Abstract
This study was conducted at a Sino-British University in mainland China with foundation level students learning academic reading and writing skills in English. Tutor observations across this type of context have noted generally high volumes of code-switching during class activities, particularly when working together. This study aims to discover why and when groups of Chinese students in an EAP classroom choose to use English and/or Mandarin Chinese during group work. It seeks to find patterns of language choice and whether this choice is made consciously, for instance as a result of the expectations of the context or their peers, or the code-switches are ‘slips’. It also investigates the role of interlocutors within the classroom, aiming to discover how great an influence they have on language choice. In order to do this, groups of students have been audio recorded during lesson time in classes led by the same tutor, covering the same materials. Participants were also given a short questionnaire prior to the recording aimed at revealing their perceptions of language use in order to compare with the recordings. It is anticipated that the data will show that code-switching is influenced by the task type and the interlocutor and that students view English as the preferred language yet perhaps are not confident or motivated enough to persevere when they cannot express themselves fully and switch back to Mandarin.
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1. Introduction

An important aspect of being able to conduct successful interactions in conversation is having the ability to initiate and respond appropriately. As situations and contexts vary, so do the requirements of what language an interlocutor selects. This selection can be nuanced, for example linguistic choices made in terms of style or formality, or more obvious as in switching from one language or dialect to another. This linguistic alternation is known as ‘code-switching’ and there are numerous ways in which it can be divided. Code-switching can be separated into categories, two often referred to are situational and metaphorical (Holmes, 2001 p.35). Situational code-switching refers to more topic-based reasons for changing language code, whereas metaphorical has more social functions such as building relationships and solidarity. Additionally, Auer (1998 p. 6) uses the term language mixing to refer to turns in which different languages are alternated to the extent to which neither language is more prominent. This involves substituting words/phrases within a sentences or switching between languages within sentences.

Contexts in which language choices and switching between them exists are known as ‘diglossia’. The term is usually considered as referring to two versions of the same root language with a ‘high’ or more prestige form and a ‘low’ form, more typically found in informal situations (Ferguson, 2007 p. 34). This report will investigate code switching and diglossia in a classroom context. It will provide a background to the context and the study before reviewing current research and literature in relation to these aspects and to sociolinguistic and educational research more generally. The pedagogical approaches informing the methodology and details of how the research was conducted will also be discussed before the results are presented and analysed.

This small sociolinguistic study was conducted in a Sino-British University in China with pre-undergraduate students learning academic reading and writing skills in English before embarking on their undergraduate degrees. Although they were studying general English for Academic Purposes (EAP) at that time, all participants were to be enrolled on Engineering-related bachelors. At this point it is important to note that although the students are from a range of provinces, they do not speak dialect with each other and, perhaps given their age and social status, Mandarin is the dominant language given its wide promotion and the necessity of its use in education (Liang, 2015 p.21). Diglossia is typical in China with Mandarin and dialects both in use, with Mandarin for education and official business1.

In addition to this, English is widely used in Chinese education with English Medium Institutions (EMI) increasing in number, particularly in Higher Education (HE) (Wang and Liu, 2011 p.214) . Coulmas (2013, p. 152) describes code-switching as being contracted at times by ‘institutionalised restrictions’ and those enrolled in the university are expected to speak English in class. This institutionalisation can affect perceptions and beliefs of the students and their families, along with the methods and activities used by teachers (Li and Ruan, 2015, p.48). It is likely that many students, and the vast majority of parents, view the use of English highly and therefore believe it ought to be used in both instruction and communication in various campus contexts.

1 The students refer to Mandarin Chinese as ‘Chinese’, therefore for the purpose of this study the language shall be referred to as such.
This concept of a prestige and therefore ‘high’ form is a feature of diglossia and mirrors the EAP classroom situation to some extent and the language choice investigated may reveal this further.

This project aims to discover whether there exists a classroom diglossia in this context and why and when groups of Chinese students in an EAP classroom choose to use either English or Mandarin Chinese during group work. It investigates whether Chinese is chosen metaphorically as a means of forming bonds and displaying solidarity with their peers (Garrett, 2010 p.11; Fishman, 2007b p.56) or used more situationally depending on the topics and task types set. It also considers the context of the L2 classroom and whether participants choose their language more practically in this context, such as to clarify meaning or when they wish to express themselves (Üstünel, 2016 p.39). The research also gives some attention to the role of interlocutors such as in exchanges with the tutor and the table leader\(^2\), aiming to discover the influence these roles have on code-switching.

The research questions to be addressed are:

- How far does the division of oral communication between English and Chinese used in class match the students’ perception of how much they use each language?
- Can what causes students’ language choices and code-switching be categorised and attributed to anything?
- How much influence does an interlocutor have on group members’ language choice?

It is anticipated that the research will show that:

- Students perceive that they use more English than they actually do as they view it as the ‘high’ form in the classroom context. Trudgill (1972 p.188) reported in his seminal work in Norwich that participants tended to either under or over report their use of prestige language when compared with recordings, this is likely to be a factor here as the subjects are students of English so feel they ought to be using it.
- Causes of code-switching can be attributed to task types or attitudes to ability as certain tasks can be completed more easily in one of the languages.
- Interlocutors such as the tutor and the table leader have influence on language choice. During turn taking a speaker provides an addressee with a ‘role’ thus predicting a response type (Matthiessen and Slade, 2011 p.388) and elicits a language choice.

2. Literature Review

Ferguson (2007 p.34) describes diglossia as being able to develop in a variety of circumstances, yet is primarily involving variations of the same language. However, Fishman (2007a p.49) proports the existence of diglossia in any situation in which multiple roles and accesses can be determined through language. Thus, given shared socio-historical features such as a high and low form many types of circumstances can

\(^2\) The table leader is a particular method of engagement used for these classes in which one learner is chosen to lead their table for that lesson. Their role is to initiate discussions and to feedback to the teacher in open class or close monitoring at various stages throughout the session and the responsibility is given to different students each lesson to maintain parity. It is widely accepted within foreign language learning that students perform better with peer support and time to formulate responses as opposed to being called upon on the spot.
be considered diglossic (Meyerhoff, 2006 p.119) even, perhaps a classroom. In contrast, Gardner-Chloros’ (2009 p.69) research into code switching argues that a diglossia cannot exist in the classroom context as learner’s choose rather than are obliged to use a particular form.

Although there is little on the concept of a classroom diglossia, there is a considerable body of research into EMIs and linguistic beliefs associated with the Chinese context. Wei, Feng and Ma (2017 p. 46) conducted numerous student surveys regarding the necessity of English as a language of instruction in higher education, with over 80% of respondents deeming it necessary. Lin (1996 p. 53) cited the need to be proficient in English in order to succeed as the commonly held view in the study into code-switching in Hong Kong. This is echoed in research by Pan and Block (2011 p.395-6) in which both teachers and students viewed English as an important means to become more international and aid career progression, thus giving English prestige status in Chinese HE.

The participants in this study are referred to as ‘Chinese learners’ , which Gu (2011 p.217) describes as among the most prominently researched collectives in higher education. Although much of this research is too homogenous to consider the complexities of multiple individuals on such a large scale, particularly considering issues with cultural labelling (Eisenhart, 2001 p. 217) and the maturing of students as they progress through university (Gu, 2011 p.218), some similarities between learners can be drawn. These can be seen in motivation, attitudes and input/experience of English.

One widely reported similarity of Chinese learners in EMIs, is that motivation is often behind students’ approach to spoken English. Gu’s (2011 p.219) study also found that the main motivation for studying at a British university was academic accreditation, with linguistic and cultural development a lesser focus. Peng and Woodrow (2011 p. 855) comment on the socio-cultural view of exam importance as a result of previous learning experience for this group. Similarly, Li and Ruan (2015 p. 48) and Pan and Block (2011 p.401) claim that prior assessment with a heavy focus on reading and writing is likely to lead to a focus on the acquisition of those skills to achieve assessment objectives, often at the expense of oral communication.

Student attitudes and beliefs, Aragão (2011 p.303) argues, can heavily influence emotions and this impacts on behaviour. While researchers often attribute behaviours to Chinese learners based on our own cultural norms (Stanley, 2011 p.112), many learners do conform to the Confucian heritage learner profile of experiencing anxiety and wishing to save face. More specifically to this context, research by Liu and Jackson (2011, p. 127) into Chinese students in an EMI context reported students felt particularly anxious when unprepared and addressing the class yet more confident in smaller groups. Therefore the language choice a table leader makes can impact widely on those of the whole group who may follow so-called ‘addressee-based’ code-switching (Meyerhoff, 2006 p. 121). Furthermore, Wei (2007 p.7) claims that bilingualism, and therefore code-switching, is as much about attitude as language, and the choice of one language over another may simply be the desire to opt for the unmarked variety (Coulmas, 2013 p. 137).

Previous research into bilingual contexts with Chinese learners have observed speakers often have little input in English outside the classroom. This results in feeling un-
natural conversing with classmates in English and a higher frequency of code-switching (Lin, 1996 p. 64). This can also result in ‘conflict control’ (Shay, 2015 p.468), where speakers reiterate points in their stronger language to either display understanding or avoid misunderstanding (Üstünel, 2016 p. 39).

Much research suggests that investigation into code switching and attitudes ‘appear to warrant more attention’ (Garrett, 2010 p. 78) and that it is ‘worthwhile’ to pursue studies that reveal social attitudinal changes (McKenzie and Carrie, 2018 p. 832). As the volume of EMIs in China grows, in order to maintain effective teaching and learning strategies, it is necessary to shed more light on the learners’ attitudes and beliefs (Li and Ruan, 2015, p. 45) to inform curriculum planning and development of learning environments. Gardener-Chloros (2009, p. 142) cites limited research into code-switching by learners of a second language, particularly into some of the variables in the Chinese/English speaker context (Wei, Milroy and Ching, 2007 p. 156). This group of participants addresses elements of this as there are fewer variables in terms of age, class and generation. Dixon and Zhao (2017, p.210) state that more research is needed into the relationship between the student perception of their abilities and how useful English is to them.

3. Methodology

As the research questions are based on use of language and inclusive of choice and identity, this study has taken an overall qualitative approach. Upon ethics approval, the data collection was conducted through a short online questionnaire (see appendix) consisting of 12 questions which had 43 respondents. Additionally, selected groups of 3-4 students were recorded and the data transcribed and analysed. The selection of three groups was based on researcher observations aiming to cover a variation including strong, confident speakers of English, a mixed ability group and a typically quiet, weaker group to form a triangular approach to the study. The groups recorded were in classes following the same lesson plan with the same tutor. Such mixed methodology is often viewed as beneficial in sociolinguistics to provide a more thorough investigation of the data (Angouri, 2010 p. 30; Dornyei, 2001 p.49). Ethical considerations were made when selecting participants, particularly as there is a perceived power relationship between tutor and student. All subjects were provided with bilingual participation information forms, anonymity and could withdraw at any time. The results will be available for any participants who wish to view them and will go on to inform curriculum development.

Rasinger (2010 p. 60) cites questionnaires as frequently employed to investigate language attitudes and choices, as a result a questionnaire was chosen for this research. It is argued that eliciting data relating to attitudes from conversational recordings is difficult, therefore focused questionnaires are recommended (Sunderland, 2010 p. 23). In this case, questions took the approach to studying language attitude using direct and indirect methods (Garrett, 2010 p.37). Participants were not only asked explicitly their reasons for code-switching but also asked questions which indirectly revealed attitudes to some extent, such as in ranking importance of skills, attributes and perceptions of their own use of language. It was decided that some questions should be open in order to avoid influencing participants’ choices and restricting them to multiple choice options. In accordance with accepted practice, there was a final question confirming the responses could be used in this research.
There are limitations in using this method to inform of language attitudes however, particularly as there is the issue of participants wishing to produce desirable answers for the researchers (Liang, 2015 p. 39; Garrett, 2010 p.42; Boberg 2013 p. 134). This is especially true in this case with the researchers’ teacher-student relationship with the participants likely to influence their desire to project a positive attitude to speaking English. Also, as previously mentioned, there is also the risk of participants over reporting.

Dornyei (2001, p.49) notes the complementary nature of using qualitative methods to supplement sociolinguistics research, thus providing deeper understanding and analysis. Similarly, Navarro and Thornton (2011 p. 290) question the direct approach and suggest that more research focusing on behaviour and interaction is required. Meanwhile Gumperz’s significant work in using a Conversation Analysis of transcripts in code-switching highlighted the importance of ‘Interactional Sociolinguistics’ (Gordon, 2011 p.67). In terms of this study, such views led to the inclusion of data collected from audio recordings which could then have the interaction analysed and compared with questionnaire data to show the differences in perception and reality, as outlined by Gee (2014 p.25-6) and Trudgill (1972 p. 188).

Hymes (1964 p.3) noted that communication and ethnography were needed in order to understand where language exists within another culture, rather than simply analysing the linguistics. This perspective meant that in order to fully examine language choice and code-switching, a variety of group types needed to be recorded. Constraints of time and number of ethics respondents meant that recording all groups was unfeasible, therefore three groups were selected based on the researcher’s perceptions of language use prior to detailed investigation. The use of tutor observations and data collected from experience has been gaining wider acceptance in academia (Duff, 2008 p.201) and Creese (2010 p.140) gives multiple examples of these methods being used in classroom contexts, which suggested it would be effective for this study.

4. Results

The questionnaire had 43 respondents aged between 18-19 spread over four different classes, all of whom were Chinese and enrolled on foundation year programmes. All participants were studying EAP and would go on to study a field of Engineering. The participants had all been exposed to similar teaching style and classroom management within this environment and were familiar with group work and the table leader strategy employed by the researcher.

The first questions (Q1-2) addressed the students’ perception of the quantity of spoken English they used in class and their desired quantity. As can be seen by the table around half of the participants believed they spoke mostly in English and just under 40% an even split between the two languages. Only one student believed they only used English in class, compared with almost a third desiring to use English only. The largest percentage again was the category of mostly English, some Chinese in terms of desired language use with only a single participant aiming for half and half. None of the respondents expressed perception or desire to use only Chinese language in this context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of language</th>
<th>Participants' perceived use</th>
<th>Participants' desired use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly English, some Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half English, half Chinese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Chinese, some English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Perceived use of Language

The next set of questions (Q3-7) examined group work and interlocutors. When addressed in Chinese, nine students would respond in Chinese and four in English, whereas when addressed in English only six believed they would respond in English and seven in Chinese which seems to contradict the answers given in Q1. In contrast, Q5 reveals that no participants would say they began discussions in Chinese if they were table leader. Thirty out of forty opted for ‘it depends’ for both Q3 and 4 and three for Q5, therefore Q6 was left an open question form for expanding on this. A pattern of similar responses emerged and were organised as in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent factors</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>difficult task/topic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to express ideas</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relation to task</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language ability of group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Dependent Factors for Language Choices

Q8 and 9 focused on the effect of task type on language choice and again used open questions. Despite being open, there were noticeable patterns in their responses. Most significantly, English exam preparation based discussion tasks and discussions based on a specific question were frequently cited as activities that elicited English, making up almost 50% of responses. Similarly, over a third of respondents cited difficult topics or concepts as a reason for opting for Chinese and discussions about gossip and new vocabulary were only mentioned in relation to using Chinese in class. One category that proved divisive was general discussion and teamwork as these concepts were mentioned almost equally when asked about both languages, with 12 respondents claiming to use English and 9 Chinese.

Finally, the participants were asked to rank skills (Q10) and desires (Q11), and the general role of English in China (Q12). It can be seen from the data that exam per-
formance and practicing oral English were deemed most important and building relationships with classmates more important than impressing the tutor. Not making mistakes did not appear to be of great concern in the questionnaire. Contrary to previously cited literature, the majority of the participants ranked oral communication skills as more important than reading and writing skills and grammar. The general response Q12 regarding the role of English in China was varied from positive and enjoyable to necessary if not always useful.

Groups were selected for the recordings from two of classes which completed the questionnaire and were chosen based on tutor perception of how much English they generally spoke in class. There groups consisted of a high-level group who complete most tasks in English as a variable and two mixed ability groups who tend to use both languages and represent the most frequently observed dynamics in this context based on researcher experience. In order to distinguish between participants’ perceived and actual language use, each group was coded and the number of turns in each language added and compared in the charts below.

![Figure 3: Division of Language used per group](image)

The first group used mostly English whereas the mixed groups relied heavily on Chinese and also showed greater proportions of mixed turns.

The transcription was then analysed according to language functions. There were found to be three main functions of exchanges: clarification, discussion of tasks and gossip. It was found that Chinese was consistently selected by all groups for clarification of tasks and for gossip, with English not used for these functions. The discussions were of various tasks being undertaken throughout the lesson, these saw a mix of languages frequently employed. The tasks and the language choice can be divided as according to the table below:
This data is more ambiguous in terms of function, Group 1 used limited Chinese and mixing, mostly keeping their interaction in English. Groups 2 and 3 employed much more Chinese and mixing to negotiate their discussions, although Group 3’s use varied considerably more, which perhaps is a result of the higher volume of turns taken throughout the lesson.

Finally, the responses to interlocutors such as the tutor and table leader yielded some interesting results. In Group 1 the role of interlocutor was significant in either language. Even when a conversation had continued in English, there was an example of a response in Chinese to a question posed in Chinese a few lines earlier. The table leader (A) in this group started all discussions in English worked to maintain this, frequently posing questions and taking the responsibility of starting a move. This groups’ interactions with the tutor were all conducted in English and continued in thus as the tutor left the conversation. The other two groups were similar to each other, yet markedly different from the first group. Both table leaders (H in group 2, J in group 3) began conversational moves in either language contradicting claims in Q5, there was also a tendency to start in English and switch mid-sentence to Chinese. In general, tutor interruptions as a direct interlocutor in a conversation triggered a code-switch to English as long as the tutor remained with the group. There are examples of the tutor posing a question then walking away or giving a prompt to the whole class without becoming an active interlocutor, in these cases both groups typically switched back to Chinese.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The results confirm that there is a disparity for most students between their perception of language use and the reality of how much of each language they speak in the classroom. The variable Group 1 however, were more aligned with the questionnaire results, yet even if the single respondent who perceives they only speak English in class was in fact in this group, all participants had at least one turn in Chinese. The view of English as the prestige ‘high’ form could not be confirmed. Despite over reporting by most respondents, the mixed usage and the answers to the questionnaire, particularly
Q12, revealed that although there is a generally positive attitude to the role of English in China and students enrolled in EMIs would like to use English, it is not such a high priority and academic achievement either in a task or assessment results takes a precedent.

Code-switching did appear to be influenced by task, ability and interlocutor. Certain task types or language functions were operated almost entirely in Chinese such as clarification of instructions and gossiping. Although the questionnaire elicited different types of discussions as reasons for using English or switching, the transcriptions gave a clearer insight into which discussions were conducted in which language. It also demonstrated the difference in the higher Group 1 compared to the other groups with certain discussion types, suggesting that certain language functions may be assimilated first such as hypothesising, giving advice and discussing paraphrasing compared with negotiating correct grammar and vocabulary. The interlocutors appeared to conform more to the ideas of social code-switching and relationship building as speakers tended to accommodate to each other.

In conclusion, students in an EAP classroom generally use more code-switching and Chinese than they perceived. This appeared to be influenced by task and interlocutor to some extent, with some circumstances more clear-cut than others. Certain task types or language functions were operated almost entirely in Chinese such as clarification of instructions and gossiping. Although the questionnaire elicited different types of discussions as reasons for using English or switching, the transcriptions gave a clearer insight into which discussions were conducted in which language. It also demonstrated the difference in a more linguistically competent group with certain discussion types. The interlocutors appeared to conform more to the ideas of social code-switching and relationship building as speakers tended to accommodate to each other. Despite over reporting by most respondents, the mixed usage and questionnaire answers, particularly to Q12, revealed that although there is a generally positive attitude to the role of English in China and students enrolled in EMIs would like to use English, it is not such a high priority and academic achievement either in a task or assessment results takes a precedent.

There are limitations to the outcomes of this study with a small percentage of the student cohort recorded. It is likely that there are considerably more variables on a larger scale and wider in-depth investigation could reveal more of the complexity of language choice in the EAP classroom. Additionally, as the same lesson was used to maintain parity, it gives a narrow selection of activities and language functions. As the outcomes of sociolinguistic studies in contexts such as education can be well utilised to provide positive impact (Lawson and Sayers, 2016 p.19), this study will be used in course planning and curriculum design to facilitate communication in English in EAP classrooms in line with students’ perceptions and desires. More locally, it will also be used to improve and develop the researcher as a tutor, particularly as an interlocutor.
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Appendix

Q1 - Which best represents the balance of English and Chinese you actually speak in class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mostly English, some Chinese</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Half English, half Chinese</td>
<td>39.53%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mostly Chinese, some English</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Only Chinese</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2 - Which best represents the balance of English and Chinese you would like to speak in class?
Q3 - If your group is speaking in Chinese during a class activity, do you respond in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mostly English, some Chinese</td>
<td>69.77%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Half English, half Chinese</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mostly Chinese, some English</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Only Chinese</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4 - If your group is speaking in English during a class activity, do you respond in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It depends</td>
<td>69.77%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It depends</td>
<td>69.77%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5 - If you are the table leader, do you start discussions in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>93.02%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It depends</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 - If you answered 'it depends', what does it depend on?

If you answered 'it depends', what does it depend on?

- level of question
- Can I Express my ideas
- Do I know what the word is
- My knowledge
- the topic
  - if the topic is difficult foe me, i will speak Chinese
  - whether I know how to answer in English.
  - if the topic is tough enough
- Whether the question is official
- When it comes to problems that is irrelevant to the lesson, chinese, otherwise, English
Whether I can explain the issue well in English
The difficulty of the problem.
if I can respond clearly in English
whether I have the ability to express my idea in English. Depends on my vocabulary.
if I master the vocabulary.
whether I can express what I want to say clearly, and whether my classmates can understand and whether they want to talk in English or Chinese
Weather I know how to explain
Emmm
If my idea can be simply understand by others in English
emotion
...who knows. Maybe whether I can express it in English.
If I can express my feelings correctly in English, if so I will speak English, or I will use Chinese.
other mates
if we can express it clearly in English
If it is too hard for me to express in English, I'll use Chinese in a low voice to express.
how difficult the words are

Q7 - If you are speaking Chinese with your group and your tutor comes over do you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stop speaking</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Switch to English</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue speaking in Chinese</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 - What types of activities make you choose to work with your group in English?

What types of activities make you choose to work with your group in English?

- answer questions
- discuss
- Discuss topic we have learned or pre-viewed
- discussion
- Teamwork
- discussion
- Discuss an answer for a problem, maybe everyone's opinion about something.
- answer the question.
- Discussion
- discussion about a certain situation
- Discuss the question asked by tutors
- discussion
- Discussion practice
- discussion
- group discussion
- all things
- may be discussion about article, lecture
- When it is a good time to practice my spoken English
- simple discuss. answer tutor's questions.
- Preparing and practicing for discussion exam.
- Discussion
- Discussion
- discussing questions or ideas
- Something isn't hard for me to use English
- group discussion
- Just simple communication about study and knowledge.
- Funny and not so difficult
- discussion
Questions or answers are easy to understand and we can easily say that out.

answering questions, group discussion
answer specific questions
discuss
the discussion maybe
discussion
Practice some speaking task like group discussion
Those have new vocabulary especially
discussion

Q9 - What types of activities make you choose to work with your group in Chinese?

What types of activities make you choose to work with your group in Chinese?
discussion
new words I don't know
Not familiar
hard to explain in english
gossip?
After-school planing
role play
When we need to describe a figure or explain something to our tutor.
discuss
Nothing
discussion about a certain situation
... free talk
QR quiz
Activities need to raise a solution
explanation about some difficult problem
definition, answering tough questions
some special or difficult problems
may be discussion about article, lectureo
maybe when it is hard to explain or understand in English
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>complex topic discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolving the questions of the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing questions or ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something I can't use English to express myself clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something do not familiar with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some need professional words and we can use English to express it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult one and not easy to express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complicated discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something that is hard to understand like words or phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actually no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion difficult topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the topic hard to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the discussion of the problem from the booklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some tasks that I cannot express in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just use in some difficult part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities with specific words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 - Put these things in order (1 = most important) for you in your English classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Getting good grades</td>
<td>46.34%</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Being friends with classmates</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Making the tutor happy</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
<td>53.66%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Practicing speaking in English</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
<td>46.34%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not making any mistakes</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Red: Getting good grades
- Blue: Being friends with classmates
- Green: Making the tutor happy
- Yellow: Practicing speaking in English
- Orange: Not making any mistakes
Q11 - Put the skills in order (1 = most important) for you in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oral communication skills (speaking and listening)</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>12.82%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written communication skills (reading and writing)</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammar and vocabulary</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>48.72%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 - What do you think about the role of speaking English in China?

What do you think about the role of speaking English in China?

- not too bad
- use for communicating with foreigners
- If it's for between Chinese, it's kinda silly, if between two countries, sure why not
- Vital
- nice
- Not bad
- maybe not useful, because when people are facing some difficulties, they can't help speaking Chinese
- it doesn't influence most of people's life. The main role of English speaking is to show the ability of that person.
- academic use
- It gives you more working opportunities.
- this important for people who are open mind
Communicate with friends from other countries.

good

More relevant on grades, I think

important

It's a necessary skill for the youngster.

Maybe not completed

It's a fundamental skill today.

It's not a perfect surroundings in China because of education but it is a good place in UNNC in campus, it is great and admirable, in my hometown, it is weird. but it is an important skill for Chinese.

It's a good thing maybe.

Interesting

It's simple and that must be an interesting guy that want to learn English well or very confident in English speaking.

It's a good chance to prepare for studying abroad.

I do have no idea about this. Sorry about this.

If we just study for English, it is important. But if just for communication, it is not essential.

It's a bridge to other countries.

great and interesting but because of the lack of vocabulary, sometime I can not express myself in easy way.

Has been treated too little.

not too bad

Happy

To enhance the global eyesight

useful in some area

Enable people to understand the outside world

no ideas

practice and learning
Are you happy for your answers to be included in Lola's research? (the answers are anonymous)