

**CODE MIXING OF FEMALE & MALE LECTURERS IN ENGLISH
LANGUAGE LEARNING OF FOURTH YEAR STUDENTS OF
ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM AT UNIVERSITAS NEGERI
PADANG**

THESIS

*Submitted as Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements to Obtain Bachelor of
Education (B.Ed) in English Language Education*



By:
NAZHIRA PUTRI DAFFIZA
19018093

Advisor:
Nur Rosita, S.Pd., M.A.
NIP. 199007122022032013

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG
2023**

HALAMAN PERSETUJUAN SKRIPSI

Judul : Code Mixing of Female & Male Lecturers In English Language Learning of Fourth Year Students of English Education Program At Universitas Negeri Padang

Nama : Nazhira Putri Daffiza

NIM : 19018093

Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Departemen : Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris

Fakultas : Bahasa dan Seni

Padang, Desember 2023

**Disetujui oleh,
Pembimbing**



Nur Rosita, S.Pd., M.A.
NIP. 199007122022032013

Mengetahui,

Ketua Departemen Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris



Dr. Yuli Tiarina, S.Pd., M.Pd.
NIP. 197707202002122002

HALAMAN PENGESAHAN UJIAN SKRIPSI

Dinyatakan lulus setelah dipertahankan di depan Tim Penguji Skripsi
Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris
Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang dengan judul

**Code Mixing of Female & Male Lecturers In English Language Learning of
Fourth Year Students of English Education Program At Universitas Negeri
Padang**

Nama : Nazhira Putri Daffiza

NIM : 19018093

Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Departemen : Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris

Fakultas : Bahasa dan Seni

Padang, Desember 2023

Tim Penguji

1. Ketua : Nofrina Eka Putri, M.Pd.
2. Sekretaris : Ririn Ovilia, M.Pd
3. Anggota : Nur Rosita, S.Pd., M.A

Tanda Tangan

: 
: 
: 



KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET DAN TEKNOLOGI
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG
FAKULTAS BAHASA DAN SENI
DEPARTEMEN BAHASA DAN SAstra INGGRIS
Alamat: Kampus Selatan FBS UNP Ali Tawar Padang Telepon: (0751) 417347
Web: <http://english.fbs.unp.ac.id>

SURAT PERNYATAAN TIDAK PLAGIAT


Saya yang bertandatangan di bawah ini:

Nama : Nazhira Putri Daffiza
NIM/TM : 19018093/2019
Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Departemen : Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris
Fakultas : Bahasa dan Seni

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa Tugas Akhir dengan judul "*Code Switching of Female & Male Lecturers In English Language Learning Of Fourth Year Students Of English Education Program At Universitas Negeri Padang*" adalah benar merupakan hasil karya saya bukan merupakan plagiat dari karya orang lain. Apabila suatu saat terbukti saya melakukan plagiat maka saya bersedia diproses dan menerima sanksi akademis maupun hukuman sesuai dengan hukuman dan ketentuan yang berlaku, baik di institusi Universitas Negeri Padang maupun masyarakat dan negara.

Demikian pernyataan ini saya buat dengan penuh rasa kesadaran dan rasa tanggung jawab sebagai anggota masyarakat ilmiah.

Diketahui oleh,
Ketua Departemen Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris,


Dr. Yuli Tiarina, S.Pd, M.Pd.
NIP 197707202002122002

Saya yang menyatakan



Nazhira Putri Daffiza
NIM. 19018093

ABSTRACT

Daffiza, P, N. (2023). *Code Mixing of Female & Male Lecturers In English Language Learning Of Fourth Year Students of English Education Program At Universitas Negeri Padang*. Thesis. English Language and Literature Department Of Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang

This research was aimed to know the types and reasons of code mixing in the classroom practised by female and male lecturers and investigated gender differences between female and male lecturers in the use of code-switching in the classroom. The research subjects in this study were English education lecturers at Universitas Negeri Padang. Two female lecturers and two male lecturers. The researcher observed the classroom using audio recorder. Then, the data was analysed using descriptive qualitative research to measure the frequency of code mixing used by female and male lecturers in the classroom. This study examined gender differences between female and male lecturers in the use of code-switching in the classroom. It wanted to understand the types of code-switching used by female and male lecturers as well as the purposes for which they are used in the classroom. The frequency of code mixing between male and female lecturers in the classroom was then determined. The results showed that all types of code mixing were used by female and male lecturers, the most used type is alternation mixing and the least used type is congruent lexicalization mixing. There were gender differences between female and male lecturers in code-switching usage, as each had different methods and purposes.

Keywords: *Code Mixing, Gender Differences, EFL Classroom.*

ABSTRAK

Daffiza, P, N. (2023). Campur Kode Dosen Wanita & Pria Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Pada Mahasiswa Tahun Empat Program Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Padang. Skripsi. Departemen Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui tipe dan fungsi campur kode di kelas yang dilakukan oleh dosen perempuan dan laki-laki, dan mengetahui perbedaan gender antara dosen perempuan dan laki-laki dalam penggunaan campur kode di kelas. ruang kelas. Subjek penelitian dalam penelitian ini adalah dosen pendidikan bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Padang. Dua orang dosen perempuan dan dua orang dosen laki-laki. Peneliti mengamati kelas menggunakan perekam audio. Kemudian, data tersebut dianalisis menggunakan penelitian metode campuran untuk mengukur frekuensi alih kode yang dilakukan oleh dosen perempuan dan laki-laki di dalam kelas. Penelitian ini mengkaji perbedaan gender antara dosen perempuan dan laki-laki dalam penggunaan alih kode di kelas. Penelitian ini ingin memahami jenis-jenis campur kode yang digunakan oleh dosen perempuan dan laki-laki serta tujuan penggunaan alih kode tersebut di dalam kelas. Frekuensi campur kode antara dosen laki-laki dan perempuan di dalam kelas kemudian ditentukan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa semua jenis campur kode digunakan oleh dosen perempuan dan laki-laki, jenis yang paling banyak digunakan adalah campur kode bergantian dan jenis yang paling sedikit digunakan adalah campur leksikalisasi kongruen. Terdapat perbedaan gender antara dosen perempuan dan laki-laki dalam penggunaan alih kode, karena masing-masing mempunyai metode dan tujuan yang berbeda. Terdapat perbedaan gender antara dosen perempuan dan laki-laki dalam penggunaan alih kode, karena masing-masing mempunyai metode dan tujuan yang berbeda.

Kata Kunci: *Campur Kode, Perbedaan Gender, Kelas EFL.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Alhamdulillah, thanks to Allah S.W.T. who has given me health, strength, and love to complete this research as the requirement for the bachelor of education degree (S.Pd) at Universitas Negeri Padang entitled “**Code Mixing of Female & Male Lecturers In English Language Learning Of Fourth Year Students of English Education Program At Universitas Negeri Padang**”.

The researcher realized that this thesis would never be completed without support, love, advice, help, and guidance from all the people around her and from the institutions. Therefore, the researcher would like to express the deepest gratitude to:

1. **Her Parents, Rina Syahrir and Syamsu Rizal** for bringing me to this world and support me unconditionally.
2. **Her Brother, Mufid Fadhilah**, for giving any help at any situation where I needed him.
3. **Nur Rosita, S.Pd., M.A.** as my advisor who has given me suggestion, correction, beneficial opinion and encouragement in the process of writing this thesis.
4. **Nofrina Eka Putri, S.Pd, M.Pd** and **Ririn Ovilia, S.Pd., M.Pd.** as my examiners for the constructive feedbacks and corrections in the process of writing this thesis.
5. **Honesty Yonanda Ayudhia, SP.d M.Pd** as my validator who assisted the researcher in validating the research instruments and evaluating thesis data.
6. **Yati Aisya Rani, S.Pd, M.Pd, Carbiriena Solusia, S.Pd, M.Pd, Rifki Oktoviandry, S.Pd., M.Hum.** and **Devy Kurnia Alamsyah, S.S, M.Hum** as my research subject for taking the time and energy to allow me to conduct research in their classroom.

7. **All of the lecturers and Academic Staff** at Universitas Negeri Padang for providing the writer with great knowledge and awesome environment for my talent and passion.
8. **My Best Friends at Dorm, Cika, Suci, Bella, and Hesti** for always be there for me in happiness and in sadness, for being the first people that seen my struggles and gave me strengths and supports to keep going in the process of writing this thesis.
9. **My Best Friends at K1-19, Fitra, Selvina, Husnuzhan, Vinda, and Nissa** for being my inspirations to be more productive in University, for always encouraged and assured me that every decision I made is the right the decision, and always supported me in any situation.
10. **All of My K1-19 Classmates**, for giving me the most warmth welcomed the first time I came to Padang and always make me laugh in the classroom, for giving me help and support during assignments, exams, and during writing the thesis.
11. **All My Best Friends in Bekasi**, for always support me in any situation even though we were far away from each other.
12. **To myself**, thank you for making it this far.

Padang, 12 Desember 2023

The Writer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
APPENDICES LIST	v
CHAPTER I.....	1
1.1 Background of The Study.....	1
1.2 Identification of the Problem.....	8
1.3 Limitation of the Problem	8
1.4 Formulation of the Problem	9
1.5 Research Questions	9
1.6 Purpose of The Research	10
1.7 Significance of The Research.....	10
1.8 Definitions of The Key Terms.....	11
CHAPTER II	12
2.1 Review of Related Theories	12
2.1.1 Sociolinguistic	12
2.1.2 Multilingualism.....	14
2.1.3 Gender and Language	15
2.1.4 Code Mixing	17
2.1.5 Gender Differences in Teaching English.....	27
2.2 Relevant Research	28
2.3 Conceptual Framework	31
CHAPTER III	34
3.1 Research Design	34
3.2 Data and Source of Data.....	35
3.3 Research Instruments	35
3.3.1 Classroom Observation Sheet.....	36
3.3.2 Interview Guidance.....	36
3.4 Technique of Data Collection.....	37
3.4.1 Classroom Observation.....	37

3.4.2 Stimulated Recall Interview.....	38
3.5 Technique of Data Validation	39
3.5.1 Content Validity.....	39
3.6 Technique of Data Analysis	40
3.6.1 Identifying The Types and Reasons of Code Mixing.....	40
3.6.2 Calculating The Types of Code Mixing	41
3.6.3 Concluding.....	42
CHAPTER IV	43
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	43
3.7 Data Description.....	43
3.8 Data Analysis	53
3.9 Data Findings	74
3.10 Discussion	79
CHAPTER V	82
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	82
3.11 Conclusions	82
3.12 Suggestions.....	83
REFERENCES	85
APPENDICES	89

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Classroom Observation Sheet	36
Table 2. Interview Guide	37
Table 3. Types of Code Mixing by Female Lecturer.....	41
Table 4. Types of Code Mixing by Male Lecturer	41
Table 5. Total Data of Classroom Observation	44
Table 6. Interview Response Female Lecturer 1	49
Table 7. Interview Response Female Lecturer 2	50
Table 8. Interview Response Male Lecturer 1	51
Table 9. Interview Response Male Lecturer 2.....	52
Table 10. Types of Code-Mixing by Female Lecturer 1	53
Table 11. Types of Code-Mixing by Female Lecturer 2	54
Table 12. Types of Code Mixing by Male Lecturer 1	64
Table 13. Types of Code Mixing by Male Lecturer 2	65
Table 14. Reasons of Code Mixing by Male Lecturer 1.....	69
Table 15. Reasons of Code Mixing by Male Lecturer 2.....	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework.....	33
Figure 2. Percentages of Code-Mixing Usage by Female & Male Lecturers.....	45
Figure 3. Percentages of Code-Mixing Types by Female & Male Lecturer	46
Figure 4 Percentage of Female and Male Lecturers Reasons of Using Code Mixing	47

APPENDICES LIST

Appendices 1. 1 Surat Pernyataan Tidak Plagiat	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendices 1. 2 Surat Tugas Seminar Proposal	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendices 1. 3 Surat Tugas Validator	90
Appendices 1. 4 Surat Ujian Skripsi.....	91
Appendices 1. 5 Surat Tugas Pembimbing Skripsi	92
Appendices 1. 6 Interview Questions.....	93
Appendices 1. 7 Transcripts Of The Interview	96
Appendices 1. 8 Transcripts Of he Observation	117

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of The Study

In the English classroom, English lecturers are required to speak in English. According to Philipson (1992) in Miles (2004: 8), it would be beneficial, if English was used more frequently in the classroom during teaching. There are two things a teacher can do to control how much English is used to deliver materials: ‘foreigner talk’ and ‘language exposure’. Inside a certain speech community, foreigner talk is commonly viewed as an imitation of the way outsiders speak the language under specific circumstances. Meanwhile, language exposure is the amount of interaction a learner has with the language they are learning or attempting to learn. The main responsibility of teachers in a classroom setting is to expose students to more diverse speakers and contexts for them to practice their foreign languages, such as watching English movies on Netflix or YouTube clips, listening to a short English podcast on Spotify, reading English novels, newspapers, and magazines, etc.

Since English is a foreign language in Indonesia, there are a lot of students who are not familiar with the English language. They have little knowledge about it. As a result, the students also have trouble in understanding the teacher whenever the teacher uses English in the classroom. Following that, teachers also have doubts when using full English in the classroom because some teachers have some difficulties in delivering words from Indonesia to English. They have to think harder in order for the learners to understand what they say. These issues

forced teachers to mix the languages between Indonesia and English. In the classroom, teachers will use some words or sentences in Indonesia and then some words or sentences in English so then the students will understand the materials by the teachers easily. This kind of activity called, code mixing.

Code Mixing is a term from sociolinguistic that means an event of mixing a language to another language in a sentence, phrase, or clauses. According to Wardhaugh in Henie (2008), code-mixing happens when speakers combine the two languages to the point that they switch between the two during a single phrase. Another definition also comes from Muysken (in Deuchar, 2005) defined code-mixing as any situation in which lexical items and grammatical elements from two different languages are used together in a single phrase. One element of a sentence that contains codemixing is often uttered in language A while the remainder is spoken in language B. Then, Gumperz (1982) defines code mixing in Trisna (2018), the speaker uses bits of one language while speaking in another. Hence, code mixing refers to the mixing between two or more languages between people who speak more than one language. One of the two languages is usually dominant; the major language is known as matrix language, while the smaller language is known as embedded language.

Code mixing has become an issue in multilingual and multicultural communities. It is also has becoming a strategy used by English teachers in Indonesia to overcome problems in delivering material in the classroom. In using code mixing, according to Sert (2005), teachers are not always conscious, which means that the teacher is not always aware of the functions and outcomes of the

process. As a result, it may be considered an automatic and unconscious behavior in some situations. For students, they are also often unaware of the rationale for code mixing, as well as its purposes and results. Although they may mix codes subconsciously, it definitely serves some purpose, whether useful or not.

Muysken proposes that a single code-mixing model should be used for all language combinations (Deuchar, 2005). He demonstrates both linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics can be used to predict the prevalent code-mixing pattern in a given speech community. For instance, insertion or alternation code-mixing may be predicted by typological distance, but not congruent lexicalization, and insertion may be predicted by a colonial environment. Historically, this approach has been seen unfavorably as evidence of a speaker's deficiencies; yet, in a typical multilingual context, speakers typically choose several codes or combine languages that they deem acceptable to help and communicate meanings in their language.

According to Prucha (1983), code mixing should be prohibited in second language classes since it can impede learning. It encourages students to rely too heavily on their teachers' code-mixing. As a result, they may lose their willingness to study as well as their capacity to predict and conclude in the new linguistic context of the second language. Furthermore, frequent code mixing may influence how pupils communicate in the second language later on. From a practical standpoint, however, some scholars, such as Crystal (1987) and Cook (1991), concur that there are situations when explaining in the first language is simpler. It can assist students learning English as a second language save time and avoid

confusion. Furthermore, because they do not see the language as difficult to learn, the students found this to be a motivating factor in learning the second language (Levine, 2003; Greggio & Gil, 2007).

According to numerous studies, there is a connection between code mixing and gender. The difference in using code mixing between men and women is one of the issues. Lin (2003:442) contends that women learn second languages more quickly than men. Furthermore, according to Alibakhshi (2007:62), society forces them to live in separate worlds. As a direct consequence of this, environmental and cultural variables serve as the primary determinants of gender differences in learning strategies. Significantly, men and women will use different kinds of code mixing for different reasons.

Gadner-Cloros (2009) asserts that the long-established findings that women use more standard forms than men, derived from monolingual contexts, were also usefully examined in bilingual contexts. Studies were conducted to determine whether women use more standard forms of language in code-mixing than males. The results were disclosed as negative. There were no statistically significant differences between men and women in either community regarding the use of code mixing. According to Jagero and Odongo (2001), it is revealed that women code switch more frequently than males. 193 instances of CM were performed by females, while 180 were performed by males. However, when both genders participate in a single conversation, males were found to alter codes more frequently. They explain further that male speakers are more likely to use nonstandard forms when communicating with females.

In terms of the number of switches observed in which the female factor is discussed, according to Poplack's (1980), over half of women code-switches were intrasentential, compared to only one-third of men. This is evidently contrary to the hypothesis that women use fewer nonstandard forms than men, but it could be interpreted as supporting Chambers's (1992) claim that women are more linguistically proficient; however, this finding is not discussed further in the paper. Since the concept of "women's language" was elaborated by Lakoff (1975, 1976) and Tannen (1990, 1994), gender differences in communication have become essential topics of discussion. This concept emphasized that men and women employ distinct communication strategies. Mellor and Fung's (2012) study on sex roles in Malaysian perspectives is one example. This study demonstrates that women are more empathic than men, while men are less forgiving.

Numerous academicians have conducted extensive research on gender differences in research performance, but there are only a handful of studies on gender differences in teaching. Wang and Song (2013) believed that the majority of female teachers took the initiative to identify with their motherhood, care, and social affinity; thus, they believed that teacher identity and teaching duties were highly isomorphic with their essence. However, there was a clear sense of estrangement from scholar status and scientific research activity. This knowledge had a profound effect on the identity and identity formation of university female instructors. In their explanation to the interviewees, they discovered that the majority of female teachers, even at research institutions, were more concerned with their own teacher status and had little subjective desire to do academic work.

In addition, the majority of current research focuses on the effects of marriage and childbearing, family, and other conditions on women, and there is little comparative research on the effects of age, professional title, degree, and other objective factors shared by men and women.

There are some previous studies on gender differences in code mixing among teachers or lecturers. First, a study from Ezech, et al. (2022) entitled “Code Switching and Code Mixing in Teaching and Learning of English as a Second Language: Building on Knowledge”. The focus of this study intended to project the socio- linguistic functions inherent in code switching and mixing that can help ESL students transcended from the known (L1) to the unknown (L2), especially in learning complex language contents; making the teacher’s work, productive and less strenuous. Second, a study by Scientia, et al. (2020) entitled “A Code-Mixing Analysis On Efl Students’ Casual Conversations At School Pkbm Dharma Sedana Santhil Sanur Seaview Hotel 2”. The study aimed to analyzed the types of code mixing used in students’ interaction and found out the reasons underlining the use of code mixing in the interactions using the theory of Suwito to know the kinds of code mixing they might be used. Lastly, a study by Jaya, Umam., Sukawati, & Oktaviana. (2019) entitled “An Analysis of Codeswitching Used By English Teacher Based On Gender Inequality (Case Study at MTs Nurul Ikhwan-Serang)”. This study aimed to find out the types of code mixing that used by English teacher based on gender inequality and the reasons of using code mixing that used by English teacher based on gender inequality.

Some previous research also focused on the usage of code-mixing in the context of education. Firstly, a study by Purwanto (2019) entitled “Teacher’s Code Switching Used by Indonesian Lecturers in EFL Classrooms”. The focus of this study is to understand the many kinds and purposes of code-switching used by instructors in EFL classes. Secondly, a study from Siddiq, Kustati, & Yustina (2020) entitled “Teacher’s Code Mixing and Code Switching: Insights on Language Barriers in EFL Classroom”. According to the study, there were four different types of code switching in the statements made by teachers and students.

Lastly, the study by Abdullo & Usman (2021) entitled “Students’ Perception towards Code-Switching and Code Mixing in Sociolinguistic: A Case at an English Education Major. This study looked into the attitudes of English education students about code-switching and code-mixing in both informal and formal settings.

Since teachers or lecturers have frequently employed code mixing, this research is relevant. Code mixing can be advantageous, but excessive use might give negative effects to students. Thus, teachers should prevent using too much code mixing in class to help students learn better. Since they're in their fourth year of English, these students should be improved in learning English and understanding the teacher's in-depth explanations. Students no longer need too much code mixing from lecturers. Furthermore, the researcher also will find the gender differences between female and male lecturers in the use of code mixing in the classroom

In this study, the researcher used two theories by Muysken (2000) and Hoffman (1991). Firstly, the theory proposed by Muysken (2000) about the types of code mixing in the classroom. Secondly, to find the reasons of code mixing, the researcher used different theory, the theory is from Hoffman (1991). This study was conducted at Universitas Negeri Padang of fourth-year English education students. This theory utilized by the author due to the fact that this theory provided solutions to the issues that the author identifies in his research. The researcher used theory of Hoffman (1991) to find out the reasons of code mixing when the lecturers use code-mixing and the theory of Muysken (2000) to find out the types of code mixing in the classroom. The writer chose this theory because this theory can explain the reasons in society when they mix codes, and this theory also considered the most suitable to be used by researcher because it is aligned with theory the researcher used to analyzed types of code mixing.

1.2 Identification of the Problem

Related to the background of the study, the writer identified some issues to focus on this study. First, the types and reasons of code mixing in the classroom practised by female and male lecturers. Secondly, investigated gender differences between female and male lecturers in the use of code mixing in the English language classroom.

1.3 Limitation of the Problem

To avoid some of the complications from this research, the researcher investigated the factors that contributed to the occurrence of code mixing among English teachers. Topics that are taken into consideration include, the types of

code mixing, the reasons, the language the female and male lecturers and gender differences between female and male lecturers of fourth year students of English Education program.

1.4 Formulation of the Problem

Related to the limitation of the problem above, the problem formulated as what the types and reasons of the code mixing, and the differences between female and male lecturers in using code mixing in English language learning classroom of fourth year students of English Education program.

1.5 Research Questions

In accordance with the limitation of the problem, the formulation of the problems are:

1. What forms of code mixing do lecturers (female & male) in the English education program at Universitas Negeri Padang typically employ to fourth year students?
2. What are the reasons of lecturers (female & male) mixing codes in the English education program at Universitas Negeri Padang typically employ to fourth year students?
3. What are differences between female & male lecturers in the use code mixing in the English education program at Universitas Negeri Padang typically employ to fourth year students?

1.6 Purpose of The Research

In reference to the formulation of the problem, the purpose of this research are:

1. To find out the types of code mixing performed by female & male lecturers in the classroom.
2. To find out the reasons of code mixing performed by female & male lecturers in the classroom.
3. To see if there are any gender differences of lecturers in the usage of code mixing in the classroom.

1.7 Significance of The Research

For the researcher, the findings of this study will be beneficial to the reader. Theoretically, this study will provide information regarding the lecturer's practice of code mixing in the classroom. This research will provide lecturers with a deeper understanding of reasons about the use of code mixing in the classroom.

Practically, the results of this study, lecturers will be armed with the knowledge about code mixing, they will consider and make efforts to reduce code mixing when teaching English and to help students be better in English speaking skills. In addition, for the reader's benefit, this study explains the definition, nature and reasons of code mixing.

Moreover, this study explains the gender differences between female and male lecturers in the use of code mixing, thereby enhancing their understanding and also the researcher is interested in and decided to conduct research on gender

differences in code mixing because, in the researcher's opinion, it is both rare and interesting to learn how males and females differ in the types and reason of using code mixing they engage in and the purposes for which they employ code mixing in the English classroom.

1.8 Definitions of The Key Terms

- a. **Sociolinguistic:** is the relationship between language and society in order to better understand the nature of languages and their roles in communication.
- b. **Multilingualism:** is a phenomenon that occurs when a speaker utilizes two or more languages, or when speakers in a community use two or more languages, or when speakers of various languages interact.
- c. **Code Mixing:** is a term from sociolinguistic that means an event of mixing a language to another language in a sentence, phrase, or clauses.
- d. **Gender:** is a person's social and cultural behaviors, whereas sex refers to the biological structure that differentiates males and females.