.	I use Bahasa Malaysia for teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
c.	I code switch from English to Bahasa Malaysia.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

3. Reasons of using code switching in the classroom

Please indicate the scale of the following statements. (Circle the number)

		Extremely Agree	**Agree**	**Uncertain**	**Disagree**	**Extremely Disagree**
a.	I only use English when using technical terms.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
b.	I only use English when introducing new technical terms.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
c.	I only use English when I feel I'm being observed.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
d.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when using technical terms.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
e.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when introducing new technical terms.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
f.	I only use Bahasa Malaysia when my students are confused.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Other reasons for CS:

_____

Section C: Attitude towards the use of code switching

4. My attitude towards the use of code switching.

Please indicate the scale of the following statements. (Circle the number)

		Extremely Agree	**Agree**	**Uncertain**	**Disagree**	**Extremely Disagree**
a.	Code switching is important in teaching any subject.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
b.	Code switching is important in teaching technical subject.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
c.	Code switching is necessary in Malaysian context.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
d.	Code switching can be planned in teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
e.	Code switching ease up teaching method.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
f.	Code switching wastes time in the classroom.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
g.	Code switching is considered as interference while teaching technical subject.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
h.	Code switching is the last resolution in teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
i.	Code switching should be avoided.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Section D: Implications of using code switching in teaching the Technical subjects

5. The implications of using code switching in teaching the Technical subjects.

Please indicate the scale of the following statements. (Circle the number)

		Extremely Agree	**Agree**	**Uncertain**	**Disagree**	**Extremely Disagree**
a.	I teach better when I code switch.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
b.	Code switch saves time in teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
c.	Code switch simplifies teaching.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
d.	Students understand better when I code switch.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
e.	Students give positive feedback (participation, results, etc.) when I code switch.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
f.	Students still get confused when I code switch.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
g.	Code switching does not promote English speaking environment in UniKL MSI.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
h.	I'm being asked to code switch by my students.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
i.	Students become fully depending on code switching for better understanding.	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

- *Thank you* –

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Date: _____

Time: _____

Venue: _____

Questions:

1. How old are you?

2. What is your highest academic qualification?

3. Which section do you belong to?

4. How long have you been teaching (overall/in UniKL MSI)?

5. How many subjects do you teach in UniKL MSI this semester?

6. Do you code switch when you are teaching?

7. How often do you code switch in the classroom?

8. Why do you code switch?

9. Personally, what is your opinion on the use of code switching in teaching?

10. Do you think that code switching affect the teaching and learning process in your classroom?

11. What are other benefits or problems that might arise when you use of code switch in your teaching?

SPSS OUTPUT

```
DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=a3 b3 c3 d3 e3 f3   /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN
MAX SKEWNESS.
```

Descriptives

Notes

Output Created		20-Nov-2009 11:52:42
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=a3 b3 c3 d3 e3 f3 /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX SKEWNESS.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.015

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
a3	35	0	5	3.74	1.245	-1.225	.398
b3	35	0	5	3.66	1.259	-1.081	.398
c3	35	0	5	2.43	1.267	.308	.398
d3	35	0	3	1.94	.725	-.403	.398
e3	35	.00	4.00	2.1714	1.01419	.175	.398
f3	35	.00	5.00	4.0571	.99832	-2.189	.398
Valid N (listwise)	35						

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=a3 b3 c3 d3 e3 f3   /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM
MAXIMUM MEAN   /PIECHART PERCENT   /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

Frequencies

Notes

Output Created		20-Nov-2009 11:54:50
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.

Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=a3 b3 c3 d3 e3 f3 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN /PIECHART PERCENT /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:04.047
	Elapsed Time	0:00:04.594

Statistics

		a3	b3	c3	d3	e3	f3
N	Valid	35	35	35	35	35	35
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.74	3.66	2.43	1.94	2.1714	4.0571
Std. Deviation		1.245	1.259	1.267	.725	1.01419	.99832
Minimum		0	0	0	0	.00	.00
Maximum		5	5	5	3	4.00	5.00

Frequency Table

a3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	5.7
	Disagree	4	11.4	11.4	17.1
	Uncertain	4	11.4	11.4	28.6
	Agree	15	42.9	42.9	71.4
	Extremely Agree	10	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

b3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	5.7
	Disagree	5	14.3	14.3	20.0
	Uncertain	4	11.4	11.4	31.4
	Agree	15	42.9	42.9	74.3
	Extremely Agree	9	25.7	25.7	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

c3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Disagree	8	22.9	22.9	25.7
	Disagree	11	31.4	31.4	57.1
	Uncertain	7	20.0	20.0	77.1
	Agree	6	17.1	17.1	94.3
	Extremely Agree	2	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

d3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Disagree	7	20.0	20.0	22.9
	Disagree	20	57.1	57.1	80.0

	Uncertain	7	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

e3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Extremely Disagree	8	22.9	22.9	25.7
	Disagree	14	40.0	40.0	65.7
	Uncertain	8	22.9	22.9	88.6
	Agree	4	11.4	11.4	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

f3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	1	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	5.7
	Uncertain	3	8.6	8.6	14.3
	Agree	19	54.3	54.3	68.6
	Extremely Agree	11	31.4	31.4	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

```
UNIANOVA frequency BY Age Gender Education Experience
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)   /INTERCEPT=INCLUDE   /CRITERIA=ALPHA(0.05)
/DESIGN=Age Gender Education Experience Age*Gender Age*Education
Age*Experience Gender*Education Gender*Experience Education*Exper
ience Age*Gender*Education Age*Gender*Experience
Age*Education*Experience Gender*Education*Experience
Age*Gender*Education*Experience. p{color:0;font-family:Monospaced;font-
size:14pt;font-style:normal;font-weight:normal;text-decoration:none}
ONEWAY Age Gender Education Experience BY frequency   /MISSING
ANALYSIS.
```

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		20-Nov-2009 12:02:09
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY Age Gender Education Experience BY frequency /MISSING ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.015

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	6.329	5	1.266	.891	.500
	Within Groups	41.214	29	1.421		
	Total	47.543	34			
Gender	Between Groups	.540	5	.108	.427	.826
	Within Groups	7.345	29	.253		

	Total	7.886	34			
Education	Between Groups	3.814	5	.763	.822	.544
	Within Groups	26.929	29	.929		
	Total	30.743	34			
Experience	Between Groups	3.279	5	.656	.493	.779
	Within Groups	38.607	29	1.331		
	Total	41.886	34			

```
COMPUTE attitude=SUM(a4,i4). EXECUTE. COMPUTE
attitude=a4+b4+c4+d4+e4+f4+g4+h4+i4. EXECUTE. ONEWAY Age Gender
Education Experience BY attitude   /MISSING ANALYSIS.
```

Oneway

Notes

Output Created		20-Nov-2009 12:06:28
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each analysis are based on cases with no missing data for any variable in the analysis.
Syntax		ONEWAY Age Gender Education Experience BY attitude /MISSING ANALYSIS.

Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.016
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.031

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	18.281	12	1.523	1.145	.376
	Within Groups	29.262	22	1.330		
	Total	47.543	34			
Gender	Between Groups	2.457	12	.205	.830	.621
	Within Groups	5.429	22	.247		
	Total	7.886	34			
Education	Between Groups	9.302	12	.775	.795	.651
	Within Groups	21.440	22	.975		
	Total	30.743	34			
Experience	Between Groups	11.088	12	.924	.660	.770
	Within Groups	30.798	22	1.400		
	Total	41.886	34			

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=a5 b5 c5 d5 e5 f5 g5 h5 i5   /STATISTICS=STDDEV
MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN   /PIECHART PERCENT   /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

Frequencies

Notes

Output Created		20-Nov-2009 12:07:52
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=a5 b5 c5 d5 e5 f5 g5 h5 i5 /STATISTICS=STDDEV MINIMUM MAXIMUM MEAN /PIECHART PERCENT /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:04.203
	Elapsed Time	0:00:04.625

Statistics

		a5	b5	c5	d5	e5	f5	g5	h5	i5
N	Valid	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.5143	3.2000	3.4571	4.0286	3.8571	2.2000	3.2571	3.2571	3.6000
Std. Deviation		1.31443	1.36769	1.19663	1.20014	1.26358	1.05161	1.44187	1.37932	1.31059
Minimum		.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Maximum		5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Frequency Table

a5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	8.6

	Disagree	4	11.4	11.4	20.0
	Uncertain	4	11.4	11.4	31.4
	Agree	18	51.4	51.4	82.9
	Extremely Agree	6	17.1	17.1	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

b5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	8.6
	Disagree	8	22.9	22.9	31.4
	Uncertain	7	20.0	20.0	51.4
	Agree	11	31.4	31.4	82.9
	Extremely Agree	6	17.1	17.1	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

c5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Disagree	5	14.3	14.3	20.0
	Uncertain	4	11.4	11.4	31.4
	Agree	21	60.0	60.0	91.4
	Extremely Agree	3	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

d5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	8.6
	Uncertain	1	2.9	2.9	11.4
	Agree	19	54.3	54.3	65.7
	Extremely Agree	12	34.3	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

e5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Disagree	2	5.7	5.7	11.4
	Uncertain	4	11.4	11.4	22.9
	Agree	16	45.7	45.7	68.6
	Extremely Agree	11	31.4	31.4	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

f5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	7	20.0	20.0	25.7
	Disagree	11	31.4	31.4	57.1
	Uncertain	12	34.3	34.3	91.4
	Agree	3	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

g5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	2	5.7	5.7	11.4
	Disagree	6	17.1	17.1	28.6
	Uncertain	8	22.9	22.9	51.4
	Agree	9	25.7	25.7	77.1
	Extremely Agree	8	22.9	22.9	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

h5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No resposnse	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	3	8.6	8.6	14.3
	Disagree	4	11.4	11.4	25.7
	Uncertain	5	14.3	14.3	40.0
	Agree	17	48.6	48.6	88.6
	Extremely Agree	4	11.4	11.4	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

i5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No response	2	5.7	5.7	5.7
	Extremely Disagree	1	2.9	2.9	8.6
	Disagree	2	5.7	5.7	14.3
	Uncertain	7	20.0	20.0	34.3

Agree	15	42.9	42.9	77.1
Extremely Agree	8	22.9	22.9	100.0
Total	35	100.0	100.0	

```
DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=a4 b4 c4 d4 e4 f4 g4 h4 i4   /STATISTICS=MEAN
STDDEV MIN MAX.
```

Descriptives

Notes

Output Created		25-Nov-2009 02:30:10
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Documents and Settings\user\Desktop\Project paper.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	35
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	All non-missing data are used.
Syntax		DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=a4 b4 c4 d4 e4 f4 g4 h4 i4 /STATISTICS=MEAN STDDEV MIN MAX.
Resources	Processor Time	0:00:00.015
	Elapsed Time	0:00:00.017

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
a4	35	2.00	5.00	3.6571	.83817
b4	35	2.00	5.00	3.9714	.85700
c4	35	2.00	5.00	3.6571	.90563
d4	35	.00	5.00	3.0857	1.19734
e4	35	.00	5.00	3.6286	1.08697
f4	35	1.00	5.00	2.4857	1.14716
g4	35	1.00	5.00	2.6000	1.09006
h4	35	1.00	5.00	3.3143	1.18251
i4	35	1.00	5.00	2.4286	1.19523
Valid N (listwise)	35				